

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 judgment¹ 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 eccle-

siastical thus to exercise civil dominion of their own, is more than when they only sustain some public office, or deal in some business civil, being thereunto even by supreme authority required.

[6.] As nature doth not any thing in vain, so neither grace. Wherefore if it please God to bless some principal attendants on his own sanctuary, and to endue them with extraordinary parts of excellency, some in one kind, some in another, surely a great derogation it were to the very honour of him who bestowed so precious graces, except they on whom he hath bestowed them should accordingly be employed, that the fruit of those heavenly gifts might extend itself unto the body of the commonwealth wherein they live; which being of purpose instituted (for so all commonwealths are) to the end that all might enjoy whatsoever good it pleaseth the Almighty to endue each one man with, must needs suffer loss, when it hath not the gain which eminent civil ability in ecclesiastical persons is now and then found apt to afford. Shall we then discommend the people of Milan for using Ambrose their bishop as an ambassador¹ about their public and politic affairs; the Jews for electing their priests sometimes to be leaders in war; David for making the high-priest his chiefest counsellor of state: finally, all Christian kings and princes which have appointed unto like services bishops or other of the clergy under them? No, they have done in this respect that which most sincere and religious wisdom alloweth.

[7.] Neither is it allowable only, when either a kind of necessity doth cast civil offices upon them, or when they are thereunto preferred in regard of some extraordinary fitness; but further also when there are even of right annexed unto some of their places, or of course imposed upon certain of their persons, functions of dignity and account in the commonwealth; albeit no other consideration be had therein save this, that their credit and countenance may by such means be augmented. A thing if ever to be respected, surely most of all now, when God himself is for his own sake generally no where honoured, religion almost no where, no where religiously

¹ Zanchius [Jerome Zanchi of Bergamo †1590: he taught theology at Strassburg and Heidelberg 1553, 1568], p. 274. *Observ. in Confess.* [t. viii. 547. c. xxv. aphorism. 21. "Non diffitemur, episcopos, qui simul principes sunt, prætauctoritate ecclesiasticam, sua etiam habere jura politica, sæcularesque potestates, quemadmodum et reliqui habent principes jus imperandi sæcularia, jus gladii, nonnullos jus eligendi confirmandique reges et imperatores, aliaque politica constituendi et administrandi, subditosque sibi populos ad obedientiam sibi præstandam cogendi. Ac proinde fatemur, politicis horum mandatis, quæ sine transgressione legis divinæ servari possunt, a subditis obtemperandum esse, non solum propter timorem sed etiam propter conscientiam." And *Append. p. 584.* "Duæ longe diversæ sunt quæstiones, utrum episcopis liceat etiam esse principibus, principibusque esse episcopis, suis retentis principatibus; et, an qui episcopi jam sunt simul et principes, ii præter auctoritatem ec-

clesiasticam jura etiam habeant politica in cives sibi subjectos; eoque an subditi illis tanquam principibus obedire debeant necne. "In meo aphorismo nihil prorsus de priori quæstione locutus sum, quia non fuit necesse, sed tantum de posteriori. Quis autem illis omnino obediendum esse, quo jure, quaque injuria principes fuerint creati, ex testimoniis a me allatis non videat aperte demonstrari? Cur enim qui subditi sunt Moguntino, Coloniensi, Trevirensi principibus Imperii simul et archiepiscopis, in rebus cum pietate Christiana minime pugnantibus non obtemperent? Seditiosorum certe fuerit non obtemperare. Quod si istis, cur non etiam Romano, iisdem in rebus et eandem ob causam, qui sub ejus vivunt imperio? Eadem enim horum omnium est ratio. De priori quæstione nihil (ut ante dixi) disserui; sed neque etiam nunc in hac mea brevi confessione disputare constitui; cum sciam, non omnium eandem esse sententiam; et in utramque partem multa dici possint." ed. 1605.]

¹ [Especially in the two embassies to Maximus, A. D. 383, and 387. *vid. ep. xxiv. ed. Bened. t. ii. 888-891.*]

adored, 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 their minds 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 Cugnieres 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 Fleury, liv. xciv. c. 2-5. Goldastus, Monarch. S. R. I. t. iii. p. 1383, having inserted the document, adds, "Sic re aliquamdiu ultro citroque agitata, cum episcopi et praelati se suo solito more reformarent, ita nempe, ut specie ac verbis injuriarum quandam alleviationem simularent, re autem ipsa ea potius augerent et aggravarent quam diminuerent; demum rex severam quandam legem fert, qua talem praelatorum audaciam et tyrannidem cohibet, seque ac suos in libertatem asserit." But it seems clear from a papal letter to the king, quoted in Raynaud's Continuation of Baronius, A. D. 1329, that this

latter statement (which is similar to Hooker's) must be erroneous. No authority for it is given. But in the proceedings of the conference complaint is made by the clergy, "quod quaedam præconizationes factæ erant in præjudicium jurisdictionis ecclesiasticæ, quas supplicabant revocari. Tum dominus rex respondit ore proprio, quod non erant factæ de suo mandato, nec aliquid sciebat, nec eas 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 toutes les disputes qui se sont élevées depuis par rapport à l'autorité des deux puissances, et dont l'effet a été de restreindre la jurisdiction ecclésiastique dans des bornes plus étroites." Abrégé Chronol. de l'Hist. de France, t. i. p. 52, Paris, 1768.]

sive: and therefore, till either by one shift or another they can bring all things to their own hands alone, they are not secure.

[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 extraordinancy; 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 souls¹." If a man would shew what the offices and duties of a chirurgion 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 Testament² 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. Jehoshaphat in his reformation³ doth "not only distinguish causes ecclesiastical from civil, and

¹ [Eccl. Disc. fol. 57-64. "Epi-
"scopi nomen, a Græca voce ἐπι-
"σκοπεῖν deductum, speculatorem
"aut vigilem significat, qui castris
"custodiendis, aut ad urbis vigilias
"ad hostium adventum denuncian-
"dum designatus est. . . Est autem
"episcopus, si vere illum definire
"volumus, minister ecclesiæ in re-
"bus divinis, et ad Deum pertinen-
"tibus. . . Sic Timothei (quamvis
"evangelistæ) munus Paulus domus
"Dei gubernatione et administra-
"tione definitiv. Et Apostolus ad
"Hebræos animarum procuracione
"τῶν ἡγουμένων curam complexus
"est. . . Videamus, recte ne eorum
"munus religione et cærimoniis
"tractandis definitum sit. Vetus
"enim opinio est, et ab antiquis
"ducta temporibus, episcopus non
"ita rei divinæ faciendæ terminis
"circumscribi, quin etiam humana
"tractare possint, ac simul quidem
"ecclesiam et rempublicam admin-
"istrare. Hinc apud nos episcopi
"pacis et otii communis conservandi
"auctoritatem habent, et ejus viola-
"tores in carcerem atque vincula
"conjiciendi, testamentorum lites,

"et alias civilium controversias in
"suo foro audiendi, disceptandi ju-
"dicandique potestatem." &c. Decl.
of Disc. 75-77, 85.]

² [Eccl. Disc. 60, "Quum utra-
"que potestas primo in Mose con-
"fusa esset, Deus, republ. Mosis re-
"licta, ecclesiæ gubernationem ad
"Aaronem fratrem transtulit." Decl.
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 dally;
"it is the distinction of the Holy
"Ghost himself. For albeit they
"that handle commonwealth mat-
"ters 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 eccle-
"siastical 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."]

"erecteth divers courts for them, but appointeth also divers judges." BOOK VII.
Ch. xv. 10.

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 judge¹? 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 Jehoshaphat's example the same person ought not to deal in both causes, yet are not scrupulous² 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 Jehoshaphat'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. "in Esdras, Nehemias, Matthias
767. "What say you to Eli and "and some other." T. C. iii. 21.
"Samuel? were they not both priests "Such were extraordinarily raised
"and judges?" T. C. i. 170, al. "up of God, and not by any esta-
211. "As for Eli and Samuel, they "blished order or election of
"are extraordinary examples, which "men."]
"may thereby appear, for that both " [Whitg. Def. 769. "Remember
"these offices first meeting in Mel- "I pray you what you said before in
"chisedech and afterward in Moses "the treatise of Seniors: you there
"were by the commandment of God "set it down that they are ecclesi-
"severed, when as the Lord took "astical persons; and yet M. Beza
"from Moses the priesthood, and "as I have there declared saith that
"gave it to Aaron and his succes- "noblemen and princes may be of
"sors." Whitg. Def. 767. "It is "the seigniory; wherefore either
"not certain whether Moses were "may civil and ecclesiastical offices
"ever priest or no. . . Howsoever "meet together in ecclesiastical
"the priesthood and civil magistracy "persons (which you deny); or
"were divided in Moses and Aaron, "else cannot noblemen and princes
"yet met they both together again "be of your seigniory, as M. Beza
"not only in Eli and Samuel, but "affirmeth."]

[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 adultery¹, and in a civil of dividing an inheritance²." 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 intermeddle 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 calling³. 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 teach⁴,

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 com- "mission from thy brother to send "thee into the moiety of the pos- "session.' Besides, if he had in- "termeddled 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: *τίς με κατέστησε*; "implieth rather that if he had been "appointed by both the parties, he "might have done it; and so may "any minister arbitrate and com- "pound a controversy civil that is "committed unto him." Sutcliffe, Rem. to Dem. of Disc. 179.]

⁴ ² Tim. ii. 4. [quoted in Adm. See Answ. 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 prayer¹."

St. Paul indeed doth exhort Timothy after this manner²: "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 ancient³), and that it is requisite the clergy be utterly forbidden marriage: for as

¹ [Acts vi. 4. ap. T. C. i. 167, al. 208; Def. 758; T. C. iii. 10.]

² [Hooker here forsakes the rendering of the Geneva Bible, which he commonly adopts, and translates the verse for himself.]

³ "Convenit hujusmodi eligi et "ordinari sacerdotes, quibus nec "liberi sunt nec nepotes. Etenim

"feri vix potest, ut vacans hujus "vitæ quotidianæ curis, quas liberi "creant parentibus maxime, omne "studium omnemque cogitationem "circa divinam liturgiam et res ec- "clesiasticas consumat." [Cod. Jus- tin. lib. i. tit. iii.] xlii. sect. 1. de Episc. et Cler.

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 freer to give themselves wholly to the service of God. Howbeit, both experience hath found it safer, that the clergy should bear the cares of honest marriage, than be subject to 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 same persons.

[14.] The most that can be said in this case is, "That sundry eminent canons, bearing the name of apostolical, and divers councils likewise there are, which have forbidden the

"clergy to bear any secular office¹; 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 person²."

¹ [Can. Apost. 72. Εἶπομεν, ὅτι μὴ χρὴ ἐπίσκοπον καθεῖναι εἰς δημοσίας διοικήσεις, ἀλλὰ προσευκαίρειν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς χρεῖαις· ἢ πειθέσθω οὖν τοῦτο μὴ ποιεῖν, ἢ καθαιρέσθω. οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν, κατὰ τὴν κυριακὴν παρακλέυσιν. Ed. Coteler. t. i. 452. Conc. Chal. can. 3. ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον, ὅτι τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ κατελειγμένων τινὲς δι' οἰκείαν αἰσχροκερδείαν ἀλλοτρίων κτημάτων γίνονται μισθωταὶ, καὶ πράγματα κοσμικὰ ἐργολαβοῦσι, τῆς μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργίας καταρραθυμοῦντες, τοὺς δὲ τῶν κοσμικῶν ὑποτρέχοντες οἴκους, καὶ οὐσιῶν χειρισμοὺς ἀναδεχόμενοι διὰ φιλαργυρίαν. ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία συνόδος, μηδένα τοῦ λοιποῦ, μὴ ἐπίσκοπον, μὴ κληρικόν, μὴ μονάζοντα, ἢ μισθοῦσθαι κτήματα ἢ πράγματα, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν ἑαυτὸν κοσμικαῖς διοικήσεσι· πλὴν εἰ μὴ που ἐκ νόμων καλοῖτο εἰς ἀφηλικῶν ἀπαραίτητον ἐπιτροπὴν, ἢ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐπιτρέψῃ φροντίζειν πραγμάτων, ἢ ὀρφάνων καὶ χηρῶν ἀπρονοήτων, καὶ τῶν προσώπων τῶν μάλιστα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς δεομένων βοηθείας, διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυριοῦ. εἰ δὲ τις παραβαίνειν τὰ εἰρημένα τοῦ λοιποῦ ἐπιχειρήσει, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. t. ii. 601, ed. Harduin. And can. 7, τοὺς ἀπαξ ἐν κλήρῳ κατελεγμένους, ἢ καὶ μονασάντας, ὥρισamen, μήτε ἐπὶ στρατείαν, μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι· ἢ τοῦτο τολμῶντας, καὶ μὴ μεταμελουμένους, ὥστε ἐπιτρέψαι ἐπὶ τοῦτο, ὃ διὰ θεὸν πρότερον εἶλοντο, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι. ibid. 603. ap. T. C. i. 168, al. 210; Def. 762; T. C. iii. 15; who refers also to 4 Conc. Carthag. can. 20. "Ut episcopus nullam rei familiaris curam ad se revocet, sed lectioni et orationi et verbi Dei prædicationi tantummodo vacet." ibid. i. 986.]

² [S. Cyr. 1 Ep. ed. Fell. "Graviter commoti sumus. . . cum cognovissemus quod Geminus Victor

"frater noster de sæculo excedens . . . Presbyterium tutorem testamenti suo nominaverit: cum jam pridem in concilio episcoporum statutum sit, ne quis de clericis et Dei ministris tutorem vel curatorem testamenti suo constituat, quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant. Scriptum est enim, 'Nemo militans Deo obligat se molestiis sæcularibus.' . . . Quod cum de omnibus dictum sit, quanto magis clerici molestiis et laqueis sæcularibus obligari non debent! . . . Quod episcopi antecessores nostri religiose considerantes, et salubriter providentes, censuerunt ne quis frater excedens, ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret: ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur." Ap. T. C. i. 166, al. 207; Def. 754; T. C. iii. 6. He quotes also S. Ambr. de Offic. i. 38. (36.) "Non te implices negotiis sæcularibus, quoniam Deo militas. Etenim si is qui imperatori militat a susceptionibus litium, actu negotiorum forensium, venditione mercium prohibetur humanis legibus: quanto magis qui fidei exercet militiam ab usu negotiationis abstinere debet: agelluli sui contentus fructibus, si habet; si non habet, stipendiorum suorum fructu." And S. Jer. on Zephaniah, c. i. "Eos, qui adorant Dominum et Melchom: qui sæculo pariter et Domino putant se posse servire, et duobus Dominis satisfacere, Deo et Mammonæ; qui militantes Christo obligant se negotiis sæcularibus, et eandem imaginem offerunt Deo et Cæsari, et cum Christi sacerdotes se esse dicant, filios consecrant Melchom, i. e. regi suo." t. vi. 680.]