

THE FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET  
AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF  
WOMEN



The First Blast of the  
Trumpet  
Against the Monstrous  
Regiment of Women

John Knox  
1558

Daniel S. Meyer, ed.  
[blast.pressbooks.com](http://blast.pressbooks.com)



This work (The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women by John Knox) is free of known copyright restrictions.

# Contents

Foreword to the 2019 edition Timothy Bayly	vii
Editor's Preface to the 2019 edition Daniel Meyer	xii
Author's Preface	xvi
1. The Declamation	i
2. Answers to Objections	62
3. The Admonition	84
Author's Postscript	89
Appendix	91



# Foreword to the 2019 edition

Timothy Bayly

A year or two ago, a well-known pulpiteer in one of North America's historic Presbyterian churches made the public claim that John Calvin did not believe what John Knox wrote here in his *First Blast of the Trumpet*. He said Calvin taught the Creation Order of Adam first then Eve applied only in the home and Church. Nowhere outside the home and Church.

Of course, he was wrong as are all those who abuse Calvin to cover their betrayal of the doctrine of sexuality declared in God's Word.

We made an effort to document to this brother the error he was promoting, asking him for any Calvin citations supporting his own claims. He couldn't produce a single one, but neither did he correct his deception.

## FOREWORD TO THE 2019 EDITION

Over the course of the past few decades this has become a common deception practiced by feminists. God's people have been told the relationship between sexuality and authority are of no consequence anywhere other than the privacy of Christian homes and churches. But this doctrine of the Creation Order has suffered serious attenuation even in the Church, and it's on life-support in many of the most conservative Christian homes.

It would be a happy day if this book you hold in your hands expositing Scripture's teaching on the universal application of God's Order of Creation convinced God's people today to turn away from the feminist rebellion corrupting our homes, churches, and world. Sadly though, many will dismiss the doctrine of Scripture laid out by Knox having been deceived by feminists who say John Calvin disagreed with him.

Knowing the ubiquity of this lie, we pause here to address it briefly, documenting John Calvin's agreement with Knox's thesis. To that end, we provide the following. First, three primary sources from Calvin; and second, a summary statement by C. S. Lewis. First, Calvin himself, beginning with an excerpt from his commentary on 1 Timothy:

*A woman must quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet. For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve. (1 Timothy 2:11-13)*



## FOREWORD TO THE 2019 EDITION

If any one bring forward, by way of objection, Deborah (Judges 4:4) and others of the same class, of whom we read that they were at one time appointed by the command of God to govern the people, the answer is easy. Extraordinary acts done by God do not overturn the ordinary rules of government, by which he intended that we should be bound. Accordingly, if women at one time held the office of prophets and teachers, and that too when they were supernaturally called to it by the Spirit of God, He who is above all law might do this; but, being a peculiar case, this is not opposed to the constant and ordinary system of government. (John Calvin's comments on 1 Timothy 2:11-13)

Next, a letter John Calvin wrote his fellow reformer, Heinrich Bullinger, concerning their discussion of this issue with John Knox:

Most willingly I looked over the answer which you gave to the Scotsman. He had talked over these matters with me before he came among you. As I had freely exposed to him in familiar conversation my opinion, he did not press the subject any further, and not even after his return, did he ask me to communicate to him my ideas in writing. The substance of what I expressed orally moreover tallied with what you had written. ...About the government of women I expressed myself thus: Since it is utterly at variance with the legitimate order of nature, it ought to be counted among the judgments with which God visits us; and even in this matter his extraordinary grace is sometimes very conspicuous, because to reproach men for their sluggishness, he raises up

## FOREWORD TO THE 2019 EDITION

women endowed not only with a manly but a heroic spirit, as in the case of Deborah we have an illustrious example. But though a government of this kind seems to me nothing else than a mere abuse, yet I gave it as my solemn opinion, that private persons have no right to do anything but to deplore it. (*Letter CCCXLVIII from John Calvin to Heinrich Bullinger*; Geneva, 28 April 1554)

Then, this letter from John Calvin to William Cecil:

Two years ago, John Knox in a private conversation, asked my opinion respecting female government. I frankly answered that because it was a deviation from the primitive and established order of nature, it ought to be held as a judgment on man for his dereliction of his rights just like slavery—that nevertheless certain women had sometimes been so gifted that the singular blessing of God was conspicuous in them, and made it manifest that they had been raised up by the providence of God, either because He willed by such examples to condemn the supineness of men, or thus show more distinctly His own glory. I here instanced Huldah and Deborah.” [John Calvin, “Letter DXXXVIII to William Cecil” in *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. Henry Beveridge & Jules Bonnet, vol. 7, (Philadelphia, 1860), p. 46.]

C. S. Lewis sums up the Reformers’ discomfort at Knox’s jeremiad against Queen Elizabeth’s governance in his *First Blast of the Trumpet* and yet their agreement that women’s governance of men was “contrary to nature and divine law”:

## FOREWORD TO THE 2019 EDITION

It was embarrassing because in a certain sense nearly everyone (except regnant queens) agreed with Knox. Everyone knew that it was contrary to natural and divine law that women should rule men . . . Calvin knew as well as Knox... Bullinger thought the same... No one wanted the thing to be said, yet no conscientious doctor could answer it in the resounding style which alone would satisfy Queen Elizabeth. No woman likes to have her social position defended as one of the inevitable results of the Fall." (C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 199-200.)

It is true that Knox's application of God's Creation Order to England's queens left other reformers squirming. Knox was under female civil magistrates—Queens Mary and Elizabeth. Calvin was under male civil magistrates. How to apply the biblical doctrine of sexuality to one's own time and political context was a dicey matter then as it is still today. There's plenty of room for disagreement without condemning one another for our individual approach.

Still, the declaration of the truth of Scripture on the subject of the Order of Creation is both necessary and good. To that end we have provided this exposition by John Knox of the universal doctrine of male headship. Disagree with him in the application of this doctrine, but not the doctrine itself. As Lewis says, this is the Protestant reformers' universal conviction of the meaning of Adam being created first, then Eve.

# Editor's Preface to the 2019 edition

Daniel Meyer

In his *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, John Knox works to establish his thesis that

To promote a woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion or empire above any realm, nation, or city, is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, a thing most contrary to his revealed will and approved ordinance; and finally, it is the subversion of good order, of all equity and justice.

Or, put even more simply, that *to have women ruling over men in society is unnatural, unbiblical, and destructive*.

Within the past year, Knox's *First Blast* has come under attack by Christians from certain quarters, who urge that its thesis must be rejected as false and unbiblical. For the

## EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE 2019 EDITION

one who wants to study the *Blast* to evaluate such claims, though, the options I found were:

- a non-modernized edition on Google Books, too obscure for general study and interaction;
- a modernized online PDF claiming full copyright restrictions,<sup>1</sup> presumably for its updates in grammar and spelling; and
- a couple of print edition books

None of these existing options served my goal of making this work available in accessible and unrestricted written and audio formats to facilitate pastors' and churchmen's ability to interact with Knox's work; thus this new edition.

This edition is based on the 1878 edition edited by Edward Arber, and I am releasing it into the public domain.<sup>2</sup> For this edition I have modernized grammar, spelling, and capitalization, and corrected references; I have also updated a few archaic words, especially words that have changed meanings confusingly since the time of Knox's writing (for instance, I updated *facts* to *deeds*). I have kept several other less common words, such as *contumely* and *delation*, when I couldn't find a more common word that had the same force as Knox's usage—in our day looking up such words in an online dictionary is the work of a moment for the reader, and I wanted to stay as close to the original as possible. I chose the King James Version (KJV) for all standalone Scripture quotes in the

## EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE 2019 EDITION

footnotes, due to the public domain status of the KJV in the United States. Emphasis is mine in all footnotes.

Where English translations of Knox's references are in the public domain I have generally brought liberal amounts of the context of the source surrounding Knox's quote into the footnote for ease of study; along with links, wherever possible, to the full work the quote comes from. As the careful reader will note, there are several references I have been unable to find.<sup>3</sup> If you find one of the missing references (or any mistakes in my editing), please let me know<sup>4</sup> and I'll be happy to make the correction.

I pray that my work is useful to Christ's church.

Soli Deo Gloria!

Daniel S. Meyer, B.A.

Indianapolis, Indiana

February 2019



To the extent possible under law, Daniel S. Meyer, ed. has waived all copyright and related or neighboring rights to *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. This work is published from: United States.

## EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE 2019 EDITION

### Notes

1. a claim I find dubious
2. I do not believe that I have any claim to copyright on my edits to Knox's text, since they were for the most part mechanical and obvious, and I've tried to be as uncreative as possible in preserving Knox's thoughts throughout; but for avoidance of doubt I dedicate this entire work into the public domain.
3. I suspect that some of these references may not yet have English translations.
4. [first.blast@outlook.com](mailto:first.blast@outlook.com)

## Author's Preface

THE KINGDOM APPERTAINETH TO OUR GOD.

Wonder it is that amongst so many pregnant wits as the Isle of Great Britain hath produced, so many godly and zealous preachers as England did sometime nourish, and amongst so many learned and men of grave judgment as this day by Jezebel are exiled, none is found so stout of courage, so faithful to God, nor loving to their native country, that they dare admonish the inhabitants of that Isle how abominable before God is the Empire or Rule of a wicked woman, yea of a traitoress and bastard; and what a people or nation left destitute of a lawful head may do by the authority of God's word in electing and appointing common rulers and magistrates. That isle (alas), for the contempt and horrible abuse of God's mercies offered, and for the shameful revolting to Satan from Christ Jesus and from his Gospel once professed, doth justly merit to be left in the hands of their own counsel, and so to come to confusion and bondage of strangers. But yet I fear that this



## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

universal negligence of such as sometimes were esteemed watchmen shall rather aggravate our former ingratitude than excuse this, our universal and ungodly silence in so weighty a matter.

We see our country set forth for a prey to foreign nations; we hear the blood of our brethren, the members of Christ Jesus, most cruelly to be shed; and the monstrous empire of a cruel woman (the secret counsel of God excepted) we know to be the only occasion of all these miseries: and yet with silence we pass the time as though the matter did nothing appertain to us. But the contrary examples of the ancient prophets move me to doubt of this our deeds.

For Israel did universally decline from God by embracing idolatry under Jeroboam,<sup>1</sup> in which they did continue even unto the destruction of their commonwealth. And Judah, with Jerusalem, did follow the vile superstition and open iniquity of Samaria;<sup>2</sup> but yet ceased not the prophets of God to admonish the one and the other, yea, even after God had poured forth his plagues upon them.<sup>3</sup> For Jeremiah did write to the captives of Babylon and correct their errors, plainly instructing them who did remain in the midst of that idolatrous nation. Ezekiel, from the midst of his brethren, prisoners in Chaldea, did write his vision to those that were in Jerusalem; and sharply rebuking their vices, assured them that they should not escape the vengeance of God, by reason of their abominations committed.<sup>4</sup>

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The same prophets, for comfort of the afflicted and chosen saints of God who did lie hid amongst the reprobate of that age (as commonly doth the corn amongst the chaff), did prophesy and before speak the changes of kingdoms, the punishments of tyrants, and the vengeance which God would execute upon the oppressors of his people.<sup>567</sup> The same did Daniel and the rest of the prophets, every one in their season; by whose examples and by the plain precept, which is given to Ezekiel, commanding him that he shall say to the wicked, "Thou shalt die the death,"<sup>8</sup> we, in this our miserable age, are bound to admonish the world and the tyrants thereof of their sudden destruction; to assure them, and to cry unto them, whether they wish to hear or not<sup>9</sup> that the blood of the saints, which by them is shed, continually crieth and craveth vengeance in the presence of the Lord of hosts.<sup>10</sup>

And further it is our duty to open the truth revealed unto us unto the ignorant and blind world, unless to our own condemnation we wish to wrap up and hide the talent committed to our charge. I am assured that God hath revealed to some in this our age that it is more than a monster in nature that a woman shall reign and have empire above man. And yet with us all there is such silence as if God therewith were nothing offended.

### Answers to the Objections

The natural man, enemy to God, shall find, I know, many

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

causes why no such doctrine ought to be published in these our dangerous days.

- First, that it may seem to tend to sedition:
- Secondly, it shall be dangerous, not only to the writer or publisher, but also to all such as shall read the writings or favor this truth spoken: and
- Last, it shall not amend the chief offenders: partly because it shall never come to their ears, and partly because they will not be admonished in such cases.

I answer, if any of these be a sufficient reason that a truth known shall be concealed, then were the ancient prophets of God very fools, who did not better provide for their own quietness than to hazard their lives for rebuking of vices and for the opening of such crimes as were not known to the world. And Christ Jesus did injury to his Apostles, commanding them to preach repentance and remission of sins in his name to every realm and nation. And Paul did not understand his own liberty when he cried, woe be to me if I preach not the Evangel:<sup>11</sup> if fear, I say, of persecution, of slander, or of any inconvenience before named, might have excused and discharged the servants of God from plainly rebuking the sins of the world;<sup>121314</sup> just cause had every one of them to have ceased from their office. For suddenly their doctrine was accused by terms of sedition, of new learning, and of treason: persecution and vehement trouble did shortly

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

come upon the professors with the preachers: kings, princes and worldly rulers did conspire against God and against his anointed Christ Jesus.<sup>1516</sup> But what? Did any of these move the prophets and Apostles to faint in their vocation? No. But by the resistance which the devil made to them by his subordinates were they the more inflamed to publish the truth revealed unto them, and to witness with their blood that grievous condemnation and God's heavy vengeance should follow the proud contempt of graces offered. The fidelity, bold courage, and constancy of those that are passed before us ought to provoke us to follow their footsteps, unless we look for another kingdom than Christ hath promised to such as persevere in profession of his name to the end.

If any think that the empire of women is not of such importance that for the suppressing of the same any man is bound to hazard his life, I answer that to suppress it is in the hand of God alone. But to utter the impiety and abomination of the same, I say it is the duty of every true messenger of God to whom the truth is revealed in that behalf. For the especial duty of God's messengers is to preach repentance, to admonish the offenders of their offenses, and to say to the wicked, thou shalt die the death, except thou repent. This, I trust, will no man deny to be the proper office of all God's messengers, to preach (as I have said) repentance and remission of sins. But neither can be done except the conscience of the offenders be accused and convicted of transgression. For how shall any

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

man repent, not knowing wherein he hath offended? And where no repentance is found, there can be no entry to grace. And therefore I say that of necessity it is that this monstrous empire of women (which amongst all enormities that this day do abound upon the face of the whole earth is most detestable and damnable) be openly revealed and plainly declared to the world, to the end that some may repent and be saved. And thus far to the first sort.

To such as think that it will be long before such doctrine come to the ears of the chief offenders, I answer that the verity of God is of that nature that at one time or another it will purchase to itself audience. It is an odor and smell that cannot be suppressed; yea, it is a trumpet that will sound in despite of the adversary. It will compel the very enemies, to their own confusion, to testify and bear witness of it. For I find that the prophecy and preaching of Elisha was declared in the hall of the king of Syria by the servants and flatterers of the same wicked king, making mention that Elisha declared to the king of Israel whatsoever the said king of Syria spoke in his most secret chamber.<sup>17</sup> And the wondrous works of Jesus Christ were notified to Herod,<sup>18</sup> not in any great praise or commendation of his doctrine, but rather to signify that Christ called that tyrant a fox:<sup>19</sup> and that he did no more regard his authority than did John the Baptist, whom Herod before had beheaded for the liberty of his tongue. But whether the bearers of the rumors and tidings were

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

favorers of Christ or flatterers of the tyrant, certain it is that the fame, as well of Christ's doctrine as of his works, came to the ears of Herod: even so may the sound of our weak trumpet, by the support of some wind (blow it from the south or blow it from the north, it is no matter) come to the ears of the chief offenders. But whether it do or not, yet dare we not cease to blow as God will give strength.<sup>20</sup> For we are debtors to more than princes, to wit, to the multitude of our brethren, of whom no doubt a great number have heretofore offended by error and ignorance, giving their suffrages, consent and help to establish women in their kingdoms and empires, not understanding how abominable, odious and detestable is all such usurped authority in the presence of God. And therefore must the truth be plainly spoken, that the simple and rude multitude may be admonished.

And as concerning the danger which may hereof ensue, I am not altogether so brutish and insensible but that I have laid my account what the finishing of the work may cost me for my own part. First, I am not ignorant how difficult and dangerous it is to speak against a common error, especially when the ambitious minds of men and women are called to the obedience of God's simple commandment. For to the most part of men, lawful and godly appeareth whatsoever antiquity hath received. And secondarily, I look to have my adversaries not only of the ignorant multitude, but also of the wise, politic, and quiet spirits of this world, so that as well shall such as ought to

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

maintain the truth and verity of God become enemies to me in this case as shall the princes and ambitious persons who to maintain their unjust tyranny do always study to suppress the same. And thus I am most certainly persuaded that my labor shall not escape reprehension of many. But because I remember that accounts of the talents received must be made to him who neither respecteth the multitude, neither yet approveth the wisdom, policy, peace, nor antiquity concluding or determining anything against his eternal will revealed to us in his most blessed word; I am compelled to cover my eyes, and shut up my ears, that I neither see the multitude that shall withstand me in this matter, neither that I shall hear the taunts, nor consider the dangers which I may incur for uttering the same. I shall be called foolish, curious, despiteful, and a sower of sedition: and one day perchance (although now I be nameless) I may be attainted of treason.

But seeing that impossible it is but that either I shall offend God, daily calling to my conscience that I ought to manifest the verity known, or else that I shall displease the world for doing the same, I have determined to obey God, notwithstanding that the world shall rage thereat. I know that the world offended (by God's permission) may kill the body, but God's majesty offended hath power to punish body and soul forever. His majesty is offended when his precepts are scorned and his threatenings esteemed to be of none effect. And amongst his manifold precepts given to his prophets, and amongst his threatenings, none is

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

more vehement, than is that which is pronounced to Ezekiel in these words:

Son of man, I have appointed thee a watchman to the house  
of Israel,  
that thou shouldest hear from my mouth the word,  
and that thou mayest admonish them plainly,  
when I shall say to the wicked man:  
O wicked, thou shalt assuredly die.  
Then if thou shalt not speak,  
that thou mayest plainly admonish him,  
that he may leave his wicked way,  
the wicked man shall die in his iniquity,  
but his blood will I require of thy hand.  
But and if thou shalt plainly admonish the wicked man,  
and yet he shall not turn from his way,  
such a one shall die in his iniquity,  
but thou hast delivered thy soul. —Ezekiel 33:17-19

This precept, I say, with the threatening annexed, together with the rest that is spoken in the same chapter—not to Ezekiel only, but to everyone whom God placeth watchman over his people and flock (and watchman are they whose eyes he doth open, and whose conscience he pricks to admonish the ungodly)—compels me to utter my conscience in this matter, notwithstanding that the whole world should be offended with me for so doing. If any wonder why I do conceal my name, let him be assured that the fear of corporeal punishment is neither the only, nor the chief cause. My purpose is thrice to blow the trumpet



in the same matter, if God so permit: twice I intend to do it without name, but at the last blast, to take the blame upon myself, that all others may be purged.

## Notes

1. "And Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David: If this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto their lord, [even] unto Rehoboam king of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam king of Judah. Whereupon the king took counsel, and made two calves [of] gold, and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan. And this thing became a sin: for the people went [to worship] before the one, [even] unto Dan." – 1 Kings 12:26-30
2. "Again the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations, And say, Thus saith the Lord GOD unto Jerusalem... Thou [art] thy mother's daughter, that lotheth her husband and her children; and thou [art] the sister of thy sisters, which lothed their husbands and their children: your mother [was] an Hittite, and your father an Amorite. And thine elder sister [is] Samaria, she and her daughters that dwell at thy left hand: and thy younger sister, that dwelleth at thy right hand, [is] Sodom and her daughters. Yet hast thou not walked after their ways, nor done after their abominations: but, as [if that were] a very little [thing], thou wast corrupted more than they in all thy ways." – Ezekiel 16:1-3, 45-47
3. "Hear ye therefore the word of the LORD, all ye of the captivity, whom I have sent from Jerusalem to Babylon..." – Jeremiah 29:20
4. See Ezekiel chapters 7-9.
5. "The burden of Tyre. Howl, ye ships of Tarshish; for it is laid waste, so that there is no house, no entering in: from the land of Chittim it is revealed to them. Be still, ye inhabitants of the isle; thou whom the merchants of Zidon, that pass over the sea, have replenished. And by great waters the seed of Sihor, the harvest of the river, [is] her revenue; and she is a mart of nations.

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Be thou ashamed, O Zidon: for the sea hath spoken, [even] the strength of the sea, saying, I travail not, nor bring forth children, neither do I nourish up young men, [nor] bring up virgins. As at the report concerning Egypt, [so] shall they be sorely pained at the report of Tyre. Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, ye inhabitants of the isle. [Is] this your joyous [city], whose antiquity [is] of ancient days? her own feet shall carry her afar off to sojourn. Who hath taken this counsel against Tyre, the crowning [city], whose merchants [are] princes, whose traffickers [are] the honourable of the earth? The LORD of hosts hath purposed it, to stain the pride of all glory, [and] to bring into contempt all the honourable of the earth." – Isaiah 23:1-9

6. "The word that the LORD spake to Jeremiah the prophet, how Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon should come [and] smite the land of Egypt. Declare ye in Egypt, and publish in Migdol, and publish in Noph and in Tahpanhes: say ye, Stand fast, and prepare thee; for the sword shall devour round about thee. Why are thy valiant [men] swept away? they stood not, because the LORD did drive them. He made many to fall, yea, one fell upon another: and they said, Arise, and let us go again to our own people, and to the land of our nativity, from the oppressing sword. They did cry there, Pharaoh king of Egypt [is but] a noise; he hath passed the time appointed. [As] I live, saith the King, whose name [is] the LORD of hosts, Surely as Tabor [is] among the mountains, and as Carmel by the sea, [so] shall he come. O thou daughter dwelling in Egypt, furnish thyself to go into captivity: for Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant. Egypt [is like] a very fair heifer, [but] destruction cometh; it cometh out of the north..." – Jeremiah 46:13-20
7. "Also, thou son of man, prophesy unto the mountains of Israel, and say, Ye mountains of Israel, hear the word of the LORD: Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because the enemy hath said against you, Aha, even the ancient high places are ours in possession: Therefore prophesy and say, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because they have made [you] desolate, and swallowed you up on every side, that ye might be a possession unto the residue of the heathen, and ye are taken up in the lips of talkers, and [are] an infamy of the people: Therefore, ye mountains of Israel, hear the word of the Lord GOD; Thus saith the Lord GOD to the mountains, and to the hills, to the rivers, and to the valleys, to the desolate wastes, and to the cities that are forsaken, which became a prey and derision to the residue of the heathen that [are] round about; Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; Surely in the fire of my jealousy have I spoken against the residue of

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

the heathen, and against all Idumea, which have appointed my land into their possession with the joy of all [their] heart, with despiteful minds, to cast it out for a prey. Prophesy therefore concerning the land of Israel, and say unto the mountains, and to the hills, to the rivers, and to the valleys, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I have spoken in my jealousy and in my fury, because ye have borne the shame of the heathen: Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD; I have lifted up mine hand, Surely the heathen that [are] about you, they shall bear their shame. But ye, O mountains of Israel, ye shall shoot forth your branches, and yield your fruit to my people of Israel; for they are at hand to come." – Ezekiel 36:1-8

8. "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked [man] shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand." – Ezekiel 3:17-18
9. "And he said unto me, Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me: they and their fathers have transgressed against me, [even] unto this very day. For [they are] impudent children and stiffhearted. I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD. And they, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, (for they [are] a rebellious house,) yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them. And thou, son of man, be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briers and thorns [be] with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions: be not afraid of their words, nor be dismayed at their looks, though they [be] a rebellious house. And thou shalt speak my words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear: for they [are] most rebellious." – Ezekiel 2:3-7
10. "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellowservants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they [were], should be fulfilled." – Revelation 6:9-11

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

11. "For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" – 1 Corinthians 9:16
12. "Now Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before [them] all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. And when he was gone out into the porch, another [maid] saw him, and said unto them that were there, This [fellow] was also with Jesus of Nazareth. And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. And after a while came unto [him] they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art [one] of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee. Then began he to curse and to swear, [saying], I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly." – Matthew 26:69-75
13. "And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews [that] Jesus [was] Christ. And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook [his] raiment, and said unto them, Your blood [be] upon your own heads; I [am] clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. ... Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city. And he continued [there] a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them." – Acts 18:5-6, 9-11
14. "And as we tarried [there] many days, there came down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver [him] into the hands of the Gentiles. And when we heard these things, both we, and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done." – Acts 21:10-14
15. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed,

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

[saying], Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." – Psalm 2:1-3

16. "And being let go, they went to their own company, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them. And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou [art] God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, By stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus." – Acts 4:23-30
17. "Then the king of Syria warred against Israel, and took counsel with his servants, saying, In such and such a place [shall be] my camp. And the man of God sent unto the king of Israel, saying, Beware that thou pass not such a place; for thither the Syrians are come down. And the king of Israel sent to the place which the man of God told him and warned him of, and saved himself there, not once nor twice. Therefore the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing; and he called his servants, and said unto them, Will ye not shew me which of us [is] for the king of Israel? And one of his servants said, None, my lord, O king: but Elisha, the prophet that [is] in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bedchamber." – 2 Kings 6:8-12
18. "At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus, And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him." – Matthew 14:1-2
19. "The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee. And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third [day] I shall be perfected." – Luke 13:31-32
20. "So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” – Romans 1:15-16

# I

## THE DECLAMATION

---

The Proposition: To promote a woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion or empire above any realm, nation, or city, is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, a thing most contrary to his revealed will and approved ordinance; and finally, it is the subversion of good order, of all equity and justice.

In the probation of this proposition I will not be so curious as to gather whatsoever may amplify, set forth, or decore the same; but I am purposed, even as I have spoken my conscience in most plain and few words, so to stand content with a simple proof of every member, bringing in for my witness God's ordinance in nature, his plain will

revealed in his word, and the minds of such as be most ancient amongst godly writers.

### A. Repugnant to nature

And first, where I affirm the empire of a woman to be a thing repugnant to nature, I mean not only that God by the order of his creation hath spoiled woman of authority and dominion, but also that man hath seen, proved and pronounced just causes why it so should be. Man, I say, in many other cases blind, doth in this behalf see very clearly. For the causes be so manifest that they cannot be hid. For who can deny but it repugneth to nature that the blind shall be appointed to lead and conduct such as do see? That the weak, the sick, and impotent persons shall nourish and keep the whole and strong, and finally, that the foolish, mad and frenetic shall govern the discreet, and give counsel to such as be sober of mind? And such be all women, compared unto man in bearing of authority. For their sight in civil regiment is but blindness: their strength, weakness: their counsel, foolishness: and judgment, frenzy, if it be rightly considered.

I except such as God, by singular privilege and for certain causes known only to himself, hath exempted from the common rank of women, and do speak of women as nature and experience do this day declare them. Nature, I say, doth paint them forth to be weak, frail, impatient, feeble and foolish: and experience hath declared them to



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

be unconstant, variable, cruel and lacking the spirit of counsel and regiment. And these notable faults have men in all ages espied in that kind, for which not only they have removed women from rule and authority, but also some have thought that men subject to the counsel or empire of their wives were unworthy of all public office. For this writeth Aristotle in the second volume of his *Politics*:

What difference shall we put whether that women bear authority, or the husband that obey the empire of their wives be appointed to be magistrates? For what ensueth the one, must needs follow the other, to wit, injustice, confusion and disorder.<sup>1</sup>

The same author further reasoneth that the policy or regiment of the Lacedemonians (who other ways amongst the Grecians were most excellent) was not worthy to be reputed nor accounted amongst the number of commonwealths that were well governed, because the magistrates and rulers of the same were too much given to please and obey their wives. What would this writer, I pray you, have said to that realm or nation where a woman sitteth crowned in parliament amongst the midst of men.

Oh fearful and terrible are thy judgments, O Lord, which thus hast abased man for his iniquity!

I am assuredly persuaded that if any of those men which, illuminated only by the light of nature, did see and pronounce causes sufficient why women ought not to bear rule nor authority, should this day live and see a

woman sitting in judgment or riding from parliament in the midst of men, having the royal crown upon her head, the sword and scepter borne before her in sign that the administration of justice was in her power—I am assuredly persuaded, I say, that such a sight should so astonish them that they should judge the whole world to be transformed into Amazons, and that such a metamorphosis and change was made of all the men of that country as poets do feign was made of the companions of Ulysses; or, at least, that albeit the outward form of men remained, yet should they judge that their hearts were changed from the wisdom, understanding, and courage of men, to the foolish fondness and cowardice of women. Yea, they further should pronounce that where women reign or be in authority, there must needs vanity be preferred to virtue, ambition and pride to temperance and modesty; and finally, that avarice, the mother of all mischief, must needs devour equity and justice. (Aristotle, *Politics* Book 2)<sup>2</sup>

But lest we shall seem to be of this opinion alone, let us hear what others have seen and decreed in this matter. In the rules of the law thus it is written:

Women are removed from all civil and public office, so that they neither may be judges, neither may they occupy the place of the magistrate, neither yet may they be speakers for others (Justinian's *Digest* ("Pandects") Book 50, "De Regulis Juris").<sup>3</sup>

The same is repeated in the third and in the sixteenth

books of the digests: where certain persons are forbidden (*ne pro aliis postulent*); that is, that they be no speakers nor advocates for others.<sup>45</sup>

And among the rest are women forbidden; and this cause is added, that they do not against shamefacedness intermeddle themselves with the causes of others (*ad Senatus Consultum Velleianum*),<sup>6</sup> neither yet that women presume to use the offices due to men.

The law in the same place doth further declare that a natural shamefacedness ought to be in womankind (*Pandects* Book 3 Title 1, "Concerning The Right Of Application To The Court")<sup>7</sup> which most certainly she loseth whensoever she taketh upon her the office and estate of man. As in Calphurnia was evidently declared, who having license to speak before the senate, at length became so impudent and importunate, that by her babbling she troubled the whole assembly, and so gave occasion that this law was established.

In the first book of the digests, it is pronounced that the condition of the woman in many cases is worse than of the man (*Pandects* Book 1 Title 5 "On Status," section 9).<sup>8</sup> As in jurisdiction (saith the law), in receiving of cure and tuition,<sup>9</sup> in adoption,<sup>10</sup> in public accusation, in delation,<sup>11</sup> in all popular action, and in motherly power,<sup>12</sup> which she hath not upon her own sons.

The law further will not permit that the woman give anything to her husband, because it is against the nature of her kind, being the inferior member, to presume to give

any thing to her head (*Pandects* Book 24 Title 1, “Concerning Donations Between Husband And Wife”).<sup>13</sup>

The law doth moreover pronounce womankind to be the most avaricious,<sup>14</sup> which is a vice intolerable in those that should rule or minister justice.<sup>15</sup>

And Aristotle, as before is touched, doth plainly affirm that wheresoever women bear dominion there the people must needs be disordered, living and abounding in all intemperance, given to pride, excess, and vanity; and finally, in the end, that they must needs come to confusion and ruin.<sup>16</sup>

Would to God the examples were not so manifest to the further declaration of the imperfections of women—of their natural weakness and inordinate appetites. I might adduce histories proving some women to have died for sudden joy; some, for impatience, to have murdered themselves; some to have burned with such inordinate lust that for the quenching of the same they have betrayed to strangers their country and city; and some to have been so desirous of dominion that for the obtaining of the same they have murdered the children of their own sons. Yea, and some have killed with cruelty their own husbands and children.<sup>17</sup>

But to me it is sufficient (because this part of nature is not my most sure foundation) to have proved that men illuminated only by the light of nature have seen and have determined that it is a thing most repugnant to nature that women rule and govern over men. For those that will not

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

permit a woman to have power over her own sons will not permit her, I am assured, to have rule over a realm: and those that will not suffer her to speak in defense of those that be accused, neither that will admit her accusation intended against man, will not approve her that she shall sit in judgment crowned with the royal crown, usurping authority in the midst of men.

### B. Contumely to God

But now to the second part of nature, in which I include the revealed will and perfect ordinance of God; and against this part of nature, I say that it doth manifestly repugn that any woman shall reign or bear dominion over man. For God, first by the order of his creation, and after by the curse and malediction pronounced against the woman by the reason of her rebellion, hath pronounced the contrary.

First, I say, that woman in her greatest perfection was made to serve and obey man, not to rule and command him, as Saint Paul doth reason in these words:

Man is not of the woman but the woman of the man. And man was not created for the cause of the woman, but the woman for the cause of man, and therefore ought the woman to have a power upon her head (that is, a coverture, in sign of subjection, 1 Corinthians II).

Of which words it is plain that the Apostle meaneth that woman in her greatest perfection should have known

that man was lord above her, and therefore that she should never have pretended any kind of superiority above him; no more than do the angels above God the creator, or above Christ Jesus their head.

So I say that in her greatest perfection woman was created to be subject to man; but after her fall and rebellion committed against God there was put upon her a new necessity, and she was made subject to man by the irrevocable sentence of God, pronounced in these words:

I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception. With sorrow shalt thou bear thy children, and thy will shall be subject to thy man: and he shall bear dominion over thee.

Hereby may such as altogether be not blinded plainly see that God, by his sentence, hath dejected woman from empire and dominion above man. For two punishments are laid upon her, to wit: a dolor, anguish and pain, as oft as ever she shall be mother; and a subjection of her self, her appetites and will, to her husband and to his will. From the former part of this malediction can neither art, nobility, policy, nor law made by man, deliver womankind; but whosoever attaineth to that honour to be mother proveth in experience the effect and strength of God's word.

But alas—ignorance of God, ambition, and tyranny have studied to abolish and destroy the second part of God's punishment. For women are lifted up to be heads over

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

realms and to rule above men at their pleasure and appetites. But horrible is the vengeance which is prepared for the one and for the other—for the promoters and for the persons promoted—except they speedily repent. For they shall be dejected from the glory of the sons of God to the slavery of the devil, and to the torment that is prepared for all such as do exalt themselves against God. Against God can nothing be more manifest than that a woman shall be exalted to reign above man. For the contrary sentence hath he pronounced in these words (Genesis 3):

Thy will shall be subject to thy husband, and he shall bear dominion over thee.

As if God should say: forasmuch as thou hast abused thy former condition, and because thy free will hath brought thyself and mankind into the bondage of Satan, I therefore will bring thee in bondage to man. For where before thy obedience should have been voluntary, now it shall be by constraint and by necessity: and because thou hast deceived thy man, thou shalt therefore be no longer mistress<sup>18</sup> over thine own appetites, over thine own will nor desires. For in thee there is neither reason nor discretion which be able to moderate thy affections, and therefore they shall be subject to the desire of thy man. He shall be lord and governor, not only over thy body, but even over thy appetites and will. This sentence, I say, did God pronounce against Eve and her daughters, as the

rest of the Scriptures doth evidently witness. So that no woman can ever presume to reign above man, but the same she must needs do in despite of God, and in contempt of his punishment and malediction.

I am not ignorant that the most part of men do understand this malediction of the subjection of the wife to her husband and of the dominion which he beareth above her: but the Holy Ghost giveth to us another interpretation of this place, taking from all women all kind of superiority, authority and power over man, speaking as followeth by the mouth of Saint Paul (1 Tim. 2.):

I suffer not a woman to teach, neither yet to usurp authority above man.

Here he nameth women in general, excepting none, affirming that she may usurp authority above no man. And he speaketh more plainly in another place, in these words (1 Cor. 14):

Let women keep silence in the congregation, for it is not permitted to them to speak, but to be subject as the law sayeth.

These two testimonies of the Holy Ghost be sufficient to prove whatsoever we have affirmed before, and to repress the inordinate pride of women, as also to correct the foolishness of those that have studied to exalt women in authority above man, against God, and against his



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

sentence pronounced. But that the same two places of the Apostle may the better be understood, it is to be noted that in the latter, which is written in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the 14th chapter, before the Apostle had permitted that all persons should prophesy one after another, adding this reason: that all may learn and all may receive consolation. And lest any might have judged that amongst a rude multitude and the plurality of speakers many things little to purpose might have been affirmed, or else that some confusion might have arisen, he addeth: the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets—as if he should say, God shall always raise up some to whom the verity shall be revealed, and unto such ye shall give place, albeit they sit in the lowest seats. And thus the Apostle would have prophesying an exercise to be free to the whole church, that everyone should communicate with the congregation what God had revealed to them, providing that it were orderly done.

But from this general privilege he excludeth woman, saying: let women keep silence in the congregation. And why, I pray you? Was it because the Apostle thought no woman to have any knowledge? No, he giveth another reason, saying, let her be subject as the law saith. In which words is first to be noted, that the Apostle calleth this former sentence pronounced against woman a law—that is, the immutable decree of God, who by his own voice hath subjected her to one member of the congregation, that is to her husband. Whereupon the Holy Ghost concludeth

that she may never rule nor bear empire above man. For she that is made subject to one may never be preferred to many; and that the Holy Ghost doth manifestly express, saying: I suffer not that women usurp authority above man. He sayeth not, I will not that woman usurp authority above her husband, but he nameth man in general, taking from her all power and authority to speak, to reason, to interpret, or to teach, but principally to rule or to judge in the assembly of men. So that woman by the law of God, and by the interpretation of the Holy Ghost, is utterly forbidden to occupy the place of God in the offices aforesaid, which he hath assigned to man, whom he hath appointed and ordained his lieutenant in earth: excluding from that honor and dignity woman, as this short argument shall evidently declare.

The Apostle taketh power from woman to speak in the assembly; *ergo* he permitteth no woman to rule above man. The former part is evident, whereupon doth the conclusion of necessity follow. For he that taketh from woman the least part of authority, dominion, or rule, will not permit unto her that which is greatest: But greater it is to reign above realms and nations, to publish and to make laws, and to command men of all estates, and finally to appoint judges and ministers, than to speak in the congregation. For her judgment, sentence, or opinion proposed in the congregation may be judged by all, may be corrected by the learned and reformed by the godly. But woman being promoted in sovereign authority, her laws

must be obeyed, her opinion followed, and her tyranny maintained—even supposing that it be expressly against God and the profit of the commonwealth, as too manifest experience doth this day witness.

The minds of some ancient godly writers

And therefore yet again I repeat that which before I have affirmed, to wit, that a woman promoted to sit in the seat of God, that is, to teach, to judge or to reign above man, is a monster in nature, contumely to God, and a thing most repugnant to his will and ordinance. For he hath deprived them, as before is proved, of speaking in the congregation, and hath expressly forbidden them to usurp any kind of authority above man—how then will he suffer them to reign and have empire above realms and nations? He will never, I say, approve it, because it is a thing most repugnant to his perfect ordinance, as after shall be declared, and as the former Scriptures have plainly given testimony. To which, to add anything were superfluous, were it not that the world is almost now come to that blindness that whatsoever pleaseth not the princes and the multitude, the same is rejected as doctrine newly forged, and is condemned for heresy. I have therefore thought good to recite the minds of some ancient writers in the same matter, to the end that such as altogether be not blinded by the devil may consider and understand this my judgment to be no new interpretation of God's Scriptures, but to be

the uniform consent of the most part of godly writers since the time of the apostles.

Tertullian, in his book *On Women's Apparel*, after he hath shown many causes why gorgeous apparel is abominable and odious in a woman, addeth these words, speaking as it were to every woman by name:

Dost thou not know that thou art Eve? the sentence of God liveth and is effectual against this kind, and in this world of necessity it is, that the punishment also live. Thou art the port and gate of the devil. Thou art the first transgressor of God's law. thou didst persuade and easily deceive him whom the devil durst not assault. For thy merit (that is for thy death) it behooved the son of God to suffer the death, and doth it yet abide in thy mind to deck thee above thy skin coats?<sup>79</sup>

By these and many other grave sentences and quick interrogations did this godly writer labor to bring every woman in contemplation of herself, to the end that every one deeply weighing what sentence God had pronounced against the whole race and daughters of Eve might not only learn daily to humble and subject themselves in the presence of God, but also that they should avoid and abhor whatsoever thing might exalt them or puff them up in pride, or that might be occasion that they should forget the curse and malediction of God. And what, I pray you, is more able to cause woman to forget her own condition than if she be lifted up in authority above man?

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

It is a thing very difficult to a man—be he never so constant—promoted to honors, not to be tickled somewhat with pride; for the wind of vain glory doth easily carry up the dry dust of the earth. But as for woman, it is no more possible that she, being set aloft in authority above man, shall resist the motions of pride, than it is able to the weak reed, or to the turning weathercock, not to bow or turn at the vehemence of the unconstant wind. And therefore the same writer expressly forbiddeth woman to intermeddle with the office of man. For thus he writeth in his book *On the Veiling of Virgins*:

It is not permitted to a woman to speak in the congregation, neither to teach, neither to baptize, neither to claim to herself any office of man.<sup>20</sup>

The same he speaketh yet more plainly in the preface of his [first] book written against Marcion, where he, recounting certain monstrous things which were to be seen at the sea called *Euxinum*, amongst the rest, he reciteth this as a great monster in nature, that women in those parts were not tamed nor embased by consideration of their own sex and kind; but that all shame laid apart, they made expenses upon weapons and learned the feats of war, having more pleasure to fight than to marry and be subject to man.<sup>21</sup>

Thus far of Tertullian, whose words be so plain that they need no explanation. For he that taketh from her

all office appertaining to man will not suffer her to reign above man; and he that judgeth it a monster in nature that a woman shall exercise weapons must judge it to be a monster of monsters that a woman shall be exalted above a whole realm and nation.

Of the same mind is Origen, and diverse others. Yea even till the days of Augustine, whose sentences I omit to avoid prolixity.

Augustine, in his 22nd book written against Faustus, proveth that a woman ought to serve her husband as unto God, affirming that in no thing hath woman equal power with man, saving that neither have power over their own bodies.<sup>22</sup> By which he would plainly conclude that a woman ought never to pretend nor thirst for that power and authority which is due to man. For so he doth explain himself in another place, affirming that woman ought to be repressed and bridled betimes, if she aspire to any dominion: alleging that dangerous and perilous it is to suffer her to proceed, although it be in temporal and corporeal things. And thereto he addeth these words:

God seeth not for a time, neither is there any new thing in his sight and knowledge, meaning thereby that what God hath seen in one woman (as concerning dominion and bearing of authority), the same he seeth in all. And what he hath forbidden to one, the same he also forbiddeth to all. (Augustine, *On the Holy Trinity* Book 12 Chapter 7)<sup>23</sup>

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

And this most evidently yet in another place he writeth, moving this question:

How can woman be the image of God, seeing she is subject to man and hath none authority, neither to teach, neither to be witness, neither to judge, much less to rule, or bear empire? (Pseudo-Augustine, *Questions Old and New Testaments*, question 45, "The Image")<sup>24</sup>

These be the very words of Augustine, of which it is evident that this godly writer doth not only agree with Tertullian before recited, but also with the former sentence of the law, which taketh from woman not only all authority amongst men, but also every office appertaining to man. To the question how she can be the image of God, he answereth as followeth: Woman, compared to other creatures is the image of God, (for she beareth dominion over them): but compared unto man she may not be called the image of God, (for she beareth not rule and lordship over man, but ought to obey him).<sup>2526</sup>

And how woman ought to obey man, he speaketh yet more clearly in these words:

The woman shall be subject to man as unto Christ. For woman hath not her example from the body and from the flesh, that so she shall be subject to man, as the flesh is unto the spirit. Because the flesh in the weakness and mortality of this life lusteth and striveth against the spirit, and therefore would not the Holy Ghost give example of subjection to the woman of any such thing... (Augustine, *On Continence*)<sup>27</sup>

This sentence of Augustine ought to be noted of all women, for in it he plainly affirmeth that woman ought to be subject to man, that she never ought more to desire preeminence above him than that she ought to desire above Christ Jesus.

With Augustine agreeth in every point Saint Ambrose, who thus writeth in his Hexaemeron:

Adam was deceived by Eve, and not Eve by Adam, and therefore just it is that woman receive and acknowledge him for governor whom she called to sin, lest again she slide and fall by womanly facility.<sup>28</sup>

And writing upon the epistle to the Ephesians he saith,

Let women be subject to their own husbands as unto the Lord: for the man is head to the woman, and Christ is head to the congregation, and he is the saviour of the body: but the congregation is subject to Christ, even so ought women to be to their husbands in all things.<sup>29</sup>

He proceedeth further saying:

Women are commanded to be subject to men by the law of nature because man is the author or beginner of the woman: for as Christ is the head of the church, so is man of the woman. From Christ the church took beginning, and therefore it is subject unto him: even so did woman take beginning from man, that she should be subject.<sup>30</sup>

Thus we hear the agreeing of these two writers to be such



that a man might judge the one to have stolen the words and sentences from the other; and yet plain it is that during the time of their writing the one was far distant from the other. But the Holy Ghost, who is the spirit of concord and unity, did so illuminate their hearts and direct their tongues and pens, that as they did conceive and understand one truth, so did they pronounce and utter the same, leaving a testimony of their knowledge and concord to us their posterity. If any think that all these former sentences be spoken only of the subjection of the married woman to her husband, as before I have proved the contrary by the plain words and reasoning of Saint Paul, so shall I shortly do the same by other testimonies of the aforesaid writers.

The same Ambrose, writing upon the second chapter of the first epistle to Timothy, after he hath spoken much of the simple arrayment of women, addeth these words:

Woman ought not only to have simple arrayment, but all authority is to be denied unto her: for she must be in subjection to man (of whom she hath taken her original) as well in habit as in service.<sup>3132</sup>

And after a few words he saith:

Because that death did enter into the world by her, there is no boldness that ought to be permitted unto her, but she ought to be in humility.<sup>33</sup>

Hereof it is plain that from woman, be she married or unmarried, is all authority taken to execute any office that appertaineth to man. Yea, plain it is that woman is commanded to serve, to be in humility and subjection. Which thing yet speaketh the same writer more plainly in these words:

It is not permitted to women to speak, but to be in silence, as the law saith. What saith the law? Unto thy husband shall thy conversion be, and he shall bear dominion over thee (Genesis 3). This is a special law whose sentence, lest it should be violated, infirmed, or made weak, women are commanded to be in silence. (Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians 14*)<sup>34</sup>

Here he includeth all women. And yet he proceedeth further in the same place, saying,

It is shame for them to presume to speak of the law in the house of the Lord, who hath commanded them to be subject to their men.<sup>35</sup>

But most plainly speaketh he writing upon the 16th chapter of the epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans, upon these words: "Salute Rufus and his mother."

For this cause did the apostle place Rufus before his mother, for the election of the administration of the grace of God, in which a woman hath no place. For he was chosen and promoted by the Lord to take care over his business, that is, over the church, to which office could not his mother be

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

appointed, albeit she was a woman so holy that the apostle called her his mother. (Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Romans*)<sup>36</sup>

Hereof it is plain that the administration of the grace of God is denied to woman. By the administration of God's grace is understood not only the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments, by which the grace of God is presented and ordinarily distributed unto man, but also the administration of civil justice, by which virtue ought to be maintained and vices punished; the execution whereof is no less denied to woman than is the preaching of the Evangel or administration of the sacraments, as hereafter shall most plainly appear.

Chrysostom, amongst the Grecian writers of no small credit, speaking in rebuke of men who in his days were become inferior to some women in wit and in godliness, saith, "For this cause was woman put under thy power," (he speaketh to man in general), "and thou wast pronounced lord over her, that she should obey thee, and that the head should not follow the feet. But often it is, that we see the contrary, that he who in his order ought to be the head doth not keep the order of the feet," (that is, doth not rule the feet), "and that she that is in place of the foot is constituted to be the head." (Chrysostom, *Homily 17 on Genesis 3:8*)<sup>37</sup>

He speaketh these words as it were in wonder, that man was become so brutish that he did not consider it to be a

thing most monstrous that woman should be preferred to man in anything, whom God had subjected to man in all things. He proceedeth, saying:

Nevertheless it is the part of the man with diligent care to repel the woman that giveth him wicked counsel: and woman, which gave that pestilent counsel to man, ought at all times to have the punishment which was given to Eve sounding in her ears.<sup>38</sup>

And in another place he induceth God speaking to the woman in this sort:

Because thou left him, of whose nature thou wast participant and for whom thou wast formed, and hast had pleasure to have familiarity with that wicked beast, and would take his counsel: therefore I subject thee to man, and I appoint and affirm him to be thy lord, that thou mayest acknowledge his dominion; and because thou couldest not bear rule, learn well to be ruled.<sup>39</sup>

Why they should not bear rule, he declareth in other places, saying,

Womankind is imprudent and soft (or flexible)...<sup>4041</sup>

Imprudent because she cannot consider with wisdom and reason the things which she heareth and seeth: and soft she is, because she is easily bowed. I know that Chrysostom bringeth in these words to declare the cause why false prophets do commonly deceive women: because

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

they are easily persuaded to any opinion, especially if it be against God, and because they lack prudence and right reason to judge the things that be spoken. But hereof may their nature be espied, and the vices of the same, which in no wise ought to be in those that are appointed to govern others: for they ought to be constant, stable, prudent, and doing everything with discretion and reason, which virtues women cannot have in equality with men. For he doth witness in another place, saying:

Women have in themselves a tickling and study of vain glory, and that they may have common with men: they are suddenly moved to anger, and that they have also common with some men. (Chrysostom, *Homily 13 on Ephesians 4:17-19*)<sup>42</sup>

But virtues in which they excel they have not common with man, and therefore hath the Apostle removed them from the office of teaching, which is an evident proof that in virtue they far differ from man.

Let the reasons of this writer be marked, for further he yet proceedeth: after he hath in many words lamented the effeminate manners of men, who were so far degenerate to the weakness of women that some might have demanded, “Why may not women teach amongst such a sort of men, who in wisdom and godliness are become inferior unto women?” He finally concludeth that notwithstanding that men be degenerate, yet may not women usurp any

authority above them; and in the end he addeth these words:

These things do not I speak to extol them (that is women) but to the confusion and shame of ourselves, and to admonish us to take again the dominion that is meet and convenient for us; not only that power which is according to the excellency of dignity, but that which is according to providence, and according to help and virtue. For then is the body in best proportion, when it hath the best governor.

O that both man and woman should consider the profound counsel and admonition of this father! He would not that man for appetite of any vain glory should desire preeminence above woman. For God hath not made man to be head for any such cause, but having respect to that weakness and imperfection which always letteth woman to govern. He hath ordained man to be superior, and that meaneth Chrysostom, saying, then is the body in best proportion, when it hath the best governor. But woman can never be the best governor, by reason that she, being spoiled of the spirit of regiment, can never attain to that degree, to be called or judged a good governor, because in the nature of woman lurketh such vices as in good governors are not tolerable; which the same writer expresseth in these words:

Womankind is rash and foolhardy, and their covetousness is like the gulf of hell, that is, insatiable.<sup>43</sup>

And therefore in another place he will that woman shall have nothing to do in judgment, in common affairs, or in the regiment of the commonwealth, because she is impatient of troubles; but that she shall live in tranquility and quietness. And if she have occasion to go from the house, that yet she shall have no matter of trouble, neither to follow her, nor to be offered unto her, as commonly there must be to such as bear authority.<sup>44</sup>

And with Chrysostom fully agreeth Basil the Great in a sermon which he maketh upon some places of Scripture, wherein he reproveth diverse vices; and amongst the rest he affirmeth woman to be a tender creature, flexible, soft and pitiful: which nature God hath given unto her, that she may be apt to nourish children; the which facility of the woman did Satan abuse, and thereby brought her from the obedience of God.<sup>45</sup>

And therefore in diverse other places doth he conclude that she is not apt to bear rule, and that she is forbidden to teach.

Innumerable more testimonies of all sorts of writers may be adduced for the same purpose; but with these I stand content, judging it sufficient to stop the mouth of such as accuse and condemn all doctrine as heretical which displeaseth them in any point that I have proved: by the determinations and laws of men illuminated only by the light of nature; by the order of God's creation; by the curse and malediction pronounced against woman; by the mouth of Saint Paul, who is the interpreter of God's

sentence and law; and finally by the minds of those writers who in the church of God have been always held in greatest reverence: that it is a thing most repugnant to nature, to God's will and appointed ordinance—yea that it cannot be without contumely committed against God—that a woman should be promoted to dominion or empire to reign over man, be it in realm, nation, province or city.

### C. Subversion of good order, equity, and justice

Now resteth it in few words to be shown that the same empire of women is the subversion of good order, equity, and justice.

Augustine defineth order to be that thing by which God hath appointed and ordained all things (Augustine, *De Ordine* ("On Order"), Book 1 Chapter 10).<sup>46</sup> Note well, reader, that Augustine will admit no order where God's appointment is absent and lacketh.

And in another place he saith that order is a disposition, giving their own proper places to things that be unequal, which he termeth in Latin *parium et disparium*, that is, of things equal or like, and things unequal or unlike (Augustine, *City of God*, Book 19 Chapter 13).<sup>47</sup> Of which two places and of the whole disputation, which is contained in his second book *De Ordine*, it is evident that whatsoever is done either without the assurance of God's



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

will, or else against his will manifestly revealed in his word, is done against order.

But such is the empire and regiment of woman, as evidently before is declared; and therefore I say: it is a thing plainly repugnant to good order, yea it is the subversion of the same. If any wish to reject the definition of Augustine, as either not proper to this purpose, or else as insufficient to prove my intent, let the same man understand that in so doing he hath infirmed my argument nothing. For as I depend not upon the determinations of men, so think I my cause no weaker, though their authority be denied unto me, provided that God by his will revealed, and manifest word, stand plain and evident on my side. That God hath subjected womankind to man by the order of his creation, and by the curse that he hath pronounced against her, is before declared.

### The first other glass: the natural body of man

Besides these, he hath set before our eyes two other mirrors and glasses in which he will that we should behold the order which he hath appointed and established in nature: the one is the natural body of man: the other is the politic or civil body of that commonwealth, in which God by his own word hath appointed an order. In the natural body of man God hath appointed an order, that the head shall occupy the uppermost place. And the head hath he joined with the body, that from it doth life and motion flow to the rest of the members. In it hath he placed the

eye to see, the ear to hear, and the tongue to speak, which offices are appointed to no other member of the body. The rest of the members have every one their own place and office appointed: but none may have the place nor office of the head. For who would not judge that body to be a monster where there was no head eminent above the rest, but that the eyes were in the hands, the tongue and mouth beneath in the belly, and the ears in the feet. Men, I say, should not only pronounce this body to be a monster; but assuredly they might conclude that such a body could not long endure.

And no less monstrous is the body of that commonwealth where a woman beareth empire. For either doth it lack a lawful head (as in very deed it doth) or else there is an idol exalted in the place of the true head. An idol I call that which hath the form and appearance, but lacketh the virtue and strength which the name and proportion do resemble and promise; as images have face, nose, eyes, mouth, hands and feet painted, but the use of the same cannot the craft and art of man give them: as the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David teacheth us, saying:

They have eyes, but they see not, mouth, but they speak not, nose, but they smell not, hands and feet, but they neither touch nor have power to go. (Psalm 115)

And such, I say, is every realm and nation where a woman beareth dominion. For in contempt of God—he of his just

judgment so giving them over to a reprobate mind—may a realm, I confess, exalt up a woman to that monstrous honor, to be esteemed as head.

But impossible it is to man and angel, to give unto her the properties and perfect offices of a lawful head. For the same God that hath denied power to the hand to speak, to the belly to hear, and to the feet to see, hath denied to woman power to command man, and hath taken away wisdom to consider, and providence to forsee the things that be profitable to the commonwealth: yea, finally, he hath denied to her in any case to be head to man; but plainly hath pronounced that man is head to woman, even as Christ is head to all man (1 Cor. 11).

If men in a blind rage should assemble together and appoint themselves another head than Jesus Christ (as the papists have done their Romish Antichrist), should Christ therefore lose his own dignity, or should God give that counterfeit head power to give life to the body, to see whatsoever might damage or hurt it, to speak in defense, and to hear the request of every subject? It is certain that he would not. For that honor he hath appointed before all times to his only Son, and the same will he give to no creature besides; no more will he admit, nor accept woman to be the lawful head over man, although man, devil, and angel will conjure in their favor. For seeing he hath subjected her to one, as before is said, he will never permit her to reign over many. Seeing he hath commanded her to hear and obey one, he will not suffer that she speak,

and with usurped authority command, realms and nations.

Chrysostom, explaining these words of the Apostle (1 Corinthians 11, the head of woman is man), compareth God in his universal regiment to a king sitting in his royal majesty, to whom all his subjects, commanded to give homage and obedience, appear before him, bearing every one such a badge and cognizance of dignity and honor as he hath given to them; which if they despise and scorn, then do they dishonor their king; even so, saith he, ought man and woman to appear before God, bearing the ensigns of the condition which they have received of him (Chrysostom, *Homily 26 on First Corinthians*).<sup>48</sup> Man hath received a certain glory and dignity above the woman, and therefore ought he to appear before his high majesty bearing the sign of his honor, having no coverture upon his head, to witness that in earth man hath no head (beware Chrysostom what thou sayest—thou shalt be reputed a traitor if English men hear thee, for they must have my sovereign lady and mistress, and Scotland hath drunk also the enchantment and venom of Circe; let it be so to their own shame and confusion—he proceedeth in these words) but woman ought to be covered, to witness that in earth she hath a head, that is man.

True it is, woman is covered in both the said realms, but it is not with the sign of subjection, but with the sign of superiority, to wit, with the royal crown. To that he answereth in these words:

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

What if man neglect his honor? he is no less to be mocked than if a king should depose himself of his diadem or crown and royal estate and clothe himself in the habit of a slave.

(Chrysostom, *Homily 26 on First Corinthians*)<sup>49</sup>

What, I pray you, should this godly father have said if he had seen all the men of a realm or nation fall down before a woman? If he had seen the crown, scepter, and sword, which are ensigns of the royal dignity, given to her, and a woman, cursed of God and made subject to man, placed in the throne of justice, to sit as God's lieutenant? What, I say, in this behalf, should any heart unfeignedly fearing God have judged of such men? I am assured that not only should they have been judged foolish but also enraged, and slaves to Satan, manifestly fighting against God and his appointed order. The more that I consider the subversion of God's order which he hath placed generally in all living things, the more I do wonder at the blindness of man, who doth not consider himself in this case so degenerate that the brute beasts are to be preferred unto him in this behalf.

For nature hath in all beasts printed a certain mark of dominion in the male, and a certain subjection in the female, which they keep inviolate. For no man ever saw the lion make obeisance, and stoop before the lioness; neither yet can it be proved, that the hind taketh the conducting of the herd amongst the harts. And yet, alas, man, who by the mouth of God hath dominion appointed to him

over woman, doth not only, to his own shame, stoop under the obedience of women, but also, in despite of God and of his appointed order, rejoiceth, and maintaineth that monstrous authority as a thing lawful and just.

The insolent joy, the bonfires and banqueting which were in London and elsewhere in England when that cursed Jezebel was proclaimed queen, did witness to my heart that men were become more than enraged. For else how could they so have rejoiced at their own confusion and certain destruction? For what man was there of so base judgment (supposing that he had any light of God) who did not see the erecting of that monster to be the overthrow of true religion and the assured destruction of England, and of the ancient liberties thereof? And yet nevertheless, all men so triumphed as if God had delivered them from all calamity.

But just and righteous, terrible and fearful are thy judgments, O Lord! For as sometimes thou didst so punish men for unthankfulness that man was ashamed not to commit villainy with man (Romans 1); and that because, knowing thee to be God, they glorified thee not as God, even so hast thou most justly now punished the proud rebellion and horrible ingratitude of the realms of England and Scotland. For when thou didst offer thyself most mercifully to them both, offering the means by which they might have been joined together forever in godly concord, then was the one proud and cruel, and the other unconstant and fickle of promise.

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

But yet, alas, did miserable England further rebel against thee. For albeit thou didst not cease to heap benefit upon benefit during the reign of an innocent and tender king, yet no man did acknowledge thy potent hand and marvelous working.

The stout courage of captains, the wit and policy of counselors, the learning of bishops, did rob thee of thy glory and honor. For what then was heard, as concerning religion, but the king's proceedings, the king's proceedings must be obeyed? It is enacted by parliament: therefore it is treason to speak the contrary. But this was not the end of this miserable tragedy. For thou didst yet proceed to offer thy favors, sending thy prophets and messengers to call for reformation of life in all estates.

For even from the highest to the lowest, all were declined from thee—yea, even those that should have been the lanterns to others; some, I am assured, did quake and tremble, and from the bottom of their hearts thirsted amendment, and for the same purpose did earnestly call for discipline. But then burst forth the venom which before lurked—then might they not contain their spiteful voices, but with open mouths did cry, we will not have such a one to reign over us. Then, I say, was every man so stout that he would not be brought in bondage—no, not to thee, O Lord—but with disdain did the multitude cast from them the amiable yoke of Christ Jesus. No man would suffer his sin to be rebuked, no man would have his life called to trial. And thus did they refuse thee, O Lord,

and thy Son Christ Jesus to be their pastor, protector and prince. And therefore hast thou given them over into a reprobate mind. Thou hast taken from them the spirit of boldness, of wisdom and of righteous judgment. They see their own destruction, and yet they have no grace to avoid it.

Yea, they are become so blind that, knowing the pit, they headlong cast themselves into the same, as the nobility of England do this day, fighting in the defense of their mortal enemy the Spaniard. Finally, they are so destitute of understanding and judgment that although they know that there is a liberty and freedom which their predecessors have enjoyed, yet are they compelled to bow their necks under the yoke of Satan, and of his proud ministers, pestilent papists and proud Spaniards. And yet can they not consider that, where a woman reigneth and papists bear authority, there must needs Satan be president of the counsel. Thus hast thou, O Lord, in thy hot displeasure revenged the contempt of thy graces offered. But, O Lord, if thou shalt retain wrath to the end, what flesh is able to sustain?

We have sinned, O Lord, and are not worthy to be relieved. But worthy art thou, O Lord, to be a true God, and worthy is thy Son Christ Jesus to have his Evangel and glory advanced: which both are trodden underfoot in this cruel murder and persecution which the builders of Babylon commit in their fury, [and] have raised against thy children for the establishing of their kingdom. Let the



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

sobs, therefore, of thy prisoners, O Lord, pass up to thine ears; consider their affliction: and let the eyes of thy mercy look down upon the blood of such as die for testimony of thy eternal verity: and let not thine enemies mock thy judgment forever. To thee, O Lord, I turn my wretched and wicked heart: to thee alone, I direct my complaint and groans: for in that Isle to thy saints there is left no comfort.

Albeit I have thus, talking with my God in the anguish of my heart, somewhat digressed; yet have I not utterly forgotten my former proposition, to wit, that it is a thing repugnant to the order of nature that any woman be exalted to rule over men. For God hath denied unto her the office of a head. And in the entreating of this part, I remember that I have made the nobility both of England and Scotland inferior to brute beasts, for they do to women which no male amongst the common sort of beasts can be proved to do to their females: that is, they reverence them, and quake at their presence; they obey their commandments; and that against God. Wherefore I judge them not only subjects to women, but slaves of Satan and servants of iniquity. If any man think these my words sharp or vehement, let him consider that the offense is more heinous than can be expressed by words. For where all things be expressedly concluded against the glory and honor of God, and where the blood of the saints of God is commanded to be shed, whom shall we judge, God or the devil, to be president of that counsel?

Plain it is that God ruleth not by his love, mercy, nor

grace in the assembly of the ungodly. Then it resteth that the devil, the prince of this world, doth reign over such tyrants. Whose servants, I pray you, shall then be judged, such as obey and execute their tyranny? God for his great mercies' sake, illuminate the eyes of men, that they may perceive into what miserable bondage they be brought by the monstrous empire of women.

### The second glass: the commonwealth

The second glass which God hath set before the eyes of man, wherein he may behold the order which pleaseth his wisdom concerning authority and dominion, is that commonwealth to which it pleaseth his majesty to appoint and give laws, statutes, rites and ceremonies, not only concerning religion, but also touching their policy and regiment of the same. And against that order it doth manifestly repugn, that any woman shall occupy the throne of God, that is, the royal seat, which he by his word hath appointed to man, as in giving the law to Israel concerning the election of a king is evident. For thus it is written:

If thou shalt say, I will appoint a king above me, as the rest of the nations which are about me: Thou shalt make thee a king, whom the Lord thy God shall choose, one from amongst the midst of thy brethren thou shalt appoint king above thee. Thou mayest not make a stranger that is not thy brother. (Deuteronomy 17)

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

Here expressedly is a man appointed to be chosen king, and a man native amongst themselves, by which precept is every woman and stranger excluded. What may be objected for the part or election of a stranger shall be, God willing, answered in the blast of the second trumpet. For this present I say that the erecting of a woman to that honor is not only to invert the order which God hath established; but also it is to defile, pollute and profane, so far as in man lieth, the throne and seat of God, which he hath sanctified and appointed for man only, in the course of this wretched life, to occupy and possess as his minister and lieutenant; excluding woman from the same, as before is expressed.

If any think the afore written law did bind the Jews only, let the same man consider that the election of a king and appointing of judges did neither appertain to the ceremonial law, nor yet was it mere judicial; but that it did flow from the moral law as an ordinance, having respect to the conservation of both the tables. For the office of the magistrate ought to have the first and chief respect to the glory of God commanded and contained in the former table, as is evident by that which was enjoined to Joshua by God, what time he was accepted and admitted ruler and governor over his people, in these words:

Thou shalt divide the inheritance to this people, which I have sworn to their fathers to give unto them: so that thou be valiant and strong, that thou mayest keep and do

according to that whole law which my servant Moses hath commanded thee. Thou shalt not decline from it, neither to the right hand, neither to the left hand, that thou mayest do prudently in all things that thou takest in hand, let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, but meditate in it day and night: that thou mayest keep and do according to everything that is written in it. For then shall thy ways prosper, and then shalt thou do prudently... (Joshua 1)

And the same precept giveth God by the mouth of Moses to kings after they be elected, in these words:

When he shall sit in the throne or seat of his kingdom, he shall write to himself a copy of this law in a book, and that shall be with him, that he may read in it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of this law, and all these statutes, that he may do them... (Deut. 17)

Of these two places it is evident, that principally it appertaineth to the king or to the chief magistrate to know the will of God, to be instructed in his law and statutes, and to promote his glory with his whole heart and study, which be the chief points of the first table. No man denieth but that the sword is committed to the magistrate, to the end that he should punish vice and maintain virtue. To punish vice I say, not only that which troubleth the tranquility and quiet estate of the commonwealth by adultery, theft or murder committed, but also such vices as openly impugn the glory of God: as idolatry, blasphemy,

and manifest heresy, taught and obstinately maintained: as the histories and notable acts of Hezekiah, Jehoshaphat, and Josiah do plainly teach us; whose study and care was not only to glorify God in their own life and conversation, but also they unfeignedly did travel to bring subjects to the true worshipping and honoring of God, and did destroy all monuments of idolatry, did punish to death the teachers of it, and removed from office and honors such as were maintainers of those abominations. Whereby I suppose that it be evident that the office of the king or supreme magistrate hath respect to the law moral, and to the conservation of both the tables.

Now if the law moral be the constant and unchangeable will of God, to which the Gentile is no less bound than was the Jew; and if God will that amongst the Gentiles the ministers and executors of his law be now appointed, as sometimes they were appointed amongst the Jews: further if the execution of justice be no less requisite in the policy of the Gentiles than ever it was amongst the Jews: what man can be so foolish as to suppose or believe that God will now admit those persons to sit in judgment or to reign over men in the commonwealth of the Gentiles, whom he by his expressed word and ordinance did before debar and exclude from the same? And that women were excluded from the royal seat, which ought to be the sanctuary to all poor afflicted, and therefore is justly called the seat of God—besides the place before recited of the election of a king, and besides the places of the New Testament, which

be most evident—the order and election which was kept in Judah and Israel doth manifestly declare. For when the males of the kingly stock failed, as oft as it chanced in Israel and sometimes in Judah, it never entered into the hearts of the people to choose and promote to honors any of the king's daughters, had he never so many—but knowing God's vengeance to be poured forth upon the father by the away taking of his sons, they had no further respect to his stock, but elected such one man or other as they judged most apt for that honor and authority. Of which premises, I conclude as before, that to promote a woman head over men is repugnant to nature, and a thing most contrary to that order which God hath approved in that commonwealth which he did institute and rule by his word.

But now to the last point, to wit, that the empire of a woman is a thing repugnant to justice, and the destruction of every commonwealth where it is received. In probation whereof, because the matter is more than evident, I will use few words.

First, I say, if justice be a constant and perpetual will to give to every person their own right (as the most learned in all ages have defined it to be), then to give or to will to give to any person that which is not their right must repugn to justice.

But to reign above man, can never be the right to woman: because it is a thing denied unto her by God, as is before declared; therefore to promote her to that estate

or dignity can be nothing else but repugnancy to justice. If I should speak no more, this were sufficient. For except that either they can improve the definition of justice, or else that they can entreat God to revoke and call back his sentence pronounced against woman, they shall be compelled to admit my conclusion. If any find fault with justice, as it is defined, he may well accuse others, but me he shall not hurt. For I have the shield, the weapon, and the warrant of him who assuredly will defend this quarrel, and he commandeth me to cry: whatsoever repugneth to the will of God expressed in his most sacred word, repugneth to justice: but that women have authority over men repugneth to the will of God expressed in his word: and therefore my author commandeth me to conclude without fear that all such authority repugneth to justice.

The first part of the argument I trust dare neither Jew nor Gentile deny: for it is a principle not only universally confessed, but also so deeply printed in the heart of man, be his nature never so corrupted, that whether he will or no, he is compelled at one time or other to acknowledge and confess that justice is violated when things are done against the will of God expressed by his word. And to this confession are no less the reprobate compelled and constrained than be the chosen children of God, albeit to a diverse end. The elect, with displeasure of their deeds, confess their offense, having access to grace and mercy, as did Adam, David, Peter, and all other penitent offenders.

But the reprobate, notwithstanding they are compelled

to acknowledge the will of God to be just which they have offended, yet are they never inwardly displeased with their iniquity, but rage, complain and storm against God, whose vengeance they cannot escape, as did Cain (Genesis 4), Judas (Matthew 27), Herod, Julian called Apostate, yea Jezebel; and Athaliah.

For Cain no doubt was convicted in conscience that he had done against justice in murdering of his brother.

Judas did openly before the high priest confess that he had sinned in betraying innocent blood.

Herod, being stricken by the angel, did mock those his flatterers, saying unto them: behold your God (meaning himself) cannot now preserve himself from corruption and worms.

Julian was compelled in the end to cry, O Galilean (so always in contempt did he name our Saviour Jesus Christ), thou hast now overcome.

And who doubteth but Jezebel and Athaliah, before their miserable end, were convicted in their cankered consciences to acknowledge that the murder which they had committed, and the empire which the one had six years usurped, were repugnant to justice: even so shall they, I doubt not, which this day do possess and maintain that monstrous authority of women, shortly be compelled to acknowledge that their studies and devices have been bent against God: and that all such authority as women have usurped repugneth to justice, because, as I have said,



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

it repugneth to the will of God expressed in his sacred word.

And if any man doubt hereof, let him mark well the words of the Apostle, saying:

I permit not a woman to teach, neither yet to usurp authority above man. (1 Timothy 2)

No man, I trust, will deny these words of the Apostle to be the will of God expressed in his word: and he saith openly, "I permit not," etc. Which is as much as I will not, that a woman have authority, charge or power over man, for so much importeth the Greek word *αὐθεντεῖν* (*authenthein*) in that place. Now let man and angel conspire against God, let them pronounce their laws, and say, we will suffer women to bear authority, who then can depose them? Yet shall this one word of the eternal God spoken by the mouth of a weak man, thrust them every one into hell. Jezebel may for a time sleep quietly in the bed of her fornication and whoredom; she may teach and deceive for a season; but neither shall she preserve herself, nor yet her adulterous children from great affliction, and from the sword of God's vengeance, which shall shortly apprehend such works of iniquity (Revelation 2).

The admonition I defer to the end. Here might I bring in the oppression and injustice which is committed against realms and nations which sometimes lived free and now are brought in bondage of foreign nations by the reason of

this monstrous authority and empire of women. But that I delay till better opportunity.

## Notes

1. "...Again, the license of the Lacedaemonian women defeats the intention of the Spartan constitution, and is adverse to the happiness of the state. For, a husband and wife being each a part of every family, the state may be considered as about equally divided into men and women; and, therefore, in those states in which the condition of the women is bad, half the city may be regarded as having no laws. And this is what has actually happened at Sparta; the legislator wanted to make the whole state hardy and temperate, and he has carried out his intention in the case of the men, but he has neglected the women, who live in every sort of intemperance and luxury. The consequence is that in such a state wealth is too highly valued, especially if the citizen fall under the dominion of their wives, after the manner of most warlike races, except the Celts and a few others who openly approve of male loves. The old mythologer would seem to have been right in uniting Ares and Aphrodite, for all warlike races are prone to the love either of men or of women. This was exemplified among the Spartans in the days of their greatness; many things were managed by their women. But what difference does it make whether women rule, or the rulers are ruled by women? The result is the same. Even in regard to courage, which is of no use in daily life, and is needed only in war, the influence of the Lacedaemonian women has been most mischievous. The evil showed itself in the Theban invasion, when, unlike the women other cities, they were utterly useless and caused more confusion than the enemy. This license of the Lacedaemonian women existed from the earliest times, and was only what might be expected. For, during the wars of the Lacedaemonians, first against the Argives, and afterwards against the Arcadians and Messenians, the men were long away from home, and, on the return of peace, they gave themselves into the legislator's hand, already prepared by the discipline of a soldier's life (in which there are many elements of virtue), to receive his enactments. But, when Lycurgus, as tradition says, wanted to bring the women under his laws, they resisted, and he gave up the attempt.

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

These then are the causes of what then happened, and this defect in the constitution is clearly to be attributed to them. We are not, however, considering what is or is not to be excused, but what is right or wrong, and the disorder of the women, as I have already said, not only gives an air of indecorum to the constitution considered in itself, but tends in a measure to foster avarice.” —Aristotle’s *Politics* book 2 part 9

2. See footnote 1.
3. “Women are excluded from all civil or public employments; therefore they cannot be judges, or perform the duties of magistrates, or bring suits in court, or become sureties for others, or act as attorneys.” —Justinian’s *Digest (Pandects)*, book 50, Title 17, “Concerning Different Rules Of Ancient Law”
4. “Under the second head the Edict deals with persons who are forbidden to move on behalf of others: here the praetor excludes on the ground of sex and accidental defect, he also puts a mark on persons who deserve one for bad character. With regard to sex, he forbids women to move on behalf of other persons. The principle of this prohibition is that of preventing women from mixing themselves up with other people’s affairs contrary to the modesty which becomes their sex, or discharging offices proper to men; the first case that gave occasion to the prohibition was that of one Carfania, a most pertinacious woman, who so worried the magistrate with shameless applications as to give ground for the rule laid down in the Edict.” --*The Digest of Justinian Volume 1*, Charles Henry Monro, ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1904. p. 140.
5. “The Velleian Decree of the Senate very fully provides that women cannot become sureties for anyone. (1) For as, by our customs, women are deprived of civil office and very many things which they do are void by mere operation of law, much more should they be deprived of the power to perform an act in which not only their services and the mere employment of the same are involved, but also the risk of their entire private property. (2) It seems to be just to come to the relief of a woman in this manner, so that an action should be granted against an old debtor, or against a party who had rendered a woman liable in his behalf, for the reason that he, rather than the creditor, had taken advantage of her. 2. Ulpianus, On the Edict, Book XXIX. In the first place, during the reign of the Divine Augustus, and subsequently during that of Claudius, it was forbidden by Imperial Edicts that women should become sureties for their husbands. (1) Afterwards, a Decree of the Senate was enacted

by which relief was granted in the most perfect manner to all women. The terms of this Decree of the Senate are as follows: "Whereas, Marcus Silanus and Velleius Tutor, Consuls, have made statements concerning the obligations of women who have become responsible for the debts of other persons, and have given advice on this subject, as to what was necessary to be done; and, whereas this matter relates to securities and the making of loans in behalf of others for whom women had become bound, and although it appears to have been formerly decided by law that no demand, on this account, could be made upon them, nor any action be brought against them when they performed the duties of men, and as it is not just for them to be liable to obligations of this description; therefore, the Senate has decreed that those to whom application is made in court must act properly and in conformity with the established mode of procedure, and exert themselves so that the will of the Senate with respect to this matter may be observed." (2) Therefore, let us examine the terms of this Decree of the Senate, after having previously eulogized the forethought of this most distinguished body of men which has brought relief to women on account of the weakness of their sex, in many supposed, as well as actual instances. (3) Relief is only granted to them, however, where they have not been guilty of deceit, and this the Divine Pius and Severus stated in a Rescript, for assistance is rendered to those who have been deceived, but not to such as are guilty of fraud; and this is set forth in the Rescript of Severus, written in the Greek language, which says that this Decree of the Senate is not for the purpose of aiding women who are guilty of deception, for it is the infirmity of women, and not their cunning, that deserves assistance. (4) Every kind of obligation is included in the Velleian Decree of the Senate, whether women have rendered themselves liable verbally, by the delivery of property, or by any other contract whatsoever. (5) Where a woman even appears voluntarily in defence of anyone, there is no doubt that she binds herself in his favor, for she assumes the obligation of another, since she exposes herself to have judgment rendered against him in a matter of this kind. Hence a woman is not permitted to undertake the defence of her husband, her child, or her father... —*Pandects* Book 16 Title 1, "On The Velleian Decree Of The Senate"

6. "*Senatus Consultum Velleianum* (Lat.) In the civil law. The Velleian decree of the senate. A decree enacted in the consulship of Velleius, by which married women were prohibited from making contracts." —*The Cyclopedic Law Dictionary: With an*

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

*Exhaustive Collection of Legal Maxims, Volume 1, 2nd ed.*, Walter A. Shumaker & George Foster Longsdorf. Chicago: Callaghan & Company, 1922, p. 928.

7. See footnote 4.
8. "There are many points in our law in respect of which women are in a worse legal position than men." --*The Digest of Justinian*, Charles Henry Monro, ed. p. 25.
9. "There is another kind of tutelage [guardianship] called fiduciary; for, if an ascendant emancipates, below the age of puberty, a son or a daughter, a grandson or a granddaughter, or any other descendant, he is their legal tutor [i.e., guardian]; but if, at his death, he leaves male children, they become the fiduciary tutors of their own sons, or brother, or sister, or other descendants of the deceased. But when a patron, who is a legal tutor, dies, his children also become legal tutors; the reason of this distinction being that a son, who has not been emancipated in his father's lifetime, becomes *sui juris* at the death of his father, and does not fall under power of his brothers, nor, therefore, under their tutelage; while the freedman, had he remained a slave, would also have been, after the death of his master, the slave of his master's children. These persons, however, are not called to be tutors unless of full age, a rule which by our constitution applies generally to all tutors and curators." --*The Institutes of Justinian, with English Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, 6/e. Thomas Collett Sandars, translator. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1878. p.64 (see also translator's notes at pp.64-65).
10. "Women, also, cannot adopt; for they have not even their own children in their power; but by the indulgence of the emperor, as a comfort for the loss of their own children, they are allowed to adopt." [Sandars' notes:] "Women could not adopt, because the meaning of adoption was that the person adopted passed into the *patria potestas* of the person adopting. The adoption mentioned in the text (which was permitted by a constitution of Diocletian and Maximian), only placed the adopted children in the same relation to the woman as her own children would have held. She gained nothing like *patria potestas* over them." --*The Institutes of Justinian etc.*, Sandars, translator. p. 46.
11. "Let us now inquire, by whom suspected persons may be accused. Now an accusation of this sort is in a measure public, that is, it is open to all. Nay, by a rescript of the Emperors Severus and Antoninus, even women are admitted to be accusers; but only those who are induced to do so through

feelings of affection; as a mother, a nurse, or a grandmother, or a sister, who may all become accusers. But the praetor will admit any woman to make the accusation, in whom he recognises a character that, bent on the fulfilment of duty and not overstepping the modesty of the sex, but animated by dutiful affection, can not endure the pupil suffering harm." [Sandars' notes:] "The action is called *quasi publico*, because on the one hand it had the private object of securing the pupil's interests, and on the other had, like public actions, criminal consequences, and might be brought by a person not interested in the private result. "Women, as a general rule, could not institute public actions." --*The Institutes of Justinian etc.*, Sandars, translator. p. 85.

12. See reference for footnote 10.
13. "(6) The wife and daughter-in-law, on their part, are forbidden to make gifts to a husband or a son-in-law. Moreover, a gift will not be valid where it is given to those under their control or under the control of the parties to whose authority they are subject; provided the husband and father-in-law are under the control of the same person, or the husband is under the control of the father-in-law... (7) A mother-in-law is not prohibited from bestowing gifts upon her daughter-in-law, or vice versa, because in this instance the right of paternal authority is not involved." —*Pandects* Book 24 Title 1, "Concerning Donations Between Husband And Wife"
14. [I have not been able to find this reference in Justinian's *Digest* ("Pandects") or Justinian's *Institutes*, to one or the other of which Knox is usually referring in this work when he says "the law"; the closest reference I have been able to find is Aristotle's *Politics*, book 2 part 9 (see footnote 1). —DSM]
15. "A proconsul is not obliged to make an absolute point of declining presents, but he must use moderation; in short, he need not be so scrupulous as to decline them altogether, but he must not be so grasping as to accept them to an excessive amount. This matter is put very well in a letter of the Divine Severus and the present Emperor Antoninus, in which they set down the limitations to be observed in this matter; the words are as follows: — "With regard to presents, what we hold is this, — there is an old saying, 'Not everything, nor every day, nor from everybody'; of course it is very discourteous to accept no presents at all, but it is a very contemptible thing to accept them indiscriminately, and to accept all is absolutely sordid." With regard to the injunction contained in the proconsul's instructions, that neither he nor any other officer is to accept

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

any gift or present or make any purchase except of supplies for everyday subsistence, this does not apply to trifling gifts, but only where the amount is beyond what is required for ordinary consumption. Still, on the other hand, presents must not be taken to such an extent as to make them amount to positive largess.” --*The Digest of Justinian*, Charles Henry Monro, ed. pp. 53-54.

16. See footnote 1.
17. [The Arber edition lists the following examples in the margin: -DSM]
  - Romilda the wife of Gisulf betrayed to Cacan the dukedom of Friuli in Italy
  - Jane queen of Naples hanged her husband
  - Athaliah, 2 Kings 11
  - Hirene [Irene of Athens?]
  - Anton [Perhaps an Antonia?]
  - Sabell [Probably Queen Isabella of France]
18. [Knox’s word here, “maistress,” carried more weight than today’s “mistress,” and was essentially a feminine form of “master”--cf. the entry for *maistress* in the University of Michigan’s online Middle English Dictionary. -DSM]
19. “And do you not know that you are (each) an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil’s gateway: you are the unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God’s image, man. On account of your desert—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die. And do you think about adorning yourself over and above your tunics of skins?” —Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women*, Book 1 Chapter 1
20. Tertullian, *On the Veiling of Virgins*, Chapter 9
21. “The Euxine Sea, as it is called, is self-contradictory in its nature, and deceptive in its name. As you would not account it hospitable from its situation, so is it severed from our more civilised waters by a certain stigma which attaches to its barbarous character. The fiercest nations inhabit it, if indeed it can be called habitation, when life is passed in waggons. They have no fixed abode; their life has no germ of civilization; they

indulge their libidinous desires without restraint, and for the most part naked. Moreover, when they gratify secret lust, they hang up their quivers on their car-yokes, to warn off the curious and rash observer. Thus without a blush do they prostitute their weapons of war. The dead bodies of their parents they cut up with their sheep, and devour at their feasts. They who have not died so as to become food for others, are thought to have died an accursed death. Their women are not by their sex softened to modesty. They uncover the breast, from which they suspend their battle-axes, and prefer warfare to marriage. In their climate, too, there is the same rude nature.” —Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, Book 1 Chapter 1

22. “So, again, when Faustus says that the wife’s being privy to her husband’s conduct made the matter worse, while he is prompted only by the uncharitable wish to reproach Abraham and his wife, he really, without intending it, speaks in praise of both. For Sara did not connive at any criminal action in her husband for the gratification of his unlawful passions; but from the same natural desire for children that he had, and knowing her own barrenness, she warrantably claimed as her own the fertility of her handmaid; not consenting with sinful desires in her husband, but requesting of him what it was proper in him to grant. Nor was it the request of proud assumption; for every one knows that the duty of a wife is to obey her husband. But in reference to the body, we are told by the apostle that the wife has power over her husband’s body, as he has over hers; so that, while in all other social matters the wife ought to obey her husband, in this one matter of their bodily connection as man and wife their power over one another is mutual,—the man over the woman, and the woman over the man. So, when Sara could not have children of her own, she wished to have them by her handmaid, and of the same seed from which she herself would have had them, if that had been possible. No woman would do this if her love for her husband were merely an animal passion; she would rather be jealous of a mistress than make her a mother. So here the pious desire for the procreation of children was an indication of the absence of criminal indulgence.” —Tertullian, *Against Faustus*, Book 22 section 31
23. “But we must notice how that which the apostle says, that not the woman but the man is the image of God, is not contrary to that which is written in Genesis, “God created man: in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them: and He blessed them.” For this text says that human nature itself, which is complete [only] in both sexes, was made in the image of



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

God; and it does not separate the woman from the image of God which it signifies. For after saying that God made man in the image of God, "He created him," it says, "male and female:" or at any rate, punctuating the words otherwise, "male and female created He them." How then did the apostle tell us that the man is the image of God, and therefore he is forbidden to cover his head; but that the woman is not so, and therefore is commanded to cover hers? Unless, forsooth, according to that which I have said already, when I was treating of the nature of the human mind, that the woman together with her own husband is the image of God, so that that whole substance may be one image; but when she is referred separately to her quality of help-meet, which regards the woman herself alone, then she is not the image of God; but as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one. As we said of the nature of the human mind, that both in the case when as a whole it contemplates the truth it is the image of God; and in the case when anything is divided from it, and diverted in order to the cognition of temporal things; nevertheless on that side on which it beholds and consults truth, here also it is the image of God, but on that side whereby it is directed to the cognition of the lower things, it is not the image of God. And since it is so much the more formed after the image of God, the more it has extended itself to that which is eternal, and is on that account not to be restrained, so as to withhold and refrain itself from thence; therefore the man ought not to cover his head. But because too great a progression towards inferior things is dangerous to that rational cognition that is conversant with things corporeal and temporal; this ought to have power on its head, which the covering indicates, by which it is signified that it ought to be restrained. For a holy and pious meaning is pleasing to the holy angels. For God sees not after the way of time, neither does anything new take place in His vision and knowledge, when anything is done in time and transitorily, after the way in which such things affect the senses, whether the carnal senses of animals and men, or even the heavenly senses of the angels." —Augustine, *On the Holy Trinity*, Book 12 Chapter 7 section 10

24. "3. Aliquibus tamen uidetur, quia in dominatione imago so dei factus est homo, quia dixit: et dominetur piscium maris et uolatilium caeli et totius terrae, cum non solum uiro, sed et mulieri ista cernantur subiecta, quam constat dei imaginem non habere. quod quidem duplici modo caret ratione; per hoc enim neque ad filium dixisse deus adseritur: faciamus hominem ad

imaginem et similitudinem nostram, sed ad dominationes caelestes, quas apostolus memorat, si imagenem dei homo in dominatione habet, et mulieri datur, ut et ipsa imago dei sit, quod absurdum est. quo modo enim potest de mulieri dici, quia imago dei est, quam constat dominio uiri subiectam et nullam auctoritatem habere? nec docere enim potest nec testis esse neque tidem dicere nec iudicare: quanto magis imperare!” —Pseudo-Augustinus, *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti* – ed. A. Souter 1908, CSEL 50 – Chapter 45, “De Imagine,” section 3

25. "But we must notice how that which the apostle says, that not the woman but the man is the image of God, is not contrary to that which is written in Genesis, "God created man: in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them: and He blessed them." For this text says that human nature itself, which is complete [only] in both sexes, was made in the image of God; and it does not separate the woman from the image of God which it signifies. For after saying that God made man in the image of God, "He created him," it says, "male and female:" or at any rate, punctuating the words otherwise, "male and female created He them." How then did the apostle tell us that the man is the image of God, and therefore he is forbidden to cover his head; but that the woman is not so, and therefore is commanded to cover hers? Unless, forsooth, according to that which I have said already, when I was treating of the nature of the human mind, that **the woman together with her own husband is the image of God, so that that whole substance may be one image; but when she is referred separately to her quality of help-meet, which regards the woman herself alone, then she is not the image of God;** but as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one. As we said of the nature of the human mind, that both in the case when as a whole it contemplates the truth it is the image of God; and in the case when anything is divided from it, and diverted in order to the cognition of temporal things; nevertheless on that side on which it beholds and consults truth, here also it is the image of God, but on that side whereby it is directed to the cognition of the lower things, it is not the image of God. And since it is so much the more formed after the image of God, the more it has extended itself to that which is eternal, and is on that account not to be restrained, so as to withhold and refrain itself from thence; therefore the man ought not to cover his head. But because too great a progression towards inferior things is dangerous to that rational cognition that is conversant with things corporeal and temporal; this ought to have power

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

on its head, which the covering indicates, by which it is signified that it ought to be restrained. For a holy and pious meaning is pleasing to the holy angels. For God sees not after the way of time, neither does anything new take place in His vision and knowledge, when anything is done in time and transitorily, after the way in which such things affect the senses, whether the carnal senses of animals and men, or even the heavenly senses of the angels.” —Augustine, *On the Holy Trinity*, Book 12 Chapter 7 section 10

26. [Following are two examples of Augustine teaching the biblical truth that wives must obey their husbands. —DSM]

But as this divine Master inculcates two precepts,—the love of God and the love of our neighbor,—and as in these precepts a man finds three things he has to love,—God, himself, and his neighbor,—and that he who loves God loves himself thereby, it follows that he must endeavor to get his neighbor to love God, since he is ordered to love his neighbor as himself. He ought to make this endeavor in behalf of his wife, his children, his household, all within his reach, even as he would wish his neighbor to do the same for him if he needed it; and consequently he will be at peace, or in well-ordered concord, with all men, as far as in him lies. And this is the order of this concord, that a man, in the first place, injure no one, and, in the second, do good to every one he can reach. Primarily, therefore, his own household are his care, for the law of nature and of society gives him readier access to them and greater opportunity of serving them. And hence the apostle says, “Now, if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” This is the origin of domestic peace, or the well-ordered concord of those in the family who rule and those who obey. For they who care for the rest rule,—the husband the wife, the parents the children, the masters the servants; and they who are cared for obey,—the women their husbands, the children their parents, the servants their masters. But in the family of the just man who lives by faith and is as yet a pilgrim journeying on to the celestial city, even those who rule serve those whom they seem to command; for they rule not from a love of power, but from a sense of the duty they owe to others—not because they are proud of authority, but because they love mercy. —Augustine, *City of God*, Book 19 Chapter 14

14. And not without just cause a doubt is raised, whether he said this of all married women, or of such as so many are, as that nearly all may be thought so to be. For neither doth that, which he saith of unmarried women, “She, that is unmarried, thinkest of the things of the Lord, to be holy both in body and spirit:” pertain unto all unmarried women: whereas there are certain widows who are dead, who live in delights. However, so far as regards a certain

distinction and, as it were, character of their own, of the unmarried and married; as she deserves the excess of hatred, who containing from marriage, that is, from a thing allowed, does not contain from offenses, either of luxury, or pride, or curiosity and prating; so the married woman is seldom met with, who, in the very obedience of married life, hath no thought save how to please God, by adorning herself, not with plaited hair, or gold and pearls and costly attire, but as becometh women making profession of piety, through a good conversation. Such marriages, forsooth, the Apostle Peter also describes by giving commandment. "In like manner," saith he, "wives obeying their own husbands; in order that, even if any obey not the word, they may be gained without discourse through the conversation of the wives, seeing your fear and chaste conversation: that they be not they that are adorned without with crispings of hair, or clothed with gold or with fair raiment; but that hidden man of your heart, in that unbroken continuance of a quiet and modest spirit, which before the Lord also is rich. For thus certain holy women, who hoped in the Lord, used to adorn themselves, obeying their own husbands: as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord: whose daughters ye are become, when ye do well, and fear not with any vain fear. Husbands in like manner living at peace and in chastity with your wives, both give ye honor as to the weaker and subject vessel, as with co-heirs of grace, and see that your prayers be not hindered." Is it indeed that such marriages have no thought of the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord? But they are very rare: who denies this? And, being, as they are, rare, nearly all the persons who are such, were not joined together in order to be such, but being already joined together became such. —Augustine, *On the Good of Marriage*, section 14

27. "And yet the woman received not pattern from the body, or flesh, to be so subject to the husband as the flesh to the spirit; but either the Apostle would have understood by consequence, what he omitted to state: or haply because the flesh lusteth against the spirit in the mortal and sick estate of this life, therefore he would not set the woman a pattern of subjection from it." —Augustine, *On Continence*, section 23
28. See Ambrose, *The Six Days*, Book 5 Chapter 7
29. [The following quote is the closest I've been able to find, though I don't think it's the one Knox was citing. --DSM]

On this account, that the building may be raised within us more rapidly, the Apostle exhorts us to open the eyes of our understanding, to lift them to things above, diligently to follow after the knowledge of God, to unravel the truth, to hide in our hearts the commandments of God, to put off deceitful lusts and hidden deeds of shame, to seek to be renewed by the graces of the Sacraments, to moderate anger, to calm all disturbance of spirit

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

before the sun goes down, to beware lest the adversary gain the upper hand of us, that mighty spirit who entered into the heart of Judas, and broke through the gates of his soul, overpowering his resistance, to shut out theft, to eschew falsehood, to rise from the dead, to put on sobriety. **He tells us likewise that wives should be subject to their husbands, as the Church is to Christ, and that husbands should offer up their own lives for their wives, as Christ gave Himself for the Church.** And lastly, that, as good soldiers, we should put on the armour of God, and continually fight, not only against flesh and blood, but also against spiritual wickedness; that we may neither be corrupted by friends nor vanquished by enemies.” —Ambrose, *Letter 76 To Irenaeus*, paragraph 14

30. [I have been unable to locate the source of this quote. –DSM]
31. Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas (ad Galatas, ad Efesios, ad Filippenses, ad Colosenses, ad Thesalonicenses, ad Timotheum, ad Titum, ad Filemonem)*[See for example the CSEL edition, ed. H. J. Vogels 1969, CSEL 81/3, pp. 263-264. –DSM]
32. [Another place Ambrose speaks of this is in his Letter 69 to Irenaeus, reproduced below in its entirety. –DSM]

LETTER LXIX. AMBROSE TO IRENAEUS, GREETING. 1. You have referred to me, as to a father, the inquiry which has been made of you, why the Law was so severe in pronouncing those unclean who used the garments of the other sex, whether they were men or women, for it is written, The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all that do so are an abomination unto the Lord. 2. Now, if you will consider it well, that which nature herself abhors must be incongruous. For why do you not wish to be thought a man, seeing that you are born such? why do you assume an appearance which is foreign to you? why do you play the woman, or you, O woman, the man? Nature clothes each sex in their proper raiment. Moreover in men and women, habits, complexion, gestures, gait, strength and voice are all different. 3. So also in the rest of the animal creation; the form, the strength, the roar of the lion and lioness, of the bull and heifer are different. Deer also differ as much in form as they do in sex, so that you may distinguish the stag from the hind even at a distance. But in the case of birds the similitude between them and men, as regards covering, is still closer; for in them Nature distinguishes their sex by their very plumage. The peacock is beautiful, but the feathers of its consort are not variegated with equal, beauty. Pheasants also have different colours to mark the difference of the sexes. And so with poultry. How sonorous is the cock's voice, night by night performing his natural office of calling us from sleep by crowing. They do not change their form; why then do we desire to change ours? 4. A Greek custom has indeed prevailed for women to wear

men's tunics as being shorter. Be it allowed however that they should imitate the nature of the more worthy sex; but why should men choose to assume the appearance of the inferior? A falsehood is base even in word, much more in dress. So in the heathen temples, where there is a false faith, there also is a false nature. It is there considered holy for men to assume women's garments, and female gestures. And therefore the Law says that every man who puts on a woman's garment is an abomination unto the Lord. 5. I conceive however that it is spoken not so much of garments as of manners, and of our habits and actions, in that one kind of act becomes a man, the other a woman. Wherefore the Apostle also says, as the interpreter of the Law, Let your women keep silence in the Churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are to be under obedience, as also saith the Law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. And to Timothy: Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection; but I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man. 6. But how unseemly is it for a man to do the works of a woman! As for those who curl their hair, like women, let them conceive also, let them bring forth. Yet the one sex wears veils, the other wages war. Let them however be excused who follow their national usages, barbarous though they be, the Persians and Goths and Armenians. Nature is superior to country. 7. And what shall we say of others who think it belongs to luxury to have in their service slaves wearing curls and ornaments of the neck? It is but just that chastity should be lost where the distinction of sexes is not preserved, a point wherein the teaching of nature is unambiguous, according to the Apostle's words; Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him: but if a woman hath long hair, it is a glory unto her: for her hair is given her for a covering. Such is the answer which you may make to those who have referred to you. Farewell; love me as a son, for I love you as a father.

33. See reference for footnote 31.
34. Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas (ad Corinthios)* [See for example the CSEL edition, ed. H. J. Vogels 1968, CSEL 81/2, p. 163. –DSM]
35. Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas (ad Corinthios)* [See for example the CSEL edition, ed. H. J. Vogels 1968, CSEL 81/2, p. 164. –DSM]
36. Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas (ad Romanos)* [See for example the CSEL edition, ed. H. J. Vogels 1966, CSEL 81/1, p. 484. –DSM]
37. See Chrysostom, *Homily 17 on Genesis 3:8*

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

38. See footnote 37.
39. See Chrysostom, *Homily 17 on Genesis* 3:8
40. [The closest match I have found for this reference is Chrysostom's *Homily 37 on 1 Corinthians*, quoted below. –DSM]:

Seest thou the wisdom of Paul, what kind of testimony he adduced, one that not only enjoins on them silence, but silence too with fear; and with as great fear as that wherewith a maid servant ought to keep herself quiet. Wherefore also having himself said, "it is not permitted unto them to speak," he added not, "but to be silent," but instead of "to be silent," he set down what is more, to wit, "the being in subjection." And if this be so in respect of husbands, much more in respect of teachers, and fathers, and the general assembly of the Church. "But if they are not even to speak," saith one, "nor ask a question, to what end are they to be present?" That they may hear what they ought; but the points which are questioned let them learn at home from their husbands. Wherefore also he added, Ver. 35. "And if they would learn any thing, let them ask their own husbands at home." Thus, "not only, as it seems, are they not allowed to speak," saith he, "at random, but not even to ask any question in the church." Now if they ought not to ask questions, much more is their speaking at pleasure contrary to law. And what may be the cause of his setting them under so great subjection? Because the woman is in some sort a weaker being and easily carried away and light minded. Here you see why he set over them their husbands as teachers, for the benefit of both. For so he both rendered the women orderly, and the husbands he made anxious, as having to deliver to their wives very exactly what they heard. —Chrysostom, *Homily 37 on First Corinthians*

41. [Another reference for this in Chrysostom –DSM]:

Now if they make the summer season their excuse: for I hear of their saying things of this kind, "the present stifling heat is excessive, the scorching sun is intolerable, we cannot bear being trampled and crushed in the crowd, and to be steaming all over with perspiration and oppressed by the heat and confined space:" I am ashamed of them, believe me: for such excuses are womanish: indeed even in their case who have softer bodies, and a weaker nature, such pretexts do not suffice for justification. —Chrysostom, *Homily to those who had not attended the assembly*, etc.

42. "The sex is fond of ornament, and it has this failing. Yet even in this you husbands surpass them, who pride yourselves even upon them, as your own proper ornament; for I do not think that the wife is so ostentatious of her own jewels, as the husband is of those of his wife. He is not so proud of his own golden

girdle, as he is of his wife's wearing jewels of gold. So that even of this you are the causes, who light the spark and kindle up the flame. But what is more, it is not so great a sin in a woman as in a man. Thou art ordained to regulate her; in every way thou claimest to have the preëminence. Show her then in this also, that thou takest no interest in this costliness of hers, by thine own apparel. It is more suitable for a woman to adorn herself, than for a man. If then thou escape not the temptation, how shall she escape it? **They have moreover their share of vainglory, but this is common to them with men. They are in a measure passionate, and this again is common to them with men.** But as to those things wherein they excel, these are no longer common to them with men; their sanctity, I mean, their fervency, their devotion, their love towards Christ. Wherefore then, one may say, did Paul exclude them from the teacher's seat? And here again is a proof how great a distance they were from the men, and that the women of those days were great. For, tell me, while Paul was teaching, or Peter, or those saints of old, had it been right that a woman should intrude into the office? Whereas we have gone on till we have come so debased, that it is worthy of question, why women are not teachers. So truly have we come to the same weakness as they. These things I have said not from any desire to elate them, but to shame ourselves, to chastise, and to admonish us, that so we may resume the authority that belongs to us, not inasmuch as we are greater in size, but because of our foresight, our protection of them, and our virtue." —Chrysostom, *Homily 13 on Ephesians 4:17-19*

43. [I have been unable to find this reference. There are echoes of it in the following quote from Basil the Great, though his argument is against the wealth-loving wife, not womankind generally. —DSM]

"I am filled with amazement," says the preacher, "at the invention of superfluities. The vehicles are countless, some for conveying goods, others for carrying their owners; all covered with brass and with silver. There are a vast number of horses, whose pedigrees are kept like men's, and their descent from noble sires recorded. Some are for carrying their haughty owners about the town, some are hunters, some are hacks. Bits, girths, collars, are all of silver, all decked with gold. Scarlet cloths make the horses as gay as bridegrooms. There is a host of mules, distinguished by their colours, and their muleteers with them, one after another, some before and some behind. Of other household servants the number is endless, who satisfy all the requirements of men's extravagance; agents, stewards, gardeners, and craftsmen, skilled in every art that can minister to necessity or to enjoyment and luxury; cooks,



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

confectioners, butlers, huntsmen, sculptors, painters, devisers and creators of pleasure of every kind. Look at the herds of camels, some for carriage, some for pasture; troops of horses, droves of oxen, flocks of sheep, herds of swine with their keepers, land to feed all these, and to increase men's riches by its produce; baths in town, baths in the country; houses shining all over with every variety of marble,—some with stone of Phrygia, others with slabs of Spartan or Thessalian. There must be some houses warm in winter, and others cool in summer. The pavement is of mosaic, the ceiling gilded. If any part of the wall escapes the slabs, it is embellished with painted flowers....You who dress your walls, and let your fellow-creatures go bare, what will you answer to the Judge? You who harness your horses with splendour, and despise your brother if he is ill-dressed; who let your wheat rot, and will not feed the hungry; who hide your gold, and despise the distressed? "And, if you have a wealth-loving wife, the plague is twice as bad. She keeps your luxury ablaze; she increases your love of pleasure; she gives the goad to your superfluous appetites; her heart is set on stones,—pearls, emeralds, and sapphires. Gold she works and gold she weaves, and increases the mischief with never-ending frivolities. And her interest in all these things is no mere by-play: it is the care of night and day. Then what innumerable flatterers wait upon their idle wants! They must have their dyers of bright colours, their goldsmiths, their perfumes their weavers, their embroiderers. With all their behests they do not leave their husbands breathing time. No fortune is vast enough to satisfy a woman's wants,—no, not if it were to flow like a river! They are as eager for foreign perfumes as for oil from the market. They must have the treasures of the sea, shells and pinnas, and more of them than wool from the sheep's back. Gold encircling precious stones serves now for an ornament for their foreheads, now for their necks. There is more gold in their girdles; more gold fastens hands and feet. These gold-loving ladies are delighted to be bound by golden fetters,—only let the chain be gold! When will the man have time to care for his soul, who has to serve a woman's fancies?" —from Basil the Great, *Homily 7 "Against the rich"*, quoted in Schaff's prolegomena to Basil's works

44. [I have been unable to find this reference. –DSM]
45. [I have been unable to find this reference –DSM]
46. [See for example Augustine, *On Order (De Ordine)*, English-Latin bilingual edition, translated and introduction by Silvano Borruso. St. Augustine's Press, South Bend, Indiana, 2007. –DSM]
47. "The peace of the body then consists in the duly proportioned arrangement of its parts. The peace of the irrational soul is the harmonious repose of the appetites, and that of the rational soul

the harmony of knowledge and action. The peace of body and soul is the well-ordered and harmonious life and health of the living creature. Peace between man and God is the well-ordered obedience of faith to eternal law. Peace between man and man is well-ordered concord. Domestic peace is the well-ordered concord between those of the family who rule and those who obey. Civil peace is a similar concord among the citizens. The peace of the celestial city is the perfectly ordered and harmonious enjoyment of God, and of one another in God. The peace of all things is the tranquillity of order. **Order is the distribution which allots things equal and unequal, each to its own place.** And hence, though the miserable, in so far as they are such, do certainly not enjoy peace, but are severed from that tranquillity of order in which there is no disturbance, nevertheless, inasmuch as they are deservedly and justly miserable, they are by their very misery connected with order. They are not, indeed, conjoined with the blessed, but they are disjoined from them by the law of order.” — Augustine, *The City Of God*, Book 19 Chapter 13

48. "Ver. 7. "For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." This is again another cause. "Not only," so he speaks, "because he hath Christ to be His Head ought he not to cover the head, but because also he rules over the woman." For the ruler when he comes before the king ought to have the symbol of his rule. As therefore no ruler without military girdle and cloak, would venture to appear before him that hath the diadem: so neither do thou without the symbols of thy rule, (one of which is the not being covered,) pray before God, lest thou insult both thyself and Him that hath honored thee. And the same thing likewise one may say regarding the woman. For to her also is it a reproach, the not having the symbols of her subjection. "But the woman is the glory of the man." Therefore the rule of the man is natural." —Chrysostom, *Homily 26 on First Corinthians*
49. "Ver. 10. "For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head." "For this cause:" what cause, tell me? "For all these which have been mentioned," saith he; or rather not for these only, but also "because of the angels." "For although thou despise thine husband," saith he, "yet reverence the angels." It follows that being covered is a mark of subjection and authority. For it induces her to look down and be ashamed and preserve entire her proper virtue. For the virtue and honor of the governed is to abide in his obedience. Again: the man is not compelled to do this; for he is the image of his Lord: but the

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

woman is; and that reasonably. Consider then the excess of the transgression when being honored with so high a prerogative, thou puttest thyself to shame, seizing the woman's dress. And thou doest the same as if having received a diadem, thou shouldest cast the diadem from thy head, and instead of it take a slave's garment." —Chrysostom, *Homily 26 on First Corinthians*

## ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

---

And now I think it expedient to answer such objections as carnal and worldly men, yea men ignorant of God, use to make for maintenance of this tyranny (authority it is not worthy to be called) and most unjust empire of woman.

First they do object the examples of Deborah and of Huldah the prophetess; of whom the one judged Israel, and the other, by all appearance, did teach and exhort.

Secondarily they do object the law made by Moses for the daughters of Zelophehad.

Thirdly, the consent of the estates of such realms as have approved the empire and regiment of women; and last, the long custom which hath received the regiment of

women. Their valiant acts and prosperity, together with some papistical laws, which have confirmed the same.

**Objection 1: The examples of Deborah and Huldah**

To the first I answer that particular examples do establish no common law. The causes were known to God alone, why he took the spirit of wisdom and force from all men of those ages, and did so mightily assist women against nature, and against his ordinary course, that the one he made a deliverer to his afflicted people Israel, and to the other he gave not only perseverance in the true religion when the most part of men had declined from the same, but also to her he gave the spirit of prophecy, to assure King Josiah of the things which were to come.

With these women, I say, did God work potently and miraculously, yea, to them he gave most singular grace and privilege. But who hath commanded that a public, yea a tyrannical and most wicked law, be established upon these examples? The men that object the same are not altogether ignorant that examples have no strength when the question is of law. As if I should ask, what marriage is lawful? and it should be answered that lawful it is to man not only to have many wives at once, but also it is lawful to marry two sisters and to enjoy them both living at once, because David, Jacob, and Solomon, servants of God, did the same; I trust that no man would justify the vanity of this reason.

Or if the question were demanded, if a Christian with good conscience may defraud, steal or deceive, and answer were made that so he might by the example of the Israelites, who at God's commandment deceived the Egyptians and spoiled them of their garments, gold and silver; I think likewise this reason should be mocked. And what greater force, I pray you, hath the former argument? Deborah did rule in Israel, and Huldah spoke prophecy in Judah: *ergo* it is lawful for women to reign above realms and nations, or to teach in the presence of men. The consequent is vain and of none effect. For of examples, as is before declared, we may establish no law, but we are always bound to the law written, and to the commandment expressed in the same. And the law written and pronounced by God forbiddeth no less that any woman reign over man, than it forbiddeth man to take plurality of wives, to marry two sisters living at once, to steal, to rob, to murder or to lie. If any of these hath been transgressed, and yet God hath not imputed the same, it maketh not the like fact or deed lawful unto us. For God, being free, may for such causes as be approved by his inscrutable wisdom dispense with the rigor of his law, and may use his creatures at his pleasure. But the same power is not permitted to man, whom he hath made subject to his law and not to the examples of fathers. And this I think sufficient to the reasonable and moderate spirits. But to repress the raging of woman's madness I will descend somewhat deeper into the matter, and not fear to affirm

that as we find a contrary spirit in all these most wicked women that this day be exalted into this tyrannous authority, to the spirit that was in those godly matrons: so I fear not, I say, to affirm, that their condition is unlike, and that their end shall be diverse. In those matrons we find that the spirit of mercy, truth, justice and of humility did reign.

Under them we find that God did show mercy to his people, delivering them from the tyranny of strangers and from the venom of idolatry by the hands and counsel of those women: but in these of our ages, we find cruelty, falsehood, pride, covetousness, deceit, and oppression. In them we also find the spirit of Jezebel, and Athaliah; under them we find the simple people oppressed, the true religion extinguished, and the blood of Christ's members most cruelly shed. And finally, by their practices and deceit we find ancient realms and nations given and betrayed into the hands of strangers, the titles and liberties of them taken from the just possessors; which one thing is an evident testimony how unlike our mischievous Marys be unto Deborah, under whom were strangers chased out of Israel, God so raising her up to be a mother and deliverer to his oppressed people.

But alas, he hath raised up these Jezebels to be the uttermost of his plagues, which man's unthankfulness hath long deserved. But his secret and most just judgment shall excuse neither them nor their maintainers, because their counsels be diverse. But to prosecute my purpose,

let such as wish to defend these monsters in their tyranny prove first that their sovereign mistresses be like to Deborah in godliness and pity; and secondarily, that the same success doth follow their tyranny, which did follow the extraordinary regiment of that godly matron. Which things although they were able to do (as they never shall be, let them blow till they burst), yet shall her example profit them nothing at all. For they are never able to prove that either Deborah, or any other godly woman (having the commendation of the Holy Ghost within the Scriptures) hath usurped authority above any realm or nation by reason of their birth and blood, neither yet did they claim it by right or inheritance; but God by his singular privilege, favor, and grace, exempted Deborah from the common malediction given to women in that behalf: and against nature he made her prudent in counsel, strong in courage, happy in regiment, and a blessed mother and deliverer to his people; the which he did partly to advance and notify the power of his majesty as well to his enemies, as to his own people, in that that he declared himself able to give salvation and deliverance by means of the most weak vessels: and partly he did it to confound and shame all man of that age, because they had for the most part declined from his true obedience. And therefore was the spirit of courage, regiment, and boldness taken from them for a time, to their confusion and further humiliation.

But what maketh this for Mary and her match Philip?



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

One thing I would ask of such as depend upon the example of Deborah: whether she was widow or wife when she judged Israel, and when God gave that notable victory to his people under her? If they answer she was widow, I would lay against them the testimony of the Holy Ghost, witnessing that she was wife to Lapidoth. And if they will shift, and allege that so she might be called, notwithstanding that her husband was dead, I urge them further, that they are not able to prove it to be any common phrase and manner of speech in the Scriptures that a woman shall be called the wife of a dead man, except that there be some note added whereby it may be known that her husband is departed, as is witnessed of Anna. But in this place of the judges there is no note added that her husband should be dead, but rather the expressed contrary. For the text saith,

In that time a woman named Deborah a prophetess, wife to Lapidoth, judged Israel...

The Holy Ghost plainly speaketh, that what time she judged Israel, she was wife to Lapidoth. If she was wife, and if she ruled all alone in Israel, then I ask why did she not prefer her husband to that honor to be captain, and to be leader to the host of the Lord. If any think that it was her husband, the text proveth the contrary. For it affirmeth that Barak of the tribe of Naphtali was appointed to that office. If Barak had been her husband, to what purpose

should the Holy Ghost so diligently have noted the tribe, and another name than was before expressed? Yea, to what purpose should it be noted that she sent and called him? Whereof I doubt not but that every reasonable man doth consider that this Barak was not her husband; and thereof likewise it is evident that her judgment or government in Israel was no such usurped power as our queens unjustly possess this day, but that it was the spirit of prophecy which rested upon her, what time the multitude of the people wrought wickedly in the eyes of the Lord: by which spirit she did rebuke the idolatry and iniquity of the people, exhort them to repentance, and in the end, did bring them this comfort: that God should deliver them from the bondage and thralldom of their enemies. And this she might do, notwithstanding that another did occupy the place of the supreme magistrate, (if any was in those days in Israel) for, so I find did Huldah the wife of Shallum in the days of Josiah king of Judah speak prophecy and comfort the king: and yet he resigned to her neither the scepter nor the sword.

That this our interpretation how Deborah did judge in Israel is the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, the pondering and weighing of the history shall manifestly prove. When she sendeth for Barak, I pray you, in whose name giveth she him his charge? Doth she speak to him as kings and princes used to speak to their subjects in such cases? No, but she speaketh as she that had a special revelation from God which neither was known to Barak

nor to the people, saying: hath not the Lord God of Israel commanded thee? This is her preface by which she would stir up the dull senses of Barak and of the people, willing to persuade unto them that the time was come when God would show himself their protector and deliverer—in which preface she usurpeth to herself neither power nor authority. For she saith not: I, being thy princess, thy mistress, thy sovereign lady and queen, command thee upon thine allegiance, and under pain of treason to go and gather an army. No, she spoileth herself of all power to command, attributing that authority to God, of whom she had her revelation and certitude to appoint Barak captain, which after appeareth more plainly.

For when she had declared to him the whole counsel of God, appointing unto him as well the number of his soldiers as the tribes out of which they should be gathered: and when she had appointed the place of the battle, (which she could not have done, but by special revelation of God) and had assured him of victory in the name of God, and yet he fainted and openly refused to enter into that journey except that the prophetess would accompany him, she did use against him no external power, she did not threaten him with rebellion and death, but for assurance of his faint heart and weak conscience, being content to go with him, she pronounceth, that the glory should not be his in that journey, but that the Lord should sell Sisera into the hand of a woman. Such as have more pleasure in light than in darkness may clearly perceive that Deborah

did usurp no such power nor authority as our queens do this day claim, but that she was endued with the spirit of wisdom, of knowledge, and of the true fear of God; and by the same she judged the deeds of the rest of the people. She rebuked their defection and idolatry, yea and also did redress, to her power, the injuries that were done by man to man.

But all this, I say, she did by the spiritual sword—that is, by the Word of God—and not by any temporal regiment or authority which she did usurp over Israel; in which, I suppose, at that time there was no lawful magistrate, by reason of their great affliction. For so witnesseth the history, saying:

And Ehud being dead, the Lord sold Israel in to the hand of Jabin king of Canaan. And he by Sisera his captain afflicted Israel greatly the space of twenty years.

And Deborah herself, in her song of thanksgiving, confesseth that before she did arise mother in Israel, and in the days of Jael, there was nothing but confusion and trouble.

If any stick to the term, alleging that the Holy Ghost saith that she judged Israel, let them understand that neither doth the Hebrew word, neither yet the Latin, always signify civil judgment or the execution of the temporal sword, but most commonly is taken in the sense which we have before expressed. For of Christ it is said,

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

he shall judge many nations,<sup>1</sup> and that he shall pronounce judgment to the Gentiles;<sup>2</sup> and yet it is evident that he was no minister of the temporal sword. God commandeth Jerusalem and Judah to judge betwixt him and his vineyard,<sup>3</sup> and yet he appointed not them all to be civil magistrates.

To Ezekiel it is said:

Shalt thou not judge them, Son of man? (Ezekiel 20:4)

And after:

Thou Son of man, shalt thou not judge? Shalt thou not judge, I say, the city of blood? (Ezekiel 22:2a)

And also:

Behold, I shall judge betwixt beast and beast. (Ezekiel 34:17)

And such places in great number are to be found throughout the whole Scriptures; and yet I trust no man will be so foolish as to think that any of the prophets were appointed by God to be political judges, or to punish the sins of man by corporeal punishment. No, the manner of their judgment is expressed in these words:

Declare to them all their abominations, and thou shalt say to them: Thus saith the Lord God: a city shedding blood in the midst of her, that her time may approach, and which hath made idols against herself, that she might be polluted. Thou hast transgressed in the blood which thou hast shed,

and thou are polluted in the idols, which thou hast made.  
(Ezekiel 22:2b-4)

Thus, I say, do the prophets of God judge, pronouncing the sentence of God against malefactors. And so I doubt not but Deborah judged, what time Israel had declined from God: rebuking their defection, and exhorting them to repentance, without usurpation of any civil authority. And if the people gave unto her for a time any reverence or honour, as her godliness and happy counsel did well deserve, yet was it no such empire as our monsters claim. For which of her sons or nearest kinsmen left she ruler and judge in Israel after her? The Holy Ghost expresseth no such thing; whereof it is evident that by her example God offereth no occasion to establish any regiment of women above men, realms, and nations.

### Objection 2: The law made by Moses for the daughters of Zelophehad

But now to the second objection, in which women require (as to them appeareth) nothing but equity and justice, whilst they and their patrons for them require dominion and empire above men. For this is their question: Is it not lawful that women have their right and inheritance, like as the daughters of Zelophehad were commanded by the mouth of Moses to have their portion of ground in their tribe?

I answer, it is not only lawful that women possess their

inheritance, but I affirm also that justice and equity require that so they do. But therewith I add that which gladly they list not understand: that to bear rule or authority over man can never be right nor inheritance to woman. For that can never be just inheritance to any person which God by his word hath plainly denied unto them: but to all women hath God denied authority above man, as most manifestly is before declared: therefore to her it can never be inheritance. And thus must the advocates of our ladies provide some better example and stronger argument, for the law made in favor of the daughters of Zelophehad will serve them nothing. And assuredly great wonder it is that in so great light of God's truth men wish to grope and wander in darkness. For let them speak of conscience, if the petition of any of these forenamed women was to reign over any one tribe, yea or yet over any one man within Israel. Plain it is they did not, but only required that they might have a portion of ground among the men of their tribe, lest the name of their father should be abolished. And this was granted unto them without respect had to any civil regiment.

And what maketh this, I pray you, for the establishing of this monstrous empire of women? The question is not if women may succeed to possession, substance, patrimony, or inheritance, such as fathers may leave to their children, for that I willingly grant. But the question is, if women may succeed to their fathers in offices; and chiefly to that office, the executor whereof doth occupy the place and

throne of God. And that I absolutely deny, and fear not to say that to place a woman in authority above a realm is to pollute and profane the royal seat, the throne of justice, which ought to be the throne of God; and that to maintain them in the same is nothing else but continually to rebel against God.

One thing there is yet to be noted and observed in the law made concerning the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad, to wit, that it was forbidden unto them to marry without their own tribe, lest such portion as fell to their lot should be transferred from one tribe to another, and so should the tribe of Manasseh be defrauded and spoiled of their just inheritance by their occasion; for avoiding of which it was commanded by Moses that they should marry in the family or household of the tribe and kindred of their father. Wonder it is that the advocates and patrons of the right of our ladies did not consider and ponder this law before they counseled the blind princes and unworthy nobles of their countries to betray the liberties thereof into the hands of strangers. England, for satisfying of the inordinate appetites of that cruel monster Mary (unworthy, by reason of her bloody tyranny, of the name of a woman), betrayed (alas) to the proud Spaniard; and Scotland, by the rash madness of foolish governors and by the practices of a crafty dame, resigned likewise, under title of marriage, into the power of France.

Doth such translation of realms and nations please the justice of God, or is the possession by such means



obtained, lawful in his sight? Assured I am that it is not. Not otherwise, I say, than is that possession whereunto thieves, murderers, tyrants and oppressors do attain by theft, murder, tyranny, violence, deceit, and oppression, which God, of his secret (but yet most just) judgment doth often permit for punishment, as well of the sufferers as of the violent oppressors, but doth never approve the same as lawful and godly. For if he would not permit that the inheritance of the children of Israel should pass from one tribe to another by the marriage of any daughter—notwithstanding that they were all one people; all spake one tongue, all were descended of one father, and all did profess one God, and one religion—if yet, I say, God would not suffer that the commodity and usual fruit which might be gathered of the portion of ground limited and assigned to one tribe should pass to another, will he suffer that the liberties, laws, commodities, and fruits of whole realms and nations be given into the power and distribution of others by reason of marriage, and in the powers of such, as besides that they be of a strange tongue, of strange manners and laws, they are also ignorant of God, enemies to his truth, deniers of Christ Jesus, persecutors of his true members, and haters of all virtue?

As the odious nation of Spaniards doth manifestly declare; who for very contempt, which they do bear against Christ Jesus—whom their forefathers did crucify (for Jews they are, as histories do witness, and they

themselves confess)—do this day make plain war against all true professors of his holy Gospel.

And how blindly and outrageously the French king and his pestilent prelates do fight against the verity of God the flaming fires, which lick up the innocent blood of Christ's members, do witness, and by his cruel edicts is notified and proclaimed.

And yet to these two cruel tyrants (to France and Spain I mean) is the right and possession of England and Scotland appointed. But just or lawful shall that possession never be, till God do change the statute of his former law; which he will not do for the pleasure of man. For he hath not created the earth to satisfy the ambition of two or three tyrants, but for the universal seed of Adam,<sup>4</sup> and hath appointed and defined the bounds of their habitation to diverse nations, assigning diverse countries as he himself confesseth, speaking to Israel in these words:

You shall pass by the bounds and limits of your brethren the sons of Esau, who dwell in Mount Seir. They shall fear you. But take diligent heed that ye show not yourselves cruel against them. For I will give you no part of their land. No, not the breadth of a foot. For Mount Seir I have given to Esau to be possessed. (Deuteronomy 2:4-5)

And the same he doth witness of the sons of Lot, to whom he had given Ar to be possessed.<sup>5</sup>

And Moses plainly affirmeth that when the Almighty did distribute and divide possessions to the Gentiles, and

when he did disperse and scatter the sons of men, that then he did appoint the limits and bounds of peoples for the number of the sons of Israel.

Whereof it is plain that God hath not exposed the earth in prey to tyrants, making all things lawful which by violence and murder they may possess, but that he hath appointed to every several nation a several possession, willing them to stand content with that portion which by lot and just means they had enjoyed (cf. Cicero, *On Duties*, Book 1).<sup>6</sup>

For what causes God permitteth this his distribution to be troubled, and the realms of ancient nations to be possessed of strangers, I delay at this time to treat. Only this I have recited to give the world to understand that the reign, empire, and authority of women hath no ground within God's Scriptures; yea, that realms or provinces possessed by their marriage is nothing but unjust conquest. For so little doth the law made for the daughters of Zelophehad help the cause of your queens that it utterly fighteth against them, damning both their authority and deeds.

### Objection 3: Consent and long custom have established women's authority

But now to the third objection.

The consent, say they, of realms and laws pronounced and admitted in this behalf, long consuetude and custom,

together with felicity of some women in their empires, have established their authority.

To whom I answer, that neither may the tyranny of princes, nor the foolishness of people, nor wicked laws made against God, nor yet the felicity that in this earth may hereof ensue, make that thing lawful which he by his word hath manifestly condemned. For if the approbation of princes and people, laws made by men, or the consent of realms, may establish anything against God and his word, then should idolatry be preferred to the true religion. For more realms and nations, more laws and decrees published by emperors with common consent of their counsels, have established the one than have approved the other. And yet I think that no man of sound judgment will therefore justify and defend idolatry. No more ought any man to maintain this odious empire of women, although it were approved of all men by their laws. For the same God that in plain words forbiddeth idolatry doth also forbid the authority of women over man, as the words of Saint Paul before rehearsed do plainly teach us. And therefore whether women be deposed from that unjust authority (have they never usurped it so long) or if all such honor be denied unto them, I fear not to affirm that they are neither defrauded of right nor inheritance. For to women can that honor never be due nor lawful (much less inheritance) which God hath so manifestly denied unto them.

I am not ignorant that the subtle wits of carnal men (which can never be brought under obedience of God's

simple precepts to maintain this monstrous empire) have yet two vain shifts.

First, they allege that, albeit women may not absolutely reign by themselves, because they may neither sit in judgment, neither pronounce sentence, neither execute any public office: yet may they do all such things by their lieutenants, deputies and judges substitute. Secondly, say they, a woman born to rule over any realm may choose her a husband, and to him she may transfer and give her authority and right.

To both I answer in few words. First, that from a corrupt and venomed fountain can spring no wholesome water; secondarily, that no person hath power to give the thing which doth not justly appertain to themselves. But the authority of a woman is a corrupted fountain, and therefore from her can never spring any lawful officer. She is not born to rule over men: and therefore she can appoint none by her gift, nor by her power (which she hath not) to the place of a lawful magistrate. And therefore whosoever receiveth of a woman office or authority are adulterous and bastard officers before God.

This may appear strange at the first affirmation, but if we will be as indifferent and equal in the cause of God as we can be in the cause of man the reason shall suddenly appear. The case supposed that a tyrant by conspiracy usurped the royal seat and dignity of a king, and in the same did so establish himself, that he appointed officers and did what he wished for a time; and in this meantime

the native king made strait inhibition to all his subjects, that none should adhere to this traitor, nor yet receive any dignity of him, yet nevertheless they would honor the same traitor as king and become his officers in all affairs of the realm.

If afterwards the native prince did recover his just honor and possession, should he repute or esteem any man of the traitor's appointment for a lawful magistrate, or for his friend and true subject? Or should he not rather with one sentence condemn the head with the members? And if so he should do, who were able to accuse him of rigor? much less to condemn his sentence of injustice. And dare we deny the same power to God in the like case?

For if woman reigneth above man, she hath obtained it by treason and conspiracy committed against God; how can it be then, that she, being criminal and guilty of treason against God committed, can appoint any officer pleasing in his sight? It is a thing impossible. Wherefore let men that receive of women authority, honor or office, be most assuredly persuaded, that in so maintaining that usurped power they declare themselves enemies to God.

If any think that because the realm and estates thereof have given their consents to a woman and have established her and her authority, that therefore it is lawful and acceptable before God, let the same men remember what I have said before, to wit, that God cannot approve the doing nor consent of any multitude concluding any thing against his word and ordinance; and therefore they must

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

have a more assured defense against the wrath of God than the approbation and consent of a blinded multitude, or else they shall not be able to stand in the presence of the consuming fire: that is, they must acknowledge that the regiment of a woman is a thing most odious in the presence of God. They must refuse to be her officers, because she is a traitress and rebel against God. And finally they must study to repress her inordinate pride and tyranny to the uttermost of their power.

The same is the duty of the nobility and estates, by whose blindness a woman is promoted. First, insofar as they have most heinously offended against God, placing in authority such as God by his word hath removed from the same, unfeignedly they ought to call for mercy, and being admonished of their error and damnable deeds, in sign and token of true repentance, with common consent they ought to retreat that which unadvisedly and by ignorance they have pronounced, and ought without further delay to remove from authority all such persons as by usurpation, violence, or tyranny, do possess the same.

For so did Israel and Judah after they had revolted from David, and Judah alone in the days of Athaliah (2 Kings 11). For after she by murdering her son's children had obtained the empire over the land and had most unhappily reigned in Judah six years, Jehoiada the high priest called together the captains and chief rulers of the people, and showing to them the king's son Joash, did bind them by an oath to depose that wicked woman and to promote the king

to his royal seat, which they faithfully did, killing at his commandment not only that cruel and mischievous woman, but also the people did destroy the temple of Baal, break his altars and images, and kill Mathan, Baal's high priest, before his altars.

The same is the duty as well of the estates as of the people that hath been blinded: first they ought to remove from honor and authority that monster in nature (so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea a woman against nature reigning above man). Secondly, if any presume to defend that impiety, they ought not to fear, first to pronounce, and then after to execute against them the sentence of death.

If any man be afraid to violate the oath of obedience which they have made to such monsters, let them be most assuredly persuaded that as the beginning of their oaths proceeding from ignorance was sin, so is the obstinate purpose to keep the same nothing but plain rebellion against God. But of this matter in the second blast, God willing, we shall speak more at large.

## Notes

1. "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." – Isaiah 2:4; cf. Micah 4:3
2. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, [in whom] my



## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.” – Isaiah 42:1

3. "And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard." – Isaiah 5:3
4. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;" – Acts 17:26
5. "And the LORD said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle: for I will not give thee of their land [for] a possession; because I have given Ar unto the children of Lot [for] a possession. ... And [when] thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them: for I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon [any] possession; because I have given it unto the children of Lot [for] a possession." – Deuteronomy 2:9, 19
6. [See for example, this from Book 1 section 7 –DSM]:

The first demand of justice is, that no one do harm to another, unless provoked by injury; the next, that one use common possessions as common, private, as belonging to their owners. Private possessions, indeed, are not so by nature, but by ancient occupancy, as in the case of settlers in a previously uninhabited region; or by conquest, as in the territory acquired in war; or by law, treaty, agreement, or lot. Thus it comes to pass that the territory of Arpinas is said to belong to the Arpinates, that of Tusculum to the Tuscans, and a similar account is to be given of the possessions of individual owners. **Because each person thus has for his own a portion of those things which were common by nature, let each hold undisturbed what has fallen to his possession.** If any one endeavors to obtain more for himself, he will violate the law of human society. —Cicero, *De Officiis* (*On Duties*) Book 1

## THE ADMONITION

---

And now to put an end to the first blast, seeing that by the order of nature, by the malediction and curse pronounced against woman, by the mouth of Saint Paul the interpreter of God's sentence, by the example of that commonwealth in which God by his Word planted order and policy, and finally by the judgment of the most godly writers, God hath dejected woman from rule, dominion, empire, and authority above man; moreover, seeing that neither the example of Deborah, nor the law made for the daughters of Zelophehad, nor yet the foolish consent of an ignorant multitude, be able to justify that which God so plainly

hath condemned: let all men take heed what quarrel and cause from henceforth they do defend.

If God raise up any noble heart to claim the liberty of his country and to suppress the monstrous empire of women, let all such as shall presume to defend them in the same most certainly know that in so doing they lift their hand against God, and that one day they shall find his power to fight against their foolishness.

Let not the faithful, godly, and valiant hearts of Christ's soldiers be utterly discouraged, neither yet let the tyrants rejoice, albeit for a time they triumph against such as study to repress their tyranny and to remove them from unjust authority. For the causes [God] alone [knows], why he suffereth the soldiers to fail in battle whom nevertheless he commandeth to fight, as sometimes did Israel fighting against Benjamin. The cause of the Israelites was most just, for it was to punish that horrible abomination of those sons of Belial abusing the Levite's wife, whom the Benjamites did defend (Judges 20); and they had God's precept to assure them of well doing. For he did not only command them to fight, but also appointed Judah to be their leader and captain, and yet fell they twice in plain battle against those most wicked adulterers.

The secret cause of this, I say, is known to God alone. But by his evident scriptures we may assuredly gather that by such means doth his wisdom sometimes beat down the pride of the flesh (for the Israelites at the first trusted in their multitude, power and strength) and sometimes by

such overthrows he will punish the offenses of his own children and bring them to the unfeigned knowledge of the same before he will give them victory against the manifest scorers, whom he hath appointed nevertheless to uttermost perdition: as the end of that battle did witness. For although with great murder the children of Israel did twice fall before the Benjamites; yet after they had wept before the Lord, after they had fasted and made sacrifice in sign of their unfeigned repentance, they so prevailed against that proud tribe of Benjamin that after twenty-five thousand strong men of war were killed in battle they destroyed man, woman, child and beast, as well in the fields as in the cities, which all were burned with fire, so that only of that whole tribe remained six hundred men, who fled to the wilderness, where they remained four months, and so were saved. The same God who did execute this grievous punishment even by the hands of those whom he suffered twice to be overcome in battle doth this day retain his power and justice.

Cursed Jezebel of England, with the pestilent and detestable generation of papists, make no little brag and boast that they have triumphed not only against Wyatt,<sup>1</sup> but also against all such as have enterprised anything against them or their proceedings. But let her and them consider that yet they have not prevailed against God: his throne is more high than the length of their horns be able to reach.

And let them further consider that in the beginning of

## FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET

their bloody reign the harvest of their iniquity was not come to full maturity and ripeness. No, it was so green, so secret I mean, so covered, and so hid with hypocrisy, that some men (even the servants of God) thought it not impossible but that wolves might be changed into lambs, and also that the viper might remove her natural venom. But God, who doth reveal in his time appointed the secrets of hearts, and that will have his judgments justified even by the very wicked, hath now given open testimony of her and their beastly cruelty.

For man and woman, learned and unlearned, nobles and men of baser sort, aged fathers and tender damsels, and finally the bones of the dead, as well women as men have tasted of their tyranny, so that now not only the blood of father Latimer, of the mild man of God the bishop of Canterbury, of learned and discreet Ridley, of innocent Lady Jane Dudley, and many godly and worthy preachers that cannot be forgotten, such as fire hath consumed and the sword of tyranny most unjustly hath shed, doth call for vengeance in the ears of the Lord God of hosts: but also the sobs and tears of the poor oppressed; the groanings of the angels, the watchmen of the Lord; yea, and every earthly creature abused by their tyranny do continually cry and call for the hasty execution of the same.

I fear not to say that the day of vengeance, which shall apprehend that horrible monster Jezebel of England and such as maintain her monstrous cruelty, is already appointed in the counsel of the eternal; and I verily believe

## JOHN KNOX

that it is so nigh that she shall not reign so long in tyranny as hitherto she hath done, when God shall declare himself to be her enemy, when he shall pour forth contempt upon her according to her cruelty, and shall kindle the hearts of such as sometimes did favor her with deadly hatred against her, that they may execute his judgments.

And therefore let such as assist her take heed what they do. For assuredly her empire and reign is a wall without foundation: I mean the same of the authority of all women. It hath been underpropped this blind time that is past with the foolishness of people; and with the wicked laws of ignorant and tyrannous princes. But the fire of God's word is already laid to those rotten props (I include the Pope's law with the rest) and presently they burn, albeit we espy not the flame: when they are consumed, (as shortly they will be, for stubble and dry timber cannot long endure the fire) that rotten wall, the usurped and unjust empire of women, shall fall by itself in despite of all man, to the destruction of so many as shall labor to uphold it.

And therefore let all man be advertised, for the trumpet hath once blown.

Praise God, ye that fear him.

## Notes

1. [Must be Wyatt's Rebellion of 1554. –DSM]

## Author's Postscript

Geneva, July 14, 1558

John Knox to the Reader:

Because many are offended at the first blast of the trumpet, in which I affirm that to promote a woman to bear rule or empire above any realm, nation or city, is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, and a thing most contrary to his revealed and approved ordinance; and because also that some hath promised (as I understand) a confutation of the same, I have delayed the second blast till such time as their reasons appear, by which I either may be reformed in opinion, or else shall have further occasion more simply and plainly to utter my judgment. Yet in the meantime, for the discharge of my conscience, and for avoiding suspicion which might be engendered by reason of my silence, I could not cease to notify these subsequent propositions, which by God's grace I purpose to treat in the second blast promised.

## AUTHOR'S POSTSCRIPT

1. It is not birth only, nor propinquity of blood, that maketh a king lawfully to reign above a people professing Christ Jesus and his eternal verity, but in his election must the ordinance, which God hath established in the election of inferior judges, be observed.
2. No manifest idolater, nor notorious transgressor of God's holy precepts, ought to be promoted to any public regiment, honour or dignity in any realm, province or city that hath subjected themselves to Christ Jesus and to his blessed Evangel.
3. Neither can oath nor promise bind any such people to obey and maintain tyrants against God and against his truth known.
4. But if either rashly they have promoted any manifest wicked person, or yet ignorantly have chosen such a one as afterward declareth himself unworthy of regiment above the people of God (and such be all idolaters and cruel persecutors), most justly may the same men depose and punish him that unadvisedly before they did nominate, appoint and elect.

MATTHEW 6. *If the eye be single, the whole body shall be clear.*



## Appendix

*Knox published his First Blast when the godly in England and Scotland were suffering intense persecution at the hands of ungodly queens. After the God-fearing Queen Elizabeth acceded to the throne of England late in 1558, Knox walked back from some of the First Blast's applications while continuing to stand for the work as a whole, as can be seen from the following exchanges. —DSM*

---

12 July 1559. John Knox to Sir William Cecil.

The spirit of wisdom rule your heart to the glory of God and to the comfort of his afflicted flock.

One cause of my present writing is right honorable humbly to require you to deliver this other letter enclosed to the queen's grace which containeth in few and simple words my confession what I think of her authority, how far it is just, and what may make it odious in God's presence.

I hear there is a confutation set forth in print against the first blast. God grant that the writer have no more

sought the favors of the world, no less the glory of God and the stable commodity of his country than did him who enterprised in that blast to utter his conscience. When I shall have time (which now is dear and strait unto me) to peruse that work I will communicate my judgment with you concerning the same. The time is now, sir, that all that either trust Christ Jesus to reign in this isle, the liberties of the same to be kept to the inhabitants thereof and their hearts to be joined together in love unfeigned, ought rather to study how the same may be brought to pass than vainly to travail for the maintenance of that whereof already we have seen the danger, and felt the smart...

State Papers, Scotland, Vol. 1 Art. 57 in Public Record office, London.<sup>1</sup>

---

20 July 1559. John Knox's Declaration to Queen Elizabeth.

To the virtuous and godly Elizabeth by the grace of God queen of England etc. John Knox desireth the perpetual increase of the Holy Spirit, etc.

As your grace's displeasure against me most unjustly conceived, hath been and is to my wretched heart a burden grievous and almost intolerable, so is the testimony of a clean conscience to me a stay and uphold that in desperation I sink not, how vehement that ever the temptations appear, for in God's presence my conscience beareth me record that maliciously nor of purpose I

## APPENDIX

offended your grace, nor your realm. And therefore howsoever I be judged by man, I am assured to be absolved by him who only knoweth the secrets of hearts.

I cannot deny the writing of a book against the usurped authority and unjust regiment of women, neither yet am I minded to retract or to call any principal point or proposition of the same, till truth and verity do further appear, but why either your grace, either yet any such as unfeignedly favor the liberty of England should be offended at the author of such a work I can perceive no just occasion.

For first my book touched not your grace's person in especial, neither yet is it prejudicial [to] any liberty of the realm, if the time and my writing be indifferently considered. How could I be enemy to your grace's person? For deliverance whereof I did more study, and enterprise farther, than any of those that now accuse me. And as concerning your regiment how could or can I envy that which most I have trusted, and for which (as oblivion will suffer) I render thanks unfeignedly unto God; that is, that it hath pleased Him of His eternal goodness to exalt your head (which times was in danger) to the manifestation of his glory and extirpation of idolatry.

And as for any offense which I have committed against England, either in writing that or of any other work, I will not refuse that moderate and indifferent men judge and discern betwixt me and those that accuse me, to wit, whither of the parties do most hurt the liberty of England:

## APPENDIX

I that affirm that no woman may be exalted above any realm to make the liberty of the same thrall to a strange, proud, and cruel nation, or they that approve whatsoever pleaseth princes for the time.

If I were as well disposed to accuse, as some of them ([to] their own scheme) have declared themselves, I nothing doubt but that in few words I should let reasonable men understand that some that this day lowly crouch to your grace and labor to make me odious in your eyes, did in your adversity neither show themselves faithful friends to your grace, neither yet so loving and careful over their native country as now they would be esteemed.

But omitting the accusation of others for my own purgation and for your grace's satisfaction, I say that nothing in my book conceived is or can be prejudicial to your grace's just regiment, provided that ye be not found ungrateful unto God. Ungrateful ye shall be proved in presence of His throne (howsoever that flatterers justify your [deeds]) if ye transfer the glory of that honor in which ye now stand to any other thing than to the dispensation of His mercy which only maketh that lawful to your grace which nature and law denieth to all woman. Neither would I that your grace should fear that this your humiliation before God should in any case infirm or weaken your just and lawful authority before men. Nay madam, such unfeigned confession of God's benefits received shall be the establishment of the same not only

## APPENDIX

to yourself, but also to your seed and posterity, when contrariwise a proud conceit and elevation of yourself shall be the occasion that your reign shall be unstable, troublesome and short.

God is witness that unfeignedly I both love and reverence your grace: yea, I pray that your reign may be long, prosperous, and quiet. And that for the quietness which Christ's members before persecuted have received under you; but yet if I should flatter your grace I were no friend, but a deceitful traitor. And therefore of conscience I am compelled to say that neither the consent of people, the process of time, nor multitude of men, can establish a law which God shall approve; but whatsoever He approveth (by his eternal word) that shall be approved, and whatsoever he damneth shall be condemned, though all men in earth would hazard the justification of the same. And therefore, madam, the only way to retain and to keap those benefits of God abundantly poured now of late days upon you and upon your realm is unfeignedly to render unto God, to His mercy and undeserved grace, the whole glory of this your exaltation; forget your birth and all title which thereupon doth hinge; and consider deeply how for fear of your life ye did decline from God and bow to idolatry. Let it not appear a small offense in your eyes that ye have declined from Christ Jesus in the Day of his battle, neither yet would I that ye should esteem that mercy to be vulgar and common which ye have received, to wit, that God hath covered your former offense, hath presented

## APPENDIX

you when ye were most unthankful, and in the end hath exalted and raised you up not only from the dust, but also from the gates of death to rule above his people for the comfort of his church. It appertaineth to you, therefore, to ground the justice of your authority not upon that law which from year to year doth change, but upon the eternal providence of him who, contrary to nature and without your deserving, hath thus exalted your head. If thus in God's presence ye humble yourself, as in my heart I glorify God for that rest granted to His afflicted flock within England under you a weak instrument, so will I with tongue and pen justify your authority and regiment as the Holy Ghost hath justified the same In Deborah, that blessed mother in Israel; but if, these premises (as God forbid) neglected, ye shall begin to brag of your birth and to build your authority upon your own law, flatter you who so will, your felicity shall be short. Interpret my rude words in the best part as written by him who is no enemy to your grace.

By diverse letters I have required license to visit your realm not to seek myself, neither yet my own ease or commodity; which if ye now refuse and deny I must remit my [cause] to God, adding this for conclusion, that commonly it is seen that such as love not the counsel of the faithful (appear it never so sharp) are compelled to follow the deceit of flatterers to their own perdition. The mighty Spirit of the Lord Jesus move your heart to understand what is said, give unto you the discretion of

## APPENDIX

spirits, and so rule you in all your actions and enterprises that in you God may be glorified, His church edified, and ye yourself as a lively member of the same may be an example and mirror of virtue and of godly life to others.

So be it. Off Edinburgh the 20 Day of July 1559.

By your graces wholly to command in godliness.

[Endorsed] John Knox.

To the right mighty right high and right excellent princess Elizabeth queen of England, etc. Be these Delivered

State Papers, Scotland, Vol. 1 Art. 65.<sup>2</sup>

---

5 Aug. 1561. John Knox's second defense to Queen Elizabeth.

Grace from God the Father through our Lord Jesus, with perpetual increase of his Holy Spirit.

May it please your majesty that it is here certainly spoken that the Queen of Scotland [Mary Queen of Scots] travaileth earnestly to have a treatise entitled the first blast of the trumpet confuted by the answer of the learned in diverse realms, and farther that she laboreth to inflame the hearts of princes against the writer. And because it may appear that your majesty hath interest, that she mindeth to travail with your grace, your grace's counsel, and learned men for judgment against such a common enemy to women and to their regiment. It were but foolishness to me to prescribe unto your majesty what is to be done in anything, but especially in such things as men suppose

## APPENDIX

do touch myself. But of one thing I think myself assured and therefore I dare not conceal it, to wit, that neither doth our sovereign so greatly fear her own estate by reason of that book, neither yet doth she so unfeignedly favor the tranquility of your majesty's reign and realm that she would take so great and earnest pains, unless her crafty counsel in so doing shot at a further mark.

Two years ago I wrote unto your majesty my full Declaration touching that work; experience since hath shown that I am not desirous of innovations [i.e. in Government], so that Christ Jesus be not in his members openly trodden under the feet of the ungodly. With further purgation I will not trouble your majesty for the present. Beseeching the Eternal so to assist your Highness in all affairs; that in his sight you may be found acceptable, your regiment profitable to your commonwealth, and your deeds to be such that justly they may be praised [by] all [the] godly unto the coming of the Lord Jesus, to whose mighty protection I unfeignedly commit your majesty.

From Edinburgh the 5 of August 1561

Your majesty's servant to command in godliness

[Endorsed] John Knox.

To the mighty and excellent princess Elizabeth the Queen's majesty of England be these delivered.

State Papers, Scotland, Vol. 6, Art 55.<sup>3</sup>



## APPENDIX

### Notes

1. One readily available online source for these papers is *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots*, Joseph Bain, ed., Vol. 1, A.D. 1547-1563. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1898; reissue 1905. Letter #488, pp. 223-225. The letters at this source are often abridged.
2. See *Calendar*, Letter #496, pp. 228-230.
3. See *Calendar*, Letter #1002, p. 542.