

violence of this inepugnabile argumēt be denied, for that it breaketh the rules of Logike, making his conclusiō vniuersall, which in that figure must needs be particular, either affirmatiue or negatiue. And so this argumēt vniuersall, faileth into one of these two straites, either cōcluding thus, the forme will not serue him, or cōcluding in another figure, the wordes of Chrysolome will not answer to his purpoit, to proue that all the world was committed to Peter. Which proposition as it is strange in scripture: so neither is it the proposition of Chrysolome. And though it were, yet both without inuolucence might be graued of vs; and being graunted, seruen his purpose nothing, so long as the proposition is not exceptiue, excluding other Apostles. For the wordes of Chrysolome do not so sound, that the whole world was committed to Peter onely and to none other. Likewise then as it may be well affirmed of vs, that the world was committed to Peter, so can it not be denied of them, that the world was also committed to John, James, Bartholomew, Paule, Barnabe, and other all and singular Apostles. For he that said to Peter, Feede my sheepe, said also to all and singular his Apostles: So into all the world & preach, &c. Math. vii. Moreover, for as much as this man collecteth out of Chrysolome, that the whole world was committed to Peter, how shall we then ioyne this meaning of Chrysolome with S. Paule, which sayeth that the Gospell was committed to Peter ouer the circumcision, as was Paule ouer the vncircumcision? And here an answer to this boughtie argumēt, both to the forme, & to the matter thereof, albeit concerning the matter, here lacketh much to be said more of Peters successours in the text of Chrysolome. By the which successours is not meant the bishop of Rome onely (as the Papists would beare vs in hand) but all such true and faithfull Pastors, whom the Lordes calling sendeth, and setteth ouer his flocke; where so euer, or whatsoever they be. For as Peter beareth a representation of the church, by the testimonie of August. in Ioan. tract 124. Prefat. in Psal. 108. so the successours of Peter be all faithfull Pastors and ouerscers of Christs Church, to whom Christ our Lord hath committed the charge of his flocke. wherefore they are not a little deceiued, which looking vpon the rocke onely of the person, and not the rock of confession (contrary to the iude of Hilarie, De trinit. lib. 6.) doe tie the Apostleship or rocke of Peter, to one onely Bishop, and the succession of Peter to one onely sea of Rome: where as this being a spiritual office, and not carnall, hath no such carnall race or descent after any worldly or local vnderstanding: but hath a moze mysticall meaning, after a spirituall sense of succession, such as Hierome speaketh of, epist. ad Euagrium. Omnes, inquit, Apostolorum successores sunt &c. What is, All, saith he (speaking of Bishops) be successours of the Apostles, &c.

Of like force and fashion, and out of the same figure, the same Author patcheth mozeouer another argumēt, prouing that the Bishop of Rome was tituled the head of Christs church, in the primitive time of the old aunciters, before the age of Gregory. His argumēt proceedeth thus, in the thirde figure.

S. Peter was called by the auncient fathers, head of Christs church.

S. Peter was bishop of Rome:

Ergo, the bishop of Rome was called head of Church in the old auncient tyme.

This argumēt expositiue, being clouted vp in the third figure, and concluding singularly, hath rather a shew of an argumēt, then maketh any necessarie conclusiō; standing vpon no mode in the said figure, if the Author thereof were put to his triall. Albeit to leaue the forme, and to come to the matter of the argumēt. First, how wel he wil dispatch himselfe of the Major, & proue vs that S. Peter, although he were at Rome, and taught at Rome, and succeeded at Rome: yet that he was bishop and proper Ordinarie of that cite and speciall sea of Rome? As touching the allegation of Abdias, Orosius, Ado, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hierome, Optatus, and Augustine, brought forth for his most advantage, to proue his Maior: thus I answer concerning Orosius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hierome, and Augustine, that where they speake of S. Peters chaire, or planting of faith at Rome, straightway this man argueth thereupon, that Peter was Bishop of Rome. But that doth not clarkely follow. For the office of the Apostles was to plant the faith in all places, and in every regio, yet were they not bishops in euery region. And as for the chaire, as it is no difference essentiall that maketh a bishop (for so much as a Doctour may haue a chaire, and yet be no bishop) so cannot he conclude by the chaire of Peter, that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome. For all this pouerth no farther, but that Peter was at Rome, and there taught the sayth of Christ, as Paule bid

also, and peraduenture in a chaire like wise: yet we say not that Paule was therefore Bishop of Rome. But that he was there as an Apostle of Christ, whether he taught there standing on his secte, or sitting in a chaire. In the Scripture commonly the Chaire signifieth doctrine or iudgement, as sitting of Moyses, or in the chaire of persistence. Wanting likewise is a worde Apostolicall, and signifieth not onely the office of a Bishop: wherefore it is no good consequent, he saith, he taught, he planted at Rome his chaire and seate was at Rome: Ergo, he was Bishop of Rome. And thus much touchyng Orosius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine.

As for Abdias, Ado, Optatus, and such other, although we should haue much wrong offered, and neuer should make an ende, if we should be prest with the authoritie of euery one that could or did moue pen, in all the whole first age of the church, to be our iudges in euery ecclesiasticall matter: and much moze wrong should haue, if the authoys either corrupted, or counterfeited, should be layd vnto vs, speaking not in the same sense, or in the same tongue, or in the same time wherein they wrote: yet to helpe and to salue the authorities of these authoys so much as we may, I answer to their allegations, with this distinction of a bishop, which is to be taken either generally or specially. After the first, a bishop is he to whom so euer the publike care and charge of soules is committed, without any limitation of place. And so the name of Bishop is conuident with the office of Apostle, or any publique Pastour, Doctour, or Curator of the vniuersall flocke of Christ. And thus may Paule, Peter, or any other of the Apostles be called Bishops. So also is Christ himselfe by expresse worde called Bishop, and Pastor, that is, Bishop and Pastor, 1. Peter. 2. And thus may Peter wel be named a bishop of these foresaid authoys after this maner of taking. But this publike and generall charge vniuersally ouer the whole, without limitation, ceased after Christ and the Apostles. For they were bishops by places and prouinces appointed, to haue speciall oversight of some peticular flock or prouince, and so to be resident and attendant onely vpon the same.

The other diuersitie of this name bishop, is to be taken after a moze speciall sort, which is, when any person orderly called, is assigned, namely & specially to some one certain place, cite, or prouince, wherunto he is only bound to employ his office & charge, and no where els, according to the old Canons of the Apostles, and of the Council of Nice. And this Bishop differing from the other, is called Episcopus inuiculus, hauing his name of his cite or Dioces. And thus we deny that Peter the Apostle was euer Bishop elected, installed, or intituled to the Cite of Rome, neyther doth Optatus, Abdias, Ado, or Hierome affirme the same. And if Ado say that Peter was bishop of Rome 25. yeares, vntill the last yeare of Nero, that is easilie refuted both by the Scriptures and Histories: for so we vnderstand by the declaration of Saint Paule, Gal. 1. 2. that 14. yeares after his conuersion, Saint Paule had Peter by the hand at Hierusalem.

Moreover, the said Paule in the foresaid Epistle, witnesseth, that the charge Apostolicall was committed vnto Peter ouer the Circumcised, and so was he intituled. Also S. Paule writing to the Romanus, in his manifold salutations to them in Rome, maketh no mention thereof, of S. Peter, which doubtles should not haue bene vnmembred, if he had bene then in Rome. Again S. Peter during his Epistle from Babilon, was not then belike at Rome.

Furthermore, histories doe record, that Peter was at Pontus 5. yeares, and at Antioch 7. yeares. How could he then be 25. yeares at Rome? Finally, where our aduersary allcageth out of Ado, saith, that S. Peter was there 25. yeares, vntill the last yere of Nero: how can that stand, when S. Paule suffering vnder Nero, was put to death the same day tweluemonth, that is, a whole yeare after Peter, &c. But especially how agreeth this with Scripture, that Christ should make Peter an Apostle vniuersall to walke in all the world: Item per vniuersum orbem. Item, Petrus mihi testes vique ad fines terre. &c. And our Papists would needs make him a sitting Bishop, and intitle him to Rome. How accordeth this: Apostolus and Episcopus ite and sedere. Omnes gentes, and Roma together?

And thus haue I retained the first vnterecty of that Popish demonstration aboute Peter, page 4. wherem they thinke to proue that as Peter, although he was not called vniuersall Apostle: yet was the head of the whole Church: so the Pope might and hath had after him the charge of the whole Church, although he was not called vniuersall Bishop in the olde tyme, &c.

Now followeth the second vnterecty to be touched in the

The worlde was committed as well to other Apostles as to Peter. A place of Chrysolome examined by S. Paule.

The successours of Peter.

August. in Ioan. tract. 124.

Hilarius. lib. 6.

Hierony. Epist. ad Euagrium.

An argumēt of the Papistes.

Answere to the argumēt.

Orosius. Terrul lib. de prescript aduer. here. Cypri lib. 1. Epist. 3. Hier. in c. 1. & Epist. 42.

A double taking of the word Bishop.

Christ himselfe a Bishop.

Canon. Apost. 23. 14. 34. Con. Nice. cap. 15. Council. Antioch. cap. 3. 13. Peters being at Rome.