

**Date sent: n.d. aft 28 March 1555 [2nd letter]**

**Date received:**

**Writer: Christopher Goodman**

**Recipient: Peter Martyr Vermigli**

**Location of origin: ?Frankfurt**

**Destination: Strasbourg**

**Original language: Latin**

**Ref: Denbighshire Record Office, Plas Power MSS, DD/PP/839 56-8**

**Transcript of Later copy/English translation of copy**

**Other Versions: None**

A copy of a letter from Mr Christopher Goodman to P. Martyr.

Though you are no doubt, singular patron and teacher by far the most dear, about to hear complaints – most serious complaints – about me from many, even perhaps from those who previously supported me with an attitude by far the most kind and well-disposed – and complaints so devised -- and as if proven by most sure affirmation -- as to extort belief from you though you resist and to leave me alone with no room for trustworthiness hereafter. Yet I persuade myself and I promise myself concerning your sound judgement<sup>1</sup> and

fairness that the persuasions of none, however much they agree, could now at length engender in you any other opinion about me than the one which has now become quite familiar to you from that long association with me – but particularly since you know that that saying of the poet has always held good: obsequiousness begets friends; truth begets hatred.<sup>2</sup> He was compelled to say that by persistent observation of manners, but I am compelled to say it by the experience which I have undergone. For I have perceived – and perhaps

---

<sup>1</sup> *Prudentia*.

<sup>2</sup> Terence, *Andria* 68. Terence was a favourite quarry for the compilers of *Colloquia*, but it is interesting to note that another well-known, but less aphoristic tag from the same play is alluded to in Goodman's petition to Elizabeth (p. [115]). That might suggest that he knew the *Andria* at first-hand, but perhaps no other play of Terence.

more than I should wish – how hard it is to obstruct the counsel of the flesh and how it is not at all safe ever simply to speak the truth, even among those who profess the truth. Nor do I say this as if I were establishing merely my own view, for I know how little there is in me in which I am able to trust, but rather because those things are open and exposed to the eyes of all because of which some people were so hostile to me and – to speak the truth – inflicted no small injury on me.

For when certain useless ceremonies and impure abuses had been set aside and our people had come together – and that on the advice and at the bidding of the magistrates with regard to the other things in our book which were to be restored and also to the effect that subscription be made to the articles which England most recently promulgated<sup>3</sup> – openly making exception for the present of those by which any could properly be offended, and moreover they were being read publicly so that all could hear and think about them, nonetheless our more expert

[57] and more learned men determined that in the matter of choosing their ministers no one was to have a vote in that election who had not previously subscribed to all the articles and ceremonies, even to those which had by common verdict previously been left out. And, what is more cruel, it was on no other stipulation than that they were all matters of indifference – both those which they had judged were not to be used and those which they had determined still to retain. But as for me, since

I was not able to be brought to subscribe on this stipulation, that all ceremonies – both those which had been rejected and those which were to be retained – were of their own nature matters of indifference – three or four days later, in the presence of a crowded church, the pastor called me by name, demanding the reason why I had not subscribed. That action of his could not in any way be acceptable, either on the grounds that so small a matter would be better handled in private or on the grounds that in my view he demanded something that was unjust. For, though I was prepared

to subscribe, with the exception of only two articles, nor did I at all doubt what pertains to doctrine but rather most fully agreed with them, yet they judged that this my subscription was in no way to be admitted – to such an extent that for this reason alone they shut off the table of the Lord, so that I should not communicate with the brethren, though I had previously made application for that from them and I had asked them privately that they carefully examine the matter and

think about it among themselves – whether for such a reason they ought to forbid sacred communion to anyone. The articles were numbers 35 and 36. The former article required the approval of all ceremonies which are contained in the book of common prayer. When they were correcting the book and would by common consent free us from the observation of certain ceremonies, it seemed to me most absurd, not to say cruel, still

---

<sup>3</sup> I am not sure of the reading. I have written and translated *Anglia* (nominative); the form of the final *-a* is then rather unusual, but compare *erga* (p. [58], line 21). *Angliae* (locative) would be possible, but there would then be no explicit subject for the verb *promulgavit*.

to bind people by subscription to these same things, especially since they are superstitious and impure and not to be defended by those who require the simple purity of the Gospel. The other article is about the title Supreme Head, which has been assumed, and so forth. I did not subscribe to it, because it ought not to be applied to a Christian king without some disgrace and because our king defended by nothing other than the abuse of that title certain absurd things –

namely, first-fruits and tithes and indulgences for forbidden foods and that sort of thing. Since they too were offended by that article, I cannot wonder enough why they were demanding subscription. But my conclusion is nothing other than that the hand approves in writing what the tongue had rightly rejected before. But they say that they do this by the authority of the magistrates. But in fact that is not true. For their principal man, Dominus Globberdus,<sup>4</sup>

did not, in the first place, judge subscription to be so necessary. Then, he judged that this condition was to be applied, in these words: with the exception of those things that have been removed or are to be removed. This did not move our people at all to relax their order in any way; on the contrary, of their charity both in private and in public with great haughtiness and boldness of speech they called all those who think the other way disputatious, troublesome folk, and sectarians. Now, to show that there are

some things which can be certainly proven by the word of God and necessarily concluded from the scriptures, of which there is nonetheless no mention in explicit words in the scriptures, I adduced for the sake of example the baptism of infants. And Dominus Whitehead<sup>5</sup> denied that. He at once seized this opportunity and said openly that because of this his judgement of me was the worse and that he did not want to try to confute an Anabaptist without open and explicit words – which he said with great persistence

that he would show, even in the case of the example that had been produced, but which he is never able to do; yet by his words he provided the occasion of evil suspicions about me, as if I denied the baptism of little children. Let him well see to that.<sup>6</sup> I know that these things will be exaggerated for Your Piety – and far otherwise than the matter really is. But, in keeping with your propriety and fairness, do not

[58] be too ready to give credence; rather, repose trust in Dominus Nowell,<sup>7</sup> a man notable for piety and uprightness, who is both able and – I do not doubt – would wish to tell the truth without any party bias. From him you can hear not only what pertains to me, but everything else – both the things that offended us and the things that offended others. This only will I say – that I take it badly that those people who demanded your judgement on the ceremonies to be accepted or to be rejected abused your authority and your name.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the ‘supplication’ beginning on p. 48 of the MS, he is called ‘Mr Jo. Globurge’; in *Troubles begonne at Franckford*, p. VI, he is ‘Maister John Glawberge one of the chiefest Senators’. He himself signs letters to Calvin as ‘Ioannes a Glauburgo Senior’ (*Epp* 2341 and 2424).

<sup>5</sup> David Whitehead = Garrett no. 441.

<sup>6</sup> That is, ‘I’ll leave that to him.’

<sup>7</sup> Presumably Alexander Nowell = Garrett no. 300, rather than his brother.

For they said openly, in my presence and quite often, that out of all of them none displeased Your Piety apart from those three – concerning vestments, genuflection, and the position at the north end of the table. Therefore many were offended, since they knew that still there were others far more absurd than these. But I, who knew that this was not true, said

that you had also read out to me those points from the letter that was sent to Dominus Cox and that not only about those things had you spoken, but that you had in addition added other things too and that you had set out for me all the other ceremonies of that sort and that, accordingly, they do not do well who use your authority – contrary to your intention and judgement – to defend all other ceremonies, however absurd. Therefore, here you see full well, most esteemed teacher, how cautiously one must deal with such people

in such a business, since they are ready to abuse the authority of any one at all in order to defend superstition. Were I to report the sequence of events, the offended feelings, the very sharp denunciations in sermons, it would be a long business – and it would be better for you to hear it from others. Accordingly, here will I make an end, and I pray for all happiness for you. If I am able to serve you in any matter, I promise my efforts

in good faith, and I will preserve toward you – though all were opposed – the same disposition I always have hitherto, even if they should alienate your disposition toward me – which I am confident will never happen – by any kind of lies. Farewell. I take leave of you in the Lord. I greet from my heart and take leave of Julius T.<sup>8</sup> from my heart.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Terentianus.

<sup>9</sup> I am very uncertain about both the reading and the expansion of this line. I have suggested something, but without any conviction. The problem is partly the abbreviations themselves and partly the hand, especially in the contraction which I have (with much uncertainty) read as *ana*. I wonder if the vagaries of the hand here might reflect a more careless or more hurried hand in the exemplar? In any event, *salutem dico vobis* would be an unexceptionable farewell formula, but (1) I'm by no means sure that's a *V* and (2) that theory assumes a switch from a you singular to a you plural. The accusative *Iulium* requires a verb to govern it, so in order to supply one I have guessed *saluto et salutem dico* in the sense 'hail and farewell'. For what it's worth (which here isn't much), Capelli's *Abbreviature* gives *ane* = *animae* and *SAL* = *Salute*.