

sometimes judge a great deal more probable than now I do, merely that after the Apostles were deceased, churches did

“conorum, officialium, et decanorum, cum cæteris officariis . . . Certum videtur quod superbia Cæsarea hos gradus et ordines adinvenit. Si enim fuissent necessarii ecclesiæ, Christus et ejus Apostoli non in expressione eorum acdetentione (sic) officii reticerent.” p. 326. Venet. 1571. In the edition of Wicliffe, 1525, the passage occurs lib. iv. c. 15. fol. 124.] Calvin. Com. in 1. ad Tit. [v. 7. “Locus hic abunde docet, nullum esse presbyteri et episcopi discrimen : quia nunc secundo nomine promiscue appellat quos prius vocavit presbyteros. . . Hinc perspicere licet, quanto plus delatum hominum placitis fuerit quam decebat, quia abrogato Sp. Sancti sermone, usus hominum arbitrio inductus prævaluit. Mihi quidem non displicet quod statim ab ecclesiæ primordiis receptum fuit ut singula episcoporum collegia unum aliquem moderatorem habeant : verum nomen officii quod Deus in commune omnibus dederat in unum solum transferri, reliquis spoliatis, et injuriis est et absurdum. Deinde sic pervertere Sp. Sancti linguam, ut nobis eædem voces aliter quam voluerit significent, nimis profanæ audaciæ est.” p. 537. ed. Genev. 1600.] Bullinger, (1504-1575.) Decad. v. Serm. 3. [p. 296. Tigur. 1577. “Non ita multis post mortem Apostolorum sæculis visa est in ecclesia longe alia hierarchia quam fuerat ab initio. Quamvis principia illa videantur tolerabiliora fuisse quam sint hodie istius ordinis omnia. . . In qualibet urbe et regione præstantissimus quisque cæteris præponebatur. Ejus functio erat superintendere presbyteris et universo gregi. Non habebat . . . in collegas vel presbyteros dominium, sed sicut consul in senatu partes habet interrogandi colligendique suffragia, leges item ac jura tuendi, ac curandi ne subnascantur inter senatores factiones ; ita non aliud in ecclesia episcopo officium

“fuit : per cætera, communia habuit cum sacerdotibus. Nisi vero longius processisset consequentibus temporibus sacerdotum audacia, et episcoporum ambitio, ne verbo quidem reclamaremus.”] Juel. Def. Apol. part. 2. c. 9. di. 1. [Harding, in the course of an argument for tradition, had remarked, that “they which denied the distinction of a bishop and a priest were condemned of heresy.” (p. 196.) Jewel replies, (p. 202,) “What meant M. Harding here to come in with the difference between priests and bishops? Thinketh he that priests and bishops hold only by tradition? Or is it so horrible an heresy as he maketh it, to say that by the Scriptures of God a bishop and a priest are all one? Or knoweth he how far, and unto whom, he reacheth the name of an heretic?” He then proceeds to quote S. Chrysostom, S. Jerome, &c. and concludes, “All these and other mo holy Fathers, together with S. Paul the apostle, for thus saying, by M. Harding’s advice, must be holden for heretics.” ed. 1609.] Fulk. Answ. to the Test. Tit. 1. 5. [The Rhemish note on this verse is, “Though priests or bishops may be nominated and elected by the princes, people, or patrons of places, . . . yet they cannot be ordered and consecrated but by a bishop who was himself rightly ordered or consecrated before, as this Titus was by St. Paul. . . . That the ordering of priests or imposition of hands to that purpose belongeth only to bishops. . . . is plain by the apostolic practice set down in the Scriptures, viz. in the Acts and in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.” Fulk’s reply : “The people had their elections, moderated by the wisdom and gravity of the clergy, among whom, for order and seemly government, there was always one principal, to whom by long use of the church the name of bishop

agree amongst themselves for preservation of peace and order, to make one presbyter in each city chief over the rest, and to translate into him that power by force and virtue whereof the Apostles, while they were alive, did preserve and uphold order in the Church, exercising spiritual jurisdiction partly by themselves and partly by evangelists, because they could not always every where themselves be present : this order taken by the Church itself (for so let us suppose that the Apostles did neither by word nor deed appoint it) were notwithstanding more warrantable than that it should give place and be abrogated, because the ministry of the Gospel and the functions thereof ought¹ to be from heaven.

[9.] There came chief priests and elders unto our Saviour Christ as he was teaching in the temple, and the question which they moved unto him was this², “By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?” Their question he repelled with a counter-demand, “The baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven, or of men?” Hereat they paused, secretly disputing within themselves, “If we shall say, From heaven, he will ask, Wherefore did ye not then believe him? and if we say, Of men, we fear the people, for all hold John a prophet.” What is it now which hereupon these men would infer? That all functions ecclesiastical ought in such sort to be from heaven, as the function of John was? No such matter here contained. Nay, doth not the contrary rather appear most plainly by that which is here set down? For when our Saviour doth ask concerning the baptism, that is to say the whole spiritual function, of John, whether it were “from heaven, or of men,” he giveth clear to understand that men give authority unto

“or superintendant hath been applied, which room Titus exercised in Crete, Timothy in Ephesus, and others in other places. Therefore although in the Scripture a bishop and an elder is of one authority in preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments, . . . yet in government by ancient use of speech he is only called a bishop, which is in the Scripture called *προιστάμενος*, *προεστώς*, or *ηγούμενος*, i. e. chief

“in government, to whom the ordination or consecration by imposition of hands was always principally committed. Not that imposition of hands belongeth only to him, for the rest of the elders that were present at ordination did lay on their hands, or else the bishop did lay on his hands in the name of the rest.” p. 718, 19. ed. 1633.]

¹ John i. 25. [ap. T. C. i. 62. al. 83.]
² Matt. xxi. 23. 25, 26.

BOOK VII. some, and some God himself from heaven doth authorize. Nor is it said, or in any sort signified, that none have lawful authority which have it not in such manner as John, from heaven. Again when the priests and elders were loth to say that John had his calling from men, the reason was not because they thought that so John should not have had any good or lawful calling, but because they saw that by this means they should somewhat embase the calling of John; whom all men knew to have been sent from God, according to the manner of prophets, by a mere celestial vocation. So that out of the evidence here alleged, these things we may directly conclude: first that whoso doth exercise any kind of function in the Church, he cannot lawfully so do except authority be given him; secondly that if authority be not given him from men, as the authority of teaching was given unto Scribes and Pharisees, it must be given him from heaven, as authority was given unto Christ, Elias, John Baptist, and the prophets. For these two only ways there are to have authority. But a strange conclusion it is, God himself did from heaven authorize John to bear witness of the light, to prepare a way for the promised Messiah, to publish the nearness of the kingdom of God, to preach repentance, and to baptize (for by this part, which was in the function of John most noted, all the rest are together signified), therefore the Church of God hath no power upon new occurrences to appoint, to ordain an ecclesiastical function, as Moses did upon Jethro's advice devise a civil.

[10.] All things we grant which are in the Church ought to be of God. But forasmuch as they may be two ways accounted such, one if they be of his own institution and not of ours, another if they be of ours, and yet with his approbation: this latter way there is no impediment but that the same thing which is of men may be also justly and truly said to be of God, the same thing from heaven which is from earth. Of all good things God himself is author, and consequently an approver of them. The rule to discern when the actions of men are good, when they are such as they ought to be, is more ample and large than the law which God hath set particular down in his holy word; the Scripture is but a part of that rule, as hath been heretofore at

large declared. If therefore all things be of God which are well done, and if all things be well done which are according to the rule of well-doing, and if the rule of well-doing be more ample than the Scripture¹: what necessity is there, that every thing which is of God should be set down in holy Scripture? True it is in things of some one kind; true it is that what we are now of necessity for ever bound to believe or observe in the special mysteries of salvation, Scripture must needs give notice of it unto the world; yet true it cannot be, touching all things that are of God. Sufficient it is for the proof of lawfulness in any thing done, if we can shew that God approveth it. And of his approbation the evidence is sufficient, if either himself have by revelation in his word warranted it, or we by some discourse of reason find it good of itself, and unrepugnant unto any of his revealed laws and ordinances. Wherefore injurious we are unto God, the author and giver of human capacity, judgment, and wit, when because of some things wherein he precisely forbiddeth men to use their own inventions, we take occasion to disauthorize and disgrace the works which he doth produce by the hand either of nature or of grace in them. We offer contumely even unto him, when we scornfully reject what we list, without any other exception than this, "The brain of man hath devised it." Whether we look into the church or commonweal, as well in the one as in the other, both the ordination of officers, and the very institution of their offices may be truly derived from God, and approved of him, although they be not always of him in such sort as those things are which are in Scripture. Doth not the Apostle term the law of nature², even as the evangelist doth the law of Scripture³, *δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, God's own righteous ordinance? The law of nature then being his law, that must needs be of him which it hath directed men unto. Great odds I grant there is between things devised by men, although agreeable with the law of nature, and things in Scripture set down by the finger of the Holy Ghost. Howbeit the dignity of these is no hinderance, but that those be also reverently accounted of in their place.

¹ Lib. i. [c. 14.]² Rom. i. 32.³ Luke i. 6.

[II.] Thus much they very well saw, who although not living themselves under this kind of church polity, yet being through some experience more moderate, grave and circumspect in their judgment, have given hereof their sounder and better advised sentence. "That which the holy Fathers," saith Zanchius¹, "have by common consent without contradiction of Scripture received, for my part I neither will nor dare with good conscience disallow. And what more certain than that the ordering of ecclesiastical persons, one in authority above another, was received into the church by the common consent of the Christian world? What am I that I should take upon me to control the whole Church of Christ in that which is so well known to have been lawfully, religiously, and to notable purpose instituted?"

Calvin making mention² even of primates that have authority above bishops: "It was," saith he, "the institution of the ancient church, to the end that the bishops might by this bond of concord continue the faster linked amongst themselves." And lest any man should think that as well he might allow the papacy itself, to prevent this he addeth, "Aliud est moderatum gerere honorem, quam totum terrarum orbem immenso imperio complecti."

¹ Confess. 169. ["Fides mea nititur cum primis et simpliciter verbo Dei, deinde nonnihil etiam communi totius veteris Catholicæ ecclesiæ consensu, si ille cum sacris literis non pugnet: credo enim quæ a piis Patribus in nomine Domini congregatis, communi omnium consensu, citra ullam sacrarum literarum contradictionem definita et recepta fuerunt, ea etiam (quanquam haud ejusdem cum sacris literis auctoritatis) a Sp. Sancto esse. Hinc fit ut quæ sint ejusmodi, ea ego improbare nec velim nec audeam bona conscientia. Quid autem certius ex historiis, ex conciliis, et ex omnium Patrum scriptis, quam illos ministrorum ordines, de quibus diximus, communi totius Reip. Christianæ consensu in ecclesia constitutos receptosque fuisse? Quis autem ego sum, qui quod tota ecclesia approbavit improbem? Sed neque omnes nostri

"temporis docti viri improbare ausi sunt, quippe qui norunt et licuisse hæc ecclesiæ, et ex pietate atque ad optimos fines pro electorum ædificatione ea omnia fuisse perfecta et ordinata." Quoted also by Bishop Cooper, Adm. 82, 83; by Saravia, De Divers. Min. Grad. c. 23; by Bancroft, Survey, &c. p. 108; and by Bridges, Def. of Gov. established, &c. p. 424. It was Zanchius' deliberate opinion, in answer to an exception which Beza had taken to a clause in his (Zanchius') draught of a Confession for the Reformed Churches.]

² Epist. [ad Reg. Polon. (Non. Decemb. 1554.) p.] 190. ["Vetus quidem ecclesia patriarchas instituit, et singulis etiam provinciis quosdam attribuit primatus, ut hoc concordia vinculo melius inter se devincti manerent episcopi." ed. Gen. 1617 = p. 140. ed. Gen. 1576.]

These things standing as they do, we may conclude, that albeit the offices which bishops execute had been committed unto them only by the Church, and that the superiority which they have over other pastors were not first by Christ himself given to the Apostles, and from them descended to others, but afterwards in such consideration brought in and agreed upon as is pretended; yet could not this be a just or lawful exception against it.

XII. But they will say, "There was no necessity of instituting bishops; the Church might have stood well enough without them; they are as those superfluous things, which neither while they continue do good, nor do harm when they are removed, because there is not any profitable use whereunto they should serve. For first, in the primitive Church their pastors were all equal, the bishops of those days were the very same which pastors of parish churches at this day are with us, no one at commandment or controlment by any other's authority amongst them. The Church therefore may stand and flourish without bishops. If they be necessary, wherefore were they not sooner instituted?"

"Again, if any such thing were needful for the Church, Christ would have set it down in Scripture, as he did all kind of officers needful for Jewish regiment. He which prescribed unto the Jews so particularly the least thing pertinent unto their temple, would not have left so weighty offices undetermined of in Scripture, but that he knew the Church could never have any profitable use of them."

"Furthermore, it is the judgment of Cyprian¹, that equity requireth every man's cause to be heard, where the fault he is charged with was committed: and the reason he allegeth is, forasmuch as there they may have both accusers and witnesses in their cause. Sith therefore every man's cause is meetest to be handled at home by the judges of his own parish, to what purpose serveth their device, which

¹ Ep. 3, lib. i. [al. 59. c. 10. "missum, . . . oportet . . . agere illic Cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis et æquum sit pariter ac justum ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen ad-

Their arguments to prove there was no necessity of instituting Bishops in the Church.

"causam . . . ubi et accusatores habere et testes . . . possint." p. 86. ed. Baluz.]

BOOK VII. "have appointed bishops unto whom such causes may be
Ch. xiii. 1, 2. "brought, and archbishops to whom they may be also from
"thence removed?"

The fore-
alleged
arguments
answered.

XIII. What things have necessary use in the Church, they of all others are the most unfit to judge, who bend themselves purposely against whatsoever the Church useth, except it please themselves to give it the grace and countenance of their favourable approbation; which they willingly do not yield unto any part of church polity, in the forehead whereof there is not the mark of that new-devised stamp. But howsoever men like or dislike, whether they judge things necessary or needless in the house of God, a conscience they should have, touching that which they boldly affirm or deny.

[2.] (1.) "In the primitive Church no bishops, no pastors "having power over other pastors, but all equals, every man "supreme commander and ruler within the kingdom of his "own congregation or parish? The bishops that are spoken "of in the time of the primitive Church, all such as parsons "or rectors of parishes are with us?" If thus it have been in the prime of the Church, the question is, how far they will have that prime to extend? and where the latter spring of that new supposed disorder to begin? That primitive Church, wherein they hold that amongst the Fathers all which had pastoral charge were equal, they must of necessity so far enlarge as to contain some hundred of years, because for proof hereof they allege boldly and confidently St. Cyprian, who suffered martyrdom about two hundred and threescore years after our blessed Lord's incarnation. A bishop, they say, such as Cyprian doth speak of, had only a church or congregation, such as the ministers and pastors with us, which are appointed unto several towns. Every bishop in Cyprian's time was pastor of one only congregation, assembled in one place to be taught of one man¹.

A thing impertinent, although it were true. For the

¹ "The bishop which Cyprian "speaketh of, is nothing else but "such as we call pastor, or as the "common name with us is, parson, "and his church whereof he is "bishop is neither diocess nor pro-
"vince, but a congregation which "met together in one place, and to "be taught of one man." T. C. lib. i. p. 99, 100. [76. ap. Whitg. Def. 360.]

question is about personal inequality amongst governors of the Church. Now to shew there was no such thing in the Church at such time as Cyprian lived, what bring they forth? Forsooth that bishops had then but a small circuit of place for the exercise of their authority. Be it supposed, that no one bishop had more than one only town to govern, one only congregation to rule: doth it by Cyprian appear, that in any such town or congregation being under the care and charge of some one bishop, there were not besides that one bishop others also ministers of the word and sacraments, yet subject to the power of the same bishop? If this appear not, how can Cyprian be alleged for a witness that in those times there were no bishops which did differ from other ministers, as being above them in degree of ecclesiastical power?

But a gross and a palpable untruth it is, that "bishops "with Cyprian were as ministers are with us in parish "churches; and that each of them did guide some parish "without any other pastors under him." St. Cyprian's own person may serve for a manifest disproof hereof. Pontius being deacon under Cyprian noteth, that his admirable virtues caused him to be bishop with the soonest¹; which advancement therefore himself endeavoured for a while to avoid. It seemed in his own eyes too soon for him to take the title of so great honour, in regard whereof a bishop is termed *Pontifex, Sacerdos, Antistes Dei*. Yet such was his quality, that whereas others did hardly perform that duty whereunto the discipline of their order², together with the religion of the oath they took at their entrance into the office, even constrained them; him the chair did not make but receive such a one as behoved that a bishop should be. But soon after followed that proscription, whereby being driven into exile, and continuing in that estate for the space of some two years, he ceased not by letters to deal with his clergy, and to direct

¹ ["Judicio Dei ac plebis favore, "ad officium Sacerdotii et Episcopatus gradum adhuc neophytus, "et ut putabatur, novellus electus "est . . . Humiliter ille secessit, "antiquioribus cedens, et indignum "se titulo tanti honoris existimans." Pont. Vit. S. Cypr. § 5. p. cxxxvii. ed. Baluz.]

² [Ibid. § 6. cxxxviii. "Viderint "pietatis antistites, seu quos ad "officium boni operis instruxit "ipsius ordinis disciplina, seu quos "sacramenti religio communis ad "obsequium exhibendæ religionis "arctavit. Cyprianum de suo talem "accepti cathedra, non fecit."]

them about the public affairs of the Church. They unto whom those epistles were written¹, he commonly entitleth the presbyters and deacons of that church. If any man doubt whether those presbyters of Carthage were ministers of the word and sacraments or no, let him consider but that one only place of Cyprian, where he giveth them his careful advice, how to deal with circumspection in the perilous times of the Church, that neither they which were for the truth's sake imprisoned might want those ghostly comforts which they ought to have, nor the Church by ministering the same unto them incur unnecessary danger and peril. In which epistle it doth expressly appear, that the presbyters of whom he speaketh did offer, that is to say, administer the Eucharist ; and that many there were of them in the Church of Carthage, so as they might have every day change for performance of that duty. Nor will any man of sound judgment I think deny, that Cyprian was in authority and power above the clergy of that church, above those presbyters unto whom he gave direction. It is apparently therefore untrue, that in Cyprian's time ministers of the word and sacraments were all equal, and that no one of them had either title more excellent than the rest, or authority and government over the rest. Cyprian being bishop of Carthage was clearly superior unto all other ministers there : yea Cyprian was by reason of the dignity of his see an archbishop, and so consequently superior unto bishops.

[3.] Bishops we say there have been always, even as long as the Church of Christ itself hath been. The Apostles who planted it, did themselves rule as bishops over it ; neither could they so well have kept things in order during their own times, but that episcopal authority was given them from

¹ "Etsi fratres pro dilectione
"sua cupidi sunt ad conveniendum
"et visitandum confessores bonos,
"quos illustravit jam gloriosis ini-
"itiis divina dignatio, tamen caute
"hoc, et non glomeratim nec per
"multitudinem simul junctam, puto
"esse faciendum : ne ex hoc ipso
"invidia concitetur, et introeundi
"aditus denegetur, et cum insatia-
"biles multum [totum] volumus,
"totum perdamus : consulite ergo
"et providete ut cum tempera-
"mento hoc agi tutius possit ; ita
"ut presbyteri quoque, qui illic
"apud confessores offerunt, singuli
"cum singulis diaconis per vices
"alternent, quia et mutatio per-
"sonarum, et vicissitudo conveni-
"entium minuit invidiam." Ep. 5.
[4. p. 9. ed. Baluz.]

above, to exercise far and wide over all other guides and pastors of God's Church. The Church indeed for a time continued without bishops by restraint, every where established in Christian cities. But shall we thereby conclude that the Church hath no use of them, that without them it may stand and flourish? No, the cause wherefore they were so soon universally appointed was, for that it plainly appeared that without them the Church could not have continued long. It was by the special providence of God no doubt so disposed, that the evil whereof this did serve for remedy might first be felt, and so the reverend authority of bishops be made by so much the more effectual, when our general experience had taught men what it was for churches to want them. Good laws are never esteemed so good, nor acknowledged so necessary, as when precedent crimes are as seeds out of which they grow. Episcopal authority was even in a manner sanctified unto the Church of Christ by that little better [bitter?]² experience which it first had of the pestilent evil of schisms. Again, when this very thing was proposed as a remedy, yet a more suspicious and fearful acceptance it must needs have found, if the selfsame provident wisdom of Almighty God had not also given beforehand sufficient trial thereof in the regiment of Jerusalem, a mother church, which having received the same order even at the first, was by it most peaceably governed, when other churches without it had trouble. So that by all means the necessary use of episcopal government is confirmed, yea strengthened it is and ratified, even by the not establishment thereof in all churches every where at the first.

[4.] (2.) When they further dispute¹, "That if any such thing were needful, Christ would in Scripture have set down particular statutes and laws, appointing that bishops should be made, and prescribing in what order, even as the law doth for all kind of officers which were needful in the Jewish regiment ;" might not a man that would bend his wit to maintain the fury of the Petrobrusian heretics², in

² bitter, so edd. 1676, 1682.

¹ [As T. C. does, in reply to a Cluniacens. Epist. ap. Bibl. Patr. paper of Jewel's, ap. Whitg. Def. Colon. t. xii. pars 2. p. 206 H. 428.]

² [About A. D. 1147. vid. Pet. "bricam fieri non debere, factas