

## M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SECOND DIVISION.

*For which cause that see hath ever hitherto of all christian nations, and now also ought to be heard and obeyed in all points of faith. For that see, though it hath failed sometimes in charity, and hath been in case as it might truly say the words of the gospel, spoken by the foolish virgins, "Our lamps be without light;" yet it never failed in faith, as Theodoretus<sup>1</sup> witnesseth, and St Augustine affirmeth the same: which special grace and singular privilege is to be imputed unto the prayer of Christ, by which he obtained of God, for Peter and his successors, (108) that their faith should not fail. Therefore the evil life of the bishops of Rome ought not to withdraw us from believing and following the doctrine preached and taught in the holy church of Rome.*

Matt. xxv.

[Evil life of the B. of Rome ought not to sever us from the faith of the church of Rome. H. A. 1564.]

The hundred and eighth untruth. For many popes have erred in faith, as shall appear.

*For better credit hereof, that is earnestly to be considered which St Augustine writeth, epistola clxv, where, after that he hath rehearsed in order all the popes that succeeded Peter, even to him that was pope in his time, he saith thus: In illum... ordinem episcoporum, &c.<sup>2</sup> "Into that row<sup>3</sup> of bishops, that reacheth from Peter himself to Anastasius, which now sitteth in the same chair, if any traitor had crept in, it should nothing hurt the church and the innocent christian folk, over whom our Lord having providence saith of evil rulers, 'What they say unto you, do ye; but what they do, do ye not; for they say, and do not;' to the intent the hope of a faithful person may be certain, and such as being set, not in man, but in our Lord, be never scattered abroad with tempest of wicked schism." And in his 166th epistle he saith: "Our heavenly Master hath so far forewarned us to beware of all evil of dissension, that he assured the people also of evil rulers, that for their sakes the seat of wholesome doctrine should not be forsaken, in which seat even the very evil men be compelled to say good things. For the things which they say be not theirs, but God's, who in the seat of unity hath put the doctrine of verity<sup>4</sup>."*

Matt. xxiii.

St Augustine speaketh generally of all bishops, and not one word namely of the bishop of Rome.

*By this we are plainly taught, that albeit the successors of Peter, Christ's vicars in earth, be found blame-worthy for their<sup>5</sup> evil life, yet we ought not to dissent from them in doctrine, nor sever ourselves from them in faith, forasmuch as, notwithstanding they be evil, by God's providence, for the surety of his people, they be compelled to say the things that be good, and to teach the truth; the things they speak not being theirs, but God's, who hath put the doctrine of verity in the seat or chair of unity: which singular grace cometh specially to the see of Peter, either of the force of Christ's prayer, as is said before, or in respect of place and dignity, which the bishops of that see hold for Christ, as Balaam could be brought by no means to curse that people whom God would have<sup>6</sup> to be blessed. And Caiphas also prophesied, because he was high bishop of that year, and prophesied truly, being a man otherwise most wicked. And therefore the evil doings of the bishops<sup>7</sup> of Rome make no argument of discrediting their doctrine. To this purpose the example of Gregory Nazianzene may very fitly be applied, of the golden, silvern, and leaden seal<sup>8</sup>. As touching the value of metals, gold and silver are better; but, for the goodness of the seal, as well doth lead imprint a figure in wax as silver or gold. For this cause, that the see of Rome hath never been defiled with stinking heresies<sup>9</sup>, as Theodoretus saith, and God hath*

M. Harding compareth the pope with Balaam and Caiphas.

[<sup>1</sup> See before, page 387.]

[<sup>2</sup> In illum, &c. qui ducitur ab ipso Petro usque ad Anastasium, qui nunc eandem cathedram sedet, etiam si quisquam traditor per illa tempora subrepsisset, nihil præjudicaret ecclesiæ et innocentibus Christianis: quibus Dominus providens, ait de præpositis malis: Quæ dicunt, facite; quæ autem faciunt, facere nolite: dicunt enim, et non faciunt. Ut certa sit spes fidelis, quæ non in homine, sed in Domino collocata, numquam tempestate sacrilegi schismatis dissipetur.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Gener. Epist. liii. 3. Tom. II. col. 121.]

[<sup>3</sup> Rew: row.]

[<sup>4</sup> Quod usque adeo cælestis magister cavendum præmonuit, ut etiam de præpositis malis plebem securam faceret, ne propter illos doctrinæ salutaris

cathedra desereretur, in qua coguntur etiam mali bona dicere. Neque enim sua sunt quæ dicunt, sed Dei, qui in cathedra unitatis doctrinam posuit veritatis.—Id. ad Donatist. Epist. cv. 16. Tom. II. col. 303.]

[<sup>5</sup> H. A. 1564, omits *their*.]

[<sup>6</sup> H. A. 1564, omits *have*.]

[<sup>7</sup> Of bishops, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>8</sup> Ἔστω χρυσὸς, ἔστω σίδηρος, δακτύλιοι δὲ ἀμφότεροι, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐγκεχαράχθωσαν εἰκόνα βασιλικὴν, εἶτα κηρὸν ἐντυπούτωσαν· τί διολοίει ἡ σφραγὶς αὐτῆς τῆς σφραγίδος ἐκείνης; οὐδέν.—Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. Orat. xl. 26. Tom. I. p. 712.]

[<sup>9</sup> See before, page 387, note 16.]

always kept in the<sup>10</sup> chair of unity the doctrine of verity, as Augustine writeth; for this cause, I say, it sitteth at the stern, and governeth the churches of the whole world; for this cause bishops have made their appellations thither; judgment in doubts of doctrine, and determination in all controversies and strifes, hath been from thence always demanded.

Whether the Pope may err.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This is a very poor help indeed. M. Harding here is fain to resemble the bishops of Rome, touching their doctrine, to Balaam, to Caiphas, and to a leaden seal; and, touching their lives, to confess they are lamps without light. "Yet," saith he, "all this notwithstanding, we may not therefore depart from them. For Christ saith, 'The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair: do ye that they say; but that they do, do ye not; for they say, and do not.'" Forasmuch as it liketh M. Harding to use these comparisons, it may not much mislike him, if some man upon occasion hereof happen to say, as Christ said in the like case: "Wo be unto you, ye scribes and Pharisees! ye blind guides! ye painted graves! ye shut up the kingdom of heaven before men: ye neither enter yourselves, nor suffer others that would enter: ye have made the house of God a cave of thieves."

Certainly Balaam, notwithstanding he were a false prophet, yet he opened his mouth, and blessed the people of God. Caiphas, although he were a wicked bishop, yet he prophesied, and spake the truth. A seal, although it be cast in lead, yet it giveth a perfit print. The scribes and Pharisees, although they were hypocrites, and lived not well, yet they instructed the congregation, and said well. The Manichees, although they were heretics, and taught not well, yet outwardly, in the conversation and sight of the world, as St Augustine saith, they lived well<sup>11</sup>. But these, unto whom M. Harding claimeth the universal power over all the world, neither bless the people of God, nor preach God's truth, nor give any print of good life or doctrine, nor instruct the congregation, nor say well, as the scribes and Pharisees did, nor, by M. Harding's own confession, live well, as the Manichees did. St Augustine saith: *Qui nec regiminis in se rationem habet, nec sua crimina detergit, nec filiorum culpam correxit, canis impudicus dicendus est magis quam episcopus*<sup>12</sup>: "He that neither regardeth to rule himself, nor hath washed off his own sins, nor corrected the faults of his children, may rather be called a filthy dog than a bishop."

Yet, all this corruption of life notwithstanding, M. Harding saith the see of Rome can never fail in faith: for Christ said unto Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail." The like confidence and trust in themselves the priests had in the old times, as it may appear by these words of the prophet Micheas: *Sacerdotes in mercede docuerunt, et prophetæ in pecunia prophetaverunt, et super Dominum requiescebant, dicentes, Nonne Dominus est in medio nostri?* "The priests taught for hire, and the prophets prophesied for money; and yet they rested themselves upon the Lord and said, Is not the Lord in the midst amongst us?" With like confidence the priests said, as it is written in the prophet Hieremy: *Non peribit lex a sacerdote, nec consilium a seniore*: "The law shall not decay in the priest, nor counsel in the elder." But God answereth them far otherwise: *Nox vobis erit pro visione, et tenebræ pro divinatione*: "Ye shall have dark night instead of a vision; and ye shall have darkness instead of prophecy." Certainly the very gloss upon the decretals putteth this matter utterly out of doubt. These be the words: *Certum est, quod papa errare potest*<sup>13</sup>: "It is certain that the pope may err." And Alphonsus de Castro: *Omnis... homo errare potest in fide, etiamsi papa sit*: "Every man may err in the faith; yea, although it be the pope." And for proof hereof he saith: *De Liberio papa, constat fuisse Arianum*<sup>14</sup>: "Touching pope Liberius, it is certain he was an Arian heretic." Pope Honorius was an heretic of the sect of them that were called Monothelitæ,

[<sup>10</sup> That, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>11</sup> August. Op. Confess. Lib. III. cap. vi. 10. Tom. I. col. 91.]

Id. Retract. Lib. I. cap. vii. 1. Tom. I. col. 9.]

[<sup>12</sup> Id. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. 11. Quæst. vii. can.

32; where *habuit, sua delicta, and filiorum crimen.*]

[<sup>13</sup> Ibid. Caus. XXIV. Quæst. i. Gloss. in can. 9. col. 1387.]

[<sup>14</sup> Alfons. de Castr. Adv. Hær. Col. 1539. Lib. I. cap. iv. fol. 8.]

xxiv. Quæst. i. in Gloss. Alphon. contra Hæres. Lib. I. cap. iv.

Mic. iii.

Luke xxiii.

ii. Quæst. vii. Qui nec.

August. Confes. Lib. iii. cap. vi. Retract. Lib. i. cap. vii.

Num. xxiii. & xxiv. John xi.

Luke xi.

Matt. xxiii.

Whether  
the Pope  
may err.

Concil.  
Constan. vi.  
Act 12.  
Concil. Tom.  
i. in Vita  
Marcel.  
Gerson.  
Holcot. in  
Lib. Sapient.  
Lect. 189.  
Dist. 19.  
Anastasius.  
Abbas Urs.  
in Chron.

Concil. Basil.  
in Epist.  
Synod.  
Dist. 40.  
Si papa.

Nic. Lyra in  
xvi. cap.  
Matt.

Iren. Lib. i.  
cap. i.

De Elect. et  
Elect. Potes-  
tate.  
Significasti.  
In Gloss.  
Idem Albert.  
Pighius.  
Lib. vi. cap.  
xiii.

condemned for the same in the sixth council holden at Constantinople<sup>1</sup>. Pope Marcellinus openly made sacrifice unto an idol<sup>2</sup>. Pope John the twenty-second held a wicked heresy against the immortality of the soul, and for the same was reprov'd, not by his cardinals, but by Gerson, and the school of Sorbona in Paris<sup>3</sup>.

Pope Sylvester the second was a sorcerer, and had familiar conference with the devil, and by his procurement was made pope. Pope Anastasius communicated with Photinus the heretic, and therefore was forsaken of his clergy<sup>4</sup>. Pope Hildebrand, that first of all others in these countries forbade the lawful marriage of priests, both for his life, and also for his religion, is set out at large in a council holden at Brixia; where he is called and published to the world to be a vicious man, a burner of houses, a robber of churches, a maintainer of murders and perjuries, an heretic against the apostolic doctrine, the old disciple of Berengarius, a sorcerer, a necromancer, a man possessed with the devil, and therefore out of the catholic faith<sup>5</sup>. The fathers in the council of St Basil say: *Multi pontifices in errores et hæreses lapsi esse leguntur*<sup>6</sup>: "We read that many bishops of Rome have fallen into errors and heresies." And the bishop of Rome himself saith: "Notwithstanding the pope draw innumerable companies of people by heaps with him into hell, yet let no mortal man once dare to reprove him;" *nisi deprehendatur a fide devius*: "unless it be found that he stray from the faith<sup>7</sup>." To conclude, Nicolas Lyra is driven to say: *Multi papæ inventi sunt apostatæ*<sup>8</sup>: "We find that many popes have forsaken the faith."

All this notwithstanding, by M. Harding's resolution, the see of Rome never failed from the faith, nor never can fail. The Valentinian heretics, as Irenæus reporteth, were wont to say of themselves, that they were naturally made of an<sup>9</sup> heavenly substance, and therefore needed not to flee from sin, as<sup>10</sup> others needed. For, lived they never so wickedly, yet said they: "We are spiritual still: no sin can hurt us. For we are as pure tried gold, which notwithstanding it be laid in a heap of dung, yet keepeth it still the brightness and nature of gold, and receiveth no corruption of the dung<sup>11</sup>." Even so these men seem to say, that whatsoever the pope either believe, or speak, or do, his faith still remaineth sound, and can never fail, because he sitteth in Peter's chair; as if he had a lease of the church of God, without any manner impeachment of waste. And therefore they say: *Quod si totus mundus sentiet*<sup>12</sup> *in aliquo adversus papam, tamen videtur, quod magis standum est sententiæ papæ*<sup>13</sup>: "If all the world give sentence in any thing contrary to the pope, it seemeth we ought rather to stand to the pope's judgment than to the judgment of all the world." Again they say: *In papa si desint bona acquisita per meritum, sufficiunt [ea] quæ a loci [præ]decessore præ-*

[<sup>1</sup> Sext. Synod. Constant. Act. xiii. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. II. p. 373.]

[<sup>2</sup> Ex Libr. Pontif. in eod. Tom. I. p. 184.]

[<sup>3</sup> The passage referred to may be seen, Joan. Gerson. Op. Antw. 1736. Serm. in Fest. Pasch. Tom. III. Pars III. col. 1205. More upon this matter will occur in the Defence of the Apology.

Holkoth. in Lib. Sap. Prælect. 1586. Lect. clxxxix. p. 623.]

[<sup>4</sup> Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xix. can. 9. cols. 86, 7. A note is added declaring this canon *omnino confictum*.]

[<sup>5</sup> Chronic. Abbat. Ursperg. Argent. 1537. Anni Henr. IV. p. 237.]

[<sup>6</sup> ... pontificibus, quorum nonnulli in hæreses et errores lapsi esse dicuntur et leguntur.—Concil. Basil. in Crabb. Concil. Resp. Synod. Tom. III. p. 146.]

[<sup>7</sup> Si papa... nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit, primo mancipio gehennæ.... Hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus... nisi &c.—Ex Dict. Bonifac. Mart. in Corp.

Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xl. can. 6. cols. 194, 5.]

[<sup>8</sup> Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Matt. cap. xvi. Pars V. fol. 52. See before, page 381, note 15.]

[<sup>9</sup> A, 1565.]

[<sup>10</sup> As as, 1565.]

[<sup>11</sup> ... οὕτως πάλιν τὸ πνευματικὸν θέλουσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ εἶναι, ἀδύνατον φθορὰν καταδέξασθαι, καὶ ὁποῖαι συγκαταγένηνται πράξεις· ὃν γὰρ τρόπον χρυσὸς ἐν βορβόρῳ κατατεθείς οὐκ ἀποβάλλει τὴν καλλονὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν διαφυλάττει, τοῦ βορβόρου μηδὲν ἀδικῆσαι δυναμένου τὸν χρυσόν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ αὐτοὺς λέγουσι, καὶ ἐν ποῖαις ὑλικαῖς πράξεσι καταγένηνται, μηδὲν αὐτοὺς παραβάλλεσθαι, μηδὲ ἀποβάλλειν τὴν πνευματικὴν ὑπόστασιν.—Iren. Op. Par. 1710. Contr. Hær. Lib. i. cap. vi. 2. pp. 29, 30.]

[<sup>12</sup> Sententiet, 1565.]

[<sup>13</sup> Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. ix. Quæst. iii. Gloss. in can. 13. col. 877. See before, page 68, note 5. See also Alb. Pigh. Hierarch. Eccles. Col. 1538. Lib. vi. cap. xiii. foll. 245, &c.]

*stantur*<sup>14</sup>: "If there want in the pope good things gotten by merit, yet the things that he hath of (Peter) his predecessor in that place are sufficient." Likewise again: *Papa sanctitatem recepit*<sup>15</sup> *a cathedra*<sup>16</sup>: "The pope receiveth his holiness of his chair." \*And pope Sixtus saith that "St Peter dwelleth in the bishop of Rome, and directeth him in his doings, and beareth all burdens"<sup>17</sup>.

Thus they feast and cheer themselves, and smooth the world with vain talk. But St John saith: *Nolite dicere, Patrem habemus Abraham*: "Never say (Peter or) Abraham was our father." St Paul, speaking of his successors, saith thus: *Equidem scio quod post discessum meum ingressuri sint ad vos lupi graves, non parcentes gregi*: "I know that, after my departure from you, there shall ravening wolves come amongst you, that shall not spare the flock." And St Hierome saith: *Non sunt sanctorum filii, qui tenent loca sanctorum*<sup>18</sup>: "They be not evermore the children of holy men, that sit in the rooms of holy men."

Now, whereas M. Harding saith, Christ prayed for Peter that his faith should not fail, that prayer pertained to all the rest of the apostles, and not only unto Peter. Origen saith: *Num audebimus dicere, &c.*: "Shall we dare to say that the gates of hell prevailed not only against Peter, but shall prevail against the rest? Why may we not rather say that the words that Christ spake were verified in every of them of whom they were spoken?" *Nam et quæ prius dicta sunt, et quæ sequuntur, velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia*<sup>19</sup>: "For both the things that were spoken of before, and also the things that follow, as spoken unto Peter, are common to all." So likewise Beda expoundeth the same generally of all the faithful<sup>20</sup>, and not of Peter only. And so Christ himself expoundeth his own words. For thus he prayeth unto his Father: *Pater sancte, serva eos per nomen tuum, &c.*: "O holy Father, save them for thy name's sake. . . I pray not for them only, but for all them that by their preaching shall believe in me."

But, saith M. Harding, be the bishop of Rome's life never so wicked, yet may we not sever ourselves from the church of Rome. Howbeit St Cyprian saith otherwise: *Plebs obsequens præceptis dominicis, et Deum metuens, a peccatore præposito separare se debet*<sup>21</sup>: "The people obeying God's commandments, and fearing God, must sever themselves from the wicked that ruleth over them." And pope Nicolas hath straitly commanded, upon pain of excommunication, that no man should be present to hear mass said by a priest that he knoweth undoubtedly to live in advoury<sup>22</sup>. Howbeit indeed it is not their life only that the church of God is offended withal, but also and specially the filth and corruption of their religion, the oppressing of God's word, the open deceiving of the people, and the manifest maintenance of idolatry. And what if the silver of Rome be turned into dross? What if the city that was faithful be become an harlot? What if they can abide no sound doctrine? What if they have made the house of God a cave of thieves? What if Rome be become the great Babylon, the mother of fornication, imbrued and drunken with the blood of the saints of God? And what if abomination sit in the holy place, even in the temple of God? Yet may we not depart from thence? Yet must that be the rule and standard of God's religion? Truly Christ saith: "Take heed of the leaven of the scribes and Pharisees." And God himself saith: *Exite de illa, populus meus, ne participes sitis delictorum ejus, et de plagis ejus ne accipiatis*: "O my people, come away from her, lest ye be partakers of her sins, and so receive part of her plagues." Irenæus

Whether the Pope may err.  
Dist. 40.  
Non nes.  
Dist. 40.  
Si papa.  
Dist. 19.  
Sic omnes.  
In Gloss.  
ἐν ὁλβία  
ὁλβία  
πᾶντα.  
\* Epist.  
Sext. ii.  
Matt. iii.  
Acts xx.  
Dist. 40.  
Non est facile.

Orig. in Matt.  
Tract. 1.

Beda in Luc.  
cap. xxii.

John xvii.

Cypr. Lib. i.  
Epist. 4.

Dist. 37.  
Nullus.

Isai. i.

2 Tim. iv.  
Jer. vii.  
Matt. xxi.  
Rev. xvii.

Dan. ix.  
2 Thess. ii.

Matt. xvi.  
Rev. xviii.

[<sup>14</sup> Symmach. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xl. can. 1. col. 193; where in quo si desunt bona.]

[<sup>15</sup> Recipit, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>16</sup> Ibid. Dist. xix. Gloss. in can. 2. col. 81; where recipit.]

[<sup>17</sup> Portemus onera omnium qui gravantur; quinimo hæc portat in nobis beatus apostolus Petrus, ejus vice fungimur legatione, et ejus regula informamur. — Sixt. Papæ II. Epist. ii. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 163.]

[<sup>18</sup> Hieron. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xl. can. 2. col. 194; where non sanctorum filii sunt.]

[<sup>19</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. Comm. in Matt. Tom. xii. 11. Tom. III. pp. 524, 5. See before, page 340.]

[<sup>20</sup> Ven. Bede. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In Luc. Evang. cap. xxii. Lib. vi. Tom. V. col. 426. Bede here declares that Christ intended to teach all the apostles by what he said to Peter; but he does not say that he prayed for all. See also in Matt. Evang. cap. xvi. Lib. iii. Tom. V. col. 52.]

[<sup>21</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cler. et Pleb. Hisp. Epist. lxvii. p. 171.]

[<sup>22</sup> Nicol. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xxxii. can. 5. col. 156. See before, page 70, note 5.]

Whether  
the Pope  
may err.

Iren. Lib. iv.  
cap. xliii.

August.  
in Johan.  
Tract. 46.

saith: *Presbyteris illis, qui sunt in ecclesia, obaudire oportet, . . . qui successionem, habent ab apostolis; qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt*<sup>1</sup>: "We ought to obey the bishops in the church, that have their succession from the apostles; which, together with the succession of the bishopric, have received the certain gift of the truth, according to the will of the Father." This holy father saith bishops must be heard and obeyed with a limitation; that is, not all, whatsoever they be, or whatsoever they say, but that have the undoubted gift of God's truth. And, for that M. Harding seemeth to claim by the authority of the scribes and Pharisees, saying, "They sit in Moses' chair; and that therefore we ought to do that they say;" St Augustine expoundeth the same place in this sort: *Sedendo in cathedra legem Dei docent: ergo per illos Deus docet. Sua vero si illi docere velint, nolite audire, nolite facere*<sup>2</sup>: "By sitting in the chair (is meant) they teach the law of God; therefore it is God that teacheth by them. But if they will teach any thing of their own (as the church of Rome had<sup>3</sup> done, and yet doth above number), then," saith St Augustine, "hear it not, then do it not."

#### M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-THIRD DIVISION.

The hundred  
and ninth  
untruth.  
For the  
bishops of  
the east  
never yielded  
such subjec-  
tion to the  
pope.

Now, that the bishop of Rome had always cure and rule over all other bishops, (109) specially them of the east (for touching them of the west church it is generally confessed), beside a hundred other evident arguments, this is one very sufficient, that he had in the east, to do his stead, three delegates or vicars; now commonly they be named legates: and this for the commodity of the bishops there, whose churches were far distant from Rome. The one was the bishop of Constantinople, as we find it mentioned In Epistola Simplicii ad Achatium Constantinopolitanum<sup>4</sup>. The second was the bishop of Alexandria, as the epistle of Bonifacius the second to Eulalius recordeth<sup>5</sup>. The third was the bishop of Thessalonica, as it is at large declared in the 82nd epistle of Leo, Ad Anastasium Thessalonicensem<sup>6</sup>. By perusing these epistles every man may see, that all the bishops of Greece, Asia, Syria, Egypt, and, to be short, of all the orient, rendered and exhibited their humble obedience to the bishop of Rome, and to his arbitrement referred their doubts, complaints, and causes, and to him only made their appellations.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

What we may think of the other hundred proofs, which M. Harding, as he saith, hath left untouched, it may the sooner appear, for that this one proof, that is here brought forth instead of all, is not only untrue, but also utterly without any shadow or colour of truth. These authorities of Leo, Symmachus<sup>7</sup>, and Bonifacius, forasmuch as they are alleged without words, may likewise be passed over without answer. Howbeit this Bonifacius the second, in defence of this quarrel, is forced to say that St Augustine, that godly father, and all other the bishops of Africa, Numidia, Pentapolis, and other countries adjoining, that withstood the proud attempt of the bishops of Rome, and found out their open forgery in falsifying the Nicene council, were altogether inflamed and led by the devil<sup>8</sup>.

But how doth this appear to M. Harding, that the bishop of Rome had all the bishops of the east in subjection, to use and command them as his servants? In what council was it ever decreed it should be so? who subscribed it? who recorded it? who ever saw such canons? The best plea that pope Nicolas can

[<sup>1</sup> Iren. Op. Par. 1710. Contr. Hær. Lib. iv. cap. xxvi. 2. p. 262; where *quapropter eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire*.]

[<sup>2</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. In Johan. Evang. cap. x. Tractat. xli. 6. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 604; where *sedendo enim cathedram Moysi legem, and illi si velint docere*.]

[<sup>3</sup> Hath, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>4</sup> Simpl. ad Acac. Epist. iv. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 957. There is little or

nothing to the point in this epistle. See however Ad Zenon. Spalens. Epist. i. ibid. pp. 956, 7.]

[<sup>5</sup> Bonifac. II. ad Eulal. Epist. in eod. Tom. I. pp. 1057, 8.]

[<sup>6</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Anastas. Thessal. Epist. lxxxiv. cap. i. cols. 446, &c.]

[<sup>7</sup> A mere mistake for Simplicius.]

[<sup>8</sup> Aurelius . . . cum collegis suis (instigante diabolo) superbire . . . cepit. — Bonifac. II. ad Eulal. Epist. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 1058.]

make in this behalf is, that Peter was first bishop of Antioch, and after Rome<sup>9</sup>; and St Mark, his scholar, bishop of Alexandria. Hereof he thinketh it may very well and substantially be gathered, that the bishops of Rome ought to have all the world in subjection<sup>10</sup>. Indeed in the counterfeit charter or donation of the emperor Constantine authority is given to the bishop of Rome over the other four patriarchs, of Antioch, of Alexandria, of Constantinople, and of Hierusalem<sup>11</sup>. But the bishops of Rome themselves and of themselves devised and forged this charter, and that so fondly that a very child may easily espy the folly. For, beside a great number of other untruths, at that very time, when it is imagined that charter was drawn, there was neither patriarch, nor bishop, nor priest, nor church in Constantinople, nor the city itself yet built, nor known to the world by that name. This notwithstanding, the bishop of Rome upon this simple title hath beset his mitre with three crowns, in token that he hath the universal power over the three divisions of the world, Europa, Asia, and Africa. And so, as the king of Persia in old times entitled himself *frater solis et lunæ*; even so pope Nicolas calleth himself "the prince of all lands and countries"<sup>12</sup>.

Nicol. Papa  
ad Michael.  
Imper.

But what duty the bishops of the east parts owed to the bishops of Rome, whosoever hath read and considered the story and practice of the times may soon perceive. First, the council of Nice appointed every of the three patriarchs to his several charge<sup>13</sup>, none of them to interrupt or trouble other, and willed the bishop of Rome, as Rufinus reporteth the story, to oversee *ecclesias suburbanas*<sup>14</sup>, which were the churches within his province; and therefore Athanasius calleth Rome the chief or mother-city of the Roman jurisdiction<sup>15</sup>. And for that cause the bishops of the east, in their epistle unto Julius, call him their fellow-servant<sup>16</sup>; and Cyrillus the bishop of Alexandria, writing unto Cœlestinus, calleth him his brother<sup>17</sup>. Fellows and brothers be titles of equality, and not of subjection.

Nicol. Papa  
ad Michael.  
Imper.  
Principes  
super omnem  
terram.  
Concil.  
Nicen. can. 6.

Rufin. Lib. i.  
cap. vi.  
Athan. in  
Epist. ad  
solitariam  
vitam  
agentes.  
Metropolis  
Romane  
ditionis.  
Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxiv.  
Cyril. Epist.  
27. p. 294.

Certain it is that sundry of the bishops of Rome began very rathe to seek this pre-eminence, even with manifest forgery and corruption of councils, as is already proved. But the bishops of other countries never yielded unto them, nor understood these vain titles. The bishops of the east, writing unto Julius, allege that the faith that then was in Rome came first from them, and that their churches, as Sozomenus writeth, "ought not to be accounted inferior to the church of Rome<sup>18</sup>," and, as Socrates further reporteth, "that they ought not to be ordered by the Roman bishop<sup>19</sup>." Gennadius the bishop of Constantinople, together with the council there, thus writeth unto the bishop of Rome: *Curet sanctitas tua universas tuas custodias, tibi que subjectos episcopos*<sup>20</sup>: "Let thy holiness see unto thine own charge, and unto the bishops appointed unto thee."

Sozom. Lib.  
iii. cap. viii.  
οὐ παρὰ  
ταῦτα τὰ  
δευτερεῖα  
φέρειν  
ἤξιουν.  
Socrat. Lib.  
ii. cap. xv.

The council of Alexandria committed the visitation and reforming of all the churches in the east unto Asterius, and of all the churches in the west unto Eusebius the bishop of Vercellæ<sup>21</sup>: by authority of which commission, Eusebius, together with Hilarius, visited and corrected all the churches of Illyricum, France, and Italy<sup>22</sup>. A man might say, Where was then the universal power of the bishop of Rome? St Basil saith: "The state and safety of the church of Antioch dependeth of Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria<sup>23</sup>," and not (as M. Harding

μη δαὲν κα-  
νοῦν ἔσθαι  
παρ' αὐτοῦ.  
Rufin. Lib. i.  
cap. xxix.  
Rufin. Lib. i.  
cap. xxx. et  
xxxi.

Basil. Epist.  
48.

[<sup>9</sup> Of Rome, 1665, 1609.]

[<sup>10</sup> Nicol. Papæ I. ad Michael. Imp. Epist. in eod. Tom. II. p. 758.]

[<sup>11</sup> Edict. Constant. Imp. in eod. Tom. I. p. 226.]

[<sup>12</sup> Nicol. Papæ I. ad Michael. Imp. in eod. Tom. II. p. 758; where *principes*.]

[<sup>13</sup> Concil. Nic. can. 6. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. II. col. 32.]

[<sup>14</sup> ...hic suburbicarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat.—Hist. Eccles. Par. Lib. x. cap. vi. fol. 107. 2.]

[<sup>15</sup> ...μητρόπολις ἡ Πάμῃ τῆς Πρωμανίας ἐστίν.—Athan. Op. Par. 1698. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. 35. Tom. I. Pars i. p. 364.]

[<sup>16</sup> ...scriperunt Julio comministro nostro, ecclesie

Romane pontifici, &c.—Litt. Sard. Concil. in Hist. Tripart. Par. Lib. iv. cap. xxiv. fol. F. 8. 2.]

[<sup>17</sup> Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1635. Ad Cœlest. Epist. Tom. V. Pars II. p. 36. Cyril does not, it would seem, use the word brother; but he addresses Cœlestine as one τῶν συλλειτουργῶν.]

[<sup>18</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. III. cap. viii. p. 414; where τούτο δὲ τὰ.]

[<sup>19</sup> Socrat. in eod. Lib. II. cap. xv. p. 76.]

[<sup>20</sup> Epist. Synod. Concil. Constant. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. IV. col. 1030. This is stated to have been a circular letter.]

[<sup>21</sup> Hist. Eccles. Lib. x. cap. xxix. fol. 116. 2.]

[<sup>22</sup> Id. ibid. capp. xxx. xxxi. fol. 117.]

[<sup>23</sup> Ἡ μέντοι τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκκλη-

here saith) of the bishop of Rome. And therefore he desireth Athanasius to see unto it.

Cod. De Sacrosanct. Eccl. Leg. 6.

Dist. 22. Renov. in Gloss.

Cod. De Sacros. Eccl. Leg. 6.

Liter. Synod.

Gregor. Lib. i. Epist. 24, 25. et Lib. vi. Epist. 5.

Gregor. Lib. vii. Epist. 30.

Paul. Æmil. in Hist. Gall. Lib. viii.

The emperors Honorius and Theodosius appointed over all matters of doubt, arising within the country of Illyricum, to be heard and ended before the bishop of Constantinople, and not before the bishop of Rome<sup>1</sup>. And the very gloss upon the decrees, expounding that same law of Honorius and Theodosius, hath these words: *Imperator dicit, quod [patriarcha Constantinopolitanus] habet idem in suis subditis, quod papa [habet] in suis*<sup>2</sup>: "The emperor saith, the patriarch of Constantinople hath the same authority over the people of his province, that the pope hath over his." The emperor's words be these: *Constantinopolitana ecclesia Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur*<sup>3</sup>: "The church of Constantinople enjoyeth now the prerogative of old Rome." And therefore, for more proof hereof, whensoever any patriarch, in any of these four principal sees, was newly chosen, he wrote letters of conference and friendship unto the other patriarchs; wherein every of them declared unto other their religion and consent of faith. Thus did the bishop of Rome unto others, and thus did others unto him<sup>4</sup>. This is an infallible<sup>5</sup> token that their authority was equal, and none of them had power and government over his fellows. And therefore, when Eulogius the bishop of Alexandria had written thus unto Gregory, being then bishop of Rome, *Sicut jussistis*, "As ye commanded;" Gregory utterly shunned and refused that kind of writing; for thus he answereth him: *Hoc verbum jussionis, quæso, a meo auditu remove. Scio enim quis sim, et qui sitis. Loco . . . mihi fratres estis; moribus patres. Non ergo jussi, sed quæ utilia visa sunt indicare curavi*<sup>6</sup>: "I pray you, have away this word of commanding from my hearing. For I know both what I am, and also what you are. Touching your place, you are my brethren: touching manners, you are my fathers. Therefore I commanded you not, but only shewed you what I thought good."

Finally, for that Michael Palæologus, the emperor of the east parts, in the council holden at Lyons, about the year of our Lord 1442, after great entreaty made unto him by the bishop of Rome, had acknowledged the bishops of the east to be subject unto him; after he returned home again into his empire, and was dead, his clergy would not suffer him to be buried<sup>7</sup>. Yet, saith M. Harding, "all the bishops of Græcia, Asia, Syria, Ægypt, and, to be short, all the orient, rendered and exhibited their humble obedience to the bishop of Rome."

#### M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FOURTH DIVISION.

*Of the bishop of Rome his punishing of offenders by censures of the church and otherwise, as by excommunication<sup>8</sup>, ejection, deposition, and enjoining penance for transgressions, we have more examples than I think good to recite here. They that have knowledge of the ecclesiastical stories may remember, how Timotheus bishop of Alexandria was excommunicated with Peter his deacon by Simplicius the pope<sup>9</sup>, Nestorius bishop of Constantinople by Cælestinus, Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, with Arcadius the emperor and Eudoxia the empress, by Innocentius, for their wicked demeanour toward Chrysostom; how Dioscorus bishop of Alexandria was deposed, though the whole second Ephesine council stood in his defence; how Peter bishop of Antioch was not only put out of his bishopric, but also of all priestly honour; how Photius was put out of the patri-*

[2. Corrections from the pope. H. A. 1564.]

σίας εὐταξία προδήλως τῆς σῆς ἡρτηται θεοσεβείας.—Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. Ad Athanas. Epist. lxxvi. Tom. III. p. 159.]

[<sup>1</sup> Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Cod. Lib. i. Tit. ii. 6. Tom. II. p. 6. See before, page 390.]

[<sup>2</sup> Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xxii. Gloss. in can. 6. col. 103; where *idem juris habet*.]

[<sup>3</sup> See before, page 390.]

[<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. i. Indict. ix. Ad Johan. Episc. et cet. Patr. Epist. xxv. Tom. II. cols. 507, &c. Ad Anastas.

Patr. Epist. xxvi. cols. 516, 7.

Id. Lib. vii. Indict. xv. Ad Cyriac. Episc. Epist. v. cols. 851, 2. See before, page 386, note 7.]

[<sup>5</sup> Unfallible, 1565.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. Lib. viii. Indict. i. Ad Eulog. Episc. Epist. xxx. Tom. II. col. 919. See before, page 346, note 5.]

[<sup>7</sup> Paul. Æm. De Reb. Gest. Franc. Par. 1544. Lib. viii. fol. 166. 2.]

[<sup>8</sup> Excommunications, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>9</sup> Decr. Simplic. Ex Libr. Pontif. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 956.]

archship of Constantinople, into which he was intruded by favour of Michael the emperor at the suit of his wicked uncle, by Nicolas the first<sup>10</sup>.

[Lib. iii. Epist. 13. H. A. 1864.] For proof of this authority, the epistle of Cyprian, which he wrote to Stephanus, pope in his time, against Martianus the bishop of Arlate in Gallia, maketh an evident argument. For that this Martianus became a maintainer of the heresy of Novatianus, and therewith seduced the faithful people, Cyprian, having intelligence of it by Faustinus from Lyons, advertised Stephanus of it, and moved him earnestly to direct his letters to the people of Arle, by authority of which Martianus should be deposed and another put in his room, "to the intent (saith he there) the flock of Christ, which, hitherto by him scattered abroad and wounded, is contemned, may be gathered together<sup>11</sup>." Which St Cyprian would not have written, had the bishop of Rome had no such authority.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This reason maketh no great proof. For it was ever lawful, not only to the bishop of Rome, but also to all other bishops, both to rebuke, and also to excommunicate wicked doers. Anthymus with his fellows was excommunicate by every of the patriarchal sees<sup>12</sup>; Paulus Samosatenus, as Nicephorus saith, by all the bishops under heaven<sup>13</sup>; Auxentius and Jovinianus by St Ambrose<sup>14</sup>; Dioscorus and Eutyches by the council of Constantinople<sup>15</sup>; Cyrillus, albeit he were a catholic and a godly bishop, by all the bishops of the east<sup>16</sup>. Yet were none of these, that thus used the right of excommunication, either bishops of Rome, or heads of the universal church. And, whereas M. Harding saith, we may remember by the ecclesiastical stories, that Innocentius the bishop of Rome excommunicated Arcadius the emperor<sup>17</sup>, it may please him also to remember, by the same ecclesiastical stories, that St Ambrose excommunicated the emperor Theodosius<sup>18</sup>; and Anastasius the bishop of Antioch both by private letters reproved the emperor Justinian for his heresy, and also oftentimes said of him openly in the church: "Whosoever followeth<sup>19</sup> any other gospel, accursed be he<sup>20</sup>." Yet was neither St Ambrose nor Anastasius the bishop of Rome.

As for the execution of sentence, and depriving, or deposing of bishops, M. Harding knoweth the bishop of Rome's authority was too weak. And therefore Innocentius saith of Pelagius: *Quibus acceptis literis, aut quando committet se nostro iudicio*<sup>21</sup>? "Upon what letters, or when will he yield himself to my judgment?" For this cause Felix the bishop of Rome prayed aid of the emperor Zeno; and the emperor answered: *Admisimus depositionem Anthymi*<sup>22</sup>: "We have admitted the deposition of Anthymus:" otherwise the pope's sentence had been in vain. And therefore the emperor Constantinus saith of himself: *Si quis episcoporum inconsulte tumultuatus sit, ministri Dei, hoc est, mea executione illius audacia coercetur*<sup>23</sup>: "If any bishop undiscreeitly rear tumult, his rashness shall be repressed by the hands of God's minister, that is, by my execution." And

Concil. Constant. v. Act. i. Niceph. Lib. vi. cap. xxviii. Ambros. Lib. x. Epist. 81. Concil. Constant. v. Act. v. Concil. Chalced. Act. x. Niceph. Lib. xiii. cap. xxiv. Theod. Lib. v. cap. xviii.

Evagr. Lib. iv. cap. xl.

Inter Decret. Innocent. Concil.

Constant. v. Act. i. Concil. Constant. v. Act. iv.

Theod. Lib. i. cap. xix.

[<sup>10</sup> Nearly all these are, with others, enumerated by Pighius.—Pigh. Hierarch. Eccles. Assert. Col. 1538. Lib. vi. cap. xiii. foll. 250, 1.]

[<sup>11</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Steph. Epist. lxxviii. pp. 176, &c.]

[<sup>12</sup> Concil. Constant. sub Menna, Act. iv. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. V. cols. 85, &c., 89, &c. Concil. Hieros. in eod. Tom. V. cols. 280, &c. See also Crabb. Concil. Quint. Synod. Constant. Act. iv. Tom. II. pp. 85, &c.; where are recorded the sentences against Anthimus by the council of Constantinople and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem.]

[<sup>13</sup> ...τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκκήρυκτος γίνεταί.—Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. Lut. Par. 1630. Lib. vi. cap. xxviii. Tom. I. p. 422.]

[<sup>14</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Ad Syric. Epist. xlii. 14. Tom. II. col. 969.]

[<sup>15</sup> Constant. Concil. in Concil. Chalced. Act. i. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. IV. cols. 243, 5. See also Concil. Chalced. Act. iiii. in eod.

cols. 423, &c.]

[<sup>16</sup> Concil. Chalced. Act. x. in eod. Epist. Ib. Episc. Edess. Tom. IV. col. 663.]

[<sup>17</sup> Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. Lib. xiii. cap. xxxiv. Tom. II. pp. 419, 20.]

[<sup>18</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. v. cap. xviii. pp. 220, &c.]

[<sup>19</sup> Follow, 1565.]

[<sup>20</sup> Evagr. in eod. Lib. iv. cap. xl. p. 416.]

[<sup>21</sup> Rescr. Innoc. ad Aurel. et cet. Epist. xxvii. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 480. See before, page 394, note 6.]

[<sup>22</sup> There was an epistle of Felix written to Zeno, praying him to confirm the deposition of Petrus Fullo, bishop of Antioch, in eod. Tom. II. pp. 18, 19. But see Const. Justin. contr. Antim. &c. in Quint. Synod. Constant. Act. i. in eod. Tom. II. pp. 61, &c. See also Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. IV. cols. 1069, &c., Tom. V. cols. 264, &c.]

[<sup>23</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. i. cap. xx. p. 51.]



Authen. De  
Eccles.

Divers. Capit.  
κατὰ τὴν  
τοῦ παρόν-  
τος νόμου  
δύναμιν.

likewise the emperor Justinian hath set out a law in this sort: *Si quis episcopus definitum tempus emanserit, &c.*<sup>1</sup>: "If any bishop tarry out his time appointed, and being called home refuse to come, let him be deprived and put from his church, and another better chosen in his room:" he addeth, "by the virtue of this present law." By the force of this law bishops were deposed; for without it the pope was not able to put his sentence in execution.

Now, if M. Harding will reason thus:

The pope excommunicated other bishops;

*Ergo*, he was head of the church:

then of the same principle we may well to the contrary reason thus:

The pope himself was excommunicate by other bishops;

*Ergo*, the pope was not the head of the church.

For the antecedent, that the pope was pronounced excommunicate by other bishops, it is out of question. For it is recorded in the ecclesiastical story, that Julius, being bishop of Rome, was excommunicate by the bishops of the east<sup>2</sup>; pope Leo was excommunicate by Dioscorus<sup>3</sup>; \*pope Vigilius was excommunicate by Menna the bishop of Constantinople<sup>4</sup>; and pope Honorius was excommunicate by the sixth council holden at Constantinople<sup>5</sup>.

Sozom. Lib.  
iii. cap. xi.  
Dist. 21.  
In tantum.  
\* Niceph.  
Lib. xvii.  
cap. xxvi.  
Council.  
Constant. vi.  
Act. xiii.

Sozom. Lib.  
iii. cap. xi.  
καθεύλον  
'Ιούλιον  
τὸν 'Ρώμης  
ἐπίσκοπον.  
In Vita Vigil.

Or, if M. Harding repose more force in deposing of bishops than in excommunication, then let him likewise remember, that pope Julius was deposed by the bishops of the east, as it is recorded by Sozomenus<sup>6</sup>; pope Hildebrand by the council of Brixia<sup>7</sup>; pope John by the council of Constance; pope Eugenius by the council of Basil; and two popes together, Sylverius and Vigilius, by the emperor Justinian<sup>8</sup>. Thus M. Harding's own grounds overthrow his whole building, and conclude plainly against himself.

#### M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FIFTH DIVISION.

*For the pope's authority concerning confirmation of the ordinances<sup>9</sup> and elections of (110) all bishops, many examples might easily be alleged; as the request made to Julius by the ninety Arian bishops assembled in council at<sup>10</sup> Antioch against Athanasius, that he would vouchsafe to ratify and confirm those that they had chosen in place of Athanasius, Paulus, Marcellus, and others, whom<sup>11</sup> they had condemned and deprived<sup>12</sup>.*

[3. Confirmations  
by the pope. H. A.  
1564.]

The hundred  
and tenth  
untruth.  
For the  
bishop of  
Rome con-  
firmed the  
bishops of  
his own  
province, but  
not all  
bishops  
throughout  
the world.

*Also the earnest suit which Theodosius the emperor made to Leo for confirmation of Anatolius, and likewise that Martianus the emperor made to him for confirmation of Proterius, both bishops of Alexandria, as it appeareth by their letters written to Leo in their favour. And as for Anatolius, Leo would not in any wise order and confirm him, unless he would first profess that he believed and held the doctrine which was contained in Leo his epistle to Flavianus, and would further by writing witness that he agreed with Cyrillus and the other catholic fathers against Nestorius<sup>13</sup>. For this, if nothing else could be alleged, the testimony of holy Gregory were sufficient to make good credit; who, understanding that Maximus was ordered bishop of Salonæ, a city in Illyrico, without the authority and confirmation of the see apostolic, standing in doubt lest perhaps that had been done by commandment of Mauritius the emperor, who did many other things wickedly, thereof writeth to Constantina the empress thus: Salonitanæ... civitatis episcopus me ac responsali meo nesciente ordinatus est; et facta est*

[Vide Leonis  
Epist. 13. H. A.  
1564.]

[<sup>1</sup> ...καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐντὸς τοῦ ὀριζομένου παρὰ τῶν ἱερῶν χρόνων ὑποστρέψουσιν εἰς τὰς ἰδίαις ἐκκλησίαις, αὐτοὺς μὲν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐξωθεῖσθαι, ἑτέροις δὲ ἀντ' αὐτῶν καλλίονας χειροτονεῖσθαι, κατὰ κ. τ. λ.—Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Auth. Coll. ix. Tit. vi. Novell. cxxiii. 9. Tom. II. p. 170.]

[<sup>2</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 417.]

[<sup>3</sup> Nicol. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xxi. can. 9. col. 99.]

[<sup>4</sup> Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. Lut. Par. 1630. Lib. xvii. cap. xxvi. Tom. II. p. 774.]

[<sup>5</sup> Concil. Constant. iii. Act. xiiii. in Concil. Stud.

Labbe et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. VI. col. 943.]

[<sup>6</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 417.]

[<sup>7</sup> Concil. Brix. in Concil. Stud. Labbe et Cossart. Tom. X. col. 389.]

[<sup>8</sup> Ex Libr. Pontif. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. II. pp. 1, &c., 4, &c.]

[<sup>9</sup> Ordinations, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>10</sup> As, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>11</sup> to whom, 1611.]

[<sup>12</sup> Epist. Orient. ad Jul. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 307.]

[<sup>13</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Theodos. August. Epist. xxxiii. cols. 344, &c.]

res, quæ sub nullis anterioribus principibus evenit<sup>14</sup>: “The bishop of the city of Salonæ (saith he) is ordered, neither I nor my deputy<sup>15</sup> made privy to it. And herein that thing hath been done, which never happened in the time of any princes before our days.” Thus it appeareth that, before a thousand years past, bishops had their ordination and election confirmed by the see apostolic.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

If this reason may stand for good, and whosoever hath the allowing of the election or consecration of bishops must therefore be taken as head of the church, then must the church of necessity have many heads. For it is certain, the allowance hereof pertaineth to many. \*St Ambrose saith that “all the bishops, both of the east and of the west, gave their consent and allowance to his election<sup>16</sup>.” Theodosius the emperor, standing in the defence of Flavianus the bishop of Constantinople, saith “<sup>b</sup>that all the bishops of the east, of Asia, Pontus, Thracia, and Illyricum, had allowed his election<sup>17</sup>.” \*Eudoxius entered into the bishopric of Antioch without the allowance and consent of Gregorius<sup>18</sup> the bishop of Laodicea, and of Marcus the bishop of Arethusa, and of other bishops that had interest therein; and is reprovèd for the same<sup>19</sup>. <sup>d</sup>Gregorius Presbyter saith: For that the election and installation of Gregory Nazianzene was past before the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia were come, and so made without their consent, that therefore they utterly refused to allow him, or to admit him as bishop there, not for any misliking in the party, but for that they thought themselves defrauded of their voices<sup>20</sup>.

Anacletus decreeth thus: *Episcopus non minus quam a tribus episcopis, reliquisque omnibus assensum præbentibus, ullatenus ordinetur*<sup>21</sup>: “Let a bishop in no wise be ordered of less than three bishops, all the rest giving their assent to the same.”

Hereby it appeareth that, to the ratifying of the election of any one bishop, the consent of all other bishops within that province was thought necessary: which consent they testified among themselves, by writing letters of conference one to another. And therefore, when John the bishop of Constantinople had entitled himself the universal bishop, Gregory counselled Eulogius the bishop of Alexandria, and other bishops of the east, neither to write to him, nor to receive letters from him by that title<sup>22</sup>. Likewise the bishops of the east, when they had excommunicate Julius the bishop of Rome, gave commandment that no man should either receive his letters or write unto him, in token they held him for no bishop<sup>23</sup>.

Neither did only bishops allow such elections, but also both the prince and the people. When St Ambrose, being once chosen and appointed bishop of Milan, began roughly to deal with the nobles of the court, and to rebuke their faults, the emperor Valentinian said: “All this I knew before; and therefore I not only said not nay, but also gave my voice and assent to his election<sup>24</sup>.”

Touching the election of Nectarius, Sozomenus writeth in this wise: The bishops that were present at the election gave unto the emperor in writing sundry

[<sup>14</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xliii. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Tom. II. col. 752; where *facta res est*.]

[<sup>15</sup> Depute, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>16</sup> Tamen ordinationem meam occidentales episcopi judicio, orientales etiam exemplo probarunt.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Ad Eccles. Vercell. Epist. lxiii. 65. Tom. II. col. 1037.]

[<sup>17</sup> ...καὶ τῆς ἑσῶς αἱ κ. τ. λ. πρὸς δὲ τῇ ἑσῶς καὶ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν ἅπασαν καὶ Ποντικὴν, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὴν Θρακικὴν κοινωνούσας ἔχει καὶ συνημμένας· καὶ τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν δὲ ἅπαν ἐκέινον οἶδε τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἐπισκόπων ἡγούμενον.—Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. v. cap. xxiii. p. 231.]

[<sup>18</sup> Georgius, 1565, and 1609.]

[<sup>19</sup> ...Εὐδόξιος...καταλαμβάνει τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ περιποιεῖται ἐαυτῷ τὴν ἐνθάδε ἐπισκοπὴν, μὴτε Γεωργίου τοῦ Λαοδικείας ἐπισκόπου, μὴτε Μάρκου

τοῦ Ἀρεθοῦσης...μήτε κ. τ. λ.—Sozom. in eod. Lib. iv. cap. xii. p. 450.]

[<sup>20</sup> Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. Vit. S. Gregor. Tom. I. p. clv.]

[<sup>21</sup> ...episcopus...est ordinandus...nullatenus minus quam a tribus, ceteris consentientibus cunctis, &c.—Anaclet. Epist. ii. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 61.]

[<sup>22</sup> State fortes, state securi: scripta cum universalis nominis falsitate nec dare umquam, nec suscipere præsumatis.—Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xliii. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Epist. xliii. Tom. II. col. 773.]

[<sup>23</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 417.]

[<sup>24</sup> Ταύτην σου, ἔφη ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ πάλαι ἤδει τὴν παρῤῥησιαν· καὶ σαφῶς ἐπιστάμενος οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀντεῖπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κ. τ. λ.—Theodor. in eod. Lib. iv. cap. vii. p. 158.]

\* Ambros. Lib. x. Epist. 82.

<sup>b</sup> Theod. Lib. v. cap. xxiii. αἱ τῆς ἑσῶς ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Φλαβιανοῦ προεδρίας ἀντέχονται.

\* Sozom. Lib. iv. cap. xii. μήτε τῶν ἄλλων οἷς ἡ χειροτονία διέφερε συνθεμένον.

<sup>d</sup> Gregor. Presb. in Vita Naz. Ἀντέλεγον τῇ ψήφῳ.

Anaclet. Epist. 2.

Gregor. Lib. iv. Epist. 36.

Sozom. Lib. iii. cap. xi.

Theod. Lib. iv. cap. vii. καὶ σύμψηφος τῆς χειροτονίας γεγέννημαι.

Sozom. Lib. vii. cap. viii. τὸν δακτύλιον ἐπιθεῖς τῇ τελευταίᾳ γραφῇ.

names of such as they thought meet for that room: the emperor, weighing the persons, set his seal upon Nectarius' name, and elected him<sup>1</sup>.

Gregor. Naz. *ἔγκαθεδρῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῷ θρόνῳ.*  
 Gratianus the emperor at his coming to Constantinople embraced Gregory Nazianzene, and, after some conference with him had, said unto him: "O father, unto thee, and unto thy labours, God through us committeth this church. Behold, I give unto thee this holy house, and the stall. And the people besought the emperor to set the bishop in his chair<sup>2</sup>."

Anacl. Epist. 2. The like might be said of the consent and allowance of the people. Anacletus, as he is commonly alleged, writeth thus: *Sacerdotes a proprio ordinentur episcopo, ita ut cives et alii sacerdotes assensum præbeant*<sup>3</sup>: "Let priests be ordered by their own several bishops, so that the people and other priests give their assent thereto."

Cypr. Lib. i. Epist. 4. St Cyprian saith likewise: "The people, being obedient unto God's commandments, hath power especially<sup>4</sup> either to choose worthy priests or to refuse the unworthy<sup>5</sup>."

Cypr. Lib. iv. Epist. 2. Thus many voices were then thought necessary to the admission of any bishop. Therefore this seemeth no sufficient ground to prove that the bishop of Rome is head of the church. For M. Harding might soon have seen that the bishop of Rome himself, touching his own election, was wont to be allowed by other bishops. Verily, St Cyprian writeth thus of the allowance of Cornelius, bishop there: *Ut Cornelium . . . noveris . . . coepiscoporum testimonio, quorum numerus universus per . . . mundum concordî unanimitate consensit*<sup>6</sup>: "That thou mayest know Cornelius by the testimony of his fellow-bishops, the whole number of whom throughout the world hath agreed (to the allowing of his election) with one consent." Afterward, in an epistle unto Cornelius himself, he writeth thereof more at large: *Ad comprobendam ordinationem tuam, facta auctoritate majore, placuit ut per episcopos omnes omnino in ista provincia positos literæ fierent, . . . ut te universi collegæ nostri, et communicationem tuam, id est, ecclesiæ catholicæ unitatem, pariter et caritatem probarent, pariter et tenerent*<sup>7</sup>: "To allow thy consecration, more authority being gathered, I thought it good that letters should be sent unto all the bishops of this province, that all our brethren might both allow and hold both thee and thy communion, that is to say, the unity of the catholic church." If M. Harding will say, this was not the confirmation of the election of Cornelius, it followeth immediately: *Sic . . . episcopatus tui . . . veritas, pariter et dignitas, apertissima luce et manifestissima et firmissima confirmatione fundata est*<sup>8</sup>: "This is the truth and dignity of thy bishopric, founded in the open light, and with most manifest and most certain confirmation." Thus, whensoever any bishop was either installed or deposed, knowledge thereof was given unto the other bishops, and the same either allowed or disallowed by his brethren.

Concil. Constant. v. Act. ii. But that the bishop of Rome ordered and admitted all the bishops throughout the world, besides that it hath no possibility, or colour of truth in itself, it is also easy by good record and authority to be reproved. Agapetus bishop of Rome, about the year of our Lord 540, after he had, upon occasion, consecrate Menna the bishop of Constantinople, he uttered these words in commendation of the party: *Et hoc dignitati ejus (Mennæ) accidere credimus, quod a temporibus Petri apostoli nullum alium unquam orientalis ecclesia suscepit episcopum manibus nostræ*

[<sup>1</sup> ...ἄλλοι μὲν ἄλλους ἐνέγραψαν... ἀναγνοὺς δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐγγραφέντων τὸν κατάλογον, ἔστη ἐπὶ Νεκταρίῳ· καὶ σύνοικον γενόμενος, σχολῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐβουλεύετο, τὸν κ. τ. λ. καὶ ἀναδραμῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν, αὐθις πάντας ἐπανῆλθε. καὶ Νεκτάριον αἰρεῖται.—Sozom. in eod. Lib. vii. cap. viii. p. 579.]

[<sup>2</sup> Καὶ τῆνικαῦτα προσδέξασθαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα Γρηγόριον ἐντίμως...καὶ τέλος εἰπεῖν ὦ πάτερ, σοὶ τε καὶ τοῖς ἰδρώσι τοῖς σοῖς δι' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἐγχειρίζει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ἰδοὺ δίδωμι σοὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἱερόν, καὶ τὸν θρόνον.....τὸν τε βασιλέα ἱκέτευον ἐγκαθιδρῶσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῷ θρόνῳ.—Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. Vit. S. Gregor. Tom. I. p. cli. clii. The emperor was Theodosius.]

[<sup>3</sup> Anaclet. Epist. ii. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 59.]

[<sup>4</sup> Specially, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>5</sup> ...plebs obsequens præceptis dominicis...habere potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cler. et Pleb. Hisp. Epist. lxvii. p. 171.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. ad Anton. Epist. lv. p. 103.]

[<sup>7</sup> ...placuit ut per episcopos...ad comprobendam ordinationem tuam facta auctoritate majore... per omnes omnino istos positos &c....catholicæ ecclesiæ &c., probarent firmiter ac &c.—Id. ad Cornel. Epist. xlviii. p. 91.]

[<sup>8</sup> Id. ibid.; where *comprobatione* for *confirmatione*.]

[<sup>9</sup> Accedere, 1565, 1609.]

*sedis ordinatum*<sup>10</sup>: "And this is an augmentation of Menna's dignity, that, sithence the time of Peter the apostle, the east church never received any other bishop consecrate by the hands of our see." Now advise thyself<sup>11</sup>, good reader, whether thou wilt believe pope Agapetus or M. Harding.

And let not M. Harding find fault, for that I place the ordering of bishops instead of their confirmation. For he himself seemeth to make confirmation and ordering both one thing, or at least to join them both together. These be his words: "Leo would not in any wise order and confirm Anatolius."

Truly Liberatus saith, the manner was in Alexandria, that whosoever was chosen bishop there should come to the bier, and lay his predecessor's hand upon his head, and put on St Mark's cloke, and then was he sufficiently confirmed bishop, without any mention made of Rome<sup>12</sup>. And St Cyprian writeth unto the bishops of Spain, that Sabinus, whom they had lawfully chosen bishop, should so continue still, yea, notwithstanding Cornelius, being then bishop of Rome, misliked him, and would not confirm him<sup>13</sup>. And that very counterfeit decree of Anacletus, that requireth all bishops once in the year to present themselves in Rome, extendeth not his commandment throughout all the world, but only to the bishops of the province of Rome. Thus stand the words: *Omnes episcopi, qui hujus apostolicæ sedis ordinationi subjacent, &c.*<sup>14</sup>: "All bishops that be bound to have their orders confirmed by this apostolic see, &c." Whereby it may be gathered, that other bishops were not subject to the ordinance of that see. And this was the fault that Gregory found in the bishop of Salonæ, that, being within the jurisdiction of his province, he was consecrate without his knowledge. And that Gregory meant it not of all bishops, but only of the bishops within his own charge, it is evident by his words. For thus he writeth: *Episcopi mei: episcopi mihi commissi*<sup>15</sup>: "My bishops: bishops being within my cure." And that the city of Salonæ, standing in Illyricum, was sometime within the province of Rome, it is plain by the epistle that Damasus the bishop of Rome sent unto the bishops of Illyricum. These be his words: *Par est, omnes qui sunt in orbe Romano magistros consentire*<sup>16</sup>: "It is meet that all the teachers that be within the precincts of the Roman jurisdiction agree together."

Whereas it is alleged, that the bishop of Rome was required to ratify the election of Flavianus, Anatolius, and of the Arian bishops; that was meant of a general allowance, such as was common to all bishops, specially to the four principal patriarchs, and not only to the bishop of Rome. Neither was the bishop of Rome's admission thought so necessary, as if he only had a voice negative, to take in and put<sup>17</sup> out whom he listed; but only of congruity and consent, that it might appear, there was no bishop in the church but was liked and allowed of all his brethren. For otherwise the bishops of the east wrote thus unto Julius: *Si...ordinatos [a nobis] episcopos, &c.*<sup>18</sup>: "If you will allow the bishops that we have ordered, we will be at peace, and communicate with you; if not, we will proclaim the contrary." And the emperor Gratian made Nectarius bishop of Constantinople contrary to the minds of the most part of the bishops<sup>19</sup>. Therefore M. Harding's argument might better have been framed thus: The bishop of Rome confirmed the bishops within his own province, and had no other special authority to confirm all other bishops in the world, no more than others had to confirm him; therefore he was not then taken for the head of the church, nor was thought to have this universal power.

Liberat. cap. xx.

Cypr. Lib. i. Epist. 4.

Anacl. Epist. 3. Dist. 93. Juxta sanct.

Gregor. Lib. iv. Epist. 34.

Sozom. Lib. vi. cap. xxiii. πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῷ Ῥωμαίων κόσμῳ διδασκάλους.

Sozom. Lib. iii. cap. viii.

Sozom. Lib. vii. cap. viii.

[<sup>10</sup> Concil. Constant. sub Menna, Act. ii. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. V. col. 46.]

[<sup>11</sup> Theeself, 1565.]

[<sup>12</sup> Liberat. Breviar. Par. 1675. cap. xx. p. 142.]

[<sup>13</sup> Quod et apud vos factum videmus in Sabini collegæ nostri ordinatione...episcopatus ei deferretur. ...Nec rescindere ordinationem jure perfectam potest, quod Basildes...Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum...fefellit &c.—Cypr. Op. Ad Cler. et Pleb. Hisp. Epist. lxxvii. pp. 172, 3.]

[<sup>14</sup> Anaclet. et Zach. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xciii.

can. 4. col. 441. See also in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 65.]

[<sup>15</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Tom. II. col. 752.]

[<sup>16</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. vi. cap. xxiii. p. 542.]

[<sup>17</sup> To put, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>18</sup> Epist. Orient. ad Jul. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 307. See also Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 414.]

[<sup>19</sup> Id. Lib. vii. cap. viii. pp. 579, 80.]

## M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION.

## Confirmation of Councils.

The hundred and eleventh untruth, standing in the wilful falsifying of the text.  
The hundred and twelfth untruth. For in those days the bishop of Rome had no authority to summon councils.

*That the bishops of Rome, by accustomed practice of the church, had authority to approve or disprove councils, I need to say nothing for proof of it, seeing that the ecclesiastical rule (as we read in the tripartite story) commandeth (111) that no council be celebrate and kept without the advice and authority of the pope<sup>1</sup>. Verily the councils holden at Ariminum, at Seleucia, at Syrmium, at Antiochia, and the<sup>2</sup> second time at Ephesus, for that they were (112) not summoned nor approved by the authority of the bishop of Rome, have not been accounted for lawful councils; but as well for that rejected, as also for their heretical determinations. The fathers assembled in the council of Nice sent their epistle to Sylvester the pope, beseeching him with his consent to ratify and confirm whatsoever they had ordained<sup>3</sup>. Isidorus witnesseth that the Nicene council had set forth rules, the which (saith he) the church of Rome received and confirmed<sup>4</sup>. The second general council holden at Constantinople was likewise allowed and approved by Damasus, specially requested by the fathers of the same thereto. So was the third council holden at Ephesus ratified and confirmed by Celestinus, who had there for his vicars or deputies<sup>5</sup> Cyrillus the famous bishop of Alexandria, and one Arcadius a bishop out of Italy. As for the fourth council kept at Chalcedon, the fathers thereof also, in their epistle to Leo the pope, subscribed with the hands of forty-four bishops, made humble request unto him to establish, fortify, and allow the decrees and ordinances of the same. This being found true for the four first chief councils, we need not to say any thing of the rest that followed. But for the sure proof of all this, that chiefly is to be alleged, that Constantius the Arian emperor made so importune and so earnest suit to Liberius the pope, to confirm the acts of the council holden at Antioch by the ninety Arian bishops, wherein Athanasius was deprived and put out of his bishopric. For he believed, as Ammianus Marcellinus writeth, that what had been done in that council should not stand and take effect, unless it had been approved and confirmed by the authority of the bishop of Rome, which he termeth the eternal city<sup>6</sup>.*

[4. The pope's approving of councils. H. A. 1564.]  
Lib. iv. cap. xix.

Quas Romana suscipiens confirmavit ecclesia.  
In præfatione Niceni Concilii.

Lib. xv.

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here M. Harding hath avouched two great untruths, the one in his translation in the English, the other in the allegation of the story. Touching the first, Cassiodorus in his Latin translation writeth thus: *Canones jubent, extra Romanum nihil decerni pontificem*<sup>7</sup>: Socrates in the Greek, out of which the Latin was taken, writeth thus: *μη δέιν παρά γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας*<sup>8</sup>. The English hereof is this: "It is provided by the canons, that rules to bind the church be not made without the consent of the bishop of Rome." Wherein M. Harding hath purposely corrupted and falsified altogether both the Greek and the Latin, not reporting one word that he found in the original: *κανονίζειν*, or *decernere*, he Englisheth "to keep," or, as he termeth it, "to celebrate" a council; *παρά γνώμην*, which is, *præter sententiam*, or, as Cassiodorus turneth it, *extra*, he Englisheth "without the advice and authority." No, he would not suffer, no not him in whose quarrel he thus fighteth, to pass without a venew<sup>9</sup>: for, where he saw him named in the Greek, *ἐπίσκοπον Ῥώμης*, and in the Latin, *Romanum pontificem*, "the Roman bishop," he thought it best to leave both the Greek and the Latin, and to call him the pope. And thus, to increase the pope's authority, he hath altered and corrupted the whole place, and not translated one word as he found it.

Touching the story, he saith the Arians' councils were not allowed, for that

[<sup>1</sup> See below, note 7.]

[<sup>2</sup> And at the, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>3</sup> Epist. Synod. Nic. ad Sylvestr. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 270. Little credit is to be attached to this epistle.]

[<sup>4</sup> Nam et nonnullæ regulæ subnexæ sunt, quas memorata suscipiens, &c.—Præfat. in Concil. Nic. in eod. Tom. I. p. 234.]

[<sup>5</sup> Deputes, 1563, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id enim ille [imperator], Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quoque, qua potiores æternæ urbis episcopi, firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti.—Amm. Marcell. Op. Par. 1681. Lib. xv. cap. vii. p. 92.]

[<sup>7</sup> Hist. Tripart. Par. Lib. iv. cap. xix. fol. F. 7.]

[<sup>8</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 79.]

[<sup>9</sup> Venew or venue: a bout in fencing.]

they were not summoned by the pope. And yet he knoweth right well, it was no part of the pope's office in those days to summon councils. For it is evident, even by the policy and practice of that time, that Constantinus the emperor summoned the council of Nice; Theodosius the first the council of Constantinople; Theodosius the second the council of Ephesus; and Marcianus the council of Chalcedon. And Socrates in his story saith thus: *Idcirco imperatores in historia complexus sum, quia ex quo tempore cœperunt esse christiani, ecclesiastica negotia pendent ab illis, et maxima concilia de illorum sententia et facta sunt, et fiunt*<sup>10</sup>: "Therefore I have comprised the emperors within my story; for that, sithence they began to be christened, the state of the church dependeth of them, and the greatest councils have been kept, and be still kept by their advice."

And the bishops in the council of Constantinople witness, that they were summoned to come to the Roman council by Damasus the bishop of Rome; but they add withal, "by warrant of the emperor's letters<sup>11</sup>," not by any his own authority. And likewise in their epistle to the emperor Theodosius they write thus: *Literis, quibus nos convocasti, ecclesiam honore prosecutus es*<sup>12</sup>: "Your majesty hath honoured the church by the letters wherewith ye summoned us together."

As for the bishop of Rome, he was not yet of authority able to call a general council. For the world as yet had no skill of his universal power over all others, neither would they have appeared upon his summon. Gregorius, being bishop of Rome, could not cause the bishop of Salonæ, being but one man, to come before him. Thus he writeth by way of complaint unto the empress Constantia: *Contempto me atque despecto, . . . ad me venire secundum jussionem dominorum noluit*<sup>13</sup>:

"He despised me, and set me at nought, and would not come unto me, according to my lords the emperors' commandment." Therefore Leo, finding this weakness in himself, wrote unto the clergy and people of Constantinople, and willed them to crave a general council at the emperor's hand: *Exposcite, ut petitioni nostræ, qua plenariam indicii synodum postulamus, clementissimus imperator dignetur annuere*<sup>14</sup>:

"Make your request, that the emperor's majesty would vouchsafe to grant my humble petition, wherein I besought him to summon a general council."

Liberatus said<sup>15</sup> that Leo the bishop of Rome, with other more bishops of Italy, fell upon their knees, and desired the emperor Valentinian, and the empress Eudoxia, to appoint a council, and yet could not obtain it<sup>16</sup>. Afterward he desired the emperor Theodosius, that he would call a council to some place within Italy<sup>17</sup>; and the emperor, contrary to the bishop of Rome's petition, appointed it to be holden at Ephesus. After that, he made the same request to the emperor Martianus<sup>18</sup>; and the emperor likewise, contrary to the bishop's humble request, commanded the council to be kept at Chalcedon. And whereas Leo had besought both these emperors, that it might please them to take a longer day for the council, for that the time of the summon seemed very short, and the ways were laid with enemies, and therefore dangerous for the bishops to travel<sup>19</sup>; yet would neither of them alter one day, but charged each man to appear as they were summoned. And Leo the bishop of Rome, with all his universal power, was fain to yield. Hereby we may soon conjecture how true it is, either that pope Gelasius writeth, that "only the apostolic see of Rome decreed by her authority that the council of Chalcedon should be summoned<sup>20</sup>;" or else that M. Harding would have us believe, that "all councils were summoned by the pope."

Neither was the bishop of Rome, nor his legate in his absence, evermore the

Confir-  
mation of  
Councils.

Socrat. Lib. v.  
in Proœmio.  
τα τῆς ἐκ-  
κλησίας  
πράγματα  
ἡρτητο ἐξ  
αὐτῶν.

Theod. Lib.  
v. cap. ix.  
διὰ τῶν  
τοῦ θεοφι-  
λεστάτου  
βασιλέως  
γραμμα-  
τῶν.  
Inter Acta  
Concil.  
Constant. v.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 34.

Leo, Epist.  
23

Liberat. cap.  
xii.  
Genibus  
provolutus.  
Leo, Epist.  
11. ad Theod.  
August.  
Leo, Epist.  
13.  
Leo, Epist.  
50.

Leo, Epist.  
13. 44. 58.

Epist. Gelas.  
ad Episc.  
Dardan.

[<sup>10</sup> Sozom. in eod. Lib. v. Proœm. p. 212.]

[<sup>11</sup> Theodor. in eod. Lib. v. cap. ix. p. 209.]

[<sup>12</sup> Concil. Constant. i. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. II. col. 946.]

[<sup>13</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xliii. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Tom. II. col. 752.]

[<sup>14</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Cler. Constant. Epist. xxiii. col. 332.]

[<sup>15</sup> Saith, 1563, 1609.]

[<sup>16</sup> Liberat. Breviar. Par. 1675. cap. xii. p. 78;

where provolutus.]

[<sup>17</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Ad Theod. August. Epist. ix. col. 303; Epist. xxiv. cols. 333, 4; Epist. xxxiii. col. 345.]

[<sup>18</sup> Id. Ad Mart. August. Epist. i. col. 366.]

[<sup>19</sup> Id. Ad Pulch. August. Epist. xlii. col. 318; ad Mart. August. Epist. xlii. col. 360; Epist. xlix. col. 365; Epist. i. col. 366.]

[<sup>20</sup> ... auctoritate, ut synodus Chalcedonensis fieret, sola decrevit.—Gelas. Epist. ad Episc. Dardan. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 980.]

Con-  
firmation of  
Councils.

president or chief of the council. For it is known that, in the council of Nice, Eustathius the patriarch of Antioch was the president, and the bishop of Rome's legates, Vitus and Vincentius, sat in the fourth room beneath. In the council of Constantinople Menna was the chief; in the council of Sardica, Osius of Corduba in Spain; in the council of Aquileia, St Ambrose of Milan; in the council of Carthage, Aurelius the bishop there: in the council of Chalcedon Leo the bishop of Rome's legate had chief room, but by way of entreaty only, and by the emperor's special grant, and not of due right or universal authority.

Concil. Chalc.  
Act. i.

But, saith M. Harding, the bishop of Rome allowed general councils. This is not denied. So did others, not only patriarchs, or bishops, but also civil princes. In the council of Chalcedon it is written thus: *Divæ memoriæ Theodosius confirmavit omnia, quæ judicata sunt a sancta et universali synodo generali lege*<sup>1</sup>: "Theodosius the emperor, of godly memory, hath confirmed all things by a general law, that were determined in the universal council." So likewise the

Concil. Chalc.  
Act. iii.

emperor Martianus: *Sacro nostræ serenitatis edicto venerandam synodum confirmamus*<sup>2</sup>: "By the holy edict of our majesty we confirm that reverend council."

Euseb. in Vita  
Constant.

So Eusebius witnesseth, that the emperor Constantinus confirmed the determinations of the council of Nice<sup>3</sup>. So the bishops in the council of Constantinople wrote unto the emperor Theodosius by these words: *Rogamus tuam clementiam, ut per literas tuæ pietatis ratum esse jubeas confirmesque concilii decretum*<sup>4</sup>: "We desire your favour, by your highness' letters, to ratify and confirm the decree of the council."

Inter Act.  
Concil.  
Constant. v.

Now, seeing it was lawful for princes and civil governors to confirm the decrees and determinations of councils, how can we doubt, but it was lawful for bishops also to do the same? Therefore Theodoretus saith: "The conclusions of the council of Nice were sent abroad to other bishops that were away<sup>5</sup>." And Victorinus saith that "many thousands of bishops allowed that same council, and agreed unto it<sup>6</sup>."

Theod. Lib.  
i. cap. ix. et  
Lib. ii. cap.  
viii.  
Victor. Lib.  
ii.

Above all others, the subscription and confirmation of the four principal patriarchs was specially required; for that both their charge, and also their countenance and credit, was greater than others. Among which four, the bishop of Rome was ever the first; and therefore his consent seemed to bear greatest weight. And for that cause the emperor Martianus required Leo the bishop of Rome to write unto the council of Chalcedon, and to declare that he gave his consent to the rule of faith that was there determined<sup>7</sup>. And in like sort the emperor Theodosius requireth all bishops to subscribe and to give their assent to the council of Nice<sup>8</sup>. For it is a rule agreeable unto law and reason: *Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus debet approbari*<sup>9</sup>: "The thing that toucheth all ought to be allowed by all." And therefore Julius, being bishop of Rome, pronounced that all the acts of the council of Antioch were void, and of no force, for that he, being one of the four patriarchs, was not called thither, as well as others<sup>10</sup>. For it appeareth by Eusebius, Theodoretus, and others, that to all general councils all primates and metropolitans were specially summoned<sup>11</sup>. And this seemeth to be that canon that Julius allegeth, that it was not lawful to make rules and orders

Leo, Epist.  
60.

Inter Act.  
Concil. Chalc.  
Regula Juris.

Euseb. Orat.  
iii. de Vita  
Constant.  
Theod. Lib.  
i. cap. vii.  
τὰς ἐκκλη-  
σίας καὶ  
ἡγεῖν.

[<sup>1</sup> Concil. Calched. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. IV. col. 112. See before, page 66, note 8.]

[<sup>2</sup> Id. in eod. Pars III. cap. iv. Tom. IV. col. 842.]

[<sup>3</sup> Euseb. De Vit. Constant. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. III. capp. xvii. &c. pp. 405, &c.]

[<sup>4</sup> Concil. Constant. I. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. II. col. 946.]

[<sup>5</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. I. cap. ix. Lib. II. cap. viii. pp. 29, &c. 74, &c. See before, page 358, note 2.]

[<sup>6</sup> Mar. Victorin. adv. Ar. Lib. II. 9. in Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Stud. Galland. Venet. 1765-81. Tom. VIII. p. 178. See before, page 358, note 3.]

[<sup>7</sup> Quod vero piissimus imperator ad omnes episcopos, qui Chalcedonensi synodo interfuere, voluit me scripta dirigere, quibus quæ illi de fidei sunt regula definita firmarem, libenter implevi.—Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Pulch. August. Epist. IX. col. 394.]

[<sup>8</sup> Imp. Epist. ad Diosc. Alex. in Concil. Calched. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. IV. col. 109.]

[<sup>9</sup> Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. De Reg. Jur. ad calc. Sext. Decretal. Reg. xxix. col. 812; where *debet ab omnibus*.]

[<sup>10</sup> Perhaps the reference is to the Epist. Incred. ad Orient. Episc. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. pp. 304, &c.]

[<sup>11</sup> Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. De Vit. Const. Lib. III. cap. vii. p. 401.]

for the whole church, without the consent of the bishop of Rome, being one of the four chief patriarchs, and having in his province one great portion of the church<sup>12</sup>. And therefore Leo bishop of Rome testifieth his consent to the council of Chalcedon by these words: *Fraternitas vestra novit, me definitionem sanctæ synodi . . . toto corde complexum esse*<sup>13</sup>: "Your brotherhood knoweth that I have embraced with my whole heart the determination of that holy council." And likewise unto the emperor Martianus he writeth thus: *Contitutionibus synodalibus . . . libens adjeci sententiam meam*<sup>14</sup>: "Unto these constitutions of the council I have gladly given my assent." The end hereof was not to shew his sovereign power above all others, but that the decrees, so ratified by him and others, might be had in more estimation. So Leo himself writeth: *Clementia vestra arbitratur, malum facilius delendum, si per universas ecclesias definitiones sanctæ synodi . . . apostolicæ sedis placuisse doceantur*<sup>15</sup>: "Your highness thinketh this evil will the rather be suppressed, if it be declared throughout all churches, that the decrees of the holy council be well liked of the apostolic see."

Con-  
firmation  
of  
Councils.

Leo, Epist.  
61.

Leo, Epist.  
59.

Leo, Epist.  
59.

But that the whole ratification of councils depended, not only of the bishop of Rome, but also of others no less than of him, it is easy to be proved. The bishops in the Roman council, in the time of Damasus, condemned the council of the Arians holden at Ariminum, for that neither the bishop of Rome, whose mind should have been known before all others, nor Vincentius, nor any of the rest had agreed unto it<sup>16</sup>. Likewise the council of Carthage and of Africa are allowed for good, notwithstanding the bishop of Rome would not allow them. The council of Chalcedon decreed, that the bishop of Constantinople should be in dignity next unto the bishop of Rome, and should consecrate the metropolitans of Asia, Pontus, and Thracia. This decree Leo the bishop of Rome very much disliked, and would never assent unto it<sup>17</sup>: yet, that notwithstanding, it is in force and continueth still. Liberatus thereof writeth thus: *Cum Anatolius consentiente concilio primatum obtinisset, legati vero Romani episcopi contradicerent, a iudicibus et episcopis omnibus illa contradictio suscepta non est. Et licet sedes apostolica nunc usque contradicat, [tamen] quod a synodo firmatum est, imperatorio patrocinio permanet*<sup>18</sup>: "When Anatolius by consent of the council had obtained the primacy, and the bishop of Rome's legates stood against it, their gainsaying of the judges and bishops there was not received. And albeit the apostolic see of Rome even hitherto stand against it, yet the decree of the council by the maintenance of the emperor standeth still in force." Which thing seemeth agreeable to that St Hierome writeth: *Major est auctoritas orbis, quam urbis*<sup>19</sup>: "The authority of the world is greater than the authority of one city;" meaning thereby the city of Rome.

Sozom. Lib.  
vi. cap. xxiii.

Leo, Epist.  
13.

Liberat. cap.  
xiii.

Hieron. ad  
Evag.

It may appear by that I have thus shortly touched, that the bishop of Rome had authority neither to summon councils, nor to be president or chief in councils, nor to ratify and confirm the decrees of councils, more than any other of the four patriarchs; and last of all, that councils may stand in force, although the pope mislike them and allow them not. I think it will be hard hereof to gather M. Harding's conclusion, "that the bishop of Rome was head to<sup>20</sup> the universal church."

#### M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION.

*Now what authority the bishops of Rome have ever had and exercised in the assailing of bishops unjustly condemned, and in restoring of them* [5. Absolutions from the pope. H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>12</sup> Theodoret. in eod. Lib. i. cap. vii. pp. 24, 5.]

[<sup>13</sup> Omnem . . . fraternitatem vestram nosse non ambigo, definitionem, &c. me fuisse complexum.—Leon. Magni Op. Ad Sanct. Synod. Epist. lxi. col. 394.]

[<sup>14</sup> Id. Ad Mart. August. Epist. lix. col. 393.]

[<sup>15</sup> Quod facilius clementia vestra arbitretur impendendum, si, &c.—Id. ibid. col. 392.]

[<sup>16</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. vi. cap. xxiii. pp. 542, 3.]

[<sup>17</sup> Leoni Magni Op. Ad Anatol. Constant. Episc.

Epist. liii. cols. 377, &c. This is most probably the epistle intended.]

[<sup>18</sup> . . . legati papæ Leonis . . . cognoverunt, quid Anatolius, consentiente concilio, egerat et obtinuerat: quibus ejus præsumptioni contradicentibus, a, &c. . . . imperatoris, &c.—Liberat. Breviar. Par. 1675. cap. xiii. pp. 93, 4.]

[<sup>19</sup> Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Ad Evag. Epist. cci. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 803. See before, page 373, note 17.]

[<sup>20</sup> Of, 1565, 1609.]



again to their churches, of which they were wrongfully thrust out by heretics or other disorder, it is a thing so well known of all that read the stories in which the ancient state of the church is described, that I need not but rehearse the names only. Athanasius of Alexandria, and Paulus of Constantinople, deprived and thrust out of their bishoprics by the violence of the Arians, assisted with the emperor Constantius, appealed to Rome, to Julius the pope and bishop there, and by his (113) authority were restored to their rooms again. So Leo assoiled Flavianus the bishop of Constantinople, excommunicated by Dioscorus. So Nicolaus the first restored Ignatius to the see of Constantinople, though Michael the emperor wrought all that he could against it. Many other bishops have been in all ages assoiled, and restored to their churches by the authority of the see apostolic, who have been, without desert, excommunicated, deprived, and put from all their dignities. But to have rehearsed these few, it may suffice.

The hundred and thirteenth untruth. For the emperor restored Athanasius, and not the pope. Pope Nicolas died in the year of our Lord 868.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Athanasius and Paulus, saith M. Harding, being deposed by the Arians, assisted with the emperor Constantius, appealed to the pope, and by the pope's authority were restored. Here I appeal unto the judgment and discretion of the reader, that can consider the state of that time, how likely it may seem, either that Athanasius should appeal from the emperor to the pope, or that the pope's commandment should be of sufficient force and authority against the emperor. For neither was pope Bonifacius the eighth yet born, that determined that the emperor should be inferior to the pope<sup>1</sup>; nor pope Innocentius the third, or his gloss, that rated the matter by good geometrical proportion, and pronounced that the pope is fifty and seven degrees above the emperor, even just as much as the sun is above the moon<sup>2</sup>; nor pope Alexander the third, that set his foot in the emperor's neck<sup>3</sup>.

De Major. et Obed. Unam sanctam. Extr. de Major. et Obed. Sol. Et in Gloss. Carion in Frederico.

Verily the pope then by his authority was able neither to depose, nor to restore, nor to call before him any bishop; as appeareth by that I have already alleged of pope Innocentius<sup>4</sup>, and pope Gregory<sup>5</sup>, by their own confessions. No, pope Leo himself confesseth that he was not able to remove a poor monk, abbat Eutyches, from his abbey, but was fain to desire the empress Pulcheria to see him removed<sup>6</sup>.

Epist. Decret. Innoc. xxvii. Gregor. Lib. iv. Epist. 34. Leo, Epist. 45.

As touching Athanasius, it was the emperor Constantinus the great that by his authority removed and banished him, as it appeareth by Socrates<sup>7</sup>; and therefore the emperor Justinian saith: "If any bishop offend herein, let him be deprived by force of this law<sup>8</sup>." And, as he was banished by the emperor Constantinus the father, so by his son Constantinus the emperor, and not by the pope, he was restored: which thing is testified, not only by Socrates<sup>9</sup>, that wrote the story, but also by sundry epistles and letters, taken out of the emperor's records, concerning the same.

Socr. Lib. i. cap. xxiii. De Eccles. Diver. Capit. κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς νόμου δύναμιν. Socr. Lib. ii. cap. ii.

First it is known that the emperor Constans, that ruled the west part of the world, unto whom Athanasius, being deposed, fled for aid, wrote in his behalf unto his brother Constantius, that then was the emperor of the east, and besought him to see Athanasius restored unto his room: otherwise he threatened that he himself would come with his power to Alexandria and restore him<sup>10</sup>. Upon the sight of which letters, the emperor Constantius wrote unto Athanasius, and willed him to repair with speed unto his court, that he might be

Sozom. Lib. iii. cap. xix.

[<sup>1</sup> Bonifac. VIII. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Extrav. Comm. Lib. i. De Major. et Obed. cap. 1. col. 212. See before, page 14.]

[<sup>2</sup> Innoc. III. in eod. Decretal. Gregor. IX. Lib. i. Tit. xxxiii. cap. 6. et Gloss. in eod. col. 426. See before, page 14, note 1.]

[<sup>3</sup> Carion. Chronic. Lib. Par. 1543. Lib. iii. Frederic. I. fol. 109.]

[<sup>4</sup> Rescr. Innoc. Epist. xxvii. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 480. See before, page 394, note 6.]

[<sup>5</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist.

Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Tom. II. col. 752.]

[<sup>6</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Pulch. August. Epist. xlv. col. 361.]

[<sup>7</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. i. cap. xxxv. p. 59.]

[<sup>8</sup> Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1668. Auth. Coll. ix. Tit. vi. Novell. cxxiii. 9. Tom. II. p. 170. See before, pages 405, 6, note 24.]

[<sup>9</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. ii. capp. ii. iii. pp. 68, 9.]

[<sup>10</sup> Sozom. in eod. Lib. iii. cap. xx. p. 433.]

restored unto his country<sup>11</sup>; and at his coming he directed out his letters unto the clergy and people of Alexandria, commanding them to receive him with favour, and to abolish all such acts as they had before made against him<sup>12</sup>. To report the whole letters at large, it would be tedious. Among other words, the emperor Constantius writeth thus: *Recipiat voluntate Dei, nostroque judicio, patriam suam, pariter et ecclesiam*<sup>13</sup>. And again: *Omnes episcopum, superno judicio nostraque sententia destinatum, libenter et pie suscipite*<sup>14</sup>: "Let him, both by God's appointment, and by our decree, recover both his country and his church, &c."<sup>15</sup> Further saith Cassiodorus: *His... literis confidens Athanasius, rediit in orientem*<sup>16</sup>: "Athanasius, upon trust of these letters, returned again into the east." Likewise the bishops in the council of Hierusalem wrote abroad letters of gratulation upon his return in this form: *Debetis ergo etiam, &c.*<sup>17</sup>: "You ought also continually to pray for the emperors' majesties, for that, understanding your desires, they have restored Athanasius again unto you." And Theodoretus touching the same writeth thus: *Procerum senatorumque conjuges, &c.*<sup>18</sup>: "The lords' and counsellors' wives besought their husbands to entreat the emperor's majesty, that he would restore Athanasius unto his flock; and said further, unless they would so do, they would forsake them, and go to him."

Theod. Lib.  
ii. cap. viii.

Theod. Lib.  
ii. cap. xi.

Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxxi.

Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxx.

Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxxvi.

Theod. Lib.  
ii. cap. xvii.

So likewise the bishops, that the Arians had deposed with Flavianus, were restored again by the emperor, and not by the pope. For pope Leo himself thereof writeth thus unto the empress Pulcheria: *[Vos] sacerdotes catholicos, qui de ecclesiis suis injusta fuerunt ejecti sententia, reduxistis*<sup>19</sup>: "Your majesties have restored home again the catholic bishops, which by wrongful sentence were thrust from their churches."

Leo, Epist.  
39.

Pope Nicolas, as upon occasion I said before, was the second bishop in Rome, after pope Joan the woman, which was almost nine hundred years after Christ. Wherefore his authority might well have been spared. It is well known, that as the pope's power increased, so the empire abated. Therefore was Platina forced to say: *Periit et potestas imperatorum, et virtus pontificum*<sup>20</sup>: "Now the emperors have lost their civil power; and the popes have lost their holiness." In old times the emperor confirmed the pope; now the pope confirmeth the emperor. In old times the emperor called the pope to the council; now contrariwise the pope calleth the emperor.

Platina in  
Adriano ii.

As touching the restoring of Athanasius, pope Julius entreated the emperor in his behalf, which, as it appeareth, was his greatest request. For thus he writeth unto Liberius: *Precamur ut vestris exhortationibus, tam per vos, quam... per apocrisarios vestros adjuvemur*<sup>21</sup>: "We beseech you that, through your good exhortations, both by yourself, and by other your agents, we may be holpen." Moreover, for that he was a patriarch, he summoned a particular council, and laboured the bishops. For the Arians said: "There was an ecclesiastical canon, that no man being once deposed should be restored again, unless he had first cleared himself before a council; and that the bishops, that would restore him, ought to be more in number than were they that had deposed him<sup>22</sup>." And therefore Chrysostom was much blamed of his adversaries, for that he, being once

Epist. Athan.  
ad Liberium.

Sozom. Lib.  
iv. cap. viii.  
Orient. Epist.  
ad Julium.

[<sup>11</sup> Theodor. in eod. Lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 83.]

[<sup>12</sup> Id. in eod. Lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 86.]

[<sup>13</sup> Hist. Tripart. Par. Lib. iv. cap. xxxi. fol. G. 6; where *recipiens voluntatem*.]

[<sup>14</sup> Id. ibid. cap. xxxii. ibid.; where *decreto superno, and suscipiatis*.]

[<sup>15</sup> 1565 omits &c.]

[<sup>16</sup> Id. ibid. cap. xxx. fol. G. 5; where *ad orientem venit*.]

[<sup>17</sup> *Debetis ergo etiam pro pietate Deo amabilium nostrorum imperatorum incessanter Deo orare: quoniam et ipsi cognoscentes vestrum desiderium vobis restituere destinauerunt*.—Id. ibid. cap. xxxvi. fol. G. 7.]

[<sup>18</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 95. The intercession here spoken of was to

Constantius in behalf of Liberius.]

[<sup>19</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Ad Pulch. August. Epist. xxxix. col. 352.]

[<sup>20</sup> The passage intended is probably the following: *Verum nescio quo fato accidisse dicam, ut una cum industria imperatorum, simul etiam pontificum virtus et integritas defecerit*.—Plat. De Vit. Pont. Col. 1551. Formosus I. p. 125.]

[<sup>21</sup> Athanas. Epist. ad Liber. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 352.]

[<sup>22</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. iv. cap. viii. p. 444.]

... cum dudum decretum fuisset, nullum a pauciore numero restitui debere, quam depositum fuisse constaret. —Orient. Epist. ad Jul. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 308.]

Socrat. Lib.  
vi. cap. xviii.

deposed, had recovered his room without a council of other bishops<sup>1</sup>. And therefore Flavianus, being wrongfully put from his bishopric, offered up his bill of appeal, not unto the bishop of Rome alone, but unto him with other bishops. The truth hereof may well appear by these words of Leo, bishop of Rome, unto the emperor Theodosius : *Omnes partium nostrarum ecclesie, omnes mansuetudini vestre cum gemitibus et lacrymis supplicant sacerdotes, ut quia . . . eisdem libellum appellationis Flavianus episcopus dedit, generalem synodum jubeatis intra Italiam celebrari*<sup>2</sup> : "All the churches of these our countries, and all the priests with sighs and tears beseech your highness, that, forasmuch as Flavianus hath offered up his bill of appeal unto them, it may please you to command a general council to be kept in Italy."

Leon. Epist.  
94.

Sozom. Lib.  
iii. cap. xi.  
καθελαου.  
Concil. Basil.

In such councils the bishop of Rome, being sometimes the chief, pronounced the party worthy either to be restored, or to be deposed. But that sentence was not always put in execution. The council of Antioch deposed pope Julius<sup>3</sup>; yet was not Julius therefore deposed. The council of Basil deposed pope Eugenius; yet Eugenius continued pope still. The decree of bishops in such cases without the emperor's authority was then of small force. And therefore Athanasius himself reporteth, that the emperor gave his consent to the determination of the council of Sardica, and so commanded him to be sent for home<sup>4</sup>.

Athan. in  
Apol. ii.  
Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap.  
xxxiv.

Sozom. Lib.  
iii. cap. viii.

But M. Harding will say the words be plain, that Julius restored Athanasius<sup>5</sup>. It is true, and not denied. But the meaning of these words is, that Julius pronounced him clear in that he was accused of, and therefore worthy to be restored. For it is certain, and M. Harding well knoweth, that Athanasius upon pope Julius' letters was not restored. The like is also written of others. Cassiodorus saith : *Maximus . . . [quoque] restituit . . . beato Athanasio et communionem et dignitatem*<sup>6</sup> : "Maximus also restored unto Athanasius both his communion and also his dignity; that is to say, pronounced him worthy to be restored." For Maximus was not the bishop of Rome.

Cassiod. Lib.  
iv. cap.  
xxxiv.

These things considered, M. Harding may make up his reason thus : The pope had no authority to restore them that were deposed; *ergo*, the pope was not head of the church.

Or thus : The emperor restored such as were deposed; *ergo*, the emperor was head of the church.

#### M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION.

The hundred and fourteenth untruth. For reconciliation is no necessary token neither of primacy nor of subjection.  
\* St Augustine was one of these schismatics.  
† During the same time Rome itself was six times sacked : which thing M. Harding hath quite forgotten.

*Concerning the reconciliation of the prelates of the church, both bishops and patriarchs, to the bishop of Rome, (114) whereby his primacy is acknowledged and confessed, I need not say much, the matter being so evident. After that the whole church<sup>7</sup> of Africa had continued in<sup>a</sup> schism, and withdrawn themselves from the obedience of the see apostolic, through the enticement of Aurelius archbishop of Carthago, for the space of one hundred years<sup>b</sup>, during which time by God's punishment they came into captivity of the barbarous and cruel Vandals, who were Arians; at the length, when it pleased God of his goodness to have pity on his people of that province, sending them Belisarius, the valiant captain that vanquished and destroyed the Vandals, and likewise Eulalius, that godly archbishop of Carthago, that brought the church<sup>7</sup> home again, and joined the divided members unto the whole body, the catholic church; a public instrument, containing the form of their repentance and of their humble submission, was offered and exhibited solemnly to Bonifacius the second, then pope, by Eulalius, in the name of that whole province, which was joyfully received, and he thereupon forthwith reconciled. Of this reconciliation and restoring of the African*

[6. Reconciliations to the pope. H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>1</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. vi. cap. xviii. p. 267.]

[<sup>2</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Theodos. August. Epist. xxiv. col. 334.]

[<sup>3</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 417. See before, page 406.]

[<sup>4</sup> Athanas. Op. Par. 1698. Apol. contr. Arian.

51. Tom. I. Pars i. pp. 169, &c.]

Hist. Tripart. Par. Lib. iv. cap. xxxiv. foll. G. 6, 7.]

[<sup>5</sup> . . . ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπος . . . αὐτοὺς εἰς κοινω-  
νίαν προσήκατο. — Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script.  
Lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 413.]

[<sup>6</sup> Hist. Tripart. Lib. iv. cap. xxxiv. fol. G. 7.]

[<sup>7</sup> Churches, H. A. 1564.]

churches to the catholic church, the mystical body of Christ, Bonifacius writeth his letters to Eulalius bishop of Thessalonica, requiring him with the churches thereabout to give Almighty God thanks for it<sup>8</sup>.

Recon-  
ciliation.

But here if I would shew what bishops, dividing themselves through heresy, schism, or other enormity, from the obedience of the see of Rome, have upon better advice submitted themselves to the same again, and thereupon have been reconciled, I had a large field to walk in. As inferior bishops of sundry provinces have done it, so have the great patriarchs done likewise. Among them that, to satisfy the malicious mind of Eudoxia the empress, practised their wicked conspiracy against Chrysostom, through which he was deposed and carried away into banishment, Alexander, bishop of Antioch and primate of the orient, was one; (115) who at length, stricken<sup>9</sup> with repentance for that he had been both a consenter and a promoter of that wicked act, submitted himself humbly to Innocentius the pope, and by all means sought to be assoiled and reconciled; and therefore sent his legate<sup>11</sup> to Rome, to exhibit to Innocentius a solemn instrument of his repentance and lowly submission, and to accept what should be enjoined. By which his humbleness Innocentius moved granted to his petitions, received him into the lap of the catholic church again; and thus was he reconciled. Sundry the like reconciliations of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Hierusalem to the see of Rome in like cases might easily be recited; which, for avoiding of tediousness, I pass over, as likewise of the patriarchs of Constantinople, which, as we read in ancient stories, have forsaken the church of Rome twelve times, and have been reconciled<sup>12</sup> to the same again.

The hundred  
and fifteenth  
untruth.  
For<sup>10</sup> this  
story is here  
interlaced  
with many  
untruths.

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

First, M. Harding supposeth that this Latin word, *reconciliatio*, can in no wise stand amongst equals; and besides that, touching the reconciliation of the church of Antioch, as it shall appear, he misreporteth the whole story. Upon such grounds these proofs be builded. For M. Harding knoweth that, as submission is made by the subject towards the<sup>13</sup> prince, so reconciliation, in proper manner of speech, is made between equal friends.

Concerning that is here touched of Eulalius, the matter needeth no long answer. The story being truly known is sufficient to answer itself. It is certain, as we have before declared more at large, and as it plainly appeareth by the acts of the council of Africa, that Zosimus the bishop of Rome, to the intent to advance<sup>14</sup> himself over all other bishops, manifestly falsified the Nicene council. This forgery in the council of Africa was disclosed and laid abroad to the eyes of all the world. The bishops there, being in number two hundred and seventeen, saw that one Apiarius a priest, whom they for his open outrage and wickedness had excommunicate, was, without any further examining of the matter, only upon his bare complaint, admitted again unto the communion, and received into favour in despite of all their doings, by the bishop of Rome.

They saw that the accusers and witnesses, without whom no ordinary judgment can proceed, either for age or for sickness and other causes, could not well travel so far: therefore they desired the bishop of Rome by their letters, that he would bring no such ambitious puff of vanity into the church; and made a strait decree in the council among themselves, that it should not be lawful for any man to appeal out of Africa to any foreign bishop<sup>15</sup>. An hundred years after that, this Eulalius the bishop of Carthage, if it be true that is reported of him, and not forged at Rome, as were many things more, reconciled himself to the church of Rome in the time of Bonifacius the second, as it is recorded in the Pontifical; for other record thereof, to my remembrance, there is none. The words of the reconciliation be these: *Hanc professionem meam manu mea sub-*

Fumus  
seculi  
typhum.

Inter Decret.  
Bonif. ii.

[<sup>8</sup> Bonifac. Papæ II. Epist. ad Eulal. Alex. Episc. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agripp. 1551. Tom. I. pp. 1057, 8.]

[<sup>9</sup> Stroken, 1565, strooken, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>10</sup> 1565 omits *for*.]

[<sup>11</sup> Legates, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>12</sup> Reconciled, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>13</sup> His, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>14</sup> Avance, 1565.]

[<sup>15</sup> Concil. Afric. Epist. ad Cœlestin. cap. 105. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 521. See before, page 356, note 6.]

Recon-  
ciliation.

Epist. Bonif.  
2. ad Eulal.

St Augustine  
condemned  
and accursed,  
and set on by  
the devil.

*scripsi, &c.*<sup>1</sup>: "This profession I have subscribed with mine own hand, and have directed the same to Bonifacius the holy and reverend pope of the city of Rome, utterly condemning my predecessors and successors, and all others that shall go about to frustrate the privileges of the apostolic see of Rome." Likewise Bonifacius writeth hereof unto Eulalius the bishop of Alexandria in this wise: *Aurelius . . . Carthaginensis ecclesie olim episcopus cum collegis suis, instigante diabolo, superbire temporibus predecessorum nostrorum . . . contra Romanam ecclesiam cepit*<sup>2</sup>: "Aurelius sometime bishop of Carthage, together with his fellows (his fellows were St Augustine, Alypius, and two hundred and fifteen other bishops), being set on by the devil, in the time of my predecessors, began to bear himself disdainfully against the church of Rome." The one of these, by a public instrument under his hand and seal, utterly condemneth and accurseth St Augustine, with two hundred and sixteen other godly bishops, together with four general councils, of Africa, Carthage, Milevitum, and Hippo: the other saith, they were all set a-work and pricked forth by the devil, and lived out of the church of God, and died in schism.

If this be true, then ought St Augustine no longer to be holden for a saint, neither to have any room in the calendar.

Pope Zosimus  
a forger of  
councils.

Euseb. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxiii.  
οἱ τοῦ δια-  
βόλου  
ἀπόστολοι  
ζιζανίων  
γεγήμεκαν.

But if all these godly fathers, that justly and truly defended the holy council of Nice, were led with the devil, with what spirit then was he led, that openly and in the sight of all the world durst to corrupt and falsify the same council? Verily, Dionysius the bishop of Corinth complaineth thus: *Rogatu fratrum meorum scripsi epistolas: sed illas apostoli diaboli, alia eximentes, alia interserentes, impleverunt zizaniis: quibus vae reponitur*<sup>3</sup>: "At the request of my brethren I wrote certain epistles; but the devil's apostles, by putting to and taking fro, have filled them full of tares and cockle. But wo be unto them!"

Rome six  
times taken  
by enemies  
and sacked,  
within the  
space of one  
hundred and  
forty years.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 32.

But in the mean while, saith M. Harding, the country of Africa even by the punishment of God was brought into subjection and spoiled by the Vandals. Here M. Harding entereth into God's judgments, and pronounceth that all this misery happened unto that country for leaving the see of Rome; which thing he reckoneth all one with the leaving and forsaking of God himself. Howbeit M. Harding might soon know that about the very same time, while Africa was thus afflicted, the city of Rome itself was six times taken by wild and barbarous enemies, the Visigothi, Ostrogothi, Heruli, Vandali, Hunni, and Longobardi, within the space of an hundred and forty years. The walls were rased; the towers thrown down; the houses burnt; the nobility taken captive; the people spoiled and banished; the city itself a long time left waste and desolate without inhabiter<sup>4</sup>. If M. Harding can guess so rightly of the miseries of Africa, how happeneth it that he can guess nothing of six-fold greater miseries, that at the same time befel upon Rome? If the bishops and people of Africa were thus plagued for their schism, wherefore then were the bishops and people of<sup>5</sup> Rome plagued, that (as it is supposed) continued still without schism? Notwithstanding, Possidonius saith that God of special mercy granted St Augustine, who then was besieged by the enemies, that during his life his city of Hippo should not be taken<sup>6</sup>. And yet was the same St Augustine the greatest discloser of the forgery and pride of the bishop of Rome, that is to say, the greatest author and maintainer of all this schism.

Touching the reconciliation of Alexander the bishop of Antioch, M. Harding, for the better furniture of the tale, hath woven in and interlaced many words of his own. For in all that is written thereof by Innocentius, there is no manner mention, neither of solemn instrument of repentance, nor of accepting of penance,

[<sup>1</sup> Hanc autem &c., et Bonifacio sancto et venerabili papæ urbis Romæ direxi, damnans et antecessores et successores meos, et omnes qui sanctæ Romanæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ privilegia cassare nituntur.—Exempl. Prec. Eulal. et Justin. in Decret. Bonifac. Papæ II. in eod. Tom. I. p. 1058.]

[<sup>2</sup> Bonifac. Papæ II. Epist. ad Eulal. in eod. ibid.]

[<sup>3</sup> Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. iv. cap. xxiii. p. 118; where γεγήμεκαν.]

[<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Mauric. August. Epist. xx. Tom. II. cols. 747, &c. In this epistle Gregory, describing the miseries of the empire, regards them as the divine judgments on the pride of churchmen.]

[<sup>5</sup> Of is repeated, 1565.]

[<sup>6</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. August. Vit. auct. Possid. cap. xxix. Tom. X. Post-Append. cols. 278, 9.]

nor of subjection or humble submission. Indeed this Alexander, at his first entry into the bishopric of Antioch, finding his church full of division by mean of one Eustathius, by his wisdom and godly exhortations brought the whole people there unto unity; and afterward wrought the like godly policy in other churches, and ceased all the strife that had long continued for the condemnation of Chrysostom, and caused his name, that his enemies had rased out, to be enrolled again among other catholic bishops; and likewise wrote unto the emperor Theodosius the younger, and to the bishops of other countries, to do the like<sup>7</sup>. In the end, having appeased all contentions, in token, not of subjection, as M. Harding surmiseth, but of full consent and agreement, he desired that his church might be joined in communion and fellowship with the church of Rome and other churches of the west, from whence before, by reason of their dissensions, they had been divided. Which thing also appeareth by the words of Innocentius himself unto Alexander touching the same: *Gratias agens Domino, communionem ecclesie vestrae ita recepi, ut prae me feram apostolicae sedis condiscipulos primos dedisse ceteris viam pacis*<sup>8</sup>: "I, giving God thanks, so received the communion and fellowship of your church, that I profess that you, being our school-fellows of the apostolic see, have first opened unto others the way of peace." Here Innocentius calleth Alexander his school-fellow, not his subject or underling. And therefore he calleth him his school-fellow of the apostolic see, for that St Peter sat first at Antioch, and after that in Rome; and for that cause, both these sees of Peter the apostle were called apostolic.

Reconciliation.

Theod. Lib. v. cap. xxxv. Niceph. Lib. xiv. cap. xxvi.

Innocent. Epist. 17. ad Alexandrum.

Again, in another epistle unto the same Alexander, he writeth thus: *Voluit... compresbyter noster Cassianus, hanc amicitiarum nostrarum paginulam... quasi primitias pacis nostrae conscribi, &c.*<sup>9</sup>: "Cassianus, our fellow-priest, would have this instrument of our friendship to be written, as the first-fruits of our peace. Therefore I greet well your brotherhood, and all others of that church that are of your mind." Here Innocentius himself calleth this composition an instrument of friendship or fellowship, not of repentance or humble submission, as it pleaseth M. Harding untruly to translate it. Neither doth this word, "reconciliation," necessarily import a superiority or a mastership; but also, and that most commonly, a fellowship or equality, as it is said before. So saith St Paul: "Christ hath reconciled both the Jew and the gentile in one body." And what is meant by that reconciliation, he expoundeth thus: *Omnes unum sumus in Christo Jesu*: "We are all one in Christ Jesu." So saith Pliny the younger: *Principis est reconciliare æmulas civitates*<sup>10</sup>: "It is a prince's part to reconcile cities that contend for the sovereignty:" not that the one may be brought into subjection to the other; but that they may be made friends, and live in peace. So likewise saith Christ: *Vade, reconcilieris fratri tuo*: "Go, and be reconciled to<sup>11</sup> thy brother."

Innocent. Epist. 15.

Eph. ii.

Gal. iii.

Plin. in Panegyrico.

Matt. v.

Thus therefore was the patriarch of Antioch reconciled to the bishop of Rome, not as a subject unto his prince, but as in a body one member unto another; and (forasmuch as Innocentius himself useth this word *condiscipuli*)<sup>12</sup> as in a school one scholar unto his fellow.

Innocent. Epist. 17.

So, whereas there was matter of dissension between the church of Rome and the church of Alexandria, it seemed good to the fathers in the council of Africa, to entreat between them, not that the church of Alexandria should submit herself, as unto her head, and live in subjection, but that they might be reconciled, and live in peace together<sup>13</sup>. So Liberatus saith, Petrus Moggus was reconciled unto Asatius<sup>14</sup>, not as unto his superior, but as unto his brother. In this sense writeth

Concil. Afric. cap. 68.

Liberat. cap. xviii.

[<sup>7</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. v. cap. xxxv. p. 241.

Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. Lut. Par. 1630. Lib. xiv. cap. xxv. pp. 489, 90.]

[<sup>8</sup> Innoc. Papæ I. ad Alex. Antioch. Episc. Epist. xvii. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 463.]

[<sup>9</sup> Id. ad eund. Epist. xv. in eod. p. 462. The epistle proceeds: Saluto itaque et tuam mihi in Christo germanitatem, et omnem illam, quæ tecum tam bene sentit, ecclesiam.]

[<sup>10</sup> O vere principis, atque etiam consulis, recon-

ciliare æmulas civitates. — C. Plin. Cæcil. Secund. Op. Basil. 1552. Panegy. p. 479.]

[<sup>11</sup> Unto, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>12</sup> See before, note 8.]

[<sup>13</sup> Placuit etiam, ut de dissensione Romanæ atque Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ ad sanctum papam Innocentium scribatur, quo utraque ecclesia intra se pacem, quam præcepit Dominus, teneat. — Concil. Afric. cap. 68. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 514.]

[<sup>14</sup> Acacius... rescripsit... quia... Petrum... Moggum suscepisset in communionem. — Liberat. Breviar. cap. xviii. in eod. Tom. II. p. 115.]

# Reconciliation.

Concil. Const.  
v. Act. 2.

Socrat. Lib.  
iv. cap. xi.

Hormisda bishop of Rome unto Epiphanius the bishop of Constantinople: *Æquale studium et æqualem curam suscipiamus, quibus una est in communione et fide amicitia*<sup>1</sup>: "Seeing we have one friendship in communion and in faith, let us therefore take like study and like care."

This manner of reconciliation is largely set forth by Socrates in his story, and may be abridged in this sort: The Macedonian heretics, having forsaken their heresies, sent their messengers Eustathius, Sylvanus, and Theophilus unto Liberius the bishop of Rome, and to other the bishops of the west. Liberius, understanding that their faith agreed fully with the council of Nice, and with the faith that he himself and all the other bishops of the west church professed, received them unto the communion, and wrote favourably unto the bishops of the east in their behalf. These messengers, departing thence, went into Sicily, and, in a council of the bishops there, likewise reconciled themselves unto them; and, being returned home, they sent abroad into all the churches of those countries, and willed them to consider the letters sent from Liberius the bishop of Rome, and from other bishops of Italy, Africa, France, Sicily, and all the west, and to agree, and to communicate together with them<sup>2</sup>.

Another like example of reconciliation we have made by one Arsenius the bishop of Hipsilitæ unto Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria. The words of the reconciliation are these: *Nos, volentes ecclesiastico canonî, &c.*: "We, desiring to be subject to the ecclesiastical canon, according to the ancient order, do write these unto you, *dilecte papa*, beloved pope, and likewise do promise in the name of our Lord, that we henceforth will not communicate with any schismatics, or with any that have not peace with the catholic church, whether they be bishops, priests, or deacons<sup>3</sup>." This submission or reconciliation was made unto Athanasius; yet was not Athanasius bishop<sup>4</sup> of Rome.

This then was the manner of reconciliation of churches, without any such humble subjection as M. Harding fancieth, or knowledge or token of supremacy, or any manner universal power.

## M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION.

*Thus, having declared the supreme authority and primacy of the pope by the common practice of the church, I need not to shew further, how in (116) all questions, doubts, and controversies touching faith and religion the see of Rome hath always been consulted; how the decision of all doubtful cases hath been referred to the judgment of that see; and, to be short, (117) how all the world hath ever fetched light from thence. For proof<sup>5</sup> whereof, because it cannot be here declared briefly, I remit the learned reader to the ecclesiastical stories, where he shall find this matter amply treated.*

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

As Rome, having achieved the empire of the whole world, both for renown and honour, and also for wisdom and learning, which commonly follow the empire, was the noblest and most famous of all other cities; so for commodity of access out of all kingdoms and countries, both of the east and of the west, and also out of Africa and Egypt, and other countries of the south, and also for receiving of questions, and resolution of doubts, it seemed to be planted in the fittest place of all the world. For as Thucydides calleth the city of Athens "Græcia of all Græcia;" so some called the city of Rome, in those days of her honour, *epitome orbis terrarum*<sup>6</sup>, "the abridgment of the whole world." The admiration of this

The hundred and sixteenth untruth. For many great questions were never removed to Rome. The hundred and seventeenth untruth. For Rome itself had her light from Græcia.

\*Ελλάς  
\*Ελλάδος.  
Cæl. Rhod.  
Lib. xviii.  
cap. xxv.

[<sup>1</sup> Hormisd. Epist. in Concil. Constant. sub Men-na, Act. v. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. V. col. 152.]

[<sup>2</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. iv. cap. xii. pp. 180, &c.]

[<sup>3</sup> ...προρημένοι τε τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν τύπον ὑποτάσσεσθαι, γράφομεν σοι, ἀγαπητὲ πάπα, ὁμολογούντες ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου τοῦ λοιποῦ μὴ κοινωνήσῃν τοῖς ἐτι σχίζουσι,

καὶ μὴδέπω εἰρηνεύουσι πρὸς τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐπισκόποις τε καὶ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις.—Athanas. Op. Par. 1698. Apol. contr. Arian. 69. Tom. I. Pars 1. p. 185.]

[<sup>4</sup> The bishop, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>5</sup> For the proof, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>6</sup> Cæl. Rhodig. Lect. Antiq. 1599. Lib. xviii. cap. xxv. cols. 858, 9.]

glory drew such resort of people thither, that Beda, a learned man of this country, being there, and seeing the multitude of strangers that came only to gaze and to see news, expounded these four solemn letters, S. P. Q. R. in this wise: *Stultus populus querit Romam*<sup>7</sup>: "Foolish folk fly<sup>8</sup> to Rome." Therefore for opportunity of the place, and expedition of answer, many matters of question and doubtful cases were brought thither. Many, I say, but not all. For men, that wanted counsel, wrote and sought unto them that had the fame of learning, and were thought best able to make them answer. So Marcellinus, Dulcitius, Bonifacius, Euodius, and others, sent their questions to St Augustine, and desired his counsel. St Ambrose saith, as it is before alleged, that many that had been with the bishop of Rome would afterward for their better satisfaction send to him<sup>9</sup>. And Leo himself, being bishop of Rome, and therefore, as M. Harding thinketh, the oracle of all the world, thought it not amiss to submit himself, and to ask counsel of other bishops<sup>10</sup>. Therefore this saying of M. Harding's neither is universally true, nor proveth his purpose. For if he will say, Some men in cases of doubt sought to Rome for counsel; *ergo*, the bishop there was called the head of the church; this conclusion will hardly follow.

King Josias, in a great case of religion, sent to a woman named Olda, the wife of Sellum, to know her counsel; and it was a proverb among the Jews: *Qui interrogat, interroget in Abila*: "Whoso will seek counsel, let him seek it in Abila." Yet neither was Olda the head of the church, nor Abila the chief town in Israel or Juda.

"But all the world," saith M. Harding, "hath received light from Rome." But all the world seeth this is another manifest untruth; and nevertheless, being granted, yet would it not conclude of his side.

Indeed in a kind of speech both Rome, and Antioch, and Alexandria, and any other great city famous for religion, may be called the head or spring of the gospel. So St John calleth Babylon *magna mater fornicationum et abominationum terre*, "the great mother of the fornications and of the abominations of the earth." And so Arnobius calleth Hetruria<sup>11</sup>, which is the country wherein Rome standeth; and St Ambrose calleth Rome itself *caput superstitionis*<sup>12</sup>, "the head of superstition."

But if we seek the place itself from whence the light of religion first sprang forth, we must needs confess it was Hierusalem, and not Rome. For so it is written in the prophet Esay: *De Sion exhibit lex, et verbum Domini de Hierusalem*: "The law shall proceed from Sion, and the word of God from Hierusalem." And therefore the bishops of the east, being in a convocation at Constantinople, call Hierusalem "the mother of all churches"<sup>13</sup>. Yet nevertheless, every great metropolitan city within her own province may be honoured with the like title. So saith Nazianzenus of the city of Cæsarea, where St Basil was bishop: *Cæsarea prope mater omnium ecclesiarum*<sup>14</sup>, &c.: "Cæsarea is in a manner the mother of all churches; and the whole christian commonwealth so embraceth and beholdeth it, as the circle embraceth and beholdeth the center." So Chrysostom likewise advanceth<sup>15</sup> the city of Antioch: *Cogita urbis magnitudinem, quod non de una vel de duabus, vel de tribus, vel de decem animabus, nunc nobis est consideratio; sed de millibus infinitis, de totius orbis capite*<sup>17</sup>: "Consider the greatness of this city: we have to deal not for one, two, three, or ten souls; but for infinite thousands, even

Ambros. Lib. x. Epist. 83.

Leo, Epist. 27.

2 Kings xxii. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 2 Sam. xx.

Rev. xvii.

Arnob. Lib. ii. adversus Gentes. Ambros. Serm. 66.

Isai. ii.

Theod. Lib. v. cap. ix.

Gregor. Naz. in Epist. ad Cæsar.

Ad Pop. Ant. Hom. 3.

[<sup>7</sup> The editor can give no authority for what is here said. There is, however, a story told of Bede, that he interpreted PPP. SSS. RRR. FFF. as meaning Pater patriæ perditus est. Salus secum sublata est. Ruet regnum Romæ, Ferro, flamma, fame.—Vit. Bed. ad calc. Hist. Eccles. Cant. 1722. p. 800.]

[<sup>8</sup> Flee, 1565.]

[<sup>9</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Ad Episc. per Æmil. Epist. xxiii. 8. Tom. II. col. 882. See before, page 382, note 5.]

[<sup>10</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Leon. Raven. Episc. Epist. xxxvii. cols. 349-51.]

[<sup>11</sup> ...genitrix et mater superstitionis Hetruria.—

Arnob. Op. Par. 1580. Adv. Gent. Lib. vii. p. 209.]

[<sup>12</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1614. Serm. in Fest. SS. Petr. et Paul. Tom. V. col. 142.]

[<sup>13</sup> Τῆς δὲ γε μητρὸς ἀπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, κ. τ. λ.—Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. v. cap. ix. p. 211.]

[<sup>14</sup> Mater est omnium, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>15</sup> Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. Ad Cæsar. Epist. xli. Tom. II. p. 36.]

[<sup>16</sup> Avanceth, 1565.]

[<sup>17</sup> Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Ad Pop. Ant. Hom. iii. Tom. II. col. 36.]



for the head of the world." Thus Chrysostom calleth Antioch "the head of the world," for that in that province of Syria it was the head; like as Rome also was the head city and principal church of the west.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTIETH DIVISION.

Now for a brief answer to M. Jewel, who denieth that within 600 years after Christ the bishop of Rome was ever called an universal bishop or head<sup>1</sup> of the universal church, and maketh himself very sure of it; although it be a childish thing to stick at the name any thing is called by, the thing by the name signified being sufficiently proved; yet to the intent good folk may understand that all is not truth of the old gospel, which our new gospellers either affirm or deny, I will bring good and sufficient witness, that the bishop of Rome was then called both universal bishop, or œcumenical patriarch, which is one; to wit, bishop or principal father of the whole world, and also head of the church. Leo, that worthy bishop of Rome, was called the universal bishop, and universal patriarch, of six hundred and thirty fathers assembled together from all parts of the world in a general<sup>2</sup> council at Chalcedon; which is both (118) expressed in that council, and also clearly affirmed by St Gregory in three sundry epistles, to Mauritius the emperor, to Eulogius patriarch of Alexandria, and to Anastasius patriarch of Antioch<sup>4</sup>. Thus that name was deferred unto the pope by the fathers of that great council; which by them had not been done, had it been unlawful. In very deed neither Leo himself, nor any other his successor, ever called or wrote himself by that name, as St Gregory saith, much less presumed they to take it unto them; but rather used the name of humility, calling themselves each one servum servorum Dei, "the servant of the servants of God." Yet sundry holy martyrs, bishops of Rome, used to call themselves bishops of the universal church, (119) which in effect is the same, as the fathers of Chalcedon understood. \*So did Sixtus in the time of Adrianus the emperor, in his epistle to the bishops of all the world<sup>5</sup>. So did Victor writing to Theophilus of Alexandria<sup>6</sup>. So did Pontianus writing to all that believed in Christ<sup>7</sup>, before 1300 years past. So did Stephanus in his epistle to all bishops of all provinces<sup>8</sup>, in the time of St Cyprian. And all<sup>9</sup> these were before Constantine the great, and before the council of Nice, which times our adversaries acknowledge and confess to have been without corruption. The same title was used likewise after the Nicene council by Felix<sup>10</sup>, by (120) Leo, and by divers others, before the 600<sup>11</sup> years after Christ were expired. Neither did the bishops of Rome use this title and name only themselves to their own advancement, as the adversaries of the church charge them, but they were honoured therewith also by others; as namely Innocentius by the fathers assembled in council at Carthago<sup>12</sup>, and Marcus by Athanasius and the bishops of Egypt<sup>13</sup>.

[The pope above a thousand years since called universal bishop, and head of the universal church. H. A. 1564.]

The hundred and eighteenth untruth. For there is no mention made hereof in any canon in that council.

The hundred and nineteenth untruth. For these names import not one thing, as shall appear.

\* All these be b stard epistles, without credit.

The hundred and twentieth untruth. For immediately before M. Harding confesseth that Leo never wrote himself by that name.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here M. Harding secretly confesseth that, in all he hath hitherto alleged, he hath not yet found that the bishop of Rome was known in the world, within the space of the first six hundred years after Christ, by the name either of the universal bishop, or of the head of the universal church; notwithstanding he hath much guessed about the matter, both by misreporting the practice of government that then was used, and also by wresting and misconstruing the words of the holy fathers. Thus hitherto he hath taken great pains to small purpose.

[<sup>1</sup> The head, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>2</sup> In general, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>3</sup> 1565 omits *for*.]

[<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Mauric. August. Epist. xx. Tom. II. col. 749. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Episc. Epist. xliii. col. 771. Lib. viii. Indict. i. Ad Eulog. Episc. Epist. xxx. col. 919. There are also other epistles in which Gregory affirms the same thing.]

[<sup>5</sup> Sixt. Papæ I. Epist. ii. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 79.]

[<sup>6</sup> Victor. Papæ ad Theoph. Alex. Epist. i. in eod. p. 93.]

[<sup>7</sup> Pontian. Papæ Epist. ii. in eod. p. 108.]

[<sup>8</sup> Steph. Papæ I. Epist. ii. in eod. p. 157.]

[<sup>9</sup> Also, 1611.]

[<sup>10</sup> Felic. Papæ II. Rescr. ad Synod. Alex. in eod. p. 358.]

[<sup>11</sup> The first six hundred, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>12</sup> See below, page 425.]

[<sup>13</sup> Ægypt. Epist. ad Marc. in eod. p. 299.]

But hereunto he putteth his rhetorical correction, and saith: "It is a childish thing to stick at the name of any thing." And so all this long talk is driven in the end to a childish conclusion. Howbeit it appeareth St Gregory was not so persuaded of it, nor thought the matter to be so childish. For after that John of Constantinople had entituled himself the universal bishop, Gregory, being then bishop of Rome, withstood him earnestly, and wrote against him in this wise: "*Deus...ab unitate atque humilitate ecclesie hoc malum superbiæ et confusionis avertat*<sup>14</sup>: "God turn away this mischief of pride and confusion from the unity and humility of the church." Again: *Omnibus viribus...providendum [est], ne in unius veneno sermonis viventia in Christi corpore membra moriantur*<sup>15</sup>: "We must labour and provide, with all that we can do, lest the members, that live in Christ's body, happen to perish in the poison of one word." Moreover, as it is before at large declared, he calleth it a new, a perverse, a superstitious, an arrogant, an ungodly, an antichristian name, a name of singularity, a name of error, a name of confusion, a name of blasphemy, against the canons, against the whole church, against St Peter, and against the gospel. Yet, saith M. Harding, to stick at this name it is but a childish matter. Howbeit, if the thing itself, that this name importeth, had been lawful, then had this name not been so horrible. But contrariwise, the very usurpation of the name is horrible; therefore the thing itself thereby signified must of necessity be much more horrible.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 36.

Now for a brief answer: M. Harding hath found six hundred and thirty bishops, that gave this title to Leo bishop of Rome in the council of Chalcedon, and called him the universal bishop; which thing, as he saith, is recorded by St Gregory in three sundry places. Here, good christian reader, by the way, this one thing, I trust, thou wilt consider of thyself<sup>16</sup>. If the name of universal bishop were given to the bishop of Rome in the council of Chalcedon, which was holden in the year of our Lord 488<sup>17</sup>; then, by M. Harding's own grant, and by the witness of this council, the bishop of Rome before that time had not the name of universal bishop. Otherwise, how could either they give that they had not to bestow, or he receive that he had already? Indeed such bestowing of gifts had been very childish. Thus, of the whole number of six hundred years, M. Harding freely, even at the sight, hath yielded us back four hundred four-score and eight years towards the reckoning.

Before we pass further, let us see what credit the pope himself giveth to this council of six hundred and thirty fathers holden at Chalcedon. Pope Gelasius saith: "The apostolic see of Rome in part allowed it not; for that things were there borne out by inordinate presumption<sup>18</sup>." Pope Leo accuseth the whole council of "ambition and wilful rashness<sup>19</sup>." And St Hierome, in the case of matrimony *inter raptorem et raptam*, is received against all those six hundred and thirty bishops, and against the determination of that whole council<sup>20</sup>. In such regard they have the councils when they list! But the law saith: *Absurdum videtur, licere eidem partim comprobare judicium defuncti, partim evertere*<sup>21</sup>: "It is against reason that one man should in part allow the will of the dead (so far forth as it maketh for him), and in part overthrow it (where it seemeth to make against him)."

Gelasius inter  
Acta Concil.  
Tarracon.  
Per incompeten-  
tem presumptionem  
ventilata.  
Leo, Ambitionem et  
inconsultam temeritatem.  
xxxvi.  
Quest. ii.  
Tria legitima.  
Pan. de  
Bonis Liberator.  
Nam absurdum.  
Caus.

But M. Harding will say: Of what credit soever this council ought to be, it gave Leo the name of universal bishop. And what if all this be utterly untrue? What if there were no such title either given or offered in the council?

[<sup>14</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Episc. Epist. xliii. Tom. II. col. 773; where *hoc* precedes *ab unitate*.]

[<sup>15</sup> Id. *ibid.*]

[<sup>16</sup> Theeself, 1563.]

[<sup>17</sup> This is the date erroneously given in Crabb. Concil. The council is usually assigned to the year 451.]

[<sup>18</sup> ...alia autem, quæ per incompetentem presumptionem illic perlata sunt, vel potius ventilata... quæ sedes apostolica...nullatenus approbavit, &c.—Gelas. Papæ Tom. de Anathem. Vinc. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. pp. 969, 70.]

[<sup>19</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Anatol. Const. Episc. Epist. liii.; ad Pulcher. August. Epist. lv.; ad Maxim. Antioch. Episc. Epist. lxii. cola. 378, 80, 5, 6, 97, 8. The exact words as they are here alleged are not found; but Leo in the places referred to again and again censures the council.]

[<sup>20</sup> Hieron. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. xxxvi. Quest. ii. can. 8. col. 1882. An attempt is made to reconcile the opinion of Jerome with the decree of Chalcedon. See Not. and gloss. in loc.]

[<sup>21</sup> Gaius in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. xxxviii. Tit. ii. 7. Tom. I. p. 543.]

**Pope not universal.** Certainly, the whole council of Chalcedon is extant abroad both written and printed, and may soon be seen. Why doth not M. Harding allege either the place, or the canon, or the words? At the least, why giveth he no note in the margin, where this authority may be found?

Perhaps he will say, this canon was burnt by some heretics, as he said before of the council of Nice. Howbeit, it were much for him to say, that of that whole council only six lines should be burnt, and that in all the examples throughout the world, and yet all the rest of the same council remain safe; or that the words, whereby the pope claimeth his title, should so negligently be lost, and that in Rome itself, in the pope's own library; and yet the words that the pope reproveth and condemneth should stand whole. M. Harding hath no other council within six hundred years after Christ to hold by, but only this; and yet the same cannot be found. But St Gregory is witness sufficient: he saith that six hundred and thirty bishops in the council of Chalcedon named the bishop of Rome the universal bishop. This is an untruth to beguile the reader. For Gregory saith not, the bishops in that council saluted, entitled, proclaimed, or called the bishop of Rome by that name. Only he saith: *Romano pontifici... universitatis nomen oblatum est*<sup>1</sup>: "The name of universal bishop was offered by the council of Chalcedon to the bishop of Rome." He saith they offered to call him so; but that they called him so indeed, he saith not. Therefore M. Harding herein overreacheth and mistelleth his author's tale. But St Gregory saith further that "neither Leo nor any other of his predecessors bishops of Rome would ever receive that arrogant and ungodly name, or suffer himself to be so called," notwithstanding it were offered by the council. The bishops of Rome never so<sup>2</sup> used that name, notwithstanding it were offered them. Therefore they ought to lose it by non-usure.

M. Harding will say: This was only their humility, and not want of right: and therefore they chose rather to be called *servi servorum Dei*, "the servants of God's servants." Verily it may well be thought that Gregory, who first used these words, as his familiar style, named himself so without hypocrisy, only in respect of his intolerable pains and continual travails. For so he himself complaineth: *Veni in altitudinem maris, et tempestas demersit me*<sup>3</sup>: "I am come into the deep of the sea; and the rage of tempest hath drowned me up." So St Augustine long before St Gregory's time, for that he was likewise troubled, used sometimes the like style. For thus he writeth of himself: *Augustinus episcopus servus Christi servorumque Christi*<sup>4</sup>: "Augustine, bishop, the servant of Christ, and the servant of Christ's servants." But he that neither feedeth the flock, nor plougheth the Lord's ground, nor dresseth his vine, nor ministereth the sacraments, nor comforteth, nor exhorteth, nor teacheth; that is carried on high through the streets on noblemen's backs, and may not touch the ground for holiness; that causeth that noble prince the French king to hold his stirrup, the emperor of all Christendom to lead his horse by the rein, and the princes and governors of the world to kiss his shoe; that doth no manner of service or ministry in Christ's church; how can he call himself either the servant of Christ, or the servant of Christ's servants, without hypocrisy? This indeed is open dissimulation, and a childish playing with words, and an open mocking of the world. So one writeth of Julius Cæsar: *Deposuit nomen dictaturæ, at vim retinuit*: "He refused the name of dictator, but the power and force thereof he kept still." So likewise saith Appianus: "The princes of Rome name themselves *imperatores*, emperors," which was a name of government in the field, and lasted but for the while; but kings they will in no wise be called, for that the name of a king among them then was odious. "Howbeit," he saith, "indeed they are very kings." So Augustus Cæsar, notwithstanding he were a tyrant, and had oppressed the people, yet he chose to be called *tribunus plebis*, "the defender and patron of the people." And Verres, notwithstanding he had miserably wasted and consumed the whole

Gregor. Lib. iv. Epist. 32, et 36.

Superbum prophanum nomen.

Gregor. Lib. i. Epist. 7, et 25.

De Meritis et Remissione Pec. ad Mar. Lib. iii. cap. i.

Dion.

Appianus.

εἰσι δὲ τὰ ἔργα βασιλεῖς. Cornelius Tacitus in Augusto. Cicero in Verrem.

[<sup>1</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiii. Ad Mauric. August. Epist. xx. Tom. II. col. 749. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Episc. Epist. xliii. col. 771.]

[<sup>2</sup> Id. Lib. i. Indict. ix. Ad Anastas. Episc. Epist. vii. xxvi. Tom. II. cols. 494, 516.]

[<sup>3</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. Lib. iii. cap. i. Tom. X. col. 71.]

[<sup>4</sup> 1565 omits so.]

island of Sicily, yet in his title he would be called σωτήρ, that is, the keeper and saviour of that island. Thus they dissemble openly, and, as one saith, "with fair names they cover foul faults." But it was not any such dissimulation or countenance of humility that moved Leo, Gregory, or any other godly bishop of Rome, to refuse this name, as M. Harding imagineth, but the very iniquity and injury therein contained. For thus saith St Gregory: *Si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur*<sup>5</sup>, &c.: "If one be called the universal patriarch, then is the name of patriarchs taken from others. But God keep it far from any christian mind, that any man should take so much upon him." "The consenting unto this wicked name is the losing of the faith<sup>6</sup>." Therefore in the council of Carthage it is decreed thus: *Primæ sedis episcopus ne appelletur princeps sacerdotum, vel summus sacerdos, vel aliquid hujusmodi; sed tantum primæ sedis episcopus. Universalis autem nec etiam Romanus pontifex appelletur*<sup>7</sup>: "Let not the bishop of the first see be called the chief of bishops, or the highest bishop, or by any other like name. But the bishop of Rome himself may not be called the universal bishop." This latter clause of that canon (*universalis autem [episcopus] nec etiam Romanus pontifex appelletur*) one Peter Crabbe, the setter forth of the councils, of purpose, and contrary to good faith, dissembled and left out. Howbeit the fraud is soon discovered. For the same clause is to be found whole, both in written examples of the councils, and also in Gratian, that compiled the decrees, and in the very barbarous gloss upon the the same, by these words: *Hic dicitur, quod papa non debet vocari universalis*<sup>8</sup>: "Here it is said, that the pope may not be called the universal bishop." M. Harding saith: "The pope was called by that name:" and for proof thereof allegeth a council without a canon. But the whole general council of Carthage saith: "The bishop of Rome may not in any wise be so called;" and the canon thereof is apparent and may be seen. Now let the christian reader judge to whether he will give greater credit.

"This council," saith M. Harding, "would not have offered this name unto Leo, unless it had been lawful." Yet he knoweth all is not law that is moved in council. Leo and Gelasius, as it is before said, condemned certain decrees of this same council of Chalcedon, as unlawful<sup>9</sup>, notwithstanding the determination of six hundred and thirty bishops. The fathers in the council of Nice attempted, contrary to God's commandments, to break the lawful matrimony of priests and bishops: but their attempt, because it was unlawful, was reproved and stayed by Paphnutius<sup>10</sup>. M. Harding therefore might better conclude thus: Leo, Gregory, and other holy fathers, bishops of Rome, refused the name of universal bishop, as it appeareth by their words, for that it was injurious unto other bishops, and a corruption of the faith; and for the same cause the general council of Carthage determined, that the bishop of Rome should not, ne might not so be called: therefore that name was not lawful.

All this notwithstanding, true it is that M. Harding saith: Leo in that council of Chalcedon was thus called. The places be known, and may not be denied. He is so saluted in three sundry epistles; the one sent by one Athanasius a priest; the other by one Ischyron a deacon; the third by one Theodorus, likewise a deacon<sup>11</sup>. But of that whole number of six hundred and thirty bishops there assembled, I trow, M. Harding is not well able to shew that any one ever saluted or called him so.

Pope not universal.

τῷ ὀνόματι  
περιέ-  
πλουσι τὴν  
μοχθηρίαν.  
Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 36.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. cap. xxxix.  
Concil. Carth.  
iii. can. 26.

The bishop of  
Rome may  
not be called  
the universal  
bishop.

Dist. 90.  
Primæ sedis.

Inter Decret.  
Concil. Tarr.

Socrat. Lib. i.  
cap. xi.

Concil.  
Chalc.  
Act. 3.

[<sup>5</sup> ...si unus, &c. Sed absit hoc, absit a Christiani mente id sibi velle quempiam arripere, &c.—Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiii. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Episc. Tom. II. col. 771.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. ibid. Ad Sabin. Diac. Epist. xix. col. 747.]

[<sup>7</sup> Concil. Carthag. iii. cap. 26. in Crabb. Concil. Cbl. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 428. See before, page 355, note 12.]

[<sup>8</sup> Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xcix. Gloss. in can. 3. col. 479;

where hæc est 3 pars distin. in qua dicitur, &c.]

[<sup>9</sup> See before, page 423, notes 17, 8.]

[<sup>10</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. i. cap. xi. p. 33.]

[<sup>11</sup> Τῷ...οἰκουμένικῷ πατριάρχῃ...Λέοντι, κ.τ.λ.—Lib. Athanas. in Concil. Calched. Act. iii. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. IV. col. 406.

Lib. Ischyr. in eod. col. 399.

Lib. Theodor. in eod. col. 395.

See also Lib. Sophron. in eod. col. 411.]

**Bishop  
of the  
universal  
church.**

Therefore, whereas M. Harding, the better to put his reader in remembrance, hath set this note in the margin, that the bishop of Rome was called the universal bishop, and head of the church, above a thousand years sithence; he might with more truth, and much better have noted his book thus: ST GREGORY'S WORDS MISALLEGED, THE COUNCIL FALSIFIED, THIS ONLY CANON LOST, ALL THE REST WHOLE AND SAFE, A STRANGE PRIEST AND TWO POOR DEACONS, IN THEIR PRIVATE SUITS FOR THEIR GOODS AND LEGACIES, NAMED LEO THE UNIVERSAL BISHOP. BUT OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY BISHOPS, THAT HAD VOICES IN THE COUNCIL, NOT ONE EVER NAMED HIM SO. Thus much M. Harding might truly have noted in the margin.

Yet, saith M. Harding, the bishops of Rome, that were godly fathers and holy martyrs, used this name, as it appeareth by their epistles. And here are brought in the titles of letters under the names of Sixtus, Pontianus, and certain others, written, as it is before declared, a long time after the writers were dead. Such ruinous foundations M. Harding hath chosen to build upon.

But what are these old fathers taught to say? Or how is M. Harding relieved by their words? In their<sup>1</sup> salutation before their letters they write thus: "Sixtus, Pontianus, Victor, bishop of the universal church." This, saith M. Harding, is even all one thing with *universalis episcopus*: there is no manner difference. O what ranging and hunting here is, to beat up that thing that will not be found! M. Harding, because he cannot find the universal bishop that he sought for, therefore he hath sought out the next of kin, that is, the bishop of the universal church; and these two, he saith, be both one. Howbeit this matter needed no great seeking: every child might soon have found it. But if an universal bishop and a bishop of the universal church be all one thing, how then is it true, that St Gregory saith, *Nemo [præ]decessorum*<sup>2</sup>, &c.<sup>3</sup>: "None of my predecessors would ever consent to this name?" Or how can he find such fault with the name of universal bishop, and bear so easily with the name of bishop of the universal church, which he knew his predecessors had used, if he took them both for one thing, without difference? To be short, if these names, as M. Harding assureth himself, be both one, how is the one godly, the other ungodly; the one arrogant, the other not arrogant; the one blasphemous, the other not blasphemous?

This error riseth of misunderstanding these words, *universalis ecclesia*. For the church universal and the church catholic, the one being Greek, the other Latin, are both one, and are commonly used of the learned fathers, as contrary to a particular church, as be the churches of heretics and schismatics. In this sense every godly bishop is a bishop of the catholic or universal church; like as also every godly man is a member of the same. Thus writeth Calixtus: *Calixtus archiepiscopus ecclesiæ catholicæ urbis Romæ*<sup>4</sup>. Thus Marcellus: *Marcellus episcopus sanctæ et apostolicæ et catholicæ urbis Romæ*<sup>5</sup>. In these places Rome is called a catholic, that is to say, an universal city; partly to exclude the churches of heretics, which were mere particular; and partly also to signify that the church there was then a church of the catholic and universal doctrine. So likewise it is written in the council of Constantinople: *Clerici et monachi apostolici throni Antiochenæ magnæ civitatis, catholicæ, sanctæ ecclesiæ Dei*<sup>6</sup>: "The clerks and monks of the apostolic throne of the great city of Antioch, of the catholic or universal holy church of God."

Again, every bishop may be called the bishop of the universal church; for that it is his duty to care, not only for his own flock, but also for all others of the whole church of God. So saith Origen: *Qui vocatur...ad episcopatum,...vocatur...ad servitutem totius ecclesiæ*<sup>7</sup>: "Whoso is called to a bishopric is called to the service of the whole church." So Chrysostom, exhorting the whole people together,

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 32.  
et 36.

Calixti Epist.  
Decret. l.  
Marcel. Epist.  
2.

Concil. Const.  
v. Act. h.

Orig. in Esai.  
Hom. 6.

[<sup>1</sup> The, 1565.]

[<sup>2</sup> Decessorum, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>3</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Mauric. August. Epist. xx. Tom. II. col. 749. Ad Eulog. et Anastas. Episc. Epist. xliiii. col. 771.]

[<sup>4</sup> Callixt. Papæ I. ad Benedict. Epist. i. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 100.]

[<sup>5</sup> Marcell. Papæ ad Maxent. Epist. ii. in eod. Tom. I. p. 207.]

[<sup>6</sup> Suppl. Cler. et Monach. Antioch. in Concil. Constant. sub Menna, Act. v. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. V. col. 157.]

[<sup>7</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. In Esai. Hom. vi. 1. Tom. III. p. 116.]

saith unto them: *Universæ ecclesiæ...curam geramus*<sup>8</sup>: "Let every one of us take the care of the universal church." So likewise pope Eleutherius writeth unto the bishops of France: *Hujus rei gratia universalis vobis a Christo...commissa est ecclesia, ut pro omnibus laboretis, et cunctis opem ferre non negligatis*<sup>9</sup>: "For that cause the whole universal church is committed unto you, that you should travail for all, and not be negligent to help all." Thus many ways the bishops both of Rome, and of Antioch, and of France, were called the bishops of the universal church. But the universal bishop none of them all was ever called. Of John of Constantinople, that first began to usurp that name, Gregory the bishop of Rome writeth thus: *Despectis omnibus...solus conatur appellari episcopus*<sup>10</sup>: "Despising all other bishops, he would only be called a bishop." So likewise saith pope Pelagius: "If the chief patriarch be called universal, then the rest have lost the name of patriarchs"<sup>11</sup>.

Bishop  
of the  
universal  
church.

Chrysost. in  
2 Cor. Hom.  
18.  
Epist. Eleuth.  
ad Episc.  
Gallie.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 34.

Pelag. li.  
Epist. I.  
Dist. 92.  
Nullus.

This is the meaning of an universal bishop, and the very self-same infinite and immoderate power that M. Harding claimeth for the bishop of Rome. For so he hath already said, that the other three patriarchs are no patriarchs indeed, but only his delegates and servants to do that shall please him to command them<sup>12</sup>. Instead hereof, M. Harding hath found out a bishop of the universal church: and so, leaving the thing that is demanded, he answereth to that is not in question; and privily confesseth, by his silence, that hitherto he hath not found nor can find his universal bishop.

Pol. 86.  
Div. 23.

This answer may serve to that is here alleged of the council of Africa, and the epistle of Athanasius; saving that the epistle bearing that holy father's name, as it is already proved<sup>13</sup>, is nothing else but apparent forgery. The bishops in the council of Africa, besides that they utterly denied the pope's universal power, forbidding their clerks upon pain of excommunication to appeal to him, sundry times in the same council writing unto him, they use the name of familiarity and equality, and call him their brother<sup>14</sup>.

Concil. Afric.  
can. 12.

Can. 101, et  
105.

Now for a surplusage, forasmuch as M. Harding, with all his study and conference with his friends, cannot yet find out his universal bishop in the church of Rome, let us see whether we may find him in some other place, and that not by the witness of a simple priest or a deacon, but by the authority of catholic emperors and councils, and of the bishop of Rome himself; and that not by shifting of terms one for another, as M. Harding is driven for want, instead of an universal bishop, to bring in a bishop of the universal church, but in plain, manifest, express words, and such as in nowise may be denied.

In the council of Constantinople, the bishop there is scarcely saluted or entitled by other name. For this is his common style: *Ecumenico patriarchæ Johanni*<sup>15</sup>: "To John the universal patriarch." "To John the father of fathers, and universal bishop." "The holy universal archbishop, and patriarch Mennas."

Concil. Const.  
v. Act. 1.

Nicephorus saith, the bishop of Alexandria was entitled *judex universi orbis*<sup>16</sup>, "the judge of the whole world." Clement unto St James the bishop of Hierusalem writeth thus: *Clemens Jacobo fratri Domini...episcopo episcoporum, regi Hebræorum sanctam ecclesiam Hierosolymis, sed et omnes ecclesias, quæ ubique Dei providentia fundatæ sunt*<sup>17</sup>: "Clement unto James the brother of our Lord, the bishop of bishops, governing the holy church of the Jews at Hierusalem, and besides that, all the churches that be founded every where by God's providence."

Niceph. Lib.  
xiv. cap.  
xxxiv.

Clem. Epist. I.

[<sup>8</sup> Chrysost. Op. 1718-38. In Epist. II. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568.]

[<sup>9</sup> Eleuth. Papæ ad Gall. Prov. Epist. in Crabb: Concil. Tom. I. p. 92.]

[<sup>10</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. XIII. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Tom. II. col. 751; where *conetur*.]

[<sup>11</sup> ...si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. — Pelag. II. Epist. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xcix. can. 4. col. 479.]

[<sup>12</sup> See before, page 402.]

[<sup>13</sup> See before, page 354.]

[<sup>14</sup> There is nothing to the point in cap. 12. Perhaps the following is meant: Recitatis epistolis beatissimi fratris et consacerdotis nostri Anastasii, ecclesiæ Romanæ episcopi, &c.—Concil. Afric. cap. 32. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 507. See also capp. 101, 105. pp. 518, &c.]

[<sup>15</sup> Relat. ad Johan. in Concil. Constant. sub Menna, Act. v. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. V. col. 161.]

[<sup>16</sup> Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. Lut. Par. 1630. Lib. xiv. cap. xxxiv. Tom. II. p. 512.]

[<sup>17</sup> Clement. ad Jacob. Epist. i. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. I. p. 31.]

Peter  
chief.

Authen.  
Const. 3.  
οἰκου-  
μενικῶ πα-  
τριάρχῃ.  
Conc. Nicen.  
ii. Act. 2.

The emperor Justinian writeth thus: "Unto Epiphanius the archbishop of this imperial city (Constantinople) and universal patriarch<sup>1</sup>." To conclude, the bishop of Rome himself thus saluteth the bishop of Constantinople: *Therasio generali patriarchæ Adrianus servus servorum Dei*<sup>2</sup>: "Unto Therasius the general patriarch, Adrian the servant of God's servants." And in the last council holden at Florence, Joseph the bishop of Constantinople, being there, used the same title, and wrote himself "the archbishop of new Rome, and the universal patriarch<sup>3</sup>." If M. Harding had so good evidence for the bishop of Rome, I believe he would not thus pass it away in silence.

#### M. HARDING. THE THIRTY-FIRST DIVISION.

Concerning the other name, "head of the church," I marvel not

[Head of the church.  
H. A. 1564.]

This is a fresh  
kind of  
rhetoric.

a little that M. Jewel denieth that the bishop of Rome was then so called. Either he doth contrary to his own knowledge, wherein he must needs be condemned in his own judgment, and of his own conscience; or he is not so well learned as of that side he is thought to be. For whosoever travaileth in the reading of the ancient fathers, findeth that name almost every where attributed to Peter the first bishop of Rome, (121) and consequently to the successor of Peter, that name, I say, either in terms equivalent, or expressly. First the scripture calleth Peter primum,

[Peter, and conse-  
quently the pope,  
Peter's successor,  
called head of the  
church, both in terms  
equivalent, and also  
expressly. H. A.  
1564.]

The hundred  
and twenty-  
first untruth.  
For Peter  
only is so  
called, yet  
was not Peter  
then bishop  
of Rome.

\* These terms  
be not equi-  
valent.

"the first among the apostles." The names of the twelve apostles, saith Matthew, are these: \* Primus Simon, qui dicitur Petrus: "First Simon, who is called Peter." And yet was not Peter first called of Christ, but his brother Andrew before him, as is before said. Dionysius, that ancient writer, calleth Peter

Matt. x.

De Divinis Nomini-  
bus, cap. iii.

sometime supremum decus, "the highest honour," for that he was most honourable of all the apostles; sometime summum; sometime verticalem, the chiefest and the highest apostle<sup>4</sup>. Origen upon the beginning of John saith: "Let no man think that we set John before Peter. Who may so do? for who should be higher of the apostles than he who is and is called the top of them?" Cyprian calleth the church of Rome, in consideration of that bishop's supreme

Liv. i. Epist. 3.

authority, ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est<sup>5</sup>, "the principal or chief church, from whence the unity of priests is sprung." Eusebius Cæsariensis, speaking of Peter sent to Rome by God's providence to vanquish Simon Magus, calleth him potentissimum et maximum apostolorum, et reliquorum omnium principem<sup>6</sup>, "the mightiest of power, and greatest of the apostles, and prince of all the rest." Augustine commonly calleth Peter primum apostolorum<sup>7</sup>, "first or chief of the apostles:" Hierome, Ambrose, Leo, and other doctors, "prince of the apostles." Chrysostom upon the place of John cap. xxi., Sequare me, "Follow

τὸν καρτερόν καὶ μέγαν τῶν ἀποστόλων, [καὶ] τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων προήγονον.

me," among other things saith thus: \* "If any would demand of me, how James took the see of Hierusalem, that is to say, how he became bishop there; I would answer, that this (he meaneth Peter) master of the whole world made him governor there<sup>8</sup>."

\* These words  
are craftily  
added to  
Chrysostom,  
as to the dis-  
creet reader  
may soon ap-  
pear.

And in another place, bringing in that God said to Hieremy, "I have set thee like an iron pillar, and like a brasen wall;" but "the Father", saith he, "made him over one nation, but Christ made this man (meaning Peter) ruler

In Matt. Hom. 55.  
Jer. i.

[<sup>1</sup> ...Ἀνθερίῳ τῷ θειοτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ, καὶ, κ. τ. λ.—Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Auth. Coll. iii. Tit. iii. Novell. xvi. Tom. II. p. 34. See also Auth. Coll. i. Tit. iii. Novell. iii. p. 6.]

[<sup>2</sup> Hadr. ad Taras. Epist. in Concil. Nic. ii. Act. 11. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. VII. col. 700. But the word *generalis* is not in the Greek text. See *ibid.* col. 121.]

[<sup>3</sup> Joseph miseratione divina Constantinopolis et novæ Romæ archiepiscopus, ac œcumenicus patriarcha.—Gen. viii. Synod. Florent. Sess. Ult. in Crabb. Concil. Tom. III. p. 474.]

[<sup>4</sup> ...Πέτρος, ἡ κορυφαία καὶ πρεσβυτάτη τῶν θεολόγων ἀκρότης.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Div. Nom. cap. iii. 2. Tom. I. p. 539.]

[<sup>5</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cornel. Epist. lix. pp. 135, 6.]

[<sup>6</sup> Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. ii. cap. xiv. p. 41; where we find τὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν.]

[<sup>7</sup> In ... Petro, in ordine apostolorum primo et præcipuo, &c.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. lxxvi. 4. De Verb. Evang. Matt. xiv. Tom. V. col. 416.]

[<sup>8</sup> Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις, πῶς οὖν ὁ Ἰάκωβος τὸν θρόνον ἔλαβε τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων; ἐκεῖνο ἀν εἰποίμι, ὅτι τοῦτον οὐ τοῦ θρόνου, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐχειροτόνησε διδάσκαλον.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Joan. Hom. lxxxviii. Tom. VIII. p. 527.]

of<sup>9</sup> the whole world, &c.”<sup>10</sup> And lest these places should seem to attribute this supreme authority to Peter only, and not also to his successors, it is to be remembered, that Irenæus<sup>11</sup> and Cyprian acknowledge and call the church of Rome chief and principal. And Theodoretus in an epistle to Leo calleth the same, in consideration of the bishop τῆς οἰκουμένης of that see his primacy, orbi terrarum præidentem<sup>12</sup>, “president, or προκαθήμενῃ. (122) bearing rule over the world.” Ambrose, upon that place of Paul, 1 Tim. iii., where the church is called the pillar and stay of the truth, saith thus: Cum totus mundus Dei sit, ecclesia tamen domus ejus dicitur: cujus hodie rector est Damasus<sup>13</sup>: “Whereas the whole world is God’s, yet the church is called his house, the ruler whereof at these days is Damasus.”

\* I would not weary and trouble the reader with such a number of allegations, were it not that M. Jewel beareth the world in hand, we have not one sentence or<sup>14</sup> clause for us, to prove either this or any other of all his articles.

But perhaps some one will say<sup>15</sup>, Yet I hear not the bishop of Rome called head of the universal church. What forceth it whether that very term be found in any ancient writer, or no? Other terms of the same virtue and power be oftentimes found. Is it not one to say, head of the universal church, and to say, ruler of God’s house, which Ambrose saith? Whereof this argument may be made: \*The church, yea, the universal church is the house of God: but Damasus bishop of Rome is ruler of the house of God, after Ambrose; ergo, Damasus is ruler of the universal church. And by like right and title is the pope, who is bishop of Rome, now also ruler of the same. What other is it to call the church of Rome the principal church, respect had to the bishop there, and not otherwise (wherein a figure of speech is used) as Irenæus and Cyprian do, and president, or (123) set in authority over the whole world<sup>16</sup>, as Leo doth; than to call the bishop of Rome head of the universal church? What meaneth

In locum  
Joh. xxi.  
Hom. 87.

Exponens illud,  
Sequitur me.

In Matt.  
Hom. 55.

Chrysostom calling Peter totius orbis magistrum, “the master and teacher of all the world,” and saying in another place \*that Christ made Peter, not ruler over one nation, as the Father made Jeremy over the Jews, but over the whole world? what other, I say, meaneth he thereby, than that he is head of the whole world, and therefore of the universal church?

Peter  
chief.

The hundred  
and twenty-  
second un-  
truth, stand-  
ing in untrue  
translation.

\* All these  
words not-  
withstand-  
ing, M. Hard-  
ing hath not  
yet found the  
head of the  
universal  
church.

\* A miserable  
syllogism. It  
concludeth  
“in secunda  
figura affir-  
mative.”

The hundred  
and twenty-  
third un-  
truth.  
For Leo hath  
not one such  
word.

\* Even so  
Gregory<sup>17</sup>  
saith of Paul:  
“Obtinuit  
totius eccle-  
siæ principa-  
tum,” in  
1 Reg. Lib. iv.  
cap. iv. 18

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Touching the name of the universal bishop, M. Harding hath but one authority; and yet the same cannot be found. Touching the other name, of head of the church, he cometh in only with jolly brags and great vaunts, as if he were playing at post<sup>19</sup>, and should win all by vying. He saith, if M. Jewel know this, then he speaketh against his conscience; if he know it not, then is he not learned. To contend for learning, it were a childish folly. He is sufficiently learned, that saith the truth. But if M. Harding with all his learning be able to find out his head of the church, he shall have his request: I will grant him to be learned.

He saith: “The bishop of Rome is so named, either in terms equivalent or expressly.” Thus he doubteth at the matter, and stammereth, and faltereth at the beginning. But if the bishop of Rome were the head of the church indeed, and so allowed and taken in the world, why was he never expressly and plainly named

[<sup>9</sup> Over, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>10</sup> Καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ Πατὴρ πρὸς τὸν Ἱερεμίαν διαλεγόμενος ἔλεγεν ὡς στῦλον χαλκοῦν, καὶ ὡσεὶ τεῖχος τίθησιν αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἐκείνου μὲν ἐνὶ ἔθνει, τοῦτον δὲ [Πέτρον] πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης.— Id. in Matt. Hom. liv. Tom. VII. p. 548.]

[<sup>11</sup> Iren. Op. Par. 1710. Contr. Hær. Lib. III. cap. iii. 2. p. 175. See before, page 364.]

[<sup>12</sup> Ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ πασῶν μεγίστη... καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης προκαθήμενη, κ. τ. λ.—Theodor. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84. Ad Leon. Epist. cxiii. Tom. III. Pars II. p. 985.]

[<sup>13</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Comm. in Epist. i. ad Tim. cap. iii. Tom. II. Append. col. 296; where dicitur.]

[<sup>14</sup> Nor, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>15</sup> Reply and say, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>16</sup> There is a passage... sicut per beatissimum Petrum apostolorum principem sacrosancta ecclesia Romana teneret supra omnes totius mundi ecclesias principatum, ita, &c., to be found among the works of Leo, which may be that intended. But it was written to, not by, Leo.—Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. Ad Leon. Epist. Comprov. Episc. Metrop. Arel. col. 525.]

[<sup>17</sup> St Gregory, 1565.]

[<sup>18</sup> See below, page 431, note 11.]

[<sup>19</sup> Probably a game at cards. See Brand's Pop. Antiq. by Sir H. Ellis, Vol. II. p. 266.]



Paul  
chief.

Terms equi-  
valent.

so? Was there no man then in the world, for the space of six hundred years, able to express his name? His terms of like force and meaning, which he calleth equivalent, must needs import thus much: That the bishop of Rome is above all general councils; that he only hath power to expound the scriptures, and cannot err, nor be judged of any man; and that without him there is no health; and that all the world ought to know him for the universal head, upon pain of damnation. Thus much the pope himself claimeth by that name. If M. Harding's terms sound not thus, they are not equivalent. It had been the simpler and plainer dealing for M. Harding to have said, This name cannot yet be found; and so to have taken a longer day.

As for the matter, the question is moved of the bishop of Rome: the answer is made of St Peter; as if St Peter continued there bishop still until this day. But it is presumed that, whatsoever privilege was in Peter, the same must needs be in the bishop of Rome by succession, yea, although he have not one spark of Peter. St Peter in the old fathers is diversly called, the first, the chief, the top, the high honour of the apostles; and in Eusebius and St Augustine, *πρωτόγονος*, and *princeps apostolorum*. In which last words of St Augustine and Eusebius, I must do thee, good reader, to understand, that *princeps* is not always taken for a prince or governor<sup>1</sup> endued with power, but oftentimes for the first man, or best of a company. So we read in the scriptures, *princeps familie*, *princeps legationis*, *princeps coquorum*<sup>2</sup>; that is, "the chief of the house or stock, the chief of the embassy, the chief of the cooks." In this sense Cicero saith: *Servius princeps in jure civili*; *philosophorum princeps Aristippus*: "Servius the chief in the civil law; Aristippus the chief of philosophers." So is St Peter called *princeps apostolorum*; and therefore St Augustine calleth him *primum, et præcipuum*<sup>3</sup>, that is, "the first, and the chief of the apostles."

We may not imagine, as M. Harding seemeth to do, that Peter was made a lord, or prince, and had power and dominion over his brethren. St Ambrose, as it is before alleged, comparing Peter and Paul together, saith thus: *Inter ipsos quis cui præferatur, incertum est*<sup>4</sup>: "Whether of these two I may set before the other, I cannot tell." Likewise St Cyprian saith: *Hoc erant... ceteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis*<sup>5</sup>: "The rest of the apostles were the same that Peter was, endued with like fellowship both of honour and of power." St Ambrose saith: "He cannot discern between Peter and Paul, whether he may set before other." St Cyprian saith: "All the apostles had like honour, and like power." Yet, by M. Harding's fantasy, Peter only was the prince; and all the rest were subjects and underlings unto him.

But Chrysostom saith: "Christ made Peter ruler over the whole world<sup>6</sup>." I know not what special power M. Harding will gather of these words. For the same commission that was given to Peter, in as large and as ample sort was given also to the rest of the apostles. Christ said unto them all: *Ite in universum mundum, &c.*: "Go into the whole world and preach the gospel." And St Paul saith it was prophesied of them before: *In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum*: "The sound of them went out into all the world." Therefore, that St Chrysostom speaketh here of St Peter, the same other where he speaketh in like form of words of all the apostles. Thus he writeth upon St John: *Apostoli suscipiunt curam totius mundi*<sup>7</sup>: "The apostles receive the charge of all the world." Likewise he writeth of St Paul: *Michaeli gens commissa est Judæorum: Paulo vero terræ, ac maria, atque universi orbis habitatio*<sup>8</sup>: "Unto Michael is committed the nation of the Jews; but land and sea and all the habitation of the world is com-

[<sup>1</sup> A governor, 1565.]

[<sup>2</sup> ...Nabuzardam principem coquorum, &c.—Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xlv. col. 209.]

[<sup>3</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Sermon. lxxvi. 4. De Verb. Evang. Matt. xiv. Tom. V. col. 416. See before, page 428, note 8.]

[<sup>4</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1614. Sermon. in Fest. SS. Petr. et Paul. Tom. V. col. 142. See before, page 367, note 12. It may be added that this is really a

homily of Maximus.—Op. Lut. 1623. col. 664.]

[<sup>5</sup> Cyprian. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Unit. Eccles. pp. 107, 8.]

[<sup>6</sup> See before, page 429, note 11.]

[<sup>7</sup> ...ἐμὲλλον τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν ἀναδέξασθαι.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Joan. Hom. lxxxviii. Tom. VIII. p. 528.]

[<sup>8</sup> Id. De Laud. Paul. Apost. Hom. iii. Tom. II. p. 486.]

Exod. vi.  
Num. x.  
2 Kings xxv.  
Dist. 44.  
Cum autem.  
In Bruto.  
Tuscul. ii.

August. de  
Verbis Dom.  
in Evang.  
Matt. cap.  
xiv.

Ambros. Ser.  
66.

Cyprian. de Sim-  
plicitate Præ-  
latorum.

Chrysost. in  
Matt. Hom.  
55.

Matt. xxviii.  
Mark xvi.

Psal. xix.  
Rom. x.

Chrysost. in  
Johan. Hom.  
87.

Chrysost. in  
Act. Hom.  
iii.

mitted unto Paul." And again : *Paulo Deus omnem prædicationem, et res orbis, et mysteria cuncta, universamque dispensationem concessit*<sup>9</sup> : "God hath given unto Paul all manner preaching, the matters of the world, all mysteries, and the ordering of all." So likewise saith St Gregory : *Paulus catenis vinctus Romam petit occupaturus mundum*<sup>10</sup> : "Paul, being bound with chains, went to Rome, to conquer the whole world." And again he saith : [*Paulus*] *ad Christum conversus, caput effectus est nationum; quia obtinuit totius ecclesiæ principatum*<sup>11</sup> : "Paul, being converted unto Christ, was made the head of nations, because he obtained the chieftly of all the church." This was that universal power that Chrysostom saith was given unto St Peter; and that not severally unto him alone, but jointly and together with all the rest of Christ's apostles. Which thing the same Chrysostom other where plainly declareth by these words : *Apostoli universum orbem terrarum pervaserunt, et omnibus principibus fuerunt magis proprie principes, regibus potentiores*<sup>12</sup> : "The apostles ranged over the whole world, and were more like princes than the princes indeed, and more mighty than the kings." Thus was not only Peter, but also all the rest and every of the apostles, made rulers over the whole world.

Paul  
chief.

Chrysost. in  
Epist. ad  
Rom. Hom.  
18.  
Greg. in Job.  
Lib. xxvii.  
cap. vi.  
Greg. in  
1 Reg. Lib.  
iv. cap. iv.

Chrysost. in  
Psalm. xlv.

It is further alleged, that "Peter appointed James bishop of Hierusalem," and the same avouched by Chrysostom<sup>13</sup>. Although this place of Chrysostom import not greatly, yet being well sifted and considered, it may seem very suspicious, as nothing agreeing either with that went before, or with that followeth afterward, but altogether savouring of some corruption. If M. Harding himself would consider the words with indifferent judgment, I doubt not but he would marvel how they came thither.

Chrysost. in  
Johan. Hom.  
87.

Neither is it likely that James took authority of Peter, having before taken sufficient authority of Christ himself. For this commission Christ gave to every of his apostles all alike : "As my living Father sent me, so do I send you; ye shall be witnesses to me, even to the ends of the world." And if Peter gave authority unto James, who then gave authority unto Paul? Certainly St Paul dwelt in no peculiar, but was as much subject to jurisdiction as St James. But St Paul saith "he was an apostle, *non ab hominibus, neque per hominem*, neither of men nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." "They that were the chief of the apostles gave nothing unto me." "The preaching of the gospel among the gentiles was committed unto me, even as unto Peter the preaching of the gospel among the Jews." And Chrysostom expounding the same place saith thus : *Paulus nihil opus habebat Petro, nec illius egebat voce, sed honore par erat illi: nihil hic dicam amplius*<sup>14</sup> : "Paul had no need of Peter's help, nor stood in need of his voice, but was in honour as good as he: I will say no more." Hereby it may appear, that the rest of the apostles took not their apostleship or authority of St Peter.

Luke xxiv.  
John xv.  
Acts i.  
John xvii.  
John xx.

Gal. i.

Gal. ii.

Chrysost. in  
Epist. ad Gal.  
cap. ii.

But being granted that Peter appointed James to preach in Hierusalem, yet will it not follow therefore that Peter had rule and dominion over the apostles. For thereof would follow this great inconvenience: The apostles at Hierusalem appointed Peter to go and to preach in Samaria; *ergo*, the apostles had rule and dominion over Peter. Which were an overthrow of M. Harding's greatest principle.

Acts viii.

But let us grant that Peter was the head of the apostles, as a matter nothing pertaining to this question; will M. Harding thereof conclude, that the pope is therefore the head of the universal church? For what is there in the pope that was in Peter? Preaching of the gospel? He preacheth not. Feeding of the flock? He feedeth not. He will say: Succession, and sitting in Peter's chair, which is in Rome. A man may answer: "The scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' chair."

Matt. xxiii.

[<sup>9</sup> Id. in Epist. ad Rom. Hom. xviii. Tom. IX. p. 635.]

[<sup>10</sup> Idem rursus dum catenis vinctus Romam peteret Paulus occupaturus mundum, &c. — Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Lib. xxxvii. in cap. xxxvi. B. Job. cap. xi. Tom. I. col. 861.]

[<sup>11</sup> Id. Lib. iv. in 1. Reg. cap. v. 28. Tom. III.

Pars II. col. 250.]

[<sup>12</sup> Chrysost. Op. Expos. in Psalm. xlv. Tom. V. p. 181.]

[<sup>13</sup> See before, page 428.]

[<sup>14</sup> Id. in cap. i. Epist. ad Gal. Tom. X. p. 677.]

Paul  
chief.

August.  
contra Lit.  
Petil. Lib. i.

1 Cor. xii.  
Rom. xii.  
Eph. i.

But M. Harding knoweth that Peter, when he received this privilege, was in Hierusalem, and not in Rome. Therefore this argument would better stand thus: Peter neither had dominion over the rest of the apostles, nor was bishop of Rome when Christ spake unto him; therefore the bishop of Rome cannot justly claim hereby the universal power and dominion over all the world. Verily St Augustine saith: *Paulus ipse non poterat esse caput eorum, quos plantaverat*<sup>1</sup>, &c.: "Paul himself could not be the head of them that he had planted; for he saith that we being many are one body in Christ, and that Christ himself is the head of that universal body." Of these words of St Augustine we may gather this reason: St Paul could not be the head of them that he had planted; therefore much less may the pope be the head of them that he never planted.

Auth. Coll.  
ix. De Eccles.  
Tit. i.

Cod. de Sa-  
cro-sanct.  
Recl. cap.  
Decernimus.

Yet reply will be made, that Theodoretus calleth the church of Rome *τῆς οἰκουμένης προκαθήμενην*, which words M. Harding untruly translateth "president, or bearing rule over the world." For he knoweth that the Greek word *προκαθήμεναι* signifieth, sitting in the first place, and forceth not of necessity any rule or government over others. He might better have turned it *ecclesiam orbis terrarum primariam*, "the most notable or chief church of the world." And so would his translation have well agreed with the constitutions of the emperor Justinian; wherein the pre-eminence of sitting in the first place in all councils and assemblies is by special privilege granted to the bishop of Rome<sup>2</sup>.

Likewise it will be replied, that Cyprian calleth the church of Rome *ecclesiam principalem*<sup>3</sup>, "the principal church;" whereof it were much for M. Harding to reason thus:

The church of Rome is a principal church;

*Ergo*, the bishop of Rome is head of the universal church.

Cypr. Lib. i.  
Epist. 3.

For Cyprian himself in the same epistle in plain express words saith: "The authority of the bishops of Africa is as good as the authority of the bishop of Rome<sup>4</sup>."

Cicero in  
Catil. Orat.  
iv.

Cicero, to blaze the nobility of that city, calleth it *lucem orbis terrarum, atque arcem omnium gentium*, "the light of the world, and the castle of all nations."

Petr. Crinit.  
Lib. i. cap.  
xviii.

Hieron. ad  
Algas. Quæst.  
xi.  
Concil.  
Chalced.  
Act. 1.

Frontinus likewise: *Roma urbs indiges, terrarumque dea*<sup>5</sup>: "Rome is a wantless city, and the goddess of the world." And St Hierome of the same in his time saith: *Romanum imperium... nunc universas gentes tenet*<sup>6</sup>: "The empire of Rome now possesseth all nations." And in<sup>7</sup> the council of Chalcedon the emperor of Rome is called *dominus omnis terræ*, and *dominus universi mundi*<sup>8</sup>, "the lord of all the earth," and "the lord of the whole world." In consideration as well of this worldly state and majesty, as also of the number and constancy of martyrs, of the place of Peter's travail, of the antiquity of the church, and of the purity of doctrine, the church of Rome was called the principal church of all others.

Polyd. Verg.  
De Invent.  
Rer. Lib. iv.

But he addeth further: *Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*: "From whence the unity of the priesthood first began." For that these words seem to weigh much, I think it good herein to hear the judgment of some other man that may seem indifferent. Polydorus Vergilius, expounding the same words of Cyprian, writeth thus: *Ne quis erret, nulla alia ratione sacerdotalis ordo a Romano episcopo profectus esse dici potest, nisi apud Italos duntaxat id factum [esse] intelligatur: cum perditu ante adventum Petri in urbem Romam apud Hierosolymos sacerdotium rite institutum fuisse, liquido liqueat*<sup>9</sup>: "Lest any man hereby deceive himself, it cannot

[<sup>1</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Contr. Lit. Petil. Lib. i. cap. v. 6. Lib. iii. cap. xlii. 51. Tom. IX. cols. 208, 322. See before, page 379, note 4.]

[<sup>2</sup> Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Auth. Coll. ix. Tit. xiv. Novell. cxxxi. 2. Tom. II. p. 184. Id. Cod. Lib. i. Tit. ii. 16. Tom. II. p. 8. But this last, a constitution of Leo and Anthemius, seems rather to intend the see of Constantinople.]

[<sup>3</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cornel. Epist. lix. pp. 135, 6.]

[<sup>4</sup> ... nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, &c.—Id. ibid. pp. 136, 7.]

[<sup>5</sup> Frontinus urbem Romam veteri verbo indigetem vocavit: Romana, inquit, urbs, &c.—Petr. Crinit. De Honest. Discipl. Lugd. 1585. Lib. i. cap. xviii. p. 96.]

[<sup>6</sup> Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Ad Algas. Lib. Quæst. Quæst. xi. Tom. IV. Pars i. col. 209.]

[<sup>7</sup> And therefore in, 1565.]

[<sup>8</sup> Concil. Chalced. Act. i. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. pp. 813, &c. See also Concil. Stud. Labb. e; Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. IV. cols. 113, 395.]

[<sup>9</sup> Polyd. Verg. De Invent. Rer. Amst. 1671. Lib. iv. cap. vi. pp. 250, 1.]

in any other wise be said that the order of priesthood grew first from the bishop of Rome, unless we understand it only within Italy. For it is clear and out of question, that priesthood was orderly appointed at Hierusalem a good while before Peter ever came to Rome." This commendation therefore, by the judgment of Polydore, was given by St Cyprian to the church of Rome in respect of Italy, and not in respect of the whole world. And therefore St Augustine saith: *Civitas, quasi mater et caput est ceterarum: unde etiam metropolis appellatur*<sup>10</sup>: "The city is as the mother and the head of other towns; and thereof (in respect of such towns) it is called the mother-city." And in this sense Chrysostom calleth the city of Antioch *metropolim fidei*<sup>11</sup>, "the mother of the faith."

August. de  
Con. Evang.  
Lib. iii.

Ad Pop.  
Antioch.  
Hom. 17.

M. Harding saith further: "The church is called the house of God; the ruler whereof," saith St Ambrose, "in these days is Damasus<sup>12</sup>." Here is narrow seeking to find out somewhat; and yet the same somewhat will be worth nothing. First, what opinion St Ambrose had herein, it is easy elsewhere of other his words to be seen. In his epistle unto the emperor Valentinian he calleth Damasus, not prince of the people, nor head of the church, nor universal bishop, but only bishop of the church of Rome<sup>13</sup>. And, writing unto Siricius the bishop of Rome, he calleth him his brother<sup>14</sup>.

Ambros. Lib.  
v. Epist. 30.

Ambros. Lib.  
x. Epist. 81.

But he calleth Damasus by express words, the ruler of God's church. He might have had the like witness of St Hierome: [*Damasus*] *virgo ecclesie virginis doctor* [est]<sup>15</sup>: "Damasus, being a virgin, is the teacher of the church, that is a virgin." And what will M. Harding gather hereof? Or what thinketh he of Ambrose himself and of other bishops? was not every of them the ruler of the church of God? Verily St Paul thus exhorteth the clergy of Ephesus at his departing thence: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to rule the church of God, which he hath gotten with his blood." There appeareth no other difference between these words of St Paul, and the other of St Ambrose, saving only that St Ambrose saith, *Rector ecclesie*; and St Paul saith, *Regere ecclesiam*. Yet did not St Paul by his words appoint the ministers of Ephesus to rule over the whole church of God. Thus St Hierome calleth Origen *magistrum ecclesiarum*<sup>16</sup>, "the master or teacher of the churches." Thus Theodoretus calleth Chrysostom *doctorem orbis terrarum*<sup>17</sup>, "the teacher of all the world." Thus Nazianzene calleth St Basil "the pillar and buttress of the church"<sup>18</sup>.

De Apol.  
adv. Jov.

Acts xx.

Hieron. de  
Locis Heb.  
Theod. Lib.  
v. cap. xxxii.  
Nazianz. in  
Laudem  
Patris sui.  
σπύλον και  
ἰδραίωμα.

But mark well, gentle reader, and thou shalt<sup>19</sup> see that M. Harding hath prettily wrested up this place of St Ambrose quite out of tune, and of an indefinite or a particular proposition, contrary to his rules of logic, will needs conclude an universal, the better to maintain the pope's universal power. For that St Ambrose speaketh indefinitely of a church, without limitation of one or other, that M. Harding stretcheth and forceth to the whole universal church; as if the whole church of God had been at Rome. The like kind of error led Bonifacius the eighth to reason thus: *Dominus dixit generaliter, Pasce oves meas, non singulariter, has, aut illas; ergo commisisse intelligitur universas*<sup>20</sup>: "The Lord said generally unto Peter, Feed my sheep: he said not specially, Feed these or them; therefore we must understand that he committed them unto Peter altogether." If M. Harding

De Major. et  
Obed. Unam  
sanctam.  
John xxi.

[<sup>10</sup> ...extra civitatem, quæ caput et quasi mater est ceterarum, unde metropolis appellatur.—August. Op. De Consens. Evang. Lib. iii. cap. xxv. 71. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 141.]

[<sup>11</sup> These words are not found in the homily cited. See, however, Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Ad Pop. Ant. Hom. xvii. Tom. II. p. 176; where Chrysostom shews that the events narrated in scripture as having occurred at Antioch bestow on it the true honour of a metropolis, though deprived by the emperor of that name.]

[<sup>12</sup> See before, page 429.]

[<sup>13</sup> ...Damasus Romanæ ecclesiæ sacerdos, &c.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Ad Valent. Epist. xvii. 10. Tom. II. col. 826.]

[<sup>14</sup> Id. ad Syric. Epist. xlii. 2. Tom. II. col. 966.]

[<sup>15</sup> Hieron. Op. Ad Pammach. Epist. xxx. pro Libr. adv. Jovin. Apol. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 240.]

[<sup>16</sup> ...Origenem, quem post apostolos, ecclesiarum magistrum.—Id. Præf. in Lib. de Int. Nom. Hebr. Tom. II. cols. 3, 4.]

[<sup>17</sup> Theodor. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. V. cap. xxxii. p. 238.]

[<sup>18</sup> Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. In Patr. Fun. Orat. xviii. 1. Tom. I. p. 330.]

[<sup>19</sup> Shall, 1611.]

[<sup>20</sup> ...dicente Domino ipsi Petro, 'Pasce oves meas'—meas, inquit, et generaliter, non singulariter has, vel illas; per quod commisisse sibi intelligitur universas.—Bonifac. VIII. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Extrav. Comm. Lib. i. De Major. et Obed. cap. 1. col. 207.]

Ambros. in  
1 Tim. cap.  
iii.

had not taken St Ambrose up so short by the words that immediately follow, he might well have known his meaning. For thus he openeth what he meant by the house of God: *Ibi necesse est dicatur esse domus Dei et veritas, ubi secundum voluntatem suam timetur*<sup>1</sup>: "There we must needs say God's house and truth is, wheresoever God is feared according to his will." This house was in all places where God was known and served; and not only in the church of Rome.

Athanas. in  
Apol. ii.

Yet will M. Harding say: These be evasions. For St Ambrose seemeth to acknowledge a special rule and government in Damasus that was not common unto others. Certainly his words import not so. And how can we know his meaning but by his words? But to put the matter out of doubt, let us consider whether the self-same form of speech have been applied unto any others in like sort. Arsenius in his submission writeth thus unto Athanasius: *Nos quoque diligimus pacem, et unitatem*<sup>2</sup> *cum ecclesia catholica, cui tu per Dei gratiam præfectus es*<sup>3</sup>: "We also love peace and unity with the catholic church, over which you by the grace of God are made governor." Here Athanasius is pronounced governor of the catholic church; yet was he not the bishop of Rome. So likewise saith St

Cypr. ad Jub.  
de Hær. Bapt.

Cyprian: *Hæc ecclesia una est, quæ tenet et possidet omnem sponsi sui in gratiam: hæc*<sup>4</sup> *præsidemus*<sup>5</sup>: "This church is one that keepeth and holdeth the grace of her spouse: in this church we are the rulers." Here St Cyprian calleth himself the president or ruler of God's church; yet was he the bishop of Carthage, and not of Rome. To be short, in like sort Origen pronounceth generally of all

Orig. in Matt.  
Tract. i.

priests: *Si tales fuerint, ut a Christo super illos ædificetur ecclesia*<sup>6</sup>: "If they be such as upon them the church of God may be built." Here Origen imagineth that every priest is the foundation of God's church; yet were it hard to say every priest is bishop of Rome. St Ambrose's meaning therefore is, that every bishop or patriarch within his precincts or province is the ruler of the whole

Cypr. de Sim.  
Pælat.

church. And this is it that Cyprian seemeth to say: *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*<sup>7</sup>: "The bishopric is one, a portion whereof is possessed in whole of every bishop." Therefore M. Harding seemeth to do wrong to St Ambrose, thus violently to abuse his words to prove the bishop of Rome's universal power.

Here M. Harding, doubting lest his reader, being weary of these cold slender shifts, and looking for some other more substantial and formal reasons, would say, "I hear not yet the head of the universal church," purposely preventeth the matter, and saith: "What forceth that, whether that very term be used in any ancient writers<sup>8</sup> or no?" Gentle reader, I beseech thee, mark well this dealing. This name, "the head of the universal church," is the very thing that we deny, and that M. Harding hath taken in hand to prove, and boldly avoucheth that he hath already plainly shewed and proved the same. Yet now in the end, finding himself destitute, he turneth it off as a thing of nought, and saith: What forceth that, whether he were called by that very name or no? As though he would say: All the old fathers of the church, both Greeks and Latins, wanted words and eloquence, and either they could not, or they durst not call the head of the church by his own peculiar name. Howbeit, if the bishop of Rome be so called, it may be shewed; if not, then is my first assertion true. Verily, touching the title of universal bishop, St Gregory calleth it *novum nomen*<sup>9</sup>, "a new name, unacquainted, and unknown unto the world;" and saith further: "If we quietly take this matter, we destroy the faith of the universal church<sup>10</sup>." This therefore was the cause, that the ancient doctors never called the bishop of Rome the head

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 32.  
Gregor. Lib.  
vi. Epist. 24.  
Universæ  
ecclesiæ  
fidem cor-  
rumpimus.

[<sup>1</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Comm. in Epist. i. ad Tim. cap. iii. Tom. II. Append. col. 296; where *illic* for *ibi*.]

[<sup>2</sup> Unanimitatem, 1565.]

[<sup>3</sup> Athanas. Op. Par. 1698. Apol. contr. Arian. 69. Tom. I. Pars i. p. 185.]

[<sup>4</sup> Sui gratiam: in hac, 1565.]

[<sup>5</sup> Hæc est una quæ tenet et possidet omnem Sponsi sui et Domini potestatem; in hac præsidemus, —Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Jubai. Epist. lxxiii. p. 203.]

[<sup>6</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. Comm. in Matt. Tom. xii. 14. Tom. III. p. 531. Origen speaks of those οἱ τὸν τόπον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκδικοῦντες χροῶνται τῷ ῥητῷ.]

[<sup>7</sup> Cypr. Op. De Unit. Eccles. p. 108.]

[<sup>8</sup> Writer, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>9</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Mauric. August. Epist. xx. Tom. II. col. 748.]

[<sup>10</sup> Id. Lib. vii. Indict. xv. Ad Anastas. Episc. Epist. xxvii. col. 873.]

of the church; for that they knew he was neither reputed nor taken so, nor was indeed the head of the church. M. Harding, having not yet found the thing that he so long sought for, at the last is fain to make it up by shift of reason: "The universal church," saith he, "is the house of God."

"Damasus is the ruler of the house of God; ergo, Damasus is ruler of the universal church."

This *sylogismus* is a manifest *fallax*, and hath as many faults as lines.

First, there is an equivocation or double understanding of these words, "the 1. house of God:" for both the universal church, and also every particular church, is God's house. Again, there is another *fallax*, which they call *ex meris particulis*, or a *non distributo ad distributum*.

Thirdly, there is another foul fault in the very form of the syllogism, easy for 3. any child to espy. For, contrary to all logic and order of reason, he concludeth in *secunda figura affirmativa*; whereas M. Harding knoweth, all the moods or forms of the second figure must needs conclude *negative*. The weakness hereof will the better appear by the like: The universal church is the catholic church. But Arsenius saith: Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria was ruler of the catholic church; ergo, Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria was ruler of the universal church.

Thus hitherto M. Jewel may truly say, M. Harding hath yet brought neither clause nor sentence sufficient to prove that the bishop of Rome was called either the universal bishop, or the head of the universal church.

#### M. HARDING. THE THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION.

[Peter and his successor called head of the church expressly. H. A. 1564.] But to satisfy these men, and to take away occasion of cavil, I will allege a few places where the express term "head" is attributed to Peter the first bishop of Rome, and by like right to his successors, and to the see apostolic. Chrysostom, speaking of the virtue and power of Peter, and of the stedfastness of the church, in the 55th Homily upon Matthew hath these words among other: Cujus pastor et caput homo piscator, atque ignobilis, &c.<sup>11</sup> By which words he affirmeth that the pastor and head of the church, being but a fisher, a man, and one of base parentage, passeth in firmness the nature of the diamond. Again, in an homily of the praises of Paul, he saith thus: "Neither was this man only such a one, but he also which was the head of the apostles, who oftentimes said he was ready to bestow his life for Christ, and yet was full sore afraid of death<sup>12</sup>." If he were head of the apostles, then was he head of the inferior people, and so head of the universal church.

A head for worthiness and boldness of spirit. So St Gregory saith: Paulus caput effectus est nationum. In 1 Regum. Lib. iv. cap. iiii.

Hierome, writing against Jovinian, saith: Propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio<sup>14</sup>: "For that cause among the twelve one<sup>15</sup> is specially chosen out, that, the head being ordained, occasion of schism may be taken away." Whereby it appeareth that Peter was constituted head for avoiding of division and schism. Now the danger of the inconvenience remaining still, yea, more than at that time, for the greater multitude of the church, and for sundry other imperfections, the same remedy must be thought to continue, unless we would say that Christ hath less care over<sup>16</sup> his church now that it is so much increased, than he had at the beginning, when his flock was small. For this cause, except we deny God's providence toward his church, there is one head for avoiding of schism also now, as well as in the apostles' time: which is<sup>17</sup> the successor of him that was head by Christ's appointment then, the bishop of Rome sitting in the seat that Peter sat in.

[<sup>11</sup> The words as alleged do not appear in the homily referred to: Peter is, however, repeatedly termed τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαῖος.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Matt. Hom. liv. (al. lv.) Tom. VII. pp. 547, 9. But see Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. In cap. Matt. xvi. Hom. lv. Tom. II. col. 460; where piscator homo, and ignobilis terrarum orbe reluctantem adamantis naturam firmitate superet.]

[<sup>12</sup> Οὗτος δὲ μόνος τοιοῦτος ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ

κορυφαῖος αὐτῶν πολλάκις εἰπὼν, ὅτι ἑτοιμός ἐστι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπιδοῦναι, σφόδρα ἐδεῖσκει θάνατον.—Id. De Laud. Paul. Hom. vi. Tom. II. p. 508.]

[<sup>13</sup> See before, page 431.]

[<sup>14</sup> Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Adv. Jovin. Lib. 1. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 168.]

[<sup>15</sup> On, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>16</sup> Of, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>17</sup> Which head is, H. A. 1564.]

## Head.

*Cyrrillus saith: Petrus ut princeps caputque ceterorum primus exclamavit, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi*<sup>1</sup>: "*Peter, as prince and head of the rest, first cried out, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.'*" *Augustine also, in a sermon to the people, calleth him head of the church, saying: Totius corporis membrum in ipso capite curat ecclesiæ, et in ipso vertice componit omnium membrorum sanitatem*<sup>2</sup>: "*He healeth the member of the whole body in the head itself of the church, and in the top itself he ordereth the health of all the members.*" *And in another place: Salvator quando pro se et Petro* Serm. 124. [de tempore. H. A. 1564.] *exsolvi jubet, pro omnibus exsolvisse videtur; quia sicut in Salvatore erant omnes causa magisterii, ita . . . post Salvatorem in Petro omnes* Lib. Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. Quæst. 75.

The hundred and twenty-fourth untruth, standing in the wilful falsifying of St Augustine.

\*St Augustine saith, Caput eorum, not Caput omnium.

*continentur: ipsum enim constituit caput (124) omnium*<sup>3</sup>: "*Our Saviour,*" *saith Augustine, "when as he commanded payment (for the emperor) to be made for himself and for Peter, he seemeth to have paid for all; because, as all were in our Saviour for cause of teaching, so after our Saviour all are contained in Peter; for he ordained him head of all."* *Here have these men the plain and express term, head of the rest, head of the church, head\* of all, and therefore of the universal church. What will they have more? Neither here can they say, that, although this title*<sup>4</sup> *of the head be given to Peter, yet it is not derived and transferred from him to his successors. For this is manifest, that Christ instituted his church, so as it should continue to the world's end, according to the saying of Esay the prophet: Super solium David, &c.: "Upon the seat of David, and upon his kingdom,* Cap. ix. *shall Messias sit to strengthen it, and to establish it in judgment and righteousness, from this day for evermore."* *And thereof it is evident that he ordained those who then were in ministry, so as their authority and power should be derived unto their after-comers for the utility of the church for ever; specially whereas he said: "Behold, I am with you until the end of the world."* *And therefore, as* Matt. ult. *Victor writeth in his story of persecution of the Vandals, Eugenius bishop of Carthago, convented of Obadus a great captain of Hunerick king of the Vandals, about a council to be kept in Africa for matters of the faith, betwixt the Arians, supported by the king and the catholics, said in this wise: Si nostram fidem, &c.: "If* Lib. ii. *the king's power desire to know our faith, which is one and the true, let him send to his friends. I will write also to my brethren, that my fellow-bishops come, who may declare the faith that is common to you and us;" (there he hath these words:) et præcipue ecclesia Romana, quæ caput est omnium ecclesiarum: "and specially the church of Rome, which is the head of all the churches"*<sup>5</sup>. *Naming the church of Rome, he meaneth the bishop there, or his legates to be sent in his stead.*

*Thus it is proved by good and ancient authorities, that the name and title of the head, ruler, president, chief and principal governor of the church, is of the fathers attributed, not only to Peter, but also to his successors, bishops of the see apostolic. And therefore M. Jewel may think himself by this charitably admonished to remember his promise of yielding and subscribing.*

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

I might well pass all these authorities over without answer, as being no part of this question. For I trust the indifferent reader of himself will soon believe, we seek no quarrel against St Peter, nor go about to scan his titles, or to abridge him of his right. It is known that St Peter, by these fathers here alleged, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, and Cyril, is called the top and head of the apostles. And, if need so required, the same might be avouched by authorities many more. For who is he that knoweth not this?

[<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. Comm. in Joan. Evang. Lib. xii. Tom. IV. p. 1118.]

[<sup>2</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. lxxix. 2. Tom. V. Append. col. 145; where *corporis morbum*, and *membrorum omnium*. This sermon is most probably not genuine.]

[<sup>3</sup> Id. Quæst. ex Nov. Test. Quæst. lxxv. Tom. III. Append. col. 73; where *Salvator autem cum pro se et Petro dari, and esse caput eorum.*]

[<sup>4</sup> This authority and title, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>5</sup> Si nostram fidem, quæ una et vera est, potestas regis cognoscere desiderat, mittat ad amicos suos: scribam et ego fratribus meis, ut veniant coepiscopi mei, qui vobis nobiscum communem fidem nostram valeant demonstrare, et præcipue, &c.—Vict. Utic. De Persec. Wand. Lib. II. in Biblioth. Vet. Patr. per M. de la Bigne, Par. 1624. Tom. VII. col. 602.]

But M. Harding knoweth the case is moved, not of St Peter, but specially and namely of the bishops of Rome. And of them he knoweth he should have answered, if his mind had been to deal plainly, and, as he saith, fully to satisfy his reader. Within the space of the first six hundred years there were in Rome sixty-eight bishops, for their constancy in the faith, for their virtue and learning far exceeding the rest, that have been sithence. The number of them being so great, their learning so notable, their life so holy, it is marvel M. Harding should not be able to shew, that any one of them all, in so long a time, was once called the head of the church, and therefore should thus rest only upon St Peter, who, when he received these titles, was not bishop of Rome; and of whom there is no question moved. Wherefore M. Harding may better consider his note in the margin; and, whereas he hath written thus, "Peter and his successors called the head of the church expressly;" he may rather amend it, and make it thus: Only Peter, and not one of his successors, called head of the church expressly. So should his note and his text agree together; and so should he not deceive his reader.

Head.

Here, by the way, I must put M. Harding in remembrance, notwithstanding, for his estimation's sake, he would fain have his forth in these matters, yet should he not therefore thus beguile the eyes of the simple, and thus misreport and falsify the words of the ancient fathers. For alleging St Hierome, he leaveth out words, and altogether dissembleth the whole meaning. In St Augustine he hath shifted and placed one word for another. St Hierome in that place, with great contention of words, commendeth St John above St Peter, namely, for that St Peter was a married man, and St John a virgin. In the heat of his talk he layeth this objection against himself: *At dices, super Petrum fundatur ecclesia: licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur*<sup>6</sup>: "But thou wilt say, the church was built upon Peter (and not upon John). Albeit in another place the same is done (that is, the church is built) upon all the apostles; and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and the strength of the church is built equally upon them all." M. Harding thought it good to skip and dissemble these words, notwithstanding they be joined all together in one sentence with the rest. It followeth: *Tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Johannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, et pene puer progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur*<sup>8</sup>: "Notwithstanding the disciples were all equal, yet therefore one is chosen among the twelve, that, a head being appointed, occasion of schism might be taken away. Thou wilt say again, And why was not John, being a virgin, chosen to be this head?" He answereth: "Christ gave the pre-eminence unto age; for Peter was an aged man; lest that John, being a young man, and in manner a child, should be placed before men of years." This therefore is St Hierome's meaning, that Christ, to avoid confusion, which lightly happeneth in all companies where as is none order, appointed St Peter, for that he was the eldest man, to speak and to deal for the rest, as the chief and head of all his brethren. Which order also was afterward universally taken throughout the world, that, in every congregation of priests, one should have a special pre-eminence above others, and be called *episcopus*, "the bishop<sup>7</sup>." This was thought a good politic way to avoid contention in the church; and not, as M. Harding imagineth, to make one man the universal ruler over all the world. But touching this whole matter I have answered more at large in the fifteenth division of this article.

M. Harding misallegeth the old doctors.

Hieron. adv. Jovin. Lib. 1.

The apostles all equal.

Hieron. ad Nepot. vii. Quæst. 1. In apibus. Hieron. in Epist. ad Tit. cap. i. Hieron. contr. Lucif.

In the allegation of St Augustine's words M. Harding, for his pleasure, hath uttered manifest corruption, in the stead of this word *eorum* purposely using this word *omnium*. For whereas St Augustine saith, *Ipsum constituit caput eorum*<sup>8</sup>, "Christ appointed him to be the head of them;" M. Harding thought it better to allege it thus: *Ipsum constituit caput omnium*: "Christ appointed him to be

M. Harding misreporteth St Augustine. August. in Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. Quæst. 75.

[<sup>6</sup> Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Adv. Jovin. Lib. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 168; where *dices*, and *ac pene puer*.]

[<sup>7</sup> Id. Ad Rust. Mon. Epist. xcv. Tom. IV. Pars II.

col. 775; Comm. in Epist. ad Tit. cap. i. Tom. IV. Pars I. col. 413; Adv. Lucifer. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 295. See before, pages 372, 3.]

[<sup>8</sup> See before, page 436, note 3.]



## Head.

head of all." He saw right well that corrupt doctrine would not stand without some corruption.

Further, I doubt not but M. Harding doth well remember, that the question that lieth between us riseth not of any extraordinary name, once or twice given upon some special affection, but of the usual and known style of the bishops of Rome. For Theophrastus saith: *Quæ semel aut bis accidunt, contemnunt leges*<sup>1</sup>: "The law-makers have no regard to such things as never happen but once or twice." Neither whatsoever name is given to any man, of favour or admiration of his virtue, is therefore to be reckoned as his ordinary title. St Chrysostom writeth thus of the emperor Theodosius: *Læsus est, qui non habet parem ullum super terram, summitas, et caput omnium super terram hominum*<sup>2</sup>: "He is offended that in the earth hath no peer, the top and the head of all men in the world." Eleutherius the bishop of Rome gave this title unto Lucius the king of this island: *Vos estis vicarius Christi*<sup>3</sup>: "You (being the king) are Christ's<sup>4</sup> vicar." Chrysostom, speaking of Elias, calleth him *prophetarum caput*<sup>5</sup>, "the head of the prophets." The council of Ephesus, writing unto the emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus, expresseth Cyrillus the bishop of Alexandria by this title: "*Caput...episcoporum congregatorum* Cyrillus<sup>6</sup>: "Cyrillus the head of the bishops there assembled." Likewise Gregory entitleth St Paul in this wise: [*Paulus*] *ad Christum conversus caput effectus est nationum*<sup>7</sup>: "Paul, being converted unto Christ, was made the head of nations." And to take nearer view of the bishop of Rome's own special titles, pope Nicolas thereof writeth thus: *Constat [pontificem] a pio principe Constantino...Deum appellatum*<sup>8</sup>: "It is well known that the pope of that godly prince Constantinus was called God." And further they say: *Papa est in primatu Abel, in zelo Elias, in mansuetudine David, in potestate Petrus, in unctione Christus*<sup>9</sup>: "The pope in primacy is Abel, in zeal is Elias, in mildness is David, in power is Peter, in anointing is Christ." These names, as I have said, of affection and favour have been given: yet will not M. Harding therefore say, that either the emperor ought to be called the head of all men upon earth, or the king Christ's vicar, or Elias the head of the prophets, or Cyrillus the head of the council, or St Paul the head of nations, or the bishop of Rome God or Christ, as by an usual and ordinary title. And although, as I have said, St Peter's titles be nothing incident to this question, yet we may examine M. Harding's argument touching the same: "Peter," saith he, "was head of the apostles;"

*Ergo*, he was head of other inferior people, and so head of the universal church.

This is a deceitful kind of argument, and riseth by degrees and steps, and in the schools is called *sorites*. In like sort M. Harding might conclude thus:

Elias, as Chrysostom saith, was "head of the prophets;"

*Ergo*, he was head of the inferior people, and so of the whole universal church.

But the error hereof will better appear by that argument that Themistocles the governor of Athens sometimes made of himself, his wife, and his child. Thus he said:

The people of Athens is ruled by me: I am ruled by my wife:

My wife is ruled by my child;

*Ergo*, the people of Athens is ruled by my child.

In this reason this one word "rule" hath three significations. For Themistocles ruled as a governor, his wife as a shrew, his child as a wanton. And therein

[<sup>1</sup> Τὸ γὰρ ἅπαξ ἢ δις, id est, Quod enim semel aut bis existit, ut ait Theophrastus, παραβαίνουσιν οἱ νομοθέται, id est, prætereunt leges.—Paulus in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. i. Tit. iii. 6. Tom. I. p. 78. See also ibid. 3, 4, 5.]

[<sup>2</sup> Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Ad Pop. Ant. Hom. ii. Tom. II. p. 23.]

[<sup>3</sup> See before, page 306.] [<sup>4</sup> Gods, 1565.]

[<sup>5</sup> Chrysost. Op. in Epist. ad Rom. Hom. xviii. Tom. IX. p. 636.]

[<sup>6</sup> Concil. Ephes. Relat. ad Imp. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. III.

col. 656.]

[<sup>7</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Lib. iv. in i. Reg. cap. v. 28. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 250.]

[<sup>8</sup> Nicol. Papa in Epist. ad Michael. Imp. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xcvi. can. 7. col. 467.]

[<sup>9</sup> Bernard uses the following expressions: "...tu primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedech, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moyses, judicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctione Christus.—Bernard. Op. Par. 1690. De Consid. Lib. II. cap. viii. Vol. I. Tom. II. col. 422.]

standeth the error of the argument. So likewise this word "head" signifieth sometime the chief in learning, sometime the chief in dignity, sometime the chief in government. And hereof also in reasoning riseth great error. For it were great folly to reason thus: Paul in learning and dignity was the head of all others; *ergo*, he was the head in government over all others.

Peter not  
Head.

Touching Victor, that wrote the story of the Vandals, he is neither scripture, nor council, nor doctor, nor writeth the order or practice of the primitive church; nor is it well known either of what credit he was, or when he lived; nor doth he call the bishop of Rome the head of the universal church: only he saith: "Rome is the chief or head church of all others." Which thing of our part for that time is not denied; as may better appear by that is written before in sundry places of this article. So doth Prudentius call Bethleem the head of the world: *Sancta Bethleem caput est orbis*<sup>10</sup>. So likewise Chrysostom, giving instructions unto Flavianus touching the city of Antioch, saith unto him: *Cogita...de totius orbis capite*<sup>11</sup>: "Think thou of (Antioch, that is) the head of all the world." Hereby is meant a head of dignity or honour, and not of rule.

Prudent. in  
Enchir.

Chrysost. ad  
Pop.  
Antioch.  
Hom. 3.

M. Harding, finding not one of the whole number of the bishops of Rome once named the head of the whole church, therefore thought it best to found his proof upon St Peter. And for that cause others of his side have advanced<sup>12</sup> St Peter above all creatures. Bonifacius saith that God took Peter *in consortium individue Trinitatis*, "into the fellowship even of the indivisible Trinity;" and that "from him, as from the head, he poureth all his gifts into the body"<sup>13</sup>. Hereof M. Harding forceth his argument thus: Peter was the head of the apostles, and so of all other inferiors;

Extr. de  
Elect. et  
Elect. Potest.  
Bonif. viii.  
Fundamenta.  
Ab ipso,  
quasi quodam  
capite, dona  
sua omnia  
diffundit in  
corpus.

Socrat. Lib.  
iii. cap. xxi.

Matt. iii.

Acts xix.

*Ergo*, the bishop of Rome is the head of the universal church.

Thus, as Julianus the emperor in his frenzy sometime<sup>14</sup> imagined that the great Alexander's soul was come by succession to dwell in him<sup>15</sup>; even so now the bishops of Rome imagine, by like phantasy or frenzy, that St Peter's soul cometh by succession to dwell in them; and that therefore they ought to have whatsoever title or interest Peter had. And for that cause they say, "We are Peter's successors:" even as the Pharisees sometime said, "We be the children of Abraham." But St John the Baptist said unto them: "Put not your affiance in such succession. For God is able even of the stones to raise up children unto Abraham." And when the children of Sæva, being sorcerers and infidels, began to practise in the name of Christ and Paul, the man possessed made them answer: "Christ I know, and Paul I know; but what are you?" Surely Peter was not the head of the apostles, because he was bishop of Rome. For he was so appointed by Christ in consideration of age and boldness of spirit, long before he came to Rome; yea, and had so been, and so had continued, although he had never come to Rome. Therefore M. Harding's argument is a *fallax*, and in the schools is called *fallacia accidentis*.

Thus, notwithstanding St Peter were head of the church, yet cannot the bishop of Rome therefore of right claim the same title. And albeit St Peter, of special reverence, and admiration of his spirit and virtues, were sometimes so called, as St Paul sometimes also<sup>16</sup> was; yet, understanding this chiefly for universal power, and government, and authority to command, St Peter neither was the head of the universal church indeed, nor was so esteemed or taken among his brethren, as many ways it may well appear. And therefore St Gregory saith: *Paulus membra dominici corporis certis extra Dominum quasi capitibus, et ipsis quidem apostolis subijci particulariter evitavit*<sup>17</sup>: "St Paul forbade

Paul the head  
as well as  
Peter.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 33.

[<sup>10</sup> Aur. Prudent. Enchir. in Biblioth. Vet. Patr. per M. de la Bigne, Par. 1624. Nov. Test. 2. Tom. VIII. p. 561.]

[<sup>11</sup> Chrysost. Op. Ad Pop. Ant. Hom. iii. Tom. II. p. 36.]

[<sup>12</sup> Advanced, 1565.]

[<sup>13</sup> ... ut ab ipso [Petro], quasi quodam capite, dona sua velut in corpus omne diffunderet. Hunc enim in consortium individue unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat, Dominus voluit nominari, &c.—

Nicol. III. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Sext. Decretal. Lib. i. Tit. vi. cap. 17. col. 131.]

[<sup>14</sup> Sometimes, 1565.]

[<sup>15</sup> Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. III. cap. xxi. p. 159.]

[<sup>16</sup> Upon like consideration also, 1565.]

[<sup>17</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. XIII. Ad Johan. Episc. Epist. xviii. Tom. II. col. 742; where we find *ille* for *Paulus*, *extra Christum*, and *partialiter*.]

August.  
contr. Lit.  
Pet. Lib. i.  
cap. v.

August.  
contr. Epist.  
Parm. Lib.  
ii. cap. viii.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist. 38.

that the members of Christ's body should not be subject particularly unto any certain heads besides the Lord; no, not unto the apostles themselves." So saith St Augustine, as it is before alleged: [*Nec*] *apostolus Paulus caput est et origo eorum, quos plantaverat*<sup>1</sup>: "Neither is Paul himself the head of them whom he planted." Likewise again he saith: *Paulus...apostolus, quanquam sub capite præcipuum membrum,...tamen...membrum est corporis Christi*<sup>2</sup>: "Paul the apostle, although he be a special member under (Christ) the head, yet is he a member (and not the head) of Christ's body." To conclude, St Gregory saith: *Certe Petrus apostolus primum membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ [est]. Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? Et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra [sunt ecclesiæ]. Atque, ut cuncta brevi cingulo locutionis astringam, sancti ante legem, sancti in lege, sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus Domini, in membris sunt ecclesiæ constituti: et nemo se unquam universalem vocari voluit*<sup>3</sup>: "Indeed Peter the apostle is the chief member of the holy universal church. Paul, Andrew, and John, what are they else, but the heads of several people?" Yet notwithstanding under one head they are all members of the church. To be short, the saints before the law, the saints in the law, the saints under grace, all accomplishing the Lord's body, are placed among the members of the church; and there was never yet none that would call himself universal."

Hereof we may well conclude thus: St Peter, touching government and ordinary rule, was not the head of the universal church; *ergo*, much less is the pope the head of the universal church.

#### M. HARDING. THE THIRTY-THIRD DIVISION.

*I will add to all that hath been hitherto said of this matter a saying of Martin Luther, that such as do little regard the gravity of ancient fathers of the old church may yet somewhat be moved with the lightness of the young father Luther, patriarch and founder of their new church. Lightness I may well call it; for in this saying, which I shall here rehearse, he doth not so soberly allow the pope's primacy, as in sundry other treatises he doth rashly and furiously inveigh against the same. In a little treatise intituled, Resolutio*

[The pope's primacy acknowledged by Martin Luther. H. A. 1564.]

*Lutheriana super Propositione sua 13, De Potestate Papæ, his words be these: Primum quod me movet Romanum pontificem esse aliis omnibus, quos saltem noverimus se pontifices gerere, superiorem, est ipsa voluntas Dei, quam in ipso facto videmus. Neque enim sine voluntate Dei in hanc monarchiam unquam venire potuisset Romanus pontifex. At voluntas Dei, quoquo modo nota fuerit, cum reverentia suscipienda est; ideoque non licet temere Romano pontifici in suo primatu resistere. Hæc autem ratio tanta est, ut si etiam nulla scriptura, nulla alia causa esset, hæc tamen satis esset ad compescendam temeritatem resistentium. Et hac sola ratione gloriosissimus martyr Cyprianus per multas epistolas confidentissime gloriatur contra omnes episcoporum quorumcunque adversarios: sicut 3 Regum legimus, quod decem tribus Israel discesserunt a Roboam filio Salomonis; et tamen quia voluntate Dei sive auctoritate factum est, ratum apud Deum fuit. Nam et apud theologos omnes voluntas signi, quam vocant operationem Dei, non minus quam alia signa voluntatis Dei, ut præcepta prohibitiva, etc. metuenda est. Ideo non video quomodo sint excusati a schismatis reatu, qui huic voluntati contravenientes, sese a Romani pontificis auctoritate subtrahunt. Ecce hæc est una prima mihi insuperabilis ratio, quæ me subicit Romano pontifici, et primatum ejus confiteri cogit*<sup>4</sup>: "*The first thing, that moveth me to think the bishop of Rome to be over all other that we know to be bishops, is the very will of God, which we see in the fact or deed itself. For without the will of God the*

[<sup>1</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Contr. Lit. Petil. Lib. i. cap. v. 6. Tom. IX. col. 208. See before, page 379, note 4.]

[<sup>2</sup> Id. Contr. Epist. Parmen. Lib. ii. cap. viii. 16. Tom. IX. col. 34.]

[<sup>3</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiiii. Ad Johan. Episc. Epist. xviii.

Tom. II. col. 743; where *Petrus apostolorum primus, and sub lege.*]

[<sup>4</sup> Peoples, 1565.]

[<sup>5</sup> Luth. Op. Witeb. 1554-83. Resol. sup. Prop. xlii. de Potest. Papæ, Tom. I. fol. 312; where 3 *Regum* 12, and *prohibita.*]

bishop of Rome could never have been<sup>6</sup> comen unto this monarchy. But the will of God, by what mean soever it be known, is to be received reverently: and therefore it is not lawful rashly to resist the bishop of Rome in his primacy. And this is so great a reason for the same, that, if there were no scripture at all, nor other reason, yet this were enough to stay the rashness of them that resist. And through this only reason the most glorious martyr Cyprian in many of his epistles vaunteth himself very boldly against all the adversaries of bishops, whatsoever they were. As in the third book of the Kings we read that the ten tribes of Israel departed from Roboam, Salomon's son: yet, because it was done by the will or authority of God, it stood in effect with God. For among all the divines the will of the sign, which they call the working of God, is to be feared no less than other signs of God's will, as commandments prohibitive, &c. Therefore I see not how they may be excused of the guilt of schism, which, going against this will, withdraw themselves from the authority of the bishop of Rome. Lo, this is one chief invincible reason that maketh me to be under the bishop of Rome, and compelleth me to confess his primacy." Thus<sup>7</sup> far Luther.

Thus I have briefly touched some deal of the scriptures, of the canons and councils, of the edicts of emperors, of the fathers' sayings, of the reasons, and of the manifold practices of the church, which are wont to be alleged for the pope's primacy and supreme authority. Withal I have proved that which M. Jewel denieth, (125) that the bishop of Rome, within six hundred years after Christ, hath been called the universal bishop of no small number of men of great credit, and very oftentimes head of the universal church, both in terms equivalent, and also expressly. Now to the next article.

The hundred and twenty-fifth untruth. For, Peter only excepted, either of these titles resteth yet unproved.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The case goeth somewhat hardly of M. Harding's side, when he is thus driven for want of other authorities to crave aid at Luther's hand. Touching alteration in religion, which it pleaseth him to name lightness, if he would soberly remember his own often changes, and the light occasions of the same, he should find small cause to condemn others. Certainly D. Luther, after God had once called him to be a minister of his truth, never looked backward from the plough, nor refused the grace that God had offered him, notwithstanding he saw all the powers of the world were against him. His argument is taken of the effects or tokens of God's will. The pope, said he, is advanced<sup>9</sup> unto a monarchy or imperial state of a kingdom: but he could never be so advanced<sup>9</sup> without God's will; ergo, it was God's will it should be so.

Arguments that be taken of God's permission, or of the tokens of his will, make no necessary proof, either that the things in themselves be good, or that God is pleased with them. For God suffered Nabuchodonozor, Sennacherib, Pharaoh, and others; and their very estates and proceedings were evident tokens of God's will. For if his will had been otherwise, they could not have reigned: yet neither were they good men, nor was God pleased with their doings. So shall God suffer antichrist to sit even in the holy place. Daniel saith: *Faciet, et prosperabitur*: "He shall take his pleasure and shall prosper." And again: *Roborabitur fortitudo ejus, et non in viribus suis*: "His power shall be confirmed, but not through his own strength," but through the strength of God. Yet shall not God therefore love or favour antichrist, or delight in his wickedness. For St Paul saith: "The Lord shall kill him with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy him with the brightness and glory of his coming."

Isai. xxxvi.

Dan. vii.  
Matt. xxiv.  
Dan. viii.

2 Thess. ii.

Now, forasmuch as it hath pleased M. Harding, for the conclusion hereof, to touch the effects of God's will, I trust it shall not be painful to thee, gentle reader, likewise shortly to consider the effects and sequels of this universal power. It is granted that the church of Rome, for sundry causes before alleged, was evermore from the beginning the chief and most notable above all others. Notwithstanding, Æneas Sylvius, being himself a bishop of Rome, saith: *Ad Romanos pontifices ante Nicenum concilium aliquis sane, etsi non magnus, respectus*

Æn. Sylv.

[<sup>6</sup> H. A. 1564, omits *been*.]

[<sup>7</sup> This, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>8</sup> Unproved, 1565.]

[<sup>9</sup> Advanced, 1565.]

Cypr. in  
Serm.  
De Jej. et  
Tent.  
Orig. in Matt.  
Tract. 12.

Dist. 99. Pri-  
mæ sedis.

Soz. Lib. iii.  
cap. viii.  
Concil. Afric.  
Epist. ad Cœl.

Gregor. Lib.  
iv. Epist.  
34, 35, &c.  
Anno Dom.  
642.

De Major. et  
Obed. Unam  
sanctam.

Ibidem in  
Gloss.  
ix. Quæst. 3.  
Nemo.  
Dist. 21. In-  
ferior sedes.  
Isai. x.

De Conc.  
Præbendæ,  
in Gloss.  
Extr. de Con.  
Licet.

Duran. Lib. ii.  
a De Elect. et  
Elect. Potest.  
Significasti.  
b Dist. 40.  
Si papa.  
c De Trans.  
Epis. Quanto  
in Gloss.

d De Conc.  
Præb. Propo-  
suit, in Gloss.  
e De Major.  
et Obed.  
Unam  
sanctam.

*fuit*<sup>1</sup>: "Verily there was some respect had to the bishops of Rome before the council of Nice, although it were not great." St Cyprian in his time complained that "pride and ambition seemed to lodge in priests' bosoms<sup>2</sup>." Origen in his time complained that the ministers of Christ seemed even then to pass the outrage of worldly princes<sup>3</sup>. Yet was the church of God in those days every where under cruel and vehement persecution. Therefore, to abate this ambitious courage, order was afterward taken in the council of Carthage, that "no man should be entitled the highest bishop, or the prince of bishops, or by any other like name<sup>4</sup>." The Greek bishops in the council of Antioch<sup>5</sup>, and the bishops of Africa, being in number two hundred and seventeen, in the council there<sup>6</sup> found themselves grieved with the pride and arrogance of the see of Rome. For that John the bishop of Constantinople took upon him to be called the universal bishop, therefore Gregory the bishop of Rome called him Lucifer and the messenger of antichrist, and said, he had chosen unto him a proud, an arrogant, a pompous, and a blasphemous name<sup>7</sup>. But after that, by great suit made unto the emperor Phocas, the bishops of Rome themselves had once obtained the same title, and had possessed and enjoyed the same a long while, in the end, their pride was such, that it seemed intolerable. Then they began to decree and determine, that every mortal man is bound to be subject to the see of Rome, and that upon pain of damnation; and that, without the obedience of that see, no man is saved<sup>8</sup>; that the bishop of Rome is an universal judge over all men<sup>9</sup>; and that he himself may be judged by no man, neither by emperor, nor by king, nor by all the clergy, nor by the whole people<sup>10</sup>, for that it is written by the prophet Esay, "The axe shall not glory against him that heweth with it<sup>11</sup>;" that, whatsoever he do, no man may presume to say unto him, *Domine, cur ita facis*<sup>12</sup>? "Sir, why do you thus?" that he hath all manner law and right *in scrinio pectoris sui*<sup>13</sup>, "in the closet of his breast;" that "all other bishops receive of his fulness<sup>14</sup>;" that no councils can make laws for the church of Rome, and that the bishop of Rome's authority is plainly excepted out of all councils<sup>15</sup>; that, notwithstanding the pope draw innumerable companies of people after him into hell, "yet no mortal man may dare to reprove him<sup>16</sup>;" that the pope's will or pleasure standeth as a law: *In illis quæ vult, est ei pro ratione voluntas*<sup>17</sup>; and that there is none other reason to be yielded of his doings but only this: *Quia ipse voluit*: "For he would." <sup>d</sup>For of that that is nothing he is able to make something: *Quia de eo, quod nihil est, potest facere aliquid*<sup>18</sup>; that he hath the right of both swords, as well of the temporal, as of the spiritual; that the temporal prince may not draw his sword, but only at his beck and sufferance, *ad nutum et patien-*

[<sup>1</sup> Æn. Sylv. Op. Basil. 1571. Ad Mart. Mayer. Epist. cclxxxviii. p. 802. See before, p. 386, note 9.]

[<sup>2</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Jej. et Tent. (Arnold.) p. 38. See before, page 354, note 7.]

[<sup>3</sup> ... ἡμεῖς δὲ ... τοιοῦτοί ἐσμεν ὡς ἐνίστε καὶ τὸν τῶν κακῶν ἀρχόντων ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπερβάλλειν τύφον.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. Comm. in Matt. Tom. xvi. 8. Tom. III. p. 723.]

[<sup>4</sup> Ex Concil. Afric. c. 6. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xcix. can. 3. col. 479. See before, pp. 355, 425.]

[<sup>5</sup> Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. iii. cap. viii. pp. 413, 4.]

[<sup>6</sup> Concil. Afric. Epist. ad Cælestin. cap. 105. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 521. See before, page 356.]

[<sup>7</sup> Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Epist. Lib. v. Indict. xiii. Ad Constant. August. Epist. xxi. Ad Johan. Episc. Epist. xviii. Tom. II. cols. 751, 742, 3.]

[<sup>8</sup> Bonifac. VIII. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Extrav. Comm. Lib. i. De Major. et Obed. cap. 1. col. 212.]

[<sup>9</sup> Gloss. in eod. ibid. col. 211.]

[<sup>10</sup> Innoc. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. ix. Quæst. iii. can. 13. col. 877.]

[<sup>11</sup> Nicol. Papa ad Michael. Imp. in eod. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xxi. can. 4. col. 96.]

[<sup>12</sup> Extrav. Joan. XXII. in eod. De Conc. Preb. Tit. iv. Gloss. in cap. 2. col. 56.]

[<sup>13</sup> Bonifac. VIII. in eod. Sext. Decretal. Lib. i. Tit. ii. cap. 1. col. 11.]

[<sup>14</sup> ... de ejus [papæ] plenitudine omnes accipiunt.—Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Lugd. 1565. Lib. ii. cap. i. 17. fol. 46.]

[<sup>15</sup> ... cum omnia concilia per Romanæ ecclesiæ auctoritatem et facta sint, et robor acceperint, et in eorum statutis Romani pontificis patenter excipiatur auctoritas.—Paschal. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decretal. Gregor. IX. Lib. i. Tit. vi. cap. 4. col. 112.]

[<sup>16</sup> Ex Dict. Bonifac. Mart. in eod. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xl. can. 6. cols. 194, 5.]

[<sup>17</sup> Decretal. Gregor. IX. in eod. Lib. i. Tit. vii. Gloss. in cap. 3. col. 217; where *ei est*.]

[<sup>18</sup> Non est alia ratio, nisi quia ipse voluit, quia de eo, quod nihil est, potest aliquid facere.—Ibid. Lib. iii. Tit. viii. Gloss. in cap. 4. col. 1071.]

*tiam ecclesiæ*<sup>19</sup>; 'that he is *hæres imperii*, "the heir apparent of the empire"<sup>20</sup>, 'and is seven and fifty degrees greater than the emperor; and that because in such proportion the sun is greater than the moon<sup>21</sup>; 'that it is lawful for him to depose kings and emperors<sup>22</sup>; as he did the emperor Henry the sixth, and Childericus the French king.

Then he made the emperor of Christendom to lie down flat before him, and spared not to set his foot upon his neck<sup>23</sup>, adding withal these words of the prophet David, "Thou shalt walk over the asp and the cockatrice:" 'then he was content that the emperor should be called *procurator... ecclesiæ Romanæ*<sup>24</sup>, "the proctor or steward of the church of Rome: 'then, as if he had been Nabuchodonozor, or Alexander, or Antiochus, or Domitian, he claimed unto himself the name and title of Almighty God; and said further that, being God, he might not be judged of any mortal man<sup>25</sup>: 'then he suffereth<sup>26</sup> men to say, *Dominus Deus noster papa*<sup>27</sup>: "Our Lord God the pope:" 'Tu es omnia, et super omnia<sup>28</sup>: "Thou art all, and above all. All power is given unto thee, as well in heaven as in earth." I leave the miserable spoil of the empire, the losing of sundry great countries and nations that sometimes were christened, the weakening of the faith, the encouraging of the Turk, the ignorance and blindness of the people. These and other like be the effects of the pope's universal power. Would to God he were indeed that he would so fain be called, and would shew himself in his own particular church to be Christ's vicar, and the 'dispenser of God's mysteries! Then should godly men have less cause to complain against him: as now, although that he claimeth were his very right, yet by his own judgment he is worthy to lose it. 'For pope Gregory saith: *Privilegium... meretur amittere, qui... abutitur potestate*<sup>29</sup>: "He that abuseth his authority is worthy to lose his privilege." And pope Sylverius saith: 'a[*Etiam*] quod habuit, amittat, qui... quod non accepit, usurpat<sup>30</sup>: "He that usurpeth that he received not, let him lose that he had."

Now briefly to lay abroad the whole contents of this article:

1. First, M. Harding hath wittingly alleged such testimonies under the names of Anacletus, Athanasius, and other holy fathers, as he himself knoweth undoubtedly to be forged, and with manifest absurdities and contradictions do betray themselves, and have no manner colour or shew of truth.
2. He hath made his claim by certain canons of the council of Nice, and of the council of Chalcedon; and yet he knoweth that neither there are, nor never were any such canons to be found.
3. He hath dismembered and mangled St Gregory's words, and, contrary to his own knowledge, he hath cut them off in the midst, the better to beguile his reader.
4. He hath violently and perforce drawn and racked the old godly fathers Irenæus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Cyrillus, Augustine, Theodoretus, Hierome, and others, contrary to their own sense and meaning.
5. Touching appeals to Rome, the government of the east part of the world, excommunications, approbations of orders, allowance of councils, restitutions, and reconciliations, he hath openly misreported the whole universal order and practice of the church.

[<sup>19</sup> Bonifac. VIII. in eod. Extrav. Comm. Lib. 1. De Major. et Obed. cap. 1. col. 208; where *sacerdotis* for *ecclesiæ*.]

[<sup>20</sup> ... vacante imperio imperatori succedimus. — Clemens V. in eod. Clementin. Lib. 11. Tit. xi. cap. 2. col. 136.]

[<sup>21</sup> Decretal. Gregor. IX. in eod. Lib. 1. Tit. xxxiii. Gloss. in cap. 6. col. 426.]

[<sup>22</sup> Innoc. IV. in eod. Sext. Decretal. Lib. 11. Tit. xiv. cap. 2. cols. 376, &c.]

[<sup>23</sup> See before, page 414, note 3.]

[<sup>24</sup> Decret. Gratian. in eod. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. xvi. Gloss. in cap. 11. col. 469; where *Romanæ ecclesiæ*.]

[<sup>25</sup> Nicol. Papa in eod. ibid. Dist. xvi. can. 7.

col. 467.]

[<sup>26</sup> Suffered, 1565.]

[<sup>27</sup> Extrav. Joan. XXII. ad calc. Sext. Decretal. Par. 1585. Tit. xiv. Gloss. in cap. 4. col. 153. See before, page 96, note 4.]

[<sup>28</sup> Orat. Steph. Arch. Patrac. in Concil. Later. v. Sess. x. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. XIV. col. 269. See before, pp. 93, 4, note 2. See also Zanæ Orat. ibid. cols. 49, &c. and Marcell. Orat. ibid. cols. 108, &c.]

[<sup>29</sup> Gregor. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. xi. Quæst. iii. can. 63. col. 943.]

[<sup>30</sup> Silver. Papa in eod. ibid. Caus. xxv. Quæst. ii. can. 22. col. 1453; where *assumpsit* for *usurpat*.]

<sup>1</sup> Clem. de Appel. Pastoral.  
<sup>2</sup> De Major. et Obed.  
<sup>3</sup> Solitæ in Gloss.  
<sup>4</sup> De Senten. et Re Jud.  
<sup>5</sup> Ad Apost.

<sup>6</sup> Psal. xci.  
<sup>7</sup> Dist. 96. Si imperator, in Gloss.  
<sup>8</sup> Dist. 96. Satis evidenter.

<sup>9</sup> Johan. xxii. De Verb. Sig. in Gloss. Cum inter. In Conc. Later. sub Julio.

<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor. iv.

<sup>11</sup> xi. Quæst. 2. Privilegium.

<sup>12</sup> xxv. Quæst. 2. Sic decet.

All this notwithstanding, he hath as yet found neither of these two glorious 6. titles that he hath so narrowly sought for; notwithstanding great pains taken, and great promises and vaunts made touching the same.

Therefore to conclude, I must subscribe, and rescribe, even as before, that, albeit M. Harding have travailed painfully herein, both by himself, and also with conference of his friends, yet cannot he hitherto find, neither in the scriptures, nor in the old councils, nor in any one of all the ancient catholic fathers, that the bishop of Rome, within the space of the first six hundred years after Christ, was ever entitled either the universal bishop or the head of the universal church.

---