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ing their right therein; shall the sanctity of their order deprive them of that honour whereunto they have right by blood? or shall it be a bar to shut out the public good that may grow by their virtuous regiment? If not, then must they cast off the office which they received by divine imposition of hands; or, if they carry a more religious opinion concerning that heavenly function, it followeth, that being invested as well with the one as the other, they remain God's lawfully anointed both ways. With men of skill and mature judgment there is of this so little doubt, that concerning such as at this day are under the archbishops of Mentz, Colen, and Trevers, being both archbishops and princes of the empire; yea such as live within the Pope's own civil territories, there is no cause why any should deny to yield them civil obedience in any thing which they command, not repugnant to Christian piety; yea, even that civilly for such as are under them not to obey them, were but the part of seditious persons. Howbeit for persons ecclesiasticam jura etiam haebeant, politica in cives sibi subjectos; eoque an subditus illis tanquam principibus obedire debeat necne. In meo aphorismo nihil prorsus de priori questione locutus sum, quia non fuit necessae, sed tantum de posteriori. Quis autem illis omnino obedientium esse, quo jure, quaque injuria principes fuerint creati, ex testimoniis a me allatis non videat aperte de monstrari? Cur enim qui sub ditii sunt Moguntino, Coloniensi, Treviriensi principibus Imperii simul et archiepiscopis, in rebus cum pietate Christiana minime pugnantibus non obtinereper? Seditionorum certe fuerit non obtemperare. Quod si igitur, cum non etiam Romano, idem in rebus et eadem ob causam, qui sub ejus vivunt imperio? Eadem enim horum omnium est ratio. De priori questione nihil (ut ante dixi) disputari; sed neque etiam in hac scratched text, the last sentence is incorrect. It should read: “De priori questione nihil (ut ante dixi) disputari; sed neque etiam in hac mea brevi confessione disputare constitu; cum sciam, non omnium eadem esse sententiam; et in utraque partem multa duci possint.” ed. 1605.

1 Zarchius [Jerome Zanchi of Bergamo 1490: he taught theology at Strassburg and Heidelberg 1539-1581], p. 374. Observ. in Conclus. l. vii. 417. c. xxv. apohorism. 21. “Non distinam, episcopos, qui simul principes sunt, praetorautoritatem ecclesiasticam, ad etiam habere jura politica, secuularisque potestates, quaedam modum et reliqui habent principes, quos inam partiti seculares, et gladii, nonnullis in iis eligendi confirmantur, aliquae reges et imperatores, aliquae politiae constituendi et administrandi, subditosque sibi populos ad obedientiam sibi præstandam cogendi. Ac proinde fatum, politicas horum mandatiss, quae sine transgressione legis divinae servari possunt, a subditis obtentur, quandam esse, non solum proprii timorem sed etiam propter conscientiam.” And Append. p. 384. “Duae longe diversae sunt questiones, utrum episcopis litteris etiam esse principibus, principibusque esse episcopos, suis et suis principatibus; et, an qui episcopi iam sint simul et prinicipes, ut prius auctoritetem ecclesiasticam jura etiam haebeant, politica in cives sibi subjectos; eoque an subditus illis tanquam principibus obedire debeant necne.”

1 [Especially in the two embassies to Maximus, A.D. 383, and 888-891.]
the ministry of the word and sacraments of Christ a very cause of disgrace in the eyes both of high and low, where it hath not somewhat besides itself to be countenanced with. For unto this very pass things are come, that the glory of God is constrained even to stand upon borrowed credit, which yet were somewhat the more tolerable, if there were not that dissuade to lend it him.

No practice so vile, but pretended holiness is made sometime as a cloak to hide it. The French king Philip Valois¹ in his time made an ordinance that all prelates and bishops should be clean excluded from parliaments where the affairs of the kingdom were handled; pretending that a king with good conscience cannot draw pastors, having cure of souls, from so weighty a business, to trouble their heads with consultations of state. But irreligious intents are not able to hide themselves, no not when holiness is made their cloak. This is plain and simple truth, that the councils of wicked men hate always the presence of them, whose virtue, though it should not be able to prevail against their purposes, would notwithstanding be unto them a secret corro-

¹ Hooker seems to refer to the conference at Paris, Dec. 1329, between the archbishop of Sens and Bertrand bishop of Autun as representatives of the Church, and Pierre de Cugnères as advocate for the royal and baronial authority: the particulars of which may be seen, Concil. Harduin. vii. 1544; or abstracted in the continuation of Fleurby, liv. xcv. c. 2–5. Goldastus, Menarch. S. R. T. i. 264.; 1381, having inserted the document, adds, "Sic re aliquamdiu ultrò citroque agitata, cum episcopi et prelati sem solito non reformarent, ita nempe, ut specie ac verba iniuriam quandam alleviavere simularent, re autem ipsa en potius augerent et aggravarent quam diminuerent; demum rex severus, quando tempore fuit, qua talium praetulion um audium et tyrannici deo cohibent, seque ac suis in liberatem asserit." But it seems clear from a papal letter to the king, quoted in Raynauad’s Continuation of Baronius, A. D. 1329, that this latter statement (which is similar to Hooker's) must be erroeneous. No authority for it is given. But in the proceedings of the conference complaint is made by the clergy, "quod quaedam praecognitiones facte erant in praejudicium jurisdictiorum ecclesiasticorum, quas superabat revocari. Tum dominus rex respondit ore proprio, quod non erat facte de suo mandato, nec aliquid sciebat, nec eis ratas habebat." Possibly the statement in the text may be traced to some of these ordinances, either spurious at first, or such as it was found convenient to disavow. Henault’s account is, "Le roi est favorable aux ecclésiastiques, mais cette querelle est le fondement de tous les disputes qui se sont élevées depuis par rapport à l’autorité des deux puissances, et dont l’effet a été de reprendre le juridiction ecclésiastique dans des bornes plus étroites." Abrogé Chronol. de l’Hist. de France, t. i. p. 52, Paris, 1768.
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[8.] Ordinances holier and better there stand as yet in force by the grace of Almighty God, and the works of his providence amongst us. Let not envy so far prevail, as to make us account that a blemish, which if there be in us any spark of sound judgment, or of religious conscience, we must of necessity acknowledge to be one of the chiefest ornaments unto this land: by the ancient laws whereof, the clergy being held for the chief of those three estates, which together make up the entire body of this commonwealth, under one supreme head and governor, it hath all this time ever borne a sway proportionable in the weighty affairs of the land; wise and virtuous kings condescending most willingly thereunto, even of reverence to the Most High; with the flower of whose sanctified inheritance, as it were with a kind of Divine presence, unless their chiefest civil assemblies were so far forth beautified as might be without any notable impediment unto their heavenly functions, they could not satisfy themselves as having shewed towards God an affection most dutiful.

Thus, first, in defect of other civil magistrates; secondly, for the ease and quietness of scholastical societies; thirdly, by way of political necessity; fourthly, in regard of quality, care, and extraordinarity; fifthly, for countenance unto the ministry; and lastly, even of devotion and reverence towards God himself: there may be admitted at leastwise in some particulars well and lawfully enough a conjunction of civil and ecclesiastical power, except there be some such law or reason to the contrary, as may prove it to be a thing simply in itself naught.

[9.] Against it many things are objected, as first, "That the matters which are noted in the holy Scriptures to have belonged to the ordinary office of any ministers of God’s holy word and sacraments, are these which follow, with such like, and no other; namely, the watch of the sanctuary, the business of God, the ministry of the word and sacraments, oversight of the house of God, watching over his flock, prophecy, prayer, dispensations of the mysteries of
"God, charge and care of men’s souls." If a man would shew what the offices and duties of a chirurgeon or physician are, I suppose it were not his part so much as to mention any thing belonging to the one or the other, in case either should be also a soldier or a merchant, or an housekeeper, or a magistrate: because the functions of these are different from those of the former, albeit one and the same man may haply be both. The case is like, when the Scripture teacheth what duties are required in an ecclesiastical minister; in describing of whose office, to touch any other thing than such as properly and directly toucheth his office that way, were impertinent.

[10.] Yea, “but in the Old Testament the two powers civil and ecclesiastical were distinguished, not only in nature, but also in person; the one committed unto Moses, and the magistrates joined with him; the other to Aaron and his sons. Jehoshapath in his reformation doth not only distinguish causes ecclesiastical from civil, and

1 [Ecc. Disc. fol. 57-64. “Epi- scopi nomen, a Graeca voces in- orvouepiv deductum, speculatorem aut vigilem significat, qui castris custodidit, aut ad urbs vigilias ad hostium admonitum denuncian- dum designatus est... Et autem episcope, si vere illum defineris volumus, minister ecclesiæ in rebus divinis, et ad Deum pertinen- titibus... Sic Timothei (quamvis evangelista) munus Paulus domus Dei gubernatione et administra- tione definitiv.” Et Apostolus ad Hebraeos animarum procuracione tæ huic nepos curam complexus est... Videamus, recte ne eorum munus religionis et cerimonis tractandis seminum sit. Vetus enim opinio est, et ab antiquis ducta tempusibus, episcope non sita rei divinae facienda terminis circumscribi, quin etiam humanæ tractante possint, ac simul quidem ecclesiam et rempublicam admin- istrare. Hinc apud nos episcopi pacis et oti communis conservandi auctoritatem habenti, et ejus viola- tores in carcerem atque vincula conijiciendī, testamentorum lites,..."  

2 [Ecc. Disc. 60. “Quum utra- que potestas primo in Mose con- fusæ esset, Deus, republ. Mosi re- licta, ecclesiae gubernationem ad Aaronem fraternam transitit.” Decr. of Disc. 79.]  

3 [T. C. iii. 7. “In saying that although the godly magistrate ruleth in the Lord over us, yet that this title is given by excel- lency (1 Thess. v. 12) to ecclesi- astical officers,” I do not daily; it is the distinction of the Holy Ghost himself. For albeit they handle commonwealth matters serve the Lord, and do things tending to his glory, yet the Scrip- ture comparing both these go- vernments together giveth this title as a note to discern the ecclesi- astical officers from the civil; as appeareth in the Chronicles, (2 Chr. xix. 11) from whence (it is like) the Apostle took this manner of speech.”]

"ereceth divers courts for them, but appointeth also divers judges." With the Jews these two powers were not so distinguished, but that sometimes they might and did concur in one and the same person. Was not Eli both priest and judge? after their return from captivity, Esdras a priest, and the same their chief governor even in civil affairs also?

These men which urge the necessity of making always a personal distinction of these two powers, as if by Jehoshapath’s example the same person ought not to deal in both causes, yet are not scrupulous to make men of civil place and calling presbyters and ministers of spiritual jurisdiction in their own spiritual consistories. If it be against the Jewish precedents for us to give civil power unto such as have ecclesiastical; is it not as much against the same for them to give ecclesiastical power unto such as have civil? They will answer perhaps, that their position is only against conjunction of ecclesiastical power of order, and the power of civil jurisdiction in one person. But this answer will not stand with their proofs, which make no less against the power of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in one person; for of these two powers Jehoshapath’s example is: besides, the contrary example [examples?] of Eli and of Ezra, by us alleged, do plainly shew, that amongst the Jews even the power of order ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction were sometimes lawfully united in one and the same person.

1 [Whitg. Answ. 217, ap. Def. 767. “What say you to Eli and...” C. iii. 170, al. 211. “As for Eli and Samuel, they...” T. C. 21, “Such were extraordinarily raised up of God, and not by any esta- blished order or election of men.”]

2 [Whitg. Def. 769. “Remember I pray you what you said before in chisedech and afterwards in Moses...” C. iii. 21, “set it down that they are ecclesi- astical persons; and yet M. Beza...” As I have there declared saith that noblemen and princes may be of the seigniory; wherefore either may civil and ecclesiastical offices meet together in ecclesiastical persons (which you deny); or else cannot noblemen and princes be of your seigniory, as M. Beza affirmed.”]
[11.] Pressed further we are with our Lord and Saviour's example, who "denieth his kingdom to be of this world, and therefore, as not standing with his calling, refused to be made a king, to give sentence in a criminal cause of adultery, and in a civil of dividing an inheritance." The Jews imagining that their Messiah should be a potent monarch upon earth, no marvel, though when they did otherwise wonder at Christ's greatness, they sought forthwith to have him invested with that kind of dignity, to the end he might presently begin to reign. Others of the Jews, which likewise had the same imagination of the Messiah, and did somewhat incline to think that peradventure this might be he, thought good to try whether he would take upon him that which he might do, being a king, such as they supposed their true Messiah should be. But Christ refused to be a king over them, because it was no part of the office of their Messiah, as they did falsely conceive; and to meddle in those acts of civil judgment he refused also, because he had no such jurisdiction in that commonwealth, being in regard of his civil person a man of mean and low calling. As for repugnancy between ecclesiastical and civil power, or any inconvenience that these two powers should be united, it doth not appear that this was the cause of his resistance either to reign or else to judge.

[12.] What say we then to the blessed Apostles, who teach,

1 [S. John viii. 11. alleged by T. C. iii. 3.]
2 [S. Luke xii. 14. alleged by Adm. see Ans. 264, 266, al. 215; T. C. i. 165; Def. 751; T. C. iii. 2.] 3 ["He, because he came not but to be a Mediator between God and man," would not become a common divider and judge of every secular cause of title of land...: 'Neither my heavenly Father sent me to that end, neither have I come to judge thee into the moiety of the possession,' Besides, if he had intermeddled in the matters of the commonwealth, it would have strengthened the conceit, that he sought an earthly kingdom, and to dispossess the Romans...Christ did not condemn the woman taken in the act of adultery: shall not therefore officers ecclesiastical condemn any such sinner? Christ refused to divide the inheritance: 'It was because he would not use the authority that he had as Lord of heaven and earth, when he came as a servant: not because either a Christian magistrate or minister should after his example lay aside all authority: 'vix mihi carissimo; imploeth rather that if he had been appointed by both the parties, he might have done it; and so any minister arbitrate and compound a controversy civil that is committed unto him.' Sutcliffe, Rem. to Dem. of Disc. 179.]
4 [Acts vi. 4. ap. T. C. i. 167, al. 208; Def. 758; T. C. iii. 10.]
5 [Hooker here forsakes the rendering of the Geneva Bible, which he commonly adopts, and translates the verse for himself.] 6 [2 Tim. ii. 4. [quoted in Adm. See Ans. 216; T. C. i. 166; Def. 754; T. C. iii. 6.]

"that soldiers entangle not themselves with the business of this life, but leave them, to the end they may please him who hath chosen them to serve, and that so the good soldiers of Christ ought to do."

"The Apostles which taught this, did never take upon them any place or office of civil power. No, they gave over the ecclesiastical care of the poor, that they might wholly attend upon the word and prayer."

St. Paul indeed doth exhort Timothy after this manner:

"Suffer thou evil as a noble soldier of Jesus Christ: no man warring is entangled with the affairs of life, because he must serve such as have pressed him unto warfare." The sense and meaning whereof is plain, that soldiers may not be nice and tender, that they must be able to endure hardness, that no man betaking himself unto wars continueth entangled with such kind of businesses as tend only unto the ease and quiet felicity of this life, but if the service of him who hath taken them under his banner require the hazard, yea the loss of their lives, to please him they must be content and willing with any difficulty, any peril, be it never so much against the natural desire which they have to live in safety. And at this point the clergy of God must always stand; thus it behoveth them to be affected as oft as their Lord and captain leadeth them into the field, whatsoever conflicts, perils, or evils they are to endure. Which duty being not such, but that therewith the civil dignities which ecclesiastical persons amongst us do enjoy may enough stand; the exhortation of Paul to Timothy is but a slender allegation against them.

As well might we gather out of this place, that men having children or wives are not fit to be ministers, (which also hath been collected, and that by sundry of the ancient), and that it is requisite the clergy be utterly forbidden marriage: for as

"fieri vix potest, et vacans hujus vite quotidiane curis, quasi liberi creant parentibus maxime, omne studium omnesque cogitationem circa divinam liturgiam et res eclesiasticas consumant." [Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. iii.] xii. sect. 1. de Episc. et Cler.
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the burden of civil regiment doth make them who bear it the less able to attend their ecclesiastical charge; even so St. Paul doth say, that the married are careful for the world, the unmarried free to give themselves wholly to the service of God. Howbeit, both experience hath found that, the clergy should bear the cares of honest marriage, be from the inconveniences which single life imposed upon them would draw after it: and as many as are of sound judgment know it to be far better for this present age, that the detriment be borne which haply may grow through the lessening of some few men's spiritual labours, than that the clergy and commonwealth should lack the benefit which both the one and the other may reap through their dealing in civil affairs. In which consideration, that men consecrated unto the spiritual service of God be licensed so far forth to meddle with the secular affairs of the world, as doth seem for some special good cause requisite, and may be without any grievous prejudice unto the Church, surely there is not in the Apostles being rightly understood, any let.

[13.] That no Apostle did ever bear office, may it not be a wonder, considering the great devotion of the age wherein they lived, and the zeal of Herod, of Nero the great commander of the known world, and of other kings of the earth at that time, to advance by all means Christian religion.

Their deriving unto others that smaller charge of distributing of the goods which were laid at their feet, and of making provision for the poor, which charge, being in part civil, themselves had before (as I suppose lawfully) undertaken, and their following of that which was weightier, may serve as a marvellous good example for the dividing of one man's office into divers slips, and the subordinating of inferiors to discharge some part of the same, when by reason of multitude increasing that labour waxeth great and troublesome which before was easy and light; but very small force it hath to infer a perpetual divorce between ecclesiastical and civil power in the persons.

[14.] The most that can be said in this case is, "That sun-"dry eminent canons, the name of apostolical, and "divers councils likewise there are, which have forbidden the clergy to bear any secular office"; and have enjoined them "to attend altogether upon reading, preaching, and prayer; whereupon the most of the ancient fathers have shewed "great dislikes that these two powers should be united in one person."