

Ex Registro Greg. lib. 4. Episto. 3.

Ex Epist. 2. Pelagij. 2. Dist. 99. ca. Nullus.

that, which now the bishop of Rome claimeth to himselfe, charging them with the breach of order in these words: Neminem privatum aliquid daretur vni, honore debito sacerdotis priuarentur vniuersi; that is, least that while any singular thing is giuen to one person, all other should be depriv'd of their due honour. And for the like cause Pelagius exhorteth that no Priest should giue to any one Archbishop, the name of vniuersall bishop, ne sibi debitum subtrahat eum alteri honorem ostendit in debitum: That is, least (saith he) in so doing, he take from himselfe his due honour, while he yeldeth that, which is not due to another. And also in the same Epistle: Quia si summus Patriarcha vniuersalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. For (saith he) if he be called the chiefe vniuersall Patriarch, then is the name of Patriarchs derogated from other, &c. Wherefore as is said, being the bishop of Rome is an Archbishop, as other be: order giueth that he should haue the dignitie, which to Archbishops is due; whatsoever is added more, is derogation to the rest. And thus much concerning distinction of degrees, and order in giuing to euery degree, his place and honour.

The second answer to the objection before moued.

The second reason or answer to the objection before moued, pag. 16. is this: that being granted to the Papists, that the Doctours aforesaid, speaking of the principallitie of the church of Rome, doe meane not onely of the inward vertues of that church, but also of the outward authoritie and iurisdiction of the same, about other churches: yet the cause wherefore they did attribute so much to the church, is to be repealed, which was this, as before was alledged out of the Council of Calcedon, cap. 28. *Διά τὸ βασιλευσθαι τὸν πόλιν καί τινι*, that is, for the rule and Imperie which that cite of Rome had then about other cities; which cause being outward & carnall, was neither then cause sufficient, and now ceasing, importeth not to vs the like effect, according as they say: Sublata causa, tollitur effectus. So that by the reason thereof, the foresaid principallitie of the church of Rome, did not hold then iure diuino, sed humano. And as it holdeth by mans law, so by mans law may be repealed againe.

Ex Concil. Calced. cap. 28.

Wherefore, be it admitted that both the Pope sitteth and succeedeth in the chaire of Peter, and also that he is the Bishop of the greatest cite in the world: yet it followeth not thereby that he should haue rule and lordship ouer all other bishops and churches of the world. For first touching the succession of Peter, many things are to be considered.

Certaine demands for the Papists to answer vnto.

First, whether Peter saue, and had his chaire in Rome, or not?

Secondly, whether he saue there as an Apostle, or as a Bishop?

Thirdly, whether the sitting in the outward seate of Peter, maketh successor of Peter?

Fourthly, whether he sitteth in the chaire & seat of Peter, which sitteth not in the doctrine of Peter?

Fifthly, whether the succession of Peter maketh rather an Apostle than a Bishop, & so should we call the Pope, the Apostle of Rome, and not the bishop of Rome?

Sixthly, whether Ecclesiasticall functions ought to be esteemed by vniuersall succession of place, or by Gods secret calling or sending?

Seuenthly and lastly, whether it stand by Scripture, any succession at all to be pointed in Christs Church, or why more from Peter, than from other Apostles?

All which Interrogatories being well discussed (which would take a long proces) it should well appeare what little hold the Pope hath to take this seate vpon him, about all other Churches as he doth. In the meane tyme, this one argument by the way may suffice in stead of many, for our aduersaries to answer to at their conuenient leisure, which argueth thus: I haue and frame in Camelites.

An argument proving the Popes of this latter Church of Rome not to be successors of Peter.

Ca. All the true successors of Peter, sit in the chaire of the doctrine of Peter, and other Apostles vniuersally.

we. All Popes of this latter Church of Rome, sit in the chaire of Saint Peters and other Apostles doctrine vniuersally.

Ites. Ergo, no Popes of this latter church of Rome, be the true successors of Peter.

And when they haue well perused the Minor of this argument, and haue well considered together the doctrine taught them of S. Peter, with the doctrine taught now by the Popes, of institution of a Christian man, of the office of the law, of the strength and largeness of sinne, of mens merites, of free will, of works of supererogation, of setting by images, of his Sacramentes, of auricular confession, of satisfaction, of sacrifice of the Masse, of communicating vnder one kinde, of eueruading and adoring the Sacramental elements, of Latine seruice, of invocation, of prohibitions of meates and marriage, of bowing chastitie, of strict & rules

of diuers religions, of indulgences and pardons: also with their doctrine taught now of magistrates, of the fitness of power, and regalitie of the sea of Rome, with many other like to these, &c. then will I be glad to heare what they will say to the premises.

Secondly, if they would proue by the allegation of the Doctours, Irenæus, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodoritus aforesaid, the Bishop of Rome to bee the chiefe of all Bishops, therefore, because the cite whereof he is bishop, is the chiefe and principall about all other Churches, that consequent is to be denied, for it followeth not (taking as I said, the principallitie of that church to stand *Διά τὸ βασιλευσθαι τὸν πόλιν* that is, vpon the principall dominion of that cite) no more than this consequent followeth.

London is the chiefe Citie in all England.

Ergo, the bishop of London is the chiefe of all bishops in the Realme.

Which argument were derogatory to the bishop both of Canterbury, and of Yorke.

Yea to graunt yet more to our aduersaries (which is all they can require) the minds of the foresaid Doctours Irenæus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoritus, in giuing principallitie vnto Rome, to haue respect vnto the vertue of succession from Peter, and not vnto the greatnes of the Citie: yet notwithstanding, for all this their argument holdeth not, if it be rightly considered, to say.

The Apostolicall See of Rome, hauing successiō from Peter, with the bishops thereof, was chiefe then of all other churches, in the primitive tyme of these Doctours.

Ergo, the Apostolicall see of Rome, with the Bishops thereof, hauing successiō from Peter, ought now to be chiefe of all other churches in these our dayes.

This consequent might well follow, if the tynes were like; or if successiō which gaue them the cause of principallitie, were the same now, which was then. But now the tyme and successiō is not correspondent; for then successiō in the tyme of these Doctours, was as well in doctrine Apostolicall, as in place Apostolicall. Now the successiō of doctrine Apostolicall hath not long ceased in the sea Apostolicall: and nothing remaineth but onely place, which is the least matter of true spirituall and Apostolicall successiō. And thus much to the authoritie and testimonie of these foresaid Doctours.

Besides these objections heretofore recited out of Irenæus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoritus, our aduersaries yet object vs: and braue vp against vs: moouing, examples of the primitive tyme of the church, testimonies of generall Councils, and opinions of ancient writers, taken out of the booke of Councils, & Epistles decretall; whereby their intent is to proue, the foresaid termes (of the head of the church, ruler of the church, chiefe of all other Churches) to be applied not onely to Peter, but also to the Bishop of Rome within the compasse of the primitive tyme. And here commeth in the testimonie cited of Vincentius Lirinensis. Of the Epistle of Paschasius and his fellowes, writing to Leo from the Council of Calcedon. The testimonie also of Iustinian the Emperour in his Codex: where Ioannes the Pope was called caput omnium Ecclesiarum Epist. inter claras cap. De summa Trinitate & fide Cath. The testimonie also of Athanasius, with his fellow-bishops of Egypt, of Thebaida, and Libya, in their Epistles to Pope Marcus, Liberius & Felix. Like wile the testimonie of Hierome, in præf. in 4. Euang. Item Epist. 42. Tom. 1. Item Epist. 41. Tom. 2. Of S. Ambrose, 1. Tim. 3. Of S. Augustine to Boniface. Ad Bonifac. contra duas Epist. Pelagian. Lib. 1. cap. 1. Item, Lib. 2. De Baptismo, cap. 1. Of Theodoritus in his Epistle to Pope Leo. Epist. Contra Gregor. in Pauli Epist. præf. 4. Of Chrysostome, Epist. ad Inportunum, Tom. 5. &c. By which testimonies our aduersaries would proue S. Peter, and after him the Bishop of Rome to be called and taken for head of the church, chiefe bishop, prince and ruler of the whole Clergy. To all which objections fully and exactly to answer in order, would require a whole volume by it selfe. In the meane tyme, leaving the rest vnto them vnto whom it doth more properly appertain, briefly with this one short distinction, I answer these & all such other like places, where S. Peter with his successors are called the head of the church, chiefe of Bishops, prince of the Apostles, &c. In which places, this worde head, chiefe, and prince of the Apostles, may be taken two manner of waies: to note, either dominion, or chief authorisation. For so we read sometime Caput, and prince, by wordes not of authoritie, but of excellencie; where this declared the chiefe and worchipp part among many parts, and not possession and gouernment of the whole. Like as in the person of a man, the head is the principall part of the whole body, being endued with reason, & furnished with sense & other senses, by the which the whole body of man is directed,

A false consequent of the Papists.

Answer to the consequent.

Successiō Apostolicall double to be considered.

Testimonies alledged for the principallitie of the Pope.

Answer by a distinction.

Caput and Prince, haue a double vnderstanding.