

independent translation was made sometime in the next century.

7cc_Yñj gWtbX' fYZfYbW' hc' U' B Yk' 7c' lege book is less exciting and even more of a bibliographical headache! but one that will be resolved by the introduction of some very beautiful books. Here is the relevant exchange:

PAP: . . . For whereas you say *Onuphrius* was the first who by reason sought to discredit the report of it [i.e. Pope Joan]: that is not so. *Iohannes de Columna* a good writer of Chronicles, long before *Onuphrius*, hath likewise vtterly reiected the vanitie of this fable as *D. Harding* noteth.

PRO: *Iohannes de Columna* his historie is extant in Lattine in the Vniuersitie library at Oxford: and in French, in New Colledge library. But there is not one word, good, or bad, for, or against Pope *Ioane* in it. If he reiected it, he reiected it by silence. (pp. 4-5)

H\Y' ÐUd]gñ [jg' fYZff]b[ž Z]fgž hc' H\Y' Roman Catholic scholar and Augustinian monk Onuphrius Panvinius, whose commentary on the fifteenth-century scholar 6Ufrc`ca Yc' D`U]bUñj *Lives of the Popes* contained a well-referenced debunking of the myth of Pope Joan.⁵ H\Y' ÐfchYgUbnñ 7cc_Yñj dcg]h]cbž cZ Wci fgY' had claimed that it was only from the time of Panvinius that Roman Catholics felt the need to deny the existence of Pope Joan, the implication being that it was only the Protestant Reformation h\U' \UX' Zc'fWX' h\Ya ž Z]gY'nž hc' Xc' gc'' H\Y' ÐUd]gñ in response, counters that one Ðc' \UbbYg'XY' 7c' i' a bUñ\UX' XYb]YX' Pope Joan long before, and! as long as this Columna is a *pre*-Reformation writer! then the case that the Roman Catholic Church only denied Pope Joan *after* the Reformation collapses.

So who is Johannes de Columna? He was a real writer, a thirteenth-century Dominican responsible for a world chronicle called the *Mare historiarum* cf' ÐYU cZ <]g'cf]Ygñ 7cc_Y' \UX'ž Uj' \Y' gUHyg'h'fci [\ \]g' ÐUd]gñ h' fYUX' Wci h'h]g'h] h]b' U'k cf_ Vm the recusant Thomas Harding, his *Confutation of . . . An Apologie of the Church of England*, published in Antwerp in 1565. Now Thomas Harding (1516-72), it so happens, had been a fellow of New College too, and one of the more prominent scholars of his time. In 1542 he had been appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew, but after some flirtation with Protestant views, he reaffirmed his orthodoxy under the reign of Mary, and then fled abroad upon the accession of Elizabeth. He was one of the predominantly Wykehamist gYhcZ Ð b[]W' -@cj U b]YbgYgñ UVUbx' cZ g'cholars concentrated in Louvain who fought the new religion from abroad. Harding was both celebrated and notorious for his attack on æ\ b' >k Yñj cZ]WU' *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* of 1562! >k Yñj is the work against k \]W' < UFX]b[ñj *Confutation* was directed.

Now Harding indeed makes the claim that Cooke repeated, but his original gUHy' a Ybhi]g' []j Yb' k]h'ci h' U bmi ž fh\Yf' fYZfYbW'' 7cc_Yñj W' a Ybhi cb' h\Y']VfU]Yg'

Dominican order could only locate two complete manuscript texts, both in Paris. Modern writers can add two Italian ones to this, and there was also indeed a translation into a vernacular language⁶ but into Castilian, not French, as Cooke had claimed. This translation was published in 1512 in Spain; and there was no available Latin printed edition to which Cooke could turn.⁷ I have not established how Harding knew this text, and my guess is that he did not, but was simply repeating a claim about it from a prior source (but not the annotations of Panvinius, it seems). I am certain that Cooke could not have read Colonna⁸ even today, there is no full edition.⁸ We can detect that there is a problem here just from how 7cc_Yñj DfchubñfYd'Yg his interlocutor, repeating Harding,

