

## THE DALMATIAN APOSTATE

JOSEPH CREHAN, S.J.

*Farm Street Church, London*

Marc'Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato in Dalmatia, then later Dean of Windsor and Master of the Savoy in London, and finally a prisoner of the Inquisition at Rome: the personage is striking enough, but what is even more important about him is that he has contributed more to the theological outlook of modern Anglicanism than anyone else, Cranmer not excepted. His writings and his doings are so little attended to that it may not be unprofitable to give them some consideration here.

Godfrey Goodman, who became the Anglican Bishop of Gloucester in 1625 (when one of his consecrators was a bishop whom Spalato had consecrated), wrote of him in his *Court of King James* thus:

Spalato's was a poor archbishopric in the Venetian's dominion, and when Paulus Quintus fell out with the Venetians, then did the churchmen on both sides stir in the business, and Spalato, being an ambitious man and never able to get any preferment in the Church, did adhere to the State; and great undertakings were on both sides. It pleased God that by the means of the French king [Henry IV] the Church and the State were reconciled. Then, as it is with great trees falling upon one another, they do themselves little hurt, but the bushes and shrubs which are between both are beaten down and shivered to pieces, so now, Church and State being reconciled, it must fall heavily upon those who were active on both sides and did nourish the difference. Here Spalato durst not return to his own . . . and, being a man of extraordinary parts for his learning . . . he began to write books of the abuses in the papacy, and living in the *serenissima republica Venetorum*, he would likewise make a commonwealth in the Church. . . . Having composed some great volumes, he himself brought them to our English ambassador in Venice, and there began to acquaint him that he had lived long in the Roman Church, that he did see there were many abuses and corruptions crept into that Church, that he . . . did desire to live in a church reformed, and of all other churches he commended most the church of England . . . and if my Lord Ambassador could but procure an exchange, he would be very glad to live and die a member of the church of England and would pray daily for His Lordship.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *Court of King James* was written by Goodman as a reply to the many stories about James which were being circulated (1640-50) to the disadvantage of the royal cause. He could not think of having it printed then, but it circulated privately on a wide scale. It was printed in 1839. The passage about Spalato occurs on p. 336 of Vol. 1.

The ambassador reported on this to King James, who was then making heavy weather of his controversies with Bellarmine and Suarez (for the date was 1614-16), and the King consulted with his Archbishop of Canterbury (George Abbot). The invitation was sent; the journey was planned (through Protestant countries as far as possible) and Spalato set out in the company of the chaplain to the ambassador, who would no doubt impart some spiritual consolation to the fugitive, but who seems to have been busy making an English version of the broadside which Spalato had written and which appeared forthwith, giving *A Manifestation of the Motives Whereupon the Most Reverend Father Marcus Antonius de Dominis . . . Took His Departure Thence* [from Venice]. He made the claim that "no man cast forth any bait to allure me; I took no man's counsel. . . . Nor let any man surmise that I drew my strength from such books as are framed against the doctrines of the Church of Rome." This was a shock for his expectant new friends, and there was more to come. "I have always had an inborn desire (which ever since my admittance to the clergy I have cherished) to see all the parts of Christendom consenting and united together." This was hardly the tidings they were waiting for.

Spalato's life story, as he put it down in the tract, was simple. He had been "brought up in the study of divinity, and that most-what among the Jesuits." He had taught humanities at Verona, mathematics at Padua, logic and philosophy at Brescia after his ordination, and then he was "plucked from the Jesuits by advancement to a bishopric." It was the corruption of the Court of Rome and encroachment on his metropolitan rights that made him move. He still held the ancient Catholic faith and was going where the "true Catholic religion holdeth up her head and taketh free breath." How like it all is to some of the modern High Church propaganda. George Abbot must have been somewhat dismayed at what the post brought him. Had he been able to check the details of the story, he would have found that Spalato had been a Jesuit from 1579 to 1596 and was made bishop only in 1600; the four-year gap between his departing from the Jesuits and being lawfully made bishop hardly answered to his account of "being plucked from them by advancement to a bishopric."

Five days after he landed in England (on December 16, 1616) he was received by James I. He was made Dean of Windsor Master of the

Savoy, and rector of the parish of West Ilsley, a nice bit of plurality, but somewhat delayed, for this was all conferred on him on March 7, 1618, though he was not installed as dean at Windsor until May 18, 1618. Certainly there was some delay in preparing the fatted calf. The Anglican bishops seem to have been somewhat chary of accepting Spalato's vision of the united and reformed Church. He asked one of them: "Do you think that the Pope and Cardinals are devils, that they cannot be converted?" The bishop (Morton) replied: "No, neither do I think that you are God, to be able to convert them."

The book *De republica ecclesiastica* was designed to have ten parts (*libri*), but, of these, two (8 and 10) were never written or printed. The first six *libri* came out at Heidelberg and at London soon after his flight. Bill, the London printer, divided the work into two volumes and made two handsome folios. The rest of the work (Books 7 and 9) did not appear till 1658, and then from a printer in Frankfurt.<sup>2</sup> The preface to this third volume tells how the missing books had been held back "certo ac bono auctoris consilio, donec ultima eis manus imposita fuerit." As Spalato was then long since dead, it must be that the printer was following blindly the instructions written for him or for his firm so many years before, unless the whole assertion is a printer's lie to excuse the publication of a truncated work. The missing books would have contained the answers to many of the difficulties left over by Spalato in his exposition of his ecclesiastical commonwealth. Thus in 7, 3, 4 he asserts that councils have authority in matters of ritual and discipline, but none in matters of faith, save in so far as they draw out the meaning of Scripture and of the apostolic interpretation of Scripture, and says this will be proved in Book 8. He thus left to his Anglican followers a gap to bridge when they undertook to defend (with Spalato's help) the sufficiency of Scripture as a source of doctrine. Similarly, when treating of papal authority (4, 9), he postponed explaining (away) the important Council of Sardica until he came to Book 8. This again caused some difficulty to later Anglican apologists such as Jurieu, who tried to deny the evidence.

<sup>2</sup> German authorities speak of a printing of the third volume at Hanover in 1622 (e.g., Herzog-Hauck, in the *Realenzyklopädie*, s.v. Dominis), but this printing seems unknown in England, and the Frankfurt print of 1658 does not refer to it. Spalato himself complained after his return to Rome that the Archbishop of Canterbury had impounded his MSS, just as King James had seized all his correspondence.

Spalato promised in his first *Manifesto* that he would sketch an ecclesiastical polity, "not a monarchy, but an aristocracy, not without some spice also of a democracy." This promise won for the bigger work the distinction of being put on the Index even before it had been published; for the Decree of November 12, 1616 proscribed the work "sive iam impressum sive imprimendum," and the Heidelberg print was dated October 23, 1616. His aristocracy is an episcopal one, but not entirely so; for, in speaking of councils (7, 3, 29), he says that bishops are called to a council not because of their orders but because of their learning and skill in sacred matters. For this view he appeals to the men of the Council of Bâle, where membership was settled by incorporation and not by rank in the Church. Here, as in some other points, Spalato revives conciliar theories which had long been dormant.

On Scripture and tradition his theory was very subtle. It was taken over by Laud and also by the Gallican Henry Holden, who is otherwise known to fame as the author of the theory of *obiter dicta*. Spalato says that it is an article of faith that all parts of Scripture which contain revealed truths are of divine authorship, but that this or that book is part of Scripture is really a matter of human testimony. Concerning the parts of the Bible which do not contain revelation but simply narrate facts of history (even such facts as this, that Christ claimed to be the Son of God), he says that these also depend on human tradition, but that it is a certain tradition. He makes great play with the term "authentic narrative," but does not make it clear whether he means that a Gospel narrative is authentic because it comes from Matthew or John, or authentic because it is a true and adequate account of what happened. Later on in the work (7, 1, 36) he brings in a distinction of *actu exercito* and *actu signato*, claiming that it is enough if the Church make a book canonical Scripture *actu exercito* (presumably by using it for Scripture) without proclaiming the proposition that this book is a part of Scripture. He would therefore deny that one could ever have divine faith about the canon of Scripture. Laud took up a similar position in his debate with Fr. Percy (or Fisher), S.J., for he said "that the bookes of Scripture are Principles to be supposed and needed not to be proved." This is rather like Spalato with his *actu exercito*: the Scriptures are used but not reflected upon. Fr. Fisher replied:

This answer was not good; and no other answer could be made but by admitting some Word of God unwritten, to assure us of this point. Like as sciences, which

suppose a principle proved in a higher science, cannot have certainty of that principle, but either by having seene that principle evidently proved by other principles borrowed of that higher science, or by giving credit to some who have seene, or have by succession received it from others that have seene it evidently so proved: so faith cannot have certainty of her first principles but either by seeing proof from the knowledge of the Blessed (which ordinarily no man now seeth) or by giving credit immediately to some who have seene, as to Christ who cleerly saw, or to the Apostles to whom cleere revelation (I say cleere *in attestante*) was made, or by giving credit to others who by succession have had it from the first seers. . . . Neither can either science or faith be divine and infallible unless the authority of that succession be at least in some sort divine and infallible.<sup>3</sup>

One can see that Spalato had not passed through England in vain, if he thus supplied ideas to such a protagonist as Laud.

On the papacy Spalato writes with some show of moderation, but in substance he is no better than an Anglican. He admits that the pope has the privileges of a patriarch and that this allows him to correct metropolitans (4, 9), but these privileges are not *iure divino*. He will even allow that the pope has a general superintendence of the Church in regard to the other patriarchs, but immediately takes away this concession with the claim that every bishop has just as much: "Omnes episcopi . . . ecclesiae universalis in solidum operarii sumus."<sup>4</sup> The pope has by custom, though not by right, this pre-eminence and superintendence; for Rome was the imperial city, the abode of two apostles, and the mother of many churches. Spalato's position is very much that of the High Church Anglicans at the Malines Conference. The proofs he offers from patristic writings for his idea of corporate episcopal superintendence are not striking. He has a sentence from one of the sermons of Gregory of Nazianzus, where the orator praises Cyprian to the Antiochenes and speaks of his care for them. Unfor-

<sup>3</sup> Laud's position is set out in his *Relation of a Conference with Mr. Fisher the Jesuit* in Vol. 2 of his collected works (1849) pp. 91-93. Fr. Percy's reply may be found in *True Relations of Sunday Conferences Had between Certain Protestant Doctours and a Jesuite Called M. Fisher*, by A. C. (1626) p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> Though he does not cite it, Spalato is thinking here of the Cyprianic maxim, "Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." He probably took *episcopatus* to mean "the body of bishops," whereas it must mean, as Fr. Bévenot and Prof. de Zulueta have recently shown (in *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 [1955] 244-48), "the episcopal authority." I may add that for Cyprian *unus* often means "unique" rather than "united." So here, he means that episcopal authority is a unique thing and, though locally divided to each bishop, he has it in totality (for that place) and not partially. Thus Cyprian is saying the opposite to what Spalato wanted him to say.

tunately for the argument, this turns out to be the legendary Cyprian, the associate of Justina, and not the Bishop of Carthage. Another sermon of Gregory praises Athanasius as having a "praefectura"<sup>5</sup> of the whole world, but with the many journeys of Athanasius this could have been said without any idea of his office extending so far. Then comes a tag from Cyprian's letters, and one from Basil (*Ep.* 69) asking Athanasius to have a care of Antioch.<sup>6</sup> Basil's request was made at an abnormal time, when Arianism was dislocating for the time being the ordinary machinery of the Church. Cyprian's words in his letter to Pope Stephen (*Ep.* 68) about the collective responsibility of the episcopate if one of their number falls into heresy have to be taken in conjunction with the conclusion of the same letter, when Cyprian shows so clearly that he and his fellow bishops wait for a lead from Stephen in the matter of the heretic bishop at Arles, just as in the Roman assembly known as the *comitia centuriata* the other groups awaited the lead of the *centuria praerogativa*.

Spalato had a neat turn of phrase. When he first arrived in England, he said that he felt like the Queen of Sheba ("one-half of its splendour was not told to me") as he was being shown round Oxford and Cambridge, but as the expected preferment was long in coming, he had to compare himself to the man at the pool of Probatice (Jn 5) who had no one to put him in when the waters stirred. The Anglicans used him as coconsecrator for one episcopal consecration (December 14, 1617) when he laid hands on George Mountaine (or Montaigne) of Lincoln and Nicholas Fenton of Bristol. One of these was the consecrator of Laud in 1621, and it would be a pretty problem in canon law to sort out the fractional validity of *some* Anglican ordinations at that time (though it could not add up to very much), and the use of the older uncorrected Ordinal (prior to 1662) sets up a presumption of invalidity even in these acts. There is no hint that he was used as a private reordainer of

<sup>5</sup> Gregory's sermon *In laudem Athanasii* (PG 35, 1128) has some words about Athanasius being the steward, or supporter, or arbiter of this people (Gk.: *tonde ton laon diexagois*), but that could have been said of Athanasius by any bishop in any city during the fight with Arianism and is in no way typical of episcopal relations.

<sup>6</sup> Basil says: "Your care of all the churches is as great as what you have for the one church entrusted to you by our common Master. You are always counseling and sending out men who will suggest what is best. . . ." A little later Basil speaks, in a very different tone, of his having asked the Bishop of Rome "to have oversight of the business here" (PG 32, 429).

(who were active pirates in the Adriatic) to the Venetians. Eubel's dates for his episcopal appointments are: August 13, 1600, Administrator of Senj, and November 15, 1602, Archbishop of Spalato. The four-year gap between his leaving the Jesuits and his securing papal approval of his appointment to his kinsman's diocese may well have been taken up with the "bowsing" described above. It was Venetian influence that secured him the translation to Spalato, which was metropolitan to the see of Senj. Sweet gives as the reason for the flight to England the fact that he had been in litigation with one of his suffragans, who appealed to Rome and was upheld there. Sweet's attack on the doctrine of Spalato is mainly an argument about the Roman primacy and takes him (pp. 259-81) into a long discussion of the passages from Cyprian used by Spalato. He uses Cyprian's dictum that "he who without authority condemneth any other bishop and refuseth to hold communion with him may be judged a schismatic" to show that this is precisely what Spalato had done with regard to the Pope, and then he addresses Spalato in the words Cyprian used against Pupianus (*Ep.* 66).

Fr. Sweet made a prophecy about Spalato: "I pray God it prove not too true that in the shape of a bishop you have received a most venomous and pestiferous serpent to your bosom." The Anglican hierarchy may have made light of this when they first read it, but as time went on they began to change their minds about Spalato. By November 14, 1618 the courtiers were noting that he "had sunk in estimation" for the way in which he behaved, as Dean of Windsor, about ecclesiastical patronage.<sup>9</sup> He himself was growing disillusioned by what he saw and heard of Puritanism and by the proceedings of the Synod of Dort. Spalato wrote twice to this Synod, urging moderation (August 17, 1617 and January 1, 1618), and sent a copy of his book, but this did not arrest the triumph there of a full-blooded Calvinism. It is uncertain when he decided to quit England, but the death of Paul V in 1621 and the election of Gregory XV is generally thought to have influenced him.<sup>10</sup> The Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, was trying all the time to

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Calendar of State Papers* (James I), Domestic (1611-18), at this date.

<sup>10</sup> The *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian) at date April 23, 1623, has a despatch from the Venetian ambassador in Spain to the Doge and Senate in which he mentions a Capuchin friar, Zaccaria di Saluzzo, who "confounded the archbishop of Spalato and made him revise his opinions." There was probably a French Capuchin, Zacharie de Lisleux, in England at the relevant time, and he may be meant.

those who doubted the validity of their orders (in the way that F. G. Lee<sup>7</sup> acted in the late-nineteenth century), but the debate about that question of validity had already begun with the work of Francis Mason, *The Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England* (1613).

The Catholics were not inactive in replying to Spalato, and on November 10, 1617 the St. Omer's press produced *The Discoverie of the Dalmatian Apostata* by Fr. John Sweet, S.J. The work was inscribed: "By C. A. to his friend P. R., Student of the Lawes in the Middle Temple," but the British Museum copy is annotated in a contemporary hand "Auctore P. Joanne Sweto Soc. Jesu," and as this copy once belonged to the Professed House of Jesuits in Rome, its ascription must be accepted. Sommervogel allows the work to Sweet, who was a man of Devon and was then acting as one of the English penitentiaries at St. Peter's. He is replying to the first four *libri* of Spalato's work and to the story of his flight. Most useful is his postscript, where he gives some facts about Spalato's tenure of his bishopric. These are based on sworn statements by men who knew him. A relative of his was bishop of Segni (or Senj, in Croatia) and was killed by brigands. Marc'Antonio then forged letters purporting to come from his kinsman and asking him to come and ransom him. He persuaded his Jesuit superiors to let him go,<sup>8</sup> and then he lived with the brigands (Senj was on the borderland between the Empire and the Turks) "becoming their pot-companion in bousing and gormandising." Defrauding them of a large sum, he fled to Venice, where he betrayed some of his former diocesans

<sup>7</sup> I have discussed the activities of this bishop in "Black Market in Episcopal Orders?", *Month*, n.s. 9 (1953) 352-58.

<sup>8</sup> Recently Pietro Pirri, S.J., has published and commented on some documents that deal with de Dominis as a Jesuit and with his leaving the Order: *Archivum historicum Societatis Jesu* 28 (1959) 265-88. From these it appears that he was making his third year of probation as a priest in Rome when he asked permission (June 15, 1596) to go to Senj and try to rescue his uncle the bishop who was alleged to be a prisoner of Turkish brigands. He was given money for the journey and a companion, but left his companion sick at Venice and pushed on alone, not to Senj but to Gratz or Vienna, where he persuaded Emperor Rudolph to nominate him Bishop of Senj, in succession to his uncle. He then asked to be released from the Society (in which he had not taken his final vows) on the ground of the destitution of his kinsfolk ("ad sublevandam suorum, ut idem asserit, inopiam"). Acquaviva let him go, but there does not seem to have been much belief in the alleged destitution. Fr. Pirri names several Jesuits who were called upon after Spalato's flight in 1616 to say what they could remember about him from their personal knowledge. It was probably from these that Fr. Sweet derived his sworn statements.



get him out of England, where his presence was a considerable trouble to English Catholics. He had made an offer to James I that he would persuade the Catholics to take the new, craftily-devised oath of allegiance which Bellarmine had condemned. Gondomar began the negotiations for Spalato's return, and when James was asked if he might have leave to withdraw from England, he was very angry. He drew up a set of searching questions and appointed a commission to extract from Spalato replies to these questions, replies which could be printed and used in public controversy.<sup>11</sup>

The first question touched on the Roman primacy. "I said that no one could rightly refuse to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of canonical obedience, and this His Majesty allows in his cautionary preface, but a primacy of divine right can for the nonce be left to the discussions of the theologians." Next he was asked what he had thought of the Anglican Church before coming to England. He answered that he had been favorably impressed by it and that he had therefore adhered to some of its doctrines (as these did not differ from Catholic doctrines), but that in other matters he did not so much disagree with Anglicanism as with some Anglicans, about free will, efficacious grace, predestination, merit, and good works. But in all this he never forsook the Anglican Articles. Asked about his having sworn three or four times to these Articles (when he accepted benefices) and especially what he intended to say to the Pope about his having accepted the royal supremacy in spiritual matters, he answered that about his oath he would sooner answer to God than to the king, but that he knew His Majesty did not mean to claim jurisdiction in purely spiritual matters but only in the external ecclesiastical administration. This was a neat side step, and Spalato added (in his own printed version) that he rejoiced to hear that when the Archbishop of Canterbury had made himself canonically irregular by shooting a keeper when using his bow and arrows at a hunt, James did not think of dispensing him from the canonical defect. This episode (a valuable witness to the survival of medieval canon law in post-Reformation England, save where it is expressly abrogated by a statute) took place on July 24, 1621, and Spalato was being exam-

<sup>11</sup> The questions and replies were printed in Latin and English several times, e.g., in *Alter Ecebolius, seu Marcus Antonius de Dominis, pluribus Dominis inservire doctus* (London, 1624) and in Spalato's own letter *De pace religionis* (Besançon, 1624). I have collated the various printings and they do not differ substantially. Neither side could afford to give a biased account.

ined on January 31 and February 19, 1622. He must have felt it too good a riposte to pass over when he was arranging for the printing of his own version of the facts. James did eventually dispense Abbot on December 24, 1621, after much hesitation and consultation, but this may not have been known to Spalato.

James was particularly anxious to know what it was that Spalato thought might be relaxed in the rigidity of the papal position. The answer given was that the Pope might abate his claim to authority over kings, give the chalice to the laity, approve the Book of Common Prayer, mitigate the anathemas of Trent, allow clerical marriage, and call a new council. Very much the same points would be raised in the projects for reunion entertained by Leibniz at the end of the century. The matter was pressed by the examiners. Had he any grounds for saying (as he had said) to the Bishop of Durham that he felt sure the Pope would approve the Book of Common Prayer? His reply was, frankly enough, that he had none. It may be this incident, coupled with vague memories of the fact that a petition had been sent to the Council of Trent by English Catholics asking for a decision about their attendance at Anglican services (to which they were commanded by Elizabeth to go), that led to the legend that a pope had once approved the Book of Common Prayer.

James was not satisfied with these answers and sent a second list on February 16, in which he cited many anti-Roman passages from an Italian tract, *Scogli del cristiano naufragio* (Rocks of Christian Shipwreck), which he had written in 1618. Spalato was to be asked if he still believed what he had written there, e.g., that there was formal idolatry in the Mass. He brushed these questions off with the remark that he had there written in popular style for a popular audience, and that there were good popes and bad popes, just as there had been good and bad kings in England. This last reply was meant to cover his assertion in the tract that Church controversies were settled at Rome by the torturers and not by the theologians. One may wonder what the purpose of the tract had been; it may have been meant for distribution in Savoy and Piedmont.<sup>12</sup> The examinee was not making too good a

<sup>12</sup> A French version, printed at La Rochelle, is reported by some historians. A sermon preached in Italian at the church maintained in London for Italian Protestants survives in print and probably embodies much of what was in the tract.

showing, and one of the privy councilors summed him up to James as "a wily beguily, rightly bred in a Jesuit's nest."

The impression Spalato made on English ecclesiastics was not effaced by the manner of his return to Rome. John Cosin, the re-creator of the Anglican establishment after its eclipse of the Cromwellian period, had just been appointed, on his leaving Cambridge, to the position of secretary and librarian to Bishop Overall of Lichfield when his master received a visit from Spalato, then a new arrival in England. The young man was tremendously impressed by the occasion. Another bishop, Richard Montagu of Norwich, got himself into trouble over Spalato. He had preached a sermon on the text "Call upon me in time of trouble" (Ps 49:15), and Spalato was present. Ostensibly the sermon was against praying to saints, but some words were slipped in about angels. Spalato, after his return to Rome, published<sup>13</sup> the suggestion that Montagu had said: "There is no cause why every man might not turn himself to his angel keeper and say: 'Holy angel keeper, pray for me.'" Montagu had to print a tract to clear himself of the imputation. He claimed that Spalato could not follow English discourse "except *carptim* and *sparsim*," and that he had done no more than to interject a remark (in Latin) at the end of one part of his sermon: "sed de angelo custode fortassis ampliandum." He did not offer any explanation of how he meant his words to be taken, and it is clear that he was caught in a position of some embarrassment. Another witness, the Dean of Winchester, John Young, who was one of Spalato's examiners, told him that "now of long time His Majesty's endeavours had been bent, not without great cost, and care, to restore the ancient episcopal government, decent rites and face of a church in the kingdom of Scotland." The Dean's drift is not clear.<sup>14</sup> Was he suggesting that Spalato might be given a post in the Scottish Church, if he decided not to go back to Rome and yet could not rest in England? He was hardly communicat-

<sup>13</sup> *Sui reditus ex Anglia consilium* was the title of his palinode. It was printed in Rome by the printer to the Apostolic Camera in 1623 and also at Milan, Tournai, Dillingen, and Paris. An English version came out at Liège in the same year. He compares himself in his closing lines to Cyprian, who had withstood Pope Stephen, and expresses the wish that he might follow Cyprian to martyrdom. One cannot say that the opportunity was lacking in those times.

<sup>14</sup> John Young was himself a Scot, and he may have felt that a forceful person like Spalato was just the man to deal with the Presbyteries.

ing the information out of sheer goodness of heart. Spalato had indeed asked to be given the archbishopric of York, thinking that old Toby Matthew was on his deathbed, and it may be that James wanted this suggestion put forward as a next best. (One of Spalato's complaints was that he could not stand the heat of an English summer. Scotland would cool his ardor.)

Two years after he had gone, Spalato was brought upon the English stage by Thomas Middleton in *A Game at Chess*. The play was a skit on the Spanish match, Prince Charles and Buckingham being shown as the White Duke and the White Knight. Spalato was played as the Fat Bishop, belonging at first to the White side, and then being won over to the Blacks by the Black Knight, Gondomar. The play was a huge success when it began in August, 1624, and was "so much frequented by all classes that one had to be there by one o'clock to find room." Spalato is called by the White King "a prepared hypocrite" and by the White Duke "a premeditated turncoat," and he is made to reply (Act 3, scene 1):

Yes, rail on:

I'll reach you in my writings when I'm gone.

The play was stopped on August 19, after protests had been made by the Spanish ambassador, but it was taking over £100 a night, and James did little more than caution the players. Spalato had indeed struck back with his writings after he left England; for on his way to Rome he had printed at Besançon an open letter to Bishop Hall of Worcester *De pace religionis* (1624), in which he lamented that the Thirty-nine Articles were no longer the Anglican rule of faith. Hall had been at the Synod of Dort as an observer for King James, and Spalato appealed to him to say whether this was not so.<sup>15</sup> With an air of

<sup>15</sup> Fuller in his *Church History* (Book 10, sect. 18) claims that Spalato was the first to use the word "Puritan" with a doctrinal connotation. It had earlier been in use for those who did not want an episcopal system of government, but Spalato first applied it to those who supported the wholehearted Calvinism of the Synod of Dort. Geoffrey Soden, in his life of Godfrey Goodman (1953), accepts the claim. What Spalato says to Hall is: "Sensi Puritanos dominari." It is worth noting that King James, while allowing a dedication to himself to be inserted in Spalato's book, would not have this put in copies that were for export. He may not have wished to let Protestants abroad think he endorsed all Spalato's views. In the event, most of the copies for export were seized at the ports by Catholic authorities and destroyed. On August 3, 1618, at the Stationers' meeting John Bill the

offended virtue Spalato went on to say that in his sense the Articles could in the main be given a Catholic interpretation.<sup>16</sup> This is the beginning of one of the most consistent lines of High Church propaganda; for it was taken up a few years later by the Friar Minor, Christopher Davenport (Franciscus a Sancta Clara), who wrote a book to show that the claim was true. On this claim have been based so many Anglican assertions that they form part of the true Church of Christ. Bishop Cosin, who looked on Spalato as a much-maligned worthy, wrote of him as having been "wearied by the unjust persecutions of some sour and overrigid men" and claimed that he gave in writing this memorable reply to the King's question, what he thought of the Church of England: "I am resolved, even with the danger of my life, to profess before the Pope himself that the Church of England is a true and orthodox Church of Christ."<sup>17</sup> The printed accounts of the examination of Spalato, his own and the King's, do not bear this out, but Cosin must have been misled by a group who were in sympathy with Spalato. The nearest he came to the above in his answers was to say "ecclesiam pontificiam et Anglicanam (seclusis Puritanis) unam esse radicaliter ecclesiam." This oracular pronouncement could be taken as inviting Laud and his party to get rid of the Puritans, for then they would be accepted by Rome, or it might be a clever denial of common ground, based on Spalato's disillusionment over the Puritans, and so worded as not to give immediate offense. At his final interview with the Commission at Lambeth (March 30, 1622), Spalato was told that the King gave him fourteen days to be gone from England, and the Archbishop of Canterbury said ironically, "Iam scilicet Babylon in Sionem conversa est," while the Bishop of Durham again reminded him that he had sworn always to defend the Church of England. He then said that

---

printer tabled a letter from the King granting him a monopoly of Spalato's works, owing to the heavy loss he had incurred by reason of the seizures, and because pirate publishers (in Germany?) had printed a garbled edition "on naughty paper," whereas his was in a good letter on fair paper. See *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602-40*, ed. W. A. Jackson (1957) pp. 362-64.

<sup>16</sup> Spalato says: "In meo sensu articuli Anglicani ad veritatem catholicam Romanae ecclesiae magna ex parte duci possunt." The choice of the word *duci* is perhaps wise.

<sup>17</sup> John Cosin, *History of Transubstantiation* (*Works* 4 [1851 ed.] chap. 2: 7). Cosin would not believe that Spalato's recantation was genuine. He regarded the printed tract containing it as a fraud and quite credulously accepted the wildest rumors about Spalato's end.

he would, because in essentials it was most orthodox, and he did not care about accidentals. It might be from this remark that Cosin derived his assurance.

How widespread the impression was that somehow the Church of England was not essentially different from the Church of Christ can be seen from the debate conducted (on May 24, 1622) by James I between Bishop Laud and Fr. Percy (or Fisher), S.J., for the benefit of the Countess of Buckingham (mother of George Villiers, the famous duke). One of the principal questions in debate there was whether the Countess could be saved while remaining in the Anglican Church. Laud drew up a list of nine points of difference between the two Churches as being those which withheld him from joining Rome, "except she reform herself or be able to give me satisfaction." Of these nine it may safely be said that there was but one, transubstantiation, which was more than accidental, but it must be admitted that in his list Laud kept off those points which a Puritan would have pressed as being, equally with Laud's list, part of the Anglican faith. Fr. Percy, formerly a pupil of Vasquez at the Roman College, was brought from prison to take part in the conference. Fr. Percy managed to circulate a MS account of the dispute, and when a printed reply was produced by the other side, he had his own version of what happened printed—no small feat for one who was confined in an English gaol. This began a pamphlet war which went on throughout the century. Laud had to clear himself of popery in the eyes of his enemies after 1638, and his way of doing this was to show how he worsted a Jesuit in argument about the papal position. Then in 1658, owing to the free debate that went on in France among the Anglican exiles and English Catholics living there, *Laud's Labyrinth* was produced by Fr. Thorold, S.J., and provoked several replies. Again, in the brief period of Catholic liberty (1685–88) under James II, the debate flared up again. Finally, Laud's work was issued by the Tractarians in 1849, after they had lost Newman to Rome. The pattern of Anglican-Roman controversy was thus set within a year of the departure of Spalato from English shores.

As in so many disputes, a stage had now been reached in the Catholic-Protestant debate where either side was maneuvering to have the final break come over a different issue: the Laudians wanting, with Spalato, to make it a matter of accidentals (whereupon they would be

able to say that they were a part of the Church and that anyone—such as the Countess of Buckingham—who was anxious could be saved as an Anglican), while the Catholics wanted to show to the world that the division reached down much deeper to fundamentals about grace and works. How artificial the Laudian position was came to be demonstrated by the ecclesiastical groundplot of the English civil war. A foreign observer who was certainly sympathetic to the Anglicans, Fra Fulgenzio Micanzio, the companion of Paolo Sarpi at Venice, wrote to an English friend at the time to say how worried he was at Spalato's support of the Arminians of Dort; for "the opinion of the Arminians is a very dangerous doctrine to the Reformed Religion, and that, going along by a Pelagianism, it would introduce Jesuitism, which in very deed tends covertly to displant Christianity."<sup>18</sup> As he saw it, the wise course for Protestants was to keep quiet about grace and works, and to concentrate on their arguments against the papal supremacy and the domination of the Court of Rome. When the civil war broke out, the party of the King was simply called "the papists" by their opponents, who did not distinguish between Laudian and Catholic.

Spalato reached Rome on November 5, 1622, traveling with thirteen attendants and preceded by the rumor that he had been vouchsafed at London a vision of St. Paul, who had told him to preach the true gospel. He had made his abjuration of heresy to the nuncio at Brussels, and this was repeated in Rome. His friend, Gregory XV, died on July 8, 1623, and even before Urban VIII had been elected, Spalato was in the hands of the Inquisition.<sup>19</sup> This was not quite so bad as some historians have made out. He was already a prisoner when he was visited in the spring of 1624 by Fr. Thomas Fitzherbert, S.J., Rector of the English College in Rome, and by Sir Edward Sackville. This nobleman was on tour and was brought to see the famous runaway. "My Lord of Spalato, you have a dark lodging. It was not so with you

<sup>18</sup> The crabbed English of this extract is due to young Mr. Thomas Hobbes (the philosopher), who was employed by Cavendish, the recipient, to put the letter into English. It is published by V. Gabrieli in *English Miscellany* 8 (1957) 227, from a MS at Petworth.

<sup>19</sup> One of Micanzio's letters, quoted by Gabrieli, reports that he was taken to Castel Sant'Angelo on April 18, 1624. Later, on July 12, 1624, Micanzio reports: "Spalato has been fifteen times in long examination; more is not known. He has liberty to write to his friends, and is in good hope." It was probably in the Castel Sant'Angelo that the interview with Sackville took place, for he left England early in 1624 and was at Florence in April of that year.

in England. There you had Windsor, as good a prospect by land as was in all the country. And at the Savoy, you had the best prospect upon the water that was in all the city." Spalato answered: "I have forgot those things. Here I can but contemplate the kingdom of heaven." When they had gone out of the room, which is described as looking upon a blank wall at no great distance from the window, Sackville asked Fitzherbert: "Do you think this man is employed in contemplating of heaven?" Fitzherbert replied: "I think nothing less. He was a malcontent knave when he fled from us, a railing knave while he lived with you, and a motley, parti-coloured knave now he is come again."<sup>20</sup>

In prison Spalato returned to the scientific interests of his earlier years and, with strange lack of humor, wrote a work entitled *De fluxu et refluxu maris*, which was printed in 1624; it might have been a commentary on his own life, for he died on September 8 of that year. A letter he wrote in these last days somehow found its way to the Advocates Library at Edinburgh, and in it Spalato says:

The Fr. Commissary of the Holy Office advised me, by order as he said of His Holiness, to bring true and effective solutions that would satisfy even the heretics. They therefore realized that I was telling them the truth, that there are many difficulties which have not been sufficiently resolved by Catholic writers, even though they are capable of solution, and I will myself resolve them all with the help of God. Of this I have already given some earnest in my first book of *Retractations*, which has been prepared and is before the public. In this I resolve the great difficulty of the equality between all the apostles, a difficulty never until now properly dealt with by any Catholic writer. I shall do the same with the other difficulties; for though it is true that many of my difficulties have not been resolved, I do not on that account claim that they are insoluble, for in my *Retractations* I present myself as willing to solve them all.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> The story is told by Fuller in his *Church History*, *loc. cit.* Sackville was a Protestant, but it was quite usual that an English Protestant on tour should be received at the English College in Rome.

<sup>21</sup> These Scottish documents were in part printed by Sir David Dalrymple in *Memorials and Letters relating to the History of James I* (1766) p. 147, but as the work is so inaccessible I give the Italian text here. (It is suggested by the editor that the papers were salvaged by a Scottish nobleman from among the private papers of Charles I during the civil war. One wonders what Charles was doing with Spalato's declaration.) "Il padre Commissario del Sant'Offizio m'avisò d'ordine, come disse, di S. Santita ch'io portassi le vere et efficaci soluzioni, che dovessero soddisfar a pieno anco gli eretici. Adunque vedevano ch'io diceva il vero, che molti argomenti non erano dagli scrittori Catolici a bastanza sciolti, se bene



When the doctors of the Sorbonne censured the work of Spalato, they picked on this matter of the equality of the apostles as a heresy, but did not offer any remedy. Their censure was not confined to these two propositions (taken from the *De republica ecclesiastica* 2, 9, 13 and 2, 9, 15): "Bishops in their office, which was common to all the apostles, succeed all to all wholly," and "Everyone of the bishops do succeed in universal authority," for they ranged widely through the work, but when they came to the proposition, "The doctrine of the Parisians differeth not at all from my doctrine" (4, 7, 9), they were content to remark: "A mere imposture on the Faculty of Paris."<sup>22</sup>

In the *Consilium reditus* (p. ix) Spalato gives his retractation of his ecclesiastical polity. His statement that Peter never came to Rome was just a lie ("foedum mendacium"), while the Scriptures and apostolic tradition make it clear that Peter had the supremacy; bishops succeed to particular churches, whereas the successor of Peter has a general primacy. This is hardly the full resolution of the difficulty about equality which he boasted about in his letter. It would not be surprising if the old man was not his own worst enemy and by his incurable vanity had raised up trouble for himself. If he said the difficulty had not yet been dealt with save by himself, the Holy Office may well have taken him at his word and considered that he had not dealt with it satisfactorily.<sup>23</sup> The account we have of the trial that was conducted by the Holy Office over his dead body shows that his chief offense had been his imprudent conversations. "He began in familiar discourse to break forth into most grievous heresies." The specimens given are

---

erano solubili, et io li sciogliero tutti con l'aiuto di Dio. E ne ho già dato saggio nel primo mio libro delle Retrattazioni già apparecchiato e mostrato, nel quale scioglio il grande argomento della equalità tra gli apostoli tutti, non mai sin ora a bastanza sciolto da alcuno scrittore Catolico, e così farò de gli altri; perche se ben è vero che molti argomenti miei non sono stati sciolti, non perciò io professo che siano insolubili, ch'io nelle Retrattazioni m'offerisco di sciorli tutti."

<sup>22</sup> The *Censure of the Faculty of Divinity at Paris against the Four Books of Spalato* was drawn up under the guidance of N. Ysambert in November, 1617, and an English version was printed at Douay in 1618.

<sup>23</sup> In other parts of his *Consilium* Spalato is able to give patristic references for his statements, but on this matter of papal supremacy he confines himself to assertions that are unsupported. It is not surprising that the Inquisitors found this unsatisfactory, and the boasts of Spalato already recorded would make matters still worse. After all, the equality of the apostles is still very much the point of the debate with such modern Protestants as O. Cullmann.

mostly attacks on the decrees of Trent, the supremacy of the pope, and the prohibition of divorce. His relatives were given the opportunity at the trial to come forward and rebut the charges, but when confronted with his own written statements (presumably to the effect that he had indeed spoken thus), they desisted, and his body was taken to be burnt in the Campo dei Fiori.<sup>24</sup> His property was declared confiscate, and thus he failed in death to aid those relatives whose alleged penury had been the beginning of his long adventure.

Though Cosin might consider Spalato's recantation insincere, it was taken more seriously by some Anglicans, and one of them, Crakanthorp, was moved by the *Consilium reditus* to write his *Defensio ecclesiae Anglicanae*, which was to prove the standard work of Anglican controversy for a long time. From his viewpoint on the marches of Christendom in Senj and Spalato, the Archbishop may have had a glimpse of the scandal caused by a divided Christendom, but his devious ways, his use of the *doppio giuoco* technique (not unfamiliar in those parts), and above all his overweening vanity, made his efforts come to nothing. A report on him when he was thirty years old<sup>25</sup> describes him as of modest intelligence and of a temperament between phlegmatic and melancholic. It was not the novelty of his ideas that struck men, but what one can call his salesmanship.

<sup>24</sup> See Sir David Dalrymple, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-44.

<sup>25</sup> The *informatio* is printed by Fr. Pirri (cf. supra n. 8) on p. 282.