

so theſeſia derived by a metaphor, to what man or thing ſoever nature or condition hath given the greateſt excellencie, of gifts and properties aboue other partes or members, the ſame ſocietie to be called of the ſaid parties, Caput, or Princes, head, or Prince. And yet the ſame head or Prince is called, hath not alwayes dominion or iurisdiction of the reſt. So we call in our vulgar ſpeech the head or chiefe men of the pariſh, who for their riches, wiſdom, or place, are moſt ſpecially noted: After like phraſe of ſpeech we call the head man of the Inqueſt, him that hath the firſt place. And yet neither they nor theſe haue any dominion or iurisdiction upon the reſidue. In a ſchool the chiefeſt ſcholar in learning, is not therefore the maſter or governour of his fellowes. Neither hath M. Cicero any title thereby to claime ſubiectiō and ſervice of all other Doctours, becauſe he is named Princes eloquentiæ, and goeth before them in that kind of phraſe. The ſame Cicero, Lib. 1. offic. calleth Cratippū principem huius ætatis Philoſophorum: as Homerus alſo may be called Poetarum Princeps: And yet neither Philoſophers to Cratippus, nor Poets to Homere, owe anye thing els, but onely ſame and praife.

How Peter is Princeps Apoſolorum. Princeps eloquentiæ Cicero. Princeps Philoſophorum Cratippus.

Petrus Princeps & Coryphaus apoſolorum.

And what if S. Peter the bleſſed Apoſtle be called and counted of the old ancient Doctours, as head and Prince of the Apoſtles, which is as much as Coryphaus Apoſolorum, for his excellent faith, for his deuine confeſſion & ſingular affection to the Lord Jeſus: yet what Interreſt or charge either hath he to challenge ouer the Apoſtles, or the Pope after him ouer all other biſhops & the whole church of Chriſt, although the Pope haue the like excellencie of Chriſtes faith which Peter had, as would God he had: As concerning theſe allegations therefore out of the Doctours, two things are to be obſerued: Firſt, that neither theſe names and titles though they be geuen to Peter, doe geue him any ſtate or dominion aboue other Apoſtles: nor yet the ſucceſſion of him doth further any whit this eſtrude and regalitie of the Pope to aduance him aboue his fellow Archbiſhops, as hereto doth.

And if our aduerſaries would needs prouoke vs to the number of teſtimonies, & deuiding the houſe (ſpeaking of the writers and Councils of the primitive age) for theſe aforeſaid teſtimonies alleged on their ſide. I would on the contrary part recite out of the witneſſe of Doctours, out of the examples of Councils, & practices of Emperors, no leſſe then 60. voices, much more repugnant againſt their allegation, then there is for the Pope. The tractation whereof for this preſent I do refer, either to them that haue more laſure at this time to diſcourſe them, or els omit it to another time, if the good pleaſure of the Lord ſhall be, to graunt me further laſure in an other Booke to increaſe thereof as large, in ſuch order, as (if the Lord ſo graunte) ſhal appeare ſufficient matter, to proue by the Doctours, general Councils, examples and hiſtories of time, that the Biſhops of Rome during the firſt 300. yeres after Chriſt, although for the greatnes of the Empire, were ſome what more magnified then the other, and therefore were ſought of many, and were ſtared of ſome, and they themſelues diuers, did ſet forth themſelues moze then they ſhould: yet by the common conſent of churches, were ſtopped of their purpoſe, ſo that by the contentiō of the moſt part, within the compaſſe of that age the Biſhops of Rome had not this regall ſtate of title, iurisdiction, and ſulnes of power, which now they uſurpe, but were taken as Archbiſhops, of equal honour, of equal merite with other Archbiſhops & rulers of church. And if any preferment was giuen vnto them ſome thing aboue the reſt, yet neither was it ſo giuen of all, nor of the moſt part: ſecondly, neither was it ſo giuen of them for any ſuch neceſſitie of Gods woide, aut iure aliquo diuino, as which did ſo bind them therunto, nor yet ſo much for the reſpect of Peter, & his ſucceſſion: as for certaine other cauſes and reſpects, as may be gathered to the number of 12.

Cauſes 12. of aduancing the ſea of Rome.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Of which the firſt is the greateſt of the title and Monarchie of Rome.

The ſecond, is the authoritie of the Emperors; Conſtantine the great, firſt of the Emperors conuerſed to the faith, and ruliſg in the ſame title, by whom the vniuerſal libertie of the church was firſt promoted; and the cauſes of the biſhops being then at variance, were committed partly to the biſhop of Rome, partly to other biſhops nere by, to be decided, as appeareth Euseb. lib. 10. cap. 5.

The third, was the Council of Nice, which confirmed the preeminence of that church to haue the ouerſight of the churches bordering about it.

The fourth cauſe of aduancing the church of Rome, was the inqueſt ſtate of the Greek church, much troubled in thoſe dayes with ſeers, factions, and diſturbances, whereof we may read, Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 15. Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 8.

The fifth, when Synodes were called by other Doctours

poſitans, then if it chanced the biſhops of Rome to be abſent, and their ſentence being abſent to be required; by the occaſion therof, they began at length to take their ſentence for a Canon or rule eccleſiaſtical, & thereby to reſuſe other Synodes, where their decree or ſentence was not required.

An other cauſe was, that when any common matter was in hand in other places, whatſoever was done, commonly the manner was to write to the Romaine biſhop for his approbatiō in the ſame, for publick vnitie and conſent to be had in Chriſtes church, as appeareth Lib. 10. Epit. 78. Ambroſij ad Theophilum.

Item, for that the reſtimonie ſometimes of the Romaine biſhop was wont in thoſe dayes alſo to be deſired, for admitting teachers and biſhops in other churches, whereof we haue example in Socrat lib. 4. cap. 37.

Moreover, this was a great ſetting vp of that church, when as their ſentence not only was required, but alſo receiued diuers times of other biſhops. And when Biſhops of other prouinces were at any diſſenſion among theſelues, they of their owne accord appealed to the biſhop of Rome, deſiring him to cite vp both parties, and to haue the hearing and deciding of the cauſe, as did Macarius and Helychius ſend to Iulius then biſhop of Rome, &c.

Item, in that certaine of the Arrians returning from their Arrianisme, offered vp and exhibited vnto the biſhops of Rome their labels of repentance, and were of them receiued againe, as Vrfatius and Valens did to Iulius. Socra. lib. 2. cap. 24.

The ſixth cauſe was alſo, for that Gratianus the Emperour made a law, that all men ſhould retaine that religiō which Damasus biſhop of Rome, and Peter biſhop of Alexandria did hold. Sozom lib. 7. cap. 4.

And alſo, if it happened the biſhop of Rome to diſallow the ordering of any miniſter or miniſters; the Popes perceiuing how diligent and redy they were to ſeek their fauour, and to ſend vp their meſſengers to Rome for their purgation, to keepe thereby no little manner of exaltation. Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 23.

Besides theſe aforeſaid, the biſhops of Rome had alſo an other artificiall practice, that in ſending out their letters abroad, as they did to many, in all their Epistles (if the Epistles be theirs, and not forged) ener they were harping of the greatnes of their name, and of their Apoſtolike ſea, and of the primacie of S. Peter, their predeceſſor and prince of all the Apoſtles, &c. And this they did in euery letter, when ſo ener they wrote to any, as appeareth in all their letters decretall, namely, in the letters of Miltiades, Marcellus, and Marcus, &c.

Again, if any of the Eaſt church directed any writing to them, wherein any ſignification was contained of neuer ſo little reuerence giuen vnto them (as learned men commonly be for modeſties ſake) that was taken by & by and conſtrued for plain ſubiectiō, and due obediēce, as beareth the letter of Damasus, written to the biſhops of the Eaſt Church, beginning thus: Quod debita reuerentia, &c. in English thus: but that your charitie yeldeth due reuerēce to the Apoſtolick ſea, you in ſo doing (deare children) do much for your ſelues, &c. Theodoret. Lib. 5. cap. 9. where as the Biſhops of the Eaſt Church notwithstanding had ſhewed little or no reuerence in their Epistle to Pope Damasus before.

Thus haue ye the firſt and originall groundes, by the means whereof, the Archbiſhops of the Romaine ſea haue atchieued to this their great kingdome and cellitude ouer Chriſtes church; firſt beginning the myſterie of their iniquitie, by that which was modeſtly and voluntarily giue them. Afterward by ble and cuſtome claime it ambitiouſly vnto them, of dutie & ſeruice; & laſtly holding faſt (as we ſee) that which once they had gotten into their poſſeſſiō, ſo that now in no caſe they can abide the birdes to cat home their ſethers againe, which they ſo long haue biturped.

And thus much concerning the liſe, iurisdiction, & title of the Romaine biſhops: In all which (as is declared) they and not we, haue fallen from the church of Rome. To theſe I might alſo ioine the manner of gouernment, wherein the ſaid Romaine Biſhops haue no leſſe altered both from the rule of Scripture, and from the ſteps of the true church of Rome, which gouernment as it hath bene, and ought to be only ſpiritual: ſo hath the biſhop of Rome vſed it of late yeres no otherwiſe, then hath an earthly king or prince gouerned his realme & dominions, with riches, glory, power, terror, outward ſtrength, force, miſd, death, execution, lawes policies, promoting his friends to dignities, retaining his affectionous, puniſhing and correcting faults againſt his perſon more then other offences againſt God committed, vſing and abuſing in all theſe things the word of God for his pretext & cloke to worke his worldly purpoſe withall: whereas

This latter Church of Rome differing from the firſt Church of Rome, in forme of gouernment.