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A TREATISE
Of the Images of Christ, and of his Saints: and that it is unlaufful
to breake them, and laualful to honoure them.
With a Contrautation of such salue doctrine
as M. Lewel hath vttred in his Replie,
concerning that matter.
Made by Nicolas Sander, Doctor of Dinnitie.

Ecclesiastici. 45.

Memoria dilecti Deo, in benedictionibus est.

5 The Remembrance of the Memorial of the
beloved of God, is blessed. That is to say, any
thing which maketh vs remember him that is
beloved of God, is worthy of praise and of honor.

LOVANII,
Apud Ioannem Fowlerum,
1567.
THE

PREFACE

CONTAINING A

Brief Declaration, which is the true Church of Christ.

Wrote of the honouring of holy Images, not because I lacked a better Argument to Write of, but because the tyme prouoked me so to doe, and it was also a truthe, which ought not to be neglected in any matter, be it neuer so smal. Yea the smaller the matter is, the more honor is don to God, if his truthe euen in that be half be iustly defended.

But when I had ended the work, considering that although I should persuade the Reader, that...
The Preface concerning honour is due to the Images of Christ and of his Saints, yet I could not gaine any great thing thereby, except I might wholly recover to the Catholike Church some of the, who by ignorance had wandered out of the right way: I thought it good to make a general Preface to this particular Treatise, to thend I might move my Countriemen (not only in this point of honouring holy Images, but much rather in all the rest) to returne again to the Church, wherein they and their Fathers had been baptized, instructed, brought vp, and nourished.

I will therefore brefely repeate certain knowne truths, whereby a man (not willfull nor stubburn) may generally informe himself, where he may be surest to find the true Church of Christ, which is the pillar and sure stay of truthe.

* Christ hath alwaies had, and for ever
which is the true Church.

euer shall have a cumpaine of men who beleue in him, and profess their faith by outward Sacraments: Within the which cumpany (as it were within the Ark of Noe) all must be, who wilbe saued fro euerlasting damnation.

This cumpaine (being named commonly the Church) is that vnto Christ, which a great Kingdom or a great common weale is vnto an other Prince. And therefore the Church is called the Citie of God, and the kingdō of heauē, wherein Christ shal reigne for euer.

As the founder and King of this heauenly Kingdō is a mountain which filleth the whole earth, and passeth all other Kings in wisdom, power, and might: So his common weale and Kingdom is spread more amply, and gouerned more prudently, the any Kingdō or Empire euer was. In so much that al Natiōs,
The Preface concerning, yea the very ends of the world are the inheritaunce of Christ, and his own possession, whom he governeth in a rod of iron, that is to saie, by a strong power, which shall not faile, nor be wasted at any tyme.

To saie, that this Church or Kingdom of Christ did lie priuie, or was hidden any one hower (after that he had planted it in all Countries by his Apostles) it is to make Christes Kingdom more obscure, then euer the Synagogue of the Iewes was, or then euer the Monarchies of the Assyrians, of the Persians, of the Grecians, or of the Romans were. Euerie of the which (whiles it dured:) could be easely pointed vnto, and was knowne through manie Nations of the world.

And yet Christes Church is described to passe and, to excell all other Kingdoms in brightnes, in glorie, and fame. For as saie, and
which is the true Church.

Micheas layeth, *it is the house of God, \( \text{I} \text{sa}. 2. \) 
which is built upon a hill, the which 
hill standeth in the top of hills. And 
Christ himself saith, *A City built upo \( \text{M} \text{ichc}. 4. \) 
a hill, cannot be hidden. And whereas 
ynder the Iewes, the Church seec
meth to haue ben forsaken and des
folate (in respect of the glorie of 
Christes Church, albeit otherwise, 
it neuer lacked the visible Minis
terie of Patriarches, Prophets or 
Priestes) yet now God saith to his 
own Christian Church, *ponam te in \( \text{I} \text{sa}. 60. \) 
superbiam seculorum, gaudium in gene
rationem & generationem. I wil make 
thee the glory of all ages, and the 
joy of all generations. And again: 
Their sede shalbe known among the 
Gentils, and their generation in the midst 
dest of peoples. All they that see them, 
shal know them. Because they are the 
sede which God hath blessed.

The chefe meane whereby the 
Church (though Christ be not vis}
The Preface concerning

...biblie present therein) is yet so
cleereely sene, and so gloriously in
the light of me, cometh hereof, be
cause Christ being himselfe the true
light of the world, communicated
some of his brightnes to his Apo1
les, to whom he said, ye are the light
of the world, a Citie built upon a hil can
not be hidden, neither do men light a
candle, and putte it under a buffel, but
upon the candelstick, to thend it maie
gene light to all them who are in the
house.

6.

As when the Apostles died,
the Church of Christ died not, so
Bishopps and Pastorps did succede
in their place: whose Churches are
as it were the Candelstiks, and the
Bishopps or Pastorps theselves are
the Light which is sette upon the
candelstick. For that the churches
be as it were candelsticks, the An
gel expoundeth it in the Apocal
lips, saing: Candelabra septem (qua
vidisti)
which is the true Church.

vidisti }) septem Ecclesiæ sunt. The seven candlestickes (which thou sawest) are the seven Churches. And (as Daniel declareth) those that instruct the multitude to righteousnes, are like the brightness of the Firmament, and as it were starres which shine for ever.

Therefore the great Light and glory of God's Church cometh chiefly by the meanes of the Bishops, and Pastours thereof. And by their knowledge and consent (which is uttered specially in the common practice of all faithful people) and next thereunto in General or Provincial Councils, all the auncient writers of the Ecclesiastical History, have describe and set before our eyes the state of the Church, as it may appear in Eusebius, Sulpitius, Paulus Lib.3.c.4. Orosius, Socrates, Theodoretus, 11. 13. 14. Sozomenus, Victor, Euagrius, and 15. &c. that not without a cause.

For
The Preface concerning,

For as the head is the most notable part of the body, and as we know the whole man by his face: so it was euer knowne where that company was, which professed the true faith in Christ, by the Bishops and Pastours thereof. In so much that, yf any one Bishop or gouernour were heretical, or did depart from the unitie of other bishops and Pastours, it was knowe that such a company as followed him, and cleaved to him in that doctrine, was also heretical and schismatical. So were all the Gothes made Arrians, because Arrian Bishops and Pastours were sent by Valens an heretical Emperour to baptize them.

And seing the Church of Christ ceased not at the end of the first five or six hundred yeres, yea seing it was then spread into moe Countries, and the faith more generally and freely
which is the true Church,
professed then before: no reason can beare, that either the glory of Christ's Kingdom shold then be darkened, or that the Bishops and Pastours should then cease to shine, or to geue light out of their Candlesticks and Churches.

For(as S. Paule witnesseth) there must be Pastours and Doctours in the Church, vntil we all meete with Christ, which shalbe at his second coming. And Christ said to his Apostles: I am with you all daies vntil the words end. The Bishops therefore who suceede the Apostles, con- tinued still. And therefore by them the Church of God is still glorious, and still most easely known.

And surely as the Histories of such Writers as I named before, describe vnto vs the state of the Church within the first five hundred yeres, alwaies naming the chief Bishops, and Pastours, and Councils kept
The Preface concerning, kept in every Countrie and Province: even to Gregorius Turonenfis for his time, Gildas, Paulus Diacon⁹, Beda, Ado Viennēlis, Nicephorus, Marianus Scotus, Zonasras, Martinus, Antoninus, Nicetas, Regino, Sigebertus, Sabellicus, Cedren⁹, Platina, and diverse other Greke and Latin Writers goe forward in describing the Ecclesiastical historic, alwaies naming vs both the Emperors, & Bishops, and General Councils of that age, whereof they speake.

Now to say that the Church of Christ was knowne at the first five or six hundred yeres by the Bishops and Pastours thereof agreeing together in one faith, and yet to say, that afterward it was not knowne: I marueile what sufficient ground it can have, sauing that those who are determined to erect a new Church, must needs deny the former visible
which is the due Church.

Sible succession of the Church, least ye it be credited, all their labour be lost.

But I speake to them who, being not altogether sette upon sefl will, are content to heare euident reason grounded upon Gods word, and vpon the authoritie of all ages and Writers. I say that as Eusebius and the Tripartite Historie painteth out to vs the true Church of the first five hundred yeres, by shewing vs the Bishops who ruled the faithfull people in Rome, in Antioche, in Alexandria, in Ephesus, in Jerusalem, and in such like places, even so the Writers of the Ecclesiastical Historie afterward, do name to vs the Bishops either of the same, or of such like Churches and Cities.

And as in the old time thei were knowne to be hereticks who departed from the knowen company of
The Preface concerning, of Bishops and Pastours agreeing in one faith; so even still they are known to be schismatickes and heretikes, who in our time forake the Bishops and Pastours, which agree together in one faith.

And as in the old time the agreement of Bishops and Pastours in one faith was best known by the common practice of their churches, in saying Mass, or in administering the Sacraments, and by General Councils: even so it is still known by those means, what Bishops kepe the unitie of the Catholik faith: As contrariwise he that refuseth the common practice of other Churches, as for example, to have Mass in his Church, which all other Bishops have, or he that refuseth to acknowledge the Latesane or the Tridentine Council, which all other Bishops doe acknowledge, he is thereby known to be
which is the due Church. be schismatical.

Where many Countries, tongues, Rulers and Teachers are in one body, and as it were many Captaines in one great Armie of men, (as there are in the church of Christ) there, if order be not exactly kept, great and horrible confusion must needs follow. The conservatio of order, is to have a knowne Judge, whose finall sentence in all controversyes all men may both heare and obey. Seing therefore the Church of Christ, which is in the earth, is like an army of men well sette in array, there is no dout, but it must haue a chefe Capitain in earth also.

Such an one Saint Peter was, to whome Christ before his ascension commended his shepe and lambs to be fed and ruled of him more then of any other: euem as he loued more then the other, accordingly as Christes words do signifie. For when he had asked
The Preface concerning, asked of S. Peter alone whether he loued Christ Plus his, more then the other Apostles, he said also to him as lone, fede my shepe, fede my lambs. As who should faie, because thou loucest more then other, fede more then other.

This Gouvernment of the faithful being by Christ comitted to one above all other, must alwaies continue in one power above all other. For who may be so bold, as to alter the order once appointed by Christ? Therefore as one flock of sheepe continueth stil, not in dede the same in number, which was comitted to Saint Peter, but an other of the same kind: euen so must the Shepherd in earth continue stil, one though not the self same which was the first chief shepherde, yet such an other as he was: that is to say, one mortal man must still feede Christes shepe above al other.
which is the true Church.

Farrthermore, whereas every particular company or flock of shepe hath euer had one, and only one particular shepheard in earth euer it: whereas every Parish hath one Pastor and Rector, every Diocese one Bishope, every Province one Primate or Archebishops: how could it be otherwise, but that the whole militante company of christians being one particulare flocke or bodie, should also haue one particular Gouernour ouer it in earth? For it is also a particular flock; both because it is limitted within certaine bounds of place (as within the earth) and within certain bounds of time (as whiles it liueth here) and also within certain bounds of nature, because all the militante Church is of mortal condition, and subject to change, and walketh by hope, and not by sight in vision or clere sight of the Godhead. So that the company of Chris
The Preface concerning -

Christians for the ryme in the earth
is not the vniversal Church, but it
is only a small parte thereof, and
yet is one certaine part. And the
greater parte it is, the more nede it
hath of one particular gouernour.

For Crist, being alone the vn-
iversal Shepheard, and properly the
gouernour of the Church, suffereth
no maner of flock, which is by any
particular meanes one flock, to lack
in that behalfe one particular Go-
vernour vnder him self. Seing then
the cumpanie of Christians in the
earth is not the whole Church, nor
yet in glory with the vniversal head
Jesus Crist: it needeth one propor-
 tionable head according to his co-
ditiō and state in this world, much
more the any Parish nedeath one Pa-
rish priest, or one Diocele nedeath
one Bishop. Cōsequently thereunto, it
is to be cōfessed, that one head was
to be set and to be continued over
the
which is the true Church.

the whole militant Church.

For as much as S. Peter was the first Shepheard on the earth made by Christ himself; and he that shall be our chefe Shepheard from tyme to tyme after him, must be like S. Peter (as one that executeth the same office which he did) it is reason that he depend wholly of S. Peter, and sucede hi in his office. By this reason all other Bishops are excluded from this office of being the chief Shepheard, who have no special affinity with the Successiō of S. Peter.

Now being S. Peter sate first at Antioch, and afterward transferred his seat into Rome, the Successiō in his chiefe supremacy could not be in Antioch, because then he himself had lost it by his owne lifetime. But if he were himself chiefe Shepheard in earth whiles he lived, that only Bishop might sucede in his chiefe office, who after his death should
The Preface concerning, should succeed in his last chair.

It is well known, that S. Peter died in Rome. And thence he wrote his Epistle, calling the City of Rome Babylon, as the learned Fathers do witness. Therefore the Bishop of Rome is certainly he that succeeds in the office of Saint Peter, and is for the time head and chief Shepherd over the whole militant Church.

And surely among all Countries, all Bishops, Pastors, Churches, Cities, and faithful people that ever have been with Christ's time, none was so notable as the Bishop, City, Church, and people of Rome. Neither any other place was so convenient for the Head of Christ's Church to be settled in. I will not here enter into that great deep sea of discussing the whole Argument of the supremacy of the pope, which is already well handled by D. Harding.
which is the true Church.
by M. Dorman, by M. Rastel, and last of all by M. Stapleton in his return of untruthes. I seeke at this time to flee great controveries, and therefore will content my self with a most simple narration of truths most evident, and for the greatest part confessed by out adversaries.

First, no Countrie was ever more notable then Italie, as the which is by nature so sette, that it is most fit to gouern, and for al other commodityes it is accompted the Garden of the world.

In Italie no Citie was ever so notable since Christes birth, as Rome: because there was the seate & head of the greatest & straghest Empire that euer was, and thence the Gospel might be spread most speedily. Therefore the Bishop of Rome hath the most notable Chaire and Church where to sitte, and the most notable Caedelshick where to gue
The Presbes, concerning,
his light, that any Bishop euer had.
No Apostle was more glorious,
the S. Peter, as who was firste chief
of the Apostles. Therefore the Bishop
shop of Rome hath the most notable
Predecessour or founder of his
chair, that euer any Bishop had.

What shall we say, that the Church
of Rome was also founded by S.
Pauls preaching, who was the Apostle of the Gentils? So that the whole
preeminence, both of the Jews,
and of the Gentils, is by Saint Pe-
ter and Saint Paul bequeathed, as
it were, and least unto that one
chair of the See of Rome.

There was never no one See
honoured with so manie Martyrs
and knownen Confessours, as the
See of Rome. Which besides many
thousands of other Martyrs, hath
had aboue thirty of the first Bishops
who suffered death for Christes sake
and as many more have be for their

Holy popes of Rome.
which is the true Church.

... and holines canonized, and commonly taken for Saints through the whole Church.

No faithful people of any other Citie had ever so notable a witness: given to the Gods Prophets or Apostles, as the Church of Rome. For Saint Paul the Apostle of Christ said to the Romans, Your faith is preached in the whole world. And as S. Cyprian noteeth, the Apostle spake it prophetically, that is to say, not only respecting their present faith which they had when S. Paul wrote unto them, but also the constant faith which they should have afterward.

In so much that S. Hierō proueth the faith of the Romās which S. Paul praised to have remained euē til his daies, because none other peple did so devoutly visite the Sepulchres of the Martyrs. The which devotiō reman nigstit in Rome til these our daies.
The Preface, concerning,

I heweth both the same faith to be still in the Romans, which was in S. Hieroms tyme: and also the Protestants of our time, who accomplish rather infidelitie then faith to visit the Martyrs Tumbs, to be of a contrarie opinion to the old Romans, and therefore not to be members of the true Church of Christ, nor to haue that faith of the Romans which S. Paules foresaw and praised.

Thus the Church & companie of christiâs which now live under the obedience of the Bishop of Rome, (as under their chief Shepheard in earth) have both one visible chefe Shepheard (which thing the scattered Protestâts lacke) and him placed in the cheife Citie of the world, and his howse builded vpon the Chaire of the two chefe Apostles, with a most notable company of Predecessours before him, and of faith.
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faithfull Christians about him. The which our chese Shepheard may not yet iustly be called the _universal Shepheard_, because he is neither Bisshop alone as though nomâ els were a bishop,nor his flock is universal:for neithery any of these are under him who were dead before his election (who soever be chese Shepheard for the tyme)nor those who are born after his death.

Therefore the Bisshop of Rome inspired allwaies with the holy goost(concerning matters which touched the publis hing of the Catholike faith)refused euermore the proud and prophane title of _universal Bisshop_, as the which only belongeth to Christ hiself. But yet the six hundred and thirtie Bisshops gathered together out of all the world in the Chalcedon Councel, which was one, and that the greatest of the first fower General Councels, offered the said

\[\text{28} \quad \text{Leo,Pelagius,Gregorius,Bonifacius.}\]
The Preface, concerning, said title to Pope Leo, not in that sense as Christ alone hath it, but only in that sense as it might be wellmeār, that accordig to this whole flock, which is in earth, he was in dede the bishop over al, and chief shepherd. But, the Popes of Rome wold neuer take the said title, least though it were offered by the Fathers in a good sense, it might be laundetous to them afterward, and a cause of error in Religion. Yea contrariwise in stede of that proude Style of universal Bishop, the Pope toke that humble name, to call him self the Servant of the Servants of God. And so by humil blig him self, he is in dede the more exalted.

Whereas there were foure Patriarches at the beginning: the Pope of Rome was not only euermore the chefe Patriarch, but also two other Patriarchs were preferred to that honour in respect of the affina.
which is the true Church.

nitie which they had with Saint Peter, who is the Founder of the Roman Church. For (as Saint Gregorie recordeth) the Bishop of Alexandria had therefore the second honour after the Bishop of Rome, because S. Mark the Evangelist, who was the first Bishop of Alexandria, had been the hearer of Saint Peter, according to whose preaching he wrote his Gospel. The Bishop of Antioche had the third Patriarchal seat, because S. Peter had governed there viij. yeres. Now S. James the Bishop of Jerusalem (who had the fourth place of honour) was also ordained Bishop by S. Peter and by two other Apostles, S. James and S. Ihon.

Was not this a maruellous honour done to S. Peter, that for his sake three Patriarchal seats should be instituted. And when those other seats beganne to be stained with
The Preface, concerning, with herefie, and consequently to be oppressed of infidels, the success fours of S. Peter instituted other Patriarchal Seats in the west part of the world, as at Aquileia, and Venice.

Neither was there ever any Epifhop or Church fo much esteemed for the maintaining of the true faith of Christ, as that See of Rome. To that See a Ireneus pointed, as to a Witnesse of the true faith against the Valentinians. To that Tertullian, against all herefies. To that Optat, against the Donatists. To that S. Hierom against all the herefies of the east. To that S. Augustine against the Pelagians. To that f Eugenius against the Vadalists, which were Arrians. To that g Theodoretus against the Eutychians, and all other herefies.

Whereas other Cities chose commonly Bishops of their own tongue
which is the true Church.

tonge and Country to govern the:
As Rome hath had care over all, so
none other Church hath had Bis-
hops in it of so diverse nations.
Rome alone by the Romans and
Latines, had in it Bishops borne in
Galilee, in Jerusalem, in Bethlehem,
in Syria, in Antioche, in Cappados-
cia, in Thracia, in Creta, in Sicilia,
in Sardinia, in Campania, in Tuscia
in Aquileia, in Pisa, in Genua, in
Bonacci, in Millan, in Parma, in
Rauenna, in Athens, in Nicopolis,
in Dalmatia, in Saxonia, in Bauaria,
in Holand, in Gasconie, in Lorain,
in Allatia, in Sauoy, in Burgundie,
in Remes, in Tolose, in Mastrick, in

The same See for the defense
of the Catholike faith, hath vled the
authoritie of a chese Judge not only
over his own Diocese or Prounce,
but also over whatsoever part of
the whole Church of Christ. So

Victor
The Preface concerning, Victor the pope excommunicated the Bishops of Asia, (though they were in another Province) because they refused to keep Easter at the same time as the other Catholikes did. And although divers Bishops, and among other Saint Ireneus, wished him not to deal so severely with them, who kept the custom which they had receaved of their Forefathers, yet none of them all denied, but that he had authoritie to doe so. Yea the veryintreating with the Pope not to doe it, was a plain confession, that he had authoritie to doe it. For there the sentence is freely neglected, where authoritie lacketh in the Judge. S. Cyprian also desireth pope Stephenus to depose Marcianus the Bishop of Arles in France, and to cause another to be chosen in his place, and pope Felix deposed Atacius the Patriarch of Constantinople being an Eunis.
which is the true Church.

Eutichian.

Moreover diverse heretiks have been constrained vpor their amendmet to geue unto the pope their scrowles of penance, as we read Pyrrhus the archbishop of Constantinople to haue don. And also Ursicius and Valens, with many others.

The Patriarchs themselfes were commaunded to geue an accompt of their doings in Ecclesiasticall matters to the Bishop of Rome, as it appeareth by the letters of Pope Leo to Flavianus the Patriarch concerning Eutiches. And to Theodosius the Emperour concerning that Anatoli the Patriarch should confess his faith before he were ordeined.

The Bishops of all Nations (yea though they were Patriarchs) appealed to the Pope of Rome, as by whom they might obtain justice against the wrogs offered to the by the
The Preface concerning,
the inferior judges of particular Provinces: and that is witnessed in
the ancient Council of a Sardike. So Athanasi⁹ appealed to the pope
of Rome as b Liberat⁹ hath write. We read also in the Ecclesiastical
histories that Athanasi⁹ being first cited to c Rome, afterward returned to his own Church with the
letters of Pope d Iulius, and by the authority of the recovered his bis
ishop: e S. Chrysostō also appealed to Pope Innocentius, Flautamus
and g Theodoretus to Pope Leo, h Ioannes Talaïda Bishop of Alex-
andria to Simplicius, i Briccius the Successor of S. Martin to the Pope
that then was, as Gregorius Turo-
neus doth witness.

And many of the said Bishops
being condemned by Provincial
Councils, were by the Pope alone
restored to their Bishopries as
again. And how could that have be
done
which is the true Church.

do, except the pope had be confessed to have been above the Provincial Councils even of the East Church.

What an excessive prerogative of honour was this, that the Patriarch of Alexandria being of all men next in dignity to the Bishop of Rome, yet was content to be his Lieutenant in the third General Council: What king did ever that honor to another king, to become his Lieutenant, except he were one way or other subject, unto him? And least any man should say it came of pusillanimity, or of the lack of knowledge in the Patriarch that was Lieutenant for the Pope, let him know, that it was St. Cyprian, a man of notable courage, wit, learning and virtue: who yet thought it more honour to be presidet of the whole Council for Pope Celestius, then to be under his Legate, if another had taken that office.

*** That
The Preface concerning,

That See had his Legats both ordinarie, and extraordinarie (where occasion required) throughout all Christendom. So might he send & latero suo Presbyterum a Priest from his own syde, into any Province as the Councell of Sadicke witnesseth.

So the Bishop of Thessalonica was an ordinary legat for the pope of Rome in Grece, as it may appere by the epistles of Leo. The Bishop of Arles was the same thing for the pope in Fraunce, as in S. Gregorie it is witnessed. So was the Bishop of Iustinianea the first legate for the pope. So was S. Gregorie Legat for the pope at Constantinople. To be short, the pope had his Vicegerents in other Countries, either Patriarchs or Bishops. And byside them he had Apocryfaries and Responsales, who certified him alwayes of the State of every quarter and Province.
which is the true Church.

The Pope by his authoritie transferred Bishops of other Countries from one Diocese to another. As for example, he commanded Periages to be sette in the Bishops throne at Corinth. And Saint Gregory commanded Martinus a Bishop, to take the charge of the Bisshoprike of Sagon.

The consent of none other See was so necessarily required to all General Councils. For there was never no one lawful General Council yet kept in the East, or West, whereunto the Bisshop of Romes comming or sending was not necessary. In so much that where his authoritie lacked, were the assembly of Bishops never so great, (as at Antioche in the East, and at Ariminum in the West) it was rather accompted a conspiracy, then a lawful Council.

*** And
The Preface concerning,

And as for Provincial Councils, either his Legat was present in the, or els they sent to the Pope to have the Authoritie of the Apostolike See given to their Decrees: as it may be sene in the Epistles of the two Councils holden against Pelagius, in the works of S. Augustine,

There was never no See after the Apostles tyme, which by his Legats and preachers converted so many nations to the faith of Christ. In so much that euë within these last thousand yeres (wherein the Protestants accep't the Pope of Rome to haue ben the forerunner of Antichrist) he converted England by S. Augustine, Saxonia, by Boniface, Morauia by Cyrilus, Frisia by Wilibrodus, Bohemia by Adelbers tus, Prussia by the Knights of the order, whom the Pope instituted for the coquering of Infidels in the north partes, and by that occasion Liuos
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Lituania also and Lituanis was converted to the faith. And is he the forerunner of Antichrist, who procureth Christes faith to be spread as large as may be.

Every Kingdom divided against itself must needs be brought to naught. If the forerunner of Antichrist doth sette forward Christes Gospel, Antichrist is against himselfe.

At this day the See of Rome converteth Infidels in the newe souled lands by the Ministerie of the Fratiscans, and of the Societie of Iesus. Yea this present yere Pius quintus the Pope converted Elias a Jew with certain of his house, as well by his own conference and talke, as by the good example of his life.

None other See dured and flourished so long. For the Cities of all the other Patriarches, and the Bishopshops belonging to them are oppressed with Infidels. And their

** *** in ** * fuc*
The Preface concerning succession is either none, or inglorious, and rather like to the bondage of the Jewes, then to the glory of Christ's Church, whereof Hæsus prophesied.

There was never no Bishop or Patriarch so honoured of Princes, kings, and Emperors: who have ordinarily taken the Bishop of Rome for a Judge in their cases, and at his motion have made both warres against the Turkes or Saracens, and peace betwene them selues.

Did not the Frenchemen despose Childericus their king, and sette Pipinus in his place by the Oracle and answere of Pope Zacharias?

Did not Pope Leo the third transferre the Empire it selfe into the West?

Gaue not Gregorius quinquatus a perpetual order for the election of the
which is the true Church.

of the Emperour? Surely he that
readeth that notable epistle, which
pope Nicolas the first wrote unto
Michael the Emperour of Con-
stantinople, may justly feare, least
that which he there told, concern-
ing the Emperours of the East,
will chance also to them of the
West, yf at any tyme they shew
such unnatural affection toward
the Pope, as the others of the East
vsed to doe.

No other See or bishoprick
hath ben so generally (as the See
of Rome) joyned in all Chronicles
from the beginning of Christes
Churche to the end, with Empe-
rous and kings, for the keeping
of the accompt of yeres and ages,
and for the knowledge of the Ec-
clesiastical historie. In so much
that yf an heretike write a chronic-
le, he yet of necessitie kepeth
the number and the succession of

*** iiiij the
The Preface concerning the popes of Rome: as without the which no certainty of the storie can be sufficiently understood; because none other See hath ben so famous, and so in the sight of all men, accordingly as Christ said, that, *Roman lighteth a candle: and covereth it with a tub; or putteth it under the bed, but he putteth it upon the Candes: stick to shend those who come in (to the house) may see the light.* For as S. Peter was the chief light of the world under Christ, so his succes: sors is a light set vp in Rome to shed Jewes, Turks, or any other infidels who wil come into the church, may see the light, and so may be illumined, that is to say, baptized, and made a Christian.

There was never no See more vehemently persecuted, not only by Tyrants the first three hundred yeres; but afterward by Heretiks, and that of all kinds: for from Simon Magus who
which is the true Church, who resisted S. Peter all hereticks for ever agreed to resist that See.

It hath ben also persecuted by the faction of Christian Princes, and Emperours, by the Citizens of Rome, by the very Cardinals, by the evil life of the popes themselves, yea by the schism and factiō of many Popes at once. So that all synnes, yea hell gates have assaulted this see of Rome, & yet they preuaile not: because it is the rock planted by Christ.

All the Countries that ever forfeke the obedience of the Bishop of Rome were shortly after possessed of infidels, as the Africās, the Asia, the Grecians, None of all the which was oppressed by the Vandals, Sarracenes or Turks; before that it had (by open profession of heresie) dissentend from that faith, which the See of Rome alwaies maintained safe, in so much that the prophetic of Isaias concerning the Church of Christ semeth

Platina Io Nica Gregor. 9 & Nicol. 1.

Matth. 16.
The Preface concerning,

Isai. 80. semeth to be fulfilled in the Shepheard thereof. The Nation and Kingdom which shall not obey thee, shall perish.

Who did euer with such credit determine, what holy bookes ought to be Authentike and of ful authoritie in the Church of God, as Gelasius the Pope in a Council of three score and ten Bisshops?

The Bisshope of Rome hath alwaies vsed to communicate euén his temporal goodes so liberally to al kind of men afflicted beyond the sea, or in Strange Countries, that it may well appere to be the prouidence of God, that he should beare a motherly hart vnto al Nations.

Pope Symmachus gave mony and cloth to the Catholikes who were oppressed by the Vandals in Afrik and in Sardinta. Likewise an other Pope named Ioannes, redeemed of the Lübards the soules which they had
which is the true Church, had taken prisoners at Beneuentum. In our age the Assyrians, the Germans, the Scots, the English or Irithme, the Gothes or Danes, who in their bannishment have desired Accour of the Pope, never lacked it according to their degree and his abilitie.

In so much that whereas the olde pensions be denied in these Countries to the Pope, he yet of his libetallitie geueth these Countriem en new pensions. If that be to render good for euill, and to bless them who curse him, then the Pope is more like a Disciple of Christ, then those who so miserably raile at him, by whome they were baptized and taught their faith. For it was not Luther or Caluin who baptized or converted these Countries, but it was some Legate or other sent fro the Pope of Rome.
The Preface concerning,
Of the sower Patriarchal Seats, none was free from an Archehereticke, frō an Archehereticke, I say, besides the See of Rome. For although in dede no herefie at al was ever maintaine'd or set foorth as the true Catholike doctrine by any pope: yet I know wel, that the consenting to some herefie is laied of some to their charge. LEauing therefore that which is in controverzie, I name that which is most euident, to wit, that there hath bē in Rome no Archehereticke, no inuictour of new doctrines, no head or capitain of a false opinion in the Articles of the faith. At Antioche Paulus Somasfatenus was an Archehereticke, at Ierusalem Ioannes, and Arsenius, at Alexandria Dioscurus, at Constantinople Macedonius and Nestorius. But at Rome none can be named.

And yet whether pride, or power
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power, or wealth, or witte were able to make an Archeheretik, no See was higher, none mightier, none richer, none wittier, as being placed in the harte of Italy. But God would kepe one chaire cleere for the honour of Iesus Christ, who praised for S. Peters faith, to thend he should not only be faithful himself, but also strengthen his brethern. And as S. Peters brethern (which al christians and specially al Bishops are) shal nede to be strenghtened vntil the end of the world, so must there alwaies one fitte in S. Peters chaire, to strengthen them. The which thing he can not doe, if himself may erre, even when he commeth to preach the faith vnto his brethern.

Neuer no Citie nor See made so many Decrees, and had them so vniverstally observed euin in other Countries, as the See of Rome.

Thence cometh the order of our Eccles
The Preface concerning
Ecclesiasticall Service, the Canonizing of Saints, the Celebration of our holy Daies, and fasting Daies, the prohibition of degrees in kinstred, and Alliance, the Appointment of keeping Easter (the which even the hereticks are constrained to observe, although it be not the expresse word of God) and such like ordinaunces, which are observed not in Rome or in Italy alone, but also in Fraunce, Spaine, Portugal, Sicilie, Britanie, Ireland, Germanie, Dëmark, Suecia, Hungarie, Pooleland, Prussia, and in al other Churches of the West. Came not this to passe through a marueilous obediéce which al Coutries haue geue to the Church of Rome? Or came that wonderful consent, which all they kept in matters of Religion, from any other spirit, then from the spirit of peace, of vnitie, and of eord? So
which is the true Church.

So many Bishops and private men have written to the See of Rome, for information and direction of their intent in matters belonging to God, (as it may appere partly by other ancient Writers, and specially by the Decretal Epistles of all the Popes, and namely of Leo the first, and of Saint Gregorie the Great, which in maner doe al answere or handle some question or other) that the Prophecie of Isay is notably fulfilled in that See, Ascendamus ad domum Dei Iacob, et docebit nos vias suas. Let vs goe vp to the house of Iacob, and he Shal teache vs his waies.

For as the house of Iacob is the Churche, so the mouth of the Churche is the Pope of Rome, euery Saint Peter is called of S. Chrysostom os. Apostolorum, the mouth of the Apostles.

Neither
The Preface concerning,

Neither did men resort only upon devotion to the Bishop of Rome, to know what they had to doe, but rather of duty many times. For as Moses having set down inferior Magistrates over the people, reserved the great causes unto him self; even so it hath been the auncient Custome in Christes Church, that every matter of most weight in religion should be reserved unto the Popes own determination, as it may appere by many witnesses, and by the continual practive of the Church.

Adde hereunto, that it was not sufficient for the Bishops to write vnto the Pope of Rome, but it was also the custome, that they shoude in their own persons visite Rome.

And S. Gregorie witnesseth it to haue ben the custome even in the old tyme, that every three yeres the Bishops should come from Sicilia to Rome. Whereas those that dwelt here,
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tere, came yerely, and others came at other tymes, according as they were enjoyned.

These many Privileges and Prerogatives of the Bilshop of Rome over all other Bilshps, declare, in what case he was sette by the appointment of God. The which was so cleere in all ages, that euen the Emperours of Constantinople themselves confessed his Supremacie, when yet they could rather haue wished that honour unto their own Patriarchs. For as they procured the second degree of honour to bee geue to the Patriarchs of Constantinople, otherwise then the Council of Nice had decreed: so ther lacked in the no good wil to haue procured them the first place also, if as by mans Constitution Alexandria was the secod Patriarchal Seat, and Antioche the third, so Rome had ben the first only by mans appointement.
The Preface concerning,

But because God himself had preferred S. Peter before all other in authority, to feed his sheep and labours and in Privilege, that his faith should not fail: and because the Pope of Rome sitteth in S. Peter's Chaire, therefore no Emperor, no Council or Aisleble was able to take the Popes supremacy from him. In so much that Iustinian the Emperor of Constantinople defined and decreed, and that secundum Canones definitiones, according to the determination of the Canons (meaning also the Canons of the four first General Councils) Sanctissimum senioris Rome Papam, primum esse omnium Sacerdorum, the most holy Pope of the Elder Rome to be of all Bishop the formost.

And whereas the Bishop of Constantinople would not so geue over his ambitious coveting still to be accepted chefe of all; Phocas did again determine, Sedé Romana caput esse
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esse oim Ecclesiāriū, the See of Rome
to be the head of all Churches.

Of all other things it is most singu-
gulary to be noted, that whereas oth-
other Monarchies and great Empi-
res served to aide and to succour
the faithful people of God: And
wheras the Romā Empire, was the strō-
geft and mightiest of al other, as Da-
niel sheweth: ad wheras it was most
specially prepared of God for the
setting forth of Christes own Gosp-
el, as a Eucherius and b Pope Leo,
and most amply of al c Eusebi° doth
declare: last of all, wheras the kingdō
and Empire of Christ, doth much passe
and excede the very Empire of
Rome, as also in Daniel we may
perceau: as sone as euer the Em-
peror Constantinus the Great was
fully instructed in Christes faith of
Syluester the Pope, by the puidėce
of God he bequeathed Rome to S.
Peter and S. Paul, as Ado testifiheth:

*** * ἥ ἐγγίζων
The Preface concerning, 
geuing place to Christes Vicar the 
Bishop of Rome, and yelding his 
own howse called Constantiniana, 
to God for his Church, and to the 
pope for his habitation. And he 
himself went to secke a new place 
of residence, and minding to build 
now at Sardika, somtime at Sigeum, 
and an other tyme at Chalcedon, 
he pitched at the last in Constantin 
ople.

So that by the event it selfe we 
may evidently see ( if we list not 
to make our selues blind) that the 
Citie of Rome was specially exal 
ted to that glory and fame which 
it had, to thend Christes Gospel 
might shine thence, and be manife 
ty lene and embraced throughout 
all parts of the world. For,as Leo 
saith, quse vnguam Gentes ignorarent, 
quod Roma didicisset? What nations 
could euer be ignorant of that, 
which Rome had lerned? And
which is the true Church.

And therefore when the tyme was come, that God would have it known to the faithful, why he had made Rome so great, he caused the Emperour himself to geue place to the Succesflour of his apostles. And whereas the Empire being divided, both the Emperour of the East and of the west coueted to be called the româ Emperour, yet neither of the both kept his continuall residence in Rome. But he of the East kept his court at Constantinople, the other of the West at Rauenna, Mil- lan, Treuers, or in some other City: not that any place was like Rome, but because Christ would shew, that as the Empire of Rome was made to serue him, so the Seat therof should be the peculiar seat of his Vicar the Pope of Rome.

Undoubtedly if ever any miracle was visible and palpable in all the world, this is one of them. The
The Preface, concerning, mighty Emperor of Rome forsakes Rome, that is to say, the seat of his Empire, and a poor Bishop takes his place. Neither was ever any Emperor afterward suffered of God, to make Rome his ordinary mansion place. He was not suffered, I say. For what heart can conceive, that they should not desire to live specially, and to dwell in that City, whence they had their name, their Empire, and all their glory? But God would not have it so, least his Vicar, and therby the glory of his Gospel, should be the more obscure, if the Emperor lived there with him. For as the Emperor made the Bishopric of Constantinople glorious (which otherwise, as Zonaras recordeth, was fallen to decay, and the town was made subject to another Bishop of Thracia) so contrarywise God would have it known, that the Bishop of Rome
which is the true Church, not of me wer they neuer so great) but of the power which Christ had geuen to S. Peter, whome he made the Rock was Math. 16. uponj the Church should be builded.

Neither hath Rome lost any thing by the departing of the Emperour. For as Leo doth witnesse, Roma per sacram B. Petri sedem capit orbis effecta, lastius presideret religione divina quam dominatione terrane. Rome by the means of the sacred Seat of Saint Peter, being made the head of the world, doth govern wider by Gods Religio, then by earthly dominion.

the very same thing saith Prosper of Rome also. Who seeth not, that the Italiás, Frēchemē, Spaniardes, Portugals, Assyrías, Aethiopiās, yea the Indiās doe acknowledge the Bishop of Rome, for theyr Shepherd and Superiour, who yet will not acknowledge the Emperour of Rome at al.

The glory of the bishop of Rome
The Preface, concerning,

hath ben so great throughout all
the Church, that the hereticks have
confessed, yea the most wrangling
heretikes of our time haue ben cos
strained to confess, that in al mees-
tings at General Councils or other
like, the Prerogative of the first place
did belong to the Bisshops of Rome, to
direct and order bisshops in their doings.
That is a signe, that he was ever the
greatest starre, candle, or light in
the whole Church.

And seing S. Paule doth liken
the members of Christes Church to
the members of a mans body, res-
sembling some to eyes, other to
eares, and others to the secte: If the
Pope of Rome be confessed within
the first six hundred yeres to have
had the first place in the militant
Church, and thereby to have bee the
chefe member, I pray you (M.Iewel)
what is the name of that member,
which hath the first place in a mans
body;
which is the true Church.

body: Is it not the head? The Pope then by your confession is, yea in the old time was, the chief member, that is to say, the particular head of the militant Church, which is but one part of Christ's universal body and Church. But what need I reason upon your confession?

The Church of Rome hath been so notably known to be the head, the root, the mother of all true Christians for the time then issuing, that among the ancient Fathers it hath ben all one to say (in matters of faith) a Catholic, or a faithful Roman, a man of sound belief, or one of the Roman belief. S. Ambrose reporteth, that his brother Satyrsus being desirous to know, whether the Bishop to whom he came were Catholic or no, asked him, utrumcum cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia consueniret? Whether he agreed with the
The Preface, concerning, the Catholike Bisshops; that is to say, with the Roman Church. As who should say, all is one to say, be you a Catholike, or be you of the church of Rome, or as now men speake, a Papist? Again, whereas Ruffinus had found fault with S. Hiero for translating some part of Origenes worcks into Latin, and yet the same Ruffinus had saied before, that in the Latin trâslation of S. Hiero nothing, was quod a fide nostra discrepet, which might be diverser fro our faith: S. Hiero asked, how Ruffinus meant those wordes, a fide nostra, from our faith. For if he meant it of that faith of ours, which is the faith of the Romane Church, then S. Hierom coceiludeth, that he there by is proued a Catholik. Fidem suam quam vocat? Eâmne qua Romana pollet Ecclesia? Si Romanam responderis, ergo Catholici sumus, qui nihil de Origenu errore transtulimus. What doth Ruffis
which is the true Church.

Ruffinus call his own faith? Doth he mean that faith, wherewith the Church of Rome florisheth? If he mean the Romane faith, then we are Catholikes, as who have translated nothing of Origenes errors. So that Saint Hierome accompliseth the Romane faith and the Catholike faith all one: verely because the Romane Church hath had and ever shall keep the Catholike faith.

Moreover, the Arriâs called the Catholikes in the old tyme Romans. For when Theodoricus the sonne of the king of the Vandals (which were Arriâswold haue killed Armogastes a Catholike, Locundus the Priest of Theodoricus (being likewise an Arrian) wished the kings sonne not to kill Armogastes with the sword, saying: Si gladio peremeras, incipient eum Romani Martyrem predicare. If thou kill him with a sword
The Preface, concerning, a sword, the Romans will beginne to proclaime him a Martyr. Where he meaneth none other thing by the Romans, then the Catholiks. For they only would call him a Martyr, that should be killed of the Arrians, for their Catholike faithes sake.

A maruelouse honour which God hath geuen to the See and people of Rome, that after the faith of Christ was once preached there, and the Vicar of Christ was settled there, it should be alone to say, the Romans, or the Catholiks, the Romane Churche, or the Catholike Church.

Howbeit, what wonder is it to see the Romane faith so much esteemed, seing the Fathers haue alwayes beleued, that the Romane Church can not erre in the profession of their faith. Thereof S. Cyprian (after he had spoken of that principal Church, which by the mea
which is the true Church.

Cyprianus
li. i. ep. 30

In ep. de
sacer.

In annio
ver.

Pope Leo in many Sermons and
Epistles prosecuteth this argument,
saying among other things. Solidi-
itas illius fides, quae in Apostolorum Prin-
cipe est lundata, perpensa est ( & Post)
Cuius in sede sua viuit potestas, excellit
autoritas. The soundnes of that
faith which is praised in the chefe
of the Apostles, dureth still. But
where? It followeth a little after-
ward:
The Preface concerning ward: In S. Peters seat his power liueth, his authority excelleth: There is the faith which Christ prayed for: there is the confession against which hell gates shall not prevaile.

The same thing Gelarius teacheth, and confirmeth it by the same Scriptures. With him the Bishops of Spain in their Epistle to Hilarius, Pope Agatho and Nicolaus the first agree. S. Bernard also Writerh thus to Pope Innocentius. Oportet ad Vestrum referri Apostolatur & ca. All daungers and occasiones of stumbling, such specially as chance concerning the faith, ought to be referred unto your Apostolike office. For I think it a worthy matter, that the defectes of the faith should there specially be made vp, vbi nō possit fides sεntire defectum, where the faith cannot faile, or seele defēct. For that is the Prerogative of this seat. Or to whom besides hath it bee said at any tyme, I have prayed for thee.

Peter
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Peter, that thy faith may not faile: therefore which followeth, is required of the Successour of Peter: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratares tuos, and thou being once converted, strengthen thy brethren. Hitherto S. Bernard. By whom (as also by the other Fathers) we leerne, that seing the Bishops of Rome are the Successours of S. Peter, their faith can no more faile (when their brethren are to be confirmed) then his could faile, after that Christ had prayed for him. For all the Privileges, which we speake of, are not meant to be geuen to the Pope for his own sake, but for the Churches sake, which is for the tyme built uppon his confession, and stayed vp by the strength which his principall chaire of vnite hath in it, by the vertue of S. Peter.

In which only respect we beleue (as we haue bene alwaies taught) that
The Preface concerning,
that the See of Saint Peter and the
Church of Rome is the head of all
other Churches. Which truth was
so commonly known in the old
tyme, that not only none of the
Clergie but neither the Emperours
could be ignorant thereof. Therefore Iustinian writing to Pope Ioan-
nes faith: Sanctitas vestra Caput est omni-
nium sanctarum Ecclesiast. Your ho-
lines is Head of al holy Churches. Like-
wise Eugenius the Archebishop of Carthage feared not to say even
to the Arrian heretiks, Romana Eccle-
sia caput est omnium Ecclesiast. The
Church of Rome, is the head
of all Churches.

The Bishop of Patara being a
Bishop of the East Church in Ly-
cia, speaking to the Emperour Ius-
atinian in the behalf of Siluerius the
banished Pope, faith: there are many
kings in this world, and there is not one
king, as Siluerius is Pope super Ecclesi,i
mundo.
which is the true Church.

mundi totius, over the Church of the whole world. In which words he declareth, the difference betwene the Kingdoms of the world and the Churche of Christ. The Kingdoms of all the world haue not one king ouer them al, as the Church of all the world hath one Pope ouer it all. There are (saith he) many kings, and not one alone ouer al. But Silvesterus is Pope ouer the Church of the whole world. And by the discourse it is euident, that he alone is Bishopp ouer all the Church: ouer it, I say, alone, but not in it alone. For there are many Bishops in the Church, and yet but one ouer al the Churche.

It is farther also to be noted, that Iustinian the Emperour acknowlaged this Bishops words to be true, because it was wel knowen to himselfe, that the Bishopp of Rome was pereliffe, and was alone.
The Preface concerning the Pope over the Church of all the world, and thereupon it repented him, that he had banished Silvester the Pope, and he willed him to be restored to Rome again.

And yet M. Jewell is not ashamed to allege this fact of Justinian, for a prove, that the Emperor had somewhat to doe in the Church of Rome.

As well he might allege the homicide and adultery of King David, to prove that David had somewhat to do with an other mans wise. For as it repented King David of his fault, so did it repent Justinian of his tyranny. For in deed he did that, which he did therein, by force, and not by judicat processe.

But to end this matter of the Popes being Head of the whole Militant Church, Saint Gregory (whome M. Jewell in this Argument would seeme to cleave vnto) getting
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instructioun to one Ioannes, what
should be done in examining spiri-
tual causes, and alleging divers
Constitutions of the Emperours,
among other things faith: if the Dio-
ceste haue neither Metropolitane, nor
Patriarche to whom the cause may be
referred, that then the matter ought to
be heard, and to be determined of the
Apostolike See, qua omnium Ecclesia-
rum caput est, the which Apostolike See(of
Rome) is the head of all Churches.

And note that he speakeoth of
such a Head, as may judge and de-
termine the controuersies of what:
soever Church. And therefore in an
other place he saith, that although
al bishops in respect of humility be
equal, yet if any fault be found in the
Bishops, I can not tell (saith he) what bis-
shop is not subject to the Apostolike See.

For all the causes, and manie
other which I omittte, because they
are in controuersie, and neede long
The Preface concerning discoueries to prove them: if ever any man (after the Apostles) was sette vp by Christ upon a Candel-stick to geue light to the whole howse of God, it is doubtlesse the Bisshop of Rome. So that in this miserable division of Christes Churche (which toward the coming of Antichrist is like daily to increase) thei only are safe, who folow that notable fame, glory, and knownen autoritie of the Catholike faith, which in al ages hath ben and is presently in the Church of rome, and in those Nations, Countries, and Cities, which haue alwaies agreed with it, and with the Succession of the Bisshops there. Wherinc, as Irenneus faith, that tradition which came from the Apostles was alwaies kept. Likewise S. Ambrose faith, that the Churche of Rome alwaies kepeth the rule or belefe of the Apostles unde.
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For this most principal, most great, most auncient, most holy and famous Church, from this Church, I say, which is the head of all Churches, and all one with the Catholike Church (because it being the rock can not erre, no more the the whole Church of Christ can, which is the pilloer of truth) from thence Eugastius and Damianus had their most lawfull commission by Eleutherius the Pope, to preach to king Lucius, and to the other Britans who are now called Welshmen.

From Celestinus the Bishop of that notable Church, Germanus the Bishop of Antioch doore was sent to our Countrie to root out the Pelagian heresie, and to plant again the Catholike faith among the Britans.

From that Church and City of Rome, the preachers of Christes Gospel came to the Saxons or Englis
The Preface concerning Englishmen in the daies of Pope Gregorius the first, who sent Saint Augustine and his brethren into England.

At whose Apostleship and comming to vs, those that now barck and enuie, declare themselves to be adders broods and un-natural children, as who would destroie their owne Spiritual Fathers, if they were able, and seem to be so sorie that euer the realm was converted frō idolatry to Christ by those blested Messingers.

From Vitellianus the Bishop of that see, Theodorus was sent into England, to instruct vs in matters belonging to Religion.

In the faith of that Church and in the company of al Natiōs which acknowledged the church of Rome, King Henry the eightsound al England, Wales and Ireland, when he first began to change our faith, and
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and to withdraw his obedience, frō that See, whence the word of life was brought vnto vs. And why he withdrew his obedience, all the world knoweth, and therein it knoweth also vpō what foundatiō this new Gospel now preached in England, was builded.

King Henrie ought not to have gone out the Roman Society because of any vices which he found or saw there, (for in a great house there are as well vessels of contumely as of honour, and in our lords field, among the good corne weede and cockle grow) but he only might have departed out of the Roman Churche, if he had found any where els a more Auncient and true Church: As Saint Augustine went from the Manichees to the Catholike Churche.

But king Henrie did know whence he went, and not whether
The Preface concerning, he went. Which thing must needs brede an infinite errour and wandering in faith, as our Realm from that day forward hath had experience more than inough.

He that goeth out of one Churche (as King Henrie and the Realm under him, went out of the Church of Rome) must either goe into another Church already extant in the world, or make a new Churche of his own, or be cleane without a Church.

King Henrie would not be without a Churche, for he called himself the supreme head of the Church of England, therefore he wold have some one Church.

Verily he went not into an other Churche already extant anywhere: for he adioyned himself to no company of faithfull men in all the earth, which had from Christes tyme liued after that profession of the
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the faith which he then instituted
and allowed. The Romane company,
which alone was the true
Church, he forsooke and persecuted.
Against Luther, and much more
against Zuinglius he caused the six
Articles, to be made, many or all
the which, Luther, Zuinglius, Calv
uin, and all their fellowes condemn
as impious and wicked.

So that in king Henries time
it was taken for true and Catholik,
that the Maffe was a propitiatorie
sacrifice. The communion in one
kind was laudable. It was euverlas
sting damnation by the faith of his
Church, to deny the real presence,
or transsubstantiation. On the other
side the Pope was not head of the
militant Churche (said he) and the
monks might be putte out of their
cloisters.

If that Church of king Henrie
was the true Churche, the present
Church
The Preface concerning the Church of England is a false church, because it teacheth doctrine cleanly contrary to that of King Henry. For it denieth transubstantiation, and the presence of Christ's body under the forme of bread, and the external Sacrifice of Christ's body.

If King Henry when he went from the Church of Rome, went not to any other true Church, nay if he went to none other at all, but made and erected a new Church of his own, where the faith began to be so professed, as it had been professed nowhere else in all the earth; surely a Church newly made and sette vp, a thousand five hundred yeres and vpward after Christ's ascensio, can not be Christ's Church. For his Church began at Jerusalem, and so increased, and continueth in the world for ever. Therefore the Church which King Henry erected now first in England, could not possibly
which is the true Church, be the true Church wherein all men must be saved who shall be saved.

If the realm were out of the true Church in King Henries time, it could not afterward have the true Church, except it were reconciled againe to the true catholic Church of Christ, that is to say, to such a company of faithful men, as had alwaies kept and professed the true faith, from generation to generation even from the time of the Apostles. For so the Prophet foretold, populi cœz Psal. 44: festuntur tibi in aeternum. Not one, but many Peoples or nations shall give praise to thee, not only for six hundred yeres to gether, but for ever.

In King Edwards time the realm was reconciled to none other more auncient Church, but went forward in building stil a Church newly desuised. For whereas the state of the realm of England was out of the
The Preface concerning the true church in king Henry's time: and consequently whereas the true church being somewhere in the world was without the Realm of England, there was no publike order taken, whereby the realm should be united to any such ancient company of Christians, as were anywhere without the realm.

Yea rather it was provided by all means, that no foreign power from beyond the sea should have any thing to doe in England, or in Wales, or in Ireland, concerning matters of Religion. And yet if Christ had any church at all (as undoubtedly he had) surely it was professed without the realm of England, wheresoeuer it was professed. For in the realm it was not professed, except it be the true Church, to deny the supremacy of the Pope, and also to maintain the Propitiatorie Sacrifice of the masse, which thing neither
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neither the Papist nor the Protestant dare confesse.

How then could England, which kept out all foreign power in spiritual matters, be reconciled to the Church of Christ, the power and authority whereof was without the realm? Or is the power of being the Sonnes of God, the power of preaching and of remitting synnes no power?

Againne, are we not bound by the Articles of our faith, not only to beleue, but also to proesse a holy Catholike Church? For as the hart be- lengeth to righteousness, so confession is made by the mouth to salvation.

What Church did the realm of England proesse under king Edward more auncient then it self was? To what companye was it united? Whom did it acknowledge for the pillar of truthe? Whether the word of God; That was surely well done:
The Preface concerning, done: but the world of God is no more the faithful men who make the Church of God, then the Statutes of England are the men of England or citizens of London.

We must have a company of men shewed vs, to which we that were out of the Church in king Henries time(by all mens confession)may be afterward reconciled, and united. Those men proffessed Christes faith in one place or other. Where was that? At Geneua: Nay, that proffession beganne about the same time, that king Henries did. And therefore they could not be that ancient Society, who had proffessed the faith fro time to time so as their forefathers had don, even until we come vp to the Apostles.

The like may be said of Zuinglius at Zurich, and of Luther at Wittenberg. These companies all beganne within these three score Yeres.
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yeres, but Christes cōpany which hath born his name, is fifteen hun-
dred yeres old and vpward.

Moreover, if it were possible for the company of Lutherans, or Zuinglians, or Calvinists to be the true companie of Christes Church, yet the realm was no more reconciled to them, then to the Anabap-
tists, or to the Swenckfeldians. For what publike order was taken, that any vnio should be made betwene our realm and any other in all the world? What Embassadage went to and fro?

In all reconciliation he maketh sup-
plication, or at the least he submits of his self and desireth to be recea-
ued, who hath swarued and wades red. In so much that he vsed to offer vp to his Cathelik bishop a libel of his repentance, and of cōfessiō of the true faith, as Vrscius and Valens did to Iulius the Bishop of Rome. As
likewise Maximus, Urbanus, Sido
donius and Macarius were reconc
ciled to S. Cyprian.

Did our realm submit itself to Luther, to Zuingle, or to Calvin? Did it offer a libel of repentance to any Bishop? It is evident, that we never meddled with Luther. For we never yet receaued the doctrine of the real presence of Christes body together with bread, so as the Lutherans teach it.

Now Caluin and Zuingleius came out of Luthers church. For he was their auncestor, and brake with the Pope of Rome (to whom al they were once subject) before the, and first profesed that Gospel, which afterward they did allow and embrace.

Last of all, if the Realm in king Edwardis tyme had submitted it selfe to Calvin, he would not have admitted them to this fellowship, except
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except the King wold first have spoiled himself of the title of being supreme head of the Church of England.

For Caluwin teacheth it to be a beastly thing, for any temporal Prince to arrogate to himself to be supreme head of any one particular Church of Christ. And affirmeth those that gave such counsell to king Henry (and consequently those that continued in giving the same counsel to king Edward) to be blasphemers.

But being king Edward kept the said title at his time, it is cleere that the realm under king Edward was not reconciled, or united in profession of the faith to any company out of England in all the world. And consequently, that either the Church of England alone professed Cristies faith (and then also it should have ben professed scant six, yea scant three yeres together)
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gether or els that the realm of Eng-
gland was out of that true Church
and company of faithful me, which
according to Gods word profes-
sed Christes true faith.

When Queene Mary came to
the crown, she found the Realm
(as it now appereth) out of the true
Church, and therefore she hastened
to reduce it unto the true Church
again: and submitted herself and
the Realm (as much as lay in her )
to the Pope of Rome, whose Aus-
thoritie her father had vniustly bas-
nished.

The Pope sent in his Legate
Cardinal Poole of blessed memory,
who reconciled the realm to that
Apostolick seate of Peter, whence
we had taken our faith by S. Aus-
gustine the Apostle of the English-
mens. And the parliament (for great
reasons which were then alleged
by the right worshipful Prolocutor
and

Reconcile
lation to
Rome.
which is the true Church.

and others) accepted the Legacy, and submitted itself to the See of Rome.

That seat of Peter having dured from the tyme of Claudius the Emperor, in whose daies S.Peter came to Rome, hath had two hundred go- and thirtie Bishops or vpward, who had alwaies not only the Christiâs of that City or of Italy, but of many Countries and Nations agreeing with it in the profession of Christ's faith. Therefore it is the true Church of Christ, as in the which, and in the Nations obeying it, the faith was neuer changed these fis ten hundred yeres together, whiles those Nations obeyed that Apostolike seat. And consequently in Queene Maries tyme the Realm was reconciled to the true Church of Christ.

Seing now the realm is againe departed from the companie of all **** nations
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nations, which have alwaies com-
municated in professing their faith
with the Church of Rome, and
seing the same hath not submitted
it self to any other auncient com-
panye of faithful men, which may
have a lineal descent in professing
the Christian faith from the Apos-
tles time; and seing the realm as
greeth not with the Lutherans in
believing the real presence, nor
with the Calwinists, because the
title of supremem governmet in spiri-
tual matters is retained stil: it must
needes follow, that our realm is
not only separated from the most
auncient and true Church of God,
the visible Head whereof is at
Rome, but also that it is a company
which professeth his faith a part
from all the world, nor acknowledges
lying anie Church more auncient
or better directed, then it self is.

I am not ignorant, that if this
matter
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matter might be ripped up to the uttermost, and as it ought to be in truth and conscience: so I mean, that the thoughts of all hearts might be opened and revealed: I am not then ignorant, that the uttermost refuge of the Protestants must of necessity be, that Christ's Church is invisible, and agreeeth only in heart between it self, and that the outward rule to make it agree, is the word of God written in the old and new Testament, so farre at the left as they list to allow it.

By this only meanes al may seeme to be safe. And for albeit the whole realm of England be schismatical, and that by some of their own hartie thinking, and by the last resolutions of some that are best lerned: yet (thinke they) one of vs agreeth in his hart with an other, and after this sort, one knitteth himself in hart to the Lutherans, an other to the Calvans...
The Preface, concerning,

unists, the third to the Anabaptists
the fourth to the Trinitaries. And
as for outward professiō, they must
imagine it to be inough, that Gods
word be proffessed to be the sus-
preame judge, though none of the
neither know the meaning therof,
nor be ruled by it, ād that the Pope
of Rome be denied to be the chief
judge vnder Christ, ād the al is safe
 accordig to their false imaginatioō.

But if the preachig of Gods word
be the groud of al belief (for faith is
by hearig, and hearig is by preachig) ād if
the preacher must nedes prech the
whole truth opening the whole cou̇sef
of God and disiēbling no part therof
(otherwise he deceaueth the peple)
if the celebrating of the Sacraments,
must be of that effect, to shew vs the
thurch in outward deede, which
preachig is of in outward word: it
ought to be graūted, that there is a
continual knowē outward pfessiō of
christianity, ād of the faith by prea-
which is the true Church.

Now Christes Gospel was prophesied of, that it should be preached in all nations. For the sound of she is gone out into all the earth; and as the church hath still pastors and teachers, so it must still have preachers, whose sound my go forth into many nations of all the earth. For Isaiah liketh Isaiah 62:11, wise faith, upon thy walls (ô Jerusalem) I have set watchmen, they shall not hold their peace all day, nor all night, for ever. Where were these preachers of this new religion before Luther? Wher, I say, were they throughout all nations? How wet their sound throughout all the earth? Surely they were under a bushel, and not upon the candlestick. Thei were heard neither in the East, nor in the West Church. And yet the glory of Christes Church must be so great, that, as Isaiah saith, Nations shall walk in the light of Christ, and Kings in the Brightness of his rising.
The Preface, concerning rising. Such nations the Romane Church alwaies had, and such kings it had from the time of Constantine the great vntil this day. But this present religion of England had nor many Nations nor kings who professed it, before these fiftie yeres.

Again, the true Church must be honoured and nourished, by kings, as Iaie sheweth. But the Churche of England honoureth kings as her supreme heads, and with her goods nourisheth them and their Courtiers.

Farthermore, concerning the writen word of God, it is in deede honourable, and true. But as there was a Church of Christ aboue two thousand yeres before any word of the whole Bible was writen: and as Christ had a Church in Ierusalem and in Antioche before any of the lower Gospells was penned: and as afterward the word of God was preas
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preached, interpreted & expounded alwaies by the Ministers of Gods Church: so the written word of God presupposeth a Church whereunto it is given, and where it is preserved.

The Romane Church therefor which preached, kept, delivered and expounded the Gospel to vs, and where the Lutherās, Zuinglians, Anabaptists and Calvinists had it in Latin, and the Greeke Church where they had it in Greek must preache the faith vnto this new Congregation of Christian me, if they wil vse the word of God as they ought to doe.

But to take the booke into their own hands, and thence to frame a Church which never was before, and which then presently is not in the world, when they beginne to reade the bible: it is much like, as if one reading the old Chronicles, Lawes, and Statutes of England, would
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wold gette him with a company
of as wise men as himself were, into
one desolate Iland or other, and
elaide stoutly, that it were England,
for that it now kept the true Lawes
and Ordinaunces of England. And
that the knownen Countrie which
is named Englād, is a forged thing,
which is departed frō old Englād.
But that he now will restore al (that
will follow him) to the true succesiō
of king Arthur and of Brutus.

The prophets Issaie, Jeremy, Das
niel, Esdras or Nehemias did not
take the law of Moses into their
hands (as these me do now the new
Testament) and so conclude with
themselves, the Church of Jerusalem
errest in this point, and in that point, in
this practise, and in that practise, and
it is full of Idolatry, and of superstiti-
tion; and therefore I wil renounce
the gouernmeet of the hīgh Bishop,
and depart from it, and cal to me a
new
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new companie, where the law of
God shalbe perhtly professid, ac
cording to the write word of God.
No, no, the Prophets neither said,
nor did so. For the that new Church
had ben the Church of this or of
that Prophet, and it had not be the
auncie Church of God, which had
dured from the beginning. Euen so
now, it is not lawful to take a new
Testament into your hands, and
so to find abuses in that principal
Churche of Rome, and thereupon
to deuise a new Church, as Luther,
Zuingleius, Caluin and Brentius
haue don.

It is evident, that the Church of
Rome was once a principal membe of
the Churche of God, because the
faith of the Romans was preached in
the whole world. It is evident, that
the succession of Popes and of
other Christians in Rome, hath
with lette interruption continued
there
The Preface, concerning there, then ever the like did in Jerusalem before Christes comming. It is evident, that in the old tyme the Romaine faith was acquainted the Catholike faith. No change of faith in Rome can be shewed at any time. But the Pope and City hath continued still in profession of the same faith vntil this day. Now euer manners must not cause vs to depart from any Churche. Therefore we ought to return again to the Churche of Rome, as to the chese membeser of the Catholike Church, ynder the paine of euerlasting damnation.

I have declared more briefly then such a weighty matter did require, that seing Christ hath a churche, and his church is that vnto him in this world, which a great kingdom is vnto a great Prince, that his Church can not be hidden by any meanes, least his glory be lesse ameng
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amōg mē, thē the glory of a worldly kings is. For Christ came into the world to make the name of his father glorious among men, euē to the outward apparence, as well as to the inward holiness.

The waies to see and heare the Church of Christ is to see and heare the gouernors of his Church, with the people that obey eē and agree with them. And as by that means the Writers of the stories in the first six hundred yeres, so the later wri ters haue alwaies described unto vs Christes true, visible and glorious Church.

The most notable bisshop or Pastour that euer was in Christes Church, was and is the Bisshop of Rome, both for the Empeiral City where he liueth, and the which not without the miraculouse worck of God, was by the first Empeour, who professedd openly our faith,
The Preface concerning, leaft unto him, and also for the honour and for the succession of the cheefe Apostles, Peter and Paul: for the number of martyrs and Saints in that See, the prophetical testimony of S. Paule, and of the anciet Fathers geuen to the faith of the Romans; for the number of Bishops, of nations, of kings, yea of General Counsels who alwaies agreed with the B. of Rome in the profession of the faith: for the Privilege of not investing at anie time anie heresie, or professing anie heretical assemble: for conversion of infidels to the faith, and the continual flourishing of that see vntil this hower. That bishop transferred the Empire, was appealed vnto by bishops and Patriarchs, confirmed Counsels, and sent his legates into all Provinces, and that Church is accepted al one with the Catholike Church, and the Romans, that is to saie, those who
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who obey the Bishop of Rome,
are as much to say as the Catholikes: it is Head of all Churches,
and can not erre in the doctrine
of faith.

Therefore when we departed
from it, we departed from the
greatest light or candle that euer
Christ after his Apostles, did sete
upon any Candelsticke in all the
Churche. And we went we can
not tel whyther, but in dede we
went to our our phantasie, and idle
braines. One imagining out of
that which he toke to be the meaning of Gods word, one kind of
Churche; an other imagining an
other kind: But all are out of the
right way, except we returne to
that Churche, which hath bene
spread alwaies thoughout all Na-
tions, whereof the Bisshop of
Rome is head, who sitteth in the
chair of Saint Peter, to whome
The Preface concerning, 
the shepe and lambs of God were committed, without whose fold there is no meane of saluation.

This much I thought good to warn the Reader of, least he shold thinck, that because I write at large only of Images, that therefor those points only were to be considered, whereas all (as it were in a short word) is comprised in the acknowledging and professing of the true Church. For there is conteined the word of God, the preaching of the Gospel, the true Sacraments, the forgeuenes of Sinees, the holy goost, the commonion of Saints, and Christ himself, who is the head of his only one mystical body and the Saviour thereof.

That at the length thou art perswaded (good Reader) that Christ hath ever had and stil must have a company of many Nations professing his faith under faithfull Bishoipes and
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and teachers: and that, none other such companie can be named, which is in any point so like to be the true Church, as that which being spread throughout all nations, hath euer had his principal Chaier and Priestly Unity in the See of S. Peter, and in the City of Rome: It remaineth, that the said companie of Christias, must be not only beleued in hart, but also confessed in mouth, and prosfessed in al our dedes, which appers teine to the worshipping of one God by Iesus Christ our Lord. For as God made the whole man, to witte, as wel the bodie as the soule, and as Christ redeemd and wil glorifie the whole man: so musst the whole man confess God and Christ, and al that belongeth to God or to Christ.

Certainly nothing belongeth more specially to Christ, then his own dere spouse the Church, which A the
The Preface concerning
he hath taken to be his wife. In so much that in our Crede and believe after the profession of our faith in God the father, in the Sonne, and in the holy Gost, it followeth immediately, Credo sancta Ecclesiae Catholicæ, I believe the holy Catholic Church.

As therefore if a Prince oure his wife intierlie, he wil never accompt him his frind, who vseth the companie of that person, which is a professed enemie to his dere wife: euen so Christ can never take him to be his faithful frind or servaet, who vseth to frequët such a Congregations, as is purposelie erected against his owne wife and Spouse, which I haue shewed to be the Societie of Catholikes. And how souer the hart of that man thincketh it self to be affected toward God, who goeth to these false congregations: surelie his fact in going to the is so slaunderous, that if the hart itself were thoo
roughly
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roughly examined, it could not jus-
tifie his own demeanour. For it dis-
uideth one mā into twain, letting
the hart in one cupanie; and the bod-
die in an other: as though anie man
could go to church, except his hart
and mind caried his bodie thither.
If then the mind wil not be without
the body (because it is not as yet dis-
pofed to die) doubtlesse the minde is
cōtent to be where the body is: and
consequentely, the minde is cōtent to
be at such a congregation or church
Service, as it beleueth to be impis-
ous and wicked And by that meas-
ures he that weuld not be at the schis-
matical service, and yet is there, de-
serveth more anger of God by his
being there, the fator by the desier
which he hath to be absent. For he
maketh void his own good desier,
by putting the cōtrary in executiō.
And yet because his desier is good,
let him not leave it, but lette him
A ņ endeouour
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endeavour fully to accomplish and 
to make perfite his good desier, by  
leaving of his evil custome.

O lamentable case of our Coun-
trie: and great oversights in that it  
hath not ben more earnestly opes- 
ned and looked vnto. But it is lesse  
euill, to know and to consyder it  
now, then never. And they may be  
happy, who hearing of it in this life  
may yet amend from hencefoorth.

How long haue ye (faith Elias) be  
setwene two sides? if this new sprung  
Congregation be Christes Church,  
then doe as the professed enemies  
of the Roman Church commaund  
you to doe. But if the Catholike so-
cietie (whereof Rome is the high  
Mother Church) be the only spouse  
of Christ, the leave the false reftes,  
the feined tabernacles, and the detesta-
ble Congregations of her enem  
 mies, and follow her alone.

Remember that it is an old con-
demned
which is the true Church. Demned hereina of the Helchesites, to thinck, that a man may beleue one thing, and speake or professe another. S. Augustin also disputing of true Religion, findeth great fault with the old Philosophers, because whereas they in their scholes held clean contrarie opinions of God, and of the highest goodnes, and of the last end of all things: yet they came al to one Church or repole, and there professed in their publike service that, which was contrarie to their private talke and doctrine. Scholas babobane dissentientes, & sempla communia, they dissented in schooles, and agreed in Churches.

Now S. Augustin judgeth that errour so great, that he doured not to saie: If we saw this fault only, healed by Christian discipline, no man ought to deny, but it were a thing to be set forth with unspeeakeable praife. For so is it blesséd and taught, that whose doctrine
The Preface concerning:

We approve not, they do not communicare in Sacraments with vs. Which thing (saith he) is lesse to be wondered at in those hereticks, who order the Sacraments otherwise than we doe (as the Manichees did, and some other did) but it is much more to be noted, in such hereticks, as keeping the same Sacraments which we have, yet because in other points they differed from the Catholicks, were not admitted to the Catholick communion, but had their proper conventicles and names, as Phoebinians, Arians, and other like. This much S. Augustine saith in effect, for it was too long to turne his word as it lay.

Which thing if it be applied to our realm, are not the opinions and Scholes contrarie? Doth not one say, the bodie of Christ is present in the Sacrament of the altar, and the other teache, that it is not present there? Will you then, who beleue it to be present, come to his sermon, sa
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his service, yea to his Communion, who teacheth openly, that Christ's body is not present? At the least wilt you give him the looking on, or the standing or sitting by whiles he ministreth in the church?

Consider now, that these men doe not only dissent from you in Schooles, but also that they have made a new kind of Church Service, and have condemned the old service, which (in the substantial points) was receaved more the fifte hundred yeres past throughout all Christendom: as in the Sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, in the adoration and Resurrection thereof, with the feast of the holy Sacraments. And yet may ye come to this new religion with a safe conscience? Surely then ye may deny the Catholike Church with a safe conscience, as trulie your dede doth in part deny it.

A iiiij  And
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And whereas there is a rumour spread by certain men, that this going to schismatical Service is, or may be winked at, or dispensed in the Catholickes, of certaintie it is not so. But rather by this keycold demeanour of the Catholickes, we may perceauve how just God was in punishing the with heresie, in who he saw so little true and harty faith, that for feare of a small temporal loss, they can be content to put in hazard their everlasting salvation. The dissleafe is great, it nedeth a sharpe medicine.

S. Gregorie telleth a notable story of one S. Ermigild sonne to Linigild, who was king of the Wifigothes in Spain. This Ermigild being converted to the Catholicke faith by S. Leander bishop of Spoleto, chose rather after prisonment and chaines, to die by the sword at his own fathers commandement, then
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to receive the communion at the hand of an Arrian Bishop. At whose body when his wicked Father saw miracles wrought, as though he repented his own deeds, yet for fear of his people (which were most of the Arrians) he durst not profess that Catholike faith, wherein his sonne had died.

But when the father was dead, his other sonne Richard being brother to the blessed Martyr Ermitgild, both himself became Catholike, and turned also his whole Country and nation to the Catholike faith. So that the event shewed his Father to have been in a vain fear. Who if he would have professed the Catholik faith, he should as well have found his subjects ready to have been made Catholikes as his son found them. Wel: S, Gregory concludeth the historic, shewing that the confession and Martyrdom of Ermygild,
The Preface concerning mygild, was a meane before God, why his brother and al the countrie became Catholike.

If it were so, what slaunder and synne haue they fallen into, who by dissembling to professe theyr faith, haue prouoked manie others to schisme and herefie. Whereas if we had plainly cōfessed the same, other mē had not onlie saued themselves, but also the whole countrie, as it may be thought, had ben preferred in the true faith.

How many now see this in·an other world, who wold leefe more then a thowsand worlds, lands, and liues, that they might haue time in this world to amend theyr former fault? And surely when al is don, none escape better, nor liue more merilie, then those who are fullie resolved to professe theyr faith plainlie and boldlie. Theyr conscience must nedes be most quiet, their
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Their honesty most esteemed, and their libertie in this world is not much lesse, and in the world to come it is infinitely greater, then any other shall haue. If the mind once (calling for grace) be at a poir, the matter is not so hard, as it seemeth. He that would be coerced to die in his bed while God should call him, and he that considereth that God may call him every hower, need no more be houful, how his wife or children should do, if he were banished, or lay in prison, then he would be houful how they should doe, if God had called him out of this word.

If it be possible for them to live well, and him selfe to die, may not thei much more do well, if he were but only in prison? Or thinkest any man, that any prison, be it neuer so cruel, is worse then hell? God kepe vs al thence. Is it worse then Purgorie? No, no: all the paine of this world
The Preface concerning, world is but painted, in respect of that which is to come.
If I wrote to flatter my country, I could write of other things more plausible. But if I may proove any one man to true penance (as I beseech God I may) I am content to beare the displeasure of the rest; and to be accepted as it shall please every man to thinke of me. I am sure if ever the faith shall be recovered, it must be don by confessing and professing it, and not by dissembling, who so ever hath read the Ecclesiastical stories, and Canons, may quickly perceave, that we ought to have no fellowship in marriage, in prayer, and in all the service of God with those men, whose religion we miss like. So the Canon of the Apostles, and the Coçcel of Laodicea teacheth, and the example of the Primitive Church.

This may suffice to him, that wilbe
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wilbe warned: others shal know (I feare me) at the later day; what it is to beleue the Catholik church; whether it be to reaue onely, or to speake that which it beleueth, or els to practise also and to doe that which the Catholik Church doth, ad commodo to be don. The doers of the law shal be justified, and not they that here it only.

God chage theyr harts, who thinck God wilbe serued otherwise outherwardly the inwardly: God streghthe the weake in faith, and increase grace and knowlege in them, that are destroue to sulfil his commaundements: To whome be al honour and glos
tie for ever.

Amen.
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The Chapters of the Treatise following.

The Argument of the Treatise.  fol. 1.
The state of the question concerning the adoration of holy Images.  fol. 8.
That although holy Images had been falsely worshipped, yet the Churches were unjustly spoiled.  fol. 12.
The Perseverance of such as heretofore have destroyed the Altars, Temples or holy Images.  fol. 20.
That the word of God forbiddeth not generally the making of all kind of Images.  fol. 41.
That the word of God only forbiddeth Hærecy to be given to artificial Images.  fol. 44.

Of a natural and an artificial image.  fol. 53.
What an Idol is, and that our Images be no Idols.  fol. 54.
That it is no Idolatry to give convenient worship to some creatures.  fol. 70.

M. Jewells ingling concerning the inversion of Images, and his corrupting of Eusobius is detected.  fol. 76.

That
10. That by the law of nature honour is due to the Images of honorable personages.

11. That by the word of God the Images of honourable things ought to be honoured.

12. Of the signe of the Cross.

13. The adoring of holy Images is proved by S. Augustins doctrine, and S. Chrysostomos Liturgie is defended.

14. The seuenth General Counel is defended. And that miracles might and have been wrought by holy Images.

15. That M. Jewell bringeth such reasons for worshipping bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar, as may serve for the worshipping of all holy Images.

16. Whether it be profitable or no, to have Images in the Churches, and to permit them to be worshipped.

17. Whether the same degree of honour be due to the Images, which is due to the Saints themselves.
A Treatise of the Images of Christe, and of his Saintes, and that it is unlawfull to break them, & lawful to honor them, &c.

The Argument of the Treatise following.
The First Chapter.

My purpose at this time, is to Answere an Objection moved by certaine Processances, concerning the late Proceedings of the Low Countries. Which Proceedings (they say) must needs come from the mighty hand of God, Sithens a sowe naked and base me, haue both cast downe Idolatrye there, and obtained permission to preach the Gospel, against the pleasure of the greatest Christian Prince that is in these our daies, against the will of an infinite number of riche Monkes, Friers, and Priestes, against the desire of the multitudes of common people, which are for the most parte al given to the old Religion.
Of Images, and religion. If then it be above the course of natural woorke, for a small number of weake men to throw downe Idols, & to spread Gods word contrary to the due of Princes, of Prelates, of Cities, of Counteries: it seemeth that the doing thereof is even the same strong power of Christ, whereby in old time the ap. Apostles being poore and ignorant men, converted all nations to the worshipping of one God, and of his Sonne Jesus our Lord. Thus some of the Protestants doe reason. This Argument maketh the preaching and decrees of our new Gospelers, like unto the preaching and decrees of the Apostles: the miracle in converting mens hartes, to be in both all one: the Images of Christ and of his Saints, to be like to the Idols of the Gentils and Pagans, and consequentlie it presupposeth God to be not onlie the permieter of these altercations, but also the worker of them, for his glory, and our salvation. But if I prove their preaching to be unlawful, their decrees to be unhonest, the pretended miracle of their working to be a heinous Sacriilege, our Images not onlie to be
no Idols, but although they had ben Idols, yet to be unlawfullie cast downe: it will remaine, that God permieth this great mischief for our great synnes, and woketh no miracle at al. And surelie it is so casic a matter to confute this fond reason of the Protestants, that the verie telling of the fact, wil be a sufficient confutation of the miracle, which is pretende to be shewed therein.

To beginne with the first occasion of this spoile, not longe after S. John Baptist his Feast, in the yere of our Lord 1566, certein men taking aduantage as wel of the busines which was betwene King Philip, and the Lords of the low Countrie (concerning an Inquisition against heresie,) as also of the businesse which they thought should have ben betwene King Philip and the great Turke (concerning the kingdom of Naples, & Malta) certein men, I saie, waiting such an opportunitie of time, stoked together in the woods, and fieldes nighe unto Antwerp, there to heare such a man preache, as neither was sent to them by their owne Bishop, nor authorized by anio

The Rest of the Spoile in the low Countrie.
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Archebishops or Patriarchs Superior to
their Bishop, no; called by anie Magi-
strate, or iausful officer. The which prea-
ching although it were a little checked by
edicts and proclamations, yet not being
remoned by force, caused as well moe
preachers to gather about that and other
cities of Flanders and Brabant, as also
moe hearers to come unto their sermons,
in so much that within one moneth,
manie thousands were found to resorte
unto this new preaching, whereas some
strange fruit must needs growe in ryme,
sichens that wilde maner of preaching
hath not ben wont to be vied, where the
whole people of the Countrie is christen
ned, vtille it be in the time of warre.

And sricelie a time of warre it was,
not onlie because these numbers of men
did all make bataille against the honie of
God, and his deere Spouse the Catholike
Church, but also because one preacher
kept warre with another, for one was a
Lutheran, an other a Calvinist. And how
could this audience lacke an Anabaptist,
sich the cheefe comming together of such
a sorte of beggarlie vagabunds, was to
Image breakers.

have a good pretense to steal, to pick, &
to make all things common? Now the com-
panie of Anabapetites lacking peace in
their hearts, have taken this name upon
them, to be called, the house of peace.

To go forward with the matter, the
blessed feast of the Assumption of our La-
die was now come, wherein the town of
Antwerp should keep their Church holydaye, as both the Jews kept perely
the Dedication or Renovation of their
Temple (whereat Christ himselfe was)
and the Christians also have used to doe
the like. But this feast of the Assump-
tion, these new preachers and their scho-
lers cannot allow, I marvel much why.
For if they keep holy the date wherein
S. Paule or S. Thomas the Apostle depar-
ted out of this world, how much more
ought they to celebrate the day, wherein
our Blessed Ladie was dissolved & made
present with God in his glory? Except
perhaps shee must fare the woorse with
those, who hate the real presence of Chris-
tes Body, under the forme of breade, be-
cause shee & brought forth the same
natural body of Christ, which they perse-
B 175  cure.
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true. May we then celebrate the day of St. Paul’s glorious death, although it be not found in scripture how or when he died; and may we not keep a like remembrance of the death of the Mother of God?

Would God they had only abstained from keeping holy her Feast, but they are so farre from sanctifying her memoria, that they profaned it most horribly.

The day. For the xx. day of August, whiles the Octanes of the said Feast was yet a celebrating (by those blessed Generations, who accompt Christes Mother holy and blessed) these new Gospellers came into our Ladie Church at Antwerp, about nine of the clock after dinner. The beginning of their purposed mischief, was committed to a Boie, who with a wand comming into the chappel of our Ladie, strooke her Image, saying, Marie thou must come downe. At which voice, as it were at a watchword, the false brethren approched nere, those that were sette to kepe the Chappel, cried out, others called the chief Magistrate, whose request and commandement these new Gospellers.
Image breakers.

Iers no more regarded, then they doe the wondre of God, which biddeth them Obey 2. Pet. 1. the king, and the officers whom he sendeth.

Neither can it serve for their excuse as though the officer forbidding them to spoile the Church, willed them to do against the commandement of God, for then it is also against the commandement of God, to steal, to spoile, to ministe or hurt any private or publike treasure against their wills to whom it belongeth. And certainly the goods of the Church, even by the common law of Nations, are holy and sacred. So that it is no common cheat to take handes upon them wrongfully.

Which notwithstanding these flesh followers of this new preaching, threw downe the graven, and defaced the painted Images, not only of our Ladie, but of all others in the towe. They rase the Curtaines, dashed in pieces the carred worke of brasse, and of stone, breke the Altars, spoile the clothes and corporezels, wrested the icons, conuered away, or breke the Chalices, and vestiments, pulled by the brasse of the granestones, The insc...
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not sparing the glasse windowes, and
scares which were made aboute the pil-
ers of the Churches for men to lihe in.

whi that I speake of the Blessed
Sacrament of the Alter, which they erode
under their feet and (horrible it is to say)
shed also their stinking pisue upon it, as
though, if it were not Chriftes owne bo-
die, it were not by their owne doctrine a
mysrical figure of his bodie. O, if it be
not so, yet at the leaft a creature of God,
which of purpose ought not to be spure-
fully ordered. A greater fault in truth
can not be named, then this was. But to
them who esteime the tremendo Mysteries
for prophane Idols, it semeth more gre-
nous, that these false brethren burned e-
xcept not only all kinde of Church bokes,
but more over destroyed whole Libraries
and bokes of al sciences and tōgues, yea
the holy Scriptures, and the Aunciente
Fathers, and roze in pieces the Maps,
and charts of the descryptions of Coun-
tries.

Is this at? They brake in pieces the
Frizers kitchen-stuffe, and al manner of
vessel. They shed their Wine and Beere,
after they had drunk thereof more than
inough, they melted their butter barrels
carried away their beds, their linnen, f
lockes of their dozes, they rooted up the
herbes of their garden, and which passed
al, they brought their trumpets in great
number with them cmong those that had
bowed chalktie, omitting neither words
nor deedes, whereby they might prouoke
the yong Monkes and Friers to cast of
their straight rule, and to come to their
holupconuse and pleasant life.

But what? These were a few lois-
terers (some man will say) and they did
that which their graue preachers allowed not. O Sir, as there were of these
robbers so many as spoyled in one night
above twenty Churches and Chappels,
so they had for their Capitaine, one Her-
mannus, who having ben a regular Cha-
non, and being long since runne out of
his Cloister, had now also lost one of his
eares (beside a marke upon his Backe)
for a robberie committed about Cleve-
lande.

This Hermannus, manned "rath
er maistred the Churche spoiles, and
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every where provoked the Monks, Friars, and Nunnés, to come from their sewe Religion, to his swee Doctrine.

He came (among other places in Antwerp to the Nunnés of S. Clares, which he of S. Francés order, whom when he begann to persuade, that they should go out of their Cloister, they fell downe prostrate, and gane themselves to prayer, whereupon immediately Hermannus gane over his exhortation, crying to his fellowes, away, away. I am able to say no more. It is verely thought, that through the Nunnés prayer, his Mouth was stopped.

Thus were the Churches and monasteries of Antwerp sacked, the example and impunitie whereof, caused the breche at Saune, at Tooney, at Uaen-signes, at Hartegenbusch, at Middel-burgh, and in diverse other places to do the like: Some of them pretending for that their mischief, a commission from the Emperour, others deriving their Authoritie from the holy ghost. As though God could be the author of their evil doing. Now let vs briefly consider this great
Image breakers.

Great miracle, which our new brethren accompany the mighty hand of God.

First, the preachers were not lawfullie called, which was enough to shew all that followed to be nought, albeit they had preached no heresie at all.

Secondlie, they preached to mane Heresies, as the Lutheranes or Calvinistes their predecessors haue taught. So that though their Preachers had been once lawfullie called, yet they had broken their commission.

Thirdly, one of them preached against the other, accordingly as the sectes are diverse, and in mane points contrarie.

Fourthly, their deeds were contrarie to natural honestie, in robbing and violentlie spoiling other mens goods.

Last of all, they did it in such a time, as it may well appeare, they cared not to haue furthered the proceedings of great Turke, lichen they must either haue drawen Kinge Philips power from resisting his invasion, if he had come to Malta (as they thought he wold) or else haue compelled theire Prince to their own conditions.

If this
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If this be a great miracle of God's working, to see who were of heretics spoile Christian churches by violence, we shall make many new miracles, such as other men call manifest sacrileges, and wicked Robberies. A Christian miracle is, when the faithful overcome by suffering, rather than by damming others.

Yea but a few did it against the will of man. They were in deed, but few who spoiled the churches, in respect of the Catholikes who were in the City. But since we can make it no miracle for a few to overcome, where no man at all resisteth, this was no miracle in the spoilers behalf, but rather a great miraculous plague to the City of Antwerp, and to such other towns for their great synnes otherwise committed. For, as Eusebius at large declareth, the greatest plague that ever God sendeth for our synnes, is when our Churches are spoiled and overthrown. But if these brethren being the fewer in number, had overcome a greater number resisting them with like violence, then had it been somewhat to have been spoken of, although it had not
not ben a sufficient prouf of their doctrine. But wheresoever any resistance at all was made to these spoilers, they had no victorie, as at Burges, Lile, Do- way, Douces, Louan, Buxels, Barogh, and divers other. In so much, that the mariners and wemen did beat them out at Flushing. Wheresoe the plague which so fell upon some townes, that other of lesse habilitie with greater easinesse escaped the same, is a manifest argument, that God was more angrie with some townes, then with others. For with whom he was most angrie, those he punished most speculie.

And in deede, such all outward Temples, Ornaments, Service, and Sacrifices be a token of the inward worshipping, which ought to be in vs, when God sawe publicke justice neglected, riot and courtesynes neglected, extortion, and Usurie without all feare exercis'd, heresie and Lewde libertie of the flesh greedily embrased, the Sacraments, and the Ordinances of his owne Churche despised: when Flay, God saw all inward righteousness decayed, it was great mercie in him, to suffer
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suffer the outward tokens of this inward.justice, to be also broken, and spoiled, to the end, those that would not take advertisement of their naughty life by hearing the word of God catholically preached, might now at the least be warned by their owne eyes, and perceive that as God suffered his owne temple in the land of Juda to be destroyed by the wicked Assyrians, when his people would take no warning at the mouth of his holy Prophets: even so now the cursed generation of Heretiques being worse than the Assyrians, was permitted to shew evidentely unto them, that their life was naught, their faith voide of Charitie, their Obedience none, neither to God, nor to the Church, nor to their Prince. This was the miracle that God wrought in suffering his Churches of stone to be spoiled by his cruel Enemies, to the ende his lively Temples and true Church might learne to detect their false Doctrine, whose errors they perceived to be so wicked,
Image breakers.

The state of the Question concerning the adoration of holy Images, Where also a reason is given of the order which is taken in the boke following.

The 2. Chap.

Before that Images can be worshipped, they must be made. And when they are made, seeing we do not defend that all Images, but onlie that certaine male be worshipped: it must be known which are the Images that male be worshipped, and which male not. Then because it is not alwaies expedient, that every thing which male be done, should be done, it is an other question, whether though some Images male be worshipped, it were well done to lette them be worshipped, specially when a farther danger might be feared thereby.

Fourthlie, for asmuch as there are divers degrees of worship, one which is due to God alone, another which is due to good men: it is doubted, whether the same worship which is due to the principal patern (as to the Saints' chesines) be also due to their ligres and Images, or els
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or els whether it be some inferiour degree of worship, which becometh their Images and representations.

Concerning the first question, the Catholikes defend, that Images may be made, and that no general or immutable commandement of God is against the making of them.

Secondlie, we defend, that onlie those Images may be worshipped (in respect of Christian Religion) which represent and bring vs in minde, either y there is a God or that there are threepersons of the Blessed Trinitie, or which represent Christ, or his holy Angels and Saints.

Thirdlie, we think it expedient, that these holy Images should be permitted to be worshipped for their sakes whom they represent.

Fourthlie, we defend it for the more probable, that the same degree of honour is not due to the Image of Christ, of our Ladie, or of other Saints, which is due to Christ, our Ladie, and to other Saints themselves. But that there is a certain proper honour due to holy Images,
Image breakers.

'g' ses, which may be called a trorship or honour due to a good Remembrance, or Monum-
ment.

Now in the first question, whether it be lawful to make Images or no, there
is no great difficulty, albeit some Calvinists doe speake vp and down in that be-
half. But for the most part, it is granted of al men, that Images may lawfully be
made, so that they be not abused.

In the second, as wel the Lutherans as the Calvinists defend against vs, that
no Image at al may be worshipped in one for or other. And much more they must judge it unprofitable to have Image
ages worshipped, which was the Third
question.

In the fourth and last question, there hath bene thought to be some contro-
versie between the Catholiques, because some have thought, that the honor due to
the thing is self(by reason that the Image
is alone with the thing, when it exer-
cisest the act of an Image) might be ge-
ne to the Image thereof. Others be of an other minde because they confyder an Image otherwise.
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Of enquirie of these questions some-
what (God willing) shalbe said, but most
of all, concerning the second question,
wherin the greatest controversy consi-
sidereth.

1. To make it then plaine what shal be
defended in this treatise, I saie, it is not
only lawful, but commendable, and most
agreeable to reason, and to the law of na-
ture, and to the universal custom of the
Church, to make Images, which may
put a man in remembrance of good, holy,
and honorable verities.

2. It is likewise lawful and commen-
dable when the Images are made, to use
them as we ought to use the remem-
brances of good, holy, and honorable veri-
ties. And then we doe use wel the remem-
brance of an honorable veritie, when we
show so much honor to the veritie itself,
that we suffer not the veritie signe and ta-
kem, or as it were, the messenger and step
of it, to be without some honour, for
that veritie sake, which it sheweth and
purreth vs in minde of.

How much did S. Iohn esteem
Joan. 1. Christ, when he thought him selvea-
the
thy to unbuckle the lachet of his dew; 
And who doth not naturally imbrace ne-
ver so meane a servant or messenger co-
mong from his deere friend? Who killerh 
not the ring, which he receaued frr fhim; 
who lonerh not the honorable naming of 
him? who estreneth not his picture and 
Image?

But whè we say, Images may and 
ought to be honored, no man may by 
and by thnck, that we make them Gods, 
as though there were not one honour 
due to a God himself, an other due to 
his Sarnes, an other to our c Prince, an 
other to his d Lieutenaunt, an other to 
our e Father and Mother, an other to 
our f Maker, an other to our g friends 
and h fellows, pe a other also to the 
| holy monuments and cememblances of 
the persons, whose monuments are in 
blissednes. Among so manie degrees of 
honour, we gene one degree to Holie 
Images, and by Gods grace I wil prove 
r to be due to them. Of which difference 
of honour, I warne the Reader before, 
lest he should think either that honour is 
due to God alone, and in no sense to any 
other.
Of Images, and other thing: or, els, that when we speak of adoring or honouring Images, that then we should mean to give them such honour, as is due to God alone.

It is the mind which genereth honour principally. If I fall down before an Image, & kiss the same, and light a candel before it, being all this while of the mind that it is no God, not no reasonable creature, but only that is a good remembrance either of Christ, or of his Mother, or of his Disciples, towards whom I desier to shewe mine affection, God it knoweth mine honour is farre of thogh honour, which is due to God alone. In so much, that if I lay prostrate before Christes seere, and kissed them, and knocked mine breast, and held vp my hands to him, and crept upon my knees after him, and called him the Sonne of God, and yet all this while thought him not to be a natural son of God (of which impiousse mind, the Arians were) mine honour should be accepted no honour at all, but a contumelie to Christ, and I should be damned (not in deed so, doing that I do, but) for not believing his true Godhead, after that
that it had ben once published and professed in the Church.

Abraham adored the people of the land of Chanaan. But was he an Idolatour therefor? He adored them as Lords and Gentlemen of the country, but not as his Gods, or his Saviour. He set God thy hart, and kepe thy faith stedie, and afterward be secure, that the honoure which is gencn, in vaine respecte, for God's sake, whether it be to the friends of God, or to his Ministers, or to the Monuments and Images of God's friends, be secure. I say, of they dede, because thy hart and intent is good, which one ly God regarded. And he regarded it so much the better, ye with a good faith to him, he see in thee a good affectio to his servants or friends.

This much I haue sayed, to thend man shoulde be offended with the names of adoration, worshipping, honouring, reverencing, bowing, kneeling, kissing, or any like, as though, because distinct words lacke to geneuerie thing, that must be honoured, his proper name of honour, we can not therefore by our

E 19 nderstan-
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restanding distinc the honour of one thing from an other. The words which betoken honour be in maner confounded in all coungs. But the hart whence the honour coueth, knoweth the difference of every thing. Therefore call it how ye list, one kinde of honour is due to the Image of an honorable personage, the which Honour is genen without all blame, where the partie that geneth it, doth in the faith of one God and of one mediator Jesus Christ, direct his honour by the Image to the truth represented, as all good Catholiks doe, the which faith and intention doth quite deliver vs from all spicce of Idolatrie.

And for as much as he can not well build a new house, who doth not first remove suche stones and rubble as lieth in his way, I think it necessarie to purge away suche objections, as may seeme to make against the fearing or honouring of Images, before I come to prove that honour is due to them. Yea before I come to either of both, my advantage against these Image breakers is so great that I will (for disputations sake) ieune, that
that Images are either whorthie of no honour, or at the least, that they were so much honoured by the ignorant Catho-
likes. And yet if even that were true, I will declare, that the breakers of Images in the Low Countrie

did not wei.

* * *
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That although the Images of Christ and
of his Saints had been falsely worshipped,
yet the Churches were unjustly spoiled
and the Images unjustly thrown downe.
And consequentlie that the doers of it
must needs be the ministers of the devil.
The 3. Chap.

Because the whole mischief done in
the Low Countries had his beginning upon this pretense, that the
Catholikes abused the Images of Christ
and of his Saints, worshipping them,
like as the Gentils heretofore did wor-
ship the Idols of their false Gods: I will
first shew, that our Images, although
they had been falsely worshipped, yet they
ought not to have been so broken and de-
stroyed, as they were. And afterward I
will shew, y they are no Idols, but may
and must be honestly worshipped of us
according to the word of God, and the
example of the first five hundred years.

Concerning the first point, if we
had given false honour to the Images of
Christ or of his Apostles and Martyrs:
it was their part, who thought so, to
have espoused us to leave y false honour,
and not to have comitted any injurious fact, whereby we might be instlie offended with their whole doctrine. For if charitie did perswade them to break our Images, lest we should worship God in a false manner; the same charitie, if it had beene ruled by right knowledge, would have told them, that the way for the to make vs worship God better, had ben to have gotten credit to vs by their good deeds. And whē we had thought them to have bē good & honest men, afterward to have prepared their great reasons, whereby we might have ben moved, to leave that our false worship (as the imagin it) and so to have both kept out Images for the instruction of them who can not reade, and to have let our Idolatry, as they call it. For seeing the Image neither is evil of itself, nor the resemblance of anie false God, nor of evil men (as the Gentils Idols were) I see not but the false worship might have ben taka away from the true representation which the Images make, & so both the Images quicke lie alone, and the abuse charitablie amended.

If they say, although the brazon scrpent was
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Num. 21. 4. Reg. 18.
1. pūt was willed to be set vp by God him
self, yet that Ezechias brake it when it
was abused: let them consider, first, that
king Ezechias was the publike Ministrer
of God, next, that he did it orderlie by
publike commandement. And thridly,
that the thing broke was rather a figure
then an Image: fourthly that it was not
used as an Image, but was abused, as if
it had ben a principal dealtre to be wor-
shipped of itself. For the people wor-
shipped the material brass, in so much
that Ezechias when he brake the serpēt,
he called it, nephilam, that is to saie, bra-
sē, or a thing of brass, declaring by the name
what metal the people had worshipped,
the which verie thing Angelomus als
bath noted. Now this worship of
theirs could not in anie sense be lawfull,
because no unreasonable creature is
worshipped of worship in it self, and for
his own sake.

Again, there was no natural ser-
pēt at all who in truthe might be wor-
shipped. But only there was to come
an intellectual serpēt, (Christ, worthy
of all worship) who should take away
the
the stinge and byting of the venemoufe Serpente the Denill. Therefore the brazen serpent was an obscure figure (to them that were spiritual) rather then a manifest Image of a knowne truth to the simple. And when the simple not knowing what the figure of the serpent did signifie, had honoured the vexte metail, as it selde being the cause of benefite to them, the King moned with the haly Ghoost, brake the serpĕt, saying, as it were, this is brazen, and nor God.

But it is not like in vs, who do not wooshippe the metail of our Images, but we knowe them to be Images, and whereof they arc Images, and we vsie them as occasions to Remember Christ, our Lady, Saint Peter, and such other true Saints, who we profess to be in heauen, keeping halie the daies of their glorious death.

But these men being not so much as inferior Magistrates, and much lesse Kingses, did without other, by sleale, by force, and by night (and therefor with an evil conscience) destroy not obscure figures, but known Images of
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ges of Christ and of his friends, & those also not worshiped concerning their metal, but only concerning that they represented a truth.

Moreover, Ezechias brake that brazen Figure of the Serpent, both without injury done to any society or company of private persons, and without seeking of his owne gaine thereby. But these men so brake the common and private Images of divers Fraternities and Companies, that they both injured many Cities and Societies in the value of certaine thousand pounds, and also many of them robbed and carried away to their owne commoditie, what so ever they were able to catche.

Last of all, if an Image might be broken and stolen by any means, yet what fault have siluer Crosses and gilded Chalices omitted, why they must needs be broken and carried away? What offense did white linnen cloth? What deserved the holy Bibles, and the works of? Ancient Fathers, why they should be torne, burnt, or spoiled? Did Ezechias spoil the whole Temple of Salomé, be-
cause the brazen Serpent was abused:

To return to Images, although thei had ben abused and falsely worshiped (as they were not) yet according to the authortie of holy Scripture, they ought not to have ben thown yet oune by private men, against their wils whose goodes they were. For thus it is written touching the Idols of the very false Gods. When the Lord thy God hath brought thee into the land wherein thou goest to possess, (and afterward) whé he hath delivered them to thee:

(again afterward) Deuor the Alters, & breake their Images. Lo, when God hath geuen any Heathenish Nation into our handes, so that we are become Lords of the land, then onely we may destroy their false Idols, whereby we are taught on the other side, if we be not Lords of the land, we may not destroy other mens Alters, or Images, albeit they be false. So doth S. Augustine reason concerning the Idols of the Gentils in these words. Hoc dicimini

charitati vestra, ne faciatis illa, quando inpos tete vestra non est, ut faciatis illud. Præsum bominum est, furiosor circuæcellionum, & ubi potestate non habent saucire, & velle mori, prope =

rant
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rall sine causa. Audistis que nobis legitimus, omnes qui nuper in mapalibus assistitis. Cum data
nobis fuerit terra in poestatem. Prinæ ast in po-
testatem, sic dixit quæ facienda sunt. Aras orum, inquit, destruetis, lucos eorum cœminuetis,
ömmes titulos eorum consfringetis. Cū acceptiris
poestatem, hoc facite, uti nobis nò est data poter-
Sius, nò facimus, uti data est non prætermittimus.
Multi Pagani habeunt istas abominatones in fun-
dis suis, nuncid accedimus & cœfringimus. Prin-
as enim agimus, ut I dola in eorum cordibus cœfrin-
gamus. Quando Christiani & ipsi sacti suerit, aut
ommitant nos ad tam bonum opus, aut pœnitet nos.

This we lay unto your charitie, do ye
not these things, which be not in your
power to do? It is part of wicked me,
of surious vagabonds, to be fierce and
cruel where they have no authoritie, and
wilfully to die, they have without cause.
Ye have heard, what we did read unto
you, that were present of late in the
schooles. When the land shall be gaven into
your povery and government. First the saith:
into your povery or government, and so he the-
ted what should be done. you shall destroy
(faith God) their Aulters, you shall set their
darke woods, and you shall breake at their Title
Monumences. When you shall receive authority, do this. Where we have no authority, we do not this, but where authority is given, we do not omit to do it. Many Infidels have these abomina-
ations in their grounds, but do we go where them and break them? First we indevour our selves to break the Idols in their harts. And when they them selves are made Christias, either they do invite vs to do that good deed, or els they them selves prevent vs.

Wherefore we may perceive, it was unlawfully done to cast downe their Images, whose land was not given over to them who rove upon them that outrage. Now let vs consider the second iniquie, which consist in turning the Crosses, Candlesticks, Jewels, Images and other Church goods into private lucre of certaine men. Whereof S. Augustine speaketh in his epistle to Publicola, shewing why it is not lawful to make our owne gaine even of Idols, or of Idolatrous Churches. No not then when it is lawful for vs to break them downe.

Et cum Temple, Idolae, luci, & si quid huius = August, in Epi. 154.

modi
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modi data potestate, evertuntur, quamuis manifestum est, cum id agimus, non causas honorare, sed potius detestari: ideo tamen in ius nostros privatos dumtaxat & proprios non debemus inde aliquid usurpare, ut appareat nos pietate ipsa destruere, non avaritia. Cum vero in ius communem non proprios ac privatos, uel in honorem Dei veri evertuntur, hoc de illis sit quod de ipsis hominibus, cum ex sacrilegis & impius in veram Religionem mutantur. And when Temples, Jdoles, Woods, or any such like, by lawful Auctoritie are overtunnew, although it be manifest, when we doe that thing, that we do not honour them, but rather detest and abhorre them:yea notwithstanding we ought not to usurpe any part thereof to our only private and proper uses, that it may apper we destroy these things for godliness, and not for courteousnes sake. But when they are connected into common uses, or not into proper and private gaine, or els into the honour of the true God, y thing is done by them, which is done by y men them selves, when thei are changed from sacrilegious and impious, into true Religion.

Now being neither the Brotherhods and
and particular Lords themselves in the Low Countries, no, the Prince & Prelates there, gave these new Gospellers any power to throw down their Images, or to rob their Churches: it is evident, that they have both he vainly thrown down those things wherupon they had no power: as many of them have more vainly carried away a great part of the same, to their own private commoditie and filthy gains. But so much as it is unlawfully for any man, whosoever he be, to turn to his private commoditie those Idolatrous and Superstitious Temples, Churches, Idols and woodes, which were before dedicated to the devil and his members: how much more must it be, for any man to throw down such holy Altars, Temples, and Images, as were dedicated to Christ himself?

They say we worship Idols in our Churches, which is not true, but certainly they worship Idols in their hearts. For some of them so worshipped cowardliness, that (perhaps even against their conscience at the first) yet they would ima-
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give our Images to be Idols, that they
might have occasion to carry away our
gilded crosses, our silver candlestickes,
and other jewels & Images of price. Let
every honest man confess, which of us is
not more like to be a worshipper of Idols.
I will prove hereafter, that our Images be no Idols. But which of them can
say he is free from Idolatry, who keepeth
the Church goods in his private hands,
which St. Augustine saith, no private
man ought to have, lest he appear to have
pulled downe Churches, or (which is al one)
Abbeis, for covetousnes, and not for godlines.
If any man will cleere him selfe of this
inward Idol, let him confess his fault
in bluring Church goods, and amend
the same by restoring that which he gotte
unlawfully, and then I may think he is
become godlie, and is not any more an
Idolator.

Farther it must be understood, viz.
according to the law and use of all Nati-
ons, the Prince also hath a private trea-
sure and patrimonie of his owne, the
which if he do enrich by Church goods,
or if he give the same to his private frie-
des
for their private commoditie, he appear'd to have pul'd downe Religious houses for conceaues, and not for godlines.
And in so appearing, he geneth cause of inst offense to his neighbour, and therefore I've un'do him (as Christ him selfe hath cried) by whom offensies come. 

If any Protestant graine, that the Images in the Low Countries were unjustly throwen downe, and the Churches unjustly spoiled, but yet say, 't the same thing ought to have been done there, and in all other places after another manner, to witte by the order of Law: I beseeche him to consider, that how so ever he mil-like the maner, and allow the thing, yet the users of this unmanerly maner, wer al of his owne opinion. Yea the Captains of the spoile, were the preachers & Doctors of his belief. So that, we may know them by the fruits of their owne Doctrine. And if any increase of this new faith ever follow in the Low Countries, these men are the beginning & foundation thereof. And consequently that fowd plank is the foundation of this new Gospel, whereof the Bospellers them selves are ashamed.

D  story
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Note for Gods love in every chris
trie, what filthy beginnings this Reli-
gion had, and it shall be lothsome to
thee to remember it. If then they that
authorised ingleton, preached false doctrine
in this point, & commanded Churches
to be spoiled, when the Country was not
yet geneuer into their hands, why doth
any man credit them in any other point?

I saie farther to him, who so favoureth
new opinions, that he is never sure to
know what his faith is, or what it shalbe
shortly. For his preachers change, as ene-
crie occasion serveth their advantage. If
the Prince be for them, the contrarie part
maie be persecuted: if the Prince be ag-
against them, no man must be constrained
to beleue or to profection which is against
his conscience. If such a woman rule, as
doeth not sauceth them, then they blow their
trumpet against the monstrous regiment
of women: if a woman fauour their sect,
the maie govern not onlie temporal, but
euen spiritual matters immediatlie under
Christ. If the Prince be with them, obey
your Prince, for he is the Minister of God:
if the Prince withsaide them, fight against
your
your Prince, as they have preached and practised in Germanie, in England, in France and in Scotland.

If miracles be alleged against them, they are fables although the Auncient Fathers haue them, as that of holy water in Epiphanius: if they make anie shew to help them, they are heuenlie revelations, albeit they be very fond fables newlie devised, as the late miracle of M. Lane in Westchester.

If the Doctors be brought against them, they are men, be they never so manie: if any one of them maie be wrested to their lybre, he was a holy Father inspired with the holy Ghost, as they speake of Epiphanius in the matter of Images.

If a Poppes Decree be alleaged against them, he is Antichrist. If they maie preënd anie pece of a Decree for them, he is an Auncient Witness of the Aposto-like faith, as Pope Gelasius in the matter of communicating in bothe kindes.

If Glooses or Doctorous within these nyne houres peres be cited for the Catholikes, thei are babes: If for the Calunies, thei are the Glooses them selues (that is to say) men principally well lerned.
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and grave. If custome withstand them, is it a corruption: if it seeme to help them, it is the laudable custome of the people of God. And then let auncient customes pre-
vaile, quod W. Jewel.

The olde Latine translation is some-
times no Scripture at al, as in containing
the seuen spirites in Eslaie: sometimes to
be preferred before the Greeke text, as in
containing the wordes, Et devno calice.

Ips. Cor. 10. Alters, be only Holy tables, and Masse is
the onely Communion, when it please
them. The body of Christe is to them
the signe of his body, and contrariwise the
signe of the Crosse, is to them the body it
selfe crucified. Thus the Real body is
made the only Signe, and the only signe
is made the Real bodie. Holy bread is
condemned, and yet the Communion is
taught to be but holy bread, & not Chris-
tes own real bodie. Priests & Bishops
never have any temporall possessions: it
is true (say they) except we our selves be
Bishops. Priests and Bishops (as they
teache) be equal by Gods law, yet they
understand it except themselves be Bis-
chops over Catholikes. For then they cor-
pel
pet tyrannically Popish Priests (their equals by their owne doctrine) to obey their decrees, as if they were their very sujectes. And while their naie not they be subject to another Bishops decree (although he were in Gods lawe their equal) as we! as they take upon them to govern other Priests who they confesse by Gods lawe to be their equals? And to conclude with our principal purpose,

If we burne their saile and malicious translations of the bible, we burn(sei they) the holy bible of Iesus Christ, the word of God, the foode of life. If they burn (as now in the Lawe Contrie they did) the Hebrew, Greeke, Latin and Doutch text, with all the comments of the holy Fathers, and also with the Maps and Charts of Geographicke, & aI writers that they could come by, yet are they holie workers in the Lordes vine. And if anie of them be hanged for it, they are notable martyrs and witnesses of the truthe.

O godly Gospel, true dythic teacheers. It were infinite to persecute cuere such particular contraristicke. But these few ex-

"Note."
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to be light, Inconstant, variable, and
fitted only to serve their own hellie and
pleasure. God lend vs grace to beware of
such sects, and to return to the Ancient
Church, or to return to the Catholicike
faith, known, tried, proned, and practi-
sed in all the world after one constant for
by the space of these fifteen hundred yeres.
But let vs heare, what may be further
said concerning this manifest Sacrilege
of spoiling holy things.

The Petegrew of such as heretofore have
destroyed the Alters, the Tempies, the
chalices of God, or the Images of Christ
and of his Saintes. With answer to cer-
taine Objections which might seeme to
make for Image breakers.

The. 3. Chapter.

Exo. 26.  
From the time that either Moples
made the Tabernacle, or Salomon
had once built the Material Temple of
God in Jerusalem, and had abourned it
with Alters, Vessels, Tables, Candle-
dickes, Images of Cherubins, and
with the holy Velikes, the rod of Aaron,
Ex. 7. the Tables of the Testament, & Manna;
the
Image breakers.

The honour or dishonour done unto it, was always a sufficient declaration, who was the servant of God, and who was against God, & that not without a cause. For as the material Temple is and ever hath been the figure and signe of the faithful men, who are the true temples of God, so where true faith is, it causeth the signe of the same faith to be honored. But where heretic, schisme, and infidellitie is, thence must needs spring the despite of any thing, which is made to betoken and to signifie right faith and true religion.

Mark well, good Reader, the cermes we stand in. We have not so doe at this time with the Temples of Idols, or with the Images of Jupiter, Mars, Juno, Minerva, but only with those who have borne the name of Christ and of his Apostles and Saints. I lay from the making of the Tabernacle, & the building of Solomon's Temple, to this house, who so destroyed the Temples dedicated to God, or any ornaments of the house of prayer (such as had been universally received in his time) shewed himself thereby to have been of a noughty Religion and Faith.
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To begin with the Phlystinns, if they were so greeuously punished in the secre
pares of their bodies only for looking upon the Arke of God, with contempt, or cu-
riolite: what may we thinke is due to them, who now have so miserably defas-
ced so many Temples consecraced unto God?

If Dza that touched the Arke (as it may be thought, to no malicious minde) yet was striken dead only because he tou-
ched it rashly: what may these throwers downe of Gods House looke to at his
hand, who should rather have put their shoulders under it, to have holden it up, when it had ben coward falling? David,
for his honor of God, honoured his Arke with daunslng before it: these men much more like to Michol, che to David,daunc
for joy, to see the like houses of God cast dwayne and defaced.

was not his sin of Jeroboam exceeding
great, when he forsoke the Temple of Salo-
mon in Jerusalem, whe he his Acestours alwaies and he him selfe sometime had
served Godde, and built him two new Schismatical Temples, putting Priestis
Image breakers.

in them not of the order of Leui, & those also taken out of the vilest sort of the
monaltie? Compare the things, and it shall appeare, that the verie like praunc is
now plaied in Antwerp, new Temples are built, new Ministers are made in
ichisme.

The Ministers and servants of Je-
zabel in the daies of Elias, destroyed the
Altars, which had ben built unto God.
which thing Elias toke so greuously,
that he desired God, to take him out of
this world. Was not Jezabel of a nough-
tie faith, and Elias of a good faith? and
who are they now, that have destroyed
Altars dedicated to God in the Low
Countries? Whether are they Papists, or
Protestants? Nabuchodonosor burnt the
Tempel of Salomō, and carried away the
ornaments, what have the Protestants
done lesse at Balduke and Amsterdam.

Baltazar called for the holy vessels, of
Gods Temple, & used them prophane lies.
These men brake verie chalices (which
were made to hold Equisstes blood ) into
peeces: And as for the service whereunto
they put them, it is horridle to thinke of.
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Malac. 1. 
In Malachie God findeth fault with the priests for offering the blind and the lame beasts, and polluted bread. These men thinke every thing to precious for God’s howle, and therefore they take away the gold and silver, judging it meeter for their own tables, then for God’s Altar, as though Moses and Solomon had not decked all things with gold in their Tabernacle and Temple.

Heb. 9. 

When Manasses (the brother of Iad-dus the high Bishop) married the daughter of a stranger against the law, and through ambition forslaking the Temple of Jerusalem, took a new bishoprike instituted in the hil Garizim by King Alexander, and there served God in a new temple, did he therein anie other thing then these now doe? who forslaking the Sardi churches whereunto they belonged before, make them selves new Bishops, and parish priests by their own authority?

Joseph, Iu daic. an= tiq. lib. ii. cap. 8. Antiochus Epiphanes, having des-filed the Temple, turned the holy daies thereof into mourning, and the honour thereof into shame. Chanced not the like
in Antwerp, when our Ladychurch was spoiled within the verie Octaues of the Church holy day?

Pompius is thought to have done no small domage to the religiō of the Temple, onlie because he would curiollie see the secrets therof, albeit he toke awaie nothing. These men breaking vp y Holy of Holies, toke the blessed Body of our Saviour out of the pιc, and having done their filthie pleasure therewith, car- ried awaie the pιc, or brake it in pieces.

Christ honoured the temple with his presence, notwithstanding the horrible vices which he knew to be in the clergie. These men pretend the clergie to be so enui, that they must needs punish the Temple of God for their sakes.

It appereth by Tertullian, that the Ethnicks did intwite the Christians of y special reverence they bare to the Crosse. The like is now laied to our charges by the Protestants.

The Monatians kept their Conνεticles and prayers a part from the old Church, or house of prayer of y Bishop of Rome, and of his Priests. So do these men
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men preach and praise a part from their
Diocesan, or Parish Church.

The Maniches not believing the true flesh
of Christ, did therefore hate his Image.
These men yet are worse, because they
have the Image of that flesh, which they
consider to have been true.

Diocletian and Maximian com-
manded all the Churches of the Chris-
thians to be destroyed even to the ground,
and the holy Scriptures to be burnt; the
first was done at Balduke, the second at
Antwerp in the Monasterie of the Fran-
ciscans.

Anno. D. when Georgius an Arrian Bishop
346-
Nicæphor
li. 9 c. 34.

was contrarie to the order of the Lands
brought into Alexandria by a Seculer
conurie (the lawfull Bishop Athanas-
tius being yet alive, and not deposed, as
himself both witnesseth) it is marvellous
to consider, how manie things were
done like to those which are now practi-
ced in the Low Countries.

Athana-
sius in ep.

The Arrians burnt the Baptisteries: and
ad ubique
orthodo-
xos li. 2.

now also the founts provided to baptize
the children, were cursed where de-
stroics.
The holy Scriptures were burnt there. And here they were burnt with a fier made of the wood of the images. There the Churches were given, in predam rapinæisque, to be made a præcie, and to be violently spoiled: here the same was done.

There they devided between them that which was laid vp in cellars, and drank up or shed out a great quantitie of wine. The like was done at S. Michaelis in Antwerp. They pulled down the candlessticks there. And here also. They burnt the tapers of the Church there unto Idols: here they burnt them to gene light to their own spoile and robberie, which Idol of theirs they at this tyme adozed. There Georgius gave reward to the Spoilers of the Churches: here I say affirm nonnoze, but that it is saide, the spoilers were byred for the sinners by the day.

All those michiels Athanasius himself described: And these of the Low Countries all men may see evidentic fee before their eyes. Whereby our new Gospellers are proued to be such followers of the Arrians. Like impietie of doctrine must haue like impietie of deeds.

Anno. D.

Julianus the Emperor after 370.
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Nicephor. li. 10. cap. 1. 2. 3. 4. baptismte renounced his faith, fel agaime to worshipping of many Gods, persecutted the Christiâs, & denoliced open bâtel to Christ himself. This Julian (moued with the same spirit wherwith these men were now moued in ï Low Countrie) took to make the Image of Christ, made in brass (which was set up by before, and had stode in Cesarea Philippi aboue three hundred perces for the honor of Christ) in place thereof the said Julianus did set up his owne Image. And the Infidel Paganes drawing the Image of Christ by the feet, brak the same into pieces, as Socrates in his booke of the Ecclesiasticall Historie, and Nicephorus also have witnesed. Beholde the first Paterne of Image breakers.

Let vs add to this deed of Julian, his wordes also. For in his booke against Christies Religion, thus he saith to the Christians. Crucis lignum adoratis, imaginis illius in fronte & ante domos pingete. Ye adoze the wood of the Crosse, painting the Images therof in your face head, and before the doozenes. Whereby we may perceine, that as the Christians had
had a graven Image of Christ himself even from his own time in Paneade, so likewise they hadde the Images of his Crosse before their houses.

Neither did S. Cyriacus (who answered the Saunders of Julianus) deny that thing, but he defended it, saying: Parro miseram esse dicit, quibus cura est semper et domos & frontes signo pretioso Crucis signare. Furthermore he calleth those men wheedes, & misers, who are careful to make the signe of the precious Crosse on their houses and foreheads. And having received what benefits Christe did vs by the Crosse, he concluded: Hec omnia recordari nos facit salutare lignum, All these things the healthful woode doth make vs to remember. And againe, Pretiosi ligni crucem facimus in memoriam omnium boni, & omnis virtutis. We make the Crosse of the holy woode for a memorie of al goodnes and vertue. And Againe: Vis itur (vir strenue) ut ligni quod nos ad recordationem omnium virtutis inducit, abijcimus? Wilt thou therefore (o good Syr) that we shal cast away thy wood, which bringeth vs to the remembrance of al vertue?

This
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This manes, bucke ait (hearing the same name) haung spoled the Jewels, and precious treasures of Churches of Antioche, face upon holy vessel & benedictions (which W. Jewes calleth Communion cups:) and for his impiete, he was eaten in the secret parts w't worms.

Wonde not (good Reader) why none of these good fellowes in Antwerp have yet so perished. For it is enough, ye God once taught us to beware by one man's paine.

Eustachius the Heretike, allowed rather private conventicles in prophane houses, then common assemblies in hallowed places. Wherin he was like to our new bishophen. He also would do what him liked about a bishop or priest, & so wil thei.

Vigilantius called ye Catholikes, ye worshippers of ashes and of Idols, because they worshipped ye churches, tubes and relics of the Martyrs, lighting tapers at them, and desiring to be relieved by their praiers, who S. Hierom esteeined to have ben of the mind, vi sanctioribus basilicis desnuaret, to destroy the Churches of the Saintes.
Now then the mind, or desire, of Vigilantius is executed in these our days. Let us farther hear, what S. Chrysostome, Opctatus, and Victor they to have been done by most vile Heretics & Schismatikes in their time. S. Chrysostome writing to Innocentius Pope to tell how the wicked soldiours breaking into his Church at Constantinople, on Easter eve at night, threw out of the Church al his Clergie and himself. The which soldiours entering into the place where the holy things were reserved, vewed all things most carelessly. And (in such a tumult) the most holy blood of Christ was shedde upon the garments of the soldiours.

S. Chrysostome in that place complained, that by the rashnes seely and tumult of the soldiours it channed the most holy blood of Christ to be shed: but seeing these men in the Low Countries breaking by force into the Churches, and calling out the Clergie of seete purpose, brake by the place where the most holy bodie of Christ was reserved, and trode it under their seete, how much more
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would that holy Father have lamented
of their impious fact?

Optatus first reported, 
The furious madness of the Donatists (who were
a vile kind of Heretics in Africa), se-
frigit, aut rasit, aut remouit altare, quaod ei se-
des Corporis et Sanguinis Christi: Their fur-
ouisie madness (saith Optatus) either
brake, or razed, or removed the Alter,
which is the seat or residence of Christes
body and blood.

Againe Optatus saith: Hoc immana
facinus geminatur est, dum fregit: is etiam cali-
ces, Christi sanguinis portatores, quorum speci-
es revocatis in masas. This heinous deed
(of breaking Alters) was doubled whiles
they brake also the Chalices which beare
Christes bloude, the soureme whereof,
Ye turned againe into lumpes of metal.
Did noe these new Solspellers both
break & remove ye Alters of Christ, & also
byeake the Chalices which beare Chri-
stes bloude, and turne them againe to
lumpes of Silver or of other like Me-
tal?

Thirdly, Optatus chargeth the Do-

natis, because they were about to
make
make Catholique Nonnes (whom there be knowne to have been spiritually married to Christ, & secularibus nuptiis renuncia'se, and to have renounced secular mariages) those vowed Religious wemen the He-

eratical Donatists wente aboute to prae-

swade, that they shoulde change their veiles, put upon their heads by Ca-

tholike Prelates, and that thei shoulde take new veiles of them. For seing they would have no Sacraments ( gotten by the Ca-
tholiques ) to stand, but would rebaprisse those that were before Baptized, and woulde rase the Alters, that no lepy of the Catholique Sacrifice might remaine vpon them. by this ground thei would also consecrate againe the holy Nonnes.

But Operatus there aanswers the to them, that notwithstanding the Nonnes had professéd their chastitie, and in token thereof had taken the veile, yet that pro-

fession being none of the Sacramentes, needed not to be repeated again, no not by the Donatists owne Doctrine.

Nudatis denuo capita iam velata, de quibus professionis detraxis fuis indicia, quae contra rap-
tores aut petitorese videntur inuentae. In mitella E ii judicium
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indiciun est voluntatis, non castitatis auxilium. Utiam Deo deus am, nec quisponsabat perseverare, aut ne raptor audiat violare. Ye have made bare the heads already covered with veiles. From the which heads ye have pulled away the tokens of profession. The which tokens seeme to have been invented against rape and woers. In ु veile there is a signe of the will, and not a helpe of chastitie. That neither the woer who had spoused her (that is to say) who had the promise of marryng her, may continue in wooing, nor the viuenc depper may be so bold as to defile her by violence. Signum est ेrgono non Sacramentum. The veile therefore is a signe, and not a Sacrament. So that ु Donatists whose doctrine was to vndo al the Sacramëts of the Catholikes, yet neved not by that doctrine to pluck of the veile of ु Nones which was a signe of their Profession, and not such a Sacrament as the Church hath but seven.

But our new brethren be not content to change the veiles of the professed Nonnes, but also they would utterly take away al such profession of chastitie: profession
professing therein these unlaws to be fleshly
limmes of all vnchasticke, and worse then
ever the Donarists were. In so much  
S. Hierom saith it generally of all Herc-
tiques : Raro diligentia castigatur Hæresicus.  
An Heretique Sellome loueth Chastitie.

Victor in his story of the persecution  
of the Vandales, declareth when Sen-
sericus had sent Proculus into a Pro-
vince of Afrike called Eurgitana, the Ar-
zian soldiery spoiling all things, made  
themselves heresies and soppes De Pallijs  
Altar, of the clothes therewith the Al-
ter was covered. Was not the same  
thing done also in these our daies?

Moreover Victor saith; Arrianitem Lib. 1 pere-
pore quo Sacramenta Des populo porrigebantur sect. Vana  
introenites maximo cum furore, corpus Christi daliis,  
& Sanguinem pavimento sparsit & illud  
pollutis pedibus calcanerunt. The Arrians at  
the time when the Sacraments of God  
were geuen to the People, entering in  
with greate furie, sprinkled the Bo-
die and Blood of Christe on the pai-
iment, and trode upon it with their pol-
luted feet.

Be mercy Masters (or rather be sorry) ye  
E iii that
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that are called Æ professo res of this new
Gospel. Your Gospel is not so new as it
might seem. Ye are not the first that have
troden Chrístis holy body under your
feet. The Arriáss did it before you. Their
paterne ye followed in England. Your
paterne againe your brethren in the Low
countries do follow. Be bold, whole exa-
ple ye haue followed in this life, their cö-
pany ye shal haue in the life to come, if ye
repenent not, which Gud graút ye may do
while the time lerneth.

I would gladly haue wished, that
this much might haue sufficed for shewing
what examples Æ Church spoiles
& Image breakers followed in this their
outrage. But they on the other side cry
me, that I omitte such Examples as
make for them. Fo Epiphanius (say
they) a good Catholike, per did cut a vei
of corteine wherein an Image of Chríst
of some Sainct was hanged vp at the
Church dope. True it is that such a fact
is reported in a certaine Epistle whiche
goeth under his name, & it is said to have
den converted out of Greke into Latine
by S. Hierom. But whether in deed he
wrote

The dece
do Epipha
niius.
wrote any such thing, I will not affirm; but Damascus supposed it to be corrupted, or else to have beene the worke of one who had the same name.

And although it were the work of that Euphanius who wrote against heloies, yet I knowe not what circum-
stance of the place or time did move him to doe it. By the coniecure of the words (there alleged) he was moved, as though it were against the Authoritie of the Scriptures to have a mans Image hang in the Church. And by the Scriptures he surely meant the commandment, which forbiddeth the Jewes to make or to wor-
ship any Image for God. But it forbiddeth not the having of Images for a good remembrance of holy men, as (God willing) it halfe beene declared hereafter.

But of other Christians had not he of an other minde, the Church of Theodosius the Martyr had not had his Mar-
tyrdom yet; such on the Church wals in Gregorius Imagerie, as Nyssenus doth witnesse it Nyssenus had. And others had neither hanged up de Theo-
an Image in that Church, where Epi= doro Mar phanius is said to have taken it downe, 1742.

not
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not murmured against that his deed, as it is written that they did. If then it was either an other Epiphanius, or else his private opinion, God would have us Images haged vp in Churches, yet therein he was not Subboine. Otherwise he would have noted the contrary practice & opinion for an heresie, whereas in al his booke of heresies (although he wrote of about foure score) he noted no such opinion (of hating Images in Church) for heretical. Damascan also doth witnesse Epiphanius his own Church was decked with Images. It maie wel be he considering the countrie where that Image was, he did ye thing there, at that time, which in an other countrie, and time, he would not have done. For ye place where he did cutte that veile, was Anablacha a village of the Land of Jewyce, where both many Pagans were, not yet converted to ye faith, and some Jewes were, who being late converted, were not so perstatlie recovered from their old custom of abstaining from graneu or painted Images, ye they were willing to see any Images externallie set vp & reverence.
Image breakers.

The which reason also might well move \textit{the Council of Eliberis in Spaine to decree, that pictures should not be in the Church, left, that which is worshipped and adored, should be painted on the walls. Now reads theewth that when a thing not evil of it self (as \textit{the painting of holy Images}) is forbidden in one certain place (that is to say, upon the Church walls) \textit{the same is permitted in other places, as in private house.} And againe, \textit{the holy thing which is permitted in other places, sauing in the Church, is much more meete of it selfe to be permitted in the Church, then anie where els, notwithstanding \textit{the particular respect either of persecutions, or of not offending \textit{the weake, may so prevaile for \textit{the time, \textit{that Images might be forbidden in the Church also. For all things are to be ruled by charitie.}}}

To return againe to \textit{Epiphanius I would not have his honor \& good name perished by a fact, which, if it were his fact \& Epistle) was done with a private scale, according to his own opinion in \textit{such place \& time, whereas we must be presentlie ruled by the whole Univer-}}

\textit{all Bodie of Christendome, which in other times and places hath universally judged}
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judged otherwise. But lettre vs consider that sith no man might possibly have bro-
ken those Images which had not ben let
by before, it must needs be, that the let-
ters by of Images were moze ancient
and near to the Apostles time, then chose
who pulled them downe.

As then before and in Epiphanius
rime Images were made, and sette by
(whiche thing slobe more largelie pro-
ned hercater) so straighte after his time
they were so commo in all the Churches
of the East (and much moze of the West)
that he was accomped an heretic, who
saiéd it was unlawfull, either to hauethe,
sy to reverence them.

To shew an example hercfor: Nisce-
li.16.e.27. phorus wriéth that in the tyne of Anastas-
fins the first, (which was not long after
Anna Do-
mini.493. Epiphanius) one Xenaias a Persian,
being by cédition a bondman, and flieing
from his Master, was (though he were
not baptized) made a Bisshop of Hierap-
polis, partly through his owne hypocri-
sie, and practic kept in the same by Pe-
trus Ejnephens, an Eutychian heretic.

Of this Xenaias Niscephorus wriéth
in this
in this wise: Xenaias iste primus O audacem animum, & os impudens vocem illam eorum suam: Christi & corum qui illi placuere, imagines venerandas non esse. This Xenaias O rash mind & wicked mouth was the first, who spewed out that saying, that the Images neither of Christ, nor yet of those who pleased him, should be worshipped. And how could Xenaias spake against the worshipping of Images, y\(\)sin his time and before, they were not worshipped? But if Xenaias was the first, who said Christes and his Saines Images might not be worshipped, surelie Epiphanius (who was a good time before Xenaias) had taught no such thing.

Yf then Xenaias be the Author of this doctrine, it hath forsooth a good foundation. For he being no Christian, perceived upon him to playe the Bishop: a mere foundation for such a howse, as now the hereticks build upon it.

After Xenaias a hundred yeres we reade, that Serenus a bishop of Marsis brake Images in the Church, when he sawe them adored of certain persons: and yet none could have ben broken then, yt none
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none had been there. And although he
was induced with zeal to do, and
not with the spirit of heresy (as now men
are) yet S. Gregorius wrote unto him,
saying, Frangere eadem Imagines non debuisse
indicamus, we judge that you ought not
to have broken those Images. And
what wise man doubteth, but that Saint
Gregorius, so good a learned a Father, his
indigemeth ought to be of more authority,
then the fact of Serenius? Who what so
cuer he was, he was not like S. Gregory.

Yea but, you will saie, it seemeth that

S. Gregorius himself wold not have Images adored, for he saith: Tuæ ergo Filantias
et illas servare, & ab eorum adoratu populum
prohibere debuit. Therefore your brotherhood
ought both to have saved those Images,
and to have forbidden the people from
adoring them. Lo (saith the wonderarie)
S. Gregorius would have the people kept
from adoring Images.

I answer, there is a double adoration, one
proper to God, which must be given to
no Image: another is common to hono-
rable creatures, and is in another degree
extended to their similitudes and re-

mimic-
Image breakers.

Of Image breakers. S. Gregorius doth forbid all adoration, sauing such as is conuenient for the Image which drieth vp in vs a good remediance. And this to be his minde, it is evident by an other place of his, where he writeth to Secondinus in this wise.

Sciō quod Imaginem Salvatoris nostrī non ideo petis, ut quasi Dei colas. I know þou desiere not þ Image of our Saviour to this purpose, to worship it as God. Behold what worship is forbidden to Images. We cleie such as it proper to God. But what? Is ther none els that may become Images? it followeth. Nōs nō quasi ante diminuīt ante Imaginem prosterminūr, sed illum adoramus, quem per imaginem aut naturam, aut passum, sed & in trono sedentem recordamur. We fall down before the Image, not as before the Godhead. But we adore him whom by the Image we remember to have ben borne, or to have satred, and also to sitte in the Throne.

The falling downe before the Image, is a kind of reverence, but it is no such reverence as we gone to God. we sat downe before God with the belefe that he is our maker, we sat downe before þ Image only as
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as before a good remembrance of our Maker. For although we may adore God without the Image, yet when we are put in minde thereof by the Image, then as S. Gregorie speaketh, per imagine Christum recordamus, & adoramus, we remember, and we adore Christ by the Image.

It is then clear, that S. Gregorie gave some honour to the Image of Christ, before which he confessed himself to fall downe, so that we have more advantage by S. Gregorie inlie reproving Serenus, then by Serenus breaking downe Images, who yet did onlie reprooue the unlawful adoring of Images, & did not reprooue (as it is to be thought) their adoration, which in deed became Images.

Anno D. 890.

About one hundred yeares after S. Gregorie, the heresie of the Monethelits raged, who falselie affirmed Christ to have but one will (whereas in deed he hath twain, one according to his Divine nature, an other according to his humaine nature) against which heresie the froth General Council was gathered under Pope Agatho.

After
Image breakers.

After those dates one Philippicus Emperor of the East expelid Lysus the Catholik Archebishop of Constantinople, and there in his place Ioannes an Archiereke. And consequentlie he threw downe the pictures of all the fathers of the general Councils, which Images were sette up in the church porch of Sophia. Likewise the same Philippicus sent unto Constantinus the Pope of Rome, his letters containing heresie, the which letters the Pope by the advise of his Council refusd, and caused other pictures to be made in the porch of S. Peter's church in Rome, where at the Fathers of the six general Councils were painted.

Now this casting downe of Images by Philippicus the Heretike, and the same defended by Constantinus a Catholike high Bishop, and also by the whole people of Rome, doth evidentlie shew the breakers of Images to be much more like unto the old heretikes, then unto the Anncient Catholicks. But Philippicus not enjoying his empire ful three yeares, had for his successour Anastasius, who intendings to correct his predecessors fault, sent
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told to Constantine the Bishop of Rome, that he favored the sixth General Council. But his army not content with his government, inquiring for Theodosius (whom Paulus Diaconus calleth a man of a right faith) chose him Emperor. Who straightaways did set up in his old place an revered Image (of table) wherein the six General Councils were painted. After Theodosius one Leo of Ancyra succeeded in the Empire, who (as Zonaras reported) where he was yet but a vile artisan, being told of two Jews which were astronomers, he should be Emperor, thereupon having promised if it came so to passe, he would grant them whatsoever they asked; afterward at their request he commanded Images of Christ and his Saints at Constantinople to be taken down, to be destroyed, in consideration of which his wickedness, he was surnamed Iconomachus, the fighter against Images. He willed also the Bishop of Rome to do like in the City of Rome, if he would have his favor. From which unctionable Act good Bishop of Rome Gregory the second, and Germanus the Bishop
Bishop of Constantinople, ç al the Catholicks of Italic so abhoered, þ (had not ç Bishop of Rome dissuaded them) the Venetias, ç the laudious of Kanenna, would have made a new Emperor.

Constantinus following his father's impiete, wish'd likewise þ honouring of Images. But what manner of mæ I phase you was he? forsorth, as Suidas doth report, one that denyped our lady þ name of God's Mother, saying our lady to be like a bag, or purse, which is nothing worth, whè the mony is out of it, one þ worship ped Venus, called by devils, and sacrificed mæ flesh. Is it any wöder if such a mæ could not abide the honour of holy Images? Surely he wold not gladly have þ Saints thèselues honorezd. But under Irene ç her sonne Constantinus, honoure was yet again restored to holy Images, ç not only with bare word ç commandemèt of þ Prince (which yet had better suffised for the honouring of Images, then other Princes word could suffise for dishonouring them) but a General Concl of þ world, Vheren in it was defined by three hundred
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Hundred and fiftie Bishops gathered out of the East and West, that holy Images ought lawfully to be honoured.

Thus whereas many changes were among the Emperours and Bishops, some putting vp, & other pulling downe the holy Images, yet the Catholickes passed their adversaries in foure things.

First, because the Images were once quierlie made and adored thorough out the whole Church. Neither do we read of any sedition or tumult concerning the setting vp of Images, verilie because the vse of them was even from the Apostles peac from Christ himselfe, as it shal afterward appeare : but the pulling downe of them was a matter of much tumult and trouble.

2. Secondly, whereas they were set vp in all Aegipt, Syria, Asia, Greece, Italic, France, and Spaine, with other like places, they were onlie pulled downe in one part of Greece, to witte, in Constantinople and such other places where the Emperour kepe his residence. But in all the west Church no such thing was done publickly, no not in Alexandria, Jerusalem,
lem, of Antioche as it is witnessed in the
seventh Council.

Such ods then as is betwene the
parte and the whole, is also betwene the
Catholicks defending Images, and the
Image breakers. And who knoweth not
that the Catholick faith is that, which is
in the whole, & not y which is in y part?
For Hereticks alwaies make parts & pri-
nate factions, as S. Augustine teacheth.

Thirdlie the Catholicks have for them
two Auncient General Councils order-
tlie gathered, the Sixth, and the seventh.
Whereunto all the Patriarches came, or
sent. But the Image breakers although
they affected an assemble at Ephesus, or
at Constantinople for that matter, yet
they both did it by stealth, and manie of
the doers recanced their dede.

Fourthly how much so ever the same
Constantinus, under whome being a
Child the Council was kept, did after-
ward goe from it, how much so ever Leo
Armenius made a new baret against
Images, yet both Theophilus at the end
of his reigne allowed holy Images, and
under the Empire of Michael and holy
Theodora
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Theodora his wife, the Images were a-gaine fullie restored. In so much that to these daies whereatner the Grecians, have ani Church or place to serue God in, flame are adorned with painted Images and reverenced by the people, as any may easilie see in the Grecians Church at Venice. The possessors therefore doth aswel remaine with the Catholicks in the end, as they were also in possession of holy Images, before they beganne to be thrown downe.

What a vanitive is it now to alleage the solitarie and uncertaine fact of Epiphanius alone, or of a few heretical and wicked Emperors against the knowne and approved practice of all the rest of the Fathers, of all General Councils, and of all Churches and ages? But what? Is there an end of pulling downe, or at the lest of wishing Images and holy Al-tars to be pulled downe? No sacelie. There were yet more heretickes of that minde beside those which I have hyther- to rehearsed.

In the ryme of Alexius Emperor there were a kind of heretickes detected
Image breakers.

In Greece, which were called in the Slavon tongue, *bogomils*, as much to say, as intercessors to God for mercy. These men rejected *Moses*’ bookes, affirmed that there was but one person of the Blessed Trinity, Satan the Devil to be the elder son of God the Father, and among other many blasphemies they said, all priests, and all the fathers were damned, as the worshippers of Images, calling them Idols. After them followed the beggers of Lions in France, called *Valdenses*.

The Saracens also, who now worship Mahomer, called the Christians *Idola- tornes*, because they reverenced Christ’s Cross. Of this case cometh John Wicel, to Wicel, Ioannes Hus succeeded, to him Lu- dther, to him Calvin, to him Hermäus.

And so heinous doctrine of spoiling Churches, and of breaking Altars and Images is derived from the Jezabelits, from the Babuchodonosorits, from the Baltaclarits, from the Manichees, from Julian the Apostata, from the Arians, from the Donactists, from the Vigilantians, from the Georgians, from the Monothelits, from Anabats, from Leo the Favouree.
Of Images, and of Jews, from Copronimus the worshippers of Devils, from the Bogomiles, from the Saracens to the Waldenses, to the Wicelists, to the Huguenots, and last of all to the Calvinists in Low countries. A mere genealogy for such an opinion, as desteth the remembrances of God, of Christ, and of his Saints.

How farre is this maine Sacriilege and filthy Church robbing from all the minds and practise of the Patriarches, of the Prophets, of the Apostles, and of the Ancient Fathers, and of all Catholicque people?

If we read the holy Bible, and the Ecclesiastical Histories from noe downward, we shall find all the blessed Patriarchs, Prophets, Bishops, Emperours and Kings, to have been occupied in correcting Alter, in building up Churches & chapels, in decking them with Jewels, Images, & other like ornaments, in visiting the graves of the Martyrs, in praying to the Saints, in offering great & precious gifts to Churches, in increasing the rates of the Clergie, in making Churchyards and places where men may be reverently buried,
barled, in dividing meanes to have psal-
mes, hymnes & service songs both night
and daie.

By such deedes Lucina the old Mat-
trone in the time of S. Cyprian, by such
deedes Constantinus and his Mother
Helena, by such Theodosius, Carolus
Magnus, and his vertuous successors,
have deserved great praise. The which
Histories as to persecute particularly, it
were a long travaile: so I can not omit
one storie, the which is so notable, 't al po-
frectie ought to renewe it in daily talks
and remembrance.

Alaricus King of the Gothes in the
days of Pope Innocentius and of Do-
nozius the Emperor, conquered the Cit-
tie of Rome, which to that day had kept
the world under the Romaine Empire &
Lawes. But when 't laid Alaricus held
enter into 't Citie, he made a proclamatio
as Paulus Orosius doth witenesse, "t siqui
in Sacra loca precipueque in Sanctorum Aposto-
lorum Petri et Pauli basilicas consagrissent, hos in
primis inviolatos securosque esse sacerent. That
if any did flee to the sacred places, & spe-
cially to the Temples of the Apostles
Peter
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Peter & Paule, those cheefly the souli-ours should suffer to be safe & inniolated. The historie which now foloweth, haile translated word for word out of Diosius.

This law standing, it happened that a noble Goth came into a certaine house belonging to the patrimonie of the Church, where he found a virgen consecrated unto God which also was wel growen in yeres. And when he had honestly and soberly demanded of this Nunc what gold & siluer she had, she brought forth a great quantity of siluer & golden plate, at f weight, price, workmanship & rare quality whereof when the barbarous Goth was astonished, she said, Hac Petri Apostoli sacra ministra ria sunt, prae summis si audes, de facto tu videns &c. These are the holy things wherewith S. Peter is served, take of them if thou dare and stand to thine owne decye, for I am not able to defend them. The barbarous man for the reverence of Religion, moned with f seare of God & with the fi-delitie of the virgen, set word of this matter to Alaricus, who immediately comanded al f plate even as it was to be caried to f Church of f Apostle: willing also the virgen
Image breakers.

virgen zal other Christians, who would go together with her, to be safeguarded either.

The house was a long way from the church, about the one half of the city being between the house and Peter's Church. That notwithstanding, the silver and golden vessels are carried by divers men, one by one, over their heads, and this godly pomp is guarded with the naked swords of strangers running from every part of the city therunto. Hymns are sung publicly to God by the Romans and by the Goths. The trumpeter of lastie louder as large in the very destruction of the city, is called out for those who lay hidden. The vessels of Christ run on every side to the vessels of Peter. Ye many pagans are mingled with the Christians, though not in faith, yet in profession and show. And yet even so they escape for the time, to the end they may be the more confounded for their not believing. The more abundantly the Romans fleeing to the vessels are gathered about them, the more greedily the strangers are spread on every side to defend them.

O holy and unspeakable discretion of God's judgement. O holy and helpful isudde, which springing from a little house
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house, whiles it goeth with a blessed course to the Scares of the saints, it ca-
rieth with his godly violence into the bo-
some of safety the wandring fortes which
were in danger. O that goodly trumpet
of Christian warfare, which with a most
sweete unlike inviteth all men generally
to life, whom (being inobedient) it reised
not to their salvation, it left them inexcu-
sable to their damnatiō. Ditherto Diosius.

Loch I am to leane of this most merci-
neous Historie, yet much more soberly
with in Diosius. Such reverenced then a
barbarous Prince came unto ñ Temples
which bare ñ names of the Saints, and
specially to those of St. Peter ñ of St Paul,
ñ to the holy vessels which did belong to
their Churches. Whereat S. August in woe-
thely so worted, ñ he made. æqu. bookes
intitled of the Citie of God, grounding all his
talke up ñ said miracle. For he saith
that no ñguerour did ble at any time to
spare ñ Temples of Gods of those Cities
which he had conquerd. And yet so great
honor was don to ñ Temples which bare ñ
names of St. Peter, ñ of St. Paul, ñ not
only ñ Christian, but also ñ deathè people
who
who fled thither, as many did, pray the gold and silver was sauc'd by the only protection of the holy place.

O how far of is this fact of Alaricus frö the horrible contempt, which now is shewed by Christiās against þ holy temples of God & his Saints? The Go- theses being then barbarous men did fanos; þ Romans for their Temples & holy vels- sels sake: now Prictes & Clerks are the more hared, because they serve those temp- ples, & have þ keeping of holy vessels. The enemie then spared those holy gifts in a strange place, which now the citizens do spoile within their own Churches. One Hone at þ time found such fanos, as thou- sand now can not find. Then Gymnes were long, & men waited upon the holy place at to hono; them for his sake whole they were:now the same place is cut in peces, & best gospeilier is he, þ can do most edcumeney to it, in so much, þ it were far better to be a prisoner & bodman to Alar- cius, or to Þ Gothes, then to be Prictes or Primate where these men line.

O Lamentable generation, how long think you to enjoy this unnatural prac- tise
Of Images, and this brutish disorder, this worst then Heathenish furie? whose Temples haue you spoiled? whose plate haue you cut in pieces? whose Alters haue you broken? whose Images haue you thrown down? whether those of Mars and Venus, or of Christe and of his Apostles, his Martyrs, his Virgins, and Confessours? whose names at the least you ought to haue reverence for their Masters sake, if you had not hated their Masters himself.

I would be sorry to have spoken so vehemently, if I will my woordes should not more come one to Repentance: to Repentance, I mean not onelie of the Spoile of the Churches (whereat many Calvinistes and Lutherans were not) but to repentance also concerning the Doctrine whence that spoile proceded. Of that detestable doctrine I speake, which made these men to spoile Churches, and to break the Images of most honorable personages, which doctrine is common to our countreymen with the Flemminges, albeit the Act of spoiling be not altogether common,
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Be that is ashamed of those Image breakers, and yet fauourereth their faith, whereby they did these things, it is no more to saie, but that by beleewing one waye, that which he hateh an other way, he both beleeweth that which he hateh, and hateh that which he beleeweth: if he love both their Faith and their dedes, he hateh them whose Temples and Images they have so persecuted.

The Christian Emperours Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius, and Valentinian doe not onely alowe the erecting vp of their owne Images, and of the Images of other like Princes (yet without adoung them) but also they permitt Images to be sette vp in the honour of Judges and of other temporal Magistrates, so that it be done by their charges, to whose honour the Image is expected.

Moreouer thei commaunded those who fled to the Images of the Prince of Emperour, to be safe fro al violéce. Much lesse can be imagined, that they commaunded Christes owne Image to be pulled downe
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In his re down, wheresoeuer it should be, as W. Jewel falsely and impudently affirmeth,

Their Edict is in the Code of the Civil law and it only commandeth the signe of Christes Crosse tolle, to be taken vp from the ground, lest by negligence it should be trod on, but not toli, to be rake down, as W. Jewel doth English it, whereof I shall have occasion to speake hereafter.

Now it sufficeth to warn the Reader that those Christian Emperours honoureth the signe of our Saviour so much; that they wold not have it made or graven vpó the ground; least if it were troden upon, it should be used dis honourably.

The Title in the Code of Justinian where that law standeth is conceived in these words. Nemini licet signum Salvatoris Christi, humi, vel in silice, vel in marmore, aut insculpere, aut pingere. Lette it be lawfull for no man, either to grave or to paint the Signe of our Saviour Christ upon the ground, either in stone, or in marble.

Thus all the historic of letting vp or of pulling down Images being briefly perused, we find on W. Jewels lyce no-thing
Image breakers.

thing but Heathens or Infidels, Renegates, Jews, Heretics, Idolators, or many paces made upon Christian princes. And contrariwise we have so vs, the woman healed of the issue of blood, who being praised by Christ himself for her faith, did sette vp an Image unto him. From which day forward all Catholicke Fathers, & Councils, and Chri-

That the word of God forbiddeth not generally the making of all kind of Images.

The 4. Chapter.

God says unto the people of Israel, thou shalt have no strange Gods before

Ex. 20;
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apointment. For after that God had said, Thou shalt have no strange Gods: immediately shewing what are strange Gods (as then things were abused) he saide, thou shalt make no graven Image or likenes of any creature, thereby declaring, that the Children of Israel should not doe as the Heathens didde, who accompted graven or painted Images for their true Gods.

Again, lest the people should thinke that they might freely make all kinde of Images (so that they take them not for Gods) an other limitation and restraint is also cast in, when God saith, thou shalt not make to thy selfe, any likenes of any creature. In saying thou shalt not make to thy selfe any Image, he saith in effect: Albeit thou maist have such Images as are not taken for Gods, yea because I know the weakenesse of thy Faith, thou shalt not make them to thy selfe, nor allow them by thine owne private judgement. But thou maist lawfully have such Images, as either my seruante Moses and other Prophetes, during the time of the Lawe, or els my Apostles and their Successours in the time of grace.
thal think her to thee to bane.

This to be the true meaning of Gods commandement, it may well appeare in the Chapters immediately following, where God commandeth Moses to make two golden Cherubim with their countenances turned toward the Propitiatory, that is to say toward the place whence God gave answer to the people by his Priestes & servants.

Likewise Salomon made and did sette in the Temple the likenes of Lions, of Oren, of Date trees, of Pomegranaters, and of diners other Flowers, as well in the inmost parte named the holy of holies, as in the Temple and Quere called the holy place.

Moreover it is evident by 1. Eusebius, 2. S. Basil, 3. S. Chrysostome, 4. S. Ambrose, 5. S. Austin, 6. Gregorius Nylenus, 7. Paulinus, 8. Gregorius Magnus, 9. pce by the perpetual practice of the whole Church of Christ, it was never taken for unlaful, to have such holy 3. in Na.

In Chri.stiā Churches, or in private houses, as might provoke our minds to remembe good holy stories, & effectually to follow the example of our most vertuous Nicen. A. Hermelion, S. & Others.
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Otherwise if by this precept, thou shalt not make to thy selfe the similitude of any thing that is in heauen above, or in the earth beneath, &c. it be ment precisely, the resembling of any creature, is utterly forbidden by the first Table (which corcineth immutable law of nature, concerning the true worship of God) then al the world were in the state of damnation, for making, hav- ing, keeping, or beholding the similitude of all kind of creatures, some in their books entituled De Animalibus, of beasts, or De Piscibus, of Fishes, or De Animibus, of Birds, or De Herbis, of Herbes, others in their tapestrie, & in their galleries, which are filled with diverse grauen or painted Images: and then al the Prophets, and high Priests, and the whole people of the Jews hadde likewise done against the law of nature, for having the Images of the two Cherubins in the Tabernacle, and of the twelve oxen, and of Pomegra- nets in the Temple. Yea the knowledge of graving and carving were utterly re- pined, and Bezeleel & Oliab, to whom God inspired that science had been practi- cers of an unlawfull art.

But
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But if it be against all reason to say, or thinke so, doubtes the similitude of every thing, is not absolutely forbidden to be made, how soever it be forbidden to be adoped, whereas we shall speake hereafter.

Therefore when we reade in the holy Scriptures, that makers of Images to be accursed, either it is written of the makers of Idols expressly (albeit the English translation everywhere almost curseth Idols into Images) or els it is me't of those, who make wanton Images, called in Greeke, ἀγαλματα: Or ceretnely of such as make images to an enem end or purpose.

But it is utterly impossible, that the making of an Image (only as it is the similitude of an other thing) should be forbidden. Otherwise God should be contrary to himselfe. For he hath so made us, that we can not learne, know, or understand any thing, without conceiving the same in some corporal Image or likeness. Our knowledge commeth by our senses, of which our cies are the chese. They see visible Creatures, and hear soundes of voices, whereby the common sense

Man doth learne naturallly by conceiving Images.
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sence being informed with such images as it is able to conceive, offereth the same to our phantastic or imagination, where the mind beginneth to gather knowledge to print (as it were) or to grave in itself that, which is power'd into it by the senses.

And so ofte as the mind will either ble or encrease his knowledge, it alwayes returneth to those images and figures, which it receiveth and laid vp, to the end it might have wherewith to occupie or to delight it selfe, when occasion should require.

If then at what time I reade that Christ did with his hands strectched and nailed upon the woode of the Cross, I may and necessarily must devise with myself an Image which theweth so much (or otherwise I can never understand) which I read) how can a wise man doubt, but that thing may be lawfully set forth in an outward Image, which must be necessarily conceived in an internal Image? The forbidding then of Images to the Jewes, was neither general, that they might have none at al, nor any immutab

Of things that are equal, one may be done as well as the other.
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able law of God, but only a Temporal prohibition after a certain maner to that people, for the avoiding of a greater inconuenience.

If then it be Lawfull, to make and to have Images, notwithstanding it be written (Thou shalt make to thy self no like-Exod.20.
nes of any thing) as the making which see-
meth to be generally forbidden, is by co-
ference of other places, restreined to a
particular prohibition, so the worshipping of
Images also being forbidden (according to the
same meaning as the making was) is to
be meant after such sorte, as other places
of Scripture, and as the conference of
the law of Nature doth declare unto vs.

Which being so (as in deed it is)
they were more foolish then the Scanes
which they pulled dowe, who exercised
such cruelty upon Images, as though
they handy wroke it selfe were unlawfull, or
as though the gening of convenient reverence to them were by no meanes tol-
erable. Whereas if al Images were
to bee rooted uppe, they shoulde not
have spared them owne brains, which
are more full of Images (that I may
be tried, not
Of Images, and
not say of Idols) then all the Churches
in Christendome are.

That the word of God only forbiddeth
Latria, which is God's own honour, to
be given to artificial Images, leaving it
to the law of Nature, and to the govern-
nours of his Church, what other honor
may be given to holy Images.

The fifth Chap.

As the making of Images for this
end, that they should be taken for
God's is absolutely forbidden, so
is the worshipping of them, with that
honor which is propre to God absolutely
forbidden. But as Images might be
made by the Authoritie of Moyses, or of
the governours of God's people (this
only provided, that they be not taken for
God's) so may they likewise be worship-
ped by the Authoritie of God's Church,
this only provided being made, that God's
owne honour be not given to them. For
God perceiving well, that when the Im-
ages of honorable personages are made,
honour is naturally due unto them, because their Images might be sette sooth for honourable (as the Image of Jupiter, or of Mars) who were not in deed honourable: And again, because though the persons were honourable (as Moses, or Elias) the weak Jews, who were in Knowledge like Children, in Faith or spirit like Bond menne, might gene too much Honour to the Images of these men: For these causes God commanded, that neither any Image should be made by private Authoritie, nor any as- dorsed with Latrun, which is the honour peculiarly due to God.

Non adorabis ea, faith God, ne Exod 20. que coles. Thou shalt not adore them, nor gene them the worshippe which is due to God alone.

For albeit the word which signifieth adoration, be indifferent to God, or to Honourable Creatures, yet the words, Neque coles, doe in Breke be- roken the peculiar Honour of God, ou- de è μὴ λατσάωσις, nor thou shalt not gene them that Honour, which is due unto God.

And
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Andsocelie howsoeuer we name st real this or that honour, if in deede there be no difference betweene honour, and honour, when God biddech vs honour our father and mother, or when S. Peter bide
dech vs honour the king, it must be meant, that we should guee them Gods owne proper honour. But seing it is absurd, to guee unto creatures the honour due unto the Creator, we must confesse a dif
terence betweene honour due to God, and honour due to his Friends or Mi-
nisters.

Now for so much as the proper dutie of honouring God is ( by such in-
strumenes of the holy Ghost, as have witten in Greeke or Latin ) most com-
monlie named latria, we must thinck, that when we are forbidden to make anie Image, and to guee it such honour as is described by the word latria, that then we are onlie forbidden to guee godlie ho
nour to anie artificial Image, which thing maie weel appere by the circum-
stance of the place, where the commaundement is witten.

For whereas it is laid in the begin-
king of the commandments, I am the lord thy God and afterward, thou shalt not have strange Gods before me, and thirdlie, whereas he had said, Thou shalt not make an ıde (for to the Senentie, Interpreters did translate it into Greece) and whereas it followeth, thou shalt not make the 4
similitude of any thing and yet again, whereas as it is afterward added, thou shalt not adore them, nor give them lática, that is to say, God's owne honour, and last of all, whereas immediate after, it doth followe, Igo sum Dominus Deus tuus, for is, Zelöres. I am the Lord thy God, strong, Jeloufe (the which wordes import, that God wil have no creature to be made his companion in honour.) It may wel appere by all that goeth before, and followeth after, that God mindeth to forbid the worship of false Gods, and of all such Idols as are made, used to be worshiped as either being the selves true Gods, or as being the representation of such creatures, which are taken for true Gods: for by all means we are forbidden to thinke, either anie creature

The circumstance of the place both shew the meaning thep of.
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creature to be God, or that God his own Divine substance and incomprehensible nature may be represented by an artificial Image.

It is a much sweeter contemplation to consider, that (whereas our bodily and imperfect nature would needs covet always to worship God by some bodily Image, or other) God the Father's own natural Image and Sonne took of the Virgin Marie our natural flesh, so that we might not lack some corporeal truth of bodily and flesh, wherein we might boldly worship the divine substance.

After then that this Mankind was assumed, being the shape of man made be lawfullie shewed by an artificial Image, we making the Image of Christ, who was man, doe not make any such Idol or similitude, as God forbid the Jewes to make, but we make a similitude of an honourable truthe, whereas no Idol doth represent a truthe.

Again, we give not unto Christes artificial Image any godly honor, albeit we being provoked by the sight thereof, doe give godly honour to Christ, who is
immediately adored by the warning of
the artificial Image.

Farthermore if we consider, that the
Israelites, to whom this precept was
given, came late out of Aegipt, where
creatures were adored instead of God
himself, and that they were like to live in
the land of promise with divers of the
Gentils, who all worshipped Idols: this
thing well weighed, it is no wonder to
see God so diligent to forbid them the
making of any similitude to themselves, to
themselves, I say. For God gave them
a corporeal similitude of two Angels, but
they might not make any Image to them
selves, by their own devise, or private de-
voition, which is oftentimes the cause of
superstition.

And therefore the Catholikes must
not sticke to private doings of their own
devise, but only to that knowne Citie of
the Church built upon a hill, which can
not be hidden, which Church is the pillar
and sure stay of truth, and it hath al-
wagies made and convenientlie worshipped
(not false Idols) but true representations
of Christ and of his Saints.

Briefly
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Briefly the precept of God forbidsthe making and worshipping of Idols, and the gening of Gods own honour to any Similitude made by mans acte. But such Images be no Idols.

After this sorte did Philo (being a Jew most excellentlie lerned) expound this precept of God, concerning Images: for he giveth a reason of the order of the commandements, saying, I when God had spoken of his own substance, and honour, order would that he shoule tell, how his holy name was to be used. It was then as the peculiar substance and name, to the peculiar honour of God, whereas the commandment spake, and not euerie other honour, which may in diverse considerations be genen to diverse things, but euer in respect of some vertue & of some honorable qualitie.

The same Philo in an other place, as-

De es quis firmeth this precept of not adoring Im-

ages, to forbid, that no man may make him

selfe any God beside his creature, ut solus vere Deus
colatur, to shede that is in dede God alone, may

be worshipped.

S. Aug.
Saine Augustine speaking of the division of the ten Commandements, faith, that those, who will have three only to belong to God (of which minde himself in that place is) do make all that to be one precipe, whatsoever is com-
manded concerning one God to be worshipped. Ne aliquid alius pro Deo colatur, that nothing else besyde one God, maie be worshipped for God.

And after: Et re vera quod dictum est, non erunt tibi Dei alii precar me, hoc ipsum perfecius explicatur, cum prohibentur colenda figura.

And trulie (faith S. Augustine) ý which is saied, there shalbe none other Gods to thee besydes me, the same self things is more per-
sificie enlarged, whē falle Images, & forged things are forbidden to be worshipped.

By which words of S. Augustine we plainly perceave, ý the words, thou shalt not adour nor worship any Image, are no more to say, but thou shalt not have any other God belyde me. So that the worshipping of an Image is then forbidden, when it is made a God unto vs. For whereas God saith three things, the first, I am the Lord thy God,
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The second, thou shalt have none other Gods; the third, thou shalt not make nor worship any Image: all these three sayings (by the judgment of S. Augustine) are but the rephrasing of one thing in diverse words. Which if it be so, these words, thou shalt not worship any Image, do not forbid all kind of worship to all manner of Images, but they forbid all such worship, as belongeth to the nature and substance of God himselfe, and so much doch the Greek word of Latria import.

It may be said unto me, that God forbideth not only the worshipping of Images, as of Gods, but also that he forbideth vs to adore Images by any means, or to bow downe to them. For he saith, Non adorabis ea, thou shalt not adore them.

I answer, Adoration is a doubtful word; and it may signifie either the proper honour of God, or also the honour of creatures, accordingly as Abraham adored the people of the land of Chanaan. But in another place the Angel refuseth to be adored, saying, adore God.

Whereby we learn, that sometime adoration
ratio appertinenth to God alone, sithens otherwise it is evident, that the Angels sometymes have ben adored.

Now then we knowe, that in these wordes, non adorabis ea, thou shalt not adore them, it is meant, thou shalt not adore them with this mynd, that they are Gods, because the word neque coles which followeth, doth declare what kind of adoration he speakeoth of, verily of that which is one with latria, by which wordely holy Scripture describeth that moste passing worship which we gene to God, as he is God. For to S. Augustine saith, Latria debetur Deo, non nisi tanquam Deo. Latria is such an excellent honour, as is due to God in that only respect, as he is God: Dulia vero debetur Deo tanquam domino, the honour of Doulia is due to God also, but it is not properly belonging to his substance, but to his government and Lordship.

Theodoretus likewise doth wittnesse, that this precept calleth the Jewes a cul-tu demonum, from the worshipping of de-niles: meaning that all Idols and false Images are dedicated unto Devils, as also S. Paule hath declared. But as it is
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not possible justly to say, that Christes Image is dedicated to the devil: so it is not possible to be true, that the same precept which forbids the worshipping of such Images as are under the power of the Devil, should thereby forbid the worshipping of the Images of Christ and of his Saints, which are only the signes of good and godly things.

By this which hath been hitherto declared it may appeare, how wel and truly M. Jewel compareth Gods words and M. Hardings together.

Jewel. God saith, thou shalt make no thy self no grauen Image: M. Harding saith, thou shalt make to thy self grauen Images.

Sander. Neither God nor M. Harding say only so, as you repose, if at the least we take saying soz meaning, as it ought to be taken. For when God beganne to show his meaning, he in rede began also his saying, with these words, thou shalt make to thy selfe no grauen Image: but as his meaning was, that no grauen Image should be made to be worshipped as God, so he afterward ended also his saying, with these words, thou shalt not adore
adore them, nor give them the honour due to God alone.

Therefore W. Jewell byd enuill
to divide Gods sayings. And by that
his division, I am sure he hath condem-
ned his owne conscience. For I dare
say, him selfe is not of this mynde, that
who so ever make thy anie grauen Image
at al, or kepeth it being made (for all is
one) is therefore straight against God.
For then Beselecll, Doliab, and al gra-
uers, were by the practising of their art
Gods ennemies. And all capestrie and
painting, were, by the same reason to be
removed from the use of men.

But being W. Jewell is not of
this mynde, that who so ever make thy,
or hath in his house anie grauen, or pain-
ted Image, is thereby an Enemie
to God, and subiect to eternall Dam-
nation (as one that hath broken Gods
commandement, wherein he said, thou
shalt make to thy selfe no grauen Image, why
doth he burden D. Harding with these
words, thou shalt make to thy self grauen Im-
ges: more then he burdeneth all the
worlde, pce hym selfe with having of
D y keeping

Exo.31.
Of Images, and keeping graven or painted Images? For the signe of the Crosse, and the Quene's Maiesties face in her copues is a kind of graven Images, and I thinke M. Jewel hath some of them in his purse.

Againe, M. Harding saith not, thou shalt make to thy selte graven Images, but only thou maist lawfully make, or have those graven Images, which (not thou to thy selft, but) which the universall Church hath vsed to make, and to leaue to thee. It were a great holy day, in the which M. Jewel could say the whole truth either by God or man.

Jewel. God saith: Thou shalt not fall downe to them, nor worship them: M. Harding saith, thou shalt fall downe to them, and worship them.

Sander. D. Harding commandeth not, that which God forbidden. But God forbidden his owne honour to be gueuen to images, leaft they should be abused as Gods: M. Harding defendeth, that an other degree of Honour incomparably inferiour to that, which is due to God, may be gueuen, not for all that to every Image, but only to the Images of Gods owne
own frindes. And that not for the images owne lakes, but for their lakes, whole Images they are.

Now judge thou (good Reader) whether W. Jewel be a wrangler, or no. For he is a wrangler, who knowing his aduerarie to meane one waie, yet preiseth him with worudes which may have an other understanding.

Either you must prove (W. Jewel) that D. Harding will haue Gods owne honour geuen to Images (the whiche thing his owne harre and worudes denie) or els you must prove, that al maner of honour is forbidden to be geuen to any kinde of Image: and then you have against your opinion the lawe of nature, the worde of God, the judgement of the auncient Fathers, the Decrees of general Counsels, and the practise of the whole Church, as it shalbe declared hereafter.

But perhaps you wil choose the third way, teaching ther is in al but one kind of honour. The which being due to God alone, none at al remaineth for Images.

Now then it remaineth to be proved, (albeit I haue toouched it before) that there
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are two kinds of honour, of which one
may appertain to creatures (thereby to
Images of honorable personages) and
the other must be referred to God alone.

S. Augustine faith: latria secundum
consuetudinem qua locuti sunt, qui nobis divina
eloquia considerunt, aut semper, aut tam fre-
quenter, et pene semper, ea dicetur servitus, qua
pertinet ad colendum deum. According to the
custom of their speaking, who by writing
delivered the holy Scriptures unto us,
that service which is appointed to the
worshipping of God, is either always
called, latria, or it is so often called latria,
that it is in manner always so called. On
the other lyde S. Augustine faith, Ea ser-
vitus qua debetur hominibus, secundum quam
precipit Apostolus, dòuloe, servos dominis suis
subditos esse, alio nomine Graece nuncupari solet.
That service which is due to men, ac-
cording to which S. Paul commandeth
Servants to be under their masters, is
called in Greek by an other name: that
other name is, douli, whereof S. Paul
faith in an other place, ἡ δὲ ἡγάπης τοῦ
λειτουργοῦ ἐκλεκτος. Per charitate servire invicem,
Serve ye one another by charitie. Now
al Service imposeth the giving of some honour to him, whom we serve.

As therefore we maie serve S. Paule, that is to say, as we maie honour hym, by thinking hym our Superiour and Master, so for his sake we maie serve, that is to say, we maie honour his Image, as a thing of his, thinking amie thing of his to be above vs (at the least, in signification) for S. Paules owne excellent honour.

Neither is this Idolodoulia (as M. Jewell sometime scoffeth) that is to say, this our Service done to Images (in putting of our cap, or in looking toward them reverently, as we passe by them) is not the Serving of Idols (as M. Jewell termeth it). For, to have an Idol serued, or honoured, it must be supposed, the Image of Christ or of S. Paule is an Idol. Which opinion I had rather M. Jewell had, the I. For it is in deed a Jewish opinion, & more mete for Artichrist his own meders to beleue, then for those who knowe Christes Image to be as farre of from being an Idol, as Christe hym selfe is farre from being a Devil.
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For so S. Paul definetly an Idol, as if he had said, it is an instrument to serve or to honour the Deity withal.

But being Mr. Jewell confesseth himself to honour the Sacrament of Christ's Supper, which he teacheth to be an Image of Christ's body and blood (as I will shew one afterward) and yet being he beleueth none other substance to be in the Sacrament besides bread and wine, and being he will not geane latria, that is to say, God's own honour to bread and wine: it doth innocently follow, that Mr. Jewell Certainly, that is to say, honoureth some Image. Now as he would not have us to call him therefore a Server of Idols, or a Server of Images: even so it may please him (for his own sake) to spare us. For as he doth not end his honour in the bread and wine, but from thence referreth it unto Christ himself: even so do we referre all our honour from all Images unto the first parent of them, not suffering our Service or honour to rest or to end in the Image which we honour.

Thus I conclude, that a certaine honour
honour is due to holy Images by y way of passing by, as it were (for the honour goeth from them to the first samplers) and that God's word only forbiddeth vs to gueue unto Images the honour of lat. ria which is due to God alone: leaning vs to his owne word, to the doctrine of his A- postle, to the lawe of nature, to the ex- amples of wise men, and to the universal practise of all good Christians, to know what other kind of degree of honour is due to all holy Images.
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What an Artificial Image is, and of a natural and an Artificial Image. And how some honour may be gaven to Artificial Images.

The 6. Chapiter.

A Gregorie Nazianzene teacheth, hoc est natura imaginis, μίμημα ὑπὸ ἄρχητος, ἀπὸ λέγεται, ἀν imitatio one id exprimat, a quo primi deducitur, & cuius imago dicitur. This is the nature of an Image, to shew by imitation (or by likeness of form) that thing, whence it is copied out, and whereof it beareth the name.

Likewise S. Chrysostome saith: imaginem, quatenus Imago est, etiam apud nos, ex omnis parte et cuius est Imago, correspondentem at similem esse oportet. An Image even among men) must (in that respect as it is an Image) be in all points like and correspondent to that, whereof it is the Image.

Here it is to be noted, that every real
reaching which is in this world, hath both a nature of his own, and also a se-
nueral subsistence, or being, the which subsistence in reasonable substance, is
called person. For example: My na-
ture is to be a reasonable Creature,
which hath life and sense. My person is
that kind of being, wherein my nature
is so limited, and fitted, as made app for
me alone, that it serveth none other crea-
ture beside me, in all the world.

As therefore every man, yea every
thing hath a Nature, and a Person, or a
several Subsistence: so each of them may
have an Image of itself, but not after
one force.

For a man's nature may only be
represented by a natural Image, that is
to say, by an other thing which taketh
of him the same nature, which him selfe
hath. For every thing begetteth an
other thing like unto it selfe, as when A natural
the Sonne is naturally begotten of his
Father, then he is made the natural Im-
age of his Father.

In so much that if the Father be God
by nature, the Sonne begotten of him,
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must needs be God by nature. If the
Father be man, the Sonne also must have
mans nature, and thereby he is the na-
tural Image of his Father.

But although a mans nature can
by no means be expressed by art, yet his
person, or at the least wise his outwarde
shape may be right well expressed, and re-
presented, by grauine, painting, or other-
wise by fashioining the same in wax, earth,
or like matter. The cause why the shape
of our Persons may be represented by
arte, and not our natures, is, for, that, the
Artificer who worketh by his own kno-
ledge, is able to conceive in his under-
standing, and afterward to scoyme out-
wardly that proper shape of every thing
which he perceiuerth by his senses that it
hath. But the inward nature which he
neuer saw, nor was able to see naked, as
as it is in it self, that nature he is not able
to conceive in his owne Imagination,
therefore he can draw forth no resem-
bliance thereof.

And that all artificial Images do re-
present the shape of our persons, and not
our natures, the very experience & com-
mon
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Use of speaking fully declared. For if wee come where an Image of Cicero standeth, a right wise man may, and sometimes doth say, Here is Cicero, or, this is a man, taking the word man, for a thing which beareth and signifieth the person, and not the nature of a man. For albeit that be no propre speech, to say of the Image of S. Paul, This is S. Paul: yet it is used, because the names of the things them selues are often times in common speech gotten to their signes and Images.

But certainly no meane wise man comming to the same Image of S. Paul by of Cicero, did, wil, or can justly say, This is a lying or a reasonable creature. And yet, if the Image did as well beare and shew a representatif of mans nature, as it doth of his person, as well it might be called a reasonable creature (by that figure of speech, which calleth the signes by the names of the things them selues) as it is by the same figure of speech called S. Paul, or Cicero.

But seeing it is vesterly out of use, to say by an artificial Image of S. Paul, This
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This is a reasonable creature, 

This is a living thing which hath sense, it is clear, that an artificial Image is only the Image of a person, or rather of personal shape of every man whom it signifies, and not at all the Image of his nature. Howbeit we are brought into remembrance of the nature also, by the means of being the Person represented.

This much being confessed, it is easy to answer their Argument, who say, that An Image of Christe can not be made, except it be a lying Image, because his Godhead can not be represented in an Image, which yet is the most excellent part of him. I answer, that although Christ had been only a man, yet his Image would not have represented, no, not so much as his humane nature, but only by a consequent. Much lesse any man should require, to have Christes Divine nature represented and sette sooth in an Image, or els to accompt it a lying Image. For an artificial Image setted sooth onely the outewarde shape and soome of every thing, and not also the inwarde Substance. How then canne it be a lying Image
Image breakers.

Image, which representeth such an external shape of Christ, as he had in deoe.

For all be it he had not a mortal and humane person, but assumed and united the true nature of man to his onely Divine person, yet as S. Paul the testifith, Formam servui accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, habitu inuentus (est) ut homo. 

Taking the shape of a servant (and) made to the likeness of men, he was found in clothing as man. That shape which Christe tooke, that similitude which he bare walking on the earth, that figure of clothing which he was found in, if any man represent by Art, his Image can not be a lying Image. For although it expresse not all that was in Christe, yet that which it representeth, is true.

As therefore when he lived in the worlde, and was scene and touched of his Apostles, the only shape of man was scene, and not either the person of man, which he had not, or the naked Substance of man (which is not scene but by his Accidet) or the Godhead (which hath no such forme at all, as is able to be scene of mortall men) so now by his Image the
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the same only shape of man is expressed, and not either his Godhead, or his humane substance, or any person of man. On the other side, as when he knew, by his shape of his manhood, the faithful were led to his true manhood, and thence to his divine nature, and person: so in his image we are put in mind first of his humane shape and figure, and thence we are also carried up to the remembrance of his divine nature, and so upward to his Divine nature and person.

If then we paint as much as the Apostles said, our image is no more a lying image, then their sight was a lying sight. But as they might lawfully see the only shape of man, believing all the rest according as they were taught: so may we lawfully paint the only shape of Christ's manhood, knowing the rest to be supplied by faith and by the preaching of wise and learned men.

Hitherto then we have showed and proved, that every artificial Image representeth the shape of the person, and not the nature of that principal paterne, whence it taketh his copie or extract.
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One of which principle, this conclusion is derived, that it is neither lawfull, nor possible for any man to make by art an Image, which may express the nature and substance of God, of Angels, or of any other creature; because no artificer can himself conceive, or see forth the inward and invisible nature of any thing.

Secondly, it will follow, that it is possible and lawfull to make an Image, which may represent the personal pro-piect of any known creature: because God hath lefte that art to man, and willed the same to be used in his owne Tabernacle, and Temple at Jerusalem.

Thirdly, the three Persons of the Blessed Trinitie (excepting the visible shape of Christes manhood) and the infinite Persons of Angels can not properly be expressed in any artificial Image, for that the artificer doth not know their proper shape and soom, as whome he never saw.

Fourthly, by whatsoever visions, revelations, or manner, the Persons of the Image of the
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of the Blessed Trinitie have here shewed in the holy Scripture to be three: after which, it becometh us to signifie (not in deed, that this is the Image of the true Personne of the Father, or of God the Son, or of the holy Ghost, but) only that by these manner of signes it is shewed, that there is a seuerall Person of the Father, a seuerall Person of the Sonne, and a seuerall Personne of the holy Ghost.

Genes. 18. For as we may lawfully preache of those Angels whose Abraham sawe to be three, and adored one, and of that vision which is in Daniel, wherein, as it were the sonne of man came to one of ancient yeres, whose garment was white like snowe, and the hoares of his head like the pure pearl, and as I may preache that vision, wherein God the Father said of Christ: This is my beloved Sonne, and that the holy Ghost came downe, as it were a dove: and as one of them I may shew, that there are three Personnes: right so I may beere forth in painting, or in gravining, the selfe same visions, and reuolutions, to shent the people maye know and
and remember, that there are three persons, of the Father, of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.

For seeing we lerne by eyes, as also by cares, I see no reason, why we may not be painted before our eyes, which may be preached to our cares.

Again, seeing he that can reade the holic Scriptures, must needs finde the said visions in the Bible: why may not he as well see them on the Church wall, as in white paper, specially seeing more can understand the meaning of an Image, then can reade and understand the Bible?

Saint Gregorie saith. Ad re non faci-mus, si per visibilia, invisibilia demonstramus. Ad Secund. We do not amisse, if by things which are seen, we know things that are not epis. See.

I know (good Reader) with what wrynglers I have to doe, and therefore I muste laie it againe, I woulde not have any Image of the Trinitie, to be taken or meant to be the true Image of print of the Pers-

I y lons
persons of the Blessed Trinity (against any such Image S. Augustine speaketh) but only, to be a shadowing and shadowy tongues, that there are three several Perfections of one natural Godhead.

The Angels likewise may be painted and graven according to the form, wherein they were graven with wings in the tabernacle, or else wherein they appeared to the Prophets, or Apostles.

The brief summe is, that a natural Image expresseth and imitareth the vvere substance of that thing, whose Image it is: the artificial Image expresseth only the shape of the person and proprie of any thing, according to its form, which the artificer both in thy conceaue thereof.

Seing then an Image made by art is not able to express the natural substance of any thing, and yet the personal proprie of that is resembled, can not be sete before his eyes without some substance or other: the artificial Image must borrow or other substance, wherein it may shew his own representation.

That other substance, whether it be wood, stone, gold, paper, or any like substance is not
is not an essential part of an Image in itself, although it be the material part of this, or of that Image, as the which can not be shewed to our eyes, without some like matter.

But as a circle in his own nature is perfect without land, paper, stone or any like stuff, and yet it can not be shewed to our eyes, except it be drawn out in some matter or other: even so the Image is perfect in itself, without wood, stone, or paper, but not shewed to us, unless it have a ground wherein it may appere.

As therefore the painter or graver had the Image which he now lettereth forth upon the wall, or upon the stone, much more perfect in his owne bed and mind, before he did visibly paint or grave the same: right so, he that seeth the Image vpon the wall, or in a stone, may much better conceane it in his owne understanding, then that outward shape can commend it unto him.

If then the Image may be separated by our understanding from the material substance wherein it is shewed, as stone as we have printed the said Image to.
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in our own head and mind: either it hath
no truth at all to be referred unco (and the
it is a baine Idol, and onlie a phantastical thing) or if it be an Image of a truth,
it hath none other real person or propriety
to stay in, else where truth whereof
it is the Image, & therunto it is straight
waies referred by him, that understandeth
whole Image it is. For he saith of thin-
kefth immediatlie, this is Christ, or this is S.
Peter, or, this is our Lady, ioyning the Im-
age to that truth, whereunto it be-
longeth.

So that, if we see the Image of
Christ crucified, we straight lay aside the
blade, yron, or wood whereupon that
Image was drawn or made, and we
apprehend Christ himself, to whole
person that Image doth appeare vs.

This being so, the mind can not
divide the Image from the truth. in so
much that if a man see an Image, and
know not to whom it may be referred,
he asketh, whose Image is this? shewing
thereby, that his mind is not satified,
for that it hath not a knowne person,
whereunto that Image may be ioyned,
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according as the nature thereof requireth. For the mind is provoked to pass immediately from the Image to the truth, which it standeth to signify: and that it both so spedstie, and so dainly, that onethought, onemoving, one act, and one intention serveth at once both the Image, and the truth thereof.

The Image therefore being wholly referred to the truth it self, whiles it reflecteth therin, is made partaker of some of that worthines, which is in the truth it self, because it is a signe and token thereof. And it is not possible, but that every signe of an honorable thing must partake some of the honour which is in it.

The outward painting of Christes death, moueth the bodilie eye, from the eye our common sense taketh advertisement, thence the phantastie or imagination is enformed. And when reason draweth out of that, which the phantastie sheweth, a depe consideration, that this Image and representation (of Christes death or of any like historie) is both true and profitable to his salvation, and
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worthie of all honour: if then Mr. Jewell

can find in his heart to say, nay, this Image

is not good, or this representation is not
worthy of reverence, or it is an Idol, let
him blame Images, and deny honour to
them.

But if to condemn this Image, or
to call it an Idol, or to esteem it worthy
of no honour, that is either to deny, that
Christ in deed suffered for us, or to say, that
the memory of his death is worthy of no
reverence at all (which thing no Chris-
tian ought to think) it seemeth to me,
that Images are worthy to be esteemed,
and to be reverenced in such sort, as that re-
membrance deserveth, which they pro-
voke in us.

I had thought to have said no more
in this place of the nature or condition
of an Image. But after I perceived
Mr. Jewell (when he had a long time dis-
couraged of the signe of the Cross) to con-
clude, that the cognizances of the Cross painted
or graven in flags, banners, targets, and coines,
were only barres laid a cross, and no Images. I
thought it needless to warn the Reader,
that my simple understanding can not
atteine

In his
Replie.
fol. 502.
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attentive to OJ Jewels meaning.

For I toke an Image to be the resemblance of any thing, whether it were lively or dead, stones, trees, birds, stars, or Crosses: so that ye Christes Crosse be resembled, that is to say, ye a like forme he made to that, whereupon he suffered, in what soever matter the Crosse barces be painted or graun, it is an Image.

For what is an Image, but the imitatio, or making of a thing like to the shape of such an other thing, as (in that behalf) is resembled, and thereby accompted moze principal?

And because it is not possible (after that Christ died upon the Crosse) to have any Crosse accompted moze principal then his (he being the head of the Church and the first begotten among many brethren) whatsoever Crosse he made in all the world, and specially whatsoever Crosse is either miracular: ye hewed, or made by Christians, is of necessitie moze to be ye Image and resemblance of Christes Crosse.

Let it therefore stand also for an undoubted truth, that not only the shape of
Of Images, and of Christes owne personage, or of his Saints, but also that the signe of Christes Crosse is truili and prosperous an Image.

What an Idol is, And that our Images be neither Idols, nor be not vsed like Idols.

The 7. Chap.

2. Cor. 8. We know (saith S. Paul) that an Idol is nothing in thy world. And again I say not that an Idol is any thing.

2. Cor. 10. By which words he meaneth to declare, the very first patern and Archetypus of Bsenils Images, hath no real truth in it self, no heavenly power, no vertue, no abilitie to make or to marre. For it is only a bare name or shew of a thing, and not in deede that thing, which it is pretensed to be.

For he meaneth not to say, that the wood or stone which is graven or painted should be nothing (sithes that is the creature of God) but only, that the thing represented by the graven or painted Image, is either nothing in itself, or at the least it is nothing toward our salvation.
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To make this matter the plainer, we must consider two kinds of false showes, or of wrongful appearings, of the which, one is such, as the thing shewed thereby neither was, nor is at all existant any where: an other is such, as though it were in deed somewhat, yet it neither was, nor is that honorable thing in Religion, which it shewed it self to be.

An example of the first sorte those Monsters may be, which were idly described by the Poets; of which kinde Orixenes and Theodoretus write. For whereas the Secracy Interpreters had interpreted the words of Gods commandement thus: οὐ ποιήσετε σταυρὸς εἰς οἶκον, οὐδὲ παντρεύσωμα θαλάς not make an Idol to thy self, nor a similitude of any thinges, Origen writing upon that precedent, saith thus: Λογικαὶ αὐτὸι καὶ ιδεῖς, καὶ αὐτὸι ἤδυστε τοὔπερ ὅσος νικήλομιν ἀποστολὸς δοετε, &c. cat.

Exo. 20.

Idols and Gods do serve differ one from the other, as the Apostle himself doth teach vs. For if of the Gods he said (as there are many Gods, and many Lords) But of the idols he saith,
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for an idol is nothing in the world. Whereby it
seemeth to me that he did not reade lightlie those
things which the law said. For he saith the dif-
ference between Gods, and idols: and againe the
difference between idols and similitudes (or Im-
eges) for he said of the Idols, that they are not, but
he did not adde, that similitudes are not. God
saith, though shalt not make to thyself an idol,
neither the likenes of any thing, therefore it is one
thing to make an idol, and another to make a
similitude.

And if it may please God to illuminate vs
to those things which are to be (aid, I thinck it
to be take in this sort: that if (for examples sake)
anie mane do make the shape or forme of anie
fourfooted beast, or serpente, or bird, in anie kind
of mettal, either of gold, or silver, or wood, or
stone, and sete vp the same to be worshipped, he
hath not made an Idol, but a similitude or an
Image: or if he sett vp a painted picture so the
same end (to be worshipped) yet we must saie he
hath made a similitude. Trulie he maketh an
idol, which maketh that which is not, according
to the Apostle, which saith, that an idol is nothing.
But what is that which is not? It is a shape which
the eye hath not sene, but the minde hath fained
it to
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it to it self, as (for example sake) if a man do make the body of a man having a dogge or gorges head, or againe doe make one man to have two faces, or doe ioyne to the face parte of a man, the hinder parte of a horse, or of a fishe: be that doth make such thinges as these are, doth make no similitude, but an Idol. For be maketh that which is not, neither hath it any thing like unto it.

Therefore the Apostle knowing these thinges 1 Cor. 8, saith, that an Idol is not in the world. For there is no shape taken of any thing that is extant, but that which the minde being idle and curious doth make by chance. A similitude is, when any thing that is either in heauen, or in earth, or in the vwater, is formed.

Where Origen teacheth vs, first that the fasse Gods which were so named were many, and were in deede extant (in hel soiidoth). Secondly that Idols be extant no where. Thirdly that Similitudes (of which kind our Images are) be the shapes and formes of things really extant.

According to the same sense Theodoricus having asked, what difference there is between an Idol & a similitude, In Exod, q.38.
Of Images, and answereth him self thus: *Idolum nihil re- presenterat, quod subsidiat: similis, vero est alia curis imago et essigies. Quum ergo Graci quidam formas minimè subsidienses essingit, veluti Sphinxus, Triton, & Centauros, Aegyptius vero nume ronnum, id est, homines caninos vulnu, Bucephalos, tales rerum non subsidiensum fictiones, idola vocat.*

An Idol doth not represent any thing that is; but a similitude is the Image of some thing. Therefore whereas certain Greeks didayne soome (or shapes) of things they were not in deed, as for example *Sphinx* (which was fained to have *y* head & hands of a mayde, the bodie of a dogge, wings like a bird, hailes like a lion, tante like a dragon, *y* face of a man) & *Triton* (who was fained to be God of the Sea) & *Centaurs* (who were thought to have the upper parte of their bodies like men, *y* nether part like beasts) and whereas the Egyptians fained men with dogs faces, such devise of things (that were not in deed, God he calleth Idols.

These Idols then were nothing set in the world, not onlie concerning Religion, but also concerning nature. But
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of the second kind of Idols which are 

of what nature, & nothing at all in faith 

in Beligion, S. Augustine, S. Ambrose 

and commonly all the other Fathers do 

expound both this place of S. Paule, and 

other places of holy Scripture, which 

forbid Idols to be worshipped.

Of this kind of Idols S. Augustine 

faith. Sum & idola, sed ad salutem nihil sunt. 

Idols be also (or have a being in the 

world but in respect of salvation, they be 

nothing. S. Ambrose is of the same minde. 

Simulachrae sunt nihil est, quia imago videtur 

rei mortae. An Idol or a sinned Image 

in dece is nothing, because it seemeth 

the Image of a dead thing. And he meaneth 

thing to be dead, not onlie to this 

world but much more to life everlasting.

An Idol therefore concerning thing 

represented by it, is either nothing at al, 

(as whi a sinned Monster is worshipped 

by an Image thereof) or els it is nothing 

in respect of Salvation, as when a devil, or 

a wicked man, or an unreasonable creature 

is worshipped, either as God himself, 

or as partaker of Gods grace. But 

the Images which we vse, are neither 

nothing
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nothing at all, concerning the thing represented by them, (sithens we do not worship either men with dogs' faces, or any like fained matter, but we worship true men, as Christ, and our Lady, and St. Paul are) and all the thing represented by our Images, is not nothing in respect of salvation; sithes Christ (whose Image we worship) delivered by his death our salvation, & his blessed Saints following Christ their head, procured our salvation as much as lay in them, whilst they lived, by turning infidels and sinners, by giving good example, by preaching, and by ministering the Sacraments, and even to his day the same Saints be careful for us their fellow members, and pray to God for us, and obtain us his grace and benefits.

Therefore as the truth represented by our Images being both somewhat in nature, and much to salvation, is farre different from the Idols of the Heathens and Paganims: so are our holy Images and representations farre different from those ungodly Images and false representations, which were vied in ? Temples of Jude
of Infidels who worshipped false Gods. And consequently our Images are as farre from material Idols, as Christ or his blessed Mother & Apostles are far from being Monsters, Devils, or wicked men. For looke what proportion is betwene thing and thing, the same proportion is betwene ligne and ligne of those things.

Moreover the Bencils committed diverse great abuses about their Idols, of the which we committe neuer a one.

They dyd commonly offer Sacrifice to the verie granen Idol, as Eusebias declareth. And the wisest of them dyd offer to that vaine creature, which the Idol represented. And of this gregious abuse Idolatrye toke specially his name. For whereas the worship of Sacrifice (according to St. Angilins judgement) is of all other most high & most peculiar to God, the Devil professing enmity to God, most vehementlie affected to hate sacrifice made to himself, or to any other thing which were not God. But (God be praised) we are so free fed offering sacrifice to our holy Images, that we suffer none to be offered, no not to those very Saints.
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Saints, whose Images we sete up. We
lay not at the Altar (as S. Augustinus re-
cordeth) VVe offer to thee. O Peter, O Pau,e: but only we offer to the Blessed
Trinitie, which is one God.

The Gentils did sometime adore a
pray unto, ye vertue material image it selfe,
saying to the wood, thou art my Father, and to
the stone, thou hast begotten me, and in that
case the visible sov'n was not an Image
to the, but God it selfe. We can not speake or
think so of our Images. For it repugneth
it is against ye nature of an Image, to be
ey principal thing it selfe, and consequently
not to be an Image.

Some other of the Gentils thought
some minie godhead or power to be con-
ained really in their Images of gold or
silver, as S. Augustine declareth. But we
neither thinke nor teache any such thing,
but we teache, ye the only good represen-
tation of a thing worthy reverence, is to
be honoured in our Images: but who can
not ere we make such a difference be-
twene our Images and Sacraments, ye
in our Images some thing worthy ho-
nour is shewed, and not obtained, but in
our
our Sacraments that grace and power is contained, which is by the words and things outwardly shewed. Some other more wise and learned among the Greeks affirmed themselves neither to worship with Godly honour the Image, nor any Deid, but by the corporal shape to behold the signe of that thing which they intended to worship, as St. Austin also reported. For by the Image of Neptune they worshipped the Sea, by the Image of Juno, the ayer, by the Image of Vulcan, the fier. But yet therein it well appereth, they referred their worship to dead elements, and to sole bodies which can receive no honour.

We doe not so worship our Images, that any element, or unreason-able creature is finally honoured in ther but only those blessed Saints, who are with God, are honoured in our Images and our Images together with them for their sakes.

The Gentils to avoide that soweile shame of worshipping the bodily elements answered, that they worshipped not finally the bodies of the earth, or Sea,
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but that they worshipped the Gods, who
bore the chief rule in governing them.
But thereby also it well appered, they
made noe Gods then one, and that they
thought one loncre might be gotten to
those Gods by the mean of getting false
worship to some creatures, from which
creatures they would have the honour
to passe againe unto certaine peculiar
Gods, who (as they supposed)were see
generally to rule those creatures. This
was highe Idolatrye. For the Image of
Juno being set vp in the shape of a rea-
sonable creature, as of a woman, pee of a
goddesse, was directed to signifie ye dead
air. And so ye Image did shew a greater
thing then that truthe had, whose Image
it was made.

Againe the aper which is a creature
and no Image, was set to signifie a God
and was honoured falsely, that an other
honour more falsely might be gotten thereby
to that, which was not at all. Thus with
al ye deceiles ye Heath's could make for
defense of their Idols, they were alwaies
found Idolatours. For, as S.Augustine
saith, Hae sunt simulachra geriui, in quibus inters
pretanea.
pretendus nobis habere exitu nisi ad creaturam quam condidit Deus agi in ipsa quoque interpretatione simulacrum, de qua se priores sero narrare coeuerunt, hoc in eis fiat, quod Apost. dicit: Coluerunt & servierunt creaturas quam Creatore, qui est benedictus in secula. These be the Idols of the Gentils, in the interpreting of which, they can not but end in thy creature which God hath made: so that even in the interpretation of their Idols (of which interpreting thy more learned sort of the were wont to boast (to be proude) that was done in them, which thy Apostle said: they have worshipped and served thy creature rather then thy creatour, who is blessed for euer. Moreover the Devils ruled at their pleasure the Images of the Gentils, genying oracles and answers out of them, to the peple. But the Images of Christ and of his Saints are feared of the devils, rather then ruled by them: neither was it euer heard of, that the foule spirits were able to abuse them to deceaue the people: and that not without a cause.

For the faith, intent and purpose of the Gentils and of the Christians is so far different, that the Gentils directed
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these images, and the honour of them to an evil end, that is to lay, to vanitie, to the worshipping of many Gods, to superstition and hypocritie: but our images are directed altogether to the glory of God, and to the remembrance of his benefites bestowed upon vs.

In this respect S. Augustine saith:

'For quarumdam rerum similis videtur nobis esse cum Gentibus, sic ete. Although we seem to vse certaine things like as the Gentils doe, as meate, and drinke, bowles, sacraments, bathes, and theke also of vs who live married life, mate and kepe wives, and begge, nourish, and make our children inhericours: ye he vseth these things farce otherwise, who refereth them to an other end (belyde God) then he doth, who by these things genereth God thankes, of whom he belongeth no eniill of falslihood.

Thus, I say, he changeth likewise in Images. For alhcie our Images be made of wood, of stone, of siluer, as the Images of the Gentils are, ye he vseth Images farce otherwise, who vseth them to have a fallie God worshipped, then he doth
of Images.

both who by the use of them seeketh the honour of one true God. Now say I, for as much as those that are baptised and beleuewed of God, and endevour to keepe his commandements, do set by Images to a good end: this faith of theirs, and this intent to beautifie their work and worship, that it is not possible for the Devils to abuse those Images (as their owne possession) which are dedicacated to Gods honour.

Furthermore, the Devils coveted alwayes to maintaine the Idols of the Grecians, and with great forow they saw them destroied. But they alwayes rejoysed to see our Images cast downe, and overthrown, as it may well appere, in that, they persuaded Iulianus the renegare to breake and cast away the Image of Christ at Paneade in Syria.

If any man object against me in this place, the great abuses which have beme wrought about holy Images, in making their eies to move, their lippes to waggge, &c so foorth: I answer, those abuses came of particular end me, who thereby sought suche lucee in certain corners, where
Of Images, and
the Bishop was a stpe. But these prac-
tices were never allowed in the Church
of God.

who doubteth also, but that the Gospel
and the name of God is abused daily?

Again, those abuses were practised
by men (who being not yet condemned
everlastingly, are the lesse afraid to at-
tempt such deeds) not by Devils, who
have no such power upon holy things,
but rather have their tormentors increas-
when they approache to holy Images.

Thirdly the men who practised such
abuses, if ever they liued where and whe
any Lutheranoz like licentiousile heresie
was preached, they commonly became
Renegates, with the first. And so they are
not our shame, from whom they are de-
parted, but theirs to whom new sprung
Congregacion they have joyned them-
selves. For if they did seere to live by Re-
ligion, as not to seare to abuse the people,
when by milleordering Images they
might gaine a penny or two: how much
more did they reioyce, to see Images
thrown down, whereby they gained the
whole gyte and Jewels of the Images,
whole
Image breakers.

Whole Croisses of silver, cortines of silke, candlestickes, copes and chalyces? They were, I warrant you, such Bellygod monkes, as gave up their abbeis, and now be Apostaras and married against their vow made unto God. So that the abuse was committed by men, and by such men as the new, Gospell (so a great part) consisteth of.

The differences betwene the Idols of the Gentils and our Images, are chiefly these.

First some kinde of Idols had no truth at all in nature, but were feined Monsters: All our Images haue that essentiall truth creat in the world, which they represent.

All their Idolles were without truth concerning faith and Religion: all our Images containe such a truth, as belongeth to Christes faith & Religion.

Sacrifice was done to their Idols: not so to our Images, but only to God.

Their Idols belonged many times to verie wicked men: our images, which we worshippe, belonget alwaies to blessed Saints.
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5 Some of the Gentils professed thes-
elves to adore the vnsensible wood, or
stone: we do not profess or teache any
such thing, but rather the contrarie.

6 Other of the Gentils thought a certain
substance of God to lye pryng in ß Idol:
we make our images only remembrances
of holy things, and not to conuaine any
Godhead.

7 The wisest of the Gentils adored by
the Image of Juno, or of Vulcanus, un-
reasonable creatures, as the earth, or the
fire, and by them, certaine Gods who go-
vernued those creatures: we adore by our
Images no unreasonable creatures, but
only Blessed soules, and one God their
Maker.

8 The Devils ruled their Idols: The
same Devils scour our Images, which
are sette vp in a right faith.

9 The Devils maintained their Image:
The same couert to throwe down our Im-
ages.

10 To be shote, their Idols were dedi-
cated by infidels to an Heathenish pur-
pole: our Images be dedicated to a vers-
ecouse intent. Therefore our images
being
of Images.

being so farre different fro the heathenish idols, are inuironily by W. Jevel and such other called idols. And the convenient worship, which we gene to them, is flannuously called idolatry. And where in the bible mention is made of Idols, they are falsely translated into English by the name of images.

That it is no Idolatrie to gene convenient worship to some creatures, and whether images be creatures or no.

The 8. Chap.

D. Harding had said; that images were set up in Churches, not specially to intent the people might worship them, but partly to instruct the simple, partly to stirre up our minds to follow the example of these men, whose images we see. So that he meaneth the worship which is gene to images, to be gene by a consequent, as it were, and rather because it may be gene lawfully, then that it is principallie soughet.
Of Images and

ought to be geneu. Hereupon M. Jewes犹wel Idolatrie concludeth, after his wise kinds of reasoning.

Jewel. An Image is a creature and no God. And to honour a creature in that sort (as it is set vp to thend to be worshipped, although not speciallie to that end) is Idolatry, therefore by M. Hardings own cōfelsfio Images are set vp to be vsed to Idolatrie.

Sander. In this argument of M. Jewels there are but foure great faults. The first is, in that he putteth idolum in stede of imago, the second in that he putteth latria in stede of doulaia. M. Jewel saith it is idolatry, to honour a creature, that is to saie, an Image of Christ or of an Apostle, in such sort as it is set vp not principallie, but secondarinie that it may be worshipped with such honoure as is due to some creatures. for M.D. harding defendeth the honour due to Images, is both due by a cōsequent, also is not latria nor Gods own honour, which is genē to the, but doulaia which is an inferior degree of honour. Now ye word Idolatry is cōpounded of latria, and of idolum, α is to saie γ γενεing of lattia or of Gods honour
to an Idol, but our Images are no Idols  
& they honor we guev the is not Iatria: how 
laith he the, by Mr. Hardings own confession Images are set up to be vilied to Ido 
latrie? For to confess so much, he must goe 
against his own doctrine, which denies Iatria to Images, & denies Images to be I- 
dols: There fore though it were true a crea 
ture were set up to a secondarie intet to 
be honoured, yet his honorizing of it, shuld 
be called by Mr. Hardings confession Ima- 
gedoulie, & not Idolatrie. For now we 
must make new names to confute new 
cauils & Saunders. The third fault in 
Mr. Jewels argument is in he presuppo- 
seth we may set up no creature to thint it 
it might be any waies honored, although 
we set it not up speciallie to intet why 
so I praiye your sir? Let vs imagin, that 
certain men had rebelled against the 
prince, & had sworn they wold never ho 
nour him whiles thei lined. If these men 
be afterward taken, & promise to change 
their minde, may not the prince be set up 
in his throne, to this intet, that these men 
may be openlie scene to honour him in 
the face of all his court? or that they com-
mits
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with idolatry, who set up the King thus
to be honoured of his own subjects; the
some creature which is not God, may
be set up with some intent to be ho-
nowned, and yet no idolatry commis-
ted.

M. Jewel should have said, that no
Domne, a unreasonable creature might be
set up to be honoured for his own sake,
or else that no creature at all might be set
up to be made a God, or to be honoured
with the same honour, wherewith God
is honoured, and then his argument
would have been good.

But I would have answered, first,
that we gave no such honour to Images,
as is due to God alone. Secondlie, that
honour of doyns may be given to some
creatures, in such respect, as they are
made the signes of heavenly things, for to
M. Jewel I am sure both honour of Euc-
charist, although he (saffly) thinketh it to
be only substances of bread & wine, which
are creatures. And so at Catholicks do
honor baptism (as St. Augustine doth-
say) in the holy Chriisme, in such like holy
sacrements. Thirdly, if we that rip up at
things
things to y quicke, an Image is not pro-
perlie a creature. For y is the last saule
in flux. Jewels discours, because he affir-
meth an Image to be a creature. Where-
as although the matter of it be a creature
(as wood, brasse, iron, or gold) yet the
image is rather a manufacture, to wit,
a thing wroght upon a creature by the
artificers hand, then a general creature
of it self.

And yet it is not to be worshipped
in respect of the act, which is in it (for
the artificer might make the image of
an ape as well as of a man) but it is ador-
ed, if it represent an honorable person
as Christ, S. Paul, or any like blessed man;
and then also it is not properly to be
adored in itself, but with respect of the
person whom it representeth. For as it
is an image, it hath not any general sub-
sistence of his owne, but (concerning his
matter and substance) it wholly depen-
deth of the metal or statue wherein it is
made, and concerning his person or
subsistence, it dependeth of his natural
person whom it representeth, and ac-
cording to whole shape it is made.
And truly no artificer is able to make a creature, or to give it either a person or a substance of his owne. Therefore an Image which is no creature of it-self, is altogether to be referred and joined to his chiefe paterne, and to be ruled whole by his paterne: and may be set up to be honoured for the paterns sake, if the patern it self (whereunto it is to be referred and joined) be worthy of honour.

Who knoweth not that the le&t difference is betweene things, the sooner they are joined, and as it were made one? Therefore being an Image, although it be an other thing, yet it is not anie other thing diverse in person from his patern: we, honouring Images for the reasonable truches sake, neither honour a creature (as it is a dume creature) no? cōnìc Idolatrie by worshipping (in a lower de·gree) of Image of a truche, which is in it selfe honorable, as David hath witnessed Gods friends to be, saying, Nimus honorati sunt anici tui Deus. Thy friends 0 God are very much honoured, yet how could they be much honoured (in the sight of God) if they were not worthy of much honour?

By
of Images.

By like M. Jewel would reply to this my answer, saying, although an Image be not a creature (as being the only work of man's hand, and not the work of God or of nature) yet it is lesse than a creature. And consequently it is lesse worthie of honour, then the least creature that is.

This were true indeed, M. Jewel, if that which is wrought with the hand, were not a thing, which is able to stirre vs vp to a vertuoust and good remembrance, and to provoke vertue in vs. For if either an Image could be separated (as it is an Image) from his true parent or if the parent thereof were not reasonable or honorable, an Image truly were much lesse, the anie creature in the world, because it hath no proper person of his owne, as exercie other creature hath. So that 's work of man's hand is lesse in substance then any creature, but not lesse in honour, when it is fct to signifie an honorable vertue.

Likewise an Image that sheweth a falsehood, or which is set vp to have an evil thing honoured by it, is lesse worthy of
Of the honouring of honour, yea rather is more dishonorable than any creature, as St. Augustine confesseth and teacheth.

But as when the handie worke signifieth a soule or civil thing, it maketh a good creature of God to be accompted leste of, then otherwise it should be (S. when we breake the wood or brasse where in an Idol is naughtily adored) ene so an image (made by act) representing a truth the which truth is worthie of honour, is more to be worshipped then any unreasonable Creature in it selfe. Because the onely similitude of an honourable truth, is of greater dignitie, than that creature which by nature can partake no honour at all, as the which hath neither reason, nor any similitude of a reasonable person in it.

To geue an other Example in the same kynde, the Kings Garment be it never so base, and of small price, yet in respect that it is about his Maiestie, although it be a generall creature, is more worthie of honour, then all the Gold and precious Stones of the newe founde Land, which are not about any
of Images.

Prince. Whereupon S. Augustine writeth, Si quis nostrum ait purpuram; etiam aegle regale sacrosanctum; quod haec consuetudinum, si ea simulam Rege quis uxor e spondidore? Cum vero ex Rex fuerit nobiles, peniculum mortis incursit, si ea simulam Rete quis uxor e compersetur. If any of us do finderlicher the Kinges purple garment, wheras Crowne lying (in any place) and we ague about to worshippe it? But when the King hath their suchim, he that doth then contenue to worshippe them together with the King, doth incure the danger of death.

If then the respect betwene suche a Kings backe, and the same lying upon the ground, be so sincere, that the one waie it must be adored under paine of death, and the other waie it neede not be endured to be adored: What wonder is it, that an Image which in respect of the matter and handie cratic thereof, is worthie of no honour, yet is worthy of some honour in respect of ye truth, whose similitude it beareth? Specially being ther is far greater cause why the Image of S. paule should be honoured, then why the Kings garment should be at al honored.
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For being it is against reason for a reasonable man to honour an unreasonable creature (which is lesse than he that honoureth it) being yet a garment which is an unreasonable creature, may be honoured in respect that it is upon y' kings backe (whereas the same garment takeng stil the same garment, may be very well separated from the kings perso, and be given to an other man) much more then, the Image of S. Paule, which is no unreasonable creature (as it is an Image) but rather it is the similitude of a reasonable creature (and takynge stil the same Image which once it was, can not in any respecte be otherwise then his onely Image) much more y' Image may be honoured in respect of S. Paule himselfe.

Last of al, when there is any danger, least a creature should rob God of his owne Honour, in that case the lesse the Creature is, the fatter of it is from possibilitie of having Gods owne honour genen to it. Even as, the poorer and baser a man is, the lesse just cause a King hath to feare, least he should despise
of Images.

mine him of his Royal Cronne.

For this cause, whereas the Sonne of God alone is naturally the Image of his Father, and thereby of equal substance and honour with him, S. Chrysostome alkeb how it chaunced, that Men are called also the Sonnes of God, and are laid to be made according to Goddes Image, whereas the Angels who are much above men, are neither found to be named the Sonnes, nor the Images of God? whereas to himselfe auntswereth in this wise. Quoniam illic quidem natura sublimitas facile complures intr ait impietatem: conicisset his vero tenuitas omnem securitatem prestat. If the Angels should be called the Sonnes of God, or his Images, their high and excellent nature would have brought many into this wicked minde, to have thought them equal with God. But the low and base nature of men, taketh away all such seare.

And afterward: Vbi multum erat hu-militatis, ibi scriptura considerenter ac securè posuit honorem: vbi vero maior natura, non item. Where much basenes was, there the scripture did boldly and without fear, place...
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and attribute Honour (by calling men the Sonnes of God) but where the greater nature was (to witte, in Angels) there the Scripture did not attribute such honour.

If the discourse of S. Chrysostome be good (as it is) then the bater a thing is, the rather it maie haue Honour geuen to it. And therefore the Image which is made by the Artificer, and is lesse then any creature, maie with much lesse daunger be honored, then any creature it selfe.

Singe then it is evident, that some Creatures maie be honoured (as the Prophete confesseth Gods Frineds to be much honoured) and seeing some unreasonable creatures musst be honoured (in that behalfe as they are assumpted by God to make a highe Mysterie, as Baptisme) and seeing an Image is the Similitude or Steppe of an Honourable Person, as of Christe, or of his Saintes: it is out of all Question with all reasoneable men, that the Images of Saintes maie be lawfully lette by to be honoured, without all suspicition or feare of Idolatrie
of Images.

Volatlie, notwithstanding that they are either Creatures, or else Manufactures, which is to say, else then Creatures, as being only the worke of mens hands.

M. Jewels juggling is detected concerning the Antiquitie and Invention of Images. And specially his manifeste corrupting of Eusebius in that Argument.


D. Deton Harding had shewed how God in the time of Moses law had commanded two Cherubins to be made, and to be sete yp in the Tabernacle, whereupon M. Jewel saith:
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Iewel M. Harding douteoth not to derive the first invention of his Images from God himself (and afterward) but learned and wise men thinke, that the invention hereof came first from the Heathens and Infidels, that knew not God.

Sander. Whereas there are two kinds of Images, one which doth represent a truth, as that Christ redeemed us; another which representeth a Clarke falsehood, as Jupiter is God: againe, whereas there are diverse kinds of honour, one, which is due to God alone, another which is in diverse degrees due to good men themselves: the third which is also in diverse degrees due to the Images or representations of good men: Heathens invented such Images as represent a falsehood, and such honouring of them as is not due to them.

But Images which represent a truth, and the true honouring of them came in deed from God, and that first of all by the law of nature and of Nations, which permieth the arte and knowledge of graving and painting, if they be well vised: Secondly God in the law showed that Images might be made by willing
of Images.  

the two Cherubims and the Images of Lions and of Oren to be set in the Ta-
bernacl, and in Salomons Temple. 
Thirdly God in the time of the new Te-
ament inspired his Apostles and See-
uanaus to allow the making of good and 
true representations, the which were lau-
dably made in the first three hundred yeares 
after Christ, as Eusebius doth witnesse, 
about whose worde hee chiefe disputa-
tion shalbe. 

Now cometh M. Jewel and taking 
upon him to write against D. Harding 
(who deëfeth only such Images as God 
hath allowed, as such as Christes Church 
hath vised ) bringeth in which was spo-
ken either of wicked Idols, or of the false 
worshipping of handie and wanton Im-
ages: so that his long discourse is an-
twered in one word: They are Idols, 
(M. Jewel) or wanti pictures, as not the 
Images of holy men, whereof the boke of 
wisdom, S. Cyriæ, S. Ambrose, S. Au-
gustine, Lactantius, and S. Athanasius 
do speake. Doth not your own boke con-
fesse so much? heath not your margette these 
worde out of Athanasius, and so forth? 

In his 
Replies. 
fol. 498.
Of the honouring

...et c. The invention of Idols came not of good, but of evil! But you turn, the invention of Images: And because you have traslaced the place falsly have you therby won the spur. Shall any mans iniquity strangely juggling in Godes matters, get him credit of good men? Is every Image an Idol? If you think so, then lity the Son of God is the Image of God and the figure of his Fathers substance, the Sonne of God is with you an Idol. Or is every Idol an Image? Then the pictures of those who are made with Dogs faces, are Images, and consequently there are such men in these. For every Image, if it be properly an Image, is the likeness of some truth. Otherwise it is an Idol, and no Image, as I shewed before out of Origen and Theodoret. But know you not the difference betwixt en Idol and an Image? Then you are very simple, in good faith, and to newly learned, or if you do know the difference (because doubtless you are not sole) why then turn you the greeke word, ἵλω&phi;ννονίστου, by this English word Images? but onely because you must maintain your cause by falshood? But let vs come to speak of the state of...
of the new testament, there see whether Images were used and received in the Primitive Church. 78

That I may not stay upon tradition, which, as Damaseus witnesseth, reported Christ sent his own Image to Augarbus, king of Edessa; neither was the Image of his face given to Veronica; which on this day is kept, he noted in Rome, no; but which Athanasius witnesseth to have been made by Nicodemus: nor was the constant witness of many, St. Luke the Evangelist painted both Christes and our Ladies Image: that I may let passe images of St. Peter & Paul, which Silvester St. B. of Rome were used to Constantinus the Great, omitting all such traditions which our new brethren refuse, because they are not of those who St. Paul biddeth keep the traditions which were taught either by his preaching, or writing (yet if he had not preached images might be made, there had not been so many images among the faithful in the Primitive Church, as it hath and shall appear there were) but all those other examples omitted, surely the Historic of the Image, which the woman that was deli-

De side Orthod. 1
in Concil. Nice. 2.
Theodore lector.
Nicothor. ib. 6 c. 16.
Metaphra
stes in vita
s. luca.
1 Thess. 2.
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delivered of the issue of blood, did sette
up in trall for the honour of Christe in
Caesarea Philippi, that Image is so notorius,
and so much spoken of in the Ecclesiasticall Histories, and so witnessed to
be true by Eusebius who saw it, that M.
Jewel can not cal it a fable, as he doth at
other holy traditions.

That Image of Christ was also set
up in a high place before her doore which
was healed, and was in such estimati-
on, that men came to be healed, by the
herbe, which onely had touched the hem
of lowest part thereof.

Moreover Eusebius plainly wit-
nesseth, that until his time, certain pain-
ted Images of our Saviour, and of Ste-
ter and Paul were preserved and had
bene sene of him. In saying they were
preserved, he geaneth vs to understand,
that they were made long before, an ythe
lined were a thousand and three hundred
yeares agoe. What saith then M. Jewel
to this evident Testimonie:

Jewel. Eusebius him selfe sheweth, that
the Pheniceans being Heathens, and hea-
ring and seeing the straunge miracles that had
of Images.

had been wrought by Christ and by his Apostles, made these Images in the honour of them, onely of their Heathenish and vaine Superstition.

Sander. If this tale might be proved one of Eusebius him selfe, it were very well for M. Jewel's purpose. But we shall finde M. Jewel as faithful of his woorde, as he is of his believe. They were not Heathens but Christians who made these Images, albeit they had been Heathens, and afterward became Christians.

Jewel. Eusebius woordes be these: Nec mirum est veteres Ethnicos, beneficio affectos a Seruatore nostro, ista fecisse. It is no marueil that the Heathens receiuing such benefittes of our Sauior did these things.

Sander. Here is one fault committed in translating the Breke wordes into Latine, an other in englishing his owne Latine wordes. So that whereas the Latine agreeeth not w the Breke, Englishe also disagreeeth with the Latine. The Breke wordes are Χριστηνος ους θεον θαλου εξ ζηνον Χερεσθενιας.
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Eccles. his flor.lib. 7. cap. 14.

Ruffinus dooth Latine it thus.

And no wonder; if such of the Gentils, as had believed, did send to offer as it were such a present for the benedictes, which they had received of our Saviour.

The whole controversy rested in these wordes, τοὺς ὀλίγους ἐξ ἔλθουν, which W. Jewel latineth, Veteres Ethnicos, and angliseth, the Beathens.

His Latine is vurtue, whether it be of his owne making, or borrowed of any of his Brethren ( whom peradwaes he trusted in turning this place of Enlueing for him ) and his English is farre worse.

Ruffinus dooth latine those wordes thus: Qui ex Gentilibus crediderant, such of the Gentils as had believed. Is there not great oddes betwene Beathens, and such as now believed, though they had ben once Beathens? Dooch not at the mater
never consist herein, whether Heathens or Christians made these Images?

Rufinus saith, such of the Heathens made them, who had beleened. SS. Jewels saith, the Heathens made them. And he saith, that Eusebius himself saith, word in, τὸ τὰ λαοί ἔστιν Ἡρώη, is word for word, Querant abol ex Genibus, they that were in time past of the Heathens. Whereby it is meant, that although they were begotten of Heathens, yet when they made these Images, they were no more Heathens.

I tel you, SS. Jewels; that Eusebius himself saith, that those old letters by these Images, who were in time past of the Heathens, πάλαξ, is olim, once, or in time past. But in time past was no good pastime for SS. Jewels purpose, and therefore he leere it passe in good time as he thought.

The Latin wordes, veteres Ethnicos, was not true, because it told not at the sense. For it is not at one to say, the old Heathens, and to say, those who were in the old time of the Heathens.

The old Heathens beoken Heathens
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of the old time, who might still have ered Heathens; but those that once were of the Heathens, be not still old Heathens, but are signified in their own life to have ben, of Heathens made faithful, as being once of the Heathens, now of the Christians, the which sense Ruffinus hath faithfully and eloquently translated.

Amorci tale, that being so many heretics & falsifying of old writers be daily laid to St. Jewels charge, many of them being so plain, and so inexcusable, as they are, that yet the inuentour is calld to no accompte. Write we sportingly, or in earnest? Seriuie we for the shado of an Asse, or els for the truth it self? And for the truth in meane maters, or els for the truth in maters of Saluation? Is there no one learned and sciolse Protestant in all Englande, who being lead with the love of the truth, and with freedome and liberty of conscience, will both loke whether the Fathers doe say as W. Jewel reporteth, and when he sindeeth him to have moiste impudently falsified their words and meanings, dare say to hun: Sy, you that unders
stand
of Images.

And, that our Gospel standeth not by lying and corrupting of the Fathers, and because you have maintained it by that means, you have slandered our Gospel, and therefore I will purge it of that slander by confessing your impudence, and by maintaining the truth some other way. Better it were to denie the Fathers altogether, then whilsts we pretend to have them for us, to be taken for most notable liers, and to be proued so in the end.

Concerning the Images Ensehins speaketh of, if the matter were not exceeding plain, that the only Faithful Christians had made them: I would lay it were not like to be true, that Christ bestowed any great care upon those, who should have tarried till Brethren. For he much more willingly cured the lourie, then the body.

Again, though sometimes the men healed, becamé unkind and forget ful of his benefit, yet those who taried so mindfully thereof, as to let by Images for his honour, were not unkind, and therefore it is not to be doubted, but that the Faith of Christ remained still in their hearts.

Thirdly
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Thirdly, if it could be doubted of any man else, yet not of this blessed woman, whose faith was so great, that she said in her heart: If I only touch his garment, I shall be safe. And Christ gave witness to her faith, saying: Be of good cheer daughter, thy faith hath made thee safe. Go in peace.

Is this woman yet a Heathen, or Jew? who believeth, and which is bid to go in peace? For this woman it was, who did set up the Image of brass, and by the occasion of her Image Eusebius came to speak of other Images.

But now all those arguments need not, because thy words be plain. It is no wonder to Eusebius, if that Image of brass bare thy figure of Christ, for those were in time past of the Gentils, did (faith Eusebius) make such things for the benefits they had received. But this is not al Thy Jewels falshood. Let us then heare more.

Jewel. Nam & Apostolorum Pauli & Petri, & ipsius Christi Imagines coloribus ductas & teruatias vidimus. For we have seen the Images of Paule and Peter, and of Christ drawn in colours and preserved.

Sander. Here beside, ensus, of him as his,
left out in Latin & in English (which was of no importance, M. Jewel hath left out two other words, of some importance, in his English. The first is &cet, that is to say, also. The second is, εφίας that is to say, of him selfe, the whole sense is, for wee have seen also, the image of his Apostles Paul, and Peter, yea and of Christ himself, drawn in colours, and preserved.

The word, also, doth shew a new history to be told, beside that of the woman, which was healed of her issue of blood. For whereas Eusebius saith the history of that Image, which was sette vp by the said woman, as it were by the way, least it should be thought that no holy Images els were among the Christias, he addeth, we, also, have seen the Images of the Apostles, and of Christ himselfe. Not only that of Cefarea in Brasse, but others also painted, and that not newlye painted, but preserved in painting. So that whereas Eusebius lyued about three hundred yeres after Christe, he sawe painted Images of Christ him selfe, and of his Apostles preserved: The which came from his forefathers time to his sight.

Also, maketh much for the purpose.
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But O the deceit of W. Jewel, who would make vs belene, that these other Images, of which Eusebius speaketh in the second place, that they also were only among the Gentils. For he saith:

Jewel. The Phenicians being Heathes made these images in the honour of Christ & of his Apostles, only of their heathenish and vaine superstition.

Sander. O vaine & heathenish custome of facying & bragging in you, W. Jewel. Were it so, that the Heathens, carping stil Heathens, had made the Image of bras in Phenicia (as they did not make it carping stil Heathens, but the blessed faithful woman made it) yet it had not bene meant, that they made the other painted Images also.

Eusebius went from one stoye to another, and from a particular storie to a more general. So if you had answered to the first example of the brasen Image made by the Pheniceas being stil (as you suppose) Heathes, yet your second storie of the painted Images otherwise seen by Eusebius, had remained unanswered. Shal we yet shew a farther falshod in W. Jewel.
Jewel, and that stil in one storie?

Jewel Et credibile est, priscos illos homines nondum relicta auita superstitione, ad hunc modum colueruisset colere illos ethnica coluerutudine, tanquam Servatores. And it maie be wel thought, that me in old times, being not yet removed from the superstition of their fathers, vled after this sort to worship the by an heathenish custome, as their Sauioirs.

San. Here is nothing but one untruth heaped upon an other. The greke word ἀπαράλλακτος is latined, nondum relicta auita superstitione. & englighed (being not yet removed from the superstition of their fathers) for we may be sure it is that greke worde which is so englighed, & so turned into Latin. W. Jewel setteth the Greke wordes by side of his boke. And surely none other woorde is left to signifie any such thing, beside ἀπαράλλακτος.

That woorde as it hath none other engligh untowte it, so it is thus englighed (being not yet removed from the superstition of their fathers) but it is lewdly & falsely so englighed: For ἀπαράλλακτος doth signifie a charging by course or by equality, & consequently ἀπαράλλακτος is as much to say...
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as without change or without difference. Now as though nothing in the world might remain unchanged, held the old superstition of the Heathens, so doth W. Jewel add unto Episcopius, no words then are in him, by all these, fro the superstition of their Fathers.

Moreover ὑποτάσσε, is as spiteful-ly engrafted their Saviours. For although the word (among other things) doth signify so, yet it is also taken for those, that preferre vs from any danger and corporal peril. And so was Joseph in the Egyptians τοῦ called ὁ Saviour of the world, for delivering of the Egyptians and the countries thereabout from hunger. But W. Jewel would have the sense to be, as though they take S. Paul and S. Peter for their redeemers. But every kinde of slaving is not a redeeming: except we shall say, that when the Mother slaueth her child from beating, that then she doth redeem her child. The right sense of the place is thus given vs by Erasmus, who translated Episcopius about eleuen hundred peres past. Quod mihi videtur ex Gentili consuetudine indifferentem observatū, quod ita solent honorare quos honore dignos duxerint. The which
of Images.

which thing (berely to make Images in the hono: of their Benefactours) first to me indifferentely or unchangeably kept from the heathenish custom, because they are wont so to honour those, whom they thinke worthy of honour.

Here Rustinus hath translated \( \alpha \pi \alpha = \rho \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha \kappa \tau w \alpha s \), indifferenter, that it is to say, indifferently : meaning, if they made Images after their conceit, even as they had done before, without diversity or difference. Also he translataeth, \( \delta \alpha \sigma \omega \tau \rho \alpha \varsigma \) quos honore dignos duxerint, who they think worthy of honour. For \( \delta \alpha \), doth import, tanquam, or veiut, & it may be englihsed (as if) : Rustinus turned it by duxerint, who they compted worthy of honor. For al is one to their opinion, to be worthy, or to be compted worthy. \( \sigma \omega \tau \rho \alpha \varsigma \), he translataeth honore dignos, that is to say, worthy of honour. For every benefactor, who laueth vs from evil, or helpeth vs to any good thing, as every kind of Sainours doth, is in that respecte worthy of honour.

what is then the meaninge of Eusebius? Surely this: That the Ancient men, who were made Christians
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...from of Heathens, were wont after their old heathenish maner, which in that behalfe they chaunged not, to hony them with Images of whom they acceptred themselves to have receaved benefite. So that ἀπαρχὴν ἀκτως, which is to say, without change, must not be understood, without change of believe and faith, but without change of their former custom in setting up Images.

Hereof you may gather, that it was a custome of the Heathens, to make Images for the honour of men accompted honourable. And I coniecte that custome, and it was a good and laudable custome, if the men were in dede honourable, whose Images were made: or if the people gaine no more honour unto them, then they were worthy of.

Therefore that custome might and did come from the Gentils to the Chri-stians, and not from the Jewes (who through pusillanimitie durst not make even good and lauful Images, noz yet though their law ceased, to eat good and lauful meates) but it came to vs from? Gentils, to make Images in the honor of
of Images.

...of men worthy in deed of honour. It is also common to us with them, that we do sacrifice in every place, and not in Jerusalem alone.

That which was amiss in them, as to do sacrifice to false Gods, and to make the Images of Jupiter, Mars, Apollo, and Vulcan, as things worthy of honour, that we do not: but so far as they kept the law of nature uncorrupted, so far these Heavens being made Christians changed not their old custom.

For S. Paul confesseth, that the Gentiles who had not the law of Moses, yet did some things which were of the Law, naturally. That is to say, by the help and light of God, which through the Law of nature he gane unto them. And that this my interpretation is good, it is evident by divers Arguments taken out of the said place of Eusebius.

First, the Adverb in construction an adverb must be joined to the Verb; for thereof it hath his name, being called an Adverb, as if a man would say, a thing belonging to the Verb, or to some Participle derived from the Verb; as here the Greeke Adverb

...
Of the honouring adverb, ἀπαραλλάκτως belongeth to the Brecke participle ἄφωριστως, as also Kussinus hath ioyned the Latin adverb, indifferentier, to the Latin participle obserua-
tum, & consequently it should in English likewise have bene referred after this sorte. The old men of their Heathenish custome were vront vwithout change, to worship among them selues after this sorte their benefactours.

But S[il] Jewell hath referred the ad-
verb, ἀπαραλλάκτως, to the nowne which were before it, and that also, whereas no article was ioynd unto the Aduerb. He hath made suche a Construction, as if it had bene saied: The Heathens tarying stil vnchaunged.

It is not readen, ἦν ἰρίκευ, the Heathens, but ἦν ἤλλαξι, the Aunciente men. Neither it is readen, that the old men taried vnchaunged in their Religion, but, ἀπαραλλάκτως is without either article before it, or ante suche Participle after it. And the sense is, the Aunciente men, wherein no Heathen-

ise superstition is meant, but onlie the Anti-
Antiquite of the Faithfull Christians: the Anciente Christians, I say, were wone without change, by an Heathenish Custome, to honoure among themselves their Benefactours, with setting vp Images, which might beare their name, and make them to be remembred.

And that the woordõ, παλαιῶν, παλαιῶν doth not belong to Anciente Heathens, but to Anciente Christians, the sense of the place doth shewe. For why should he saie, that they used to doe so without change, if themselves had in no pointe bene changed? It were a wise tale to saie, that Heathens carying Heathens, doe without change use, after the Heathenish Custome, to Honour their Benefactours, with setting vp thay Images.

I praine you, what newes were that? But for a Christian, who is changed frome an Heathen, for hym to doe it stil after the Heathenish custome, and his Faith beinge changed, not to change his old custome, that is a thing worthie to be told.
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For there is a difference in such a man betwixt himselfe & betwen his owne dede. Himself is changed in Faith, but not changed in any kind of custom. And so without change he doth it, which seemeth not now to belong to him. It seemeth not (I say) to belong to him, but in dede it becometh him right well.

For (as S. Augustine hath well noted) when S. Paule reproves the Gentils for offering to Idols, Non quod offerebatur culpatur, sed quia illis offerebatur. He blames them not because Sacrifice was made, but because it was made to the Devils. And againe: Non ideo contemnem davel de essaenda est Virginitas sanctimonialis, quae & vestales virgines fuerunt. The virginity of Monnes is not therefore to be despised or to be detested, because the maidens of the false Goddesse Hessa were also Virgens. And last of all: Non similem cum gentibus vivimus easdem res uon ad eundem finem referendo, sed ad finem legitimi diviunique praecepti. We live not in like sorte with the Gentils, for that we referre not the same thinges to the same ende (as they did) but we referre them to the end of
of Images.

of a lawful and godly commandement, which is Charity grounded upon a good Faith.

To applie this to our purpose, we make Images as the Heathens did, not abstaining to make them, as the Jewes did abstaine: but yet we line not in like sort with the Heathens. For we make not our Images of the same persons whereof they made them, nor to the same ende. They made the Image of Jupiter: we make the Image of Christe. They for the honour of the Deuil: we for the honour of God. But hereof more shalbe said hereafter.

There followeth in Eusebius immediately in the next line and wordes after the Sentence, whereof now we have spoken, an other most evidente reason, which sheweth that Eusebius meante, ἢ ἑλθαται, to be the Anciente Christians, and not the Heathens, who sill called Heathens. ἢ γὰρ ἡ παλαιὰς θρῆνος, &c. For the bre- Ec.Hist.li. thren there by Succession, that is to say, as 7.ca 15. Eusebious doth declare, the Bishoppes apud Rus- who succeeded one after another, esteeme finum.
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and embrace the chaire of S. James the Apostle,
which is kept even hitherto.

Know you not Mr. Jewell, that by, is to lay (so2)? Know you not that, for,
geneth a reason of that which wente be-
foze: what wente before? You lay, it wente before, that the old men tarpyng in
their Heathenish superstition, bled to see
by Images. Wel: then Eusebius must
gene a cause thereof, when he saith: Ia-
cobi enim Cathedram bue usque conservatum,
fratres qui ibi sunt per successionem calunt.
For the breechien which are there according
to succession, make much of and honour
the chaire of S. James kepte until this
daie.

Now put together. The olde men
kepyng their heathenish superstition, saith
Mr. Jewell, doe honour their Benefac-
tours with Images, because the breechien
at Jerusalem do honour the chaire of S.
Jomes. Doth not this geare hang wel
together?

O cursed lying spicie, which pos-
sesteth Mr. Jewell. And O dreadfull
judgemente of them, that hauing his
impiecie laied before their eyes, doe still
honoure
honour him as a Minister of the truth.

Eusebius makest no such foolish connection of maters, as to say, the Heathens doe the one, because the Christians doe the other. But he saith, the Anncient men (thereby meaning the Anncient Christians being made Faithful from Heathens, which they were once) did vsle after the Heathenish fashion without change (in that behalfe) to honour their Benefactors with letting up their Images. How prove you that? For faith he, the Heathen there, to witt, the Christian Bishoppes at Jerusalem, kepe to this daie and honour S. James Chaier.

For this Participle χερεκτοσ, doth manifestly declare, that they honored or gave reverence to the Chaier, because χερεκτοσ is to worship, to embrace, and to esteem highly. Whereby it may appeare, that it hath been an olde custom with the olde Christians, to reverence honourable Personages, by hauing, keeping, and Reverencinge the Restiques, Monumentes and Images of them.

But
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But hath Eusebius yet don with this honour given to honourable personages by their Images? No surely. For it followeth: ἐν τοῖς πάσις ἐμφάνισις ἰδιον. & cæ. (the brethren at Jerusalem esteeming so much S. James's chaier) evidently shew to all men, in what manner both those that were in the old time and those that be even til our daies have maintained, and yet doe maintaine a worshippe reverence and worship of holy men, for their Godlines sake. This is the whole place of Eusebius. Whereby it is manifest, that he alloweth and stoutly defendeth the honour whiche is given to Saints by their Images and Reliques. And he fertoeth the vse thereof from the old time, and continueth the same til his owne tymc.

Iewell. By these wordes of Eusebius it is plain, that the vse of Images came not frō Christ, nor from the Apostles, as M. Harding saith.

Sander. Damascusc told you otherwile, as I have shewed before. Yea Eusebius also told you otherwise. For he deduced the making of Images, and the honouring of Reliques by the Faithfull, into
of Images.

And Christes owenepynce, sayynge that the chair of S. James was honoured by the that succeeded one after another untill his daies.

Jewel. But the making of Images came fro the superstitious custo of the Heathes.

Sander. The first act of exercise of making of Images among Christians came (as farre as we know) from such as had ben Heathes, in this respect, because they who first made Images were rather such Christians, as had bene once Heathens, as had been once Jews. For the Jewses (by like) were more superstitious in that behalf. But the custome of making such Images, as those Heathens being now Christians did make in y honour of Christ, concerning the authority of making Images, came fro the law of Nations, and therefore it was no superstitious custome. Neither doth Eusebium call it so in his Grecke history, albeit M. Jewel make him speak so in Latin 

Jewel. Neither doth it appere, that those Images were sette vp in any Church.

Sander, D. Harding as per the word
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only the antiquicie of Images, and com-
meth afterward to speake of them, as
they were sette vp in Churches.

Jewel. As for the Image of Christ it
is plaine it stode in the strete abroad, and
an herbe of strange operation grew under-
neath it.

Sander. Eusebius nameth more then
que Image of Christ. For he saw also
painted Images of the Apostles, and of
Christ himself. And where was it so like
he should see them (specially in the tyme
of Constantinus the Great) as in the
Church? But where you say, it is playn
that Christes Image stode in the strete
abrode: it stode there in deade, but it stode
honourably, as being sette vp for Christes
honour. And when Julianus the Renegade
had throw it down (as you, Mr. Jewel,
and your companions doe throw down
Christes Image, wherefore you may
find it) after that tyme, the pieces of his
Image were caried into the Church also, as we reade in the Tripartite Dis-

Statuam vero Christi tunc quidem Pagani
trahentes confrerent. Postea vero Christiani
sollie

Tripart. li.
6.cap. 41.
of Images.

Alligentes in Ecclesiam recon siderunt, rbi ha- 
benus referuantur. The Pagynims at 
that tyme dize a long, and broke Chris-
thes Image. But afterward the Chris-
rians gathering it vp, did lay it vp in 
the Churche, where it is kepte to this 
day.

Of ye were M. Jewels chance to come into the same Churche, where 
Image of Christ were kept, what wold 
be doe to it; whether wold he breake it 
again into smaller peeces, than ener the 
Pagynims did? Of els wold he make 
much of it, & kepe it for a Relique, as the 
Christians of those countries did twelue 
hundred peeces past? Whom wold you 
more gladly follow? M. Jewel? Speake 
ye powdare, would you be like the Chri-
stians? Then some Images are so highly 
to be esteemed, that even when they are 
broken, these peeces are proued worthy 
of the rescuing in a Christian Churche. 
O, would you be like the Renegate Julius 
us, and the Pagynims? Boc to your kind 
then, M. Jewel, and trouble no more one 
realm, which would gladly be accepted 
a Christian realme.
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But to returne to our purpose, that Image of Christ being broken, was worthy to be kept in a Christian Church, how much more was it worthy to stand there being profaned? But when it was set up in the streete, the Christians had no Church at all.

Now if this be not the gaining of honour to Christes Image, even after it is no more an Image, yet to gather by the broken pieces thereof, and to put them in a holy place, I can not tell what we shall accompt the honouring of Images to be.

Was this an Idol, W. Jewel, whole pieces the Christians so reverencie re-secured about twelve hundred pieces past Brieftlie Images have ben vied amongst the Christians ever since Christes time. And W. Jewel to make the conccratic appere, hath falsified many wares the publique Histories of the Church.

First he maketh vs belcve that Eusebius onlie speake of such hollie Images, as the Phenicians made, whereas he speake of diverse othe which himselfe saw painted.

Secondlie,
of Images.

Secondlie, he affirmeth that the Images were made by Heathens, only of their Heathenish and byn superstition: whereas the Images were made by Chri-

stians, who had ben Heathens, but were become faithful.

Thirdlie, he compriseth Eusebius, by leaving out in his English the Greek word (with once or in time past, by on which word the whole controversy dependeth.

Fourthlie, he addeth to Eusebius all these words of his owne (the superstition of their fathers) to make his owne forged sense probable.

Fifthly, Eusebius proneth by the religiously keeping of S. ames chaire, that it is no wonder if the Auncient Chri-

stians did make Images for the honour of them of whom they had deceased benefi-
tice, which thing M. Jewell wisteoth to an other sense.

Last of all, it is evident by Eusebius, that the Chri-

stians did reverence and honour the verit chaire of S. ames, for as he speaketh, ἀπ’ ἀυτῆς τῆς λαοῦς Ἰωσηφ συνέλευσεν καθεδραμ. Iacobii, Now

R is shipping
Of the honouring using or highly esteeming the chaire of St. James: not worshipping it as God (as by & by this wrangler would make men believe we meane) but worshipping it with such convenient reverence, as is due to holy Reliques and Images, or to the remembrances of good and godly men.

That by the law of nature honour is due to the Images and Monuments of honourable Perionages. And by what means that may be known.

The 10, Chap.

Whereas God hath ruled his people in divers manners & sorts, sometimes by inspiring his will secretly to the Patriarches and Prophets (as concerning sacrifice to be made of clearer beasts, a & of the best) at other times by expresse commandment given by one ward voice (as concerning Circumcision) and also by custome and tradition of his people from hand to hand.
By the Law of nature.

And (as in bewailing the dead) again afterwards; by giving them a written letter of his law, last of all, by writing his own law of grace and spirit in their hearts: in all these varieties, the Law of Nature hath strove always immutable, and hath ordained one and the same eternal, in Paradise, before the Flood, in the time of Circumcision, in the time of Moses's law, and of the Gospel.

For albeit the use thereof in some part hath been for a time, in some one place stopped by some secret dispensation (as in permitting many wives to one man) else corrupted by evil custom: yet universal right thereof hath nor been utterly changed, nor at all taken away. It was ever the law of Nature to acknowledge a God, and to honour him, for one man to have but one wife at once, to love and reward him who doth a good turn, and to punish vice.

Wherefore it is a matter worthy the knowing, whether as images may be made by law of nature (for that I take to be now proved, because the acts of painting and of graving are laudable.
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and in the amongal nations so likewise they may be honoured and esteemed by the same law, or no. If we find that natturally the Images of honorable Persons may be worshipped, they must needs be unnatural men, who have pul'd them downe, and thereby have dishonoured them.

To find out what the law of Nature is in any case, two special grounds doe help us. The one is, the judgement of right and sound reason: the other is, the universal use and like practice of all Nations. Concerning the rule of right and sound reason, it seemeth to me, that God who made man of such condition and stature as must come to all his knowledge by similitudes and images, hath given him also this natural instinct, that when the inward Image represented to him, is apprehended as good and laudable, then he loveth it: where it is apprehended as impious or unhonest, that then he detesteth and abhorrith it.

Of interest. Let us omitte for a time artificial Images and speake only of those which are so planted in very man's own soule or mindre
By the Law of Nature.

made. One tellth me, that Christ died, only to save man from everlasting paines. DOTH not this sayinge cause me (who heare arrently and believe those wordes) straight to conceive Christ dying for my sake? And am I not straight moved to love him, who hath don this great good euen for his enemy?

Wel: this love so prouoked in me, to whom doth it chiefly belong? To Christ, or to him that told me the story, or to the Image which I conceived in my mind by hearing the story? There can be no dout, but (if I heare it as I ought)both my understanding, and my will is so immediately caried up to Christ, that in comparison thereof, I forgette both him that spake, and the inward image which was printed in me, I think only upon Christ himself.

whereby we lerne, that an Image is not a thing needes for it self, but for another end, which end is not only more principal then the Image, but also it is naturally more acceptable unto him, who taketh joyful information thereof, in so much that, when a man heareth sayings which

Note how the thing is the che-
self of all.
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which he most desired to heare, al-
though he learned it by true and se-
vice of his owne inward imagination,
yet he so much thicketh of the thing,
that he forgeteth all other matters in
the world.

But when the mind is loosed from
that great and sodaine affection which it
bare to the thing it self, and will againe
solace it self with repeating and failing to
reminembrance the same thing, then the Im-
age thereof (whereunto the mind re-
turneth) being viewed at leisue, doth
please more and more: and according as
it is good, verenouse, or delectable, so
doth the man love, honour, or imbrace
the same. And whilsts the mind readeth
backwarde (as it were in his inward
booke) the whole order of the history, it
cometh to his reminembrance at the length
who told it matter to him, and consequently
he loueth, honoreth, or imbrace him also.
Of this natural instinct it cometh, that
all Princes & great men give rewards to
those, who bring the good tidings.

Thus, whereas threc things do obs-
cure, the thing which is told, the inward
image
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Image whereby I learned it, & the repor-
ter's chick & first honour naturally be-
longeth to the thing it self; the second to 
the inward image, which was the next 
means of apprehending the tidings, the 3 
third to the reporter.

Now being the outward Image made 
artificially, beareth the office of a repor-
ter (so oft as I see an image, the signifia-
tion whereof is known to me) it can not 
be denied, but the said Image necessarily 
and naturally deserueth so much honour 
of me, as he that should have told me this 
self thing, if no Image had been there to 
have don it.

What skilleth it, whether I learn by 
hearing, or by seeing, whereupon S. Basil 
saith, Res in bello fortiter gestas tum eloquentes. Basil, Ho-
bomines sapemunero, tum pultores exprimit illi mi:
fermone ornantes, in tabulis delineantes, et vivi-
que multis ad forstudinem excitarunt. Often 
times both the eloquent men, and also 
the painters do expresse (and sette forth) 
their acts done in war: they adorning 
the matter with words, & these drawing 
same forth in tables; & so both of them 
have stirred up many to do valiant acts.

Ye then 
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If then aswel the Painter as the Dioratour do praquote many to fortitude, and yet the Painter doe it by leaning an Image behind him which may worke his fear: it is cleere, that a good Image descuereth that place of honour (be it little of great) which is due to him, who receiveth vs good newes.

Moreover the Image is by so much in the better case to be honoured (thea the Dioratour)by how much it hath more affinity with my inward Image, then the Dioratours words had. For it descuereth to me both in the whole cread of the Dioratour, and also in part of the cread of soorning my inward Image, because it genceth me the very expresse soom and figure already made, which my understanding must conceiver: whereas if I learned the matter by words, I must have taken the paine to have changed the shape of the words into another soomme, and therunto have soormed a visible image.

For the eye being the highest and most spirichiall outward sense, is most ready to instruct the mind after that loze, as it apprehended every thing.
By the Law of Nature.

By which means we are come to the case, that the painted Image is an easier and a more lively way to instruct us, then any Orator: and thereby it deserveth also more honour, then any Orator, in so much that, we say of him who can tell his tale most lively, that he seemed to paint it sooth, and to doe it rather, then to speake and report it.

Therefore when God gave the ten Commandaments to the Children of Israel, his words were not only heard, but even visibly seen, as the holy Scripture both Witnesseth. Cunctus autem populus videbat voces, the whole people, saw the words. Upon which place Philo (that learned and ancienct Jew) wrote in this wise: "Lam malam in propria loquiam audotoribus assuetam articulatim distincta erat, quae quidem ea quae dicerantur adeo clare & perspicue efferebat, ut populus illum oculis cernere potius, quam auribus accipere videretur.

A flame of fyre was particularly distincted into a proper form of speache, such as f hearers were accustomed unto, which flame did utter those things which were said, so clearly and eviendely, that
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"people did some rather to see speache in their eyes, the to here it in their eares.

Scoring this miraculose kind of speache was chasen of God, as the more worthie, and more lively way, to speake rather to the peoples eyes, then to their eares, and to speake by deedes as well as by words: for the making of the same to appeare in such sort, was a fact and a deed, yea also it was an outward Image painting or graving which have the same effect, and conteyn a deede or wroke in themselves which is uttered to our eyes, are by the same reason, a more worthy and honorable kind of reporting, then that which is done by bare words.

Thus have we two considerations, for the which Images naturally deserve some kind of honours. But the third part eth the other twaine. For whereas in the degrees which I made before, the joyful thing it selfe which is tolde, had worthily first place of honour, the aritficial image is so nighly joyned to thing it selfe also, therefore it deseruethe most honor of all. If any orator describe Chri-

the third cause of honours artifical images.
he discerneth honour of me. First generally, as the reporter of a good thing; secondly, as the occasion of a good inward image, the which is particular ly foamed in me according to his words: Thirdly as one who hath some affinitie with Christ, of whom he speaketh.

And therein I consider how he approacheth to Christ, if he be an Ethnarch (as Sybilla) or a Jew (as Josephus) I honour him as joined to Christ in a certain natural line of the truth, and in moral honesty, but not as one known to be made a member of his Mystical body be Baptism. If he be baptised, I honour him much more: and yet more, if he be a Deacon, a Priest, or Bishop, and so be made a publick Minister of God's word.

But if he be a Prophet, there is in him a higher grace of dignitie, worthy of a special estimation for the extraordinary gift, which God hath indewred him withal. But we must let the Apostles alone at those other degrees, whom Christ hath taketh so nigh to him, as to make them sit up twelve forces with him in ingenwet. But if ye doubt be God's own natural

Matt. 17.
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Hebr. v. 1

rural Sonne (as Christ is) what honoure
tis he worthy of, in such respect as he tel-
leth vs good eyings from his Father,
whome only with his Sonne and with
the holy Ghost we love and honour for
ttrue God.

This being so, that the Oratour is
none e more honoured, according as he
cometh next to Christ, or to God, whose
messenger he is: so as much as when the
Image of Christ is the Oratour, it is so
night to him, that it is his own likeness,
and similitude, doubtlesse it ought to have
a singular prerogative of honour in that
respect also.

For vs a Prophet or an Apostle taketh
to me of Christ, although in grace he be
very nighte joined to him, and also in
Ministerie and authority: yet he is a di-
Stince Person from Christ. As for example,
he is S. Peter, or S. Paul. And the ho-
nour generall to him, both stay in him, be-
cause he is a reasonable creature, which
is able to deserve, to partake, & to receive
honour. And from him it goeth to Christ
(whose Messenger he is) but yet, as for
the distinct Person, to an other, the which
psal-
passage is not without some staying by the way. But when the image of Christ speaketh to vs (as it doth alwaies to the, that have spiritual cares of understanding) it (as an image) hath no person or substance of his own, which may be separated from Christ: but only it beareth the shape & likeness of Christ, according to his humane nature. Let the image of Christ be graven in wood, if it be asked of me, what subsisting, what hypostasis, what propriety among things, or what several being this thing hath, I answer: As it is wood, it hath such a general being & kind of propriety, as belongeth to wood, but as the Image of Christ, it hath no peculiar being or person at all, but hath only the shape and forme of Christ's Manhood carved or graven out in wood. In that it hath no person proper to it self (as being an image) it hath no power, no meane, not only not to deserve honour to it self, but neither to receive honour for it self, nor to keep and receiv honour in it selfe.

As the words which me speake, being for the time spread & multiplied in the Damas., aier, have no severall subsistence of their own.
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(for only ý word of God hath a person of his own) as our words lacking a peculiar person, cæ receave no peculiar honour to the likeness, but al ý is don to the, must needes passe oner, either to ý speaker, or to ý thing spoke of; so farreth it in images.

To which what soeuer honour we gene (as to images, I mean, and not as unto material suftaces) it must needes passe away to ý thing, which they represent.

For which caule, the honour necessarily p cladeth from them without any lay, and it is genen(by the minde of him that seeth the Image) to the principal truth, before ý image have any honour at all.

And part of ý same honour cometh to the image, as to a most swift & speedy instrument, which for his speedy Ministry, and nighnes to ý truth is to be honored with, in & for ý truches sake: but so far behind the truth (when it is consydered a part from it) as a likenes, or instrument (be it neuer so nighly joyned) is behind the thing it self.

A man will say unto me: is then the Image of Christ more worthy of honour, then S. Peter or S. Paul?

These blessed Apostles are worthy of ho-
of honour in their own persons, almost incomparably above any artificial image, because they shall live in honour with Christ for ever. Whereas an image in his person can be worthy of no honour at all, because (as it is an Image) it hath no person of his own. But when we speak of the honour which is due to the image not as a thing consisting of itself, but as reporting, or only reporting, and necessarily reporting the shape of Christ unto us, and as a thing so highly joined to Christ, that beside him it hath no true being at all, in him the verity thereof hath a most true being and subsisting: in such respect, his honour due to the Image is greater, then that which is due to any other man (reporting the same tydings) for the only report sake. For now we must respect the reporter (whether it be a man, a writing, or an image) according to his nobleness, which it hath to the thing reported, not any otherwise.

The man, as one's reported freely and voluntarily, deserves an other kind of reward, which letters or image cannot deserve, for lack of reason, of free will.
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By as the written letter or Image respecteth necessarily, and according to the imitation of nature; so the honour due to them is necessary, and a natural kind of honour, with perpetual respect of that, whose image it beareth. Fewer words would prove, if all men were so quickly instructed, as some be.

But for as much as I write to instruct, let it be no grievance to the Reader, if I lay once again, 'tis the Image of an honourable truth represented, as it were, lively reported, is by good and right reason worthy of some honour, nor as decerning honour by grace and free will, but as having it belonging to his condition and propriety, and that for three causes.

First, for 'tis makest us to know or to remember a good thing. Secondly, because it informeth our understanding most lucidly and speedily. Thirdly, because it is a thing more highly joined to the original verity (in it beareth it natural shape thereof) than any other thing is (such I mean as yet is no natural part or relic of the verity, if it is excepting only a natural Image, which representeth the verie substance of his
of his original. If common sense and sound judgment show this matter to be true, if when I may honour the truth represented to me, I must necessarily honour the inward image wherein it is represented (because I can not at that instant divide the one from the other) if thence I may come to honour the occasion of the said image, of that my good resemblance (least I acknowledge not those means whereby God hath informed me) as an artificial image communicate most interiorly withal three causes, which are all worthy of honour: if it be the shape of the thing itself, the pattern of my inward image, and the occasion thereof, let there be either man's nature be made a new, and God the author thereof be reproved (which is abominable to think of) or let there be nature have his course in honouring the inward and outward image of a truth worthy to be honoured. This much for the finding out of honour naturally due to Images, according to the way of right and sound reason.

The second way to come into the knowledge of the Law of Nature, is, by marking wherein all or most parts of natural actions
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Euseb. de preparat. Evangel. li. 1, 6, 3

tidos hane at all times agreed. Foalbeit the Persians in despite of nature wold company with their Mothers or sisters: yet other Nations generally abhorring from that abuse do shew that the Persians by free will and for lack of good Magistrates, did violently breake the Law of Nature, the which in other places was reverently observed. Such things as all men keepe or obserue, are of two condition. Some are by only natural instinct common to all: as, to defend our selues, to honor our parents, to love our children, & briefly, to know, that we ought to do that unto others, which we wold have others do to vs. Other things are not so naturally born with us, but they are afterward so grasped in us, that they become, as it were, natural, that is to say, to abstaine from marrying with certain degrees of our nigh kinred or alliance, to make them prisoners whom we take in just battle, to seize a Prince or government over vs, and to bind our selues to live within a precrire order or Law. Whether the honoring of Images be of the first or second order of the law of nature, although it skilfulh
By the Law of nature,

not much (sithens both are good, & both to be observed) yet the ground of honouring internal images is in the first order of the law of Nature, because we are naturally borne to learn by internal images, must needs naturally honour the holy thing which we learn, together with the image thereof, as wherein only the mind seeth, & consequently straight honoureth the thing. When Christ Crucified, is shewed to my understanding in the partem imaginaetum of my soul, if I detest the image and lay, I will not honour thee, thou art an idol, or thou art only a natural image, and not worthy of honour, I am worse than a brute beast. For a beast apprehending the image of a thing good for it, followeth it naturally, & imbraceth it with his force.

But if when Christ Crucified, is represented to me, I doe gene honour to the inward image, and must so by force of nature (if at the least Christ crucified do please me) doubtless the necessitie of honouring good & honorable internal images (for of the now I speake) is ground in us, & born in us, according to the first and highest order of nature.
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But yet the use of making external artificial images, rather came in (according to the imitation of nature) long afterward (as all other handy crafts) then was born together with vs. And for that cause, as well the Law of Moses in the old time, as now the Law of the Church, might, for inst causes, moderate, or in some part inhibit the making of artificial images.

For that which was begun by man's own invention, may be restrained by the law of wise Governors.

But either to teach, that images may not be made at all, or when they are lawfully made, and doe represent an honorable person, to teach that they may not be conveniently worshipped, it is against the Law of Nations (concerning the making of Images) and (concerning the worshipping) it is against the Law of Nature, which teacheth some honour to be naturally due to all holy signes: and much more to Images, which are most lieuely and Snyderly representations of the truth, & very highly devoted to the truth itself.

In so much that I would thinck it a Law
By the Law of Nature.

Law scarce more tolerable, to say, let no Image of Christ or of the Saints be made, then to say, Though they be made, let them not be worshipped. Wholy to forbid the making of Christes Image, it is an unreasonable law. For ye the art of making images be the imitation of nature, and therefore be good and laudable, what reason can beare, that Christes name and remembrance may not be set forth by imagerie, as well as other mens names? Or why not by imagerie, as well as by writing? for as much as writing also is but an art invented by men.

But yet he that shall forbid Christes Image to be made in some one place, for a certain godly purpose or after some one manner, it might be well done. Howbeit if any man were so bent, he wold whoyp forbid the making of Christes Image in all cases and conditions, that law (which seemeth to me unreasonable) should only brake the law of Nations, which is brought in by y good use and laudable praticse of many countries. But he that should say, though yow make Christes Image, I charge yow honour it not, should make
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make a law much worse, then the former was.

For though it be not the Law of Na-
cure preciselie, to make an image, yet
when the image is made, if it do signifie
a truth worthy of reverence, it is viterly
against Nature, to forbid the honour of
it. For as it is lesse evil, to say, lete vs
have no King at al, then to say, lete vs not
honour the king, though we have one: so
it is lesse evil wholly to forbid the making
of holie Images (though it be evil) the to
forbid the honouring of them, when they
are made. The one taketh away the use
of Nations, which in part may be well
embraced: the other denieth the Law of
Nature, the which possibly can not be
changed.

To leave this argument, and to re-
turn to the laudable custome of al Coun-
tries, what Nation hath ever yet bene
heard of, so barbarouse, or so rude, which
hath not shewed a singular affection of
honour to al Monuments of those men,
whome they have taken for vertuouse 
founder, which thing is evidencly confirmed,
by great reverence which hath increas
been

the fourth cause of ho-
nouring Images.
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been done to \(\psi\) images of Kings \(\&\) Emp-
perors: \(\&\) likewise by the reverèce \(\psi\) al
postercity hath ever gene,\(\tau\) \(\psi\) bodies, Re-
liques,Tumbs, Ashes, Imagès, and to
the verie names and Titles of their ver-
mouse Predecessors.

Of which kind of honour amongst
heathens Cicero,\(\nu\) Pliny, and \(\nu\) Theo-
doreslœn do e speake. And among those
who beleued our \(\Phi\) God the like was don,
as both \(\nu\) S. Hierom \(\&\) S. Augustin. \(\&\) S.
Basil \& S. Lypian, and dierse other
Fathers doe tournelle. Yea it is affermed
of the wise man, that the memorial of Mopses
(and the like is of al iust mē) is blessed. The
Greeke word \(\nu\) \(\mu\) \(\nu\) \(\mu\) \(\mu\) \(\sigma\) \(\nu\) \(\mu\) \(\nu\), doth signify
any Monument, which bringeth \(\psi\) to \(\psi\)
memory of the man. So that, be it what
soever thing which makest \(\psi\) remèber
Christ, or his Apostles, and Saints, it is
in \(\psi\) respect pronounced among \(\psi\) blessed
things of God. And do not \(\psi\) Imagès of
\(\psi\) Saints bring \(\psi\) to \(\psi\) remembrance of the?

Neither doth it much skil, that those
who lacked faith, were many, yea most
gymes to farce in this kind of honour
(because they turned mortal men into
Gods).
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Gods) for therein we follow them not. But that thing wherein all Nations agreed, never lacked some truth in it, as being either itself the Law of Nature or most agreeable to Nature.

All Nations worshipped those who they rooke for Gods, they did sacrifice to them, they honoured and maintained the Priests and Ministers of their Gods. They honoured the Images and Monuments of noble and vertuous personages, they buried honorably those that had died for their Countrie, and much more those who had died for Religion.

All these deeds have some truth in the Law of nature, although there were some falsehood mingled by the Decehens in the practice thereof. But how shall we know the truth from the falsehood? Accrly by the consent of their laws and deeds joined together.

That thing, wherein the Law and practice of everie Nation agreeth together, is thereby knowne to have proceeded from the inclination of nature, and therefore to be good in ye behalf. All Nations worshiped one God or other, but not
By the Law of Nature.

not al the same God, nor al many Gods: for \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) Jewes professed \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) worship of one God alone, so did \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) Sybils, so did \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) Pla-

conists, so did many Philosophers and Poets, as many auncient Fathers have witnesed. Therefore it is not onlie the Law of God (which the Jewes alone had; but also it is the Law of Nature (which al Nations had, though many of them corrupted it) to have one God wor-

shiped, for therein only they agreed. For he that worshipped many Gods, worshipped one also.

Likewise all they made sacrifice, one Louterie one way to one God, \\( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) an other Louterie an other way to an other God. But wherein they disagreed, let vs leave them. That is to say, let not vs make di-

verse Sacrifices to diverse Gods, but wherein they agreed, let vs know that to be \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) Law of Nature, verily that some external sacrifice be made to one God.

They al had a certain Religion, but not at the same Religion. For Eusebius sheweth, that the Phenicians had one, the Egyptians an other, the Greci\( \text{\textsuperscript{a}} \)s the third, \( \text{\textsuperscript{b}} \) Phrygians the fourth, \( \text{\textsuperscript{c}} \) Mozes the fifth.

\text{\textsuperscript{1}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{a}} \text{\textsuperscript{b}} \text{\textsuperscript{c}}
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the kitch, &c so forth. So many Religions let vs not have, but as al they had one, so let vs al have one, and let yt be yt which is most Catholike & most universeal. For God neuer suffered yt whole world universeally to erre, least the error should be invincible, and not able to be perceaved.

Many Nations, yea al honored the images of noble and vertuous Personages, by carrying them forth in great pompe, by setting them in high places, & strewing flowers up the, & by decking them with garlands, and by pointing to the whiles any oration was made, either praising, or wondering at those mens vertue, whose images they were.

So did the Athenians sette vp a golden image of Socrates in the Temple, as Tertullian witnesseth. And likewise of them that killed Pisistratus, as Theodoretus writeth. So did the Romans sette vp the images of Eciles, of Bozatnus, of Hulpitins and of Constantinus, who was made with the Image of the crosse in his right hand, and of diverse others, who had ben either valiant Capitaines, or wise & politick Senatours.
By the Law of nature.

Ye every man's house was filled with the images and Monuments of his Ancestours. And the Christian Emperours, Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius and Valentinia doe themselves allow the honour due to them by erecting their images, although they well forbid adoration to be made unto them, lest the faithful should come to communicate therein with the Heathens.

The Jewes also had the images of two Cherubins, not only grauen in the Propitiatory, but also both grauen in the walls of the Temple, woven & stitched in ye veile, as it is witnessed in ye Bookes of the Kings, and of the Paralipomenon. And they worshipped those Images and ye whole Temple for his sake whole Temple it was, & for the honorable representations and relics which were in it, to wit, for ye images of ye Cherubins, for Manna, for ye Rod of Aara, & for ye Altars of gold which were in ye Temple, whereupon S. Hierom saith, venerabantur Judaei Sancta Sanctorum, qui ad Marse ibi erant Cherubi &c. ye Jewes worshipped cellam. the most holie places, because the Cherubins were there.
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If then all Nations did grue honour to the Images of noble and virtuous personages (albeit some were appointed noble and virtuous among them, who indeed were not so) yet herein they agreed, that the image of him that in deed was virtuous, might and by the law of Nations ought to be honoured.

Neither did the Christians, when true Religion was published, put down such images, as were only set up for a testimonie of moral vertue, and wisdom (and were not at all honoured for Gods) but they suffered them still to remaine, not verily in the inward parte of their Churches (lest they should be taken for to have been faithful men, whereas they were infidels) but yet in the Market place, or in the Streets.

In so much among divers other images, which yet stand in Rome, the Image of Marcus Aurelius the Philosopher standeth to this day in brass, upon a hoile of brass, in the Capitol, and the Image of Constantinus the Great standeth upon the steps of the church called Araceli.

This reason (of natural honour) persuaded
of Images.

swaved the woman, who was deliver'd by Christ from the bloody issue, to erect an Image vnto him in Panneade of Shechina, which is adjoynynge to the Lunde of Jewrie. The which Image neither any Christian (though all the Apostles continued a good time thereabout, and must needs heare of it, and might have commanded the woman that made it, to haue pul'd it downe, because she was Faithfull, as the Gospel doth wittnesse) nor any Paimim did pul'd downe, untill he came who from a Christian became a Paimim: euidently soerenelling vs, that he must be an Heretike in part of his faith, or a Resetegae from the whole Faith, who pulleth down the Image of Christ, or of any other man worthy of remembrance.

Thus I have shewed, that external Images (being once made) have honour due to them, os well according to the Law of nature, as also according to the practise of Nations. Which practise in that behalfe as it is unforme, as well by theyr Lawes as by theyr dedes, is an evident argument, that there is a natural truth
Of the honouring therein. Albeit by some circumstance, wherein all Nations agreed not, som abuse might be mingled therewithal.

Furthermore, being all the world made Images for the honour of them, who had bene men of Vertue, what honour would come to them thereby, if the Image had not a necessarie relation to those men, whose Image it is? If the relation be necessarie, being the Image is made for the mans honour, the relation of honour is also necessarie betwixt the Image, and him whose Image it is. How could els honour come to a man by that thing, which itselfe were not able to be honored? When we will honor a man by making an Oration in his presence, is not he more honored, by how much the Orator is more noble, and his Oration the more eloquent?

If you make the Image of S. Paul with a wise mouth, and with great goggling eyes, and laie the same uppon a dish, writing upon it, this is the Image of S. Paul, surelie no wise man wil thinke anye honour to be done to S. Paul thereby, but rather great dishonour: and per
heis remembered. But he is not honorably remembered.

If then to have the principal partie honoured by his image, the Image must be honourably handled (as for example, it must be honestly made, and be set up in an open and decent place): It is the Law of nature and of right reason, that, if the Image of an Honourable Personage may be made (as doubtlesse it may) then it may be also honoured, that is to saye, honourably regarded, and esteemed. The which estimation ought to be more or lesse, according to the true Werte of the man. If it be the Image of Cato, I maie well thinke his worldy wisdome worthie of an Image. But I will not thinke hym a Saint, and consequently I will not thinke his Image to be a holy Image, or the Image of a Saine.

Neither yet would I pul it downe, except I perceaued it to be abused, and to be taken for a Saints image.

But if I knowe it to be the Image of Christe, or of his Mother, I will do it accordingly.
Of the honouring

For seing eue honour commeth from mind: as my faith is, so shal my honour be. to all holy Images I may either bow my body, or put of my cap, or knele before the, and praine to God, or desire the Saints to praine for me. For all this honour is of necessitie genen to the thing it self, whose Image it is.

Beside al these reasons, ther is yet an other of great force, and that is this. The name of an honourable Personage is honourable, because it belongeth to his perso: in so much that the Prophet every where crieth out, Sit nomen Domini bendictum. Let the name of the Lord be blessed. And it is written of the blessed Saints of God, their name shall live from generation to generation. And the very Heathens in mentioning a man of honor, use to say, quem honoris causa nomino, whom I name to honour him thereby.

Seing then the Image of Christ beareth Christes name, & in common speache is called Christ, it must needs insue, that the Image of Christ as it parraketh his name, so it parraketh the same honour also, which is due to the name of Christ.
This argument is so strong, and the reason thereof so well grounded in nature & truth, the Imagebreakers although they broke Christ's Image whereas ever they found it, yet being demanded whether they had broken Christ's Image or no, were naturally ashamed to say, they had broken Christ's Image, but turned the thing into others terms, saying, we have broken Idols.

And when it was againe asked, whether Christ's Image were an Idol, being yet pricked a fresh with natural inclination to avoid the envy and shame, either of breaking any thing which bare that blessed name of Christ, or of calling it an Idol, they were constrained to answer, not directly to the question, but generally, all Images which are worshipped, are Idols.

O the testimony of our conscience how great it is! The tongue dare not speake, that which th' hand feared not to do. And why so? Because our words have a greater affinity with our hart, the our hands have. Many dare kill a man, who dare not speake, they have killed a man. Moreover why men doe that which the dare not speake.
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there are found me so desperate, that they
dare confess them selves to have killed
their enemie: but yet few of none dare say,
I have killed a man.

As therefore we are certified by that
natural scare, which me have, to say they
killed a man, that it is against nature to kill
a man: so in that men are ashamed to say,
they have destroyed His image of Christ of
the Saints, it appeareth vvel to be a thing
against nature, to destroy His images of the Saints.

In verbo Suidas wryther, that Constantinus

Constanti. Codrornumus commanded, that none of al
the friens o; Ministers of God should be
called Sanctus a Saint, or holy, but only that
we should say, Mary, Peter, Paul, & not S.
Mary the Mother of God, nor S. Peter,
or S. Paul: as thinking thereby to save
himself from the infancy of destroying the
images of Saints, if he might provide, there
should be none called Saints at al.
To the same matter it belongeth that Theodorus Studiensis wryther. Imaginem hominis
hominem vocant, houis houe: imagine vero Christi,
Deipara, aut cuius denique tande Sanctorum nulla
pasto suscipient nominare iuxta prototypum, aut
iuxta id unde derivatur: Sed Imagines simplici-
of Images.

ter, nec aliud esse sactum, quam imaginum. Huius autem ne sint, an illius, non addunt, ut ne com-
perto errore a communione abarceantur. Tanta igitur redundant absurditate et blasphemia.

They call the image of a man, a man: and the Image of an ox, an ox. But they cannot abide by any means, that the image of Christ, or of his Mother, or of any one of all the saints, should be called according to the first sampler, or els according to the, from whence it was derived: but they call the Images simply, neither do they confess them to be any other thing then Images, nor adding whether it be this(Sainst) Image, or that, least, their error or being found, they may be expelled from the Communion. Into such absurditie and Blasphemie these men be fallen.

If then in all ages they themselves who make the Images of the Saints, were ashamed to call them the Images of the Saints, our intent is proving thereby, that it is against the natural honestie, to break his Image, who is himself honourable Personage, as Christe is, and his blessed Mother, and Apostles.
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For when that is done which the tongue is ashamed to name, the silence of the tongue proueeth the filthines of the face.

By this also M. Jewels Proposition may be understood, wherein he affirmeth: that Images were not set vp in the Churches within the first six hundred yeares, to the intent the people might worship them.

What meane you by Images, Mr. Jewel? There are Images of Devils, Images of Heathens, and Images of Heretiques. For Germanie is full of the Images of Luther, and of Melanchthon. But the Catholiques did never set vp such Images to be honoured. You should have expressed unto vs the Images of Christ, and of his Saints. But you were ashamed to call these men Saints whose Images you allow not.

If you, M. Jewel, be not ashamed of your owne doctrine, if you dare say that, which your brethren everywhere doe: Mark what your doctrine must needs be, seeing it must be contrary to ours, which is as foloweth.

Christes Image is sete vp in the Church
of Images.

Church with this faith and believe of the Catholiques, that Christ himselfe is worthy to have the honour of an Image. The which hath alwaies beene one kinde of honoring Noble men.

Item, Christes Image is sette vp in the Church to this end, that we remembering what he did and suffered for vs, should love him and follow him. The which end being good, maketh the Act of the setting vp the Image to be good.

Item, we adore Christ so perfitlie, that we suffer not so much as his Image to be unhonoured.

Item, we beleue it to be a contumelie done to Christ, if his Image be broke.

It would grieve any Prince (I am sure) to heare, that his Image should be broken. And thinke you, that such contumelie may be freely done to Christ, as no Prince would take at your handes? Breake (W. Jewell) if you bare the Image of the Queenes Maiestie, or the Armes of the realme. But done any banner or helmet, or other Ensigne, or token belonging to the honorable knights of the Garter, or to the Knights of any wor-
Of the honouring
shipful older. If they take't wel, then
Christ may perhaps be content to see his
owne Image destroyed.

But if all noble men would accompe
themselves disaimed, and utterly disho-
nered, if their Images or Armes of Do-
none, should be contemporously throwe
donne: what vilanie, what impiete,
what blasphemie is it, to thinke Christ to
be of lesse Nobilitie, then these are; some
of who may be damned for euer to heliire?

If any saith or lorne of Christ be left in
nobilitie, I would wish they toke it at le-
ast so gravously to see Christes Crosse,
which is his arms of hono, or his Image
broken and thrown downe, as it grie-
nerth them to see their owne Armes or Im-
ages obtained. Thus Catholicks say.

But W. Jewel being of a contrary
opinion to vs, must needes defend the con-
trary propositions: to witte, Christ is not
worthy of that honour, which is given to
noble men by setting vp of their Images.
How say you W. Jew, is this your pro-
position or no? If it be, profess it, & then
I say, by your doctrine Christ (concer-
ning his manhod) is not worthy of gl
such hono, as one man may give to an
other.
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other. For this is one kinde of honour, which all Matiœs have usuâly given unto excellent men, to set up their Images or arines.

Item, you must say, Jewell, their faith who think Christe as worthy of the honor of an Image, as Iulius Cæsar or Socrates was, is no good faith. Ergo by your doctrine, Christ is lesse Honourable, then Iulius Cæsar.

Itē you must say: It is not well done to set vp Christs Image, to thend we may remember what he did or suffered for vs, and to honor the cause of that remembrance: otherwise you can not goe against our doctrine, as you now do.

Itē you must say, Christ is not worthy of so much honour, that for his sake his Image should also be honoured of vs.

Item you must say, It is well done to breake Christs Image.

Item, it is no contumelie to a Prince, to have his Image broken.

But if these propositions be false, as soone as they are spoken, appere absurd & against al reason: consequentely the whole doctrine, which oppugneth & honoring of Christs Image, is false, absurd, & against al reason. For it doth that thing, which yong dareth not simplie plainly profess.
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On the other side, when we honour Images, we doe no more then we dare say. For as in my dede I bow to Christes image, so put of my cap to an saintes Image, so without suspicion of an Idolatrie, I may say, in words, This image reprenteth a Saint, who reigneth with God in heauen, who is a liuely member of Christ, who in Christ as in a glasse seeth me, when so ever I desire helpe by his prayer, and know yth my hart (by Christes revealing) and therefore I honour him in my hart, and honour his remembrance in my mouth, and honour his Image in my dede. Al is one to say this much, or by my dede to signific the same.

So that the Images of Christ, and of his Saintes, may and must be honoured, according to the law of Nature, the which is declared seuen waies.

1. First, because they be an occasion to vs of a good remembrance.

2. Secondly, because they speedly & most conveniently informe our inward imagination, wherein our understanding apprehendeth the truth.

3. Thirdly, because they are naturally knit and adjoyned to the truth (concerning
ning their shape and representation.

Fourthly, because all Nations have
honoured them in respect of their vertue
whose Images they are,

Fifthly, because the relation of ho-
nour is so necessarily between the image,
and the thing meant to be honoured by
the Image, that if the Image be not ho-
noured, the thing can not be honoured
thereby.

Sixthly, because as the name of Christ
is communicat to his Image, so the ho-
nour due to his name, is in the same de-
gree, to be communicated unto his I-
image also.

Last of all, if it be a customelie to 
Princ to haue his Image broken, and
an honour to haue it regarded: the like
must needes come to passe in Christ, whose
honour is so great by nature, that no-
thing at all, which belongeth to
him, ought to be without
Houour and Este-
mation.
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It is proved out of the word of God, that the images of honourable things ought to be honoured.


Pope Adrian writing to the Emperor Constantine and Irene his mother, concerning the Seventh General Council gathered together at Nice, allegedly for making a honouring of Images (among other many texts of holy Scripture) that place of the Genesis, where it is written, that God made man according to his own image and similitude: and showing wherein that image and similitude consisted, the Pope addeth that God illumined and established man in free power of himself. And that he being of free will, called through the pleasure of God, all the beasts of the earth and the soules of the air, by proper names.
W. Jewel in his Replie understandeth not, how these places appertaine to the purpose of making or of honouring Images, but rather he mocking at all those Fathers learning, and disdaineth to be accounted fitter or then they were, which attempt of those reverend Fathers mov'd me at this time to speake of certaine places alleaged out of Gods woode in that Counsell, and to shew, that they are learnedly applied: truing that by these few, the Reader will judge the like, of all the rest.

First of all is to be noted, that Damascene also bringeth many of the verie same places for the same purpose. I pray you, W. Jewel is Damascene of so lighe credite with you, that he also can not tell how to vse the holie Scriptures?

Surely how perey a man so ever you thinke your selfe to be, your bookeвал wil lie rother in corners, if they scape the fire, when his woorkes wil be in such Estimation even to the ende of the worlde, as they have been above these seuen hundred yeares past.
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De Ortho. He saith: Deus hominem ad suam imaginem fecit. Cuius igitur gratia in nuce adoramus, nisi quatenus ad imaginem dei facti sumus? Nam, ut inquit, deus et magus in divinis Basilius, imaginem honor ad exemplaris transisset honorem. God made man to his Image. For what cause then doe we adore one another, but in that respect, as we are made to the Image of God? For as godly Basil, who is great in divine matters, saith, the honour of the Image is transferred or conveyed over to the honour of that thing whence the Image was taken.

Cyrillus reasoneth after the same: Imago lignae terrae regis honoratur, quantum magnis rationibus Imago Dei? The wooden Image of an earthly King is honoured, how much more is the reasonable Image of God worthy of honour?

It appeareth then that man being the Image of God, is for very cause worthy of honour. Which thing if it be once granted (as it is most true) argumet of Pope Adrian derived from honour due to men in they are the Images of God, to the honouring also of such Images, as doe represent holy men, is a most perfect argument.
of Images.

argument. And that may be shewed at large after this sort.

God is absolutely worthie of all honour, which thing nederth no proofe.

Man is made according to the Image of God, and that also is plain.

Whether this image consist in grace and in all Vertue, or in reason, free wil, and in the Authentike of Government, or in whatsoever thing beside, once the Image of God is the highest gift that man hath in him.

Therefore if any man be worthy of honour in any respect (as many men are for diverse causes) doubtlesse that honour is due to man specially for that he is made according to Gods Image.

If man may and must be honoured, because he is made according to His Image of God, the Cause of his Honour dependeth of the Image of God which is in him. For God himselfe is so honorable, that A thinge made according to his Image can not be but worthy of some honour.

This being true, the doth it necessarily follow that the Image of an honorable thing is worthy
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of Honour, for his sake whose Image it is.
For this particular proposition, man being
made to the Image of God (who is most worthy
thee of honour) is himself to be honoured in that
respect, as he is made according to God's Image:
this particular proposition, I lay, dependeth
both of this universal proposition, and
of this general reason: every image of an
honourable thing is worthy of some honour, for
his sake whose Image it is. For if that be
not so, it will follow, y man being made
to the Image of God, must be in such
respect honoured, to thend honour may
come thereby to God.

But if this last particular laying be
ture, it is true, for that the other uni-
iversal laying is true. As likewise it is
true, that, Plato being a man, is reasonable be-
cause euerie thing that is a man, is reasonable.

If then the universal proposition be
ture, that euerie Image of an honourable thing,
is worthy of honour, for his sake whose Image
it is, then wil an other particular propo-
sition be inferred also thereupon: to wit,
that the Image of our Ladie, or of S. Paule, and
much more of Christ is the Image of an honour-
able thing: therefore the Images of our
Ladie
of Images.

Lady, and of S. Paulie, and of Christ art worthy of some honour for our Lady, S. Paulie, and Christ's own sake.

Woe be now, O Jewels, if you have either wiser, or sense, or shame. Or if you have done mocking, then either fame and treat in vaine, or humbly gene once your blasphemies, and confess Pope Adrian to have had another manner of this course, then your understanding blinded with affection could attaine unto.

Yet to shew we farther the weight of this reason, it is to be considered, that as God only is honourable by nature (accordingly as S. Paulie saith, to God alone be honour and glory) and yet as man being made of God according to his Image, is thereby partaker of God's honour (for God will render honour to them that feke him) but yet in a degree so much inferior to God, as the creature is behind the creator (for as Theodorus faith, man hath f name of God's image, but not f thing, that is to say, not the selfe same substance of God) so, whereas our Lady or S. Paulie are honourable in their own personages by God's gift, yet their Images and being
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(being made by the Artificer according to their similitude) ought also to be partakers of their honour, but in a degree so much inferior to our Ladye and to S. Paul, by how much a reasonable and living creature doth excell a representation of similitude, which hath the name only and not also the thing, that is to say, which hath not man's reason or life in it.

Marke the proportion enerie waile.

On the one side, God is the principal, and man is made to his Image. On the other side, man is the principal, and a stone or a piece of wood is made to his Image. God maketh man according to his Image of nothing. And that is the power and glory of the Maker, but not of him that is made. The Image of man is made of something, because the Artificer who maketh it, is not able to make it of nothing, and that is the weakness of the workeman, but not any defect of the Image.

Man is not God's Image by nature, but by creation, neither is the stone of the painted colours man's Image by nature, but by art. God painteth man infinitely
Man passeth his owne Image much in deede, but not infinitely. Wel then, some honour is due to man, because he hath some similitude of God in him: surely some honour also may be due to the painted or graven figure of a man, because it hath some step or similitude of the man in it. For it beareth man's shape, also his name.

Among all men, none is so truly honourable, as those who continued to the end of their life according to that Image of God, wherein they were first made. Such are all the Saints. Moreover their Images are made in the Faith of God's Church, to them other men may be sketched by the light of them, to like virtue and godliness.

Therefore there can be no more, but that by the force of God's word, we are bound to honor the Images of Saints, because they are made according to the shape of them, in that behalf as they were made like unto God.

What say we, if there be a greater distance between God and his holy creatures, the between our Lady and her image?
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Doth not then the honour more quickly and more certenly, & with lesse danger of Idolatrye, passe over from our Ladie's Image, to her selfe, then from our Ladie her selfe, to God? And for that good reason may be allegeied. For there is no comparison betweene God and any creature, be the creature made never so houorable. But betweene a creature, and the woork of the Arctificer, there is some comparison.

God is an everlastinge estate and nature. But the Creature is made of nothing, and should againe fall into nothing, if God dyde not sustaine, and uphold it. What proportion then can be, betweene all thing, yea betweene that, which is for ever by nature above all things, and that which is by gift made of nothing, and still by gift kept from nothing? There is doubtlesse no comparison to speake of, betweene God and our Ladie, or S. Paulo.

But betweene our Lady and her Image, there is at the least some proportion. For they are both made both consiste of materiall Elementes, both subject
Subject by nature to corruption, and both keep from nothing through the goodness of God.

If now S. Paul and our Ladie, may be honored for God's sake, who is so far distant from them by nature, and to whose Image they approach so tenderly and scantily; how much more may the Image of our Lady be honored for our Ladies sake, the which her image approacheth nearer to her in nature, then she doth approach to God?

Moreover, the Image and similitude of God in vs (consisting rather in virtue and grace infused into our intellects from God, then in our natural substance or manhood) may be dimmed and darkened unto such a degree that many men have not been known to be the images of God, but have been principally worshipped as Gods themselves, as it is known of Jupiter, Mars, and Venus. But our Ladies artificial Image being only known or called by the name of her shape or Image, can never be principally worshipped as our Ladie herself. For then it is not any more the only shape or Image of our Lady.
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So that it is a contradiction to say, it is only our Ladies Image, and yet it is our Ladie her self.

The like would have chaced to men, if their names had ben to be called Gods created images. For then they could never have ben principally worshiped, under that name, as Gods, but only as the Images of God. But for so much as they were not always called not taken to Gods Created Images, they were abused as Gods themselves. And in deed the more they had in them selves of reason, of vertue, or of power, the sooner they were to much honored by ignorant men. Likewise the further of, all Artificial Images are from life and real (they have in deed none at all) the farther they are from the danger to be worshipped as Gods.

Let this suffice for the first Reason, whereat M. Jewels wisdome mocked. And whé he had answered it as I make it (and not as he according to his waggling custom wil turne it, and make my argument anew) then time wil erie, who had the truth.
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It were infinite thus to amplify every reason, which is alleged in the seuench most learned Council. But I will touch only a few of them, leaving it to the Readers iudgemente, to weigh by this one example, the gravity and breuiete of those holy Fathers (who composed long discourses in very fewe woordes) and the light braines of these newe brochethrchen, who reproue they can not tell what.

The same Pope Adrian doth also allege an other Testimonie out of holy Scripture, which now followeth.

Jacob having sene the vision of the ladder, whose toppe toucht he Heauen, & the Angels of God going vp and downe upon it, and heareng God say to him, at the tribes of the earth shall bee blessed in thee, and in thy seede, rose vppe in the morrowning, and tooke the stone which he had laied under his Head, and he raied, or, did sette it vppe for a Monument (or standing Image) pou ring one vppe on it. And he named the place (which was before called Luz) Bethel, That is to saye, the house of God.
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And he vowed to offer there, the tenticles of al things at his returne. This stone (sai he) which I haue reede vp for a Monument, shall be called the house of God.

This stone thus set vp, was made thereby a manifest Signe, Monument, Image, and representation to Jacob, of God's promise, and of his vision. The same stone erected by set vp for a Monument, in a place named the house of God, doth declare, that Images may be set vp for a good remembrance in Christian Churches, which also are the houses of God. The pouring of oile upon the stone, and the vowing to offer the tenticles of his goodes there, doth shew that stone to be singularly segregated and separated from other common & prophane stones, albeit not for the stones owne sake, but for the honour of the Divine promise there heard, and of the heavenly vision there seen, whereof the stone is made an Image.

Now when a stone which was before common, is sette above all common stones, and preferred not onely before things of the same kind, but also before grave.
praise, trees, and beasts (which are of higher degree in nature, than ordinarily the stone should be of) is not that the making of the stone to be a reverent and honourable Monument?

Now became every Image is the Super Ge-
figure and signe of some truth. St. Augu-
Rte calleth vs, that this stone thus lette 83. 24. et
up, be taken, that Gods House and Temple 85.
shold stand afterwaten the same place. And
pouring of oile upon it, was a propheisy
belonging to Chri$t, who by his in-
carnation was anointed the Bead of
Wankinde, even according to his Man-
ynde.

As thersfor, it was no Idolatrye, to
set vp and to anoint the stone with such
a minde as ended in the honour of Chri$t
(though otherwise it had ben Idolatrye
for either the stone it self or a false God,
had ben the last end of the anointing) so
when any Image of Christ or of hisAp-
Stles is set vp, and when convenient re-
dence is done thereunto by Chri$tcs
like, it is no idolatrye, but a godly and
vermouth are.

For S. Augustine wel note, ehar,
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Iacob did not adore the stone, nor made sacrifice to the stone nor called it God, but the house of God. No more may we adore an Image made of stone, either with godly honor, or else with any honor at all for the stones own sake, nor we may not make Sacrifice thereunto, nor call it our God, but a thing of God, that is to say, the Image of that Sainte, whose shape it beareth, the which Sainte is of God. And in that respect, whilsts we reverence it, as it is appointed to serve a godly life, God is the last end of our honour.

But as the anointing of Kings Saul made him so Honourable, that King David would not lay his hands upon the anointed of the Lord: So the anointing of the stone for true Religious sake, shewed it to have been made a reverent Monument, which neither Jacob nor any other good man would afterward have pulled downe, but rather he would purposely have gone to that place to have honoured God there, like as Celsibus both witnesseth, that even at his time the place was reverence, where the three Angels appeared to Abraham.
of Images.

And that God doth preferre one place before another, it is evident in Abrahahm, whose he commanded to go into the land of vision, saying: there thou shalt offer thy sacrifice, a whole burnt offering upon one of the hills which I shall shew to thee. And this hill is thought to have been the very same place, where Jacob also did sitte by this Monumental that some one Monumet and place may lawfully be honorded above another, in respect of God and of his Friends.

The same Jacob also adorred, as the Scriptures teach, the toppe of Ioseph Rodde or Sceper. That is to say, Hee bowed downe towarde it, and showed hym selfe to reverence it, and in it to ador: the holy Crofe or Sceper and royall power of Christe, whose Image Ioseph bare.

Whereupon Sedulius writeth:

Mystice designas regnum Christi in fine seculi Sedu! in adorandum, sicut ipsa Virgam fili sui adorat c. Hec.

Be both betoken Mysticallie, that the Kingdome of Christe, must be ha-

noured in the ende of the world, even as Jacob
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Jacob did adore the rodde or sceptre of his sonne.

There is then a cause when a creature without sense, may be adored for his sake, which hath reason and reverence. Neither doth it skil, that this place is otherwise readen in the Hebrew, and otherwise expounded by some ancienct Fa
tthers. For although the readings differ, yet they are both true: the one being uttered by Moses, the other by S. Paul, and by the seuentie Interpretours.

There is no worse custom in Heretiques, then by one truth to marre another. Why might not Jacob adore the toppe of Josephs rodde or scepter, bowing himself also toward his head? Admitte Jacob had onely leaned upon the scepter of Joseph, and so had worshipped Joseph, and in Joseph Christ: yet enen that was the doing of honour to Joseph by his scepter, and to the scepter for Josephs sake, and above all to Christ.

S. Augustine saith, Non salutique conserre tantisper insignis poteestasis sit, uti figura magna res futura prafigurabatur. (Jacob) was
was not ashamed to heare a little while the ensigne of his sones power, where the signe of a greate thing that should come after, was betokened. Lete not vs then be ashamed in like case to esteeme a thing of a baser condition then we our selves are of, when it is the signe of a greater thing then we are.

What shall we say of that vision of Moses, when he saw the bush a fire, & yet not consumed? Said not God to him at that time, Moses, Moisés, approche not bi ther, put thy svelves of thy feete, for the place where thou standest, is holy ground? Could the ground which was without reason or sense, yet be made holy?

If it was in deede holy for his presence who spake out of the bushe, and being holy, it might not be eroden upon with Moses's cheues, seeing the absteyning to cread upon it, is the doing of a certaine honour to it, may not an image which is appoinced to bring vs to the remembrance of holy things, be also holy? and being holy, shal it not, according to this Example, be reuerenced some way or other?
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What excelsine honour gane David
to the arke of God, when he danced before
it, and became like a foole in the sight of
fooles, y he might be rewarded as a wise
man in the sight of God: And yet the ma-
terial Arke was but a shadow of Christ.

The brazen Serpent being set vp pro-
fully, for a signe, and the children of Israel
being commanded to looke vpon it, & being
thereby healed, did it not shewe eviden-
tly, that an Image may be sette vp to be
looked vpon, and that by looking on it
God may succour vs, if we vse it only to
that purpose, for which it was sette vp ?
But if we make the signe to be the thing
it selfe (as the Jewes dyd) that is in deed
a most miserable servitude, and suche as
more easily fall vpon carnall Jewes,
who commonly were inclined to make
every thing their God, then it is like to
fal dyd those, who Christ hath deliuered
frō such blindness and chaldō. But how-
succuer a thing be well of evil dyd, it is
proved by this example of the Serpent, an Im-
age being dyd (as a image ought to be
dyed) may be reverenced & churckedly regar-
ded soz thy truches sake which it signifieth.

When
of Images.

When the children of Ruben, of Sod, and of the half Tribe of Manasses built an Altar in the Land of Chanaan, not to make sacrifice upon it, but only for a testimony between them and the other Tribes their brethren, what was that, but only the Image of an Altar? But yet it was an honourable Image, because it bare the name of God's Altar, and because it was a remembrance to them, \\
}

In the law of Moses God willed two Angels to be made, and to be sette up in eche lyde, over the Arke, their faces looking toward the Proprietary, & thence he promised to speake unto Moses, and by him to shew his pleasure to the Children of Israel. These graven Angels were manifest images of the highest order of Angels (saving one) which is in heaven. They were made with faces of beautiful yong men, and were commanded to be sette up of God himself, in the Holy of Holies, which S. Hierom \n
Exod. 25.
Of the knowinge witnesseth the Jewes to have worshipped and thereby procured to Marcus, that much more the Sepulche of Christ in Jerusalem ought to be worshipped.

As then the Jews, being as yet not made see in spirite, nevertheless worshipped the Holy of Holies, and that (as S. Hierom there saith) because the Cherubins, and the Propitiatory, and the Ark of truth were in them, much more in the time of spiritlel liberty, when grace aboundeth, and the knowledge of God is spread by the holy ghost in our hartes, that we rede not to feare idolatry (as the Jewes rede) much more nowe holy Representations and Images may be lere up in our Churches, and may also be worshipped of vs.

And so; as much as (the Veile of the old Temple being rent in sunder at the time of Christes Passion) all that was hidden in the Lawe, is now lere open to vs, \( \Psi \). Jewels answere (which he makeh to Doctor Dar-viding) wil not lerne, to say, that those Images were lere vp within the veile, whether nowe entred by the
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the Bishop. For now the body and lower part of our Churches is that unto vs, which the place enclosed within the Veile of the Chauncel was unto the Jewes.

We then may in the state of the new Testament as freely have Images in our open Churches, as the Jewes had them in their Chauncel or secret vestry. And yet if their whole Temple was an Image of Christes bodie, (as in decoe it was ) they also had John 2, an Image openly sette up before their eyes.

Yes but we may not honoure I-mages ( saith Master Jewel ) As who should say, the Temple was not exceedingly honoured of all the Jewes in the Law. For whereas the Jewes were in all the worlde, they prayed to God turning their faces toward the Tabernacle or Temple. Thereof King Salomon saith, if the peo- ple going forth to battle praise toward the house of God, he will heare their prayers in heaven.

And therefore the Prophet Daniel V. 9 being
Of the honouring his chamber windowes, he prayed toward Jerusalem, where the Temple of God was wor to stand. It was a great honour, doubtless to that material Temple, so to be vled, not indeed for his own sake, but because it was an image, yea rather a shadow of Christ. For an Image is more then a shadow, as S. Paulus saith, the Lawe had a shadew of good things to come, and not the self image of the things.

If then a material Temple being but a shadow of Christ, that is to say, a dark Image, only shewing that Christ should come in a body, but yet not able to tell what kind of body it should be: yf that Temple being so but a shadow of Christ, was yet adored for Christes sake who was not then in flesh: how much more shall an expresse image of his body, the which body is now really united to him, how much more shall that Image so nere representing his shape, be adored & worshipped for his sake, of those who will performe that in the new Testament, which the Law prefigured:

Neither onght this honour which
is given to Images, some absurd to any man, if he remember, that the honour given to them, both goe into the principal truth which is figured: the which relation and passing of honour from one thing to another, if he take away, I ask him, by what means he giveth godly honour to Christes natural flesh?

Surely if he wil goe no further, but to the only nature of flesh, as flesh, it may not be worshipped with Gods owne honour. But because the flesh of Christ must be respected, as a thing united to the Godhead in one perion: for the respect and cruch the aid of this union, we ought to give rather honour to Christes flesh, which we give to God. For it is made the flesh of the natural Sonne of God.

Being then a thing may be honoured above the condition of his owne nature, for any other cause (although the union be a greater cause, why Christes flesh shoulde be honoured, then the relation which is betwene the Image and the first sample) yet herein they agree, that eche of them is honoured for another true respect, beside that which is in the nature of the stuffe
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by matter whereof they consist.

Christ's flesh is not God, but it is
united to God. Christ's Image is not
Christ, but it is referred to Christ. The
union is higher than the relation, ther-
Note. for the honour due to it is greater, but
the relation is one degree of a certain
union: therefore some honour is due to the
image, for that it is referred unto Christ.
for every image is referred to the thing,
whose image it is.

Christ being demanded, whether
tribute might be paid to Cesar or no,
called for a penny, and having learned that
it bane the Image and inscription of Ce-
sar, said, render therefore those things unto Ce-
sar, which belong to Cesar. Did he not here
cutely teache, that every Image be-
longed to that truch, whose Image it
beareth?

If this be Cesar's Image, give it
then ( faith he ) unto Cesar. As who
would say: the very shape, the very in-
scription, the very soulme, and prince
thereof, leade you to consider, that this
toyme may lawfully be genen to Cesar,
Euen so doth every image lead us to that
truth,
of Images.

truth, whereof it is the Image.

If then the Image belong to the truth, the honour of the Image belongeth to the honour of the truth: and consequently, when the truth is worthy of honour, the image thereof is (for the truths sake) worthy of some honour.

I omitt in this place to prosecute at large such holy Scriptures, as doe prove the Signe of the Crosse to be most honorable. (And yet the said Signe being the similitude of Christ redeeming vs vpon the Crosse, is a very true and persite Image.) For Amalech was overthrown by the signe of holy representacion which Moses made, when he prayed to God with his hands lifted vp and spread abroad.

And because Moses did not spread and hold vp his hands by chance, but prophetically, that is to say, betokening and imitating that soorm and shape, wherein Christ would redeem the world: for 'cause, the lifting vp of his hands was an Image, And who may doute, but it was an honorable Image, which God did honor.

Exo. 17,
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E commend unto vs by a miracle wrought therein.

For when Moses held vp his hands, Israel overcame, but if he did never so little slacke them, Amalech overcame. What meant this, but to shew, that the Signe or Image of lifting vp Moses hands, was so holy, so reverend, so honorable (for Christes sake, who should spread his handes upon the Cross) that by it the people of Israel overcame? We may therefore and must honour the Signe of the Cross, in whatsoever stuff or matter it be made. And by the same reason, we may honour every Image, which expresseth and followeth the shape and form of a holy thing.

By this Signe of Thau, that is to say, of the Cross, those were marked in the forehead (as Ezechiel witnesseth) who hated Idolatry. And shall we now think, that the honouring of the same Signe is the committing of Idolatry? Those that Ezechel 6.9 had Thau (the Signe of the Cross) were not slain corporally; and think we now, those who have it and embrace it, shalbe slain everlastingly?
of Images.

Make a new Bible, by you can (Ei. Jewel) for certainly the old Bible will hane the Signe of the Crosse worshipped. Yea the new also, because y same Signe is called The Signe of the Son of man, which shall appere in heaven at the day of judgment. Neither doth it skil, whether the Crosse it self where upo Christ died, or the Signe there of made in the aier, shall appere, or els whether Christ stretching out his armes will make that Signe unto vs.

Every way that Signe shal appeare, to the confusion and utter damnation of those, who now hane throwe down that Signe, whereoever they could come by it: unless they repent, whiles yet the vertue of that Signe may be applied to them.

A thousand tymes, what say I, a thousand? Everlastingly accursed is he, that hath or destroyeth any one ioce belonging to Christ, be it neuer so far distat from his holy flesh and Person. A far bigger booke then this present is, wold not serue to shew, what honour is due to the Signe of our Redemption.

When
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When Saint Peter walked in the streets, the people crowded to lye only within the compass of his shadow. And why so? Because they saw God work miracles by his hands. Now they discoursed thus with them sellers.

If this man be so well beloved of God, surely anything that belongeth to him, is deere and acceptable unto God. Therefore if we may but assine to have his shadow come over our bodies, we are safe. The like said the faithfull woman, who was cured of her bloody issue.

If I only may touche his garment, I shall be safe.

Verily the Image of Christ is some what of his: otherwise it were not his Image. Therefore if a man had that faith, as to beleve that if he might touch or only see his image, he should be safe, I see no reason, why that faith might not make him safe. Sithens as the touching of the garment failed not there, but the faith of the woman went unto Christes owne person: so the seeing or touching of the Image, is not the end of our affiance, but only Christ him self.
of Images.

whose Image it is. But one faith in Christ appeareth so great when we looke to be holpen by his Image, that weudge him so almighty, so infinite, so present every where by grace, that the least thing in your world belonging to him, yea though ye were much lesse than his Image, is able to doe vs good. Whereas the Heretickes take all things to his Person, and nothing to his other instruments.

Much more might be said in this behalfe (as in the senceth Council it is to be sene;) but I will contente my self herewith, telling Master Jwuel, that he is our impudent, to stroke at the holy Scriptures alleged by the most grave Senate of three hundred and sixtie Bishops, not only to be considereed as learned, wise, and good men, but also as gathered together in the name of Christ, who promised to be in the middest of them. And no meane Christian doze, but that he performeth his promise.

How God is the better worship, in

paying in spirit and truth, for such convenience,

honour
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honour as is genen to Images, in res-
spect of the truth which they represent,
it shalbe declared, when I will intreat
of the profite which we take by Images.

To make an end at the length, All
that ever a Maie, b Jeremie, c Eze-
chiel, d Micheas, e Sophonias, f Za-
charias, o2 King Dauid say of the de-
struction of Idols in the tymc of grace,
is utterly void and of none effect, ye it
be not lawfull to worship or to adour Im-
ages.

For all the whole Church of Christ,
that great Church, I say, which is spread
throughout all Nations, hath in all
Temples and Chappells, where Christ's
name was called upon, always, and
specially after the tymc of Constan-
tius the great, (who restoyed the Christians
to that libertie of worshipping God,
whereof the Prophets had spoken) sette
up and usd reverently the Images of
Christ and of his Saints.

If now to honour Images after
that sorte, it be to committre Idolatrie (as
our new Gospellers charge vs) Idols
have
of Images.

dane not ben taken away by Christ, and
the Prophers of God are made lyers.
But much later it is to thincke, that to
scteme holy Images for that honorable
truches lake which they shew, is rather
a help to the true worshipping of one
God, then any Idolatry at al.

That the Siigne of the healthful Cross was
honoured in the first six hundred yeres,
and of those two grotse ignoraces in M.
Jewel, thinking the Siigne of the Cross,
not to be an Image, or that to haue the
Siigne of the Cross, in great regard for
Christes lake, is not to worship the same
Siigne, and consequently to worship an
Image.

The 12. Chap.

W hen we speake of worshipping the Cross, we may either
meane the material Cross, 
wherevpon Christ suffered, or els the
Siigne and Image thereof. The mate-
rial wood of Christes Cross is not only
holy for the Signes lake (wherby it stet-
tweth him who died upon it) but also se
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that it was sanctified to Christ's blood,
æ was ÿ Altar whereupon ÿ sacrifice of
our reconcileth was offered, ÿ instrument of our redemption, whereby it is a holy relicque a 3o and not only an Image.

when ÿ wood was brought by Helena in
Incunabula, a person dead, or diseased even
to death (or both) was thereby restored to
health as 1. Rustins, 2. Sulpitius, 3. So
crates, Theodoretus & Sozomenus doe
witness. And ÿ particles or pieces there
of were sent in the first six hundred years
from one faithfull man to an other, for
the greates treasure that might be.

This Cross found by Helena, is
called of S. Ambrose the standard of salvatio
the wood of truth: yea life itself. But because
this honour may be certainly known to
beuen to this Cross, not as it is a
piece of wood, but as it is a relicque or
an Image, & a representation of Christ's
death viato by S. Ambrose in the same
place Cuth by Helena, rege adorante, no lignum
propter quia hic gentilis est error; ÿ Samas im-
piori, sed adoravit illu qui sepcedit in ligno. He-
lena did woodshipne the King (to wit, Christ, and not the wood, for this is the Semitc
of Images.

...error, a vanitie of wicked, but the worshipped him, which did hang on the wood. And again, whereas an heretike might reply, that no honour at all was due to the wood, no nor in that respect as it beongs to Christ, St. Ambrose authoreth thereunto. Non insolentia...ed piece est, cum deseruer sacra redemptionem. This is no insolency but godliness, when honour is given to the holy redemption. So that the honour done to Christes Cross goeth to Christ himself who redeemed us.

Again, St. Ambrose makest the perspicuo...Jews with greese to say: Ecce & clarus in honore est, behold the naile also is honoured. Ex quem ad mortem impressus, remedium salutis est, aque invisibili quadam potestate damones torquet. And the naile which we drave in, to kill him, is a remedy to avoid death, and it comenceth the Deuils by a certain secret power. Ferro pedum exs...Reges inclinantur. Kings are bowed to the pron of his lecturer.

Thus have we a plaine doctrine, the wood, and naile, and pron are to be honoured, & to be worshipped or bowed unto, nor in that they are material wood,
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and a materiel nale (for then they should be worshipped for they own laces, and not as Images) but in that they have a relation to Christes hands, sence, death, and passion; that is to say, in that they are relics of Christ, or Images and representations of an honourable truth unto vs. Therefore we have learned by Saint Ambrose, that the Images of honourable things ought to be honoured, as they are Images, and not otherwise.

The wood of the same Crosse is also called by Rustinus, blessed, by S. Cypyllus, precious and healthful, not yet as it is wood but as himself faileth, because it leadeth vs to the memory of Chrystes death, whole words I alleged before. Verily for wood to be honoured for an other honorable things sake, to whom the honour of the wood is referred, that is no more to say, but to be honoured in that it is an Image.

And in this respect the Ancient Bishop Paulinus doth witnesse, that the same Crosse of Christ had a Church and a secret place made at Jerusalem, where it might be honorably reserved. Quam Crucem Episcopus urbis eius quotannis, cum pascha Domini.
Domini a citur, adorandum populo princeps ipse 

veuerantium promit. The which Crosse (of 

our Sauiour) the Bishop of that City 

(of Jerusalem) byngeth with every pere 

at the Easter of our Lord, to be adored by the 
pople, himself being the first who doth 
worship it.

Much more is said there, as likewise 
in many other Fathers, concerning they said 
Crosse of Christ. But what nede particular witnesses, for so much as the whole 
Church of Christ hath kept these twelve 
hundred pere together, it Invention, and 
these nine hundred pere, the Exaltation 
of the same Crosse? So that to dout of the 
honouring of they Crosse, whereon Christ 
died, it is to dout, whether it be day, or 
the son shineth brightely. Concerning they 
signe or Image of they same Crosse, they testimo 
nies of they Primitive Church are so famous 
& so well known, that Mr. Jewel doureth 
not to say:

Jew. The signe of the crosse, I graut, emog 
the Christias was had in great regard, etc.

Sander. Yea thereof he sheweth both 
reason, and examples at large. What is 
it then, wherein he disagreeoth from vs?

S. 

Iewel
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1. De corona mulitis.
2. De spir.
S.c.27
3. Ad Iun. 
baianum.
4. Serm.19 
de sanctis.
. Sozome 
nes lib.8 
c.8
5. Lib.2. 
De perse 
cut. Vaud.
6. In vita 
Hilarion.
8. de incar 
mat. verb.
9. Laéan. 
l.4.c.27. 
10. De vi 
sitat. in,Sr 
c.3. Conc. 
6. in Trul. 
Damasce. 
l.4.c.17.

Iewel. It is not the Crosse, nor the signe 
of the Crosse, that we finde fault withal, but 
the superstitious abuse of the crosse.

Sander. Why is it not shewed, what 
the same superstitious abuse is? For if 
it be a thing used in the whole primitive 
Church, it must not be called a superstiti 
ious abuse. For if a Jew hath submitted 
himself to the first six hundred peres. We 
signe our forheads with the Crosse (as 
1. Terrullian witnesseth, that the Chri 
stias did in his dayes) and those that are 
baptized (as 2. S. Balit) or bishopped 
(as 3. S. Cyprian) and we consecrate all 
our Sacraments, Churches, Altars, with 
the same Signe of the Crosse (as 4. S. Au 
gustine) the diviners anciet Fathers haue 
taught vs. We beare it before vs in our 
processions (as 5. S. Chrysostom) & ble it at 
the halowing of the fount, as Victor wit 
nesseth. 6. Euschius did: We confesse 
Miracles to be wrought by it, as 7. S. 
Hierod sheweth, & venem, & witchcraft to 
be made void therewith (as 8. S. Athana 
sius) & Devils to be put to flight there 
by (as 9. Lactantius) haue taught vs.

We revere, reverence and worship it, as they 
both
of Images.
both did, and taught us to doe.

And surely which hath power to
doe those things which I have now re-
hered, must needs be a worshipful signe,
seth it hath some of his vertue in it, who
is God above all things Blessed for euer, y latchet
of whose shew we ought to reuerence. So
y we need not woder, if S. Chrysfot said
not only y Cross it self whereon Christ
died, but also eius figuram & effigie colendam
adorandumque esse, cui y figure & shape of y
crosse ought to be worshipped & adored.

For the honour of this gloiouse signe
of Christes death, the Emperors Theo-
dosius and Valentinianus made a Law
in these words: Cum sit nobis cura diligens
per omnem superni nunninis religionem tueri: signi
Saluatoris Christi nemini licere vel in solo, vel in
stilo, vel in marmorebus humi positis insepul-
cre, vel pingere, sed quocunque reperitur tolli,
grauisima pena multandis, siquidem contrarium
statutis nostri tentauerint, specialiter impera-
mur. whereas we take diligent care to
defend in al points y Religio of God, we
specially comand, y it shalbe laufull for no
man to grave oz to paint the Signe of our In the
Sanior Christ in the ground, oz in stone, oz
ground.
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in marble stones lying on the ground, but
wheresoever it is found, we command it to be taken vp, under a most gracious forsette to be paid of them, if any shall attempt the things which is contrary to our lawes.

Even the same thinge S. Ambrose said by Helena, metuebat calcare sacramentui Salvatis. She feared to tread upon the holy Signe of Salvati. Was not this a kind of honouring ye holy signe of the Crosse, when for ye honour thereof it is forbidden to be graven upon the ground, least it should be dishonoured, if it were troden upon? This law being written so long past, and preserved so notably these eleven hundred yeeres in ye body of the civil Constitutions, W. Jewel could not see: but he went to one Peter Crinite a ma of very late yeeres to learn of him this auctiust law, as though he knew it better then Justinian. And when he had scraped out an obscure apparence thereof, he englished it falsely, as I will shew hereafter.

But being neither Helena, nor the Emperours wold have be a feared to have troden upon two straues, or two rushes,
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or two stuckes lying by chance a Crosse, what is y matter, why they wil not haue a panired oz grauen Crosse erodien upon? Surely because there is not only a naturall oz a causal crosslyng of bars therein, but there is also a holy image erodien upon, that is to say, such a thing is eroden yph as was made of the Christias purposely with this faith and love toward Christ, to haue his death honorably remembred: so that when such a Crosse is eroden upon, the Faith of Christians, yea the Death of Christ is erodien under seete. But what need we prove ye the Signe of the Crosse was in old tym: no honoure[d]? W. Jewell himselfe confesseth it, saying:

Jewell. The Signe of the Crosse, I graunt, among the Christians was had in great regard, and after for that most wor-thye price which was offered upon it.

Sander. Is not this all one, as ye in other words he said, ye signe of the Crosse among the Christias was adoured, worshipped and reverence[d]; for ye great regard which was had of it, was had because the most worthy price of our redemption was offered upon it, sithens a "$ w great
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great regard had to a thing for God's sake, and in the respect of his Religion, is a kind of worshipping: so I. Jewels hath granted to us, that the Signe of the Cross was honoured in old time. What difference is there between having a great regard to a thing for God's sake, and honouring the same?

If I esteem my neighbour for God's sake, surely therein I honour, and serve, or worship my neighbour, according as S. Paul faith, by love serve ye one the other. Now it is well known, that every servant regardeth & honoureth his master, and in him (if he doe it for God's sake) he honoureth God much more, for whole sake he esteemeth and reverenceth his Master.

For the end why every thing is done, is more worth, and more to be respected, than that which is done. And therefore he that loueth his neighbour for God's sake hath in one word fulfilled the Law, as S. Paul teacheth: because in such a love of his neighbour, the love of God is more principally contained.

Even so it is in regarding the Signe
Signe of the Crosse for his sake, who died upon it. For both the Signe is honoured, and much more thing which is signified.

I know every regard is not commonly taken for a worshipping, but yet it is so in his kinde, as, when a man regardeth mony so much, that he couereth to haue more then he needeth, doth not S. Paule name him the worshipper of Idols? And yet he perhaps intendereth not purposely to set up his gold before him, and to fall down before it, and so to worship it.

But in that he regardeth it so much, as in deede minding to goe beggarly, to face miserably, or to die excision, and to letter his neighbours about him to die to hunger, rather then to spend his mony upon himselfe, or his neighbour: this man doth in trueth worship his mony, and worshippeth it where he should not do so, although himself neither say, nor chide so much.

Right so, if W. Jewel were assured, that he had a peice of Chistles owne Crosse, and were of the minde to kepe 

$\$ it so safely,
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it so falsely, and to regard it so improperly, that he would preferre it before common wood, yea before all gold and silver for his sake, who died upon it (which to doe is no unlawful thing, but good and vertuous) even that regard of his, should be a worshipping and honouring of it, though he did neither kyse it, nor lye downe prostrate before it. For it is the minde, much more then the body, which determyneth and causeth worshipping or honouring. In so much that if the minde should take ye pece of wood to be God, the man should be straight an Idolatour. If againe he should take it for no better then a cymbal pece of wood, he should be blasphemous against ye death of Christ.

For if Christ vouchsafed to segregate and discerne it from other wood, in making it alone of all woods the instrument of his passion, ought not I likewise to regard it thereafter?

If then the great regard of the signe of the Crosse being had for his sake, who died thereon, be a certain worshipping of the Crosse: seeing the Signe of the Crosse is an image, Master Jewell is forced
forced by his own words to confess the worshipping of images. But here let him answer for himself.

Iewel. It is not hitherto any way proved, that this Crosse was an image, or that it was set up in any Church, or that it was adored of the people. Certainly the letter that Ezechiel saw in a vision: the Crosse that Constantine saw in the air, the marks that were either stained with water, or burnt with fire: the laborers garmets, the secret mystical letters in the Temple of Serapis: The cognizans of the Crosse painted, or graven in flags, banners, targets, and coynes, were only arres laid a crosse, & no images.

Sander. Who euer heard of such a blind ignorance? Are not those Crosses, or rather those Signes, which follow, imitate, betoken, and set forth Christes owne Crosse, whereon he died, or else the same shape, wherein he hong with his armes spread abroad, are not such Signes, the Images of Christes Crosse? What call ye then an Image? I thought an image had ben the likenes or similitude of the shape of one thing, which hath ben taken out according to the samplar of another more principal thing, as I alleged before our
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out of S. Gregory Nazianzene.

If then the Crosses, whereof W. Jewel speaketh, were the similitude of Christes own Cross, which is the principal pattern of all our holy Signes, what meant he to say, they be no Images? Let him the show us the definition of an Image: yea let he him tell us, whether that inward sense of man, which is called the Imagination, be not such, as either receaue of the common sense Images already formed, or frame it Images to it self, by compounding those things together diversely, which it learned before one by one.

For either I conceaue a Tree, as in deed the Tree is, and then the Image thereof is already extant before that I understand it, or els I add to a Tree the wings of a bird, the caile of a fish, and so forth, and then although my Image (as is compounded) be monstrosely, yet every thing alone hath a truth, whereunto the parts may be referred.

To my purpose it suffiseth, that as the Imagination, is named of conceaing Images, so every thing really extant, that may
may be imagined, or conceauned in the Imagination, may haue an Image thereof. Which thing I speake, least perhaps W. Jewel should thinke, that an Image must be alwaies meant, either of the shape of a man, or els of a beast, or els of some liuing thing. Whereas in deed, seing I may imagine a stone, it also may haue his Image. Why then shal not there be also an Image of the Crose, sithens we may imagine a Signe of Christes Crose? Nay (saith W. Jewel) al such Crosses are barres laied a Crose, and no Images. Good Spy: If barres be laied a Crose so; y end to initate y barres laied a Crose, where Christ died, or y Crose of his own body, whereon his head stood upward, his feet down ward, y his armes stretched souther in eche syde, al Crosses, I say, y are made to represent that Crose, are most truly Images, because they depend of an other principal truth whose shape thei expresse.

Jewel. Againe, the same Crosses were not set vp in any Temple.

Sander. Not these in deede, that were in the field, or in private houses: but othes like to the were set vp in y Tepies,
Of the honouring of the storie of S. Stephæs image painted in a veile and hanged by before his own Sepulcher with a Crosse upon his shoulder, doth evidently witnesseth, which storie Euodius the Bishop of Uzal in Africke, writing about S. Augustines ryme hath at large set forth, as it may be sene in a booke of S. Augustines Sermons, printed at Louan apud Hieronymum Vreilain A.D.C. Domini, 1. 6. 4.

Iewel. The people were not taught to kneele down to any Crosse, or to say, Alhaile O Crosse our only hope.

Sander. It is A marueile if the people were not taught to doe that, which it is well known they did, and they did it not only without reprehension of their preachers and Bisshops, but also they should have ben reproved, if they had refused to kneele downe, or to adore the Crosse.

Sozomenus speaking of Saint Michaelis Church in Constantinople, calleth this storie, Probianus cum dudu Paganus esset, posteà factus Christianus, aliquatenus dogma sequatur. Totius vero salutis causam, id est, Sacratissimam Crucem solusque adoraret. Hanc habenti sentientiam
Divina virtus apparet, signum monstravit Crucis, quad erat positum in altario eus Ecclesia. Et aperi patefact, quia ex quo crucifixus est Christus, omnia que ad vsilitatem humani generis facta sunt, quolbets modo prater virtuem adorande crucis gesta non essent, neque ab angelis sanctis, neque ab suis hominibus.

Probiansus being sometimes a Pagian, but afterward made a Christian, did in some parte follow the doctrine of the Christians. But he would not adore the cause of all our health, that is to say, the most holy Crosse. He being of this mind, the Divine power appered unto him, and showed to him the Signe of the Crosse, that was set on the altar of S. Michael's Church. And did manifestly declare, that from the tyme wherein Christ was crucified, all things which are done for the welfare of mankind, were not done by any means, neither by the holy Angels, nor by godly men without that vertue of the Crosse, which ought to be adored.

Here it is evide, yborh there was a Signe of the Crosse set vp on the Altar of S. Michael's Church, and also that Probiansus was accepted as yet no persite Christian.
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for ? he would not adozc the most holy
Crosse of Christ, but having adozed the
Signe of the Crosse upon better instruc-
tion, he was healed of his distaste. It was
therefore the use of persite Christians in
those daies, to adozc ? Signe of ? Crosse.

And whereas M. Jewell upbraideth
ys of these our wordes, O Crux anhes vn-
c, Allelue O Crosse our only hope, the
which we sing kneeling on our knces on
Passion Sonday: it may please him to con-
consider, that those very wordes do so con-
vince his blasphemous doctrine, that he
shal never be able to avoid the Argument
which is grounded vpom them.

Those words are in one of the hym-
nes of that holy rime, the which hymne
beginneth thus: Sexilla Regis prodeunt. Fal-
get Crucis mysterium. The Banners of the
King come forth, the mystery of ? Crosse
Arth: , whereby he that made flesh, in
flesh was hanged on the gibber. And when
? said Hymne had staid a certaine tyme
upon the contemplation of that dreadful
Sacrifice of Christs death at ? length. It
crieth out, Al haile O Crosse our only hope.
meaning suitletly thus, O Chrst shered
out upon the Crosse, thou art our only hope. For is the end of the Hymne that agree with the beginning, and with the middle, it is Christ crucified, upon whom the whole song is made.

And to make us the better to think upon that we singe, and to concerne it more devoutly, we are appointed at the singing of those words to kneele, to turn our selues toward the altar, to fix in our eyes vp to the Signe of the Crosse, might plie in our hart a more liuely representation of thy precious death of Christ.

I pray you, my Jewe, did not S. Paul use the same self phrase, when he said, abest mihi gloriar, nisi in cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi? God forbid that I should glory, but only in the Crosse of our Lord Jesus Christ? Is it not al one to say, I glory in nothing els but in the Crosse, or, the Crosse is my only hope? For we glory in the hope of the glory of God, as also S. Paul affirmeth. If then the meaning be good, and the like phrase be in S. Paul, what a canced malice is this, to set forth those words in contempt, which are so devoutly meant of al good Christians?

But to
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But to come neere to the principal point, if this hymne were made, before the six hundred yeres were ended, are not the same very words, & the custom of God's people in kneeling down before the Signe of the Cross, while they sing or speake them, a sufficient witness, to prove that M. Jewel ought to subscribe? It may be well thought, that seeing this hymne doth concern the holy yrne of Len, and of Christ's passion, and seeing it is receaved, not only in England, but also in Italie, Fraunce, Spaine, and in other like Countries, that it is one of those anciet hymnes, which were made in the old yrne.

Of the which, as there were diversel authors, to wit, S. Hilari, S. Ambrose, Fortunatus, Sedulius, Prudentius, and S. Gregorie: to who sooner of them made this hymne, he was within the first six hundred yeres: and consequently these words were taught to be long and laid toward the Signe of the Cross (in respect of Christ Crucified) by the people kneeling, and sayeing, Allelui O Cross, thou art our only hope. Whatchach M. Jewel won now by his scolding at these words?
Moreover, being M. Jewel confesseth, that the signe of Christes Crosse was had in great regard among the Ancienc Fathers, and that for Christes sake, is yet not alone, to regard, y laid Crosse greatly (as he before confessed the Fathers to doe for Christes sake) or els, for Christes sake to kneele dounse vnto the Crosse, or to say, Haile a Crosse, that is to say, Christ Crucified, our only bope: And yet S. Chrysostome saith also: Hodernus dice prletiosa Crucis venerations constitutus est. This date is assinged for the worshippinge of the precioust Crosse. And againe: Admodum beatiss, qui castis labijs sanctiquoque ore eam ve amplissentiur exeunt. They are verie happie, who come out of their dozcs to embrace, or kiss this Crosse, with chaste lyppes & with a holy mouth.

The which words albeit they were spoken of the holy wood of Christes Crosse, whereof Chrysostom did sette forth some parcell to be killed and embraced, yee seeing I proned before out of S. Ambrose, that the wood (as materiall wood) was not to be adored, but only as an Image or representation of Christ crucified: The
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same Example doth also prove, that Im-
ages may be kissed with chaste lippes,
and with a holy mouth.

But my intent is not to speake at
large of the Croste, whereof whole bokes
and Treatises be written, by Mr. Lope,
and M. Marshal.

It suffiteth me to note first, that a
great regard of the Signe of the Croste
had of the Anicient Fathers (which Mr.
Jewell confesseth, not knowing, the se-
mele thereof) both prove, that they wor-
shipped the said Signe.

Againe, that the Signes of the holy
Croste of Christe are verely Imagges;
therefore that when they were set
up in Churches, and worshipped,
Images are proued to have beene sette up and
worshipped,
That other holy Images both might be adored profitably, and without Jewish bondage by S. Augustines own doctrine, and also were adored within the first six hundred verses after Christ. With a defense of S. Chrysostomes Liturgie against M. Jewel.

The 13. Chapter.

The general doctrine of S. Augustines concerning Signes which belong to Religion, may be well applied to this our purpose. Thus he writeth: *Quis aut operatur, aut veneratur unde signum divinitus institutum, cuius vim significationemque intelligit, non hoc veneratur quod videtur & transit, sed illud potius quo talia sunt, *De Deo, *Christi, *3. cap. v.

Be that either workeith, or worshipeth a profitable Signe instituted by Gods Authoritie, the strength and signification whereof he understandeth, he worshipeth not that which is seene and passeth away, but that thing rather, whereunto all such things are to be referred.
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Images are profitable signs, because they bring us to the remembrance of good things. They are also instituted by God's authority, because he willed them to be made according to the imitation of nature, and of Nations, & namely he instituted some Images in the Law of Moses, and left the tradition to his Church freely to make Images of good things, which thing the Church practised so comonely, that beside the examples alleged before out of a Eusebius, we read thus in S. Augustin, as well of the Echniks as of the Christians: Pluribus locis simul Petrum & Paulum cum Christo pietos viderunt, quia merita Petri & Pauli etiam propter eundem passionis diem celebrius & solemniter Roma commendat. They sawe in very many places Peter and Paul painted together with Christ, because Rome doth see forth the merits of Peter and Paul and more famously and solemnly, even so, that they suffered both upon one day.

Upon which these Images so comonely seene, the Heathens grounded this error, that Christe wrote certaine bookes, dedicating or intitling them to Peter and Paul. But although the light
of Images.

Sight of Images did them no good, as being Infidels, to whom the Gospel it selfe did no good: yet by this example it appeareth, that before the daies of S. Augustin, Images were commonly vled in Rome, and in other like places.

S. Gregorie of Nyssa sheweth the like custome to have bene vled in the Greeke Church, confestig expresslie, that the Painter with the Flowers of his art, as it were in a booke, did sette forth in the Church of Theodorus the Martyr his valiant deeds, his torments, and his glorious victorie and conquest by suffering death.

Of the Images in the Church walls of S. Felix his Temple, who knoweth not, that hath readen S. Paullinus workes? Gregorius Turonensis also speaketh of those paintings of the walls, in S. Martins Church at Tours in France.

If now it be certain, Images were made without at all scruple in the Primitive Church, if they were commonly set by both in Churches, & without Churches, I take it for an evident proue, Images are signes instituted, dumitatis, that is to say, by the will and pleasure of God, whether this image

De Theod. Malalude Images in Churches.
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til were commended to vs by the law of nature, of Nations, or els whether the Apostles and Fathers made this Reason for it, that if in the time of bondage, for some Images were permitted to the Ec-

cles, who were so prone to Idolatry, much more Christes people delivered fro

Adolatrie, from the feare of Idolatry, may according to the freedom of the new Testament, make al good & profitable im-

ages: or els whether it were by special wordes of Christes owne mouth, or by special inspiration of the holy Ghost reeued to the Apostles: once it is cleere, that Images are a kind of Signes, whiche bring greate profitte to vs. And that the same kind of Signes was instituted by God's will and pleasure.

Whereupon it followeth by S. Au-
gustines doctrin, who so worshipeth such a Signe, worshipeth not anie transitorie thing, but he worshipeth rather that thing wherein those signes are to be referred. He therefore that worshipeth S. Peter's Images worshipeth S. Peter himselfe, rather the his image. And likewise in S. Peter he worshipeth Christe, rather then S. Peter.
And in Christ, the God, of Images, Peter. By the force of which doctrine, we may wellestherefore, that there is no better in worshipping figures, than by bis-
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referring them to the worshippe of one
God. Which later kind of worshipping
is not unprofitable, although it be not
free and thoroughly spiritual.

But the former kind of Signes is
very hurtful. And verily both are a cer-
taine bondage. For he is bond to the
Signe, either who taketh it for the thing
it selfe, or else worshippeth it as a Signe,
and yet knoweth not what it signifieth.

But we ye are made free in Christ, both
know our Signes and Images to be i-
mages and signes (which also ye Jewes
did) and we knowe moreover, whereof
they are the Signes (which thing the
Jewes did not know) ye we refer ye wor-
ship of them, not finally to any creature
(as the Gentils did) but unto one God,
by Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore
our worshipping of Signes is not only
profitable, as that of ye Jewes was, but
also spiritual and free from all bondage.

The Signes of the Gentils were
taken away and clean destroyed, because
they ended in the onely honour of Cre-
tures and not of God. The Signes of
the Jewes were not utterly dissolved a
of Images.

abolished, but rather altered and changed. We then must have Signes also: and not only new Sacraments for old, as Baptisme for Circumcision, Christ’s Supper for the Paschal Lambe, which most holy Signes are directly instituted by Christ, but we must have also certain Signes made with faithful mens hands as they had Signes made in mens hands. We must have Alters, Aestments, Chalices, lighters, and Images, as well as they had all these things. And so long as we know what they meane, we may worship them both profitably and without any bondage.

The Jews being cleere unable, to conjecture what the lifting up of the brazen Serpent signified, lest the worshipping of a profitable signe, and worshiped unprofitably the brazen it self. But we worship neither wood, nor braze, but principally the truth which is meaned by our Images, & consequently the Images as holy things belonging to that truth. For now Christ hath provided our signes to be so wel known, & to be so common, that no man is able to be ignorant of
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of them, though he would in maner affect ignorance.

The conclusion is, that S. Augustine confeseth we may worship Signes instituted by God's appointment. But Images are instituted by the law of nations (for the acts of painting & of graving are laudable) by the law of Moses, and by the Univercall custome of God's Church, cuery of which is the appointment of God: therefore Images may be profitably and freely worshipped.

And that in practise it was so done within the first six hundred yeres, S. Chrysostome, Paulinus, and S. Gregorie do witness. In S. Chrysostomies Liturgie (which obtinemeth the Service of Æ Breke church for the publicke Sacrifice) we read, that Æ Priest went forthe at the little dore (of Æ quiet) carrying the Gospel, and the Minister going before with light. Et conversus ad Christi Imagenem inter duo os iuxta inflexo capite dicit hanc oratione:

And Æ Priest being turned towards the Image of Christ betwene Æ two dores, having barred his head, saith this prayer, and there the prayer foloweth. Condy the Priest hane turned him selfe toward the Image
of Images.

Image of Christ between two dozes, except Christ's Image had stood between two dozes? Or when he bowed his head before this Image, did he not then reverence this said Image? Herunto S. Jew. answer.

Jewel. In the communion boke that beareth the name of Chrysostom, there is mention made of Nicolas B. of Rome, who lived well here, v. C. yeres after Chrysostom.

Sander. This table S. Jewel bringeth in to discrède the witness of S. Chrysostom, willing his Reader to persuade himself, that it is not s. Chrysostom's own Liturgie. Yet what thing can be known to be his, if that which beareth his name, which is witnessed to be his by other Greeks who have written since that time, as Proclus, Cabasa, Methodius, and M. Ephesius, who al make mention thereof: to be short, if that which is not only copied out, kept and read, but also sung every holy day in the Greek Church, if that work be denied to be S. Chrysostom's, then let us derive the Psalm Quicunque vult, to be made by S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine.
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If al the East Church suffice not to make faith for S. Chrysostomes' Liturgie, what witnesses shall be credited hereafter?

Concerning Mr. Jewel's reason, it is a mere causel. For whereas in al publike Service and forms of Othes, there are certaine common places which must be least void for names according to the persons and times (as the name of the Saint whose feast is kepe, the name of the Bishoppe whose then Lyueth, and of the Emperor that then reigneth, or of him that speakerly do sweareth) that place and part is subject to change as the occasion serueth. And therefore commonly no name of them is expressed. Howbeit now it so chaunced, that the Greeke copie, one of which Leo Tuscanus translated S. Chrysostomes Liturgie not long after the time of Alexius, was such as had ben used in the time of Alexius the Emperor, and therefore his name was written in the sayd boke, and likewise his name of Nicolaus, who was at the same time Patriarche of Constantinople, and not Bishoppe of Rome, as Mr. Jewel reporteth.
The words are these. Nicolai Sana Bissimi & Universales Papa longa sint tempora. Eleutherij Alexandri, Cyrilli Antiochia, Leon. 3. Hieropolymorum longa sint tempora. In which words the Priest standing at the Alter, prayeth for Nicolas the most holy & universal Pope, & for the other three Patriarches of Alexandria, Antiochia, & Jerusalem. This most holy and universal Pope was not meant the Pope of Rome, as M. Jewel saith, for the Pope of Rome never yet would take the title of Universal Bishop, as it may appeare by Leo the first, and by S. Gregorius, but reproved alwayes the Patriarches of Constantinople for usurping the same proud and false name of universal, as the which imported, as though there were but one Bishop or Patriarch in all, and that all the rest should be no Bishops. Neither is it like, that any man is prayed for by that title which him selfe mistiketh.

Moreover in the time of Alexius, and before the See of Constantinople was so divided from the See of Rome (concerning the proceeding of the holy Ghost) that the Pope of Rome was not prayed for.
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for ordinarily at Constantinople.

And hereunto, that there is no Bishop of Constantinople prayed for at all, if the said Nicolas be not the Bishoppe thereof. For the name of Pope was giv'en in the old time to every Bishop, being no more to say but, Father.

There was no Pope Nicolas at Rome in the time of Alexins.

Moreover the common Breke copies have not those names of Nicolas or of Alexins: no nozal \( \) Latin copies, as it may appeare by \( \) translatic of Cralinus:

What shall I say that Claudius de Sierra etes, by consecring diverse places taken out of S. Chrysostomes owne workes, hath evidently proved, the said Liturgie to be his.

Lack of all, Zonaras writing the life of the Emperor Alexins, hath these words: Patriarcha vero Nicolas, Ecclesiapen annos viginti septem gubernata, senex admodum decessit eius fundus Imperator magnificis honoriibus prosecutus est. Nicolas the Patriarch having ruled the Church seven and twenty yeeres, died a very Olde man, whose corps the Emperor did honour.
of Images.

tably burie. There was no Pope of Rome that ever lived in his Bishoprike seven and twenty yeres, not yet five and twenty (S. Peter onely excepted) nor Alexius did not come to burie any Pope at Rome.

This being so, is not S. J ewel a discrete reprouer of S. Chryso所有es Liturgie? But if it standethafe, then is there an Image proued to have been barred unto, in the Church in S. Chryso所有es time, even by that translation which Erasmus made. But lette vs go forward to other examples.

One Senerus a man of notable verene and learning, did build two Churches and a Baptisterie, which was a Chapel wherein a great Font stood to Baptise men in. Within that Baptisterie Senerus painted the Images of S. Marce

Images in a Church.
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Of S. Martius Image thus wri-
teth S. Paulinlus in his twelvethe epis-
Alle. Recte in loco refectionis humana Marti-
nus pingitur, qui celestis hominis imaginem
perfecta Christi imitatione portenit, ut deponen-
tibus in lavacro terrena imaginis vetustatem sa-
miranda celestis animae occurrat effigies. Mar-
tin is well painted in the place of mans
regeneration. Who caried the Image of
the celestial man by the perfect following
of Christ, that the shape of a heaventie
Loute may come to their mind to be fol-
lowed, who laid downe in Baptisme their
earthly Image.

And least any man should thinke,
that the said Image was there to be only
seen or looked on, but otherwise might
not be reverence : the same Paulinus
in the same Epistle speaketh of the same
Image in this wise.

Martinius veneranda vis testatur Imago.
The reverence Image of the man doth
witness of the sooth Martin. Vene-
randa Imago, is an Image worthy of re-
currence, or which oughte to be reverence.

It was alleaged before out of S.
Diego.
of Images.

Gregorie, that he said, we lie prostrate, or fall downe, before the Image, not as before the Godhead, but we remember him that was born or died for vs, whereby it may appeare, how falsely S. Jewel saith.

Jewel. As for Gregorie, notwithstanding he speake expressly of Images, yet he speaketh not one word of the adoration of Images.

Sander. De faith, Non quasi ante Divitatem, ante illam (imaginem) profieri nimirum. We lie prostrate before that (Image) not as before the Godhead. Is not lying far downe before an Image, one word spoken of adoration of Images?

Yea rather it is cleere, that it was the vs in S. Gregories time, to lie prostrate or to fall downe before holy Images, but not with the minde that they were Gods, but with the mind that they maskeing vs remember God, & that as thinges instituted and specially assigned to that purpose, were also worthy of hencé and of falling downe before them, for his sake, whom they represented.

But because it were to long to prosecute particular Examples one by one,
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(of which soe many are sett foorth in the
Seventh General Council) let us gene-
 rally defend the adoption of Images,
according to y Seuenth General Coun-
cel, to shew those examples and autho-
rities, which are well and truly alleged
therefor this purpose, maie at once
be defended, agaist Mr. Jew-
els harking and railing.

That the Seuenth General Counsell was a
ttrue Counsell, and ought to be obeyed,
and Mr. Jewels flaunders be anwered
concerning the same. Where also it is
briefly shewed, that Miracles might and
have bene wrought by holy Images.


Because the Protestantes haue refus-
led the cōmon and ordinarie judg-
ment of certaine General Coun-
cells, I haue hithero proued the
honouring of Images by other meanes.
But nowe I maie not omittte to shewe allso, that they doe uniuiclie take upon them, to condemne that graue Senare of three hundred and Fiftie Bishoppes gathered together at Nicea.

Iewell. This seconde Councell of Nice was holden well nere eight hundred yeares after Christ.

Sander. Then was it holden above seuen hundred yeares before you, or your Congregation were borne. If that then muste nor be credited, because it was yonger then the firste Sixe hundrdez yeares after Christe, will you be credited, which write almooste sixten hundred yeares after Christ? If this Councel lacke Antiquitie, as being keppe two hundred yeares after the firste six hundred yeeres: doe not al your miserable Connenticies keppe now in these our daies lacke Antiquitie, which are almoost a thousand yeeres behind the firste six hundred? It is an Extreme blindness, to thinke that eight hundred yeeres are late, and that Fiftene hundred after Christe are Antique.

Iewell. To open the whole solie and fondnesse of that Councell, it would require a long treatise.
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Sander. Who is more like to a be foole and fond? Dr. Jewel, of three hundred and fiftie Bishops gathered out of all Christendome, as the most excellent that then lived for wit, vertue, and learning?

Jewel. Iren: the Empresse a wicked woman, &c.

Sander. Nicephorus telling the argument of his twelfth tome, faith, it shall comprehend Res gestas sui imperii Constantinii & Irene. The Actes of the Godlie Empire of Constantinus and of Irene. Neuternus saith she was borne to gouerne. Jonaras confesseth Her to have bene ambitious. But that whiche purgeth all, she her selfe confessed her selfe to have bene worthlie punished for her synnes, and so by aceing to God for mercie, she is at the leafte noe we made a good woman. And verely her Zeale towardde holy Images did make her the better.

Jewel. The Kings daughters of Tartarie, a Heathen borne.

Sander. A weightie cause sure-liet, why the Seuenthe Generall Coun-cell should be discredited. As though Constantinus the Great, who called the
first Generall Councell, was not a Dea-
then born. The Odirection were some-
what worth, if any man were borne a
Christian. Tertullian saith, Eius, in Apo-
on naecuntur Christiani: Christians be
made, and not borne.

I am sure Erce was Christened,
before she procured the Councell. And
yet I doubt, whether W. Jewell thinke
so much of Constantinus Magnus. For per-
haps he doth credit Eusebius in that be-
halfe, and so taking the power of Autho-
rizing that Councell from Sylvester the Pope
of Rome, he makeh the first Councell to
be called, and confirmed, and Authori-
zed by one that was not Baptized. Thinke
upon it, W. Jewell, what you will
choose to saie.

Jewell. She caused that Councell
to be summoned in despite of the Coun-
cell of Constantinople, that had decreed a-
gainst images.

Sander. Ionarasserkerh, that she
and the Patriarche Taralbus sent to A-
drianus the Pope of Rome, despizing him
and the other Patriarchs, to be at the
Councell. So that it was not Her
in vita
Constant.
& Iren.
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only Authopitie that ruled the mater.

But in that you speake of a Coun-
cell gathered at Constantinople, by like
then there was A Counsell gathered
there. But by whome? I aske you not
by what Pope(for that you can not abyde)
but by what Empeour was it gathered?
What Patriarches came to it? What num-
ber of Bishoppes was there assembled?
Where be the Actes and Canons of it?
Which, I speake not, as though I
thought, there was none at all, but to
shew that it was an obscure, and a Sedis-
cionse conspiracie of a few Heretikes, nor
reached at any tyme for a General Coun-
cel, nor at all confessd by the cheefe Patriar-
ches, nor Authorized by the Bishoppes
of Rome. Neither both anie Brecke
or Latine writer of that Age, or wight
about that tyme, accompt it for any other
then a false and impious Convencile.

Nicephorus, Photius, Euthy-
minus, Zonaras, Plellus, Basilamon, Si-
gebertus, Platina, Ranclerus, yea all
the Grecians which meate at Florence,
and all the Latine writers and Fathers
acknowlege none other General Coun-
cell
cell (after the Sixth under Pope Agatho) beside that Seventh Council, which was solicited by Irene and Constantinus.

But the occasion of calling it, was Paulus the Patriarch of Constantinople, who perceiving Constantinople to be divided from all the rest of the Catholic-like Church (for that the holy Images were there pulled down and dishonored) he refused to Govern any more, and went into a Monasterie to do penance for himselfe and his People. And Tarasilus being chosen Patriarch after Paulus, refused it likewise, except a Generall Council might be called, whereby the Church of Constantinople might be united to the rest of Christendome.

Upon this occasion Irene moved with his Requeste, sent to Pope Adrian and to the other Patriarches, despyrning them to assemble togeather, which they dyd.

Iewell. She tooke her owne sonne Constantinus and pulled out his eyes.
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Sander. Is the Council naught therefore? As though the Princes evil deed were able to make the Doctrine of the Church naught.

Jewell. She did it onely, because she would not consent to the Idolatrous having of Images.

Sander. That is not true. Except perhaps you will make vs new histories as wel as you geue vs a new faith.

Did not he first repel his owne mother from the gouernement? who, I pray you was elder of the sonne or of the mother? who should succede rather in the Empire, if the mater went by succession?

Or who was more bound to the other? Be to his Mother, or shee to him?

Reade you (W. Jewell) that the Mother should honour her Child, or that the Child should honoe his Mother? Which thing because Constantinus did not, but rather deposed her, he died in prison, and that worthy as Placina saith, Tanquam sacrilegus, minimaque pietatis, quippe qui ma-

Exod. 20. 

In vita Leonis. 3.

Fonacan
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Jonaras also and Euclerus tel, y he did shue up in a Monastery Marie his wife against her wil, and meried a crowned queene Theodora her handmaiden. This was the way to make him to hate holy Images. For as Jonaras telleth, In vita Constant.

he adored Images in the beginning: but after that the mind is embazed with evil deedes and wicked thoughts, it is a grieve to the eye, to see afterwardes any good remembrance. Every Saints Image is a condemnation to him that is evil.

Jewel. The Bishops and doctours of that Councell manifestly corrupted the Scriptures.

Sander. A great fault and if it be provun: and being not provun, it is a great deadly sinne for you to say it. And for my parte I have showed before, that the Scriptures were wel applied by the bishops, and that you doe untruly reproue them.

Jewel. They falsified the holy Fathers without shame.

Sander. Let vs thinke, whether it be more credible, that thire hundred and fiftie did so, or that you belye them.

Jewel
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Jewel. They said, Imago melior est quàm oratio. An Image is better then a prayer.

Sander. Here are but five Latine wordes, and yet thrice faultes are found in W. Jewel, in citing them. First they were not many who said it, but only one. And yet W. Jewel wrieth, that (they said). Next it is not wrieten melior est Imago, an Image is better, but, Maior est Imago. An Image is greater. Some things are greater then other, which yee are not better. Last of all Oratio, both signify an oacion in that place, and not a prayer, as W. Jewel hath translated it. For it foloweth immediately, Atque hoc prouidentia Dei consigit, propter idiotas homines. And this thing hath come to passe by the prouidence of God, for the simple mens sake, who can not read or understand a learned oacion.

So that the Father who spake these wordes, meant y the lively setting forth of the topic of Euphemia Martyr (where of they spake) was greater to move affections in the ignorant people, then either a learned oacion made to the song, or
of Images. of writers in bokes. And according to the same sense it is said by another man afterward, Conspectus eis sacra imaginum ex-citarunt in Sanctis viris. Holy images have stiered by a compunction or a vehement affection of the harte in holy men. But if oratio did signify twenty things, St. Ies well comming like a spier to every flower in the garden woude picke nothing but Poison out of it.

Is oratio a praiser, evry where? When Cicero was a very devout man, so he made e wyrote many e long orations. But if in examining five woordes there are foude threc faultes, what would come to passe, if I should aunswere the whole Article of St. Jewel?

Jewel. And againe, Who so euer wil not adoure the Godlie Images, accursed be he.

Sander. You have pronounced their sentence against your selfe. They said: Accursed be he, who so euer wil not adore the Divine Images. That is to say, Images belonging to God, or to his Friends: but you being more to be a iste, then a Bishop, thought to make a little spoyre,
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by calling them godly Images. And as they said it, so they might say it, for that Christ said to their Predecessors, and thereby to them, What so-ever things you bind in earth, they shall be bound in heaven.

They have bound them that refuse to adore holy Images, let them that are guilty of that evil Opinion, looke whose will loose them at the day of judgement.

Beside this, W. Jewell in divers other places, reproueth the same Councell as Childish, and at his pleasure reciteth their words, not in dedicat large, and as they were spoken, but defacing them after his maner. To all which his ungodly doing, I make this answer.

First, there is no impietie or fals-hod approv'd or decreed in that Coun-cell.

Secondly, whereas every Father one by one, spake his mind, it must not be thought, that every word there utte-red, is the determination of the whole Council: no more then every Burgesse voice or suffrage is the Acre of Parlia-
ment.

Thirdlie, the Scriptures which they bring,
of Images.

being, are better applieed for the honou- ring of Images (as I haue in part the- wed before) then they are hitherto im- puigned by W. Jewei. For he bine- geth nothing but his Bishoplie scowles against them.

Forthly, the miracles there told, as things that were wrouthe by god in the Images of his Saintes, are such, as be not against the Faith. And therefore they ought to be credited of charitable men, rather then to be laughe at. And soasmuch as I haue hitherto laid no- thing of the Miracles, which maye be wrouthe by Saints Images, it shall not be ainside to speake a little of that mater.

The Apostles wrouthe so great mi- racles in Jerusalem, and the people so magnified and honoured them, that they carried sicke and weake men into ï Arca- tes, putting them in couches and beds, ut veniente Petro, saltem umbrâ illius obumbrâ- ret quenquam illorum. To thend when Pe- ter shoule come, at the least his shadow might one the shadow some of them. Here the very shadow of S. Peter is accom- pted of vertue and power to heale men, and
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and consequently it is honoured. For whereas the ground of al honour consisteth in the minde, surely the minde lootheth for aid above nature by miracle of none other thing, then of which it judgeth to be of more worthinesse then it selve, or then any other ordinarie means of healing is.

Eccles. 38.

If then we honour the physician, when we esteeming his knowledge, loke for ordinary helpe at his hande: much more they honoured S. Peter's shadowe, who looked for miraculous helpe by approching thereunto.

And yet what thing is that shadow of his, but the coming of his body between the Sannes and those whom he overshadowed?

If then the shadow which is so, as it were by chance, occasioned, yet because it was his shadow, was able to helpe them, who in the faith of Christ (whole Apostle S. Peter was) laid themselves in the way, he could passe: being the Image of S. Peter is also a thing occasioned not only by chance, but by special devotion of them who for their afor-
tion to him, and much more to his mas-
ter, caused it to be made: why may not
it also heale them, who in the faith of
Christ (whose Apostle S. Peter is) come
to the Church, to have the only image of
S. Peter before their eyes? For as be-
ing at home, if they only pray to S. Peter
in this belief, that he now being to Christ
is able, as well as other Saints are, to
obtaine aid for them, they may and many
times have been healed by virtue which
God hath granted to his Apostle S. Pe-
ter: so, much more if with the same faith-
ful devotion a man come to Church, and
there see him selfe done, or kneel before
S. Peters Image, intending for the
better directing of his minde to S. Pe-
ter, to have his Image before his eyes,
and so to ioyne the inwarde Understanding and the outwarde Sense to-
geather: Much more this man were
like to obtaine his desire through Christ,
because he sought the more meanes to
gene strength unto his prayer.

What say we then? Doth S. Pe-
ters Image heale diseales? How say
you, W. Jewel, doth S. Peters shadow
heale
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heale diseales? Doth S. Pauls girdle or
napkin, heale diseales, and cast out Deuilles?

Doth Elizeus staffe reise vp the dead?
At the left the Prophet thought it would
have done so, and by like it had done so,
if some other unknown dispensation of
God had not stayed it.

I praire you, did not the Herb, which
grew at the feet of Christes Image, then
take Verue to heale diseales, when it
came to touche the hem of the cote of the
Image? It was therefore the Image
which gane that verue of healing to the
Herb. When I say, the Image gane ver-
ue, I meane, that Christ by the Image
gane it.

Therefore is so much honour due
to Christys visible appearing on f earth,
that not only he in his flesh doth worke
what him plealeth; but he also in his Sa-
cramences, he in his Word being prea-
ched, he in his Apostles and Servantes,
he in their napkins, he in their Images,
he in their shadowes worke their Miracles,
according to our Faith and his pleasure.

And as that most heavenly instru-
ment of Gods grace toward vs (I meane
the
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the flesh of Christ) being nighest ioyned to the Godhead, is worthy of the highest Honour of all: So all other things are worthy of more or lesse Honour, but all are worthie of some Honour, whiche so euer are made the instrumentes of Gods grace toward vs.

What meaneth then W. Jewell, to call the Miracles, reported in the Seventh Generall Counsell, to be done by Images, Idolatrous Fables? Is not that to call Eusebius, the Writer of the Tripart Hitrope, Nicephorus, Theophylactus Idolatours? For they beleued the Miracle, which was wrouthe by Christes Image in Pancade a City of Phenicia. And is Gods hand bound from that date forwarsd, that it may neuer worke any other Miracle by holie Images?

Hitherto I have answered generally to W. Jewells general objections, concerning the Seventh Counsell: but now I will bring a most evident reason, why every man ought to beleue, & to obey: the same eueth general Counsell kepe at Nicaea, under paine of everlastinge damnation.

| 16. | 5. | 3. |
| Triur. | lib. 6. | cap. 4. |
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The state of the Question at that time was, whether the Images of Christ and of his Saints might be used and honoured in the Churches, or no. They that said they might be venerated and honoured, maintained the use of their Foesabathers, and thereby were in possession. For it was impossible for Images to have been thrown down (as being said to be abused, and to be made fools) if in deed they had not been both venerated and honoured of the Christians.

Those then that threw them down, because they judged them to be abused, went about (as they thought) to amend y' abuse. But the other Christians judged it no abuse at all, and therefore withdrew the Imagebreakers. Therefore (as I said at the first) it must needs be confessed, that those were in possession of honoring Images, who defended the honoring of them. Let that be well remembered.

Again, the Imagebreakers being well assured, that in all great controversies a Generall Councell is wont to be called, endeavoring to prevent and to possess the name and Authoritie, came together so concertlie, y' it is neither known...
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men who summoned the, now what manner was present, nor what order they had, nor who approved or executed their Decrees.

It was the a thing done in the darkness, which is the sign of an evil conscience; for he that doth evil, hateth the light. Yet because it bare the name of a conventicle, the Catholices were desirous to have a just, full, and perfect Council, and thereupon they solicited Queen Elizabeth for the same purpose.

She being persuaded to have a Council called, causeth Adrian the Bishop of Rome and the other Patriarchs to be certified thereof: who all agreed upon the time and place. And when there were together about three hundred and fifty bishops, beside many Abbots and other learned men, they decreed, as other Councils, especially the Sixth had given them a President, and as the universal practice of the Church was, that the holy Images ought to be adored.

This Council was confirmed and registered for a known lawful General Council throughout all Christendome, and hath borne the name of the Seventh
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Generall Counsell so generally, that Heret-
rikes can not doe otherwise, then so to-
cal it, if they wil be understood where-
of they speake.

Now if this were a lawfull Generall Counsell, it ought to be obeyed and bele-
ued. If it were not lawfull, how shall we
knowe what is a lawfull Counsell? Or what had the first General Counsell being
keepe under Constantinus the Great, which this Counsell had not? That was
kept at Nicea so was this.

Whether that was summoned by a
Pope of Rome (without whose Authoritie
the old Decrees will no Counsell to be
available) or by an Emperor, whomc the
Protestantes would have to be cheefe in
that kind, or by both: this also was sum-
mened by Constantinus the Emperor, Irene
the Empresse, and Authorized by Adrianus the
Pope of Rome.

In first there were three hundred and
eightene Bishops: here were moe. There,
the matter in controversie was persiflie dissected,
and so was it here: in so much that much
more is now extant of this Disputation,
then of that.

There
of Images.

There, were the foure cheef Patriarches, the same where here. There, sentence was ghen for that believe, vte, and custome, which the Church had observed before: so was it done here. That decree was put in executi- on, so was this.

Against that Council the Heretickes made false Conuenticles, so did they against this. That prevailed in the end, so did this: in so much that all Churches in Christendom were again filled with images, and they were again honoured until these our daies.

What is it then why the first General Council was good, and the Seuenth being in all points like it, was not good? W. Jewell would say, that in the First Council the Word of God prevailed, and in the Second it was oppressed. But as the Arians would not confesse, that the Word of God prevailed in the First Council: so they are Heret- tiques who affirms, that the word of God was oppressed in the Later Coun- cill.

And I praise you, what a franticke madness is this, for a private man to sitte E viij judge
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judge once a whole Generall Counsell? Was it therefore gathered out of all the world, that private me might afterward control it? They that made that decree, laid it was agreeable to Gods word, that holy Images should be honoured. And therein stood the chefe controvercie. And shall it nowe be lawfull to saie, that they judged am wel?

A judge comming to site bypon a weightie matter, hath a solemne order prescribed to him by the law, the which he is bound to follow. If now he doe follow that order, shall his sentence be afterward revoked, because he is laid not to have given sentence as the cheefe would have wished? The seventh Counsell kepe the same order in comming together, in examining matters, in making Canons, and in departing home, y which all other General Counsels had kepe.

Beside many other thinges, which this Seventh Generall Counsell hath common with all other Counsels, it hath this singular Prerogative, that, none other Counceel is knowne to have had so many present in it, who recanted openly their
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their former error, as this Council had.

For whereas there had been a false Synode kept clam and latenter, priusly and in corners before, in the which certaine Bishoppes had upon their owne private and Schismatical opinion decreed against holy Images, many of the same Bishoppes being afterward better instructed, went from that their error, & in the Seventh Council were againe reconciled to the Church. As Basilius, the Bishopp of Anzius, Theodorus, the Bishope of Myzon, Theodosius, the B. of Amopium, Hypatius, the B. of Nicaea, Leo, B. of Rhodes, Gregorie, B. of Pilsidia, an other Gregorie, B. of Pessinuntum, an other Leo, B. of Ico

num, Nicolas, B. of Hierapolis, and an other Leo, B. of Carpath, and Gregorius, Bishope of Cesarea.

All these reconciled in one Council, confessing that they erred through ignorance, and that they were returned to the truth by the Doctrin of the Apostles, and of the Fathers.

Gregorius of Cesarea repeting after the first Action was ended, in the second Action said: Quandocuidem minores iste catus Actione 2. idem fol. 479.
Of the honouring

idem sentit, didici & instruxeram sum, quo hea
sit veritas quanunc existimatur & predicatur.

For, so much as this whole companie,
doe both speake and iudge one and the
same thing, I have learned & am instru-
cred, that this which is now thought &
uttered, is the truth.

If so many noble and reverend Bi-
shoppes were not ashamed to be instru-
cred better, and to recant, specially when
they sawe above three hundred men so
twile, and learned, and veruouse, to a-
gree togetheuer: what doe we accomplre
that a childish companie of Council (as
Mr. Jewell vouchesafeth to call them)
whose learning and consent tourned o-
thers from errour to the truth?

The question is, whether Images
may be honoured. The General Coun-
cel bringeth forth first the holy Scriptures,
next the Ancients Canons, among the which
there is one, yea two or three, in the fift
General Council, which speake lauda-
able of honouring Images, and call them
Venerandas, worthy of reverence. Third-
ly, they bring forth y practice and the judge-
ment of the Ancient Fathers. Last of a1

1.  
2.  
Can. 73.
& 82 & 300.
3.  
4.
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by consent of all the Patriarches, and bishops they conclude, that boigne images ought to be honoured.

who now may unjustly pretend, that they followed not the Scriptures, seeing the Scriptures have given them a higher authorticie to teach and feed Christes Sheepe, then any private man hath?

For they comming togethether in the name and power of Christ, out of all Nations, do represent the whole Catholique Church; even as the Apostles and Priests at Jerusalem, did beare the person of all the Mystical bodie of the Church.

Now Christ saith, if any man heare not the Church, let him be rather as an heathen and a Publicane. The Church speaketh in those Reuerend Bishops and Fathers, & by them it expoundeth to vs, that when God forbiddeth the making and worshipping of Images, he forbiddeth the Honour of Latria, which is due to God alone, to be genere to Images, And forbiddeth all of making of Idols, & of waten or bile pictures called αγαλματις, such as also the first General consel doth forbid. But Images of Christ, of our Ladie, of the Apostles, of Mar-

Math. 28.

Math. 18.

Math. 18.

Acts 15.
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tips, Confessours and Virgins are not
forbidden to be made, or to be conveniently worshipped.

Thus both the Church teach us in
that and other Councils: Shall we hear
it, or no? For my part I say, He that
heareth it not, shall be unto me as a Heathen
and a Publican.

Let us now add hereunto, what
Notable men were about that time and
after, who at reverence that Decree of
the Seventh Council, or if some of them
were before, yet they are well known to
have ben of the same mind. Their names
are: Germanus, Paulus, Tarasisus, Archbishops of Constantinople: Beda, A-
do, Haimo, Jonas Aurelianus, Damascenus,
Theophylactus, Strabo, Anastasius, Bibliotheca-
rius, Remigius, Theodorus Studites, Nicephorus,
Photius, Procopius, Euthymius, Zonaras Bal-
samon, Sigibertus, Metaphrastes, Lanfrancus,
Anselmus, Algerus, Guimundus, S. Bernard,
Ivo, Rupertus, Petrus Comestor, Gratian, Pe-
trus Lombardus, Alexander de Hales, Hugo
Cardinalis, Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas of As-
quine, Bonaventura, Dionysius Carthusianus,
Hugo and Richardus de Santo Victore.
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what reckon I up one by one?
At the least six General Councils which
followed after, beside many more Pro-
nvincial Councils, yea at the Sopes of
Rome, at the Bishopps, Doctours,
Pastours and Clergie, at the common
people both of Greece and Latines,
Cities, Provinces, Kingdomes, are
known to have reverence and obeyed
that Seventh General Council.

what like Authority can M. Jewe
shew for his Opinion? Where are his
Patriarches, his Bishopps, his Coun-
ceils, his Doctours, his Writers of His-
tories, and his Churches? Yea where
are his Cities, his Provinces, his King-
domes? Now I know his common
place, that this pompe of Names need
not nor, and the time was barbarous.
Antichrist ruled, the flocke of Christ is a
small company, and such other leaves, the
which be as Heretical, as his Opinion
is in condemning the Seventh Coun-
cell.

If there be no way least unto the
Church to end Controvercyes, we are
Dew, 17.
woze then the Jewes, who had a living
high
Of the honouring high Judge among them, then the Romans, whose chief pretent was the lively voice of the Civil Law, yea we are worse then any Common weale in al the world: in every of the which there is a meane to knowe in this life, what must be at the length trusted unto. Doubtlesse the Churche of Christe can not be in worse case, then other Common weales are.

If then there be an order in Chrisies Common Weale, whereby controversies may be ended: if the order be so much the better, by how much the Governour is the wiser: certainly the judge is not without a tongue, nor without a meane, to applie the Generall and indefinite Authoritie and rule of Gods word vnto the circumstances of the presence Controversie: nor unable to conferre the holy Scriptures togethether, nor he is not so Contemprible, that when the sentence is geaven, it may be revo- ked by private mens vsurping, and that because the Scriptures be not of Private interpretation.

If any Supreme Judge be in al the Church
Church, when the Pope, the Patriarchs, the Bishops, the Abbots, and Priours, and the learned Divines together, and when the Emperor, the Empress, the Legats of Kingdomes, of free States, and of Christian Provinces, resist them, if any Judge, I say, be at all, if any Voice of speaking of the Church may be: in that, and such other assemblies, that Judge, and that Voice must be found. And having once given sentence, that must be obeyed.

Therefore he is without all peradventure in the state of everlasting damnation, who after the Seventh General Counsell hath defended, that Holy Images ought to be adored, with such convenient honour as is due to holy representations: that notwithstanding both teach, write, defend, or thinke the Contrarie.

***
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That M. Jewel himself bringeth such reasons for worshipping Bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar, because he saith they are the Image of Christes Bodie and Bloud, as may right well serve for the worshipping of all holy Images.

The. 15. Chapt.

As nothing is more necessary to a lyer, then to remember what he hath said before (that his tale may still agree with itself) so if he be a man full of words, nothing is more impossible to a lyer, then to avoid contradiction in his owne tale: because many words detect many circumstances, the which in a lyre, will not all stand togethther.

M. Jewel was so careful to ridde away the duty of Godly honour from the Sacrament of Christes Bodie and Bloud, that whilsts he would needs expound
pound the wordes of Adoration (which
the Fathers euery where attribute on-
to the Sacrament of the Aulcer) of such
worshippe and reverence, as may be-
long to holy Signes and Images, and
not of such as belongeth to Christes own
substance : in the meane time he is con-
streined to graunt, that some kind of A-
doration is due to creatures, as to bread
and wine, in that respecte as (by his
doctrine) they are Images onely of Chri-
tes Bodi and Blood. Wherby Mr. Jewell
is againe fallen into a new trouble, how
to saue him selfe from genuing worship to
al holy Images, the which yet he hath
hitherto denied unto them.

Al our writing hath been these ma-
ny yeeres, to trie who maketh the Lie
in Religion : whether the Popish Ca-
tholiques, or els the new sprying Protes-
tantes. I say, the Lie is made by the
new sprying Protestantes, and that I
prove, because their tale, to wite, their
belief and Doctrine, can by no meanes
hang togeather.

Which thing to be so, as euery Ar-
gument that I may chaunce upon doth
easily
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easly shewe: so at this time writing of Images, I will declare his Doctrine to be disagreeable to it selfe in the matter of Images.

Iewel. The old Fathers in their Writings commonly call the Sacrament a Representation, a Remembrance, a memorie, an Image, a Likenes, a Samplar, a Token, a Signe, and a Figure.

From in the eight Article he saith, Neither doe we onlie adore Christe, as verie God, but also worship & reverence the Sacrament and holie mysterie of Cristes Bodie.

Sander. Nowe saie I, if the Sacrament be an Image, a Signe, or a Representation of Christes Bodie, & yet not his own Bodie in substance (as the Sacramentaries teach) if also not only the Bodie of Christ it selfe, which is in Heaven, but the verie Sacrament and Image of Christes Bodie be of Jewishe, and of his Companions worshipped and reverenced: thereof it doth follow, that an Image of a holy thing, which is not in substance, yet may be worshipped and reverenced of the newe Gospellers.

But
But the Images of Christ suffering death, and of St. Laurence laid upon the gridire, are images of a holy thing which is absent in substance: therefore the Images of Christ and of St. Laurence may be worshipped & reverenced of the Protestants them selves. What can be answered to this reason, but only that Christ's Sacraments are an other kind of Images then those be, which are painted and graven by men?

In deede to vs they are a farre other kind of Images, because we teache the truch it self to be conteined in the Sacraments, which is signified by them. For when it is saide at the time of baptizing, I baptize thee &c. we say that then wasching is both signified in word, and wrought in deede. But those that thinke the Sacraments neither to conteine, nor to gene any grace, but only to signe and seale vp in the harts of the faithful the benefits otherwise geneu by Christ, they make the Sacraments to be only Signes and Images, & therefore I see not why they should stand so much upon the difference that is betwene the holy Images, which are
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are in the Sacraments, and those which
are painted.

But yet I wil now declare, that
this reverence and worship, which W.
Jewel allowed to some images, is not
only restrained to the Sacraments by
his own doctrin, but may be more large-
ly taken. For he goeth forward to an
other example in these words.

Jewel. We worship the word of
God according to this counsel of Anatha-
fius: Dominica verba attente audiant & fi-
deliter adoren. Let them diligently heare
and faithfully worship the wordes of God.
Briefly we worship other like things in
such religiouse wise vnto Christ belonging.

Sander. Hitherto W. Jewell to whose
words I adde, that an image represe-
ting Christes birth or death is a like
thing to Gods words, in such religiouse
wise belonging vnto Christ: because it
bringeth Christes death to our hart by
the eye, as the words wherein his death
is preached, doe bring the same death to
our hart by the eare.

Neither is there any other diffe-
rence
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rence, sauing that the epe is the higher and more worship sense, and the Image seruerth all men that can see (of what tonge oz knowledge soever they be) but the words readen oz preached serue none but those, who understand the tongue wherein they are pronounced, and not all those, if perhaps they be obscure, as most words of the scripture are: therefore W. Jewel must as wcl worship the painted oz grauen Image belonging to Chrift, as he doth worship the words of the Gospel which belong to Chrift.

Or wil he divide his worship, when the reason of worshipping is all one? Why doth he worship Chriftes words? him self faith, because they belong to Chrift in a religious wise.

Looke then how large your cause of worshipping is, so large must your wor-
ship be. But Chriftes owne Image be-
longereth to him in a religious wise (for it is a guise of Religion agreeable to the Law of Nature, receauned in very Pri-
mitive Church which maketh vs to set up Chriftes Image) therefore Chriftes Image
Of the knouring Image is to be worshipped by the force of M. Jewels doctrine.

Jewel. Doubtles it is our dutie, to adour the body of Christ in the word of God, in the Sacrament of Baptism, in the mysteries of Christes body and blood, and wheresoeuer we see any step or token of it.

Note. Sander. I adde hereunto: we see a steppe and token of Christes body, when we see his Image painted or graven: for the painted or graven image of a thing, is a toké and steppe at the lest of that thing: therefore by M. Jewels doctrine it is our dutie to adore Christes body in the painted Image thereof.

Yea farther: A steppe is much lesse, then an Image. For a steppe is only a token of the foote, whereas the Image is a token of the whole bodily shape. But M. Jewel confessed, that even in any steppe or toké of Christes body, his body ought to be of dutie adowred: therefore M. Jewell by right reason must confess, that much more in the whole Image shape of Christes body, his body ought so evadonred.

Neither can M. Jewel and all his brethren
of Images.

hetween ever avoid this argument.
Wherefoever we see any steepe or token
of Christes body, it is our dutie to adoure
Christes body therein. These are W.
Jewels own words. But in Christes
painted image we see at the least a steppe
and token of Christes body: therefore it
is our duty, to adoure Christes body in a
painted Image.

Note Misters, what W. Jewels must
now say: either he must deny Christes
painted Image to be the steppe or token
of his body (and then how is that the i-
mage of his body, which is not so much
as a steppe of his body) or els he must
graune, that it is our duty to adoure
Christes body in his painted Image.
Now y can not be done, excepte Christes
body be some way or other in his painted
Image. For y ching can not be adoured
in the Image, which at al is not there.

If Christes body be in his painted
Image by any meane (as in bede it is
there by y like shape thereof) then he that
destroyeth or pulleth downe Christes
painted Image, destroyeth or pulleth
down y thing, wherein (by W. Jewels
y II doctrine)
Of the honouring doctrine it was his duty, to have adored Christes body. But that must needs be a filchy, an impious, and an unnatural deed, to pull down that, wherein he ought of duty to have adored Christes body: therefore, being by M. Jewels doctrine preached and practised in Sarilbury Diocle, the painted Image of Christ ought to be pulled down and destroyed, by his doctrine also, a filchy, an impious, and an unnatural deed ought to be committed.

How is it then possible, to reconcile these two propositions? It is our duty to adore Christes body, wheresoeuer any step or token is of it, etc. It is also our duty, to pull down and to destroy Christes painted or graven Image, wherein a step and token of Christes body must needs be. And so by M. Jewels doctrine, it is our duty to adore Christes body in this painted Image, which painted Image it is our duty to pull down & to destroy. Moreover M. Jewels saith in another place.

Iewel. The Sacraments in this sort are the flesh of Christ, and are so understood and beleued, and adoured. But the whole honour
honour resteth not in them, but is passed over to the things that be signified.

Sander. Mark well Mr. Jewels words: for by the self same reason we reverence, worship or adore holy Images, yet so, that the whole honour resteth not in the, but is passed over from them, to the things that be signified. And therefore as Mr. Jewels doth honour the Sacrament without danger of Idolatry, so doe we honour holy Images without fear of committing Idolatry.

But this above al is to be noted. Mr. Jewels doth not give to the Sacrament of Christes supper any honour at all: for though he is desirous to have it honoured, but only he alloweth it such honour as is due to an Image, to the he may therby take away the greater honour of Latria, which the Catholicks doe worthily gene unto it. For if he were disposed to honour it in deed as an Image, he wold honour other holy images also. But now whereas he denyeth any honour at all to be due to other holy images: Yet he genceth the honour of an Image to the body of Christ, in the Sacrament,
Of the honouring

not because he delighteth in honouring
that Image or any other Image, but be-
cause he is sure that if the Sacrament may
be honoured only as an Image, then it
shall not be honoured as the thing it
self.

Now be it he is deceived even in that
point also. For whereas there are two
kind of Images, one which is the Image
of the outward shape, an other which is
the image of the inward nature and sub-
stance: for as much as the Sacrament of
the Altar is not an Image of Christ's
personal outward shape, but of his body
& blood, which are the names of his na-
ture and substance: And being there is no
Image of nature (as I shewed before)
beside that wherein the self same nature
is, which was in the first pattern: it is
clear, that the Sacrament of Christ's
Supper being called by the name of Christ's
natural body, is an Image of Christ's
natural substance, and therefore the
honour of a natural Image (as not only
of an Artificial Image) is due to it. This
point were worthy to be prosecuted, if it
were not somewhat beside our purpose.
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An other thing that I intend to bur- den M. Jewell withal in this argument, are his own words in the first Article where he faith.

Jewell. The very names of the old godly Fathers are worthy of much honour.

Sander. Judge, that the names of the old godly Fathers are attributed to their Images.

For the Images of S. Augustine, and of S. Hiero are commonly called S. Augustine, and S. Hiero: therefore their Images are, by M. Jewell's own confession, worthy of much honour. For if the very names of the old godly Fathers be worthy of much honour, wheresoeuer their names be, there is that which is worthy of much honour. Seeing then their names be in their Images, their Images (or the least for that very came) are worthy of much honour.

Here it is to be noted, that whereas the Images of the Saints are called by their names, that thing cometh not only to passe through the mere ambiguity of the word (as when it chanceth sometime a private man to be surnamed King, who in deed is not in any point a King) but the
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the Images are called by the names of
the things themselves, because they belong
to them, following and imitating their shape
and likeness, and having somewhat in the agreea-
ble to that person, whereof they take the name:
In so much that the very chiefe nature of
an Image is, to be like unto that thing,
which it goeth about to express. And it
is made altogether with this intent from
the beginning to be his image, whose shape
it representeth.

Therefore seing the names of the old
godly Fathers come to their images, not
by chance, but upon determinate purpose and
counsel, neither without cause, but for the
likeness of shape, which is in them: there is
some true cause in Images, why they may
be called by the names of the old godly
Fathers, and consequently there is some
true cause, why they should be worship
of honour, and that (if M. Jewel say well)
of much honour.

Last of all leauing M. Jewels own
words (whereof we have said sufiicietly)
let vs come also unto his deedes. What
shall we say that in the self same Reply
which he made against D. Harding, and
wherein
wherein he burdenseth him, as though, whereas God had said thou shalt make to
thyself no graven image, Yet D. Harding
should say, thou shalt make to thy self gra-
uen Images, what shall we now say, ye in
that Reply W. Jewel hath often tymes
grauen Images: Yea such images, as are
in deed warren, filthie and unhonest.
Looke he that listeth at the end of
W. Jewels Answere to D. Hardings
Preface. And at the end of the xix. xxiiij.
and xxv. Article. There and in other pla-
ces he shall find, a graven Image in W. Je-
wels booke: And that such a one, as is
meete for a brother, I warrant you.
That I may not speake of the
Antiques and Boggons heads which be
there (which are Fools, because they
hauue no truth extant in the nature of
things) in the places before named
a desperate naked boye is sette forth
in such soft, that an honest man would
goe backwarde and couer it with his
cloke.
This Image was grauen in wood, or
in some like matter, before it could be
printed. And W. Jewel had the oversight
of the
Of the honouring of the print himself. Neither did it fail out by chance, that such a foule Image escaped him. For if the Printer had brought him the blessed signe of Christes manhood spread upon the Cross, he would have espied it out of hand: Yea, he would have stormed at him not a little, and have caused him to have amended the same as a great fault.

But now when a bawdie Image was prostituted to the Readers eye, the which might provoke him to unclean thoughts, that Image though it were graven first in wood, and afterwards lette forth in white and black: Yet it pleased him right well, and was lette to stand still.

O the judgements of God. He that hath pulled down Christes Image, and the signe of his healthfull Cross in all Churches and Chapels where he might come, now letteth forth unto vs a most bawdy spectacle, and thinketh he hath do wel inough.

I can not tel (Mr. Jewel) whether you being advisedly asked hercuf, would have said in plain words, that this foule Image were to be preferred before Christes
of Images.

But surely in that you were so blind in your dedes, as not to see and to cobyder this abhominable image, whereas you looked so exactly to the printing of your booke & wold so quikly have fou’d fault with a good Image: that is an Argument, that you are genen over to a levvede mind, and are void of al grace, as one who speaketh against good Images, and in his fact permitting naughtye representations: as though God had only forbidden the good Images to be made, and had only allowed the evil.

The sixth General Council was of a farre diverse mind. For it thought, that the Images of Christ and of his Crosse ought to be allowed, and that bawdy Images ought to be forbidden. Whereof the Fathers decreed after this sorte. Facile sensus corporei, quæ funt in animam derivant &c., the senses of the body do quikly bring unto the minde those things, which belong unto the: therefore we do decree, that hereafter by no means there shall be painted any Images in tables, or otherwise sette forth, that shall bewitch (or allure the eyes to evil) or corrupt the mind, or inflame it to filthy pleasures.

If any
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If any man shall doe this hereafter, lette him be accused, or, be excommunicated.

I beseeche our Lord at the length to touche some Protestants hearts in such sort, that he well returning to himselfe, may accompt it better, humbly to behold the Image of Christ crucified with the Catholicks: then with the Sacramentaries first to deface Christes image, and afterward to sette forth other filthy Images meter for common stewes, then for booles which intreat of Religion.

God graunte also, that some few at the least may perceave, how maruellously these men are forsaken of God. Who whereas they would seeme to correct our faults, to be right holy in their words: yet they are so without grace in their deeds, that both they themselves & other may well perceave, that in very deed they preferre any thing, be it never so vile, before Christ, in that they preferre any vile Image before his Image. For the same proportion that is between Image and Image, is between thing and thing.

Our Christes Image is thrown down
downe, and a bawdie Image is sette
foorth: Therefoor bawdinesse is more
esteemed with them in truthe, then Chrixt
himself.

Awake awake good Countrie men,
and see what which can noe be hiddē. See
and judge. Judge and amend. Chrixt is
in the lippes, but if he were in the herte,
a zeale so fervent would be reised in him,
who weighed this matter as it ought to
be weighed, that he would beleue: If e-
uer the arce of painting or of graving
were worthy to be suffered in any com-
mon weale, it shoulde specially be suffered
for Chrixtes sake, and be applied to the
honour of Chrixt and his Saints. For if
those arces did not vs the service the ho-
nour of noble men, every man would not
make such haste to have his own and his
friends Image painted or grauen.

But seing all the world accompt it
glorious to have their Images made,
so Godes love lette that poore man
Jesus Chrixt be thought worthy of one
place among you. And lette his Images also be allowed, ye not
atwel as other Noble mens Images,
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yet at the least as well as the Images of
the meaner sort. Or at the vertemost, let
not Christes Image be accompyed more
unlawfull, then such bawdie Images,
as W. Jewell hath commended to vs in
his Replie.

Whether it be profitable or no, to haue I-
mages set vp in Churches, and to per-
mitte them to be worshipped.


Sure that haue thought it no un-
lawfull thing to make Images, nor
utterly unlawful to use some re-
curence unto them, yet haue thought it
unmer, to haue them commonly sette
vp in Churches, lest the ignorant peo-
ple might perhaps be draven thereby
unto idolatry, or to a superficious wor-
shipping of outward and visible things:
where-
of Images.

whereas God being a spirit, should be worshipped in spirit and truth: In which point M. Jewel is quicker and peremptory.

Jewel. The best remedy in this behalf and most agreeable with God's word is, utterly to abolish the cause of the evil. So Ezechias brake in pieces the brazen serpent, Epiphanius rent in sunder the painted veile. Theodosius commanded the Image of our Saviour to be take downe, wherefoeuer it should be found.

Sander. Of * Ezechias, and of * Epiphanius I spake in theyr due places. Yet this much I thought good to add in this place, affirming M. Jewel to be overthrown by his own example. For as Ezechias threw not down all Images for the abuse which was committed about one, no more may M. Jewel verely abolish all Images from our Churches, though some one be abused. But as Ezechias left the Cherubins in the Holy of Holies, as he suffered the Altars in the Temple, yea the Temple it self to stand (which was made to be an obscure image of Christ's true Altar (or true Temple): So that one image being broke I which
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which happened to be abused, at the rest
of our Images ought to stand stil in our
Churches, and to be conueniently wor-
shipped, because they represent honou-
rable Serenities and Truthes.

The Law of Theodosius is misrepor-
ted, & misenglished: Misreported because
it was meant by him, y such honour was
due to y Signe of our Saviour (which is
the Signe of y Crosse) y he would in no
wise have it painted, or grave on the ground,
left by treading on it, dishonour should be
don thereby. The words of which law
I alleged before out of y Code of Justian,
where y law was safest preserved above
these thousand yeres in y light of al y world.
And y is a mother testimony to assure our
selves of, then y which Crinitus reciteth
imperfectly, I can not tell whence; but (as
it maie be thought) out of some blinde
copie uneruly wriete, yet Crinitus doch
not wriete the contrary of that which is in
the Civil Law, but only he hath left out
the word humi, upon the ground.

Againe, M. Jewell hath erred, so as
y lest wold make others to erre by engli-
shing, tolli, to be také down, where as in y
place
of Images.

place it signifieth to be také vp. For ἡ ἐπι-
percours meaning was, that whersoever the 
Signe of our Saviour was found pain-
ted or graven under mens secte, it should 
be taken vp. and saued from tredding on.

The which thing will appere the moore 
evidently, if we consider the sixth Gener-
al Counsell decreed the same thing, saying: 
Cruces figuræ quæ à nonnullis in solo a pàumi: o 
sunt, omum deleri iubemus. We commaund the 
figures of the crosse (which are made of som 
men in the ground & in the pavement) to 
be utterly taken away, or to be put out.

If the Counsell had staid here, it had 
temed a text alone for Mr. Jewel. But the 
cause of that Decree followeth, ne inclendi 
cœculcatione victorienobis trophœi iniuria affis-
tiatur. Least the triumphant signe of the 
conquest (gotten for vs) should be injui-
ried by their treading upon it, who should 
walke vp and doun. And per farther the 
same decree coseffeth the Fathers of that 
Counsell, tribuere adoratio viuisca Crucis & 
mente, & sermone, & sensu. To geue the honor 
of adoration to the Crosse (of Christ) which 
causeth vs to live (a spiritual life) both in 
mind, in word, and in understanding.
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And therefore witnessing that they
adozation by an outward Decree, they
wil, no signe or figure of the Cross be
made or suffered upon the ground, least
injury be done to it, while it is trod upo.
And the very same meaning had those
Emperours, whom Ὺ. Jewel, according
to his lying spirit, maketh to command
the signe or the Image of our Saviour
to be taken downe: whereas they com-
manded it to be taken vp, for the ho-
nor they gave unto it. But taking vp,
is taking downe with him, to whom vp
is downe, white is black, and good is
evil.

Here also it is to be noted, that Ὺ.
Jewel Englisheth Signum Salvatoris, the Im-
age of our Saviour, notwithstanding
he had denied before, that the Signe of the
Cross (which is the Signe of our Sa-
vour) was an Image. Thus it is by his
judgement both an Image, & no Image.

That order which the Council of
Ments taketh for altering or taking a-
way of Images which be abused, is mis-
liked of no man. But our question is ge-
nerally of all Images: whether it be expedieīt
to per-
of Images.

to permit Images to be worshipped, or no. For now I take it pioned and granted, that Images may both be made, and reuerced, according to the desert of the thing represented. And if al me knew al things and were perfic, I thinck fewe would doute, but that Images might be permitted to be worshipped: but men being as they be, the question is uneccesarily coceased, whether it were good to permit the worshipping of Images in publick Churches, or no.

In the whiche question we must consider, on the one side the daunger of Idolatry, or of superstitiose worship, and also the ignorance of the people: on the other side, the truth of our faith, and the profite which commeth by images. And according as the causes doe most vehemently presse vs, thereafter we must be ruled.

I say and doute nothing thereof, that it is much better to permitte the vvoorshippinge of holy representations and Images in Churches, then to imbarre altogether the same, by taking away images. For herein standeth the point of the question, as now the new Gospellers make it. They to take away
Of the honouring the use of worshipping images, would have no Images at all sette vp in the Churches. We albeit we setten vp Images principally to be worshipped, not to be worshipped at all for their owne sake, yet seeing a certaine worship maiestfully be gotten to them for the churches sake whiche they signifye, we judge it much better, to let them be worshipped (teaching the people what worshippe is due to them) then wholy to abolish the great profit which cometh by Images.

And surely it in comparison of the danger of Idolatrye (which is little or none at all) the profit be certain and evident, even as, for the abuse which is daily committed about the holy Scriptures, we doe not daungerly take away and abolishe the holy Scriptures: even so the particular abuse of any one Image, or of some few, should never move vs to remoue all Images from our Churches.

Now it remaineth, that I must prove this danger of Idolatrye to be small, or not to be such as ought to be esteemed, and the profit of images to be so great, that it ought to be of great estimation.
of Images.

In every question which shall be circumspectly handled, the particular circumstances must be respected of the men, of the time, or place, & of the thing itself.

Concerning our question, I must consider the state of the Church at this present, not busying my selfe with that which is past, or is to come. For the state of the Church might have been otherwise in the old time, and maie be otherwise hereafter, and then other men heretofore might, and hereafter maie, give an other judgement in this very matter, whereof I speake presently.

But surely if evere time were, when Images might be permitted to be reverence and honord, this is it. For now, although all the Catholikes in Christen- dom held their peace, which yet they doe not, the deves & doctrine of the new Gospellers against Images are so wel knowen, and so spread throughout all places, that it is not lightly possible for any people to be deceavd in honouring Images so muche. Yea rather it is daily sene, that many honour them neuer a whit, and beginne plainlie to contenue them.
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And those which remaine good, have yet alwaies a certaine feare of their dedes, so so much as they know themselves to be repzoned in that behalf.

2. Besides this, when the ryme was most quiet, he that should see the Seuen sweeping copwebbes from them, and the Parish Clerke putting the Crosse to homely under his cloke, until he came where it were to be set upon the banner, might well perceave a great difference betwene that meane reverence which was geuen to Images, in comparison of that which both was geuen, and was due to the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar.

If then the people were neuer so much bent, and now be so little bent to reverence images, shall we now help forward their ignorance, and hasten them to error? Again, when the question is, not only concerning the facte or deed, but also concerning the Law and right, if the one of the twaine must needs be defaced, it is lesse evil, to suffer some one to doe amisse, then to falsifie the whole Law and right it selfe.
That Images may be made & permitted, it is the Law of Nations, & therefore undoubtedly a certain principal ordinance, and Law of God. Likewise, that such Images as represent a truth worthy of honour, are in that respect to be regarded, and in some part honoured, it is a truth of the Law of Nature, and also of God's Law as it hath been proved before.

This Law then and this right of God's truth being general in itself, ought not to be hindered or stopped, although it chance that one or twain take hurt by the misfortune therof: sithens it is worse, that God's Law should be in danger to be pronounced wrongfull and false, then that some one man should be deceived. For if Images should be forbidden generally to be worshipped, the matter would shortly grow to this opinion, that Images may not be worshipped at all, which is an error in doctrine.

When the faith and intent of him that worshippeh the Image is good, as when he mindeth to worship only one God, & to shew his good affection to his glorious Saints,
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Saintes, what so ever is done with this
mind (so that Sacrifice be not made to
Images) it can be no Idolatric. And
therefore the danger of idolatry is not
great. For none of the common peo-
ple can make external Sacrifice. And
inward Sacrifice to the Image they doe
not make, if they be of this minde, to be-
lieue one God, & to honour his Saintes
but as his friendes and seruants.

And surely, if it would please any
noble man in England to examin a thou-
sand poore men, and to geue them no cap-
tious question of purpose (as some maliti-
ously do) he shall find them all of this mind
to beleue and worshippe onely the blessed
Trinitie as one God, and al others as
seruants to him. And as for Priestes,
who make the publique Sacrifice, it is
certaine that they neither doe make any
Sacrifice to Images, nor can doe it, be-
cause the rule and Canon of their Masse-
booke doth direct them to make their sa-
crifice to God alone. If men were of
good conscience, and would rest in the truth,
these reasons might shew unto them suf-
ficiently, that the danger of Idolatry is
not
of Images.

not great. For no outward act is so properly belonging to God (beside external Sacrifice) but the same may be done to other things without any danger of Idolatrie. And therefore although the people do knele before an image (as they also doe before Princes) or do put of their cappes, or do light a taper or candle before them, shewing the Saint's to be those lights whose worke do shine before men, that God in beautie may be glorified: If all this while they be of this mind, to acknowledge but one God, there is no Idolatrie committed.

And that thing (to say, why there is but one God) we preach, they protest daily in their belief, and hope in their hart, if they be not utterly become Insidels, of whom we now speake nor, but onely we say, that there is no sufficient feare of Idolatrie, among faithful Christians, for which Images ought to be utterly abolisht.

In this behalf, I can but offer you choice to Mr. Jewel, or to any other of his breath, as asking them whether they will have the Christian people considered as of a good & strong faith, and as free men from all Idolatrie (whence
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(whereunto Christ hath redeemed them)
which may be quickly seduced and easily caried away from
the truth. If he consider the Christian people as of a good faith, and as delivered by Christ from all Idolatry: then seeing there is in them no just scare of idolatry, the Images of Saints may be lawfully worshipped, because the worshippers be safe.

If they will consider the Christians as weake and fraile, and make them like unto the old Jews and Pagains, they surely do great iniurie to Christ, who promised to be mercifull to their synnes, & to deliver them from Babylon, Egypt, Ædumæa, & to be short, from all the Idols and abuses of Gentils. The which promise was fulfilled by Christ, causing the Idols to be first thrown out of their harts, and afterward out of the Temples of all Nations.

[Erve 31.]
Ero illis in Deum (faith God) & ipsi erunt
mihi in populâ. I will be to them for (their) God, and they shalbe to me for (my) people. That is to say, I will be to them, not only their God, but also my purpose and
intent is so to be their God, as to be & to continue to the last end of all their affiace.
And they shall so be my people, that I will have none other for my people. For this phrase in Deum, and in populum, doth signify a being to the end, without change or revocation.

As then the Church of God was prophesied to be one over all the world, and confirmed of Christ to be Actie built upon a hill, which cannot be hidden, so that notable and famous company of Christiæs, who the Turks, Saracês, & Tartariæs have alwaies known: that knoweth multitude which encreaseth from the time that they have had Churches, have set up Images in them, that multitude, I lay, compared for his number to the dust of the earth, and to the sand of the sea (which consisteth of rude and ignorant persons for the most part) must of necessitie continue the people of God, and he must continue their God, because the word of God can not fail.

If then these Christiæs which have alwaies lived in Greece, in Italie, in Spaine & in such other places, have the promise to
Of the honouring
to be Gods people: seeing they have had
Images in their Churches, and have
had them in great price, as it is proued
before: it can not be, that these images
should become Idols, for they that ho-
nour Idols are no more Gods people.

And verely although the woorde
that folow in Jeremie, and in S. Paule,
be true many waies, yet I thinke cer-
tainly they are truer no one other way,
then in this, y the Christians shall never
again become Idolatours. For thus it is
written: And every man shall not teach his
neighbour, nor every man his brother, saying,
Know the Lorde: because all men shall know
me from the lesser of them to the greater, be-
cause I will be mercifull to their iniquities,
and I will not now remember their sinnes.

Behold, whereas many things nede
to be taught, yet this onething is so war-
ranted by God himselfe, that no man
shall nede to say to his neighbour, Cognos-
see Dominum. Know the Lord. For God
himselfe taketh this charge upon him,
to prouide that every brother, to witte,
every Christian shall be taught by God
himselfe, that God is his Lord, & yt he shall
neither
neither have nor worship any other god.

He therefore that now judgeth God's people to be as prone to idolatry as the Jewes were, and therefore will have them to make no images, or to worship rather obscure and darker shadowes, as the Jewes did in their Holy of Holies, then plain and evident images, as we now doe, he is injurious to Christ's grace, & contumelious to his blood, and perfidious in denying the performance of his promise. The Jewes were kept from evident and express images, because they were either hard hearted, or mercurial and scrupulous. And therefore the use & liberty of the lawe of Nature was in some parte barred them by God's owne lawe, both in certain meats, & in the use of Images: and the libel of difference was winked at in them. But it were dishonorable to Christ's people not to be so delivered from the bondage of sin, as to be able to profess every parte of the law of Nature freely and boldly: notwithstanding that we are also ready to be restrained from certain meats upon Obedience, but not as from things which
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which we may not at all take: as (for example) when either we be justly dispensèd withal, or when 'tis Law is changed. For such laws as are made by men, may be changed by men of the same authority.

Seeing then it is the Law of Nature, to honour venerated men, by setting up Images to them, we may do 't thing freely now, and ought not to stay from it upon the pretence of fearing Idololtry.

On the other side, if need be we shall respect the Christian people as somewhat weake and apt to fall into idolatry, yet I pray thee (good Reader) to attend this one reason. I say, the best way or meanes to stay faithfull men from Idolatry, is to let them have, and conveniently to honour the Images of honorable personages.

For as God permitted the Jews being in desperate to Idolatry, to offer by to him ocree, calves, lambs, goats, wheaten meale, loanes, wine, not that he needed them, or that these things pleased him so much, but because they should be occupied in serving him, & because seeing
of Images.

they would needs offer some externall Sacrifice, they might have a meane to do it vertuously and honestly; even so now God permitteth the Christian people to have and to worship the Images of heavenly chuches, not that he needeth such worship (who needeth of vs none at all) nor that he is so muche pleased with the honoring of Images, but that the people may have, wherewith to intertaine it self vertuously, and honestly.

And so much the more Images are now permitted, because it is not lawfull for anie other externall Sacrifice to be offered, beside that Bodie which was geuen for vs, and that blood which was shedde for vs, the which they only maie offer externally, to whome Criste gane externall power by his externall wordes, to make that thing, whiche; wheresoeuer it be, is the Propitiation for the Synnes of the whole worlde. And wheresoeuer it is made there is made the Propitiatorie Sacrifice for mankind (concerning the substance which is consecrated) albeit the Age of death he no more repeated.

So that, sozalmuche as the people
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have not that multitude of sacrifices, which once the Jewes had (if they were still weake) it mighte be permitted to them, to have good and Godly remembrances of Christes death upon the Crooke (which was the onely Propitiatory sacrificing of him selue) and of the death of his Apostles and Martyrs, who sacrificed their owne will and Bodies to his will, by sutfring death according to his example.

But verily Images are not so much permitted to Christians for their weake-

nes, as for their strenght. For therin God's promise & strength is gloriied in that the same people which once committed spirit-

tuall Fornication with so many flockes and Stones, nowe is through Christe so stronge, that it doth no suche thing. And that not only by providing to have no Im-

ages at all (soz) were a pusillanimy, but by having & worshipping suche Images, as doe represent a thing worthy of wor-

ship. Moreover seing the true worshipping of God consisteth in spirit and truth (as Christ hath taught vs) whez which is outward lie lene, doth lead vs to whez which is true
of Images.

Spiritual, ther is a great help obtained by y outward sight, to our spiritual devotion. For as whē we see creatures which pronoke vs to evil (as harlots doe) we are bōūd to abstain fro y sight of the as nigh as may be: enē so whē a creature cometh in our way which was made to pronoke vs to good (as al our images are) we are bōūd by natural reasō, to apprehend y visible help of our inward devotion.

We must not therefore apply y text of Christ true vvorshippers adore the Father in spītic and truth, against holy outward representations, y which help our spirit, but against Idols, against y bondage of praying after one certaine corporal fashion, y which is not at al times profitable. But as it is ever good, to hear y word of God corporally preached: so is it ever good to see holy & godly images of heavēly thinges, as of Christ rising fro death, ascending into heauen, or comming againe to judge- mēt. And every man who intētheth perisically to amend his naughty life, hatch nowmoze neede to provide, y he may haue a good re membrāce alwaics before his eyes, then he was careful before to haue his harlot,
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or his baine apparrell in his owne eye. But they that can see our Images to be
Idols (as they thinke) are most of them such, as make no conscience at all, even
after the Word of chastitie, to see their Concubines and Harlots daily about them. So
they fear where no fear was, and there be desperate, where at the fear ought to
have bene.

I have been longer in this argument, then I minded. I will briefly recite the
commoditie, which cometh to vs by holy Images.

1. The first is, in that we learne there-by some things, which we knew not
before.

2. The second, because other things, which we knew before, we do remember.

3. The third, because we doe not onlie remember them (as by reading, or by
repeating) but by the most spidie twinkling of the eyes.

4. By seeing and knowing, we are
provoked to become lyke those men, whose Images we behoold with reverence and estimation.

5. We are confirmed in our Faith,
of Images

perceann these things, which are painted before our eyes to be so true, that euerie where they are openlie sette foorth and honoured.

We are kepte well occupied, and delivered from occasion to imagine idle things of our owne phantastical devising, the which might in deede cause I=
dolacrie.

We carie more willinglie in the house of God, which is so adozned with Godly Histories

We consider the companie of heauen, howe maruellouse it is. For as the Hole of Holies being decked with the Images of Angels, dyd (by S. Paules interpretation) signifie Heauen to the Jews: so must our Churches be decked with the Images of Angels and Saints, that they maie be to vs a Figure of everlastinge Blozie.

We praye to Christe at the sight of his Image, and we lykewise desire our Ladie, or the Apostles, or Virgins to praye for vs, at the sighte of their Images.

We honour God in his Saints, and
Of the honouring in the very Signes and monuments of his Saintes.

Also we glorify God in that we are so free & strong in our faith, ÿ we nee nor be kept fro conveniente worshipping of landsable Images, as ÿ weake Jewes were.

Last of all we profess the truth of the Gospel, and of the law of Nature, which requireth convenient honer to be givem to the Images of honorable personages.

Thus the peril of Idolactrie being litte, or none at al, and the profite of Images being great: it must needs be profitable to permitte the people to hounour Godly representations and Images in our open Churches.

Whether the same Degree of honour be due to the Images of Christe, or of his Saints, which is due to Christ and to the Saintes themselves.

The 17, Chap.

This point is in controversie be tween the Catholikes them selves, and therewith M. Jewel burdened vs not a little. For he saith, some Schole
Schoolemen would haue the Crosse and Images of Christ honoured with 
tria, that is, with godly honou; others would haue them honoured with doulia, that is, with an honou; whereas creatures may be served. The matter in dede is very 
hard, as the which consisteth rather in 
subtile points of Philosophy, not yet de-
cided by þ church, then in any dilléion of 
wis oz minds in matters of Divinitie.

First, al the Divinies agree, that in an 
Artificial Image we may consider three 
thinges: either the matter of the Image 
(as the wood, stone, or silver) or els the 
outward forme (as the painted colours, or 
proportion of the Image) or els the repre-
sentation which it maketh.

Concerning the matter of the image, 
they all agree, it is not by any means 
worth of any honou at al, because it is a 
thing without life and reason. The 
lyke maie be said concerning the colour 
or good Proportion of the Parces. For 
they also are worthy of no Honour be-
longinge to Religion. Albeit per-
dappes a worldly man maie naturallic 
esteme the Arte of the Painter oz of the 
AA
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greater, but that is not any honor of Re-
ligion, whereof we now speake.

But if any Image be made to resem-
ble a person, who is worthy of everla-
sing honour with God in heaven: all
the learmed Writers agree, that the said
resemblance of such an honourable Personage,
deserveth some kinde of honour per-
neding to true Religion. Therefore in these
three points we all agree. And because
we do agree in them, those that disagree
from their and our Ancelltours & Fores-
fathers in this behalf, can not be excus-
SED FROM Schisme, nor from Heresie, if thei
wil stubbornly defend their false opinion.

In the point that now foloweth, if
we disagree, we require not you (W.Jes-
wel) to take this on that side, but we lay
you are bound to agree with the univer-
sal Church, in that respect, as the faith
of it is universal. And it is universal
in affirming, that some honorne is due to
al holy Images.

wel, what is the Fourth point, where-
in some Catholiques disagree? It stan-
deth herein, to knowe, by what speciall
meanes an Image, as an Image, doch
repr
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sent the truth which it signifieth unto vs. For either the Image may send vs from it self, and referre vs ouer to the truth, and so it is considered apart from the truth, and so it is honoured in a lower degree then the truth: or els y truth and the Image may meete togetherr in his minde, who in the Image beholdeth the truth, and at the same time with the truth honoureth the Image. And in y case, the Image and the truth be as one thing, and so the same honour semeth to be due to the Image, which is due to the Truth.

Both these opinions in diverse considerarions may chaunce to be true, and therefore perhaps there is no such dissen- sion between the Scholemen, as to some it appeareth.

And surely in this question (where- in the Churche hath as yet not defined neither part) any man may speake his owne conjecture : and I with harrely, y W. Jelwel had spent his vircue and learning rather in crying out such errour- ties, as, without danger may be conclus- ed this way, or that way, wherein only the
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the Schole men dissented) then with the evident destruction of his owne soul, & of all that follow him, to trie his wit and learning in undoing that, which Christ, the Apostles, and the whole Church have ben a building up so many hundred yeres. But let vs returne to my purpose.

It is a thing most cleere, that as none as euer I understand whole figure and Image that is, whiche is before mine eyes, immediately the person him selfe commeth to my minde, and that so sodainly, that, the knowledge of the Image, and of the thing whole Image it is, make both but one knowledge. For I understand not one after the other, but both together. In so much that untill I understand somwhat of the truth, I cannot understand any particular thing of the Image. For if I see an Image, and can not conjecture by any outeward token whole Image it is, well I may know it to be the Image of a man, because it beareth the shape of a man, or the Image of a Saint, because it standeth in my Church, & so as I know the Image generally, I know the truth thereof generally.

But
But I can not determine or specially restrain the image to this or to that man, or this or that Saint, except I first know, it it belongeth to S. Peter, or to S. Paul, or to some like person.

If then the Image be not particularly known without some foreknowledge of the truth, it is not possible that the Image (as any particular man's Image) should be in my mind or understanding, before that self thing be there, whose Image it is: The Image in deed may be in mine eye, and consequently it may be offered to my understanding, before that I thinke actually of the thing represented. But when so ever I know this or that to be Christ's image, I have Christ in my understanding rather before the Image be known or to be his, then after. For I conserce and compare the Image offered to me, with that which I have readen or heard of Christ, and when I find them to agree, I conclude this to be Christ's Image. If then the motion of the mind toward the image of Christ be so inseparable from the motion of the mind toward Christ himself, that as well the Image as the thing represented
Of the honouring presented he known togetherness, and so known, that (when the knowledge cometh by the Image) the knowledge of the one can by no means possibly be divided from the knowledge of the other: it remaineth to discuss, whether it be like also in worshiping as it is in knowing, That is to say, whether as my mind is in one instant moved and carried by the means of the Image to the remembrance of the truth itself, so the honour and worship of both be at one, or no.

Whereunto I answer thus, that the honour may be understood to be one after two sortes & orders of speech: either that the same honour which is given to the Image, the same in number is given to Christ, or contrarywise, that the honour which is given to Christ, is also given to his Image. Of these two wares I wil (by Gods grace) intreat so much the larger, by how much the harder this matter is.

With me it shall stand for an undoubted conclusion, that when we ever we beginne our worship on the Images behalf, that the same self honour which we gave to the Image
of Images.

Image, wholly and altogether commeth to the thing represented. And by thy means there is one & the self same honorizing of thy image and of the truth. And this conclusion of true proposition is found in thy Seventeenth General Council. The which can not be better examined, then if we heare how W. Jewell understandeth the same proposition: And then by comparing my sense with W. Jewels, it shall appeare, who hath found out the true meaning thereof.

Jewel. In the Second Nicene Council, it is determined thus: Non sunt due adorationes, sed una adorationis imaginis & primi exemplaris, cuius est Imago. There are not two sorts of adoration, the one called Latria, the other Doulia, as M. Harding divideth them, but one only adoration, both of the Image and also of the sampler where of the Image is.

Sander. This place is worthy to be examined, because there is so much folly and ignorance committed therein. To declare the mater plainly, S. Basil had written a booke against the Sabellians, Arians, and other like Heretiques, in the which booke he speaking of the blessed
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sed Trinitie, theweth that the second person therof being naturally the Image of God his Father, doth not cause the Un

titie of God to be thereby corrupted.

And that St. Basil prouerth by an example taken from Artificial Images: because he that calleth the King's Image, by

the name of the King, dooth not thereby divise the King, or make two Kings.

Upon this Authoritie, one Ioannes, the Viceregent of the Bishoppes of the East, declareth, that they speake and

teach falsly, who say that we divide Christ into twaine, when we seeing the Image of Christ, saith therof, This is Christ.

For as the saying by the Kinges Image, This is the King, maketh not two Kings: so the saying by Christes Image, This is Christ, maketh not two Christes.

And so returns to the first purpose (of St. Basil) the saying that God the Father is God, and God the Sonne

is God, maketh not two Gods, because God the Sonne being naturally the Image of God his Father, is one and the

same God which his Father.

We seethen a proportion to be kept

Note.
of Images.

between the Natural Image and the Artificial Image. For as the Sonne of God being naturallie the Image of his Father, is not an other God, but the same one God in an other Person: so the Artificial Image of Chryste, is not an other Chryste, but an other representation of one and the same Chryst.

Whereupon the said John conclueth, S. Basilie do have declared, that as the painted Image of Chryste maketh not two Chrystes of one, so likewise the Adoration of Chrystes Image, maketh not, that there are two Adorations in that behalfe, but that there is one Adoration of the Image, and the same also of the first sampler, whose Image it is. The meaning then is this.

As when we call the Image of Chryste by Chrystes owne name, we meane that Image to be a thing that representeth Chryst who sitteth in heaven, and not to be an other Chryst beside him which sitteth in heaven, but only to bear his name & shape: so whē we adore & reverence this Image of Chryst, we meane not,
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not, that Christe in heauen is to be adored as an other thing cleane diverse from
that which we adore in the Image, but
only that the Adoration given to the Image, is at the same instant given to
Christ, and so it is one adoring of the Image and of the first sampler.

For the adoration goeth from the Image to the sampler. And therefore
all the adoration which is done to the Image, is done to Christ, albeit not all
that which is done to Christ, is also necessarily done to the Image. That is W.
Jewels error, in that he thinketh, he
maie as well begin with Christes owne honour, and bring that doun to the Image,
as contrarietwise the Councile beginning
with the Image, sendeth up the whole
honour thereof unto Christ himselfe.

We gene in deede that seife same
adoration to Christe, which we gene to
the Image, but gene not all that to the Image, which we gene to Christ himself.
It is then one adoration of the image
and of Christ, in respect that we referre
the whole honour of the image to Christ.
But y honour is in a baser degree in the image
of Images.

Image, then it is in Christ. For it is in Christ naturally, and really, and for his owne sake: but in the Image by the waie of representation, and of relation, and by an accidente, and secondarily, and for Christes sake.

But this matter belongeth never a whitte to take away the distinction of 

latristia, and of doulia. And herein farther appereth St. Jewels forging, because he englisheth these wordes, non sunt duæ adorationes. There are not two sorts of adoration. And he exemplifieth his doctrin by 

latristia, and doulia. Whereof Joannes the learned Father meant not: yea rather 

the contrarie thereof was taught before, fol. 519. in the very same Action.

It is meant, that the adoration of the Image is also at the same time the adoration of the truth, and that no division of adoring is made in him that ador- reth. But it is not saied, that the same adoration in all degrees is given to the Image, which is due to the truth: even as when I honour the Servant of my friend, I honour my friend. And so the honour is one, because the selfe same
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honour goeth (by mine owne appoint-ment and intent) from the servant to mie friend: but I gene not al that honour to the servant, which I gene to mie friend himselfe.

And that in the Conccel it was so meant, the reason there alleged out of S. Basil thewheth. Nam Diusus Pater Basilis honorem imaginum ad ipsum exemplar primum redire testatus est. For the Holy Father Basil hath witnessed, the honour of the Images to return to the first模范 it selfe. So that the one adoration which is named, is without division in him that genech it, and without division in him that receauneth it.

And yet to make it plainer, the adoration of the Image to palleth immediately to the first Samplar and Paretne, that it becometh not first one in the Image, and then afterward another in Christe, but it palleth altogether (remaining still one and the same) from the Image to Christ himselfe.

Being then in the Image doulia, it is doulia in Christe. For by his Image there commeth no higher Do-
nour to him, then the Image is able to convey: Although him self receive otherwise a higher Honour of vs, and that also greater, then his Image can receive or carie.

And yet doth not his Image anie more hinder his owne Honour, then S. Paul doth. For when I honour S. Paul for Christes sake, thereby no greater Honour then the Honour of Doula, commeth to Christe. For no more commeth to hym by the honouring of his Creatures, then that where with his Creature may be Honoured. And albeit the Honour of Doula be not all the Honour that is due to Christe, yet it is well done to gene him so muche (soas he is our Lord, so is Doula, due to him) and more we may not gaine by that meanes of his Creatures.

Let it be the custome in some Cities, that if the Ringe hym selfe come, he should have presented to him a hundred Pounds, but if his Lieutenant come, balle thereof should tereue.
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The halfe that is genen to the Lientes-
naunt, is genen for the Kings sake, and
the honour of it come th to the King. And
yet although it be not so great an honour
as his owne, it is wel genen, and was
due to him by the meanes of his Lientes-
naunt.

Thus we understand, that W. Jev-
ell either was or would be decreased in
this matter of one adoration: thereby to
burden us with gening of Gods owne
honour to Images. And whereas he
alleageth a little before certaine wordes,
which the Bishoppe of Constance is re-
ported to haue laied in a booke bearing
the name of Carolus Magnus, the booke is
forged, and there is no crust to any thing
that is laied therein.

For howe coulde Carolus Magnus,
who buildt so many Churches and Mo-
siegb. An.
asteries, and so diligently obeyed the
Dom. 801. Bishop of Rome (who also crowned him
Emperor) who leaft so many Reliques
at Aquiligrane where he lieth buried,
who among other holy Reliques leaft
a little grauen Image of our Ladie, there,
with other Jewels which he warre at his
breast,
of Images.

break, who caused the Frenche men to
contrue them selues in their Church-
Songe to the Romans: how can he be
lustily thought to have writen a Booke
against Images? And a Booke of such
small credit, that neither the Librarie
whence it was taken, nor towne where
it is printed, nor the man who printed it,
is named therein.

Therefore leaving to answer that Booke, and all such authorities as are al-
leged out of it, I wil come to examine,
whether, as when we beginne our ho-
nour on the Images behalfe, all the ho-
nour which we gave to the Image, com-
meth necessarily vnto the truth: so on the
other side, whether, when we honour
Christ in his Image, and purposely doe
genchun his owne honore, we may gene-
also the same honour at that tyme to the
Image.

For although hitherto I have defen-
ded against M. Jewel, that the learned
Father Iohnnes (whose woords M. Jew-
ell interpreted falsely) meant to say no
more, but onlie, that the honour of the
Image, and of the truth is one honour

BB it be-
(because it goeth altogether from the Image to the truth) yet I have not hither-to denied, but that it may be possible for the same honour in some sense or other, to be communicated to the image, which is given to the truth, albeit the said St. John spake not thereof. For I at this present speake rather of St. Thomas of Aquines mind, then of any mans els.

St. Thomas defendeth one and the same honour to be due to the truth, and to the image thercof, then only, when we adore the Truth in the Image. To make his meaning plaine, we must imagine, 'a devout man commeth to a place where the image of Christ is. This man no sooner seeth Christ's image, but immediately he listeth vp his hart and mind to Christ, and his strenghe doth he adore Christ, true God and true Man. Of whom if anie man should aske, what he adored, his conscience would answer, I adore nothing els but Christ. For in dede he thinketh not mindeth nothing els.

But St. Thomas is persuaded, that although he thinke not speciallie and namely of adoring the image, yet because

The opinion of St. Thomas.
the Image was to him at this time the
meane of adoring, that he naturally and
necessarily adored the Image with Christ
in that instant, wherein he began to adore
Christ; because Christ was then shewed
him in the Image.

This is somewhat like, as if whiles
Christ lived on the earth, one of his A-
postles meeting him after his resurrec-
tion, clothed in purple, should have adored
him, not thinking at all upon his purple,
but only upon his Godhead. This Ap-
postle might notwithstanding be said to
have adored the purple of Christ, not in
deede namely and distinctly, but as the
matter then gaue: because, Christ, whom
he adored, was then in a purple Gar-
ment. And the Apostle dyd not then
exclude his Garment from his adorati-
on, but adored his Master as he found
him, not bidding him putte of his Cotte,
before that he would worship him.

Now, as I alleged before, S. Au-
gustin confessed, that when we adore a
Prince crowned or clothed with purple, 
then we adore his crowne and garment with
him, as a thing united to him soz y time.
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And he bringeth this example, to prove that we may adore the flesh of Christ with Gods owne honour, because it is evermore adored as a thing vniced to God. And although the union of the flesh be farre greater then that of the garment (because it is both made in one person, and dureth still) yet there is, for the time that the garment is once the Kings back, there is, I say, a like consideration: in so much that Christes owne Garment wrought miracles, and healed diseases. How I pray you? But as a thing for the time alliedned to his body, and considered as a part of him, or as a thing of his.

And yet this example of adoring the garment, is not in all points like to the other of adoring the Image. For the garment is an other several thing. But the Image of Christ, as it is the Image and Shape of his manhood, hath in truth of things none other person or subsistence beside Christ him selfe, where it is, what soever it is, in the true condition of his Image.

For as I said before, we must now lay
of Images.
lay aside the matter of the Image. From the arte of the Painter, the colours of the Painter, the proportion, yea the very relation which is between the image & him whose image it is. And we must consider, that when we first see the Image, Christ is so present to us therein, that before our mind doth by thought separate his image from Christ, we adore Christ, and at that instant of our adoration, we finde Christ's Image made to us, as it were, one with him self. The truth of which his Image hath none other thing finally to rest in, beside the Manhood of Christ, and his Manhood raised only in the person of Christ, and his person is the woode of God, and God it self.

Therefore in this condition & state of adoring, S. Thomas teacheth, that the Image of Christ adored, onely, and wholly for Christ's sake (with whom it is then made one thinge) may in that consideration of unitie with Christ be adored with the same honour, wherewith Christ is adored. Thus he teacheth. In which doctrine it is to be noted, that neither S. Thomas, nor any man els doth

if I speake of Christes Image, or to see God, if I speake of Saints. And therin I account them to be in an everlasting honour, whereof they are partakers for their own sake. But this transcendent honour which we give to them by their Images, is not worthy to be so much as the shadow of that honour which our hart blesseth. S. Thomas thinketh the doctrine of giving Godly honour to Christes Image to be true, by the force of natural sequel, and by the very true nature of such an Image well understood.

Theroyp, if S. Thomas hath been deceived in this Question, it is an error in Philosophic, and not in Divinitie. For he alleageth not for his doctrine any other Authentique, than Aristotle, who teacheth that an Image may be considered two waies: either as it is a thing of itself, whereof so ever it be made, or as an Image only.

Concerning the first way, Image differeth from the truth: concerning the second, the minde is at once so moved, as caried at one instance by the Image to the
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the truth, that as S. Thomas goeth for-
ward with Aristotle's doctrine, it appre-
hends the truth in the Image. Then is
the image for that time with the truth,
and so the truth being adosed in the image,
and the Image being joined with the
truth, causeth the Image to partake the
same adoration which is given to the
truth.

But what? wilt you, M. Jewell,
that I shall tell you whether S. Thomas
both disconce well out of Aristotle, or
no? As though you or I were to con-
verse with the Metaphysikes, as to make
semibries, and minimis, of Quiddities, and Enti-
ties, and Essenies, and to consider what differ-
ence is between an Image, as a relation,
and an Image as a condition. And what
Union is made with the truth in this or
that case.

I think verely if the question had ben
moved in the General Council (where
better Philosophers had ben like to have
mete, then you and I am) they would
ver have refused to have talked of that
Article: only contenting themselves with
this doctrine, that the image of Christe,
any the images of his Saints ought to be honoured: leaning it to the thinge it self, what honour should come to the images parte, sith the intention of the Church is only to have Christ honoured by that kind of way, as well as by divers other waies.

It is a madness conteyneth, that the Church intendedeth to honour the image, for the images owne sake: if that were so, the Church would say, all images without exception must be honoured. But now it neither saith nor thinketh so: but that the images of honorable & of godly persons must be honoured. Then it is the honor of y person which is sought, & not the honour of the image, but only as the image apperteyneth to y person. So y if any man for Christes sake honour Christes image never so much, y honor is not given to the image as to staine there, but to passe ouer immediately unto Christ. And therefore there is no such great peril in S. Thomas doctrine, except there be any peril in honouring Christ with godly honor, which way sooner y honor be made ouer to him. And amos: all external means of hono-
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ring Christ, none lightly is more subtle, more speedy, more necessarily or nightly joined to Christe, then the honoure which commeth to him by his Image.

Al this not withstanding, I purre it for an undoubted truth, that, All images be honoured in the Church with an inferior honour to that, which is due to the first samplers and principal patterns. For whether in any case the honour of the image may be the same with the honour of his truth, or no, I neither will, nor am perfectly able thoroughly to discourse. But certainly the honour of the image may right well be lesse, and of a baser degree, then which is given to the truth itself. Because while honour is given to one thing for another things sake, as to the Image for her truths sake: there is greater honour given to the truth, then to the image. For her truth is honoured for his owne sake, and the Image not for his own sake at all, but as belonging to the truth.

1. Again the truth may be honoured without her image thereof, as God himself is honoured of vs, although we can devise no Image of his incomprehensible
of Images.

substance. But no Image can be justly honoured at all, without the Truth whereunto it belongeth. For as it is an image it hath this nature, to be necessarily referred unto y whose image it is.

Last of all, the Image is seere uppe and honoured, because it is a thing directed to this end, that the truth may be thereby remembered and honoured. And therefore even when no man seeth the Image, or bleseth it: yet it standeth still, in a high place, and is decked or adorned after some honourable force. Which declareth a certaine externall honour to be genen to the signe it selfe, for y it may signify, and is appointed to signify the truth, though presently it doth not signify, because no man beholdeth it.

This honor of letting an image stand in a high place, or suffering a lampe to burne before it, is genen to the truth by them, who love the truth so wel, that for his sake, they do thus honor the Image. But this is not all the honour which we gene to the truth. For we beleue y truth to be in heaven, and to see the nature and substance of God face to face.
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The which believes of ours concerning the honour of Saints in an inestimable honour given to the Saints, in comparison of that which is temporally done about their images. For we thinke the artificial Image to be a transient thing, which may be honoured to daie for the Truthes sake, and by my chance may be burnt to moze without any dishonor to the truth, if the fire proceed not of their malice, who for despite desiroe Saints Images.

This honour then, which is given to the Images, being incomparably lesser then y which we gene to the truth, is undoubted ly to be gene, without curious distinguishing, whether any more may be gene, or no. For if more may be justly gene, more is gene though we know not of it. Because the thing itself & the nature of an image hath all alwaies in it, which is due to it in the truth it selfe, whereas ever by the Image we assured the truth.

Howe much is due to the Image, we neede not care, sithens it is the truth that we honour, and not the Image in it selfe, or for his owne sake. So that if
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when we see Christ's Image, we grant Christ's owne honour to him, either the Image is then adjoynd to nigh to him, that it necessarily percepts the same hon- nor with him, and then the Image is so honoured : or els the Image is not so nigh adjoynd, as to have the same honour, then I gene it not the same honour : but what so euer honour I gene the Image as an Image, it surely passeth over, to the thing it selfe.

Ego Cornelius Lansenius testor, me à fide dignis virù Sacra Theologia Doctores Anglis intellexisse, hunc librum à Doctore Theologo mihi etiam notissimo tanquam fidei Catholica zela- tore edidisse, diligentier lectum esse, examinatū, & Catholicum repertum, ac plane dignum qui pro defensione Catholica Doctrina de Imaginibus, typis excudatur, ad consultationem Hæretico- corum, & instructionem infirmorum.

Ita esse testor Cornelius Lansenius
Sacra Theologia professor.

Cum gratia & Privilegio
Regiae Maiestatis.
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S. Stephens Image painted and hanged before his sepulcher with a Cross on his shoulder. 134.b

Probianus was accepted no perfecte Christian, because he would not adore the holy Cross of Christ. 135.a

M. Ievvel is convinced by words of his own alleging. 135.b

The Writers of hymnes. 136.b

S. Chryostome did set forth some par-
vel of Christes Crosse to be adoured and kissed. 137.a
The general doctrin of S. Augustin concerning signes is applied to Images. 138.a
Images were made without all scruple in the primitiue Church. 139.b
Bowving to the Image of Christ in S. Chrysoftomes time. 141.b
His Liturgie defended. 142.a
Seuer painted the images of S. Martin and Paulinus in a holy place. 144.a
S. Gregorie laie prostrate before a holy Image. 145.a
M.levvels vaine arguments against the seuenth general Counsell, and Irene the Emperesse. 126.147
M.levvel committeth three faultes about five latine wworldes. 149.b
The shadow of S. Peter is accompted of vertue and povver to heale men. 151.a b
They were and are in possession of honouring Images, who defended the honoriung of them. 153.b
The cause why the seuenth general Counsell was called. 154.a
The
The seuenth general Council is con-
ferred with the first. 154.b
VVhat Bisho[ps] recated in the seuenth
Council. 156.a
It is proued by M. Ievvels ovvne vvor-
des, that the Image of an holy thing
maie be vvorshipped. 160.b
VVith vvhat intent an Image is made. 165.b
M. Ievvel hath filthie and unhonest
Images in his owne booke. 166.a
M.Ievvel hath english[ed], tolli, to be
taken dovvne, whereas it signifieth
to be taken vp. 169.170
Images are not so muche permitted to
Christians for their vweakenes as for
their strenth. 177.b
The commoditie vvhich commeth to
vs by Images. 178.b
Three things are to be considered in
an Artificial Image. 180.a
M. Ievvels forging is detected. 185.a
Doultia only commeth to Christ by his
Image. 185.b
M.Ievv. allegeth vwords out of a boke
vwhich is forged. 186.b
The Church honoureth not the Image
for his owyne sake. 191.b