

A true report of the disputation or rather priuate conference had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581. Set downe by the reuerend learned men them selues that dealt therein. VVhereunto is ioyned also a true report of the other three dayes conferences had there with the same Iesuite. Which nowe are thought meete to be published in print by  
 authoritie

Nowell, Alexander, 1507?-1602.

1583

A true report of the Disputation or rather priuate Conference had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581.

Set downe by the Reuerend learned men them selues that dealt therein.

Whereunto is ioyned also a true report of the other three dayes conferences had there with the same Iesuite. Which nowe are thought meete to be published in print by authoritie.

IMPRINTED AT LONDON by Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie, Ianuarij. 1. 1583.

## ERRATA.

A. signifieth the first page. B. the second. The numbers shewe the line

	Faulte	Correction.
C. ii. a. line last.	commoda for	commoda.
D. ii. a. 25. in the margent.	Normam	Limam.
D. ii. b. 36.	both	loth.
D. iii. a. 27.	lewd	lowd.
D. iii. b. 19	Proofe	processe.
H. iii. line last.	by	in.
D d. iii. b. 9.	iustified	infected.

## To the Reader.

MAster Campions Booke being at large answered shortly after our conference with him, which was concerning certaine points in the beginning of the fayd booke onely: and our sayd conference also, being partly remembred in the saide answere of his booke, (though we had immediatly vpon the sayd conference, set downe in writing certaine notes of the same, out of our fresh memorie to all euent:) Yet we thought there was no cause, the whole booke being confuted, why we should publish our dealing with him, concerning a fewe pointes in the beginning thereof onely, specially Master Campion being now dead, and not to replie thereunto himselfe: so that we layd aside our notes, and without all thought of any publishing of them at all. But there hauing bene sithen by others the faouurers of him and his cause partly in print, but in written Pamphlets much more dispersed, wherein Master Campions surmised glorious conquest against vs, is exceedingly set forth, and some of them so confidently, that in the conclusion thereof the Authour saithe: The Catholikes by the iudgement of those that were not wedded wholly to will, did get the Goale. And againe: In my soule I protest, that in any indifferent iudgement, the aduerse protestaunts were quite confounded: and if I were not a Catholique already, the onely hearing of that conference, would haue made me one.

Vpon such vntruthes and impudencie of such writers, we were partly of our selues enclined, and by the often and earnest exhortations of others importuned, and by some of great authoritie almost inforced to set downe the true report of the saide conference: whereby we trust that all those Catholiques, as they woulde be called, that haue any sparke of shamefastnesse left, may blush for Master Campions sake, being so manifestly deprehended in so many lyes so braggingly aduouched, and in print in the Lattin tongue published to the worlde.

Surely we doe thinke our selues, and may say in trueth, that if we had bene so openly conuicted, so many wayes and in such sorte, as Master Campion then was: we should while we liued, be ashamed to shewe our faces. And we haue indeede heretofore, out of our fresh memories then, made reporte of diuers partes of this our conference vnto diuers persons as occasion hath serued, and not dissembled, that we found not Campion such a man, as by his challenge and booke, and other mens reportes of him we looked for: and that vpon this our conference with him, we verely thought the booke published in his name, to haue bene none of his. But by such Pamphlets as these be, and like reports by word, his surmised victories against vs were so speedily suread abroade, that diuers Gentlemen and others, neither vnlearned, nor of them selues euill affected, gaue not much credite to our sayings: of that value is the first report in some eares and heades, which hath among other things moued vs not a litle, to set downe at the last this our true report of our saide conference, vpon hope, that trueth in time may take place. We doe knowe they will cauill at this, as our biting of a dead man, whome being aliue, they will say, we could not all matche But the trueth is, we doe defende our selues against the backbitings of many slaunderous reporters, who doe yet liue and lurke in euery corner, by false reportes and writings continually indeuouring to suppress, or at the least to blemish the trueth, vpon euery least occasion offered or sought. As first they began, so they continue. For whereas diuers of vs at diuers times had

A true report of the conference had with Campion and others, by the Deane of Paules and the Deane of Windsor, in the Tower of London the last of August, the 23. yere of the Queenes Maiestie, and of the Lord 1581. 3

conference with Campion and his fellowes, the time being such, that so many of vs as could get leaue, when we had once conferred with him & his fellowes, departed into the countrey from whence we were called: and others remaining in the citie, assaying whether it might please God, that they could doe any good with them to their reformation: this was foorthwith by reportes and pamphlets euery where so framed and dispersed, as though Campion like some great beare or Lyon rather (as they woulde haue him seeme) had shaken vs all off like cowardly cures one after another. But that religion can not long stand, that is vnderpropt and stayed by such impudent lyes, as amongst many other things may well appeare to all, that with indifferencie, without foreiudgement, will reade and consider our true reporte of the sayd conference. Which why we haue not published it before, and why we doe publish it nowe, we haue shewed the true causes, howsoever they shall cauill, that vpon misliking of our parts, we haue not published it hitherto, and find fault also that we haue published it nowe. Surely we with good conscience may affirme this our report, in the substance of matter to be most true, though our memorie could not alwayes retaine the order, or the very wordes wherein euery sentence was vttered.

A. Nowell.

W. Daije.

## **A true report of the conference had with Campion and others, by the Deane of Paules and the Deane of Windsor, in the Tower of London the last of August, the 23. yere of the Queenes Maiestie, and of the Lord 1581.**

WE the Deane of Paules & the Deane of Windsor (being sent to the Tower to haue conference with Master Campion and his fellowes in matters of Religion, and by order of Master Lieutenant, admitted into the Chappel of the Tower, whither the said Campion and others were brought) shortly after our meeting, sayd to Master Campion, that we came thither to the end to do him good, if it might please God to giue such good successe, howsoever he or any other should thinke otherwise of vs. And because it should not seeme to him, that our meaning was to take any aduantage against him by our sudden comming to him, we our selues being prepared for the Conference: we sayd we intended to deale with him in no other matters, then such as were contained in his owne booke, by him so much studied, written, and so lately published in print: wherin he hauing made so large a Challenge as he had, we sayde, we thought he could not thinke himselfe to be suddenly taken as unprouided. Of which speach he seemed not much to mislike, onely he sayd, that he vnderstoode not of our comming.

Then we beginning with the first part of his sayd booke, did demaund of him with what reason he could charge the Queenes Maiesties most mercifull gouernment, and vs that at this time professe the Gospel (as he did in y Preface of his said booke) with unused and strange crueltie and torments, practised vpon his fellowes in religion:

seeing that the Authors and professors of their Religion, had most cruelly burnt aliue, so many thousands of vs, for the maintenance of our Religion onely, besides diuers other wayes of most horrible torments: whereas none of them was euer executed for Religion, but either for treason, or some other notorious crime punishable with death by ye Lawes of ye Realme.

Whereunto he answered, that he was punished for Religion himselfe, and had bene twice on the Racke, and that racking was more grieuous then hanging, and that he had rather chuse to be hanged then racked.

Whereunto one of vs sayd, that belike Master Campion being the Popes tender Pernell, accounteth a litle racking of him selfe, to be more crueltie, then the roasting quicke of many thousands of vs.

You must (quoth Master Campion) consider the cause: the cause why, and not the punishment onely.

It hath bene euer your maner sayd we, not onely to vse petitione principij, but totius also: not only to require a principal point in controuersie, but euen ye whole it self to be graunted vnto you: as that your cause is good, and that you be the true Church of Christ, as you continually presume and take vnto you. But thanks be to God, the contrarie hath bene so prooued, that a great part of Christendome doeth evidently see it. And many thousands, who were before of your Church, haue fled to vs from it, as from the synagogue of Antichrist. And concerning his racking, Master Lieutenant being present, sayde, that he had no cause to complaine of racking, who had rather seene then felt the racke: and admonished him to vse good speache, that hee gaue not cause to be vsed with more seuerity. For although (said he) you were put to the racke, yet notwithstanding you were so fauourable vsed therein, as being taken off, you could, and did presently go thence to your lodging without helpe, and vse your handes in writing, and all other partes of your body: which you could not haue done, if you had bene put to that punishment, with any such extremitie as you speake of. Besides this, Master Beale one of the Clarks of her Maiesties priuie Counsell, being by chaunce present, demaunded of him before all the companie there assembled, whether that being on the racke, he were examined vpon any point of Religion or no:

Whereunto he answered, that he was not in deede directly examined of Religion, but moued to confesse in what places he had bene conuersant, since his repaire into the Realme.

Master Beale sayde, that this was required of him, because many of his fellowes, and by likelihood he him selfe also, had reconciled diuers of her Highnes subiectes to the Romish Church, and had attempted to withdrawe them from their obedience due to their naturall Prince and Soueraigne.

Whereunto he answered, that forasmuch as the Christians in olde time being commanded to deliuer vp the bookes of their Religion to such as persecuted them, refused so to doe, and misliked with them that did so, calling them Traditores: he might not betray his Catholike brethren, which were (as he sayd) the temples of the holy Ghost.

But it was replied by Master Beale, that it was conuenient in policie for the Prince to vnderstande, what such as were sent from the Bishop of Rome (her Maiesties and the Realmes mortall enemy) did within her dominions: and to knowe her foes from her faithful subiects, specially in such a time as this, wherein we liue: & that this

inquirie did not touch the cause of Religion. After this we came to the matter of his booke.

And first, where he chargeth vs that we haue nowe of a sudden, cut off many goodly and principall partes of the holy Scriptures from the whole body thereof, of meere desperation and distrust in our cause (as hee writeth:) and for example and prooffe thereof, he nameth first the Epistle of Saint Iames, which Luther, that flagitious Apostata saith he) in the Preface of the same Epistle, and in his booke, De captiuitate Babilonica, nameth contentious, puffed vp, drie or barren, & as a thing stuffed with strawe, and iudgeth it vnworthie the Apostolique spirit: wee answered, that if Luther had so written, yet Master Campion did vs wrong, to charge vs with violating of the Maiestie of the holy Bible, for reiecting of the sayde Epistle of S. Iames, who doe, and alwayes haue receiued the same Epistle. Yet we prayed him that he would shewe these wordes, in the places by him noted: which he sayd he would, if he had the booke. The booke, wherein was Luthers Preface to that Epistle being deliuered him, when he had read some part of the sayd Preface, and found that Luther did allowe and commend that Epistle, as in deede he doeth, testifying, that though it were reiected of some olde writers, yet he commended it and tooke it to be good and profitable: which wordes of Luther when Master Campion had read, he shut the booke and sayde, that it was not of the true edition.

Flagitiosus  
Apostata.  
Contentiosam,  
tumidam,  
aridam,  
stramineam.

Lutherus in  
praefat. in  
epist. Iacobi.  
Hanc epistolam  
S. Iacobi laudo  
& pro vtili ae  
commodo  
habeo.

We answered that the print was not lately published, being almost fourtie yeeres sithence, and that we had searched all other printes that we could come by, and found them to agree with this: and that we thought there was no other, and therefore we prayed him, that he would shewe some edition wherein it was so set downe, as he alleaged it in his booke.

He sayd, he thought it was so as he had alleaged in the same booke of Luther in the Dutch tongue.

Then we offered to bring him the Dutch booke for the triall of the trueth of the Latin translation: but he refused to see the same. But it was aduouched vnto him (as the trueth is in deede) that it was likewise in the Dutch booke, as he had read it in the Latin, for that we had made conference thereof.

Then he desired to see Luthers booke, De captiuitate Babilonica. This booke also we deliuered to him, and desired that he would shewe those wordes there. He read the wordes in Latin, which are these in effect: I passe ouer (saith Luther) that many doe very probablie affirme, that this Epistle is not Saint Iames the Apostles, nor worthie the Apostolike spirit. Here Master Campion thought that he had founde at the least, that Luther had sayd, that the sayd Epistle, was not worthie the Apostolike spirit.

But wee prayed him to consider, that Luther spake of other mens iudgement, and not of his owne, as in the same place is most eident to see: and also before in his Preface to that Epistle he expresly deuideth his iudgement from theirs.

But Master Campion much vrged the wordes (very probably) whereby saith he, Luther shewed his allowance of their iudgement.

We answered, that he so sayde, for that they brought very probable reasons for that their iudgement. But he still charged Luther with blasphemie for saying that some doe very probably affirme, that the Epistle of Iames, was not written by the Apostle Saint Iames, nor worthie the spirite of an Apostle, and vrged vs to answer what opinion we had of that Epistle, meaning to intangle vs with that Dilemma

either to condemne Luther, or else to doubt of the Epistle, as Luther saith that some probable doe.

We answered that our Church doubteth not of that Epistle, but receiue it as Canonical, readeth it in our Churches, expoude it in our scholes, and allegeth it for confirmation of doctrine. Notwithstanding for Luther or any other to say, that some haue very probably affirmed that Epistle not to be written by Saint Iames nor to be worthie the spirite of an Apostle, is no blasphemie.

It is blasphemie, blasphemie (quoth he) pronoucing those words with disdainfull countenance and voyce.

It is soone said (quoth we) but not so easely proued.

I will proue it (quoth he) to be blasphemie by two reasons, and thus he framed a syllogisme.

The Gospell of Saint Iohn, and the Epistle of Saint Iames, were written by the same spirite:

But to say that some doe probably affirme the Gospell of Saint Iohn not to be written by Saint Iohn, nor to be worthie the spirite of an Apostle is blasphemie:

Therefore to say yt like of Saint Iames Epistle is blasphemy.

Answer was made that the Maior was Petitio Principij the challenging of the graunt of that which chiefly is in controuersie. For those that so say of Saint Iames Epistle, doubt whether it was written by the same Spirite, that the Gospell of Saint Iohn was or no: and that still resteth for you to proue said we.

And here Master Campion when he coulde not denie, that he required that to be graunted to him which he should haue proued, was put to silence, and had no more to replie.

Then was his second reason called for, but none could be found.

Then saide one of them, Why, is not Saint Iames Epistle called the Catholike Epistle of Saint Iames? Howe doe you then denie it to be Canonickall?

It was said, that that was a simple reason. For whereas other Epistles of the Apostles, were written vnto speciall Cities, people or persons: this of Saint Iames, for that it was written commonly to all the tribes of the Iewes dispersed, was called Catholike or generall.

Then sayd we to the auditorie: You haue heard that Luther doeth much commend this Epistle of Saint Iames, as good and profitable: and Master Campion alleadgeth, that he calleth it contentious, puffed vp, drie or barren, stuffed with strawe, and vnworthie the Apostolike spirit. Whereby (sayd we) ye may see the diuersitie or rather contrarietie of Luthers wordes, and Master Campions reporte, and so may ye iudge of his synceritie & trueth, which he vseth likewise continually.

Then saide Master Campion, that Luther himselfe and others had purged these workes, and taken away all such places as that was, and the like that ministred such occasions of offence as that did: and he said he woulde procure from the Emperours Maiestie, and the Duke of Bauaria, and from another Prince (whose name we remember not) the true copies of those bookes to be sent to the Queenes Maiestie. Which wordes he (rising vp from the forme whereon he sate) pronouced with so great contention of voyce, and with such gesture, casting vp his armes, & beating vpon his booke, that one of vs challenged him therefore, demaunding why he vsed such outrageous speach and behauiour?

He answered, for that so many yong Catholiques were present there, he woulde not by any faint defending of the cause, giue them occasion of offence.

Whereby we vnderstande, howe he would haue behaued him selfe, might he haue obtained a disputation among the youth of the Uniuersities, trusting they woulde be caryed away many of them by such his bolde and confident dealings and actions.

And we saide further to Master Campion, that if Luther had purged his books, & where he first reiected Saint Iames Epistle (as Master Campion saith) he hath sithen receiued and much commended it: with whatreason hath Master Campion charged vs vpon his surmise of Luthers first writing, which doth no where appeare as reiecting Saint Iames Epistle? He should rather haue commended vs, who doe and alwayes haue allowed of that Epistle, and should haue praised Luther, who after the example of Saint Augustine (and other ancient and godly writers) had amended in his writing that which vpon better aduise he misliked.

Then we turning to the auditorie, sayd, that seeing all the printed Bookes of Luther extant, that we could finde, doe containe such commendations of Saint Iames Epistle as they had heard, and that Master Campion hath charged Luther so contrarily to all his printed bookes, wherein he commendeth that Epistle, and therby also chargeth vs as reiecting it, who euer haue receiued it: they might, we said, take Master Campions trueth and synceritie to be as it is, vntill he haue brought out his copies from the Emperour and the Duke of Bauaria, which he nor any liuing we beleue can euer doe.

But Master Campion said, that might he haue his own bookes from Oxeforde, he woulde shewe that in Luther, which he had written of him.

Whereunto it was answered, that if he woulde let vs knowe where they were, we would become humble suters to their honors, that he might both enioye his bookes, and that the partie who had them in keeping might be without daunger. But this woulde he not consent vnto.

Then Hart one of his fellowes saide, that he being at Rome, heard Bellarminus the reader of controuersies there affirme, that the wordes reported by Campion in his booke were in that preface of Luther, and that therefore vpon his worde it was so.

Whereunto we answered, that neither his wordes, nor the testimonie of Bellarminus were of sufficient credite to carry away such a matter as that was without better prooffe, specially so many and most manifest proofes in Luthers printed bookes being to the contrarie, who agreeth with vs in allowing the said Epistle, and that therefore Master Campion hath most impudently alleadged this place of Luther, as a profe that we should reiect S. Iames Epistle.

Then Master Beale said, It is not materiall to vs, if Luther had once so written: but he asked Master Campion whether euer he did read him selfe any such wordes in Luther, as he in his booke doeth charge him with, or not?

Whereto he answered, that in a treatise made by Doctor Lee, sometime Archbishoppe of Yorke, against that booke of Luther intituled De captiuitate Babilonica, he had read these wordes alleadged, as he had set them downe in his booke.

Being againe asked, whether either vpon his othe, or vpon his credit, he would say to the presence there assembled, that he had euer seene the places alleadged by him in his booke: and whether he knewe them to be true?

He answered, that he wrote his booke as he traueiled, and that he coulde not, we

S. Aug. in his  
booke of  
retractations.

knewe, cary a librarie about with him, and therefore he was forced to giue credite to his notes.

We said it was more credible, that he brought the saide booke ouer with him, readie framed by the common and long conference of him selfe, and his fellowe Iesuites at conuenient opportunitie suddenly to be published, rather then yt he did write it in his trauels, hauing so much besides to do, & being destitute of his librarie as he said, which is the vsual maner (as we said) of you all, huting thereby for popular praise of speedie writing. But when & howsoeuer you did write your booke said we, you haue vsed ouermuch boldnes, so cofidently to publish in print these slauderous reportes of such men as you haue named, being not able to make any prooffe of yt, wherof you accuse them. And vpon these such good grounds of yours, you doe most vnreasonably and vntruly charge vs all, as those that haue rased, mangled and spoyled the body of the holy Bible.

The third testimonie or prooffe alleaged against vs by Master Campion in his booke, is taken out of the Centuries, written by Illiricus, and others: which booke being giuen into his handes, and the like demaunde made as before, he would neither reade, nor once open the booke, neither yet made he any answere thereto, knowing that he could make no exception to the print, as he did before to Luthers bookes, seeing that booke was neuer printed but once.

And besides, where they as Historiographers, had only set down the iudgements of S. Hierome, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and of other ancient fathers concerning this Epistle of Saint Iames, of Tobias, the bookes of Macchabees, &c: he knewe that he could not thereby proue his assertion, that they suddenly cut away so many goodly partes of the holy Bible, much lesse that we had so done, as he doeth in his booke charge vs. For which causes chiefly, he would not as much as once open those bookes, and for the same cause, he would not looke vpon Kemnisius, whome, and vs by him, he had likewise falsely charged.

When Master Campion could not shew these words, out of any of those books by him alleaged, nor any good matter to proue the, nor vs suddenly to haue rased, mangled and spoyled the holy Scriptures, as he chargeth vs of desperation in our cause, to haue done: then did we shewe him, that we had not nowe suddenly (as he vntruly reported) cut off any part or line of the body of the holy Scriptures, but made onely a difference betweene those bookes of the Scriptures, that be commonly called Canonically, and of all men be taken for vndoubtedly true, from those that haue bene long ago suspected of many, and are called Apocrypha, according as was before set downe by the ancient Doctors of the Church, aboue a thousand yeres since & more. And for the prooffe hereof, we alleaged the testimonie of Saint Hierome, In Catalogo Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, where he thus writes of the Epistle of Saint Iames named by Master Campion: The Epistle of Saint Iames, is sayd to be published, by some other man vnder his name. And of the second Epistle of Saint Peter he saith in the same booke, that it is denied of many to be his, by reason of the difference of the stile.

S. Hieromes  
wordes.

To this Master Campion answered, that Hierome spake not of his owne iudgement, but reported what others sayde of them.

We answered, if Saint Hierome so reported of other mens sayings of those Epistles, and did not him selfe gainesay it, that it was a manifest token, that he did not greatly mislike their sayings. And seeing in S. Hieromes time and before, those



Epistles were doubted of, you doe vs great wrong sayd we, to charge vs that we haue suddenly cut them off from the body of the Bible, who in deede notwithstanding the former doubttes of them, gladly receaue and allowe them. We alleaged againe S. Hierome, In Prologo Galeato, et Epistola ad Paulinum, where hee sheweth his owne iudgement, what bookes of the Scriptures of the olde Testament are to be taken for Canonically, and which haue bene doubted of: which Epistles (quoth we) haue bene written and printed in all Bibles, by the space of these thousand yeres and more, to warne al readers of that difference of the said Apocrypha, from the true Canonically: and to arme them as it were against the error of confounding the Canonical Scriptures with these Apocrypha: for the which cause as it seemeth, hee also nameth that Prologue Galeatum, as an helmet for defence against that error. But nowe sitchence the Tridentine Councill, some Popish printers haue left out the sayd Prologue and Epistle of S. Hierome, who yet declareth this his iudgement likewise, in his Preface to the first booke of Esdras also.

Sherwin one of Master Campions fellowes, answered to these allegations, that Hierome did Iudaizare, and more was not ayd to these places.

We also alleaged Eusebius, who hauing made rehearsall of those bookes of the newe Testament, which be vndoubtedly true, nameth also such as were gainesayd, and writes thus: Quibus verocontradicitur, &c. those bookes that are gainesayde, though they be knowen to many, be these: The Epistle which is attributed to S. Iames, the Epistle of Iude, the latter of Peter, & the second and third of Iohn. And the same Eusebius in another place affirmeth plainely, the sayd Epistle of S. Iames, to be a counterfaite or bastard Epistle.

Euseb. lib. 3.  
cap. 25.

Euseb. lib. 2.  
cap. 23.

Adulterinam.

To this authoritie they said that it was true that he so said, and as we alleaged them, and that when he wrote, it was lawfull for any man to doubt of those bookes, that he called Apocrypha: but seeing by the Church (that was by the Councill of Carthage, & now also by the Councill of Trident) they were receiued for Canonically, it was blasphemie, they said, to doubt of the authoritie of those bookes.

To that was replied, that the Synode of Laodicea, helde them for Apocrypha.

Yea said they, but that Synode was not generall.

No more was that of Carthage said we.

No said they, but that of Carthage was after confirmed by a generall Councill in Trullo.

So was (quoth we) the Synode of Laodicea, which helde them for Apocrypha, confirmed also by the same generall Councill in Trullo, as there is to be seene. But howe doth this agree, that not long before you did saye absolutely, that S. Iames epistle was written by the same spirit that S. Iohns Gospell was written with, and now you ground the credit of S. Iames Epistle and the other vpon these Councils:

But said we, these Councils had no authoritie to make any maner writings Canonical, that was not before Canonically. For, by the iudgement of S. Augustine in many places of his bookes, there are two things requisite to proue any writing Canonically: one is the testimonie of the Church, in which the authour liued when he wrote: The other is the continuall contestation of the Churches succeeding. To this effect writeth S. Augustine: and so be all latter Churches barred from authoritie to make any writings canonically scripture, specially those that haue of olde bene doubted of. They may testifie what the olde Churches before them haue done, as we nowe doe.

August. contra  
Faustum. li. 28.  
cap. 2. & lib.  
33 cap. 6.

Hereunto they saide againe, that it was blasphemie after those Councils to call

those bookes Apocrypha, or to doubt of the authoritie of them.

Distinct. 19.  
cap. In  
Canonicis.

It is rather most horrible blasphemie said we, to make humane writings equall  
with the Canonically scriptures, (as of late your Tridentine Councill hath done, and as  
your Pope being but one man hath made his Decretal epistles) then with S. Hierome,  
Eusebius, and other ancient godly fathers, to call those bookes Apocrypha, which  
they do so call.

Ad norm  
Hieronimi.

And we said, that notwithstanding those Councils, Caietanus their Popes Car-  
dinall thought it no blasphemie, who in the ende of his expositions vpon the olde  
testament, in very plaine wordes, maketh the same difference of the bookes of the  
scriptures, & doeth not onely alowe the iudgement of Hierome, but addeth further,  
that all writtings, yea of bishops of Rome them selues, of whome he nameth some,  
must be brought to S. Hieroms rule.

They vtterly reiected Cardinal Caietanus, because (as they said) he was but one  
man against all the Church.

We said, you of your side will not be charged with the wordes of others, though  
they be the Popes Cardinals, and yet you doe thinke it reason, that we should be  
charged with euery worde, that hath slipped from Luther. Nay you charge him, and  
vs by him, with that which you can neuer proue, that he did write or speake.

Hart said further, that Caietanus was a good scholema and traueled in that  
course with commendation: but when hee began to become an expositor of the  
scriptures, said he, then he lost his grace and credit.

August. De  
Doctrina  
Christian. lib.  
2. ca. 8.

We answered, if they thought it reason to charge vs with all the sayings of Luther,  
or of any other: we might by good and great reason, charge them with the sayings  
of so great & learned a Cardinal of Rome, as Caietanus was. Last of all wee came  
to the place of S. Augustine in his second booke De doctrina Christiana. Which  
Campion and his fellowes gladly receiued, because they said, it made for them and  
not for vs. For, saide they, S. Augustine rehearseth those bookes for Canonically  
scriptures, which you call Apocrypha.

Euseb. lib. 3.  
cap. 25. dubia,  
ficta,  
adulterina.  
August. de  
Ciuit. Dei. lib.  
15. cap. 23. &  
contra 2.  
Gaudent. Epist.  
lib. 2. cap. 23.  
Testes Domini.

To this wee answered, that they shoulde rather charge Saint Hierome and Euse-  
bius, and other auncient fathers, who doe call them Apocrypha. And S. Augustine in  
that place rehearsing the order of the bookes of scriptures, though, said we, he differ  
somewhat from Eusebius and S. Hierome in shewe of wordes: yet hee doeth in deede  
agree with them. For where they deuide the bookes of the scriptures into three  
sorts, that is, Canonically, Apocrypha and feigned or vntrue: Augustine deuideth  
them, into Canonically and Apocrypha onely: and then he deuideth the Canonically  
bookes into two sortes, that is, those that be certainly true (which we with S. Hi-  
erome and Eusebius, do call properly Canonically) and those that haue bene doubted  
of, which Eusebius and S. Hierome do call Apocrypha. And S. Augustine nameth  
those that be vtterly vntrue, Apocrypha, which Eusebius calleth doubtfull, feigned  
and forged. And this may be gathered out of Augustine him selfe in diuers places,  
whereof we haue noted some. And albeit Augustine calleth those bookes Canonically,  
yet he giueth not the like authoritie to them, as namely to the Maccabees, and to  
the other of that sort, as he doeth to those that be Christes the Lords witnesses, as  
he nameth them, which be these that are named properly Canonically. Here would  
they not admit in any wise, that the worde Canonically was aequiuocum, or of di-  
uers significations in diuers places: but that wheresoeuer that worde was founde,  
it brought all bookes so called vnder one kinde. Much time was spent here about,

and the matter was much argued on Master Campion and his fellowes part. At the last Master Campion was desired by vs, to reade the chapter in yt Canon law, beginning In Canonicis, which Gratian takes out of this place of Augustine: and first that hee would reade the rubrick, which he seemed both to do. And Pound one of his companions sitting by (who with his importunitie & impertinent speaches, had often interrupted the course of the conference) saide, Father Campion, let them reade their places them selues. Yet at the length Master Campion read it, and it is thus. Inter Canonicas scripturas, Decretales Epistolae connumerantur: which after much desiring he englished also. The decretall Epistles are numbred together among the Canonically Scriptures.

Distinct. 19.  
cap. In  
Canonicis.

Whereupon one of vs saide, you charge vs with blasphemie, for naming those bookes Apocrypha, which Saint Hierome, Eusebius, and other ancient holy fathers doe so name: but here may you see most horrible blasphemie in deede, in the Canonical lawe of your Pope, which matcheth his Decretall Epistles (that is meere fables) with the Maiestie of the Canonically Scriptures, as he doeth in this distinction, and sundry other places, whereby you may see to what point this boldnesse of making mens writings Canonically Scriptures is come.

Then saide we to M. Campion, do you hold yt Popes decrees for Canonical scriptures? as you do the bookes of Moyses and the Prophets?

He answered no: and graunted then that the worde Canonically, was aequiuocum or of diuers significations, which before they all did so constantly denie.

Whereupon we sayde that we had some good hope of Master Campion, for that he blushed. And we sayde further that Cardinall Caietanus in the place before alleadged, sayeth expressely that S. Augustine placed those books in the Canon of maners, but not in the Canon of doctrine, whereby he plainly declareth that the word Canonically is aequiuocum.

After this he was desired to reade the text of that Chapter, and there he founde and could not denie, but that the place of Augustine was vntruely reported by Gratian, and by manifest corruption drawe altogether from the meaning of Augustine. For where S. Augustine saith, that those Scriptures are to be taken for Canonically, which the most or greatest part of Christian Churches so take, among the which those Churches be, which deserued to haue Apostolique Seas, and to receiue Epistles from the Apostles: these wordes of S. Augustine are chaunged, and in the place of the Apostolique Seas, is put the Apostolique Sea, (meaning the Church of Rome) and those Churches which deserued to receaue Epistles from the said Church of Rome: which is cleane contrary to S. Augustines wordes and meaning.

S. Augustines  
wordes.

The report of  
them. Distinct.  
19. Cap. de  
Canonicis.

Both often before, and here specially, Master Campion and his fellowes seemed to be desirous to dispute vpon some pointes of religion, rather then to continue in this examination of his booke, which we said we woulde not at afternoone refuse, but the forenoone (qd we) is so farre spet, that we must at this time make an ende. And then turning vs to the auditorie, we said: You haue heard howe Master Campion in his printed booke, hath charged vs as rasers, manglers and spoylers of the holy Scriptures, of meere desperation and distrust in our cause, as he saith. You haue heard how he would proue vs so to be, by certeine places by him in his said printed booke noted, as being the wordes of Luther and others in their bookes. You haue heard and seene proued by the bookes them selues, that there is no such thing to be founde in those places of their bookes as he hath set downe: but onely that S.

Hierom. Prolog.  
Galeat. &  
epistola ad  
Paulinum.

Hierome, and Eusebius aboute a thousande yeere sithen, doubted of the authoritie of those Epistles & bookes. And you haue heard, and it is vniuersally knowen, that S. Hieroms Prologue and Epistle, wherein he noteth those bookes to be Apocrypha, haue bene ioyned with all Bibles that haue bene written and printed euer since S. Hieromes time, by the space of a xi. hundred yeeres and more, vntill now of late sithen the Tridetine Councill, some Popish Printers haue left them out. And you haue heard, that not onely now of late, the Councill Tridentine hath made the Apocrypha of equal authoritie wt the vndoubted Canonical scriptures: but also that it is set down in the B. of Romes Canon law, yt his Decretal epistles are to be numbred together among ye Canonical scriptures: & so finally you see what iniurie these men do theselues to the holy scriptures, & what blasphemy they haue comitted, in matching their fables wt the Canonical scriptures, who do most vniustly charge vs wt those crimes.

Sherwin said, but you should haue told withall, what we haue answered to all those pointes.

We said, your answeere is to be looked for, when you can bring foorth your copies which you speake of, and promised: for in any bookes by you named, & extant and to be had, there is nothing of that which M. Campion hath set downe to be found. And here the time being spent we made an end for yt forenoonnes conferece.

### **The after noonnes conference.**

**I**N the fore noonnes conference both Master Campion himselfe, & others of his companions, had oftentimes required vs that we woulde deale with them in some matter of doctrine, and leaue that course that we began with, in the examining of his booke.

Whereunto we answered, that we were minded (if the time would suffer vs) to examine other partes of his booke, and lay it open to the audience there, howe that as he had most vntruly charged Luther and others, with the mangling and spoyleing of the bodie of the holy Scriptures in the beginning of his booke: so had he likewise most vntruly and impudently in other places slaundered other worthie men: and vpon the same his good groundes, he had charged vs all, as rasers and manglers of the holy Scriptures. And surely our opinion was, that if any thing at all, (that laying open before his face of his continuall vntrueths, which he hath so braggingly aduouched in his booke) might haue reclaimed him. For vndoubtedly he could neuer haue endured the manifestation of those his lyes, as they were in the confutation of his booke shortly after set out, had they bene layde open before his eyes: which might manifestly appeare to all that did marke his gentle and milde behaiour and speach in the After noonnes conference, in comparison of his bragging and lewde wordes vsed in the forenoone.

Notwithstanding at our meeting at after noone, we sayde vnto Master Campion, seeing your desire is so much to dispute in some matter of doctrine, we will not refuse. But first we pray you, let vs (qd we) peruse the Canon that foloweth, that which we last dealt with in the fore noone concerning the Popes Canons, and the Canonickall Scriptures, for that the time would not then suffer vs to reade it. The wordes of Pope Leo the fourth, there translated worde for worde, are these: For this

cause I feare not to pronounce more plainely and with a loude voyce, that he that is conuincd not to receiue indifferently the statutes of the holy fathers (which we haue spoken of before) which with vs are intituled by the name of Canons, whether he be a Bishop, a Clarke or a laye man, that he is proued neither to beleue, nor to holde profitably and effectually to his effect, the Catholique and Apostolique faith, nor the foure holy Gospels. This saith Pope Leo. You may see, (quoth we) whereunto this boldnesse of matching mens writings with the holy Canonical Scriptures, is come. Fore here Pope Leo with a loude voyce pronounceth, that whosoeuer doeth not indifferently receiue the Canons, is conuicted, neither to reteine effectually, nor beleue the Catholique and Apostolique faith, nor the foure holy Gospels: whereby he matcheth the beleeuing, receiuing, or refusing of his Canons, with the beleeuing or refusing of the foure holy Gospels: for so we said that the prooue of that Canon, and the worde indifferently did importe.

Master Campion indeuoured very much to quallifie this worde indifferentr, indifferently, and so to mollifie the Popes blasphemie if he coulde: and he confessed that there was difference betweene the Euangelistes and other writers, for that the Euangelistes and writers of the Scriptures coulde not erre in memorie or any other circumstance, but Councils might be deceiued in some such small matters of circumstance. As for example, sayeth he, I am bounde vnder paine of damnation to beleue that Tobias dogge had a tayle, because it is written he wagged his tayle.

It was sayd by vs that it became him not to deale so triflingly in matters of such waight.

Why then, saith he, if this example like you not, take another. I must beleue that Saint Paul had a cloake, because hee willeth Timothie to bring his cloake.

We said these thinges were nothing to purpose, vnlesse hee could proue, that such a promise was made to the bishop of Rome and his Coucils, that whatsoever they should determine, was sure to be true and certaine.

They alleaged Christes saying: Hee that heareth not the Church, let him be reputed as a publicane and heathen.

We answered that text serued them for all purposes. But first they must proue them selues to be the true Church before that text would belong vnto them. And where they alleaged out of the 15. of the Actes, So it seemeth to the holy Ghost and vs. Wee answered, wee knewe well enough that that Council was gouerned by the holy Ghost, wherein the Apostles were president. But what maketh that to the wicked Councils of Popes? And after much reasoning about the worde indifferenter, we said, were that word put out, yet were it blasphemie to saye, that he that beleueeth not the Popes Canos (which are with other there mentioned) beleueeth not the foure holy Gospels. After this wee began our disputation concerning iustification, both for that it is first of all other mentioned in your booke (quoth we to Master Campion:) and both Luther and we all, are most grieuously charged by you, with error therein: and also for that it is in deede a matter of the chiefest controuersie betweene vs. And first, for that you doe in your booke, vntruely charge Luther, and vs by him, with the cutting away of Saint Iames epistle, for that the wretche (as you saie of Luther) was by this epistle vanquished and ouerthrowen, and for that, that epistle doth so manifestly conuince his and our error in this matter of iustification (as you do write) we do protest that we will neither refuse, nor make any exception to that epistle of Saint Iames, nor to any other part of the newe Testament, which

you vntruely haue charged vs to haue cut off from the bodie of the holy scriptures.

It is well, said they, that you doe receaue this Epistle of Saint Iames.

We haue euer receiued it saide we, Howe much the more vntruely, haue you charged vs with the contrarie? And so entering into the matter, we said, Whereas you doe charge Luther, & with him vs all, for teaching a newe and false doctrine, yea heresie also, in that we saie and write, that we are iustified by faith onely: we say for our defence against this your slaunder, that the same doctrine is taught, both in many places of the holy scriptures most effectually, and is also expressly affirmed and pronounced by the ancient holy fathers and doctors of Christes Church, both Greekes and Latines, in the verie same wordes that wee do vse.

Let vs heare your scriptures and doctors sayd they. The, for that we came purposed to examine y vntruthes of Campions booke, rather then to dispute: we did very briefly, as our memorie did then serue vs, note rather then thorowly alleage many places out of the holy scriptures, for the proofe of our iustification by faith, and consequently by faith onely, to this effect.

Our sauour Christ saide we, as it is in sundrie places of the Euangelistes recorded, saith often: Thy faith hath saued thee. Onely beleeeue, beleeeue onely. They shall receaue remission of their sinnes, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. As many as beleeeue in me, to them hath God giuen power, to become the sonnes of God. Whosoeuer beleeueth in me, shall not be condemned, shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life. Thus saith our sauour Christ, &c. And Saint Paul saith, Beleeeue in the Lord Iesus Christ, and thou shalt be saued. God doeth iustifie thorowe faith. Wee are saued by gracethorowe faith. We are blessed by faith. We are the children of Abraham: yea we are the children of God by faith. The righteousnes of God by the faith of Iesus Christ vnto all, and vpon vs all that beleeeue. If thou confesse with the mouth the Lorde Iesus, and shalt beleeeue in thine heart, that God raised him vp from the dead, thou shalt be saued. For with the heart man beleeueth vnto righteousnes, and with the mouth man confesseth vnto saluation. We are freely iustified by his grace thorowefait.

Then said they, we knowe right well that the scriptures doe containe great commendations of faith, but in all these there is not this worde faith onely, which is your doctrine.

But the ancient holy fathers said wee, vpon these groundes of the scriptures by vs alleaged, doe gather and plainly pronounce, that onely faith iustifieth, as you shall heare anone. And howe many thinges saide we, doe you your selfe teach vs as necessarie articles of religion, not hauing for you one plaine worde therefore, but doe affirme, that in effect they are contained in the holy scriptures. And you haue heard that iustification and righteousnes, yea, saluation and the kingdom of heauen, are attributed to faith, and that without any addition of any other thing. And you haue heard the wordes of our Sauour: beleeeue onely, only beleeeue. And of Saint Paul, you are freely iustified by faith, which are in effect as much as faith onely, and to more effect exceedingly, then are your proofes of a great many of the principal pointes of your Popish religion. And where as we meane none other by faith onely, but faith without the workes of the Lawe, and without our good workes: if the former place can not satisfie you, heare what Saint Paul sayeth further. Know ye that a man is not iustified by the workes of the Lawe, but by the faith of Iesus Christ. The righteousnes of God is made manifest without the Lawe, by the faith of Iesus

Christ vnto all, and vpon all that beleue. We holde that a man is iustified by faith, without the deedes of the Lawe. It is one God that iustifieth circumcision by faith, and vncircumcision through faith. Euery one that beleueth is absolved from all, from the which they could not be absolved by the Lawe of Moses. Thus saith Saint Paul, and to the like effect in exceeding many places, declaring that we are iustified by faith, and not by the Law, by faith and not by workes, which is all one as to say, by faith onely.

No it is not all one, sayd they.

But the ancient doctors of the Church said we, do vpon these very places of the holy scriptures by vs alleaged, gather and in expresse wordes set downe, as we doe, that we are iustified by faith onely, as ye shall see. Saint Hillary (quoth we) sayeth thus, reading his wordes out of the booke it selfe, *Mouit scribas remissum ab homine peccatum: hominem enim tantum in Iesu Christo contuebantur, & remissum ab eo quod lex laxare non poterat: fides enim sola iustificat.* That is to say, It moued the scribes that sinne was remitted by man: for they behelde man onely in Iesus Christ, and that was remitted by him, the which the Lawe can not release: for faith onely doeth iustifie. Thus farre Saint Hilary: who as you doe see of this doctrine of Saint Paul by vs alleaged for iustification by faith without the Lawe, gathereth and setteth downe the same doctrine in the same wordes that we doe teach, that faith onely doeth iustifie.

But he saith not so in the same sense that you doe, saith Master Campion.

We shall see of the sense anon saide we: but we pray you heare the other doctors also, who doe agree with vs in the same wordes. Saint Ambrose also vpon the place by vs alleaged out of the third to the Romanes, among many other sentences hath this, *Non iustificari hominem apud Deum nisi per fidem.* That a man is not iustified before God but by faith. And shortly after Saint Ambrose saith, *Tam Gentiles quam Iudeos, non aliter quam credentes iustificauit. Quia enim vnus Deus est, vna ratione omnes iustificauit.* That is, both the Gentiles and the Iewes God hath iustified none other wayes, but beleeuing. For because there is one God, he hath iustified all by one meanes. And most plainly vpon the wordes by vs before alleaged, he sayeth, *Iustificati gratis per gratiam ipsius: Iustificati sunt gratis, quia nihil operantes neque vicem reddentes, sola fide iustificati sunt dono Dei:* That is, they were iustified freely by his grace: They were iustified freely for working nothing, neither making any recompence: they were iustified thorow only faith by the gift of God. Thus farre Saint Ambrose, who doeth very often in his expositions vpon that Epistle to the Romanes repeate, That we are iustified by faith alone. And Saint Basil most worthely named the great sayeth, in non-Latin alphabet in non-Latin alphabet, &c. That is, perfect and sounde reioysing in God is this, when a man doth not boast of his own righteousnes, but knoweth that he wanteth him selfe true righteousnes, and that he is iustified by only faith in Christ. And Saint Paul doeth glorie in the contempt of his owne righteousnesse. Thus farre Saint Basill. And Gregorie Nazianzen saith, in non-Latin alphabet. Confesse Iesus Christ, and beleue that he is risen from death, and thou shalt be saued: For to beleue onely is righteousnesse. Thus saith Nazianzen surnamed Theologus the deuine for his excellent learning in the scriptures. And the same doctrine of iustification by faith alone, do many other ancient, godly and learned fathers and doctors set downe most plainly in their workes. After that these sayings of these ancient doctors were read,

we said, You see that this doctrine and the very words themselues, which we doe vse, we are iustified by faith onely, or faith onely doeth iustifie, are not any new inuention of ours, but are set downe and pronounced by many ancient and holy fathers of the Church aboue a thousande yeere sithen and more, and that, being grounded euen vpon the same places of the holy scriptures, that we do alleage for our iustification by faith onely.

Master Campion said, but those Doctors and you doe not agree in sense, as I said before.

It is well said we, that you cannot denie but that they doe agree with vs in wordes, and that they doe gather these wordes euen of the same scriptures, which we alleaged for onely faith to iustifie: and that therefore these wordes, we are iustified freely thorow grace by faith: faith without the law, without the works of the lawe doeth iustifie, (which are the wordes of Saint Paul) are all one with these words, faith only doeth iustifie, which was before by you denied.

Master Campion said, but the trueth of the matter resteth in the sense and meaning of the Doctors.

What sense is it that you doe speake of, said we.

Master Campion answered, We do graunt that it is true that onely Faith doeth iustifie in this sense, that is, that when we be first brought into the state of grace, no good works do go before primam gratiam the first grace or iustification, but that our first iustificatio is by faith only, without any works going before: but the workes that followe the first grace and iustification (said Master Campion) doe both iustifie and merite also.

We alleaged Saint Augustines saying, Opera non praecedunt iustificandum, sed sequuntur iustificatum: Workes doe not preceede a man to be iustified, but doe follow him being iustified.

That is true, said Master Campion, as I said before of the first grace and iustification: but good workes doe goe before the second iustification.

It is but a small matter (said we) to graunt y no good works doe go before the first grace or iustification, when before the same grace there can be no good workes at all. And concerning the seconde iustification, we replied to that, that Saint Paul speaking of that iustification, and alleaging the example and saying of king Dauid therefore, sayeth expressely, that to a man that doeth beleue in him that doeth iustifie the wicked, his faith is reputed to righteousnes, according to the purpose of the grace of God. Euen as Dauid setteth downe the blessednesse of a man, vnto whome God reputeth righteousnesse without workes. Blessed are they whose wickednesse is pardoned, and whose sinnes are couered, &c. Thus sayeth Saint Paul, thus sayeth the King and Prophet Dauid, teaching plainly that our iustification is by Gods pardoning of our euill workes, and not by the merites of our good workes: for he saith expressely that iustice is without our workes. And S. Paul and King Dauid were in the state of grace when they did thus write, and yet doe shew that their iustification then, as well as before, was without workes.

Master Campion said, a man being in the state of grace, may write of the first grace and iustification, why not? and so did they in that place.

Yea (quoth we) but if he be set downe for an example himselfe, after that he hath obtained the first grace and continued therein, and yet sayth that God reputeth his iustification without any his workes, though he haue done many good, as Abraham



first, and then Dauid are here set out for example, and as Saint Basill, as was before alleaged, setteth out Saint Paul himselfe for an example, who doeth glorie in the contempt of his owne righteousnesse: it is euident, that that iustification or righteousnesse which is before God, is without any workes of ours at all, and that all iustification of all persons, and in all times, is by the grace of God through faith onely, without any merite of our workes.

Then they alleaged Saint Iames wordes, Faith without charitie is dead, making thereby charitie the soule and life of faith.

Hereunto we made answeere, that faith without charitie was in deede dead, and altogether vaine and vnprofitable. But Saint Iames meaning herein, was not to make charitie the principall parte, or the forme of faith: but onely to shewe, that by charitie faith is approued and declared to be a true and a liuely faith, which we doe most willingly graunt. And therewith we alleaged the saying of Thomas de Aquin. being a scholeman of their owne side, who saith, Deus iustificat effectiu: fides iustificat apprehensiu: opera iustificat declaratiu. That is, God doeth iustifie effectually, faith doeth iustifie apprehendingly, workes doe iustifie declaringly.

Master Sherwin said it was Fides iustificat instrumentaliter, Faith iustifieth instrumentally.

That worde (quoth we) doeth make no alteration in sense at all. And here you may see howe Saint Paul teaching that we are iustified by faith without workes before God: and Saint Iames teaching that we are iustified by workes, that is, doe declare our selues by our workes vnto men to be iustified, do agree.

Master Campion said that he could yeelde and subscribe vnto that saying of Saint Thomas.

And we saide, that we woulde doe the like, for that it is the very true doctrine that we teache: howbeit he held his penne from subscribing.

Then Master Sherwin alleaged these wordes of Saint Paul, If I had all faith, and haue not charitie, I am nothing. And he did very vehemently vrge the wordes, all faith, all faith without charitie is nothing worth.

Here saith one of the Pamphleters, silence was the answeere: but howe truely, let him selfe see: for it was straight answered, Master Sherwin you may see, that the Apostle speaketh there of faith in working of miracles, euen by the wordes of the Apostle him selfe, who saith, If I should haue all faith, so that I could remoue mountaines, and haue not charitie, I am nothing. And when he cryed still omnem fidem, all faith, and that therefore it must containe our faith also, els we had none at all.

It was answered by vs: If you will not beleeeue vs, yet let Saint Chrisostomes exposition be of some authoritie with you, who calleth it in non-Latin alphabet, faith not of doctrine, but of miracles, saith Saint Chrisostome, euen as we also do say: which faith the wicked may haue as our Sauour Christ teacheth, and therefore all faith to worke miracles, doeth not containe that true faith, which doeth iustifie him that hath it.

Further they obiected Saint Pauls wordes in his Epistle to the Galathians, Faith worketh by charitie.

We answered, that vnlesse faith doe worke by charitie, it is no faith at all: but that made nothing against our iustification by faith onely. But here they reasoned against vs thus.

If faith onely iustifie, then it iustifieth without charitie: But that was contrary to the text of the Apostles: Therefore onely faith doeth not iustifie.

We answered, this Syllogisme consisteth of foure termes. For it is one thing to say that faith onely doeth iustifie, and another, that faith is not without charitie. For when we say that onely faith iustifieth, we meane not to denie that charitie is ioyned with that faith which iustifieth, being inseparably vnited vnto it: but that onely faith and not charitie is the meanes, by which we imbrace Iesus Christ our iustification and righteousnesse. And this we indeuoured to make manifest by an example. The fire (quoth we) hath heate and light, which qualities can not bee seuered in that subiect, yet the fire burneth by heate onely, and not by light. Nowe if any will reason thus: If the heate of the fire onely burne, then it burneth without the light of the fire: but that it can not doe: Therefore it burneth not by heate only. They should shewe them selues to be absurd that so woulde reason, sayd we. And such is your reason against the iustification of faith only, because it can not be separated from charitie. Likewise though the parts of mans bodie be ioyned together, and one is not without another in a perfect bodie, yet doeth the eye onely see, and the eare heare onely, and euery part hath his distinct office.

Then Master Sherwin alleaged out of the Epistle to the Ephesians: *Ipsius sumus factura, creati in Christo Iesu in bonis operibus.* That is, We are his workemanship, created in Christ Iesus in good workes.

We looked in the Greeke Testament and found in non-Latin alphabet *ad opera bona*: vnto good workes, and so answered, that Saint Paul saith not, we are the creatures of God in Christ thorowe good workes, but that we are created of God in Christ to do good workes: which Master Sherwin (looking vpon the greeke Testament) coulde not denie. Further we told Master Sherwin, that if he tooke that place in that sense, that we were created in good workes, he was contrary to Master Campion, who graunted that good workes doe come after the first grace, and not to be ioyned with our first creation in Christ Iesus, as Master Sherwin would haue it. And besides that we did admonish him, that the place by him alleaged, did of all others most effectually make against the, and for vs. For immediatly before the wordes by him alleaged, Saint Paul sayth thus: *Gratia enim estis saluati per fidem, & hoc non ex vobis, (Dei enim donum est) non ex operibus, ne quis gloriatur.* That is, You are saued by grace through faith, and that not of your selues, it is the gift of God, not of workes, least any man should boast himselfe. In this sentence of Saint Paul, euery parcell (quoth we) maketh for vs, and against you. The cause of our saluation is the grace of God, the instrument whereby we receiue it, is faith, the false cause alleaged by you is here excluded, that is, our workes.

Master Campion alleadged, *Qui iustus est, iustificetur adhuc.* He that is righteous, let him be more and more righteous. And thereupon he sayde, he would not refuse to subscribe, that we be iustified by faith onely, so that we would subscribe, that being so iustified, we ought afterward to walke forward more and more in the workes of righteousnesse.

We graunted that we would so subscribe.

But M. Sherwine said vnto M. Capion, Take heed what you do.

Then sayde Master Campion, If you will so subscribe and graunt withal, that those good workes are meritorious, or do merite, I will subscribe to faith onely.

Doe you nowe come in with your merite, (sayde we?) we will none of it, neyther

will acknowledge any merite (quoth we) in respect of our iustification, or of the kingdome of heauen, but only the merites of Christs passion. And so our subscribing was dasht by master Campions addition of merite to that, which before he promised without any mention thereof.

But you doe knowe well (sayde master Campion) that often mention is made in the scripture of this worde merces, that is of rewarde for our good workes. And that at the last iudgement it shall be sayde, Come into the kingdome ye blessed: For I was hungrie, and ye fed me, &c. So that these good workes are mentioned 1 page duplicate1 page duplicate as a cause or a meane at the least, of entering into the kingdome of heauen.

We deny not (sayd we) but the worde merces is often mentioned in the holy Scriptures, and that God will rewarde our good workes, farre aboue our deseruing: but that merces, is ex misericordia Domini dantis, & non ex merito hominis accipientis. That reward is of the mercie of God giuing it, and not of the merite of man receiuing it. For when it is sayd, He that giueth a cuppe of colde water, shal not loose his reward: if you take that reward to be the kingdome of heauen, and the lande of the liuing to be giuen for the merite thereof, surely you make it to be of more easie purchase, than any land in this worlde can be, be it neuer so little. And concerning the last iudgement, the wordes of our Sauour, Come possesse the kingdome prepared for you before the beginning of the worlde, may giue you to vnderstand, that it is not giuen for the merite of any their good workes, which they coulde not doe, before they were any thing. And the worde in non-Latin alphabet Take ye the inheritance of the kingdome, sheweth that it is giuen to vs in Christ, as inheritaunce, which the Father giueth to his children freely, and is not purchased by our good workes. Besides that, though our Sauour Christ will of his speciall grace and fauour, remember those almes done to the poore in his name, and take them as done vnto himselfe: yet were it an intollerable arrogancie for vs to say, We fed thee when thou wast hungry &c. Or to say, Giue vs the reward of our cuppe of colde water, which thou promisedst we should not loose. Wherefore as we sayd, that merces and rewarde or hire, is of the grace and mercie of God giuing it, and not of the merite of man receiuing it, which is according to y true doctrine of y holy scriptures, that not flesh or mandoe glorie or reioyce, but that he who doeth glorie or reioyce in his iustification and saluation, may glorie and reioyce in the Lord onely: For Saint Paul sayeth, Where is then thy reioysing? It is excluded, By what lawe? of workes? Nay but by the lawe of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is iustified by faith, with out the workes of the lawe. And againe: If Abraham were iustified by workes, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God. For to him that worketh, the wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt. But to him that worketh not, but beleueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his sayth is counted for righteousnes. And againe: Now if by grace, then not of works, for so grace is not nowe grace, &c. Thus farre Saint Paul. Whereby you may see, that if iustification and saluation shoulde be attributed to the merites of mans good workes, it would occasion boasting and glorying in the fleshe, and chalenging of our iustification and saluation as due vnto the merite of our works, & so much abate & abase the glorie of Gods grace, that grace should then no more deserue the name of grace. But if iustification and saluation, be as it ought to bee, giuen wholly vnto Gods grace and mercy, promised vnto vs in Christ Iesu, which we doe apprehend and lay hold of

by fayth onely, as the onely instrumentall cause vnder Gods grace: then is all the glorie and honour of our iustification giuen vnto God onely, without any merite of man. And so we conclude as we sayd before, that we meane not by faith onely, to exclude the doing, but the meriting of good workes.

One of them alleadged the wordes of our Sauour, He that beleueeth and is baptized, shalbe saued. And hereupon he saide, We grant that n merite doth preceede this fayth.

Whereunto one of vs sayd, when he was baptized, and obtayned that first grace and iustification which Master Campion speaketh of, he may safely graunt, that no good workes doe preceede or go before that iustification which hee had in his infancie, the which no worke at all doe or can preceede: but for his parte (sayde he) when he doth consider, howe after that first grace, hee hath most vngratiously broken the vowe made to God in Baptisme, and how fewe and small good workes he had done towards the atteyning of any second iustification which Master Campion speaketh of: howe many and great euill workes hee hath done: how much of his life, his time and goods he had mispent: howe little he had spent in the seruice and to the honour of God: howe late he came to the Lordes vineyarde, and howe loytering a labourer he had bene in that short time: Surely (quoth hee) for my part, when I doe looke vpon my righteous workes so fewe and so imperfect, and on the other side vpon my vnrighteous deedes so many and so sinnefull, I can not but thinke it to be a most damnable arrogancie, to challenge any part of that seconde righteousness, or of the kingdome of heauen, by so fewe and small good workes: and do see how great occasion I should giue therby, that God should condemne me for my so many and great euill workes, in respect of which I cannot but dispaire of any desert or merite towards that seconde iustification that you doe speake of. Here Master Campion, to shewe belike that he was no Pharisee: I must confesse also (sayd he) that I haue bene most defectiue in all good workes, and in deede a loytering labourer (as you tearme it) in the Lords vineyarde.

What remedie then quoth the other?

The remedie (quoth Master Campion) is, the mercie of God in Christ Iesus.

That is (quoth the other) that I beleue, and this my beliefe onely in his mercies thorowe Christ, and not in any late and loytering worke, is that faith, that shall saue me and you too, I trust: and therefore (quoth he) here (as in some good hope of our agreement, in this poynt of iustification by faith onely, without any merite of workes, which we trust we haue by the holy Scriptures, and by the ancient Doctors both Greekes and Latines, by examples, yea and by our consciences sufficiently proued) if it shall so please Master Lieutenant, let vs make an end: and so we ended our conference.

### **A briefe recitall of certaine vntruthes scattered in the Pamphlets, and libels of the Papists, concerning the former conferences: with a short answeere vnto the same.**

WE thought it not amisse, here in the ende, to note some of the principall poynts vntruely set downe by the authors of such Pamphlets, as haue hitherto come to our handes concerning this conference. First, they leaue no circumstances of Mas-

ter Campions imprisonment, his racking, sicknes, lacke of his note bookes, of his librarie, our sodaine coming vpon him &c. vntouched. But they that will consider his bragging challenge made in his booke, and prompt readines to dispute with all protestants: howe lately his booke was before by him set out, and howe fresh in his memorie, and howe we dealt with him onely in his owne booke, and in a fewe pointes in the verie beginning thereof: and did bring with vs all those bookes which he himselfe had noted and alleaged, and gaue them into his handes: and our selues also hauing made ready the places in the said bookes by him noted to ease his trauell in seeking of them: who will (I saye) consider these things, may hereby easily vnderstand, their allegations of sodaine taking of him, and his lacke of bookes, to be most vaine. And hee himselfe by his lowde speaches, and bolde and busie gestures, shewed no token of any either sicknesse or weaknesse: neither did him selfe then complaine vpon those difficulties, which the Pamphleters hath so diligently & largely noted sithe.

They do charge some of vs and specially one with vncourteous wordes, and vncomely for professors of the Gospell (as they saye) spoken to Master Campion and others. But they shewe not vpon what occasion by Master Campion and others of his companions offred, these wordes were spoken. For when Master Campion did rise vp from the forme whereon he fate: did cast vp and fling with his handes and armes: did knocke and beate vpon his booke at euery other worde, with an exceeding lowde voyce and sharpe countenance, affirming that all our printed bookes were false, and that he would procure true copies to be sent from the Emperours Maiestie, & from the Duke of Bauaria, and from another prince (whom we remember not) vnto the Queenes Maiestie: was it I pray you so outragious in the Latine tongue, as seuerally to admonish Master Campion him selfe, without the vnderstanding of the common audiorie, for one of vs to say, *Qui hic mos est mi homo? Quis hic gestus? Et loqueris & pultas fores? Gloriosus miles. Projcis ampullas, & sesquipedalia verba?* We may bee bolde to saye, that considering Master Campions bragging in English, and the admonition of the other in Latine, there was no such outrage as they doe note. But this they much disdain, that he sayde once, *Os impudens*. Truth it is, but vpon his often and fierce affirmation that all the printed bookes of Luther in Englande were false: and vpon Poundes odious interpellations (as, we knowe you to be a good Terence man) and his most scornefull lookes through his fingers, staring vpon him cotinually whiles he was reasoning with Master Campion, to put him out of his memorie: hee being offended both with Poundes mockings, wordes and lookes, and with Campions shameles sayings, brake out with *Os impudens*, as he thinketh, most deseruedly on their partes.

Yea, but he vsed the word *obgannire*, or *oggannire*. Hee denieth not, but coming by commandement to conferre with Campion onely, when two or three of them spake together, and many other of them muttered, and sometime brake out into scornefull laughter, he sayd, *Siccine tam multos oggannire & obstrepere?* This is the rage and railing wherewith the Pamphleters do charge him.

They say that he by a Commissioners checke, put the priests that would haue spoken, and Master Sherwin to silence. The trueth is, that though we were sent onely to Master Campion at that time, yet others did speake sometime, and Master Sherwin specially very much, & almost as much as did Master Campion. Whereupon not we, but Master Lieutenant told him, that he should be dealt with another time,

and willed him then to quiet himselfe. Hereupon it is, that the Pamphleters say, wee should haue vsed them as the Queenes prisoners. Wee say, they should haue remembred, and behaued them selues as becommed prisoners, and not as Ruffians in all libertie, or licentiousnes rather, as they in deede, and specially Master Campion in the forenoone behaued himself. And yet the Pamphleters are not ashamed to write, The Catholikes vsed no such wordes as did the Protestants, (and one of them specially) but being passing modest, went directly and soberly toche cause. And againe, God gaue Master Campion (speaking very mildely as hee euer vsed) such modestie in answering. Thus write they, &c. Then surely his speaking did much differ from his writing, as is to bee seene by that his chalenge and booke, the most bragging and vaine glorious, that euer was written. Nowe Sherwin hath his contrarie commendation, of whome they write thus. But Master Sherwin like him selfe, with excellent courage spake. Master Sherwin here notably tooke the aduantage. Crosse blowes were continually giuen to the Protestantes, by Master Campion and Master Sherwin. Master Campion and Master Sherwin framed their reasons exceedingly well, with many such like commendations. But of vs they write, The Protestantes shuffled vp the matter. They answered to an argument of the Catholikes, there be foure termes in this syllogisme, and no further answer. Silence here was their answer. M. Daye hauing belike of olde collection an other place in store, spent much time in that impertinent question. The Deane of Paules when he could doe naught els, grinded with his teeth for despite & rage. And so the Catholikes by the iudgement of those that were not wholly wedded to will, did get the goale. Scilicet.

But the Pamphleters labour about nothing more, then to deliuer Master Campion from the note and blemish of ignorance in the Greeke tongue: whereof one of them writeth thus, The Deane of Paules and Master Beale shewed great ostentation towards Campion, in offring him a Greeke Testament to reade a text of Paul. To whome Master Beale said, Graecum est non potest legi, calling vpon him to reade if hee could, &c, to the others vtter defacing, if he could haue procured it. But our good Lord gaue the other such modestie in answering him, as al indifferent persons were edified by it. And refusing there to reade (wherby Beale and the rest, were flatly then persuaded it was for lacke of skill) in the ende it fell out that Saint Basill was offered him in Greeke, and the booke holden him by a minister, wherein he read skilfully, and by the hearing of all the audiorie confessed the text to be as they alleaged it, answering it as before. And withall (quoth he) let this man witnesse, whether I can reade Greeke or no? who in open hearing answered, Uery well. Whereupon being confounded, We confesse (quoth the Deane of Paules) you can reade Greeke, wher at some might haue blushed, if they had had any such good humour in them. Thus writeth one of them.

Another of them reporteth the matter thus. It happened in processe of their disputations, by occasion incident there was talke of a text of Scripture (which forsoth must bee viewed by Master Campion) & to make the matter most plausible (as the Protestants imagined) they caused a Greeke testamet to be brought vnto him, which he refused to take, saying merily to his contrarie, it shalbe yours. At which doing many laughed, condemning him for ignorance of the tongue, and therefore gestingly by the Protestants it was said, Graecum est non potest legi. It is Greeke, perhaps it cannot be read. Whereunto Master Campion gaue no answer but rested at the matter, as a man vnable to reade Greeke, or to vnderstand the same. But it

chaunced not long after, that the Protestantes as they had prepared before, were to alleage a place out of Saint Basil the Greeke doctor: and againe thinking to giue the Catholikes another bob, they commanded againe the booke of that ancient father to be giuen to Master Campion that he might reade, whome before they derided as not able to doe the same. But he tooke the booke, and hauing one of their ministers at his elbowe, both read and gaue the sense of the writer, and bad him beare witnes that hee was able to reade and vnderstande Greeke: whereat there was some admiration made among the Protestantes. and he was demanded why hee did not so before? who mildely answered, that the print was ouer small. Why saide they, had you not declared so much before? that had bene sufficiet. The like triall they made of an other Catholike, to wit Maister Sherwin, who by report of his fellowes and companions, is very well seene in the Greeke and Hebrewe tongues: yet hee tooke the booke and viewed it, but openly did not reade, which was imagined that he did to be accounted ignorant in the tongue, or rather for that he was willed to holde his peace, for that there should bee other times to talke. Thus they write of this matter, farre more largely and earnestly, then of any other. But the truthe is, that when we had read the sentences out of the Greeke Testament and Doctors once or twise our selues, wee offered the Greeke Testament first, and afterwardes Nazianzene in Greeke to Campion to reade, that he might credit his owne eyes, and that we alleaged their wordes truely. But he refused to reade in the Greeke testament altogether, as them selues do here confesse. And when Saint Basill and Nazianzen in Greeke were offered to him to reade, he said once or twise, I knowe, I knowe, it is as ye haue alleaged: which we tooke to be a shift, to auoyde the reading of it him selfe. But when he was vrged, & Master Stollard who stood by, tooke the booke and held it to him, he read, but so softly as it were to him selfe, that wee may with good conscience protest before God, that we heard not one word: so farre off was it that he read skilfully, & in the hearing of all the audiorie, as they doe write. But surely, whosoeuer did knowe Campions vayne, may thinke that hee would haue read in the hearing of al the audiorie in deede, had he had any knowledge in that tongue: and not so haue whispered to him selfe, or in Master Stollardes eare. Truthe it is, that he saide, Let this man witnes whether I can reade Greeke or no. But why did hee not reade so, that not he alone, but that all we might haue bene witnesses thereof?

But saye they, Master Stollard said, hee read very well. They onely heard him so saye belike: for of truth he said to vs, If he did reade at all, he read the worst that euer I heard, which some of vs thought that Master Stollard spake, for that wee hauing read those fewe wordes of Nazianzen, in non-Latin alphabet once or twise before the booke was giuen Campion, he might seeme out of his memorie to haue repeated them, rather then to haue read them out of the booke. Nowe, that we should be in any admiration hereat as they write, what cause was there? For that we should aske him why he did not so much before, who heard him then not reade one word: or that the Deane of Pauls confounded should say, We confesse you can reade Greeke: or that there was any cause giuen why we should blush or be confounded, are most impudent lies, and most meete for such reporters. Nay, rather may all Papistes blush for Campions sake, who making such a chalenge, as though he had had all knowledge, in all learning and languages, when it came to the triall, vpon conscience of his ignorance, durst not reade openly one short sentence

in Saint Basill or Nazianzen, the bookes being of a large and faire print. Surely wee before our comming thither, vpon Campions owne bragging challenge and booke, and other mens reportes of him, thought wee should haue bene sore incumbred by his learning, and ouermatched by his knowledge in the tongues: so farre off was it, that wee meant to make any ostentation therein towards him (as they write:) but vpon experience and triall with him, we found him not to be that man that we looked for, and went away with that opinion, that the booke which was so sodainely after his bragging chalenge, put in print, was none of his writing, much lesse penned by him as he was in his iourney, as he reported him selfe: but that it was elaborate before, by the common and long studie of all the best learned Iesuites, to serue at all oportunities. To the same effect is the report of Sherwin, who looking vpon the Greeke Testament, and reading neuer a worde, goeth yet away thereby, not onely with the commendation of a man very well seene in the Greeke and Hebrew tongues: but also of singular modestie and contempt of all praises, as seeking to be accounted ignorant in that, wherein he had great skill. For that they would haue the cause of his not reading to be, for that he was willed to hold his peace, is very ridiculous: for he did oft speake, after he was so willed to holde him selfe contented: and then he was specially desired to reade, and not to holde his peace. But we thought the truthe to be, that when Sherwin had alleaged out of the second to the Ephesians after the olde translation, *Creati in bonis operibus*, we were created in good workes: and the originall Greeke being shewed vnto him, when he found it to be in non-Latin alphabet *ad bona opera*, created to do good workes: he looked in the beginning and in the ende of the Greeke Testament, trusting as wee thought, that if he might haue found, that it had bene printed in any place, where the Gospel is preached, hee might after Campions exaple, haue made a challenge to the print as false, (which is now become a speciall shift of the Papistes, and the last refuge when all other do faile) but when he did see that it was Plantines print, hee held his peace. Notwithstanding we do not thinke, but that Sherwin could reade Greeke, the ignorance wherof we neither obiected to any, nor did make any ostentation (as they write) of any our knowledge therein. Only we offered the bookes them selues vnto Campion, that his owne eyes might bee witnesses, that the auncient fathers both Greekes and Latines did teache iustification by faith alone, euen as we do. By which occasion, God as wee thinke by the opening of his ignorance, meant to controll his vaine glorious bragging of all knowledge and habilitie to deale with all men. Thus much, and to much of this matter, were it not that the reader may hereby vnderstand, what vantages these writers and reporters doe take vnto them selues: yea and by speedy and continuall spreading and beating of the same into the eares and heads of many, do much preuaile also, vntill time the mother of truthe, shall discouer their vntruthes.

But we may by no meanes dissemble another matter, by these Pamphleters sore laide to our charge. Saint Augustine in the fourtenth chapter of his booke *De fide & operibus*, was by some of them in our conference (as we thinke) alleaged, as against our doctrine of iustification by faith alone: but in that confusion of many speaking at once, it was not greatly by any of vs marked or said vnto, that we remember. But the authors of the Pamphlets do report this place of Saint Augustine, as by them of al other most effectually alleaged against vs. Their words be these. Unto this was added by the Catholikes the authoritie of Saint Augustine out of his booke



De fide & operibus and the fourteenthchapter, where he hath registred that this doctrine of Iustification by faith onely, was an heresie taught in the Apostles time: for reformation whereof he declareth that Saint Iohn, Saint Peter, S. Iude, and Saint Iames, did write their Epistles, wherein they so much inculcate the doctrine of good workes. Thus they write, thus they whisper in euery eare open vnto them, to the slander of vs and our doctrine of iustification by faith onely, as not onely an error, but an heresy also. But wee doe pray all indifferent readers, to consider of these maner of dealings. For Saint Augustine in that place writeth against the wicked opinio of those, who mistaking Saint Paules wordes of Iustification by sayth without workes, do by an euill securitie neglect to liue well, not seeking by true faith the helpe of God, to the ouercomming of their owne euill concupiscences, but doe despise the workes of righteousnes, & by a dead faith do promise to them selues euerlasting life. These be Saint Augustines expresse wordes in that place truely translated, which they haue most vntruely and malitiously alleaged against vs, & against the heresie (as they terme it) of iustification by faith onely: which they woulde haue the simple people to mistake, as though wee woulde exclude all things vniuersally sauuing faith onely: and did vtterly cast away all care of good workes, & godly life, yea, and all desire of Gods grace to assiste vs, as did they against whom S. Augustine in that place did write. But we protest before God and all good men, that we neuer meant to make faith the chiefe and onely cause of our iustification, but that the grace and mercie of God by our sauour Iesus Christ promised to the faithfull in his holy worde, is the principall and originall cause, and very fountaine of our iustification: and that faith, not a dead faith (as they thought against whome S. Augustine doth write) but a liuely faith (being wrought in our hearts by the said word of God, and by the operation of the holy ghost) beleeuing Gods promise of his mercy in Christ, is the instrumentall cause in vs, whereby onely wee receiue our iustification, without the merite of our workes: and yet being iustified, we are most bounde to walke in all good workes, as much as it shall please God to giue vs grace thereunto, for the which we ought to sue by cotinuall & most heartie prayer. Which our doctrine, you may see to bee most contrarie to the wicked opinion of those, against whom S. Augustine writeth in that place, and that therefore it is most falsely and malitiously alleaged as against vs, who by faith onely iustifying vs, meane not to exclude the doing, but the merites of our good workes, which is no heresie, wherewith these men would charge vs, but the very truthe it selfe taught in the holy Scriptures, and by the auncient godly fathers and learned doctors set down in the very same wordes which we do vse, as hath bene before at large declared.

Of the conclusion of our conference the Pamphleters write thus. At the last, the Protestantes did make a doe, as though some thing had bene wonne, when in my soule I protest there was not, but in any indifferent audience the aduerse Protestants had bene quite confounded. For Master Campion and Sherwin too, would haue sayde much more in defence of their cause, but one of them by his Commissioners authoritie suddenly made an ende, cutting them off from all further speache. Thus they do write. In deede when we had continued very long, and the sunne shining vpon our faces in at the South windowes, and the throng being very greate, and by occasion of both, the heate so intollerable, that some of vs were fayne to go out of the chauncel to take breath, and to returne againe: and Master Campion and wee being nowe come to a very neare point of agreement in the question of iustification,

(as is afore noted in the end of our conference) we turning to Master Lieutenaunt, sayde, If it shall so please you, let vs here make an ende. With a good will sayd he: and so we brake off. And here is all the Commissioners authoritie, which they speake of, that wee or any of vs did take vpon vs. And thus ended our conference with Campion: the iudgement of the trueth of their or our reportes whereof, wee doe leaue vnto God, and to those who were present thereat. Surely we by our notes set downe, whiles our coference was yet fresh in memorie, and by sundry conferences amongst our selues sithen, and with other also, who were there present, yea and by diligent perusing of the pamphlets written against vs, haue endeuoured to set downe all poyntes that were dealt with, in our sayd conference, with as much trueth concerning the substance of the matter, as our diligence and memory, and the remembrance of other also, could possibly attayne vnto.

Alexander Nowell.

William Daie.

The three last dayes conferences had in the Tower with Edmund Campion Iesuite, the 18: 23: and 27. of September. 1581. collected and faithfully set downe by M. Iohn Feilde student in Diuinitie.

Nowe perused by the learned men themselues, and thought meete to be published. Ianuarij. 1. 1583.

## To the Christian Reader, grace and peace.

Thou hast here, gentle Reader, a true report of the whole substance of the conferences had in the Tower the last three dayes, faythfully gathered out of the notes of diuers that wrote there, and afterwarde perused by the learned men them selues, and nowe lastly published by authoritie. If any man be inquisitiue why they were set forth no sooner, he may vnderstande, that being priuate conferences, it was thought not much requisite to make the publikely knowen, neither had they bin now set forth, if the importunitie of the aduersaries, by their sundry vntrue and contrary reportes made and scattered amongst their fauourites, had not euen perforce drawn the forth. If Campions answeres be thought shorter the they were, thou must knowe that he had much wast speach, which being impertinent, is nowe omitted: although I protest, nothing is cut off from the weight and substance of the matter: for of that, I made conscience, and had speciall regarde. Againe, if the repliers speaches seeme to be more ample: it is, because their authorities then alleadged onely in Greeke or Latine, are nowe at large put downe, both in Greeke, Latine, and English. But for the arguments and answeres, I was euen religious faythfully to reporte them, as they were. Wherein, I appeale to all the hearers in Gods sight, to whose grace I commit thee.

Iohn Feilde.

## **A remembrance of the conference, had in the Tower with Edmunde Campion Iesuite, by William Fulke, and Roger Goade Doctours in Diuinitie, the 18. of September, 1581. as followeth.**

**A**Fter that Master D. Fulke had made a godly prayer for direction in that action, that it woulde please God to confirme the faithfull, and to confounde the obstinate and wilfull, & that Campion denying to pray with them, had superstitiously all to be crossed himselfe, Master D. Fulke beganne with this preface in effect.

D. Fulke.

Where as there hath bene some proceeding with you before, and we are come by order to the thirde chapter of your booke, where you slaunders our Church of Englande & the whole Church of God, for the definition of the Catholike Church, for that we define it so, as it shoulde be inuisible: we come to prooue both by the Scriptures and Fathers, that it is inuisible. But this I woulde haue knowen vnto you, that our purpose is not to deale by discourse, but briefly by Logical arguments, according to the order of schooles, &c.

After he had inquired D. Fulkes name, Campion also spake after this maner.

Campion.

The disputation that I desire, is yet behinde: for I desire it might bee in the Uniuersities. This may bee called a conference, but it is not the disputation which I require. Besides, these conferences are vnequall, both in respect of the suddainnesse of them, as also for want of such necessary helpes as were fitte and conuenient. I see that you haue some appoynted to note, as if it were made a solemne matter. I shoulde haue the like, so shoulde I haue come better furnished, and all these might haue bene better profited. Besides, I haue bene yll dealt withall already, & things heretofore spoken by me, haue bene mistaken, and published in print otherwise then I euer meant.

D. Fulke.

For the suddennesse, it is all alike with vs. Master Lieutenant sent you worde by my request, to chuse the question your selfe on Saturday last at noone: so that you had knowledge of the question as soone as we, and also the choise and appointing thereof. As for the noting, it is not made so solemne a matter that it can preiudice you, but to preuent false reportes that may bee spread of the conference, iniurious as well to you as to vs. As for the disputation you require, it is not at our appoyntment: It must be ordred by them that are to appoynt both you and vs. We come by commandement, &c. but let vs goe to the matter. You slaunders vs, and Master Caluine likewise, in the thirde chapter of your booke, for defining of the Catholike Church as we do. You say we make it a Platonicall Idaeae, an ayrie thing, that is no where &c. But I will proue that it is against the nature of the Catholike Church, at any time to be visible.

Campion.

Where do I slaunders you or Caluine? Reade my booke, I wil maintaine my booke and euery part of it. And as for the Catholike Church, I will mayntaine, that from the time of Adam to Christ, and from Christ vnto vs, the Church hath bene visible.

But because you say I slaunder you and Caluine, shewe my wordes.

D. Fulke.

These are your wordes. Non est ausus contrauenire sonitu, videri noluit Ecclesiae quam toties Scripturae commemorant, refragari, nomen callid retinuit, rem ipsam funditis definiendo sustulit &c. And ye quote Cal. Institut. lib. 4. cap. 1. Sect. 2. & 3. Here you plainly slaunder Caluine and vs, for defining the Catholike Church (comprehending all the elect of God that haue bene, are, or shalbe) to be inuisible.

Camp.

The Catholike Church is considered according to her parts, triumphant in heauen, and militant on earth: generally, & particularly: and I am ready to maintaine, that alwayes the militant Church in earth is visible: euery in his mayer knoweth this, who in their prayers pray for the Church militant: therefore this is the poynt, whether this be alwayes visible?

Fulke.

Wel then it appeareth in the very beginning that you swarue from the title of your owne booke, sclaundering vs without cause, for the definition of the whole Catholike Church, and Sophistically you goe from the whole to a parte, from the Catholike Church to the Church militant, which is but a part of it, when as the whole Catholike Church comprehendeth all the elect, and is the full body of Christ, that filleth all in all things, as the Apostle sayeth, and as we confesse in the articles of our faith, We beleue the Catholike church. We deny not that the church militant sometime is visible: but we affirme that the whole Catholike Church, whereof our definition is giuen, is not visible. And what cause haue you then to exclaime vpon Caluine and vs, for defining the Catholike Church to be inuisible: This we are here ready to prooue.

Camp.

I haue sayd, that vpon earth the Church is alwayes visible. But I pray you let vs speake of ye Church militant. I am sure these gentlemen would heare, not of a Church of Saints in heauen, but of a Church in earth, wetd they may ioyne themselues, what shoulde we talke of the Church in heauen? They would rather knowe I am sure, of what Church they are here: Aske them.

Fulke.

Wel then you are found recreant in this paynt, openly to sclaunder our definition to be such as should take away the nature of the Church, in that we make it inuisible, and now when it commeth to the tryall, you will not deale with the Catholike Church, whereof our definition is giuen: but with a part of it, to witte, that which is vpon earth, which wee neuer denyed in some sense to be alwayes visible, because it consisteth of men vpo earth, although it be not alwayes seene, because it is oftentimes hidden from the worlde, and sometimes also from the true members thereof. But this Church vpon earth you wil haue to be alwaies visible. Seeing therefore you giue ouer y defence of your slauder of our definition of the Catholike Church, which we came prepared to maintaine: we are ready also to reason of ye church militat.

Campion.

The state of the question is, that the Church militant vpon earth, can not be hidden, but it is alwayes knowen, so that a man may vnderstand of what Church he is. &c.

Fulke.

The case may be such as a member can know no more but himselfe: what meane you by visible?

Campion.

I meane to be visible, is to knowe one another, to meete at Sacraments, when I can tell that I am of this church, and you of that, I a Catholike, and you a Protestant, as I certainly know there is a Church in Fraunce, a church in Spaine, and in Flaunders, though I be farre from it, and we may knowe one another: a member can say, This is my pastor, these are my prelates and gouernours. This is playne. I would to God I had one also to write for me. I pray you let me not be mistaken, for I haue had great wrong that wayes, and thinges haue bene put in print, that I neuer spake or meant.

Fulke.

If we haue this discoursing, we shal neuer haue done: I would you would be briefe. I will prooue from a place of scripture, that the church militant (vnderstanding visible as you say) is not alwayes visible in earth. Elias complaineth, that he was left alone &c. Ergo the Church was not then visible.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent, & further declare the meaning of the place, which maketh altogether for me. For Elias setteth out the schismatical church of the Samaritanes. In this schismaticall church, a member being driuen out, (as sometime it falleth out to be) the worlde turning and changing, he might not know the rest: but yet knew there were 7000. that neuer bowed their knees to Baal. Agayne, you must not bring a particular to ouerthrowe a generall. There were none there: therefore there were none in other places. But this place is an excellent place against you. For as the Prophet complained there, so we may iustly complaine now, O Lord they haue forsaken thy couenat, they haue destroyed thine altars, and slayne thy prophetes with the sword, and I am left alone &c. Yet no doubt, there were many: as for example, I might haue complayned of Geneua, when I was there, that I had bene alone, not knowing of any other Catholike there. Were all the Protestants in England in Queene Maries time gone? were there none? and are all Catholikes nowe gone? Whatsoever they bee, I knowe certainly there is a Church in Fraunce &c. And so then there was a flourishing church in Iudea, vnder Asa, and Iehosaphat, whither Elias was flying for succour and reliefe &c.

Fulke.

I thought wee should haue discoursing. You declare your selfe vtterly ignorant in all this matter. For where were these wordes spoken?

Cap.

They were spoke as he was flying into Iudea, to y church whither he knew to repaire, teaching vs what to do in y like case.

Fulke.

That is not true, they were spoken in mount Horeb, as he was in the wildernes, after he was fled from the persecution of Iezebel, when she had determined his death.

Campion.

The text is playne, Venitque Beersebae Iudeae &c. He came to Beerseba of Iudea &c.

Fulke.

His flight was into the wildernes, & Beersheba was in his way, where he left his seruant, & so went forward into the wildernes. For Beersheba was the vtmost towne in Iudea towards Horeb, & both Beersheba & the wildernes of Arabia, were from Iudea towards Horeb. And therefore the text sayth, Ipse ver perexit He went forward &c. continuing his iourney to the wilderness, and therefore it is not true you sayd, he went into Iudea, to ioyn himselfe with the Church, or to seeke reliefe there.

Campion.

But his complaynt was of a particular place, for the Church florished in Iudea vnder two notable kinges, Asa and Iehosaphat. And when he sayeth, Ego solus, he meaneth that hee was the onely prophet that was left &c.

Fulke.

This ansuere cannot stand with the oracle, which pronounceth that God had left 7000. true worshippers. Wherefore it is manifest, that Elias thought himselfe the onely true worshipper that was left in Israel, except you will say there were 7000. prophets, whereof he was ignorant. But ye ansuere y the church was then so visible, yt he knew whither to resort. But I will proue y the church of Iudea, (vnto which y cogregation of Israel, if they be a true church must be ioyned) was so inuisible at some time, that it had not so much as the face of a church, whither any ma in Elias case might resort. It is written 2. king. 16. that vnder y raigne of Achas, there was taken a paterne of the Altar of the idolaters of Damascus, & that Vrias the high Priest remoued the Altar of the Lord. Whereby it appeareth, that the priesthoode was corrupted, the altar was remoued, and the sacrifices vtterly ceased, &c.

Campion.

That might well bee. For there might be such a time, and the case might so fall out, that there could be no exercise of the priestly function, & yet it might remaine visible ynough, &c.

Fulke.

Uery wel, what visibilitie could there be in those daies of Achas, Manasses, and such like, when there was no face at all of an outward Church, neither in the head nor in the members, whe the high Priest was become an idolater? How could they knowe whither to resort, the Temple being defiled, and the priesthoode it selfe so defiled with idolatrie? &c.

Camp.

What meane you by the face of a Church? It might for all this be knowen, though they could not exercise their function.

Fulke.

How could that be? when there was no outward forme of a Church, it fayled in the head, in the chiefe, & in the members. There was no place for their publike sacrifices, seeing that only place, to which they were bounde to resort, was defiled with heathenish idolatrie. For it must be there and no where else. And I doubt not but there were particular members, that were knowen to God, or might knowe one another: yet was there not a visible Church, as you determine of the worde visible, to be, when men know their pastors & prelates, and the place whither to resort, &c.

Campion.

I say, the dayes were as these dayes are nowe to Catholikes, or as they were to you in the daies of Queene Mary, to them that are in prison: & yet we know there

were protestants left, and those that were in prison knew well inough to resort vnto them, that were abroade: and so of the Catholikes, though nowe Masse be forbidden, and the execution of their priesthood, yet Catholikes know Catholikes, and whither to resort for the exercise of Catholike religion.

Fulke.

But in Iudaea they knewe not whither to resort, when the temple it selfe was defiled, where onely by the law of God the sacrifice was appoynted to be offered. Therefore although there were a Church then, yet it could not be visible.

Camp.

Reade the wordes: The kinges of Iuda were as our kings, & as I said, before the times turned, there was many changes. But doeth this follow: there is no church in England where Masse is said (which I dare say many catholikes loue, & would go a great way to heare with all their hearts:) Ergo there are no Catholikes in England. They had no open Comunions in Queene Maries time: ergo there were none, &c.

Fulke.

You make bolde coparisons, you cloye vs with wordes and goe from the matter. We say not that the Church could euer perish out of the earth for one moment of time, or that they were not, because they were not seene, but wee saye against your assertion, the Church in Iudaea was not visible, because there was neither place nor sacrifice, nor high Priest, &c. The Priest was wicked, the Temple was defiled, &c. Nowe all kingdomes may professe religion, and haue their exercises thereof in all places, though they could not doe so in Iudaea.

Campion.

You haue made a good argument for mee, Master Doctor. I will knit it vp with this: though they might onely exercise in the Temple, yet we may euery where: and though Elias sawe them not, yet there were thousandes: so though it be not permitted now to say Masse publikely, and to exercise our functions, yet there are thousandes.

Fulke.

Here is nothing but repetitions. All this is not denied, but where is the visibilitie of this Church vpon earth knowen to men, (as for God he alwayes knoweth them that are his) when the head Pastor, and the only place of exercise of Iewish religion was corrupt.

Campion.

And yet there was Tobias in Israel, and other.

Fulke.

That is not the matter: it was not visible, because they had no other place to exercise in but the Temple at Ierusalem, which at these times was polluted, the very Aultar of God being remoued, and an idolatrous altar set in the place.

Campion.

That is not alike, for we haue our functions free, we may sacrifice euery where, & say Masse vpon euery mountaine.

Fulke.

Like enough for that matter. But there was not so much as an outward face of the Church, the high Priest being an Idolater, and the true Altar taken away, and therefore there could bee no visibilitie. You answeere nothing to the matter,

but abuse the presence with multitude of wordes, and therefore committing the iudgement to them that be wise and learned, I will giue place vnto my brother.

Mast. D. Goade.

Concerning the short warning, the case is al one with vs, as it was with you, we had no longer deliberation the you had, litle about one dayes space, concerning the question, and therefore you haue no cause to complaine, &c.

Campion.

What shall I call your worships name?

Goade.

My name is Goade.

Campion.

Yes that may appeare by this preparation, as it were to a set and solemne thing, these booke also declare, besides the bringing of a writer with you, &c.

Goade.

Well, all these concerne not the matter, you had word assone as we, and were so made acquainted with the question, as it was of your own choice, &c. but in deede you are gone from ye state of the question, against which we came prepared, being of ye whole Catholike Church, as your owne booke doth importe, and it is apparant that you haue wrongfully challenged our definition, being (as hath bene truely sayd) of the Church in general: wel we must I see now, followe whether you leade vs. We must leaue the Catholike Church, and talke of the militant Church, the generall, & goe to a particular. One thing before I ioyne with you I woulde wish you to forbear, namely your dealing with the present state and personall speaches, it will better beseeme modestie, and pertaine more to the matter we haue in hande, &c. which may be performed with lesse waste of wordes and more humilitie. You answere not to the report I haue heard of you, for modest behauing your selfe in conference.

Campion.

Concerning my selfe, I will lay my handes vnder your feete, but I must not huble God to you, you know who saith, *Ne sis humilis in sapientia tua*, be not humble in thy wisdome. I must with courage mainteine religion. *Haec est sapientia vestra coram populo*, this is your wisdome before the people, &c. I must not be prayed in religion.

Goade.

Howe fitly those places of Scripture are applied, I will not now stande to discusse: but concerning the state of the question as your selfe set it downe, you are fallen from it. And the Church euen as it is vpon earth, being but a part of the Catholike Church, I will proue sometime to be hidden. But what meane you when you write that it must be of the nature of the Church, to be visible?

Campion.

I meane that it must be an essentiall marke of the Church, and such a qualitie as is inseparable. It must be as visible, as fire is hote, water moist, &c.

Goade.

Very good: but as you vnderstande this qualitie of visibilitie, you declare your selfe to dissent from others of your side, who by visible, vnderstand a notable glorious Church, who hath her beautie and pompe & as your Bristow writeth her continuall succession of Bishops, &c.



Campion.

That same outward pompe and glorie, may be wating, and yet the Church be visible inough. I woulde bee loth to medle with that question of succession. You knowe why I woulde not willingly deale in it.

Goade.

Well, as hath bene proued out of the olde testament that there was a time when the Church militant was hidden, so will I proue it out of the newe. There was a time when our Sauour Christ being smitten, and all the rest of the Apostles scattered and hidden, that visibilitie was not an inseperable qualitie, ergo this qualitie is not alwayes inseperable.

Campion.

I denie the Antecedent.

Goade.

I thinke any here might proue the Antecedent: the storie of that time sheweth it plaine. The face of the visible Church was then not in Christ & his Apostles, but in the Iewes amongst the Scribes and Pharisees: they had the succession of the Priesthoode and held the chaires. Christ was crucified, put to death and buried, the Apostles scattered and fled into holes and corners, so that if visibilitie be such a certaine marke of the true Church, then the high Priestes, Scribes and Pharises, were the true Church, and not our Sauour Christ and his Apostles.

Campion.

It was a Church in choate, beginning, not perfect.

Goade.

Therefore it was at sometime hidden, &c. namely in the beginning of the Church: where was then this visibilitie?

Campion.

In the virgin Marie, Zacharie, Iohn Baptiste, Peter, &c.

Goade.

What shewe you me these to proue the Church visible? who was Pastor, when the Pastor was smitten and killed? who occupied the chaires? where was the outward face of the Church, which you will haue to be so glorious? and where was the Pastor and outward exercise of Religion?

Campion.

I haue said before, that it is not necessarie, it should haue alwayes that outward pompe and glorie. In the beginning, it is not apparant, as afterwards.

Goade.

Ergo there is a time, when it may be hidden.

Campion.

Not hidden, for they were gathered together. It was in deede pusillus grex, a litle flocke, but proue that it was not visible.

Goade.

Because you make light accompt of these times, as being but the beginnings of the Church, let vs goe on to the proceedings and encrease. In those great persecutions vnder the cruell Emperours, the Church became hidde and inuisible, ergo visibilitie is not an inseperable marke: specially in thee time of Dioclesian, Christians were so wasted as to the iudgement of me, there were none remaining: their bookes

were burnt, their churches destroyed, and them selues put to death with sondrie tormentes.

Camp.

You answere your selfe. For against whom was this secutio so hot, against whom fought they, were they shadowes: I am sure there were Christians, or els they could not haue stode forth to haue endured those tormentes: but I coulde shewe you Rome in that time. Some escaped till Constantines time, much about three and twenty yeeres. All were not eaten vp: for then euery man would be a Christian, and well was he that could shewe him self so. I could name you the Bishop of Rome that then was.

Goade.

But in the ende after that great hauocke was made, and crueltie had wasted all that could be founde, where was then the visible Church: In the ende it was enforced to be hidden. It had lost that which you say must needes be of the nature of it, the glorie of it was so eclipsed that it shined no where.

Campion.

It was most visible then and most glorious, and not long after, when Constantine came, al were Christias: Wherby it appeareth that diuers remained.

Goade.

That is not to the point: though some remained, yet they were hidde. All being persecuted and put to death that coulde be knowen or founde.

Campion.

The time of these persecutions, was euen like to our times. For then the Christians were exiled, put to death, driue into corners, as the Catholikes are nowe, and yet there remained inough, &c. and they were knowen.

Goade.

Surely you make euill and vntrue comparisons, you haue no such cause to com-  
 plaine of bloody persecutios in the time of our gracious Queene, and doe not wel to  
 compare her highnes peaceable and milde gouernement with those tyrannical perse-  
 cutions: ye might better liken your crueltie shewed in Queene Maries time to those  
 examples. I had thought to haue founde more modestie in you.

Campion.

Well, let the comparison bee of Q. Maries time: then Protestants were put to  
 death, & yet there remained many.

Goade.

The question is not whether they remained, but whether they were seen. But  
 you said of those Emperours times, that there remained many, and they were not  
 vnknowen. They were vnknowen both to the faithles and faithfull: ergo they were  
 altogether vnknowen.

Campion.

I deny both partes of the antecedent.

Goade.

Then I must proue both distinctly, and first touching the faithles. The faithles  
 could not knowe the Church: therefore they did not knowe it.

Camp.

They knew it not by faith, but by sense they knewe it.

Goade.

Iohn 3. The worlde knoweth not vs, because it knoweth not him.

Campion.

I tolde you they did not knowe him as they ought to know him, to saluation. They knewe, but not fruitfully and effectually. As I knowe you are a Protestant, but yet beleue not your religion. And a man that saith Masse is knowen, and yet you doe not beleue in it.

Goade.

But though the persons were knowen, yet they knewe them not to be of the Church. I will come to the other part of the antecedent.

As is the whole so are the partes:

But God onely knoweth the whole:

Ergo he onely knoweth the partes. For the members of Christ are knowen to Christ alone. By reason of many hypocrites, men are not able to iudge who are truly faithfull. There are many wolues within, and many sheepe without: Deus nouit qui sunt sui, 2. Tim. 2. God knoweth who are his, therefore the true members of Christ can not be knowen but to God alone.

Campion.

I knowe not who is elect, but I knowe who is a Catholike: I knowe not whether the Bishop of Rome bee elect or no, &c.

Goade.

Onely the elect are of the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

Camp.

I say that both good & euill are of the visible Church.

Goade.

Christ hath no dead members of his body: therefore the reprobate can not bee of the Church. I will helpe you with a distinction. They may be in the Church, but not of the Church.

Campion.

The distinction is Caluins, and therefore I refuse it. But you answere your selfe, for euill men may be viua membra Christi, the liuely members of Christ in respect of faith, but not in respect of charitie. A man may be a member of the body of Christ, as it is here in earth, being a wicked man: but onely the godly are members of his body as it is in heauen. Your own argument doth confound you. It is impossible to knowe the elect: therefore it is impossible the Church should be inuisible.

Goade.

It is your parte to answere, not to oppose: you vse many words & graunt absurdities. Your argumet doth not folow.

Campion.

You cannot know any particular man to be elect, you cannot pronounce it of your selfe: therefore you cannot measure the Church by election. then it remaineth the Church must be visible, because it must be knowen.

Goade.

To be elect or true members of Christ is one thing, & to be in the visible Church is another.

Campion.

This was Wickliefes error that onely the electe were true members of the Church: but as I haue sayde, no man can knowe who is elect, and therefore you teache that

no man can knowe a member of the Church, nor no man can knowe that he shall be sau'd.

Goade.

Particular electio is not so vnknownen as you would make it: for a man may haue knowledge of his owne election by vndoubted testimonies, and see the signes of election in others.

Fulke.

You saide before that visibilitie was an inseparable qualitie of the Church, whereupon I reason thus.

If it be an inseparable qualitie, it is an inseparable note:

But it is not an inseparable note:

Ergo not an inseparable qualitie.

Campion.

I deny both the Maior and the Minor: both may be doubted of.

Fulke.

I will proue both.

Campion.

Giue me leaue: A note is more then a qualitie. The qualitie is to goe right, to goe the neerest and gainest way, the safest way. A note is a marke that may be remoued, that teacheth to turne on the right hand, or on the lefte, by this crosse, or by that windmill or marke, &c.

Fulke.

I graunt there is a difference betweene a note and a qualitie, and you needed not so many wordes to haue shewed that, but I speake of an inseparable note, and an inseparable qualitie. That qualitie which is inseparable, being also a note, must needes be an inseparable note. Also of that your selfe haue saide, that it is an essentiall qualitie. I will proue the Maior.

Whatsoever marke is of the essence or nature, is inseparable:

The visiblenes is a marke which is of the essence and nature of the Church:

Therefore it is an inseparable marke.

Campion.

It is an inseparable qualitie, but not an inseparable note, but after a sorte: for a qualitie must euermore stande, but a marke may be taken away.

Fulke.

The question is, whether it be an inseparable note of the Church that cannot be taken away.

Campion.

I say it may be, in a sense.

Fulke.

I know not what sense you speake of, but this is eident by your owne confession, the visiblenes of the Church is a marke, and it is of the nature. Ergo it is inseparable. so my Maior is plaine.

Campion.

Proue your Minor.

Fulke.

There was a time when visiblenes was no note of the Church: ergo it is not an inseparable note.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent.

Fulke.

There was a time, when the Church was only knowe by the Scriptures: therefore there was a time when visiblenes was no note of the Church.

Campion.

I deny both the Antecedent and the consequent.

Fulke.

I will proue both, and first the Antecedent.

Cam.

Nay proue the consequent first, & then the antecedet.

Fulke.

Why, the other is first, both in order and nature.

Campion.

Nay. Whensoever the consequent is denied, you must straight proue the argument.

Fulke.

That is, if the consequent onely be denied, but seeing you deny both, I will first proue that which in nature & order is first, and afterward I will proue the other, (if it neede.) It is but a sory shift of you, to decline from the point of the question. Chrysostome saith, that Christianitie which is the Church, is to bee knowen only by the Scriptures. He hath these wordes, Tantummodoper scripturas: nullo modo: nulla probatio, &c.

Wherefore thus I frame my argumet out of Chrysostoms place.

The Church is to be knowen onely by the Scriptures:

But visibilitie is not the Scriptures:

Ergo the Church is not to be knowe by visibilitie. Or thus.

The only note to know the Church by, is y holy Scriptures:

Uisibilitie is not the holy Scripturs:

Ergo visibilitie is not a note to know the Church by.

Campion.

Yea, out of the Scriptures the Church may bee knowen, for the Scriptures appoint visiblenes to bee a marke of the Church. But I deny the Minor.

Fulke.

Do you say then, that visibilitie is the Scripture?

Campion.

I say, visibilitie is conteined in the Scriptures.

Fulke.

My Minor is, that visiblenes is not the Scripture, & so vpon my Maior, which is Chrysostomes authoritie, I conclude that visiblenes is no marke of the Church.

Campion.

I know Chrysostomes place, hee denieth not visiblenes to be a note. You may go to an other argument.

Fulke.

You would not heare Chrysostome by your will, but he shalbe read by your leaue.

Tunc cum videritis abominationem desolationis stantem in loco sancto, id est, cum videritis haeresim impiam, quae est exercitus Antichristi stantem in locis sanctis Ecclesiae: in illo tempore qui in Iudea sunt, fugiant ad montes, id est, qui sunt in Christianitate, conferant se ad scripturas. Sicut enim verus Iudeus est Christianus dicente Apostolo, non qui in manifesto, sed qui in occulto: sic vera Iudea, Christianitas est, cuius nomen intelligitur confessio. Montes autem sunt scripturae Apostolorum aut Prophetarum, de quibus dictum est: Illuminas tu mirabiliter a montibus aeternis. Et iterum de ecclesia dicit: fundamenta eius in montibus sanctis. Et quare iubet in hoc tempore omnes Christianos conferre se ad Scripturas? Quia in tempore hoc, ex quo obtinuit haeresis illas Ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse verae Christianitatis, neque effugium potest esse Christianorum aliud volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi Scripturae diuinae. Antea enim multis modis ostendebatur, quae esset Ecclesia Christi, & quae gentilitas: nunc autem nullo modo cognoscitur volentibus cognoscere quae sit vera Ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummod per scripturas, &c. Then when you shall see the abomination of desolation standing in that holy place, that is, when you shall see an vngodly heresie, which is the army of Antichrist, standing in the holy places of the Church: in that time, they which are in Iury, let them flie to the mountaines, that is, they that are in Christianitie, let them get them to the Scriptures. For as the true Iewe is a Christian (as the Apostle sayeth) not which is in open sight, but which is in secrete: so true Iurie (whose name is vnderstood to be confession) is Christianitie. And the mountaines are the Scripture of the Apostles and Prophets: of whome it is sayde, Thou doest giue light marueilously from the euerlasting moutaines. And againe he sayeth of the Church, Her foundations are in the holy hilles. And wherefore doeth he commaunde all Christians in this time, to get them to the Scriptures? Because in this time, since heresie hath obtained those Churches, there can be no tryall of true Christianitie, neyther can there be any other escape of Christians, which woulde knowe the trueth of the faith, but the Diuine Scriptures. For before times, it was shewed by many wayes which was the Church of Christ, and which was gentilitie: but nowe to them that woulde knowe which is the true Church of Christ, it is knowen by none other meanes, but onely by the Scriptures. This is playne for the Antecedent. And these particles are playne, Nullo modo cognoscitur, It is knowen by no meanes, there is no other profe, but tantummod per Scripturas, onely by the Scriptures.

Campion.

Master Doctor you knowe the order, I deny the consequent, you proue the Antecedent.

Fulke.

You denied the Antecedent, and therefore it was necessary for me to proue it. But this place also doeth prooue the Consequence of mine argument, which you denied. Let me see howe you can answer to the place.

All other markes in time of heresie or schisme, by Chrysostomes iudgement are excluded, but onely the Scriptures:

Therefore visibilitie also is excluded from being a marke of the Church.

Campion.

When the Church was first planted, there was miracles, by which it might be knowen: but nowe they ceasing, it is to be knowen (sayeth Chrysostome) onely by the Scriptures: meaning that it is not to be knowen by miracles, &c.

Fulke.

This answere is a senseles cauil, which is easily auoyded. For there is an Antithesis or opposition in Chrysostomes wordes: howe it was knowen before, that is, multis modis by many wayes, and howe it may be knowen nowe, by one onely way, tantummodo per Scripturas, onely by the Scriptures. For nowe that Antichrist is reuealed, he excludeth all wayes, except one, & sayeth it must be knowen onely by the Scriptures. Therefore he excludeth visiblenesse as well as miracles, from being an inseparable note of the Church.

Campion.

It excludeth miracles, &c.

Fulke.

Well then your answere is, that nullo modo: nulla probatio: & tantummod: excludeth nothing but miracles.

Campion.

Yea, and that appeareth by the wordes, Ante tempus Antichristi. For whereunto els should nunc and ante be referred, except it had meant by ante, before the primatiue Church, and nunc nowe by the present and instant time.

Fulke.

You do but talke. you cannot so put away, Nulla probatio, No prooffe. Nullo modo, by no meane it is knowen, but tantummodo per Scripturas, onely by the Scriptures, &c. He speaketh of all times since heresies haue occupied the Churches. If you wil answere no otherwise, I will rest vpon iudgement.

Campion.

I haue answered, but I would to God I had a notarie: well, I commit all to God. But I pray you note that I say, that visibilitie is included in the Scriptures.

Goade.

I will examine this cause by a manifest place, one of the strongest that is alleadged by those of your side, to prooue the visibilitie of the Church: namely, that out of the 5. of Mattheue, A citie that is buylded on a hill, can not be hid, whereupon they inferre, therefore the Church must needes be alwayes visible.

Campion.

If it please you, though it be commonly alleadged, yet it is allegoricall. There are many stronger places, and you were best take a more pregnant place, &c.

Goade.

It is alleadged by Hosius, and others on your side, to this purpose, and therefore I chose it: notwithstanding, if you shunne it and would haue me to omitte it, I will.

Campion.

No, I say there are apter and stronger places: neuerthelesse I shunne it not, but because of these hearers, wee should seeke most for edification, and it is the speciall cause of our meeting.

Goade.

Thus then I reason:

This speciall place alleadged by those of your side, can not be vnderstoode of the Church: Ergo it proues not this visibilitie

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent.

Goade.

I would be glad, for the better waying of this place, that you would remember what your selfe hath written, concerning the finding out of the sense of any place of Scripture, in the second chapter of your booke. I would you had bene as reasonable in other thinges of your booke, and then we should haue agreed better: for the rule is very good to helpe to the true sense, that the circumstances of the place be considered, the wordes that goe before, that followe after, the scope, the clauses, and whole context. Nowe both out of that which goeth before, and of that which followeth, out of the whole scope and drift of the place, it is euident to be spoken onely of the Apostles, and their successors in the ministerie: Ergo it is onely to be vnderstoode of them, and not of the whole Church.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent.

Goade.

Whatsoever is spoken properly of the Apostles doctrine and life, can not be vnderstoode of the whole Church:

But this is properly spoken of their doctrine and life:

Therefore it can not be vnderstoode of the whole Church.

Campion.

You must not petere principium. It was not onely spoken in respect of the Apostles function, but of y whole church, no otherwise then as the Apostles were Christians, including the whole Church.

Goade.

Then that commaundement, *Bibite ex hoc omnes, Drinke ye all of this*, spoken to the Apostles, much more must include the whole Church, being spoken of the sacrament which appertaineth to all, and yet ye exclude the people from the cuppe.

Campion.

This was not spoken to them as they were Christians, but in respect of their function, as they were priestes: the other was spoken as they were Christians.

Goade.

Neither of these is true: but briefly deny one part of my argument.

Campion.

I deny the minor.

Goade.

Out of the circumstaces of the place and conclusion, it is manifest, that it is properly spoken of the Apostles doctrine and life, and not of the whole Church. Consider the wordes. *Vos estis sal terrae, You are the salt of the earth. Vos estis lux mundi, &c. You are the light of the worlde. Non potest ciuitas abscondi, &c. A citie can not be hid. Then the conclusion: Sic luceat lux vestra, So let your light shine, &c. You are the salt of the earth, noteth ye Apostles doctrine, wherwith they should seaso others. You are the light of the worlde, noteth their life, whereupon all mens eyes are cast, and so can no more be hid then a citie vpon an hill. Both these poyntes are proper to the ministerie, and hereupon the conclusion inferred, So let your light shine, &c.*

Campion.

You haue very well answered your selfe: For the text containeth both. There is the salt and the earth: the light and the world: who must season, and who must be



seasoned: who must shine, and to whom they must shine. Do you not see plainly, that he includeth both the teachers, and them that are taught? &c.

Goade.

Nowe you fall to discoursing cleane besides the purpose. It is true that the one can not be without the other, but yet it is playne, that to season, to lighten, and to be set as vpon an hill, is proper alone to the Apostles and their ministerie. For the drift and scope of the place, is onely to set forth the Apostles doctrine & conuersation, and you violently wrest it to the whole Church. The life of the ministerie, is as it were set vpon an high stage, the light of their conuersation is looked vnto of all: what is this to the visibilitie of the whole Church?

Campion.

Very wel, doth a candle shine to it selfe? and is not a master of a familie, a Master? and that which is spoken to him, may it not be sayd also to them?

Goade.

I pray you howe holdeth this argument? The life and doctrine of the ministerie is as it were set vpon a stage for all men to looke vnto, and therefore they are called the salte of the earth, the light of the worlde: Ergo the whole Church is visible. This is the force of your argument from this place.

Camp.

I haue sayd the text maketh not for you. It is not vnderstoode of their ministerie and life only, as they were Apostles, but as they were Christians.

Goade.

As I haue proued this out of the text, so nowe I will shewe this to be the sense out of the Fathers, both Chrysostome and Ierome vpon the place.

Campion.

You may spare your labour, you shall neuer finde Doctor that vnderstandeth it onely of the ministerie: I tell you that aforehand.

Goade.

Yes I will shew out of Chrysostome, that it is onely vnderstoode of the ministerie, and of their life: in the afternoone according to your request, the place shalbe shewed.

Campion.

It is a common and an vsuall kinde of speache, to vtter that to the master, which is meant to the seruants.

Goade.

Wil you beleue none but your selfe? hearken what Saint Hierome sayth vpon this place.

Campion.

Yes, if you would beleue Hierome, as well as I, we should be soone agreed. What thinke you, is Hierome of your religion? would you be of his?

Goade.

I would not be of any mans religion, to buylde vpon man. I holde neither of one nor other, but of Christ, and grounde my religion onely vpon his worde. But remember your strong place you spake of, to proue the perpetual visibilitie of the church. Let vs heare what it is.

Campion.

Shall I then haue one argument?

Goade.

Yea let vs heare it: you shalbe answered, though it be not your part to oppose.  
 Campion.

It is out of Matthew chap. 18. Dic Ecclesiae, Tell the Church. I will proue out  
 of this place, that the Church of necessitie must continually be visible. I proue it  
 thus.

This is a commaundement that is perpetuall, and must be alwayes executed in  
 the Church:

But that can not be, vnlesse the Church be visible:

Ergo the visibilitie of the Church is continuall.

Goade.

I distinguish of the maior. When the Church is gathered & may retaine a face,  
 when it doeth-execute gouernment, & hath a consistorie to heare matters, then  
 it ought to be done: but this cannot be alwayes had, being often hindered by  
 persecution.

Camp.

Offences betweene brother & brother happen alwaies, and this is the medicine  
 and remedy. There is no age, wherein there are not offences, & where shal I seeke  
 the perpetual remedy that is appointed, vnles the Church be perpetually visible?

Goade.

I haue said before. Whe there is a state, & an established Church, this remedy  
 is to be sought for. But this cannot alwaies be had, because the militant afflicted  
 church oftentimes can not be suffered to exercise this medicine of holsome discipline.

Camp.

The disease is continuall, ergo the remedy is continual. I must tell my Prelates:  
 where shal I tel the, if they be not.

Goade.

The remedy is continually necessary & holsome, but can not cotinually be vsed.  
 Diuers most necessary things are not alwayes in vse. It is most necessary the Gospel  
 should be cotinually preached, it is Christes commandement, & yet this oftentime  
 fayleth: as in persecution, whe the church is driuen into streights, and the publique  
 exercise of the worde restrained. I deny your argument: It is alwayes necessary,  
 therefore it is alwayes in vse and practise. Many other necessary thinges are wanting  
 many times that ought to be, and yet this taketh them not away, neither maketh  
 them vayne or vnecessary, &c.

Campion.

The disease is common: it is perpetual. To whom shoulde I haue gone before  
 Luthers time? What Prelats should I haue made my complaint vnto in those dayes?  
 I must tell my Pastor, &c.

Goade.

You are answered, that in times of persecution this coulde not be, and specially  
 in those times of generall Apostacie foretolde by the Apostle, 2. Thess. 2. this  
 could not be practised, no more then the true preaching of the worde. You deale  
 straungely with vs. When you had shut vs in prison, embrewed your handes with our  
 blood, driue the true Church as it were into the wilderness, through your grieuous  
 persecutions and tyrannies, so as there coulde be no meetings for publike exercise

of religion: then you aske where was our Church, and to whome we shoulde haue gone before Luthers times.

Campion.

Where was your Church for 900. yeeres agoe? Whose were Iohn Husse? Hierome of Prage? the Waldenses? &c. Were they yours? Helpe him Master Doctor.

Fulke.

It needeth not: this is beside the matter, your place is answered. The remedy is not ydle or vayne, though sometimes men are restrayned from the vse of it. Cyprian complayneth aboue 1200. yeeres agoe, that for the great persecution that was against the Church, they could not meete so often as they desired, to execute discipline, and yet who will deny but the discipline of the Church is perpetuall? It must be vsed when it may bee had. A medicine is not an idle medicine in the Apothecaries shoppe, nor Galens prescription thereof is vayne, because sometimes it can not be had.

Campion.

Though of some at sometimes it cannot be had in one place, yet it may be had in another. There may be some cases wherein I can not tell where the Church is, to tell it: but if I wil seeke it, I may finde it.

Fulke.

The words are spoken generally to euery man, Si peccauerit aduersuste frater, If thy brother offend against thee, &c: and yet euery man can not obteyne it. You that are in prison, what Church can you tell, if you bee offended? will you say the remedy is vayne, because you can not vse it? Againe, there are meane remedies before a man come to this, that he should tell the Church: hee must first giue priuate admonition, and before witnesses, which euery man can not do that is offended. As to whom shoulde Elias haue complayned, when hee knewe none but himselfe? Therefore it is no more necessary, that there should be a visible Church alwayes to complayne vnto: then it is necessary that euery man should alwayes bee able to admonish priuately, or to haue two or three witnesses to call vnto him. Againe, you aunswere your selfe, that there may be some cases wherein I can not tell where the Church is, to tell it. Therefore it was very yll concluded of you, that if a man can not alwayes haue a visible Church to make his complaynt vnto, the remedie prescribed by our Sauour Christ is vayne or idle. And concerning the name Ecclesia in that text, when it is sayde we should tell the Church, ye abuse the audience: for it meaneth not the whole Church, but the consistorie and eldershippe, that haue the gouernement of euery particular congregation. For howe can a man tell the whole Church on earth, or yet the whole parish where he dwelleth: but he may tell the company of Elders and gouernors, when such are established to haue the execution of discipline, and this also may be interrupted by persecution.

Campion.

Master Doctor you haue sayde well for mee: the worde Ecclesia is taken for the gouernours of the Church, and they are alwayes in sight. In what place of the Scripture is the worde Ecclesia taken for an inuisible Church, you can shewe mee no place. Shewe mee one place: shewe mee one place if you can.

Fulke.

I can shew you a great many. But because you call so earnestly for one, I will shew you one.

It is taken for the whole body of the Church: therefore for an inuisible church, in the first chapter to the Ephesians, in the latter ende, where the Apostle sayeth, in non-Latin alphabet : And he appoyntedhim head ouer all thinges vnto his Church, which is his body, and the fulnes of him which filleth all in all. So that it is taken for the whole Catholike Church, as it containeth all the elect of God, those that haue bene, are, and shalbe, &c. which vniuersall Church is inuisible.

Campion.

I graunt it is there taken for the Church triumphant and militant.

Fulke.

Ergo it is there taken for an inuisible Church. For we speake of it as it conteyneth euery member, and is the whole body of Christ, whereof some are yet vnborne.

Campion.

I graunt it of the whole: but the Church militant is visible, the other inuisible.

Fulke.

But the Catholike Church of Christ being the body of Christ, is mysticall: ergo insensible.

Campion.

Prooue it according to all partes to bee inuisible.

Fulke.

It is sufficient for mee to prooue, that the Catholike Church, which is the whole body of Christ, is mystical: & therefore it is inuisible. I speake of the Catholike Church, as it is an article of faith. For, wee beleue the Catholike Church according to the articles of faith: Nowe fayth is of things which are not seene: ergo the Catholike Church is inuisible.

Campion.

I knowe that the whole Catholike Church and euery part of the same, as it is of faith, is inuisible: but what is this to the Church militant:

Fulke.

You vrged me to shewe a place where the word Ecclesia is taken for an inuisible Church: and I haue shewed you, that it is taken for an inuisible Church, wheresoeuer it is taken for the Catholike Church, which you confesse to be inuisible, both in the whole and euery part.

Campion.

So farre as it is of faith.

Fulke.

And we speake of it, as it is of faith. For the whole Catholike Church, being an article of fayth, is considered no otherwise then as it is of faith, neither any part thereof by your owne confession: whereof it followeth that the visible Church, for which you striue so much, is no article of our faith, because it is seen, faith being of things that are not seene. You haue graunted many absurdities this daye, while you labour to defende that the Church on earth is alwayes visible. And now the conclusion is worst of al, that the visible Church (for which you are so earnest) is proued to be no article of faith.

Campion.

Why may not a man see & yet beleue. Peter sawe him whom he beleued, saying, thou art Christ the sonne of the liuing God, &c.

Fulke.

That which hee sawe of Christ, was experimentall knowledge: but that which he confessed, Christ to be the sonne of God, was of faith, and not of sense. For flesh and blood reuealed it not vnto him, but God from heauen. That which Peter sawe of Christ with his bodily eyes, was seene of many vnbeleeuing Iewes, and of Iudas the traytor: but his confession (which came of faith) he had not by bodily sight, but by diuine reuelation. It is not of faith, to see men which are the members of the Church, but to see them as they are members of the Church, that is of faith: therfore that which is seene of the Church is not of faith.

Camp.

Why, you said the Church might be seene by experimentall faith, as Peter sawe Christ and beleued.

Fulke.

When said I so?

Campion.

Euen now when you spake of Peter.

Fulk.

I neuer thought it, much lesse did I speake it. It is needfull there should be writing, els I see you would outface the matter: I said the cleane contrarie. That which Peter sawe of Christ, was experimentall knowledge, and not faith: that which he beleued and confessed, he sawe not. Euen so I say, that which we beleue and confesse in our Creede of the Catholike Church, wee neither do see, neither can we see.

Campion.

I can see the whole world, though I cannot see it all at once: so I can see the Catholike Church in her parts, although I cannot see it all at once, or in one place.

Fulke.

Whatsoever you can see at seuerall times, and in seuerall places of the Catholike Church, is no article of faith, For that which we beleue of the Catholike Church, is not seene at any time, or in any place.

Campion.

That is true.

Fulke.

Ergo the whole Catholike Church, and euery part thereof, as it is of faith, is not visible.

Here Campion of himselfe brake vp.

Campion.

Shall we meete againe. It were to be considered of what question we shall talke.

Here question being made, what point they should deale vpon, and being asked whether he would defend the Church of Rome to be the true Church of Christ, he denied to medle therein, as being daungerous, vnles leaue might be obtained of her Maiesties most honourable Counsaile. Then being demanded whether he would deale with that question in the after noone, Whether the Church might erre, he consented, the company present agreeing therunto. And so the houre was appointed at two of the clocke after dinner: the Replyers hauing no longer time to provide their arguments.

**In the after noone. The Question. whether the visible Church  
 may erre.**

**F**irst, because promise was made in the forenoone, that those places which were omitted, should bee shewed, D. Goade brought forth his place out of Chrysostome vpon Math. 5. Rursus eos per ista ad bene viuendum ac diligentiam cohortatur, ostendens vt studeant esse solliciti, quasiante omniu oculos constituti, & in medio orbis terrarum teatro. Nolite inquit aspicere, quia in isto nunc residemus loco, in exigua sumus parte certaminis. Sic enim eritis manifesti cunctis quemadmodum ciuitas in montis vertice collocata, vel sicut lucerna in domo super candelabru relucens. Againe by these things he exhortheth them by diligence of well liuing, that they might stande to be carefull as they that are set before all mens eyes, and in the middest of the Theatre of the whole world. Do not you regarde (saith he) that we remaine nowe in this place, and are but in a small part of our battle: for you shalbe so manifest to all men, as a citie placed vpon the top of a hill, or as a candle shining in a house vpon a candlestick, &c. Here you see by the iudgement of Chrysostome, expounding the place, that it onely respecteth the Apostles which you denied to day. For he exhortheth them to liue well, as those that are set in the sight and eyes of all, and therefore must be carefull howe they beare them selues vpon that open stage of the whole worlde, being as a citie vpon an hill.

Campion.

The place is nothing against me, for it pertaineth to the whole Church. Doth Chrysostome cotrarie any thing spoken by me? doeth not their function, their faith and religion, their place shew that this is not spoken onely to them?

Goade.

These are but wordes. It is plaine, hee noteth their doctrine by the salte, and their conuersation by the light.

Campion.

He speaketh not any thing contrarie to that which I haue said.

Goade.

Yes, you say the place meaneth the whole Church to proue the visibilitie thereof, as a citie set vpon an hill, can not bee hidde. Whereas Chrysostome interpreteth it of the Ministerie onely, as is manifest by ye word Salt, & the whole drift of the place.

Campion.

Of all other, first it belongeth to the Prelates, then to their flockes, as I haue shewed you by the example of a Master of a familie.

Goade.

It belongeth in deede to the flocke also to liue well, but this place is not directed vnto them. It is absurde, against the whole scope of the place, to make a general conclusion from a particular, from the Apostles to the whole Church.

Campion.

The Apostles were faithfull, they include the whole Church, as they were Christians, and not Apostles.

Goade.

Why then, that which was spoken to the Apostles, was likewise spoken to ye

Church. But it was said to the Apostles Drinke you all of this: ergo to the whole Church.

Campion.

That was personall, and in respect of their functio, he spake onely in respect of those that were present, but there was none present but the Apostles: like that which was saide to the Apostles, Go ye and preach to all nations, baptizing, &c. doeth he therefore commande the people also to preache and minister the Sacraments?

Goade.

The rase is farre vnlike. The receauing of the Sacramentes belong to all Christians: they must all receaue. And though preaching the word, and ministring, in respect of the function, be onely appropriate to the Apostles and Ministers: yet the word and Sacraments, are commo to al Christians. So by manifest difference it appeareth, that the commadement, Go & preach, is personall, belonging to one calling: and the commandement Drinke ye all of this, is generall to all the faithfull.

Campion.

There is no place in the institution that comandes the common people to drinke, or not to drinke.

Goade.

The Apostle (the best interpreter of Christes institution) applieth it to the whole Church, 1. Cor. 11. verse 23. That which I receaued of the Lord, &c. And by the same reason you may say as was said before, there is no commandement to receaue the Communion.

Campion.

There is no comandement in that institutio, that the lay people should receaue the Communion.

Fulke.

That is a shamefull absurditie. But nowe seeing the place is shewed, let vs come to the question agreed vpon. Whether the Church militant erre? That it may, I proue thus.

Whatsoever error is incident to euery member, is incident to the whole:

But it is incident to euery member to erre:

Ergo to the whole.

Campion.

I deny both the Maiorand Minor.

Fulke.

Why, the Maior is from a place in Logique: that which is incident to euery part, must needes be incident to the whole: as euery part of a mans body, is subiect to corruption, therefore the whole body is subiect to corruption.

Campion.

There is no such place in Logique. Euery man may erre, but not the whole gathered together. Your example is not like: for the whole hath a promise, and so hath not euery particular man.

Fulke.

The whole hath no promise that it shall not erre, more theu euery particular member: for euery member of Christ hath the spirit of Christ, which is the spirit of truthe, and therefore the same promise that the whole hath.

Campion.

Why, then there should be no heretikes.

Fulke.

Yes, heretikes may be within the Church, but not of the Church: Si ex nobis  
 essent permansissent nobiscum saith Saint Iohn, If they had bene of vs, they had  
 abidden with vs.

Camp.

They were of vs in apparance, & in outward shewe.

Fulke.

I denie that they were of vs, though in outward profession they seemed to bee  
 of vs: for in deede they were neuer of vs. Iohn. 3. They went out from vs, but  
 they were neuer of vs. And he addeth the reason: For, if they had bene of vs, they  
 had remained with vs. They were within the Church, but they were neuer of the  
 Church.

Campion.

Christ saith of them that fall away in persecution, that they beleued ye Gospel:  
 therfore before persecution they were of vs, but they departed from vs, &c. they  
 were of vs according to faith, though they were not according to election.

Fulke.

Christ speaketh not there of true iustifying faith, nor of the elect, but of those  
 that beleued for a time. For if they had bene of vs, they would haue remained still  
 with vs: but they were not of vs, neither according to iustifying faith, nor according  
 to election.

Camp.

The meaning of Iohn is, they were not of vs according to the election of God,  
 yet they were of the militant Church, which conteineth both good and euill.

Fulke.

It is true, that in the visible Church be conteined both good and euill: but the  
 elect onely are of the Church.

Campion.

Why, what say you by Dauid when he comitted adulterie, was he elect and the  
 childe of God?

Fulke.

I say he did wickedly, but yet he was and remained elect, and the childe of God.

Campion.

This is strange. But I say, when he comitted adulterie, he was the childe of the  
 deuill: for it is plaine,

He that committeth sinne is the seruant of sinne:

But Dauid committed sinne:

Ergo he was the seruant of sinne and the childe of the deuill.

Goade.

The meaning of the place is, that he that giueth him selfe ouer to sinne is the  
 seruant of sinne, to be led wholly by it, in whom sinne reigneth. But no particular  
 sinne in the elect, doeth make the children of God to become the children of the  
 Deuill, neither doth separate them from the hope of saluation.

Fulke.

He that is once a true member of Christ, can neuer become a member of the  
 Deuill.



Campion.

Then once good, and neuer euill.

Fulke.

That followeth not. Hee may fall into euill, but neuer finally.

Goade.

The place is to be vnderstodde of him that falleth of malice, and not of him that falleth by infirmitie.

Campion.

He that falleth into adulterie, falleth malitiously: for he may resist if he will. For euery member of the Church hath power to withstand sinne if he will.

Fulke.

Nowe, we shall haue free will.

Campion.

I meane not of him selfe, but by grace. For when God hath giuen him grace, he may if he will resiste. Answer me this place, He is the seruant of sinne that committeth sinne.

Fulke.

You were answered before.

Campion.

Why then you holde, that a Catholike falling into adulterie is still the childe of God. I graunt that for euery offece God doth not cast out his sonnes. For in a great house, In magna domo, there be many sonnes, which though they be disobediat, they cease not to be sonnes till they be cast out, &c. but when they are cast out, they are no more the sonnes of God.

Fulk.

God casteth out none of his sies. For, if they be sonnes, they are also heyres. They are the Apostles wordes.

Camp.

I say they are sonnes for the tune, which are cast out. Eijcit in exteriores tenebras. He casteth them out into vtter darknes. He that had not the nuptial garment, maketh this claime to be the sonne of God, and sitteth down amongst Gods children, but he is cast out into vtter darkenes.

Fulk.

But he was neuer any sonne, but an hypocrite, & therefore no maruaile if he were cast out: S. Paul saith, yt a sonne is an heire.

Camp.

Why, are not all that are bapti the sonnes of God?

Fulk.

No, for they haue not all the spirit of adoption.

Camp.

Why then, what iudge you of infants that die without Baptisme, or immediatly after they are baptized: are they not the children of God:

Fulke.

I take not vpon me to iudge. But if they bee not Gods elect, baptisme cannot make them his children.

Camp.

Then Christ commanded baptisme in vaine, if it saue not those that are baptized.

Fulke.

That is not so: for there is a necessary vse of baptizing, though the holy Ghost be not giuen to euery one that receiueth baptisme. I baptize with water (saith Iohn Baptist) but Christ baptizeth with the holy Ghost.

Camp.

I wil proue that infants are without si, & therefore must needes be saued. For if they haue sinne, they must either haue original sinne, or actual sinne: but being baptized, they haue neither of both: (for originall sinne is taken away by baptisme, & as for actual sinne, they neuer committed any) ergo they are without sinne.

Fulke.

Originall sinne is not taken away from any in this life, but it is not imputed to the elect.

M. Lieutenant.

M. Doctours, the question that was appointed before dinner, was, Whether the visible Church may erre.

Goade.

M. Lieutenant, he continually draweth vs into newe questions to auoid the matter in controuersie. Shall I enter that question? I will recite some Churches in ye Apostles times, & aske your iudgement of the, & then go to mine argumet. The Churches of Corinth & of Galatia, what say you to the The Church of Corinth (though they had a promise, as you said) did erre about ye matter of resurrectio: ye church of Galatia, about ye matter of iustificatio

Camp.

The Apostle though he wrote to all, yet he meaneth but some fewe of them. And what are these to the whole Church, being but particular churches? the militant Church of Christ coplehendeth y whole nuber of churches on earth. As for y error of y church of Galatia, it was no otherwise reprobud then as preachers are wot to reprove, who are wot to rebuke al for some y are faulty.

Goade.

In deede you say some thing concerning that of Corinth. I grant yt the error was not so generall. For he said, Quida inter vos, &c. Certaine amongst you, &c. But for the Galathians it was otherwise. For the whole Church was iustly reprobud, according to that, O you foolish Galathians, who hath be witched you, that you should not beleue the truthe? These wholly fell & were not particular mebers, but whole Churches, planted by the Apostles them selues, replenished with speciall giftes of the holy Ghost. And if these faded in the Apostles time, & in so great a matter, what priuilege haue any other churches since, y they shuld not likewise erre & so cosequetly what priuilege hath y militat church:

Camp.

Make your argument, & then we shal see what ye will conclude.

Goade.

So then I make mine argument.

Whatsoever congregation doth erre in matters of faith, is not the true Church:

But the Church of Rome erreth in matters of faith:

Ergo the Church of Rome is not the true Church.

Campion.

This is from the question. M. Lieutenant might doe well to put vs in minde of the question.

Goad.

I remember the question well. I bring an instance according to your meaning, because you in saying that the Church canot erre, meane y the church of Rome canot erre: this priuilege agreeth not to y church of Rome, which you say is y true Church.

Campion.

I deny your Minor. The Church of Rome hath not erred. You suppose the Church of Rome to be y true Church, and I beleue it.

Goad.

In deed I only suppose it for disputatios sake, & beleue it not: but y errors are infinit, & I should weary my self & al y company, to rehearse many. I omit inferior errors of lesse waight and moment, and come to those that shake the foundation of faith.

Campion.

We shall then runne into all controuersies: bring some, proper error that I my selfe shall couse to bee an error, that the church of Rome holdeth.

Goad.

Why a general must be taken away by particulars.

Campion.

That is true.

Goad.

Then I reason thus. It hath erred, and doeth erre in the foundation, touching saluation by Christ: Ergo it is subiect to error.

Campion.

It doeth not, God forbid it should. But if you will properly proue it hath erred, shewe me that some generall Councill hath erred.

Goad.

Well, I will followe you in this poynt. The Councill of Trent hath erred in mny poyntes of doctrine, and namely in the matter of iustification: ergo a generall Council hath erred.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent. &c.

Goad.

It ascribec whole or part of righteousnesse to be inherent in our selues:

But this is an error:

Ergo it erreth in iustification, &c. The very words I do not remember, but this is the effect of the doctrine, that Inhaerens iustitia est pars iustificationis, That inherent righteousnesse is a part of iustification.

Campion.

The Councill hath no such wordes, or if it haue, it doth not ascribe any thing to righteousnes cleauing in our selues as of our selues, but as giuen of God. In deede it is in vs, but as y gift of God. As there are vertues, faith, hope & charity, which must be in vs seruing to this righteousnes, which yet are not of vs.

Goad.

Whatsoever is in vs that must iustifie vs before the iust iudgement of God, must be perfect:

But our righteousnes is not perfect:

Ergo our righteousnes canot either in whole or part iustifie vs.

Campion.

I answere your Maior: it must be perfect, according to that perfection that God requireth of vs in this life.

Goade.

This is most corrupt. For God wil haue a perfect & vndefiled righteousnes, such as he hath set downe in his own law. Qui fecerit &c. He that shall do them, shall liue in them. Gal. 3. Againe, Maledictus est omnis, qui non permanserit in omnibus quae scripta sunt in libro Legis, vt faciat ea, &c. Cursed is euery one that abideth not in all things that are written in that booke, to doe them, &c.

Campion.

I say, God doeth not exact such a perfect righteousnes according to the lawe, for we are deliuered from that by Christ, &c.

Goade.

Then we must rest on Christ alone: but if we will be iustified by any part of righteousnes in our selues, it must be perfect. For Gods iustice alloweth no vnperfect righteousnes. Doe you thinke you can fulfill this law: &c.

Campion.

Yea that I can.

Goade.

Can you loue God aboue all things, & your neighbour as your selfe? Can you loue him with all your heart, with all your soule, and with all your strength?

Campion.

I can. For when I preferre God before all things, and loue him chiefly, I loue him aboue all.

Fulke.

Note that Blasphemous absurditie.

Goade.

If a man may fulfill the lawe to iustification, then Christ dyed in vayne.

Campion.

What now, shall we haue hissing? &c.

Goade.

Sure it is worthy of hissing, and of blusshing too, if you had any feare of God before your eyes, or conscience. I praye God make you to vnderstand the absurdities that you holde, that you may be ashamed of them, and renounce them.

Campion.

Why, is euery motion to sinne deadly sinne: &c.

Goade.

You are like ye Pharisee, that thought the keeping of the law to consist in the outward letter. What say you, is not cocupiscence, & the motions of the flesh against y law of God, sinne?

Campion.

No that they are not: for if I being tempted, refraine my selfe, and when I haue a motion to euill, bridle my selfe from it: as, if I see my neyghbours goods, and

haue a motion to steale, and do not, do I not herein loue my neighbour as my selfe: If a man bee in the Queenes Iewell house, where he may take some precious thing, and bridle himselfe of it and abstaine, shall this man be condemned? What wil you codemne a man for euery litle tentation? It is a good thing to be tempted. &c. Iam. 1. Blessed is he that endureth temptation.

Goade.

Ye abuse the place. For it is vnderstode of afflictions. And as for concupiscence, it is the transgression of the law: Thou shalt not lust, ergo it is sinne. But I will leaue this as impertinent to the purpose. Consider that notable place in the ende of the fift chapter to the Corinth. Epist. 2. Him that knewe no sinne he made sinne for vs, that we might be made the righteousnesse of God in him, not in our selues, to shewe that it is no righteousnes cleauing in vs but in Christ, & is made ours by imputation, euen as our sinnes were imputed to Christ: consider the place hereafter with your selfe.

Fulke.

Marke here his absurdities. First he holdeth, that he can keepe the lawe in such perfection as God requireth: and he can loue God with all his heart, with all his soule, and with all his strength, and his neighbour as himselfe. Secondly, he affirmeth that though he haue a lust to steale, yet if he bridle that lust, hee loueth his neighbour as himselfe. Thirdly, he holdeth that we are iustified by inherent righteousnes, which he thinketh to colour by the grace and gift of God. But neuerthelesse, ye are in the case of the Pharisee, Luke 18. which trusteth in his owne righteousnes, & yet ascribeth all to the grace of God, saying, I thanke thee, &c. He boasted not before men, but humbly gaue thanks vnto God, acknowledging his righteousnes to be Gods gift, and yet Christ tolde this parable against him and such as he is, which trust in themselues that they are righteous, that is, by iustice inherent, although they confesse they haue it by the grace and gift of God.

Campion.

But this was of pride that he gloryed in his righteousnes, and therefore the parable is told against himselfe.

Fulke.

I graunt that he was proude, and so are all iusticiaries that trust in themselues that they are righteous, howsoeuer they would cloke their pride, by ascribing it to the gift of God: but he is condemned for trusting in himselfe that he was righteous, that is, for inherent righteousnes, which neuerthelesse he ascribed not to his owne strength, but to the grace of God, saying, I thanke thee God, &c. But I will go to another argument.

Campion.

I pray you let me answere this argument first, for it shalbe reported that I sayd this and that, and my wordes shalbe depraued. I say therefore, there are two wayes of iustification: one in vs, another without vs. Christ is a cause of iustification by his grace and merite without vs, and so we are iustified by baptisme: and we are iustified by the giftes of God in vs, faith, hope, and charitie. how say you, were not these my words: And why then do you challenge me for saying we are iustified by Gods righteousnesse, saith, hope, and charitie, which is within vs. For how say you, are we not iustified by faith? and is not faith within vs?

Fulke.

I challenged you for blasphemous absurditie, in saying you could loue God with all your heart, with all your soule, and strength. And albeit hope and charitie follow that same faith, (by which we are iustified) in the regenerate that are the children of God: yet we are not iustified by them, no nor by faith, otherwise then instrumentally, as by apprehending the righteousness of Christ, which is without vs, and is no otherwise ours then by imputation. And howe can you loue God with all your heart &c. when you can not giue him an entire loue, according to his lawe?

Campion.

I said a man may loue God with all his heart in this life, according to his lawe, when he doeth preferre God before all the thinges in the worlde: as when a man doeth chiefly preferre him, &c.

Fulke.

But can you loue God onely?

Campion.

A man loueth God onely, when hee loueth him chiefly, &c.

Fulke.

Chiefely and only is all one: write that.

Campion.

Why, thinke you the lawe was giuen to no purpose? I am sure it was giuen to be fulfilled, and we are notbidden to keepe it, if it were impossible.

Fulke.

The lawe was giuen for another cause, then that we should be iustified by fulfilling it: namely, to shew vs our infirmitie, that we may be conuicted of sinne.

Campion.

That is a wise cause in deede. Belike a father comandeth his children, not that they should do his will, but because he would haue them to see that they can not do it.

Fulke.

As though almightie God can haue none other ende of giuing commaundements, then mortall men vse to haue. But this is not to the question. I would goe forward with another argument, if you would suffer me.

Campion.

You will giue me leaue to declare my meaning.

Fulke.

Belike you haue an yll opinion of the auditorie, that they can vnderstand nothing, except you tel it them twenty tunes ouer. If you will not suffer me to proceede, I must desire Matter Lieutenaunt to commaunde you.

If a generall Council may erre, then the Church may erre:

But a generall Council may erre:

Therefore the Church may erre.

Campion.

I deny the Minor.

Fulke.

A generall Council may be corrected, as Augustine sayth: therefore it may erre.

Campion.

It may be declared or explained, but not corrected by a contrary decree.

Fulke.

Will you heare the place? it is Tom. 6. lib. 2. contra Donatistas cap. 3. Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam tam veteris qum noui Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita praeponi, vt de illa omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, vtrum verum vel vtrum rectum sit, quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit. Episcoporu autem literas, quae post confirmatum Canonem vel scriptae sunt, vel scribantur, & per sermonem fort sapientiore cuiuslibet in ea re peritoris, & per aliorum Episcoporum grauiorem auctoritatem doctiorumque prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, siquidem eis forte veritate deuiatum est. Et ipsa Concilia quae per singulas regiones vel prouincias fiunt, plenariorum Conciliorum auctoritati quae fiunt ex vniuerso orbe Christiano, sine vllis ambagibus cedere: ipsaque plenariasaepe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, & cognoscitur quod latebat, sine vllo typho sacrilegae superbiae, sine vlla inflata ceruice arrogantiae, sine vlla contentione liuidae inuidiae, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum charitate Christiana. That is to say, Who knoweth not, that the holy canonical Scripture, both of ye old & new Testament is coteined within her certaine boudes, and that the same is so preferred before all latter writings of Bishops, that of it there canot be any doubt or questio at all, whether it be true or whether it be right, whatsoeuer is certaynely knowen to be written therein. But that the letters of Bishops, which since ye cano cofirmed, either haue bin writte, or be nowe in writing, may be repreheded both by the saying which is perhaps more wise of any man that is more skilful in that matter, & also by the more graue auctoritie & wisdom of other bishops, that be better learned, if any thing in them perhaps be declined out of the way of trueth. And that euen those Councils which are held in euery region or prouince without al doubt must giue place to general Councils, which are gathered of all the Christian world: and that euen the general Councils themselues are often corrected, the former by the latter, when by any tryall of thinges, that is opened which was shut vp, and that is knowen which was hidden, without any swelling of sacrilegious pride, without any stiffe necke of arrogancie, without any contention of malicious enuie, with holy humilitie, with Catholike peace, with Christian charitie. Here you haue a plaine place, that only the Scripture cannot erre, that all other writers may erre, that all prouincial Councils may erre, and last of all, generall Councils themselues may be corrected, the former by the latter: therefore without question they may erre.

Campion.

I answered before you read, that a general Council may be declared and better explained, but not corrected.

Fulke.

It may be amended, and therefore corrected. There is no difference betweene amending and correcting.

Campion.

So farre forth it may be corrected, as it may bee better explained, but not to set out thinges that are contrary. For generall Councils are not one contrary to the other.

Fulke.

Saint Augustine sayeth, The generall Council may be ignorant of some thing at the beginning, that afterwarde by experience may be amended: something may be

close, which afterwarde may be opened: it may be hid to one Councill, that may be knowen of another. And the Antithesis in these wordes must needes stand, that only the Scriptures cannot erre, and therefore are not to be corrected. As for Councils generall and prouinciall, and Bishops writings of all sorts, may be corrected, and therefore they may erre.

Campion.

A generall Councill may erre in matter of fact, as in condemning and absolving some Bishops, &c. but it can not erre in matters of doctrine.

Fulke.

Doe you know whereof Augustine speaketh in this place? &c.

Campion.

Yea, as well as you.

Fulke.

Why then declare it before this company.

Campion.

He speaketh of a matter of fact.

Fulke.

Nowe you shewe your selfe altogether ignorant of the matter: for he speaketh of the Councill of Carthage, that was helde in Cyprians time, wherein was concluded an error of faith. For they had decreed, that such were to be rebaptized, as had bene baptized of heretikes, With which decree, and Cyprians authoritie (who was President of the Councill) when Saint Augustine was pressed, he answereth, that onely the Scripture coulde not erre, but all other both Bishops writings, and Councils might erre, and therefore might be reformed, &c.

Campion.

He speaketh not of a matter of faith, as appeareth by the worde experiment. For there can bee no experiment in a matter of faith: heresie cannot be amended.

Fulke.

These are vaine shiftes. Men may finde by experience they haue erred.

Campion.

The worde amending, sheweth that it was in maners.

Fulke.

To be corrected and amended is all one, and may bee as well in faith as in maners, and the argument whereof he entreateth, and the Antithesis he maketh betweene the Scriptures, and all other authorities, sheweth plainly, that hee meaneth of error of faith. But seeing you haue nothing else to answeere, I will leaue it to the consideration of them that bee wise and learned, and so long as you bring no matter, I will not answeere your wordes.

Goade.

Seeing you stande vpon Councils, I will proceede that way.

General Councils haue erred, ergo &c.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent.

Goade.

They are contrary one to another, &c.

Campion.

I deny it.



Goade.

The Councill of Constantinople, and the Councill of Nice are contrary.

Campion.

They are not.

Goade.

They are contrary in the matter of Images, namely the Councill of Constantino-ple condemning the setting vp of Images in the Church: and the Councill of Nice afterwarde allowing Images.

Campion.

You can not shewe, that they were contrary one to an other.

Goade.

It shalbe shewed afterward. I will come to another generall Council. The Council of Constance hath erred in matter of faith, ergo a general Council hath erred.

Campion.

I deny the Antecedent.

Goade.

The Councill of Constance erred in taking away the cuppe from the common people: this was a matter of faith: ergo that Council erred in matter of faith.

Campion.

Thus we shall runne into all questions, and then we shal haue done this time twelue moneths. This was no error in the Council, for I say there is no commandement that the people should be partakers of the cuppe.

Goade.

By the same reason you may aswell exclude the people from the bread also, but though you haue in this poynt denied the force of Christes institution: yet the commaundement in the same is plaine, Bibite ex hoc omnes, Drinke ye all of this. And Paul interpreteth it so, 1. Cor. 11. deliuering aswell the cuppe as the breade to the whole Church, euen as hee had receaued of the Lord. The Council of Constance decreeth against it: ergo a manifest and foule error in that Councill.

Campion.

Doeth Saint Paul make it a precept, that the lay people should receiue the cuppe?

Goade.

Paul iudued with the spirit of God, giueth a flat precept in the same chapter, verse 28. Probet seipsum homo, Let a ma try himselfe, and so let him eate of that breade, and drinke of that cuppe. These are playne preceptes, Let him eate, Let him drinke: and here is as great a commadement to the whole church for the one, as for the other.

Campion.

The place is to be vnderstoode, when he doeth receiue, and vnder the obedience of the Church, it may be done. And this that you make so much a doe about, I haue seene it done to many Catholikes my selfe: but it is not so necessary, that you should make such adoo about it.

Goade.

It is not left free, but an expresse commaundement, and therefore necessary. It is the Imperatiue mode, and therefore a commaundement. I maruayle howe you can stande in this being so plaine?

Fulke.

Here are two thinges, Probet, & Edat & bibat, Let him examine himselfe, and let him eate and drinke, and both be commaundementes. First, he must be prepared, and then he must eate, and not onely eate, but he must drinke also. For as the institution is of eating and drinking, so is the commandement of the Apostle drawn from the institution. And if there be no commandement, then is no man bounde to receiue the Lordes supper.

Camp.

No, it is a thing indifferent by the institutio touching the common people, sauing that only the authoritie of the Church hath layde it vpon vs: here you may see the authoritie of ye church, in things not commanded.

Goade.

It is a commandement, both in the institution and by the Apostle, 1. Corinth. 11. saying, That which I receaued I deliuered, grounding his commandement vpon the institution, and therefore commanded in the institution.

Camp.

Yea, he saith when he will, or when he doeth receiue, then let him examine him selfe.

Fulke.

These are your owne wordes, there is no such worde here. When he will, and when he doeth, he must proue him selfe, and so he must eate. The wordes which the Apostle vseth here, are both the imperatiue mode in the Greke text: Let him examine him selfe, and let him eate and drinke.

Campion.

I graunt there are two precepts, but this is the summe and ende, Vt dign edat, That he may eate worthely.

Fulke.

Here is the booke, see it and reade it: this is the originall, giue him the booke, it is a reasonable great printe.

Campion.

You are stil vrging me to reade Greeke, what childish dealing is this, can I not see the imperatiue mode aswell in the Latine as in the Greke, shall this disaduantage the cause? I haue (I thanke God) and you shall know it, asmuch Greke as wil serue my turne, and when there is occasion to vse it, I will shewe it. But is not the Latin togue as good a togue as the Greeke? &c.

Fulke.

You were best confesse your ignorance. We make not tongues the measure of the truthe, but we bring the originall to preuent your caullations, and your finding faulte with translations. But I will deale with you with an other argument.

The whole Church did thinke it necessarie for infantes to receaue:

Ergo the whole Church hath erred, &c.

Campion.

Nowe we shall haue a question whether infantes may receaue, so we shall runne into all questions.

Fulke.

Not so. But I will proue that Innocentius Bishop of Rome, and all the Church with him, as S. Augustine confesseth, held this error, that it is necessary for infantes to receiue the communion, which you your selfe holde to be an error, seeing

you affirme it is not of necessitie by Christes commandement, that any lay men should receiue it. You shal heare the wordes of Augustine and of Innocentius both, as Augustine citeth them. Why are you afraide of the place before you come at it, let me reade it. Saint Augustine citeth the wordes of Innocentius, out of his Epistle to the Bishops of Numidia, Lib. 2. ad Bonifacium contra duas epist. Pelag. cap. 4. Haec enim eius verba sunt. Illud vero quod eos vestra fraternitas asserit praedicare, paruulos aeternae vitae praemijs etiam sine baptismatis gratia posse donari, perfatum est. Nisi enim manducauerint carnem filij hominis, & biberint sanguinem eius, non habebunt vitam in semetipsis: qui autem hanc eis sine regeneratione defendunt, videntur mihi ipsum baptismum velle cassare. For these are his wordes. But where as your brotherhoode affirmeth them to preach, that litle children may be rewarded with the gift of eternall life, euen without the grace of Baptisme, it is a very foolish thing. For except they shall eat the flesh of the sonne of ma, and drinke his blood, they shall haue no life in them selues. But they which defende this vnto them without regeneration, seeme to me that they wil make frustrate baptisme it selfe. Upon which wordes of Innocentius, Saint Augustine inferreth, Ecce, beatae memori Innocentius papa, sine baptismo Christi, & sine participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi, vitam non habere paruulos dicit. Behold, the Pope Innocent of blessed memorie saith, that litle children cannot haue life without the participation of the body and blood of Christ. In these wordes Saint Augustine sheweth the generall practise of the Church was, that infantes should receaue, because it was thought necessary vnto saluation.

Campion.

It was onely a practise, it was no opinion of necessitie of saluation.

Fulke.

Saint Augustine writeth against the Pelagians, that held that Baptisme was not necessarie for infantes, and that infantes might be saued without Baptisme, against whome he reasoneth thus. Infantes cannot be saued without they receaue the communion: but they cannot receiue the communion vnles they be first baptized: ergo infantes cannot be saued vnlesse they be baptized. And to proue that they cannot be saued except they receaue the communion, he alleaged the decree or diffinitiu sentence of Innocentius.

Campion.

Saint Augustine sayth not, that the whole churth thought it necessarie to saluation. But when Innocetius commanded that infantes should communicate, it was but a necessitie of the commandement, the necessitie was not in the thing, but to keepe the vntie of the Church, and so no error of faith, but a lawful practize of the Church: but shewe the decree.

Fulke.

You haue heard the wordes of Innocentius, out of his synodical Epistle, and thus Saint Augustine citeth his decree: Ecce, beatae memoriae Innocentius papa, sine baptismo Christi, &c. Lo, Innocentius the Pope of blessed memorie, &c.

Campion.

There is no such decree: I will beleue none of your notes. He saith they be damned vnles they be baptized, but he sayeth not, they be damned except they receaue the communion.

Fulke.

He saith both: you shall see the booke, seeing you will not credit my notes.

Goade.

Upon supposition as before, I will suppose as you beleue cocerning the Church of Rome. The head (as you hold him) of that Church, hath erred in matter of faith: ergo the Church being the members, are subiect to error.

Campion.

I denie your Antecedent.

Goade.

Saint Peter did erre in faith, and that, after the sending downe of the holy Ghost vpon him and the rest therefore the principall head of the Church, as you accompt of Peter.

Campion.

He did not erre in faith. I knowe the place, Gal. 2. It was a matter of manners not of doctrine. For it was but a litle dissimulation.

Goade.

It was matter of doctrine, for it was somewhat concerning that, where about the Coucill was gathered at Hierusalem touching Circumcision.

Campion.

Ye vtterly mistake it, for it was about the obseruation of the Lawe by the Gentiles, and not concerning Circumcision.

Goade.

I nowe well remember it was not directly about the question of Circumcision. But it is certaine, Peter was in that error, that the Gospell pertained not at all to the Gentiles, vntill hee was reformed by vision, Act. 10: For then at legth he said, Nunc tandem comperio, &c. Now at length I finde, &c: so hee was for a time in error. But for the place, Gal. 2. it is saide, Non ambulauit recto pede ad veritatem euangelij. Hee walked not with a right foote according to the truth of the Gospel, &c.

Camp.

It was but a small matter of dissimulation in maners.

Goade.

The text saith, Paul withstoode him to the face, because he was blame worthy, and iustly to be reproofed: therefore it was no small matter. And Augustine against Hierome, De Petro iure reprehenso, Epist. 19. doth iustifie this open reproofe by S. Paul, though Hierome laboured to lessen this faulte, &c.

Campion.

And so do I. But this proueth not that it was any matter of faith.

Fulke.

It was against the truthe of the Gospell:

Truthe is contrary to error:

Ergo it was an error of faith.

Camp.

I haue saide the faulte was in maners, for dissimulation. When I sawe that he did not walke well, or right, &c. as at this day any poore Priest may tell the Pope, seeing the Pope to erre in manners, and may say vnto him, Syr, why do you so?

Fulke.

But that is against your owne Canon Law. For what so euer the Pope doth, no man may say: Syr, why did you so?

Campion.

I thinke there can bee shewed no such wordes in the Lawe.

Fulke.

I pray you answere me, Did Peter dissemble against his conscience, or with it? Surely he did it not for any worldly respect, but because he thought it was his dutie in so doing to beare with the weakenes of ye Iewes, & to thinke that aman may dissemble in such a case, is a matter of faith, therefore his error was a matter of faith, and not of facte onely.

Camp.

Why, in some case the Catholikes thinke they may communicate with you, come to your Churches, & you againe communicate wt vs, & go to our churches, dispute & conferre wt vs, &c.

Fulke.

I would wish you to containe your selfe, I knowe where you are. It is a matter that doth not belong vnto you. You drawe to a thing you ought to be silent in. It is a matter of state, it were best for you to leaue such things.

Camp.

I meane to dispute, what do you threaten?

Fulk.

No, but I giue you good cousail, I am more your friend then you are aware of. I thinke you are already founde deepe enough in such matters. But to an other argument.

The generall Councill confesseth that it may erre:

Ergo the Church may erre.

Camp.

In deede this is to the point, if you can proue it.

Fulke.

Answere directly, and you shall see I will proue it so, as you shall not be able to auoyde it. The whole councill prayeth in the ende of euery generall Council, in a set forme of prayer, that God will pardon their error: ergo they confesse they may erre, &c. for thus they saye, Te in nostris principijs occursorem poposcimus, te quoque in hoc fine iudicioru nostroru, pro excessibus indultorem adesseprecamur, scilicet vt ignorantiae parcas, vt errori indulgeas, &c. This is the very forme of their prayer. Wee prayed that thou wouldest be an ayder in our beginnings, thee also in this ende of our iudgements we pray to be present as a pardoner of our excesse, that is to say, that thou wouldest spare our ignorance, and pardon our error. Here you see plainly, they confesse they may erre, when they desyre pardon of their errors.

Campion.

Master Doctor they pray against your errors, doe they not? that God would pardon your errors.

Fulke.

They pray that if they themselues haue erred, they may be pardoned, they speake of their owne errors committed in their owne Councill, and the wordes that followe doe plainely expresse the same.

Campion.

I would see the printed booke, and first I woulde knowe whether they speake of any error of faith: then secondly I would know if it can be shewed wherein the Councill erred.

Fulke.

Seeing the Councill by this prayer confesseth that it may erre, what neede it be shewed wherein it erred.

Campion.

Was this prayer said in the Councill of Trent?

Fulke.

I know not, but it is the prayer that is appointed to be said after euery Councill.

Campion.

I answere, the Councill of Trent will not acknowledge any error: it was some matter of facte.

Fulke.

Their wordes are plaine that they may erre, not onely in facte, but also in faith: and therefore they pray to be pardoned in both. *Et quia conscientia remordente tabescimus, ne aut ignorantia nos traxerit in errorem, aut praeceptis forsitan voluntas impulerit iustitiam declinare, ob hoc te poscimus, te rogamus, vt si quid offensionis in hac Concilij celebritate contraximus, codonare ac remissibile facere digneris.* And because our owne conscience accusing vs we do faint, lest either ignorance hath drawen vs into error, or hasty will perhaps hath driue vs to decline from iustice, we pray thee, we beseech thee, that if wee haue committed any offence in the celebration of this Council, thou wouldest vouchsafe to forgiue it, and to make it pardonable.

Campion.

That very worde declareth, that they meane of some error in facte, & not of doctrine. They pray that if they haue ignorantly erred from iustice, they might be pardoned.

Fulke.

Those thinges which the Councill doth wisely distinguishe, you do vnwisely confound. They acknowledge, that ignorance might drawe them into error, and heady will drawe them from iustice, they distinguish error from iniustice, and desire to bee pardoned of both. As for ye booke, it shalbe brought. We could not haue bookes here, for we agreed vpon the question but immediatly before dinner, and could not go out of the place since for bookes, but it shalbe shewed.

M. Lieutenant.

Here M. Lieutenant told them the time was past, but M. D. Fulke desired to haue one agument more.

Fulke.

The Councill of Nice 2. decreed an error, therefore the Church may erre.

Camp.

Now we shall haue the matter of Images.

Fulke.

You are *Nimis acutus*, you will leape ouer the stile or euer you come at it: I meane not to speake of Images.

Campion.

Well then, I denie the Antecedent.

Fulke.

The Synode decreed, yt Angels, Archangels, soules of men, &c. haue bodies, are visible & circumscribable, and this is an error: ergo they decreed an error, &c.

Camp.

They decreed no such thing.

Fulke.

You shall heare the wordes of the Councill, Actione 1. First, yt saying of one Iohanes, Bishop of Thessalonica, was read in these wordes. De angelis & archangelis & eoru potestatibus quibus & nostras animas adiungo, ipsa Catholica ecclesia sic sentit, esse quidem intelligibiles, sed non omnino corporis expertes & inuisibiles. Concerning Angels and Archangels, and the powers of them, to which also I adioyne our soules, the Catholike Church her selfe doeth so thinke, that they are in deede intelligible, but not altogether without bodies, and inuisible. Which wordes of Iohanes Thessalonicensis, the Archbishop of Costantinople Tharasius, who was prolocutor of the Councill abridgeth, and concludeth vpon them saying, Ostendit autem pater quod & angelos pingere oporteat, quando circumscribi possunt & vt homines apparuerunt. This father hath shewed that we must paint the Angels also, seeing they may be circumscribed, & haue appeared as men. Sacra Synodus dixit, Etiam domine. The holy synode said, Yea my lord. Here you see the decree of the whole Synode approuing the saying of Iohannes Thessalonicensis, and the conclusion of Tharasius thereupon.

Campion.

Shewe me the decree, and let me see the Canon. many things are spoken in Councils that are not the Canons.

Fulke.

I haue read the decree.

Campion.

Shew me the Canon, reade their Canon.

Fulke.

As though euery Council hath set forth Canos: many Councils haue no Canons, neither hath this any yt I know. You shew your selfe a man well read in the Councils, yt will exact Canons of euery Councill, but this was yt consent & the agreement of the whole Council, the whole Council answered Etiam domine.

Campion.

Shew me the booke.

Fulke.

If I do not shew it, then let me beare the blame.

Camp.

Well, admit it be so: first, they might meane that Angels and spirits had a certaine definite substance of their being, which they called their bodies.

Fulke.

Then belike they knewe not howe to speake: but I am sure, they knew what difference there was betwixt in non-Latin alphabet & in non-Latin alphabet substance & body: if they had so meant, they wated not words to haue expressed their meaning.

Camp.

They might thinke they had certaine subtil bodies, according to the formes that they did take, as Augustine and some other haue helde. besides, this was not an

error of faith.

Fulke.

Ergo it was of maners belike.

Camp.

It was a smal error, neither of faith nor maners.

Fulke.

I proue it was an error of faith. We beleue that God is the creator of all things visible and inuisible: but if Angels and spirites be visible, then are there no inuisible things whereof wee beleue God to be the creator. Besides, they do not onely make the visible, but circumscribable also: and therefore they do meane bodies, and not substances generally, for onely bodies are circumscribable.

Camp.

They meane not such bodies as we haue, but such as they tooke, how could they els be painted.

Fulke.

But they (say they) were visible and circumscribable.

Campion.

Because they doe Assume corpora, not because they had bodies in deede, but seemed to haue.

Fulke.

But the Councill saith, they haue proper bodies of their own, & are circumscribable, & haue bene seen in their proper bodies.

Campion.

It was no decree.

Fulke.

Sacra Synodus dixit, Etiam domine: All the holy Synode confirmed it, saying, Euen so my Lord.

Campion.

Many a saint in heauen haue thought as hard matters as this, and they are saued.

Fulke.

I deny not that, but yet this was an error of faith, neither doth euery error in faith shut out a man from saluation.

Camp.

In deede so you say in your booke against Bristow, that the Church may erre in matters of fayth, for you say that Inuocation of Saints, and prayer for the dead, were errors in faith, and yet that they which vsed them, are saued. I wonder therefore why you crie out so lowde in your pulpits against Inuocation of saintes, and haue nothing more in your mouthes the Blasphemie, Blasphemie, when the Catholikes mainteine it.

Fulke.

I say in deede, that Inuocation of saints, as it was held of some of the later sort of auncient fathers, was an error in faith: but yet not such as could exclude them from being members of the true Church, and yet the same error as it is vsed of Papistes, is blasphemous. These fathers helde the foundation Faith, and therefore that error was not damnable in them.

Campion.



In deede you say, that if a man haue faith, what errors soeuer he haue besides, it is well enough so long as hee holde your faith: it makes no matter what errors soeuer e hold with it, hee cannot perish.

Fulke.

You slander my booke, I neuer writte so.

Camp.

Let me see your booke, and I will shew it you.

Fulk.

In what booke will you shewe it?

Campion.

In your booke against Bristowe.

Fulke.

You shal see the booke at our next meeting, and if you be able to shewe any such wordes, or matter either, I will lose my head. I may say, and haue sayd, that the Fathers had their errors, among which some allowed inuocation of Saintes, and yet holding the foundation, they may be saued.

Camp.

Uery well, that is all one, why should you then make so much a doe against inuocation of Saintes? Why doe you not say in your pulpits, that it is an indifferent matter?

Fulke.

Because as you holde it, it is in deede a blasphemous error: but as the Fathers helde it, it was no blasphemous error, but yet an error, and no indifferent thing.

Goade.

Are you ignorant that they which hold the foundation, though they erre in some particular pointes of doctrine, they may be saued? Shall euery particular point of error in doctrine depriue a man of saluation, holding soundly ye foundation Christ?

Campion.

Well he saith it in his booke, &c. If a man haue onely faith, it maketh no matter what errors he hold beside.

Fulke.

You shamefully slaunder my booke, and I knowe you can shewe no such thing out of my booke. Nowe you haue graunted so many absurdities, ye know not how to make vp the matter, but by slaundering my booke.

Campion.

I haue graunted no absurdities, but I will defend them, bring me the booke, and I will shew it you. And thereupon I challenge you, you and I at Cambridge M. Doctor, to trie it.

Fulke.

Uery well Sir, you shew your selfe according to your publike challenge, more bold then wise, you that haue challenged all the Realme, no maruaile if you challenge me.

Campion.

I wil stand to my challenge, and here I challenge you to dispute with you at Cambridge, if you dare.

Fulke.

It lieth not in mee to remoue you to Cambridge. I came hither vpon commande-  
 ment at this time, otherwise you are not the man whom I would chuse & take for to  
 be mine aduersarie, if you were at libertie. There are twentie of your side, whom I  
 would rather take if I should chuse mine equal, which make no such challenge. *Non  
 tibiplus cordis, sed minus oris inest.*

Goade.

Your Church denyeth an article of faith: ergo it erreth, &c.

Campion.

God forbid, it doeth not.

Goade.

You deny the bodily ascention of Christ into heauen: ergo an article of faith.

Campion.

We do not deny it.

Goade.

You deny that he is bodily in heauen, for you say that he is bodily in earth: but  
 he can not bee both in heauen and earth at once, if he haue a true bodie.

Campion.

I deny your argument. For he is, and may bee in many places at once; touching  
 his body.

Goade.

It is contrary the nature of a true bodie, to bee in many places at once. For a  
 true naturall body, must haue the properties of a very naturall and true body, and  
 so you make Christ to haue a phantasticall and not a true body. You say, at the  
 same time he is in earth and in heauen. Saint Augustine confuting the lik error of  
 those that denied that Christ had a true body, saith: *Cauendum: no ita diuinitatem  
 astruamus hominis, vt veritatem corporis auferamus.* We must beware that we doe  
 not so maintaine the diuinitie of Christ, that we take away the true nature of a  
 body. *Iesus Christus vbique est per id quod Deus est, in coelo autem per id quod  
 homo, &c.* Iesus Christ is present euery where, according to his Godhead, but he is  
 in heauen according to his manhoode. And in *Ioh. tractatu 3. Corpus Domini in  
 quo resurrexit, vno tantum loco esse potest: veritas autem eius vbique diffusa est,  
 &c.* The body of Christ wherein hee rose againe from the dead, can be onely in one  
 place: but the trueth of Christ is spread euery where.

Campion.

All this is true according to nature, but in the sacrament it is a miracle.

Goade.

Augustine denieth any miracle to bee in the Sacramentes: therefore you can not  
 flee to miracle. The very words I nowe remember not, but I am sure I haue read it  
 to that effect.

Fulke.

His wordes are as I thinke, *Sacramenta honorem vt religio sa habere possunt,  
 stuporem vt mira habere non possunt.* Our Sacraments may haue reuerence as  
 things religious & holy, but they can not be wondered at, as things straunge &  
 miraculous.

Goade.

Peter saith Act 3. Whome the heauens must holde till the restauration of all  
 things.

Campion.

What will you make him a prisoner nowe in heauen? must he be bound to those properties of a naturall body? Heauen is his palace, and you would make it his prison.

Goade.

They are the wordes of the holy Ghost, Whom the heauens must containe vntill &c. It becommeth not you so to iest at them, and specially considering your state, being a prisoner, ye should not so play with the worde of God. I see nowe, the modestie I heard reported to be in you, is cleane contrary. I would to God you would make more conscience in speaking more reuerely of such Diuine matters.

Campion.

I am a prisoner for religion, but touching Christ his bodie, why I pray you, might not tha same naturall bodie, which by nature being heauy, and yet ascended vpward steppe by steppe, and pearced those thicke Christall heauens which are harder then any christall, walked vpon the waters, and orow the doore being shut, why may not the same y like many places at once?

Fulke.

It were a hard matter for you to prooue, that the heauens are harder then christall.

Campion.

I can proue it.

Goade.

The text doeth not say, that hee came thorowe the doores being shut, but hee came when the doores were shut, the doores by his diuine power giuing place to his body, as the brasen gates in the Actes did vnto Peter of their owne accorde. Besides, these other thinges you speake of, they were extraordinarie workes. &c.

Cap.

The text is plaine, that he came in by a great miracle.

Fulke.

First there is no wordes in the xt to enforce a miracle, notwithstanding I am content to graunt that he came in miraculously, which might bee, either the doores opening of their owne accord vnto him, as was saide they did vnto Peter, or by giuing place vnto his diuine power.

Camp.

If he neither came thorowe the doores, nor wrought a miracle, how came he in? Belike he played some iugling tricke.

Fulke.

That is a vile blasphemy. It appeareth you haue great reuerence of Christ, that speake so blasphemously of him, and beare no more reuerence to his holy worde.

Campion.

Why what would you call it? if it were not a miracle, it must be some such thing.

Fulke.

It might be a miracle, though he came not thorow the doore, for he came after the doores were shutte. Is it a necessarie consequence, to say such a one came in after the doores were shut: ergo he came thorow the doores? What tempus is the verbe?

Campion.

I thinke it be the Aoriste.

Fulke.

The word is, in non-Latin alphabet . I pray you what tempus is it?

Campion.

The perfect tempus, euen as clausis the Latine worde is.

Fulke.

But you did English it before, the doores being shut, which is the present tempus.

Campion.

You know it is the phrase of our English speach.

Fulke.

Our Englishe phrase will beare as well, after the doores were shut.

Here Master Lieutenaunt shewed them the time was past, and so they left off.

William Fulke.

Roger Goade.

**A remembrance of the conference had in the tower with Ed-  
mund Campion Iesuite, by William Fulke and Roger Goade  
Doctors in Diuinitie, the 23. of September, 1581. as foloweth.**

**The assertions of Campion were these. 1. Christ is in the  
blessed Sacrament substantially, very God and very man, in  
his naturall body. The 2. After the wordes of consecration,  
the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and  
blood of Christ.**

**F**IRST Master Lieutenaunt in a short and pithie speache, exhorted Campion to consider what great fauour her Maiestie shewed him, that hee might haue conference with the learned to reforme his errours, when they shoulde bee playnely conuincid out of the worde of God. &c.

Campion.

I do acknowledge, that I am beholding to her Maiestie. If she haue appoynted this conference to instruct me, thinking me to be out of the way, I can not but be thankfull to her Maiestie for the same. Yet I protest (being resolute in my conscience) that I come not with my minde so suspended as to doubt of my cause, but my intent is to doe you good: as you would instruct me, so would I instruct you: as you would drawe me, so would I drawe you. Therefore take my intent in good part, as I would do yours. I come to giue an accopt of my faith, I am not vnresolute. This said, he crossed himselfe after his superstitious maner.

Fulke.

Let vs begin with prayer. O eternall and most mercifull God, we humbly thanke thy Maiestie that thou hast lightened our mindes with the knowledge of thy trueth: we hartily beseeche thee, to confirme & encrease our faith alwayes in the same, and at this time graunt, that we may so defende thy trueth, that thou mayest haue the glory, the obstinate heretike may be confouded, the weake may be strengthened, & we all may be edisied in Iesus Christ, through whome we make our prayers, and to

whome with thee and the holy Ghost the Spirite of trueth, be all honour and glory, Amen.

We are earnestly moued, because of the confusion the other day, that it might be auoyded nowe, to desire that we might haue some Moderator, if we might intreate any of these learned men that are present to take the paynes: otherwise that it might please Master Lieutenaunt when one argument is done, to commaunde vs to go to another. And also when we haue accepted an answeere, not to suffer the aduersarie to carie the matter with multitude of wordes: so that we be neither forced to leaue our argument, as though we could followe it no longer, nor the aduersarie permitted with large discourses to spende the time vnprofitably, contrary to the right meaning of this conference.

But before we enter into the matters appoynted, wee haue to discharge our credite for the authoritie of the Fathers, whom we alleadged the last day in the afternoone when wee had not the bookes ready to shewe, because the question was then vpon the suddaine both chosen and disputed vpon, all within two houres: whereupon we promised to bring the bookes as this day, because the aduersarie would not credite our allegations written in our note bookes, some of them more then twentie yeeres a goe, not to deceiue the Papistes, but to helpe our owne memorie.

The first place that I haue to shewe, is out of Saint Augustine, de Baptismo contra Donatistas. lib. 2. cap. 2. Quis autem nesciat, &c. as before in the first dayes conference.

Camp.

You might haue spared this labour, for of this place I did not doubt, my answeere was &c. vt supra.

Fulke.

We haue your answeere: let vs haue no repetition.

Campion.

The greatest matter that was doubted of, was the decree of Innocentius cocerning the communicating of infants, the second Councill of Nice, and the prayer at the latter ende of euery Council. You must proue these three to be erroneious.

Fulke.

I haue proued them already: I am nowe onely to shew that the bookes theselues agree with my written notes. I would haue shewed you them all in order, though you had not put me in minde. The decree of Innocentius cited by Saint Augustine conta 2. epist. Pelag. ad Bonifacium lib. 2. cap. 4. Haec enim eius verba sunt, &c. vt supra. These are the wordes of Innocentius, concerning the communicating of ints. S. Augustines wordes vpon the fame are these. Ecce beatae memoriae Innocentius, &c. Behold Innocentius of blessed memorie, &c.

Campion.

This is plaine, I will answeere you.

Fulke.

We haue your answeere.

Campion.

You read not so much afore.

Fulke.

I haue read no more nowe then I did before out of my note booke.

Campion.

Mine answere is, to deny that Innocentius maketh it necessary for infants to communicate.

Fulke.

We haue your answere before, I come onely to discharge my credite for alleaging the booke truely.

Campion.

Mine answere was, that it was neuer simply necessary, but necessary according to the praetize of the Church.

Fulke.

What neede these repetitions?

Campion.

I must declare mine answere.

Fulke.

We haue it already.

Campion.

You come to appose mee, as if I were a scholer in the Grammar schoole.

Fulke.

You thinke by multitude of wordes to carry away the matter: but you shall haue no such scope, as you had the last daye.

Campion.

You are very imperious. I trust, I answered you sufficiently the last day.

Fulke.

The other day when wee had some hope of your conuersion, we forbare you much, and suffered you to discourse, contrary to the order of any good conference, whereupon it hath bene giuen out by some of your sect, that you had the best part, because you had the most wordes. And therefore nowe that we see you are an obstinate heretike, and seeke to couer the light of the trueth with multitude of wordes, we meane not to allow you such large discourses, nor to forbear you, as we did.

Campion.

You are very imperious to day, whatsoever the matter is. My answer I am sure was sufficient, to any thing you could bring, you neede not to be so imperious: I am the Queenes prisoner, and none of yours.

Fulke.

Not a whit imperious, though I will exact of you to keepe the right order of disputation. What your answeres were the last day, it is well knowen to so many lawefull witnesses as were present: beside, they are registred out of your mouth: they were euen such as are like to proceede from a Fryer, full of impudencie and garrulitie.

Campion.

Well, I must beare this at your hands, and much more. You charge me with multitude of wordes: may I not adde vnto my answere?

Fulke.

We haue heard your answere before: we are not now to dispute the matter againe, but to deliuer our credite for the allegations.

Campion.

Doe forward then.

Fulke.

This was the second. Of the forme of prayer after the Councill, which is this: Te in nostris principijs &c. vt errori indulgeas, &c. We beseech thee in these our beginnings &c. that thou wilt pardon our error. And againe, Et quia conscientia remordente tabescimus, ne aut ignorantia nos traxerit in errorem, &c. And because our owne consciences accusing vs, we doe faynt, least either ignorance hath drawn vs into error, &c. As was alleadged in the first dayes conference.

Camp.

Where you inferre, that the Councill asked forgiuenesse of their erronious decree: they meant not any error of doctrine, but of wordes whatsoever had bene spoken against the decree, before the determination of the Councill: as, many wordes might be before vsed, which after the Councils determination it was not lawfull to vse.

Fulke.

They feare least ignorance might haue drawn them into error, or headlong Will driuen them to decline from Iustice: & therefore they desired pardon, euen for their erronious & vniust determinatios if any were: which were needeles, if none could be.

Camp.

I say, they prayed for those that before the determination of the decree were in error, or for those that spoke against the decree before it was concluded: as, when thinges are disputed of doubtfully, many things are spoken amisse: as, if any wordes be spoken here to conuert an other. &c.

Goade.

You are full of similitudes, and as euill you applie them. It is well that you make no more accompt of general Coucils: for by your similitude, you make a generall Councill no better then this meeting.

Campion.

I doe not make this and a generall Councill a like.

Fulke.

The next place was cited out of the second Council of Nice, which decreeth that Angels and soules of me, haue bodies, are visible, are circumscribable. Actiōe 5. Sanctus dixit de Angelis. &c.

Campion.

Let me haue the booke.

Fulke.

You shall haue it when I haue read the place. De Angelis & Archangelis & eorum potestatibus, quibus & nostras animas adiungo, ipsa Cathol. Ecclesia sentit esse quidem intelligibiles sed non omnino corporis expertes & inuisibiles, vt vos Gentiles dicitis: verum tenui corpore peditos & aereo siue igneo, vt scriptum est, Qui facit Angelos suos spiritus & ministros eius ignem vrentem: sic autem multos sanctorum patrum sensisse cognouimus. Quoru est Basilius cognomento Magnus, & beatus Athanasius, & Methodius, & qui stant ab illis. Solummodo autem Deus incorporeus, & informabilis. Intelligibiles autem creaturae nequaquam ex toto sunt incorporeae & inimitabiles. Pictura existunt, quare etia in loco existunt, & circumferentiam habent. Quanquam autem non sunt vt nos corporeae, vtpote ex quatuor elementis, & crassa illa materia: nemo tamen vel Angelos vel daemones vel animas dixerit incorporeas. Multoties eni in proprio corpore visi sunt, sed ab illis, quibus dominus oculos aperuit. Nos igitur eos no vt Deu, sed vt creatur as intelligibiles & ministros

Dei, non tame vt ver incorporeos, pingimus & colimus. Quod aute hominis formae pinganturin causa est, quod in ea visi sunt, si quado ministeriu Dei apud homines obierint. Tharasius sanctiss. Patriarcha dixit, Animaduertamus dictum patris, quod illic, Samaritae imagines Domini & seruatoris nostri, item intemeratae eius matris subuerterunt: hic vero, Gentiles. Ostendit autem pater, quod & Angelos pingere oportet quando circumscribi possint, & vt homines apparuerint. Sacra Synodus dixit, Etiam domine. Concerning Angels and Archangels, and the powers of them, vnto whome also I adioyne our soules, the Catholike Church her selfe doeth so thinke, that they are in deede intelligible, but not altogether voyde of bodies and inuisible, as you Gentiles do say: but that they haue a thinne bodie, either of ayre or of fyre, as it is written, Which maketh his Angels spirites, and his ministers a burning fire. And so we haue knowen that many of the holy fathers haue thought, among whome is Basill, surnamed the great, and blessed Athanasius and Methodius, and them that stande with them. Onely God is without body and shape: but the intelligible creatures are not altogether bodiles, and they are such as may be portraicted in picture. Wherefore they are in place also, and haue a circumscription although they be not bodily as we are, as of the foure elementes, and that grosse matter. Yet no man may say that Angels, or deuils, or soules are without bodies, for they haue bene often seene in their proper bodies: but of them, to whome the Lord hath opened their eyes. Therefore we do paint and worship them, not as God, but as intelligible creatures and the ministers of God, but yet not as truely being without body. But that they are painted in the shape of man, the cause is, that they haue bene seen in that shape, if at any time they did execute the ministerie of God amogst me. Tharasius the most holy Patriarch saide, Let vs marke the saying of the father: that there, the Samaritans did ouerthrowe the images of our Lord and sauour, and also of his vndefiled mother: but here, the Gentiles. The father also sheweth, that wee ought to paint the Angels, seeing they may be circumscribed, and haue appeared as men. The holy Synode said, Yea my Lord.

Campion.

You haue answered your selfe.

Fulke.

That is your common answere, when you can coyne no better.

Camp.

I answered then, and so do nowe: Assumunt corpora, They take bodies vpon them, they haue none of their owne.

Fulke.

He saith, they may be circumscribed.

Camp.

That is, they may be painted.

Fulke.

Nay, he saith plainely, they are not *Expertes corporis*, voyde of body, and defineth of what bodily matter they consist, namely of ayre or fire, and for that he alleageth the scripture: also he sayth, they are not inuisible.

Campion.

Looke in what bodies they haue appeared, in such they may be painted: they did appeare as men, they bee not men, neither haue they bodies of their owne.

Fulke.



He saith expressly, they haue bene seene in their owne proper body.

Campion.

The iudgement of the Councill is, that the Angels may be painted: that is all.

Fulke.

That is not all: for it affirmeth that they are circumscribable and visible, as I said before.

Campion.

You haue proued no error of the Councill.

Fulke.

We might haue brought the Epitome of the Councils, gathered by one Bartholomew Garanza a Spanish Fryer, which noteth it for an error in that Councill, contrary to the Lateran Councill vnder Innocentius the third, who thought him selfe as well learned as you.

Campion.

It is no matter.

Fulke.

Yes, it is a matter when Papistes agree not amongst them selues.

Campion.

You should haue brought it, I woulde haue answered him also.

Fulke.

Well, let them that bee wise and learned, peruse the Councill at their leasure. Further, in reasoning of Peters reprehension, you said his error was a matter of facte, and not of faith: for the Pope you say may so erre, and bee reprehended of a poore Priest, who may say vnto him: Sir, why do you so: To this I replied that so to reprehend the Pope, was against your owne Canon lawe, which now I proue out of the decrees. Parte 1. Distinct. 40. cap. Si Papa suae & fraternae salutis negliges deprehenditur, inutilis & remissus in suis operibus, & insuper a bono taciturnus, quod magis officit sibi & omnibus: nihilominus innumerabiles populos cateruatim secum ducit primo mancipio gehennae, cum ipso plagis multis in aeternu vapulatuos. Huius culpas istic redarguere praesumit mortalium nullus, qui cunctos ipse iudicaturus a nemine est iudicandus, nisi deprehendatur fide deuius. Pro cuius perpetuo statu, vniuersit as fidelium tanto instantius or at, quanto suam salutem post Deum ex illius incolumitate animaduertit propensius pendere. If the Pope be found negligent of his owne and his brethrens saluation, vnprofitable and remisse in his workes, and also holding his peace of goodnesse, which doeth more hurt him and all men: neuertheles, he leadeth with him innumerable people by heapes, to the chiefe slaue of hell, with whome hee shalbe beaten with many stripes for euer. No mortall man doeth here presume to reprove his faultes, because he him selfe being to iudge all men, is to bee iudged of no man, except he be founde erring from the faith: for whose perpetuall state, the vniuersitie of faithfull doeth pray so much the more earnestly, by how much it perceaueth their saluation after God to hang more readily of his health. Againe, by the Extrauagant, De concessione prebendae: titulo 4. cap. 2. ad Apostolatus, in the Glosse, where hee sheweth that the Pope may doe that which to all others is forbidden: Nec est qui audeat dicere, Domine cur ita facis? And in the marginall note: Papae nullus audeat dicere, Domine cur ita facis? No man may be bolde to say to the Pope, Syr, why do you so?

Camp.

Reade the decree againe.

Fulke.

Si Papa. &c.

Campion.

The meaning of the decree is, that no man may iudicially reprehende him: I say so.

Fulke.

Both the decree & the Extrauagant, speake generally, that the Pope must not be reprehended of any man, except he be an hereticke, whereof it followeth that Gratians Decree and the Glosse thought not, but that he might erre in faith.

Camp.

Mine answere is, he may doe it soberly, as a man may with humilitie reprehende his prince, but not iudge him.

Fulke.

Let other men iudge, I haue shewed as much as I promised out of the Canon Law. You charged me to affirme in mine answere to Bristow, that so a man holde the foundation of faith, it is no matter what errors he holde beside. Here is my booke, shewe these wordes, or any wordes to that sense, as you promised.

Camp.

You say that the true Church may erre in matters of great weight, so they retaine the foundation.

Fulke.

I say, yt so long as a man holdeth the foundation, though he erre in small matters, he may be saued.

Cam.

You say ye fathers erred in inuocation of Saints, which is a great matter with Gods Church, though you call it a small matter, and yet you wil not teach the people yt it is a smal matter.

Fulk.

I said, that inuocation of Saints as it was held by some of the latter sort of auncient fathers, was but a small error in comparison of such grosse heresies which the Popish Church doeth now holde, and in comparison of such inuocation of Saints as is now mainteined and practised by the Papistes: but your accusatio of my booke was written, therefore you can not alter it.

Camp.

Lend me your booke that I may charge you. The booke being deliuered, after a litle turning, he sayde, This is not the booke that I meant.

Fulke.

This is the booke that you named.

Camp.

I meant your answere vnto Doctor Allens articles, because Bristow hath confuted it.

Fulk.

This is a poore shift, whe you haue slandered my booke, and named one, to flie to another: so would you do with that booke you name now. For I am sure, that neither in that, nor any other that euer I wrote, your slander can be founde.

Goad.

There is an other thing ye were desirous to see, touching the Council of Constantinople, and the Council of Nice, one of them being alleaged to be cotrary to the other about setting vp of Images in the Church: the Council of Constantinople disallowing Images, and the second Council of Nice allowing the, and condemning the other Council as erroneous.

Camp.

That of Constantinople, was not a generall nor lawfull Council, but a certaine Iconomachy, and may rather be called a conuenticle then a generall Council, and therefore no contrarietie hereby proued betweene generall Councils.

Goade.

It appeareth it was generall, and solemnely gathered in the chiefe citie: heare the wordes in the title of the Council. Sancta, magna & uniuersalis Synodus quae iuxtagratia Dei, & per pium deuotorum & orthodoxorum nostrorum Imperatorum Constatini& Leonis decretum, in hac diuinorm studiosa & regia ciuitate congregata est, &c. The holy great and vniuersall Synode which by the grace of God and the godly decree of our godly Emperours Constantine and Leo, is gathered in this holy and royall citie. This Council did confute by the Scriptures, the setting vp of Images in ye Church, out of Deut. 20. Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any Image nor likenes of any thing. &c. and Deut. 4. For which cause (saith this Counsaile) you heard the voyce of wordes in the midst of the fire, but you sawe no image. Contrary to this, the Council of Nice doth accurse those that will not worship images in these words: Qui venerandas imagines, non veneratur Anathema. Accursed be they yt worship not holy images.

So it appeareth that these two Councils were contrary, and therefore one of them did erre. But I will proceede to the next place. You doubted also, whether it were to be founde in Saint Augustine, that there is no Miracle in the Sacrament. Now you may heare his owne wordes. To. 3. De Trinitate lib. 3. cap. 10. Sicut panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo Sacramento consumitur. Sed quia haec hominibus nota sunt quia per homines fiunt, honorem tanquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tanquam mira non possunt. As the bread ordained for this purpose, is consumed in receauing the Sacrament. But because these things are knowen vnto men, & are done by men, they may haue honour or reuerence as holy things, but they can not be wondered at as things strange and miraculous. Here you haue Augustines wordes against miracle in the Sacrament.

Camp.

In deede there is no such euident miracle visibly appearing, as when Christ cured y lame, the blinde, &c. but yet there is a great miracle which our faith doeth acknowledge.

Goade.

Augustine speaketh simply against miracle: so that whether it be visible or inuisible, both is excluded. Beside, it is perpetuall in all miracles, that there must bee some outward sensible signe. Further, you doubted of Inhaerens iustitia, righteousnes inherent in our selues, which I auouched to bee erroneous doctrine set forth in the late Council of Trent. The wordes are these, Concil. Trident. cap. 7. Ver iusti nominamur, & sumus iustitiam in nobis recipientes vnusquisque suam, secundum mensuram quam spiritus sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, secundum propriam cuiusque dispositionem & cooperationem. Et cap. 16. Quae quum iustitia

nostra dicitur, quia per eam nobis inhaerente iustificamur, illa eadem Dei est, quia a Deo nobis infunditur per Christi meritum. We are called and in deede are truely righteous, receiuing in our selues euery man his own righteousnes, according to the measure which the holy Ghost doth deuide to euery one euen as he will, according to euery mans own proper disposition & cooperation. For that righteousnes which is called ours, because we are iustified by it inherent in our selues, the selfe same is the righteousnes of God, because it is powred into vs from God by the merit of Christ.

Camp.

I did not doubt of inherent righteousnes in our selues, whether it were in the Council of Trent, for I defend & mainteine it as the Councill teacheth it: you saye it is by imputation of Christes righteousnes being without vs, whereby wee are iustified: and I say, wee are iustified by that righteousnesse which is within vs, though it be not of vs.

Goade.

The place which I vrged against you the other day, beside many other in ye scripture, is direcly against this doctrine. 2. Cor. 5. 21. He hath made him to be fin for vs which knewe no sinne, that we should be made the righteousnes of God in him.

Fulke.

Well, nowe we are to come to the question. You holde that the natural body & blood of Christ is contained in the Sacrament of the Lordes supper. Your wordes are, Christ is present in the Sacrament substatially, very God & man in his natural body.

Camp.

I say there is really present in the Sacrament, the naturall body and blood of Christ vnder that bread and cup.

Fulke.

What meane you by these wordes vnder the bread and cup, that we may agree of termes?

Campion.

You knowe in the bread is whitenes, &c. that is not in his body: make your argument.

Fulke.

So I will.

The cup is not the naturall blood of Christ:

Ergo the other parte is not his naturall body.

Campion.

There is present in the cup, the naturall blood of Christ. Go to my wordes.

Fulke.

Well.

The naturall blood of Christ is not present in the cup:

Ergo the naturall body is not present in the other part.

Campion.

The naturall blood of Christ is present in the cup.

Fulke.

Thus I disproue it.

The wordes of Christes institution be these:

This cup is the new testament in my blood:

But the naturall blood of Christ is not the newe testament in his blood:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not in the cup.

Camp.

The ward, Is, is neither in ye Hebrew, nor in ye Greeke.

Fulke.

Very well, you shall see me finde it. in non-Latin alphabet .

Campion.

You must adde this worde in non-Latin alphabet .

Fulke.

Nay, the worde in non-Latin alphabet is in Saint Paul, This cup is the new testament in my blood.

Campion.

The worde in non-Latin alphabet , which is vnderstoode, is referred to the beginning of the sentence. Hic est calix nouum testamentum in sanguine meo: This is the cup, the new testament in my blood: he saith not this cup is the new testament.

Fulke.

You peruert the wordes, you cannot shift it off so.

Campion.

My text hath it so.

Fulke.

It cannot be so, you haue heard the Greeke, and your vulgar translation is according to the Greeke: Hic calix nouum testamentum est in meo sanguine. 1. Cor. cap. 11.

Camp.

No Syr, I was in hande with the 22. of Luke.

Fulke.

Shall you appoint me my text? I say, my text is taken out of Saint Paul. I haue shewed in non-Latin alphabet in the Greeke & Latin both.

Campion.

It is referred to the beginning, Hic est calix nouum testamentum.

Fulke.

The composition cannot admitte that peruersion, you would obscure the sense by disordering the wordes: but Saint Paul is a better interpreter of Saint Luke, in whom the verbe in non-Latin alphabet lacketh, then your vulgar translation.

Campion.

What do you inferre of these wordes?

Fulke.

The cup is the newe testament:

But the naturall blood of Christ is not the newe testament:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not the cup.

Camp.

M. Doctor this is your argument. The cup is the new testament, &c. I deny your argument.

Fulke.

It is a syllogisme.

Campion.

It is neither in mode nor figure.

Fulke.

It is in Baroco.

Camp.

You take the cup otherwise in ye Maior then in ye conclusion. For when it is said, the cuppe is the new Testament, the meaning is, that in the cuppe, which is the blood of Christ, is the couenant of the newe Testament. In the conclusion you take the cuppe for the chalice, wherein the blood of Christ is.

Fulke.

I take the cup for the same in both: I speake & meane as the Apostle doeth. I take the cuppe for that which is in the cuppe. Therefore marke my argument againe.

The cup, or that which is in the cuppe, is the new Testament:

The naturall blood of Christ is not the newe Testament:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not the cup, or that which is in the cuppe.

Answer to this Syllogisme.

Campion.

It is no Syllogisme, there be quatuor termini.

Fulke.

Well I perceiue then, you can answere no otherwise.

Campion.

It is plaine taking the cup, for that in the cuppe.

Fulke.

Master Lieutenaunt, you heare his answere: I wil rest in the iudgement of those which know what a Syllogisme is.

Goade.

I will propoude an other argument. You say that Christ is present in the Sacrament substantially, very God and man in his naturall body, which I improue thus.

Looke howe Christ was present to the Fathers in the wilderness in Manna, and in the rocke, euen so he is present to vs in our Sacrament:

But he was not present to them in their Sacrament in his naturall bodie:

Therefore he is not in his naturall body present in our Sacrament.

Campion.

I deny your Maior or first proposition.

Goade.

I proue it thus. They receiued in their Sacrament the same substaunce that we doe: Therefore they had the same presence.

Campion.

I denie your Antecedent.

Goade.

I proue it out of the plaine wordes of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 10. 3. Et omnes eandem escam, &c. speaking of our fathers the Israelites, he saith, And did al eate the same spirituall meate, and did all drinke the same spirituall drinke, for they dranke of the spirituall rocke that followed them, & the rocke was Christ.

Campion.

They did eate eandem escam spiritualem, the same spirituall grace, but not the same substance.

Goade.

They receiued the same that we do touching the substance: you can not so anoyde the force of this place. Spiritual is added in respect of the corporal signes, which differ betwene them and vs, as shall after appeare, but the same spirituall substance in both, as the circumstance of that place enforceth.

Camp.

Why, Christ had yet receyued no substance of fleshe, and therefore could not then bee present to them substantially in his naturall body.

Goade.

You reason well for mee. Therefore he was present vnto them spiritually, as the wordes are, eandem escam spiritualem: And so he is to vs present, and not carnally, because Christ had not then taken flesh, and the Fathers did then eate Christ in substance as well as we, therefore the presence and eating in both must needes be spirituall.

Camp.

I answere they had the same in a mystery and figure.

Goade.

This is no answere. I will easily take it away both by the wordes following in the text, and also by the manifest circumstance of the place, both which proueth to be clerely the same in substance. They had the same Christ, who is the substance of our Sacraments: ergo the same substance that we haue.

Camp.

They had not the same Christ in substance, in their Sacrament.

Goade.

The words folowing are plaine to expoud the Apostles meaning: Et omnes eundem potum biberunt, &c. Petra autem erat Christus. They did all drinke the same spirituall drinke, for they drunke of the spirituall rocke that followed them, which rocke was Christ: Therefore they eating and drinking the same Christ, did eate and drinke the same substance.

Campion.

There is a fallacion in the worde, eandem, the same. In a mistery and in signification the same, but in substance, great difference.

Goade.

The difference was onely in the outward signes, the measure of reuelation, and in time, they beleeuing on Christ to come, and we in Christ that is come: but in matter and substance the very same. And that the Apostles meaning must needes be so, I will nowe manifestly proue out of the circumstance of this text, and out of the Apostles owne argument. His purpose is to proue that the Israelites were nothing inferior to the Corinthians, touching the seales or Sacramentes of Gods fauour: and therefore the Corinthians had no more to boaste in, touching their Sacramentes then the Israelites had. Whereupon he sayeth they did eate the same meate &c. ergo they were equall. Nowe if they eate not the same in substance, which the Corinthians did eate, but only in shadow & figure (as you say) then the Israelites were much inferior to the Corinthians in their sacramentes, and so ye would make the Apostles argument of no force.

Campion.

The Apostles meaning is, that the old Israelites beleueed in the same Christ, and did eate him after a sort, as wee doe: they were not altogether equall, for he speaketh a litle before of Baptisme, saying, that they were baptized in the cloude, this was not the same with our baptisme.

Goade.

In deede the outward signe differed, as I said before, namely the watery cloude from our water in Baptisme, but in matter and substance it was a signe of the same inuisible grace. And so the Apostle proueth the Israelites equall to the Corinthians, and consequently to vs in both the Sacraments.

Campion.

Abraham beleueed in the same Christ, yet Christ was not then incarnate to Abraham, as he is now to vs, &c.

Goade.

To what purpose is this? What doeth it helpe you? doeth it not rather confirme that I said to be true, the same in substance, the same Christ before & nowe, the difference to be in time? These are your olde excursions, when ye can not answeere the argument. But now, after I haue proued the same substance (which you denied) first by the playne wordes, & then by the euident circumstance and drift of the text, I will yet further vrge this argument by the iudgement of Saint Augustine. tom. 9. in Ioh. tract. 26. *Sacramenta illa fuerunt in signis diuersa, sed in re quae significatur, pariasunt. Apostolum audi. Omnes eandem escam spiritualem manducauerunt, spiritualem vtique eandem: Nam corporalem alteram, quia illi Manna, nos aliud: spiritualem ver quam nos.* Those Sacraments were in signes diuers, but in the thing signified are equall. Heare what the Apostle sayeth. All did eate the same spirituall meate: in deede the same meate spirituall. For touching the corporall meate they did eate one, & we another, but they did eate the same spirituall meate that we doe.

Campion.

You must prooue out of Augustine, that they did eate the same Christ.

Goade.

That hath bene already plainly proued out of the text, They dranke of the rocke, &c. the rocke was Christ. But you shall haue it proued also out of Augustine, who expounding the Apostles wordes, sayth, they did eate the same spiritual meate that we do eate.

Campion.

He meaneth the same in effect.

Goade.

Augustines wordes are plaine, not the same in effect, but in substance and matter. In *signis diuersa, sed in re paria.* Those Sacraments in matter or thing signified are equall: He maketh difference in the signes, but none at all in the thing. *Re paria:* the same thing or substance in both, therefore the same Christ.

Campion.

The same Christ was to them incarnate in hope and effect, as the Lambe is said to be slaine from the beginning of the worlde: but Christ in deede was not yet incarnate.

Goade.



True it is, that touching the purpose and counsaile of God, and the efficacie of Christes death in all ages, the Lambe Christ was slayne from the beginning. But what is this to mine argument out of Augustine? The difference of time is no matter, they eate the same thing, they did eate Sacramenta re paria, sayth Augustine. And in his treatise de vtilitate poenitentiae Tom. 9. he proueth very plainely, the same Christ and the same substance to be in the Israelites sacrament, and in ours.

Campion.

Reade the place.

Goade.

Eundem inquit cibum spiritualem manducanerunt: quid est eunde, nisi quia eum quem etiam nos? Suffecerat vt diceret, cibum spiritualem manducauerunt: eundem inquit: eundem non inuenio quomodo intelligam, nisi eum quem manducamus & nos. Quid ergo ait aliquis, Hoc erat Manna illud, quod ego nunc accipio: Ergo nihil modo venit, si ante iam fuit, ergo euacuatum est scandalum crucis. Quomodo ergo eundem, nisi quia addidit spiritualem? Nam qui Manna illud sic acceperunt, vt tantummodo indigentiae suae corporali satisfieri putarent, & ventrem suum pasci, no mentem: nihil magnum manducauerunt. Quicumque in Manna Christum intellexerunt, eundem quem nos cibum spiritualem manducauerunt. Sic etiam eundem potum quem nos, sed spiritualem, id est, qui fide capiebatur, non qui corpore hauriebatur. Audisti eundem potum, petra erat Christus. Non enim alter Christus tunc, alter nunc. Tunc enim Christus venturus, mod Christus venit. Venturus & venit, diuersa verba sunt, sed idem Christus. He sayth they did eate the same spiritual meate. What is the same, but the same that we also eate? It might haue sufficed to saye, they did eate spirituall meate, but he sayth, the same. I do not finde how to vnderstand this worde, the same, but the same which we also do eate. Then may some say, What, was Manna the same which I nowe receiue? then doth nothing come now but that which was before? then the offence of the crosse is become voyde: howe then can it be true that he sayeth, the same, but that he addeth spirituall? For they that did receiue Manna in such sort, that they thought thereby to satisfie onely their corporall necessitie, and to feede their belly and not their minde, did eate no great thing. Whosoeuer in Manna did vnderstand Christ, did eate the same spirituall meate that we doe, and also receiued the same drinke that we doe, but spirituall, that is, which was receiued by faith, and not by the body. Thou hast heard that it is the same drinke, the rocke was Christ. For there was not one Christ then, and another nowe: for then Christ was to come, nowe he is come. To come, and is come, be diuers wordes, but the same Christ. You heare howe Augustine, as it were of purpose, often vrgeth the worde, eundem, the same meate. And afterward explaneth it to be the same Christ in their Sacraments and ours, and notwithstanding the difference in time, yet the same in substance.

Campion.

I graunt to be the same Christ, as I sayd before, touching the effect and deede, slaine to them in hope, but to vs in deede: they had the same touching the fruite and effect, and so S. Augustine is to be vnderstoode.

Goade.

Your answere is more absurde then some other writers of your side. For they distinguish, though very corruptly, Sacramenta veterum sub lege tantum figurabant, nostra autem conferunt gratiam. The Sacraments of the fathers vnder the lawe did

onely figure, but ours do conferre and giue grace.

Campion.

This is mine answere: the same in effect and end, touching saluation. If you can say no more, ye may go to another argument.

Goade.

Your aunswere is taken away, and can stand neither with the text of the Apostle, nor yet with Saint Augustines iudgement. Beside, it is manifest you would confound those thinges, which of their owne nature must nedes be distinguished, namely the thing it selfe, and the effect, ende, or fruite that commeth thereof. For the effect being saluation, is the fruite that followeth the spirituall eating of Christ being the thing it selfe or substance: whom whosoever first eateth not, can not be partaker of the fruite that followeth.

Camp.

You haue not, neither can take away mine answere. The same I say stil, in effect & ende, but not equal in the thing signified. As, a man may be sicke to day, and to morowe whole: the same man, but not the same in substance of his body and blood.

Goade.

Well, seeing you haue none other answere, I will leaue this argument, and commit it to the iudgement of the learned to iudge of your answere.

Fulke.

Thus I will proue, that Christ is not present in his naturall body in the Sacrament. Whatsoever is in the sacrament is voyd of sense, or insensible:

But Christ is not insensible:

Ergo Christ is not in the Sacrament.

Camp.

Your maior and your minor are both vntrue in some sense.

Fulke.

This is your olde shift, to trouble the hearers vnderstanding, with prooffe of both partes, that you might not be espied in the poynt of controuersie.

Campion.

That you say vnsensible, it is true, if you meane the spirituall grace, which is not subiect to sense.

Fulke.

I meane by insensible, voyde of life or sense.

Campion.

Then I deny your maior.

Fulke.

I proue it out of Epiphanius. lib. Anchorato.

Campion.

Reade the place.

Fulke.

The wordes be these. in non-Latin alphabet, &c.

Campion.

What worde builde you vpon:

Fulke.

I haue read the wordes, where he sayth it is insensible, if you vnderstand it.

Campion.

You might haue brought the Latine booke.

Fulke.

Then you would haue cauled, that it was not rightly translated: but you were best confesse your ignorance.

Campion.

I pray you helpe me.

Fulke.

If you vnderstand it your selfe, I neede not.

Campion.

I vnderstand Latine better then Greeke. Yet I trust I haue Greeke ynough to answeere you withall. Reade it in Latine.

Fulke.

Nay, I will reade it in English, that other men may vnderstand it as well as you. For we see what our father tooke in his handes, as it is contained in the Gospel, that he arose at supper, and tooke these things. And after he had giuen thankes, he said, This of me is that. And we see that it is not equall, nor like, neither to the incarnate image, nor to the inuisible deitie, nor to the lineaments of his members: For this thing is of long shape, or rowle fashion, and voyd of sense, as concerning power. And yet hee woulde say through grace, This of mine is that, and no man doth discredit the saying.

Camp.

You lose time: we should not credit our eyes, but faith. What haue you gotten by this place: Epiphanius saith none must discredit the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, because it is a long white thing.

Fulke.

You vnderstand not the place.

Campion.

The meaning is, wee must not credite sense, but faith: you haue gained nothing by this place.

Fulke.

Yes, more then you would willingly afford. First, that the sacramental bread in that time, was not such a round thin cake, as you vse in your Masse, but a rowle of bread: Secondly, that the sacrament was not equal with Christ: and thirdly that it was an insensible thing, void of life, hauing not so much as yt power of sense.

Campion.

He sayeth that we should not credit our sight, but faith: we must beleeeue Christ to be present.

Fulke.

As Christ hath sayd and meaneth.

Campion.

That which I see is voyde of sense, it is against your selfe, it teacheth vs to beleeeue faith.

Fulke.

You know not the argumet of ye booke, nor of ye place.

Campion.

Yes as well as you.

Fulke.

Then shewe it afore this company, you that will challenge the whole Church of England, and make profession of vniuersall knowledge.

Camp.

I wil answere any challenge I haue made.

Fulke.

Yea, euen as you doe this. Shewe vs the argument which the Doctor handleth in this place, if you can.

Campion.

I haue sayd, you are not able to reply.

Fulke.

Yes if you wil shew the argument, I will replie. Campion. You do not.

Fulke.

I do not, therefore I cannot: I wil first shew the argumet of the place: he speaketh of images, & namely he sheweth how man is made after Gods image, & yet is not equall with God, although Christ being the image of the Father, is equal with him. This he sheweth by example of the sacramet, which is the image of Christ, in such sort as man is the image of God. For it is not equal with Christ, nor like vnto him, either concerning his humanitie or deitie: but a mere insensible thing, as that which hath no power of life: whereas Christ is all sensible, all of power, all incomprehensible, concerning his Godhead.

Campion.

Reply against mine answere, if you can. The exterior forme or colour which we see, is that which he sayth to be insensible.

Fulke.

He speaketh not of colour, hee speaketh of that which Christ calleth his body. Is the exterior forme called the bodie of Christ: Is the colour of bread the image of Christ: Epiphanius sayeth, that of which Christ sayde, This is my body, is voyde of sense: Therefore he sayth the whole Sacrament, or whatsoever is contained in it, is insensible.

Campion.

That is, Christ is not seene, but vnder the exterior forme or colour, For no substace ca be seene. Are not you Doctor Fulke? and yet I see nothing but your colour and exterior forme. I wil abide by this, that the substace of any thing can not be seene.

Fulke.

I will not vouchesafe to replie vpon this answere, too childish for a Sophister.

Camp.

You are very imperious. You come I trowe, to pose me as a Grammar scholer, and to take me vp with checke at your pleasure. I know no cause why I shoulde take it at your handes: I am the Queenes prisoner, and not yours.

Fulke.

I would you were the Queenes true subiect.

Goade.

Whatsoever is naturally present in the Sacrament, is beneath vpon earth:

But Christ touching his body is not beneath vpon earth:

Ergo Christ touching his body, is not naturally present in the Sacrament.

Campion.

I deny your minor.

Goade.

Christ touching his bodily presence is in heauen, and onely in heauen: therefore not vpon earth.

Campion.

I deny your Antecedent, it is partly true, and partly false, ordinarily he is in heauen, but miraculously his body also is in earth.

Goade.

I will ease you of your distinction.

Christ is no way present on earth, touching his body:

Therefore neither ordinarily, nor yet miraculously. Answere to the argument briefly.

Campion.

As briefe as you wil. He is some way present vpon earth touching his body. Proue your antecedent.

Goade.

I proue it thus.

If Christ touching his bodily presence, be any way present vpo earth, then he is to be sought vpon earth:

But he is not to be sought vpon earth:

Ergo no way present vpon earth.

Campion.

I deny your Minor. Hee is some way to be sought vpon earth in the Sacrament, but not by his ordinary presence.

Goade.

Mine argument is against all distinction.

Campion.

Will you not giue me leaue to distinguish:

Goade.

I say, he is no way bodily present on earth, which vtterly taketh away your distinction. And I proue it by the Apostles reason. Colos. 3. 1. Si consurrexistis cum Christo. &c. If ye be risen together with Christ, seeke those things that are aboute where Christ sitteth at the right hande of God, set your affection on heauenly things, and not vpon earthly things. The Apostle exhorteth vs to seeke things aboute, because Christ is in heauen touching his body, sitting at the right hand of God. If he be beneath on earth bodily any way, then the Apostles reason is nothing.

Campion.

The Apostles meaning is, that Christ is not to be sought for now, in that sort as when he walked vpon earth.

Goade.

This answere is taken away before. The Apostles true meaning is, to drawe them from mens traditions, and earthly ceremonies, by this reason, Because Christ is not beneath on earth touching his body.

Campion.

He meaneth of all earthly things, and not of ceremonies.

Goade.

That is but your coiecture, of ignorance or forgetfulnes of the Apostles argument in the former chapter next going before.

Camp.

Is not Christ to be sought vpon earth? when I looke into my Bible, doe I not seeke Christ?

Goade.

I thinke you doe not truely seeke him.

Camp.

Do you?

Goade.

I will not answere your wordes. Answere you mine argument, ye would go from the matter.

Camp.

Your argument is nothing. If Christ be in heauen, I must not seeke him in earth.

Goade.

It is the argument of the Apostle, and may thus bee framed.

Our affection must there be set where Christ is, touching his body:

But Christ is in heauen alone touching his body, where he sitteth at the right hand of God:

Therefore our affection must be in heauen.

Camp.

What is it to seeke Christ aboue? must I flie vp into heauen? it is our affection and cogitation that must be lift vp.

Goade.

What is this to the argument, you answere not the Apostles reason, being framed into a Syllogisme.

Our affection must be where Christ is, touching his body:

But he is in heauen in his body, at the right hand of God:

Ergo there to be sought, and not vpon earth.

If Christ be any way vpon earth, the Apostles argument holdeth not: but contrariwise by the Apostles reason, earthly things were to be sought, if Christ be any way vpon earth touching his body.

Camp.

I must not now seeke Christ in conuersation in Ierusalem: to seeke him in the Sacrament, is not to seeke him in earth.

Goade.

But if he be on earth in the Sacrament (as you say) bodily, then he may be sought vpon earth, yea and earthly things also, which the Apostle denieth. There is a manifest opposition in the Apostles wordes betweene aboue and beneath, in heauen and in earth: ye may not confound these.

We must ascende thether where Christ is:

But he is aboue in heauen:

Therefore in minde we must ascende into heauen.

Campion.

The drift of the Apostle is, we must ascende with Christ, we must die with Christ, in affection, and spiritually.

Goade.

You neuer answeere directly to the argument. It contrary to the Apostles plaine wordes, and against the scope of his exhortation, that we should seeke Christ beneath, as any way bodily present on earth.

Camp.

Mine answeere is, that according to his ordinary presence he is aboue, but according to miracle, he is bodily vpon earth beneath.

Goade.

Now ye flie againe to miracle: but this shift is taken away before. For if Christ bee any way bodily present on earth, though it be by miracle, then he is to be sought on earth, which the Apostle denieth. You heare his answeere, this stone hath bene rowled enough.

Fulke.

If Christ be present in his naturall body, he is present in his true body:

But he is not present in his true body:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall.

Campion.

I deny your Minor: he is present in his true body.

Fulke.

If he be present in his true body, then wheresoeuer the Sacrament is, there is his true body:

But wheresoeuer the Sacramet is, there is not his true body:

Ergo he is not present in his true body.

Campion.

Proue your Minor: Wheresoeuer the Sacramet is, there is his true body.

Fulke.

Chrysostome denieth it in cap. 5. Math. Homilia 12. operis imperfecti: Sin vasa sanctificata ad priuatos vsus transferre peccatum est & periculum, sicut docet nos Balthasar, qui bibens in calicibus sacratis, de regno depositus & de vita. Si ergo haec vasa sanctificata in priuatos vsus transferre periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed misterium corporis Christi continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quae sibi Deus ad habitaculum preparauit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quae vult. Here you see Chrysostome doth plainely deny the true body of Christ to be present in the holy vessels, in the which the misterie or sacrament thereof is contained.

Campion.

Of all other Doctors he maketh most against you.

Fulke.

He maketh nothing against vs for this question, in any place of his workes: but how answeere you vnto this place?

Camp.

I saye, where the naturall body of Christ is present, there is his true body present.

Fulke.

But this Doctor saith cleane contrarie, that in the holy vessels is contained the misterie of the body of Christ, but not the true body of Christ.

Camp.

He speaketh of Balthasars vessels.

Fulke.

Although he bringeth Balthasars example of abusing the holy vessels of the  
Iewes, to shewe howe daungerous it is to conuert holy things to priuate vses: yet he  
speaketh expressly of the holy vessels of the Christians, wherein was the misterie  
of the body of Christ.

Camp.

The chalice may bee abused, after the true body of Christ is taken out of it, and  
that is a great fault to abuse it, when the body of Christ is not in it.

Fulke.

Then he should say, In quibus non erat: but he sayth, In quibus non est, In  
which the true body of Christ is not.

Campion.

Hee talketh of all holy vessels, not onely of the chalice.

Fulke.

I graunt he reasoneth from the lesse to the more: if it be daungerous to abuse al  
holy vessels, namely those, in which the true body of Christ is not, but the misterie  
thereof: howe much more perilous is it, to abuse the vessels of our body, wherein  
God dwelleth?

Campion.

Doeth he say, that the body of Christ is not in the chalice?

Fulke.

He saith it is in none of the vessels:

But the chalice is a vessell:

Ergo it is not in the chalice.

Campion.

May not the holy vessels be abused after masse is done? and so he meaneth that  
though the body of Christ be not in them when they are abused, yet it is an heinous  
fault to abuse the when the Sacrament is taken out.

Fulke.

His wordes are plaine, that the true body of Christ is not in them, but the  
misterie or sacrament thereof.

For if it be a sinne and daunger to transferre the sanctified vessels vnto priuate  
vses, as Balthasar doth teach vs, which drinking in the hallowed cuppes, was deposed  
from his kingdome, and from his life. Therefore if it be so daungerous to transferre  
vnto priuate vses these sanctified vessels, in which is not the true body of Christ,  
but a misterie of the body of Christ is contained: how much more the vessels of our  
bodie, which God hath prepared for a dwelling place to him selfe, ought wee not to  
yelde vnto the deuill, to do in them what hee will. The place is so plaine, that no  
man can deny it: hee saith the misterie of Christ is contained in the vessels, therefore  
hee speaketh not of the vessels when they are emptie, but when the sacrament is in  
them, which he denieth to be the true body of Christ.

Campion.

The thing may bee abused after the true body of Christ be taken out, and yet  
there is a misterie there, because of the spirituall vse, the meaning is, you must not  
abuse the thing referred to holy vses, by the example of Balthasar, and therefore  
the misterie is alwayes there, when the vessels are emptie.

Fulke.



A very secret misterie in deede; that is in the emptie chalice. Well, well, I thinke that there is none so simple here, but he may see in what case you stande.

Campion.

A misterie is not alwaies taken in one sense. Why may there not be a misterie of Christ in the emptie chalice? there is a misterie of Christ in euery thing. I would you might answere me a while to that I could bring out of Chrysostome.

Fulke.

You are not allowed to oppose at this time, but I will answere you in writing whatsoever you can bring. As for this matter, all men see how vnable you are to answere. I could helpe you with a better answere my selfe.

Goade.

If Christ be present in the sacrament in his naturall body, then his bodily presence must continue so long as the vse of the sacrament continueth, to the worldes ende:

But Christ touching his bodily presence doeth not so continue:

Therefore Christ is not present in the sacrament in his naturall body.

Camp.

Christ doeth, and so shall continue his bodily presence to the ende of the worlde.

Goade.

Christ him selfe hath denied his bodily presence or continuance:

Therefore he shall not so continue.

Campion.

I denie your antecedent.

Goade.

Io. 16. vers. 28. I leaue the world and goe to the father. And Math. 26. 11. The poore yee shall haue alwaies with you, but me ye shall not haue alwaies.

Camp.

He meaneth, he will not be conuersant in the world as then he was, touching his outward conuersation, and poore estate: you shall not saith he, haue me alwaies with you as you haue the poore. Here he was entring into a long tale.

Goade.

I looked for this shift before. I will take away your distinction, ye are too full of wordes, ye will not suffer mee to goe on with mine argument: you are belike afraide.

It is spoken in respect of his bodily presence simplie:

Therefore not in respect of his poore estate.

Campion.

Proue what you can: I deny your antecedent.

Goade.

I proue it by Saint Augustine, expounding the same wordes of our Sauour Christ. Tractat. in 10. 50. Pauperes semper habebitis vobiscum, me autem non semper: loquebatur enim de presentia corporis sui. Nam secundum maiestatem suam, secundum prouidentiam, secundum ineffabilem & inuisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecce ego vobiscum sum vsque ad consummationem seculi: secundum carnem quam verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de virgine natus est &c. non semper habebitis vobiscu. Ascendit in coelum, & non est hc, ibi est enim: sedet ad dextra patris, & hc est, non enim recessit praesentia maiestatis. Secundu praesentia maiestatis semper habemus Christum, secundum praesentiam carnis, rect dictum

est discipulis, Me autem non semper habebitis. The poore ye shall haue alwaies with you, but me ye shal not haue alwaies: he spake this of the presence of his body. For according to his Maiestie, according to his prouidence, according to his vnspeakeable & inuisible grace, that is fulfilled which Christ said, Lo I am with you to thed of the world: according to the flesh which the word tooke, according to that he was borne of the virgine, &c. you shal not (saith he) haue me with you alwaies. He is ascended into heauen & is not here: for he is there sitting at the right had of the father. And he is here, for he is not departed according to the presence of his maiestie. According to ye presence of his maiestie, we haue Christ alwaies with vs: according to the presence of his flesh, it was well said to his disciples, But me you shal not haue alwaies. Augustine in his first wordes expoundeth this, to be spoken of the bodily presence of Christ, simply.

Campion.

It is spoken according to his visible conuersation: Proue any thing against this.  
Goad.

Augustine excludeth all kinde of bodily presence:

Therefore it is not spoken according to his visible couersation.

Camp.

I denie your Antecedent.

Goad.

Augustine acknowledgeth only two kindes of presence of Christ: the one, ye bodily presence of his flesh: the other, according to his maiestie, prouidence & inuisible grace. According to this latter kind he saith, Christ is present with vs: which he directly opposeth to his bodily presence. Therefore all kinde of bodily presence is excluded.

Campion.

There is no contrarietie to that I said before. S. Augustine excludeth not by maiestical presence al bodily presence. Make your Syllogisme, and I will answere you.

Goad.

It is more then the vsuall order of disputatio, to require a Syllogisme, when I am come to ye issue of mine argument, namely to authoritie, as now we are come to Augustine: but I will followe your request: Do you answere directly. Thus I make mine argument out of Augustines wordes.

Christ is now present with his Church touching his maiestie, and vnspeakeable grace:

Therefore by no meanes touching his body.

Campion.

I deny your argument.

Goad.

Augustines wordes proueth it, making but two kindes of presence of Christ: namely, presence of maiestie, and presence of flesh: and opposeth the one against the other.

Camp.

He speaketh not of Christ present in ye sacrament, but of his presence which euery Christia man may haue: he speaketh according to Subiectam materiam, he excludeth not his naturall presence in the sacrament.

Goad.

You answere not the argument out of Augustine. But I will followe you, and proue that hee excludeth the presence of Christes naturall body in the sacrament.

He excludeth all presence, saue that by his maiestie, prouidence, and grace:

Ergo he excludeth the presence of Christes naturall body in the sacrament.

Camp.

To your Antecedent I answere: he excludeth all ordinary presence by outward conuersation, and sheweth how Christ is present with euery Christian by his spirit and grace: hee speaketh not of his presence in the sacrament.

Goad.

He speaketh generally, excluding all bodily presence.

Therefore aswell in the sacrament, as without.

Camp.

Hee speaketh generally, quoad subiectam materiam, according to the matter that he had in hand.

Goad.

You answere not ye argument. Thus I vrge it briefly.

Christ is now present with his Church, only touching his spirit and grace:

Ergo he is no way present touching his body.

Mine argument you see is grounded vpon Augustines plaine wordes, opposing the one presence to the other, *Secundum presentiam maiestatis, semper habemus Christum. &c.*

Campion.

He compareth these two together, how he was present to his Apostles, and how to vs: he talketh generally of an vsuall presence; as euery man may haue Christ present by prayer, &c.

Goad.

And he maketh Christ present to vs, none other way but by his maiestie, and inuisible grace: and touching all presence of his flesh, saith it is true, me ye shall not haue alwaies. I pray you, would or durst Augustine so haue written in so plaine wordes absolutely to allowe onely of Christes presence by his grace, denying that touching his bodily presence we should not alwaies haue him with vs, if Christ any way were still bodily present vpon earth:

Camp.

Yea, I warrant you, being rightly vnderstoode. For he opposeth his presence then, and his presence now, not any more according to visible conuersation. And so your argument ye woulde make out of Augustine, is not good.

Goad.

You vse not to answere the point of the argument, but your manner is to holde you stil to one shifting distinction, though it be often taken away. Your kinde of answering is not onely against learning, but against common sence.

Fulke.

I will take an other argument.

If Christ be present in the sacrament in his naturall body, he is present in truth and in deede, not onely in a signifying misterie:

But he is not present in the sacrament in truth and in deede, but onely in a signifying misterie:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall body.

Cam.

I denie your Minor: he is present in ye truth of his body.

Fulke.

I proue it out of the Canon Lawe. De Consecratione Distinct. 2. cap. Hoc est. Sicut ergo caelestis panis qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum reuera sit sacramentu corporis Christi illius videlicet quod visibile, quod palpabile mortale in cruce positu est, vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quae sacerdotismansibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: sic Sacramentum fidei, quod Baptismus intelligitur, fides est Therefore euen as the heauenly bread which is the flesh of Christ, after a peculiar maner is called the body of Christ, when in deede it is the Sacrament of the body of Christ, to wit, of that body, which being visible, which being palpable, being mortal, was put on the crosse, and euen that immolation of the fleshe, which is done by the Priests handes, is called the passion, death, crucifixion of Christ, not in trueth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery: so the Sacrament of faith, which is vnderstoode to be baptisme, is faith. And the Gloss. hereupon sayth: Coelestis &c. id est, Coeleste Sacramentum, quod ver repraesentat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed impropri: vnde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio. Vt sit sensus. Vocatur corpus Christi, idest, significat. The heauely bread, that is, the heauenly Sacrament, which truely representeth the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ, but vnproperly: whereupon it is sayd by a peculiar maner, but not in the trueth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery. So that the sense is, It is called the body of Christ, that is, it signifieth it.

Camp.

All this maketh for transubstantiation. That which we see, is called the body of Christ, where in deede, it is but the colour and the accidents.

Fulke.

All makes for you: but let vs see whether you can so runne away with the matter. He saith, Coelestis panis, the heauenly bread: can the colour or accidents be called the heauenly bread:

Campion.

The meaning is of the accidents and of the signe.

Fulke.

This is a straunge proposition, color or accidens, is coelestis panis.

Campion.

It is called Coelestis panis, because it is heauenly bread by consecration.

Fulke.

That can not be. For he calleth that heauenly breade, which is the fleshe of Christ, and after the maner of it the body of Christ:

But accidents are not the flesh of Christ, nor ye body of Christ:

Ergo they are not the heauenly bread.

Campion.

If you respect the qualitie, it is the heauenly bread by consecration.

Fulke.

It seemeth you knowe not the place: the Glosse sayth the heauenly bread which is the heauenly Sacrament, is called vnproperly the body of Christ, not in trueth of

the thing, but in a signifying mysterie.

Camp.

Saint Augustine there speaketh popularly. You bewray your slender reading of Augustine, in citing this as Gratiens authoritie.

Fulke.

It is Gratian in the decrees of your owne Canon law, and the Glosse thereupon. In deede the decree is borrowed of Augustine: but it is more fully against the carnall presence, as it is cited by Gratian.

Campion.

I will answere both Gratian and the Glosse.

Fulke.

Set it downe then in few wordes.

Campion.

It is called coelestis, in respect of consecration and transubstantiation: bread, in respect that it is bread & wine in outward shewe: and for the accidents it is called Sacramentum the Sacrament, in respect that vnder those outward shewes the naturall body of Christ is present.

Fulke.

So you vnderstand the sacrament (which is denyed to be the body of Christ in trueth of the thing) to be the accidents: but it is absurd, that accidents should be called the heauenly bread.

Campion.

It is not absurd, if it be heauenly vnderstood: but accidents visibly considered of themselues, import absurditie.

Fulke.

The Sacrament is the outward shewe, which is not the body of Christ. I will proue that he taketh the worde Sacrament, for the whole Sacrament, not for the accidents as you doe.

Campion.

He speakes of the whole.

Fulke.

He speaketh of the whole, and not of the whole: this is manifest contradiction.

Campion.

The worde Sacrament, is here taken for the exterior formes, and not for the whole Sacrament.

Fulke.

I proue it must be taken for the whole Sacrament, els it could not be compared with Baptisme:

But it is compared with Baptisme:

Ergo he taketh it for the whole Sacrament.

Camp.

Your maior I answere: He compareth the element of the sacrament of the altar, with the element of water in baptisme.

Fulke.

He speaketh of the whole Sacrament of Baptisme, which is called faith, euen as the heauenly bread is called the Sacrament of Christ:

But the water of Baptisme is not called faith:

Ergo he speaketh of the whole Sacrament.

Campion.

He respecteth the externall signes, and compareth signes with signes.

Fulke.

That which he spoke of, is called the body of Christ:

But the accidents are not called the body of Christ:

Ergo accidents are not that he spake of.

Campion.

This is a booke, and yet I see not the substance of a booke, but whitenesse, and other accidents.

Fulke.

Who would say that whitenesse is the booke? none but a madde man: neither will any say, that whitenesse is the body of Christ, or called the body of Christ. Therefore by the word of heauenly bread, and of the Sacrament, he meaneth the whole sacrament. I see you haue nothing but shamelesse shiftes, against so cleare authoritie of your owne Canon law speaking against you.

Campion.

If you dare, let me shewe Augustine and Chrysostome: if you dare.

Fulke.

Whatsoever you can bring, I haue answered already in writing against other of your side: and yet if you thinke you can adde any thing, put it in writing, and I will answere it.

Campion.

Prouide me ynke and paper, and I will write.

Fulke.

I am not to prouide you ynke and paper.

Campion.

I meane, procure me that I may haue libertie to write.

Fulke.

I knowe not for what cause you are restrained of that libertie, and therefore I will not take vpon me to procure it.

Campion.

Sue to the Queene, that I may haue libertie to oppose, I haue bene nowe thrise opposed, it is reason I should oppose once.

Fulke.

I will not become a suter for you.

Camp.

Sue to the Queene for me, it is but an easie suite: you being in such credit with your Prince, may (if you dare) procure this matter. Catholikes of their prince can obtaine a greater matter: and are not you Protestants in such credit with your Prince, that you can obtaine so small a matter?

Fulke.

We meane not to trie our credit in this matter. But if you write any thing, I will answere you in writing.

Campion.

Procure it.

Fulke.

It were to small purpose: I haue answered already Heskins and Saunders, which are like to bring as much as you.

Campion.

I am not worthy to cary their bookes after them. And you your selfe Sir, may be scholer to either of them.

Goade.

If Christ be present in his naturall body, he must be present in his true body:

But Christ is not present in his true body:

Ergo not in his naturall body.

Camp.

I deny your minor. He is present in his true body.

Goade.

A true body must haue the properties of a true body: But this hath not the properties of a true body:

Ergo it is not a true body.

Camp.

I deny againe your minor. It hath the properties of a true body.

Goade.

Amogst the properties of a true body, this is one special, to be circumscribed in place, & not to be in many places at once.

But in your transubstantiation, Christes body is made to be in many, yea in infinite places at once:

Ergo it hath not the properties of a true body.

Campion.

It is in respect of a miracle, not seene with eye, but with our faith.

Goade.

Now you runne againe to miracle. It hath bene before shewed you out of Augustine, that there is no miracle in the Sacrament, and your selfe sayd that miracles are now ceased.

Campion.

It is a great miracle to conuert a sinner, yea greater then to make the worlde, and this kinde of miracle is dayly.

Goade.

Now you would go from the matter, this is not properly a miracle. But to the purpose, Answere the argument.

That which is in many places at once, is not a true body.

But as you teach, Christ in the Sacrament is bodily in many places at once:

Ergo not a true body.

Campion.

The propertie of the fire is to burne, yet the three children in the fire ed. Wi you there that it was truely fire:

Goade.

That was in deede and properly a miracle, whereof the Scripture testifieth, which visibly was seene.

Campion.

So is this a miracle.

Goade.

Beside, it is not sensible, which must be in a miracle: There is no ground of the worde for it. And faith must be grounded on the worde of God.

Campion.

The word teacheth that God is omnipotent.

Goade.

You that wil reason from Gods omnipotencie, must prooue also his will. Omnia quae voluit fecit, Hee hath done all things whatsoever he would.

Camp.

Nay, you must proue it is not his will.

Goade.

I wil proue it out of Theodoret. Dialo. 3. qui inscribitur impatibilis, writing of the glorified body of Christ after his resurrection: Non est mutatum in naturam diuinitatis, sed post resurrectionem est quidem & immortale, & corruptione & interitu alienum, & diuina gloria plenum: sed tamen corpus est, quod habet propriam circumscriptionem. The body of Christ is not changed into the nature of his diuinitie, but after his resurrection it is in deede a body immortall, free from corruption, and ful of diuine glory: but yet it is a body that hath a proper circumscription.

Campion.

When it pleaseth Christ to worke a miracle, he is not bound to the natural properties, he doth not alwayes practise all his properties. His body ascending into heauen, had the true properties of a body, yet did not then practise them. It is against the naturall propertie of a body to ascend vpward.

Goade.

This ascension of Christes body, being an article of our faith, is grounded vpon the worde, that his body was taken vp, & neuerthelesse remayned a true body circumscribed in place. Augustine sayth we must not take away the trueth of Christes body. Epist. ad Dard. 57. Cauendum ne ita diuinitatem astruamus hominis, vt veritatem corporis auferamus, cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Wee must take heede, that we doe not so maintayne the Godhead of Christ being man, that we take away the trueth of his body, whereunto hee gaue immortalitie, but tooke not away the nature.

Campion.

You neede not bring these places, I graunt that Christ hath a true body. But you may as well deny the ascension of Christ, being against the propertie of a true body to ascend vpwarde.

Goade.

I answered before, that this is an article of our faith, grounded vpon the expresse worde of God. And because we do beleue by the word, that Christes body is ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of God, and from thence shal come to iudge: therefore we cannot beleue the cotrary, that Christ is yet present on earth. So Augustine reasoneth in the same Epistle. Christus Iesus vbique est per id quod Deus, in coelo autem per id quod homo. Spacia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt: & quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Christ iesus is euery where as he is God, but as he is man, he is in heauen. Take away space of places from bodies, & they shall be in no place: and because in no place, they shall haue no being at all.

Campion.



I thinke I haue answered sufficiently: he is present not naturally, but miraculously.

Goade.

Why, then ye destroy the propertie of a true bodie, and so consequently take away the trueth of a body.

Campion.

I grant the properties, though the same be not alwayes put in practise.

Goade.

Then sometime Christ may haue many, or rather infinite bodies in many places at one time, when the propertie of a true body ceaseth.

Campion.

Nay, it remayneth still one and the same body, though in many places at one time.

Goade.

When Christ deliuered his body in his last supper, I pray you, were there not by your opinion two sundry bodies? namely Christ himselfe the author and actor in the supper, was it not the one: and the bread transubstantiate (as ye wil haue it) into Christes body, was it not the other?

Camp.

Christ the actor in the Institution, yet was then present in the same body in the Sacrament: if he will haue it so, who can let him? I say he is miraculously in many places at once.

Goade.

Nowe we come againe to his will. But I deny that he will haue it so, and you can not proue it. Saint Augustine is flat against you in the forenamed Epistle, writing against the like heretiques of his time, that would take from Christ the properties of a true body, after his glorification, as to bee circumscribed in one place. &c.

Cap.

Ye vrge me much with Augustine. Let me shew for my selfe Augustine, Chrysostome, & others of y fathers, if you dare.

Goade.

This is not to answere. Come you to dare? This is like your bolde challenge.

Campion.

You may if ye list, procure leaue that I may oppose. Catholiques could easily obtaine a greater matter then this of their princes, and can not you obtaine this of your Prince?

Fulke.

We see it is to no purpose. Whatsoeuer you ca bring is knowen and answered already. Heskins, Allen, and others of your side, who are farre your betters, I haue already answered. Well, I will go to another argument.

If Christ be present in his naturall bodie, he is receiued not onely of the godly, but also of the wicked:

But he is not receiued of the wicked:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall body.

Campion.

I denie your minor.

Fulke.

I proue the minor out of S. Augustine de ciuitate Dei. lib. 21. cap. 25. Nec isti ergo dicendi sunt maducare corpus Christi, quoniam nec in mebris computandi sunt Christi, (vt alia taceam) no possunt simul esse & membra Christi, & mebra meretricis. Denique ipse dicens, qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, & ego in eo, ostendit quid sit, non Sacramento tenus, sed reuera corpus Christi manducare, & eius sanguinem bibere. Therefore neither is it to be sayd, that these vngodly men do eate the body of Christ, because they are not to bee accompted in the members of Christ, (for to omit other things) they cannot be at one time, both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. Finally he himselfe, saying he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him, sheweth what it is, not so farre as a Sacrament may goe, but in very deede to eate the body of Christ, and to drinke his blood.

Camp.

His meaning is, they receiue not the grace of Christ effectually to saluation.

Fulke.

His wordes are, they receiue not the bodie of Christ, reuera in deede, but sacramento tenus, in a sacrament, or sacramentally. Againe he saith, that Christ dwelleth not in them: Ergo they eate not the body of Christ.

Campion.

He dwelleth not in them vnto saluation.

Fulke.

True, and therefore they eate not his bodie: for whosoeuer eateth the fleshe of Christ, hath Christ dwelling in him to saluation.

Camp.

Whosoeuer eateth the fleshe of Christ worthily: but the wicked also eate the body of Christ, though vnworthily.

Fulke.

He saith expressly they eate not the body of Christ reuera, that is in deede, or verily, but sacramentally.

Campion.

Wherefore then are they guiltie?

Fulke.

That is an other question. And yet one may be guiltie of the Maiestie of the Prince, which refuseth to obey the same, or dispiseth the same: so are they guiltie of the bodie of Christ, which refuse to receiue it being offered.

Campion.

They receiue Christ, but not worthily. He that receiueth Baptisme, receiueth the holy Ghost, or else the Sacrament should not be true: so Saint Paul saith, He that eateth the body of Christ vnworthily, is guiltie of the body and blood of Christ.

Fulke.

He that receiueth vnworthily, receiueth the sacramet: & the Sacrament may be true, though he receiue it vnworthily. Againe, you falsifie the text, when you say, he that eateth the body of Christ vnworthily. Saint Pauls wordes are: He that eateth this bread and drinketh this cuppe of the Lord vnworthily.

Campion.

They must either receiue Christ vnworthily, or his grace:

They receiue not the grace of Christ vnworthily:

Ergo they receiue Christ vnworthily.

Fulke.

Christ can neuer be separated from his grace. A man may receiue the grace of Christ, though he receiue not his body. But he cannot receiue the body of Christ, but he must also receiue his grace.

Campion.

The wicked receiue the body of Christ, but not his grace.

Fulke.

So you say: but answere to Saint Augustine, which saith, The wicked eate not the body of Christ in very deede.

Campion.

They eate Christ sacramentally.

Fulke.

Yea, but not in deede, as Saint Augustine saith.

Campion.

They receiue the same Christ, but not to the same comfort that the godly do.

Fulke.

They do not receiue Christ, saith Saint Augustine: because they are not to be accompted in the members of Christ.

Campion.

And I say the same.

Fulke.

He saith, they eate not the body of Christ in deede: you affirme that they eate the body of Christ in deede. Againe, Saint Augustine saith. Hoc est in Christo manere. &c. This it is to dwell in Christ, that Christ may dwell in vs. For so he saide this, as though he had said, He that dwelleth not in me, and in whome I dwell not, let him not say or thinke he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood.

Camp.

The wicked eate the same bodie, but not to the same effecte.

Fulke.

Augustine saith, they eate not his body reuera, in deede: I see you haue no other shift of answere. Therefore I will leaue it to iudgement.

The Apostles receiued not the same body that afterwards was crucified, therefore your solution of the same body, not after the same maner and qualitie, cannot stand.

Campion.

They receiued the same body, both before and after his passion.

Goade.

I will followe the confutation of that absurde assertion, that the wicked eate the body of Christ, which is easie to bee improued many wayes. I frame mine argument thus.

Whosoeuer eateth the body of Christ, doth eat Rem sacrameti, The thing or substance of the sacrament:

But no wicked or vnbeleuing person, can eate Rem sacrameti:

Ergo no wicked person can eate the body of Christ.

Campion.

I distinguish of your Maior. *Res sacramenti*, is taken two wayes: for the body of Christ, or the inuisible grace of Christ. The wicked are partakers of the bodie of Christ, but not of his inuisible grace.

Goade.

You cannot thus distinguish that which in it selfe is all one, though it differeth in wordes: as the body of Christ, and the thing or substance of the sacrament. Which I proue evidently out of Augustine in 10. *Trac. 25. Huius rei sacramentu sumitur quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium, res vero ipsa cuius sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque eius particeps fuerit.* The sacrament of this thing is receaued of some vnto life, and of some vnto death. But the thing or substance it selfe, whereof the outward signe is a sacrament, is receiued of all men to life, and of none to death, whosoeuer is partaker therof. Whereby it is manifest, that S. Augustine doeth make but two partes of the sacrament, which hee doth distinguish: viz. the outward signe which he calleth the sacrament, and the inward thing or substance of the sacrament, which is Christ him selfe. And out of the same wordes of Augustine, I followe mine argument thus against your absurde distinction.

Whosoeuer eateth Christ the thing or substance of the sacrament, shall liue for euer,

But none of the wicked or vnfaithfull shall liue for euer:

Ergo none of the wicked can eate Christ, being the substance of the sacrament.  
Camp.

If you will replie vpon mine answere, take my words. The wicked eat not Christ effectually and worthily, according to inuisible grace.

Goade.

You answere not mine argument out of Augustine, and as for your wordes and *distinctio*, it is too absurde to separate the eating of Christ him selfe from effectually or worthy eating, seeing that whosoeuer eateth Christ the substance of the sacrament, doeth liue for euer, and so consequently must needes eate him effectually. Consider the wordes of Augustine, hee affirmeth the sacrament to consist of two things, the visible signe, which hee calleth *Huius rei sacramentum*, and the inuisible grace, or Christ him selfe, which he calleth *Rem sacramenti*. As also Irenaeus saith, the sacrament consisteth of two things: the one earthly, the outwarde element: and the other heauenly, which is Christ him selfe.

Campion.

That part of the sacrament, which is called heauenly, is taken two maner of waies: either in respect of Christ him selfe, or in respect of the wicked. Christ in him selfe is alwaies heauenly, but to the wicked which receiue not the grace of Christ, hee is not heauey, though he be present, and they receaue him to their condemnation.

Goade.

You answere not the reason nor authoritie of Augustine. This was taken away before, none can receaue Christ, but they must also receaue his heauenly grace to eternall life: but my purpose was not to haue vrged this argument.

Fulke.

I will vse but one briefe argument.

That which Christ promised to giue in the Sacrament, was not the same which was crucified:

Ergo it was not the naturall body of Christ which they receaued.

Camp.

It was the same which was crucified.

Fulke.

S. Augustine denieth it, speaking in the persone of Christ in these wordes. In Psal. 98. *Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis & bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent: sacramentum aliquod vobis commendaui, spiritaliter intellectum viuificabit vos.* You shal not eate that body which you see and drinke, that blood which they shall shed that shall crucifie me: I haue commended vnto you a certaine sacrament, which being spiritually vnderstoode, shall giue you life.

Campion.

This is a fallacion: he denieth modum, the maner & not the substage. Your reason is like this *Quicquid emisti &c.* that which you haue bought you haue eaten: you haue bought rawe flesh, therefore you haue eaten rawe flesh.

Fulke.

You cannot so auoide it, he denieth the same body, and speaketh not of the maner.

Camp.

The same body that was crucified we receaue, but not eodem modo, after the same maner.

Fulke.

Was the maner of his blood shedde, or his very blood in deede?

Camp.

His very blood in deede was shed.

Fulke.

Why then, that blood which was shedde is denied to be giuen.

Camp.

The same body which was crucified, is giuen, but not after the same sort: for when he was crucified, he was mangled and wounded, so he is not nowe, he is giuen after an other sorte.

Fulke.

So by your Glosse you make Corpus to be in the predicament of qualitie, which is absurde: *Maledicta glossa quae corrumpit textum.* You haue sodde these coleworts long enough, the place is plaine, denying the same body and the same blood, and not the maner and sorte thereof.

Camp.

The learned knowe mine answere. He is not the same man which he was before, which is altered in qualities.

Fulk.

A fine answere in deede: As though Christ should meane that the qualities of his body & blood, should be so altered that they might iustly be saide not to be the same, although they were the same.

Campion.

Augustine vpon the same Psalme, affirmeth the body of Christ is so present in the Sacrament, that it may bee adored.

Fulke.

Doth he say, that the body of Christ may be adored in the sacrament?

Camp.

He saith, no man eateth that body, except he adore it.

Fulke.

That is an other matter. I say so likewise, that no man receaueth the body of Christ, except hee adore it. But Augustine saith not, except he adore it in the sacrament. But the time will not suffer vs to proceede any further.

Goade.

If Christ be present in the sacrament in his naturall body, the he is present either in a mortall, or els in a glorified body:

But neither in a mortall, nor yet glorified body:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall body.

Campion.

I denie your Minor. Hee is present in his glorified body.

Goade.

If he be present in body, it must be the same body that he deliuered to his Apostles in his last supper:

But that was not glorified, but mortall:

Ergo if he be present in any kinde of body, it must bee a mortall body.

Camp.

The body of Christ was not yet glorified when the Sacrament was instituted. What of that it is no matter whether his body were glorified or not glorified.

Goade.

Yes, for you affirmed before, that Christ is present in his glorified body, which I haue improued, Christ hauing then a naturall and mortall body, wherein shortly after he was to be glorified, not the same it was after his resurrection.

Camp.

A fallation in the same. Glorification doth not make it not the same body: a man sicke and a man whole at sundrie times, yet remaineth the same man.

Goad.

My meaning and wordes are plaine, hauing made the comparison betweene mortall and glorified. I made the difference to be not in substance but in qualitie: but nowe it appeareth that you must seeke an other place then Hoc est corpus meum in the institution, whereon to builde your reall presence. Wee talke what was then at the time of the institution.

Camp.

Nay, we ground sufficiently vpon that place: though Christes body be now glorified, yet we do not builde vpon glorification, but vpon the wordes, This is my body, which Christ hath spoken, and therefore it is his body.

Goade.

But you are not yet resolued what kinde of body. It is an other now, from that it was then.

Camp.

Yet the same bodie, though differing in condition. Christ cannot be wounded now as afore, yet the same flesh.

Goade.

I do not denie the same body in substance to bee nowe that was then: but you see that the presence of a glorified bodie which you affirmed, is not grounded vpon Hoc est corpus meum. But I leaue this argument

Goade.

Let vs conclude with prayer. Almightye Lord and merciful father, we yeele thee humble thanks for thy manifolde benefites bestowed vpon vs, especially y thou hast vouchsafed vs the knowledge and loue of thy heauenly trueth contained in thy holy worde, which thou hast denied vnto many others, leauing the in their owne peruerse blindnes: we beseeche thee to encrease daily in vs more and more the true knowledge of thee, & of thy sonne Iesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, & vouchsafe to make thy truthe so much the more deare and precious vnto vs, for that it hath enemies that daily seeke to obscure and impugne the same, and as for those that goe atraie, so many of them as pertaine vnto thy kingdome, we beseeche thee in thy good time, to call, to lighten their mindes, and to mollifie their heartes, that we may together with one heart, and one mouth glorifie thee, thorowe our Lord Iesus Christ. Amen.

**The disputation in the afternoone the same daye. The second question or assertion of Campion.**

**The question. After the wordes of Consecration, the bread and wine are transubstanciated into the body and blood of Christ.**

Fulke.

LEt vs beginne with prayer. O almightye God and most merciful father, we humbly submit our selues before thy maiestie, and doe vnfainedly acknowledge that our heartes are full of ignorance and blindnes, so that wee cannot vnderstande thy wonderfull trueth by our selues, nor see it when it is reueiled by thee, except it please thy maiestie by thy holy spirite to lighten our darkenes, & giue sight to our blindnes. Wherefore we humbly beseech thee, to assiste vs by thy grace, and to giue vs sight to see thy trueth, and strength to defende the same against all thine enemies, that the weake may be confirmed, the obstinate confounded, and thy name glorified through Iesus Christ our Lorde.

Because you tooke a time to finde those wordes which you reported to be in my booke, and I see the booke in your hand, I pray you reade them if you haue founde them.

Camp.

The booke is mistaken, it is not that booke I meant.

Fulke.

It is the booke that you named.

Camp.

I am sure you do not disclame the opinion.

Fulke.

As I tolde you in the forenoone, I do disclame it in such sorte as it was vttered by you, which you are not able to proue to be affirmed by me.

Campion.

You make inuocation of Saintes, a matter of great waight.

Fulke.

The Church did erre in that point, but not as you Papistes do erre in it. There is great difference betweene their errour and yours. But let vs come to the appointed question, which is against Transubstantiation.

I proue there remaineth the substance of bread and wine in the sacrament after consecration.

Our Sauour dranke the same that his Apostles did:

But our Sauour dranke wine:

Ergo his Apostles dranke wine.

Camp.

I deny yt our Sauour dranke of the cosecrated wine.

Fulke.

The words of the Euangelist are plaine, that our Sauour Christ spake, I wil drinke no more from henceforth of the fruite of the vine. These wordes are plaine of wine: for the blood of Christ is not the fruite of the vine.

Camp.

This signifieth that our Sauour did eate indefinitely, whether hee did eate of the same bread, or drinke of the same cup of wine which he gaue, I doubt of it: he did eate & drinke with the.

Fulk.

He protested that he would not drinke any more of that which he gaue:

But that which he gaue vnto them was wine:

Therefore he dranke of the same wine.

Camp.

This text conuinceth it not.

Fulke.

Yes, plainely.

Camp.

He speaketh of that wine which was drunke at supper, for all was wine, if there had bene 20. gallons before consecratio.

Fulke.

He speaketh of the wine in his hande: for whereto els hath the pronowne (this) relatio: After he had taken the cup in his hand, immediatly he faith, I will not drinke any more of this fruit of the vine.

Camp.

He had supped with them, hee had eaten the Pascall lambe with them, he would not take any more repast with them in this life till his resurrection, as afore: therefore it is to be referred to the action that went before.

Fulke.

It is plaine that he speaketh of the same wine which he had in his hande, & which he gaue vnto them. And Chrysostomes wordes declare the same in Math. Homil. 89. Sed cuius rei gratia non aquam sed vinu post resurrectionem bibit? perniciosam quanda haeresin radicitus euellere voluit eorum, qui aqua in mysterijs vtuntur, ita vt ostenderet quia & quando hoc mysterium traderet, vinum tradidit: & iam post resurrectionem in nuda mysterij mensa vino vsus est. Ex germine aute (ait) vitis, quae cert no aquam sed vinu producit. But for what cause did he not drinke water,



but wine after his resurrection? His purpose was to pull vp by the rootes a certaine pernicious heresie of them which vse water in the mysteries: so that he shewed, that both when he deliuered this mysterie, he deliuered wine, and nowe also after his resurrection, in the onely table of the mysterie, hee vsed wine. Of the fruite of the vine saith hee, which verely bringeth fourth wine and not water.

Campion.

All this makes for me.

Fulke.

You shall heare howe it maketh for you. Here you see, that he dranke of that which he deliuered to his disciples:

And he dranke wine:

Therefore he deliuered wine to his disciples.

Campion.

He deliuered that which had the shew of wine: doth he say that he gaue wine:

Fulke.

He saith, Vinum tradidit, He deliuered wine, or he gaue wine.

Campion.

Goe to, he deliuered consecrated wine: He did consecrate wine and did giue it vnto them.

Fulke.

He gaue consecrated wine:

Ergo he gaue wine.

Campion.

I denie your argument: for consecrated wine is not wine.

Fulke.

Then he gaue wine that was not wine: For Chrysostome saith, Vinum tradidit, He gaue wine.

Camp.

He gaue that, that was wine.

Fulke.

Chrysostome sayth, That which hee deliuered was wine when he deliuered it, or els howe did hee take away the heresie of those that brought in water, if he had not giuen wine.

Campion.

The meaning of Chrysostome is, to bring in wine against those that would haue water. He saith hee deliuered wine, but consecrated wine, to exclude water.

Fulke.

He excluded water to bring in wine, and not to shut out both water and wine.

Camp.

We vse wine in the misteries.

Fulke.

But he saith, Christ deliuered wine: so doe not you say when you giue the cup

Camp.

He gaue them that which had the name of wine, and had the shewe of it, but nowe was not in deede wine. As for example, the rod of Moyses was called a rod, after it was turned into a serpent, because it was a rod a litle before.

Fulke.

The rodde was miraculously turned into a serpent, and returned into a rod againe: both which miracles were to be iudged by the sense, and yet you proue not that it was called a rodde, while it was a serpent.

Campion.

Yes that I do. Et deuorauit virga Aaron, &c. And the rod of Aaron deuoured the rod of the enchaunters.

Fulke.

Yea Sir, That which was a rodde while Moyses did write, and was a very serpent before Pharao, deuoured the rodde of the Egyptians which were serpents in shew, but rods in deed. Moyses called it a rod when it was a rod, and not when it was a serpent. Againe, it was a sensible miracle.

Campion.

So there is great miracles in the Sacrament.

Fulke.

So you say, but none appeareth to our sense.

Campion.

They are vnderstoode by faith.

Fulke.

It is an easie matter so to faine miracles in euery matter: but God did neuer shew miracle in conuersion of substances, or any sensible thing, but it was to be iudged by the senses to be a miracle. Bring me one instance of any miracle in couersion, or in any other sensible thing, that could not be discerned by sense.

Camp.

It was a rod a litle before, that after was called a serpent, and yet retained the name it had before: as Clandi ambulant, Caeci vident, &c.

Fulke.

That is not denied, although by you it can not be proued: but here the place is plaine. Chrysostome speaketh of the substance of the Sacrament, he deliuered wine, and they receiued wine.

Campion.

I haue answered. Leaue the rest to God, and their consciences which are the hearers.

Goade.

I will continue to vrge you further with the wordes of the Institution. Your answere can not bee allowed for good, when you would shift off the plaine wordes of our sauour Christ, calling it wine being the fruite of the vine, and would haue this referred to the wine vsed in eating the Pascall, before the institution. You may not so leape backe from the Institution to the Pascall, there was some distance of time betwene the Pascall and the Supper: so you can not referre this to the whole action.

Campion.

You say well. The eating the pascal Lambe went before, and the Institution followed: and yet I say the wordes of Christ concerning the fruit of the vine, hath relation to the whole.

Goade.

Consider the order of the wordes in the Euangelist: As they were eating the Passeouer, Iesus tooke bread, &c. And then after he had deliuered the cup, and bad them all drinke thereof, calling it his blood, then followeth, I say vnto you, I will

not drinke hereafter of this fruite of the vine. &c. But I will make my argument from the Institution, thus.

The Apostles did eate the substance of breade and wine after consecration, as you terme it:

Therefore there remaineth the substance of bread and wine after consecration.

Campion.

I deny your Antecedent.

Goade.

That which our Sauour Christ gaue, the Apostles did eate:

But he gaue bread and wine:

Ergo they did eate bread and wine.

Camp.

I deny your minor. He did not giue bread and wine.

Goade.

The same which Christ tooke into his handes, he also deliuered:

But he tooke bread and wine:

Ergo he deliuered bread and wine.

Camp.

I answere out of Ambrose. Before consecration it was bread, and so he tooke bread, but after the wordes of consecration, he saith it is no bread.

Fulke.

You falsifie Ambrose, and would abuse the auditorie, for he doeth not say it is no bread.

Camp.

He sayth there is a chaunge. I may you let me make one argument out of Ambrose, and answere me if you can.

Goade.

Well, make your argument, you shalbe answered.

Campion.

Let me borrow the booke. Nowe heare Ambrose wordes lib. de Sacramentis. 4. cap. 4. Tu forte dicis panis est vsitatus. Sed panis iste panis est ante verba Sacramentorum: vbi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. Vides ergo quum operatorius sit sermo Christi: iussit & facta sunt. Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini, vt inciperent esse quae non erant, quanto magis operatorius est, vt sint quae erant, & in aliud commutentur. Peradventure thou sayest that it is common bread. But this bread before the sacramentall words is bread: but after consecration, of bread is made the flesh of Christ. Thou seest then of what efficacie the word of Christ is, he commaunded and the creatures were made. If then there is so great force in the worde of the Lord, that the things that were not, begun to be: how much more is it able to worke, that the things which were, should haue still their being, and be chaunged into other things.

Goade.

I know the place, and thus I answere. First ye haue not any worde in Ambrose to exclude the substance of bread. We acknowledge a chaunge with Ambrose, not of one substance into an other, as you would haue to be, but touching the vse whereto the sacrament serueth, namely that which was common bread before, ordeined to

a common vse to feede the body, is now conuerted and consecrated to an holy and spirituall vse, to nourish the soule, by feeding vpon Christ by true and liuely faith.

Campion.

But Ambrose wordes are plaine, that which before was bread, after consecration *ex pane fit caro Christi*, of bread is made the flesh of Christ.

Goade.

Ambrose words in deede are plaine in the same chapter, whereby he doeth expound his meaning, the chaunge to be as I haue said touching the vse, and not the substance. *Dicis comunem panem, &c.* By these wordes it appeareth, that Ambrose purpose was to confute their opinion, who thought ouer basely of the Sacrament, making no difference betweene it & common bread. Thou sayest it is common bread, but thou art deceiued, it is consecrated and chaunged to an holy and heauenly vse, and is become sacramentally the flesh of Christ.

Campion.

It is called bread, but it is not bread, for *ex pane fit caro Christi*. And euen as he made heauen and earth by his worde, so by his worde the bread is made his flesh.

Goade.

Wee deny not that it is Christes fleshe, as himselfe sayeth of the bread, This is my body: but it is to be vnderstoode as a sacramentall speach, when the name of the thing is giuen to the signe, as after shalbe shewed out of Augustine.

Camp.

The words are forcible, of bread is made flesh, & *Sermo Christi est operatorius*, The word of Christ is of power & efficacy.

Goade.

That is, of common bread is now made Christes body, appointed to be a sacrament of his body. And although this be a wonderfull chaunge by the force of Christes word and Institution, that common bread should be chaunged to a spirituall vse, yet Ambrose doeth not say that the substance of breade is chaunged, but rather the contrary, that the substance doeth still remaine, as appeareth by diuers examples of miracles he alleadgeth in the same chapter, and also by his wordes, *Vt sint quae erant, & in aliud commutentur*, That they should remaine and be as they were, & also be chaunged touching the vse. Now you haue vrged what you can out of Ambrose, I will returne againe to followe mine argument drawn from the wordes of the Institution, as they are explained by S. Paul. 1. Cor. 10. 16. *Panis quem frangimus, &c.* The bread which we breake, is it not the partaking of the body of Christ? Whereby appeareth, that after sanctification remaineth bread: for he sayth, the bread which we breake, and breaking followeth after blessing or sanctifying. It can not be vnderstoode the body of Christ, for that can not be broken. So by this place, after consecration remaineth bread still.

Campion.

It reteineth still the name of bread in diuers respects: first, because it was bread before, and secondly because it hath the shew of bread: as Moyses rod being turned into a serpet, keepeth still the name it had before.

Goade.

You are nowe wandring into discourses, I will not followe you. The Apostles plaine wordes taketh away your answeere. It followeth in the text, We are all partakers of the same bread, he sayth not the same that was bread before: and it is consecrate

before it commeth to participation. And the same Apostle in the next chapter, oftentimes repeateth and calleth it breade, when it commeth to be receiued after sanctification.

Campion.

I haue giuen you two causes, why it is so called: I will adde the third, because of the analogie betweene the bread and that which feedeth our soules. Make a Syllogisme.

Goade.

I vrge the wordes of the Apostle, there needeth no Syllogisme: answere plainly and directly.

Campion.

I haue giuen three causes, why it is called bread.

Goade.

Your causes can not stand. For touching your comparison of the rod turned into a serpent, there appeared a sensible chaunge as is vsuall in miracles, but here is no such thing in the sacrament, and therefore the comparison holdeth not. And for the analogie, it maketh directly against you. For euen as the bread receiued feedeth the body, so eth Christ the soule. But if when it commeth to be receiued into the body, there be no bread in deede as you say, then where is your analogie:

Campion.

It suffiseth that it was bread before, and so appeareth the analogie by the feeding of our soules.

Goade.

What doeth the bread feede our soules:

Camp.

Yea, Christ that is the bread of life, feedeth our soules. Make a Syllogisme, and then we shal see whether your argumet hath any face or force.

Goade.

Wee are come to the wordes and authoritie of the Scripture. If the wordes of Christes Institution, and all these manifest places of the Apostle be of no force, then I confesse mine argument to be nothing. I leaue you to iudgement.

Fulke.

Your answere is taken away by the worde breaking. The breade which wee breake, &c. The bodie of Christ is not broken, but the breade, and not that which appeareth to bee breade.

Campion.

The bread is broken by qualitie, and not by substance. Can substance be broken:

Bulke.

Bread is broken:

And bread is substance:

Therefore substance is broken.

When stickes are broken, shal we say that the subance of them is not broken, but the accidents: this is foolish Sophistrie. But I will reason thus with you. There is something in the Sacrament materiall, which goeth the way of all meates:

Ergo there is bread and wine.

Campion.

Whatsoever becommeth of all those qualities, the colour, the taste, the quantitie, &c. it happeneth to them as to accidentes: for it is certaine there remayneth neyther bread nor wine.

Fulke.

The taste goeth not that way, nor in deede any of the accidentes vnaltered: but heare what Origen sayeth, in Matth. cap. 15. Quod si quic quid in os ingreditur, in ventrem abit, & in secessum eijcitur, & ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei, perque obsecrationem, iuxta id quod habet materiale in ventrem abit, & in secessum eijcitur. Caeterum iuxta precationem quae illi accessit, pro portione fidei fit vtilis, efficiens vt perspicax fiat animus, spectans ad id quod vtile est. Nec materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo est qui prodest non indign comedenti illum. Et haec quidem de typico Symbolicoque corpore.

Camp.

The quantitie is auoyded, and other accidentes.

Fulke.

It is monstrous that you speake. Origen sayeth the materiall part of the Sacrament, and the matter of bread. I will reade his wordes in Englishe. If whatsoever entreth into the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught, euen that meate also which is sanctified by the worde of God, and by prayer, according to that which it hath materiall goeth into the belly, and is cast forth into the draught. But according to the prayer which is added vnto it, after the portion of faith, it is made profitable, causing that the minde may be made cleare of sight, looking to that which is profitable. Neyther is it the matter of bread, but the worde spoken ouer it, which profiteth him that eateth it not vnworthily. And these things are spoken of the typical and symbolical body.

Campion.

I haue answered. The accidentes go, the quantitie, qualitie, and such like.

Fulke.

The place is playne. Origen acknowledgeth a materiall part of the Sacrament, which is substance. In what praedicament is Materia?

Campion.

In none. Materia taken indefinitely, is in no praedicament, for it is in all praedicaments. The matter of substance is in substance, of quantitie in quantitie. &c

Fulke.

Wel, then the matter of substance is substace. The matter of bread is the matter of substance: therefore the matter of bread is substance. Then it is substance and not accidentes, which is auoyded by Origenes iudgement.

Campion.

He sayth not, the matter of bread is auoyded.

Fulke.

He sayeth that meate which is sanctified, according to that which it hath materiall, is auoyded:

Meate is that which feedeth, accidentes feede not:

Therefore accidentes are not called meate.

Campion.

Accidentes doe feede, and that I will stande to prooue.

Fulke.

Philosophie, Physieke, and Diuinitie are much beholding to you. It was neuer heard of before, that bare accidentes without substance could feede or nourish.

Campion.

He meaneth the matter of the sacrament, and not the materiall substance of bread which is auoyded. The sacramet consisteth of the signe, and the thing signified. The signe is the outward shape, whitenes, quantitie, &c. this is the materiall part of the Sacrament, which is auoyded.

Fulke.

There is no one of these accidents, shape, quantitie, colour, taste, that are auoyded, because they are altered in the stomacke, before they come to the place of auoydance. Againe, i is a shameful absurditie, to say that the accidentes are the meate which is sanctified by the word and prayer.

Campion.

I answere, *Id quod habet materiale*, is the matter of the Sacrament, not of the bread.

Fulke.

This place is too playne against you: euery one may see your answere how vaine it is.

Goade.

That which ouerthroweth both the nature and vse of a Sacrament, is not to be admitted:

But transubstantiation doeth ouerthrowe doth the nature and vse of a Sacrament:

Ergo it is not to be admitted, and consequently vntrue that you affirme, the bread and wine to be transubstantiate. &c.

Campion.

I deny your minor, it doeth ouerthrow neither the nature, nor the vse of a Sacrament.

Goade.

I must proue both the members seuerally, because you deny both: and first, that it taketh away the nature of a Sacrament. A Sacrament consisteth of two things, the matter, and the forme: the visible signe, and the inuisible grace: the one earthly, and the other heauenly, as Iraeneus sayth: the element, and the worde according to Augustine, *Accedat verbum ad elementum, & fit Sacramentum*. Let the worde come vnto the element, and so it is made a Sacrament. This being so, then thus I reason.

Whatsoever taketh away the element, ouerthroweth the Sacrament: for the word must come vnto the element, as Augustine fayth, the element must not depart away:

But transubstantiation taketh away the element:

Ergo Transubstantiation ouerthroweth ye nature of ye sacrament.

Campion.

I deny your minor, it doeth not take away the element.

Goade.

It taketh away the materiall part, the substance of bread and wine:

Ergo it taketh away the element.

Campion.

I say it taketh away neither the heauenly nor the earthly part.

Goade.

You answere not directly to mine argument. But I will prooue that it taketh away the earthly part.

It taketh away the substance of bread:

Ergo the earthly part.

Campion.

I deny your argument. For there remayneth *res terrestris*, an earthly thing, though the substance be chaunged.

Goade.

What is that earthly thing; if there remayne no substance? Euery Sacrament must consist of the element and the worde: the element is the earthly creature or substance.

Camp.

The element doeth not note a substance, there remaineth an earthly creature, the whitenesse of the bread.

Goade.

What, can the whitenesse remayne without substance or subiect: The Sacrament must consist of the substance of Christes body, and the substance of bread and wine.

Campion.

*Resterrestris*, the earthly thing remaineth, but not the substance: we are come to a nyce poynt.

Goade.

So it seemeth. I will here leaue the first part I had to proue, and now will come to the second, touching the vse of the sacrament: which I will also proue to be destroyed by your transubstantiation. You spake before of the analogie in the Sacrament, there must be a similitude and proportion betweene the signe and the thing signified. As in Baptisme, the element of water washing the bodie, and the holy Ghost through the blood of Christ washing and sanctifying the soule. So in the other Sacrament, as the substance of breade receyued, nourisheth the bodie: so Christ receyued by faith, nourisheth the soule. Euen as Augustine very well noteth this analogie, in his 23. Epistle, in these wordes. *Si Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sunt Sacramenta non habent, omnino Sacramenta non essent, &c. Hac autem similitudine plerunque ipsarum etiam rerum nomina recipiunt. Sicut ergo secundu quendam modu, Sacramentu corporis Christi Corpus Christi est, Sacramentu sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est: ita sacramentu fidei, fides est.* If sacraments had not a certaine resemblance of those things whereof they are sacraments, they should not at all be sacraments, and by reason of this resemblance, for the most parte they take the names of the things them selues. Therefore as the sacrament of the body of Christ, after a certaine maner, is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ, is the blood of Christ: so the sacrament of faith, is called faith.

Nowe this similitude or proportion by you, is cleane taken away, while ye take away the substance of bread that should norishe the body, and so consequently ye take away the nature of a Sacrament by Saint Augustines reason.

Campion.

The similitude is not taken away, though there remaine no substance of bread and wine, for there remaineth accidentes which do nourish. Do not qualities feede? bread may feede by accidentes in all the qualities of bread.



Goade.

This is strange. I might tell you that this is against Philosophie, that accidentes without substance should feede: but we are in diuinitie. The very true and principall vse of this sacrament, is to confirme our faith, that as surely as the bread and wine feedeth our bodies, euen as certainly the body and blood of Christ receiued by faith, feedeth and nourisheth our soules.

Nowe by your taking away the substance of bread, wee are brought into doubt of the nourishment of our bodies by the outward element, and so consequently of the feeding of our soules by Christ the heauenly bread: and so ye destroye the analogie & chiefe vse of this sacrament.

Camp.

When God doth worke a miracle, it is no marueile though there followe wonderfull sequels. I say, that colour may remaine without substance, and accidents may feede and nourish. I will defende it in the Uniuersitie: I would I might haue libertie to defende it.

Goad.

What, will you defende that accidentes without substance may nourishe? that is too absurde.

Camp.

No absurditie at all. If it please God to take away the substance of water, and leaue the qualitie of madefaction, what hurt were it, might it not bee sufficient? And if you will needes vrge the analogie of feeding by the substance, it is sufficient that there was also the substance of bread before consecration, wherein may stande the analogie.

Goade.

Let me make it plaine vnto this auditorie, how manifestly you take away the comfortable vse and analogie in this sacrament. When I come to receaue, by this meanes I ought to strengthen my faith, that euen as I knowe most assuredly, that the substance of bread and wine serueth to nourish, and doeth feede my body: euen so Iesus Christ being receiued by faith, doeth also nourish my soule vnto eternall life. This is a most comfortable analogie or similitude in this sacrament. But if I should beleue that the substance of bread and wine is cleane gone, and though before consecration the substance remained, yet before I can receaue the sacrament, the substance is taken away, and there remaine nothing but accidentes: howe can I be assured that my body is nourished by the outward elements, and so in like maner my soule by feeding on Christ? Thus by your doctrine of Transubstantiation, you ouerthrowe both the nature and vse of the sacrament, & would spoile vs of the comfort and streng thning of our faith, which wee should haue by this notable comparison: the grounde whereof resteth vpon the certainty of nourishing our bodies with the substance of the elementes.

Camp.

Nay, now ye preach: I thought ye had come to dispute. Make a Syllogisme.

Goad.

I open this more plainely for the edifying of the hearers, that they may the better see the fruite and comfort of your doctrine of transubstantiation.

Campion.

I would I might appose: the auncient fathers are all on my side.

Fulke.

Not any one of them, ye abuse the auditorie: if you can bring any thing, do it by writing, & I wil answere you by writing.

Camp.

Mine answere and assertion is, that we are fed by accidentes without substance, by that which is left, the quantitie and qualitie.

Goade.

Can you shew any ground or word for this?

Campion.

This is worde enough for me, Hoc est conpusmeu, This is my body.

Goade.

Those wordes doe nothing proue your assertion, as hath bene shewed.

Campion.

I would I might be suffered to shewe my cardes, as you haue done yours.

Goade.

Whatsoever you can shewe is well enough knowen, and hath bene shewed by others of your side, and is sufficiently answered.

Fulke.

I reason thus. That which Christ gaue at his supper was bread:

Ergo there remaineth bread in the sacrament.

Campion.

I denie that it was bread in substance that hee gaue, but only in shewe.

Fulke.

It was pieces of bread that he gaue:

Ergo it was bread.

Campion.

He gaue not substantial pieces.

Fulke.

I neuer heard of accidental pieces. But Cyrillus saith, speaking of yt sacrament, Dedit eis fragmentapanis, In Ioh. cap. 4. He gaue them pieces of bread:

But bread is substance:

Therefore he gaue them pieces of substace, or substatial pieces.

Camp.

It is all one, to giue pieces, and to giue bread:

The whole is not bread:

Ergo the pieces were not bread. It was consecrated bread.

Fulke.

How answere you to Cyrillus, that saide, he gaue them pieces of bread?

Campion.

Euery piece of bread is called bread: he speaketh after the common maner, because it was bread by appellation.

Fulke.

What gaue hee? or whereof were those pieces but of bread?

Camp.

He gaue pieces of bread in appellation. The Doctors acknowledge it to be no bread.

Fulke.

That is vtterly false. The Doctors alwayes called it bread, and pieces of bread: and no Doctor within 600. yeeres after Christ saide, that the accidentes of bread and wine onely did remaine, and not the substance.

Camp.

I haue answered, and giuen three reasons before, why they called it so.

Fulke.

You haue answered nothing: but you teache the Doctors to speake. Name one Doctor for fiue or sixe hundred yeres after Christ, which saieth that there remaineth no substance of bread in the sacrament, or so speaketh as you would expounde them.

Camp.

The Doctors say, that after consecration the bread is made the body of Christ.

Fulke.

I beleue and confesse as much.

Camp.

Then you must beleue that the substance of bread is turned into the body of Christ.

Fulke.

It followeth not.

Campion.

Master Doctor, if you feare not your cause, for charitie answere me. I challenge you, that you can not answere the Doctors.

Fulke.

It is not in me to giue you leaue to oppose. I come hether by commandement to oppose you: otherwise as I tolde you the last day, you are not the man whome I woulde take for my aduersarie.

Campion.

I speake to you to be a meane for me. I compare the cause with you, and not my person with you.

Fulke.

I haue answered els where, whatsoever could be opposed by your betters, Heskins and Saunders: and neuertheles, if you can bring any thing that they haue omitted, put it in writing, and I will answere you, as I haue often said: therefore I will go forwarde. As Cyrillus calleth the sacramentes pieces of bread: so Belasius calleth it a portion of the holy body, as it is in the decrees cited by Gratian. Comperimus autem, &c. We haue founde out of a certaintie, that certaine men after they haue receaued a portion of the holy body, do absteine fro the cup of the holy blood, &c.

Camp.

Now we shall haue an other disputation, whether the cup be necessarie for lay men.

Fulke.

Though the communion vnder both kindes, bee proued vnuincibly by that testimonie, yet I bring it onely to shewe that terme (a portion of the holy body:) which proueth that there remaineth bread which is broken, for the very body of Christ is not broken.

Campion.

He calleth it a portion by a popular speache: because the signe being deuided, Christes body is in euery parte of that bread, which is not bread in deede but in

apparance only, and so seemeth to be deuided into sundrie partes.

Fulke.

This answere of popular speache is with you Tanqua Delphicusg , to auoide all authoritie that makes against you, be it neuer so plaine: but in deede it is a figuratiue speache, not vsed of the people.

Camp.

Is not a figuratiue speache common and popu? They say we drinke the . Therefore mine answere is, it is a popular kinde of speache, because when the signe is broken, the thing it selfe is said to be so.

Fulke.

Do the people saye, the Lordes body is broken, when they meane that the accidentes only are broke? such kinde of speaking and meaning, is farre aboute the peoples itie.

Camp.

The signes are broken, not the body of Christ it selfe.

Fulk.

Againe, in that counterfeite epistle ascribed to Cleme, which he should write vnto S. Iames, exhorting him that he should keepe the Pix diligently from mise dung & putrifaction, hee calleth ye sacrament which is reserued, Reliquias fragmentoru corporis Dominici, The reliques of the fragments of our Lords body, and Puluis dominici corporis, the dust or small crummes of the Lordes body, and fragmeta Dominici corporis, & fragmeta dominicae portionis. The fragments of the Lords body, the fragmets of the Lords portion. What are al these reliques, fragments, dust or crummes, but of bread?

Camp.

All these remnantes & breakings are in respect of the exterior forme of bread, an vnproper kinde of speache.

Fulke.

These speaches are vnproper of yt body of Christ, which can not be broke: but they are proper of the bread, of the which Cyrillus speaketh plainely.

Camp.

Proue you that the substance of bread remaineth, and not the accidentes onely.

Fulk.

I haue proued that the bread remaineth which is broke: and bread is substance: therefore substance remaineth.

Campion.

The signe is broken, but not the bread.

Fulke.

You shew your iudgement. We must take all your answeres: when the bread is broken, the signes are broken.

Cam.

I could make as good sport about yt incarnatio of Christ.

Goad.

It is no sporting matter: we are in earnest, and about weightie matters.

Fulk.

These speaches may become a Iesuiste, but are not semely for a Christian. This is like your iugling tricke the other daye, which ye said, belike Christ did play.

Goade.

I will now come to examine the ground, whereupon ye would build your transubstantiation: and I reason thus.

If the bread and wine be transubstantiate, then it is grounded vpon some part of the Scripture:

But it is grounded vpon no part thereof:

Ergo the bread and wine are not transubstantiat.

Camp.

I deny your Minor, it is grounded vpon some part.

Goad.

If vpon any, then vpon the wordes of the institution, This is my body:

But not vpon those wordes:

Ergo vpon no part of Scripture.

Camp.

I deny your Minor, It is groded manifestly vpon those wordes of Christ.

Goad.

If vpo this place, then vpon ye true sense of the wordes:

But not vpon the true sense:

Ergo not vpon this place.

Camp.

It is grouded both vpon ye words, & the true sense also.

Goad.

If vpon ye true sense, the it is a plaine & a proper speach:

But it is not a proper speache:

Ergo not vpon the true sense.

Camp.

It is a proper speache.

Goad.

It is a figuratiue speache:

Ergo not a proper.

Camp.

So farre forth as it is figuratiue, it is not proper. It may be figuratiue and proper both.

Goad.

This is straunge, but ye shall heare the iudgement of y fathers, yt it is merely figuratiue. Augustine epist. 23. in y wordes before alleaged, maketh it a Metonimical speache, when by reason of the neere similitude, the name of the thing it self is attributed to the signe: which he saith is vsual in sacraments. So Circumcision is called the Lordes couenant. So the Pascall lambe is called y passeouer. The same Augustine vpon the 3. Psalme, Christi miranda patientia adhibuit Iudam ad couiuum, in quo corporis & sanguinis sui figuram discipulis tradidit. The great patience of Christ receaued Iudas vnto his feast, wherein he gaue a figure of his bodie and blood vnto his disciples.

Camp.

Wherefore bring ye this, it is from ye matter in questio: we spake euen nowe of proper speeches, this is not a proper argument to the matter.

Goad.

I am come to this point orderly to proue the speache to be figuratiue, and not proper, and now ye see your selfe brought in some streightes, ye would drawe me back againe: but answere out place of Tertullian against Marcion lib. 4. Which doth notably expound the wordes of the Institution, to be figuratiuely spoken.

Camp.

We shall then go to the forenoones question.

Goade.

No, It serueth for the point wee are now come vnto, being verie weightie to expounde the wordes of the Institution, This is my body. Wherupon ye would build your transubstantiation. Belike you feare ye place of Tertullia, & are loth to come to it.

Camp.

I feare not, let vs heare it: we lacke a moderator.

Goad.

I would we had one, wee shoulde then dispute more orderly. The wordes are: *Christus acceptum panem, & distributum discipulis suis, corpus suuillud fecit, hoc est corpus meu dicendo, id est figura corporis mei, figura autem no fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.* The bread which Christ tooke & gaue to his disciples, he made his body, saying, this is my body, that is, a figure of my body, but it could not haue bene a figure, vnlesse Christ had a true body.

Camp.

I answere your place of Tertullian, two wayes. First, for the vnderstanding of the people, and after, in respect of the learned. For the people thus. He had to do with ye heretique Marcion, who denied that Christ had a true body. Tertullian proueth that Christ had a true body, because hee gaue a true body to his disciples, saying, this is my body. The wordes that follow, *Id est, figura corporis mei,* are not Tertullians, but are added by the Heretique, who would haue Christ to haue had but a figure or shew of a body, and not a true body: Tertullian saith to the heretique, Christ saith, this is my body, thou saiest a figure, admit it were a figure, yet it must be a figure of a true bodie.

Goade.

You shew your selfe ignorant in this place of Tertull. which is a knowen & familiar place: the whole wordes are Tertullians, & nothing at all here, added by the heretique Marcion: both the wordes & sense of Tertullian is plaine, consider better of them.

Camp.

Tertullian tooke vpon him the person of the heretique, & maketh the obiectio, which he thought y heretike would obiect.

Goad.

You are greatly deceaued in this place of Tertullian, who reasoneth thus against Marcion very substantially, to proue yt Christ had a true, & not a phantasticall body as Marcion supposed. That must needes haue a true body, whereof there is a figure:

But Christ in the Institution of his supper, gaue a figure of his body, when he said, This is my body, that is a figure of my body:

Ergo Christ hath a true body. This is Tertullias reason, as it appeareth in ye next clause. *Figura aute no esset, nisiver it at is esset corpus.* But there could not

be a figure of a body, except it had relation vnto a true body. And in the next words following, yet more plainly, *Caeterum vacuares, quod est phatasma, figuram capere non potest.* But an empty or vaine thing, such as is a phatasm; can not be capable of a figure. Take the booe and peruse this place, ye shall finde it to be as I haue opened the minde of Tertullian.

Campion.

I know the place. I made one answere before in respect of the people, nowe mine other answere is for the learned: that Tertullian vseth to alleage many harde and obscure places, and figures out of the olde testament, hee must be read with iudgement and great diligence, the wordes, *Idest figura*, are not in way of exposition, but of obiection.

Goade.

You shew your skill in the fathers. This is not Tertullians exposition onely, but also Augustines, vpon the thirde Psalme before alleaged, and Tom. 6. against Adamantus. *Non dubitauit Dominus dicere hoc est corpus meu, quum signu daret corporis sui.* The Lord doubted not to say, this is my body, when hee gaue a figure of his body.

Camp.

Then belike ye woulde altogether exclude from the sacrament, Christ the substance, making him altogether absent, allowing onely of a bare signe in the sacrament.

Goad.

The wordes are Augustines, that Christ gaue a signe of his bodie. Howebeit, wee exclude not the substance, which is Christ him selfe, who together with the signe is receiued by faith of the godly, and so we make not a bare signe, but we say he is not vpon earth touching his body included in the sacrament.

Campion.

It is well knowne to the learned, that the signe excludeth not the thing signified.

Goade.

I graunt: neither do I exclude the thing. It is a sacramentall speache vsuall (as hath bene saide) in the Scriptures to giue the name of the thing to the signe, for the similitude betweene both, and therefore must be sacramentally expounded, *propter similitudinem signi, & rei signatae.*

Campion.

That maketh for me, that the signe hath the name of the thing.

Goade.

Doth it make for you, that y signe is so termed *Secudu quendam modum*, after a certaine maner, as Augustine saith before, and yet simply is not for The Sacrament is not the thing it selfe, but in a kind of speach sacramentally: as Circumcision is said to be the couenant, which was not the Couenant it selfe, but a signe therof.

Campion.

Make your argument.

Goade.

Seeing ye will haue me draw it into an argument, thus I reason.

It is vsuall in the Sacraments, for the Scripture to speake figuratiuely, calling the signe by the name of the thing signified, as in Circumcision, Gen. 17. the Pascall Lambe, Exod. 12. and the rocke in the wildernes. 1. Cor. 10:

Therefore the like in this sacrament of the Lordes supper.  
 Campion.

I denie your argument, they are not alike.

Goade.

I proue it. The same reason of Augustine from the analogie to take the name of the thing, holdeth in all sacraments: Ergo in this. And for example he bringeth this: Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum Sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est, Therefore as the Sacrament of Christes body, after a certaine maner is sayd to be the body of Christ, &c. Also the very maner of speach in the other Sacraments is like, viz. of circumcision, This is my Couenant: of the Pascall, This is the Passeouer: of the rocke, The rocke was Christ.

Camp.

I say they are not like, for Christ was not naturally present in those sacraments of the olde Testament, as he is in this Sacrament.

Goade.

You bring an instance by *Petitio principij*, but I ouerthrowe your particular instance by the generall.

The like vsuall speache is vsed in all Sacraments both of the olde and newe Testament:

Ergo in this sacrament of the Supper.

Camp.

The speache & sense is this in the sacrament, *Hoc est corpus meum*, This that I see is my body, as the quatitie & colour.

Goade.

You answer not mine argument. I haue said inough for the true vnderstanding of these wordes, it must haue a sacramentall sense. I leaue it vnto iudgement.

Camp.

I graunt a sacramentall sense, so farre forth as goeth to colour. The fathers you alleadge, but those that I bring can not be answered.

Fulke.

They haue bene, and may be, as time and occasson will serue: but nowe your lot is to answere. I will take away your common and onely answere.

Campion.

I haue answered already.

Fulke.

Your answere sheweth, that you vnderstande not the scope and purpose of Saint Augustine, which is to proue that this saying, *Anima est sanguis*, is such a kinde of speach, as this of the sacrament, *This is my body*. For these are his words: *Nam ex eo quod scriptum est, &c.* For of that which is written, that the blood of a beast is the soule of it, beside that which I said before, that it pertaineth not vnto me what becometh of ye soule of a beast, I can also interpret this commandement to be made in a signe: for our Lord doubted not to say, *This is my body*, when he gaue the signe of his body. Here you see, Augustine hauing disputatio with the heretique *Adimantus*, which helde that the blood of a beast was the soule thereof, affirmeth that the blood is but a signe of the soule, as the sacrament is a signe of the body of Christ: and yet is called the soule, as the other is called the body of Christ.

Campion.



You are answered already.

Fulke.

This is your common answer: You are answered already, and you haue answered your selfe, when you haue none other shift. You vnderstand neuer a place of the Doctors, that hath bene yet alleadged.

Campion.

Twentie yeres agoe I haue read this booke.

Fulke.

I do not beleeu that euer you read it, you are so ignorant of the argument of it. But sure I am, that xx. yeres agoe you had not read it. You would seeme to be an older student in Diuinitie then you are, by a great deale.

M. Norton.

Where were you Campion, twenty yeres agoe? were you not a poore boy in the hospitall:

Camp.

I was two and twentie yeeres olde, and then I was Bacheler of Art.

Fulke.

You might reade that place noted out by some other, but the whole worke of the autor you read not.

Camp.

I did not say that I had then read his whole worke.

Fulke.

It is not a dosen yeres agoe, since I heard you at Garbrandes staule in Oxenforde aske for Irenaeus Epistles, wherein you shewed that you were but a yong reader of the Doctors at that time.

Campion.

Peraduenture I might aske for Irenaeus workes.

Fulke.

Nay, you asked for Irenaeus Epistles, and namely, that to Victor.

Campion.

Why might I not, hauing read in Eusebius of his Epistle to Victor, aske of the Stationer whether that Epistle were extant:

Fulke.

I deny not but you might: but yet that argueth that you were but a yong man in the Doctors, that knewe not what workes of Irenaeus were extant. But howe answer you to Saint Augustine?

Campion.

I answer, Saint Augustine sayth, that Sanguis is a signe of the soule present, as the bread is a signe of the bodie of Christ being present.

Fulke.

Saint Augustine sayth, that the blood doth onely signifie the soule, and is not the substance of the soule: but you vtterly destroy his argument, and so, helpe the heretique very well.

Camp.

The heretique thought it was an absurditie, that Sanguis being eaten, anima is eaten. Augustine sheweth, because Sanguis is a principal part of life, it is called the

vitall blood, &c. Like as this Sanguis is a token that Anima is neere, so the signe of the bread is a token that Christ is neare.

Fulke.

You goe quite from the matter. The question was not whether the blood be a signe of the soule, but whether it bee the soule it selfe.

Campion.

Let it be noted: why is blood called Anima, but because Anima is neare it, & because it exerciseth his functions therein: So he gaue bread, that was a signe of his body present. The question was neuer, whether the blood were the substance of the soule, but whether the blood being eaten, the soule were eaten? Therefore in that saying of Saint Augustine, Christ doubted not to say he gaue his body, when he gaue a signe of his body, there, signe is a token of his presence.

Fulke.

That is a meere fallacion: signe a token of presence, as blood a signe that anima is neere: Augustine is cleare, that the blood is not the soule, but a signe thereof: as that which Christ gaue, was not his body, but a signe thereof. Or els the heretique had his purpose, in saying that eating of blood, is eating of soules.

Campion.

I must not eate his blood.

Fulke.

You haue many wordes to no purpose in the worlde.

Campion.

Why is a mans brayne called his witte: It were reason that I also should haue my course sometime to oppose, and you to answeere: which if it fell so forth, I doubt not but I coulde vrge you as well in these matters, as you do me, and driue you also to narrowe shiftes, in the defence, how Christ tooke flesh of the virgine Marie.

Fulke.

To take vpon me the person of an answerer, is not my choyse and yours: as also the place of opponet, which I nowe susteine, was not sought for by me. And to graunt that which you now require, resteth in the superior powers.

Camp.

Well then, vse the helpe of your friendes to sue for obteneing of the same. For if you or the like were in Catholique cities, that I know, and did but once signifie your desire in the like case, free disputation and conference would out of hand be procured. And I in my defence challenge you here, if you dare, to aunswere to such points as I shal obiect against you.

Fulke.

I wil make no suite for the matter, neither are you the man whome I would choose mine aduersarie, to matche my selfe withall.

Camp.

In deede, I thinke to obtene that suite, would not bee for your aduantage.

Fulke.

Thinke of your selfe as highly as you list, yet when you haue reckened all, your gayne will be litle or nothing. I will come to mine argument.

The elements go not from their nature and substance:

Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion. I deny your Antecedent.

Fulke.

I proue it by authoritie of Theodoret Dialog. 2. Neque enim signa mystic apost sanctificationem recedunt natura sua. Mauent enim in priori substantia, figura, & forma, & videri & tangi possunt sicut prius. For the mysticall signes after sanctification do not go from their nature. For they remaine in their former substance, shape, and forme, they may both be seene and touched, as before.

Camp.

I answere, he is so to be vnderstoode, as he may confound the heretique with whom he did dispute.

Fulke.

Uery well, and for that purpose he sayth, the nature of the signes remaineth, to moue that the nature of Christes humanitie remaineth after the assumption.

Campion.

Nature is not taken for substance.

Fulke.

Theodoret sayeth, they remayne also in their former substance.

Campion.

He speaketh popularly, hee must not be taken so strictly. The word substance is often times taken for being, therefore it must not be here taken for a speciall substance, but generic, for a generall being.

Fulke.

Then it woulde followe, that the proper substance of Christes body remaineth not, but a generall being thereof.

Camp.

The heretique graunted that Christ had a body, but he said it was a phantsticall body, and not a true body.

Fulke.

And your answere will helpe the heretike very well. As the signes remaine not in their proper substance, but in a generall being or accidents: so the humanitie of Christ after it was assumed by the Diuinitie, was absorpte of the same. But Theodoret against the Eutichean, by the similitude of the mysticall signes remayning in their nature and substance after sanctification, proueth the veritie of Christes humanitie after his incarnation.

Campion.

You must not presse the similitude so: substance is taken generally for being.

Fulke.

You were best to say as Saunders doeth, that substance is taken for the bulke of the bread, though there be no bread.

Campion.

I say it is an vnproper speach.

Fulke.

If euer we must speake properly, we must do it when we dispute against heretiques, as Theodoret did.

Camp.

I haue answered: by substance he meaneth a being, and such haue accidents.

Fulke.

That answere wil not stand with Theoderets words. For Christ hath not nowe those accidentes with the which hee was incarnate, but the same substance. You shall heare the argument of Epanister the heretique. As the symbols of the bodie and blood of our Lord are one thing before inuocation, and after inuocation are changed and made other things: so the Lordes body after the assumption, is chaunged into the diuine substance. But Theodoret telleth him, that he is taken with his owne nette. For the mysticall signes depart not from their nature, but abide in their former substance, forme and shape. Here you see he speaketh both of substance and accidents.

Campion.

I graunt, so farre forth as it made against the heretique.

Fulke.

But it maketh not against the heretique, vnlesse transubstantiation be denied.

Campion.

Yes, it maketh against the heretique, that the bread being turned into the very bodie of Christ, prooueth that Christ had a true body.

Fulke.

You doe open violence to the place. His argument is not of the bodie of Christ, to prooue his humanitie: but by the remaying of the mysticall signes in their former substance and accidents, to prooue the perfite remaying of Christes humanitie after his incarnation.

Campion.

Euery argument vsed by the Fathers, must not bee pressed farther then their purpose, which was to confounde heretiques.

Fulke.

But herewithal is his minde expressed against the heresie of transubstantiation.

Camp.

I graunt it doth cary some suspition against transubstantiation, but it doeth not make against it.

Fulke.

He could not more plainly haue spoken against it, then to say, the nature and substance, forme and shaperemayneth in the bread and wine after sanctification.

Campion.

He is to be vnderstood, that the substance doeth remayne in vacuitate, sed tamen quantitate & qualitate. &c.

Fulke.

Euery man may see howe seely shiftes you be driuen vnto, and howe farre you roue from that auncient fathers meaning. I will presse you with another authoritie.

Goade.

I will vrge you with an other argument out of the same author, whereby his iudgement shall appeare in moe places then one, that he is flat against transubstantiation: his wordes are these, dialog. 1. qui dicitur immutabilis. Volebat enim eos qui sunt diuinorum mysteriorum participes, non attendere naturam eorum quae videntur, sed propter nominum permutationem, mutationem quae fit ex gratia, credere. Qui enim quod natura corpus est, triticum & panem appellauit, & vitem rursus seipsum nominauit, is symbola & signa quae videntur, appellatione corporis & sanguinis honorauit: non naturam quidem mutans, sed naturae gratiam adijciens.

For he would haue those which are partakers of the diuine mysteries, not to regard the nature of those thinges that are seene, but for the chaunge of the names, to beleue that chaunge which is made by grace. For he which called that which by nature is his body, corne & bread, and againe called himselfe a vine, euen he did honor the symbols & signes which are seene, with the name of his body and blood: not chaunging nature, but adding grace vnto nature. Out of which wordes I reason thus.

The symbols and signes remayne in their owne nature after they be consecrate: Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion.

In great and weightie matters they are forced to vse these termes, he speaketh generic generally, not strictly.

Goade.

You answered nothing to the place: reade the wordes, and consider them better. He speaketh plainely, and in speciall of the nature and substance of the sacrament still remaining.

Camp.

I haue answered before, that by nature he meaneth the exterior forme, as accidents and qualitie.

Goade.

By nature it is plaine he meaneth the very substance: for he doeth confound these two, as appeared in his other place before alleadged. Non recedunt natura sua, manent enim in priori substantia. They leaue not their nature, for they abide in their former substance. When you finde the worde nature sometime in the fathers, yt seemeth to make for your transubstantiation, then you triumph, then you vrge the worde that it must needes signifie substance. Now when the same worde is vrged against you out of Theodoret, and the same Theodoret explaining also himselfe, that he meaneth the very substance of bread and wine, yet it must bee nothing but qualitie and accidents.

Camp.

When the coherence of the place yeeldeth it, then we say it must signifie the substance. It can not alwayes be taken for the substance. For I pray you, is not heate the nature of the fire? yet it is not the substance of the fire.

Goade.

Heate is a propertie of the fire. But what is this to the answering of Theodorets place? where both the coherence and his owne exposition, doeth shewe it to be all one with the substance?

Campion.

I haue answered, the substantiall part doeth not remayne.

Goade.

Then I see we shal haue none other answer to Theodoret. I will proue howe you will answer Iustinus Martyr in his Apologie.

Campion.

These Doctors were great Philosophers, and therefore no maruaile though sometime they speake as they were wont.

Goade.

The substance of bread and wine remaineth.

Ergo they are not chaunged.

Campion.

It doeth not remayne.

Goade.

That which nourisheth the body, remayneth:

But the substance of bread and wine nourisheth the body:

Ergo the substance of bread and wine remayneth.

Campion.

This is answered already. When the substance is present, it nourisheth by the qualitie.

Goade.

But the qualitie can by no meanes nourish without the substance.

Campion.

The qualitie nourisheth alone, if it can bee there without substance.

Goade.

But it can not be there without a subiect. Now consider the wordes of Iustinus in 2. apologia. Non enim vt communem panem aut communem potum haec accipimus, sed quemadmodum Iesus Christus seruator noster per verbum Dei factus caro, & carnem & sanguinem nostrae salutis causa habuit: sic etiam cibum illum, postquam per precationem verbi illius fuerit benedictus, ex quo sanguis & caro nostra per mutationem nutriuntur, edocti sumus esse carnem & sanguinem illius. &c. For we doe not receiue these things as comon breade & common drinke, but as Iesus Christ our sauour, being made flesh by the worde of God, had both flesh & blood for our saluation: so also we are taught, that that meate after it is sanctified by prayer of the worde, by which meate our flesh and blood is by chaunge thereof nourished, is the flesh and blood of him.

Camp.

The accidentes alone wheresoeuer they be, they may nourish.

Goad.

You speake against learning, reason & sense. Will you say, that accidentes without substance, can nourish our blood and flesh?

Camp.

That is, physica quadam ratione, naturally it can not be: but where there is a miracle supernaturall, the miracle being graunted, the other followeth.

Goad.

But your imagined miracle is denied, and it hath bene shewed out of Augustine, that there is no wonder in the sacramentes. This is an easie answere to all arguments, when ye haue nothing els, then to say it is a miracle: and this is your common answere.

Camp.

When the substance is present, the qualitie nourisheth. I would this question might be handled in the Uniuersitie.

Fulke.

You would faine be remoued, but it lieth not in vs to remoue you. Gelasius against Eutiches, writeth thus: Certe sacramenta quae sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi, diuina rs est propterquod, & per eadem, diuina efficimur consortes naturae, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et cert ago & similitudo

corporis & sanguinis Christi, in actione mysterioru corporis Christi celebratur. &c. The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receiue, are a diuine thing, and therefore by them we are made partakers of the diuine nature, & yet the substance, or nature of the bread & wine ceaseth not to be. And surely a similitude or image of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the misteries. Therefore, it is shewed vnto vs evidently enough, that we must iudge the same thing eue in our Lord Christ him selfe which wee professe, celebrate and receiue in that which is an image of him: that as by the working of the holy Ghost, these things passe into a diuine substance, and yet abide still in the propertie of their owne nature: euen so the same principall misterie doth shewe that one Christe, whose efficiencie and trueth it doth truely represent vnto vs, abideth whole & true, those things of which he cosisteth properly, still remaining. What say you to this plaine testimonie of Gelasius, who saith, the substance of the bread and wine remaineth.

Campion.

Make your argument.

Fulke.

I haue made it already.

The substance of the bread and wine remaineth:

Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion.

I denie your Antecedent.

Fulke.

The wordes of Gelasius proueth it.

The substance of bread and wine departeth not:

Ergo it remaineth.

Camp.

Gelasius and Theodoret haue one answer: in the misteries, which are the bodie of Christ, there remaineth that which appeareth bread and wine.

Fulke.

Gelasius sateth, the substance of bread and wine remaineth, and not the appearance only: and so saith Theodoret.

Campion.

I tolde you they meane to proue that there is not a third thing, as a phantasticall body, but one Christ, God and man.

Fulke.

This is nothing to the purpose. The substance of the bread and wine ceaseth not to be in the sacrament: for your credit sake, answere to the authoritie. Gelasius was a Pope, hee coulde not erre.

Camp.

The substance of the bread and wine remaineth, that is, the being.

Fulke.

Euen nowe, you denied my Antecedent, and now you graunt it: you go backward and foreward. In deede you knowe not what to say.

Camp.

His answere is, substance is taken for being.

Fulke.

What being, a generall being:

Camp.

Such a being, as is in all the predicamentes.

Fulke.

Ergo the sacrament is a transcendent.

Camp.

I denie the argument.

Fulke.

The bread and wine are the sacrament:

Bread and wine are transcendentis:

Ergo the sacrament is a transcendent.

Camp.

The being of them both after consecration, is a transcendent: the bread is a sacrament, as it is a signe.

Fulke.

Take the sacrament for a signe, and then you will say, it is a transcendent, which is in all predicaments. I pray you what remaineth:

Campion.

Aliquid, the signes of bread and wine.

Fulke.

Hoc aliquid nihil est. There remaineth the substance of bread and wine, saith Gelasius, that is to say, the accidentes, as you expound him. By like reason you may expounde him by white, to meane blacke, by hoate, colde: you might as well say, when hee speaketh of God, hee meaneth the deuill, by such monstrous interpretations, all heresies may be defended.

Camp.

Your arguments cary a shew, because you reason physically: but we must not be led by senses in these misteries.

Fulke.

I reason truely: and truthe is able to stande with all true sciences against all gainsaiers.

Goade.

There remaineth the substance of one of the elements:

Ergo there remaineth the substance of both.

Camp.

There remaineth substance in neither.

Goade.

The substance of the wine remaineth:

Ergo of the one.

Camp.

Wine doeth not remaine substantially.

Goade.

Cyprian epist. 3. ad Caecilium. Dico vobis non bib am amodo ex ista creatura vitis, vsque in diem illum quo vobiscum bibam nouum vinum in regno patris mei. Qua in parte inuenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit. I say vnto you, I will not drinke hereafter of this creature of the vine, vntill the day that I shal drinke it new with you in the kingdome of my father. In which parte, we finde the cup which the Lord offered,



to be mixed, and that it was wine which he called his blood. By these wordes it appeareth that wine remaineth. He saith, we finde that it was wine, &c.

Campion.

His intent is to proue that Christ did consecrate in wine, and so must we do: he doth not call it wine after consecratio.

Goade.

I proue that his meaning is after consecration, as Christ him selfe doth call it, whose wordes he doth recite.

He saith, it was wine which he offered, and called his blood:

But he did not offer and call it his blood till after consecration:

Therefore it was wine after consecration.

Campion.

That is, hee tooke wine to make it his blood, and when he tooke it, it was wine: he saith not, that when Christ did offer it, it was wine.

Goade.

He saith that it was wine, which he called his blood, & he did not call it his blood before consecration. I leaue the place to the iudgement of the learned. I will farther confirme this out of Irenaeus. There remaineth an earthly substace after consecratio:

Ergo there is not transubstantiation.

Camp.

There doth not remaine any substance.

Goade.

Heare his wordes, Iren. aduer. hereses lib. 4. cap. 34. I am non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constas, terrena & coelesti. Caeleste hoc quidna est? Dominus Iesus. Terrestre autem quid? panis qui ex terra est, quique corpora nostra pascit quemadmodum reliqui panes. Nowe it is not common bread, but the Euchariste consisting of two things, one earthly, and the other heauenly. This heauenly what is it? the Lorde Iesus. And what is the earthly? bread which is of the earth, and which doth feede our body as other bread doth.

Camp.

He saith the sacrament consisteth of two things. There be nine predicaments beside that of substance, and this word Res, or thing, may be in them all, and they may bee all saide to be earthly things.

Goade.

You can not so shift of Irenaeus plaine wordes. I will proue that Res, in this place, must needes signifie a substance.

Sacramentes consist of two substances, the one earthly, and the other heauenly: Therefore, it must needes be vnderstoode of substance.

Campion.

I deny that they consist of two substances: they consist of two things.

Goad.

You will graunt that Christ the inuisible grace, is one substance: and so that part of the sacrament which is heauenly, is a substance. The earthly part, namely the elementes of bread and wine, remaine also in their proper substance: for as Irenaeus saith, the bread is of the earth, and doeth nourish our bodies, as other bread doeth.

Campion.

It is inough to consiste of two thinges: of Christ, and the grace of Christ. An euill man may receiue Christ, but not the grace of Christ.

Goade.

Do you make the two things to bee Christ and his grace: the one of these two must be earthly, according to Irenaeus. And it hath bene confuted before, that the wicked can not eate Christ: for whosoeuer is partaker of Christ, must also be partaker of his spirit and grace.

Campion.

I say that the wicked may receaue Christ, yet t their condemnation, when they receaue that part of the sacraniet which Irenaeus calleth the thing earthly, being not the substance, but the accidents.

Goade.

The wicked receaue the sacrament, the thing earthly, to their condemnation: but Christ they receaue not. I haue before proued that by the earthly thing must needes bee vnderstoode the substance: but ye are much beholding to accidentes and miracle, they haue helped you well to daye, when yee had nothing els to answer.

Fulke.

Irenaeus calleth the sacrament a sacrificie. I thinke you like the phrase in regard of yourmasse, but he faith, it was such a sacrifice as doth not sanctifie the offerer. lib. 4. cap. 34.

Therefore it was bread and wine.

Camp.

You say that it is a sacrifice, so it is in deede: but hee meaneth by the offerer, Christ which doth sanctifie, not man.

Fulke.

Hee meaneth cleane cotrary, you shall heare him speake: hee meaneth man.

Campion.

Man is also the offerer, after a soere.

Fulke.

You hurt your selfe, because you will not heare the place, but take vpon you to answer you knowe not to what. His wordes are (speaking of the sacrament) *Igitur sacrificia non sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget sacrificio Deus: sed conscientia eius qui offert sanctificat sacrificium pura existens, & praestat acceptare Deum quasi ab amico.* Therefore the sacrifices do not sanctifie the man, for God needeth no sacrifice: but the conscience of him that offereth being pure, sanctifieth the sacrifice, & causeth God to accept it as of a friend. Hereof I inferre:

That which ye conscience of ma must sacrifice, is bread & wine:

Therefore the sacrifice is bread and wine.

Campion.

Hee meaneth, except the conscience of the offerer be pure, it sanctifieth not the man.

Fulke.

Not onely that, but hee saith the pure conscience doeth sanctifie the sacrifice.

But no mans conscience doth sanctifie the body of Christ:

Therefore the sacrifice of bread and wine, are not the body of Christ.

Camp.

The pure conscience maketh it an holy sacrifice to him that offereth, but otherwise it is holy of it selfe.

Fulke.

Irenaeus affirmeth that the sacrifice hath no sanctification, but of the pure conscience of the offerer.

Campion.

If that be wanting, it signifieth not the man that is holy.

Fulke.

But if his conscience be neuer so pure, it sanctifieth not the bodie of Christ: Therefore there is no way for you to escape.

Goad.

If there bee transubstantiation, then Christ is really present in his true body:

But Christ is not really present in his true body:

Ergo there is not transubstantiation.

Camp.

Christ is really present in his true body.

Goade.

He is not present in his sensible body:

Therefore not in his true body.

Campion.

I deny your argument.

Goade.

It is the argument of our Sauour Christ, who neither deceiueth, nor can be deceiued, Luk. 24. 39. See my handes and my feete that it is I, handle me, and see. &c. Here Christ proueth his true body to be present by the senses of seeing and handling, as reasoning thus:

You see and feele my body:

Therefore I am present in my true body.

And it is not a spirite as you feare, as if he could not haue bene seene and handled, then not to be beleued to be his true body.

Camp.

The argumet of Christ is good. The body that might be felt, must needes be a true body. The body of Christ is alwayes sensible, but he doth whe it pleaseth him, withdraw this propertie.

Goad.

Then by our Sauour Christes reason, we may doubt of the trueth of his body.

Camp.

It is said of Christ, that he vanished out of their sight, yet his body was visible. And can not Christ bee present nowe without our seeing him?

Goad.

He was taken out of their sight, and then howe could they see him? but you say his body is present with vs. Will you chalenge more vnto you then Christ him selfe doth? It pleased Christ to be iudged by our senses, touching the presence of his body, our senses do see, feele, smell and taste nothing but bread.

Campion.

Christes pleasure is nough: the e him rise out of his sepulchre

Goad.

It pleased the Lorde to holde their eyes, astonished for feare: so when he , it is true that wee can not vse this sense.

Campion.

Then his body may be to s if he will, & yet he in him selfe is alwayes sensible: so the cause of not seeing him, is in him, and not in mine eye.

Goade.

Yea, if our eyes were holden that we could not see: but it is manifest that the Apostles knewe nothing of this doctrine of reall presence in the sacrament before Christes resurrection. For if they had bene taught before in the , that Christ was present in the sacrament in his naturall bodie, and yet they sawe and handled nothing els but bread, this argument nowe after his resurrection drawen from their senses, had bene of small force.

Campion.

Ye haue heard mine answere, though now it pleased him to shew him selfe palpable, yet there may bee impediment in him, and also in vs, why this is not alwayes so. Here was no miracle when Christ did thus shewe him selfe, but Christ wilbe present in the sacrament miraculously.

Goade.

Let vs ende with prayer. Wee yelde thee humbly thankes most gracious God and merciful father, that it hath pleased thee to call vs to the knowledge and profession of thine euerlasting trueth reuealed in thine holy worde: and although it bee the lotte & condition of the same truthe, alwayes to haue aduersaries and gainsayers, that set themselues against the cleare light of thy word: yet we beseech thee so to establish and confirme our faith in the knowen trueth, that we be neuer offended by reason of errors and heretiques, knowing that as there hath bene alwayes amongst thy people, so there wilbe still false prophets, which priuily shall bring in damnable heresies: yea there must be heresies in the Church, that they which are approued, may be knowen. But rather O Lord, by this meanes stirre vs vp the more to study and meditate in thy lawe. And specially vouchsafe to worke in our heartes a greater measure of zeale and loue towards thy truthe, seeing that of thy iust iudgement thou vsest to sende strong delusions, that they should beleeeue lyes, which woulde not receiue the loue of thy trueth. And amongst the multitude of those that wander in blindnes and errour, wee beseeche thee in thy good te, so many of them as pertaine vnto thy kingdome, of thy mercie to conuert, and the rest that are obstinate against thy trueth and glorie, of thy iust iudgement to code: and finally to breake the might of Sathan by the power of our Lord Iesus Christ, to whome with thee and the holy spirit, be all glorie now and euer.

Amen.

William Fulke.

Roger Goade.

**A remembrance of the conference had in the Tower of London, betwixt M. D. Walker, and M. William Charke opponents, & Edmund Campion Iesuite respondent, the 27. of September, 1581. as followeth.**

**1. Whether the Scriptures containe sufficient doctrine for our saluation. 2. Whether faith onely iustifieth.**

**M**ASTER Charke beganne the action with this godly prayer, but Campion refusing to pray with them, becrosse himselfe on the forehead, breastes, and other partes, after his superstitious maner.

Our helpe is in the name of the Lord, who hath made heauen and earth. O eternall God and most mercifull father, we thy seruantes doe humbly acknowledge, that we are by nature miserable sinners, ful of darkenesse and errour, without thee neither meete to receiue the loue, nor able to yeelde the obedience of thy trueth. Therefore wee beseech thee in Iesus Christ, to throw all our sinnes into the bottome of the sea, & to chase away all our darkenes with the brightnesse of thy wisdom, that we may growe vp in the knowledge, in the loue, and in the obedience of thy most holy will. And because we are here assembled to maintaine thy trueth against the errour and superstition of Antichrist, vouchsafe, O Lord our God, to be present in this action by thy holy spirit, and so sanctifie our hearts and gouerne our tongues, that our corrupt affections being suppressed, all things may be done in a godly zeale for thy trueth, and nothing against it. Moreouer, for those that are come to heare, graunt that as many as loue thy Gospell, may be more and more confirmed in the knowledge thereof, by that which shalbe faithfully deliuered out of thy holy worde: such as be otherwise minded, wee pray thee that they may yeelde either to the manifest trueth, if they appertayne to thy holy election: or being none of thine, that they may appeare guyltie and conuicted of a lying spirite, such as is gone out into the worlde to deceyue those that will not receyue the loue of thy trueth, but delight in darkenesse. These things, O Lord, and whatsoever thou knowest to be good for vs, we aske in the name of Iesus Christ, and by that forme of prayer, which he hath taught vs. Our father &c.

After the prayer was ended, M. D. Walker entred with this preface.

Walker.

Gentlemen, ye shall vnderstande that we be sent hither by authoritie, to talke & conferre with one called Campion, an English man borne, and brought vp in this realme in schooles & places where good learning hath bene taught, so that he might haue bene a good instrument in this common wealth and Gods Church: but contrary to his bringing vp, his friendes expectation, & hope that this Church might haue conceaued of him, like an vnnaturall man to his countrey, degenerated from an English man, an Apostata in religion, a fugitiue from this realme, vnloyal to his Prince, hath not onely fled to the man of Rome, an aduersarie to Christ and his doctrine: but hath gotten a courage from that Romaniste with certaine other his sectaries, to come into this realme againe, to vndermine the Gospell of Christ, to seduce Gods people, and withdrawe her Maiesties lawfull subiectes to disobedience and sedition, and hath bene (disguised in Ruffians apparel) in diuers places of this

realme, to plant secretly that blasphemous Masse and other Poperie, whereunto it appeareth hee hath allured many vnstable fooles: and in Yorkeshire where his Sectaries & disciples are apprehended & iustly imprisoned, nowe they rage (as I heare say) and curse him that euer he came there. So ye see what maner of ma we are to talke withal. What good we shall do with him, the Lord doeth knowe, other maner of men then we are, and of another calling, were more meete to talke with him then we: notwithstanding we will doe our best that we can, God giue it good effect. As for you, Campion, I heare say, that you vse to scoffe and iest at such as come to conferre with you: we come not for that purpose, it is not our profession, yet I giue you warning, Si quam maledicendo coeperis voluptatem, eam mal audiendo amittes.

Now to the question, which is, that the scriptures containe all things sufficient to saluation, against the assertion of your booke: For you say that the Lutherans haue cut off many bookes from the body of the new Testament, and so diuided them from the Canonickall scripture, which is not true.

Camp.

Yes that they haue, and therein they haue done euill.

Walker.

Here Master Walker reade the words out of Campions challenge.

Campion.

Luther hath cut off the Epistle of Iames, the second epistle of Iohn, Iude, and the seconde of Peter. Luther hath found fault with these, and improved them in his prefaces vpon those Epistles.

Walker.

Luther hath not doubted of them himselfe, but shewed that others haue doubted of them.

Campion.

It is one thing to doubt, an other thing to cut off. Bring me the bookes, and I will shewe that he hath cut them off.

Walker.

That can not bee shewed, if the bookes were here: For the Doctors doe not agree, concerning these bookes that are of the Canon. Some recite more, & some recite lesse, as Origen, Hierome, and others, and yet it were hard to say, that they cut off any of the Canonickall bookes. They doe, as Luther may, shewe what bookes were doubted of in their time, and yet no whitte preiudice the bookes of the Canonickall Scripture.

Campion.

Well, I say whatsoever they might doe then, yet now seeing the Church hath otherwise determined, it is blasphemie for any to doubt of them. The Lutherans doe doubt of them: bring me the bookes, and I will shewe where Luther doubteth, and therefore blasphemeth, because the Church hath taken away the doubt, videlicet the third Councill of Carthage, and that of Laodicea.

Walker.

I do not professe my selfe a Lutheran, but a Christian. But if olde fathers and olde Councils haue not receiued these bookes for Canonical and bookes to ground our faith vpon, then 1 page duplicate1 page duplicate can not new men, nor the Tridentine Council (being full of errors) make the Canonickall. August de doct. Christ. lib. 2. ca. 8. leaueth out Baruch, & the two last bookes of Esdras. Hieronymus

praes. in li. Reg. Huc prologu galeatu principiu vocat. He saith, Igitur Sapientia quae vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, & Iesu filij Syrach liber, & Iudith, & Tobias, & pastor, no sunt in Canone. Macchabaeoru primu libru Hebraicu reperi, secudus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa phrafi probari potest. Eusebius also ecclesi. hist. lib. 6. cap. 18. fol. 368. & sequentibus, omittit tertiu & quartu Esdrae, Tobiae, Iudith, Baruch, Sapientia, Ecclesiastici, Machabaeorum libros. Paulo post: De eo (inquit) qui est apud Hebraeos nonnulli dubitauerunt. &c. Sed ego dico ficut mihi maioribus traditum est, quia manifestissim Pauli est. Ibi de secunda Petri Epistola nonnullis dubitatur. De duabus vltimis Iohannis Epistolis apud quosda dubia sententia. He omitteth in the forenamed place the third & fourth booke of Esdras, the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Baruch, of Wisdome, of Ecclesiasticus, & of the Macchabees. A litle after: Cocerning that (saith he) which is written to the Hebrues, many haue doubted: but I say as hath bene deliuered vnto mee from mine Elders, because it appeareth most manifestly to be of Paules. There also, concerning the second Epistle of Peter, he sayth, that it was doubted of many: and so with some were the two last Epistles of Iohn. The same Eusebius lib. 4. cap. 26. loquens de Melitone Episcopo Sardensis Ecclesiae, qui recitans volumina veteris Testamenti, omittit Esdras, Tobi, Hester, Iudith, Baruch, Sapientiae, Syrach, Macchabaeorum. &c. Speaking of Melito the Bishop of the Church of Sardis, who reckening vp the volumes of the olde Testament, he omitteth Esdras, Tobie, Hester, Iudith, Baruch, Wisdome, Syrach, the bookes of the Macchabees, &c. And the Laodicean Councill omitteth Lukes Gospel & the Apocalyps. You see therefore that these old fathers haue left these bookes out of the Canon, and yet were they neyther called heretiques, nor blasphemers.

Campion.

It is not lawfull to cut off the bookes of the olde Testament from the Canon: which not onely, as I haue sayd, Luther hath done, but also Caluine. The one hath reiected those bookes I haue named, and the other reiecteth the bookes of Tobie, Ecclesiasticus, the booke of Wisdome, the bookes of Maccabees, Baruch, and the like, which are de sincero Canone.

Walker.

What is this to that I haue saide: I haue shewed that the olde Doctors haue refused them for Canonically, and therefore so many may we refuse: and they them selues wil de no further admitted then they agree with the Canonically Scriptures: and these bookes which you name, haue alwayes bene esteemed Apocrypha. Augustine contra Maximinum Arrianorum Episcopum lib. 2. Cap. 14. Nec ego Nicenum, nec tudebes Ariminense tanquam praeiudicaturus proferre Concilium: nec ego huius autoritate, nec tuistius debueris: Scripturarum autoritatibus non quorumcumque proprijs, sed vtrisque communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet &c. August. against Maximinus the Bishop of the Arrians. Neither oughtest thou to bring the Council of Arimine, nor I the Nicene, as it were to preiudice the trueth: neither should I be holden with the autoritie of this, nor thou of that: but let it be tryed by the authority of the Scriptures, not the proper witnesses of any, but common to both, let matter with matter, cause with cause, and reason with reason trye it, &c. And Hierome writing to Laeta de institutione filiae, fol. 58. willeth, not to reade some without doubting, and other some warely: but he sayth, Caueat omnia Apocrypha, Let her beware of all the Apocrypha, (which

he nameth in Prologo Galeato.) Et si quando ea non ad dogmatum veritatem, sed ad signorum reuerentiam legere voluerit, sciat non eorum esse quorum titulis praenotantur, multaqu ijs admixta vitiosa, & grandis esse prudentiae aurum in luto quaerere. And if at any time she will reade them, not for the trueth of opinions, but for the reuerence of signes, let her knowe that they are not theirs whose titles they beare, but that many vitious thinges are mixt, with them, and that it is a point of great wisdome to seeke out golde in dirt. Loe, here you see that he biddes her to beware in the reading of them.

Camp.

The Scripture is principally to be admitted: but I would we might haue an argument.

Walker.

Then thus I reason.

That which he biddeth to beware of, is not to be holden authenticall:

But he biddeth to beware of the Apocrypha:

Ergo the Apocrypha is not to be holden authenticall.

Camp.

Apocrypha are taken two wayes. First, for those bookes which are doubted of: and then, for such bookes that are not allowed. Such were ye prophecie of Enoch, Iacobs testament and such like, which he calleth Somniolenta deliramenta, vitiosa, &c. of those Hierome speaketh in this place, and not of those others. For what point is there in Ecclesiasticus, the booke of Wisdome, that is to be found fault wt that is vitiosu, & not good?

Walker.

They are called Apocrypha, that are not in the Canon receiued and allowed to haue proceeded vndoubtedly from the holy Ghost: these Apocrypha are forbidden to be read. And Hierome in praefat. in lib. Reg. saith, Hic prologus scripturarum &c. Si quid extra hos est, inter Apocrypha est ponendum &c. They are not in the Canon: therefore Apocrypha are onely to be read.

Camp.

Woulde Hierome forbid the gentlewoman to reade Ecclesiasticus, where there are giuen so many morall precepts? Non sunt in Canone Hebraeorum, sed in Canone Christianorum. They are not in the Canon of the Hebrewes, but they are in the Canon of the Christians.

Walker.

They may be read for morall Lessons, but not for matters of religion, which must be proued by Canonically scripture. What say you to the second booke of Macchabees? Thinke you that to be holden for Canonically scripture?

Camp.

I thinke so: What should let?

Walker.

What say you to yt sentence 2. Macch. 12. thrust into the text, Salubris est oratio pro defunctis, and to that which followeth, Et si quidem bene, & vt historiae competit, hoc est vt ipse velim, sin autem minus digne, concedendum est mihi. And if I haue done well, and as is meete for a storie, this also my selfe did wish, &c.

Camp.

It is marueile that you should say that it is thrust in.



Walker.

It is noted so by other, and the duetie of an historiographer is to reporte things done truely and plainely, without arguing like a Logitian: but he sayeth, Ergo salubris est oratio pro defunctis, Therefore prayer for the dead is healthfull, which appeareth first to haue bene set in the margent. But howe auoyde you the last? Can such asking of pardon be of the holy Ghost? wherein hath hee fayled? or of whome shall hee be pardoned?

Camp.

The interpreter asketh pardon of his speach for his style, and not for the doctrine. The holy Ghost asketh no more pardon, then Paul did when he saide, Rudis sum sermone, I am rude in speach, when he spake in a base and lowe stile.

Charke.

Campion, howsoeuer you labour to auoyde the direct course of disputation, and haue obtained some change of the question, I must call you home by and by. Notwithstanding, I minde a while to followe this your course, and to finde you out in your owne trace: where I maruaile howe you dare thus speake in this assemblie. For what a blot is it to the holy Ghost, to affirme he should aske pardon: and to the Apostle Saint Paul, to say his stile to the Corinthians is a base and lowe stile: But to vse no further preface, I will thus proue that the 2. booke of the Macchabees was not indited by the holy Ghost.

Whatsoever needeth pardon either for matter or maner, was not indited by the holy Ghost:

But the story of the 2. booke of Macchabees needeth pardon, either for matter or maner:

Therefore it was not indited by the holy Ghost.

Camp.

This man would be angrie with me, if he knew why.

Charke.

If I woulde, knowe I not why to be angrie with you, a notable and vowed enemie of the trueth of God, and a seditious man against the state? But I come not to deale with your person, but against your errors: Answere the argument.

Camp.

I say the writer of the Macchabees asketh pardon of his speach, neyther doeth Paul blotte the holy Ghost when he saide that he was rudis sermone, that he spake not so eloquently, nor so finely, as sometimes he might.

Charke.

You answere not directly: and beside, you affirme an error. For S. Paul craueth no pardon for his stile, but setteth his plainesse against the set and curious speach of the false Apostles, who did come in gay apparance and shewe of wordes, as if they had had al ye power of trueth that might be: and yet in this plaine style, the Apostle was of al others most mightie & most eloquent. As for the 2. booke of Macchabees, which you make Canonicall scripture, here I will make this challege (if you dare answere it) to proue many lyes in it through in non-Latin alphabet, and that therefore it was written by a prophane spirite for the matter. But to come to the Syllogisme, and to disproue your distinction, I reason thus.

The writers of holy Scriptures aske not any pardon at all, either for the matter or for the manner:

Therefore they aske no pardon for their stile.

Camp.

I deny your Antecedent: Paul sayeth, Rudis sum sermone.

Charke.

If Saint Paul saith Rudis sum sermone, doeth he (I pray you) in those wordes craue pardon for his stile? howe hang your wordes together? I will proue my Antecedent by the place of Peter.

None that haue written, as they were directed by the spirit of God, craue pardon either for matter or for manner:

But all the holy men of God that wrote the Scriptures, haue written as they were directed by the spirit of God:

Therefore none of the holy men of God, that haue written the scriptures, craue pardon either for matter or manner.

Camp.

This acknowledging of the weakenesse of his stile, is in the Apostle an humilitie comming from the holy Ghost.

Charke.

You answere not to the Argument: therefore to auoyde the cauil, consider the Syllogisme againe in this sort.

Whatsoever the worde of God, is full, sound, and perfect, it doeth neither aske, nor neede pardon in any respect:

But the second booke of Marchabees, doth both neede & aske pardon in some respect:

Therefore it is not the worde of God.

Norton.

If you will stay a while and speake leasurely, you shall haue the Argument written: and while it is writing, if you will haue any thing added or changed, it shall be done. It will be more profitable for the hearers, and greater ease for your selues.

Camp.

With a good will. I answere: In it selfe and for it selfe it neither needeth nor asketh pardon, but for circumstance. In respect of dainty eares, it may aske pardon.

Charke.

Why Campion, shall the holy Ghost begge pardon in respect of daintie eares?

Camp.

Syr, Put this in also, that I say it was in respect of the stile, for the forme and the maner of it.

Norton.

Well I haue put it in so.

Charke.

Let him put in all his shiftes & helpes, clogging his answeres as much as he will, we will cast the clogges vpon his owne heeles: and thus I reason agaynst all your cauils. Whatsoever is in the worde of God is all of the holy Ghost, both for matter, for stile, and for circumstance, and the holy Ghost asketh no pardon for any of these: Therefore the 2. booke of the Machabees asking pardon is not of the holy Ghost, nor canonical scripture.

Here Campioneeing hastie before master Norton had written it through out, master Norton willed him to stay a little. Campion replied, that it was losse of

time. To which Master Norton answered againe, that it was a gaining of the time. He desired that the word all might bee inferred in the Antecedent.

Charke.

I sayd, all.

Norton.

So it is, and rightly set downe.

Camp.

Then I answere thus. This circumstance, of asking pardon, is of the holy Ghost: for it is a speach of humilitie, proceeding from the holy Ghost, as is Saint Pauls speach, Rudis sum sermone, I am rude in speach: Et non in persuasibilibus verbis humanae sapientiae. Not in the perswasible wordes of mans wisdom.

Charke.

Rudis sum sermone commeth oft and rudely in: and yet the alledging of it hath bene disproued long ago. Neuerthesse seeing it pleaseth you so wel, it shalbe a weapo of your owne giuing, to vse against your selfe. For the Apostle, of purpose auoyding the wisdom of mans eloquence, doth iustifie that which his aduersaries called rudenesse of speach, as lawfull and good. Neither doth he (as you imagin) confesse any want, or craue pardon. Therefore your example is false, deceitfull, and vnlearned. It is a trim thing for you to abuse the multitude vnder opinion of great learning, and to match those that are no scriptures with scriptures, sometime affirming one thing, and another time another: sometime that the Apostles speach is rude and the stile base, and needeth pardon in respect of daintie eares: and now last that it needeth no pardon, but is done for humilitie: whereas the holy Ghost neuer asketh pardon of man for any thing he doth: for that were to bring God vnder man, and make the spirit of God subiect to the allowance or disallowance of sinfull flesh.

Camp.

I answere, that neither this of the Macchabees, nor Pauls speach hath need of pardon in it selfe.

Charke.

It is too too much & absurd to accuse the holy ghost of waste and needles speach. For if there needed no pardon, it was not according to the holy Ghost to craue it.

Camp.

I haue said, neither this nor the Apostles speach needed any pardon in it selfe, and yet it was not waste and needlesse, because it proceeded of humilitie.

Charke.

Will you charge the holy ghost with dissimulation? speaketh he one thing, and meaneth another?

Camp.

I say it was not waste, because it proceeded of humilitie, to craue pardon.

Charke.

Wel, I proue my assertion against this your imagined humilitie of the holy Ghost to sinfull flesh.

Whatsoever is without cause is waste and needlesse:

But your self confesse it to be without cause for the holy ghost to craue pardon: Therefore by your owne confession it is waste and needlesse.

Camp.

I denie the Minor. For there is cause: For in trueth the stile is simple.

Charke.

How often haue you granted the Minor, saying, he needed not to aske pardon?  
 & now (as forgetting your selfe) you say there is cause of asking pardo: For (say  
 you) in truth the stile is simple. Your speaches are contradictory. Set it downe that  
 y aduersarie is not at one with him selfe. Besides, he was driuen before to grant the  
 stile is not base or simple.

Camp.

I haue set downe no contrarietie, but in respect.

Char.

In respect, is a simple shift. Are not these contradictorie propositions? He  
 needeth not pardon, but asketh it in humilitie: and He needeth pardon, for in  
 trueth the stile is simple.

Camp.

I pray you read the place of the Maccabees.

Charke.

Thus you retire: and aske moreouer that which needeth not. For the place is  
 well knowen, and was read before. But I will read it againe. *Et si quidem bene, & vt  
 historiae competit, hoc & ipse velim: si autem minus dign, concedendum est mihi.*  
 This I would haue all the companie marke and vnderstand, whom you labor with  
 indirect speaches to abuse & draw from the truth, that whether the authour of this  
 booke excuse himself & craue pardon in these wordes for his stile, or for his storie,  
 neither can be of the holy ghost: because (as hath bene proued at large) the holy  
 ghost faileth nothing at all in any point of speach, of matter, or of circumstance.  
 Thus your distinctions and cause fall together.

Camp.

I haue answered you in what respect he craueth pardon, and if that cannot  
 satisfie you, leaue it to God and this companie to iudge of.

Charke.

Sure your satisfaction is verie weake: farre from satisfying God that hateth such  
 fond distinctios to darken his word, or those of the companie that seeke to be edified.  
 But you giue me new occasion to prosecute this matter. What thinke you therefore  
 of the storie of Iudith, touching the dressing and decking of her selfe with apparell  
 and ornaments fittest to deceiue Holofernes eies? and what say you to her lies and  
 praier that he might be taken with the snare of his eies looking vpon her? the  
 speaches vntrue, and the action vnchaste in outward apparance, were they (thinke  
 you) of the holy Ghost?

Camp.

I maruell not that you so speake of me, when you so speake of a blessed woman,  
 to bring so holy an action into doubt. Surely you greatly offend me in so doing.

Charke.

I speake of the words and storie as it is plainly written, she prayeth, saying,  
*Capiatur laqueo oculorum suorum in me, & Percuties eum ex labijs charitatis meae.*  
 And againe, *Verte sermonem meum in fraudem.* Do you thinke this speach proceeded  
 of the holy Ghost? Nay rather (howsoeuer it displease you to heare of the matter) it  
 proceeded fro a prophane spirit, as I haue said, to charge the holy ghost with fraud,

& to pray for such an effect, that Holofernes might be taken wt her loue, & snared with her kisses.

Camp.

There be no such wordes in the booke.

Charke.

Here you are manifestly ouertaken: for they are worde for worde in the 9. Chapter: and after your translations, the vulgar and Vatablus.

Camp.

Is that to be esteemed fraude, which the holy Ghost deuisseth? Is it fraud to deceiue the deuil? blame you her, who did that she did to a good end, and for the deliuey of the Church?

Char.

What dealing is this? Euen now he denied the words: now finding them strong against his cause, he would auoid them with a distinction of good intents, to iustifie bad parts, Thus you Papists hold against the word of God, that we may do euill that good may come of it. No Campion, Gods spirit is alwayes like it selfe: It is not agreeing with the maiestie of the spirit of God, for any woman to pray that a stranger should be taken with the snare of his eyes looking vpo her: or that she may deceiue by lies. This story therefore & this practise proceded not fro ye holy ghost.

Camp.

It is a shame for you to bring that example. She desireth God, that it will please him to turne the wickednes of Holofernes to the deliuerie of his people. She prayeth not (as you say) that he should sinne.

Charke.

She doth pray for it in plaine words, and set out her selfe in sumptuous apparell and ornaments to that purpose. It is a shame for you Campion to mainteine any such absurditie, and againe to deny and misconster the manifest wordes of that you would haue Canonically scripture. We stand before ye face of God for the maintenance of his truth, and giue such honour therunto, that we acknowledge with our harts, & cofesse with our mouths, that it is perfect, full, and sufficient, and that there is no prophanation in it: but you would haue that to be matched with holy scripture, which is far vnworthy that honor. What say you to the argument & the place? Let him be taken with the snare of his eies in me, & turne my speach into deceit or fraud. This is a praier for successe in a matter of sinne, most vnseemly for the holy ghost.

Camp.

I receiue this booke, first because the Nicene coucill hath allowed it: then I say further, that this was her meaning, that whereas God had giue Holofernes ouer to fleshly lust, yt he might be taken with the loue of his eies towards her, to be besotted with her, y she might the better performe her determinate purpose: she prayeth that God will turne his sinne to ye deliuey of his distressed people. And what doth she commit worthy of blame in this?

Charke.

This is not only worthy of blame, but also to be condemned as sinfull, and sauouring of a prophane spirite, that shee prayeth God to blesse her lyes and falshood, her tentations and allurements to lust. For the Lord hath appointed good wayes for good purposes, and for the performance of yt his worke he needed not her

deceit. For (as Iob saith) God needeth not any mans lie, or any mans fraude. Which is also true of the fraude and dangerous allurements mentioned in that chapter.

Camp.

What Chapter, what Chapter?

Charke.

The ninth Chapter. Reade and acknowledge the words you haue denied. Here Campion read in his owne booke, saying he perceiued we builded vpon our owne tulation.

Camp.

Well, this is mine answere. It was not truely and formally fraude, but materially in the formall act fraude: as for example, when the people of the Iewes were commanded to steale from the Egyptians, it was in the act theft, but not formally theft. So Abrahams intent to kill his childe, was to do murther in the act, but formally it was no murther.

Charke.

You woulde nowe in steade of a short and schoolelike answere drawe me to a in non-Latin alphabet, from the place in hande to the examination of newe matters. Therefore to take you where you will needes be, I say the Hebreweworde hath not that signification that it shoulde import theft, but a spoyle, which was iust and commanded of God, as after a victorie, or for a rewarde of their labours & seruice in Egypt: therefore no theft. But this fraude is another thing. So ye first example is vnlike & proueth nothing, no more do the rest. For Abrahams act was no murther, nor intent of murther, but a duetiful obedience and seruice to God who had expresly commanded it. Lastly, you can not thinke yt the Magistrate in taking the life of a transgressor, or taking away y head of a traytor, is a murtherer. No, this duetie of iustice is layd vpon him by his office from God, and can not but ignorantly be called murther. And such was the warrant for Abraham in his office.

Camp.

I meane killing, as it respecteth the taking away of life and no otherwise.

Charke.

How do you confound the speciall with the general? All murther is the taking away of life, but all taking away of life is not murther. To kill and to take away life from the wicked by the sworde of iustice is iust, and in no respect to carry the name of murther, which is euermore euill.

Walker.

Concilium Laodicenum, The Councill of Laodicea hath left out Toby, Iudith, the booke of Wisdome, Eccclus, Baruch, Maccabees, Esra the third and fourth, and in the newe Testament Luke & the Apocalyps, these are the wordes: Quae autem oporteat legi & in auctoritatem recipi haec sunt, Genesis, Exodus, &c. But those which ought to be read & receiued for authentical are these, Genesis, Exodus, &c. Where the forenamed bookes are omitted.

Camp.

The Laodicene Councill, was particular and not generall. And againe, it reckoneth vp those bookes yt were vndouted, and not douted of in yt part of the world. But what maketh this to proue yt they were douted of, of yt Catholike Church? They were douted of in yt Church, or in yt part of the Church, Ergo they were douted of, of the whole Church. How holdeth this? Therefore it is plaine yt these

bookes were not doubted of in yt whole Church. For the same Nicene Council accepteth Iudeth, as Hierome testifieth in the preface to Iudeth. Further, because ye Church of Rome approueth them, it followeth not that we should dout of them.

Walker.

Then you confesse, that the Council set not downe al that we should receiue. And where you make the Councill particular, it was prouinciall: and further, was confirmed by the sixth generall Councill holden at Trullo, Constantine being president, as Bartholomaeus Caranza writeth fol. 71. and therefore we may wt them leaue out of the Canon, Tobie, Iudeth, the booke of Wisedome, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, &c. which your Councill of Trent thrust in as authenticall. But to leaue that, it is plaine, that Cyprian vpo the Creede omitteth al yt Apocrypha, hauing rehearsed those which be Canonically, he sayth: Haec sunt quae patres intra Canonem concluderunt, ex quibus fidei nostrae assertiones constare voluerunt. Sciendum tamen est, quod & alii libri sunt, qui non Canonici sed Ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt, vt est Sapientia Salomonis, Ecclesiasticus libellus, Tobiae & Iudith, & Machabaeorum libri, quae omnia in ecclesijs legi voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex ijs fidei confirmandam. These are those thinges which the fathers shut within the Canon, by which they would haue the assertions of our fayth to stande. Notwithstanding we must know that there are other bookes also, which of our Elders were called Ecclesiast. and not Canonically, as Salomons booke of Wisd. Ecclus. the bookes of Tobias, Iudeth, & the Macca. all which they would haue read in the Church, and yet not brought forth, to confirme the authoritie of fayth out of them.

Camp.

He is called comonly Author expositionis in Symbolum, and therefore doubtfull whether it were Cyprian or no: but admit it were, I answere to these and all such like places, that when particular Fathers, & particular Councils doe reckon vp such & such books, & omit others yt either were receiued there or in other places sithens, they reckon vp such as were the come to their knowledge, and such as were approued in that part of the worlde, where they the liued. But it followeth not, they reckoned no more, Ergo there were no more. They doubted, therefore we must acknowledge no more. For the Church hath since put them out of doubt.

Walker.

You answere not, but trifle: For those are not onely omitted and left vnreckoned, but they are set downe for Apocrypha or Ecclesiastici, & so certaynely named, and not Canonical.

Camp.

Some might bee set downe then as doubtfull, that nowe are out of doubt, because they are receiued.

Charke.

Hitherto you haue gone from the matter: wherein I haue bene willing to followe you a little, to cleare the poynt that then was in hande when I began with you. Nowe let vs come to the questions agreed of betweene vs.

Camp.

Nay let vs first speake of the authoritie of the Scripture, then (if you will) of the sufficiencie.

Charke.

Of the authoritie we haue spoken alreadie, and it is not within our question, which is onely of sufficiencie.

Camp.

I deferre to the scriptures all authoritie, and all sufficiencie: therefore you haue nothing against me.

Charke.

Yes, I haue this against you, that you doe not thinke the scriptures onely and alone sufficient to all doctrine of fayth and maners. For whatsoever you say, we knowe you holde and teache the contrary: namely that all things are not set downe and written in the worde. This other day you were still calling for Syllogismes, and when you had receiued a blowe, and stooode astonied vnder it, yet you cryed out, a Syllogisme, a Syllogisme, to make men beleue that you were not touched. Now you shal haue Syllogismes: answere to them directly and shortly. Thus I proue the sufficiencie of the scripture without traditions.

What the Apostles taught viua voce, by liuely voyce, that also they wrote:

But they taught viua voce, whatsoever is necessary to saluatio:

Therefore they wrote also whatsoever is necessary to saluatio.

Camp.

Nego argumentum, I deny the Argument.

Charke.

It is a Syllogisme, you woulde haue denied my Maior, I thinke.

Camp.

Proue your Maior then.

Charke.

What care they had ouer the Churches present, the same care they had ouer the Churches to come afterwarde:

But their care ouer the Churches present, was to open to them all the counsell of God:

Therefore they left the like prouision in writing to al posterity, that they might be instructed in all the counsell of God.

Camp.

I answere to the Maior. They had the same care, but in such sort as it was expedient. It was not expedient that they shoulde write all and euery sillable that they spake: and yet notwithstanding they disclosed all the counsell of God, either in speciall or generall words written.

Charke.

Uery wel, then we are come to the issue of the matter, and you graunt the question, that all doctrine both concerning faith and maners, is either in speciall or generall words contained in the Scripture.

Camp.

I agree. But heare mine answere out of S. Augustine against Crestonius. Where it can not be aduouched in scripture by speciall words that the baptisme of heretikes is good, yet it is deliuered in the scripture by generall wordes, forasmuch as the scripture doeth command vs to obey the Church which hath allowed this baptisme being conferred in forma Ecclesiae. So the doctrines not particularly discoursed in scriptures are yet conteyned in these wordes, Obey your prelates. The Church is the



pillar and supporter of trueth. And if he heare not the Church, let him be to thee an Ethnike and Publicane.

Charke.

You say particular matters are contened in those general words, Obey your Prelates. Do you meane yt we must obey them in causes not contened in the word? Then you may binde vs to what you list, and disalowe what yee please. Therefore, syr, that I may seeke your corners and finde you out, what meane you by this when you say that Generall commandementes allowe particular traditions?

Camp.

I named not traditions.

Charke.

But it is the effect and scope of your speache for obedience to your Church Prelates, in matters not expressed in the Scriptures.

Camp.

I saye there be poyntes wherein wee accorde with you, as the baptisme of here-tiques, the baptisme of infantes, the holy ghost proceeding from the father and the sonne, that baptisme is a Sacrament and Preaching is none, being both commaunded at one time, that the Eucharist is a Sacrament and washing of feete none, being commanded at one time: and such like. &c.

Charke.

To say that the proceeding of the holy ghost from the father and the sonne is not expressed in the scripture, is a blasphemous speach.

Camp.

Shewe me any sentence expressing it in the scripture.

Charke.

It sufficeth to shewe it inferred in the scripture by good proofes of consequence & implication. But what say you to traditions, decrees and such like, which the Church of Rome maintayneth as the very word it selfe? Let vs speake of them being now in question, and not breake out into newe matters not in controuersie.

Camp.

I will not go from my question.

Charke.

You shall come to it, if you take vpon you the defence of your traditions, which I disproue in this maner.

If the Apostles left nothing vnwritten that is necessarie to saluation, the scriptures are sufficient:

But the Apostles haue left nothing vnwritten necessarie to saluation:

Therefore the scriptures are sufficient.

Camp.

I graut it as before, referring it to yt Church, & supposing alwayes a true Church. I pray you of what Church are you?

Charke.

We talke of the true Church, and therefore this question is needles. Are we to obey any thing contrary to the worde of God? You can imagine nothing left to the Church, that is not manifestly conteyned in the scripture.

Camp.

Call you manifestly particularly:

Charke.

To what purpose is that question: I must bring you to a Syllogisme, lest you auoyde disputation by digressing into other matter.

If any thing be left obscure or not fully handled by the Apostles, it was either because the Apostles could not, or because they would not write manifestly and fully:

But it is a blasphemie to say they could not, and it is false to say they would not:

Therefore they haue written all, manifestly and fully.

Here Campion repeated the Argument, and then sayd thus:

Camp.

I answer to the word manifestly: either in generall or particular termes manifest, and this the Apostles both could and would. For this is manifest enough, Beleeue the Church: but it is not particular.

Charke.

While we dispute of the manifest and full contents of the scripture, leaue to choppe in the needles terme Particular: manifest generals include particulars. And where, I pray you, are we commaunded to beleeue the Church in matters not contained in the written worde? By this vncerteine rule you may warrant all former traditions, and bring in any newe absurdities.

Camp.

That is not the question.

Charke.

But it is a necessary note for the confutation of your answeres and doctrine of vnwritten verities. Therefore I thus proue against you.

To leaue a doore open to any chaungeable or doubtfull traditions, is not to teache things manifest enough in the scriptures:

But to send vs to your Church prelates in matters not expressed in the written word, is to leaue a dore open to chaungeable and doubtfull traditions:

Therefore to sende vs to your Church prelates in matters not expressed in the written worde, is not to teach thinges manifest enough in the scriptures.

Camp.

To leaue a doore to traditions, which the holy ghost may deliuer to the true Church, is both manifest and seene: as the baptisme of Infants, the holy ghost proceeding from father and sonne, and such other things mentioned, which are deliuered by tradition. Proue these directly by the scripture.

Charke.

Which proposition in the Syllogisme doe you deny?

Camp.

Proue the baptisme of children and the proceeding of the holy Ghost, not to be traditions.

Charke.

I maruayle you thus auoyde the Syllogisme, and what you meane to match doctrines contained in the word of God with vnwritten and vncerteine traditions of men. It is plaine, that the baptisme of children is proued by the analogie of Circumcision with baptisme, childre being circumcised the eight day. Also by that the Sacraments of the old Testament, are the same with the Sacraments of the

newe. The proceeding of the holy ghost is evidently proued by this that our Sauour promiseth to send the holy Ghost.

Camp.

Proue the proceeding of the holy ghost Ex parte filii: That is on the sonnes part: For that is the point.

Charke.

It is proued by my former words, and where Christ breathed vpon his disciples and said, Receiue the holy ghost.

Camp.

Well, leaue that & talke of baptisme, which this company vnderstandeth better. Suppose that I am an Anabaptiste: And y Anabaptist denieth this argument, because children should not be baptized till the eight day, and the scripture willeth them to be baptised that beleue: so that first they must haue Faith, or els they may not be baptized.

Charke.

I reply to you, that Infidels, of age to vnderstand and beleue, must beleue before they be baptised and admitted to the Church: but the children of beleuers being the seede of the faithfull, they may receiue the seale of the couenant of God made to the Fathers and to their seede, according to that of the Apostle, If the first fruites be holy, the lumpe also: If the roote be holy, the branches also are holy. But to the question. Notwithstanding the scriptures be the only rule & triall of all questions in religion, and do fully proue the matter in hand: yet (because you wil not be cotented without them) answere a place or two out of ye Doctors. Eusebius lib. 3. cap 35. of his ecclesiasticall storie writeth, that Ignatius being caried prisoner to Rome, did exhort the Churches to cleaue vnseparably to the tradition (that is, to the deliuered doctrine of the Apostles) which for safetie it was necessarie to put downe in writing, that we might not depart fro it. Which excludeth the generall bringing in of vnwritten verities vnder the colour of that text, Obey your prelates.

Camp.

Reade the place.

Charke.

in non-Latin alphabet . In English thus: He exhorted the Churches to cleaue vnseparablie to the traditition of the Apostles, which he supposed and testified nowe for safeties sake necessarily to haue bene set downe euen in writing.

Camp.

What word doe you inferre? Tradition I graunt is not alwayes taken for vnwritten veritie. This place maketh for those traditions which were not then written. Ignatius was S. Iohns scholler, and he was Oculatus testis, An eye wnesse of things that were not then written, but went from hand to hande, and therefore he thought it necessarie to leaue in writing such trueth as he had heard and was not written before. For the Gospels were not then written, & Ignatius wrote no Gospell, and the text noteth that the things whereof he spake, were such as himselfe wrote.

Charke.

You mistake the meaning of the place. For Ignatius spake not of your doubtfull and multiplied traditions, but of the certayne Tradition, that is, of the deliuered and written doctrine of the Apostles, to the which we must cleaue in non-Latin alphabet , that is, so stedfastly that no force, no arte may cut vs off, or withdrawe

vs from it: no not an Angell from heauen, much lesse any mortall man, howsoever magnified with the high titles of Popedome, or Prelacie, or Apostolicall authoritie.

Walker.

You haue graunted that all things are written in the worde, and that such traditions as can not manifestly be gathered out of the Canonick Scriptures, are not to be receaued. Thereupon I reason thus.

The same that the Apostles wrote, the same they deliuered in tradition:

But they haue written and deliuered the same things that they read in the Canonick scripture:

Ergo their writings and traditions be all one and the same.

Camp.

The same, that is to say, nothing contrarie.

Walker.

The same and no other is needefull to saluation. Heare the Apostles wordes.

1. Cor. 4. Hac de causamisi vobis Timotheum, qui est filius meus dilectus, & fidelis in domino, qui vobis in memoria reducet vias meas quae sunt in Christo, quemadmodum in omni ecclesia doceo. Who is my beloued sonne and faithful in the Lord, who will put you in minde of my wayes which are in the Lorde, euen as I teache euery where in euery Church. That he wrote and taught in one Church, he wrote and taught in another, and therefore 2. Cor. 1. he saith, Nam gloriatio nostra est testimoniu conscientiae nostrae, &c. Non enim alia scribimus vobis, quam quae legitis & agnoscitis. For this is our glorie, euen the testimonie of our conscience, &c. For we write no other things vnto you, then which you reade and knowe in deede. Againe. 2. Cor. 2. Quales sumus sermone per epistolas cum absumus, tales sumus & cum adsumus, facto. The same that we are in speach by our Epistles, when we are absent, such we are also when we are present.

Camp.

The same, no contrarietie. For there were afterwards many scriptures that were not then written. Nowe therefore could they teache all thinges? This Epistle was not then written, and diuers others. The meaning is, they taught one Faith, one Christ, one doctrine: but hee speaketh not of the Scriptures.

Walker.

He taught the same things that Moses and the Prophetes taught. Quales sumus sermone per Epistolas, tales & facto.

Camp.

I graunt the same testimonies out of Moses and the Prophetes: and Paul was as stout in speaking as in doing. But what proueth this against me? For he sayd more then he wrote.

Walker.

He sayd no more then is written in the Scripture.

Camp.

It is true that the Apostles proued all that they preached out of the scriptures, out of the Lawe and the Prophetes, and thereby iustified their preaching: and yet that parte of the newe Testament which was afterwards written, was not superfluous: therefore sufficiencie employeth not that it must be expressed, but that it may be gathered.

Walker.

You are one absent, and another present. You would bring in Idolatrie vnder the name of your traditions: but I shew you, that whatsoeuer we are to receaue, it must be in ye scripture.

Camp.

These are but wordes, they neede no answer.

Walker.

Well, I wil vrge you with matter out of Ambrose, 1. Cor. 4. Super verba, regnetis vt & nos vobiscum regnemus: Quicquid ab Apostolis traditu non est, sceleribus plenum est. Whatsoeuer is not taught and deliuered by the Apostles, is full of wickednes.

Camp.

He disputes against false Apostles, and by waye of comparison he seuereth the traditions of Catholiques, from those of Heretikes: and this he doth to shew the difference of traditions, and not to condemne traditions.

Walker.

It is an vniuersall proposition, that all traditions that came not from the Apostles are full of wickednes: but those which they wrote came not from them. Ambrose also lib. 3. de virginibus: Nos noua omnia quae Christus non docuit, iure damnamus, quia sidelibus via Christus est. Si igitur Christus non docuit quod docomus, etiam nos id detestabile iudicamus. We doe iustly condemne all new things which Christ hath not taught, because Christ is the way vnto the faithfull. If therefore Christ hath not taught that which we teache, wee also doe iudge that to bee most detestable.

Campion.

This is against false prophetes, whereof there were many that then went abroad from place to place, teaching many things vnder the names of the Apostles that were none of theirs.

Walker.

Uery well. So there are things taught by you vnder their names which are none of theirs: wherefore we may conclude you to be in the number of false prophetes. Christ saith, Iohn 15. Omnia quae audiui patre meo, nota feci vobis. I haue shewed all things to you which I haue heard of my father. He shewed all thinges necessarie to saluation: and therefore this is the conclusion. Iohn. 20. Haec scripta sunt vt vitam habeatis: ideo vita consistit in ijs quae scripta sunt. These things are written that ye might haue life: therefore life consisteth in those things which are written. Tertullian de praescriptionibus Haereticorum: Apostolos enim domini habemus authores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio quod inducerent eligerunt, sed acceptam Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus assignauerunt. Itaque etiamsi Angelus de coelis aliter euangelizaret &c. We haue the Apostles for our authors, who neither themselues chose any thing that they brought in of their owne brayne, but they faithfully assigned that discipline which they had receiued from Christ to the nations. Therefore, albeit an Angell should preach otherwise from heauen. &c.

Campion.

Christ did teach all, and therefore the Apostles writte all that Christ taught? Nego argumentum. I deny the argument.

Walker.

Why, Haec scripta sunt vt vitam habeamus: These things are written that wee may haue life: what neede wee more?

Campion.

Enough is written, but in such sorte as was sayd before, either in generall wordes or speciall: either discoursed, or touched.

Walker.

Although as the Euangelist saith. Iohn 21. *Multa alia fecit Iesus in conspectu discipulorum suorum, quae non sunt scripta in hoc libro.* Iesus did many other things in the sight of his disciples which are not written in this booke: as true it is, hee wrought many miracles before his death, to declare himselfe to be the sonne of God, and after his resurrection to declare that he had a true bodie, which both did suffer, and was raysed vp agayne. And Luke Act. 1. sayth, *Scripti tibi Theophile de omnibus quae Christus tum fecit tum docuit.* I haue written vnto thee o Theophilus concerning all things which Christ both hath done & hath taught. He saith, *De omnibus, non singulis.* For then if euery particular worde and act of Christ had bene written, the worlde could not haue receiued the volumes of bookes that should haue bene written, Iohn 2. 5, 9. But these things are written. Iohn. 20. 9. that ye might beleue, and in beleueing haue eternall life. Wherefore, *Scrutamini scripturas, quia in ijs, non alibi vita quaerenda.* Iohn. 5. Searche the scriptures, because in them is life, and not els where to be sought.

Charke.

This you haue bene inforced to graunt, that all thinges necessarie to saluation, are contained manifestly in the Scriptures.

Campion.

I graunt it with my distinction: they are either manifestly written, or contained vnder that generall commaundement, Obey your prelates.

Charke.

To proue, that whatsoever you teache, ought to bee in the written worde of GOD, I haue a plaine place out of Tertullian against Hermogenes, which also maketh strongly against you. His wordes are these. *Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina: si non est scriptum, timeat vae illud adijcientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.* Let Hermogenes schole shewe that it is written: if it be not written, let him feare that curse appointed for them, which adde or take from the scriptures.

Campion.

Where, say you, is this place of Tertullian?

Charke.

In his booke aduersus Hermogenem.

Camp.

Aduersus Hermogenem? I thinke ye are deceiued: there is no such booke in Tertullian.

Charke.

I do not onely thinke, but knowe of a certeintie that you are deceiued, and will shewe you the booke.

Camp.

Note this obiection. This is myne answere to it. Hermogenes the Heretike did alleadge a bastard tradition, and Tertullian doth call him to proue his opinion by true scriptures. For Tertullians argument is not to say, It is not written, Therefore it is not true: but to call him to proue the Scripture true, which he alledged for him.

Charke.

And note this answer. He that euen now knewe no such booke, taketh presently vpon him to discourse of the argument thereof. What great boldnes is this? From what present reuelation doth it come? Beside your boldnes, your error is great, in affirming that Hermogenes brought a bastard tradition: For there is no such thing, as may appeare to any man that for triall hereof wil reade ye booke. Hermogenes is cofuted for saying as an Aristotelian Philosopher, ye God made al things of materia prima. Againe, of your answer I conclude, that of necessitie the prooue of euery particular tradition must be by a true scripture. And it is in non-Latin alphabet, a generall position: Tertullian would haue Hermogenes proue all that he helde by scripture.

Camp.

I say it is not to shewe a bastard writing for his tradition, but that which is true scripture.

Charke.

And that is all I aske: for what do I seeke more, but to proue that euery tradition must be proued by true Scripture? when therefore you Iesuites bring in vnwritten traditions concerning your Candles, your vnholly graines, your Agnus deis and such beggerly stuffe wherewith you abuse and pester the world, Tertullian sayth, you bring a Vae vpon your selues, except you can proue the vse of them by Scriptures.

Camp.

Why, I say it must needes be proued there, or els it is not to be receaued.

Charke.

Remember what you graunt: I aske no more. To leaue Tertullian with you, to aduise better of: I alledge also a place of Basill out of his treatises called in non-Latin alphabet, capite in non-Latin alphabet. This place doth clearely establish the sufficiencie of scripture, and banisheth all vnwritten and selfe will worshippings. Consider the place, for it is worthy of consideration, as making against you in this question: and charging you with pride and apostasie, for bringing in things not written.

Camp.

Well, let these your speeches passe: Reade the place. S. Basill is not against vs.

Charke.

in non-Latin alphabet. &c. It is a manifest Apostasie or falling away from the faith, and a fault of high pride, eyther to dissalowe any thing written in the Scriptures, or to bring in any thing not written: seeing the Lorde hath sayde, My sheepe heare my voyce: with other arguments to that purpose.

Camp.

I will not trouble the audiorie with this place. For Basill declareth that in some things we must be referred to tradition, he speaketh onely for the alleading of false scriptures, and hath nothing against me.

Charke.

Then nothing can make against error, if this make not agaynst you. But you abuse the audiorie, and knowe not the drift of Basill in this place, and that I will make euident to all the companie. Take the booke and reade it if you can, the place is easie Greeke, and the sentence but short.

Camp.

I had rather reade it in Latine then in Greeke: I vnderstande the Latine better.  
I maruell you are so much in your Greeke.

Charke.

If I shoulde not haue brought it in Greeke but in Latine, then you woulde haue  
taken exception against the interpreter. I bring not the interpretour, but Basill him  
selfe in the tongue wherein hee wrote. Here Campion being long in turning the  
Latine booke, coulde not finde the treatise, but desired Master Charke to finde it,  
who answered, I haue it readie in Basill him selfe. If you flee to the interpretour,  
turne your owne booke.

Camp.

I haue answered you. Saint Basills meaning is, as it was then, a common doctrine:  
that it is a great fault to disalow true scriptures, or to bring in false scriptures: and  
to father a false writing vpon the Apostles.

Charke.

I protest, that hauing perused the circumstaunces of the place, I finde no such  
generall or particular drifte of the father, as you misreport: but a playne doctrine  
and sundrie argumentes to proue it, that nothing is to be receiued or brought into  
the Church, that is not written.

Camp.

Your protestation is no argument. I am acquaynted with this dealing since the  
other day. But the scope of Saint Basill is as I haue saide.

Charke.

My true protestation doeth ouerway your misconstruing, as wel of Basill nowe,  
as of Tertullian before, and therein I referre my selfe to the examination of both  
places. If you will or can read but twentie lines further, your owne eyes shal see and  
giue sentence against your selfe.

Camp.

I haue giuen you the sense of the Doctours wordes, and neede not reade the  
place.

Charke.

Reade first, and then answere. What Authour, or what place can make against  
you, if you will of your selfe frame an interpretation after your owne purpose, without  
reading the wordes, or making conscience what construction you giue?

Campion.

Saint Basill in other places is of a contrary iudgement: and I am sure he is not  
contrary to him selfe. The Apostles had fayth before they wrote, and therefore it  
must needes be the scope.

Charke.

What kinde of answere is this? Speake to the purpose, or confesse your insuffi-  
ciencie. Basills owne wordes in this place doe euidently proue that hee is against  
you: answere them, or acknowledge your selfe not able to satisfie the Doctour.

Campion.

Was all written when the Apostles first taught?

Charke.

Is this any answere to Basill? Propoude no newe questions, but answere the  
former place so full against you.

Camp.



You see mine answere.

Charke.

I see and all men may see your vntrueth to shift off the matter. Basills wordes are too strong against you. To your newe question, I answere, that since the worde of God was first written, that which hath bene written, conteyned sufficient matter to saluation.

Campion.

Then what needed so many additions since, of the Prophets and Apostles writings, if we had sufficient before?

Charke.

The most honourable addition of the Prophetes and Apostles serued to a clearer manifestation of Christ, of whome Moses had written before, but added nothing to the substance.

## **In the after noone.**

### **The Question Whether faith onely iustifieth.**

M. Charkes prayer.

**O**Ur helpe is in the name of the Lorde, &c. Almighty God & merciful Father, we acknowledge against our selues, that we were conceiued and borne in sinne and corruption, that wee remaine vnprofitable to any thing that is good, and most prone and ready to that which is euill in thy fight. Ignorance doeth possesse our mindes, and dulnesse ruleth in our vnderstanding, so that of our selues wee can not see into thy glorious and excellent trueth: and in our selues wee finde no health, nor hope of health. Therefore, according to thy riche mercie, O Lord, take away our sinnes, and heale all our diseases, through the righteousnesse of Iesus Christ our onely saluation. Open our eyes we beseech thee, that wee may at this time beholde, and so frame our hearts, that we may gladly embrace thy most holy trueth as thou hast left it vnto vs, by thy holy seruants, the Prophets and Apostles. Graunt this knowledge and loue of the trueth, with dayly increase, not onely to vs, O Lorde, who through thy grace alreadie make profession thereof, but also vnto all those that yet set them selues against the same: that they acknowledging the trueth of thy word, may cleaue to it, forsaking all superstitious vanities, and seeing the all sufficient righteousnes & sacrifice of thy only sonne, may lay hold of it, denying them selues, & renouncing their own merites & falsly named righteousnes. Graunt vs these things, O heauenly Father, for thine onely sonnes sake Iesus Christ our alone sauour & redeemer, in whose name we aske the, praying as he hath taught vs: Our Father, &c.

Walker.

We haue in the forenoone entreated of the Canonicall scriptures and of their sufficiencie. Now we haue to entreate of fayth: God graunt vs grace that we may see the trueth, and hauing fayth may rest in it to our endelesse comfort. Let vs before we enter into the matter, declare somewhat concerning the state of the question. We holde therefore that we are iustified by fayth onely, and that freely, no other woorkes concurring for that purpose. And yet we set not downe a bare and naked fayth, as our aduersaries charge vs. For we confesse that fayth, hope, and charitie

are coupled and lincked together, and that loue is the greatest. But we affirme, that fayth onely is that instrument whereby we lay holde vpon the loue of God, which is the onely foundation of our saluation. By that title therefore wee exclude all mens workes and vertues as meritorious, and onely looke to the merits of Christ.

Camp.

I will declare to you my meaning also. Wee are agreed that God doeth iustifie, and for Christs sake onely, through his grace, and through his mercie alone, through his Sacraments and through baptisme. Thus farre we agree: but herein we disagree. For we say, that when God doth iustifie, he doth giue vs of his grace three distinct giftes, fayth, hope, and charitie, and these are as three causes of iustification, and charitie a principall cause, which frameth the first act in vs. We say therefore, that as grace is put in vs in iustification, so also our righteousnesse is enlarged through good workes, and is inherent in vs. Therefore it is not true that God doeth iustifie by fayth onely.

Charke.

Campion you are not to vse your old sleight in running from the matter, and loading one thing vpon an other. The question is, whether we be iustified by faith onely: that is now that which is in question, & to be decided: in non-Latin alphabet, and you are not to change the state of the question.

Walker.

Well, let your declaration stande for defence, although we agree not. For there are sundry causes of iustification, finall, and middle. But faith is the first thing in vs that receiueth iustification, and yet it is not of vs.

Camp.

I grant that there are mo causes then one.

Walker.

Well, though I be an olde man, and haue bene long from the vniuersitie, I meane yet to examine you in the grounds of these things, and to go with you from poynt to poynt, and so we shall find out our disagreement best. I pray you what is the Etymon of fayth?

Camp.

It is called fayth, Quia fit quod dictum est, Because it is performed that is spoken, as I take it.

Walker.

That is true, Dicitur a fiendo, quia Dominus fidelis est, Because the Lorde is faythfull, standing to his worde and keeping his promise with vs. But in vs, fayth is a certaintie or sure perswasion, and therefore it is called by the Apostle in non-Latin alphabet or elenchus, foundation or argument. It is therefore the ground, and before all other things that come after it, as the foundation is before the building.

Camp.

I grant it: But what inferre you hereof?

Walker.

This I inferre. Fayth is the grounde and before all things that come after it: Ergo it is before hope and charitie.

Camp.

In nature it is before them, but it doth not iustifie before they do come.

Walker.

Prius and posterius, First and last, bee taken diuers wayes. It is not before Tempore, but Dignitate & ordine: Not in time, but in dignitie and order.

Camp.

That is contrarie to S. Paul: For he sayth, Charitas est maior, Loue is greater.

Walker.

You must vnderstand what Paul meaneth therby. It is Maior duplici respectu. It is greater in a double respect. In respect of God, and in respect of men, and so extendeth further.

Camp.

Uery well: I like your causes well, but it is simplie greater and more excellent.

Walker.

Let me proceede then. It is greater in that it is more necessarie to the life of man, and also in diuturnitie, because it neuer dieth, nor hath any ende.

Camp.

I grant you all this. But what are those to the matter of iustification? But let me adde a thirde also, that it is digior, because faith and all good workes are nothing without loue. But let vs heare your argument.

Walker.

The ground is before that which is grounded vpon it, and in all good order we vse to set the most worthie first: Thus therefore I reason.

Faith is the foundation: ergo before the other.

Camp.

If you meane in dignitie, it is not true. It is before in order, but not in dignitie. For the roote is not more worthie then the tree, though it be afore it.

Walker.

Paul sayth Fundati & radicati in fide, speaking of the assurace they had in their saluation. And it was necessarie they should be thus grounded and rooted in the faith, before they could bring forth the fruits of faith. The fruits were good works, which were not the cause of their iustification, but the effects of men, engrafted in Christ & iustified already: this root was before ye fruit.

Camp.

I grant as before: In order but not in worthinesse. For the fruit is more worthie then the roote.

Walker.

Omnis causa efficiens est dignior effectu. Euerie efficient cause is more worthie then the effect.

Camp.

I deny that faith is the efficient cause of good works. It is a cause antecedent, but not efficient. But we are agreed vpon this. Let vs go to another argument.

Walk.

Uerie well, it is called in non-Latin alphabet a sure argument of things that are not seene: a thing vndoubted.

Camp.

Where is the place? It is called the foundation of euerlasting life, and an argument of things not seene, because I knowe it is by no other argument but by fayth. But what inferre you?

Walker.

You shall heare anon. What is Subiectum fidei, the subiect of fayth: and what is Obiectum fidei, the obiect of fayth? In quo versatu fides & circa quod: In what and about what is fayth occupied?

Camp.

Subiectum fidei, The subiect of faith, is man: to whom God hath giuen the gift of fayth, and thereupon man is denominate faythfull.

Walker.

Doth man consist of one part or more?

Camp.

Man doth consist of bodie and soule.

Walker.

Whether doe I receyue fayth into my bodie or soule chiefly?

Camp.

Fayth is receyued into the soule by the instrument of the bodie.

Walker.

What part of the soule is it receyued by? For the soule hath diuers potentias, faculties. Receyue we it per memoriam, voluntatem, or intellectum: by the memorie, will, or vnderstanding?

Campion.

I answere, the soule doth receiue it per intellectum, by vnderstanding illumined by fayth, because that part was properly corrupted by error.

Walker.

Why then, Intellectus humanus is subiectum fidei, in quo versatur, and so intellectu nos cognoscimus deum, Mans vnderstanding is the subiect in which faith is, and so, by the vnderstanding we know God.

Camp.

Intellectu illuminati per fidem cognoscimus. I grant we know God, our vnderstanding being illumined by fayth.

Walker.

And what now is obiectum fidei, The obiect of faith?

Camp.

Obiectum fidei, is truth inspired from God.

Walker.

Whether it be inspired or no, Truth is Obiectum still. Aeterna veritas est deus, ergo Deus est obiectum fidei, promissio Euangelij. Gods worde and his trueth is the obiect of fayth, and so sayth Thomas of Aquine one of your owne doctours.

Camp.

It is no obiect to me, till I looke to it. God as he is to be knowen, is the obiect of fayth, and as hee is to bee loued, of charitie.

Walker.

It is true: but God is incomprehensible, and wee knowe so farre of him as he hath reuealed of himselfe, as in creating to be Almighty, in gouerning to be wise, in preseruing to be true, and helping to be good, and in his promises to be sure and true: and so much he hath reuealed of himselfe. And this to apprehend, is sufficient to saluation.

Camp.

To apprehend these things effectually, so that we also obey his commandements, and not onely to grant them to be true, but also to apply these things to our selues through the passion of Christ, this is saluation and sufficient.

Walker.

Hact enus conuenit. Hitherto we agree. But Paul Rom. 4. writeth: Non haesitans fide, & nititur promissione. Not doubting in fayth, and leaning vpon the promise. So that there were two things: the promise, which must be beleued that it is true, and the power of God, that he is able to performe.

Camp.

Concedo, I grant it. And that made the fayth of Abraham to be fruitfull and meritorious.

Walker.

What, meritorious: But that is Perergon. I will come neerer to the matter. You will graunt likewise, that hope hath suum subiectum, & obiectum, her subiect, and obiect.

Camp.

Yea that I will, & that it is in the same soule of man, but more properly in voluntate & affectu, then in Intellectu, in the will and affection, then in the vnderstanding.

Walker.

That is verie true. Nowe tell me what is Obiectum spei, The obiect of hope.

Camp.

The good of the life to come.

Walker.

But what was the obiect especially of Abrahams hope:

Camp.

The same that is common to all other men, but seorsum: the comming of Christ the Messias, promised to him and his seede after him.

Walker.

What commoditie is promised to vs in Christ:

Campion.

Saluation, which is to haue eternall life with Christ.

Walker.

This promise being beleued and knowen by faith, is looked for by hope, & euery Christian ma hath a great desire to this saluation promised. Either he hath or shoulde haue, as Saint Paul, Cupio dissolui & esse cum Christo, I desire to be loosed and to be with Christ.

Camp.

When God hath enlightened his heart by charitie, then he hath that desire stedfast.

Walker.

Well then I wil leaue the obiect of hope and come to the subiect of charitie: What is the subiect of charitie:

Camp.

The affection of man.

Walker.

What is the obiect:

Camp.

It is God as he is beloued, quatenus appetitur propter se.

Walker.

Uery good: then you see the foundation and causes with the whole order of our iustification: what neede all the worlde haue any more, but first to beleue these things, next to looke for that which we hope for, thirdly to loue him who hath made vs this promise, and hath giuen vs these great benefites. Nowe see whether we are iustified by faith alone, or faith, hope, and charitie. But I leaue the persecuting of this to Master Charke.

Camp.

I graunt that this is the order of our iustification, wherein these doe ioynly conre and worke together.

Charke.

You may not auoyde the point and issue of the question, as you did in the forenoone, which is, that Faith only iustifieth. It is a chiefe question, and you can not carry the matter so vprightly betwixt the olde popery and the newe, but we shall easily finde you out: you say faith onely doeth not iustifie, but with faith, hope and charitie also are requisite, as causes and merits of our iustification, This is your cunning and newe Poperie to mention onely hope and charitie: yet vnder these wordes you carry the olde Poperie, which addeth popish shrift, penance, pilgrimages and other satisfactions: all which you would match with the death of Christ, if you might recouer your kingdome. But I haue to proue against you, that Faith onely doeth iustifie, without these merits and workes which you adde, as though the righteousnesse of Christ were not inough.

Camp.

I denie it: for you haue it not in all the word of God, that faith onely doeth iustifie.

Charke.

Surely if you acknowledge any doctrine to be true in all the Scripture, this of iustification by faith onely, will be proued most trus: if any plaine, this will appeare most plaine. And thus I proue it.

Euery doctrine, the substance and sense whereof is contened in Scriptures, is true:

But the substance and sense of this doctrine, Faith only doeth iustifie, is contened in Scriptures:

Therefore this doctrine Faith onely doeth iustifie, is true.

Camp.

I answere that this proposition Faith onely doeth iustifie is not to be founde in all the worde of God: and therefore I denie the Minor.

Charke.

I haue affirmed in my Minor that the substance and sense of this proposition Faith only doeth iustifie, is contened in the Scriptures. For profe hereof I haue in the worde of God eleuen places all negatiue, excluding workes in the matter of our saluation. Namely Rom. chap. 9. verse 11. where the Apostle saith, Not of workes. Againe chap. 11. ver. 6. Not of works. Also Galat. 2. ver. 16. Not of workes. Moreouer Rom. 4. 6. Without workes. Chap. 3. ver. 21. Without the Lawe. And so in the rest.

Camp.

Let me answere them.

Here the rest of the places were demaunded by them that wrote, and by others. Charke.

Turne further to these places. Rom. Chap. 3. verse 20. chap. 4. verse 13. Eph. 2. ver. 8. and verse 9. 2. Tim. 1. 9. Tit. 3. 5. beside some other.

Camp.

I doe but request that I may answere them seuerally, for not one of them proueth your assertion.

Charke.

If you answere any of them, I will subscribe to your doctrine in this point. Tush Camp. you may not thinke to face out the matter wt these bare words: Dare you say our iustification is partly of workes, when the holy Ghost saith so often plainly and exclusiuey, Not of workes: Without workes: Not of the lawe, but without the lawe: Herein I challenge you that make challenge against the trueth, & will proue that this weightie and great cause which may worthily be called the soule of the Church, is directly and plainly set downe in all these places. Denie it if you can.

Camp.

Bring one of the eleuen places.

Charke.

What say you to the Apostles conclusion Rom. 3. verse 20: Therefore by the deedes of the lawe, no flesh shall be iustified.

Camp.

Will you giue me leaue to answere, and to speake somewhat generally to this:

Charke.

You haue a particular place, make a particular answere, plainly and to the issue: roue not in generall discourses, that come not neere the marke.

Camp.

The meaning of Saint Paul in such places, is to exclude the Iewes Ceremonies. For the Iewes asseuering the obseruation of the lawe, the keeping of their sacrifices and ceremonies, as Circumcision, &c. to be necessarie to saluation: S. Paul informeth the Gentiles that these things were not so necessary, but faith was sufficient. This he vrgeth throughout the Scripture: So that faith is vrged, but not faith only. Againe, by faith is meant all Christianitie and the whole religion of Christians, which is sufficient, without any parcell of the Iewes religion. This is one generall consideration, why Paul so often vrgeth faith, throughout the Epistle to the Romanes, and else where. Another generall consideration is, for that the wise men of the Gentiles did alledge their moralities as a cause of their election, which Paul in the same Epistle stoode specially vpon, and meant to confute, as is afore sayde.

Charke.

Whether of these two interpretations you will allowe, it followeth by your owne exposition, that the Apostle concluding for faith against workes, concludeth that it is Faith only that iustifieth: shutting out all such workes as are opposed vnto it. Nowe whereas you say that the workes opposite to faith, are onely either the morall workes of the Gentiles, or the Ceremoniall of the Iewes: I will easily ouerthrowe the distinction.

Camp.

Ouerthrowe it then.

Charke.

First, there was neuer any such errour mainteined in the Church, that the morall workes of the Gentiles shoulde iustifie: therefore Paul neuer laboured so much and so often to confute that errour which did not trouble the Church. As for the Ceremonial workes, the Apostles writing to the Ephesians, not iustified with the obseruation of Iewish ceremonies, had no cause to barre ceremoniall workes from iustification. Therefore he teacheth that all the workes of the faithfull, euen of Abraham, are excluded from being causes of iustification, and not Ceremonies onely, or the moralities of heathen men, as you imagine against the Apostles argument, and scope in those places.

Camp.

The generall scope of Saint Paul, is to exclude all workes both of Iewes and Gentiles in that Epistle: but in the way of discourse I denie not, but incidently another answeere is to be giuen.

Charke.

This last part of your speach is in non-Latin alphabet : the first doeth graunt all that I desire.

Camp.

He excludeth the precedent workes of Abraham.

Charke.

The ende why workes are secluded from iustification doeth proue for me: for the Apostle in that place sheweth the finall counsaile & purpose of the Lord, to be farre otherwise then you suppose. And to remember my promise of Syllogisme, I will proue it by the very forme of the Apostles wordes.

The ende and the meanes differ not:

The ende of our iustification was to exclude all workes precedent or consequent from being causes of iustification:

Therefore the meanes also must exclude euen all workes precedent and consequent, going before or comming after.

Camp.

The ende was not to exclude all workes consequent.

Charke.

Whatsoever it was wherein Abraham might glorie, that was excluded from iustification:

But in workes consequent or following he might glorie:

Therefore they also and al other workes whatsoever, first and last, are secluded and can be no cause or piece of cause, in our iustification.

Camp.

The example of Abraham proueth that Abraham was iust before the couenant of Circumcision, and so, before the lawe of Moses was giuen: and therefore he inferreth that the Iewes must not glorie of iustification through their lawe and by the ceremonies thereof, seeing their father Abraham was iust before circumcision, and therefore circumcision not necessary to iustification. But though workes voyde of Christ are nothing, yet thorowe grace they serue to iustification.

Charke.



Is this your way to answeere Syllogismes, to tell a tale of your owne, and expaunde newe matter, leauing the question? Answere shortly.

Abraham hath nothing left to glorie in:

Therefore all workes whatsoever are excluded: and so, faith onely iustifieth.

Camp.

That is another place.

Charke.

Answere it then, be it another, or the same.

Camp.

The Apostle meaneth to shewe that Abraham was iustified by workes done in grace, and not by workes without expectation of Christ, or voide of Christ.

Charke.

An open contradiction to the holy Ghost: note it. The Apostle (faith Master Campion) proueth that Abraham was iustified by workes. I reply against you with a double argument. First, Abraham had all his workes of Christ, for hee was faithfull: therefore the works excluded, are works wrought in grace. Secondly, he speaketh not of him as of an infidel, but as being the father of beleeuers: Therefore the Apostle excludeth not workes without expectation of Christ as you speake. Answere it, Campion.

Camp.

I answeere, that no workes of Abraham are excluded.

Charke.

And I haue proued that all are excluded: and you can neither answeere the syllogisme, nor satisfie the place of Saint Paul. The text and argument is cleare.

If Abraham were iustified by any workes, he had wherein to glorie:

But he could not glorie in any thing, (for that were absurde by the Apostles reason:)

Therefore there were no workes of merite or iustification in him.

Camp.

This is the Apostles reason, All the good workes of Abraham were founded in Christ, and by these good workes he was iustified: therefore he was iustified by Christ. For if he had bene iustified by other workes excluding Christ, he might haue gloried, and not bene iustified by Christ.

Charke.

I can goe no further in this argument. For in non-Latin alphabet is against you, that is, the plaine text and argument. Also I aduow it and make all this companie witnesses, that you haue vttered in these straytes, plaine contradictorie propositions. The Apostle proueth that Abraham was iustified by workes, he leaueth nothing for Abraham to glorie in: but you leaue wherein he may both glorie, and iustifie him selfe. You haue also said the precedent workes of Abraham were excluded, and (which is the contrarie) that no workes of Abraham were excluded. These things are very bad, which I the rather repeate, to lay open your contradictions for some that I thinke are present, and looke for no such weakenesse in their Champion.

Camp.

What neede you aduowe? I aduowe the contrarie. And I say, that Abraham was iustified by good workes in Christ.

Charke.

There is no such worde in Paul, but the contrary very often. Therefore your affirmatiue is contrarie to the holy Ghostes often repeated negatiue, Not of workes, Without workes.

Camp.

I say you must repent before you die, or else you shall finde what it is to charge me with that which is not true. A particular example must haue a particular answeere. His workes be not to his glorie, because his works were fouded in Christ, therefore Christ must be all to his glorie. Ahraham was alreadie iust and in the fauour of God before these things were sayde, and so being iust, he was made more iust: and so first iust, and afterward iustified, and was not iustified by workes that went before his iustification, but being alreadie iust was made more iust by works. And this was one of his good workes, Creditit deo, he beleued in God: and to say the Creede is a meritorious worke: and the worke of faith is a worke.

Charke.

These discourses you might well haue spared, and framed a short answeere to my argument: For yet you answeere not the Apostles negatiue, which ouerthroweth both your affirmatiue & your distinction contradictorie to the Apostles wordes. For, to be iustified without workes, as the Apostle saith, and to be iustified by workes, as you say, are contradictorie: if your words be true, the Apostles are false. But seeing I can haue nothing for answeere but indirect speaches, or wordes ful of contradiction: I will giue place a while.

Walker.

We that be the children of Abraham, and Christians, are iustified by the same faith that Abraham was iustified:

But Abraham was iustified by faith onely, and by nothing else:

Therefore we are iustified by faith, and by nothing else: that is, by faith onely.

Camp.

I answeere to the Maior: As Abraham being a iust man, was made more iust by a liuing faith: so the children of Abraham being alreadie iustified, eucrease their righteousnesse by a liuing faith.

Walker.

Doe you thinke that we are borne of our parents, as the sonnes of Abraham, or as the sonnes of Adam? Are we iustified by the fame meanes that Abraham was, or no?

Camp.

Yea, by the same meanes.

Walker.

But Abraham was iustified by faith onely: therefore we.

Camp.

I denie the Antecedent.

Walker.

Paul saith, Sed robustus factus est fide, &c. Rom. 4. Imputatum est illi ad iustitiam. And whether did faith giue credite to the promise of God, whose proper and onely office it is?

Campion.

To giue credite to the promise is the proper office of faith: but to giue credite to the office of God effectually, is the office both of faith and charitie.

Walker.

In the office of giuing credite, you adde that which is not in the text.

Camp.

It must needes be vnderstoode, because the Apostle speaketh of Abraham alreadie iustified, which had not bene possible, if he had not had faith and charitie.

Walker.

What made him giue glorie to God? *Robustus factus fide, dedit gloriam deo.* Being made strong in faith, he gaue glorie to God.

Camp.

The good worke gaue glorie to God: For it was a good worke in Abraham.

Charke.

I will vse another Argument.

Whosoouer is iustified, is iustified according to the tenour eyther of the first or of the seconde couenant (for there are but two couenants:)

But no man is iustified according to the tenour of the first couenant, which is by the workes of the lawe:

Therefore by the forine or tenour of the seconde, which is by Faith onely.

Camp.

I graunt all in this sense: By Faith onely, not as Faith is distinct from charitie, but as faith is distinct from the olde lawe: so that the worde onely doeth exclude all things impertinent to faith, and include all things inherent to faith.

Charke.

Wordes. I will proue them to be but wordes, following my argument. The charter or stipulation of the first couenant is, Doe this and thou shalt liue: of the seconde, The righteous man shall liue by Faith. Therefore this forme of speach in the Couenant, excludeth your implication and all ioyning of workes with faith.

Camp.

I answere, that the Formula of the second couenant, is Christ.

Charke.

You vnderstande not then what Formula is.

Camp.

Teach me then.

Charke.

I will teach you. Christ, I graunt, is the cause and authour of the couenant of saluation: but the forme or tenour of a couenant are *concepta & stata verba*, the set and standing wordes, whereby the condition and issue of the couenant is expressed. For example, of the first couenant published in Sinai, this is the forme: *Hoc fac & viues*, Doe this and thou shalt liue: of the second out of Sion, this: *Iustus ex fide viuet*, The iust shall liue by faith: which is in effect, Beleeue this and thou shalt liue.

Camp.

The seconde couenant is all the religion of Christ, which includeth fayth, hope, and charitie. For otherwise the Eucharist were excluded. Hee meaneth therefore by fayth all obedience.

Charke.

This is expressly against the Apostles doctrine and argument, Galat. 3. vers. 11, 12. who there proueth, that faith and workes are opposite causes of saluation.

Camp.

The second couenant is, that we shall be saued by doing those things that Christ commanded: and the first couenant was by doing all that Moses commanded. And this is the very interpretation and meaning of the Apostle. The righteous shal liue by fayth, that is, by fayth of Christ.

Charke.

A false position. I pray you, is obedience the faith of Christ: Is it faith to fulfill that which Christ commadeth, or not rather to beleue that he hath promised and performed?

Camp.

Yea, that it is.

Charke.

How can that be, seeing the Apostle Gal. 3. vers. 12. doth not onely set downe the two couenants in Sinai and Sion, with their seuerall forme of words, but addeth plainly, The lawe is not of fayth, and maketh workes and fayth opposite causes of iustificatio: teaching that he yt is iustified by Christ is not iustified by workes: and he that is iustified by workes looseth the benefite of Christ. Your wordes therefore must haue a third couenant, that the righteous man liueth partly by fayth, and partly by workes, or else they cannot stand.

Camp.

I answere to this, The law is not of fayth: that is, the law as it is a naked commandement is a burthen, and so it is not of fayth, that is, it doth not giue the iustice which we haue by fayth of Christ.

Charke.

You haue giuen a false and grosse interpretation: and thus I proue it. If your distinction be good, then there is either a third couenant, or the couenant of the lawe is mixed with the couenant of the Gospell: But no man will say that there is a third couenant, and the Apostle proueth yt in the work of our iustificatio the couenant of the lawe doth no way participate with the couenat of fayth: therefore your distinction saying, as it is a burden, is not good, and your interpretation absurd and false.

Camp.

I answer to the Minor, that the law is considered two maner of wayes. The couenant of the lawe, as it is of the lawe, is no way mixed with the couenant of the Gospell: but as it is the couenant of the lawe eternall, of the lawe morall, of the lawe of nature, it is mixed with the new testament, & Christ hath renued it in the lawe of charitie. Moses gaue it one way: and Christ another. Moses the lawe maker: and Christ the law giuer. Praeceptum nouum do vobis, vt diligatis inuicem. I giue you a newe commandement, that ye loue one another.

Charke.

What absurde speaches are these, to make a substantiall distinction of the lawe in regard of the minister, or of the time: The morall lawe and commandement of God is euermore the same in substance.

Camp.

I vnderstand not what you meane. I say it is mixed: but as it is mixed, it is not called Moses law, but y law of Christ, who gaue it more perfectly. &c

Charke.

Againe, I say this is absurde: for the lawe of God was alway the lawe of God: and therefore the same, and exacteth the same obedience: which because no man can performe, no man can liue thereby.

Camp.

You are still gathering absurdities.

Charke.

I must gather them where you scatter them. For what materiall difference can there be made of one and the same thing. The second couenant offereth life, onely by faith in Christ: the former onely by workes: and these cannot be confounded, as you confound and huddle them together. Thus your answeres are from the arguments.

Camp.

My answeres are to the purpose. What is it that you would haue more of me:

Charke.

Is your answer to the purpose, that mixeth & confoundeth the two couenants, which are so opposite by ye Apostles place alledged, that he which cleaueth to the one, can receiue nothing by the other: For the couenant of the lawe can beare no transgression: and to iustifie vs, the couenant of fayth needeth no satisfaction or workes on our part, Christ hauing most fully wrought and satisfied for vs. Therefore, it is the pride of man to thinke, and the error of man to teach, that the righteousnesse of Christ is not sufficient without addition of our righteousnesse.

Camp.

Well, shewe me but that negatiue sola, onely, in all the Scriptures.

Charke.

This is a new matter: I woulde haue the olde first satisfied.

Camp.

Shew it me: can you not shew it:

Charke.

Seeing you would shift off the former argument by crauing a newe: I am contented to proue that exclusiue tearme, which you call negatiue.

Whatsoever excludeth all other causes in iustification, that remayneth a sole cause:

Fayth excludeth all other causes in iustification:

Faith therefore remaineth a sole and onely cause.

Camp.

Proue your Minor.

Charke.

The absolute negatiues so often repeated in the Scripture, Not of workes: Without workes: Not of the law: Without the law: do plainly exclude all other causes.

Camp.

Will you by this argument exclude al causes besides fayth: Then with good workes you will also exclude the mercy of God. What is your meaning:

Charke.

What a vanitie is there in this question: Understande you not that I speake onely of causes in vs, excluding no former causes, as the eternall decree and loue of God, the obedience and righteousnesse of Christ:

Camp.

Proue that Sola fides, onely fayth is in the scripture.

Charke.

I haue proued it: and why doe you not answere the argument:

Camp.

What argument would ye haue me answere:

Charke.

The last. All other causes in vs are excluded by the worde of God, where it is sayde so often, Not of workes: Not of the lawe: therefore sola fides, fayth onely remaineth, by many testimonies of the Scriptures.

Campion.

This fides is Christian obedience, and hath good workes.

Charke.

I graunt as the good tree hath good fruite necessarily, so fayth hath good workes: but these good workes, though they be not separated from fayth, are yet separated from being any cause of iustification with fayth. As light, though it bee not separated from fire: yet it is separated from the force of burning: for the heate burneth, and not the light of fire.

Campion.

But where proue you that sola, onely, is in the Scripture:

Charke.

My argument hath fully and plainly proued it: you neither will nor can answere it. Therefore to proue it againe, because the text Deut. 6. hath the negatiue, Thou shalt serue no strange gods: Christ Mat. 4. addeth the worde ONELY, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him ONELY shalt thou serue. So we by the same warrant and worde, do in this question of iustification take these words, Not by works, Not by the law, to import as much as faith onely: for al works whatsoever, being excluded by these negatiue speaches, faith alone remaineth.

Camp.

Why, doth he say, Thou shalt worship by fayth onely:

Char.

I had hedged you in before, that you should not leape ouer to run at large in your bie questions. I sayd Christ Mat. 4. thus alledged against the tempter, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serue. This negatiue ONLY is not in Moses, yet added by Christ for interpretations sake, to expound words importing it, as I haue said before: & so do we in the matter of iustification, finding all righteousnes by workes or by the lawe so oftentimes excluded, doe conclud thereupon, that fayth onely doth iustifie.

Camp.

The word adorabis doth of necessitie infer so much, and therefore Christ doth well to expound it by onely. But the worde iustifie doth not necessarily inferre the excluding of workes. And therefore you do not well to inferre, Faith only iustifieth.

Charke.

What: do you not blush to bring this strange & false distinction against a cleare truth of God: Or wil you ouerthrow a maine pillar of Poperie for auoiding the force of one poore argument: Doth the word adorabis exclude all other creatures, and necessarily inforce that God alone must be worshipped: TheCampion condemmeth al images, all adoration of the crucifix, all inuocation & worshipping of saints. For to adore or to worship (sayth he) importeth that adoration & worship is due to God

only: & so he excludeth all creatures fro worship, euen the crucifix that they say must haue the adoration done to it, which is due to Christ himself.

Camp.

What needeth all this: it foloweth not which you say. There is much differece betwene to adore & to reuerence or serue. For latria or to adore is due to God onely, and dulia to serue, is that which I may yeeld to any Saint, or creature.

Charke.

Yes, the speach needeth, and the argument foloweth. For your verball distinction of Greeke wordes to deceiue English people, is vnlearned and impious, to saye in non-Latin alphabet is for God onely, (which yet, as I sayde, you allowe to the bare image of Christ) and in non-Latin alphabet for Images. Can all knowe and keepe a iust weight and measure in their deuotions, giuing no more but iust in non-Latin alphabet to saintes? To bee short, the error and vnlearnednesse of your distinction appeareth, that not vnderstanding the vse and proper signification of the worde in non-Latin alphabet, you haue allowed it to be giuen to Images, being a worde that noteth as base and as slauish bondage as any worde in the Greeke tongue: so by your distinction the worshippers of the Church must be as bondmen to their Images. Thus you see onely is gathered fitly of the negatiue, and that your distinction is both false, and also against your owne doctrine of Image worship.

Campion.

I saye it is gathered from both, and the negatiue not sufficient alone, but because of the matter speaking of God.

Charke.

Why then I perceiue you will borrowe of me for a neede. Before you said Adorabis included onely, nowe you come to me and say it is gathered also of the negatiue. This is al I can desire.

Camp.

Fayth onely as it is a good worke, ioyned with hope and charitie, doeth iustifie.

Charke.

I woulde not haue you to abuse the companie, in graunting fayth onely, and yet you will expounde it, Fayth not alone. It is a straunge onely, that is not alone. Furthermore, Fayth as it is a good woorke, doeth not iustifie, being alwayes imperfect, but as it apprehendeth the righteousnesse of Christ which is perfect, That is, as it is a piece of obedience to the promise of God, it doeth not iustifie, but as it apprehendeth the precious promises.

Campion.

You are still charging mee with abusing the companie: but if you will giue mee leaue, I will declare howe fayth is a woorke. There is an habite, which is called Fides, and the act of this habite within a man is credere, to beleue, an act interior proceeding from this habite. An act exterior proceeding from this habite, is to professe this fayth consonant to the Apostle, With the heart I beleue, and with the mouth I confesse. Nowe, I saye, to beleue is fyrst a good woorke, and to professe this fayth, is also a good woorke. As to giue an almes, to fast, to doe penance, &c. and this fayth Abraham had. And your saying is contrary to Saint Iames. Abraham pater noster nonne ex operibus iustificatus est, offerens filium suum Deo? Abraham our father, was he not iustified by woorkes, offering vp his sonne?

Charke.

My saying is not contrary to Saint Iames: but your obiection is in non-Latin alphabet, farre from the question in hande. Wee dispute what be the causes of saluation, and you runne out to the notes and effects of him that is iustified.

Campion.

Let me oppose. Is it not reason that I shoulde oppose?

Charke.

Yes, when you are thereto appoynted, and you shall fynde enowe to answeere you. Yet because you haue so often chalenged vs to answeere you an argument, though I come not with any commission to suffer you to proue your erroneous doctrine: I will notwithstanding, suffer you to oppose and make an argument in this matter. First giuing the companie to vnderstande, that you woulde deceiue them with an opinion that our aduantage is great in replying: but it is not so. If your cause were good and your skill great, you might make it harder to reply, then to answeere. For the answerer may with a worde deny the proposition, and so, soone take from the replyer all his weapons. But make your argument.

Here Campion paused long before he coulde frame his argument. Whereupon Master Charke sayde: a Syllogisme, Campion, a Syllogisme. Yet staying longer, Master Charke sayde, We shall haue it anone.

Camp.

He that was iustified for beleeuing, was iustified by a good worke:

But Abraham was iustified by beleeuing:

Ergo Abraham was iustified by a good woorke. The Maior is out of Saint Iames, Chapter 3. *Suppleta est Scriptura, dicens, &c.*

Charke.

Proue your Maior in the sense we dispute of, and I wil answeere you to two other Syllogismes.

Camp.

It is easely proued.

Charke.

Howe can you proue it out of Saint Iames, that fayth is a good woorke? When Saint Iames sayeth, Abraham was iustified by good woorkes, his meaning is, that Abraham is declared and knowen to be iust according to that phrase, Wisedome is iustified of her children. Againe, all the people and Publicans iustified God.

Campion.

I will none of your interpretations: the question is cleare with me.

Charke.

I woulde fayne haue of your answeres, so they were to the purpose of the argument.

Campion.

Procede, and proue somewhat for your cause.

Charke.

I haue proued more then you can answeere. And because you generally slaunder vs, that our doctrine concerning this, and other principall poyntes of religion, is against the Doctours: (although the Scriptures bee large, full and sufficient ynough, and are the onely touchstone for the tryall of sounde and true doctrine,) yet I will not sticke a little to followe you in this.



Cyprian, Basill, Ambrose, Theodoret, Hierome, Gennadius, all these Greeke and Latine Fathers, doe flatly and fully teache that we are saued by fayth onely.

Campion.

Bring mee one of them, and I will answere you.

Charke.

There is a notable place out of Basill in non-Latin alphabet, where, of purpose disputing of humilitie, among other notes hee sheweth that wee must attribute all to the grace and ryghteousnesse of God, who alone is our glorie, our wisdom, and our iustification. Thereupon falling into this question, hee sayeth, a man must acknowledge him selfe voyde of true righteousnesse, and in non-Latin alphabet. That is, a man must knowe, that hee is iustified by onely fayth in Christ. I English it to your hande, because you deale not with the Greeke.

Campion.

I acknowledge your places: and yet your doctrine is vtterly newe. For the Fathers when they vrge that doctrine, they dyd it in respect they had to deale with Iewes and Infidels and Pagans. And further, by faith they meant Christian religion, excluding Paganisme, and not excluding charitie and good workes.

Charke.

Our doctrine newe, and yet the auncient Doctours teache it: I aske with what conscience or iudgement you can saye it. Dyd the Apostle writing to the Romanes, to the Galathians, to the Ephesians, Churches so effectually called and reclaymed from Gentilisme, that he termeth the Saintes and brethren, and affirmeth that they are no more darkenesse, but light in the Lorde: Did the Apostle (I say) writing to them, deale as against Iewes and Pagans? I maruayle you blush not at so fowle a shift and so palpable an errour. But will you not vouchsafe the Doctours an answere? shall they be sent away before they haue receiued their answere?

Camp.

They wrote vpon occasion against an heretike, hauing affiance in workes.

Charke.

Be it so: then they write aswell against Papists, hauing affiance in workes.

Camp.

They had affiance in workes done without Christ, and are therefore reprobued by the Fathers.

Charke.

This is onely sayde, to shake them all off with one false distinction. Agayne, it was a straunge occasion (you speake of) that made the Fathers write an vntrueth. But rather you are straunge to expounde them directly against their wordes, saying, Faith onely doeth iustifie. I could here helpe you with a better answere, which the better learned on your side vse to this obiection.

Camp.

It was the heresie, that most troubled Christians in the Primitiue Church.

Charke.

This is a newe question, and in doubt. But howe will you euer bee able to proue that the Apostle disputing for iustification by fayth against iustification by woorkes, excludeth onely Paganisme: Answere this.

Camp.

I haue answered.

Charke.

In deede you haue stil somewhat to say, but not to answere that point of ye argument which most woundeth your cause. Therefore a Syllogisme against your shift.

The Apostle excludeth the morall Lawe from iustifying:

Therefore your distinction is wast.

Camp.

But he excludeth not charitie and good workes.

Charke.

What a But is that? Is there any charitie, or be there any good workes not conteyned vnder the morall and eternall Lawe of God? If the deedes of the morall Lawe be shut out from the causes of our iustification by S. Paul, what doore can you open to let them in againe?

Camp.

I say, charitie and good workes are not excluded.

Charke.

And I say this is still to begge the question, and not to answere the Argument. So your doctrine is sufficiently ouerthrowen.

Walker.

Besides a great sort of places that master Charke hath brought, Sadolet one of your owne, hath a plaine place in Epist. ad Rom. Abraham attulit tantum fidem, non sua opera. And againe, Quantum quisque affert de sua iustitia, tantum defert de diuina beneficentia. &c.

Camp.

It is but lost time that you alleadge Sadolet. Hee was but a man of late yeres, whose credite is not to be set against the determination of the whole Church: besides, his meaning was, that man should not trust in his owne workes.

Walker.

You will allowe no man, neither those that are against you, nor with you. But if he had dealt as soundly in other things as in this, he had bene to be striued withall. He sheweth by an apt similitude, that if a man take a Potte hauing some troubled water in it, and goeth to the cleare water to fill it, the troubled foule water in the potte doeth not become cleare, but rather troubleth and defileth the water which was cleare: Euen so, the more we bring of our owne, the lesse we attribute to God, and the lesse we receiue from God. Wee must bring nothing of our owne to God. It is troubled water when we mingle our workes and righteousnes with Gods.

Camp.

Let the similitude be rehearsed. It is an apt similitude. He that commeth to be iustified by Christ must not bring troubled water, but cleare: that is, those good workes that he did before, and those prayers that he made before, his morall deedes, his almes, his fasting, &c. For all the morall workes that are done before, they are troubled water: but those we doe afterwards, they are made cleare in the Passion of Christ, although they be not in all respects perfect.

Charke.

I wil so proue that good workes haue no place in iustification, that you shall not be able to answere: and because the Doctors can haue no answere, I will returne to Scripture.

Sanctification and iustification are two sundry things:

Therefore good workes, the fruites of sanctification, haue no place in iustification.

Camp.

Make your Syllogisme.

Charke.

Whatsoever is an effect of sanctification that followeth, is not a cause of iustification that went before:

But charitie and other good woorkes are effectes of sanctification which followeth:

Therefore they be no causes of iustification which goeth before. Answere if you can.

Camp.

I deny that they are onely of sanctification: they are of both.

Charke.

They be disparata, handled by the Apostle as diuers things: also the one, some degrees before the other. Therefore you doe euil to confound priora & posteriora, the effectes of the latter, with the causes of the former.

Camp.

Is this the argument that can not be answered? I say whosoever is iustified, is also sanctified: and so, good workes proceede from both.

Charke.

Let all men marke the absurditie of this speache. If good workes proceede from sanctification, and sanctification from iustification, howe can good workes goe before them both as a cause, seeing they come after both as an effect: Thus you are entoyled.

Here was an open misliking of the answeres, and some speach of making an ende. Then M. Charke saide, I woulde faine vse one argument more, to turne Campion out of all his shiftes, and to let the company vnderstand his weakenes, and especially the weakenes of his cause.

Campion.

Let vs heare what argument this is, whereof you make such bragges.

Charke.

The authoritie and trueth of scriptures for my cause maketh me so confident. Therefore marke the argument well.

We are iustified by Imputation onely:

Therefore by faith onely.

Camp.

Nego Maiorem. I deny your Maior.

Charke.

I proue the Maior, if you so call it.

Christ died onely by Imputation:

Therefore we liue onely by Imputation, and are consequently iustified by faith onely.

Camp.

I deny the argument.

Charke.

I proue it by Analogie.

Christ died onely through the imputation of our sinne:

Therefore if we liue, we liue onely by the imputation of his righteousnes.

And therefore to say that we liue by any imputation of our owne good workes, is asmuch as to say, that Christ died by imputation of some of his owne sinne. For this analogie and proportion betwixt the causes of Christes death, and the causes of our life, doth necessarily hold, and must diligently be obserued.

Camp.

I answere to your similitude.

Charke.

If it be a similitude, it is by good analogie and demonstration of trueth out of the scripture. It is you that abuse the hearers with similitudes that are not similia: my argument is demonstratiue.

Camp.

I answere then to your analogie. So farre as the scripture doth intend, it holdeth: like as Christ did beare our sinnes, so we haue in vs the iustice of Christ. The righteousnes that we haue, is giuen vs by Christ. Christ had our sinnes by imputation onely, because hee was not capable of sinnes inherent. But we are capable of iustice inherent, which Christ doth giue vs, and therefore in vs we haue the iustice of Christ, both by imputation, and also inherent, giuen by him. And therefore it is called the iustice, Non qua ipse iustus est, sed qua nos iustos fecit, Not whereby he is iust, but whereby he hath made vs iust.

Walker.

Sinnes inherent in vs, and righteousnes inherent in Christ:

Camp.

Nay, I say righteousnes inheret in vs giue by Christ.

Charke.

Campion ye answere not the argument, but in place of answering you lay downe newe positions. Your inherent righteousnes is not graunted you: if it were, yet it followeth not that it should bee a fellowe cause in our iustification with Christes righteousnes.

Camp.

I say we haue inherent righteousnes, and Christ had not inherent sinne.

Charke.

What answere is this to my argument? If we had it, yet it followeth no more that it should iustifie vs, then the inherent sparke and light of nature which is leaft, should make vs able of our selues clearely to behold the hidden mysterie of the grace and mercie of God, reuealed onely by fayth in the Gospell.

Camp.

Will you not admitte an answere?

Charke.

You are graued. It is no answere to bring a newe and false position, & that not applied to the argument. But I will not let you rest in this starting hole, you shall haue Syllogismes.

Our sinnes alone were of full sufficient force by imputation to condemne Christ vnto death:

Therefore his righteousnes alone is of full and sufficient force by imputation to iustifie vs vnto life. Againe, and shortly.

In Christ there was no inherent sinne to be any cause of his condemning:

Therefore in vs is no inherent righteousnes to be any cause of our iustifying.

Camp.

I dispute not how he might haue iustified, but by what meanes he doth iustifie vs.

Charke.

This is plainely in non-Latin alphabet, to say the least. Answer the reasons. Doe my arguments proue howe he was able, or rather proue they not most manifestly howe he hath iustified vs? But as the Scribes & Pharisees supposed some inherent sinne in Christ, so you their successors, suppose some inherent righteousnes in vs: and we shall as truely liue by this, as he iustly dyed for that.

Campion.

I deny the argument, because his will is otherwise.

Charke.

Here againe is a newe proposition brought in place of an answer. But I haue proued that GOD hath done it: and therein reuealed his will which is most holy and most perfect in al proportion of iustice.

Camp.

I deny it. For we haue inherent righteousnes.

Charke.

I would you would so answer as men might see with what iudgement ye vse so many denials. But I will followe my argument, and proue there is no inherent righteousnes in vs, whereby we are more or lesse iustified.

If we haue any inherent righteousnes as a fellowe or helping cause of our iustification, then the righteousnes of Christ is not alone without vs, so full and absolute to our saluation, as were our finnes to cause his condemnation:

But Christs righteousnes alone without our inherent righteousnes, is de facto, as full and perfect euery way:

Therefore we are aswell de facto, iustified onely by the imputation of his righteousnes, as he was condemned onely for the imputation of our sinne.

Camp.

I deny the Minor.

Charke.

You deny it manifestly against the doctrine of the Apostle. Rom. 5. teaching that there was more force in the righteousnes of Christ to saluation, then was in our sinne to condemnation. Whereupon you are turned out of your shiftes, and must confesse that as Christ was condemned onely for the imputation of our sinne, without any inherent sinne of his owne: so are we iustified onely by the imputation of his righteousnes, without any inherent righteousnes of ours. Which who so denieth, he shalbe found to match mans supposed righteousnes, with the righteousnes of God: and to exalt flesh and blood against the almightie.

Here Master Lieutenant signified the time was past.

## Let vs conclude with prayer.

ALMightie GOD and most mercifull Father, we giue thee humble and heartie thanks in the name of Iesus Christ, for all thy goodnes, especially, for the alone and

all sufficient sacrifice of Iesus Christ, beseeching thee, that renouncing all opinion of any righteousnes of our owne, we may by faith lay holde of his righteousnes to our euerlasting saluation. Also wee thanke thee for the inestimable treasure and armour of thy holy worde, whereby thou makest thy children rich in all spirituall and heauenly wisdome, inhabling them, euen the weakest of them, to triumphe against proud and bold ignorance, against the deceitfull and lying spirits gone out into the world in these last times, to deceiue those that receiue not the knowledge and loue of thy trueth. Moreouer, good Lord, as it hath pleased thee to vouchsafe some blessing vpon our labours this day, for which we likewise giue thee thanks: so we beseech thee yet further to blesse them, that the trueth may be more and more precious to thy children, and that they which are yet without, may either acknowledge the power and light of thy Gospell, if they belong to thee: or being none of thine, may stand conuicted in their owne conscience, as children of darkenesse, and haue their mouthes stopped, which they so open against the light and trueth of thy most holy word. Graunt vs these things, O Lorde, and whatsoeuer else may serue to thy glory and our saluation, through Iesus Christ our onely Lorde and Sauour.

Amen.

Io. Walker.

W. Charke.

Imprinted at London by Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie.

Anno 1583.