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THE ROCKE OF

THE CHURCHE

Wherein the Primacy of S. Peter and of his Successours the Bishops of Rome is proved out of Gods Worde.

By Nicolas Sander D.of divinity.

The eternal Rocke of the universal Church. Christ was the rock, another foundation no man is stable in. I Cor 3 & 10.

The temporal Rocke of the militant Church. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke I will build my Church. Matth. 16.

The continuance of this temporal Rocke. In the Church of Rome the primacy of the Apostolike chaire hath alwayes flourished. August. in Epist. 162.

Reckon even from the very seate of Peter: and in that rew of Fathers, consider, who succeeded the other. That is the rock which the proud gates of hell doe not overcome. In Psal. c. 1. part. Don. Tom. 7.

LOVANII

Apud Ioannem Foulereum.

Anno D. 1567.
Regiiæ Majestatis Privilegio concessum est Nicolaæ Sançdro Sacrae Theologiae Professori, vi librum inscriptum, The Rocke of the Church, per Typographum aliquem iuratum imprimere, ac impune distrahere liceat.

Datum Bruxellis 27. Febr. 1566.

Subsig.

Frats.
TO THE RIGHT

Worshipfull M. Doctor Parker bearing the name of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and toal other protestants in the realme of England, Nicolas Sander wisheth perfect faith and charity in our Lord, declaring in this Preface, that the Catholicks (whom they call Papists) doe passe the Protestants in al manner of Signes or Marks of Christes true Church.

Besech your worshippe not to mislike with me for omitting any parte of your accustomed title in this my letter, sithes I doe it not of any contempt, but onely of conscience grounded upon Gods Worde: as who are persuaded the religio presently authorized in the realm, and consequently your ministry therein, to be so far of from Christes true religio, as it is far from Christ, to have his Church
The marks of

Ps. 21:4-7, 83:14-14.
Phil. 2.

 Isa. 54:8-10.
Math. 28.

Church (which after the publication of the Gospel ought, according to the prophecies, to be openly spread through out the world, and her Citizens ought to shine in the midst of the perverse nation, of infidels, like stars, and to remain glorious for ever in many nations together) now first (after nine hundred yeres oppression as your own brethren doe confess) to shew it selfe abroad, and openly to be professed.

So that although it could be shewed that your faith had bene alwayes in the world (as it was not yet in that; if at all it were) it lay hidened, it could not be the faith of Christes true Church, which never ceased to be a City built vpon a hill which can not be hideden. And he did sette his candel vpon a candelstick, not only to give light for a few hundred yeres: but to give light to all, that either should come into his house or, tarie in his house.

And
the true Church.

And seing at al momentes men in diverse countries came into Gods house by faith and baptism, and seing likewise he is with his disciples al daies vntil the end of the world, and not only liueth, but regneth for ever, that is to say, abideth gloriously and royally in the house of Jacob, which is the Church, dootlese his Church is for ever built upon a hil, and therefore it can not be hidden any one moment, and his light neuer can cease to shyne, to thend it may ever be true which Malachias the Prophet saied: From the rising of the sonne to his going downe, my name is great among the gentils.

And yet seing Christes name is not great by them who beleue falselie, (for they must nedes also haue naughty woorkes, and so the name of God, as Saint Paule faith, is rather blissehe med amonge the Gentiles, then glo- rified by euil men) it remaineth that Chri-
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Christes name must be great among
the Gentills through a good faith,
openly gening light by the good works
of true Christians, who may thereby
cause Gods name to be glorified,
and by their good conversation
may cause the Insidels to be converted
unto Christ.

Now for as much as your faith was
not openly alwaies professed in many
nations together, but was altogether
hidden before these fifty yeres, and so
hidden, that no history or Chronicle
doeth make mention of any congregatio
at all professing your faith from tyme
to tyme in any Cities, Townes, Villages,
or private houses of diverse provinces
and countries at once: nothing can be
justly said or alleged, why you should
not renounce this obscure religion of
yours, which is so slanderouse to Gods
glorious name, and returne again to

A Church
under a
bushel.
the true Church.

wer so dimmed, or darkened, but that
the very Iewes, Turks, Saracês, Moores,
and Tartariês, knewe where we dwelt,
and what we professed.

I chose at this tyme to intreat with
alsober Protestants the rather by your
person (M. D. Parker) because I have
heard of so much good nature in your
Worshippe, that it was not unlike, but
he woulde voutesafe to heare what so
ever should be reasonably said, specially
touching Gods Worde, and the practife
of the primatine Churche, of which
pointes my chiefe talke shalbe at this
tyme.

Many men have laboured to gene
diverse Signes and Markes of the true
Church, to shintet it being ones knowe,
al other controversifs may gene place
to the pillor and sure stay of truth. "Tim:"

But that it may appear to them, who do
not Willingly stop their eares against
the truth, what notable aduantage the
Catholiks have ouer and aboue the Pro-

Protestants
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testants in this behalf: I will shew the
truth of our Churche to be so safe and
clere, that hitherto it was not possible
for the Protestants themselves to de-
vote any such marke or signe of a true
Churche, the which doth not much
rather make for us, then for them.

They teach Gods word to be the
chiefe mark, whereby the true Church
may be known, which yet can not wel
be so, because the marke whereby an o-
 ther thing is known, ought it selfe to
be most exactly known. Whereas we
are not agreed, what Gods Woorde is.
For some call onely the written letter
and the meaning thereof, Gods
Woorde: others thinke many things to
be Gods Woorde, which are not ex-
pressly written, but are revealed from
God to the Church by the tradici-
tion of the Apostles, and by the holy
ghost, who hath written Gods lawes
in our harts, and there hath imprin-
ted them.

Also
the true Church.

Also we are not agreed upon the written word of God, because the Protestants do not admit so many books of the old Testament, as the Catholikes do. Thirdly the meaning of those books which we are agreed upon, is altogether in question between us. How then can that be a mark sufficient to show another thing to us, which itself is not sufficientlie known of us? All which reasons notwithstanding, the confidence of our cause is such, that I may grant the word of God (what soever it be) to be a sufficient mark, whereby God's Church may be known. And then I say, that every way God's Word standeth more on our side, than against us.

For if you mean by God's word, the written letter of the old and of the new Testament, we are before you in that behalf: because you have no assured copies thereof, which were not
The marks of
not preserued by the former Christiās,
Whome yee call Papists, of the you toke
as your baptism, so your Bible. By them
not onley the old and the new testament,
but also the works of the antique Fa-
thers were copied out, printed, and
layed vp in libraries, &d in other places
Whence they came to your hands.

If then the having of Gods Woordę
prove a true Churche ; that is the more
true Church, which bad it first, special-
ly seing we came not by it privily, or
violently but receaued it eue at the A-
posiiles bāds. For after that day where-
in S. Peter and S. Paule delivered Gods
Word to the faithfull Romans , the
Church of Rome hath alwaies kept it
safe without either lesising, or corrup-
ting it.

2.
More of
Gods
Woorde
with vs.

Again we beleue and acknowledge
more of the Bible then you doe , by the
bookes of Toby, of Judith, of Wiles-
don, of Ecclesiasticus, and of the
Machabees. All which we accompt
for
the true Church.

for God's own word, according to the consent of many ancient Fathers and councils: whereas you call them Apocrypha, and so make them unable to decide any controversy about religion.

Thirdly we do not only grant the Hebrew text of the old testament (such as may appear uncorrupted) and the Greek text of the new testament, to be God's word, but we also acknowledge with the ancient Fathers, the Greek translation of the Septuagint, *ad* with the Trinitarian Council the common Latin translation (which so many hundred yeres hath bene diligentie expounded and preserved in the Latin Churche) to be of full authority: Whereas you gene small credit to either of these translations, except (by your judgement) they agree with the first Hebrew and Greek copies. We then have God's word in more authentic tongues and copies, then you have.

Fourthly we preach, expound, interpret,
The marks of
Better translation of God's Word in all manner of tongues, better than you, because we do these things not only by internal, but also by such external vocation and commission, as may be shewed to have sprung from the Apostles, by the lineal and ordinary succession of our bishops and priests. Whereas you can fetch no higher commission, then from the common weal, which never receaued authority of Christ to make priests, or to send preachers: and yet how shall they preach, if they be not sent?

Concerning that you read God's Word to the people at your Church service time in the vulgar tongues, it is no perfection at all on your side. For you lack thereby the use of the better tongues, as of the Greek and Latin, which were sanctified on Christ's cross, as for all other holy uses, so most specially for to serve God withall at the time of sacrifice, wherein he requireth the very best in every kind to be offered unto him,
the true Church.

him, as to our dreadful Lord, and loving father. And who doubteth, but that a learned, a holy and a common tongue, is more honorable, than a barbarous, a profane, and a private tongue?

In so much, that in respect of the whole body of the Catholike Church (wherewith we specially communicate in our service and prayers) these vulgar tongues are much more to be accepted strange or unknown (which strange tongues only S. Paul doth least regard) than the common tongues, which were alone delivered to the very first Christian Church, by the Apostles themselves, in the East and West: not regarding the infinite multitude of vulgar tongues which were in particular provinces of the same countries. For of the Greek tongue used in the East Churches, and of the Latin used in the West Churches, it came to passe, that it is alone to say, the Greek or the east Church, the Latin or the West Church.

And
The marks of

And surely being Christ being upon the Cross (whereas the paternal of all prayer and oblations is to be taken, 

Li, 2. ep. 3

then the Sacrifice which we offer (saith Cyprian) is the passion of our Lord) whereas he knewe right well, that the common people of the Jews (the pure Hebrew tongue being either lost, or much decayed in common speache, euery daie more and more after the captivity of Babylon) could not understand him, did yet recite the beginning of the Psalm (My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?) in Hebrew, and did not either by and by, or at al interprete the same in the vulgar tongue: need we to doubt, but that after his example, we may doe the like in those tongues at oure service, Whiche Priests and Clerkes do understand, though the common people do not understand the same?

6. We vse also vuls

But lest there should be any one more in the passages of Gods Catholik Church, we
the true Church.

We also haue in certaine countries, the use of vulgar tongues in the Churche service, as in Dalmatia it is to be seen at this tyme, and the like is said to be in Abyria, and in Aethiopia, the Christians of which Countries doe acknowledge the Supreamacie of the Bishoppes of Rome.

And although by this very means, those Countries are become the more barbarous (for thereby the Priestes and Preachers can not reade either the Greek or the Latin Doctours) yet this good arises to the Whole Churche of their loste, that it both hath all degrees of tungs (to wit, both lerned and vulgar) in her prayers, and by the example of those barbarous countries, she warneth the other more civil parts to avoid that mischief, whereby those other men fel into that reproche of barbarousnes.

Moreover, those Countries (some of which never knew any better then their
The marks of their own nature tounge have their service in the vulgar tongues by mere force and necessity, and that allowed by the good dispensation and toleration of the See Apostolike, without breach of unity: whereas the Protestants having once had the Latin service, are fallen from Latin to English, that is to say from the better to the worse, and that also by making a schism, and by diuiding the coat of Christ (which was without any seame) into many partes, which thing the very unfaithfull soldiours were afeard to doe. Thus touching the written word and the use thereof, there are many causes, why we should be in better case then the Protestants, but none at all, why we should be in worse.

7. The meaning of Gods word. Math. 26, If not only the written letter, but also the plaine meaning of every proposition be to be considered, we read it literally and plainly spoken, this is my body, and as the words doe sound, so doe
the true Church.

doe we understand them. Why then is 
(this) which Christ pointeth unto, de-
nied to be his body? A man is justi-
"fied of works, and not of faith on-
ly. Why then are good workes done in a 
right faith, denied to justifie? or why is 
onely faith taught to justifie? The Rom.
doers of the law shalbe justified.
Why is the law then taught not to be 
able to be don, or kept? By the obe-
dience of one (which is Christ) many 
shalbe made just, that is to say, in-
justice shalbe wrought or settled in many, entur.
Why the is it denied that we are made 
really just? Or why is it taught, that 
righteousnes is onely imputed to us,
Whereas S. Paul saith also, the charity 
Rom. (or love) of God is spread in our 
harts by the holy ghost which is 
gene vs. This spreading & establishing 
of charity in our harts, is more then a 
bare imputing of charity to us.

Whose synnes soever yee for-
geue, they shalbe forgeuen them.

Why
The mark of

Why are then the bishops and priests (who succeded the Apostles) denied to forgive sines? He that is greater among you, lette him be made as the yonger. Why then deny you, that one was greater among the Apostles, or, that one stil is greater among the bishops, their successors?

Math. 16. Thou art Peter or a Rocke, and vpon this Rock I wil build my Churche. Why then is the militant Church denied to be built vpon Saint Peter, and vpon his successors in that chair and office? Keepe the traditions which yee haue learned either by woorde, or by our epistle.

Chrysost. Why then are traditions, yea though they be Apostolike (as the use of praying for the dead is) so despised, that the very name of tradition used in the better part, can not be suffered to be in the English Bible, though it be both in the Greeke and in the Latin? He
the true Church.

He that joyneth his virgin in marriage, doth well, and he that doth not joyn her, doth better.

Why then is marriage made with you as good as the state of virginity, whereas S. Paul maketh the state of virginity better?

Vow ye, and render your vows unto God. If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all things which thou hast, and give them to the poor, and follow me. There are eunuchs, who have gilded them selves for the kingdom of heaven. Obieie your rulers, and be subjects unto them. Why then are the vows of poverty, of chastity, and of obedience (to all which the word of God exhorteth us) accosted unlawful? Or why are men exhorted, yea constrained not to perform them?

Doe ye the worthy fruits of penance, saith Saint John. Why then is satisfaction and penance despised
The mark of

Ephes. 5

With you? The husbands ád the wives
being two in one flesh, is a great
Sacrament (or mystery, or a holy and
secret signe) in Christ and in the
Churche. Why then is the marriage of
faithful persons denied to be a Sacra-
ment?

Work your salvation (faith S.
Paule) with fear and trembling.
Why then are your so presumptuous,
as even by faith, to assure your selves of
your salvation? Or how can he fear,
who is assured to be saved? Or how can
the deep secrets of God’s predestination
be ordinarily known in this life? Or is
not faith an ordinary gift in the Chur-
che?

Thus might I goe through all the ar-
ticles in controversy, and in every one
I should finde your side to be the farther
of, and ours to be the nearer to the plain
literal meaning of God’s word.

If not only the plain understanding
of any sentence, but also the circum-
stance
the true Church.

stance of the place, and the conference of Gods word be necessary, have we not used it in every question which hath been hitherto handeled? Here I must needs referre the reader to my treatise of the Supper of our Lor:amælie in the fourth booke, and to my booke of Images in the v. and the xi. chapters. Item in this booke, to the second and fourth chapters. For in this preface, it were over tedious to handle so long a matter.

If you say, I doe not conferre the places so as I ought to doe, thereof riseth a new question, wherein we must have a new judge. For we believe and use the scriptures as well as you, and betier to, as I have declared. Item we allege plain words: We shew the circumstances to be for us: We conferre one place with another. If now all this will not end the controversie, it is cleere that the only word of God be it never so well handled, is no sufficient mark to shew
The mark of
the true Church. For this is all that can be done about the word itself.

Seizing then we must go farther, I say the heads of the Church, the Councells, the bishops, and the ancient Fathers must be the judges, whether we do well apply the holy scriptures, or no.

Math. 16. For example: M. Iewel saith, S. Peter is not this rock wherupon Christ said he would build his Church. I faie on the other side, that S. Peter is this rock. And I shew it by the circumstance of the place, and by the coherence of other holy scriptures. M. Iewel must needs say, that I do not welcoyer the holy scriptures. I take then for my Judges, above six of the best doctors, who expresslie stand on mine side, as I will shew in this present booke. So that this mark of the true Church also maketh clearly for vs. And surely although the protestats in words preted to have the consent of the auncient fathers; yet that in truth be it is not so, this one thing may sufficiently declare, because who so ever
the true Church.

...and occasion never so far set maie serve, they do what they can to reiect the Fathers: partly by imputing errors to the, as M.le Wel ordereth S. Hilarie partly by denying the work to be theirs as he faith of Dunssthe Ariopagite, ad of S. Christostos Liturgy, etcet. Another shi surf is, to allege the private opinion of some one agaist the consent of the rest, or to say that the fathers lined, when the tyme began to be corrupted: and where all other things fade, their plain doctrine and assertion of the faith, are illuded with a like figurative speeche. If in dede the fathers mad for the, they wold not thus shi surf their hands of the fathers, but the moe they could hate, and the better they as greed ad the plaier thei spare, the bet ter thei shuld be welcome. Wel seeig the Protestats (although falsly) yet comoly doe allege the old fathers, and we also do allege them most plentifully, hereof it wil folowe, that neither the only alleges of the is so able to end a controversy, that
The mark of
that the simple and unlearned may be
sure of the truth.

For which cause we must joyneto
the former marks, the tradition and
practice of Gods Churche, which
being in every mans eyes and cares, can
ever deceaue him. We thinck (faith
Chrysostome) the tradition of the
Churche to be worthy of beleeve. Is
it a tradition? Ask no farther.

This mark so evidently maketh for
us, that the Protestants are constrain-
ed utterly to deny all credit unto it:
for by this rule they are inexculcable
who deny either the popes supremacy, which
ever was so universally practised, or the
Sacrifice of the masse, or any like mat-
ter, which was and is generally recea-
ued in the Church.

But because many questions arise in
the Church, rather depending of substill
points in divinity, then of evident cu-
stome and practice; if sodainly some ler-
ned men deny such An article of the
faith,
the true Church.

faith, which before was not commonly preached of (as that the holy ghost proceedeth from the Son or any like) seeing here tradition saith, and the preachers are divided: the Church hath used the meanes of Generall Councils, wherein the bishops of many countries meeting together, after sufficient debating, do publish the one part to be reputed heretical. Whereby all men do clearly know, what to follow, and what to avoid. Such a Council gathered together of late at Trèt, published that to be the true faith, which we defend, and the contrary to be heretical. So that this mark is wholy ours.

But for as much as it is very hurtful, for so many bishops to leave their cures so oft as any such question is moved, and also because their meeting is many times stayed by the occasion of battel, or of pestilence, or els for lacke of their safeconduct out of whose countries, or by whose countries, or into whose
The mark of

Whose country they should passe and specially because they are come together for a violence may be used as it was so at the second Ephesine councel, and at Ariminis it is necessary, so have some other more speedy certain, and profitable way in the Church, whereby heresies may be sooner stayed, and God's people more quickly instructed in the truth.

In respect of which considerations, Christ hath most notably provided, that one chiefe pastour and high bishop S. Peter should be set by himself over the whole flock in earth, to confirm his brethren, and to fed them. Of whose faith by praying for it, he hath assured us. In S. Peter's chaire the bishop of Rome siteth, who is well known to have publike sentence against the Protestants for our faith and Church, neither can the Protestants denie us the assurance of this mark. The which mark because it is of most weighty importance, as being the easiest way of all to find out the
the true Church.

the truth, and which serveth in all cases without any exception: I have made this treatise, to declare that it is no lesse true, even according to God's word, then it is profitable and needful in all wise men's understanding.

Here I might make an ende, but that the Protestants affirm, the lawfull preaching of God's word, and the lawfull administration of the Sacraments to be the thing whereby they will be tried, as though we need not a new judge to know what these terms doe mean.

For what call you lawfull preaching, or administering? That (saie you) which is according to God's word.

Very well. Are we not now come againe to the first beginning of our talk? What call ye Gods word? haue I not proued (whatsoever it be) that it is much more with vs, then with you?

Adde hereunto, seeing those are most lawfull.
The mark of lawful preachers who are most like unto the Apostles, (whose sound went into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world) we are more like unto the, who within these nine hundred yeeres by our preaching have converted Bohem, Saxonie, Friseland, Prussia, Liuonia, Denmark, and divers other countries, then you, who in the same tyme lived so under a bushel, that no man alive could heare you once pepe. Again our Sacraments being more in number by five, then yours, were administered in the face of the world, even as the Apostiles did administer them in Jerusalem, Corinth, Rome, and in such other cities and places: whereas you hadde not one Church or knowne house of prayer in the whole earth.

14. Persecution. The persecution (say you) of the Ro- nish Antichrist oppressed us, which mark also you alleage for the truth of your congregation. What masters? Ant- ichrists
the true Church.
suchistes persecution shall endure but three yeres and a half. And is the Pope Antichrist, whose persecution (as you say) hath dured these nine hundred yeres? Hel gates that not preuaile against the true Churche. And yet is your congregation the true Churche, against which you confesse Antichrist so to have preuailed, that for many hundred yeres, noman could tel, whether any such Church were in the earth, or no?

Surely hel gates preuailed not against us any one moment, although our Church hath ben assaulted with al kinds of trouble: therefore this mark (that is to say, to stand safe and sound against hel gates) is a token, that ours is the true Churche. For it is not persecution, but the conquering and preuailing against persecution, which is the true mark of Gods Churche.

But seing I promised to prove our Churche the more true, even by your own
The mark of own Marks, let us grant, that Church to be true, which is persecuted, yet I say that you rather have persecuted us, the we have persecuted you. For, I pray you Sir, when the child who lived in one house with his loving mother (as you did once in the same Catholick Church with us) goeth afterward out of the house, and saith, his mother is a strong boore (as you say by the Catholick church Whence you are departed) if then the mother not being able by faire means to reconcile the child to her again, after long and oft warnings, doth pronounce him a bastard member, and a renegade child doth the mother in this case persecute her child, or doth not the child rather persecute his mother?

The child began the defection, the mother defendeth her possession and inheritance: and yet did we first persecute you? Remember what S. August in writeth in this matter, and that not of himself, but as taken out of S. Paul. Sara

Note vvel.
the true Church.

With her son Isaac doth signify the Galat. 4. Churche, Agar with her son Ismael doth signify carnall men, as heretikes are. Now wheres we reade that Agar the handmaid and Ismael suffered Gen. 21. gresuous things at the hāds of Sarā, yet S. Paule consideringe, that Agar was not perfecute of Sarā, before that she had through pride contemned her mai-stres, doubted not to say, that Isaac sufferèd persecutiō of Ismael. As then (faith S. Paule) he that was according to the flesh (Ismael did persecute him who was according to the spirit (Isaac) so is it now also. vt qui pollut intellignant, therend they who are able may understand (faith S. Augustine) that the Catholik Church suffereth perme- secution by the pride and wickednes of carnall mē whom she goeth about to as mēd by tempora trobles ad terrors. And much more followeth in S. Augustine Writing against the Danatis, who being departed from the Church then,
The mark of
as you are now said then, as you do now, that the Catholickes did persecution the, and therefore that they were the true Church.

And surely if you can shew that we through pride departed from the obedience, which we once had ought to you, then in deed we might be said to persecution you. But seeing certainly you were at once under the obedience of our Pastours (as Agar the handmaiden was under her master Sara) and you through pride withdrew yourselves from us, and made a new congregation of your own erecting: doubtlesse you are the Agarens and the Ismaelits: but we being the children of Sara, are altogether persecuted of you, and so that mark sheweth us (Whome ye call Papists) to be the true Church.

Are there yet any more markes of the true Church behind? Yea, saith the Protestant. For Antiquity is ours altogether. Now you seeme to say sum-
the true Church.

What. But if the Church of Christ be in all but one, seing Antiquity is but the beginning or the auncient state of Christes Churche, if the end of the same Church make for vs (as your selues can not deny, but that these nine hundred yeres, we were more like to be that Church of Christ which must be spread through all nations, then you) it is not possible, that the begining should make for you. For Christes Church is ever like it self.

If you appeale to particular examples, I say, the Christians in the primitive Churche communicated under one kind both at Emaus, and at Ierusalem, as the words of the holy scripture (which the auncient Fathers testifie to appertiein to the Sacrament of Christes supper) doe import. Item the Christians did then make and sette up Images in the honour of Christ, as the most famous history of the Woman cured of her bloody issue, doth most euidently
The marks of

dently witnesse.

An.D.50.

Dionylius (whom M. Jewell confesseth to be an ancient writer, as it may, faith he, many waies wele aperez) makeht mention of a insulliation, of holy oyle, of altars, incense, healthful sacrifice, of holy Chrism and of holy orders of priesthood, of the profession of Monkes blessed with the signe of the crosse, shoren, and receaung a new gement, of praying for the faithfull soules, of confessing synnes to a priest. All these things we haue, but the Protestantes know them not.

An.D.70.

Ad Simpnes,

Ignatius speaking of such a sacrifice, as ought not to be offered without the Bishoppe, must nedes meane a publike and externall Sacrifice, for the making whereof a speciall minister was ordered. He woulde haue the Emperour to obey the bishop.

Ad Phil, he speaketh of Virgins, which had confe-
the true Church. consecrated them selves to God. ad antio. And commendeth a certaine ap. chum. pointed number of fasting dayes, to witte, sortie, which fast we call the Lent.

Justinus witnesseth, water to haue An. Dom. bene mingled with the wine, and, 150, the Deacost to haue caried the cose consecrated mysteries (as we also doe) to them which were absent, which thing Calvin reputeth an abuse.

Pius the first, decreed Easter day to be kepre unifoormlie of all men: whereupon Pope Victor excommunicated the bishoppes of Asia for not obeying. And those who continued in their stubburnesse, were taken for heretikes both of the Greekes and Latins.

All doctrin is false and lying (faith Tertullian) which agreeth not with some Apostolike Church: our doctrine agreeeth with the chiefe Apostolike Church of Rome.

Yours
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yours with none at all that is now in
the earth.

It was the custom in those dayes, to
make oblations for the dead the
twelve moneths day: to goe unto
the Stations, to visit holy places, and
specially those of Jerusalem, which cu-

Paula, ad 

Stom dured fro Christes ascension until 
Marcel. to 
S. Hieroms tym, through all Christen-
1 Hierom 
dom, and yet is called Pilgrimage of 
us.

An. Dom. 
250. De 
exin Do.

Saint Cyprian confesseth the bread
which our Lord gaue to his disciples, being changed not in shape,
but in nature, to have bene made
flesh. Item that even the consent in
heart to commit a great synne was to
be confessed apud Sacerdotes Dei
before the priests of God. And that,
for givenenes made by the priests is
acceptable vnto God. Item, that
the temporal penance (which is due to
Gods injustice after the fault is for given)
might for just causes be for given by the
bishop,
the true Church.

bishop, which the Nicer council doth also decree. And that is it, which we now call a pardon.

What should here rehearse the reverence gene in old syne to - S. James chaier and to other Reliques, the solemnne dedicating of Churches, the straight life of Eremites, the driving away of duels by holy water, the authority of unwritten traditions, the use of beoer.
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Ibidem, two Wivers, that the Bishop of Rome q Auguśti. used to answer the consultations or re-

lations directed to him from the Coun-
cels both of the East and of the West, that the fire of purgatorio is more greuose, than whatsoever a man may suffer in this life?

All these things were in the ancien
tient Churche: the same are in our Churche: the same are not in the Pro-

testants Churche: How then can it be, that Antiquity should either help the Protestants, or hinder us? As therfore we are assured of the mark of Antiquity: so let us go forward with certain other markes, which are no lesse peculiar to us.

Among other things which Staid S. Augustine in the right faith, this was one, because no hereifie could obtein the name of the Catholike Churche, although every hereifie did much desier to obtein it. The reason is, for that heresies be but parts and pecu-

liar
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May sects of some one country, or the doctrine of a sect, cause, whereas the word Christian Catholic, doth betoken a certain universal profession during from the beginning to the end, and spread throughout. Those therefore who beg their doctrine after the Apostles' time, were either named of their master, as the Arriás Heretics or Arrius, the Pelagias of Pelagius the Lutherans of Luther, the Calvinites of Calvin, or of some place where they lived (as the heresy of the Pythagoreans) or of the false God which they taught (as Quartadecimani, Analectists, Aquarians) or of some like particular circumstance.

But they were only called Catholicks, who kept the universal faith, which the Apostles had first taught, and Catholicks which was continued always in the whole Church. To our purpose, I say the Protestants never had the name of Catholikes, nor never shall have it, because they beganne
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after the Apostles tyme, to wit within
these fiftie yeres. But we so bad once
the name of Catholicks, that we shall
never leese it.

I doe not onely report me to al kind
of histories and writers, who accom-
ted for ever the flock and society of the
Romā church for Catholiks (a as S. Am-
brose, b S. Hierome and all maner of ot-
ther Fathers do witnesse) but also I say
our ennemies confesse this Marke to
have bee ours. Reade the very title of M.
Jewels Reply, reade it, I say, ad see what
God to his everlastinge damnatiō (if he
repeint not) caused him to write there.

A Reply (saith he) unto M. Harde-
dings answere, by perusing where
of the discrete and diligent reader
may easily see, the weake, and un-
stable grounds of the Romā res-
ligiō, which of late hath ben
acceptept Catholik. By
I. Jewel bishop of
Sarinburie.

Heare
the true Church.

Hear ye not what he saith? The Roman religion of late hath ben accompted Catholike. As men accompt a thing to bee, so doe they name it: those therefore who accompted the Roman Religion to be Catholike, na-
med it also the Catholike Religion. But S. Augustine saith: Tenet me in eccle-
sea Catholicae nomen, quod non fine causa inter tam multas hare-
"sies hic ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit, & c. The very name of the Catholick Church holdeth me in the Church, the which name this Church alone hath not without a cause so obtened, among so many heresies: that whereas all heretiks couet to be called Catholiks, yet if any stranger ask, where the Catholick communion is kept, no heretike dare shew his own Churche (or palace) or house.

Behold, the true Church alone hath obtened the name of the Catho-
like Church, and no heresy could obten
The marks of the same. But we that are none called Papists, by Maister Jewels confession: were of late accompted Catholikes, therefore we are the true Church, and we are not heretikes at all. This mark then standeth also our syde.

Beside the name of Catholikes, we also have the continuall succession of bishops and priests, ab ipsa fede Petri (as S. Augustine speaketh) vsque ad praesens in Episcopatum, even from the very See of Peter, to the bishoply office which now is. Such a continual succession we shew from S. Peter himself until Pius the fifth, who presently sitteth at Rome in Saint Peters chaire. The same Marke (as being one of the most evident of all others) is approved by S. a treneus, by Tertullia, by c Optatus, and d by S. Hierome. The Protestantes on the other syde neither have continual successio of Lucifera, bishops, nor yet of any preachers, nor of any
the true Church.

any peole that are knowne to have pro-

fessed their faith So that either no such
congregation was, or they were al dam-
ned, because they were ashamed to co-

fesse the Gospel of Christ by their word
and conversation before men. Marke

Wel this point: I cannot see, what can
be reasonably answered unto it.

Consider now (good Reader) the
riches and preeminence of our cause
above the Protestants. 1. We have God's
Word before them. 2. We have and
believe more of it, than they. 3. We have
more authentic copies, even of those
books, which they together with us
does receive for God's Word. 4. We
have a more certain commission to use
it in preaching, or otherwise. 5. We reade
it in more holy and profitable tungs. 6.
We use it also in vulgar tungs without
breach of unity. 7. The plain meaning
thereof maketh for us, 8. The circum-
stance and conference thereof sheweth
our faith to be the truer. 9. The ancients
Fathers
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Fathers veraciously with our doctrine. 10 The tradition and practice is only with us. 11 General Councils are only with us. 12 The unity of one chief judge is only with us. 13 The lawful preaching of God's Word and the lawful administration of the sacraments is that, which we use. 14 Victory in persecution is ours. 15 Yea, we are persecuted of the Protestants our children, as of whom they were baptized in whose universities they were brought up, and now they turn the weapons which we gave them, against us. 16 Antiquity and the practice of the primitive Church is agreeable to that of our time. 17 The name of Catholics by their confession is ours. 18 The continual succession of bishops we do show, and they can not so much as pretend it.

Rom. 3.
Galat. 3.
Iacob. 3.

Generally what have they which we lack? Have they a faith justifying? If so have we, but not justifying alone, but justifying with charity, which is as it were the
the true Church, the life of faith. Ergo their justification of faith alone, is a deade righteousness; ours is it which quickeneth to life everlasting. Have they two Sacraments? We have seven. Have they an inward priesthood whereby Christ is offered in their harts? We have an inward, and an outward, whereby he is offered both in our harts, and in our hands. Do they beleue that Christ with one Sacrifice paid our rausom for euer? We beleue it, and shew to the eye (under the foorm of bread) the self body sacrificed, and by offering and eating it sacramentally with our mouth, we are made partakers of the redemption which is in it.

Is Christ with them the head and pastour of his Church? We do not onely beleue so, but we shew it to be so by the real figure of one chief head ad pastour of his particular flock in earth, whereby the eternall things are lively represented.

Doe lay men with them receaue the
The marks of communion under both kinds? even so doe they with vs by dispensation of the See Apostolike, in Austria, and in diverse other parts of Germany, both without schisme, and also without injury of another truth, which must confess one kind to conteine as much as both, and therefore to suffice alone.

Math. 26. And both kindes were instituted of Christ, rather to shew by an unbloody sacrifice the nature of Christes bloody sacrifice (where his soule and blood was a part from his body and flesh) then that any more is either conincied or distributed by both, then by one alone.

Hebr. 11. Have you Mariage in great price? Not in so great as wee, who teache it to be a Sacrament, which by the outward and visable signe of mutuell consent in faitfull persons signifieth the gracios union of Christ and of his Churche and whiles it signifieth such

Ephes. 5. a singular grace, it partaketh of the grace
the true Church. grace Whereof it is the signe.

Yea but you allow Marriage in all kind of men? What? Even in those, who have gelded them selves for the kingdom of heaven? For they onely who make the vow of chastity, can justly be said to geld them selves for the kingdom of heaven. For he that abstaineth from Marriage without any vowe, he is not yet gelded, when he made lawfullie ma-

But who so hath gelded himself for the kingdom of heaven, is meant to be no more able to marry by the right of Gods law, and in very conscience, the he is able by the course of nature to have a child, who either is borne, or by force is made an Eunuch. For these three kinds of Eunuches Christ doth compare together, expressly giving us to understand, that it is both praise worthy to vow chastity, and when it is once vowed, that by Gods owne law there is no
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no more possibilitie to return to the use
of mariage, then it is possible for a gel- 
ded man to be restored again to that
which he lacketh.

By these few examples it may appere,
that you have no maner of thing praise
worthy, which we lack, whereas we
have a great nuber of things both good
and laudable, and (many of them) ve-
ry necessary, all which you lacke. You
have no invisitations, no exorcism, no
boly oyle in baptism, no holy Christ in
bis hopping, no externall priest-hood, no
publik sacrifice, no altars, no censings, no
lights at your service, no Images in your
Churches, no adoration, no reseruation
of Christes body, no Eremits, no Muks,
no virgins vealed and consecrated, no
unwriten traditions, no communion
With Saints, or With faithful soules, by
praying to the one, or for the other. no
Stations, no pilgrymages, no confession
of synnes to the priest, no foryeuenes by
the priest, no temporall satisfaction in-
joyned
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Joyned, nor the same remitted by part
don, no holy water, no holy vestments,
no Reliques of Martyrs, no extreme
unction, no place of purgatory where
their synnes may be released after this
life, who died in charity, but yet not
without the det of temporall purga-
tion.

You say falsely) that all these things
are naught: but once we receaued the
of our auncestours, and we iustifie the
by Gods Word, and by the bookes of the
auncient Fathers.

If we our selues had once had other
things, and so had cast away those other
and taken these (as you have taken, up-
on your own heads) naked tables in
steade of adorned altars, praying toward
the south in steade of praying toward the
East, marrige of priestes in steade of
chastity, vulgar tungs in steade of holy
and learned, the sacrifice of praying
God by bare words, in steade of Masse
which praised him by the consecration

Note.

Galat. vi.
preterquir
quod ac
cepistis.
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of Christes owne body. With other like
matters) then indeed there had ben
cause, why we might have feared our
owne dedes and inventions.

But seing we made no new religio,
bute kepe the olde : humilitie, obediz
cence, and the keeping of vnity is
our fault, if we have any. Of such faults
I beleue none shall gene accompt, but
rather of pride, of disobedience, of
breaking vnitie, of makinge schismes,
and of troubling the Churche.

Neither can it be justlie replied
Disimili: of you that you doe toward us in chag-
ing our religion, as Christ and the Ap-
postles did toward the Iewish Syna-
gogue. For Christ changed his owne Re-
ligion (Whereof himself was Lorde)
and not onely theirs. But Luther is
not that toward Christ, Which Christ
was toward Moses, neither hath Cal-
um that power to alters the state of Chri-
tes Churche, Which Christ had to alter
the Law.

It must
the true Church.

It must be understood that in all Religions there is a law, which prescribes in what manner God's halbe served. The chief point of God's service consists in public Sacrifice. The Sacrifice depends upon the Priesthood, for of what soever order the priest is, thereafter he makes his sacrifice, whereupon S. Paul said: The priesthood being transferred (or changed) it must needs be, that the law be transferred or changed also. Now from Adam till Christ, there was indeed an increase of outward Sacraments and Cerimonies in diverse ages. But there was no change at all of the solemn and public Sacrifice. For albeit Melchisedech brought forth his unbloody oblation, and blessed Abraham yet it was done to shew aforesaid, after what sort Christ should make sacrifice in his supper, and not to abrogate the order and kinde of bloody Sacrifices, for they continued still, as Abel hadde begun Gen.4:1.
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With them. Likewise the Altars remained in use, as Noe had erected the. Circumcision was kept with the law. And the law with the Temple of Salomon So that from the beginning of the World til Christ there was increasing of Ceremonies, but not taking away, no changing, no newe making or altering of the publike sacrifice.

For the change thereof is of such importance that God would his owne Son to take flesh for the working of such a weighty matter, to the which he should understand, that God reserueth to his owne selfe the appointment of the Religion wherwith he will be served. And the Religion (as I shewed before) consisteth chiefly in the publike sacrifice and priesthood.

Heb. 7.

Phil. 109. Christ therefore being a priest after the order of Melchisedech, when he had proved his commission from God the Father by diverse notable miracles, in his last supper toke bread and wine

the true Church.

Wine accordingly as Melchisedech had fore/here in a figure. He blessed brake, and gave saying, take, eare, this is my body which is geuen for you, doe (or make) this thing for the remembrance of me. By which woordes the Apostles and their successors in priest-bod, haue commissiō to make of bread and wine the bodie and blood of Christ even till the worldes end.

This then is the publike and external sacrifice of the new testament, the which Sacrifice (faith S. Augustine) is now spread in the whole circuit of the earth, and it is come in place (faith be) of all the sacrifices of the old testament, and is the Sacrifice of the Churche.

And all the world doth know that both the Greek and Latin Church hath ever used this blessed mystery, as the Sacrifice prophesied of by Malachy and belonging peculiarly to the Christian people gathered out of all nations.

Malac. 3.
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Now to thinck, that Luther and Calvyn have power to alter and abrogate this publike sacrifice ( called now the Maffe ) it is to thinck, that Luther and Calvyn are the same toward Christe, which Christ was toward Moses. For that is it which Christ meaneth saying: False Prophets, and false Christes shal arise. Verily, because some shal come, who wil arrogate that to them selves, which no creature ca do. belyde Christ the Son of God, whose proper office and honour it is, to be of power to change the state and order of the publike priesthood and sacrifice in Gods Church. They then are Idolaters, who supposing Luther and Calvyn to be able to abrogate the former sacrifice and manner of service, and to sette up a new form of publike prayer, do therein make them to be fellowes with Christ himself. But certainly they are false brethren and false Christes.

And whereas the Protestants pretend
the true Church.

tend that Luther and al: in do all things according to Gods Worde (to omit now, that the one of them teacheth cleane contrarie doctrine to the other) they are so much the more to be abhorred: for as Christ in verie truthe in chargynge the Lawfull, filled the old figures and the old prophecies eu: so they (taking Christes power upo them) pretend falsely by changynge Religion, to haue their doings figured and prophesied of in the Gospell.

But if there can be but one Christ, and be can be but once borne, and dide but once: be ye assured, these men have no power to abrogate the Masse, or to take away the keye of our auncient Religion.

If any man say that our Masse is not that in deede, Which we saie it is: I answer, that as we never reade the Jewish Priestes to haue erred, concerning the substance of their publique Sacrifice ( because all the people were
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Were bound to frequent it by God's own commandement, so it is much lesse possible that the universall Church of Christ should err in that publike act, wherein Christ himself (saith S. Cyprian) is the Sacrifice. No no masters, Antichrist's ye may be, Christ ye cannot be. He is with his Apostles (all their successors the bishops): I dayes vntil the worlds end.

This being so, reason would that all novelties laid aside, men should return to the old faith, and Church again. Whereunto if I am so bold as to exhort you, M. D. Parker, before all other, I trust you will not take it in enui part. For as my exhortation commeth of my well-wishing to your worship, so I consider no Ecclesiastical person in all our Country is able to doe more good in that behalf then you.

Consider then for God's love, in whose chaire you sitte, consider whence the first Bishop came who satte there, yea farther
the true Church.

further consider what all your predecessors taught, only one excepted, of whom all good and zealous men must needs be ashamed, as who at the en-	ring into his bishopric was wilfully sworn to the Pope of Rome. And after-
ward changed his religion from Luth-
ernisme, to the Sacramentary heresy: And alittle before his death: for a few hours of temporal life sold his poore faith twise a day.

Neither was he otherwise a wit-
ess of your doctrine, then that des-
eration made him pretend to suffer that for religion, which he must needs suf-
er though he had changed his religion. That one desperat man then excepted (who seemeth to have ben of no religio) at your predecessors were of our faith. What speake 1 of your predecessors? Al the bishops of the realme, yea all of the whole world were of the same belefe with us, as it may right wel appeare for that all the Catholikes in the world co-

Cranmer
The marks of
municated with S. Gregorie as with
the best man, the greatest Doctor, the
highest Bishop that lived in those dat-
es. Now S. Gregorie sent S. Aug-
gustine to our Anceflours, fro whose
time till the change which began a late,
all Christian men are known to have
believed and professed that, which we
do presently defend.

If this holy fellowship be not that Ca-
tholike and Apostolik Church, which in
all times and eontries professed Christes
Gospel: then goe into the desert after
Wiclefan: Hus goe into the corners
and privie inmoste places of the house
after the poor men of Lions. And then
for the space of certain hundredyrs to-
gether, yee can not name, what pre-
achers or pastours your Churche had. But
tho to flic into privi places, ado lack opè
preachers, is directly against the Word
of God, and expressly against the com-
mend of our Saviour, whose was to crieth
in the tops of the waies and in the
gates
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gates of the cityes, whose whatching cease not to speak both day and
night vpô the walls of Jerualem, in whose house the cadle stádeth vpô
the candlestick to give light to al me, whose faith must be confessed with
the mouth, whose gospel must not be
blushed at, whose servants shine like
stars, whose spouse being most beautiful
through internal faith and charity, is yet
garnished about with variety of divers
túgs which are daily heard to preache,
and ceremonies, which are daily seen in
Gods service among the Catholicks. Which
spoule also hath promised to be mindful
of the name of Christ from generation
to generation, in so much that, many
people shall confess and give praise to
God for ever age after age.

If such a glorious, a manifest and
a beautiful Church be must be beleued,
then must Wiclet, Hus, and their
fellowe be avoided, and our knowne,
manifest, and in all generations must
glorious
The marks of

glorious Church must be imbraced
which never lacked a chief bishop in
St. Peter's chair with a number of bis-
ships, and faithful nations obeying his
doctrine and governement. The truth of
which Catholic Church and chair that
I might the more effectually persuade, I
have taken in hand to prove the Su-
premacy of the bishop of Rome, accor-
ding to the reason and meaning of
God's Word. The which point alone if it
be granted, all other controversies are
superfluous. For all is concluded under
one, if one be appointed the chief
shepherd by God over all, then every
man must hear and obey the shepherd's
voice.

I request most humbly of your patience
to read, or to hear the whole trea-
sise readen (which is not long) and not
to condemn the matter before it be
well understood. If my discourse be
doubtful, I am ready to make it plain. If
is some to fail in proof, a charitable
answer
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answer made unto it / shall shew by the
reply how strong the Arguments ge-
nerally be, concerning the chief points.

Thus taking my leave. I wish as well
to your worship as I do to myself, besee-
ching you not to miscontrue my doings,
but to take them so charitably, as they
are means. For God is my witness, the
thing I seek is as well the reducing of
them to their Mother Church who are
gone astray, as the staying of them who
through mans frailty beginne to dout
of their faith. Which effects God
grateth through Jesus Christ
our Lord to his own
glory. Amen.
The Chapters of the Treatise following.

1. The state of the question. fol. 1.
2. That there is a primacy of spiritual government in the Church, and how it differeth from secular governement. 16.
3. Of the diverse senses of these words, upon this rock I will build my Church, ad which is most literal. 92.
4. These words (thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church) have this literal meaning, upon the, ó Peter, being made a rock, to shend thou shouldest stately confesse the faith, I will build my Church. 103.
5. The Fathers teach, that S. Peter is this rock. 126.
6. The reasons which the Fathers bring to declare why S. Peter was this rock. 155.
7. The authorities alleaged by M. Jewel to prove, that S. Peter was not this rock, prove against himself. 171.
8. The conclusion of the former discourse and the order of the other which followeth. 189.
9. That S. Peter passeth far the other Apostles in some kinde of Ecclesiasticall dignity. 194.
10. That the Apostles besides the perogative of their Apostleship, had also authority to
rity to be particular bishops. 204.
11. How far St. Peter did either excel, or was equal with the Apostles, in their Apostolike office. 206.
12. That St. Peter's prerogative above the other Apostles is most manifestly seen by his chief bishoply power. 212.
13. That the Pastoral authority of St. Peter was ordinary. 207.
14. That his ordinary authority belonged to one bishop alone 279.
15. That the bishop of Rome is that one ordinary pontiff who succeedeth in St. Peter's chaire 305.
16. That the good Emperours and princes did never think themselves suprem heads of the Church in spiritual causes. 378.
17. That the bishop of Rome is not Antichrist himself. 421.
18. That the bishop of Rome is not any member of Antichrist, concerning his doctrine. 464.
THE STATE OF THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE SUPREMACIE OF S. PETER, AND OF THE BISHOPS OF ROME AFTER HIM.

The First Chapter.

In writing to and fro, concerning the Supremacie of S. Peter and of the Bishops of Rome after him, great controversies are fallen out, the which to the end they may be the better opened, I thought good to propose in order, the chief points of the said question.

The Catholiques beleue, that the Bishop of Rome, sitting in S. Peters Chaire is, by the appointment of Christ himself, the chief Pastour of the whole militant Church, whose voice every sheepe ought to hearken unto.

The Protestants on the other side denie, not only the Supremacie of the
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Bishop of Rome, nor onlie the Supremacie of S. Peter: but also they affirm, that there is no Primacie, nor any one chief government in the Church at al.

Therefore the first Question must be, whether it be against the Word of God or no, that there shoulde be in his Church any Primacie or chief Authority.

The second is, whether S. Peter had the said Primacie, or no.

The third, whether the Bishop of Rome had it after S. Peter.

Concerning S. Peter, we fall againe into divers new questions, as it shall now appeare.

When Simon the sonne of Jonas was first brought unto Christ by his brother Andrew, Jesus loking upon him, said: Thou art Simon the sonne of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas, the which by interpretation is Peter, that is to say, a stone or a rocke. Here is the promise made, that Simon shall be
of the Church.

Shalbe called Peter, which name is de-

riv'd of a rocke or stone. Verelie, be-

cause he shal occupie that place in up-

holding the frame of Christes militant

Church; the which a stone occupieth

in holding up the house which is built

upon it. And when it pleased Christ
to chose vnto him his twelue Apostles,
then he gaue the said name vnto Simo,

surnaming him, Peter. Thirdly, Mar.30.

When Simon hauing the Godhead of

Christ reveale to him from heau'n, had

confessed the same, saying: Thou art

Christ the son of the liuing God:

then Iesus answering, said vnto him
(alluding to his new name, and shew-
ing the reason thereof) And I saye

vnto thee, that thou art Peter, and

upon this rocke vvi'l I build my

Church, and the gates of hell shal

not preuaile against it. And to

thee I wil geue the Keies of the

kingdome of heauen. And what's

soever thou shalt bind vpon the

A ny earth,
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earth, it shalbe bound also in the
heauens: And whatsoeuer thou
shalte loose vpon the earth, it shal
be loosed also in the heauens.

By these wordes both the promise of
Christ was fulfilled, and the reason of the
promise was also declared, concerning
the new name; which was before spok
ken of. Neither do our adversaries de
nie these points, as I suppose. But the
Catholicques reason farther upon this
place, in this wise: The name of Peter,
which is derived of a rock or of a stone,
was no sooner given to Simon, but also
a new promise was made, that vpo this
Rocke Christ would build his
Church. Now the Catholickes doe say,
that Peter himself is here called this
rock, and that Christ promised to build
his Church vpo him. And because the
building of Christes church varieth not
after his Gospell once planted, but is al
waies like it selfe, the Catholickes beleue
and teach, that when S. Peter died, an
other
of the Church.

other did succeed in his place, upon whom Christ's militant Church might be still so builded, as it had been once builded upo S. Peter. And for as much as the Bishop of Rome succeedeth S. Peter, the Catholikes most constantly affirme, that the Bishop of Rome, who liueth for the time, is the rocke which confesseth evermore Christ's true faith, upon which confession of the See of Rome, as upo a most sure Rocke Christes Church is build. The Protestants being at a point to deny this later assertion, must needs affirme, that Peter himselfe is not called this Rocke, but rather that either Christ alone, or the faith which Peter confesseth, is only called this rocke. So that they will have these wordes (upon this rocke I wil build my Church) to be onely thus meant, upon this faith and confession of thine, wherein thou hast said to mee (thou art Christ the Sonne of the living God) upon this Rocke, which I am,
or upon this strong faith, which is confessed of me, I will build my Church: and wheresoeuer this faith is, there (say they) is the rocke, upon which Christ buildeth his Church.

The Catholikes reply, that although the faith and confession of Christes Godhead be in deede a most strong rocke, whereupon the Church is built, yet that is not all which Christ meaneth at this time. For these wordes (Thou art Peter, and upon this rocke, I will build my Church) have a respect unto three divers times: to the time past (because they are spoken to him, who was promised to be called Peter) to the present time (because they are spoken to him, who now confesseth Christes Godhead) to the time to come (because they are spoken to him, to whom Christ faith, he will give the keyes of the kingdom of heaven, and upon whom he will hereafter build his Church which thing he performed, when he said: Pe-
ter louesst thou me more the these? Feede my Sheep. For Christes Sheepe are Christes Church: And to be made the Shepheard of them, is to have Christes Church built upon him. And to be Peter, is to be this Rocke.
Solemus videre pastores sedere supra petram, & inde commissa sibi pecora custodire. We are vōt (saith S. Augustine) to see sheeps heards sit vpon a rocke, and thece to keepe the sheepe commited to their charge. Thus we see, how wel the Metaphore of the Rocke dooth agree with the Metaphore of feeding sheepe.

Therefore these wordes vpon this rocke I vvil build my Church, are perfectly fulfilled, when it is saide to Peter who is this Roke, feede my sheepe.

Now wheras this Propositio, Thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke I will build my Church, is thus qua-
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liified with the person to whom it is spoke, and with the diversitie of three several times, to take one part of these foure away from all the other conditions, whereunto it belongeth, and to say, that the confession of Peter alone is the rocke whereupon Christ will build his church, and thereby to deny Peter himselfe who maketh that confession, to be this rocke, and to divide the confession from the promise going before, (which first of all wrought the effect thereof) and from the last fulfilling which ensued after: it is in deede a truthe (for so muche as is affirmed therein) but in respect of that which is denied, it is a mane falshood.

But the Catholiques (getting the whole sense of Christes woordes, as they ought, and not diminishinge any parte thereof) doe teache, that, this Rocke whereupon Christ built his Church, is S. Peter, not barely and nakecly considered, but with respect
of the Church.

respect of the promise past, of the present confession, and of the auctoritie of feeding Christes sheepe which then was to come).

And so,nomā(he he never so faithfull) is this rocke whereupon Christ hath built his Church, except he be lawfully called to suceede in the auctoritie and pastoral office of S. Peter. This thing then remaineth to be prov'd in his due place.

The Catholiques teache also, that it was said to Peter alone, feede my sheepe. And seeing no particular flocke was named, it must needes be meant, that the whole flocke, which for the time liued on the earth, was committed to Peter, even above all other, according as he loued Christ more then other.

And for as much as the order of governing Christes Church, which himself appointed, may not afterward be changed by mans invention, it insueth, that
that at wayes one chief shepheard must be made, who may feede the whole mi-
litant flocke of Christes sheepe in earth above al other pastours, as Peter once
did feede them above al, concerning the principal power which he received of
Christ.

Hereunto the Protestantes replie, that Peter alone was not made the
shephead of Christes flocke above all
others: but that in him Christ spake to
al the Apostles.

The Catholiques demaund Whych the
Peter alone is spoken unto, and Willed
to feed Christes sheepe, in the presence
of certaine other Apostles, to none of
Whom Christ speaketh any thing ther-
of at this time?

The Protestants answere, that every
Apostle was made a pastour no leffe the
Peter. But that he was namely spoken
unto at this time, as one who had lost
his office of Apostleship by denying his
Master, and therefore as he denied
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thirse, so he was commanded thirse to feed Christ's sheep, to th'end he should know that his fault is now forgeuen, and that he is restored to his Apostles' ship againe; so that he may feede Christ's sheep as wel as Andrew or John; and with no greater power then they.

This answer is utterly false for three causes. First because Simon Peter had not lost his Apostleship by denying his Master. For although the fault seemeth to some men (who are cruel Judges over the Apostles) worthy of degration; yet for so much as the same was neither externally proved nor confessed in judgement, nor stubbornly defended, but rather was gratiously purged by tears, it was verely for-geuen through mercy, before it came to be punished by injustice. In so much that Optatus writeth thus: Petrus est solus negavit, & tamen bono unitas tis de numero Apostolorum separati non meruit. Peter alone denied
ned thripe, and yet for the benefit of unitie he deserved not to be sepa-
perated from the number of the
Apostles. Moreover if S Peter had
once lost his Apostleship, yet before this
time he had been restored againe ther-
unto. For Christ after his resurrecitio
entered into the place where his disci-
ples were (the doores being shut) and
stood in the midst, and said, Peace
to you, As my father hath sent me, and I send you. When he had said
these things, he breathed, and said to
thee: take ye the holy Ghost, whose
sinnes foruer ye shal forgove, they
are forgone un them; and whose so-
uer ye shal retaine, they are re-
tained. Now seing it can not be de-
nied, but that S. Peter was the present,
(for only Thomas is noted to have ben
absent from the disciples at that time )
surely though Peter had lost once his
Apostleship, he had ben restored before
this time, and had ben sent with Christes
of the Church.

fies authotie, no lesse then any other Apostle: So that it was not needful for the restoring of him to his Apostleship, that Christ shuld now saie to him alone, feed my lambs, feed my sheepe. But rather he being before euall with any other of the Apostles by the commissio of binding and losinge syns, of preaching, or of any like authotie generallie before, was now alone principally willed to feed Christes sheepe, and Christes lambs in such sort, as no other Apostle was. Last of al, admit, Peter had not ben restored to his Apostleship before this time: yet he had ben now restored to a greater authotie, than any other Apostle had receiued at any time. So that euery way Peter in thi end remaineth with the greatest power. Against this my affer to the Protestants cry, that al th Apostles were equal, and that Iohn was the same thing which Peter was, which thing S. Hiero, and S. Cypria say they doe witness and the very practisfe of the Apostles,
so much that Paul, who was none of the twelve, yet with Aoad S. Peter, and reproved him.

Our answer to this matter is, that S. Peter was not onely an Apostle (in which office of Apostleship during only for their liues, all the other were his equalles) but also both chief of the Apostles, and also an ordinarie chief shepheard, or high byshop, wherein they were all inferiors to him, as being only Apostles and Bishops under S. Peter their chief Apostle and chief Bishop, their Primate and their head. The which my destruction shall be exactly proved by Gods grace hereafter. Hi

terto concerning S. Peter.

More over, some men are so wilful, that although they are driven to confesse, that S. Peter him selfe was this rocke, and chief passtour, vpo whose assured faith the militant Church was once buylt, yet they will have no one Bishop to be the same after him. Wherefor
fore I have to prove, that both one Bishop for the time should have continually the same pastoral power which S. Peter once had, and that the same is none other beside the Bishop of Rome.

Which point being once declared, it will the better appere, what a blasphemous it is unto Christ, to burden his Vicaire in earth with the name and tyrannical power of that soule beast Antichrist: Whereas it shalbe right well proved, that the Protestantists of our time come much nere to the nature and condition of Antichrist, then any Pope of Rome ever did or can doe.
That there is a certaine Primacie of spiritual gouvemement in the Church of Christ (though not properly a lordlines or heathenish dominion) And in what sort this Ecclesiastical Primacie differeth from the lordly government of secular Princes, and how it is practised by the Bishop of Rome.

The II. Chap.

No man properly can be Lorde among the Christians, where are servants indifferently under the obedience of one true Lord and Master Jesus Christ, who hath created them of nothing, and hath redeemed them with His owne bloud. Whereupon our Saviour Christ said: The Kings of the Nations haue dominion ouer them, but you not so.

Matthew 20. Againhe saith: The Princes of the nationes haue dominion ouer them. It shal not be so among you. And S. Peter did forbid his fellow Priestes, to surpe any dominio ouer the Clergie; but he commaunded them.
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them, to be an example and paterne of the flocke). Upon which places we may conclude, that Lordly dominion is forbidden in the Church of Christ, but not likewise all Ecclesiastical Primate).

For Dominion is properly the power of life and death upon slaves or bondmen, whereas we (in this spiritual government and kingdom of Christ) are not servants one to the other, but brethren. But a kind of primacie is found even among brethren. For whereas Ruben had eleven brethren, yet notwithstanding, his Father said of him.

Ruben my first begotten, Thou art my strength, and the beginning of my grief. The more excellent in gifts, and greater in power. For Ruben should have had received both the Priesthood and the Superioritie over his brethren, if he had not wickedly demeaned himself toward his owne Father.

B Nei-
Neither onely among brethren, but even among fellow servants there is found a certaine Superioritie, which is nothing els but that power, which it pleaseth the chief Lord to geue to some one of his servants ouer al the rest.

Math.24. For the Lord of the house (as the Scripture witnesseth by a parable) appoineth ad seteth a wife and faithful servant ouer his familie, that he may geue them meat in due time. To be appointed and sette ouer a familie, is to be chief in the familie. And to be chief in the familie, is to have the chiefdome, superiority and primacie in the familie.

Wherefore seeing our Saviour Christ (so farforth as concerneth his visible presence) taking a iorney into a farre Countrie which is heauen, hath like a wise Lord appointed and set one of his servants ouer his familie, that is to say, ouer his Church, saying to him: Feed my sheepe, meaning that he should geue every man his due portion, and inst
measure of wheat or of other viuitals
in convenient time: that servant so
appointed and made ruler ouer this
Militant Church, hath a certaine pri-
macie in consideration and respect of
them, ouer whom he is made Primate
and chief gouernour: albeit when we
consider the maiestie of our Maister
Christ, the very Primate stil continu-
eth altogether a suppliant and an humble
servitor to him.

As for other who under the chief
ruler have the charge of particular pa-
rishes and Churches committed unto
them, they have also in the same degree
and sort, a certaine Superioritie, which
S. Hierom calleth Exortem quandâ &
eminentem potestatem, a cer-
taine perelesse and high power.
If he be a Parish Priest, he is above any
other in that parish. If he be a Bi-
shop, he is above any other in that Dio-
cefe. Of such Rulers S. Paul saith:
Obedite Prepositis vestris. Obey

In Dial.
ötrot Luc-
ciferanos.
them who are sette over you. Now it is to be known, that in any one parish, or in any one diocese, there never was but one ruler at once ordinarily.

For thence come heresies and schisms (saith S. Cyprian) because one Priest in the Church for the time, and one judge in Christes stede is not thought to be.

If then the whole militant Church be also one certaine particular body of a certayne particular administration and condition (in respecke of the triumphant Church, which is otherwise guided in heauen) it must needes follow, that over the whole militant house of God, one only master and governour is set, whom we ought to obey as our chief ruler in earth. And so by the superioritie, which experience sheweth to belong to one in euery parish, we come by the force of the same reason, to acknowledge one chief Postour in the great parish of this world, of which
which kind S. Peter was, whiles he lived.

And that may well be perceived by the Gospel it selfe. For seeing the Evangelist S. Mathew repeating the names of the twelve Apostles, saith: Primus, Simon qui dicitur Petrus, the first is Simo, who is called Peter, and afterwards reckoneth none neither second, nor third, nor fourth, undoubtedly by calling Peter (Primum) first, he meaneth that he was the first in dignitie, and the chiefest among the Apostles, and that all the rest afterwards were to be equallie esteemed.

For, to be first where none is put as Second or Third, is to be first not by order of numbering, but only by dignitie and preeminence, in somuch that the Anciente Fathers express the force of this Woorde, Primus, First, by calling S. Peter the Prince or chief of the Apostles. And certes,
The Rock

Where there is any in the Church of God, first in dignitie, and chief in pre-eminence, there must needs be some primacie.

Besides, if the Bishop of the old law Exod.12. was called in those daies, Princeps populi, The Prince of the people, and if S. Paul honoured Ananias with that name, even after the death of Christ,

Actor.23. saying: It is written, Thou shalt not curse (or reuile) the Prince of thy people, how much more ought he both to be called, and to be also believed to be the chief governour and Prince of all Christian people, Whom Christ hath appointed, and sette over his fa-

milie, saying: Feede my sheepe:

Onely he must be circumspect, that he turne not his primacie into a tyrannie, as the Gétiles and Princes of the world doe.

How be it, this also is to be considere-red, that neither the Prophets, nor the Evangelists are wont to be so carefull of
of the Church.

of words, as of the sense and things themselves. Wherby it commeth to passe sometimes, that they give the name of God to such me as have by participation any divine or godly thing in them, as to Judges, and to whom God vouchsaeth to speake. By like means it may be verified, that some Ecclesiastical persons have a certaine dominio, in that respect verely, that by participation they receive a divine and heavenly thing, that is to say, that power which Christ their liege Lord and natural Soueraigne indued them withal, when he made them gouernours of his familie. For among the holy orders of Angels, in like manner there is reckened one, which is called of S. Paule Dominationes, Dominations, not because they have any dominion or soueraintie ouer other Angels (as servants in subjection unto them) because they receive that vertue and power of God (the onelie true Lord) which is
The Rock

seth his Majesty to have annexed to that order, thereby to give forth some token and shew of his infinite Lordship and power.

Therefore if some man not thinking peradventure of these controversies, nor weighing rather the thing then the bare word, hath at any time expressed the primacy of the Church, with this word Dominion, or if any made a Bishop by the name of Lord we ought not for any such respect to make an hurlyburly, as though any proper or true dominio were challenged in the Church, of one towards another. For as touching that which is properly called Dominio, we defend it not: But that there is a primacie in the Church that is the thing which we defend. The which Ecclesiastical primacie although it may evidently appere by that which is already said, yet it shal not be out of the way, to consider how one of those places which are allledged of our Adversaries,
of the Church.

... and the third time, after his last Supper: albeit Christ always did dehort them from expectation of that heathen kind of dominio, which was used in the world, and alwaies invited them to humiliatie, yet he neuer denied, but that there should be one in deed greater among them, and he ofteentimes signified, that the same should be S. Peter, and that as wel when he chose him to be the first Apostle, as when he said, Thou art Peter, and vpon this
this rocke I wil build my Church, and to thee I wil geue the keies of heauen, and paie for thee and mee.

If then you demaund, how it happe-
red, that this notwithstanding, th' Apo-
stles striued who should be greater, ad
that even after supper, whe it had ben
already said, Upon this rocke I wil
build my Church; I answer, that, not
withstanding S. Peter was most like to
be preferred, yet whiles Christ lived in
the earth, it was in his free choise to
have appointed it otherwise. And
When the Apostles saw either S. Peter
called Satanas, that is an adversarie, or
any special favour shewed to any other
man beside S. Peter, so oft they doubted
(as Origenes also witnesseth) lest per-
haps Peter should not be the greater,
as namely, when they saw the mother
of the sonnes of Zebede entreating for
her Children, and likewise when they
saw S. John at his last supper to leane
upon
upon his breast.

Moreover being not yet replenished with the spirit of Christ, it may well be, that although they believed S. Peter should be the chief pastor, yet they might, like for another to be made the chief governor in secular causes.

But when once Christ had said to him a little before his ascension, Simō the son of Iona dost thou love me more then these? Feed my lambs, feed my sheep: after that time of strife ceased, and Peter had the superiority established to him by all their confession.

The same question was in manner ended between Christ's last supper and his death, though not so plainly and express as afterward. For after his last supper, when they strived who might seem to be greater, Christ having shewed, that some one of them was greater, ended his talk at the last with Simon Peter, shewing him to be that one.
The Rocke

one. The which woordes of Christ rehearsed by S. Luke, that they may be made the plainer, I will compare them with the woordes of S. Mathew and S. Marke, spoken at another time.

And that I doe, because all these places are huddled up by the Protestants as if they were one and the same, wher as they differ much.

In centur. Magdeburg.

Math. 20. Marc. 10.

S. Mathew and S. Marke recite onely that Christ said to the Apostles (When they disdained at the sonnes of Zebede) Whosoever among you will be greater, let him be your servaunt. And who so euer among you will be first, shall be your servaunt. In which words we may consider two things: the first is, that if any man will be greater, he is permitted to be so, if yet he will kepe the condition which foloweth, verely to be a servaunt to all the Disciples. For the lowlines of spirit is the way to this true greatnes
greatnes, whereof Christ now speaketh. And this kind of greatnesse may be in those who are no Ecclesiastical officers at all. Because it consisteth in the inward minde rather, then in the outward power.

But S. Luke witnesseth Christ to Luc. 22, have said moreover: Quia maior est in vobis, nati fuit minor, & qui praecessor est, fuit ministrator. He that is the greater among you, let him be made as the yonger, and he that is the chief (or guide) as he that ministreth.

In which woordes it appeareth evidently, there was one certaine man greater then the other among the Disciples. For whereas S. Matthew, and S. Marke speake indefinitely ἐστίν ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑμῶν ἑαυτῆς, Whoso euer will be greate, S. Luke faist not generally, ὃς ὑμῖν ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρχῃ, but ὃ κοίμησεν τὸ ὑπάρχον, the greater among you. So that we finde six
Six differences.

1. For the other speake of any man, 
   whatsoever he be. S. Luke of one 
   certaine man, who by the article ὁ, 
   is, as it were, pointed unto. For the 
   said article doth determinately shew 
   some one apart from the rest.

2. The other speake of a certaine desire 
   to be great. ὅς ἐστιν θεῖος, Who so 
   would, or counteth to be great. S. 
   Luke speaketh of the effect already pre-
   sent, for the Participle ὁν, is to be 
   supplied to these woordes, ὁ ἐστιν, 
   the which causeth the sense to be, He 
   that is the greater, and not he that 
   would be, or counteth to be great.

3. Thirdly, the other doe speake (accord-
   ing to the Grecce copies) of him that 
   would be, μεγας, great, and not 
   of him that is greater. S. Luke of him 
   that is μεγας, greater among the 
   Apostles, and according to the Grecce 
   phrase
of the Church.

phrase (where the comparative standeth for the Superlative) it is meant, be that is greatest among them all.

By all which differences, whereas in S. Mathew and Mark, Christ only showeth humilitie to be the way to greatnes in his sight: in S. Luke he teacheth one certain man who is already greater, and greatest among them, to be made humble.

For in S. Mathew and S. Marke, the Nominative case to, sit, and, erit, let him be, or, he shall be, is he onely, who would be great and not he that is great. Let him who would be great, be a servant, that by serving he may be come great. But in S. Luke it is said: Let him that is already the more great, be made as it were a younger. Certainly this man who being already the greater, must be made as the younger, is not meant to be onely great already by the vertue of humilitie, or by inward righteousnes, but rather by power and authority.

For
For whereas the Apostles pronounced
who should be greatest in power, and
not who should be greatest in humilitie, Christ by pronouncing one among
them to be greatest, and by exhorting
him to be made as though he were the
least doth evidently shew that he mea-
neh one of them to be already great in
power, and that if he wilbe in al points
the greatest, he must adde humilitie
of his minde to the authoritie of his
office, which he already hath, either
by the right of promise, or els by ex-
presse gift. And so the man, who is
spoken of in S. Luke, is already greate
in office and dignitie, and now he must
afterward be made humble in minde
and soule. He hath his greatnesse
by commission, and being made humble,
he must receive a new kind of greatnes
by grace.

Thus in the other twaine there are
three degrees. A man first would
be great, secondly he must be humble,
and thirdly he then only is great where he is humble. In S. Luke the man is first great (without declaration made whether he would be so or no) and secondly he must behave himself truly. Which if he will not doe, he loseth not his former greatness, but onely he loseth that greatness which is gotten by humilitie.

The fourth difference is, that whereas in S. Mathew he that would be great, is willed to be δοῦλος, a servant, in S. Luke no such name of service is geuen to him that is the greater. But he is willed to be as the yonger, or as the least. By which name of νικότητος, minor, yonger, it is geuen us to understand, that ὁ μεῖζων, major, is not only meant the greater, but also the elder. Nor yet only meant the elder in yeares, but also the greater in power, and elder in office.

For whereas the contention was, ἃς ἄν τῶν δοξῆς σου μεῖζων, Quis corum
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eorum videreur elle maior, which of them should seeme to be the greater, or the greatest, it is certaine that they striued not, who shoulde be elder in yeares (for that was out of their reach) but they striued who should be greater and elder in power and Authoritie.

And Christ not denying at all, that some one was greater, but onely prescribing him how he should use his greatnesse, biddeth him be made as the yonger. That is to say, as the underling, although in deed he be the elder. By which name of yonger, Christ alludeth to the custom of the chilidern of a Patriarch, or of a high Priest, among the Iewes: Where the elder brother was Prior in donis, & maior in imperio, formost in gifts, and greatest in rule. And consequentl
y the yonger brother was lesse then his elder brother.

Wherby we understand, that wher-
as the Disciples were all brethren, there
of the Church.

there was among them, as it were, an elder brother, who was greater in rule and foremost in gifts, who was S. Peter, as we read in S. Mathew; Primus Simon, qui dicitur Petrus. The first is Simon, who is called Peter.

To whom S. Ambrose saith in this wise: Qui lapsus es antequam feres, in Luca, postquam fluistis erectus es, ut alii os regeres, quique ipsum ante non rexeras. Thou which diddest slide before thou didst weep, after thou hast wept, art set upright, that thou shouldest rule others, who before hadst not ruled thyself. Lo, Peter did rule others: and how could he do that, except he were set over them in such sort, as a ruler is over them whom he ruleth?

For although the end of the ruling were better then that which was used among the nations, yet it was a true ruling and government.

The fifth difference is, that whereas in the other two Evangelists, it is abso-

lutely
lately said, let him be a minister and a
sennaunt, in S. Luke it is said, with
a
great moderation, let him be made as
the yonger, and as he that ministreth.
So that the greatness is absolute, but the
ministerie is as, as it were a ministerie,
being in deed more truely a greatness
(concerning the power) then a
ministerie. Because it is a greatness
by the power and nature of his office, but
a ministerie by the good and humble
use of the same. The which good
use if it lacke, the power of the office is
not the lesse, but the merite of the per-
son is the lesse.

How were it possible for the use of
a thing to be prescribed to him, who
had not the thing itself? How can he
that is greater, be made as the yonger,
if in deede he be not greater? It is
utterly to denye the expresse woorde of
God, if any man saye that there was not
one certain man greater amongh' Apo-
stles, who might be made as the yonger.

It is
It is, I say, the plain contradiction of that which Christ speaketh, and therefore the maintainer of that opinion is an Antichrist.

Last of all, the greater man whom S. Luke speaketh of, is evidently named a little after. For when Christ had brought an example of his owne humility, as who had ministered to them sitting downe at the table, and had she-wed, that because they had continued with him in his tentations, they should eat and drinke at his table in heaven, he said immediately unto S. Peter, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to sift you, as it were wheat, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren. What other thing is it for S. Peter to confirm his brethren, but to practise and exercise his greatnesse over them? For he that doth confirm other, is the greater, and they who are confirmed

C. iij. are
are thereby inferiours to him, who confirmeth them.

Thus we understand, that without al question S. Luke doth witness Christ to have described one certaine man to be presently the greatest among the Disciples, who is exhorted to be made as their minister, and in the end by name is called Simon, which was the forename of S. Peter. And seeing the Bishops of Rome doe sitte in his chaire, they are likewise the greatest among all their brethren and fellow Bishops, and ought to be made as ministers, or yongers, for the perfitt use of their greatnesse, which is before committed to them at their election to that office, whether they doe afterward use it wel or no.

For the power which God giveth to man for the commoditie of the Whole Church, never dependeth upon the good use of that man, lest while he as a private man doth misuse his dignity, the Whole
of the Church.

Whole Church (which is of greater respect) be deprived of her profit and utility. Wherefore by all these reasons it must needs follow, that there is a Supremacie among the Apostles themselves (as it shall be afterward more directly proved) and consequently, much more among their Successours, who having lesser grace and humilitie, would sooner make schismes, if one were not set over them, whom they might al acknowledge ad obei as their chief pastor.

In so much that S. Ambrose writing upon this place of S. Luke, generally saith: Caueamus, ne in perditione aliqua inter nos de praelatione possit esse contentio. Si enim co-tendebant Apostoli, non exsulattionis obtenditur, sed cautioni proponitur. Let us beware, lest any strife of preferment make be among vs to our destruction. For if the Apostles did strive, it is not an excuse to be pretended for vs, but it is set forth
foorth to make vs beware, et ideo vna
datur omnibus forma sententie, vt
non de praelione iactantia sit, sed
de humilitate contentio, eō q se
Dominus proponit imitandum.
And therefore one fourme of sentioce
is genē to al, that they should not boast
of their preferment or prelateship,
but that they should strive to be hum-
ble. Because our Lord hath set forth
him self to be folowed.

Here S. Ambrose denieth not but
that one is preferred before an other,
yea rather he confesseth it, for he could
not forbid any man to boast of his pre-
lateship, except he were a prelate.
Onely this is common to al, that even
the Prelates ought to strive with their
inferiors, in lowlines, because Christ
who is Lord of al, did minister to his
own disciples, ad became the lowest
and most humble of al other.

S. Bede upon this present place of
S. Luke writeth thus. In forma hu
milita
militatis obtinenda Maiores & precessores, id est, doctores Ecclesiae non minima discretionem opus habet, ut & bonis in nullum se preserant, & cum prauorum culpa exigit, potestatem protinus sui prorsus agnoscant, ne enim presidetatis animus ad elationem potestas tis suae delectione rapiatur, recte per quendam sapientem dicitur: Ducem te constituerunt, noli exstollit, sed eis in illis quasi unus ex illis. In keeping the sooner of low-lines the greater and more chief, that is to say, the Doctours and the teachers of the Church have need of no small discretion, that they neither preferre them selues in any thing before good men, and when the fault of evil men so requireth, that by and by they may acknowledge the povver of their prelate's hippe. For to the end the minde of the President might not be puffed up with pride through the delight.
light of his owne power, it is well said by a certaine wise man: They haue made the a capitain, be not proud, but be among them as one of them.

At this tale of S. Bede presupposeth a prelatishe in the Church: and requireth also, that it be practised whe the faults of evil men prouoke their Superiour, to use his authoritie.

The chief point of the whole disputation is, that the Ecclesiastical primacie doth in all points imitate and resemble (as much as it possible may) the Primacie of Christ, who setteth forth him selfe as a persite example of a true primacie euin in this place of S. Luke.

Therefore who so ever denie the Superioritie of him, who is the greatest among the Apostles, to be a true primacie in his kinde, is blasphemouse against Christ him selfe. For after that it was said: He that is greatest among you, let him be as the yonger,
yonger, and he that is chief, as he that ministreth, Christ intending to shew that the primacie of the Apostles, could by no reason be greater, then that of Christ was, but that it ought rather to follow ad to be like unto it: whether ( saith he ) is greater, he that sisteth doun, or he that ministreth? Is not he that sisteth doun? But I am in the midst of you as he that ministreth: as if he said, seeing none of you may reasonably couet to be otherwise the greatest, then I am, and yet I being incomparably the greatest, doe behave myself like one that ministreth, much lese the greatest among you, may desire to be great after any other sort.

Therefore in such sort the Apostles and their Successours ought ( for their degree ) to be servants and ministers in their Primacie, as ( for his degree ) Christ was in his own primacy, who after that he had washed their feet, said unto them: Do ye know

what
What I have done unto you? Ye call me Master and Lord, and therein you say vvel: for I am your Master and Lord in deed. Wherefore seeing I, being your Lord and Master, have washed your feete, ye ought to vwash one an others feete. For I have geuen you an example, that you should doe as I haue done. Verely verily I say unto you, the Servaet is not greater then his Master, nor the Apostle more vworthy then he that sent him. If ye knowe these things, ye shal be blessed if ye doe them.

Christ therefore, whereas he was most truly Lord and Master, hauing the Primacie in all points, yet notwithstanding he was a minister among his disciples. And after the same sort (as S. Gregorie testifideth) Petrus authore De sanctæ Ecclesiae principi patum tenens, &c. Peter hauing the Primacie of the holy Church by
of the Church.

by God's commission, refuseth to be ouermuch reuered of Corneuus vvho did vvecl. But when he found out the fault of Ananias and Saphyra, Mox quanta potens tia super ceteros excrescisset ophiis dit. He shewed straignt how farre he was grove in power aboue the rest. Wil any man denie Christ to be Prince and Lord of al? No, I suppose. For Christ died and rose againe, to this end that he might be Lorde both of the quick and of the dead.

If then he that is Lord of al, could notwithstanding be as a minister without losse of his lordship, how much more easiely may he that is not properlie a Lord, but a chief ruer among his brethren, being set rather ouer their faults then ouer the men, how much more may he be as a servant and minister in that Primacie and Authoritie of his, without any hinderance to his superio-

rity? Which being true, their err-
r or rather malice is discovered, who think, that none can be chief among the faithful Christians, because it is written: that he must be as a minister, that will be first or chief. See I pray you their wise discourse. Thus they reason.

To be a ruler, and as a younger, a chief gouvernour, and as a minister, are contrarie and repugnant one to another.

If that be true, how was Christ both a Lord and as one that ministr'd? A Master, and as it were a minister? A Lord by nature, a minister by subjection. It is not said, he that is the greater, let him be a servant, but: let him be as a minister. If it be so, that Christ being absolutely Lord of all, was also notwithstanding as a minister: how much more may the Apostles and their successors being not properly Lords in deed, but only for the time appointed rulers over Christ's family, be in that kind both gouvernours, and as servants?
of the Church.

1. Cor. 4:1.

Who for their faults deserveth the rod (as S. Paul speaketh) and as servants in the midst of them who deserveth praise. Gouernours indeed, and servants by humilitie, Gouernours in office, and servants in consideration of the good end and use of their office. But what need many woords? Doth not every good shepherde both rule his flock, and serue his flock? Doth he not judge between the fat sheep and the lean? Yeas verely. And Christ would have Bishops, even after the example of shepherdes, to be both rulers over men induced with reason, and also to serve them with their spiritual food. Now look by what reason one man being as it were Aries Dux gregis, a ram who guideth the flock, is chief Ruler over many men being as it were sheepe who follow him: by the same reason the very self same guide may (as it were a capitaine ram) be again in subiectio to another guide, as being his sheepe.
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Therefore as Bishops are governours over their particular flockes, and servitors unto them: so one superiour Bishop is both governour over many Bishops (as his one flock) and also servant unto them all. How sentenceously was it said of Pope Leo? Quis quibusdam sit eile prepositum, non moleste sceraliquum sibi esse praelatum. He that knoweth himself to be sette ouer some men, let him not disdain to have some man preferred before himselfe.

An Objection.

But some man will saie: They that beare rule and dominion euEn among the Gentils, doe serue their subiects, in that they provide to keep out their enemies, to eferue peace, to make lawes, and to punnish malefactors. Wherefore seing they have such a dominion, as maie be called a ministerie and service, not onely that dominion, which practiseth a tyrannical power, and hath confidence in his owne force, is inhibi-
of the Church. 49

ted to the Apostles and their sucess-
sours, but also al kinde of primacie. For
the clergy must be altogether unlike to
the temporal gouernours.

To answere this obiection, in very
deede I doubt not, but the end of that
dominion which is practised among the
gentils ought to be such, that it should
have a special eye to the preseration of
the commonweale. But because at the
first beginning Kings and Princes of
the earth had not that end either en-
ly or specially before their eys, but desig-
red that dominion, and practised it al-
so because it was a pleasaut and lord-
like pleasure to be a prince, and because
the most part of Princes are prone to
the worst, therefore our sauour Christ
considering that which was first, and
which happeneth most oftimes for-
biddeth his Apostles and bishops such
dominion and superiority as is used
among the Princes of the earth, and
not altogether such as ought to be a-

D among
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among them. Therefore it is not lawful for us to desire any primacie for the primacies sake, but for the travaile, labour, and end for which the primacie is ordained of Christ. For he that desireth the office of a bishop, desireth a good worke, and not a vaine honour.

Againe albeit it be true, that some worldly princes take the dominion and soueraintie upon them for the profite of the common weale, yet it is more that Christ requireth of his Apostles and Bishops, who are bound not onely to see unto the common weale, but to the Christian common weale, of which end no worldly princes could thinke, when Christ spake those words, because no Princes of the earth had receaued the faith of Christ at that time.

Wherefore that commaundement was specially geuen to the Apostles, that they shou'd direct their primacie and
and superioritie to the publick commoditie of faithfull men, and to the saluation of their soules, to edifie withall, 2 Cor. 8, and not to destroie.

Furthermore, albeit the King be faithfull and also vertuous for his own person, yet it is not the kingly, but the priestlie power, which God chose from the beginning to rule his people withall. For although by his almightie Rom. 13, goodnes he ordained the Royal power, and made the state of Kings to serve both his eternal purpose, and also the common weale, and willed even the faith- 1 Pet. 2, ful to obey them, as being sent of God, yet we reade not, that the making of Kings over Gods owne people at the first, came of God by the way of his mercifull grace and election, but by the way of his angrie permission, and injust judgement, in suffering thereby the paines of their great synnes to fall upon them.

So Nero, that strong hunter (the first Hebr. D),
first King that we read of) either
usurped his kingdom by force, or was
announced to it by evil men, without the
gracious appointment of God. And
When the people of Israel rejecting the
government of Samuel the priest,
Wold nedes have a King over them,
God accompted himself to be res-
pected of them: doubt not but because
it was a synneful thing to have a King,
but because it was a great dishonour to
God (who had appointed priests to go-
vern) to have his government changed.
And it was lesse profit for their sou-
dles to be ruled by a King, then by a
priest.

1.Reg.3. For albeit a priest may be also taught,
(as the sonses of Samuel were yet he
can never be so hurtful and slanderous
to eternal saluation, as the King may
be: partly because the state and (as the
world hath ever misjudged it) the right
and law of a King is to be secular and
lib. 4.c.2. Wordly, in so much that S. Gregorie said:
ea qux
ea quæ in iure regio continentur vitanda potius quàm imitāda præ dicuntur, the things which are contained in the law that concerneth the Kings, are foretold rather than they may be avoided, then folowed (whereas the law and state of a priest is to be spiritual and godly, and therefore it is always a more perfitt State and profession: partly also because the making of a King had his beginning from the fact and consent of men, working only according to the law of nations (allowed indeed by God) whereas the instituting of priestes came directly from God himself. And who doubteth but that it may be sōner abused whichmen by good reason ordeined, then that which God, aboue all course of reason, instituted by grace only? In so much that the Iewes being providèd for by God himself of a spiritual governement, did synne gresously and were forsaken of God concerning their act of choosin

d iij after-
afterward a temporal King, who shuld be aboue their high priest, whereupon Saint Gregorie faith: Merito se abscetum Dominus conqueritur, merito regiam dignitatem concedit indignatus. Tanta quidem erat iniquitas postulatum, vt cum illud peterent, per quod a Deo recederent, ex Dei iudicio permittisset, prohiberit non possedet. Our Lord did worthily lament himself to be abjected. He being offended, did unjustly grant the Royall dignitie. so great was the iniquitie of the desirers, that (when they desired that, whereby they should goe from God) by the judgement of God it might be permitted, but prohibited it could not be.

But on the other side the first institution of Priests came not to Gods people by their own invention, but directly from God himself, to Whome, A-bel, Noe, Abraham, Aaron and
of the Church.

his successors served in that office, by the gracious election of God, until Christ, fulfilling the figure of Melchizedek, instituted in his last supper the order of priesthood, according to the state of the new testament, giving power to his Apostles to make, and by that means to offer mystically his own body and blood, witnessing thereby how much more he gave them all manner of necessary or profitable power over the Church his mystical body.

For if his priests be so great, that they have taken power to make his own body with their holy mouth (as Saint Hierom speaketh) shall now any man disdain, to be under that order, which God hath so excellently honoured? This much may be said for the whole order of priesthood.

But after that the Apostles were made Priests, he ordained...
Saint Peter the general pastour and high bishop of his whole flock, and he did it with such protestation of love and charitie, that it must needs be confessed, even by the despisers of Christes institutio, that there was never lightely any act don in this world by the son of God, with shewing of greater love toward mankind, then at what tyme he himself in his own person appointed us a pastour and shepheard.

Now this pastour being thus greater then the rest, is not only primate in a far other sort then the Kings of the unfaithfull nations, but also in a far more excellent kinde, then the Christian Kings are. For to what Christian King did Christ ever say, As my father sent me I send thee, or, upon this rock I will build my Church, or, doest thou love me more then these: feede my shepe, feede my lambs?

And yet is a King aboue priests,
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yea above the high pastour of Christes flock? he is so in dede with them, who make lesse accoempt of Christes beauly institution and Officer, then of him that was first made either by the necesitie of Wordly calamities to kepe away a greater evil from the common weale, or els by the wanton and proud affection of earthly men, ambitiously af-fecting tyrannical power.

Let no man thinck that I despise the authoritie of Kings (God forbid) but thei are a good thing brought in mercifully sumwhere to slaye violent injuries and robberies, and other where permitted of God for our just punishment, and not any like thing to that divine order of pastours, which Christ ordeined purposely for our re-conciliation to God the father, and for the avoarding of aliust punishment otherwise deserved.

It was a King (as Saint Gregorie note th) who divided the ten tribes from
from the Churche of God, and made to be idolatours, who so greedely preferred his government before the government of the priests. And are we now in the same case, who for greediness to reiect the Vicar of Christ, are come to preferre the secular and temporall power before the spiritual? the body before the soule, and earth before heaven?

I. Reg. lib. 4. c. 1. Nonnulli (saith Saint Gregory) intantum dementiæ malum proficiunt, ut commovere ipsum etiam statum Ecclesiasticum culminis non vereantur. There are some who are come to so great madness, that they are not afraid to move (and trouble) even the state itself of the Ecclesiastic (toppe, or) highest dignitie of the Churche. And a little after.

Ibidem. His autem qui viuebant sub spiritali regimine, Regem petere, quid alium est, quäm eandem spiritali.
ritalem prælacionem in secula rem dominationem transferre ge-
stire?

For those that did live under the spiritual government, to require a King, what other thing is it, then to go about to transfer the same spiritual pre-
lateship (or government) into a temporal dominion?

If any man would deeply weigh with himself, that God chose such a secret and extraordinary way to save mankind, that no creature could work it beside his own Almighty Sonne, and that he comming into the world, was so farre from working his purpose by Kings and princes, that whereas it was most easie for him to have made many Kings and Princes at the beginning to beleue in him, he rather chose the weakest things of the world to confound the strong things, and wrought the beginning and increase of his Church

1 Cor. ii
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Church by the misbesiefe and persecution of princes: if he would be think himself, how farre the poorety and humilitie of the Kingdome of heaven is from the pompe and wordly distraction of Kings (Yea though thei be Christian and good also) he wold much wonder what sense in holy matters thei haue, Who dare make that princely state supreme head of the Church, which of al states came last to the faith, and the pomp whereof is most contrary (of all other degrees) to the profession of the same.

And yet what are they who persuade this matter? verely those who hauing justly reproved some lewd and proud bishops for their wordly pompe, afterward set up Kings in the bishops places, yea above them also, as though any King had lesse wordly pompe then the bishops. Tea they also doe it, who, protesting thei will beleue nothing but the expresse word of God, yet beleue Kings
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Kings to be the heads of the Church, which they not only can not find in God's word, but they rather finde there, that God was angrie, when the government of the highe priest was rejected, and a kingly government called for.

Moreover ye by this precept (the Kings of the nations haue dominion over them, it shall not be so among you), not only all tyrannical or lordly power of life and death, but also at spiritual primacie and superioritie be forbidden to the Apostles over the whole militant Church, it is forbidden likewise, that there should be any superior in any one part of the Church. For the parts (according to their degree) are of the same nature whereof the whole is. Therefore if the whole militant body may have no one head, much lesse any part thereof may have a head.

If then no Apostle may be superior or primate in any parte of the Church, much
much lesse any other Christian, who is inferior to an Apostle, may be supreme governour in any one part of the same Church. But every King in that behalf, as he is a Christian, is inferior to the Apostles (for he is both taught his faith of them, and baptized by them, and in spiritual matters he must be guided by them) therefore seeing the King may not be supreme governour of any parte of Christes Church, in that respect as he is a Christian, if yet he shall be supreme head of his own Christian realm by any meanse at all, it must be by that power, which he either had before his Christianity, or beside it. For by his Christianity it is not possible, that he should have any greater power then the Apostles had, who were sent into the world with Christes authority.

If then a King be supreme governour of the Church (where he is a King) besides his Christianity, he is no otherwise supreme governour thereof, then any
of the Church.

Ethnik prince might have be. And so it is brought to passe by the doctrine of the Protestats, that an insidial King hath supreme power to vitiate, to reforme, to correct, and to depose any bishop within his own realm. The which argument whè Antichrist, or the great Turk shal make unto the Protestats, they must nedesyed unto it, and grant him to be supreme head of their Church. Be it so, of their Church, but the Catholickes shal stil keepe them under the spiritual gouvernement of the bishops and pastours which Christ hath instituted.

To enter one degree farther in this matter, let vs graunt, that some King were so pit, so poore in spirit, so chaste, so liberal, as ever any bishop or priest was required to be in Gods law: can he yet baptize, can he cosecrate Christes body, can he forsewe synnes, can he preache, can he excommunicate, can he blesse the people, can he judge of doctrine by his kingiy authority? If he can not doe these things a King can not doe.
these things, how can he above them (concerning these causes, who have receaued comission of God to doe all these things? It is not possible for a man to have the supreme government in all Ecclesiastical causes by lawful power and right, but that he should thereby have also power and right, to execute any of those things which belong to such Ecclesiastical causes as are under his government. Mark the point.

I say not he is bound to execute every such matter as falleth under his government or that it is decent for him to doe it: but that he may doe it, and hath right and power to doe it, if he be rightly the supreme governour in that behalf. For example: the King who is supreme governour in the civil and temporal causes, hath under him Judges, shrines. majoris, Capitains and constables. If his majestie will pleae the judge in Westminster hal, or the shrine in any sessions, or the Capitain in warre, he surely

An example in civill Masters.
suerelie may doe it concerning the right of his Kingdome. Yea he lacketh no right nor lawfull power to play the Sol-
diour, the Tailour, the Mason, Car-
pen ter, or Tanner, albeit he perhappes
doe lacke the cunning or experience
to exercise or practifie those Artes,
so as they ought to be practised.

Likewise an Archbishopp or Pri-
mate, Who hath Bishoppes, Arche-
deacons, Officials, Priestes, and Clerks
under him, may by right of his Su-
periorie baptize anie childe, blesse or
gene benediction, burie the dead, ap-
prove their last Wils by his own fect,
help a Priest to Masse, cary the crosse
in procesion,digge the graue, and to be
shorte, he maie doe anie thing which
anie man may doe, who is under his
jurisdiction.

If then the king haue the right and
power of Supreme gouernement in al
Ecclesiastical causes, seing it belongeth
to the right and power of Ecclesiastical
Causes
causes that a man may preach, baptize, bless, or geue benediction to the people, and administer the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, and binde or loose synnes. It must needs be, that the King even by that his supremacy should also have power and right to preach, to baptize, to geue benediction, to administer the sacrament of Christ's supper, and to binde or loose synnes.

A farther declaration.

I say not that he by his supremacy hath cunning either, to preach or to baptize, or to geue benediction, or to administer the sacrament of Christ's supper, or to play the tailor or the mason: but that no law, right, and power doth, or can forbid him to doe these things, if in these things he be the supreme governour. So that if he otherwise had cunning, he might with praise no lesse preach and baptize, and geue benediction or administer the sacrament of Christ's supper, then he might build a howse with his own hâds, or cutte
or cutte a garment, if he were cunning therein.

But now if all the world confesse, that a King by his kinglie office doth not only lack knowledge, but also hath no right or power at all to preache, to baptize, to give benediction, or to consecrate the sacrament of Christes supper, yea although otherwise he be most cunning and excellently lerned: (except he have the office of a priest also gaven him, and be lawfullie sent and authorised by the imposition of the hand of priesthood) doubtlesse it ought to be confessed, that a King by his kinglie office hath no right or supreme power at all in Ecclesiastical causes (unlesse it be committed to him from the bishop.) And that, as well because he of him self cannot practise those causes, though he wold, (as even our adversaries confess) as also, because his power (be it never so roial) reacheth not so high, as the power of spiritual governmët appointed.
by Christ, doth. And surely no man by the commission which he only hath to rest or to prison men, make also hang them or burn them. For the lesser authority doth not comprehend the greater.

Say now, M. Horn, whether to celebrate our Lords supper, and to preache Gods word and to absolve or bind sins, it be a lesser or a greater minisery, the Kings authoritie? If it be lesser, you have reason on your side. For then a greater, power may comprehend it, being the lesser. But if it be incomparable greater to minister unto men the heavenly Sacraments, then to minister justice in temporal things, if that be a higher power which toucheth the soule then that which only toucheth the body, then by what means extend you the commission of a King (which hath to do with lesse matters) not only to the commission of a Priest, but also above it?

You bring many examples cuii appli-
ed to make an appearance of somewhat.
But they al concerne matters of fact, which are for many circumstances subject to much wrangling. But either it was no good Prince, who medled of his own authority, with disposing holy matters. Or if he were otherwise good, that deed was not good, Or if he did it well, he did it by commission from a Prophet or from a high Priest, Or he was deceived by flatterers, Or else being forced by necessity, which is under no law, he only sought the public peace in that his deed, and not to set himself ordinarily above the spiritual government. For howsoever the deeds of men be uncertain, deceitful, and unknown in all their particular circumstances, the word of God cannot fail, which saith to Peter and to other Bishops after him, Feed my sheep.

Here I ask whether the King or Emperor, who is christened, be Peter's sheep or no? If he be not, he is not only not above the Church, but he is not at all of the Church. If he be his
Sheepe, then I say boldly, that as it is against the law of nature (which never can be wholly changed) for a shepe to rule his shepheard (in anie manner of such sort, wherein he is the shepheard) even so it is utterly impossible for anie King or Prince to be in anie respect of Ecclesiastical government, above his own pastrate, who soever he be for the time.

And yet further to make this matter more plaine, be it that a Christian King doth take upó him the supreme government in Ecclesiastical matters. What if a bishop being called before him, say boldly (as S. Ambrose in a like case did) may it please your maiestie to commaund my goods, my iadis, my body, my life, it shalbe at your commaundement. But as for the ordering and governing of my bishoprike, I will not yeld it to you, because Christ (and not your maiestie) committed the same to me: What could that Christian King doe to that bishop
bishop more the Nero or Traian might have done? Could he excommunicate him by his royal power? Mr. Born will not say so. What is it the which he could doe? might he putte him in prison? so might Nero, and also the great Turk.

By this meanes it appeareth, that the King be he never so much christened, hath yet no power ouer the Bishops soule. And yet all spiritual and ecclesiasticall power toucheth the soule. Therefore the King hath no spiritual power ouer the bishop at all. Si vel scriptus rarum seriem divinarum, vel vetera tempora retrahimus, quis est qui abnuer in causa, in causa, inquam, fidei Episcopos solere de Imperatoribus, non Imperatores de Episcopos iudicare? If we call to mind, either the proccesse of holy scripture, or the auncient tymes, who can denie, but that in a cause of faith, in a cause, I say, of faith bishops are not to judge of Christian Emperours, and
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not Emperours of Bishops.

If then the King haue no Spiritual power over the Bishop, how shall he correct or depose the Bishop, according to any spiritual or ecclesiastical process of judgement? Shall he cause a Synod of Bishops to be gathered, that therin he may depose the said disobedient Bishop? Put case the Synod find him not worthy to be deposed, or els wil not depose the said Bishop? How can the King come to exercise yet any spiritual power upon the Bishop? You will say, he shall constrain the Synod to depose him. Where with I pray you? By the spiritual sword, or by the temporal? Not by the spiritual, for it was never committed to the king, that whose finnes he should retaine, they should be retained.

If then he shal obteine his purpose by the temporal sword, who seeth not, that the last resolution of the kings power is upon his temporal and secular jurisdiction, which he should have had, though
though he had not ben a Christian. Therefore S. Augustine finding many times great fault with the Donatists, because they appealed from the judgment of Bishops to the Emperor, calleth even Constantine, who was then a christian Prince, terrenū regem, an earthly king. Datus fíbi Episcopos iudices apud terrenū rege accusavit. They accused the Bishops, who were assigned to be their judges before an earthly King. For albeit he was a Christian, yet his Kinglie power was earthlie, in respect of that heavenly power, which Christ brought with him, and gave to his Disciples. What doe I stande about the woordes of menne?

A most plaine demonstration of the dignity of high priests above the dignitie of faithful princes even in the sight of God, is to be seen in the olde Testament. Where God (who is no parcial Judge) assigneth a sacrifice for the syn of every
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of every degree of men according to their dignitie even at his own altar. And first he beginneth with the highest priest saying: Si Sacerdos, qui vult peccauerit, delinquere Sebastianum populum, offeret pro pecceato suo vitulum. If the priest which is anointed shall sinne, causing the people to sinne, he shall offer a calf for his sinne.

The second degree is not the prince, but the whole people. Quod si omnisturba filiorum Israel ignoraet rint, offeret pro peccato suo vitulum. If the multitude of the children of Israel do amisse by ignorance, it shall offer a calf for his sinne.

After these two degrees cometh in the Princes place, si peccauerit princeps, offeret hostiam coram Domino, hircum etc. If the prince shall sinne, he shall offer a hee gote in sacrifice before the Lord. Behold the prince is not only in the third place, both behind
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hind the highe priest, and behinde the whole multitude, but also his sacrifice is of lesse value, and of a baser condition the theirs. For a kee gote was not so honourable a sacrifice, as a yong ox or a calse.

The fourth degree is, that if one of the common people synne, he shall offer as heegote. Of this matter Philo writeth thus: Decebat principem privato homini præferrri vel in sacrificio, sicut principi populi, quoniam doquidem totum est sua parte maius. Pontificem vero æquiparari populo in expiatione impetrans sumpsit peccator venia. Habetur tibi is honor pontifici, non propter ipsum, sed quia minister est populi, publicè vota faciens soluenda tuis gentis nomine. It became the prince to be preferred before a private man even in the sacrifice, as also the people to be preferred before the prince, because the whole is greater than
then the part. But it became the bishop, to be made equal with the people, in purging and in obtaining pardon of his sines. Howbeit that honor is given to the bishop not for his own sake, but because he is the minister of the people, making his prayers or vows public likely to be performed in the name of the whole nation. Marke the comparison, the prince is a minister of the people, as well as the bishop. But because the bishop is a minister in holy matters, he is preferred before the prince.

In Leuit. quarte. Theodoreus also writeth thereof:
Docet quanta sit sacerdotii dignitas, quam vniuerso populo parem facit. Principem autem qui pratergregatus fuerit legem aliquam, non vitulum, sed circum, aut capru an
cicum offerre iubet; tam procul abest a sacerdotii dignitate is, cui corporei imperii cōmillum est. (God) doth teach how great the dignity of
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of priesthood is, which (dignity) he made equal with the whole people. But he com-
mandeth the prince that shall trans-
gresse any lawe, not to offer a calf, but a
be gote of one yeres age. So farre is he,
to whom corporall power is committed,
behind the priestly dignitie.

If then the whole people be above
the Prince (as who are habile to choose
and to make a Prince, when one lack-
eth) and yet the bishop be equal with
the whole people, and also be set be-
fore it in the order of the law (as being
made by God himself, and not habile to
be made by the people, because they can
not consecrate a bishop or give him spiri-
tual power.) What impudency is this,
to teache, that a prince by his own right
and power maie visse, judge, correct
and depose a bishop, who is now well
seene to be farre greater in the light
of God, then the King himself? Let this
much suffise to shew that the Bishoplie
or pastor all authoritie of the Church
is not
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is not only distinetc fra the tyrannical kingdom of the unfaithful nations, but also from the moderate reign of whatever ever Kings, though they be christened.

One thing now is briefly to be touched, that, notwithstanding many Bishops be evil, and use not their office well, yet they lose it not thereby, but still we are bound by Christes commaundement to do the things, not which they doe, but which they say and teach to be done. For as S. Augustine teacheth, they that sitte in the chaire of unity (which I will prove hereafter to be the chaire of S. Peter) are constrained to teach the doctrine of unity.

And in deed whereas the office or power is one thing, and the use there of an other thing, seing the office is given before it be used, the evil use of it which insueth afterward, can not make void the former power: And so without
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out al question, the substance of the
Primacie remaineth safe and sure in
the Apostles and their successors, al-
though they practice not their Primacie
in such sort as they ought to doe.

Whereupon it followeth, that it is
starke false and ungodly, that these me
teach, saying, not only that all primacie
is forbidden in the Church of Christe,
but also that they leese their Primacie,
who ceasing to preach, doe abuse their
office. For they indeed leese the me-
rite of their Primacie, but not the self
Primacie, so long as the Church doth
tolerate and permit them in their pla-
ces. Otherwise Caiphas being so evil
a man as he was, had not been the Bi-
shop of that yeare, which yet the Go-
spel sheweth to have been otherwise.

As concerning (which some are
wont to object) that the Bishoppe of
Rome doth not governe as a Pastor, but
doth beare a seuerainsie as Princes of
the world, it hath no colour of truth,
Whether they respect the manner of coming by this primacy, or the order in practising the jurisdiction of it.

1. First of all, no man succeedeth into that Chaire by any right of inheritance, which is a common mean to get Domition among worldly princes.

2. Secondarilie, that Chaire is not obtained by any right of battaile, or lawe of Armes, neither when it is voide, it is permitted to him, that can first possesse it, but it is given onely by election.

3. Besides, neither child nor woman, nor infidel, nor catechumen or learner of the faith, can be chosen to be bishop of Rome, or of any other citie, which is farre otherwise in worldly Kingdomes.

Lastly, although the faithful people and the princes also may erane, desire and require a pastoure or Bishop, and may geve their consent to the choice of him, yet the right to choose as well the
of the Church.

the bishop of Rome as all other pastours, apperteyneth only to ecclesiastical persons, as whose dutie it is by Gods law to place and make priests in the cities and Churches where need is, to fede, to rule, to confirm, or to displace, or trasfer, and generally to provide for the flock, as Paulus, Barnabas, Titus and other bishops have doe, whereas the right of choosing a Prince (where he is made by election) may as well or much more apperteyne to the common people, being the body of the realme, then to the clergie or to the nobilitie alone.

When the bishop of Rome is thus chosen (that I may omitt his temporal dominion, which is but an accessorie to his bishopsrie) doubtlesse in his Ecclesiastical government he useth not that force and power which worldlie Princes doe. Hee compelleth no man by violence (no not so much as the Iewes that live in Rome) to baptism, or to embrace the catholike faith.
faith of Christ. Whereas worldly princes may justly enforce the people whom they have under them, both to obey their lames, and to live after their cu-

6. Moreover the bishop of Rome (as bishop) never punisheth any of them with the material sword, who after baptism forsake the Church, but only with ecclesiastical censures. And to them also he cometh very slowly, and teacheth, that men must have recourse unto them none otherwise, then to a medicine. For albeit he both plainlie affirmeth, that hereticks are worthy of all punishment, yea of violent death it self (and that according to Gods word) yea although he permitteth, and also (where he hath any temporal dominion) procureth schismatiques and heretes to be punished with death, (partlie because they are themselves unworthy to live for their own he-

Deut.13.
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not infect others with their words, 2. Tim. 2. which crepe and fect like a cancer) yet notwithstanding he doth it not by himselfe, nor by others as a bishop and pastor of Christes flock, but he doth it by the ministerie of others, as a temporal prince and lord, even as Moyses Psal.98. being one of the Priests of our Lord, was also master of the civil governement, and a disposer of warre and peace, as who commanded Ioseue to fight against Amalech, and to be his successor in the civil governement.

Now whereas the Protestants deny Moyses to have been a priest, and that by pretense of the Hebrew text, they stake therein against the express word of God, and against the most auncient and best learned Fathers.

The word of God saith: Moyses & Aaron in sacerdotibus eius. Moyses and Aaron are among the priests of the Lord, the Hebrew word is cohanim, the Greeke ἵππωρ, the Latin, sacerdo- F山谷 tibus,
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tibus, which is to say, those who make sacrifice. S. Augustine reasoneth that he was Sacerdos, a Scaccifer, because whereas he was in all authority and power the very greatest among the Israelites, yet he could not be Mayor facers, dote, greater than he that hath power to sacrifice.

S. Hierom (being I am sure as good an Hebrician, as M. Novel) in his booke against Iousinian, groundeth the Priesthood of Moses upon the same test of the Psalmes, making a differesse between Samuel the Leuite, and Moses and Aaron, who were Bishops or high Priests.

In oratio - S. Gregorie Nazianzene is of the ne de modo same domicile ye a Dionysiuse Areopagi- se & Aar. ta confesseth Moses to have been Pris De Eccles, mum legallium sacerdotum mys

Hierar, stem ac ducem, The first cunning ma

65. after and guid of the Priests of the law, qui fratem Aaron ad sacerdotalemunus ingenies, sub Deo principec facer-
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facerdotelam consecrationem pontificabiliter consummavit. Who
anointing his brother Aaron to the
Priestlie office (under God the chief
of al) finished the Priestly consecra-
tion, ἵψαξώσθη, Bishoplike, or as
Bishops are wont to doe.

Philo Judæus writing three bokes
of Moses life, and having spoken be-
devita fore of his authoritie in civil matters, Mosis.
speaketh in the third of his Priesthood,
which he could not justly doe, except
he had been a Priest. But what neede
many woordes? What thing doth in
all the world belong to a Priest’s office,
which Moses did not? He toke the law
of God, ad taught it the people, he pre-
ached to them, he consecrated the high
Bishop with his own hands, he erected
an altar, and offered publike sacrifice,
he did poure the bloud upon the Altar,
and sprinkled the garment of Aaron
with it. And yet did he al these Priest-
lie offices, being himselfe no Priest?

Exod. 28, 29.
I marwile that neither the letter of God's word, nor the reason, and as it were, the soul thereof, nor the authority of wise and learned men can move the Protestants to confess that Moses was in dede a priest and a sacrificer. But if it be cleare, that he was both a priest and a civil governour, using the priestlie office in his own person, and prescribing to others when they shuld fight, or punish malefactours: much more in the tyme of the new Testament, which must needs be as perfit a state as the old law, it is lawful for a bishop, to haue the right of both offices in him, governing the Ecclesiastical state by his own personal ministry and the outward cares by the help of wise men. Quiquis regi dis fratibus presf, vacare fun ditus a curis exterioribus non postest, sed tamen curandum magnos pere est, ne ab ipsis immoderato deprimatur. Who sooner is set to rule his brethren, he cannot utterly be noide of exter-
external cares. But it is diligently to be provided, that he be not over pressed with them.

But concerning the Ecclesiastical state, whereby I speak at this time, the bishop of Rome neither condemneth any man for heresie or schisme to corporal death in his own person, nor teacheth, that any malefactor may be so condemned of any other ecclesiastical person. Which thing being not rightly understood of the most part of men hath made them affirm, that the bishop of Rome in matters of faith persuadeth his religio with fire and sword. Which to be farre otherwise, both the whole body of the Canon law declareth, and also experience testifieth.

To goe forward with our matter, this is the greatest difference betweene the primacie of the Church, and the dominion of worldly princes, that the temporal princes have power only over the bodies, whereas the rulers of the Church
Math. 18. 1. Cor. 5.

Church, have power upon mens soules. They gyue the bodies of wicked men to corporal death, these have power to cleanse the soules, and so to bring them to everlasting salvation.

Whereupon Saint Chrysfom saith: Habent etiam terreni Principes vinculi potestatem, verum cor porum solum. Id autem quod dis co facerdotum vinculum ipsam etiam animam contingit, atque ad coelos vsque peruadit. The earthlie princes have power to bind, also, but only of the bodies. But the bad of the priests whereof I speake, doth touche the very soule, and reacheth euern to the hea uens. And not without a cause. For

Math. 16.

our Lord said to Saint Peter: To thee I will geue the keyes of the kingdom of heauen: and whate soever thow bindest upon the earth, shalbe bound in the heas uens, and whatsoever thow loos est upon the earth, shalbe loosed in the
in the heavens.

To these words of Christ (which are derived to the Bishop of Rome by means of the chair of Saint Peter) the said bishop referreth all his power: and exerciseth it upon the souls of me both in his own person, and by others, *Leo ep. 52* who are called to susteine part of the Ecclesiastical care and charge that is committed chiefely unto him, whereas notwithstanding, the Princes of the world appeale not to the lawe of the Gospell, neither in getting, nor in governing, nor in establishing their Dominion and power.

Last of all, this is to be inquired and considered, whether the Bishop of Rome doth rule with such pietie, lenitie, affection, and desire to helpe others, and to bring them to Christ, that he may seeme to minister and to serue, rather then to rule. And in good sooth, if he doth it not, as it is certain that he synneth
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syrmeth greuorlie; so (for any such respect) he leseth not his primacie, because the humilitie and mercie of the governour doth not so much appertaine to the substance of his authoritie, as to the true perfection and merite of the man.

For like as they that preached Christ through enuiie and emulatio (that they might raise adversitie to S. Paule, who was in Prison) were notwithstanding true preachers, albeit they preached with an euill intent and minde: so albeit the bishop of Rome did rule like a potentate, and did seake his own glorie, and not the glorie of God, yet thereof it can not be brought to passe, that he is not a true ruler and governour of the Church. But it wold weel follow that he were an euill ruler. Of which sort of men our Lord hath said: Do those things which they say, but doe not those things which they doe.

But what arrogant presumption is this...
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this, to thinck that the Pope doth good
deedes with an evill minde? If he geue
gentle answeres to them that in mat-
ters of dout, if he his counsell, if he send
forth good decrees, if he reconcile such
as are at variaunce, if he provide care-
fulie for the necessarie affaires of the
Church, whie doe we judge evil of that
which is well done? Or if he doth evil
at any tyme, what maleice is it to scorne
at his nakedesse, and with laughter
to discouer his shame?

It is evident to all that Will see, that
the bishop of Rome doth shew that hu-
imilitie and Zeale, which Christ requi-
reth in the ruler of his Church. He cal-
leth vs nor bondslaves, nor seruaunts,
nor subjectes, but all Princes he salueth
gentle, as sones, and bishops, as bre-
thren. And as for his owne person,
he writeth not himself, neither Lord,
neither universall bishop, nor head of
the Church, but seruaunt of the ser-
uaunts of God. That euen by his
name
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name he may gene al men to under
stand, that he is that greatest and chefe ruler, who is, as it were, a mis
nister and seruaut.

And seing he doth and saith that, which becometh the primate of the Church both to say, and to doe, it is our parte to judge his well doing, by that which is well said, rather then to synne against the holie ghost, whiles we desire to wrest that to an euill sense ma-
litiouslie, which was spoken and meant by him charitablie.

Of the
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Of the diverse senses which are in the holy scripture and namely about these words (upon this rock I wili build my Church) and which is the most literal and proper sense of them.

The third Chap.

Among manie other things, wherein God's word passeth all other sciences, one is most notable, in that not only the syllables and words which are written there, doe express the meaning of the holy Ghost, but also the things, which are told and reported by those words, doe againe signifie and meane an other thing. We reade that Abraham had two sonnes, the one born of Sara the freewoman, the other of Agar the handmaiden. Which historie being true in very deed according as the words doe sound, doth againe signifie unto us a more deepe mysterie.

The son of Sara doth betoken the new testament, or the promise of God made
made to his true children by adoption:
and Agar doth betoken the old testament, no lesse, than if it had been so written in express words. Likewise, whereas David faith that the sound of the heavens is gone forth into all the earth, meaning, that all men may by the very order and course of the heavens see the glory of God. S. Paul doubted not by the heavens to understand the Apostles and Preachers: whose sound he teacheth, to have gone over all the earth.

So that the New Testament was gotten and printed in the old, not only according to the Prophecies there, which are fulfilled here, but also according to the figures there, which are verified here. And so the justice of God is marvellously revealed from faith to faith, from Patriarches and Prophets to the Apostles and their disciples, from the law to the Gospel, from Moses to Christ, to th'end they should be inex-...
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cusible, who beholding such a divine
kind of writing, wherein things and
deeds were ordained to be, as words
and letters unto us, would yet remain
in their incredulitie.

If then out of one sentence diverse
ture meanings may be gathered. We
must know farther, that both those mea-
nings are not alike principal, but one of
them is the foundation and ground of
the other. And therefore although
both be found, as it were, in one build-
ing, yet being the one is before the oth-
er (at the least in the order of place)
we must exactly know, which is the first
meaning of the twaine. Else we can
never be sure of the seed, as the which
lacketh a sufficient ground to state upon.

The first meaning is that, which the Hieron. in
holy Ghost uttereth according to the Amos 6.4
first sense of the words: the which is
now called Literal, because it ariseth of
the written letter rightly understand-
ed. The other sense, which is buil-
ded
ded thereupon, is called spiritual, because it is known rather by the spirit of
God, then by the sound of the written letter. Now it skillett so much to know
which is the literal, and which is the spiritual sense of holy scripture, that
the Literal sense is onely of force to convince any adversarie withal, who
belongeth Gods word, whereas the spiritual sense (except it be revealed by
the holy Ghost) is such, as may be easilie denied, because it hath no sufficient
ground appering outwardly to man. For
there may be many spiritual senses ge-
uen of some one sentence, and it is ever
uncertain, which speciallie of them all
is meant of God in that place.

The literal sense of holy scripture is
that, which is first meant by the holy
Ghost, not alwaies according to the græ-
matical sound, but according to the
most plaine meaning of the speaker. For
example, when Christ faith unto Pe-
ter: To thee I wil giue the keies of the
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the kingdom of heauen, the literal meaning is not, that Peter should receive any material keyes of iron or of brasse. But by the keyes (according to the phrase of holy scripture) is meant the power, authority and right which Christ wиль гене Peter in his Church. For as they, who haue the keyes of a house, may by right open or shut the dores of that house: so Peter hath right and power, to open or shutte the kingdom of heauen to vs.

And as the delivering of the keyes of a citie among men, doth betoke the giving of the possession of that City to be governed by him, who receiueneth the keyes: euen so Peter hath the militant Church, as it were, committed to his government in this life by Christ. So that the literal sense is, I wil geue thee the power and authority to govern my Church for the saluation of soules.

Likewise when it is said, t'ou art Peter, I call not the literall sense, 

G thow
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thou art a rock or a great stone, but thou art that toward my Church, which a stone is toward the house that is built upon that stone.

It is farther to be considered, that the literal sense being once agreed upó, there lyeth hidden in that sense manie times another more profound sense also, the which is not directly and plainly uttered, but it is inferred and gathered by the force of argument. God hath ben called of old time the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob. Neither doth any man dout of the first meaning of those words, which is, that God acknowledgeth himself to have chosen those three men to his servants, and doth witness, that they did in deede serve him.

But that in these words there lyeth hidden a strong argument, to prove the resurrection by that, I say, dependeth of the literal sense also, but not such as is sense straight waies, but onlie it is conceaue
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cenad by discurs[e. For God is not
the God of dead things. But he is
God of Abraham: therefore Abraham
is not dead. Abraham is a man con-
sisting of body and soul. If Abraham
then live and yet his body be dead, his
body must rise againe, to the God maie
justly be called the God of whole A-
bram. ergo in that God is called the
God of Abraham it is shewed (by dis-
course) that the bodies of men shalbe
reised to life againe.

After this sort the consubstan-
tiality of Christ with God the Father
maie be well proved out of the holy
scriptures. Item the perenual virgi-
nic of our Ladie, transubstantiation,
the sacrifice of the mass, purgatorie and
divers other matters, which be not di-
 stiffly named there.

At the length to come to our pur-
pose, there are found in the auncient fa-
thers at the left foure diverse senses
of these words, uppon this rock I will
build
build my Church: of the which those
onlie are of force to prove anything by,
Which are literal.

The first is, that the Church is meat
to be built upon Christ. And that S.
Augustine doth follow, as a probable
sense, but not as the only sense. For that
in deede, but more also is meant in this
place.

The second is, that every Disciple of
Christ is the rock whereupon the Church
is built; and that being the sense of Origenes,
is only spirituall, and therefore of no
great force to prove anything by.

The third is, that Peters faith or con-
fession is this rock whereupon the Church
is built, which is a true sense, but it is
not at the whole sense of those words.

The fourth and perfitt sense is, that
Peter concerning his office in Gods Chur-
che, that is to say, through the promise
of Christ which is past, and the faithful
confession of his godhead, which is pre-
sently made, and the power of feedig his
sheepe
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Shepe, which then was to come, is this rock upon which the Church is built.

The first sense can not be all the whole sense, because then all the other three senses were void. For if the Church be meant to be only built upon Christ, then is the Church built neither upon the faith of Peter, nor upon Peter himself, nor upon any disciple of Christ.

Again the word (thou) which goeth before, doth not well agree with Christ, but only with Peter. Neither doth the word, I will build, which followeth after, well agree with Christ alone. For it were not properly said at Cesarea where Christ then was, I will build my Church upon Christ, upo whome it had been already built from the time of his incarnation.

Concerning the second sense, no Disciple of Christ is there literallie either spoken unto, or spoken of, beside Simon the Sonne of Iona. Therefore the sense of Origen hath no
sufficient ground in the letter of God's word.

Thirdlie the faith, which Peter hath confessed, is not the onlie rokke, whereupon the Church hath been built. For the it had been built, upon the faith of John Baptist before this tyme. Againe seing the said faith hath been already confessed by Peter himself saying: Thou art Christ the Sonne of the Living God, to what purpose is the building yet also differed? Why is it said; I will build my Church upon this Rocke, and not rather, I have built it, or I do build it upon this Rocke?

For if two things only are necessary, the one, which maie be the Rocke or foundation, which is nowe said to be faith, the other, which is the building of the Church upon that Rocke: seing the foundation is alreadie laid, in that the faith is confessed: And seing the Church is present (for Christ even the had a Church of his owne) why is the

John 2.
building yet putte of, untill an other tyme, but that there is an other thing beide faith requisite to the same building?

But if (as the very truth is) Peter himselfe, concerning his office, be pronounced this Rocke, and that not only in respect of his faith (although it be a very principal point) but also in respect both of the promise past, wherein it was said (though (nah be called Peter) and of the authoritie of feeding Christes sheepe, which is to come: then all absurdities are avoided and all the former truths are perfislie conteined in this last sense).

For if Peter be this rocke, then Christ who made Peter to be this Rocke, is much more proued thereby to be the rock himselfe, for the gener of any heauenly power hath much more that power in himselfe, then he that receaueth it. If Peter be this Rocke in respect of his confession, then his confession.
being in himself, is also coexisting (as a certain rock for his part) unto the building of the Church. If Peter be the Rock, seing he was not only a Disciple, but the captain Disciple of all that ever were: all other Disciples, which are contained in him as in the chief, may also be (for their part) this rocke, whereupon the Church shalbe built.

Seing then this last sense is moste persif, and conteineth al the other senses, not being it selfe fully conteined in any of them, out of al controuersie none other is so literal, so ful, so true, as this, to witte, that Peter, confessing the true faith, with respect of such autoritie, as shalbe afterward geuen to him, is this Rocke, whereupon the Church shalbe built. I wis in the sight of God that, malice being layd apart, any reasonable man would nowe consider, what M. Jewel and his adherents have done in this behalfe.

He forsaking the most literal sense of
of all, and mingling three opinions (of these foure) in one, not regarding to sette euerie thing in his proper place, doth secke to confound the Reader with the multitude of words, and with the name of the Fathers, whom he moste shamefully abuseth.

But if there be truth in M. Jewel, or in his adherents, lette him or none of them descend particularlie to discusse the meaning of Christ, with all circumstances belonging therunto, as by God's grace I will do to my poore ability. And that the discourse, which followeth, may be the more easily perceaued, this is the somme of it.

My intent is to prove, that not only Christ, nor onlie the faithful confession of Peter, but Peter himselfe with respecte of his confession, and of such other authoritie as God gave him, was this Rocke, wherevpon Christ said he would build his Churche, meaning that part
part of his Church which wandereth in this life.

1. Christ promised Simon, that he should be called Peter, when he had not yet confess'd, to thend he might confess the more strongly as a rocke.

2. He named him Peter before he had confessed; so that he was this farre forward in being the rocke before his confession.

3. When he had confessed, Christ pronounced him not only a rock, or a ma of the steadfastnes of the propriety of a rock in his faith, but also such a rock, whereupon he wold build his Church. For every Apostle was a rock in his kind, but none beside Peter and the Successours in his office was this kind of Rocke, whereof Christ now speaketh.

4. That the confession of Peter might tarie immovable after Christes ascension (for the Church should alwaies neede a visible rock) Christ praised for Peters faith, even so farre that he was bid
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bidde to strengthen his brethern after his conversion from the denial of Christ.

Last of all, to shew what kind of strength Peter should gene to his brethern, Christ had him feede his lambs.

The promise of the name of Peter was the first cause of Peters being the Rocke.

The giving of the name was the performance of the promise.

The confession of Christes godhead was the fruit of the gift, and of the promise.

The promise to have the Church built upon that Rock, was the reward of the confession.

The prayer of Christ for Peters faith, was the warrant of the perpetuitie of his strong confession.

The power to feede Christes sheepe was to make Peter such a rock, as should stay up his Church by teaching and ruling the faithfull, as whole voice the sheepe.
Sheep should be bound to heare under paine of damnation.

All these things concurring togethers cause Peter to be this rock whereupon the militia Church is built. Whereof I wil now intreat more at large.

The III. Chap.

Divers reasons are alleged to prove (cheefely by the circumstance and conference of holy scripture) that these words (thou art Peter, and upon this rock I wil build my Church) haue this literal meaning, vpo the, o Peter, being first made a rock, to thend thou shouldest stoutlie confesse the faith, and so confessing it, I wil build my Church.

When our Lord first saw Simon the son of Iona, behol
ding him, he said: thou art

Simon the son of Iona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation Peter, that is a great stone or a rocke. By these words a new name is before hand promised to Simon,

Whereupon Saint Chrysostom faith: Honorificè de eo prædictit. Certa
autem prædictio futurorum, imm mortalis Dei duntaxat opus est. Animaduertendum autem, quod non omnia quæabeatura ei erant hoc primo cōgressu prædictit. Nō enim appellavit eum Petrum, non dixit super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, sed dixit: Tu vocaberis Cephas. Iullud enim maioris erat & potestatis, nec nō etiam auctoritatis. Christ dōth forespeak honorably of him. For the certaine foretelling of things to come, is the worck only of the immortal God. It is to be no ted, that Christ did not foretel at this first meeting al thing which should come to passe afterward to hi. For he did not cal hi Peter, neither did he say, vpon this rocke I will build my Church. But he said, Thou shalt be called Cephas. For that was both of more power, ad also of more auctority. Likewise S. Cyrill: Nec Simō fore iā nomē sibi, sed Petrus prædictit, vocabulo ipso.
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Ipsoc commodè significans quod ineo, tanquam in petra lapideque
finitissimo suam esset ædificatæ
rus Ecclesiæ. And he telleth
a fore hand, that his name shalbe
Peter, or a rock, and not now Simon sig-
nifiyng, by the very word that he
wolde build his Church on him, as
on a rock and a most sure stone.

Theophilaet and Euthimius are of the
same mind.

By these fathers we lerne, that this
prediction or promise of Peters name,
is a thing which agreeeth with the buil-
ding of the Church which is to come.
These words then, Thou shalt be cal-
led Peter, are words of Prophecie
or of promise. A word of promise
spoken by God is effectual to worck all
theses meanes, which are necessarie for
the performance of it. For as when God

had once said Sara vox tua pariet
tibi filiú, Sara thy wife shalbringe thee
foorth a son, that self word (as S. Chry-
sostom)
So itom noteth) wrought both in Abra-
ham and in Sara the power and habi-
litie to begette and to conceaue a child,
nowithstanding that naturally through
old age they were unapt thereunto,
right so, these words Thou shalt be
called Peter, wrought in Simon the
effect whereby he might beleue, and in
due tyme like a rock confesse Christ to
be the Sonne of God, how far sooner he
had naturally bene otherwise from so
highe a grace.

And as, though Abraham did ac-
company with his wife Sara for the be-
getting of Isaac, yet the birth of the
child is not imputed to their lying toge-
ther, but unto the word of promise,
wherin it had been said. Sara shal bring
thee forth a child: even so, albeit Si-
mon be made Peter to the end he maie
confesse, and therefore not without co-
Fessing Christ to be the Son of God, yet
his being Peter (concerning the efficiet
cause thereof) is no lesse to be imputed
to this.
to this former word of promise, thou
shall be called Peter, then unto the
faithful confession which he made after-
ward of Christ's Godhead.

For the first cause was the promise,
and it wrought the second cause of the
confession. This matter is put out of all
question, if we consider, that this pro-
mise (thou shalt be called Peter)
was fulfilled before the confession was
made. For when Christ chose to him
twelve Apostles, then as S. Mark
saith, he gave to Symon the name
of Peter, and S. Luke telleth the same
thing. Whereupon Euthimius writeth.
Verum simile est (apud Ioanne) Chris-
tum dixisse vocandum esse Petru:
nunc autem vocare eum Petrum.
It is like to be true, that in Saint John
Christ said, he should be called Pes-
ter: and that he now calleth him Pe-
ter, neither doth God use to give the
name, without giving also the thing
which is meant by the name. For his
calling not words alwaies have their effect ioyned with them.

Therefore when Simon was reallie named Peter, then was he in deede made the rock. And seing he had not as yet confessed, the confession which followeth, doth not either only or first make him to be the rock. But he is alreadie by Christes promise well entred to be made the rocke, to thend he maie confesse the more stedilie and surely. 

And therefore his confession is a most sure rock, because it procedeth from him who was before made the rock to thend he should confess most stedily. Whereupon when Christ asked, whom the faithful said him to be, then the rock did his dutie. For (as Cyrilus saith) Peter as being the Prince and head of the rest, first cried out, saying: In Iohn 64. prim. thou art Christ the Son of the living God, to whom Christ answered, ceps & ca and I say to thee, thou art Peter, to put, witness, of the qualitie of a rock, and upo

H this
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this rock I wil build my Church.

Lo, Peter cried out or confessed as being the head. He was then the head by some means, even before his confession, that is to say, by promise and name. This much being granted (the which is the very order and express drift of the Gospel,) it will further follow that seeing these words, υπὸ this rock I will build my Church, depend upon these other: Thou art Peter, (for they are immediately inferred υπὸ the, adjoined to them with a copulative consuetudo &c., and) it will follow I say, that these words, υπὸ this rock I will build my Church, are to be understood according to these, thou art Peter.

And seeing these words, thou art Peter, depend no less principally upon the former prophecy and promise of Christ, wherein it was said, thou shalt be called Peter, then upon the confession which Simon made afterward of Christ's Godhead, it is certain, that the other
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other words also, upon this rock I will build my Church (concerning the nature and order of a certain cause efficient) depend no less principally upon those former words (though shalt be called Peter) then upon the confession of Christ's godhead: so that the first efficient cause, why the Church is builded upon this rock, is not the present confession of Simon, but the vocation and promise of Christ, which was long before made unto Simon. Which thing being true, then Christ will build his Church upon this rock, not indeed without the grace of confessing, but yet not any rather by the force of the confession then of the promise. For S. John Baptist confessed also but because he confessed not as one that was promised to be this rock, the Church was not built upon him: but to Peter the promise was made before the confession, and it was the first cause of the confession, therefore the promise was the chief and first cause of building the church upon this rock. 

John. 14
If it were so, then the whole meaning of these words, upon this Rock I will build my Church, is this, upon him who therefore strongly and firmly confesseth my true faith, because he was before promised to be called this Rocke, or (which is more) upon him who in part is already this rock, and promised to be called this rocke, so confesseth my Godhead like a most sure Rocke, upon him I will build my Church.

The which most true and certain sense standing, the only confession of the faith maketh no man to be this Rocke, wherupon Christ will build his Church, except it be a confession, which is wrought by the force of a promise to be called and made a rock going before it. The which promise (of being assured to be called Peter) for as much as it belonged literally to no Prophet, to no disciple, to no Apostle, but only to Simon the
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the son of Iona; for that cause, the whole militant Church is at this time promised to be built upon none other man's faith or confession, beside only upon the confession of S. Peter himself, and of those who succeed in Peter's chair. For (as God willing I shall prove hereafter) every bishop of Rome is that for his time unto the militant Church of Christ, which Peter once was.

Christ then intending to confirm and to make perfect his promise, wherein he had said, thou shalt be called Peter, asked his Apostles, whom they thought, or rather said, and confessed him to be S. Peter having a revelation from God the Father, to send Christ's former promise might be thoroughly and perfectly verified, faith: thou art Christ the Son of the living God, that is to say, thou art not only a prophet, or a Son by adoption, but thou art the natural Son of the only true God.

Here it is principally to be noted, that
The Rocke

When S. Peter confessed Christ to be the Son of God, that then he confessed the rock of rocks, which only Christ is. Neither doth any man deny but that these words (thou art the Son of the living God) appertain only to Jesus Christ. But our question is not of these words, but concerning the words which Christ spake afterward unto Peter. For when Peter had confessed the chief rock, then that chief rock shewed, that Peter had played also the rock saying to him after this sort: Simon the Son of Iona, thou art happy. As S. Peter said Christ to be the Son of God, so Christ calleth S. Peter the Son of Iona, thereby declaring, that as Peter was naturally the Son of Iohn his father, so Christ is the natural Son of God his father, and as Peter speaketh only to Christ at this tyme and to none other person, so doth Christ only speak to Peter, and to none other person. Christ after this meaning is alone the Son of God, ad Simo alone after this meaning is Peter. Christ goeth forward,
callig Peter happy, because he had blud did not reueale Christes godhead vnto him, but Christes father who is in heu. Se that S. Peter oly at this time had this high revelatior, ad to his oly Christ directeth his words. And I say vnto thee, that thou art Peter. What? was S. John, or S. Mathew the son of Iona? no truly, or had any other man in the earth this revelatior at this time beside Simo the son of Iona? no verely. If we consider the first and most literal sense. Thou oly art Peter, because thou alone both hast this name, promised to the when Christ first save thee, thou alone haddest it gene thee, when thou wast chosen an Apostle, and thou alone hast now confessed me to be God by nature, ad to thee alone I say, Thou art Peter.

It is otherwise most true that Christ is the rock, incorparably abone Peter, and that the whole universal church is built upo Christ far more excellently then any part thereof is built upo any mortal man.
For if we did not beleue so much of Christ, we could not now beleue that he were able by his only word and promise to make Peter also to be a Rock in his kind.

It is also true, that the confession of S. Peter is a rock, ad in respect also of that confession, Simon is called Peter. And in respect of the same confessio, the Church is built upon Simon. But as upon one who confesseth, because he had before the promise to be called Peter made to him, and the name it self given him. All things which are true, are not every where principally meant, or intended alone of the holy ghost.

We now seeke the literal and first meaning of these words, va po this rock I will build my Church, and not of these, thou art Christ the son of the living God. And yet M. Iewel professing to dispute of these words, va po this rock I will build my Church, privily conceieth the disputatio from them,
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them, unto those other, Thou art Christ the Sonne of God. But I beseech the good Reader to mark the point, and not to suffer himself to be deceived in so weightie a mater.

At the length to gather all my reasons together, I saie, that the most literal sense of these wordes, vpon this rocke, is to signifie, that vpon S. Peter, as vpon a man called by office to confess the true faith, Christ wil build his Church.

First, because he alone is promised to be called Peter.

Secondly, because he alone at the choice of the twelue, is named Peter.

Thirdly, because Christ speaketh to Simon the Sonne of Iona alone, saying: Ego dico tibi, and I say to thee. Therby shewing that the words which follow, belong to S. Peter alone.

Forthly, because Christ speaketh againe to him, and of him alone, saying: Tu es Petrus, Thou art Peter. If there were none else, and to none else but to Peter, the saying: Tu es Petrus, would not referre to the others, which followed him.
pose there is a difference betwene, I am Peter, and, thou art Peter. Most true it is, that Christ is Peter, that is to say, a rocke. And most true it is, that Simon in confessing Christ to be the sonne of God, confessed the principal and only natural rocke. But now that truth is not first of all and chieflie uttered by Christ, although it were before uttered by Simiö, but of Christ it is now said most literally, thou art, thou I sai art Peter.

Moreover, Thou, and This, doe answer one to the other. Both are pronounes, both shew a thing reallie present to the understanding of the hearer. As therefore, Thou, apperteineth most certainly to S. Peter, so doth also the pronoun, this, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock (which thou art) I wil build my Church.

Petrus and Petra, doe most literallie agree, in somuch that in Grecche Petros, by which name Simon Peter is called, doth signifie a Rock. And in Latin
Latine Petrus is named of Petra, as if a man said in English, thou art stonic, or of the nature of a Rock, and upon this stone or rock I will build my Church. Who can deny but Thou and This, stonic, and stone be referred all to one person?

Hitherto I have considered, thou, confes, this, and rock, severally. Now let us receive, joyne them altogether. It is first said, thou art Peter, to the intent it might be known whereunto the word (this rock) belongeth. For the nature of the Pronoun is, most properly to declare a certainty, either presently pointed unto before the eye, or next of all named and described. Thou art stony and upon this stone. Which this, If not this, which was last named? For albeit Christ be above all things the rock and corner stone, yet he was not at this time named so. This rock doth refer it self to one certain rock which is pointed unto one way or other. But no material rock
He is a rock by similitude.

Upon thee.

The Rocke

Roche is pointed unto naturally and indeed (for no such was then present or minded) therefore it is a Rocke by a Metaphore which is described.

And seing it is not only sayd. I wil build upon a rocke, but also upon this rocke, that rock must be understood to be such a one, as before was shewed. But none was before shewed, except he were named (for at this time that is shewed, is shewed by words) so that for as much as it was saied in wordes to S. Peter only, Thou art Peter, or a rocke, when it foloweth vp this rocke, it must needs be meant most literally, upon thee will I build my Church. Yet not absolutely upon thee, as thou art a bare man, but as thou art Peter: and thou art Peter, to the end thou shouldst confesse mee to be the Sonne of God. And thou diddest confesse mee, because I promised thee that thou shouldst be called Peter, and because my father did reveale it to thee, there-
therefore upon this rocke, which thou art made by Grace, I will build my Church.

It is said in the time to come, I will build, which declareth a building as yet not perfity made, but only promised, as also Theodoretus hath noted. But the Church was built upon Christ the great rocke, concerning his divine nature from the beginning, and concerning his humaine nature from the first moment of his incarnation. Wherefore that kind of building God's Church upon Christ, was already past. Likewise the confession of S. Peter, was already made and past.

But the building whereof Christ speaketh, is to come. I will or shall build my Church upon this Rocke. Therefore this rocke is meant chiefly at this time, S. Peter, in such respect as he may no lesse hereafter confess the true faith, then he had done alreadie.

Marke
Ecclesiæ mean.  

Mark these words, my Church. It was Christes Church alreadie. It was his, when he spake the words, and before also. He therefore doth not now speak of planting or founding it upon himself, but of making one to be the Rock and Head thereof; who hitherto was not the Rock and head but onely by promise and hope.

For whiles Christ was visible upon the earth, he governed all things, not onely by his power, but also by his visible presence, by preaching and governing the flocke in his owne person, being for the time the visible Rock and Head.

10. Ioan.21.

But when it pleased him to depart out of the world, then he sayed to S. Peter; Pasce agnos meas, pasce oves meas, Feede my lambes, feede my sheepe. At which time that power of being the head stone of Gods Militant Church, nexte unto Christe, was moste perfectely gen-
uen, which was before minded when it was said: upon this Rock I will build my Church.

For, to be the Pastor and Governor of Christ's flock, and by the open confession of the faith to keep it from straying into false doctrines, and heresies, that is to be the rock, whereupon Christ will build his Church. Who seeth not, that so long as the chief shepherd is acknowledged, and obeyed, all Christendom must needs believe and say one thing? Now by believing and worshipping one truth, the Church is built up from the lowest to the highest, from earth to heaven.

To shew that this Rock is meant of S. Peter, it followeth: and to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Behold, if this Rock were not meant to be S. Peter, Christ should in his wordes runne in, and out, speaking now to S. Peter, and now to himselfe.

He
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He beginneth with S. Peter, saying: thou art Peter, he endeth with him, saying: and to thee will I give the keys, between which two sayings, these words (upon this rocke) do stand. Which being so, reason would, that we drawe not the middle words from the first and the last, but that we saie, S. Peter concerning his office, whereby he beareth the keys, to be this Rock, whereupon Christ promiseth to build his Church.

The property of a rocke is to withstand tempestes of huddes and winds, and so neither to faile it selfe, and to strengthen the house built upon it. But Christ said in an other place to S. Peter: Ego rogaui pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua. et tu aliquae do confersus confirmas fratres tuos. I have prayed for thee that thy faith faile not, and thou being once converted, strengthen thy brethren.

Behold, thou art Peter, because of
of the Church.

my promise, and therby thou diddest receive the gift of the right faith, which thou hast confessed of me. I have prayed, that thy faith may not fail, yea it shall be so far from failing, that I bid thee, when thou art converted, to establish, confirme, and strengthen thy brethren. For of all thy brethren, thou art the chief, and the surest Rock, through my prayer.

If then it be out of all question, that S. Peter's faith doth not fail, and that he hath power to strengthen his brethren, seeing these are the properties of a Rocke, not to fail it selfe, Math.71 but to strengthen the whole house built uppon it, against raines, fluddes, and windes, it is evident by the order of Christes wordes, by Grammar, by reason, and by conference of holie scriptures, that S. Peter is called this Rocke, when it is sayed to him: Thou art Peter, and uppon this Rocke I will build my Church.

I It fol-
It followeth: And hell gates shall not prevail against it. That is to say, the power and strength of heresies shall prevail neither against thee, who art the Rock, nor against my Church.

Not against thee, being the Rock, because I have prayed for Peter's faith: not against my Church, because so long as the Rock wherein it is built, is sure, the Church itself, which standeth upon the same Rock, is sure also. These words cannot be well referred to Christ only, the chief Rock. For it is Christ the chief Rock, who warranteth the assurance of the under Rock. And so it is Peter, who is assured, that hell gates shall not prevail against him, nor against the Militant Church, which is built upon him.

Ioyne to these considerations the authority of Tertullian, of Hippolytus, of Origenes, S. Cyprian, S. Hilare, S. Basil, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Gregorie, S. Hierom, S. Leo, S. Chrysostom, S. Cy-
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S. Cyrilus, Theodoretus, Prosper, Theophylact, with a great number of the Fathers of the fourth General Council, who teach, S. Peter to be this Rock as I will shew anon.

Neither do they only speak it, but they bring such reasons for S. Peter being the Rocke, as can agree to no man else, but to him, and to his successors in the same office.

Join the practice of fifteen hundred years, in which the seat of S. Peter standeth in Rome, ad floris beth like a most immovable Rocke, among so many tyrants, heretics, and naughty Christians.

Join so many General Councils, as have been in Christendom, which all have so acknowledged this Rock, which S. Peter is, that they were all either authorized by his Successors, or else for lack thereof disannulled as unlawful.

Add to the former reasons, that if the Church were built only, or

15.

16.

17.

18.

Tripart. lib. 4. c. 9.
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Chiefly upon the confession alone, it must needs have been built upon the confession of S. John Baptist, before it was built upon the confession of Peter. For John Baptist confessed Christ to be the Lambe of God who tooke away the synnes of the World, before S. Peter, and in more words than S. Peter did. But the ground of Christ's building is the Rocke, which Peter is, and S. John Baptist is not that kinde of Rock. And the Church is now promised to be built upon his confession, who is first made the Rock, and who being the Rock, doth strongly confesse.

Remember also, that I shewed in the former Chapter, how at the foure senses, which the Fathers gave of the foresaid words (upon this Rock I will build my Church) are perfectly conteined in this one sense, wherein the church is promised to be built upon Peter. For so it is proved to be
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to be built upon Christ, because he is so universal a Rocke of the Whole Churche, that he maketh Peter particular Rocke of the Militant Church. In Peter is the faith which he confessed, in him are all faithful Disciples comprehended. But in none other sense at the ancient Fathers interpretation can be saved upright.

Moreover, seeing it is cleare, that to be the rock, is to be a certain foundation of the Churche (for Christe buildeth his house upon a Rocke) sith all the Apostles are certaine foundations of God's beautifull Citie, and thereby they are also certaine Rockes, upon Whiche the Churche is built: how can Peter be denied to be a Rocke and foundation of the Churche for his part?

Now, that his parte doth passe all other mennes partes, I prowe it mosste evidentlie, because the names of things are tokens of the things them selves, and that mosste speciallie, when God I iiij him.
himselfe geveth the name, as now he hath done. For if the thing were not so before, as he nameth it, at the leasst his naming it so, maketh it to be that, which he nameth it.

Therefore being onely Peter after Christ beareth the name of a rocke, it is out of all question, that the said name is a signe of his being the rock in some such sort, as none other Apostle is the rocke. But the faithfull are built upon the foundation of all the Apostles and Prophets (as S. Paul saith) and they are the Church of Christ: therefore the Church of Christ is much more notably built upon S. Peter above all others, because he is the rocke and foundation above all others.

And whereas by the power Apostlelike all the Apostles were equal, certainly S. Peter is this rock, not only as an Apostle (wherein he had many ministers as fellows) but also as a cheife bishop, and sumpt. as the primate of all Bishops and Priests.
Priests, wherein he was perelesse, being the head and top of all others in that sense as I shall declare hereafter. In the which highest priesthood only Peter hath a successor, who sitteth in the See of Rome, to continue a Rock for ever; sith Christes militant Church needeth to be alwaies built up by visible preaching and governement.

This my interpretation is not a little fortified by the prevarication of our adversaries. For they being at a point to deny, that Peter and his successors are this rock, whereupon the militant Church is built; are yet by no means agreed, what chiefe sense these words (upon this rocke I wil build my Church) ought to have. But sometime they make Christ to be this rocke, sometime the confession of the faith, sometime every disciple, not regarding what they grant or hold, so that the truth be denied.

But it were reason they told us some
one chief literal sense whereunto they hold stand. Which if they did, all the world should perceive their vanity. For if all our reasons were not divided to answer diverse senses, as now they are, but were driven al to one purpose: that opinion of theirs should have been much more easily destroyed and utterly vanquished, which never the lefse is now sufficiently disproved by the circumstance and coherence of holy scripture.

It is proved out of the auncienne Fathers, that S. Peter is this rock, whereupon the Church was promised to be built, otherwise then M.Iewel affirmeth.

The V. Chap.

THE chiefest ground of our disputation, are the words of Christ spoken to Simon his Apostle, wherein he said. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke I will build mie Church. By the force of which words the
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the Catholicks beleue and teache, that S. Peter was made a rock, whereupon Christ would build his Church.

And because it appereth afterward, that the building of Christes Church uppon Saint Peter, was the making of him to be the chiefe shepheard of Christes whole flock, the Catholicks teache, that who soever succeeded S. Peter in the office of the cheefe shepherd (as the bishop of Rome doth) that he is also the rock, whereupon Christes Church is builded for the tym. Against which doctrine M. Ierwel writeth after this sort.

Ierwel. Forasmuch as they seme to make greatest accept of those words of Christ, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I wil build my Church, therefore for answer hereunto, understand thou. good Reader, that, the old Catholike Fathers haue written and pronounced, not any mortal man as Peter was, but Christ himself the Son of God, to be this rock,

Sander,
The Rocke

Sander. Note (good Reader) that we dispute not at this tyme, whether Christ be absolutely the chiefest and most principal rock, or no (for both sydes confesse that thing) but whether S. Peter for his part also, be not this Rocke, whereof Christ at this tyme faith, 

1 Cor. 10, 

this rock I wil build my Church. M. Jewel denyeth S. Peter to be this rock. I wil prove (God willing) directlie against M. Jewel's words, that the old Catholike fathers haue written and pronounced not only Christ the son of God, but also euen such a mortal man as S. Peter was, to be this rock, whereof Christ at that time spake. And that as well by their plaine words, as by the reason of their owne words. Ye a also by the places which M. Jewel alleageth for the contrarie opinion.

In Decre. epist. Tom. I. c. 6, cilior. First, omitting to speake of Ambrose, of Pius, of Fabianus, and of other holie bishops of Rome (whose testimonies
nies are yet most unjustly rejected of the Protestants, seeing they suffered death, and not only with their words, but also with their blood bare witness to Christ's name. I will only bring forth such authorities, as they themselves do not reject.

Tertullian's faith: Latuit aliquid Petrus adfiscitque Ecclesiae Petro, being called the Rocke of the Church, which was to be builded? Here is Peter affirmed to have been called Petra, the rocke. Ye a the rocke of the Church, and of the Church which Christ intended to build: so that the building by Tertullian's judgment was yet to come, verily because it was perfectly built upon S. Peter, when Christ said unto him above all others, feed my sheep.

Now good Reader, confer this place of Tertullian with that which M. Jewell affirmed, and see what I say. I shall I call it? I say
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say no more, but see that M. Iewel was oversee, and trust him no more.

De cons. summ. mundi.

Hippolitus the martyr faith: Prinsiceps Petrus, sive petra, Peter is the chief, the rock of faith.

Hos. 5. in Exod.

Origines calleth S. Peter Magnum illud Ecclesie fundamentum, & petram solidissimam, super quam Christus fundavit Ecclesiam, that great foundation and most Malsy and sound rock, whereupon Christ hath builded the Church.

Lib. 1. ep. 3. & lib. 4. epist. 9.

S. Cyprian agreeth with them, saying. Super Petrum ædificata à Domino literat ecclesia, the Church was built of our Lord upon Peter. Christ our Lord said, upon this rock will I build my Church. Saint Cyprian saith, our Lord hath build his Church upon Peter. Therefore S. Cyprian understode Peter to be this rock. And consequently some excellent old Catholique Fathers understode a mortal man, as S. Peter was to be this Rocke.
Rocke wherof Christ speaketh.


lieth under the building of the Church. To lie under the building, is to be the foundation, which foundation either is a Rocke, or in the stead of a Rock to the house which is built uppon it.

Likewise in another place he crieth: In cap.
O in nuncupatione noui nomic.

nis fœlix Ecclesiæ fundamentum,
dignaque ædificatione illius pes
tra, quæ infernas leges dissolue-
ret. O happy foundation of the Church, in having the new name pronounced of thee, and o Rocke worthie of the building of that (Church) which should undoe the lawes of hel. The new name is the name of Peter which was newlie geuen to Simon, that he might be thereby the happie foundation and worthie Rock whereupon the Church should be built.

S. Am-
S. Ambrose reciting the authority of these words, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke will I build my Church, thereupon faith: Sicut ergo Petrus petra est, super quam aedificatur Ecclesia, rectè prius pectes fanat, ut sit in Ecclesia fidei fundamentum continet, ita & in homine membrorum fundamenta confirmet. Siting then Peter is the rock whereupon the Church is built, he doth well to heale first the feste, that even as he doth conteine the foundacion of faith in the Church, so likewise in the man be may confirme the foundations of his members.

In Concio. S. Basil speaking of this very cose in poenit. on of S. Peter, writeth thus: Petrus petra est proton Christum petra. Largitur enim Iesus suas dignitates, petra est, petram facit. Peter is a Rock through Christ the Rocke. For Iesus giveth to Peter his own dignities. He is the Rocke, and maketh
of the Church. 

keth (another) to be the Rock. What can be said more plainly against M. Je-
wel? Not only Christ is the Rocke, but he maketh Peter also a Rock.

S. Hierom|sheweth by an example, that as Christ being the light, gave to the Apostles, that they should be called the light of the world, ad as they had of our Lord other names: even so to Simon, who beleued in Christe the Rock, he gave the name of Peter, and consequently he saith, that (according to the Metaphore of a Rock) it is well said to him, Aedificabo Ecclesiam tuam super te. I will builde my Church upon thee. Behold, the Church was promised to be built upon a mortal man as Peter was.

S. Chrysostom writeith thus: Princ. Ex Var. in eceps Apostolorum Petrus, super quem Christus fundavit Ecclesiam, verè immobiles petra, & firma cōs felsio. Peter the Prince of the Apo-

S. Hieron. 

Matt. 16. 

Ioan. 1. 

Matt. 20. 

Super te; 

Vpō theo 

meam super te. I will builde my 

Church upon thee. Behold, the Church 

was promised to be built upon a mor-
tal man as Peter was.
The Rocke
the Church, a very immovable Rocke, and a strong confession.

Note. It is much to be noted, that S. Chrysostome calleth S. Peter the confession: whereby we may understand, when S. Chrysostome saith in another place, that the Church is built upon the faith of confession, he meaneth upon the faith of Peter confessing, or, making the confession. So that, not currie mans, but Peters confession is this rock, whereupon the Church is promised to be built.

Epiphanius doubted not to write of S. Peter in this wise: Ipse Dominus constituit eum primum Apostolorum, petram firmam, super qua Ecclesia Dei edificata est, & portae inferiores non valebunt adversus illam: portae autem inferiores sunt haereses & haeresices. Juxta oem enim modum in iudicium firmata est fides gaccepit clauem coelorum. Our Lord himself, did constitute him chief of the Apostles, a firme
and sure Rock, upon which the Church of God is built, and the gates of hell shall not avail against it: for the gates of hell are heresies, and the fouders of heresies. For by all means the faith is established in him, who hath received the keys of heaven.

And in that I may goe forewarde with the Grecians, in Cyrillus we read: In Ioan. lib. 2. c. 13. Nec Simon fore iam nomen sibi sed Petrus predicat, vocabulo ipso commode significans, quod in eo tantum in petra lapideque firmissimo suam esset adificaturus ecclesiæm. Christ did foretel, that his name shold not now be Simon, but Peter, signifying fitly by the very name, that he would build his church in him, as in a most sure stone ad rock. And yet M. Iewel could see none of these testimonies. Pcellus is alleged of Theodorecus after this sort. In Petro Apostolorum prince Domino in Evangeleos se ecclesiæ suam adificaturum promisit.
In Peter.  Our Lord in the Gospels hath promised that he will build his Church in Peter the prince of the Apostles. Note that these words which do promise a building, can not properly belong first of all to Christ: for upon him the Church was already built.

In Iosaphat, & Barl.

Damascene hath also this saying: Princeps Apostolorum Petrus, deipetra. Peter the prince or chief of the Apostles, the rock of faith.

In Luc. 22

How plain are these words of Theophilaet, which he speaketh in Christes name? post me, Ecclesia petra es & firmamentum. Thou art the rock and staye of the Church after me.

In Matt. 16.

Euthymius: sидеi petra futurus es, fiue, etpona fundamentui credentiui: edificabo super te Ecclesiæ meam. Thou shalt be the rock of faith, or, I will make thee the foundation of the faithfull: upon thee I will build my Church. Thus much the Grecians.

Let us now retorne to the Latins.

S. Am-
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S. Augustin did ever accept it probable, In Ioan. to say, that the church was built upō Ἰησοῦ \begin{equation}
\text{Tra\textit{\textup{\textsc{t}}\textsc{a}}}\end{equation}, Peter, but he doubted sometime,whether it were not safer to teach, that it was built upon Christ. For whereas both opinions are true, he knowing this later to be more true in its self (because Christ is a surer Rock then Peter) did use commonly to apply that his most sure doctrine unto this place of the Gospel, where yet S. Peter is more literally called this Rock.

Therefore on the other side, when he considered that S. Ambrose made an Hymne, wherein S. Peter was called the Rock of the Church, then, in those bookes of his Retractions, which he wrote with most grave judgement, he allowed both senses for good, and Catholike. Such humility was in that pillar of the church. Dixi in quodáloco de Apostolo Petro, quin eo tanqin pe tra fundata sit Ecclesia. Quisensus etiā cantatur ore multorum in versis

\[ K \ \text{\textup{\textsc{y}}} \ \text{\textup{\textsc{b}}} \]
bus beatissimi Ambrosii,ubi de gallo gallinaceo ait, hoc ipsa petra ecclesiæ, canete, culpa diluit. I said in a certain place of (his book write against the Epistle of Donatus) that, the church is founded in Peter the Apostle, as in a rock. The which sense is sung with the mouth of many men, in the verses or Hymnes of the most blessed S. Ambrose, where he faity of the Cock: the very rock of the Church, did wash away his fault, when the Cock did crow.

Thus both S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine, ad the faithful who used to sing those verses, allow it for a right good sense (which M. Iew disalloweth) that a mortal man, as S. Peter was, is this rock, upon which Christ built his Church. And although S. Augustine had in many other places affirmed, that the Church was meant in these words to have been built upon Christ, rather than upon Peter (which, of it selfe is true,
true, though not first meant in this place) yet he concludes thus: Harum duarum sententiarum quæ sit probabilior, eligat lector. Let the Reader make his choice, whether of these two meanings is the more probable.

Behold, S. Augustine judgeth it a probable sense, that the Church is built uppon Peter, as also that it is built upon Christ: but which is the more probable, that he leaueth to be judged of the Reader. Why doth M. Jewel thinke without the assente of any old Father at all, deny that sense, which teacheth a mortal man as Peter was, to be this Rocke, sithens as all the other Fathers, so S. Augustine doth not onely beleue it to be probable, but he doubteth whether it be not more probable then the other?

And surely, as the circumstance of the Woordes geue, I have shewed above twenty reasons why it is more probable,
The Rocke

that in those words, Peter is first and most literally called this Rock, and Christ is not so called there, but only by discourse and by the force of a necessary consequent.

Prosper Aquitanicus affirmeth boldly of S. Peter: Hæc fortissima petra ab illa principalis petra communionem & virtutis sumplit & nominis. This most strong rocke did take the same enjoying both of virtue and of name from that principal rock.

Leo agreeth with him, who intreating upon these words, thou art Peter, saith: Sum ego sim inuiolabils petra, tam, & in quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidaris. Whereas I am the rock which can not be stirred, yet never the less, thou art also a rock, because thou art made firm by my strenght.

S. Gregorie could not disagree from Epistol. li. so manie blessed Saints. Quis nesciat sanctam Ecclesiam in Apostolarum principiis soliditate firmatam, quia
firma
tatem mentis traxit in nomi
ne, ut Petrus a petra vocaretur?
Who doth not know, that the holy Chur-
che is established in the stedfastnes of
the prince of the Apostles, because he
tooke stedfastnes of minde in his name,
in that he was called Peter of Petra, a
rock of a rocke?
When he saith, the Church to haue
been established in the strength of
the prince of the Apostles, in that
he declareth him to be this rock where-
upon the Church is promisid to be
built. When he addeth, that he was cal-
led Petrus of petra, a rock of the rock,
he sheweth the reason how he came to
be the rock: verily, because Christ the
rock who gave him his name, gave him
the strength also which did belong to
the name.
Lette vs conclude this matter at
the last with the witnesse of six hun-
dred fathers at once, who in the fourth
general Council teache thus: Petrus
Concil.
Chalced. 
Ae.

K iiij 
Apo
Apostolus est Petra & crepido ecclesiae Catholicæ. Peter the Apostle is the Rocke and toppe of the Catholik Church.

What meant you then, M. Jewel, so say, that the olde Catholique Fathers have written and pronounced, not any mortal man, as Peter was, but Christ himselfe the Sonne of God to be this Rocke? The old Fathers affirm both Christ, and Peter to be the, Rock.

Christ by nature, Peter by vocation and election. Christ to be both the Rocke absolutelie, and also by a consequent to be this Rocke, whereupon the militant Church shalbe built: Peter to be this Rocke, but not absolutely the Rocke.

But what? did not M. Jewel know all this? that surely is scarce likelie, sith these things are so rie in the old Fathers, and so oft alleaged by the new Writers. Unlesse perhaps M. Jewel reade not the old Fathers, and truft not
not the new writers, ad so be ignorat of these authorities. For in dedid appe-
reth by his doings, that either he never saw the originals, whence he citeth his testi-
onies ( but onlie followeth blind note booke made and collected by other his ancefetours and masters in he-
resie ) or els he is one of the most ma-
ifest falsifiers, that ever was in the Church.

For Wilinglie to belie so mane Fathers at once as he now hath done, it is a malice not much lesse, then Simon Magus or any scholar of his had. I ra-
ther thinck, he saw not the originals. Howsoever it be, he is an horrible in-
strument of perdition to the childern of perdition. Osyr, Are Tertullian, Ori-
genese, Cyprian, Hilarie, Basil, Epipha-
nius, Ambrose, Hiero, Augustine, Chrysofome, Cyrillus, Damascenus, Psellus, Theodoretus, Theophilactu, Euthimius, Prosper, Leo, Gregorius, no auncient Fathers?
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Al they teach, a mortal má as Pes-
ter was (verily euén Peter him self) by the gift of Christ to be this Rock, whereof it is said, upon this rock I will build my Church. What a lye now is he, who saith they doe not so? their books be forth in print, let them be sene. If M. Jewell be an impudët lier, let him either openly recant, or be avowi-
ded as a faissier of Gods Gospel, and of true religion: yea as one more worthy of a whetstone, then of a bishopricke.

But now lette us consider also the reason, why the fathers confess the Church to have been built upon S. Peter. For every thing is made the plai-
er and surer, when the reason of it is known.
of the Church.

The diuerse reasons which the Fathers bring to declare, why S. Peter was this rock, doe evidently shew, that he was most literally this Rocke, whereupon Christ would build his Church.

The VI. Chap.

H e that gaueth a cause of a thing done or said, sheweth himself to be most fully persuaded concerning the truthe of the thing: other- wise he would never indenour, to find out the reasons, why that should be so done or said, which he thought not to be done or said at all. Seing then the auncient Fathers do shew, why and how S. Peter is this Rocke, whereupon the Church is built, it is impossible, that they should anything dout thereof, and much lesse can they deny him to be this rocke, whereupon Christ said he would build his Church.

And yet M. Jewel hath said most falsely, that they doe write and pronounce not any mortal man as Peter
The Rocke

Peter was to be this Rocke.

To beginne with S. Basil, he faileth:

Petrus Ecclesiae edificationem in seipsum suscepit. Peter received the building of the Church upon himself. But why? propter fidei excellentiam, for the excellency of his faith.

Behold his faith alone was not properlie the Rocke, but Peter was the Rocke, and that not onlie for his faith (for then other faithful men might have been the like rock) but for the excellency of his faith.

Two things then are necessarie for being this Rocke: that he be Peter, and that he have an excellent faith: to wit, such as none other had, as the which was promised most singularly, and for the continuance whereof Christ himself hath praised.

And because this faith was most Libr.6.de excellent, Saint Hilarie teacheth further, that, Supereminentem glos-
of the Church.

riam beatae fidei sue confessione promeruit. Peter by the confession of his blessed faith, deserved a passing glory. Peter's faith had not excelled, yf anie man had ben like to him, neither had Peter's glory passed for the confession of his faith, yf any man had been like to him in glory. His glory was, to receave the building of the Church uppon him for the excellencie of his faith; therefore the Church was more singularly built uppon him, then upon any other man els.

S. Cyprian writeth of S. Peter Ecc Ad lukan.

*elesia quae vna est, super vnum, ian.

qui claves eius acceptit Domini voce fundata est. The Church, which is one, is by the voice of our Lord founded uppon one who hath receaved the keies of it.

This reason can beare but one such Rocke at once, as Peter was, for els the Church (as one) is not founded upon one
one, if there are more such rocks at once. Otherwise what can be said, why if there be many such rocks, there should not also be many Churches. But the Church being one, is built upon one; therefore that one (who is Peter) hath no fellow in that behalf, until after him, an other doth succeed in that one office.

Homil. de Pastor.

S. Augustine discoursing upon those words of Christ, spoken to S. Peter: Feed my sheep, writeth thus: Dom minus in ipso Petro unitatem commendavit, &c. Our Lord hath commended unity in S. Peter himself. There were many Apostles, and it is said to one, feed my shepe. S. Augustine calleth the other Apostles also good shepherds, but S. Peter he calleth the one good shepheard, by whose one pastoral office, unity is commended and set forth; verely because it is meant, that, as many Pastours and particular flocks in this life, are under Peter.
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Peter one chief pastour, and in him they al are one: euen so all the states and ages of the Church that euer haue ben, be, or shalbe, are under one chief pastour Iesus Christ, and in him they al are one.

But as al the ages of faithful me are one Church in Christ the chief pastour, because he in deed and in truth contei-neth them al under his unitie: right so Peter shoulde not be the chief one Pastor of al the particular flocks in respect of the other Apostles, except in deede he had power geuen him to seede them all within the compasse of his one folde.

S. Hierome hauing called S. Peter, the Apostle of Christ, and the Rock, afterward confesseth to Iouinian (who rejoysed to see a maried man so honoure) that, Super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia. The Church is built upon Peter. Adding thereunto: Licit id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, & cuncti claues rei gni
The Rocke

gni coelorum acceptat, & ex equo super eos Ecclesiae sortitudo solidetur: tam propterea inter duos decim unus eligitur ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio.
Albeit the self same thing in an other place be done upon the Apostles, and also receive the keyes of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church be fastened equally upon them: yet therefore one is chosen among twelve, that a head being made, the occasion of schisme may be taken away.

Three things are to be noted in this sentence. First, that the Church is so built upon Peter the Rocke, that in the same place where it is built upon Peter, the like is not done upon the other Apostles.

Secondly, the Church is equally founded upon all the Apostles in an other place, to witte, when they are sent of Christ, as Christ was sent of his Father.
of the Church.

Thirdly, one is chosen head of
the twelve to th' intent schisme may be
avoided. A man may say: if all be equal,
How is one head? This shall be more
fully answered hereafter. I say for this
time. At twelve as touching the office
of the Apostleship, were equal, and all
were Rockes and heads of the Whole
Church. But being considered as par-
ticular Bishops and Pastours, whereby
they had particular authority to teach
some here, and some there (as now
Bishops doe every man in his own dia-
cese) so, one was their head.

How can it else be, that S. Hierome
should agree with himself? All be equal,
and one is the head. Can the head be
equal with the other members? Or is it not
highest of all, as chief of all? We must the
say, that all are equal in the office of the
apostleship, but Peter was otherwise ap-
pointed the chief Apostle and head in
the Bisholplie power, whiche every

I Apo-
Apostle had, beside the Apostolike office, as it shall appeare hereafter.

In the meantime it is certain, that Hieron. \textit{aluervus} \textit{Iouin. li. 2}

Propterea inter duodecin vnus eligitur, vt capite constitueto schismatis occasio tollatur. Therefore among the twelve, one is chosen, to the end a head being appointed, the occasion of schism may be taken away. And that Hierome \textit{speaketh not of the Apostles owne choise, but of Christes own choosing, it appeareth evidentlie, when he faith afterwarde, that the good maister (Christ) would not prefer S. John before S. Peter, lest he should cause so yong a man to be enuied at.}

Lib. \textit{ad merf. loui.}

Neither did it suffice, that during the Apostles time onely, such a Rocke and head should be appointed, for so muche as the Churche of God, nether ended in their time, and their successors in their Bischopy authority ha-
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wing (without all controversy) less assurance of grace then they had, and being also farre more in number, had more need (then the Apostles) of a head and of a perpetual Rocke among them wherunto they might leane.

So that Leo the great hath most just cause to say of S. Peter: Super hoc In Aniuerf Saxum, hanc soliditatem, & formam assumpt. titudinem, æterni construam teplu, serm. 3. & Ecclesiæ meæ coelo inferenda sublimitas in huius firmitate consistet. Upon this Stone, this soundnes, and strength I will build an everlasting temple, and the heighth of my Church, which is to be grazed in heauen, shall rise in the strength of this Rock.

S. Augustine affirmeth in many places, that S. Peter did represent the whole Church, according to whiche sense he writeth thus: Petro totius Epift. 165. Ecclesiæ figuram geret Domini Dominus ait, super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiæ meam. Our Lord saith "
unto Peter bearing the figure of the whole Church, Upon this Rock I will build my Church. So that he geneth this cause, why this muche is sayed to Peter, verely because Peter beareth the figure of the whole Church.

But how commeth it to passe, that Peter doth bear the figure of the whole Church? Surely because he is the head and Rocke of the whole. For every prince doth beare the figure and as it were the general person of his subiectes, and of them who are committed to his Charge. For that they all are, as it were, gathered together and united in him alone. And this to be the true meaning of S. Augustine, it appeareth evidentlie by his own wordes: Ecclesiæ Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitatem personæ. Peter the Apostle (by a generalitie which was figured) did beare
bear the person of the Church by real\textsuperscript{o} of the primacy of his Apostleship.

Peter did bear the person of the Church, not as menne cary burthens on their backs, but by a figured generalitie, that is to say, as a general officer. For he doth bear their persons, not naturalie, but figuratively. To witte, by interpretation of the Law, and not by real extension of his body to be made so big as to uphold all their bodies. S. Augu-

Generalistic calleth that a figured generalitie, tas figu-

lie made, but when the lawe doth impute and take it so to be.

For the Lawe interpreteth and expoundeth the chiefe officer of a common weal, to bear the person of the self common weal. And therupon the head being present for the common weals behalfe, the law worketh, as if the common weale it selfe were present, when the head alone is present. What was the Peters office? The primacy of the
Apostleship. He was first and chief, & propter Apostolatus sui primatum, and for the primacie of his Apostleship he signified all his flock in himself alone. So that he tooke the keyes for all, and was the general Rocke for every other particular Rocke, and for that primacie of his he bare the figure of the Churche.

To shew yet farther the force of this reason, the Reader must consider, that first, Peter is said to be the Rocke, and therein to beare the person of the Church figurata generalitate, which is to say, as if he were in deed the general, or the whole mystical bodie of the Church, which yet he is not, but is only the officer thereof.

Secondarily a reason is given, why Peter should signifie or beare the figure of the whole Church more then any other. And the cause is, propter Apostolatus sui primatum, for the primacie of his Apostleship, that is to say,
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to say, because he is chiefe. If this cause were not found in S. Augustine, the Protestants might have some pretense to say (as they doe) verelie, that Peter was not in deede the rock, nor head, but onlie that he is called so to signifie, that the whole Church is built upon Christ. But now Peter doth not signifie the Church to be built upon Christ, as Peter is a man, nor as he is a faithful man, nor as he is an Apostle, but as he is the primate of the Apostles, propter Apostolatus sui primatum, for the primacie of his Apostleship. If he be not Primate in deede, he doth not signifie that which S. Augustine teacheth.

For all mystical significations in God's word he builds upon a real truth. Noë by offering clean beasts upon the altar, did signifie the death of Christ. Therefore in deede Noë did offer upon the altar. Let it be taught to be a feined thing, that Noë did offer those beasts,
and that dede of his can not be a figure of Christes death. For that which is not reallie true, is the figure of nothing.

Therefore seing the primacie of Peter is the cause why he beareth the person of the Church, and why he bath the Church built upon him, it is not only true, that Peter is the primate of the Apostles, and therby of the whole Church, but also he is (at the least in the order of nature) first the primase, before he doth beare the figure of the Church.

For as if a man do beare the person of Gloucester in the Parliamemt, because he is Burges of that Citie; it is most necessarie true, that he is first Burges, before he doe so beare that person: even so if Peter beare the figure of the Church, because he is the primate, he is surelie the primate before he beare the general person of the Church. Whě I say he is primate before, I meane not
not in time, but in course and order of nature. For first Peter is considered as made primate, and then we afterward consider, that upon his primacy the person of the Church is laid, although both things be done at once.

Seing then Peter could not beare this general person but only for those, whose officer and primate he was, it is evident, that by this reason of S. Augustine, Peter was the general officer of the whole militant Church, even of S. John, and of S. James also, in such respect, as he tooke the keys for them. Not yet the keys of their Apostleshippe (which they tooke for them selves) but the keys of the chiefe pastoral office, within which the Apostles also were constained, in that respect as they were shepe, and of that one flock in earth, which was wholy committed to Peter.

Thus have we many reasons, while S. Peter above all others was the rokke,
1. the excellency of his faith, 2. the excellency of his glory, 3. the unity of the Church built upon him being one, 4. the signifying of Christ to be the one everlasting shepherd, 5. the eschewing of schisms, 6. the receiving of ecclesiastical power for the whole Church.

Which reasons if they be deepely pondered (7.) they prove not only that he was once the Rocke, but that also another like him must still be the Rocke, whose excellent faith may direct the faithfull, whose glory were cause the Church to be glorious, whose unitie may kepe the flocke one, and kepe away schisms, and signifie stil the unitie of one everlasting head and one mysticall bodie, whose generall office may receive power to be distributed to euerie other member (in the outward ministerie of the Church) as everyone Ephes. 4. hath neede thereof for the building up of the Church of God.

For the building of the Church upo this
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this rock (which S. Peter is) goeth still forward, as it once began, sithens all the building is not yet ended, but is enuerie day a working. Endenour once, M. Iewel, to answer these reasons of the Fathers, and the lack of reason in your syde shall spyrioyt appere. Words you can patche together, as other heretics have don before you: but the examining of an authority with the reason there of doth spayntly confound you.

The Authorities alleaged by M. Iewel to proue that S. Peter was not this Rock, proue against himself, that S. Peter was this rock, although they proue, that there was an other kind of rock also byside him, which thing we deny not.

The VII.Chap.

Iewel. The old Catholike Fathers haue written and pronounced not any mortal man as Peter was, but Christ himselfe the Sonne of God to be this Rocke.

Sander.
Sander. There are two parts of this proposition, the one, that Christ is this Rock: Which we grant to be most true, and how it is true, we shall see hereafter. The other part of M. jewel's assertion is, that no mortal mà (as Peter was) is this rock. This part, I say, he neither proveth, nor is able to prove. For I shewed before, that above twenty auncient Fathers have taught, and have confirmed it by reason, that Peter was this rock. But let us heare M. Jewel speake for him self.

In locis veteris Testament.

Jewel. Gregorius Nyslenus faith: Thou art Peter, And upon this Rock I wil build my Church. He meaneth the confession of Christ, For he had said before, thou art Christ the Sonne of the living God.

Sander. It is not here said, that Peter was not this Rocke, which was the chief thing that M. Jewel ought to have proved. Ye a I say farther, it is not here said, that Christ was this Rocke.
Rocke: which was the other part of M. Jewels assertion. But only Nyssennus faith, that Christ meaneth to build his church upon the confession which Peter made of him. And verily I believe so too.

But Christ meaneth not to build his Church upon the confession, without all respect of S. Peter, but upon the confession which Peter had, and alwayes should make, whiles in feeding Christ's flock, he should alwayes teache the the true faith of Jesus Christ. So that if the confession of S. Peter be this rock, then S. Peter, who maketh it, is much more this rock. For no mans act of confessing can be greater then himself is, sithens it cometh from his soule ad hart as fro a certain spring or fontaine, where God hath planted the grace thereof.

Such Arguments then M. Jewels bringeth to prove his fond assertion, as if he should say: there commeth Eloquence from the man, but the man is not eloquent. For he woulde prove, that
that S. Peter, who maketh the confession, is not the Rock, because his confession, which commeth from him, is the Rock. Whereas it is no lesse true, that if Peters confession be the Rock, Peter himselfe is also much more the Rocke, then it is true, that if a mans Oration be eloquent, himself also is eloquent. For the vertue which either the oration or the confession hath, was before in the man himself, and proceeded from him.

Ierwel. So faith S. Hilarie: Hæc est una felix fidei petra, quam Petrus orae suo confessus est. This is that only blessed Rock of faith, that Peter confessed with his mouth.

Sander. When shal we have honesty dealing in you M. Ierwel? Did you not promise to prove, that the Rock spoken of in these words, Upon this Rock wil I build my Church. was Christ and not Peter? But S. Hilarie speaketh not of those wordes, but expressly
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prrslic of the other words which went before, when Peter said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. And that would have appeared plainly, if you had not cut off the sentence.

For after S. Hilarie had said, this is the only happy Rock confessed by Peters mouth, it followeth immediately: Tu es filius Dei vivi, Thou art the Son of the living God. And whereas the Pronoun, Hæc petra, this Rock, was referred to these wordes, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, the falsifier of all good writers, divided the Pronoun Demonstratiae (Hæc) from the Proposition which it should point unto, and did cut off the sentence in the midst, making the ignorant believe, that S. Hilarie spake of the rock whereupon Christ promised to build his Church, whereas he speaketh of the only Rock, which is the Sonne of God.

To make the matter plaine, Peter saith to Christ: Thou art the Sonne of the
The Rocke

of the living God, this Rocke which
the Son of God is, Peter out of al contro-
versie is not. Neither did ever any Ca-
tholike say, that Peter was the natural
Sonne of God, by whom al things were
made. But after that Peter had con-
sessed this only blessed rock, then Christ
said unto Peter: Thou art Peter, ad
vpon this Rocke wil I builde my
Church. Of this later sentence, our
disputation is.

And surely, S. Hilarie denieth not
Peter to be this kind of Rocke, which
we last speake of, but expressly confesseth
it in his Commentaries vpon S. Mathew, as
I have shewed already. But now S. Hi-
larie speaketh only of that Rock which
the Son of God is. So whereas there are
two rocks, Christ and Peter, M. Iewel
would deceiue us by conveying the one
instead of the other. But God hath de-
tected his unhonest dealing.

Iewel. Again he saith, vpon this Rock
of Peters césession is the building of
the Church.

Sander.
Sander. This place is abused as the former was. For S. Hilarie there in- De Trinitatreateth of these words: Thou art tate, lib. 6 Christ the Son of the living God.

And sheweth, that Peter both believed and confessed Christ's Godhead. The confession of which Godhead is indeed the foundation of the Church, but that confession is one thing, and the answer to it is another thing. The confession toucheth the honor of Christ, saying: Thou art the Sonne of God. The answer toucheth the honour of Peter, saying: Thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church.

Christ is the Rocke that Peter confesseth, and Peter is the Rocke which Christ maketh. The confession, concerning the thing confessed, is a greater Rock then Peter. But concerning the thing who confessed Peter is no lesse a rock, then his own act of confession was.

Now when Christ saith: Vpon this Rock I wil build my Church,
he meaneth not only, nor first of all literally, that he will hereafter build his Church upon the thing confessed, to wit, upon the Godhead of Christ which Peter confessed (for thereupon it was built already, even from the beginning of the world) but he meaneth, that he will build that Church (which was for ever built upon his Godhead, and was built upon his manhood ever since his incarnation) that Church, I say, he will hereafter build upon the inward faith and outward confession of S. Peter, whiles he by confessing the truth shall uphold, stabile, establish all other faithful men. So that S. Hilarius includeth S. Peter's person most necessarily under the confession of S. Peter. And so M. Jewel tealeth the tale alwaies against himself as liers do.

S. Cyril: The Rocke is nothing els but the strong and assured faith of the Diuicile.

Sunder. This is that I would have,

M. Jewel: for I said before, that Christ
in saying, Upon this Rock I will build my Church, did not now onely or most literallie meane, so muche upon the thing confessed, as upon the faith of the confessor, and now M. Jewel confirmeth my saying.

For the Rocke is the faith of the Disciple. But the Disciple is S. Peter: therefore the faith which is the Rock, is the faith of S. Peter.

Who hiered M. Jewel to bewraye his owne cause? When I say, that Saint Peter is this Rocke, I mean S. Peter beleeving, Saint Peter confessing, Saint Peter feeding his sheepe, S. Peter strengthing his brethren. But yet every way S. Peter is the rocke. And so it is true, that Cyrillus faith: the rock is nothing els but S. Peters strong and asurued faith. But S. Peters faith is not Christ: therefore Christe (who is somewhat els beside the faith of the Disciple) is not now said to be that Rocke, where-
upon he wil build his Church. And yet M. Jewel faith that and nothing els.

O trustie preacher to build a mans sole upon. Thus he reasoneth, not Peter, but Christ is this rocke, because the Rocke is nothing els, but the faith of the disciple: as though the faith were not in Peter who is the disciple?

Jewel. So likewise Chrysoftom: vπό this Rock, that is to saie, vπό this faith and this confession I wil build mie Church.

Sander. But he that beleued and confessed was Peter, and not Christ, and Peters faith and confession was in himselfe (as being revealed to him by God the Father) ergo S. Peter is the rocke, in that God gave him grace to confesse Christ to be the Sonne of God. You confound your self, M. Jewel, not caring how your Words agree, so that a shew of sumwhat be made. I shewed also before, that S. Chrysoftom nameth S. Pe-
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S. Peter himself a strong confession, so that the name of confession doth necessarily include S. Peter within the meaning thereof.

Iewel. S. Augustine: Christ was the rock, upon which foundation Peter himself was also built.

Sander. Did you never know, M. Iewel, that one rocke might be built upon another? the lesser upon the greater? is not the house of God built of many stones: Christ is the chief stone, the corner stone, upon him lieth S. Peter a rock, in comparison of Christ verily small, in comparison of us verily great. Upon Saint Peter the rest of the Church which lived under him, was built; which also is a rocke as well through Christ the Rocke of Rocks, as through Peter the second Rocke, and through it self, sith every man is according to his degree a living stone concurring to the building up of the whole Church, which stones being joined together and fastened
ned by faith and charitie make also a Rocke of themselves, belye that they are built upon the foundations of the Prophets and of the Apostles. One of these verities doth not imbarre the other.

Ieruei. S. Augustine addeth in Christes person: I wil not build my self vp of the, but I wil build thee vp on me.

Sander. It is but reason trulie, that Peter be builded upon Christ, and that we also beleue. But for asmuch as we are in the metaphore of building, doth not reason teache vs, that when we have layed in the foundation of a house a mightie great stone, that the next which we laye upon it, should be also a verie great one, yea (after the lowest) the very greatest of all? Doth any wise man, haueing laid in the foundation a stone of twentie cubitites, place next upon it a stone of one or two ynches?

If not so, by all proportion, the seconde stone shalbe the greatest that can be
be gotten next unto the first. Christ is so great a stone, that he hath filled the whole earth. I ask of M. Iewel, who shall be next unto Christ? Mis verdist is, that (in respect of the militant Church, which is daily a building on the earth) S. Peter is the next stone. Because God (who genereth his benefis most freeli) would have first of all men to graunt S. Peter this grace, to be the Pastor of his flocke, and the porter of his kingdom, next unto himself.

Saint Peter being the next stone in building of the Church, unto Christ, is therefore a Rocke, because he is built immediatlie upon the Rocke. For in a bodie compacted together, euery thing partaketh most intierrlie the nature of that, whereunto it is next eyoned.

Note (good Reader) that we speake not of the whole Church, which hath be from the beginning of the worlde, but M iiiij only
only of that portion which liueth on the earth for the time. For thereof only Peter and his successors are the Rocks, whereas Christ is the Rocke of Rockes, which uphouldeth the Whole Church, and all the rocks that ever have ben or shalbe in the Church from the beginning of the World, to the ende thereof.

Iewel. All these Fathers be plaine.

Sander. Against you, for as none of them denie Peter to be this Rocke (which thing you have denied) so many affirme, that the confession of S. Peter, and his faith, is the Rock whereof Christ spake. And yet seeng the faith of S. Peter is no greater then himselfe is, if his faith be the Rock, him selfe is also the Rock.

Iewel. None is so plaine as Origen, he is the Rock, whosoever is the disciple of Christ.

Sander. This kind of sense is not literal, as I shewed before. But admit it Were
Were literal, yet seeming S. Peter is the disciple, yea the chief disciple of Christ (as S. Mathew faith: Primus Simō, q dicitur Petrus. Simon is the first, who is called Peter) surely M. Jewel by your confession, Peter (next unto Christ) is the chief Rock. A man would thinke you were frantike, when you denying a mortal man (as Peter was) to be this Rock, yet afterward proved that every mortal man who is Christes Disciple, is the Rocke.

Ierwel. Upon such a Rock al Ecclesiastical learning is built as Origen faith.

Sander. But S. Peter is such a rock: therefore upon S. Peter al Ecclesiastical learning is built. Who could with such an adversarie as M. Jewel is, who poueith altogether against himself?

Ierwel. If thou think that the whol Church is built only vpô Peter, what then wilt thou say of John the sonne of the thunder, and of every of the Apo-
The Rocke
Apostles, faith origen?

Sander. Maister Jewel left out in his English this woords (illum) Petrum. If thou thincke the whole Church to be onelie built upp on that Peter, to witte, that Rocke of stone, what wilt thou saie of John, and of euery of the Apostles? Origen faith, Peter is a Rocke: Which thing Maister Jewel denieth. But he is not only a Rocke, and that we graunt.

But Maister Jewel faith, no mortal man but Christ himself is this rocke: therefore I ask him, what he saith of S. John and of al the Apostles? Was not Saint John a mortal man? Wo to this cause, M. Jewel, whereof you are become the patron. God kepe me from such an advocate, who shall neede none other evidence against him to dese my cause withal, besides his owne words.

You saie, the old Fathers have
written, not anie mortal man, but Christ himselfe the Sonne of God to be this Rock. But S. John and S. Peter and euery one of the Apostles is called here this rock (whereof being named in the sixteenth of S. Matthew, we dispute) and yet no Apostle is Christ the Son of God, therefore some mortal man is this Rocke beside Christ the Sonne of God.

Ievvel. Shall we dare to saie, that the gates of hell shall not preuaile onlie against Peter? or are the keyes of the kingdome of heauen geuen only unto Peter, saith Origen.

Sander. It is inough, that the gates of hell shall leasf of all preuaile against Peter. And he hath chzefelie the keyes of heauen.

For as S. Peter of all the Apostles first confessed in the name of the Whole Churche, so al that confess after August, in him and by him (for all were in him, 10an. 17. 14 as in their primate and chiefe pastour) let, 11. 4.
enioye both his confession, and his reward. That as he was sette over all the Church for ever, so others for their parte were called into parte, of the care.

To conclude this matter, Mr. Jewel should have proved, that S. Peter is not the Rocke, whereupon Christ promised to build his Churche. But he hath not done it, neither was he able to bring any one syllable out of the holy scriptures, nor anie one saying out of the Doctours, which denied Peter to be this Rocke. But he only hath ministred matter to me for the prouf of the contrarie assertion.

The
The conclusion of the former discourse, and the order of the other which followeth.

The VIII. Chap.

Hitherto it hath been proved by most evident reasons of God's promise, of the circumstance, and of the conference of the holy scriptures, of the authority of the Fathers, and of the special reasons which moved them to think and write so, and last of all, by the refutation of M. Jewels own words, that Saint Peter with such qualities and conditions as Christ induced him withal, is this rock, whereupon the Church was built.

And because, looke what kinde of building the Church was once promised to have, that must still continue being the Church doth still tarie the same howse of God: there must be alwayes some one mortal man like unto Peter, who being first made a rock by election, may
may afterward by Gods revelation stil confesse the faith for the Whol Church, When so ever he is demaunded or con- sulted, what is to be thought and bele- ued in matters belonging to Christian religion.

If then there must be some one such Rock upon whose authoritie the faithfull men may grounde themselves, it is not possible, that it should be any other manne besides the Bishoppe of Rome.

First because he aboue alothers is confesse of all sides to haue ben the first ad chief in all assemblies and meetings to whome (by M. Jewes confesston) the prerogative of the first place did belong to directe and order Bishops in their doings.

Secondly, because he onely sitteth in Saint Peters chaier, and is his law- ful successour.

Thirdly, because the consent of the World hath taken it so, ad so hath pra- ctisid
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etised (indeed for ever) but even by our Adversaries confession, from the time of Pope Zosimus and Leo, and so above a thousand years.

And although (if I had no farther proufe) this alone were never able to be avoided, yet I have so many other proufes, that I am more troubled what to leave unsayed, than I am to seeke what may be said.

I have chosen to speake of that point speciallie, whiche is of all other the mooste hard. For there is no greater obiection against Saint Peters Supremacie, than to saye, that all the Apostles were the same thing which he was. The same Rocke, the same Pastor, the same Confirmour of their brethren. Whereby he may seeme, to have had no more, then they had, and consequentlie that all Bishoppes are as good, as the Successour of S. Peter.

To which obiection if I should only answer...
The answere, by demanding of the Protestantes, in what Gospel or holy scripture it were written, that every other Apostle was the same rock, which S. Matthew testifieth S. Peter to have been: seeing they have bound themselves to believe nothing which is not expressly written in the holy Scriptures, they were not able so to reply, that their owne conscience might justlie be quiet.

For if they brought me forth S. Cyprian, or S. Hierom: it were sufficient for me to say, that they were no Evangelists. I shew it written, thou shalt be called Cephas, and thou art Peter, that is to say, a rocke or of the qualitie of a rocke. For as S. Hierom witnesseth, that which the Greeks and Latins call Petra, the Hebrewes and Syrians call Cephaan. Let them shew it written where S. Mathew or S. John is called such a Rocke, or is said to be of such a condition and qualitie, that the Church shalbe built upon him.

How
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How unhappy are men now a daies, that whereas they have moste plaine scriptures in al pointes for the Catholike faith, and none at al againste the same yet they pretend by the very scriptures to overcomme the Catholikes?

And by the bare naming of Gods Worde (whiche they neither understand, nor love) they haue among pedlars won the spurs, and amonge the ignorant haue gott the opinion of knowledge. But seing there is an infinit treasure in Gods word, to proue those things whereby the Catholike faith is fortified. I wil take upon me this one point, for this time, to shew, by what meanes S. Peter excelled the other Apostles. Wherein I wil procede in this order.

It is certaine, that S. Peter excelled the Apostles in some kind of honor and dignitie.

The Apostles had two kinds of dignitie. The one proper to their Apostleship, the other common with al Bishops.

1. How
3. How far S. Peter was above or equal with them in the Apostolike function.

4. That S. Peter's great prerogative above the Apostles is most manifestly known by his supremacie in the bishopslie power of governing the Church of Christ.

5. That S. Peter's bishopslie authoritie was an ordinarie power.

6. That it must continue in some one bishop.

7. That it is the Bishop of Rome, in whom S. Peter's ordinarie power and supremacie resteth.

That S. Peter passeth far the other Apostles in some kinde of Ecclesiasticall dignitie.

The IX. Chap.

IF what soever authoritie any Apostle had, concerning the government of the Church, S. Peter had the same: and yet if besides he had verie manie things
things of greatest importance promised and given to him alone, which none else had: it is out of all controversy, that S. Peter passed a great way the other Apostles in some kind of Ecclesiasticall dignitie. Otherwise if he had no more authority then they, or if his privileges had been only personal (as the lone was which our Saviour bore toward S. John Ioan. 13. who laid upon his breast at his last supper) certeinlie S. Peter should either have had nothing at all committed to him above and beside the rest of the Apostles, or it should have been onlie some temporall privilege, and not any such function, as had appertained to the perpetual establishment of Christes Church.

But now, for so much as he is not onelie first among the twelve, but also he had the promise to be called Cephas or a, Rocke, before the twelve were chosen, and was really named Peter at the tyme of the choice: And for
so much as although both S. John Baptist had confessed Christes godhead before, and Nathanael had said, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel yet only Peters confessed being made long after, was so highlie rewarde, that Christ said to him alone, thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke I will build my Church: For so much as the keyes of the Kingdom of heaven are namely promised to Peter alone: And whereas the tribute of drachma was due for the first begotten of every familie: Yet Christ paid both for himself, and for S. Peter also, as being the underhead and first begotten of his familie the Church: And for so much as Christ although another bote also were at hand, yet he taught the people out of S. Peters bote, to shew that in Peters chaire his doctrine shuld alwayes be stedily professed: And whereas all the Apostles were sure to be sifted of Satan, yet the faith of Peter alone
alone is praised for, that he being once Leoserm.
converted might strengthen his brethren: And when word of Christ's resurrection was sent to all the disciples, for so much as Peter both entered first into the Sepulchre, and was not comprehended with the rest, but was severally named by himself, whereas the Angel said, tell his disciples, and Peter, that he will go before you into Galilee: and as St. Ambrose thinkest, of men he was the first who saw Christ after his resurrection, (ab initio some women had seen him before.) And whereas the other Apostles sailed in the sea within the compass of a bote, yet St. Peter alone walked upon the whole Sea, without any particular bote, tokening that the whole world (which is meant by the Sea) was ordinary subject unto his jurisdiction. Furthermore for so much as some other Apostles standing by, St. Peter alone is both shewed to have loved Christ more than they, N. iij and
and he is alone rômauded to feed Christ-
jes hepe, and to rule his läbs: yea for
somuch as it is said to Peter alone nota-
blie, Extendas manus tueas, and a-
gain tu me sequere, thou shalt stretch
foorth thy hands, and, follow thou mee,
so that his particular kind of death by
stretching foorth his hands upon the
crosse, was principally prophecied of, by
Christ himself: Seing Peter answered
alwaies for the Apostles, as being the
mouth of them al: and seing after Chri-
stes ascension, Peter alone gave sentence
upon Judas, and pronounced him de-
posed from his Bishoprike, and that an
other must be chosen in his place: se-
ing when the holy Ghost came downe,
Peter aboue al the rest first of all, sought
the faith ad the multitude being couer-
ted, said to Peter, and to the other Ap-
opstles, but to Peter by name: what
shall we doe? Seing Peter made
answere for al, that they should repent
and be baptizéd: seing Peter did the
first
first miracle after the coming of the Holy Ghost, and first healed the feet of them lame, because he being the Rocke, shewed mysticallie, that he establisheth the feet of others: seeing Peter confessed Christ first, not only before private men, but also at the seat of Judgement: seeing Peter saw the secretes of hartes, and whereas menne laied their goods at the other Apostles feet also, yet Peter alone gaue with fulnesse of power, sentence upon Ananias and Saphyr, cutting of their life with a word, and thereby shewing (as S. Gregorie noteth) Quanta potentia super ceteros excrudisset, With how great power he had encreased above the rest: seeing, although all the Apostles did also miracles, yet Peter was so famous above the rest, that men did putte the sicke and the weake in the streets to the end at the least, the shadow of Peter might come over them (which was the greatest miracle that
cuer is thought to have bene done of man, seeing Peter did excommunicate and enioyne penance to Simon Magus the first heretike: Seeing he was the first after Christes Ascension who reised a dead person to life (as he did Tabitha) Seeing he had first by vision, that the Gentils also were called to beleue in Christ, and God chos that the Gentils shoulde first of al heare the vworde of the Gospell by Peters mouth, and shoul beleue: Seeing when Peter was in the prison, prayer was made in the Church for him without intermission (which thing we read to have ben so earnestly done for none other Apostle, albeit many were also in prison) Seeing when a sedition was among the Disciples, in so much that Paul and Barnabas (not for their own learning, but to signifie what other Bishops should do afterward) came to the Apostles to Ierusalem (to set a solutio fro Peter), as Theodoretus noteth, and told the
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the controversie in the Councell, then Peter did not only speake first, but also he gave a determinate sentence, that the Gentils should not be burthened with the law, and the whole multitude held their peace for a time: Seeing S. Paul himself came to Ierusalem to see Peter, and that, as S. Ambrose saith, because he was Primus, first or chiefe among the Apostles, to whom the Lord had committed the care of Churches: seing Peter was either alone, or first and chief in the greatest affaires as S. Chrysostom noteth most singularly: seing he was sent to occupie with his chaire, Rome the mother Church of the Romaine province, as Athanasius calleth it, and the head Citie of all the World, and there to conquer all heretics by vâquishing Simon Magnus the head of al Heretikes, whom with his prayer he destroyed; seing his Chayer and succession hath ben acknowleded of Bernard, as the Ancient Fathers, and the see of Rome, had very often the first sprake in the Councells of the Church.
shed there til' this hower, without interruption of that faith, whiche S. Peter confessed and taught as the verie experience doth beare witness: so many things so singularlie belonging to the governement of the whole Churche, could never aboue all the other Apostles, have bene so speciallie done or spoken about Saints Peter alone, if he bare not some other more excellent person then euerie of the other Apostles did.

For as Christ is proued by S. Paule, to excelle the Angels because God never saied to anye Angell as he saied to Christ, Thou art my Sonne, this daie I haue begotten thee: even so seeing Christ never saied to anie other Apostle, as he saied to Peter: Thou shalt be called Peter, or, vps on this rock wil I build my church or, to thee I will geue the keies of the kingdome of heauen; or, paie for thee and me: or, I haue deisiered for
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for thee, that thy faith fail not, and or, feed my sheepe, rule my lambs: doubtlesse we may bodelie conclude thereupon, that S. Peter in these praecominences farre excelled any other Apostle.

For what so ever any other Apostle had, whether it were by vocation, or election, or authoritie to preach, to binde, to loose, to baptise, to be a Bishoppe, to make a Bishoppe, or to doe any thing els, Peter had al that as well as any of them, as also Leo the Great hath noted.

Seing then beside al that, he had many things which none other had, may they not seeme to have lost their common senses who wil have S. Peter to be no greater a prelate then any other Apostle was?

If any wrangler not joyning al these privileges together, but separating som one or two of the fro the rest, do scoffe at these proufs, let him know aforesaid, that albit
albe it some ser: alone would not haue made a perfite prove, yet as they now are ioyned together, they prove exactly that S. Peter had some greater dignity then any other Apostle had.

That the Apostles beside the preroga-
tive of their Apostleship, had also the
authoritie to be particular bishops,
which thing their name also did signi-
fie in the old tyme.

The X. Chap.

For the better opening of that
which followeth, I must declare
the double office which the first
prelates had. Christ called twelue unto
him, whom he made Apostles, and
he sent them to preache, and gave them
power te heale diseases, and to cast out
diuels. And he said to them: What-
soeuer thigs ye shall bind vpõ the
earth, they shall be bound in heauē
also. And whatsoever things ye
shall
shall loose upon the earth, they shall be loosed in heaven also. And again after his resurrection, he said: As my Father hath sent me, and I send you, take ye the holy ghost. And, going into the whole world, preach the Gospel to all creatures, teaching all nations, and baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.

And after Christ's ascension S. Mathias, and after the coming of the holy Ghost S. Paul was taken into that holy office and vocatio. So that by their commissions it is evident, that the Apostles were all sent into the whole world with singular authority.

Now that beside this Apostolike function, they had also power to be resident upon some one particular cure and flock, the example of S. James the Apostle doth declare, who is confessed by all manner of Writers to have been Bishop of Ie-
of Ierusalem. Yea Simon also another of the Apostles is readen to have succeeded after S. Iames in the same Chaire and Church. S. Peter likewise having sitten at Antioche seven yeres afterward transferred his seat unto Rome.

More ouer S. Peter made Euodius Bishop of Antioche, after his departure thence, and sent his discipke S. Marck to govern the Church at Alexandria. S. Paul appointed Titus Bishop in Cædia, and Timotheus Bishop of Ephesus, and the like was don by other Apostles in other countries. Therefore the Apostles had also the power to be and to make Bishops, in so much that when S. Peter deprived Judas of his Chaire, he shewed the prophecy to be fulfilled. Epi- scopatu eius accipiat alter. Let an other man take his Bishoprike, or his office of a Bishop.

For although every Bishop be not an Apostle, yet every of Christes Apostles was or might be a Bishop. And because the
the bishop's power was most certainly contained within the compass of the Apostolic office, the very name of an Apostle came also to signify a bishop in the primitive Church, as Theodorets hath well declared. Eos dē olim vocarunt Episcopos, Eos autem nunc vocantur Episcopi, nomen minabāt Apostolos, pœdetē autē tempore, nomen quidē Apostolatus reliquerūt iēs quērerērē Fort Apostoli, Episcopatus autē appellatōnē imperiuaretē iēs, qui olim appellabātur Apostoli. Ita Philippēsii Apostolus erat Epaphroditus. vestri, iugt Apostolū, adiutorē necessitatis meē. Ita Cretēsii Titō, Aφianorū Timothē. Ita ab Hierosolymis iēs quērerē Antiochiae scriberēt Apost. & Presbyteri. In the old time they called the same men both priests, and bishops. But those which are now called bishops, they did call Apostoles. And in process of tymē they left the name of Apost-
Apostleship to those that were truly (and in deed) Apostles, and called them Bishops which (in the primitive Church) were called Apostles: so was Epaphroditus the Apostle of the Philippians. Your Apostle (saith S. Paul) and the helper of my necessitie. So was Titus (the Apostle) of those of Candie, and Timotheus of those of Asia. So did the Apostles and priests write from Hierusalem to those that were at Antioche.

Seing then the name of an Apostle, did conteine both properly that extraordinary honour, which the true Apostles only had, and also that ordinary power, which al Bishops then had, and alwaies shold have, it is easie to understand, that when S. Hierome wrieth concerning Bishops: Omnes Apostolorum successores sunt: All are the successors of the Apostles, and when Augustine saith, Pro Apostolis constituti sunt Episcopi. Bishops
shops are made in stead of the apostles, that they both (and all the other fathers saying the like) do mean, that bishops doe succeed the apostles, not in the apostleship, but in their bishoplie authority, which also S. Irenaeus calleth: suum ipsorum magisterij locum, their own place of teaching or governing.

If any man aske, why the bishoplie authority is so namely distingished from the apostleship, sithens it was conteined therein (as the lesser dignity within the greater) I aswore, that it is needful so to doe, because when the apostleship ceased, the other bishoply authority continued stil. And yet if the bishoplie authority had onely depended upon the apostolike function, it must needes have ceased with it also. For the whole apostleship is ended, no part thereof can remain in his force, except it have an other ground to stand in, beside that apostleship, as the bishoply power had.
This being so, when we read that Peter was head, prince, chief, first, and captain of the Apostles, it may according to the former distinction, either be meant, that he was both their head according to their excellent Apostolike dignitie, and also according to their inferior authority of being particular Bishops, or else according to the only one consideration of the twaine.

How farre S. Peter did either excell or was equal with the Apostles in their Apostolike office. Wherindivers objections are answered, which seeme to make against S. Peters Supremacie.

The XI. Chap.

ERE it not, that the Adversaries of the Catholick faith, do [force] me to intreat of this matter, I would think it a sinne to enter into so curiouse a question. For what have we to doe nowe with the Apostles
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Apostles equalitie or inequalitie, whereas it should have suffisied us, to follow the present state of the universal church, which we finde practised in our time, not searching out other things which are perhaps above our capacitie. But being the equalitie of the Apostles, is now pretended against the universal faith which hath alwayes gueue the primacie to Peters Seate, it behoueth to answere thereunto, trusting that God wil beare with the humble defendats, how so ever the wantonnesse of the other side stand in great danger to be punished for their schism, troublesomenesse, and pride.

I take it for a thing agreed upô, that S.Peter was the first of the Apostles, accordingly as S. Mathew reciting the name of the twelve Apostles, saith. Primus Simô, quidicitur Petrus. The first is Simô, who is called Peter.

If then none other Apostle be first, beside Peter, and al that which is not first,
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first, must needs be somewhat behinde that which is first, doubtlesse none other Apostle could be in al pointes, equal with Peter.

If you say, the word, Primus, first, serveth only to kepe the order of numbering, and not any whit to prefer Peter before the rest, I answer, that whè Primus, the first, doth only stande to kepe the order of numbering, sith the number at this time is twelve, S. Mathew should have gone forward with the second, the third, and the fourth, until he had come to twelve. But nowe seing he doth not so, Primus is rather meant the first in dignitie, then in order onely.

And surely it is worth the noting, that where as S. Andrew came to Christ before S. Peter, and brought afterwards his brother Simon to Christ, yet S. Peter is set alwayes, not onely before S. Andrew, but before al the rest. In so much that whereas the other Apostles
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files are never named orderly, but after diverse sorts, yet S. Peter keepeth always the first place.

After Peter sometime Andrewe is placed next, as in S. Matthew, sometime Iames, as in S. Mark, sometime John, as in the Acts of the Apostles. And the Church as well in the Canon of the Masse as in the Litanies ad processionem, placeth S. Paul, nexte unto S. Peter.

But euermore in all these varieties, howsoeuer the order of the other Apostles be changed, seing S. Peter is without exception every where preferred before them all: certainly that his primacie cometh neither by chance, nor by the choice of the Writer, but by the very counsell and will of the holy Ghost, who thereby sheweth S. Peter to have bene absolutely the first, and chiefest even by the appointment of Christ himselfe, which no Evangelist might alter or change.

Which
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Which to true the authoritie also of the ancients Fathers doth evidentlie convince. First because out of primus (the first) they have derived Primatus (which signifieth the chiefe authoritie, and not onlie the first place in order) accordinglie as S. Augustine teacheth, S. Peter to have represented the whole Churche, propert primatum Apostolatus, for the primacie or chiefeedom (that I may so speake) of the Apostleship.

And consequentlie thereunto, they call S. Peter commonlie Principem, Corypheum caput, verticem, ducem, & os Apostolorum, the prince or chiefe of the Apostles, the head, the top, the guide, and the mouth. By which words they declare themselves to take primus the first, for princeps, the chiefe, and for maximus the greatest (which word S. Hierom also vseth) so that the meaning of S. Matthew is: The chiefe is Simon who is called Peter.
Peter. Thus it is evident by the word of God, that Peter being chiefest, all the Apostles be not equal with him, except perhaps anie man who is not chief, can be equal with him who is chief.

If you ask, wherein Peter was chief, or what he could doe more then his followes, I say, that question also is curious. It becometh him, who will obey the Gospel, to believe, that S. Peter is the first or chief, as he readeth in the Gospel, without demanding why or how he should be chief. But if the question were demanded humbly, thus I would thinke it might be answered.

In the nature and order of the Apostleship, every Apostle was wholly equal with all the followes of his owne order. The which is not only true in the Apostles, but also in Bishops, in priests, in Kings, in Dukes, in Knightes, or in any other state of men. For there is a certain reason why a man is either an Apostle, or a King, or a duke, the which
reason must nedes be common to all
that be of that degree and state.

But there may be another thing co-
incident to some degree of men, the
which although it be not necessarie for
their being yet it is necessarie for their
Well being. And so whereas of twelve
Apostles every one is equal in that of-

c
cice with the other, yet it was neces-

dary for their good continuance in peace
and unity, that one should be chiefe am-
mong them. lest whiles every one should
draw a diverse way, the Whole Church
which ought to be but one body, should
be torn in pieces, and be divided into
manie companies or bodies.

Thus whereas al the Apostles were
equal by the nature of their vocation,
one was set over the rest by the provi-
dence of God, and he was so set over the,
that he was even at the first choise
(though that wer not thoroughly perca-

wed until Christ's resurrection, made first
of al, and appointed for most of all, that
there might be no moment in the which unity should be missed in the Church.

This reason is allowed of S. Cyprian, who having said concerning the nature of the Apostleship: The rest of the Apostles were the same thing, which Peter also was, being all indued with equal fellowship of honour and power: addeth immediately, sed exordiā ab unitate proficiscitur, vt ecclesia una mōstretur. But the beginning procedeth from unity, to which the Church may be shewed one.

S. Hierom likewise having said, albeit al the Apostles take the keyes of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church be fastened equally vpo the al, addeth immediately, tamen propterea inter duodecim vnum eligitur, vt capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio. Yet therefore among the twelve one is chosen that ahead being made, the occasio of schism may be taken away.
Optatus ys of the same judgement, affirming that there is one singular chair wherein Peter did sit; that in it unity might be kept of all men, lest the other Apostles might every man challenge a chair to himself.

Leo the great confesseth the same truth, saying: that whereas the choice of all the Apostles was like, yet is was given to one, that he might be above the rest.

If then all were equal in office, and yet one was set over them to keep unity, he was not thereby an Apostle more than they, but he was greater than they. Not greater in his office, or in his Apostolike power: but greater in his prerogative of being head, and of making all the to be as one, while they were all content to obey him alone, rather then to make a schism.

But now let us ad to their doctrine another truth, which is, that all the
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Apostles were so confirmed and established in grace, by taking the first fruits of the holy Ghost, that it was not possible for them to err in faith, or to seduce others. For Christ said unto them: Ye know the spirit of truth, because he shall tarie with you, and he shall be in you.

Hereupon it will follow, that the Apostles in their owne persons needed no head, but that S. Peter was set over them, to geue thereby a forme and a paterne, that afterward when the personal prивilege of the Apostles should cease, yet the rest, who should be the successors of the Apostles, might al obey one, who should succeed in Peters place. 

By whose assured faith (because Christ prayed for it) al they might be sure not to err in the faith.

By this means it is easie to answer the objections which are made against the supremacy of S. Peter. For if S. Paul did as well preache to the Gentils, as S.
as S. Peter did to the Jewes, he did it by the office and nature of his Apostleship which was to goe into the whole world, and to preache to every creature, and to haue the care of all Churches lying upon him. And therefore S. Peter did also (as well before as afterward) preache unto the Gentils with no lesse power then S. Paule: And S. Paule to the Jewes, no lesse then S. Peter.

For the order, power and grace of their Apostleship was equal, as the degree and line of brethren is equal. But as God preferred in old time the eldest sonne to the priesthood, and so a greater power in government not by the force of the brotherhood, but by his own ordinance, even so whereas Peter and Paule were equal Apostles, yet Peter by the appointment of Christ was the head, not by force of the Apostleship but by the will of God, to shew, that his Church was one, by having one pastour in it.
in it above the rest, as a Kingdom is one, by having one King in it; or as a house is one, by having one master in it.

Again if S. Paule did reprove S. Peter concerning circumcision (as one that Galat. iv. walked not according to the truth of the Gospel in his behavior) S. Paul might do it, both because they were fellows and brethren in the Apostolike office, and also for that he had the same holie Ghost which Peter had. But we must consider (as Tertullian in his booke of prescriptions doth witness) that no doctrine of S. Peters was then reproved as false, but only his behauiour concerning an outward fact of his, in that he having freeliie eaten before with the Gentiles without respect of keeping the Law of Moses, (wherein his deede was right good, and did witness, that he believed the observançes of the olde Lame to bind noman) yet at the comming of Iewes, he did abstain
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abstein and withdraw himselfe, asperswaded that he should do more good to the Ieues if he forbare certain meats to winne his weake brothern.

Likewise S. Augustine writeth:

Epist. 19.

ad Hieron


Neither truly we do deny but that Peter was now in the same mind that Paul was. Therefore he did not then teach Peter, what was true in that case: but he reproved his dissembling, whereby the Gentils were compelled to plaie the Ieues.

So that whereas S. Peter was no lesse perswaded then S. Paul, that Circumcision ad the ceremonies of the Law must cease (as S. Peter himself pronounced at Hierusalem) And whereas S. Paul no lesse then he, had tolerated the obseruances of the
the law for a time, in circumcising Timotheus: the question is not, whether Circumcision ought to be abrogated, nor yet, whether it might be at all for a time permitted, but whether it might be now any more winked at, as hitherto it had been.

For S. Paul believing the time to be now come that every man ought to profess his faith openly, concerning the abrogation of the old ceremonies, did reprove S. Peter's outward simulation, as by his fact, yielding longer time to the Jews, then was profitable.

And herein surely S. Peter proved himself to be indeed the head of all the Apostles. For whereas Christ had said: he that is greater among you, let him be made as the yonger, or lesser, he in deed accomplished that precept, and yielded unto S. Paul's advice, as S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, and S. Gregory doe testify.

Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Cyprian Domic
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Divs elegit, & super quod edificavit Ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione disceptaret, postmodum vendicavit sibi ali quid insolenter, aut arroganter as sumpsit, ut dicaret se primatū tene re, & obtenerari a nouellis & posteris sibi potius debere, nec de spexit Paulum, quod Ecclesiae prior us persecutor fuisse, sed confiuit veritatis admisit. For Peter, whom our Lord chose to be firste, and upon whom he did build his Church, did not when Paul did strine with him about Circumcision, afterward challenge or attribute any thing to him: self insolently, or proudlie, and saye, that he had the primacy, & that he ought rather to be obeyed of Novices, and aftercomers: neither did he despise Paul, for that he was before a persecuter of the church: but he did admit the counsel of truth.

By which wordes we perceive that S. Cyprian did not judge this reproving of
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of S. Peter, to be any argument against his supremacy, but only to be a witness of S. Peter’s humility and meekness. But as it was in deed true, that S. Paul had once persecuted the Church; so was it also true, that S. Peter held the Primacy, although (as S. Cyprian hath noted) he did not then allege it.

S. Augustine likewise confesseth: De Baptis. In Scripturis sanctis didicimus Apostolorum tam excellenti gravis Apostolorum tam excellenti gravis cap. 17. tiapreeminet, alter quam veritas postulabat de Circumcisione ase re solitum, à posteriore Apostolo Paulo esse correctum. We have learned in the holy scriptures, that the Apostle Peter (in whom the Primacy of the Apostles appeareth above the rest by so excellent and gracious favour) that he according to doe otherwise concerning Circumcision then the truth did require, was corrected of Paul, who was admitted af-
ter him to be an Apostle.

S. Gregorie stablisheth S. Peters supremacy the more by the very same example of his humility in bearing gently the correction of his fellow Apostle. Quatenus qui primus erat in Apostolatus culmine, esset primus & in humilitate. That he who was chief in the top of th' Apostleship, might also be chief in lowliness: Ecce à minore suo reprehenditur, & reprehendi non designatur, non ad memoriam revocat, quod primus in Apostolatum vocatus est. Behold, Peter is reproved of his inferior, and he disdaineth not to be reproved. Neither dooth he call to mind, that he first was called to the Apostleship.

Consider good Reader, how far these Fathers were from this minde of the Protestants, to Witte, that the reproving of S. Peter by S. Paul, did anie thing withstand his primacie, whereas thereby they (never doubting of his suprema-
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macie in power) rather shew him to have becheise every way, as well in grace, as in authoritie.

S. Peter is reproved of S. Paul, and S. Peter praiseth the verye same Epistles of S. Paul, in which he is reproved. Didde ever Martin Luther, Zuinglius, or John Caluin, shewe any such lowlinessse towarde their Superior, as S. Peter shewed to his inferior?

Zuinglius reproved Luther, concerning his doctrine of the real presence. But did Luther, trau you, praise Zuinglius for it? Except he praise a man, who doth excommunicate him, and pronounce him a Sacramentarie, and an heretike. And yet they were both brethren, and both apostles of this new Gozell. But, o Lorde, how farre of are they from the true Apostles? Their primacie was liker to that of Diotrephes, then to S. Peters humble government.

Epistola

P. 7  There

Ioan. 3:9
There is in these men no humility, but intollerable arrogancie, no yelding of the one to the other, but extremely defending of every mans ownphantasie. And yet they Protestants bring this example of S. Peter and S. Paul, to defend their heathenish and heretical debate. Whereas the reprouse of S. Peter, neither consisted in any false doctrine of his (as theirs doth) nor was defended stubbornly by him, as these men defend their errours even to death, and so they make them never able to be reconciled.

On the other side, although dissensions happen oftentimes among the Catholikes (While they are in the world) yet they are like unto the Apostles in prosecuting them. For that alwaies they are ready to yeld one to the other even in this life, at the farthest, when the high judge shall gene sentence for the one part. And they all confesse, that there is a mean ad power in earth able to determine al controversies in Religi-
Religion. But the dissentions of the Protestants are like to the dissentions of the life to come, which are immortal, nor never shall be reconciled, because there can be no Judge acknowledged in the way, to bring them at one, since they are at their waies end: after which time there is no place of reconciliation left, but the Judge delivereth either the one partie, or both to be tormented for ever, if the greatnesse of the faulte be such, as between Luther and Zwinglius it is.

It is farther laid against the supremacy of S. Peter, that the Apostles sent him to lay handes upon those whom Philippos the Deacon had Baptized; for by sending they wil conclude him to be onely equal with the Apostles, as though the Canons of a Cathedrall Church may not choose their Deane or Bishop to go about certaine busines of the Chapter, whom therein they sende to doe those things, not as their infe-
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riot, but when the common good is to be procured, and no fault is to be punished, every man ought to yield up his superiority and to condescend to charity, as S. Peter did. For as Gregorie most wisely saith: who no fault requireth the contrary, all bishops according to the respect of humblenes, are equal.

Briefly, th' Apostles were sent every of them equally into the whole world, but Peter beside that, was made chief, to th' end the unitie of the Church might appeare in one chief Apostle, and schisms might be avoided, not so much among the Apostles (where none could chance) as among others afterwarde, who should have lesse grace to kepe unitie, then the Apostles had. But in case th' Apostles had ben so destitute of grace, that any one might have taught false doctrine, and stubbornly have defended the same: doubtlesse S. Peter might no lesse have deposed him, then he
be did separate Judas from the College of the Apostles, even after his death. And that had bene alwaies the true Catholike Church, which had followed S. Peters doctrine.

But now the privilege of the other Apostles, did nothing hinder S. Peters chief power, who had sufficient authority to have controlled them, if they had de lacked sufficient grace, to have taught only true doctrine. And although they had grace not to erre, yet his power was not in deed the less thereby, but it had the less occasion to shew it selfe upon the Apostles: even as the Law is not therefore the weaker, because it can not be practised upon the just men.

That

1 Tim. 10. Lex iusti non est potiō.
The Rock

That S. Peter, presbyteriue above the other Apostles is most manifestly sene by his chiefbishoplie power.

The XII. Chap.

1. It is alread shewed, first, that S. Peter passed the Apostles a great way in some kinde or other of Ecclesiastical power.

2. Secondlie, that the Apostles had two kinds of power, one proper to their Apostleship, an other common to al Bishops.

3. Thirdlie, that in the Apostolike office all the Apostles were in allpoints equal with S. Peter, saveing onlie that aboue and beside his office, he was made by Christ the first and the chiefe of the all: to thend unittie might be alwaies shewed and kept by one capitain Apostle, being also able to have strengthened the, but that they (prevented with grace) needed not his help.

4. Now the it remainth to see, how far S. Peter
S. Peter passed the other Apostles in the state and degree of their bishops in power. Herein, I say, that whereas we may consider in a prelate either his order and office, or els the authority and jurisdiction of the same, the order and office of bishoply power was equally common, not only to all the Apostles, but likewise to all other bishops.

For it is generally true which S. Hierom saith: ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, hinc Romae, hinc Eugubia, eiusdem meriti, eiusdem est & Sac
cerdontij. Wheresoeuer a bishop be, whether at Rome (which is the head citie of the world) or at Eugubium (which is a small town) he is of the same merit, and of the same priesthood. That is to say, euerie Bishop may as wel preache, and minister the sacrament of confirmation or of priesthood (and much more all the other Sacraments) to his owne Citizens, or doe any like matter belonging to his order, as the highest bishop in...
in the world may. For the order is equalie common to them all.

And that is it which S. Cyprian saith, Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidu pars tenetur. The bishoplie office is one, whereof every man holdeth a part for the whole, that is to say, every man doth partake the bishoplie office wholly, and without diminution. For as every man hath for his part the whole nature of a man in himselfe, so hath every Bishop for his part the whole nature of a bishop in himself.

This equalitie of bishoply order and office not withstanding, the Apostles were in their bishoply prelateshippe and jurisdiction a great way before S. Peter, because he had a higher and larger power of governing given to him over Christes shepe, then any of the other had in that behalfe. Touching then the superiority of S. Peter's jurisdiction, for as much as all the power he had, was either Apostolike, or bishoply, seing
Seing he could not easily have more committed to his over the rest of the shepe by his Apostolike office, then the other Apostles had (for e'ch of the had charge over the whole Church, and the government of their own persons excepted) what greater power could S. Peter haue) if this notwithstanding I prone euidently that Christ committed to S. Peter more Ecelesiastical power eu'h over his shepe then to anie other: it must needs be rather meant of more bishoply, then of more Apostolike power. And so albeit the power and jurisdictiō of the Apostles over the rest of the shepe be equal, yet the power of bishops eu'n over the same shepe is not equal. How prone I the that S. Peter had more committed to his charge, the the other Apostles? Verily because Christ in the presence of S. John, S. James, and S. Thomas the Apostles, ad of other three disciples sauid to Peter: Simō Ioānis diligis me plō his. Ioan.21: Simon the son of John doest thou love me
me more then these. And surely, seing S. John was among them, who was so tenderly beloved of Christ, that he was known by the name of the Disciple whom Jesus loved, when Peter is asked, whether he love more then they, he us in effect asked, whether he love more then any other Apostle or Disciple.

Neither doth our Lord demaund his question, as a thing whereof he doubted, but to instruct vs, that Peter loved him more then the other. Whereupon S. Augustin concludes: Sciebat igitur Dominus, nó solá quod diligert, verum metiam quod plus illis diligert eum Petrus. Therefore our Lord did know, that Peter did not onely love (him) but also that he loved (him) more then they.

And yet seing Peter could not love Christ more then the other did, except Christ had first loved Peter more then he loved the other (for Peters excellët love
love towards Christ must needs come of the former exceeding love of Christ toward Peter as the scripture it selfe doth teach us) it is out of all controversy, that Christ first loved S. Peter, more then he loved any other man in the whole world. What? more then he loved S. John? or more then he loved his own mother?

I answer, that there are diverse considerations of love. Alexander the great had two frindes, who loved him for diverse respects. The one called Craterus loved him as king, and loked to his honour in matters belonging thereunto. The other called Hephhestion, loved his son, and diligently pursued his health and private well doing. Whereupon King Alexander was wont to saie, that Craterus loved the King, but Hephhestion loved Alexander. Ewe so Christ loved his Mother above all creatures, in the respect of that love which it pleased him (as her Sonne) to
Exod. 20. owe unto his Mother by the Law of nature. And therein he loved her almost incomparable above S. Peter. Likewise he loved personally S. John the Evangelist, and S. John loved him more then other, in that he was a virgin by Christ's gift, as who had dedicated his bodie and soule to Christ alone.

But in respect of Christ's flock which was to be feed, and governed in the earth, in that respect, Christ loved S. Peter, and S. Peter him more the others. The distinction being kept, we may well say, that our Lady loved Christ (as the Sonne of God taking flesh of her own bodie) more then any other: and that S. John loved Christ (as the cause of his virginitie, and the Author of his chast loure) more then any other, and that S. Peter loved Christ (as the Prince of pastours) more then anie other, of which last kind of loure Christ now spake, as it may well appeare by his owne words.

For
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For whē S. Peter had answered, ye a Lord, thou knowest, that I loue thee, Iesus said to hi, fe de my λάβσ. As who should saie: for as much as thou in respect of my pastoral power, loueest me more then these, take more power then they to feede my lambs. For now sith Peters loue is the cause why Christ geneth him power to feede his lambs: according to the measure of the loue, the measure of the feeding must be under-standed. Dominus Iesus (saith S. Au- De temp. gustine) respondenti amorē, com: ferm. 142. mendat agnos suos, & dicit: pæce eues meas. tanquam diceret, quid retribues quia diliges me, dilectios nem ostende in omnibus. To Peter answering that he loue, our Lord Ie- sus commendeth his lambs, and saith: Feede my shepe, as if he should say: what wilt thou render to me because thou loueš me? shew thy loue toward the shepe.

The same verie sense S. Chrysostome geneth.
...geue th: Si amas me, fratri curas sui pias. If thou loueest me, or seing thou loueest me, take the care of thy brethren. If then the authority of feeding, be the reward of Peters loue, forasmuch as according to S. Augustines judgemet grounded upo the expresse word of God, Peter loued more the the other, Peter is now bid to shew more loue in taking care of his brethren, then any other. Which thing because he can not doe, except he receive more power and authoritie to feed his brethren, then other have (for Peter can doe no more in that behalfe, then is from heauie committed to him) it doth instinctible follow, that Christ at this time geueth to Peter alone more power and authority to feede his sheepe, then any other had, or can have.

For the literal meaning of Christes whole discourse, is none other thing, than to say, for as muche as thou loueest me more then these, feede my sheepe.
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In the compass or meaning of which words, it is not possible for any other Apostle to be comprehended equally with S. Peter. For if any other may feed equally with him, by the force of this commission, the same cause of feeding must be in him, which is named in this commission. That is to say, he must love more than these. But these, if any other do so, then hath Peter no commission to feed Christ's sheep, because he then doth not love more than they, seeing they must love more than he, or else no commission of feeding is given to him. Whosoever hath this commission to feed Christ's sheep, he must first love Christ the prince of pastors, more than these, as Peter now doth. And by these I shewed before all the Apostles and disciples to be meant. Therefore they are all excluded from this authority wherof Christ speaketh presentlie: And yet seeing the sheepe of the whole world are in other places committed to all
the Apostles the which power (concerning all other beside the Apostles themselves) is so great, that this can be no greater, if these things be well conferred and weighed together, we are forced to confesse that this commission whereunto more authoritie over the sheepe to one then to the reast, is not proprly anie Apostolike power (for then al the Apostles should have it equally) but it is an other kind of power which being perhaps not much inferior to the Apostolike authoritie, must yet so remaine in one above others (so long as the shepe of Christ doe remain) as it is now given to one more then to other, because he loueth more then the other.

This kind of power is now called the power of one chief Bishop or pastour: Whereupon S. Augustine saith concerning this very text of scripture, and this one pastour S. Peter: Dominus in ipso Petro unitatem commens datur.
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davit. Multi erant Apostoli, & In homini
uni dicitur, pastæ oves meas. Abs
sit ut desinat modo boni pastores,
se omnes boni pastores in uno
sunt, unum sunt. Our Lord hath recom-
mented unity in Peter himself. There
were many Apostles, and it is said to
one, feed my sheep. God forbid, there
should lacke now good Pastours, but
al they are in one, they are one.

S. Augustine manifestly declarith
hereby, that Saint Peter alone was spok
en unto (among other causes) for
this also, to signifie (in him selfe, be-
ing one Pastour) the unitie which al
Pastours have in Christ, the Prince of De sanctis
Pastours. In uno Petro figurabas formam,
unitas omnium Pastorum. The uni-
ty of all Pastours was signified in Peter
alone or in Peter being one Pastour.

But whereas the unitie of all good
Pastours in Christ alone, is not literal-
ly expressed in this place of the holy
scripture, but is onely builded mystical-
lie upon the literal storie of Peter, being made one shepheard: that mystical and allegorical sense is void; except this other literal sense be true. For in manner allegories are grounded upon some true and literal historie. Therefore S. Peter is indeed made Pastour alone, who may conteine al the Pastours of the earth in his unitie, to the ende he thereby may shew that al the good Pastours which have ben, be, or shalbe, are one in Christ the prince of Pastours.

So that by S. Augustines discourse it is cleare two waies, that Peter hath no fellow in this pastoral office whereof Christ now speaketh. Both because he alone loneth more then other, and he is one pastour in earth for the time, to shew that Christ is one everlasting pastour of his whole flock, both in earth and in heauen.

From S. Augustine let vs passe over to S. Chrysostome, who hauinge taught, that Christe asketh, whether Peter
Peter loueth him (not to teache vs that S. Peter loued him, but to informe vs Quanta sibi curae sibi gregis hujus praefectura, how great care he taketh of the government of this flock) conclueth in this wise: Petru Christus authoritate præditum esse voluit, ac reliquis item Apostolos longe præcellere. Christe would haue Peter to be indowed with authoritie, and also to passe a great waie the other Apostles.

Marke first, that it is praefectura gregis, the rule and governement of the flocke Which Christ intendeth.

Secondlie, that Christe would haue Peter to be indowed not onely with grace, and vertue, but with such authoritie, as did apperteine to the feeding of Christes sheep.

Thirdly, that he would him to passe the Apostles: and wherein, I pray you, but in authoritie? For he passed them in that thinge, where with he...
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Was indowd. But Christ indowd him
With authority; therefore Peter passed
the other Apostles in authority.

Forthby he passed them longe, a great
Way.

He passed the Apostles in al other
power after some certain sort, either be-
cause he had that power first, which was
guen them afterward, or els because
he had that power ordinarily, which
was extraordinarily guen them, or
els because, whereas they were heads
of the shepe together with him ( thro-
ough their Apostleshippe) he was
also their head, as being the prince and
cheafe of the Apostles. But above all
other respects, he passed them longe, a
great way in the power of feeding the
shepe, as the cheife bishop.

So that Leo had just cause to saye:
Cùm Petro præ cæteris solvendi
& ligandis tì tradìta potestas, pas-
cendarum tìn ouii cura specialius
mandata est. Whereas the power of
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binding and loosing is delivered to Peter above others, yet the care of feeding the shepe is more specially committed. Will you see how much more specially?

Arnobius noteth none of the Apostles ever to have had the name of a Pastour given to him by Christ, besides S. Peter alone, to whom it was said, pasce oves meae, feed me mine shepe. That is to say, be thou the pastour of my shepe. Nullus Apostolorum nomen pastoris accepit. Solus enim Dominus Iesus Christus dicebat: Ego sum Pastor bonus. & iterum: me inquit, sequuntur oves meae. Hoc ergo nomen sanum, & ipsius nominis potestatem post resurrectionem suam Petro pecunia tenti concessit, & ter negatus negotiori suo haeque, quam solus habuit, tribuit potestatem.

None of the Apostles hath receaved the name of a pastour. Four our Lord

2 iiij Iesus
Jesus Christ alone did say: I am a good pastour: and againe he saith, My shepe doe follow me. But this holy name and the power thereof after his resurrection he graunted to Peter repenting, and being thrife denied, he did give unto him, who denied him, this power, which he alone had. Christ alone had the power to feede his owne flocke; this power he gaue to Peter in such sort, as none other Apostles had it.

For he gaue to Peter the name of a Pastour, & ipsum nominis potestatem, and that power which the name did import. But as Arnobius said before, nullus Apostolorum nomen Pastoris acceptit. None of the Apostles toke the name of a pastour: therefore none of them toke the power of feeding after such sort, as the name and power thereof was now given to Peter. And seing every Apostle had authority before to feede all nations through his Apost-
Apostleship: this feeding which is now given to Peter alone, and must be meat of some other power beside the Apostolic function, is doubtless meant of Peter's bishoply power.

I beseech the discreet Reader neither to use cauls himself, nor to give care to them who love to wrangle. Here would M. Jewel straight way shew, that Christ gave manie pastors and teachers to his Church, and that every Apostle did feed, of which things I deny no one. But I say there was beside the Apostleship a kind of feeding so peculiar to Peter, that no Apostle toke (so specially as S. Peter did) either the name thereof, or the thing meant by the name.

Which thing the holy scripture doth insinuate, when it sheweth Peter to have loved more then other, and consequentlie according to the measure of his love to have taken the measure of feeding. In which sense Saint Chrysostom
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Sotom, S. Augustine, Leo and Arnobius doe evidently agree. We must therefore confesse a supereminent power of the pastoral office in Peter, that preeminence, say I, consisted in the ordinarie power of being the chief shepherd. He that denieth my interpretation, must bring a better, which I marveile how he shall come by.

But lette vs also consider the mind of S. Ambrose in this behalf. Who having said by S. Peter, that he was ubi quis aut solus, aut primus, every where either alone, or chief, at the last he cometh to speake of these woordes of Christ spoken to Peter, amas me, doest thou love me?

Dominus interrogabat, non ut disceret, sed ut doceret, quem elevandus in coelum amoris sui nobis velut Vicarium reliquast. Sic enim habes: Simon Ioan: nisi diligis me, utiqui tulestis Domine quia amo te. Dicit ei Iesus, palce agnos
agnos meos bene conscius sui non ad tempus assumptum sed iamdum dum Deo cognitum Petrus testificatur affectum. Quis est enim alius qui de se hoc facilè profiteri possit? Et ideo quia solus profiteatur ex omnibus, oibus antecertur. Our Lord asked, not to lerne, but to teache him who he, being to be assumpt into heauen, did leave to vs as the Vicar of his loue. For so thou readest. Simon the Son of Ion, doest thou love me? Yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee. Iesus said to him, feede me lambs. Peter being privy of a good conscience, doth testifie his own affection not taken for the time, but already well knowen to God. For who els were able to profess this thing of himself? And because he alone among all professeth he is preferred before all.

First note well, that S. Ambrose comparëth the loue with the feeding. For he reasoneth alwaies from the one to the
Secondlie he saith, that Christ, in consideration that he should ascend into heaven, taught him, whom he left the Vicar of his loue. Behold if Peter be the Vicar of Christ, it is no wonder that the Pope sitting in Peters chaire, is called also the Vicar of Christ. Yea but, (say you,) he is the Vicar of his loue, and not of his pastoral office. Yea, Syr, of both.

For now S. Ambrose speaketh of that loue, which consisted in having authority to feed the flock. For it foloweth in S. Ambrose: Sic enim habes, for thus thou readest. And immediately he commeth to the power of feeding, which Christ gave unto Peter in the highest degree of any mortal pastor, because Peter loved more then other. Christ left to vs a Vicar of his loue, who was that? Peter. When was he leaste a Vicar? When Christ said, feede meie lambs. The loue then left to vs was the
the power of feeding, which Peter had over us, and the Vicar of Christes love was the Vicar of Christes power, which he had to feed us.

Although Christ our euerlaeting meate feede us alwayes by his migh-
tie power, yet when he should goe corporallie into heaven, he leaft vs a Vi-
car of his corporall kinde of feeding.
His Wordes doe not nowe found in
our eares, as they did whiles he linid,
in preaching, in teaching, in admini-
string the Sacraments, in governing
the Church, and in sending other to
preache. Christ hath a Vicar, whome
to that effect he loueth above all other,
and who loueth him above all other:
to that effect, I saye, of feeding his
flocke.

Moreover S. Ambrose noteth, that
Peter omnibus antefertur, is preferr-
red before al, why so? Quia solus pro-
fitetur ex omnibus. Because he alone
of them al, doth professe. But why saith
S. Am.
S. Ambrose that he alone doth profess? Might any other man profess, when Peter alone was asked? No aile. And so dooth S. Ambrose mean, that Peter alone professeth his love, because he alone is asked whether he loved more than these. Otherwise if S. John who stood by, had been asked, I think he was not gilie of any lack of loving Christ. But Christ intended to give unto Peter more love then the other had, even for this purpose, that he might receive a higher power to feed, then other had.

Last of all, S. Ambrose noteth, as it were three degrees in the commissio of Peters authority of feeding, and that, according to the power of feeding thrice repeated. Ia non agnos (vt primo) quodam laete veles, endo, nec ousculas (vt secundo) sed oues pasces re subetur, perfectiores ve perfectior gubernet. (At the third time wherein our Lord said to Peter, pass feede)
of the Church.

feed) he was not now bid to seede
as it were with milke, the lambes
(as at the first time) nor the smaller
sheep, as at the second time, but the
sheep, to the end he being more perfit
might govern the more perfit.

It is now also to be noted, that S. Am
brose putteth the worde gubernaet,
to govern, in stead of pascere, to feed.
For in deed the shepheard hath autho-
ritie to rule and governe his sheepe.

Peter then hath authority not only over
the lambes, which are, as it were, the
childern, and the unlearned Christiaens,
not only over the smaller sheep, which
yet are elder then the lambes (as the
Christian lawyers, the learned physici-
ans, the Judges and Princes of Chri-
stendom) but also he hath power to go-
vern even the sheep which are of most
perfit age. Verely the ewes, the wea-
thers, ye the rams themselves, which
in divers places are capitaines of divers
flocks. So that parish Priestis, Bishops,
Arch-
Archebishes and Patriarches are committed to the government of Peter alone. He is the vicar of Christ, in love and power of feeding: therefore as none was without the compass of Christ's fold, no more may he be without the compass of Peter's fold, who will be reckoned in Christ's fold.

S. Bernard writing to Eugenius the Pope of Rome (whose bookes he that readeth, may welperce he speake it for no flatterie) hath these wordes: Alij Pastores habent sibi assignatos greges, singuli singulos, tibi vniueri crediti, vni vnutus. Nec modo ouium, sed & Pastorum tu vnutus omnium pastor. Vnde probem, quæris? Ex verbo Domini. Cuï enim nò dico Episcoporum, sed etia Apostolorù hic absolute & indiscrete tota commissæ sunt o- ues: Si me amas Petre, pasce oues meas. Quas: Illius aut illius populos ciuitatis, aut regionis, aut certi regni
Oues meas, inquit. Cui non planū, non designasse aliquas, sed assignasse omnes? nihil excipitur, voit distinguitur nihil.

Other pastours have flocks assigned to them, every pastour one flock: to thee all are committed, one flock to one shepheard. And not only of the sheepe, but also of the pastours thou alone art the pastour. Doest thou aske, how I proue it? By the word of our Lord. For to whome (I say not onely) of the Bishops, but also of the Apostiles so absolutelie and without distinction are all the shepe committed? If thou loyst me Peter, feede mie shepe. Which shepe? Whether the people of this, or of that citie, or countrie, or of a certaine kingdom? He saith, mie shepe. To whom is it not evident, that Christ did not appoint out some, but assigned all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinckted.

This place needeth no declaration.
tion, it is so full in all points. Wherefore I suppose it is by this time sufficiently proved, that St. Peter did excell a great way even his fellow Apostles in the pastoral authority of feeding Christ's flock. By which power St. James (otherwise wise St. Peter's equal) yet after he was once bishop of Jerusalem, was thereby of necessitate subject unto Peter, as who could not feed a part of that flocke, which was whole committed unto Peter, but by the acknowledging of Peter his general shepheard.

In signe whereof St. Peter being not readen himselfe to have ben ordei-

ned bishop of any other then of Christ, did yet with two other Apostles ordain St. James Bishop of Jerusalem, as the Ecclesiastical historic doth witnesse. In consideration of which St. Peters Bishoplie power, Arnobius (who would never haue called Peter the Apostle of the Apostles) yet dou-

ted not to name him the Bishop of
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Bishops, and to confirm the same by this place of the Gospel, where Peter alone is made the pastour, whiles it is said to him, feede my shepe.

And because his other woordes were alleaged before, it maie suffise now to heare him saie this much one lie of S. Peter: Ecce Apostolo pae nitenti succurritur, qui est Episcoporum Episcopus. Behold, the Apostle who is the Bishop of Bishops, being penitent findeth succour. Could anie thing be spoken more plainlie?

But you will say, that S. Clemente ge- In epist. with the very same title to S. James ad Iacobum also. As though Saint James being the Sir. Dom. Archbishop of Ierusalem, had not divers other bishops under his of which bishops he might well be called the bishop. But S. Peter being alone called the pastour (as Arnobius shewd before) adso being a bishop as he was a pastour, must be understandingly, not onely to be a bishop.
of some bishops (as every Archebishop is) but also a bishop of all bishops, as no man at al is, beside S. Peter and his successors. But Peter being alone the pastor, is alone the bishop of the very Apostles also, in that behalf as they were bishops, and not in that respect as they were Apostles.

Yea, but here an other may bring forth S. Cyprian, who saith: Neque quisquam nostrum Episcoporum esse constituit. Neither doth any of us make himself a bishop of bishops. I pray you Sir, what is this to the purpose? Because no man maketh himself a bishop of bishops, shall therefore Christ make no man a bishop of bishops? S. Cyprian speaketh of his own deede, and Arnobius speaketh of Christes deede. But if Christ himselfe make no man a Bishop of bishops, how is then S. James called a bishop of bishops? Or was S. James that, which S. Peter could not be?

Again,
Again, Saint Cyprian meaneth, that in matters, which are yet in controversy, no man may plaie the bishop of bishoppes in judging another bishoppe; or, in prescribing to him, what he shall beleue in dautfull cases. But S. Augustine expounding this verie place of S. Cyprian, sheweth it to be otherwise in matters which are alreadie well knowne and thoroughly discussed in the Church.

Moreover, Saint Cyprian in that place sheweth his humilitie and his loue of vaitie (as Saint Augustine hath well noted) in that he being in deedee a Bishop of some Bishoppes (because he was an Arche-bishop) yet doth renonc to use his authoritie, whereas notwithstaniding, if he had not ben aboue other Bishoppes, he should not have alwaies both sitten, and spoken first in the provincial Coucel, as both he and his Ancestours also had done.
Last of all, S. Cyprian doth most evidentlie confesse, the Supremacie of S. Peter, by that which he writeth of his principal Chaier and succession, as it shal appeare afterward. At this time it suffiseth, that S. Peter is taught by Arnobius to have been a Bishop of Bishops, which thing no Catholic like Father did at any time denie. Yea on the other side Optatus feared not to write thus of S. Peter: Preferri apostolis omnibus meruit, & clauces regni coelorum, communicandas coeteris, solus acceptit. Peter deserued to be preferred before all the Apostles, and he alone toke the keyes of the kingdome of heaven to be communicated unto others.

This preferment in taking the keyes to be communicated with others, is to be meant, concerning that whiles S. Peter alone was made the high Pastor and Bishop, therby the keyes were communicated to the other Apostles, in such
such sorte as they all were Bishops, and not so as though he communicated the keies to them in respecte that they were Apostles, for the Apostles take the keies belonging to their Apostolike office immediately of Christ, and not by the mediation of S. Peter. Accordingly as S. Paul teacheth himselfe to be an Apostle neither of men, nor by a man, but by Iesus Christ. Therefore, when Peter alone is said to have taken the keies, it is meant that he alone as high Priest and chiefe Bishop, took the keies of his pastoral office, to be comunicated by him to particular Bishops his inferiors. For as Leo writeth of his christian brethern: Petrum non solum Romanæ sedis praefulem, sed omnium Episcoorum nouerunt esse primatem. They know Peter to be not only the Bishop of the See of Rome, but also to be the Primate of all Bishops. This most plaine sentence I suppose, nedeth
no declaration. But it sheweth S. Peter beside his Apostolike office, to have a dubble power of governing the Church, one particular in the Citie of Rome, an other general over al Bisshoppes. Now such a primate of al Bisshoppes S. James was not, albeit he was a Bishop of some Bisshops.

To end this mater, let vs heare the judgement of S. Gregorie: Certè Petrus Apostolus primum membru sanctæ, & universalis Ecclesie est. Paulus, Andreas, Ioannes, quid aliud quàm singularum sunt plebium capita? Surely Peter the Apostle is the chiefe member of the holy and universal Church. Paul, Andrew, John, what other thing are they, then eche one the heads of particular Churches? Here S. Gregory meaneth not to saye, that Saint Paul or S. Andrew could not preache in all the worlde (God forbid) but onely that (as Bisshoppes) they could haue but this or that
that flocke under them, whereas in 1. Reg. otherwise Sainte Gregorie him selfe iii. 4. 4. confesseth, that S. Paule obtained the chiefe gouvernment of the whole Church. And the like, all the other Apostles obtained by their Apostleship, without any division of flockes or Churches assigned by Christe. But Peter hadde the charge of the whole Churche, not onely as an Apostle, but also as a high Bishop. And therein onlie S. Gregorie meaneth that he passed Paule, Andrew, or John.

This much I trust may suffice them who will be satisfied, for prove that whereas every Apostle had in him the whole right of the Apostleship, and also the right of being a particular Bishop: Saint Peter had not only those two Authorities, but also he had the right of the highest Bishoppe in respect of all other Bishoppes. He as a Bishoppe, was the chiefe member of the whole militant Church (that
(that is to saie, to the head thereof) as S. Gregorie teacheth. He was the bishop of bishops, faith Arnobius, and the Primate of all prelates, faith Leo, the pastor of all pastors, faith S. Bernard. He alone by the judgement of Arnobius was called of Christ a Pastor, because there was none other announced to that power of feeding, which he received. He was preferred a greater way before the Apostles in authority, faith S. Chrysostome. In him (being one Pastor) unity was signified, faith S. Augustine. He was the vicar of Christes love in feeding vs, as S. Ambrose affirmed. Concerning this primacie of his Bishoply power, in that sense, he was much more properly the guide, toppe, mouth, chief, and head of the Apostles, then in the Apostolike function. For where-as they were chosen Apostles equally with him, he alone was chosen high Pastor above them. All these things have
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have been proved out of God's Word, and out of the holy Fathers.
Order now requireth, that I should shew S. Peters prerogatiue also by the continuance of his authoritie.

That the pastoral or chiefe Bishops authroritie of I. Peter was an ordinary authroritie, and therefore it must goe for euerynto his successours, whereas the Apostolike authroritie being extraordinarie, hath no successours in it.

The Xiiij.

The Apostles were instiuted for a certain purpose, vertlie to publishe the Gospel, and to plant the faith of Christ in al nations, with a most absolute power and with an authritie which never should be controll'd.

For, seing S. Peter being one man alone,
alone, was not able to preach the Gospel at once in all places, nor by and by to govern diverse nations newly converted (as whose commission from Christ was not as then sufficiently known) Christ gave him twelve Companions, with as full authority over the sheep for the time, as he had, who having converted many countries to the faith, might commend them all as sheep to be fed of many pastors under one perpetually chief shepheard S. Peter.

Who knoweth not, that it is much easier for one man to govern all the faith full (being once converted and well instructed) by the help of many inferior officers, then it is for him to subdue all those unto the faith, which being as yet infidels, are also dispersed into diverse quarters? But when the Apostles had spread the faith into all parts of the world, with the death of them, the Apostolike authoritie likewise was at an end. And that being con-
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confessed by our Aduersaries, even this last yer in a Confession printed at Zurich, needeth no farther proufe. For they saie: when the Churches were now stablished, the Apostles ceased to be. But that S. Peter must have successors, not in his Apostleship, but in his supremacy of being chiefe Bishop above all Bishops, that now is to be declared.

Who so marketh the peculiar names of a Rock, of a Pastor, and of a Con firmer of his brethren, whiche are given by Christ to S. Peter alone: may well perceive, that S. Peter's supremacy being meant by those names, must necessarie continue for ever. If a rock be laid in the foundation of the house, to stabe it up out of all question, the rock must not be taken awaie, if we will have the house to stand.

The Rocke Whereupon the whole Church is built from the beginning of the world to the end, is Christ himself.
The Rocke

sell, but not onlie the whole Churche, but also that part which liueth in the earth for the tyme, wherin vessells both of honour and of contumelie are (which vessells of contumelie are not in beaue) that part I, say, liuing on the earth is called the house of God, as S. Paule teacheth. Therefore it also must have a rock of his own sort and nature to leane unto.

For as Christ alone is the uniuersal Rocke of that uniuersal house, and the uniuersal shepheard of that great flocke: so besyde him, God alwaies ered some certain particular stones, ad certain small Rockes in the earth, which might stay vp that part of his house, which for the time wandered in this world. Such were Adam, Enos, Henoch, Noe, Abraham, Izaac, Iacob, Moses, Aaron, and his successours, who late in the chaire of Moses until the coming of Christ. For alwaies there was some visible Rocke of the Chur-
Churche in this life, who might be so strongly fastened in the faith of Christ the great Rocke, that he (though not for his own, yet for the Churches sake) might be able to stae up other small stones which leaned unto him.

Christ at the length having taken flesh, and walking visibly in this world, ad preaching in the land of Iewrie, did not only stay his univerfal house upon his Godhead (as he had euer done before) but noone also he stayed the militant Church upon the visible example of his own life, and upon the preaching of his own sensible doctrine according to his manhood, even after the same rate, as Mosyes did whiles he lived.

Now in consideration that Christ would forsake this world concerning his visible conversation, and that he would goe in his manhood to raigne in heauen gloriously over the glorious part of his Church: he instituted an other particular Rock and shepheard, who by
the outward preaching and confessing of his faith, might for his lifetime stay the militant Church of God in a right belefe, as Abraham or Moses had done whiles they liued.

Matth. 16

This particular militant Rocke was S. Peter for the tyme. But when he died, he left behind him still a particular militant Church (I call it particular in respect of the universal Church which for ever was and shall be) therefore some mortal man ought still to be in the earth, who may so uphold the militant Church by the assurance of his faith and confession, as S. Peter did once uphold the same: who likewise may still so confirm his brethren, as S. Peter was once willed to confirm them. All Christians are brethren among themselves, but all bishops are brethren in a higher degree of holy government.

Matth. 20

The Rocke therefore which shall strengthen both all the Christians, and namely all the bishops, must continue so
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so long, as there are either bishops or Christias in the earth. The same reason is also found in the name of a pastor. For as the flocke of shepe continueth after S. Peters death, even so must such an other pastor (as S. Peter was) be made, who may still sede and rule the flock of Christ. Whereupon S. Chrysostom saith: Christus sanguinem judicat, ubi pessuces eas acquirere, quorum curam tum Petro, tum Petri Success foribus committetabat. Christ hath shed his blood, to gette unto him those shepe, the cure of whose he did committe both to Peter, and to the Successours of Peter.

In that verye place it was ware S. Chrysostom said, that Peter being indowed, with authority passed the Loge pra other Apostles a great waie. As cellere, therefore Peter in the authoritie of feeding, passed the other Apostles: so must the Successours of Peter passe a great may the Successours of the other S. Apost.
Apostles which are al Bishops. For now Chrysostome confesseth, that the same care is committed to the succeffours of Peter, which was committed to Peter himself.

With S. Chrysostom Pope Leo agreeeth, saying: Soliditas illius fidei que in Apostoloru pricipe est laudata, perpetua est. Et sicut permanet, q in Christo Petrus credidit, ita permanet, quod in Petro Christus instituit. The strength of that faith which was praised in the prince of the Apostles is everlasting. And as that remaineth, which Peter beleue in Christ (that is to say, the Godhed of Christ) so doth that remain, which Christ instituted in Peter, that is to say a sure rock which may alwaies cõesse the true faith of Christ.

And Leo shewing afterward, how that remaineth, which was ordained in S. Peter, he saith: In fede Petri sua viuit potestas, excellit authoritas. In the seat of Peter his power liueth, his
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His authoritie excelleth. Therefore the authoritie of S. Peter, is an ordinarie power, which hath an ordinary succession in Christes Church.

These reasons are so plaine, so straigh, so true, so forceable, that I muse what understanding, what wit, or sense they have, who graunting Peter to have been the rock, whereupon the Churche was built for the time (which thing they must needs graunt, unlesse they will deny the expresse word of God; ad the perpetual consent of all the Fathers) yet will not graunt that another like Rocke shoulde be substituted after S. Peter.

Verely seing the reason of S. Peters confession, and of his power is such as agreeth to an ordinary office of the Churche, the office also of S. Peters being a rock, of strethning his brethren, and of feedynge Christes sheep, is an ordinary office, which hath ad must continue so long as there is a Militant house of God.

S. y in
in earth, and so long as either any brethren are who may be confirmed, or any shepe who rede to be fed.

And verily if S. Peter have no successors in his pastoral office, what means a Irenaus, b Optatus, and c S. Augustine by name to reckon up such successors of S. Peter as had lined c Ep. 165. till every of their age and tyme.

Moreover, whereas roman (excepting the cases of necessity) may rightly preach to them to whom he is not sent: if, as euerie particular pastour hath (as S. Cyprian teacheth) a portion of the flocke assigned to his government, for which he shall be accountable unto our Lord: so there be not some general pastour alwaies in the Churche, who, beside his particular charge, may send others to preach unto them, which are not yet converted, and who (when they are converted) may erect new Churches and plant new bishoprikes in those parties: (as S. Gregorie
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goried in England) if there be not Bed. ii. 1.
some, who mai(e (as Paule saith) cor- c. 23. &
trest the things which lack, and also 27.
controll other Bishoppes when they till.
are negligent. and who may excom-
municate even those Christians which
live in no particular diocese, but being
comersent among the Jewses or par-
nims, do there teache false doctrine,
and thence do write hereticall books or
sefis : if, I say, there be not
some general partours, who may com-
mon all other Bishoppes to Generall or
provinciall Counseles, and maie change
the former positive lawes of the Chur-
che, when either necessitie or chari-
tie requireth it, and who mai(e either
make two Bishoppes where one was
before, or unite two into one, or commit
Greg. i. 2.
the cure of any See or chaie vacant
epili. 35. &
to the next bishop, and so in all cases 35.
may pro vide for the benefit of Chri-
sties flock: it will come to passe, that the
house of God shall not be so well provi-
S iii ded
The Rock

ded for, as other meane States and com-
mon vocale are.

But if there be a power in Gods Churche, whereby all the former cases maie be well provided for, seing it is cleere, that the Apostolike power is ended: it must nedes be the high pasto-
ral power of S. Peter, which shall pro-
cure these affaires. And consequently
the high pastoral office of S. Peter is an
ordinary office, which ceased not with
his own death, but is transferred
to his Successours, as it shal
farther appere in the
next chapter
sauing
one.

That
That the ordinarie authority of S. Peter's primacy belongeth to one Bishop alone.

The XIII. Chap.

Saint Peter had not only the same power of binding and loosing committed to him alone, which was given in common to all the Apostles, but also he (as the head of all Bishops) had it specified to him before they had it. For whereas their authority is showed to have been given in the eighteenth chapter of S. Matthew, and in the twentieth of S. Iohn: the authority of S. Peter is described and promised in the sixteenth of S. Matthew, and it depended of the promise of Christ, wherein he said, thou shalt be called Peter, or the rock: the which promise was made (as it appeareth in S. Iohn) not only before the Apostles were chosen, but also before they were called to be the Disciples of Christ.

S. iiiij

Matth. 18

Iohn. 10

Matth. 16

Iohn. 1
In consideration whereof S. Cyprian might boldly say: Petro primus Do- minus (super quem ædificauit Ecclesiæ, & unde unitatis originem instituit, & offendit) potestatem illam dedit, ut id solus retur in terris, quod ille solutisset. Our Lord did first give unto Peter upon whom he built his Church, and from whom he did institute and shew the original or beginning, of unity) this power, that what soever he did loose, it should be loosed in the earth.

Notevel, when one hath first that right and power alone, which afterward others haue; if there be any ordinary power of that thing at al, it must nede be in him who hath it first. For whereas all ordinarypower dependeth cheifely of order, and whereas in order nothing can be before that which is first: seing S. Peter had first of all the right of the keyes of the kingdom of heauë in himself alone, and seing the power of the keyes
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keyes, that is to saie, of forsgening and of retening synnes is ordinarily in the Church, it cannot be otherwise, but that ordinary power was first in S. Peter alone.

If the pordiny power of binding ad loosing be once in one pastour alone, it must til continue (concerning that degree) in one alone, if it shal (at the leaft) remaine stil the same power. For if it be geuen to many, and be equal in them all, it is not now the same which was promised and geuen first to Peter alone, but another kinde of power, euon as the government of one prince differeth in kind from the government which is equally common either to manie, or to the whole people.

Seing it is cleere that the Apostles had the same power over the sheepe, which S. Peter had (concerning the exercise of all manner of binding, loosing, preaching and baptising) and yet their autoritie could not be the ordinarie power

Augustin in Ioan. Tract. 124.

Monats
chie, aristocratic, democratic.

Ioan. 20.
power which is in the Church (because they were manie, whereas the ordinary power was promised before to one alone) it doth insue, that they had their authority delegated ad specially appointed to them extraordinarily. Therefore although they fed the flock of Christ as well as S. Peter, yet they did it by delegatio, and by special comissio: whereas S. Peter alone was the ordinarie chief of shepheard, according to whose pattern there must still be some one appointed to feed Christes whole flock.

No man is at this day, that which the Apostles were. No man is able to write us an other Gospel, or to increase the Canonical Epistles, or to warrant that he received the first fruits of the holy Ghost, as the Apostles did. That authority died with them, and came to none other after them: ad consequentie, it was not ordinarie, but onely was committed to a few, during their owne lives. But the ordinary autho-
authority of this highe administration beganne in one alone, and therefore it must continue still in one alone. There must be still one Rock, beside and above all petite Rockes. There must be still one Shepheard, beside and above many petite shepheards. There must be still one greater then other, who may be made as the younder, and for whose faith Christ hath prayed, to the end he may strengthen his brethren.

And verily seing (as S. Bernard saith) there is most perfection in unitie, and in al division some imperfection is included: shal we thinck that Christ hath chosen to gouern his Church in earth, rather in an unperfet, then in a perfet sort? Again, sith as the state of the new testament, must needs be more perfet, then the state of the Lawe, which brought nothing to perfection: and yet seing in the Lawe, the ordinary Pastour was one high Priest ad Bishop (as

Matt. 16

John 21

Luke 22

De consid. 2

Heb. 7
(as Aaron and his seed after him) having many synagogues and Levites under his supreme government. What reason can be are, that the state of our visible Church should lack also in earth one higher priest and bishop over many particular parishes and dioceses? Thus have we both natural reason, the example of the Law, and the institution of Christ for one cheefe Bishop.

And that this was the mind of all the auncient Fathers also, it appeareth most evidentlie, because they gave such a reason, while the Church was built upon S. Peter, the which reason (without an extraordinarie appointment of God; ca neuer agree but onlie to one shepheard who may be aboue the rest. I say, without an extraordinarie appointment of God, for that the Apostles being manie, and being all equal, did govern the church in a maruelouse vnitie and concord, as if they had been al but one man. The which spirit of unity Christ
Christ gave them, that his institution (of twelue equal governours for the time) might well appeare not to be slaunderous or hurtful unto his Churche. For he would never have sent manie with equal authoritie into the whole world, except he had ben able to make them govern with one minde, spirit, and hart.

But seing it were stil a miraculouse thing to see twelue, and much more to see manie thousand bishops and rulers, being all equal stil to govern the whole Church in their equal authoritie without schisme, (as the Apostles did) that Apostolike authority being only instituted for the better publisheing of the faith, doth now cease, and one Shepherd is ordinarily alone set over all, by whose general power it may appeare, that Christes Churche is but one.

For that is the reason which S. Cyprian bringeth, why Christ built his Churche upon S. Peter, Ecclesia quæ vna
vna est, super vnum, qui claves eius accept, voce Dni fundata est: The
church which is one, was fouded by our
Lords voice vpon one, who take the
keies therof. And againe: Quauiis As
postolis omnibus, &c. tamen vt
vnitatem manifestaret, unitatis ex
iusdem originæ ab vno incipientë
sua authoritate disposituit. Although
Christ after his resurrection geneth to
al the Apostles like power, and faith:
As my Father sent mee, and I send
you, take ye the holy Ghoste: if
you doe remitte to anie man his
sinnes, they shalbe remitted: and
to whom you shal retaine them,
they shalbe retained: yet to the end
he myght make uinitie manifest, he
disposed by his authority the original
of the same Uinitie beginning fro
one.

Note, good Reader, that the Church
was built vpon one, both that it might
be one by the institution and ordinae
of
of Christ, and also that it might appere one. That it might be one, that is to say, that all the faithful might be in this life one visible flocke, because they have in this life one visible chief shepheard, to whom if they obey, no schismes can be in the Church: that it might appere one, because this externall unitie of one flocke under one shepheard in this world, is a signe that the universall Church (which was, is, and shall be) is in deed for ever one, through the one shepheard Jesus Christ who is alone the universall shepheard: whereas Peter had no more but that piece of the flocke committed unto him, which was in the earth whiles he lived.

But if Peters chiefe authoritie, shall be now dividied into manie Bifhoppes of equall power: then the Militante Church, neither is one visible flocke under one visible shepheard, nor it dooth not signifie, that the
the universal Church was, and is, and shall be one by Jesus Christ; but rather it most falsely signifies that, as in earth there are thousands of flocks all equal, and at several: so there are as many Christ's, and as many shepherds over the universal Church. Which signification seeing it is impious, and meeteth for heretics only, who being many, and coming in Christ's name, do make so many Christ's, as they are men: I exhort all men, who favour the only one universal head Jesus Christ, to believe and profess only one general head of this flock of his which is in earth. For as this militant flock is one, by one military shepherd: so is the universal Church one flock and one body, through Jesus Christ alone the universal shepherd and head.

Optatus sayeth likewise, that S. Peter's chaire was singularis, that is to say such a one, as had no fellow, and why so? ut in una cathedra in qua sedit Petrus.
Petrus, unitas ab omnibus seruas retor, ne cæteri Apostoli singulas sibi quiser operarentur, ut iis schismaticus & peccator esset, qui contra singularem catedram, alteram collocaret. Ergo cathedra unica quæ est prima de dōtib’ sedit prior Petrus. (Peters chaire was singularie one) et thend unity might be kept of all men in that one chaire, where-in Peter sat. And that the other Apostles might not chalenge every man a chaire to himself; so that he should now be a schismatic and a sinner, who should place another chaire against the chaire which hath no fellowes. Peter then satte in the onely chaire, which is the chiefe dourie of those that belong to the Church.

Could anything be devised more plaine? the Chaire of Peter is one, and onely, and singular, where-in he being foremost satte, to thend none other Apostle might erect a contrarie
trarie chaire to Peters chaire. Whereby he meaneth not, that any Apostle would so much as indevour any such thing, but it was done, to shend no successour of the Apostles might take any occasion to say: Nye chaire is as good as Peters. For an Apostle also did sitte in my chaire. For this cause, I say, Peter alone had the first chaire and the singular chaire, which had no fellow at all.

S. Hierom also bringeth the selfe same reason, why S. Peter alone was the head and chief of all, saying: Prop.: terea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio. Therefore among twelve one is chosen, that a head being made, the occasion of schism might be taken away. But who was that one? A: Erat celerum est, quia Petrus senior erat, ne magister bonus in Ioannem adolescentem causam præbere videretur inuidiae. The age
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age was preferred, because Peter was the elder, lest the good master (Christ) should come to gene occasion of enuie, if he had chosen the yong man Saint John.

If then Peter was the one who was chosen and if he was chosen of Christ to take away the occasion of schisme: one chiefe pastour must still continew, stil to take away the occasion of schism. for S. Peter was not made the Apostles head, as though the Apostles themselfes had ben in daunger to make a schisme (it were a madness to thinck so of those blessed vessels of God) but his primacie (as Leo doth recorde) was a Serm.3 in plat foorme for other bishoppes, who should have lesse grace, and would have more pride: that they might under stand how themselves ought not to disdaine to have one head sette over the, if the very Apostles had a head among them. For their dedes are our instruction.

Ty If
If then a head was set over the Apostles for their sakes who should be pastors afterward, what extremity of folly is it, to make S. Peter alone a head over them, who last of all needed a head: and to leave our weak prelates all without a head? Who (many of them) need not only a head, but also a diligent and a severe head.

Here might I worthily fall into a common place, and show, that according to the saying of S. Cyprian, heresies have sprung of none other cause so much, as for that one judge hath not been acknowledged in the see of Christ; for the tyme, to whom the whole brotherhood might obey. The which saying if it be verified (even by M. Jewels and M. Nower's confession) in every particular diocese: how much more is it true, that the whole Church containing certaine thousands of dioceses, must have one judge for the tyme, to whom the whole
Whole brotherhood should obey, so that heresies and schisms may be avoided?

For if one judge be so necessarie, that one little shore and diocese can not lack him, but that (Whilest one parish priest disdains another) the diocese falleth straight into a schism, can the Whole Church being spread through, Aforemore out the world lack the same one judge, and yet not fall into schisms? Or shall the part be provided for, and shall the Whole remain without so good a provision? But this argument is begun already between Mr. Dorman and Mr. Novel. And we have manie a day looked, what Mr. Novel will answer to it.

Furthermore, we never found, nor shall finde one word or syllable in the whole new testament, where it maie appeare, that ever Christ committted any particular companie of the faithfull men (Who then lived) to any
any one apostle or disciple, who might be residing with the alone, as their only Pastor. The parts and members of Christ's whole militia flock which are now made here, and there, were instituted by the Apostolike and Ecclesiastical authority, not surely without the special providence and inspiration of the holy Ghost, but yet not immediately by Christ, but through his will by man's authority. And therefore the bounds of any parish or diocese, may for probable causes be changed again by another man, who hath such like authority, to change the bounds of parishes as they had, who first made them.

Particular flocks then are voluntary, and likewise particular pastours. But one flock and one pastour, is of absolute necessity in the earth. Also doth S. Cyprian witness: Deus unus est & Christus unus, & vna Ecclesia, & Cathedra vna super Petri Domini voce fundata. There is one God
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and one Christ, and one Church, and one chaire founded upon Peter by our Lords voice. Behold, this one chair which is founded upon Peter, must needs be the one pastoral preeminence which Christ himself did institute in the militant Church.

This matter standing so shall we say that the Church of Christ continueth in the earth or no? If it do continue, shal Christes owne absolute institution continue above the vertuouse, but yet voluntarie institution of men? or shal the good and voluntarie institution of man prevailmore then the most persit institution of Christ? Men made many particular flocks according as they thought most convenient for this or that place, and they did set over them many particular pastours, somewhere a Priest, and somewhere a Bishop. Christ made in at but one militant flock, which should consist both of Iewes and Gentils, and did set over it Saint Peter one general.
heard. And there was made (euen in earth after Christes ascension) one Sheepcote, and one Shepheard.

Shall now these many flocks, and mane Shepheards, which men appointed, continue stil: And shall not the one flock, and the one Shepheard, which Christ assignéd much more continue? Forasmuch as a flock of sheep is one by the force of one pastor, if the pastor in earth be not one, the flock in earth is not one. But al me beléue one militat church, which is the flock of Christ in earth: therefore al men ought to cöfesse one militat Shepheard of the same flock in earth also. For although the Churche be one more ways then by one Shepheard, yet if Christ had not meant, that his Churche should be one flock, not only for having one faith, one baptisme, or one spirit, but also for having one Shepheard: he would never have said: There shalbe made one Sheepcote, and one Shepheard.

But now, seing he faith: I haue other
other Sheepe, which are not of this fold (so wit, of the Iewes synagog) and I must bring those, and they shal heare my voice, and there shalbe made one fold (or flocke) and one Shepheard: it is evidente, that as the Iewes and the Gentils, beside the unitie to come in heauen, are one fold and one flock in this world: even so, that they have one temporal Shepheard in this world, beside Christe the everlastinge Shepheard.

Which thing fith it is so, is it possible, that any Protestant wilbe so iniuriose to Christ, as to preferre the good institution of S. Paule (who planted one Church at Corinth, another at Ephesus, and the third at Athens) before the absolute and perelasse institution of Christ, who in the whole earth piled one great Church, wherof he made one great Shepheard under himselfe the universall Shepheard?

I see, that the Protestantes talke much
much of God's Word, but the Word they speak of, is written in no Gospel. They will have many flocks and many shepherds to continue still, neither do we deny it, because it was so instituted by the Apostles: but the Catholickes will much more have all these flocks to be only one church in earth, because they are all to be reduced unto the obedience of one chief shepheard in earth, which was the institution of Christ. Either let the text be named, where Christe did institute many parishes, ad many dioceses, or seeing there is none such, and on the other side seeing we bring a plain text, where it is said to one pastor, feed my sheep, let not the other see the order veraciouslie taken afterward by the Apostles be so maintained, that the former appointment of the Sonne of God be thereby made void. Either let both orders take place (as with the Catholickes they doe) or if one of the two shall needs be disappointed, let us rather have
have in albut one chiefe shepheard, as Christ immediatly left the mater, then to have many, and not to have one.

Moreover to what other thing doth al the whole order of the Church tend in earth, but only to an unity? Why is one Curate in a parish set over many families and houses? Why is one Bishop in a diocese set over many parishes? Why is one Primate or Metropolitan in a province set over many Bishops? Why are all the primates of one quarter of the world, reduced under one Patriarch? but only euermore to shew, that the government of the Church tendeth by many midle unitiies, to one supream pastoral unity in this life. Wherevpo Leo saith: Magna dispositione, quipu est, ut esset in singulis provinciis singuli, quorùm inter fratres habenter prisma sententia, & rursus quidain majoribus viribus coauthoritute sollicitudinè susciperet ampliorè, per quos ad vnà Petri sedè universalis Ecclesiæ

The vyhol gouvemmet of the mil itant Church tendeth to unity.
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ciesse cura confuereret, X nihil vna
quan a suo capite ciscideret. It was
ordained with great providence, that
there should be in every province one,
whose judgment (or sentence) might be
chief among the brethren. And again,
that certain being spoilt in the grea-
ter Cities, should take greater charge,
by whom the cure of the universal
Church might flow together to
the one seat of Peter, and that no-
thing might at any time dissent fro his
head. Lo, by may primates the cure of
the whole cometh to him, who sitteth
in S. Peters See, which is at Rome.

Again, seeing all Ecclesiastical institu-
tio and government of the Church came
from Christ, one way or other, it must
needs be, that every bishop hath the
portio of the flock (which he go-
governeth) assigned to him by some
order or other, taketh by Christ him-
sel. But Christ by his own express
word assigned not, that S. Peter should rule
any
any one piece of the Militant flocke, and S. James an other, and S. John the third, but rather by his appointment, S. Peter might rule the self same flock, which S. John, or S. Paule, or S. James might, and contrariwise, they might rule the same flock which S. Peter did. For all were sente equallie into the Whole World.

Therefore except beside this common commending of the flock indifferentlie to all, S. Peter alone had bene made the chiefe Pastor and head of the whole flock (as indeed he was) and that not onely as an Apostle, but as a Bishoppe and as one ordinarie officer, the like Whereof should for ever continue in the Church: We might boldlie saie, that the example of having any one ordinary Curate, Bishop, or Metropolitane, in anie one parish or Diocefe, or Province, were utterly without anie example of Christes institution in the Apostles themselves. And therefore (that equall institu-
institution of many pastours over one flock only standing, which thing the protestants doe maintain) it should innin
cibly follow, that seing no devise of man is able to controll the institution of Christ, it were at this day much better, to haue twelve or thirteen curates in one parish and so many bishops in one diocese, the to haue one alone.

For Christ (if Peter alone were not alone the Apostles in the chiese pastoral dignitie) made thirteen Apostles to be equal pastours and governers of the seif same flock: and that foorm of government, which Christ ordained, ought still to continue in every particular Church: for who dare change our Lords institution?

But on the other side, if all the world confesse, that now in one Church, there ought to be at one time, but one bishop, or one pastour, in so much that...
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res, vt nuncupantur, Episcopi esse non poterant: in one city there could not be many bishops, (according as a bishop is now taken to signify one that is above common priests) If whereas once many priests (according to S. Hieroms minde) ruled one Church for a time equally, yet for the better avoiding of schismes, that government was changed, and one bishop was set over them as being S. Hierom alloweth well the change as being made for the better, and yet it could not have ben for the better, if it had wholly lacked a form and patern in that government, which Christ himself appointed to the Church: being the same S. Hierom saith, that among twelve one was chosen, (ad that by the good master Christ) to shende the occasion of schisme might be taken away: of these things (I say) Well weighed and conferred to gather. I may most certainly conclude, that Christ did not only institute S. Pe-
terto be as one chiefe pastour in the
Wholemilitant Church according to S.
Hieroms expresse meaning, but that
also he did institute him alone as an
ordinarie officer, according to whose
unity, every other Church should be at
the iegth ruled by one curate or bishop.
For as the twelve Apostles governed
the flock for a tyme togethery with S.
Peter extraordinaire, and S. Peter a-
alone governed the whole flock ordina-
arily: so when the Apostles yet issued,
some few parishes were governed ex-
traordinariy by many pastours at once,
as S. Hierom thinkest. But as we see
most clerely, that the equall govern-
ment of many pastours in any one pa-
rishe or diocese in the Whole World tog
before S. Hieromstyme was Wholy ex-
pired: so we may as evidently perceave
(if we be not gueen over to a blind
hart) that the extraordinaire govern-
ment of the twelve Apostles, or of any
other prelates with equal power, was
fifteen
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fifteen hundred yeres past expired. And that now the onely ordinarie meane to gouerne Gods Churche, as well in the whole, as in the parts, is to have one pastour alone in every parish, and one chief pastour alone over the whole militan Church, the which one chief pastour is the bishop of Rome, as now it shalbe proued by Gods grace.

That the Bishop of Rome is that one ordinarie pastour who succedeth in S. Peters chaire, and is aboue all bishops according to the meaning of Gods word.

The XV. Chap.

As Sina, being a mountaine in Arabia, is said of the Apostle to be ioyned, or to be nighen to the earthly city of Jerusalem, not so much for the nighnes or affinity of the place, as for the likenes of condition (because the self same Law of Moses, which had ben geuen in Sina, was af-
terward continued and preserved in Jerusalem). And as by that meaneth the Jewes who (at the tyme of the Lawe first receaved) were not bound to Jerusalem at all (as the which was then full of Idolatrie) were afterward bound to come thither thrice every yeare, because the highe priesthood and temple was settled there, as in the place which God chose: even so farre it betweene the chiefe power, which Crist gave to S. Peter, and the Church or bishop of Rome.

For albeit when the Church was built upon Peter, and when he was made chiefe pastour of the same, he were in Palestina, and not in Rome, ad for that tyme was rather accounted the highe bishop of the Circucision, that is to say, of the faithfull Jewes, then of the Gentils (who were not then converted fro their Idolatrie) yet for asmuch as the same S. Peter (whose primacie is plentifully set forth in Gods Worde) at the
the length settled himselfe at Rome by Iren. lib. 3
Gods appointment, and left a successor cap. 3.
there: for this respect I may well affirm Tertul. de
that the Bishop of Romes Primacy is præscript;
comended and warranted by Gods own
word.

And seing it hath ben already declared, that S. Peter alone, according to
the first literal sense, was both the rock, whereupon Christ promised
to build his Church, and also the pastour, who as he loued Christ more
then other, so he had authoritie to feede Christes flocke more then
anie other Bishop: Item, that the power of Peter was ordinarie, and
must continue still in the Church of
God: Item, that it must continue in
one chiefe Shepheard onlie: Now
if I shew, that the Bishop of Rome
is that one ordinarie chiefe Shep-
heard, who successeth in the said Au-
thoritie of Saint Peter, how can it
be avoided, but that the Supremacie
V ÿ of the
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of the Bishop of Rome is auouched and taught by Gods owne word?

First, not only at the histories, all holy writers, and the general tradition of all ages have testified, that S. Peter came to Rome (notwithstanding some basormfick men woulde now persuade the contrarie) but also the selfe same thing is witnessed by the expresse word of God, when S. Peter faith in the end of his own epistle, salutat vos Ecclesiae, quae est in Babylone collecta. The Church which is gathered together in Babylon, saluteth you. For there he called Rome Babylon: Because as Babylon was named of the confusion of tongues, and had in it (whiles it was the seat of the monarchy) a manner of nations, and consequently a manner of vices: even so had Rome (being now the seat of the Romane Empire, when S. Peter wrote thence) a manner of tongues, of nations, and of vices in it. And of this mind was that Auncient Fa[ther
ther Papias, and diverse other holy Euseb. his
Writers concerning the same place of S. fir lib. 70
Peters Epist. 15. 8

Neither did S. Peter only come to
Rome, and preache at Rome for a tym, but he also died there, ad so died there,
that it appered euidently God would
have him die no where els. For 
wher-
as (according to the duty of the chiefe
pastour ) he came to Rome chieffely to
saue his flocke there from the raging
furie of Simon Magnus the capitaine
of all heretiks ( who began to be wor-
shiped for a God in Rome ) whě by his
praier he had caused the devils who cas-
ried Simon Magnus along in the ayer, to
let him fall ( whereupon his death in-
sued shortlie after ) the Emperour Ne-
ro ( who toke no small delight in the
forcerie of Simon Magnus ) being sore
offended with S. Peters dede, sought
straight waies his apprehension and de-
struction.

As that tym, the Christians being
Vij verie
The Rock

Ambros. post epist. 32. lib. 5

verie loth to be deprinced of so good a pastour as S. Peter was, with much intreating and many teares prayed him to goe out of the way, and to saue himselfe. At whose requeste Sainet Peter (otherwise unwilling thereunto) beganne to take his journey out of the citie.

But when he was come to the gate, he seeth Christ comming toward him, whence he adoring said, Domine quo vadis? O Lord, whether goest thou? Christ said unto him, venio Romam iterum crucifigi. I come to Rome to be crucified againe. Peter understoode thereby, that Christ would suffer in him at Rome, who suffereth in every of his members, not by paine of bodie, but by compassion of pitie, or rather by the greatenes of glorie which is gotten to him by the victorious death which his Saints are put unto.

Upon this vision Peter returned againe into the Citie of Rome, and being
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being taken, he was putte to death upon the crosse with his head downward: so that Christ himselfe appoin
ted Rome to be the place, where S. Peter should rest.

This matter is witnessed, not onlie by Saint Ambrose, but also by Egesippus, who was a very auncient Writer, even straight upon the tyme of the Apostles: albeit his worcke being translated into Latin, seemeth to have certain names of Cities added by him, who did translate it about the tyme of S. Ambrose, and of Ruffinus.

Neither is it to be dount, but S. Luke would have writen the same appearing of Christ unto S. Peter (as well as he wrote the appearing of Christ unto S. Paul) if he had gone so farre forward in his storie of the Acts of the Apostles. But seing he did not continue his narration untill the death of S. Peter, and of Saint Paul, we must needs credit those faithfull auncient witnesses.
Witnesses, who report the same. By
which history we learn that Christe
(who might easilie have graunted the
the glory of Martyrdom to his Apostle
in any other place) had a special regard
that both hee, and his fellow Apostle
S. Paul, might die in Rome. Where-
of I find diverse causes alleged in the
Fathers.

1. Augustini
de sanctis
serm. 27-

Vvhy S.
Peter
shuld die
in Rome.

One is, for the glory of the Apostles,
alteri Roma dedisset, that Rome
might not lacke to either of them, or
that they might not lacke the glory of
the chiefe Citie Rome, concerning the
place of their Martyrdom.

2. Augustin.
ibidem.

An other is, for the destruction
of superstition: Ut vbi caput super-
stitionis erat, illic caput quiesce-
ret sanctitatis. Et vbi genusiu princi-
ces habitabant, illic Ecclesiarum
morerentur. That where the head
of superstition was, there might be the
head of holines. And where the
Princes of the Gentils dwelt, there the
Princes
Princes of the Church might die.

The third cause is, for the honour of the West Church. Cum Dominus orientis regionem propria illustrauerit passione, occidentis plagam ne quid minus esset, vice sui Apostolorum sanguine illuminaret dignatus est. Et licet illius passio non bis sufficiat ad salutem, tamen etiam horum Martyrium nobis constulit ad exemplum. Whereas our Lord hath made the East part lightsom with his owne passion: he vouchsaft in his stead (that it might be no lesse) to geue light vnto the west quarters by the blond of his Apostles. And albeit our Lords passion suffiseth vs for salvation, yet their Maryrydome also hath done vs good for example.

The fourth cause is, for the spreading of the Gospel: Ut lux veritatis, quæ in omnium gentium revelabatur salutem, efficacius se ab ipso capite, per totum mundi corpus effun-deret.
deret. That the light of the truth (which was revealed for the salvation of all nations) might spread it self more effectuoueslie fro the very head through out the whole bodie.

Now, forasmuch as God used the Citie of Rome as a moost special meane, Wherby to enlarge and spread his faith through all the world which obieded that one citie, it came also to passe, that the same citie per sacrā B.Petris fedē ca-
put orbis affecta, latius præsideret religione divina, quam dominatio-
one terrena. Being made the head of the world, through the holy See of S. Peter shuld rule more largely, by Gods religion, then by earthly dominion.

Petrus enim (faith S. Gregorie) subli-
mauit sedē in qua etiā quiescere & presentē vitā finire dignatus est. For Peter hath lifted up a hight the See Wherin he also voutsafed to reast, and to end this present life. Marke, that the glory and prerogatire of the Romaine Church
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Church is most specially imputed to S. Peter.

For although two Apostles died in one City, at one time, for one truth of Christ's Gospel: yet they left not two Chairers or Successions there. Neither is the Bishop of Rome called the Succession of S. Paul, or said to sit in his Chair, Augustus, but only in the Chair of Peter, as ep. 162, the whole practice of the Church, and 165, all the Writings of the Fathers doe Witnesse.

Whereby we are informed, that Rome is the place chosen by Christ him selfe, where S. Peter's Chaire should reside. For S. Peter returninge to Ambros, Rome upon the former vision, didde lib.5. po; before his death consecrate S. Clement ep. 32. Bishoppe cu & Cathedram (saith In Pontis Damasius) vel Ecclesiam omnem sicali. committit, diciens: To whome he committted also his chaire, or at the Church: sayinge : Sicut mihi gubernandi tradita est à Domino meo Iesu
Iesu Christo potestas ligandi solvendi evertendi, ita & ego tibi committio. &c. As the power of governing of binding and loosing, is committed to mee of my Lord Iesu Christ even so I commit to thee also, that thou maist order others by whom diverse causes may be disposed, and such acts (as be not meet for the Church) may be repelled, and thou must not be found geuen to the cares of this world, but onely endeavour to use most leisure to prayer, and to preaching unto the people.

The like report S. Clement himselfe maketh of this commission, Whiche S. Peter gave to him, Whose Epistle Rufinus turned into Latine about eleven hundred yeres past: and in the preface whiche he maketh to the Recognitions of S. Clement, he so well declareth that Epistle of S. Clement to have bene of ful credit in his time, and before, that he answereth such objections as might seeme to make against that which is said in it.
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in it. Tertullian also confesseth, that the Church of Rome doth shew evidence, that S. Clement was ordained of Peter.

And S. Hierom namely saith: Pleri Latinorù sed undù post Petru Apostoli putant suisse Clemèrem. The most part of the Latins think Clement to have been second (or next) after Peter the Apostle. and in another place he saith: Clemens successor Apostoli Petri scribit epistolas. Clemens successour of Peter the Apostle wrote Epistles. Leo the second, Mariani Scotus, and divers other, are of the same judgment. Now whereas Linus and Cletus by the life time of S. Peter (as Damascus and Rufinus do witness) did administer many things belonging to the Bishopric (as being in the exterior matters coadjutors of S. Peter) the Grecians, who were farther absent, and were less expert in the Romaine affairs, supposed Linus to have been chosen.
chosen next after S. Peter. Whereas Clement was only chosen, but Clem-
ent (as other think) yielded to Linus for a time, as to his elder.

Howsoever that be, whether Linus or Clement practised that high au-
toritie, once S. Peters Chaire was setled at Rome, not without the special pro-
vidence of Christ. In so much that Athanasius writeth, that S. Peter and 
Paul, audierit, oportere se Romae Martyrium subire, heard that they 
must suffer martyrdom at Rome.

And what so ever hearing he mea-
neth, surely he meaneth it of a hearing 
which came from God, either by their 
owne vision, or by some prophetical re-
velation, such as both they did well be-
lieue, and we also ought to credite.

But to come neare to our present 
purpose, S. Irenæus speaking of the suc-
cessions of Bishops in those Churches 
whiche the Apostles had first 
instituted: calleth the Church of Rome Maxi-
of the Church.

Maximam, & antiquissimam, & omnibus cognitam, à gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis, Petro & Paulo fundatam & constitutam.

The greatest Church, and most ancient, and known to all men, being planted and settled by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.

Ad hanc Ecclesiam, propter potentioriem principalitatem, necesse est omnem conuenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt vnae que fideles. To this Church, for the mightier principalitie, or authority of government, every Church, that is to saie, the faithful which are round about, must needs come or agree.

Whereas then everie Churche hath a certayne principalitie or authority of government committed to it by Christe, through the which principalitie, it maie preache the faith,
faith, overcom synnes, and heresies, and excommunicat open synners and heretics: The Church of Rome being founded and planted by the most glorious Apostles hath potentiorem principalitatem a mightier principalitie then any other Church. For it is a Wilfull ignorance Whereas Irenes speaketh only of the successours and traditions of faithfull Churches, for M. Jewel to say (as he hath done) that the mightier principalky here mentioned is meant of the Civill Domini and of the Roman Empire, as though Irenes had spoken any syllable in that place of the Roman Empire.

He speake of the Churches which the Apostles had founded and instituted, among which he calleth the Church of Rome maximam the greatest. Why so, but because it was founded of the greatest Apostle? ad how founded? For if S. Peter had only made a bishop thereof, as he did of diverse other Churches: surely there-
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therby it had not ben greater then the other. But because he being the greatest of the Apostles (as Eusebius Æd. S. Hierotheus) left in Rome a Successour in his own primacy, that is to say, a rock, Æd chief shepherd, as great as himself had Æd. Galat. been, therefore it was the greatest Church in the Worldwide. And thence cometh the priapality wherof this æquæf father speakest. S. Irenæus calleth the same Church of Rome æquitissimæ the most æquæcient Church. how so? Was not Ierusalem and Antioche before it? Tela verily in time of hausage bishop Æd of pitting the faith: but not in the ppetual honnor æd: residence of the chief bishop. For Peter was the first Æd. chief bishop of the new testament. In him was the roote, the fountain, the head of all bishopal power, Æd frō his (as S. Cyprian witnesseth) priestly unity toke his beginning touching the ministry of the new testament: and for that cause his successors being reckoned (as in deede they are) one with him,

De simplicitate prælatorum.
Concerning his office of feeding Christ's sheep, cause the Church of Rome still to be the most ancient and the mother Church of the Romaine circuit, as also Athanasius doth name it: For this cause the mightier principality is in the Church of Rome. And for as much as the same succession of Peter is now at Rome which was in the tyme of Irenæus, the same Church is still the greatest and the most ancient Church wherunto all other faithful ought to resort, by reason of the mightier principality or preeminence thereof.

S. Cyprian confesseth the chaire, that is to say, the authority of S. Peter to be at Rome. For whereas certain factious hereticks sailed from Carthage to Rome as intending to complaine upon S. Cyprian and the other Bishops of Afrik to Pope Cornelius: S. Cyprian writeth thus of that matter: Audent ad Petri

Li, i, ep. 3. Cathédra atque Ecclesiæ principalem, unde unitas facerdotalis
His exorta est, à schismaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitás re eos esse Romanos, quorum fits des Apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessus. They dare carie letters from schismatical and prophane me, to the chair of Peter, and principal Church, whence the priestly unity began. Neither do they consider them to be Romans, whose faith is praised by the report of the Apostle, to whom infidelitie can not have access.

In this sentence all the privileges of S. Peter's supremacy are acknowledged to be at Rome.

First, there is S. Peter's chair, to wit, his ordinary power of teaching and of judging ecclesiastical matters.

Again, there is the principal church or flock of Christ's: verily because they are governed by Cornelius the Bishop of Rome, who successeth in the pastoral office of the prince of the Apostles.
For otherwise Ierusalem might have seemed the mother Church to all Christians, were it not that S. Peter committing Ierusalem to the government of S. James, caried his own autoritie with him, and left it all at Rome.

3. Thirdly, how is it said, that the vnity of priests or of bishops (for facers dos coteineth both dignities) bega at the Church of Rome, but because it hath the wholpastoral authority of Peter in whoso the beginnig of al ecclesiasticall primency was, because he first was promised to be called Peter, that is to say, the rock, ad, to haue the keies of the king do of heauen geuetho Sir? but take away S. Peters prerogative, ad the Church of Rome is not the beginnig of priestbod, but rather Ierusalem or Antioche.

4. Fourthly, this word vnity doth import that as Peter alone had in him the whole power of the chief shepheard in earth (which can be but one) so Cornelius the successor of Peter hath in him the
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the same power: and so unity continues still in the succession of Peter, not every unity, but priestly unity, because he sitteth in Rome, by whom and in whom all priests and bishops are one, while they all (concerning their government and jurisdiction) are overseen, are confirmed and fed of him, who is without fellows in his supremacy.

Furthermore when S. Cyprian saith, infidelity can have no access to the Româs, what other thing is that, then to say, that in the church of Rome he ruleth, for whose faith Christ praised? For what flock can be sure to be always safe from infidelity except it be warned by Jesus Christ the only safeguard of his Church? Add hereunto that the same S. Cyprian calleth Rome Ecclesia catholica, matrice & radice, the mother and root of the Catholic Church. Verily because the See of bishops' authority of feeding Christ's flock did spring first, and is continually nourished and maintained.

X iij. Did.
Did not S. Cyprian confess Cornelius
lib. 1. ep. 4 to have received the appellation of Basilides lawfully out of Spain, albeit he shew also, that Basilides for his part, did unjustly appeal, and did deceive the Pope by false suggestion and evil report?

Last of all, S. Cyprian requireth Stephanus the Pope, to depose Martinus the Bishop of Arles in France. Whiche surely to doe in an other province, is a signe that the Pope of Rome is above other Bishops. Thus did that holy Martyr defend both the right and the practife of the Church of Rome.

The which thing is the more notabe in S. Cyprian, because he otherwise dissenting from the opinion of Pope Stephanus (concerning the baptizing of such in the Catholike Church, as had been baptized before of the heretiques) did not yet for the greedy defense of his own opinion, deny the prerogative of the Bishop of Rome, but therein shewed, that not withstanding his private
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mote error, he kept still the unities of the Militant Church, in acknowledging the visible head thereof.

Novatus taught falsely, that those who had once denied Christ, or had committed great and mortal sins, might not be admitted afterwaerd, by Christian Priestes or Bishopps to do penance, nor to their old state of grace. With which heresie, a Christian Priest (who was named Hippolytus, because he was torne in pieces with wild horses) was for the time deceived. But forasmuch as the said Hippolytus did otherwise love Christ so hartelie, that he was content to die for his name: that the said death might not be unprofitable to him, God of his great mercie revealed to him, the true Catholike faith and religion before his death. The whiche true faith he did not keepe to himself, but as well for the recompense of his own evil example, which he had gaven whiles he followed that heresie,
as also for the instruction of others, he had grace to confess the same.

For when he was now leaden to the place of his Martyrdom, the Christian people came about him, and asked which was the better religion, whether the Catholic, or else that of Novatus; to whom he answered thus: as Prudentius doth recite:—

Respondit: fugite omiseri execranda Novatiz.
Schismata, Catholicis reddite vos populus.
Viae sibi pariter prisco que consedet templo est
Quam Paulus retiner, quamque Cathedra

His answer was: O flee the schisms
of cursed Novatus lore,
And to the Cath'like folk and flock,
Your felues againe restore.
Let only one faith rule and raine,
Kept in the Church of old,
Which faith both Paul doth still retaine,
And Peters Chaire doth holde.

Marke these degrees, auoid schisms and diuisions. Before the time of
of Novatus, there was but one faith: after him, there began to be two faiths. He then divided the former faith. Avoid ye the division, and restore your selves to the Catholick people which were spread everywhere before Novatus was borne. Let one faith prevail. Which one? That which is in the most ancient Church. Which is that? The which Paul ad the Chair of Peter kepeth. What is the Chair of Peter? The Bishop of Rome, who siteth in that Chair. So that he goeth from Schism to the Catholikes, and he sheweth where the Catholikes are by one faith without division. That one faith is sene in the auncient Churche, and is kept by the Bishops of Rome.

May we not now say, according to the example of Hippolitus to our Country me, avoid the Schisms? May we not say, restore your selves to the Catholike people? Follow not the two faiths which are now stirring, but let
The Rocke

Let that one faith preuaile which is preserved in the auncient Church of Rome, and kept there in the Chaire of Peter? Doth any man doubt, but that the Pope of Rome is elder then Luther, then Wiclef, then Berengarius? Restore your self then to the old faith, to the chaire of Peter, therein you maie rest without alseare. Let your Pa-stour S. Peter answere for you, if that See can deceive you: yea let Christ an-swer for you, if it be possible, either the faith of Peter, which he praiied for, to faile in it selle, or not to streng-then others. It is the Rocke planted by Christ: build upon it without seare, and no fluddes or windes of heresie shall at anie time overthrove your house.

Athanasius the second Patriarch in all the world, and in honoure next unto the Bisshoppe of Rome, Paulus the Archbishhoppe of Constantinople, whiche seate afterwarde came to be
be preferred before the Patriarch of Alexandria, Marcellus the Bishop of Ancyra, Asclepas the Bishop of Gaza, and Lucianus the Bishop of Hadrianople, being all Greeks, all of the East Church, but so farre distant one from the other, that there was no part of the East Church which to some of them did not belong: all these, I saie, being expelled not by one or two, but by Councils of other Bishops, comming from diverse quarters met together at Rome, in the daies of Pope Julius, of whom Sozomenus (himselfe also a Grecian) writeth in this wise.
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fius ait & Paulus epistolae Iulij or-
rientalibus Episcopis miserunt, &
ingulorum suas sedes aeperti est.

Athanasius leaving Alexandria, went
unto Rome. It chanced him even at the
same time to meet there Paul Bishop
of Constantinople, and Marcellus of An-
cyra, and Asclepas of Gaza. Which As-
clepas being an adversarie to the Arri-
ans, suffered inuirie of them, ad under
the pretece, that he had overthrowe
an Altar, he was cödemned. In whose
fleed the church of Gaza is committ to
Quintianus. Also Lucianus the Bishop
of Hadrianople, being deprivèd of his
Church for an other accusation, did re-
maine at Rome.

The Bishop of Rome then discussing
the crimes of every one, ad finding that
they did al agree to the Nicene Coun-
cel, did receive them into the Comu-
nion, as one that had cure of al, for
the worthines of his own See, ad
did restore to euer of them their own
Churches.

Note.

The B.of Rome hath cure of al, for
his own feats sake.
Churches, writing also to the bishops of the East, and blaming the for that they had not well handled men not worthy of blame, in expelling them from their Churches, and (likewise blamed them) in that they had not observed the constitutions of the Nicene Council of which (Arrian bishops) he commanded a few to appere before him at a certain day, to thend he might shew them, that he had instly geuen a decree or sentence upon them. And did threaten, that he would not longer suffer it, onlesse they would cease fro these srobles and nouelties. And thus he wrote. Nowe Athanasius and Paulus did send the letters to the bishops of the East, and every of them receaued his owne See.

1. Note first, that these were patriarches, Archebishops, and Bishops.

2. Secondlie, that they were Grecians.

3. Thirdly, that the Bishop of Rome did judicially inquer, what was laied against
against every one

Fourthlie, that he did it tanquam omnium curam gerens, as he that had the charge of all.

Fifthlie, he had this charge, not onlie by the way of love and charity, but propter sedis propriè dignitatem. For the worthines of his own See.

Moreover he restored to everyone his own Church âd bishoprick. Yeâ he did it not in bucker mucker, nor by bare word spoken only at his own house, or in his own citie: but he wrote letters for execution thereof to the bishops of the East, reproving their sentence and judgement concerning these vertuouse prelats.

Besides this he cited some of the Bishops of the East to be present at Rome by a certain daie, to see the equitie of his Decree.

Last of all, his decree was obeyed and every of the good Bishops (sendig Pope Julius his letters to the other bishops of the
The Rocke of the East receaveth their bishopricks againe.

If by the confederation of the world the supremacy of Pope Julius was not now acknowledged, I can not tell what can make a man known to be the supreme head of the militant Church. He judged the highest patriarches next himself. He meddled with matters as far distant in places and provinces from him, as lightly could be. He undid the judgement of provincial Councils. He did these things by the prerogative of his own See. He was obeyed by the faithful Christians, and that even whiles the Council of Nice was yet fresh in every man's remembrance, so that no tyranny or usurping needed to be feared.

Anno D. 300.

In Psalm. 106.
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mina benedicuntur vsque hodie à Petro. Ipse exitus aquarū in sitim: ita vt qui exierit foras ab Ecclesia Petri, siti pereat. Peter wandering in the desert of this world, preached the baptism of Jesus Christ until he came to Rome; in which (baptism) all fluids (that is to say, Churches) are blessed of Peter euent til this day. He biself hath made thirsty (or dried up) the forth running of the waters: so that, who so goeth forth from the Church of Peter, he periseth for thirst.

This auncient writer in his Comets upon the psalmes, understanding baptism by the name of fluids and of waters, doth accompt those only to be baptized unto salvation, who are baptized in the fluids which are blessed of Peter. That is to say, in the founts of those bishops and priests, who tary in the unity of the successors of Peter. For except he shake of Peters successors, he could not say vsque hodie, euent til this daie. For
For whereas Arnobius liued about three hundred yeares after Peter, in saying, al fluids are blessed of Peter vntil this day be maneth that all the ministries of baptism in the Church are still profitable to salvation, through that they are done in the unity and obedience of Peters Church.

But wher is that Church of Peter? for soth in Rome. For Peter wandered preaching Christes baptism vntil he came to Rome. But at Rome he rested, thence the fluids are blessed euentil this day. But if any man of discretion be baptized in those fluids, which are without the Church of Rome, he is without healthfull water, because the grace of unity, and the participation of Christes mystical body the Church, is not given to him. For that grace is derived from Christ the chief head, by Peter the under head, unto all those who are made members of Christes militia Church. Ita vt qui exierit foras ab
ab ecclesia Petri, siti pereat, so that he who goeth from the Church of Peter doth perish for thirst. Verily, because he lacketh the grace of the Catholic unity which is only preserved in Peter's Church as in the head Church, where it is first planted, and whence it is derived to all other Churches, which tarie in the unity thereof.

Negare non potes (saith Optatus) scire te in urbe Roma Petri primum cathedram Episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sedet omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est. In qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur. Thou canst not deny, but that thou knowest the bishop's chair to have been first given in the City of Rome unto Peter, wherein Peter the head of all the Apostles hath sat. Whereof he was also called Cephas, in the which one chair unity might be kept of all men.

Ty Optatus
Optatus writing against Parmenianus a Donatist, saith unto him: thou canst not deny, but that thou knowest Peter to haue had first the chair at Rome. That heretick could not deny it, but now other hereticks have profited so well in their facultie, that they are become doctours, in narrating that S. Peter was never at Rome. But in the old time it was a most famous, and a most confessed truth. Well, the chair she was at Rome. But whose chair? wherein Peter satte. What was Peter? the head of all the Apostles. How proue you that? because Christ named him Cephas, that is to say, a rock or stone. For the foundation is the head of the house, and the rock is the most sure and strong foundation. What is then the end, why this chaire is at Rome? to the end unity might be kept of all men in that one chaire.

It suffised not to say, that unity might be instituted or begun: it must be
be kept and preserved still. But unity must be kept.

Wherein? Whether only in faith, hope, and charity? So in deed, but not one lies so, but in the Chaire also. Yea, but in what soever Chaire? Nay, in one Chaire. Which one? In that in one, wherein Peter sat at Rome. Be they not blind, who cannot see, what Optatus thought of the bishops of Rome? Yet it followeth, ut iam schismaticus esset, so that now he should be a schismatique, qui contra singum larem Cathedram alteram collas caret. Who should sette an other Chaire, against the singular Chaire, which hath no fellow: not that there are no more Chaires, but that there are no more such Chaires as that of Rome is.

After that Optatus had wrote this much, he goeth forward, shewing that the said singular and one Chair wherein Peter satte, did not onelie continue for Peters syme, but saieth he:

Y II] Petro
The Bishop of Rome successeth Linus, Linus successeth Clemens. Linus succeeded to Peter, and Clement succeeded to Linus. And so he nameth the Bishops of Rome in order, until the time of Pope Siricius, who sat in the said Chair of S. Peter, in the days of Optatus. And because Siricius was fellow of the same Communion and faith whereof Optatus was, he thereby concludeth himself to be a Catholicke, as in whose side the singular Chair of Peter is found, which is the chiefe gift and dowrie, which the Militant Church hath.

Contrariwise, seing Parmenianus had no fellowship with the Chair of Peter, nor with his successors, Optatus concludeth him and his fellowes, to be schismatikes. Hearken to this M. jewel, if any spiritual cares be at al un- to you. He is a schismatike, who doth not communicate in Religion and faith with the Bishop of Rome: you doe not come
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communicate with him: therefore you are
a schismatic: and consequently, your
part (except you repent) is in hell. Why
With Core, Dathan, and Abiron. God
sake us at thence, which he must be ob-
tained by returning to the unitie of S.
Peters Chaire at Rome.

S. Hierom writing to Damasus con-
cerning the faith in the Trinitie faith
thus in certain places of his Epistle:
Ministred Petri & sancto Aposto-
lico ore laudatam censuit co-
sulendam. Cum successor Petri.
Piscatoris & discipulo crucis loquor.
Ego nullum primum nisi Christi
seuens, beatitudinem tuam, id est, ca-
theredra Petri comunione co-soccior.
Super illam Petram edificata Eccle-
siam sicco. Quicunque extra hanc
domum agnum comederit, profa-
nus est. Si quis in arca Noe no fur-
erit, peribit regnante diluvio. N0
nouit Vitalem, Meletium respvuo,
ingoro Paulinum. Quicunque tes

In Epist. ad Damas-
sum.

Successor Petri.

Super Ca-
thedram
Petri ade-
ficata,
est ad eca-
clesia.
cum non colligit, spargit; hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. 
I thought best to ask council of the Chaire of Peter, and of the faith prai-
ised by the mouth of the Apostle. I speake with the Successour of the Fi-
sher, ad with the disciple of the Crosse. 
I, following none first but Christe, am 
joynd in Communion with thy holy-
nesse, that is to say, with the Chaire of 
Peter. I do know, that the Church 
is built vpon that Rock. Whosoever 
shal eate the Lambe out of this house, 
he is prophane. If any man be out of the 
Ark of Noe during the time of the flood 
he shal perish. I doe not know Vitae 
Lis, I despie Miletius, I have no ac-
quaintance with Paulinus. Who so e-
uer doth not gather with thee, he doth 
scatter abrode, that is, he that is not of 
Christ, is of Antichrist.

Who can deny, but that, when he 
faithe wil askke counsell of S.Pes-
ters Chaire, he meaneth, that he wil 
aske
aske Councell of Pope Damasus, who sitteth in his Chaire. The which Pope he calleth the successor of the fissher, and the Disciple of the Crosse, that is to say, the successor of S. Peter, who was a fissher, and who died upon the Crosse. When he saith: he followeth none as first or chief, but Christ: he well declareth, what an infinite distance is between Christ, who is absolutely lie first and chief, and any other Pope or Bishop, who is not absolutely first, but onely so first and chief, as S. Peter was. For we aske no more at any time, but that the Pope of Rome be confessed to be so great a Bishoppe, as Saint Peter was. And as Peter was first after Christe, so after the same Christe, Saint Hierome placeth Damasus, and joyneth him selfe in Communion with Damasus. That is to say (as himselfe expoundeth it) with the Chaire of Peter.

Note, I pray you, that Damasus the Pope
Pope, and the chair of Peter is alone. And the chair of Peter is the Rocke (saith S. Hiero) whereupon the Church is built. Cathedrae Petri cotunger. Super illam petra edificata Ecclesia scio. I am joined with the Chair of Peter, to wit, of the Rock. Vppō that Rock I knowe the Church to be built. There was no doubt of the matter is was a knowledge.

To what point are we now come? Not only Peter, but the Chair of Peter is taught to be the Rock whereupon the Church is built. And by the Chair of the Bishop of Rome is understood, who sitteth in the Chair, as Damascus then did. He is prophane (saith S. Hierom) who eateth the lamb without this house. That is to saie, there is but one house in all Christendo, and that house is there, where this Church is acknowledged. Who so eateth the Paschal lambe that is to saie, who so receiueth the Sacraments,
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or is sedde by preaching without that house, where the Pope is governour: he is prophane, he is an Heretike and a schismatike, as Vitalis, Meletius and Paulinus were.

The Chaire of Peter, that is to saie, the Church of Rome is the same to vs, which the Ark of Noe was to him ad to his children. He that is not in this fellowship of Rome, shall as surely perish at the daie of judgement, as they did perish in the flood, who were without the Ark of Noe. By these means S. Hiero sheweth what a necessary thing to salvation it is, that a man should tarry in that fellowship of Christians who beleue and profess their belief as the Bishops of Rome doe.

It is not I that say it, but S. Hierom. Who generally gueueth this rule: Whoso seuer doth not gather with Damasus (Who was Pope of Rome) he scatereth. What is it, to gather with Damasus? He expoundeth, that it is to be
to be of Christe. What is it to scatter? To be of Antichriste. What is Damasius? The Chaire of Peter and the succession of the sibber. Who is with that succession at this daie? The Catholikes, called now Papistes, who are all and continue still one flock under one chiefe shepheard. They then are of Christe. Who scatter from the succession of Peter? The Protestants, as who make moe heads, and moe shepheard, all of equall authoritie, without anie one visible chiefe shepheard, and moe houses without anie one maister. They then are of Antichrist.

Epist. 156. Saint Augustine geneth vs this rule. Cælethis maister, &c. The heavenly maister maketh the people secure, concerning euill ouers seers, lest for then fakes the chair of heathful doctrine should be for taken, in the whiche Chaire euill men are euene constrained to saie good things. For the thinges which
which they speake, are not their owne, but they are the things of God.

We have then in the Church a chair of healthful doctrine. Happy were they, who finding that Chaire, might at the least bee sure of the true doctrin of Christ.

You will say perhaps, it is every Bishops Chaire. If that were so, every Bishop should be constrained to speake good things. How could then so many Bishops have been the inventours of heresies, as have been since Christes time? If every Bishops Chaire have not this privilege, to be constrained to speake the truth, and yet there be suche a healthful Chaire in the earth, as really, as ever the Chaire of Moses was at Jerusalem (the which example S. Augustine vseth oft times to proue, that such an other Chaire is in the Church) S. Augustine might have eased vs of muche paine, if he would have named vs the said Chaire.

But lette vs see, whether we can not find it named in him. It followeth: Deus in Cathedra unitatis, doctrina nā posuit veritatis. God in the chaire of unity, hath placed the doctrine of verity. This much then we haue won toward the finding out of that chaire, whiche is constrained to teache the things of God: it is the chaire of unity. What is that to say? Verily not only that it is one certain chaire which it selfe tarieth in unity, but also that it kepeth unity in all the states of the Church.

For if God hath made vs secure (as S. Augustine signified before) that we should not nede to forsake the chaire of the heathfull doctrine for the faults which are in the gouvernours or teachers: doutelesse he meaneth that to be the chaire of unity which must not be forsaken, but be followed and embraced. So that the chaire of unity is that chaire, which causeth unity not to be forsaken. For when all other Chaires agree
agree with one principal chair, and conform themselves to it, that must needs be the chair of unity: and consequently, therein is the doctrine of verse.

Then the chair of unity is that, wherein one pastour sitteth, in whom all other pastours in the earth are one. Inuenio omnes pastores bonos in vno pastore. Non enim verè pastores boni defunt, sed in vno sunt. Multi sunt, qui dies sunt: hic unus praedicatur, quia unitas commendatur. I find (saith S. Augustine) all good pastours in one pastour. For truly good pastours do not lacke, but they are in one. Those are many who are divided, here one is praised, because unitie is commended.

Behold, the one pastour is to be sought for, in whom al other good pastours are one. But this one (say you) of whom S. Augustine here speaketh is Christ himself. I confesse: but Christ hath his chair and
The chair of unity is in the earth.

The chair then of unity, wherein evil men speak good things, must be a chair placed in earth, wherein one pastor may sit, who may for the rate of his measure and ministry make other good pastors to be for the time one, in being one, even as Christ maketh all good pastors, that ever haue be or shall be, to be for ever one in him, most singularly being one.

Is there then an other kind of unity among pastors, besides that everlasting unity of all good men in Christ? Truly and that other kind of unity

S. Augustine faith: Imo vero Dominius & in ipso Petro unitatem comen-
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mendaust. Multi erant Apostoli, & vni dictur ?Palce ouses meas. Ablit vt defunt modò boni pas- res, sed omnes boni pastores in vno sunt, vnum sunt. Tea our Lord hath also commended unity in S. Pe- ter himself. There were many Apo- stoles, and it is saied to one, seede mie sheepe. God forbid there should nowe lack good pastours, but al good pastours are in one, they are one thing.

Thus, beside the unity which is in Christ, we have also found an unitie in Saint Peter, and that unitie was not onely to tarie for his own tyme, but to be preserved in the Churche for ever.

There is a temporall unitie in Saint Peter, and in his successeours, by the which unitie we come afterward to enjoye the everlasting unitie which is in Christ. For Saint Peter (as the same S. Augustine doth witnesse) bare the figure of the whole Churche,
In Ioan. Trait. 214

and that, propter Apostolatus sui primatum, by reason of the primacy of his Apostleship.

Therefore as the Apostles have continually successors in their bishoprie and pastoral ministry: so hath S. Peter, the prince of the Apostles a continual successor in his primacie, and in his chaire of unitie, concerning the force of which succession S. Augustine justly faith: In Ecclesia me teten ab ipsa fede Petri Apostoli, cui pascet das oues suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, vsque ad præsentem Episcopatum, successionem Sacerdotum. Among other things, which say me in the Churche, the succession of priests from the very seat of Peter the Apostle (to whom our Lord commended his shepe to be fed after his resurrection) the succession (I say) of priests from Peters seat to the present bishoprik, doth say me in the Churche.
of the Church.

Is there any man so proud, or so well liking with himself, who if S. Augustine were now alive, would not be glad to follow his judgement in establishing his faith and conscience? He being within little more then fower hundred yeres of Saint Peter's tyme, yet so much wondered at the continuance of Saint Peter's chaire in the right faith (whereas all other successions had bene spotted with heresies and schismes) that he confessed the succession of Bishoppes in that Chair of Peter to have stayed him from being either a Maniche, or an Arrian, or any other thing, fasuing a Catholike.

For he sawe the promise of Christ so fulfilled in the successors of Saint Peter, he saw the doctrine of veritie so wel fortified in the Chaire of unitie, that it was no small force to strengthen him in his faith. In so much that he said in another place:

Zij    Si
356 The Rocke

Epist. 165. Si ordi Episcoporum libi success
dentium considerandus est, quan-
to certius & verè salubriter ab ip-
so Petro numeramus, cui totius
Ecclesiae figuram gerenti: Domi-
nus ait, super hanc petram ædificas
bo Ecclesiæ meam. Et portæ in-
ferorum non vincent eam. Petro
enim successit Linus, Lino Cle-
mens, &c.

If the rew of bishops one succeeding
to the other, is to be considered, how
much more safely, and in dede health-
fully doe we number from Peter him
self? to whom bearing the figure of the
whole Churche, our Lord saith: vpon
this Rock I wil buid my Churche,
and the gates of hel shall not o-
uercome it. For Linus succeeded to
Peter, Clement to Linus: and so he
goth forward, untill he come to pope A-
naftasius, who was bishop of Rome
in S. Augustines tyme.

Who after all the popes reckoned
up in
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up in order, conclueth thus: In hoc ordine successioniis nullus Donatista Episcopus inuenitur. In this order of succession, no Donatist Bishop is found. If S. Augustine after four hundred yeres proved the Donatists to be far from the doctrine of veritie, because in the chair of unity no Donatist was bishop, or because no bishop, who succeeded in S. Peter's chair was a Donatist, what shal we say after a thousand five hundred yeres?

A fortiori

Let us reckon up all the popes from Saint Peter himselfe, untill we come to pope Pius the fifth, (who in our dayes sitteth in S. Peter's chaire, and is notable for vertue, learning, holiness, and the grace of working miracles) and in all that order of succession, we shall finde never a Lutheran, never a Zuinglian, never a Calvinist, never an Anabaptist, or a Swenksfedian.

Who is then so madde as to go from
S. Peter's Chaire (to whom our Lorde commended his sheep to be fed) to the upstart Chaire of Luther, Calvin, or Zuinglius (to none of whome, nor to anie predecessours of theirs our Lorde is reade to have commended his sheep) except he be more like unto the heretical Donatists, then unto the moiste wise and learned man S. Augustine, who after the Apostles, had scarce ever his match in discerning the true faith from falsehood, and heresi or hypocrisy, from the Catholike religion.

He presseth the Donatists euerie where with the breache of unitie.

And think you, that when they should come to talk with him, he would onely say generally to them: Maisters, you are to blame because you are gon from Christ the onely one Pastour? If he should have come nowhere to the mark he shot at, they would quickly have answered: Sir, we love Christ and believe him as well as you. We hold him for our only
only one Pastor, we obey his voice, why burdens you us with forsaking him? It is you that have other Pastours: for you flee to the seat of Peter, and to his successors, whereas we content our selves with the everlasting Pastor Jesus Christ. I trow we are not without one Pastor, so long as we have him for our Pastor.

But now S. Augustine talketh not only of Christ to them, nor onely of that unitie which is in Christ, but of that also, which is in the Churche, and in the succession of S. Peter. And therefore in his Psalm which he made against the Donatists, having shewed that the Prophets, albeit they saw most grievous faults in the clergie of Hierusalem, yet did not set up another Altar, and another Religion, nor did not break unitie, faith at the length unto the Donatists:

Venite fratres, si vultis ut inferamini in vitæ dolor est cum vos Z iiij vides

In psalmo cour. Par. Donat.
videmus preciositatem. Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede. Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui successit videte. Ipsa est petra, quâ nō vincit! Superbe inferior portât. Come ye, brethren, if ye wilbe graffed in the vine. It grieveth vs whē we see you lie thus cut of. Nūber ye the Bishops euē from the very seat of Peter, and cohder who succeeded whō, in that order. That self is the Rock which the proud gates of hel doe not overcome.

Is not this a marueilsouse witness for the Primacie of the See of Rome? First S. Augustin calleth the Donatists to untie. To Christ, say you: no doubt of that. But whereas the Donatists named Christ as fašt as the Catholikes, S. Augustine sheweth them where unity is in this world, saying: number the Bishops euē from the very seat of Peter. Behold the vine into which in this life we must be graffed. Behold the
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unite whereby we must hold. Nüber
the bishops euch fro the selfe seate of
Peter. Higher we can not go in this
world. But let us nüber them. At the
left, let us see who succeeded the òe
after the other. Why should we see
that successiò, I pray you? Ipsa est pe-
tra, that see or successiò is the rock not
only Christ, not only Peter, but the self
Se and successiò of Peter is the Rocke.
Which Rock? that rock, which hell
gates do not overcome. What S. Au-
gustine? You are become a stark Papist.
There was neuer Scholemà, Canonist,
Popish priest, no there was neuer any
Pope, who said more for the see of Rome
then S. Augustin now hath sayd. That
See or successiò is the rock which he
gates doe not overcome, and
to be cut of from that See, is to be cut of
fro the vine, whose the braches receiue
life and nourishmèt. Who is now cut of
from that See? Whether the Catholiks
who lie in prison for the defense of it,
or the
or the Protestantes, who call it the seat of Antichrist.

To the See of Rome the two Coãcels gathered against Pelagius in Africa ad Numidia sent their decrees, vt status tis nostræ mediocritys etiam Apostolice sedis acchibeatur autoritas, that the authority of th' Apostolike See may be genæ to the decrees of our mediocrity: they adde also the cause herof, p tuenda salute multorum, & quorum dà puerlitatem etiam corrigenda, for the defense of many mæs salvation and for the correetio also of som mens fromardnes.

And whereas Pelagius was absolved in th' East: as it is to be thought, of those Bishops who understood not his crafty meaning: the Coãcel of Carthage doth shew that the Pope was the judge who ought to examine this questio: Vtrum Pelagius episcopalis gestis que in Oriente coãceta dicitur, iustè visus fuerit absolutus. Whether Pelagius seemeth justly to have been absolved by
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those Acts, which are said to have bene made in the East by the Bishops.

Neither is this required of the Pope only by the way of charitie, but they require his holinesse to take compassion of the pastoralibus visceribus, according to that mercy, which a Pastor ought to have toward his sheep. And after the absurdity of his opinions rehearsed, thus they conclude: Quæcunque alia ab eis obiectantur, non dubitamus Venerationem tuam, cum gegeta Episcopalia perspexerit, quæ in Orientali in eadem causa constetat dicuntur, id iudicaturum, unde omnes in Dei misericordia gaudeamus.

What so ever things els are objected of them, we dout not but your Reverence (which hath examined th' Acts, which are said to have bene made in this behalfe of the Bishoppes in the East) will judge (or will decree) that thing, whereof we may al rejoysse in our Lord.

The Whiche Epistle of the Counsell
of Carthage being received, Innocen-
tius the Pope praieth the, because an-
tique traditionis exēpla seruātes,
keeping the examples of auncient tra-
dition, they referred such matters to
the judgemēt of the Bishop of Rome,
scientes quid! Apostolice sedi de
beatur, knowing what is due to the A-
póstolike See: cum omnes hoc loco
positi ipsum sequi defyderemus
Apostolum, à quo ipse Episcopas-
tus & tota authoritas nominis hus
ius emersit: quē sequentes tā ma-
la iam damnare nouimus, quàm
probare laudāda. For as much as all
we that sit in this place, desire to fol-
low the Apostle him self, from whom
the Bishopslie office it selfe, and all
the authoritie of this name sprang:
The Whiche Apostle we following,
doe now as well know how to condemn
euil things, as to allowe those things
Which are to be praised.

What is it then, Whiche the auncie
of the Church.

ent tradition delivered? Patres non Epist. 91. humana sed divina decreuere sententia, vt quicquit de disiunctis remotisque provinciis ageretur, non prius ducerent finidum, nisi ad huius sedis notitia perueniret, vbitota huius autoritate insta quæ fuerit pronunziatio firmaretur, ins déque furent ceteræ Ecclesiar, velut de natali suo fôre aquæ cûte procederent. The Fathers (saith Innocentius) haue decreed, not by mans, but by Gods sentence, that what so euer was done in the Provinces or countries afarre of, they should not accompt it before to be ended, except it came to the knowledge of this See, where (what so euer had bene istly pronounced) it should be stregthened by the autoritie of this See, and thence other Churches should take it, as it were waters which should procee de or from their owne native fountaine.

Like-
Likewise the Council of Milenium wrote from Numidia to the same pope Innocentius: Quia te Dominus gratiae sua praecipua munere in fede Apostolica collocavit, magis periculosis infirmorum memento Christi pastoraliter diligentiisque se sus adhibere digneris. Because our Lord hath placed you through the gift of his special grace in the See Apostolike, we beseech you, to use your pastoral diligence in the great dangers of the weak members of Christ.

Mark here, that these bishops of Numidia speak to the Pope as to their pastour, and as to the pastour of the shepe which were under them, among which bishops it is evident that S. Augustine was, who also wroteth to Hilarius of the same matter in this wise: iam cum ila scriberem, cognovisse ramus in Ecclesia Carthaginensi adversus eos Episcopalis Concilij conditum fuisset Decretum, per episto-
epistolam sanæo & venerabili Patre Innocentio dirigendam, & nos de Concilio Numidiae ad eandem Apostolicam sedem iam similiter scripteramus. Now whiles I wrote these things, we understood a Decree to have been made in the Church of Carthage by a Council of Bishops, which was to be directed by an epistle unto the holy and reverend Pope Innocentius. And we likewise had written from the Council of Numidia to the same Apostolike See.

It is then evident, that these two Councils sent their Decrees to the See Apostolike (as also all other Councils were wont to doe) according to the most ancienst tradition: and that as well because the See Apostolike was assured not to erre (as being the Rocke of the faith which was prayed for by Christ himselfe) as also to the intent all Churches might receive the sooner that Decree, which were deriving to them from
from the authority of their own head under Christ, and of their chief shepheard: and again because the heretiks and their followers might the soner be either reconciled, or kept downe, when it were once known, that the highest court in earth had condemned their opinions.

Wherupon, the Fathers of the Mile.

Epist. 92. nitan Counsell say: Arbitramus fads iuuante misericordia Domini Dei nostri Iesu Christi, qui te & regere consulentem, & orantes exaudi.

ti re dignatur, auctoritate sanctitatis tuae de sanctarum scripturarur auctoritate depromptae, facilium eos qui tâ peruerla & perniciosam sens.
tient, esse cessuros. We thinck these men, who have so enil and fruward opin.

ions, wil the soner yeld to the auth.

hority of your holinesse, being tak.

ke out of the authority of the holy scripturrs, by the help of the mercy of our Lord Iesus Christ, who woulsafeth both
both to rule you whiles you consulte, and to heare you when you pray.

Two things are specially to be noted in these words: one, that the authority of Pope Innocentius is taken out of the authoritie of the holy scriptures, verily because it maie be proved by the woorde of God, that the bishop of Rome (who succeddeth S. Peter;) is the highe shepheard, whose voice all the faithful are bound to heare. The other point is, in that these Fathers affirm, that Christ ruleth the Pope at his consultatio: alluding therein to the faith of S. Peter which was praied Luc.12.

for, so thendal his successours might not erre in consulting about matters of Religion.

To which epistle pope Innocentius made answer, praising them, because in doubtfull matters they asked him what sentence or judgement was to be followed, antiquæ scilicet regulæ formæ secuti, quam toto semper ab orbe A a mecum
mecum nostis esse servatam. See followed (faith Innocentius) the patern of the ancient rule which ye know as well as I, to have been always kept of the whole world.

Marke, that Innocentius doubteth not to affirm, that the Fathers of the Counsell of Milinitie (among whome Saint Augustine was) did know, that the whole world always vied to referre doubtfull matters to the See Apostolike, and that (as it followeth) praesertim quos fidei ratio ventilatur, specially so oft as the matter of faith is discussed.

If anie man saie, that the Pope in dede wrote so, but that he said not true: lette him consider, that Saint Augustine doth also acknowledge and praise the Popes answer in these words. Scripsimus ad B. memoriae Papam Innocentium &c.

We wrote to Pope Innocentius of blessed memorie. Ad omnium ille nobis
nobis rescriptit, eodem modo quo fas erat, atque oportebat Apostolicae sedis Antistitem. He wrote again to us to every point in such sort, as it was right and as it became the Bishop of the Apostolike See.

What can be now required more? Saint Augustine acknowledgeth the answers to have ben mete for Saint Peters succedour: and yet shall the Protestants now a dayes be suffered to rale at that epistle, which Saint Augustine esteemed so much, that he maketh mention thereof with great commendation? Saint Augustine then doth confesse, that, from all quarters of the worlde the Pope of Rome was wont euén in the old tyme to be consulted, as being the general pastour, whose duty it was, to provide for the whole militant flocke, the particular bishops them selues being comprised therein.

Aa y I haue
The Rocke

I have ben somewhat long about S. Augustines doctrine, partly for the worthisness of the man, partly because I perceave, that our Adversaries pretend to gene more credit to him, then to any other Father. But if S. Augustine be not cleere for the Supremacy of the bishops of Rome, ther was neuer nothing cleere in him. Let this one place be added for a surpluse to the rest.

The bishop of Carthage (faith he) needed not to care for the multitude of his enemie, for so much as he saw his selfe to be ioyned in communio, as wel with other countries, whence the Gospel came to Afrike it self, as also with the Church of Rome, in qua semper Epist. 162. Apostolice Cathedre viguit pricis patus, in the which Roman Church the principate or priracy of the Apostolike chaire hath alwaies flourished: not only the chair of the Apostle S. Peter, but also the principal power of the Apostolik chaire did not only stand in the Roman
Roman Church, but it flourished there: and that not only during S. Peter’s life, or a little after, but semper, alwaies. Happy then are we, who till this day communicate in faith with that Apostolike chaire. And wooto them, that cal the Apostolik chaire, the Seat of Antichrist.

To goe forward with some other In Lib. de holy Fathers, Prosper the Bishop of Re-ingratia-gium being of the same tyme (though sumwhat youger then S. Augustine) and speaking of the condemnation of the heretike Pelagius writeth thus tou-ching the See of Rome.

Peitem subeuntem prima recit dit Sedes Roma Petri, quæ pastores ralis honoris facta caput mundo, quicquid non possicet armis, Religione tenet. Rome the See of Peter did first cut of (Pelagius) being a pe-stilence which then began to crepe into the Church. The which Rome being made the head of pastoral A a iij honour
honour unto the world, holdeth all that by religion, what so ever it doth not possess by the sword.

Rome then is the Seat of Peter, the head of Bishhoplie honour, or of Pastoral power, the which reacheth farther, and hath more Christians subject to it, because the Vicar of Christ sitteth there, then ever it had through the mightie Empire thereof.

The selfe same thing Prosper saith in another place: Roma per Apostolici sacerdotij principatum amplior facta est arce religionis, quam solio potestatis. Rome through the chiefe dome or primacie of the Apostoke Priesthood (or Bishhoplie power) is made greater by the chiefe Castell (or Fortresse) of Religion, then by the Throne of (Imperiall) power.

Leo the Great, having saied that, in Saint Peters Seat his own power liueth, his authoritie excels leth
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Ith: in another place sheweth him-
selze to have bene the successor of S.
Peter and therefore to be the president
of the Church. For thus he writeth
to Iulianus the Bishop.

Memor sum me habi ills nomi-
nine Ecclesiae præfide, cuius ā
Domino Iesu Christo est glorifi-
cata confessio, & cuius fides omni-
nes herefes destruuit. I am mind-
full, that I am President of the Chur-
che under his name, whose confessio
on was made glorious of our Lorde
Iesu Christe, and whose faith des
stroetethal herefies. It were in-
nite, to bring all that Leos faith in this
behalfe.

Eulogius the Patriarche of Alex-
andria wrote to S. Gregorie after this
sense, as S. Gregory himself doth report
it. Suauissima mihi sanctitas ve-
stra multa in epistolis suis de san-
cti Petri Apostolorum principis
Cathedra locuta est, dicens quod
A a iiiij ipse
The Rock

ipse in ea nunc visque in suis successoribus sedeat. Torus most sweet Holiness hath said manie things in his letters concerning the chair of S. Peter the prince of the Apostles, saying: that S. Peter himself sitteth it it euen til this present tyme in his successours. And S. Gregory with great humility acknowledgeth it to be true, affirming in an other place that, the Apostolike See is head of all Churches.

For the honour of our country I wil not omit the testimony of S. Bede, who in a sermon made upon the Feast of a certain Abbate of England, named Benedictus, affirmeth him to have gone to Rome, vt ibi portus perfecta viuendi formam fumeret, vbi per summos Christi Apostolos totus Ecclesiae caput eminer eximum. That he might there rather take the perfect example of living, where the excellët head of the whole Church
of the Church.
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ehe doth appere above the rest, through the highest Apostles of Christ. Whereas much more may be alleged, yet these few testimonies may suffice to prove, that the bishop of Rome is the Successour of S. Peter in his most principal and chiefest pastoral office. And surely if we may be deceived in any point of the faith, which is so well grounded in God's word, so uniformly confessed by the holy Fathers, and so notoriously practised in the Catholike Church, as the Supremacy of S. Peter, and of his Successours in the See of Rome is: I can not devise, when a man may be sure of any article of his faith.

But if there be a meane whereby a man may be sure of his belefe, surely that meane whatsoever it be, shall we appear to be found in the proof of the Supremacy of S. Peter and of his Successours.

That
That the good Christian Emperours and Princes, did neuer thinke them feluTes to be the Suprem Heads of the Churh in Spiritual causes, but gaue that ho-nour to Bishops and Priests, and most speciallie to the See of Rome, for S. Peters sake, as wel before, as after the time of Phocas.

The XVI. chap.

P Hilippus who was the first Christain Emperour, did so little thinke himselle to have bene the Heade of the Bishoppes in Spirituall causes throughout his Dominion, that wher-as on Easter daie he would have bene at the Vigils and holy Watches, and would have communicated of the holy Mysteries: the Bishope of the place would not lette him doe it, except he hadde first confessed his Sinnen, and stood amog them that did penance, and so by penance had washed awaie, the faults which were reported of him.

Ferunt igitur libenter eum (Sainth
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(St. Eusebius) quod à facerdote eccles. bis
imperatum fuerat suscepisse, divini-
num fisci inesse metum, & idem
religionis plenissimam, rebus at
que operibus comprobando. They
faie therefore, that he toke gladly that
whiche was inioyned to him of the
Priest, making faith by the things and
workes, that the feare of God, and most
full persuasion of Religion was in him.

Is he chief in all causes, who in some
must obey the Priest? Or can he that
is supreme gouernour in all things and
causes Ecclesiastical, have an other a-
bove him in putting him back from the
mysteries, and in enioyning him publick
penaunce, and in confreining him to
conffesse his sinnes? Or is the comming
to the Mysteries no cause Ecclesiasti-
cal, or Spiritual? Or is not the Bis-
shoppe or Priest, who in this cause go-
urneth the Emperour, the Superi-
our and gouernour of the Emperour
in the same cause? Or is it not a
kind
kind of governing, to command him to stand back? to threaten him if he repine? to punish him, if he be stubborn?

1 Cor. 4: Ye, how to punish him? to come to him in a rod (as S. Paul speaks) that is to say, in power and authority to beate or to correct. And is not he a governour who may justly beate the child? If then in prescribing confession, satisfaction, and abstinence from communion, the priest be the governour of the king; I ask, whether all other Ecclesiastical causes be greater or lesse then these are?

Note an infallible argument against your Antichristian supremacy, M. Nowel. If other Ecclesiastical causes be greater then these were, surely the Emperour or king, who is governed by a priest in the lesser Ecclesiastical causes, and therefore can not be supreme head in them, is much more to be governed by a priest in the greater causes.
of the Church. And therefore he is much lesse supreme head in them.

For if when one thing standeth above another, I am to low to reache the lower: much more I am to low, to reache a higher then the other. But if other Ecclesiastical causes be lesse then the suspending from communion, or the injoyning of publike penance: then the bishop or priest, who is the governour of the Emperor or King in the greatest Ecclesiastical causes, is much more his governour in the leffer Ecclesiastical causes. Because the leffer are of the same order, kind, and kinred, whereof the greater are.

As therefore he that is supreme head in the greatest temporall causes (as in judging our life and death) is much more supreme head in the leffer temporall causes (as in judging our lands or goods) and as he that is not of
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sufficient authority to be supreme ruler
in sitting judge upon mens lands or
goods, can much lese sitte judge over
their lives by anie his former autho-
ritie: even so neither the King, who
can govern in the lesser causes, can by
his Kingly power judge in the greater,
nor the priest, who is the Kings supe-
riour in the lesser, can possibely but much
more be his supeirour in the grea-
ter.

The reas
mouning
of the ob-
jection.

Or have we diverse Kinds of Ec-
clesiastical, and of spiritual causes? Be
there never so manie, the Act of par-
liament gaveth the highest and the
supreme government of them all, unto
the King.

And yet the king lacketh not one-
lie practise, experience, or cunning,
but also he lacketh spirituall and Ec-
clesiastical power to beare confessions,
to absolve men from their synnes, to
unjoyne penance, to consecrate the Sa-
crament of the altar, to Ordre bishops
and
and priests by the Imposition of hædes, or to excommunicate open sinners.

Here Master Jewel Wolde say, that he never meant the prince should be supreme gouvernour, either in administering, or in frequenting, or in directing others to frequent the holy mysteries, or in any like sacramental functions.

Why then doth he and his fellows swear, men, generally to acknowledge the secular Christian prince Supreme gouvernour in all things and causes? Why doth he not rather declaim and speake with all his force, against that most impiose and blasphemous othe? Ye so impiose, that those Protestants, who most earnestly pressed the setting forth thereof, dare not now justify the form of it.

Shall men in a Christian realme be sworn upon the holy Evangelistes, to keepe, beleue, or acknowledge that which no man at all, no, not they who procu-
procured it, dare maintaine? See, good Countrie men, see the discretio of your parlaments in matters of Religion. Al men anone abhorre from that act, which the Laity made and enacted, as a form so warely drawn, whereunto men might commit their everlasting salvation or damnation.

Mark, I say, that M. Nowel, M. Horn, M. Juwel dare not warrant the King to be suprem gouernour in al Ecclesiastical causes. But rather they confesse that a Bishop or Priest may, and ought to gouerne the King, concerning his comming to the Mysteries, and in such like matters. This much being said concerning Philippus the first Christian Emperor (who obeyed, but gouerned not the Bishop in Ecclesiastical matters) let us now goe forward.

Av. Dom. 324. Constantinus the Great, perceiving the Bishops which came to the Synod at Nice, to have many quereils and sutes among them selves, appoynten a day
day wherein every man should offer his complaint in writing, and when he had taken all their libels, without disclosing the contents of them, he said unto the bishops: Deus vos constituit Sacerdotes, & potestas vobis dedit de nobis quoq; judicandi, & ideo nos a vobis recte iudicamur: vos autem non potestis ab hominibus iudicari: propter quod Dei solus inter vos expectate iudicium. God hath made you priests (or Sacrificers) and hath given you power to judge of us also. And therefore we are rightly judged of you. But yee can not be judged of men. For which cause expect yee (or tary for) the judgemet of God alone among you.

This discourse of Constantine containeth three things Worthy to be noted. First he saith, the bishops are Sacerdotes, Priestes, or men that have publick authority to make externall sacrifice unto God for the whole
pople's synnes. Secondly, he saith, that they have power to judge even of the Empetour himself. And this their power of judging, dependeth of their power of priesthod. For the highest power may judge the lower. But no power can be higher then the power of a priest, because he is the minister of God in that office which most directly toucheth God's honour and service.

Whereupon S. Augustin having said: In Psal.98 what was Moses if he were not a priest? geneth this reason of his words, Núquid maior Sacerdote esse possetat? Whether could he be greater then a priest? as who should say: being Moses was the greatest officer amog the Israelits, and yet he could not be greater then a priest, it must needs be, that he was a priest.

The priestes then of God being the greatest officers in earth have power to judge even of an Empetour, if any be in their parishes or Dioceses.

Thirdly
Thirdly of these former points Constantine deduceth another conclusion, that priests can not be judged of men. How then can they be judged of the Emperor? Neither doth it seem, that Constantine seemeth to have judged certain priests, or Ecclesiastical causes, when the Donatists appealed unto him: for he did it (as S. Augustine saith) in epistol à sanctis antistitibus postea veniéntam petiturum, as one that would afterward ask leave or pardon of the holy bishops.

Who asketh leave or pardon for that, which he may doe by his owne power? He did it then through the importunat fute of heretickes, for the peace of the Church: otherwise detesting them, that demaunted his judgement after that the bishops had judged, and finding great fault therewith himself, as Opstatus, and S. Augustine also doe witnesse. But take away importunity of heretikes, and the commission, leave or pardon.
pardon of the right bishopps (who may for diverse respects, either committe certain Ecclesiasticall causes to lay me, or winck for anyme at such judgementes) take away, I say, heresie and permission; and ordinarily it is against the law of God, that any secular Prince (who needeth the office of a priest for his reconciliotion unto God) should fitte judge upon him in causes of the Church, at whose handes he must receave the Sacramentes of the Church, and by whose ministry his soule must be purged.

Now if one priest doe judge another, that is Gods judgement, and not the judgement of men. For God hath sette one priest over another, as the high priestes was aboue the Levites in Moses lawe, and as the Apostles were of a higher degree, then the seuenty Disciples, or then the seuen Deacons.

These woordes then of Constantine
vos non potestis ab hominibus judicare, yw (ô priestes of God) can not be judged of men. are thus meant: the order of priesthood is such, as is not subject to anie secular or earthly jurisdiction. And seeing all the power of judgement, which even Christian Emperours or Kings have by their own state, is earthly and secular: it will follow, that no King or Emperour can by his owne power judge a priest in priestlie causes and in Ecclesiasticall matters.

That all the power of Emperours, though they be Christians, is secular, Constantine himself pronounceth, saying to the Donatists (as Optatus recor-deth) Petitis à me in seculo judicium, cum ego ipse Christi judiciûm expectem. Yee aske of me judgement in the world, whereas I myself looke for Christes judgement.

There are then two judgements: one in the world, an other of Christ. That
Secular judgement is worldly or secular: this is heavenly or spiritual. Constantine had none other judgement but secular, because his sentence could bind no farther, then in this life.

But Christes judgement (which he exerciseth as well presently by his Priests and Ministers, as at the later day in his own person) is spiritual, and rather apperteyneth to heaven, and to the life to come, then to this world.

Again, that Constantines judgement was earthly, S. Augustine in divers places declareth saing of the very same Donatists: Terrenum Res geminum cause judicem esse voluerunt. They would an earthly King to be the judge of their cause. He meaneth there, Constantine the Christian Emperour, by the name of an earthly King.

Hitherto I have shewed, that Constantine believed and professed, that Bishops or Priests are not (ordinarily and
and where aquatic or conscience maie take place) to be judged by secular Princes. Now it only remnineth to consider specially, the great honour which he gane to the See of S. Peter, and to his Successour the Bishop of Rome.

First, I take it for moiste certaine, that Constantinus the Great, was instructred and baptized of Sylvestre the Pope of Rome, as not onely most auncient witnesses, but euë the very stones ad pillers of marble doe witnesse, which being erected in the Emperors owne house (named Constantiniana) beare the name of his baptisterie, to witte, of the verie place, wherein Constantinus was baptised.

Whiche thing also Pope Damasus, who liued not long after, and consequetlie. 2.S. Bede. 3. Ado, and Marianus Scotus affirme the same. 4. Gregorius Turonensis, who liued long before, alludeth to the same storie, in describing the baptism of King Chlodoucuse.
Neither only, the Latines have thus avouched the truth, but the Greciä also, as Zonaras, 6 Nicephorus, 7 Cedren- nus, not esteming what Eusebius and some other moven by him, reporte in that behalfe, as whom for his affection to the Arrian heresie they had suspected.

Constantine then being baptised at Rome, and thereby instructed, that S. Peter had died there (to whom he built a faire Church in the hill named Vaticane) and that he had left a succession in that See, who beside his Bishopricke of Rome, should have the chiefe pastoral cure over all the faithful: gave such reverence to the said Chaire and See of S. Peter, that he thought it not convenient for him, to keep his ordinarie courte and Residence anie more in that Citie, where the chiefe causes of all Christendome should be daily examined.

In so much that he did not onely
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protest his faith in Christ, and the honour due to S. Peter in expressse words, which are before the first Nicene Councell kept at Nice) but also he in deed went out of the city of Rome with this intent, to keep no more his Imperial residence in the same.

Which thing is farther proved, in that he gave away his own palace, dedicating it a Temple unto our Saviour (which temple it standeth till this day) wherein also the Pope had afterward a dwelling place. And who doth not perceive, that he departeth with the mind to returne no more, who at his going, giveth his own house away?

Adde hereunto, that Constantine went to seeke a newe dwelling place, as Zonaras reporteth, and at the last reasted in Bizance, calling it of his owne name, Constantinople, or new Rome. Why should Constantine thus
thus advisedly separate from the head of the world, the glory of his Empire, and the chief estate of his inheritance, except he had bene fullie persuaded, that S. Peter and his successors the Bishops of Rome had bene placed at Rome by the will of God; to publish the faith of Christ into all Countries (as Pope Leo saith) whereunto he would that his Imperial court should be no hinderance. For otherwise if he had yielded to a simple Bishop, there was a Bishop in Constantinople also, as in every other great City. But it was not every Bishoppe to whom Constantine yealded; but the chief Bishop of all, and the head of the whole Military Church. Which Example of his al good Emperours following, never kept afterward their court and ordinary residence in Rome, albe it Constance perceiving more honour to be geuen to the Mother (which was Rome) then to the daughter (which was...
of the Church.

Was Constantinople) would have returned to Rome, but (as Zonaras declareth) without success. Which thing who so thinketh to have chanced with out the singular providence of God, may seeme to think, that the world is governed by chance.

To this fait of the Emperors (in their absteining to keepe their residence in Rome) let vs ioyn the expresse words also of divers good successours of Constantine the Great. For if anie evil came betwene, it is no marueil, if thei did hase so good a thing as the Primacie of the Church was.

Concerning Constantius the here-vike (who was the sonne of great Constantine) Athanasius complaineth, that he and his adherents the Arrians, had no reverence toward the Bishop of Rome, not consideringe vel quod sedes illa apostolica esset, vel quod Roma Metropolis esset divis onis Romanet; either that it was the
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In Epist. ad Solitar. vi tam aper...
Apostolike See, or els that Rome was the Mother citie of the Roman circuit. So that we may see euens from the beginning, that as the most faithful Emperours did alwaies honour the Apostolike See of Rome, euens so the here-tikes and worse men did alwaies hate it, and despise it.

For on the other side, in the midst of the Arrian heresie, the noble and vertuouse Emperours, Gratianus, Valentinianus, and Theodofius doubted not to sette forth a Lawe in these woordes: Cunctos populos, quos Clementiam nostrce regit imperium in talie volumus religione versari, quam D. Petrum Apostolui tradidisse Romanis, religio vsque adhuc a biso insinuata declarat, quam Pontificem Damasum sequi claret, & Petrum Alexadri Episcopum, virum Apostolice sanctitatis. We wil alna-tions, which are governed by our Clemency, to live in such a religiö, as the reli-
giō which is vſed from S. Peter til this day doth declare him to haue delivered to the Romans, &d which religiō it is euident, that Pope Damasus &d Peter the Bishop of Alexandria (a mā of an Apoſtolick holines) doe follow.

By this Law it is witnessed, first, that S. Peter delivered a certain religiō to the Romans (as weel concerning the Trinitie, as other things)

Secondly, that the said religion coming from S. Peter, was kept stil in the Church of Rome.

Thirdly, that it was kept speciallie by the perpetual succession of Bishops. For which cause Damasus the Bishop of Rome is named in the Law.

After Damasus, a blessed Bishop of Alexandria, called Peter, is also named, not with the intent to shewe also that the Bishops of Alexandria, kept alwayes the true faith (for at that monet Lucius a raging wolf, occupied the seat in Alexandria) but because this
Peter of Alexandria who is now named was in deed the true bishop of Alexandria, albeit he was now kept out of his Church by violence.

Whereas then there were two bishops of Alexandria, one who agreed with the bishop of Rome, another who disagreed because the said Peter did agree with Damasus, and fled out of prison to him, he is named with Damasus, and thereby the other bishop is insinuated to be an usurper. So that the whole force of the Decree resteth upon the tradition and succession of S. Peter at Rome, and of those who agree with him.

If Peter of Alexandria had not followed that succession of S. Peter, he had no more been esteemed than Lucius, Georgius, Gregory or Dodicorus, who being bishops of Alexandria, were al heretics.

Pope Bonifacius the first wrote to the Christian Emperor Honorius, in
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in this wise: Mihi Deus nostra meum Sacerdotium, vobis res humanas regentibus deputavit: Our God hath appointed me the priesthood to me, whereas you do govern worldly matters.

And in the same epistle he requireth the Emperor's help, not I warrant you for the disposing of his own priesthood, but for the conservation of the peace of the Church. To whom the Emperor promiseth his help, confessing that he receaued the writings of his Apostolae blessednes with dew gratulation of eius, reverence, desiring his Apostolae shippe to pray for the safegard of his Empire.

Honorius faith then was, that the Emperours were heads of the civill government for the defense of Ecclesiastical peace, and not supreme heads in all Ecclesiastical things and causes: to defend, I say, the lawes of the Church made by bishops, and not to make new Ecclesiastical lawes, where-
400 The Rocke to bishoppes should be subject against their Wils.

Let vs addde hereunto, that which an Empresse also writheth of the same matter for we may wel beleue that she wrote according to the faith of Church in her tyme. Thus then Galla Placisca faith, concerning the Churche of Rome. In Apostolica fede primus tile, q coelestes claues dignus fuit accipere, principatum Episcopas tus ordinavit. He that was worthy to receave first the heavenly keyes (that is S. Peter): 2nd ordered the primac- cy of the Bishoplye office in the Ap- postolik See. If this be so, Peter was not only first and prince himself, but he also ordered the bishop of Rome to be the first and chief of bishops after him. When I say, Peter ordered it, I meane, that Christ by Peter ordei- ned it. Valentinian is of the same belefe and judgement, saying: Fidem à nos

Ad Synodii
Chalcedo.
Domino
nvo Thevo-
disio. &c.
cum omni competenti devotione defendere, & dignitatem propriæ venerationis B. Apostolo Petro intemeratam & in nostris temporibus conservare, quatenus beatissimæ Romanæ ciuitatis episcopus, cui principatum Sacerdotij super omnes antiquitas contulit, locum habeat ac facultatem de fide & sacerdotibus indicare. *We ought to defend with all competent devotion the faith delivered from our elders. And to conserve and keep in our times to the blessed Apostle S. Peter the dignity of his proper and owne worship uncontrolled: so that the most blessed bishop of the City of Rome (to whom antiquity hath given above all the cheeity of priesthood ) may have place and power to judge of faith and of priests.*

*Lo the honour that is given to the bishop of Rome, is given to Saint Peter: verily, because the bishop of Rome...*
sitteth in his chaire. And when the bishop of Rome is despised, the worship of S. Peter is shamed. If the oldtyme gaue the primacy of priesthood unto the bishop of Rome for S. Peters sake, and that every emines, over al men; if ele-
ven hundred yeres agoe, it was true to say, that Antiquity gaue the chiefty of priestly power to the bishop of Rome: are not they new teachers, who after fifteen hundred yeres, goe about to pluck, the primacy of priesthood from the bishop of Rome?

Martianus likewise with Valentinian confesseth of the General Council which came togethers at Chalcedon, in this wise: Quæ Synodus dum fì
dem diligenter inquirit authoris
tate beatissimi Leonis Episcopi
æterna æ vbis Romæ, & religionis
fundamenta constituit sanctæ cis
uitati, & Flauiano palam mortis
tribuit gloriose. The which counsel
whiles it maketh diligent inquisition
concer-
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concerning the faith, it both appointed
the foundations of religion to the holy
city (the Church) by the authoritie
of most blessed Leo bishop of the
everlasting City of Rome, and also
gave to Flavianus the crown of a glo-
rionse death. All this was done by the
authority of the bishop of Rome.
And why by his authority, the same Mar-
tianus gave the cause thereof before, in
an oratio which he made in the fourth
general council, where he said of Leo
the Pope, qui Apostolica gubernat
thronus, who governeth the See Aposto-
like. And it is well knowne he ment
only the Apostolike see of S. Peter.

For the honour of that See Iustiniæ
Writeth thus to John the second pope of
Rome: Nos reddetes honore Aposto-
lice sedi, & vestre sanctitati (quod
semp nosis in voto fuit, & cft) & vt
decet patrie, honorates vestra beati
rudine, oia quæ ad ecclesiarii statu
pertinet, festinausim ad notitiam
Cc iij desperre
deferre vestra sanctitatis. We render honour to the See Apostolike, and to your Holines (the whiche thing ever was and is our desire) and we honouring your blessednes, as it be commeth us to honour our Father, haue hastened to bring to the knowledge of your Holines all things which doe appertein to the state of Churches.

If the Pope be as a Father to the Emperor, and be so to be honoured:it is utterly impossible for the Emperor, Who is, as it were, a Sonne, to be the supreme head or governour in spiritual causes of his spiritual Father.

Againe he saith: Nec enim patimui quicquaque quod ad Ecclesiarum statui pertinent, quamuis manifestu & indubitatum sit quod mouetur, ut non etiam vestrae innotescat sanctitati, quae capit est omnium sanctorum Ecclesiarum. Neither doe we suffer anie thing, that doth appere to the state of the Churches.
of the Church.

(how manifest ad undoubted so ever it be, which is called in question) but the same is also notified to your holines, who is the head of all holy Churches.

If the Pope be head of all holy Churches, and therefor be made privie to all ordinances ad laues which apperteine to the state of Churches: it must needes follow, that the Church, wherof a King or Emperour shalbe suprem head, is no holy Church, but a profane Synagog ad a malignat congregation, such as those of the Arrians, Donatists, and Pelagians were, who obeyed not the Bishop of Rome, nor suche bishops as were of his fellowship, but either Julianus the Renegate, or Valens, or the Kings of the Gothes and of the Vandals, as the Histories of the Church doe witnesse.

Here the order and place requireth, that I should declare also, how Procos the Emperour, in the time of Pope Bonifacius the third pronounced the See of Rome head of all churches, but.

Vvho was the supreme head of the Heretikes.

An. Dom. 607.
but the Protestants not able to deny the
false assertion, that now first the See of Rome
began to be accepted the head of all Churches. Which thing shall appear as true as the rest of their doctrine is.

For S. Gregory being before Bonifacius, faith of the See of Rome: Apostolica sedes omnium ecclesiarum caput est. The Apostolic See is Head of all Churches.

Before him also the Bishop of Patala, being a Grecian, said of Sylverius the Pope: Ille Papa est super Ecclesiam mundi totius, He is Pope over the Church of the Whole World.

Justinus writing to Ioannes the Pope (as I alleged before) calleth his holiness caput omnium Ecclesiarum, Head of all Churches.

Eugenius the Bishop of Carthage being an African, had said before Justinian's time (as Victor writeth) Romana ecclesia caput omnium ecclesiarum, The Roman Church is the head of all Chur-
Churches.

Ye a Prosper had write before Eugenius: Sedes Roma Petri, que pastoralis honoris factura caput made. Rome the See of Peter, which is made unto the world, the head of pastoral honour. Leo the great, being elder the Prosper, preached thus: Roma per sacra B. Petri sede caput orbis effeceret. Rome by the holy seat of Peter, is made the head of the world, and again p. quos universalis ecclesie cura ad vnab. Petri sede cohaui. By whom the cure of the universal church floweth to the one See of Peter, that nothing might at any time different from his head.

Now the fourth general Council, albeit it was not elder in yeares then Leo, yet confessing of 630. Bishops gathered out of the whole world, it is worthy to be harkened unto of all the Christiæ flock, as of most ancienct and pereleffe authoritye.

This great Council making relation to Pope Leo of such things as had bene done
done there; writeth to him: Tu quis
dem licet membris caput praeras.
Thou wast over us, as the head is over
his members. And whereas the Church is
compared to a vineyard, they there co-
sesse, that unto Pope Leo vinea custo-
dia à Salvatore commissa est, The
keeping of the vineyard is committed
of our Saviour. Note here, gentle Rea-
ders, that this famous, great, and lear-
ned Counsell referreth the matter to
our Saviour, and not unto Photas, or
to any mortal man: The keeping of
the vineyard is committed to the
Pope of Rome by our Saviour
himself.

If we shall go yet higher, when Cy-
rillus confesseth S. Peter to have been
caput Apostolorum, the head of the
Apostles: doth he not confess, the suc-
cessors of S. Peter (who are the Bishops
of Rome) to be much more the heads
of the successors of the Apostles, which
all bishops are?

Shall
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Shall we goe from Cyrilus to S. Ambrose, who writing upon S. Pauls epistle to Timothee, calleth Damasius (the bishop of Rome) the ruler or gouernour of that Church in his tyme, which Church is named of S. Paul the hose of God, the pillow of truth, meaning, that Pope Damasius was gouernour of the whole Militant Church, and not only of any one parish or Diocese. And what other thing is it to be a temporal ruler of Gods whole Church, but to be the temporal head thereof? Saith not Sozomenus, that pope Julius cura gestit omnium, propter sedis propriæ dignitatem? He toke the care of all, for the worthinesse of his own See? Where al is comprised, what can be excepted?

Optatus, who proueth S. Peter to have be head, because he was called of Christ Cephas, a rock (for the rock or foundation is that unto the house, which the head is to the body) doth thereby refer the
the primacie of S. Peter and of his successours to Christ himself.

If I shal goe now to the Council of 300 Bishops held at Sinuessa, where although Marcellinus had confessed him selfe to have done Idolatrie, yet all the Bishops answered: Prima sedes non iudicabitur ad quowam the first See shall be judged of no man: Wilt not therby appere, that the See of Rome being the first See was not preferred to that honor by any mortal man (otherwise he that had professed it, might also have judged it) but was made head of all churches by him who said to S. Peter: vpon this rock I wil build my Church: It is not therefore Phocas, but Iesus Christ, who making S. Peter the temporal foundation and head Pastor of the church, made the Bishop of Rome his successor, as I have declared before.

Let us now goe forward with other good Emperours ad Kings shewing that not Phocas alone, but others also after him
honoured the See Apostolike, as the highest power in the church of God. Constātinus the fourth, being a most Catholike Prince, procured the sixth general Council to be called, ad therin cōfessed himself to have wōdred at the relation of Pope Agatho, as if it had bē the voice of Peter. The same Emperor in the time of Benedictus the second Pope of that name, decreed: vt deinceps quē clerus, populus exercitus Romanus in Pontificē deles gissēr, nūdē Statim verum Christi vicaria esse omnes crederēt. That fīō thence forward, whom the Clergy, people, and the Roman armie should chose to be bishop, all men should straight beleue him to be the true vicare of Christ. He faith not the Vicare of Phocas, or the Lieutenant of the Emperor, but the Vicar and Lieutenant of Christ.

It was then the publicke faith not onlie in the Latine, but also in the Greeke church, that who so was duely chosen
chosen Bishop of Rome, was Christ's own Vicar.

If the whole nobilitie and people of Fraunce, had not beleued the Pope of Rome to be of such authorie: for what purpose would they have sent to Rome to know the mind of Pope Zacharias, who should be King of Fraunce, whether Chilpericus, who hadde the bare name thereof, without exercisings any kingly power in maner, or the greate Stuard, who exercisid the publik office and power of the King without the name?

The Pope answered (as Adu testifieth) Regem potius illum debere vocari, qui rempublicam regeret. That he rather should be called the King, who ruled the common weal. Upon which answer, Pipinus was anointed King autoritate Apostolica & Fra corum electione (faith Sigeberthus) by the Apostolike authoritie, and by the election of the Frenche men. Neither may
may this so great credite, Whiche the Whole people and Nobilitie of France repose in the See Apostolike, be right-ly imputed to the sentence of Phocas, Who before that, had declared the See of Rome to be head of all Churches. For even after this election of King Pipius the first Emperour of the French men, or rather of the Germans (for the French men came out of Germanie) Carolus Magnus, protest ing his re- uerence to the See Apostolike, she- weth the cause why he honoureth it, to be the Chaire of S. Peter, and not the judgement of Phocas. His wordes are these:

In memoriam beati Petri Apostoli honoremus sanctam Romam ecclesiam, & Apostolicam sedem; quae nobis fæcundae est mater ecclesiasticae esse debeat magistra rationis. Quare servas uada est cum manfuettudine humillis, licet vix scripsi, sed non
The see of Rome is the mother of priestly worship.

Thus we see, that Carolus honoured the see of Rome, not for Phocas, but for S. Peter's sake.

Ludovicus, who for his singular vertue and godlines was surnamed Pius, having been triator onlie ordered by Adalgisius the Duke of Bencuens tum, (who went about to kill him in his palaice) and being afterward forced to sweare, that he wold not revenge that
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that injury, was so far from taking himself to be the supreme head over the Bishop of Rome, that rather he was content to take absolution from his oath of John the pope, Authoritate Dei & Sancti Petri, by the authority (not of Phocas) but of God, and of Saint Peter.

I would go forward to shew at large the obedience of all good Emperours and Kings to the See Apostolik even till this day, but that it should be accompted a superfluous labour, sith, as I suppose, no man doth doubt of it.

And verily concerning our own countrie, as above fourtene hundred yeres past, Lucius the first Christian King of the Britans, did send to Eleutherius the Bishop of Rome, to receave from thence by his authority the ordinary meane of administring the Sacraments for him and his realm: eue so Ethelbert the first Christian King.
King of the English Saxons take his faith and the government of the Church from the See of Rome (S. Gregory being the Pope) by our Apostle S. Augustine. And the good King Oswiu of Northumbriand, and Ecbert the King of Kent, understanding that the Romæ Church etext catholicæ & Apostolica Ecclesiæ, was the Catholik and the Apostolike Church, sent Wichardus with the consent of all the faithfull of England to Rome, that having ther take the degré of an Archbishops, he might ordain bishops to all the Catholike Churches through Britannie.

From that day forward it is evident by all our Chronicles, which at the least were made before that schism and heresie began, that as every King, not only of England, but of all Christian Countries was best, it most came to godlines and to vertue so was he most obedient and frindful to the bishop of Rome. And contrarywise, as every of them was most licen-
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licentious, most given to extortion, to tyranny, or to robling of Churches: so was he most disobedient to the See of Rome.

So that as all the heathen Emperours, from Nero to the Renegat Ulpius, did alwaies persecute the Apostolike See of Rome: and as afterward all the heretical Emperours did the same, as Welthose of Constantinople, as of the West, so contrarywise all the good Constantines, the Theodosians, the Martias, Carolus, Ludouicus, Otho, and their good successors did so little thick themselves the supreme heads over the bishops of Rome, and of the other Christians in spiritual causes: that contrarywise they obeyed them as their chiefest pastors, and as the Vicars of Christ, and the successors of S. Peter.

And that they did, not only being a part evey man in his own Realm, but also when that most famous battell against the Turkes and Saracens was by the
by the inspiration of the holy Ghost begun at one tyme by the Spaniards, Gascons, Britains, Normans, English, Scottish, and Frenchmen: by the Burgundions, Almains, Lumbards, and Italians, when diverse Dukes (as Godfrid of Lorrain, and Baiamund of Apulia) when diverse Erles (as Baldwin of Mos, one Robert of Flanders, and another of Normandy, Stephè of Blefe, and Raimund) when Hugh the brother of Philip the King of Fraunce toke that most holy warre in hand, when, I say, they were stirred uppe with one spirit, and hart, to recover the holy land: did not they shew as wel their own beliefe, as the univerfal faith of all their countres and nations, in that they had Hamarus the bishop of Podium sette over them Apostolica authoritate by the Apostolike authoritie?

And how marueilouse successe of victorie had they, conquering as well Antioche as Hierufalem? It can be unknov-
unknown to no man who readeth the old histories, what prosperity these realms have alwaies had, which keeping themselves in the obedience of the See of Rome, kept also the faith which that Church professeth. In so much that Africe was invincible, until the Donatists, and the Pelagians had withdrawn the obedience thereof from the See of Rome. Neither was the Turke able to conquer the Greciæs, either of Asia, or of Thracia, until after the concel of Florence against their consent there geue, they had again divided themselves from the society of the Pope.

I wil come nere home. The English Saxons conquered the Britons for no cause rather, then because the Britons began to forsake the old faith, wherein Fugastius, Damianus and Germanus all coming as Legates and preachers from the Pope, had instructed them. For (as Beda hist. S. Bede testifieth) the Britons now had Angloriæ, left the keeping and profession of Easter 2. cap. 2. after
after the use of the Church of Rome
(with Whome the Catholike Church
agreed therein) and began to keepe it
as the Iewes did. Ten also they mini-
stered the sacrament of Baptism other-
wise then the Church of Rome did.

If then we continue again in this
division and schisim against the Church
of Rome, we have to feare the like spoil
and conquest or some worse, and even
of temporal calamity beside the everlas-
ting damnation of those, who die with-
out the Society of S. Peters See, who
was made of Christ, and in his
successors continueth stil,
the shepheard of the
whole militat
slocke.

Their
Their doctrine who teach the bishop of Rome to be Antichrist himself, is confuted by the authority of God’s word, and by the consent of the ancient Fathers.

The XVII. Chap.

Antichrist doth signify the adversary or enemy of Christ our Saviour. In which kinde of malice as Lucifer the captain of all cursed rebels was the first and chiefe: so he was first named Satan, which is to say, an adversary. For as the goodness of Satan, God not being content to send his prophets and priests to guide men to life everlasting, at the last sent his owne sonne in mans flesh, thereby to worke most effectuallie our salvation: so on the other side Satan, having procured as much as laie in him, that men should not believe in Christ, nor follow his prophets, shal the length of time attempt to possesse a certain accursed maz,
by whome he may worke his feates against Christ, so muche the more hurtfulle, bow muche the prier he shal ly, being covered ad hidde both with mas fleshe ad with the very name of Christ.

As therefore the Deuil shal geue his strength and power most specially to that cursed man; so the Deuils name is most specially geuen him also in the holie scripture. Where he is called of S. Paul διάτηκθεν, the Adversary, and S. John sheweth whose adversarie he is, by naming him ος ἀντικειστος, which is to saie, that Antichrist who is most spittfully set against Christ, and is most certeinely foretold to come, and ought most carefullie to be eschewed of all Christians.

For albeit euerie false teacher be a certaine Antichriste, or ennemie of Christ, and therefore (as S. John saith) there are manie Antichristes: yet as there is one aboue other, so he saith of hit ον εν ονει διδος ος ἀντικειστος ἡ γατε, you have
have heard, that the Antichrist cometh
you have heard, not only that an Antichrist, but that the same one most notable Antichrist cometh.

Now this singular Antichrist shall be suffered to come, partlie for the trial and revealing of the invincible strength which God hath given to the elect, partlie to shew, howe inexcusable the stubborn Jews are, who pretending to believe the old Prophets, and to looke for the true Messiah, yet having repelled Jesus Christ, who most evidently was described in the Lawe and Prophetes, shall in the end embrace the Dinele him selfe, of whome all the Prophetes hath warned them to beware.

For S. Paules faith: Because they have not receu'd the loue of truth that they might be fau ed, therefore God shall send them the working of errore, that they may beleue lying. To the end all men may be judgement, who haue not beleued
The Rock
the truth, but have consented to iniquity.

Thus, whereas there are three kinds of Antichrists, first the Devil, who is only a spirit, next, false teachers, thirdly he that being possessed of the Devil, shall in the end oppose Christ's glory most of all in apparent show, and in outward working: the question is not now of the two first kinds, but only of the last. to wit, whether the Pope of Rome be this main and chief Antichrist, who was prophesied of to appear so singularly toward the end of the world. For some Protestants are grown to that excessive malice against the Church of Christ, that they doubt not to affirm, to preach, yea to set forth in print, that the chief pastor of the whole Church, to whom Christ commended his sheep and lambs, is not only an arme, or hand of Antichrist, but the very head and captain Antichrist himself.
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self, who shall be destroyed with the spirit of Christ's mouth.

Among others, one Henrie Bullinger, and another as wise as he, called Rodulph Gaulter, each of them Ministers of Zurich, have set this doctrine abroad in books: whom I name the former, because their books are translated into the English tongue, as a special treasure to enriche fools with all: whereas in deed, that blaspemous doctrine is directly against the express word of God, as I will shew hereafter.

And verily, if God said generallie of all his elect people, yea if it be said of the hard harted Jews: He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye: if he said more speciallie concerning his Prophets and Priests: touche not mine anointed, if his Apostles were nere to him then any other, because they taried with him in his tentations, if among all the Apostles, S. Peter loued him best, and was best behol.
beloved of him (concerning the love which belongeth to the chief shepherd and pastor of his flock) if Christ provided by singular prudence, that S. Peter should glorifie him by suffering death upon the Cross in the City of Rome, if Saint Peter's Chair and the succession in the chief Bishopric hath bene acknowledged in Rome with great reverence, of S. Irenæus, of S. Cyprian, of Hippolytus the Martyr, of Athanasius the Patriarch of Alexandria, of likewise of Paulus the Archbishop of Constantinople, both being holy confessors, if Arnobius, i Optatus, S. Hieron, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, with the rest of the holy Fathers, have so esteemed the noted succession of Peter, that without the unitie of that Chair, they accompt no salvation, and in it, they reckon an assurance of the Catholique faith: if God bath prospered that succession against the enuie of al heretiques, and to the com-
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forte of all Catholiques in allages: if thence, the faith of Christe hath been dilated and spread into diverse coun-
tries: After all these gratious and mi-
raculous woorkes of Christe, to charge that See so welbeloved of God, not on-
yly with errore ( Whiche yet is false ) nor onely with decreeing of heresies (Whiche is impossible, because Christ hath praised for it) but to charge it even with the begetting, and nursing, and fostering vp, and maintaining of Anti-
christ himself: it is (to speake in shor-
words) to burden Christe himself with the bringing forth and with the com-
mending of Antichrist unto the world.

The raging madness of the Prote-
stants not being content to burden the Apostolike see of Rome with a-
buses, or with meane errores, will
nedes haue, not a frind or member of Antichrist, but the very head and ca-
pitaine of al the enemyes of God to sit
in S. Peters own chair. And that is not

only
only asserted by bawdes, and min-
strels, and plaiers, but also by Preachers
and Doctours of this new divinitie.
And it is beleued of ignorant men, as if
it were an article of their faith. As
though it had not bene Christ onelie,
who hath set Rome in so great honour,
as it hath alwaies had. It was not Ant-
ichrist, but Jesus Christ, who made S.
Peter to goe thither, and to die there,
and to have a perpetual succession of Bi-
shops in that Citie, without any inter-
misston or coming betwenn of insidelity,
or of professed heresiie from the begin-
ing of our Christian profession even

til this daie. It was not Antichrist, but
Christ who gave the crowne of Mar-
tyrdome to almost fortie Bishoppes of
Rome. Did Christ the prepare the way
for Antichrist by the chiefe of al his A-
postles? Could ye make none other man
to be the foreruner of that cursed crea-
ture, besides the Sonne of God, and the
redeemer of mankind? O blasphemeouse
tongues
Whom have so many general Counsels, so many faithful Princes, and nations honored at this while in the Citie of Rome? We say they have honored Christ Jesus in his Vicar. We say, they have committed fornication with Antichrist. Ergo had Christ no male, upon Whom he might omit Antichrist to be built, but only upon the foundation of Peter, upon Whom he built his own Church? Christ said, hell gates should not prevail neither against the rock (Which was Peter, as it hath been evidently proved) nor against his Church, which was built upon the rock. And yet have hell gates so far prevailed against the rock which was Peter, that euen Antichrist himself doth sit in the seat of the Rock?

Did Christ so muche labour to preferre S. Peter, that in the end Antichrist might have a moste honourable seat prepared by God himselfe, for his abominable enterprizes?
Are they worthy of the name of men, who fear not to avouch this detestable and blasphemous fable? Surely although the verie filthines of the doctrine being once understood, be hable to overthrowe it self for euuer, yet that they may perceave I fight not against them with words only, but also with authorities and reasons, I will briefly declare out of the holy scriptures and auncient Fathers, why the Pope of Rome can not be Antichrist himself, as the Protestants doe most impudently and unlearnedly teache? I must indeede soffe the thing I speake of to be so hard, that no more can be said in it, the either Gods word or the consent of the Catholike doctours hath reveale.

It is then the common and certain judgement of all holy writers, that Antichrist (who is so notable prophecied of in Isaias, in Daniel, in the Gospels, in S. Paule, and in the Apocalypse) is one certaine man, But the Popes of Rome are
are not any one certaine man, but their succession is the continuance of a certain office, in which some hundreds of men have succeeded one after the other: therefore the Popes of Rome are not Antichrist.

As the name of Christ being given in the olde tyme to many prophetes, priests and Kings (who were anoynted for a figure of the trueth which was to be fulfilled) did not hinder, but that there should come one certain singular person, who alone should be the sauour of mankind: so the name of Antichrist being given to many wicked adversaries of Christ, and namely to all hereticks, doth not hinder but rather helpeth to prove, that some one singular man shall come at the lengthe, who shall passe all other men in setting himself against Christ.

This comparison of mine is directely proved by the expresse word of God. For Christ faith unto the Jews: I came in John 5. the
the name of my Father, and ye receaued me nor: if an other come in his owne name, him ye will receaue. Which wordes being confessed by the auncient Doctours, to be spoken prophetically of Antichrist, doe proove that as Christ was one certain man, so Antichrist shalbe one certain man. The only ods is, that Christ cometh from God, but Antichrist from the deluil. He to saue, this to destroie. He to unite, this to diuide and to distraict. But in this they both agree, that eche of them is one singular person.

2. Thef. 2. And this much S. Paule doth manifestly teache, saying: that the man of synne must be reveale before the day of judgemet. The said man of sinne is described in S. Paule, by the article ὁ ἄνωτρος, the man, or that man, and not a man. For the man betokeneth one certain man by name, who is there called also ὁ ἄνωτρος, the wicked man, ὁ ὄς, the son of perdiction, ὁ ἀντικηρσ, the
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the adversary, and not (as the English bible hath euill translated it) an adversarie who is spoken of such as never came before, nor shall come after, who is called of S. John, ὁ ἀντιχιστὸς, the Antichrist.

The strength of the Greeke article in this word, the man, Saint Cyril-lue declareth in this wise: Quum homo sine articulo dicitur, homo quispiam designatur: quando autem articulus accedit, unicum atque singularem hominem designat. When a man is named without the article, any man is meant: but when the article (the) is adioyned, then it pointeth to one certaine singular man. And of the same judgement all other lerned Grecians are.

Seing then we reade Antichrist to be called ὁ ἀντιχιστὸς, and ὁ ἀντιχιστός, not a man, but the man, or that man, not generallie an Antichrist, but the Antichrist, or that Antichrist, by the
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judgement of the Fathers, one singular person is meant, and not a whole order and succession of many men, such as the popes of Rome are. So that S. Hierome saith: Putemus unius esse de hominibus, in quo totus Satanas habiturus sit corporalis. Let us thinck him to be (not the deus or a spirit) but one of the kinde of men, in whom Satan shall dwell corporallie. Behold, he is one of the number of men, and not certain hundreds of men.

In cap. 7. Dan.

Againe S. Hierome saith: As our Saviour had Salomon and other Saints for a figure of his coming: so Antichrist must be rightly beleued to haue had Antiocbus the worst Kinge, who persecuted the Saints, and desiled the temple, for a figure of him. Whereby we lern, that as there was one certain person Iesus Christ: so he meant there should be one certain person, who should be Antichrist.

S. Am
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S. Ambrose by distinguishing three kinds of Antichrist, of the which the second is the devil, the third is every heretic, sheweth the first of all, to be that cursed Antichrist, who shall fulfill the prophecies which are of him. Whom he numbreteth in the first place, not because he passeth the devil his master and founder, in setting himself against Christ: but because in the name and nature of Antichrist, he passeth his as only we mean by Antichrist, not generally an adversary, but such an adversary comming in flesh, as never walked in flesh beside him. For S. Ambrose also in another place saith of him, that as the sonne of God took flesh: so Satan as in homine apparebit, the devil shall appere in a man. He saith not, in hominibus, in men, as though they were many, but in homine, in a man, who is but one.

S. Augustine also confessing manie Antichristes with S. John, called one of them
of them, ipsum principem, the verie head, and afterward illum nouissimum Antichristum, the last Antichrist. The woordes ( prince ) and ( last ) agree to one onelie, and not to a whole succession of men in one state of life.

In 2. Thefalon 2.

S. Chrysothom having asked, who is the Antichrist of Whome S. Paule spake, answereth: homo quispiam omnem Satanæ energiam adeptus, a certaine man having in him all the strength of the diuell.

Theodoretus saith, as the sonne of God toke flesh to procure our salvation; so the devill chooseth a man to himself who may receive his whole working of mischief.

In eüdem locû Pauli

In 13. Lab. li, xiv, xi, xvi.

S. Gregorie agreeth with all the rest of the Fathers in these woordes Dias bolus in vlimis temporibus illud vas perditionis ingredietur, quod Antichristus vocabitur. The devill in the last daies shall enter into that vessels
vessel of perdition whiche shal be called Antichrist.

With these Fathers agree Sedulius, Primasius, Haimo, Theophilo last, and the Writers of the Greek Commentaries gathered together by Oecumenius. All which witnesses may suffice for proue, that not the order and state of the Bishops of Rome, but onelie one certaine man is properly Antichrist, who shal sette himself against Christ more singularly, then ever any heretike hath done hither-to.

Againe, whereas Antichrist is called of Saint Paul the aduersarie: it is meant, that he withstandeth Christ so much, that no man is able to withstand him more. He doth not therefore withstand onelie a piece of the faith, but he withstandeth the whole faith, denying Iesus Christ to be God and man, or to be our mediatour.

For
For S. Hierom faith in commenting this place of S. Paul: Extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus, ut cum omnibus gentium deos sive probatam omnem & veram religionem suo calcet pede. He is exalted above all that which is called God, that he may tread under his feet, the Gods of all Nations, or else, a true and approved religion. Again he saith out of the same Apostle, that God shall send not only operatorum, the worker of error, sed ipsam operationem, id est, longem erroris, the very working, that is to saie, the fountain of error.

S. Ambrose affirmeth, that he shall dispute out of the Scriptures, that he is Christ. What speak I of these small matters? Antichrist shall teach himself, and no man else, to be God. Non enim ad Idololatriam adducet ille (saith Chrysostom) sed antit. quisquam erit, quisquis deos postludans, ubebitque seipsum pro deo colit ac venes

In Luc. 21

In 2. ad Thess. hom. 3.
venerari, & in templum dei collo-
cari, non Hierosolymitanum solus
sed & in Ecclesiis. He shall not lead
or bring to Idolatrie, but he shalbe one
certain man so contrary and against
God, that he shal make himselfe equall
with God, throwing downe at Goddes:
and he wil also commaund himselfe to
be worshipped and adored, and to be
placed in the temple of God, not only at
Hierusalem, but in the Churches also.

S. Ambrose accordeth therewith:
Sciēs enim venturum Dominum
ad se comprimirēdum, nomen eius
hibi usurpabit: & vt regnum eius
verum videatur, attrahet secum qu
t simul cum eo pereant, vt in domo
Domini in sede sedeat Christi, &
ipsum Deum se afferat, non filium
Dei. Antichrist knowing, that our
Lord shal come to beate him downe,
Wil usurpe his name unto himselfe.
And to the end his Kingdome maie
seme true, he wil draw with him such
as may perish together with him, that he may sit in the house of our Lord, in the seat of Christ, and may affirm him selfe to be very God and not the Sonne of God.

Thirdlie, Antichrist shall not come, before the Roman Empire be clean taken away. for so much doth S. Paule signifie by those words: And now ye know what withholdeth, or what letteth the coming of Antichrist, verily the Roman Empire, nisi venesexit dispensatio primus, & revelatus erit homo peccati (Christ faith he shall not come to judge the world) unlese the departing come first, and the man of sinne be revealed.

Defectio. The departing is meant, when all nations and countries shal depart whollie from the Romæ Empire. For that it must be a full departing, it appeareth, because it is the Emperour himselfe who staith the coming of Antichrist, and who must be taken out of the way. For thus
thus we read in S. Paul: Tantū vt qui tener, teneat, donec de medio fiat. Onely that he who holdeth, may hold, until he be taken awaie.

Κατ' εὐνοι, which signifieseth to hold, and to withhold, being of the Masculine gender, doth shew the talk to be of a man. Verilie of the Emperor, who both holdeth the Empire (as S. Augustine doth expounde the Worde) and Dei, lib. 10 withholdeth or stoppeth the comming of cap. 19.

Antichrist. If any man ask why the Emperor of Rome should be said to stop the comming of Antichrist: there of diverse reasons may be gven, and which of those is most true, or how many are true, it is hard to judge, because all prophecies and the reasons of them are obscure and darke, until they are fulfilled.

The first cause may be, either the revelation of the holie Ghost, or the prophecies of Isai, of Daniel, and of such others by whos S. Paul might understand that...
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that Antichrist cometh not, until the
Roman Empire be destroyed. And in
this only sense, the Emperor is a stop
unto Antichrist by the way of signe or
token, because God hath given suche a
Watchword, that Antichrist shal not
rise, til the Roman Empire doth who-
bie faile.

The second reason may be, the ini-
quity which is wrought by the Roman
Empire, of the which iniquitie, there
is a certaine measure known to God
alone, until the fulnes Whereof, An-
tichrist can not come. And to this rea-
son the text of S. Paul semeth to agree
in that it is said: that the mystery of
iniquitie worketh now. As who
should say, when it hath done wor-
ting, then is the coming of Antichrist
ripe. S. Irenæus, and S. Hierom also
incline vehemently to this reason.

The third reason may be, the streth
of the Roman Empire, because whiles
it dareth, Antichrist who must rule té-
porallie
orally) can not have full obedience done to him: and so doth S. Chrysostome, and manie Grecians after him, take the matter.

The last reason may be, for that God (after the conversion of the Emperours to the faith) hath caused most of them to serve him for the defence of his true faith and Church. The which defense whiles it standeth, Antichrist cannot prevaile. For aEusebius, bLeo, cEucherius doe affirme, the Roman Empire to have bene provided for the propagation and preservation of the faith. It is possible truely, that in diverse respects all these reasons may be true.

But how so ever it be, once, forasmuch as the Emperour withholdeth the comming of Antichriste: so long as there is one who holdeth the Empire, Antichriste can not be in the Church of Christ. For Saint Hierome gueueth this sense to Saint Paules'siam. words: Non veniet Antichristus.
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nisi prius deletur Romanum Imperium. Antichrist shall not come, unless the Roman Empire be first destroyed. And again: nisi fuerit Romanum imperium ante desolatū, Vnlesse the Roman Empire be first desolated. And again: vt omnes gentes, quæ Romano imperio subiecent, recedant ab eis. That all those Nations, which are under the Roman Empire, may goe or depart from them.

S. Augustine (although he could not assure himselfe to understand perfectlie this hard place of the Apostle) yet of this part, which I now speake of, thus he writeth: Illud quod ait Apostolus, tantum qui modō tenet, tenet, donec de medio fiat, non absurde de ipso Romano imperio creditur dictum, tanquam dictum sit: tantum qui modō imperat, imperet, donec de medio fiat, id est, de medio tollatur, & tunc revelabitur iniquus, quæ significari Antichristum.
Stum nullus ambiguit. *That which the Apostle faith, onely he that hol-
deth now, let him hold, until he be made away, is not absurdly believed to*
*be said of the Roman Empire it self: as though it were saied, only he that doth gov-
ern now, let him govern, until he be made away, that is, be taken away, and*
*then shalbe reuealed that wicked man, whome no man doth doubt to be Antichrist.*

See what S. Augustin faith: let him ruler who doth rule, until he be taken a*
*way. Which is not only spoken of Nero*
*by name (who then ruled) but of euerie*
*successour of his, as Haimo expresselie*
*Writeth. As if it were saied, let the Em-
peror rule so long as he shall rule.*
*And when he ceaseth to rule, Antis-
christ shalbe reuailed.*

How is then the Pope Antichrist, *Whereas there is as yet a Roman Em-
peror living? Hereunto S. Chry-
*家纺agreeth, saying: tant u quitetenet in*
in præsentia, donec è medio fiat. hoc est, quando è medio sublatum fuerit Romanum imperium, tum veniet ille, & non abs re. Donec enim imperij illius timor fuerit, nemo Antichristo statim subdetur. Quando vero istud fuerit destrus ejus imperium, vacatem imperij principatum inuadet, & tentabit ad se rapere & hominum & Dei imperium. Only he which holseth presently, untill he be taken away. That is, when the Romæ Empire shalbe taken away, then he shal come: and not without cause. For so long as there is feare of that Empire, no man wilbe straight waies subject to Antichrist. But whè this Empire shalbe destroyed, he will inuade the dignity of the Empire being voyd, and wil assay to gette unto himself the Empire of man and of God.

In 2 Thes. 2. 3. Haimo faith: Revelabitur con; gruo tempore Antichristus, post quam
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qua oia regna diiscefferint á Romano imperio. Antichrist shall be revealed in a meete tyme; after that all kingdoms shall depart from the Roman Empire.

Note, that all kingdoms must depart from the Roman Empire. If then it be cleere, that Antichrist doth not come, untill the Roman Empire be voide, ad all nations be gon from it; seing Maximi- milian reigneth in it at this day, it is cleere, that the pope of Rome is not Antichrist, who hath dured these fiifté hũ-dred yeres together with the Empe- rour, whereas Antichrist shall not come, untill there be no moe Roman Emeperours.

Lette us goe foreward. Whensoeuer Antichrist cometh, his dedes and doctrine against Christ must be opě and without all cloking or disfeeming. For S. Paule sheweth a difference between Antichrist himself, and between the mystery of iniquity. Mysteriũ. For
The Rocke

For a mysterie is as much to say, as a privie thing. And so the mystery of iniquitie was the privy and close working of all impiety against Christ. Whereas on the other side he saith by Antichrist, reuelabitur iniquus ille, that wicked man shall be revealed, and made open. Whereupon S. Chrysostom saith: Neronem hic dicit tanquam typum Antichristi gerentem. nam ille vollebat reputari Deus. & benè dixit mysterium, hoc est, non apertè hoc agit (Nero)sicut ille Antichris tus)actus est, nec adeo perficita fronte & impudenter. He saith, that Nero doth here beare the figure of Antichrist, for he would be taken as God. And he saith verie well, the mysterie, that is to say, Nero doth not this openly, as he (that is to say, Antichrist) will doe, neither with so blased a face, and so impudently.

Theodoretus : Haereticos appells ad Thessa, lauit mysterium iniquitatis, vt qui habent
of the Church.

habit celatum iniquitatis laqueo.
Ipse enim (Antichristus) aperit a
Deo abducit homines. quamobrem
etiam eius aduentum revelatone vocavit Apostolus. Quod enim
citanum semper confirmabat, id
palam & aperit prædicabit.

He doth call hereticks the mystery of iniquity, as
whose iniquity is hidden. But Antichrist himself doth bring men fro God
openly, wherefore also the Apostle
doeth call his comming a reuealing:
for that which he did privily alwayes
confirm, he wil preache openly and ma-
nifesty. Haymo and Theophilaet are of
the same minde.

If then Antichrist shal oppogne
Christ without al dissembling: how is it
possible for the Popes to be Anti-
christ, who surelie forbidde no man
in plaine woordes to beleue in Christ,
nor yet denie anie part either of the
Gospel, or of the holie scriptures of
the new testament.
The Rocke

All which things Antichrist will not only doe, but he will doe them openlie and plainly. Moreover seing Antichrist shall say himself to be God, and yet no pope did ever say so: doubtlesse no pope can be Antichrist.

I know here that a wrangling protestat Wolud not feare to say, that the Pope accompieth himself God, because some gloses of the Canon law call him so, or make him squall with Christ.

But in truthe there is no glose, that ever called the pope God in that sense, as though he were God by nature, but only God by the office which he beareth under Christ, as Moses was called the God of Pharaoh. And every judge is in the holy scripture called God.

Notice whereas the gloses alluding evidentlie to those texts, and to other which were made according to the example of them, doe call the pope God by an aquinocation, and that also by the
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by the example of God's word: is it not a marvellous desperate point for the Protestantes to ground a doctrine, upon such an abuse and equivocation of a word.

Now Antichrist must not onlie be called God of others, but he must extoll himself above God, even after such sense as the blessed Trinity is God by nature. Whereupon Haimo faith: supra sancta Trinitate se extollet, He wil extol himself above the holie Trinitie. Certeinly no Pope did ever so much as dreame to doe any like thing, and much lesse do they professeit, but they professe only themselves to be the servants of them who serve God.

The fifte difference betweene the Pope and Antichrist may be, in that Antichrist shalbe receaued most specially of the Iewes, who as yet haeve not receaued the Pope at any tyme. Concerning this matter Christ himselfe said unto the Iewes: I came in my Fathers name.
name, and me ye haue not receaued: if an other man come in his own name, him ye will receaue.

This other man is expounded to be Antichrist, by Saint Hierom, Saint Chrysostom, Saint Ambrose, Cyril, Theodoretus, and all the other Fathers. And seing the woordes are spoken to the Iewes, they also must receaue Antichrist. And so much doth S. Paulus teache also in his epistle to the Thessalonians. According to which sort S. Ambrose saith: Ex circumcisione aut circumciscum illum venire sperandum est, ut sit Iudaice crede dignitatissimius. It is to be looked, that Antichrist shall come circumcised or of the circumcision, that the Iewes may have some confidence in believing him.

Faciet hae omnia (saith S. Hiero-

drom) non sua virtute sed concep-
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The Iewes. Theodoretus: Iudaei eù ex-
The Iewes doo looke for him, and whose he cometh, they wil beleue him.

Whoseth not, that the Iewes have not yet receaued the pope? yea rather as they hate Christ most of a l. So doe thei hate his Vicar above all other Christiæs yea al most as much as the protestantes them selves do hate him, as by Whome they understand their religiö and faith to be most hindered.

The sixth difference is expresssed in Daniel, where after the description of the foure Empires it is saied, that, the fourth beast (which is the Ro-
man Empire) had ten horns, I con-
fydered the horns. And bee holde an other little horn sprang out of the middest of them, and three of the first horns were pul-
led vppe before his face, and he hold the eyes, as it were of a man, were in this horn, and a mouth

Fs iy speas
Vpon this place, S. Hierom saith: Dicamus quod omnes scriptores Ecclesiastici tradiderunt. In consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros reges, qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant. Et undecimum resurrectum esse regem paruulum. Quirites reges de decem regibus superaturus sit. Id est, Aegyptiorum regem, & Africae, & Aethiopix, sicut in consequentibus manifestius dicemus. Let us saie that which al the Ecclesiastical writers haue left by tradition. In the consummation of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans must be destroyed, there shall be ten Kings, who will divide the Roman Empire or Dominion among themselues. And there shall arise the eleventh being a very little King. Who shall overcome three of those ten Kings, that is to saie,
saie, the Kings of Egypt, and of Africa, and of Ethiopia, as we wil declare more manifestlie afterwards.

Herewith Hippolytus and Theodoretus in his Comment upon the same Prophet agreeeth. But what neede I write their wordes, seeing S. Hierome confesseth it to be the opinion of all Ecclesiastical Writers? Wherefore seeing the Pope hath not conquered to him the kingdoms of Egypt, Aethiop, and of Africa: who soever saith him to be that chiefe Antichrist who is prophesied of, is no Ecclesiastical Writer, but a false Prophet and a seducer.

The seventh difference is, that Antichrist shal puail in his reign but three yeres and a halfe. Sancti tradentur in manu eius vsque ad tempus, &a tempora, &c dimidium temporis. The Saints shalbe deliuered in his hald until a time (that is to saie, one yere) times (that is, two yeres more) and half a time, that is, halfe a yere. And that
We may be sure this interpretation to be true, it is noted of S. Augustin, that Daniel afterward nübreth the daies, ad in the Apocalips the moneths are also nübred, to wit forty and two moneths.

Daniel faith: Frō the time wherein the continual Sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination of desolatiō shall be set vp, daies a thowland, two hundred, nientie. Where S. Hierom faith: Perspicuum est, tres istos & semis annos de Antichristi dicit temporibus, qui tris bus & semis annis, hoc est mille ducentis nonaginta diebus sanctos persecuturus est. Et postea corruis turus in monte inclyto & sancto. It is evident, that these three yeres ad an halfe, are said of the time of Antichrist, who shall persecute the Saints three yeres ad an halfe, that is, a thousand and two hundred and nienty daies, and afterward he shall fall in the glorious and holy hil. Of the same mind were Eusebius Cæsarien-
S. Irenæus likewise saith: **Cum va** aduersus haeres.

When Antichrist reigning threescore and six moneths shall have spoyled all things in this world, and shall sit in the Temple at Jerusalem, the Lord shall come. If Antichrist then prevaieth but three yeres and a halfe, seing the Popes have kept their succesion stevente hundred yeres together, and have had their temporal power which is annexed to the bishoprick euery by the confession of our Aduersaries, at the least these viij. or ix. hundred yeres, I can not see, what ground they have to teache the Pope to be Antichrist himself.

I might addde to these differences, that Helias shall come at the tyme
time of Antichrist, as *Hippolytus*, *S. Augustine*, *S. Chrysostome*, and *Theodoretus* teach, who is not yet come, although the Popes hath flourished so long.

*Item*, that Antichrist shall be born of the tribe of Dan, as *Irenaeus*, *Hippolytus*, *Theodoretus*, and S. *Gregorie have written (whereas the Popes are of no such tribe) and also, that Antichrist cometh but even a little before the end of the world, as *Irenaeus* saith, and *S. Augustin*, and *Theodoretus*: *In ipso tempore consummationis*, in the verie time of the last end. But either these former differences doe suffice, or with them who have settled their hartes against the truth of Gods worde, and against the judgement of the Catholike fathers, no arguments at all wil prevaine. Whose infinite selfe will, if it be punished with infinite damnation, it is but the just judgement of God. *Onelie I beseech*
seeche him to staie their harts, whiles yet the time of penance is not shut up. I have not lightlie spoken one word in this behalfe without authoritie, because the matter is harde, and aboue mans capacitie. In so muche that S. Hierom, considering Daniel him selfe not to have perceived the mysteries before they were expounded to him, writeth in this wise: Si Prophe-
ta audiuit, & non intellexit: quid faciunt hi qui signatum librum & visque ad tempus consummationis multis obscurationibus inuolutum, presumptione mentis edisserunt? If the Prophet did heare, and did not understand, what shal they doe, who by presumption of the minde, do expound and declare the book sealed, and folded uppe with many obscurities untill the time of consummation?

Let now the Protestants speake without the booke after their presumptuous phantasie, or els let them shew vs one aunt-
ancient Father of the first six hundred yeres (among so many as have wrote) who said at any time, the Pope of Rome was or should be Antichrist.

Or if none can be named, yea if the Prophets, the Gospels, the Apostles describe Antichrist in such wise, that it is impossible for the Popes to be meant thereby: shall yet this furious opinion still prevaile? It shall indeed, but with men possessed by some evil spirit, who have neither eyes at libertie to see, nor eares to heare, nor common sense to conceive either the word of God, or the consent of grave and learned men. God open the eyes of the blind, if it be his wil.

Now whereas to make a shewe of somewhat, the Protestants allege, that Babylon is expounded by Tertullian to be Rome, and that Rome is called the harlot clothed with purple in Saint Hierome, and that there are
the seven hils whiche are spoke of in the Apocalips. If these men care not what they saie, or how they allege the Fathers, so that they may seeme to the ignorant not to lack wordes: I can not enuiue them their small pleasure, which shalbe afterward recompensed with so bitter a sauce of eternaldamnation.

But if they seek the truthe with a sincere conscience, thei are well assured that Rome is called Babilo, not in respect of the Christians which are nowthere, but oly in respect of the colusi of al tongs al peple whiche haunted thither in the time of th'Emperors. And then Rome was ful of Idolatry, ad did persecute the Saints, and did put to death aboue thirty of the first Bishops of Rome. So that Rome is called Babylon for persecuting the Bisshops, and not for honouring them. For disobeying the Popes, and not for obeying them.
Again S. Hierom expoundeth the harlet clothed with red purple, namely to be that everlasting wordlie Empire and monarchie, which (as the Romans dreamed) should continue still over the whole world. The which opinion (of the eternity of the Roman Empire) S. Hierome calleth the name of blasphemy which is written in the harlets forhead. And in this respect the Romæ Empire prepared a way for the abomination to come, which being once come to his ripenes, Antichrist shalbe revealed. One of the greatest signes of whose comming is the weakenes of the Romæ Empire. Which when it is cleane taken away, then cometh Antichrist.

But it is to be understood (if I shall play the child with childish Divines) that the city of Rome at this daie standeth not upon the seven hills, but as the Empire is gonne from the city, so is the City gonne from the hills, and
and standeth in the plaine along by the rivers side, in the field, which sometime was called campus Martius. And so by the changing of the place the Protestants have lost their argument.

The pope also doth sitte for the most part on the other side of the river uppon the hiinamed Vatican, hard by S. Peters Churche, by whom he holdeth his chaire, not at all deriving his power from the seuen hils, whereupon the seuen Kings dwelt, or from the Roman Empire.

But indeed the seuen hils are well meant the fulnes of pride and vaine glory, which is in all the worlde, and specially in secular princes, to whom yet the protestants committ the supreme government of the Church, being thereby nere to the state of Antichrist; then they are ware of. But lette all our new brethern bring but one holy Father or auncient doctour (who hath ben alwaies accompted Catholike) who ever said,
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said, that the bishop of Rome should be Antichrist; or if none can be alleged, let this doctrine of theirs be accosted a palpable novelty of words, which S. Paul would have to be avoided among good Christians.

Not the Pope of Rome, but the Protestants themselves are the members of Antichrist by forsaking the Catholike Church, by setting up a new Church, and by teaching false doctrine against the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The XVIII. chap.

This being once cleared, that the Pope of Rome can not be that notable Antichrist, who was so long before prophesied of, the next shift of the Protestants must be to say, that the Pope is at the least a forerunner of that principal Antichrist. Of which sort all such are, as by teaching false doctrine do promote his kingdome, who is the head and capitaine of all error and heresie.

I am
I am not ignorant, that if I should exactly handle this argument, I should runne over all the articles which are at this day in controversie. For in every of them, he that holdeth the false part, is a member of Antichrist: and he that defendeth the truth, is of Christ. But for so much as that were an infinite labour, it shall suffice by a few general reasons to shew the way unto him, who list to prosecute the said argument more fully.

The first mark of an Antichristian.

Sieg we now speak not of Panims or Jews, who are without the Church, but of heretikes, who were once of the Church: the first way to know this kind of Antichristes is, if we can shew, that any man departed from the Catholike Church. For when Christ intreated of false Prophetes and erronious teachers, he said to his faithfull Disciples, nolite exire, go ye Matth. 4:19

Gg not
not out. As who should say, you are at this time within. If ye can tarrie where you are, no danger can come to you. But all the peril is in going out after them, who preach otherwise the Church beleueth. Of them S. John said, exierunt ex nobis, they went forth from us. Likewise the Apostles complain of them who went out from the, and preached the necessity of circumcision. And S. Augustine faith generally, exire hæreticorum est. It is the point of heretics to goe out.

Who then went from the Church of these two? Did the Pope go out of the true Church, or did the Protestants? If the Pope went forth, who did he leave behind him? Where dwell they who he forsoke? Let the country, the City, the town, the village, the Church, the chapel, the company of neuer so fewe men be named, from whom (being members of the true Church) the Pope went. For he that goeth out, goeth from
some, and leaveth some behid him. But it can never be named, whom the pope left behind him in the true Church, when he went out of the said Church, because in deed he never went forth, but dwelt in the midst of all faithfull Nations, being their guide and Pastor.

Neither did he depart fro the Grecians, but some of the Grecais for a tyme departed from him, upon the quarel, of the proceding of the holy Ghost from God the Son. Which truth the Grecians uniuftlie denied. And therefore after a tyme upon better advise and conferenge, some of them came into that Church againe, where the Pope remayned head, as at the Counsell of Florèce. And some other taried without stil, and died in the schisme. But at this time the pope went not out of the Church.

On the other side we can al tell who a Berengarius, b Wiclef, c Hus, d Luther, e Zuinglius, f Caluin, and such G g y others
others professed to go out the Roman Church. We know whom they left behind them within the Church: verily they left all Italy, all France, all Spain, all Polonia, all Hungary, all England, all Sicily, and so much of Germany in the Church, as went not out after them.

If now it be the point of an heretical Antichrist, to go out of the faithful company of Christ: who is like to be Antichrist, the Pope who departed from no company of Christ, or the Protestants, who departed from so many Christian nations, as now I named, and most of all the Sacramentaries, who departed also both from the Pope, and from the verie Lutherans themselves?

As for that vaine bragge, wherein they are wont to say, the pope departed from the Apostles and prophets: is it not as easy for vs to say the selfe same thing unto them? When we speake of departing, we speake of the departing
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ting from the unity of such, as once li-
ued together with us in one house of
God: For then some goe out, and some
starie within. As Arius and Eu-
sebius of Nicomedia departed out,
and his bishop Alexander, with good
Athanagius staried stil in the Church.
Novatus went out, Cornelius staried
Within. Pelagius wente out, Saint
Augustine and Saint Hierom follo-
Wed him not, but staried Within. Even
so Luther went out from the company
With whom he once liued peaceably, ad
the pope staried stil within. Therefore
Luther and his adheavents are here-
ticks and the members of Antichrist.

If it be said here, that the Apostles
and disciples departed from the Chaire
of Mosses, and yet were not heretiks:
I answere, that such examples make
nothing for the departing of the Pro-
testantes from us, except they can
bring such prophecies, and such evident
miracles for their departing from

Another
objection
answer:
red.
us, as the Apostles brought ad wrought for their departing from the Iewes. There should be but one suche change of Religion in all the world, ad because it was so hard a matter to make men forsake their former trade of serving God, it was not done without the coming done of the Sonne of God from heaven into the earth, who shewed by the Prophets, and by his very workes, that the same one change of the whole religion should then only be made, and never els.

If now, Luther be the same to undone, or to fulfil Christes Lawe, whiche Christ was, in the dissoluing or rather in fulfilling Moyses Law: then I haue done, let Luther prewaile. But if Luther maybe an heretike, where as he can not be Christ: surelie the Argument of his departure, stil concludes him and all his to be members of Antichrist. Hitherto concerning the going out of the Churche.
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The second mark of an Antichristian.

Secondlie, he that goeth out of one Church (if he wil be in any Church at all) either he goeth into another Church, elder then that which he was in, or he maketh a new Church of his owne. The Pope is not without a Church, but rather he is in the Romaine Church, as who is head and pastor thereof. But he could not goe into any other Church elder then his owne.

For S. Irenæus cōseffeth the Romæ Church to be antiquissimam, the moiste ancient. Neither did he make a new Church of his own. For then it must needs be known, which Pope it was, who erected this new Church. And of the Pope it must have taken a proper name, as the Arrian Church was named of Arrius, and the Church of the Donatists was named of Donatus. And the holy Martyr Iustinus fourteene hundred years past, gave this note, that all new sects be named by their
Authors: Exorientur multi pseus
docnristi et pseudoapostoli, & mul
tos seducet & fidelibus, & Et sunt in
ter nos distincti cognominiibus.
Denominati à quibusdam viris, ve
quisque fuit author alius, & unque do
trinae & sententiae. Ex his alii vos
cantur Marciani, alii Basilidiani, alii Saturniniani; alii alio vocabu
lo, quisque à primo inventore sui
dogmatis. There shall arise many
false Christes, and false Apostles, as they
shall seduce many of the faithful. And
they are distinguished among us by their
surnames: taking their names of cer
taine men, as every one was author
of any new doctrine and judgemen
And of these some were called
Marcianists, others Basilidians, others
Saturninians; and other some with an
other name, euerie one, of the first in
ventour of his opinion.

In Apolog. To this rule Athanasius alludes, say
secunda, ing: Meletius schisma fecit, adeo
vt illi,
Willius sectatores etiam nunc pro Christianis Meletiani vocitentur. Meletius made a schisme, in someche that even at this time his followers are named Meletians, in the stead of Christians. Cum Marcionite aut Arriae ni nominantur, Christiani esse des sierunt. When they are named Marcio nits, or Arrians, they have ceased to be Christians, saith Lactantius Firmianus. But now if of the Popes from S. Peter downward, should be named, the Protestants were not able to say, that either Anacletus, or Victor, or Cai ius, or Sozimus, or Leo, or Gregorius, or Bonifacius, or any other Pope beganne any new sect, or left any disciples who might be named after his proper name. And yet if the Popes did goe out of the Church, it was some one or other, who did lead the disance. He had a certaine name, he had a time to do it in, he had companions who followed him: otherwise there could be no suche going out if there
if there were no circumstance thereof. Seing then it is not possible, to name anie Pope, who first went out of the Church and made the Schisme, nor to shew any name gueuen to his Disciples: it is cleere, that it is only a vainable, and faunter fained upon the Popes, without any truth at al. For no here-sie began without an author. Who if he were unknowe in some obscure sect, yet at the least the here-sie was straight named of the coutrie, or of the doctrine it self, or of some other notable circumstance.

But when our enemieys studie to give vs a name, eight or nine hundred yeres after, that we departed (as they saie) from the true Church, what signe is that? Verilie that they beleue vs. Nowe they name vs Papists, and Romanists, and what they list. But, I pray you Masters, was there any man called Papa, by his proper name, or anie called Romanus, Who was our Capitaine? Shew
of the Church.

Shew the Historie, and we beleue you. Or did euery any heresie tarie in the Churche eight or nine hundred yeares without a name geuen to it? Naie, I think, it can not be shewed, that euery any heresie taried eight or nine yeares without a name, wherby all the churche might learne to beware of it. I appeale herein to antiquitie, to Philaster, to Epiphanius, to S. Augustine, to Theodoretus, Damascenus, Euthimius, who al writing against heresies, never left any of them al, without a peculer name. And in deed how could they els describe the heresie unto vs, but by naming it?

And yet those who nowe firste after eight or nine hundred yeares, begin to haue a name; haue all this while remayned without any proper name at al, which might shew or describe any sect or heresie of theirs; and that, because it was not possible, to name that which was not. For we in dede are, and
and alwaies were Catholikes, and no-
thing els, what so ever pightfully maie 
be inuented and saigned upon vs, with-
out cause or ground, after so many hun-
dred yeeres: Whereas a newe sect hath 
straight a newe name.

But is it so, trow ye, with the Luthe-
vans, the Zuinglians, the Calvinists, 
and the Suenckfeldians? Doe not their 
names shewe, who instituted and in-
uented that sect? Can we not tel in 
what yere euerie of them began? How 
he went forward? And who suceed-
did in his Chair of Pestilence?

The Protestants therefore going out 
of our Catholick Church, and leaung vs 
within, did not goe to any elder Chur-
che, either of the Grecians, or of Aethi-
opians, or any like, but did sette uppe a 
new Synagogue, whiche was named of 
them. Wherefore they are heretikes 
and members of Antichrist.

Neither can they justlie object (as 
they doe foolishie endemour) that we 
have
have also Benedictins, Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, and such others for the rule of S. Instinu then taketh place, when (as himselfe expressie saith) there is an author, or a beginner noue alicuius doctrinae & sententiae, of anie new doctrine or judgement. Beholde, it is not onely a new name gotten of a special man, which name she is with an heresie: but it is a name gotten by reason of a new doctrine, and of a new judgement or sentence in Gods religion.

Saint Benedict or Saint Francis, taught none other thing, but that it was good to forfayne all that a man had, and to follow Christ's. The whiche thing, because it is not easie to doe persecution without a guide, they declared, what way seemed best unto them to accomplish that Counsell of the Gospel. And that their institution was not fulfilled by their authoritie. But they submitted their order and rule
rule unto the chiefe bishop, who allo-
wed it for good and vertuous, so that,
now their followers be named of their
rule and obedience, and not of their do-
ctrine, which in all points was Catho-
like, as the very written rule doth tes-
stitute.

It is then the property of hereticks
to goe out of the Church. And the Pro-
estants are gon out. It is the property of
Capitaine hereticks, to leaue their own
names to their scholars. Hereof some
protestants are called Lutherans, oth-
ner Zunglians, other Calvinists, other
Hosiandrines and so forth: from both
which conditions the popes of Rome,
and their adherents are free, as it hath
been declared.

The third marck of an Antichristian.
Thirdly, when heretickes are once
without the Church, they can not
possibly agree: partly because the grace
of God and the spirit of unity is not a-
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mōg them partly because they are without one visible judge and head, and are also proud and puffed up, that every man will be a master, so that no one of them will yield to the other. So the old heretics were divided as S. a Irenæus witnesses. So the Arriās wēt straight into three diverse sects: as b Epiphanius declareth. And the like chaunted to the Donatists, as S. c Augustine hath c heres 69. testified. But are the popes or the Catholikes in this case concerning their faith? Who can shew a pope unlike his predecessors, or a Catholike disobedient to the pope? from the first to the last, their faith is one: their profession is still the same: their government is al after one rate. Which thing could not possibly come to passe, except they were all directed by the God of peace, and by the Spirit of unity.

But on the other side, how many sects are strong in Germany alone, within these forty years? How doe the Lutherās daily
daily write and preach against the Calvinists? in so much that they were in arms of late in Antwerp the one against the other. How doe the Ana-
baptists dissent from them both? How cruelly doe the civil Lutheras of Wits-
temberg persecute even with filthy and slaunderous Images Flaccus Illyricus a
soul and straight Lutheran?

Neither can this matter be justly coloured (as it is to them who perish) by the example of the Apostles and disci-
iples. For if any small disagreeing did fall out between them, it was first rather
about some temporal fact, then any do-
ctrine of the Gospel. As when Paule and Barnabas dissent ed in this point,
whether Marck should goe with them
or no.

Again, if the fact did touch in a-
ny point the doctrine of the Gospel, the
one straight ways yielded to the other,
as S. Peter did yield unto S. Paule, who
reproved him for a dissembling deede
concerning the law of Moses. Or if the doctrine it selfe was called in doubt, straight waies a visible judge was chosen, who might end the strife: as when S. Paul and Barnabas came to Jerusalem, to have the Apostles decree concerning the law of Moses not to binde any more.

Thus the Catholicks also dissent some time, either upon a fact, as whether it be best to reduce the keeping of Christ-masse to the shortest day in the yere or no (which is of no great importance) or els the one yeldeth to the other who reprooveth him, if the matter be plaine: or if it be intricit, they both must undr pain of damnation be content, to referre them selves to a visible judge in the earth, after whose determination their strife is at an end, as it was evidently sexe in the matter of Clandestine Marriages at Trent. For among vs he that obeyeth not the sentence of the highe priest, is excommunicated, Deut. 17.
and separated from our society.

But Luther being reproved by his brethren at many meetings, did evermore stand in this matter of faith, against the, that the body of Christ was really present with the substance of bread. Zuinglius on the other side, being reproved often times, yet died stubbornly in this opinion, that the body of Christ was present, not in truth, but in a signe and figure.

As it is certaine to vs, that neither of those two is saued, so their faith must needs be monstrose, who beleue that they both are saued. The contentio was not of a matter which as yet was hidde or unrevealed. For what in all the world ought to haue ben, or was more knowne, then the supper of Christ? Which these fiftien hundred yeres hath ben in daily practise, and therefore the whole doctrine concerninge the substance of it, may not be unnownen, no not to yeome and to yong men. Moreover eche of the said
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said he was sure of the truth, and bele-
ued his opinion most constantly. And
shall now both he be saued, who teacheth
stubbornly even to death, that, in this
sacramental bread the substance of
Christes body is present: and he also
who teacheth stubbornly even to death,
that in this sacramental bread, the sub-
stance of Christes body is not present?

If both these preachers defended the
truth, what kinde of religion is this,
where contradictory articles are true
at once? If the one was a false teacher
even with stubbornnes, he was therein
a member of Antichrist. And seing it
must needs be, that the one did as-
uouche false doctrine, and yet did war-
rant it for the true Gospel: we are sure,
that one of the two, must needs be a me-
ber of Antichrist. And yet seing the
Popes Catholike doctrine doth dissent
from them both, which soever of two
be an Antichrist, the Pope shall not
be thereby in any danger to be an An-
tichrist
tichrist together with any of them.

Mark the reason well. It goeth not

to this opinion or to that, wherein there

is no end of contention. But it conclud-
eeth an necessary sequel upon a confes-
sed trueth.

If any man for false doctrine may be

an enemy of Christ (as doubtlesse he may).

he is that enemy, who teacheth most

presumptuously his false doctrine. But

of these two doctrines, it is the body

of Christ, and, it is not the bodie

of Christ, the one must needs be

false.

Therefore seing Luther taught

fioutlie the one, and Zuinglius fioutly

the other, either Luther or Zuning-

lius is an aduerarie of Christ.

But all the whole number of Pro-

testants (a verie few Illyricans ex-

cepted) accompt them both saued, and

consequentlie, they justifie the stub-

born preachers of clean contrarie do-

ctrines: therefore the whole number

of pro-
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of Protestants doth justifie one who is an Antichrist.

And therefore the whole number of Protestants is condemned of God, for justifying a false prophet, and for defending an evident member of Antichrist, as who teache evil to be good, and good to be evil.

To you I speake, M. Jewel: did not Luther teache false doctrine, when he said, that the bodie of Christ was really and substantially present with the substance of bread in the Sacrament of our Lords supper? I know you beleue his doctrine to be stark false in that behalfe. Wel, was he not warned thereof, not onlie by his owne Catholike bishop, but also by Zuinglius a man of God, as you saie? Did he not after a sharpe warning or two, yet still defend his false doctrine manie yeeres togethers most stubburnlie? Therefore by Saint Paules doctrine Luther was an heretike, and was to be
be avoided, as a man condemned by his own judgement.

How do you avoid him, when in your Apologie of the Church of England, you justify him, as a man whom God reixed after long darkness, to give fresh light unto the world? Can you then an errour in religion the light of the Gospel? What was there I pray you, while the old false Prophets of the primitive Church, were accompted heretiques the which is not also founde in Martin Luther? Did they teach erro-
nious doctrine? So did he, even by your confession. Did they stand in it being warned? So did he. Did they die in it? So did he. Made they a schism for it? So did he. Left they scholars behind them, who bare their names? As though the Martinists and Luth-
ervans, be not named of Martin Luther. Did their Schism hurt the peace of the Church? So doth this. Was their her-
resie condemned by General or Provin-
ciall
cial Counels? So was the doctrine of the Lutherans condemned at Trent, at Rome, at Magunce, at Colon, at Cambray, and where not?

To be short, define an heretique for your life, how euer you can, and Luther shall be within the cupasse of your definition. And yet shall you, that justifie him, be saued? No surely, no more the they that justifie the Nicolaits, or Monothelits.

It wil not now serue to saie, that S. Cyprian died in his opinion of rebaptizing those, who were baptized of heretikes. For then, partly the Catholique faith in that point was not fully and universally revealed in any General Coun celerys, partly S. Cypriand did not die with such a stubbornnes in this behalf, that he was ready to judge, or to excommunicate the contrary teachers as his own Epistles, and S. h. Augustin doth wel prove at large. Neither would he haue refused a judge even in earth, if occasion had

Hh iiij. ben a ad Quo-
tum. & ad
Lubataniu-
blas, 2, 6,
; de bap-
ismo cot. 
Donat.
hen geuen to haue come to the tryall of
the mater. But the questio of our Lords
supper was universally knowe, and five
hundred yeres past, it was defined in
judgement at certain Councels, even
to the recantation of Berengarius, the
first publike mainteinour therof. And
When the great general Councel of La-
teran had ended it, the whole Church
was confirmed in their former belefe.
Now the definitio of that great Councel
doeth codene both Luther ad Zuinglius.

Moreover, Luther and Zuinglius
died with suche a presumptuous stub-
bornes, that eche of them refused anie
Judge in the whole earth: because eche
of them said him selfe to be sure of the
Word of God, beside the which, eche of
them refused any judge at al. So that
now no excuse in the world remaineth,
but that either Luther, or Zuinglius
must be an Antichrist. And that who
so justifieth them both (as the Prote-
stants and Sacramentaries doe) is ut-
terlie
terly damned for allowing one Antichrist at the least.

The fourth mark of an Antichristian.

The Fourth mark of an Antichrist, is, in that God suffereth not Antichrist himself in his own person, neither his ministers ad falsi Prophets to continue or tarie long. For (as Christ said, where he intreated of these matters) Except those daies had been shortened, no fleshe should be saved. And S. Peter faith : The perdition of false teachers sleepeth not. For indeed except God provideth, that heresies might haue a short reign, the whole faith would be in danger to be corrupted by them. And, I pray you, see, how short a reigne Luther had, who was the first false Prophet of our age. His heresie and doctrine is in manner, nowe come to remaine onely in two or three persons. For whereas his sect is onlie that whiche he him selfe taught, he was no sooner dead, but

\[ \text{Matthew 2:4} \]
\[ \text{2 Peter 2:}\]

The Short reigne of Luther.
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but Philip Melancthon begane to change his doctrine. The which thing so displeased Flaccus Illyricus, with a fewe others, that they toke upo them the defense of their Master Luther, and thereby they are so hated in all the states and cities of the Civile Luthersans (who are spread through moste parts of Germanie) that now it is not lawful for the said Illyricus, so muche as to appere in those quarters, nor his bookees may not be openly sold at Lipsia or Wittenberge, except some fewe of them which are by name permitted.

The short reigne of Hosian der,

Hoshiander a Protestant taugh in Prussia at Coninseg, That God justifieth man onely by his divine nature. And that the man justifi- ed, must be just with the very same justice, wherewith God is just in his owne nature and substance. And whiles this Hosiander lived, Duke Albertus was altogether of his opinion, and fauoured him above measure.
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Sure. But now at my being in Prusia, I learned, there were scant three men left, who openly maintained this sect. And the Duke was said to care now no more for it. And good reason why: for their heresies die with the inventours of them.

As for Zuinglius opinion, it is utterlie extinguished by the Calvinists. For Zuinglius and Oecolampadius thought these woordes: This is my bodie, directly to concerne and to appertaine to the bread, and onlie to make it a figure of Christes bodie. Whereby he that should receive the same bread, might be put in minde of Christes death. But Calvin hath affirmed the said words of Christ, not to be directed to the bread, but onlie to be a sermon, and a preaching made to the audience, which is present. Whereby the bodie of Christe is consecrated, not now in the bread, as in a signe (whiche Zuinglius believed)
but in every man's heart by faith, and by
the remembrance of Christ's death.
And in the heart Christ is present (as Zwing-
lius had taught) but reallie, and in ve-
ry deed, Where certaine names come
from the flesh of Christ in heaven in-
to his heart, who eateth with Calvin's
phantastical faith.

Now as for Calvin's own doctrine, it
shall decay every hour, sithen he is
once dead. Even alreadie in Polonia
it is overwhelmed with Trinitaries,
Jesuits, and with those who circum-
cide themselves, and with diverse o-
ther blasphemies, whereunto those
are now fallen, who were once Calv-
ins Scholars.

In England it is forsaken by his own
scholars, who allow, defend, and both
doe sweare themselves, and make other
men to sweare unto the supreme
governement of temporall Prin-
ces, over the spirituall Pastours in all
things
things and causes by Act of parliament, which thing Calvin accompted a beast-
lie matter.

Again, at Geneva, his doctrine is decayed. For whereas he beleueth, that Christes soule went downe into hell, even to the place where the souls are tormented in everlasting fire: Beza so much misliketh him therein, that he will have Christes soule to goe no lower then into the grave. The which opinion the English translation of the Actes of the Apostiles made at Gene-

ua, doth embrace.

And concerning his opinion of the Sacramët (that I may omit, how vehementlie Flacius Illricus hath shaken it already in his bokes against Beza) it can not long stande, because the common sorte can not understande it. And worthelie, for that which is not true, is not able to be understanded, and his doctrine is altogether grounded upon imagination, without
any assurance of God words. To be short, if the Anabaptists shall not by a worse heresie oppress the glory of Calvin's doctrine, or if all other means to destroy it should faile, at the best by this one way it is sure to perish. For as the Marcionists, the Manichees, the Arrians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Monothelites, the Pelagians, the Donatists, the Imagebreakers, were at the last all wrapped in Apostasy, and insideliety, and were swallowed uppe by the Moores, the Saracens, and the Turcks: even so is it most certaine, that if the Calvinists do escape other destructions, they shall perish in the end, either being made infidels, or being conquered of others.

But in the meanetyme how safe standeth the See Apostolick? How many hundred yeres hath it dured, alwaies like to it selfe? How unremoueable is that rock? How doth the doctrine thereof flourish more and more every daie?

Truth,
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Truth, which is the daughter of time, hath now made many heretics to confess, that they thought so much could never have been said for the Apostolike See of Rome, as now they finde. In so much that if all these things which are now revealed, had been known before, thousands of them would never have gone that way. But now either shame, or servith, or covetousnes, or feare of worldly princes, or the hard profession of the Catholikes, or desperation, causeth them to stoppe their eyes and their ears, lest perhaps they might see the truthe, and be converted. Yet God to show his almighty power, doth daily re-woke some to his true Church, both in Germanie, and Fraunce, and I beseech him to doe the like in our countrie of England also.

The fifth marck of an Antichristian.

The fifth marck, whereby to know the forerunners of Antichrist is, if any man
man preache Gods Word Without com-
misision rom his superiours. For such
a one runneth before he be sent, and
cometh of himself, as Antichrist shall
doe. For how shall they preach,
faith S.Paul, except they be sent?
Now as Christ the head preacher of all,
Was sent of his Father visiblie insleth:
so he visiblie sent his Apostles, and
they, by imposition of hands, sent others
to preache. And their successours fró
age to age have sent others in the Cas-
tholike Churche even till this day. So
that all Catholike preachers are hable
to reduce their commision from step
to step, until they come to Christ him-
sel. But seing Luther, Zuinglius, and
Calvin rebelled against their own bis-
shops, who are the successours of the
Apostles, and seing they were not sent
of any in all the world, who had a kno-
wn and publike authority from the
Apostles of Christ: it must nedes follow,
that they came of themselves, and were
not
not lawfully sent at all.

As for temporall magistrates, who are only sheele, and which can not preach themselves, can much lesse send others to preach. For no man can send an other to doe that which himself is not able to do: Sibh no Apostle or Legat is greater then he that sent him.

And yet it was not possible for any temporal magistrate or any common weale to send Luther to preach, because they, who should have sent him, were (by his judgement) misbelieuers, until he had converted them to a new faith. And so when he had first preached his doctrine, he was sent of no man in all the world, but came of himself; ad therefore was an Antichrist, who cometh in his own name, as Christ hath taught.

It is well known also, that Luther would not send Zuinglius to preach against himself. Neither would Zuinglius send Calvin to deface his own doctrine.
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étrine. And consequently every one of these is a false preacher, who cometh not from Christ, nor from his Apostles or their successors, as the Pope doth, who succeedeth lineally S. Peter, as it is known.

The sixth mark of an Antichristian.

The sixth marke, whereby to know this broode of Antichrist, may be in that Antichrist himself being altogether carnal shall prefer the temporal reign or sword, before the spiritual. A certaine signe wherof this is, because he shall constrain men with force of armes, not only to kepe their former faith (for that were lawful for he who is a true officer of God) but also to take a new faith, which thing no man would doe, except he were of this minde, that mens consciences ought to yeld to his violent force.

And in deed when his master the devil said to Christ: If thou fal down and
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and adore me, I wil geue thee all these things (showing all the kingdowes of the world) he declared himselfe to be of this minde, to plucke the seruice dew to God to himselfe, and to make vs pre-
fer the kingdoms of the world, before the faith of Christ.

And therefore Antichrist who is ruled by the dewill, shall putte confi-
dence also in an earthlie Kingdome. And as Saint Paule saith, he shall come, in virtute, that is to say, in
power and strength.

Whereunto it is very agreeable, that his preachers also doe preferre the ju-
risdiction of temporall princes, above the jurisdiction of the spirituall mini-
sters of Christ, teaching that Kings are the supreme gouernours of Christes
Church: And that secular princes may visite, correct, reforme, and
depose any bishop in their owne realmes.

Which is directly to say, that the power

Pi y of the

Note.
In Horn
gainst
M. Fecke
nam.
of the Kinge is a higher and a greater power in Gods Church, then the power of a bishop, or of a pastoure. For as the lawiers know, and natural reason teacheth, nec par in parem potentatet habet, nec interior in superierem. Neither any equal hath power upon his equal, nor any inferior hath power upon his superior.

But (say the Protestants) the temporal King may depose a bishop, and yet that he can not doe unjustly, except he may first sitte judge upon a bishop even as he is a bishop, and sitte judge over him as he is a bishop, he can not, except he be his superior: therefore it is the protestants doctrine, that a Kings temporal power (for we speake not of that King who is also a bishop) is greater then a bishops power, which is spiritual and heavenly.

What is this to say, but onlie that the bodie is above the soule, the civill policy above the Church of Christ, and the
the temporal reign of heaven? This is a vehement mark to betraie our naturall brethren by. For we speake not now of works or maners, that is to say, whether a man love the world more then God, or whether a pope be more greedy of his temporall jurisdiction then of his spirittuall duty. We speake not, I say, of these abuses (lette him that hath them yea though he be a pope, looke well to himselfe in that behalf) but we speake of doctrine at this tyme.

The Pope teacheth, that every spirittuall pastour is of a higher dignity, the any temporal officer, whatsoever he be. And that, because he is instituted of Christ for to help vs toward life everlasting. The Protestantes teache, that a Christian Emperour or Kynge is above all spiritual pastours in his own realme, and may depose them by his own power: which is the very doctrine of Antichrist.

Ii:ii For

the bishop of Millan before him, willing them to subscribe against Athanasius, because it was his pleasure and his proceedings: those blessed bishops exhorted him, ne ecclesiastic cons rumperet, neque Romanum imperium ecclesiasticis constitutionibus immisceret, that he should not corrupt Church matters, and that he should not mingle the Roman Empire with the Ecclesiastical ordinances.

Here you see, that the Româ empire is discharged from meddling with Church matters. It is not only said, Arrians, or heretiks, but it is said, the Roman Empire ought not to mingle itself with Ecclesiasticall causes. Even a Bishoppe being an heretike is removed from Church matters: but an Emperour is not onely removed from them, if he be an hereticke, but also because he is an Emperour onelie, and not a Bishop. Oney this hath bene al-
waies the custom, that Emperors should be careful to maintaine the former constitutions of Bisshoppes, and the civil peace of the Church. For they being Christians, ought to use the sword, which they beare by Gods appointment for the Churche.

But the outward and civil peace: ad the Ecclesiastical constitutions (which touch the belefe and the inward direction of the soule) are two things, much different: in so much that Pope Liberti said to the messinger of the same Emperour Constantius (as Athanasius also doth witness) after this sort: If the Emperour will needes interpose his care for the Ecclesiastical peace, lette an Ecclesiastical synode be made, longe a palatio, ubi nec Imperator praefit, nec Comes se ingerit, nec ius: dext minatur, & cæt. Let the Ecclesiastical meeting be made a great way off from the palace, where neither an Em-
Emperour is at hand, nor a County thrusteth in himself, nor a judge threateneth, but where the only care of God, and the institution of the Apostles is sufficient. Thus he said, not that an Emperour might in no case be at a Council of bishops, but because he might not be there to use his Imperial authority in judging the bishops, or in prescribing what the Church shall decree or believe, but only in maintaining that which the bishops, according to the Apostolical institution, either have or shall agree upon.

That Reverend Father Holius, who after that he had suffered persecution for Christ's faith under Maximian, lived three score years in the Church: being tempted by the same Constantius to subscribe against Athanasius, asketh first of him by letters, whether his brother Constans (the good and Catholik Emperour) did use to banish bishops or no? and then...
then, whether Constitas his brother, aliquando judiciis Ecclesiasticis intersuit, was at any time a medler with the Ecclesiasticall judgements? Last of all he saith to him: Ne te misceas Ecclesiasticis, neque nobis in hoc genere precipe, sed potius ea à nobis disce. Tibi Deus imperiū commitit, nobis, quae sunt Ecclesiae, cōcredidit: & quemadmodum qui tuum etiam imperium malignis oculis carpit, contradicet ordinationi divinae, ita & tu caue, ne, quae sunt Ecclesiae ad te trahens, magno crimini obnoxius fias. Da-te (scriptum est) quae sunt Caesaris, Cesari, & que Dei Deo, necigitur fias est, nobis in terris imperiū te nere, nec tu thymiamatum & facrorū potestate habes Imperator.

Doe thou not intermedle with Ecclesiastical matters, neither do thou command what we shall doe in this kind of matters, but rather lern thee of vs.
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God hath committed the Empire unto thee, and he hath put vs in trust with those things which concern the Church: and like as he that malignly carpeoth thy Empire, doth gainsay the ordinaunce of God: so doe thou take hede, lest, in takynge vnto thee those things which belongeth to the Church thou be made guilty of a great crime. It is wriiten, geue vnto Cæsare those things which are Cæsars, and vnto God, those things that are Gods. Therfore it is neither lawfull for vs, to haue the rule of the Empire in earth, neither haste thou (Emperour) any power owr the holy incense and sacrificces. Mark that it is rehearsed for a praise in the Catholike Emperour Constans, not to haue medled with Ecclesiastical judgements.

Also Athanasius himself saith thus for his own part. Si illud est iudiciwm Episcoporum, quid com-mune
mune cum eo haber Imperator: & cæt. quando judicium Ecclesiæ autho-
ritatem suam ab Imperatore cepit: & cæt. Paulus Apostolus 
habebat amicos in Cesariis familia, 
& per eos in litteris salutabat Phil-
ippenses, non tameneos in iudici-
dicio socios assumpsit. If this be the 
judgement of bishops, what hath the 
Emperor to doe with it? ad contrarywise, 
if these judgements are gathered by the 
threatenings of the Emperor, what 
neede is there of men, who haue the 
title of bishops? When hath it bene 
heard of, since the beginning of the 
world? when did the judgement of 
the church take his authority from the 
Emperor? or who at any time was 
this acknowledged for a judgement? 
There haue ben very many fynods her-
tofoer, many judgements of the Church 
haue ben kept. But neither the Fathers 
went about to persuade these things to 
the prince, nor the Prince did shew 
him.
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himself curiouse in the matters of the Church: Paule the Apostle hadde
friends in Cesars house, and did salute the Philippians in their name in his
letters, yet did he not take them as his fellows in judgement.

By this ye may perceave, that no Em-
perorours at al, were they neuer so good,
no County Palatines, or secular Lords,
be they neuer so much faithful(as Con-
flas was of those of th' Emperors house
of whome S. Paule speaketh ) haue yet
any right or power, to sitte presidents in
Ecclesiastical matters (otherwise then
to kepe civil order and peace) but onlie
those, to whom God hath committed
the care of sowles. In so much that A-

dranus doubteth not by name to call
Constantius the foreruner of Antin%
christ, because he being a secular prince,
intermedied with the spiritual govern-
ment of the Church. Quid igitur
Constantius quod Antichristi
non sit, omittat aut quomodo ille in
aduen
aduentu suo non repererit sibi expeditam viam ab ito præparatam? Si quidem in locum ecclesiasticæ cognitionis, suum palatium tribunal earum cauferum constituit, sed earum litium sum- mum principem & authorem facit. What hath Constantius then omitted, that doth not appertain to Antichrist? Or how shall not Antichrist, when he cometh, finde a fitte way for him to all deceits, prepared by this ma? For in stead of the Ecclesiasticall judgement, he appointeth his palace to be the place of judgement for their causes: and maketh himselfe the chiefest prince, and bearer out of those controversies.

The part of Antichrist.

Ibidem ubi anteq. And againe Grauia sunt ista, & plusquam grauia, sed tamen istiusmodi, quæ congruant in eum, qui Antichristi imaginem induerit. Quis enim videns eum in decernendo principem se facere Episcopos
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eopop, & præsidere iudiciis Ecclesiasticis, non meri. dicit, illum ipsam abominationem desolationis esse, quæ à Daniele prædicta est: nam cum circumamis sit Christianismo, & cæt. These things are grievous, and more then grievous, but yet they are such, as do well agree to him, who hath put on the Image of Antichrist. For who, seeing him, in making a decree, to take upon him to be prince of the bishops, and to be president in Ecclesiasticai judgements, may not worthily say, that he is the abomination of the desolation, which was foretold by Daniel: For when he being clothed with Christianitie, doth both enter into the holy places, and also being there, doth spoile Churches, abrogate the Canons, vielding force to make men obserue and keepe his (commandements) who will at any tyme dare say, that
that this is a quiet tyme to the Chris-
stians? and not rather a persecution? 
and such a persecution, as neither hath 
ben before, nor perchance woman will 
at any tyme make again, but that sonne 
of iniquity (which is Antichrist.)

Thus haue we the determinate sen-
tence of Athanasius: of Athanasius, I 
say, the most notable bishop that eu
er was for vertue and lerning, since the 
Apostles time. And his sentence is, that 
the Christia Emperor (and the like is of 
any Christian Prince) who taketh upo 
him to be prince of the bishops in ma-
kay a decree, and to be president in 
Ecclesiasticall judgements, is a me-
ber of that abominable desolatio, wher-
of Daniel prophesied. Can any plainer 
sentence be wished for to conclude my 
present purpose? Neither was this do-
ctrine only meant of an heretical Em-
perour: for the Catholike Emperour 
Constans is praised, for not medling 
Phil. 4.  With Church matters. Ye a S. Paule is 
alleaged.
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alleged, not to have communicated the Church matters with those good Christians of Caesar's house.

I know what wranglers I have to do. They will bring examples, to shew that some Emperours have sitten in general Concils, as Constantine the great, Martianus, and some others. But I answer, that they sate to kepe good order, and to preserve peace and quietnes among the bishops, especially, because the Archeheretikes were commonly themselves great Prelates, as being the patriarches of Antioche, or of Alexandria, or of Constantinopie. Who (if the Emperour were not present) would use force in the stede of holy scriptures, as Dioscorus did, and Eusebius of Nicomedia in the tyme of the Arrians. For the preserving the of civil and ecclesiastical peace, the Emperour was present, and not as supreme judge in Ecclesiastical causes.

S. Ambrose noseth, and thinkest, that
that even an heretical Emperor coming to yeares of discretion wil be hable to consider, qualis ille Episcopus sit, qui Laicis iste Sacerdotale sustinet, What manner of bishop he is, who layeth the priestly right under the laye mens feete. And yet by gening of the most proud and most intolerable title of supreme Head or gouernor in aeclesialistical causes to lay princes, al the religio used now in England wholly standeth. What bishops then are those of England, who making the secular prince their head, putte the priestly right under his feete?

S. Augustine being fully persuaded, that nothing could be greater then a priest in the house of God, thereupon concludest, that Moyses must neded have ben a priest for (saith he) Augustin nunquid maior sacerdote esse potest Psalms, 55, terat? Could he be greater then a priest? Tea Marie, saith M. Horn, he might have
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bene ben a King or a secular Prince. But S. Augustine knew no such divinity. And yet the world, toward the comming of Antichrist is grown so wise, that these men have found now, that every Emperor, King, Prince, or Duke (who hath any temporall state of his owne) is greater, even in Ecclesiastical causes, then the lawfull successor of S. Peter.

This, I say, is the divinity of England. For therein, our countrie maintaineth a peculiar Secte of his owne, wherein they disagree, even from their fellow Calvinistes.

But let them loke to it as well as they will, they shal finde it a badge of Antichrist, as Athanasius hath plainly affirmed. And when the date of triall commeth, it shall evidenciably appeare, that those are most faithfull subjects to the prince, who gave him his due place of honour in Gods Churche, without derogation.

K k ĕ to that
to that beauchy power of bishops, which Christ himself came down from heaven to plant, and whom he hath set even over the Kings themselves, as being the sheepe of their foydes.

Theod. lib. 4.64

Choose such a bishop in Milan (said the good Valentinian) cui nos quosque Imperiij moderatores nostra subdamus syncerè capita. To whom we also being the governours of the Empire, make syncerlie submitte our heads. And now such Antichristian bishops are chosen, as may make a lay man their supreme head. When Constantius was preferred before, and above the bishops, by flattering heretical prelats, then said Leontius most freely to him, Σαυμαχω, &cet. I wonder that you being set, to dispose ad govern one thing, do meddle with other things. You are chiefe ruler in warlike and civil matters, and you prescribe what bishops shal doe in matters which belong to
to Bishoppes alone.

When the capitain of the heretical Emperor Valens required the priests and Deacons of Edeife, to embrace the Emperors proceedings (for it is a madness, saith he, to resist so mighty a prince and Lord) then Eulogius said mildly: Nūquid vā cum Imperio, etiam ille Pontificatum cēt consecutus? Whether hath Valens together with his Empire obtained also the office of a bishop? Ėt pastorem habemus (sam Eulogius) X nutus illius sequimur. We both have a pastour, and his commandement we follow.

Our Lord graunt, that our countrie men may remember, that they have pa-stours, whose voice they ought to follow by Christes commandement, even in matters of their faith. But Christ never commanded us, to follow any secular prince in our belefe and religion. That precept remaineth for Antichrist, who setteth the worlde aboue the
Churche, and the earthly power above the heavenly.

The seuenth Mark of an Antichristian.

THE seuenth marke of the ministers of Antichrist is, to withstand the externall and publicke sacrifice of Christes Churche. For as Antiochus the figure of Antichrist, caused the Jewish temple to be shut up, and no sacrifice to be made externally unto God, for the space of three yeres, and as Antichrist, for his part fulfilling the foresaid shadow shall cause the coni-

Daniel:12 null sacrifice ( of the new testament ) to cease likewise for the space of three yeres and a halfe: so the forerunners of Antichrist, do shewe their masters badge as it were upon their fleue, by taking away the externall sacrifice of the new testament, and by destroying holy altars dedicated unto Christes name, which have ben erected and have continued even from the Apost-
les tyme till this day, throughout all nations, as the very forme of all manner of auncient Churches, and as all holy Writers doe declare.

Yea, the prophet Malachie did so evidently foretell, that in all nations a cleane externall and publicke sacrifice (for thereof he spake) should be made to Gods owne name, that no man is hable, to deny the plaine worde of God in that behalfe, except he take the impudency of Antichrist upon him.

For whereas the priests of the Iewes had offered polluted bread vpon Gods holy table and altar (which two names stand in Malachie to signifie one thing, that is to say, the place where- vpon the sacrifice was offered) and whereas the saied polluted offering of the Iewes was a dishonour to Gods name among men (for otherwise God can not be dishonoured in himselfe) the Prophet doth shew, that this dishonour donne to God among the Iewes,

Kk iiij

shalbe
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shall be recompensed and amended among the Gentils: where God's name shall be great, and a clean offering shall be made unto him, not in one temple only, but in every place. Now let us compare these things together.

The defects of the Jewes.

1. Ye (Israel) despise my name.
2. Ye offer upon my altar (which was only in Jerusalem.)
3. Ye offer polluted bread, or the blind and lame.
4. Here lacked a clean outward sacrifice, whereof specially the prophet now speaketh.
5. Here

The perfection of the Gentils.

1. My name is great among the Gentils.
2. In every place there is sacrifice made to mine name.
3. A clean oblation is offered or a fine cake of meal, for so the Hebrew word also doth signify.
4. Here the body and blood of Christ is meat, the most clean outward sacrifice that can be devised.
5. It is
5 Here it is said, I will not accept the gift (or meat offering) at your hand.

6 The talk is not heere of their inward sacrifices. For they are as acceptable among the Jews, as among the Gentils. And are not knowen to men.

7 Among the Jews the Altar or table is rejected, with the meate upon it.

8 Here God hath no pleasure, specially in the priests of the Jews.

9 That

5 It is meant on the other side, that he will accept the cleane oblation or fine meate offering of the Gentils.

6 It is the outward sacrifice, which at this tyme is both rejected among the Jews, and accepted among the Gentils: as by which anelie God's name is either despised or honoured among men, who see but the outward things.

7 Among the Gentils the table of our Lord is wilde to be regarded, and the Altar whereof the Jews cannot eate.

8 Here on the other side the priests of the Gentils are specially meant to be acceptable unto God.

9 Is
9. That which lacketh in the Jews concerning sacrifice.
10. These have both inward and outward sacrifices: for there never lacked some just men among them, who might sacrifice inwardly.

11. These men's outward sacrifice was shut up in one place, but not their inward sacrifice which Daniel made even at Babylon.

12. Here lacked not prayers also, but they were not the kind of sacrifice which is now rejected: but they were joined with the chief sacrifice which is prophesied of for they are

9. Is meat to be supplied among the Gentiles concerning sacrifice.
10. Here may be more, lest there can not be: therefore here must be outwarde sacrifice also, lest if these have anie thing lese, the word of God be found false.
11. Therefore these men's outward (and not only their inward) sacrifice is meant to be made in euerye place, because Churches and Altars are built unto the name of God in all nations.
12. Neither among the gentils doe prayers lacke, but neither they are the chiefe kind of cleane sacrifice which is prophesied of for they are
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sacrifice, as well among the Jews as the Gentiles.

13. The proper sacrifice of the Jews is reioiced, which is made according to the law of Moses and of the old testament. 

14. It is a sacrifice consisting in fact (and not in woord only) which is here reioiced.

15. The very fire which devoureth the sacrifice here is contemptible, but yet it did really devoure the things that was brought unto the altar.

16. They are cursed who having a beast of the male kind, doe not offer it, are no new kinde of sacrifice, but are common to all that serve God.

13. The proper sacrifice of the Gentiles is accepted, which is made according to the law of Christ and of the new testament.

14. And here the sacrifice consisteth in fact, and not in woord only; for Christ said: hoc facite deo et facite hanc thing.

15. The woord of God which faith this is my body, is the fire which devoureth the earthlie substance of bread and wine brought unto the altar, the which word worketh that which it saith: and is honorable.

16. We shuld likewise be cursed, if hauing Christes body we shuld not offer it,
it, but rather doe offer a spotted or weake one, as the rejected Jews did. but rather should saie our own righteousness to be most principall thy cleane oblation, where- of the prophet speakest. Which yet the members of Antichrist doe say.

Read the prophet Malachie with diligence, and see whether the conference of the holy scripture doth not necessarily import this sense, which I have now given. And I have genit it according to the uniforme interpretation of the ancients fathers, of Whome, no one denyeth the body and blood of Christ to be here meant, albeit some of them expound some part of this chapter of prayers, and of inward righteousness, the which inward sacrifice is alwaies to be joyned with the unblodie outward sacrifice, or consecration, and oblation of Christes body and blood: Which is the new oblation of the new testament.
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Faith a Irenæus, with Whose 6 Eusebius, c S. Hierom, d S. Chrysostom, e Damascus agree.

Neither doth this our unbloody sacrifice derogate any iota to that one bloody sacrifice of Christ's cross. For we honour that one sacrifice so much, that through the power of it, we believe the daily remembrance thereof, being made by the outward consecration of bread and wine into the same body and blood which was once offered upon the cross, to be necessarily a publike sacrifice, because it is not possible, but that every publicke and external fact, which is made by God's authority, to put us in minde of that great sacrifice once fulfilled on the cross, must also partake the nature of that sacrifice, whereof it is the remembrance.

For if even the killing and burning of a calf was an external ad publike sacrifice, because it signified that Christ should die for us: how infinitely more shall
That the body and blood of Christ, being made of bread and wine to signify his owne death, be a publick and an external sacrifice? And because in the sated body of Christ, the whole merit of his priesthood and cross is still really contained (for he is a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech) whereas that body is made present by consecration (as it is always at Masse) then, seing that substance is made present which cuen till this day (wheresoever it be, in heauen, or in earth) maketh God merciful to us, a propitiatory sacrifice in his kind is made, able to be applied to the use of the live and of the dead.

Which doctrine, who so denieth upon pretence of a zeal to Christes death, let him be well assured, he dishonoureth his death above measure, if whereas every signe externally made in calues, or goates which went before his death, was therefore a publick external sacrifice: he wil now deny the same honour to a signe
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signe of the same deathe, appointed to be made, even by Christes owne mouth and exa ple in the self same body which died for vs. I can not tarie any longer upon this matter because, it is not my principal purpose.

The eight mark of an Antichristian.

THE viij. mark of the false prophets of Antichrist is, to boile Christ of his inheritaunce, which God gave him in all nations. For soa David, b Isaias, yea the c Gospels doth teache. Neither is it only meant, that in diverse nations some or other shall, some at one, and other at another time privily believe in Christ, but it is meant, that many nations together shall professe Christes religio and name outwardly and openly: for his name is great among the Gentils, not in one nation only, but among many, nor surely by those who lie privie, but by those who are not ashamed to be known for Christians and for Catholics.
For such only doe honour the name of God, as he known to be of his Church.

Hereof, it is called a city which cannot be hidden, a hill built in the toppe of hils, a tabernacle sette in the son, a candle being light and sette vpon the candlestickke, the children of light, the kingdom of Christ, who reigneth in the house of the spiritual Jacob for euer. Yea it is called the crowne of glory in the hand of God, and the pride or magnificent joy of all ages from generation to generation.

Al which texts notwithstanding, the protestants will make us beleue, that they are Christes Church: where as sixty yeres a goe, there were not onlie not many nations of them, which professed their faith openly (so that Gods name might therby be great among the Gentils) but there was not euen nation, no not one eity, not one towne, not one whole viliage in al the Wyde Worle,
Where it may be shewed, that they had one Church, or chappel, or howse of pub-
lite prayer under the son. And yet though they shewed half a dozen such, it could not serve. Is this the glorious kingdom and common weale which Christ doth inherit?

O unspakeable blasphemy unto his glorious name. The Jewish synagogue was neuer half so base: whereas Christes Churche among the Gentils was pro-
phecied to passe it in number and great-
nes. And yet this misery of the Church (say they) dured eight or nine hundred yeres Ergo so long hel gates prevailed against the Church of Christ. But on the other side, there can no moment of an howse be named, in the which we are not ready to shew, that many, yea very many nations profesed openly, and outwardly practisid Christs true religion together with the pope of Rome, from S. Peters tyne to this howse. O glorious ye Cyty of God, and a kingdom proph.
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phrased of in all ages before Christ, Worthy of his Son Jesus, against which hell gates never did, nor never shall prevaile. To this City and kingdom ye must all resort, who looke to inherit the kingdom of heaven.

The ninth Mark of an Antichristian.

THE ninth marke of Antichristes brotherhood is, the intolerable pride, whereby they make themselves sole, the supreme judges of the right understanding of Gods Woord, yea of the text also and of the letter thereof. For whereas it is not possible for any resonable man to cite with good conscience any one text of holy scripture for his purpose, unless he judge first the same text to be convenient and agreeable to his intent; and therefore whereas nothing is so daily and hourly in practice, as to judge what understanding the woord of God must have, these men make no man in the earthe to be
to be a good judge of the saied woörde of God, beside themselves. And among themselves they make every woman and childe a sufficient, yea the supreme judge in carthe of Gods owne woörde.

Was ther ever heard of anie such pride, besides onely in the members of Antichrist? Marke whether this be not true, by this example. It is written 1 Cor. 7: in S. Paul: Qui matrimonio jungit virgine: in suam, bene facit; & qui non jungit, melius facit. He that icious his virgen in mariage, doth well, but he that doth not icious (her in marriage) doth better. Upon this most plain text, we ground this doctrine, that whereas both states are good and honest yet virginity is a better state and more acceptable unto God then the state of mariage. No faith the Protestant. I take it no so, and why Sir I praye you? Is not facere melius, to doe better? and doth not he better.
please God, who doth the better thing?
And is it not said of S. Paule to be the
better thing, not to ioyne his virge
in Marriage?

Nay but (saith the Protestant) by
this word better, the Apostle mea-
neth not a thing better in the sight of
God, but a thing better in the sight
of the world. For he that is unmar-
rried hath lesse worldly care, and there-
fore he is in better case for an easie and
pleasant life, but not in a better state
of a more vertuous life. I answere, if
melius be not meant better in the
sight of God, neither is bene meáti wel
in the sight of God: But if he that ioy-
neth his virgen in Mariage doth wel
in the sight of God, he that doth not
ioyne her in mariage, doth better in
the sight of God. Therefore my inter-
pretation is the better. No, saith the
Protestant, melius standeth for com-
modius this word better standeth for
more commodious, and none otherwise.

I say
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I say, it standeth also for more vertuously, and more godly. And that is the plain sense of the word of God. It is not so, faith he.

Well, what shall we doe? I say, 'tis so you say, it is not so. Will you take a judge? Tea (quoth he) if he judge according to the word of God. I pray you, Syr, what is God's word concerning this point we now speake of? Is not our question, whether this word (better) doth signify better in the sight of God, as I say, or else better only according to the world, as you say? Is this question defined in God's word? We must confer Scriptures (saith he). A God's name.

The more ye conferre, the more playne it wilbe, that Christ chose virginity for himself, not as for the better state according to the world (who therein sought no care) but as better according to God, as who fulfilled in himself all righteousness. He gave the same state to his
his Mother, not for the quieter (for a
sword of sorrow also went through her
soul, that is to say affliction and tra-
vaile) but surely for the purer state, as
being neere to the nature of Angels,
ado the blessed soules in heau'ne, where
no mairriage is exercised. Also it is
ameane to serve God with lesse disfrac-
tion of the minde, as also S. Paule doth
teach. Or how faith Christ, there are
cunuches who haue gelded them-
selves, not for ease and worldly commo-
dity, as you say, but, for the kingdome of
heau'ne: if it be not better towards God
to live chaste, then in mairriage?

Thus if we went through the
Whole Bible you should never be hable
to shew, that mairriage is of equall digni-
ity with virginity, though it be ho-
ourable in all, and an unspottedbed,
and therefore be a right good state, the
which onely thing all the scriptures
that you can bring doe proue.

What shall we then doe? Will
our
our Protestant yeld? to whome should I yeld, saith he? At the leaft, to Gods woorde, say I. no (saieth he) you mis- understand Gods woorde. Are you content to be tried by the auncient Fathers? If you be, Saint Hierome wrote against Ioninian, who helde this verie errore, to witte, that marriage and virginitie were of equall merit.

Saint Hierome (saieth he) was to much affectionate to virginity. And I doute not, but that he woulde say the like of your affection toward marriage, if he were alive. Whome then should we rather beleue? you, who may hap to be damned, or him whom your self doute not to be saved?

But goe to: like you then S. Augustin? he writeth thus: Ioninianus ante paucos annos hereticus nouus virginitate S. Mariae destruebat: C. duar & virginitatii sacre, nuptias fidelii episc. Pela-coequabat. Ioninian a new hereticke...
before a few yeres, did destroy the virginity of our Lady S. Mary; and made equal the mariage of the faithfull with holy virginity. What say we to S. Augustines judgement? He was a man (quoth he) and he might err. I cry you mercy, SIR: are you a God? Is it more like that he did err, then you? What if I shew S. Chrysostome to be of the same minde, as undoubtedlie he is? What if I joyn to them S. Athanasius, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, S. Hilary, S. Bernard, and diverse others who with one accord preferre the state of virginity euene in the sight of God, and that in whole treatises made of that argument? What if I shew, that pope Siricius condemned Iouinian with his companions in publike consistorie? and that S. Ambrose praised him for it, and also condemned the same Iouinian, euene by the force of those words of S. Paule which affirm him to doe better, who joyneth not his virg.
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in marriage?

What if I joyn also the practise of
the Whole Church, which in every na-
tion under heaven hath built mona-
stryes for virgins, and hath gaven the
first place of honour and merit to the
state of virginity? Will you then yeld at
the least to this univerall judgemen-
t of most best, grave, and wise men, who
directed all their writings and doings
according to Gods word? No, no be
never yeld (if he once have the marke
of Antichrist) whatsoever be brought
forth to the contrary: and that because
he creditetth himself and his own pro-
per judgemen, more then al the worlde
beside.

Is not this an un tolerable pride, all
this not withstanding, to tarie stil in
the former mind? And the very same
tyrany doe they exercise in every other
questio. Say holy scripture what it wil,
say the Fathers, say the Councils what
they lift, howsoever the matter be pra-
tised,
Etisèd, if thei once judge otherwise, thei wil beleue the selues, and remayne still supreme judges ower every man and every thing, without conforming them selues to any superiour authority.

Yea, what shall we say, if the Protestants will not only be supreme judges over the meaning of Gods Woorde, but also ower the bookes themselves, and ower the reading thereof? For beside that they reject the bookes of Tobie, of Wisedom, and of the Machabees, with certaine other parts of holy scripture from the Canon of Gods Woorde, thei also reject the epistle of S. James, and that was done not onely by Martin Luther, who called it straminea, of no more force then a straw is, but euem thus last yere of our Lord there came forth a Confession of the faith printed at Zurich, whereunto all the Sacramentaries of Zuicherland, yea also the preachers of Geneva gane their assent and consent, as the title of the booke

booke doth witness. In which booke it is said, that S. James is to be rejected, if he be cōtrarie to S. Paule. The which heathenish saying doth presuppose, that S. James may be contrary to S. Paule, and in that case he is to be rejected, say they. Their words are, Iacobus ille dixit, opera justificat re, non contradicens Apostolo, reiciendus aliosque, that fellow James said, that works do justify, not speaking against S. Paule, otherwise he were so rejected.

No man could say this much of S. James, but he who thought it possible for S. James epistle to be no holy scripture. For if it be clearly admitted (as it hath ben alwaies among true Catholicks) for holy scripture, then (if it could be contrary to S. Paule) it were no more true, that S. James should be deceived, then S. Paule. For of that which is confessed to be the word of God, there is no difference at all. But one Holie ghost
The Rock

Ps. 44. Ghost speaketh with like authority in all his instruments, whatsoever they be. Therefore this pestilent opinion is principally fostered among the Protestants, that S. James epistle is not the undoubted word of God, and thereof can they give none other reason, but because he is contrary to their diabolish doctrine of only faith.

For whereas they say, that S. James meaneth, that works declare our justification before men, and do not in deed justify before God, it is stark false which they say. For he saith: What good shall it do, if a man say himself to have faith, and have not works, shall his faith save him? Behold, he speaketh of works necessary to that justification, whereby we are saved before God, and not to that onlie, whereby we are declared just before men. For salvation dependeth of God only, and not of men at all. The which thing may be proved out of S. James by divers
of the Church.

... divers other arguments. For he speaking of Abraham (whom no man saw offering up his sonne beside God alone) faith, that faith was made perfitt of woorkes, and concludeth generallie, a man is justifiied of woorkes, and not of faith onlie. And againe, faith without works is dead. Therefore, if the Protestants will have faith without works to justifie, they will have a dead faith to justifie.

When Joeruer S. Paul said that faith did justifie, he meant of faith, which worketh by love, as himself hath declared. And when he saith, that faith justifieth without works, he meaneth, without works which goe before justification, and not without charity or love of God, which is spread in our harts by the holy ghost, at the tyme when God loving vs first, maketh us believe, and also to love him: and so doth justifie ad rectifie vs which were his enemies before. The which love being

Rom. 3, S. Paul's meaning.

Gal. 3, 5.

Rom. 5.

1. Ioan. 4.
being infused to us with a right faith, doth cause us to bring forth such good works, as God hath prepared for us to walk in, and by those works our former justification is increased, and fortified, according as we read, qui justus est, justificetur adhuc, he that is just, let him be justified as yet.

Thus doe all the Catholike Fathers expound the one Apostle, both by himself and by the other: in so much, that S. Augustine confesseth an olde error to have sprung upon S. Paul's words to the Romans not well understood, for which cause he testifieth, that S. James, S. Peter, S. John and S. Jude wrote their epistles all in commendation of charity, and of such good worke as be joyned with faith. And S. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians, doth also declare, that faith he would have to justify, for as much as he faith, all faith to doe no good, yf a man haue not charity.
of the Church.

ritie. Now when the Protestants per-
ceased, that of all other, S. James was
most plaine against their onely faith,
they first did cast a smoke before mens
eyes, as though his woordes might be
defended. And yet when they con-
sidered that solution woulde not serve,
ty gave an other, that S. James is
to be rejected, if he be contrary to
S. Paule.

Neither onely doe the Protestants
make themselves judges ouer whole
bookes and epistles of the Apostles, but
also ouer the very letter of Christes
Gospel. For beside their wicked in-
terpretations thereof, they finde fault
with the construction of the Evange-
lists, and bring the text it self in doubt.
For whereas S. Luke witnesseth, that
Christ said in his last supper, this cup
(is) the new testament in my blood
which (that is to say, which cuppe)
is shed for you: whereas the par-
ticiple (shed) is manifestly referred in
the
the Greeke text of S. Luke unto (the cup) and not unto the name (blood) yet Beza translating the Greeke woordes into Latin, readeth thus: Hoc pociuli est nouum illud testamentum per sanguinem meum, quipro vobis emundatur. He shoulde have said, quod, and not, qui. 'Tis his cup is that new testament by mie blood, which (that is to say, which blood) is shed for you.

S. Luke then readeth, which cuppe, but Beza readeth, which blood is shed for you. Was there ever any like impudence heard of, as to correct the verie text of the holy Gospel? But perhaps Beza did finde it so in some copies. No surely: For he himselfe confesseth in his annotations printed at Geneua vpon that place, in this wise: Omnes tasmen verustinostri codices ita scriptum habebant. Yet all our old bookes had it so writen, that is to say, so, as the Greeke copies every where extant doe read.
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read in all which the participle (shed) can not be referred to the blood, but unto the cup.

What is then the matter, why Beza would needs translate it otherwise? For sooth S. Luke (in this kind of reading) is directly against his sacramentary heresie. For S. Luke geueth us the words of Christ in this sense: This cuppe, that is to say, the liquor and drinck conteined in this cuppe, is the new Testament in my blood, the which liquor conteined in the cup (being so the new testaments in my blood) is shed for you. But no liquor conteined in the cup is (head for us, beside the substantial and real blood of Christ: therefore the liquor conteined in the cup (after the woordes of Christ once spoken) is none other liquour, beside the substantial and real blood of Christ.

To avoide this argument, Beza, who was at a point never to yeld in his heresie,
resie, would nedes signifye, that S. Luke
doth not wel rehearse Christes woords,
and therefore he himselfe hath rehe-
sered them better, yet he shall be cre-
dited more then the Evangelist. But
lettevs also see the wordes of Beca in
his Comment upon this place. Qui
pro vobis estunditur, Τὸ δειπήμων
ἐκχυμομενον. Qum haece verba, si
constructionem spectemus, necesse
fari non ad sanguinem, sed ad po
culum pertineant, necuetamen de
vino, nedum de poculo intelligi
possint, aut manifestum est Solace
cophanes, quia dicenda fuerit Τὸ
δειπήμων ἐκχυμομενον : aut potius cu
hac effente ad marginem annotata
ex Matheo & Marco, postea in
contextum irreperunt.

Whereas these words (which is
shed for you) if we looke to the con-
structio, doe necessarily appertaine, not
to the blood, but to the cuppe, and
yet they cannot be understaunded of the
Wine,
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wine, and much lesse of the suppe, either it is an euydent apparencè of 
incogrues speache (where that is reade in the nominative case, which should 
have ben readen in the datine) or ra-
ther, whereas these woordes were 
noted out of Mathew and Marke 
in the margent, they crept aftsers 
ward into the text.

See, for Gods love, this mans owne 
confesion.

First the participle (shed) in Greeke 
can not agree with the nowne (blood) 
because in Greeke the participle is the 
nominative case, and blood is the da-
tine case. Doth Beza so seffe this much, 
and yet doth he the contrarie? O un-
speakeable malice!

Againe, the participle may and 
must agree with the noun (cup) with 
whome it is of the same case, gender, ad 
number. Why then doth Beza refer the 
participle to an other noun?

Thirdly, the participle can not be 

M my unders
understanded of the wine: for wine was not shed for us, and that Beza confesseth.

Fourthly, it cannot be understood of the material cup literally: for it cannot be shed for us, as being no liquor, but gold, or silver, or some like massy stuffe. All these things Beza confesseth.

Well, what followeth then? in truth it only followeth, that the cup is neither meant the matter and stuff of the cup, nor the wine which now is no more in the cup, but it is meant, the blood in the cup made of the wine. For so the word cup standeth to signify that which is in the cup, as all men know that have common sense: and that is in the cup, which Christ pronounced saying: this is my blood, &c.

Therefore Beza should have confessed the fifth point, to wit, that the blood of Christ contained substantially in the cup and made there present
of the Church.

present by changing the wine into it, is the new testament in Christ's blood, that is to say, it doth testify unto vs, that Christ by his bloodshedding upon the cross is our sacrifice reconciling vs to God. The which blood so mystically contained in the cup is shed for vs, because the substance of that in the cuppe, and of that which is shed on the cross, is all one substance, the difference being only in the outward forme, and not in the inward truth. So that, whereas Christ's blood was really shed for us on the cross in his owne forme, that which is mystically contained in the cup under the forme of wine, is the self same blood, made also present after the sort of a mystical sacrifice, to represent in the truth of Christ's own substance made invisibly present, the great visible sacrifice openly made upon the Cross.

Mm iij This
This only was the whole meaning of S. Luke, the which thing if Beza would not have learned of the catholick church, he should have learned it of S. Luke at the least: for his wordes gene that sense. But he would not learn it of S. Luke, because he had hated it in the Catholike Churche, perhaps before he knew what S. Luke wrote. For these men profitte more by spite, then by reading. They first chose to forsake the Church, and then if any thing make for the same Church, be it epistle, be it gospel, it shall sooner be false Greecke and false Latin to, then they wil come into the Church againe. I pray you, what a shamelesse point is this, to teach that S. Luke wrote false Greecke, and did put the nominative case, in stede of the datiuue case? Well, therein Beza would not stand over longe. But he rather thinketh, that the words (which is shed for you) are not at all of the Gospel, but crept in, or were put in.

O God
of the Church.

O God! All their auncient Greek copies have it, by his own confession: all our Greek and Latin copies have it also. Yea our masse booke hath it to. And yet now we must thinck, that it is an error crept in. If this glose may be admitted, every thing which in holy scripture maketh against the furiose opinion of any mæber of Antichrist, shalbe a thing that out of the margent crept into the text. O Satanical pride of our prests! Where is the obedience you pretend to God's word? Where is the reverence, which ye ought to geue, and we doe in deede geue to the blessed gospel of Christ? Which reverence is so great amonst the Catoliks, that we dare not chage a letter, nor a point, neither in the Grecke, nor Latin copies, except we finde it so in many auncient and well corrected bookees, and those well knowen to many witnesses, and that by the judgement of a Synod. But albeit al you know not so much, yet now learn, that your heads and your
false preachers are so maliciously sette, that if the gospel be not conformable to their commodite, and preindicate opinion: be he Luke, be he James, be he John, be shalbe made as light of, as ever was any Pope of Rome.

Looke up at the last for Christes sake, and consider that you are held captives of raving wolves, who spoile your soules of all their spiritual trea- sures, ad feede you with mere dreams, and phantasies, the which if you amend not before, at the hower of death, will bring you to desperation, and to ever- lasting fire of hell. Other places I could bring where the Protestants have thus abused Gods own worde: but it would carie me to far away from my principal purpose. Only this I assure you of, The Pope hath no such custom, to say, S. Luke speaketh false Greeke, or the words haue crept out of the margent into the text, or if James be contrarie to Paul, he must be reiect ed, or the Mac- chabees
of the Church.

chabees is no scripture with the Christians, because it is not in the Canon of the Jews, but he keepest all things as he receaued them without any maner of change.

The tenth marck of an Antichristian.

What an infinite disputation would this be, if I should shew particularly how the Protestants agree in doctrine with all the members of Antichrist?

Eunomius (as S. Augustine witneseth) said, no synne should hurt a man, vult her, if he were partaker of the faith which he taught. And are not the Protestants secure of their salvation (what soeuer their works be) if they haue that presumptuous faith which Luther taught them? We reade in the Tripartite history, that Acesius the bishops of the Nouatians affirmed, that who so had synned mortally after baptism, he might not hoape for remission of his synnes by
by the priests, but by God alone. Against which heresie of the Nouratians, S. Ambrose reasoneth shewing, that the priests have no lesse right gaven them to res
mit synnes by penance, then by baptism. Vnū in vtroq; mysterium, there is one mystery (or sacrament) in both ca
ses. Doo not now all the Protestantes
deny the priests to haue any right g
uen them to forgent synnes? Euthy
mius writeth, that the Massaltans de
ied baptism to pluck up the roote of
synnes. Is not the same the opinion of
the Protestants?

Taught not Aérius, that we must not
pray for the dead, nor kepe solemby the
appointed fastings? and that there is no
difference betwenn a priest and a Bis
hop? Which things both Epiphanius,
and S. Augustine with the consent of
all the Catholicks of their tyme, and all
that followed after, witness to be her
retical. And yet our Protestants teach
the self same.

S. Au
of the Church.

S. Augustine reckoneth it an heresy in Io uninian, because virginitate sanctimonialium & continentiam sexus virilis in sanctis eligentibus celibem vitam, conjugiorum casuum ars fidelium meritis adequebat. Io uninian did make the virginity of Nunnies and the continence of men, in those who chose to live chaste, equal with the merits of chaste faithful marriages, where S. Augustine doth accompany virginity the higher state. But our Protestants hold the same heresy word for word.

S. Hierom reputeth Vigilantius an heretic, for denying prayers to Saints, and the giving of honor to holy relics. Are not these men of the same minde with Vigilantius?

The Arrians would not believe the Hilar.de consubstantiality of the son, because that Synod.ad word was not written in Gods word: and how many things by the same pre tense do the Protestants deny?

It is
It is recited for a heinous impiety in Novatus the heretic, quodd Christo matris signaculo non est consummatus. Because he was not consummated with the seal or signe of Chrism: do not our Protestants abhor Chrism, calling it greasing?

Lucius the Arrian persecuted the holy Monkes, as our Protestants now do.

The Montanistes blasphemed the whole Church throughout the world: and the followers of Lucifer, said there was a stues made of the Churche. Is not this the talke of our Protestants?

The Donatists said the Church was lost from the whole world, and preserved in Africk alone: say not the Protestants worse, that the Church was once lost from the open face of the world, ad was not preserved, but reised in Germany againe? Neither wil their most absurd opinion be excused, by saying, that some in every contrie were primit
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of their opinion. For that is noe true Church of Christ, which doth not so profess his faith, that it may be known to be Christes Churche: for his Church is not a shamed of Christ and of his Gospel.

The heretiks called Severiani used Euseb.Sib. the Law the Prophets, and the Gospels, s.cap.160 fed propria quadam interpretat tione scripturarum senum persuerterit. But they perverted the sense of the scriptures, by a certain peculiar interpretation. The same doe the Protestants, who wil neither admitte the practife of the Church, nor the consent of the Fathers, against their owne peculiar interpretation.

It hath ben alwaies a trick of Iewes and hereticks, to be still in hand with translating the holy scriptures, to shend by much changing, they might Hieron.in Caral.in gette some apparence to haue the scrip tures on their side. Such were Theos verbo Ordo
dotion, Aquila, Symachus, all who genes. forsoke
forsoke the Catholike faith, and translated the old bible upon a stomak concea-
ved against the Church of God: and what end is there now of translating
the scriptures into every tongue? Whereof although they that are learned take
great profit (as also S. Hierom, and S. Augustine then did) yet it bringeth
the word of God into an uncertainty,
and to a confusion with them, who not
being leamed see so great changes, that
they know not what to take for the
word of God. Against which mis-
chief, the Catholikes judg'd it necessary
without prejudice to other copies, ei-
ther of Hebrew, or of Greeke, to con-
firm the translation which hath ben
always vned in the Latin Church,
as whereof it self hath ben a most faith-
full and diligent keper.

But whiles the Protestants pret-
tend to appeale to the originals, and by
many translations make the meaning
of the originals more doutfull daie by
daie, st
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diae, it must needs come shortly to pass, that none of them all will be able to know, how the word of God is either pointed, or meant. It were a thing without end thus to prosecute every particular agreeance of our new Protestant with the old prophets of Antichrist. But this one thing seemeth to gather all into one.

The eleventh mark of an Antichristian. Seeing that Antichrist is contrary to Christ, and Christ came to replenish men with grace, giving them diverse gifts, and spreading charity in their hearts; Antichrist on the other side must go about, and alwayes hath endeavoured by his members, to deny, to take away, and to make void, the supernatural graces which God hath given men to his Church. Christ came to build, Tertull. de Antichrist to pull down. Christ to gather prescript into one, Antichrist to scatter abroad: adversus Christ to enriche us, Antichrist to bare.
rob, and spoile vs of our heavenly treasu-
sures. If then it appeare, that the Pro-
estants doe spoile Gods Church of cer-
taine graces, which the Pope doth dili-
gently maintaine, it must nedes be, that
the Protestantes are the members of
Antichrist, and that the Pope with
his company, is the flock of Christ.

It hath ben alwaies the fashion of
all heretikes (as Tertullian faith) to de-
sroye other mens buildings, and to un-
doe that, which other men doe. Ipsum
opus eorum non de suo proprio
adificio venit, sed de veritatis des
structione: nostra suffodiunt, vestra
adificent. Their very worck riseth not
of their own building, but from the de-
sroying of the truthe. They undermine
our things, that they may build up their
owne. And Hippolytus thinkest the
scale of Antichrist to be nego, I deny.

For as faith be the devildid exhort the
Martyrs to deny their God, who was
crucified, so at the last day the scale of
Antichrist and of his members; saith, I nego creatorem coeli & terrae, nego baptisma, nego adorationem me Deum praestari solitam. I deny the maker of heaven and of earth, I deny baptism, I deny the adoration which I was wont to doe unto God.

Thus in the old tyme, whereas the Apostles preached Christ to be true God and man, Arius denied his true Godhead. Marcion and Valentinus and Mancbews denied his true manhood. Apollinaris denied his true soule, the Monothelits denied his doble Will, the Donatists the Continuance of the unis- versality of his Church, the Pelagians the necessity of Gods grace and the like may be said of all other heretiks, whose opinions always detracted some perfec- tion from Christ or from his Church.

Now I will shew, that the Protestants doe the like in our tyme. For whereas the universal Church as wel by the preaching of the Apostles, as
by the witness of God's written word, was in possession of a publick sacrifice, of priesthood, of seven sacramentals, as of most undoubted instrumentes of grace, and of diverse other godly and divine orders and Canons: have they any other Gospel, any other Church, or any other doctrine, then that which consisteth in denying, and in taking away that which was before?

The holy scriptures and Church taught, that a man being justified, is both really delivered from his sins, and really receaue faith, hope, and charity. They deny our sins to be taken away by the lamb of God, who came for that purpose, saying, they tarry still, but only that they are not imputed. They teach also that no justice is at all made in us by spreading charity in our hearts, whereas St. Paul saith, justi coetiuentur multimus, many shall be made just. But they only say justice is imputed to us.

Again
Again they deny five Sacraments of the seven. They deny that baptism remitteth our synnes, or that baptism is necessarie to children which are born of Christian parents. Which was the heresie of the Pelagians: They deny the use of holy oyle and of chrism. They deny the real presence of Christes body, the adoration, and reseruation thereof, the transubstantiation of the bread into his body, the unbloody sacrifice of Christes supper, the communion of one kinde to be sufficient, and consequently they deny, that whole Christ is under eche kinde, and the mingling of water with the wine.

And that one may receive alone, that Altars are lawfull, that there are Priests of the newe Testament, that Bishops are of any higher degree, then Priests, that there is any one bishoppe chief of all other: that Priests can forgive synnes, but onelie may preache that they are forgenen: that
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it is lawfull to appoint certaine daies of fasting, or the abstinence from cer-
tain meates for obedience, although God both willed Adam to abstaine
from a certain fruit, and the Jews to abstaine from certain meates. They
deny that it is lawfull to pray to the Saints in heaste, or to pray for the faith-
ful which died in Christ, wherein they deny any communion of praiere betwene
the faithful which are alive, and their brethren whome out of this Worlde
With Christ. They deny the infallible authority of generall Councells, the visi-
ble succession of bishops, the place of purgation after this life, the remaining
of paine after the sinne is forgiven, the changing or pardoning of the said paine
by the high bishop, the use and moderate honour of Images, the signe of the
healshfull crose, the making of a vowe to live chaste, or to renounce all prop-
riety of goods, or to live in obedience, the reverence done the reliques of the
blessed
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blessed Martyrs, the use of prayer in the holy songs, the universal tradition of unwritten virtues, and to be short, they deny the books of the old Bible, such as are not in the Canon of the Jews.

These things and many other like whilsts they deny, what other thing do they, the put down the religio of Christ, which hath been abuilding these fifteen hundred yeeres? And therein they prepare away to Antichrist who in the end must deny all that they as yet leave undenied. For if they should openly deny every whit, then the mystery of iniquity should not be a working and many simple men should not have bene deceived by them, who now are deceased, because they pretend to refoarme, and not to take away Christ's religio. But when the tyme is ripe, then the iniquity, which is now begun, must be fulfilled, and so is the whole religio destroyed.

I would this were not true. And yet it is
it is possible that every Protestant knoweth not so much, because Satan the great captaine of their army keepeth his Counsel to himselfe, knowing that the more he worketh, the more hurt he is like to doe. But God through mercy deteareth his snares, and warneth them, who wilbesaued, to flee into the hill with Lot, and to the ship of the Churche with Noe, there to provide for their eternal salvation, which our Lord granted through his bitter passion. Amen.

In his.

Librum istum de primatu Romani Pontificis & Petri Ecclesiae universalis legerunt vnum sacerdotes Theologici & Anglicani idiomatis permittant, quibus subdito merito & tuto credendum esse, ut sine periculo, ino summa cum visitate eundem caret posset.

Cunentui Petri, P.S. Petri Louny
A BRIEF SOME OF THE chief points of this treatise.

TH E preface conteineth the marks of the true Church.

The difference between a dio

mination, and a primacy. 17.

The Apostles strive concerning

superiority is declared, 25.26.27.

That there was one greater as

among the Apostles. 29,41,46.

To be a ruler and as a minister
do not repugne. 46.47.

The preeminence of priests as

about Kings. 51.52.53.

A King can not be supreme go

governor in all ecclesiastical causes

because by right and law he can

not practise al ecclesiastical causes

62.64.67.

The highe priest is preferred

before the King by Gods lawe.

72.73.74.

The evil life of a bishop taketh

not away his authority. 78.79.

The differences betw the bish

hop
shop of Rome and temporal princes.
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The promise to be called Peter was the first cause why the church was built upon him. 110.
The Protestant can not tell which is the first literal sense of these words, upon this rock I will build my Church. 130.
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Hereticks preach without cons
Heresies do prefer the temporal reign or sword before the spiritual.

They are the members of Antichrist, who withstand the external and public sacrifice of Christ's Church.

Heresies deprive Christ of his glorious inheritance in many nations together.

The intolerable pride of heretics, in making themselves only judges of the right sense of God's word.

The Protestant teach the same doctrine which the old heretics did.

The Protestant are the right members of Antichrist, in that they spoil God's Church of very many gifts and graces, and articles of the faith.
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