

hanc committed that vnto him, or haue offered it to the Bishop of Rome before? or if they had, howe could it be possible for him alone to serue all Churches, without any fellow Bishop to helpe him: And where this is to be said clerke standeth so much vpon the wordes of S. Gregory: Solus Episcopus Gregory therefore shall expound Gregory, and one Solus shall declare another. wherfore if this diuine (whatsoeuer he be Doctour or Bachelor) either knoweth not, or would learne, what (onely Bishop) meaneth in this place: an other place of the sayde Gregory may instruct him, where Gregory wytyng to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, geueth this reason, why he refused the same title offered to him (which then was offered to the sayde Iohn Patriarche of Constantinople) saying: Quia videlicet si vnus Patriarcha vniuersalis dicitur, Patriarchatum nomen ceteris derogatur, sed absit hoc. &c. That is to say: If one alone would be called Patriarch vniuersall, then should the name of Patriarches be derogated from all other, &c. wherby two things are to be noted: First what thing it was which the Patriarche of Constantinople did seeke; for Gregory here findeth no other fault, but with the same which was geuen to Iohn, which was to be called Patriarche vniuersall. The seconde thing to be noted, is the cause why Gregory did re-  
fuse this title, both geuen to Iohn, and offered to him; because (sayeth he) if one take vpon him the name of vniuersall Patriarch, then is the name Patriarche taken from the rest. As who would say: if I should take vpon me to be named vniuersall Patriarch, then should there be no other Patriarche, but I should be Bishop Patriarche alone. And here cometh in your Solus Episcopus. &c.

Ex Epist. Greg. 36. Lib. 4.

Ex Epist. Greg. 38. Lib. 4.

Another objection resolved.

A double vntouch in one Popish argument. Peter how he had charge and not charge of the Church. The first vntouch in this argument. The dignitie of the Church as borne the Apostles.

Vide Baldum cons. 1. 69. lib. 3 Secundum nouam impressionem. Et secund. Vere cons. 359. lib. 1. Prooves and reasons that there was no

Furthermore, the same Gregory speaking of the sayde Solus, in an other place by leaueing to declare there what he meaneth by this Solus here, in these wordes as follow: vt & nulli subesse, & solus omnibus preesse videretur That is to say: so that he would be subiect to none, and would be chieftain to all other alone, &c. And so by this place, may the other place be expounded, vt solus Episcopus sit is, qui solus inter Episcopos preesse appetat. That is, he that seeketh to be as bishop alone, who alone seeketh to be extolled above other by wordes. But to be thort in a matter that needeth not many wordes: he that thus caulleth vpon this place Solus Episcopus in Gregory, must be desired here not to take Solus alone, but to yne with all the word going before, which is, despectis fratribus; by the which might seeme sufficiently declared, what Gregory ment by Solus Episcopus, meaning, that to despise other bishops, & to diminish their honoz, to set vp his owne, & to be subiect to none, but to preferre himselfe in equality before all other, is as much as to be counted bishop alone. And thus much touching this obiection.

An other obiection of our aduersaries is this: although (say they) no Bishop of Rome was euer called, or would be called by the name of vniuersall Bishop: yet it followeth not therefore, that they be not, or ought not to be heades of the vniuersall Church. Their reason is this:

As S. Peter had the charge of the whole Church (by the testimonie of Gregory) committed vnto him, although he were not called vniuersall Apostle:

So no more absurd it is, for the Pope to be called the head of the whole Church, and to haue the charge thereof, although he be not called vniuersall Bishop, &c.

wher in is a double vntouch, & to haue the charge of the whole Church: if we take here (charge or head) for dominion or maisterly vpon or aboute the Church, in all cases iudicarie, both spirituall & temporal: for the wordes of the Scripture be plaine. Non dominantes in clerum 1. Pet. Vos autem non sic. Luke. 22. That is, Not as maisters ouer the Clergy, &c. but you not so, &c. Again that the Church is greater, or rather the head of Peter it is cleare: 1. Corin. 3. All things are yours, whether it be Paule, or Apollo, or Cephas: either the world, death, or life, you be Christs, Christ is Gods, &c. In which wordes the dignitie of the Church no doubt is preferred above the Apostles, and as aboute Cephas also. Moreover as the dignitie of the wife is aboute the seruant, so must needs the honoz and worthines of the Church (being the spouse of Christ) surmount the state of Peter or other Apostles, which be but seruants to Christ and to the Church; yea and though they were Princes of the Church, yet after the minde of Baldus: Magis attenditur persona intellectualis, quam organica. Otherwise if by this word (charge) he ment only the office and diligence of teaching: to that I answer: The same Lord that sayde to Peter, feede my sheepe, said also to the other, go & preach this Gospell to all nations. And he that said to Peter: what soeuer thou locest, said also to the other: whatsoeuer ye remitt in the earth, &c. Moreover if the matter goe by preaching, Paul the Apostle laboured more therein, then euer did Pe-

ter by his owne confession: Plus laborauit, also suffered more for the same, Plus sustinuit, neither was his doctrine lesse sound. Yea and in one point he went before Peter, & was teacher and scholmaister vnto Peter, whereas Peter was by him iustly corrected. Gal. 2. Furthermore, teaching is not always nor in all things a point of maisterly, but sometime a point of seruice. As if a Frenchman should be put to an Englishman to teach him French, although he excelleth him in that kind of facultie, yet it followeth not therefore, that he hath fulnes of power vpon him, to appoint his diet, to rule his household, to preferre his lawes, to stinte his lands, and such other, wherfore being in trauail in teaching, in paines of preaching, in gifts of songs, in largenes of commission, in operation of miracles, in grace of vocation, in receauing the holy Ghost, in vehemencie of tormentes and death for Christs name, the other Apostles were nothing inferior to Peter: why Peter then should claime any special prerogative above the rest, I vnderstand no cause. As in deed he neuer claimed any, but the patrons of the Apostolicall sea do claime it for him, which he neuer claimed himselfe, neither if he were here, would no lesse abhorre it with soule and conscience, then we do now: & yet our abhorring now is not for any malice of person, or any vantage to our selues, but only the vehemencie of truth, & zeale to Christ and to his congregation. Moreover, if these men would needes haue Peter to be the Curate and ouerscar of the whole vniuersall Church (which was too much for one man to take charge vpon) and to be Prince of all other Apostles, then would I same learne of them, what meaneth (Dextra societatis) the right hand of societie betwene Peter, Paul, & Barnabe, mentioned, Gal. 2. What taking of hands is there betwene subiects & their Prince, in way of fellowship? Or where fellowship is, what maisterly is there? Or againe, what state of maisterly is it like, that Christ would geue to Peter; who being in deede maister of all, toke such little maisterly vpon himselfe, and that not only in inward affection, but also in outward fact: Although I am not ignorant that Peter in places of the Gospell hath his commendation, neither doe I denie Peter to be worthy of the same. But yet these wordes of commendation, geue to him no state of superiortie, or inferiori-  
tion vpon all other, to haue all vnder his subiection. As if a Scholemaister should haue more special charge to some one of his scholers for his riper towardnes: yet this geueth him no fulnes of authoritie, or power coactive vpon the rest, vntesse by special aduision he be deputed therunto. wherof, nothing can be gathered of Peter; for if it be true that S. Augustine saith, that such things as were spokē to Peter, haue no lightsome vnderstanding, except they be referred to the church, wherof Peter did beare a figure: the hath y perion of Peter nothing to claime by these wordes, but all redouider to the church; which being ment by Peter, hath power by this reason, both ouer the perion of Peter, and all other persons in the Lord.

inequality of preeminence among the Apostles.

Office of teaching geueth no dominion, farther then in his book.

Peter in no point excelleth the rest of the Apostles.

Dextra societatis.

August. in prefat. psal. 103.

Answer to an inuincible argument propounding by Christofte the whole Church to be committed to S. Peter.

Christofte. Lib. 2. de sacred.

But here stumbleth in an argument of our aduersarie againe, which he in the margin of his booke calleth an inuincible argument drawn out of the bowels of S. Iohn Chrysostome. Lib. 2. De Sacerd. wherby he supposeth to haue giuen a shewd blow to the Protestants, and to haue gotten Hectoris victory vpon a certaine English prisoner taken in plain field, and of all such as take his part. The text onely of Chrysostome he reciteth, but maketh no argument albeit he maketh mention of an inuincible argument in the margin. But because he either wist not, or list not to shew his cunning therein, I wil forme that in argument for him which he would haue done, but did not: and so will forme it (the Lord willing) as he himselfe must of necessity be drinen to do, if the matter euer come to the trial of act, and not to the triking of wordes. First, he taketh his text out of Chrysostome, as followeth: for what cause, I pray you, did Christ shed his blood? Truly, to redeeme those sheepe, whose charge he committed to Peter, and to Peters successors. Upon this place of Chrysostome this Clarke taketh his medium, Christs suffering. His conclusion is, that all which Christ died for, were committed to Peter, wherfore the forme of the argument must needes stand thus in the third figure.

Christ suffered for all men.  
Christ suffered for them whome hee committed to Peter.  
Ergo, All that Christ dyed for, were committed to Peter.

If this be the forme of his insoluble argument, as it seemeth to be, by the order of his reasoning, & also must needes be, taking that medium, and making that conclusion as he doth, (for els in the first figure, and first mode, the text of Chrysostome will not serue him) then must the forme and violence

A Popish perillous paralogisme.