

For a full and final answer whereunto, I would first demand, whether the commixtion and separation of these two powers be a matter of mere positive law, or else a thing simply with or against the law immutable of God and nature? That which is simply against this latter law can at no time be allowable in any person, more than adultery, blasphemy, sacrilege, and the like. But conjunction of power ecclesiastical and civil, what law is there which hath not at some time or other allowed as a thing convenient and meet? In the law of God we have examples sundry, whereby it doth most manifestly appear how of him the same hath oftentimes been approved. No kingdom or nation in the world, but hath been thereunto accustomed without inconvenience and hurt. In the prime of the world, kings and civil rulers were priests for the most part all. The Romans¹ note it as a thing beneficial in their own commonwealth, and even to them² apparently forcible for the strengthening of the Jews' regiment under Moses and Samuel.

I deny not but sometime there may be, and hath been perhaps, just cause to ordain otherwise. Wherefore we are not so to urge those things which heretofore have been either ordered or done, as thereby to prejudice those orders, which upon contrary occasion and the exigence of the present time by like authority have been established. For what is there which doth let but that from contrary occasions contrary laws may grow, and each be reasoned and disputed for by such as are subject thereunto, during the time they are in force; and yet neither so opposite to other, but that both may laudably continue, as long as the ages which keep them do see no

¹ "Cum multa divinitus, pontifices, a majoribus nostris inventa atque instituta sunt, tum nihil præclarius, quam quod vos eodem et religionibus deorum immortalium, et summæ reipublicæ præesse voluerunt." Cic. pro Domo sua ad Pontific. [c. 1.]

² "Honor sacerdotii firmamentum potentiae assumebatur." Tacit. Hist. lib. v. [c. 8. fin.] He sheweth the reason wherefore their rulers were also priests. The joining of these two powers, as now, so then likewise, profitable for the public state, but in respects clean opposite and contrary. For whereas then

divine things being more esteemed, were used as helps for the countenance of secular power; the case in these latter ages is turned upside down, earth hath now brought heaven under foot, and in the course of the world, hath of the two the greater credit. Priesthood was then a strengthening to kings, which now is forced to take strength and credit from far meaner degrees of civil authority. "Hic mos apud Judæos fuit, ut eosdem reges et sacerdotes haberent, quorum justitia religioni permixta incredibile quantum evaluere." Just. Hist. lib. xxxvi. [c. 2.]

necessary cause which may draw them unto alteration? Wherefore in these things, canons, constitutions, and laws, which have been at one time meet, do not prove that the Church should always be bound to follow them. Ecclesiastical persons were by ancient order forbidden to be executors of any man's testament, or to undertake the wardship of children. Bishops by the imperial law are forbidden to bequeath by testament or otherwise to alienate any thing grown unto them after they were made bishops¹. Is there no remedy but that these or the like orders must therefore every where still be observed?

[15.] The reason is not always evident, why former orders have been repealed and other established in their room. Herein therefore we must remember the axiom used in the civil laws, "That the prince is always presumed to do that with reason, which is not against reason being done, although no reason of his deed be expressed." Which being in every respect as true of the Church, and her divine authority in making laws, it should be some bridle unto those malapert and proud spirits, whose wits not conceiving the reason of laws that are established, they adore their own private fancy as the supreme law of all, and accordingly take upon them to judge that whereby they should be judged.

But why labour we thus in vain? For even to change that which now is, and to establish instead thereof that which themselves would acknowledge the very selfsame which hath been, to what purpose were it, sith they protest², "that

¹ Cod. Justin. I. iii. de Episcopis, &c. 42. § 2. ["De his vero episcopis, qui nunc sunt, vel futuri sunt, sancimus, nullo modo habere eos facultatem testandi vel donandi vel per aliam quamcunque excogitationem alienandi quid de rebus suis, quas postquam facti fuerint episcopi possederint et acquisierint, vel ex testamentis, vel ex donationibus, vel alia quacunque causa: exceptis duntaxat his, quas ante episcopatum haberint ex quacunque causa, vel quæ post episcopatum a parentibus et theiis, h. e. patris vel avunculis, et a fratribus ad ipsos pervenerunt, perventuraque sunt: quæ-

cunque enim post ordinationem ex quacunque causa extra præfatas personas ad ipsos pervenerunt, ea jubemus ad sanctissimam ecclesiam, cujus episcopatum tenuerint, pertinere." A. D. 528.]

² T. C. lib. i. p. 126. [98, ap. Whitg. Def. 452. "I have done, only this I admonish the reader, that I do not allow of all those things which I before alleged in the comparison between our archbishops and the archbishops of old time, &c. . . . Only my intent is to show that although there were corruptions, yet in respect of ours they be much more tolerable."]

BOOK VII. "they utterly condemn as well that which hath been as that
Ch. xvi. 1. 2. "which is; as well the ancient as the present superiority,
"authority and power of ecclesiastical persons."

The argu-
ments an-
swered,
whereby
they would
prove that
the law of
God, and
the judg-
ment of the
best in all
ages, con-
demneth
the ruling
superiority
of one min-
ister over
another.

XVI. Now where they lastly allege¹, "That the law of
"our Lord Jesus Christ, and the judgment of the best in all
"ages, condemn all ruling superiority of ministers over
"ministers;" they are in this, as in the rest, more bold to
affirm, than able to prove the things which they bring for
support of their weak and feeble cause. "The bearing of
"dominion or the exercising of authority (they say²), is that
"wherein the civil magistrate is severed from the ecclesiastical
"officer, according to the words of our Lord and Saviour,
" 'Kings of nations bear rule over them, but it shall not be
"so with you:' therefore bearing of dominion doth not agree
"to one minister over another."

[2.] This place hath been, and still is, although most
falsely, yet with far greater show and likelihood of truth,
brought forth by the anabaptists³, to prove that the Church
of Christ ought to have no civil magistrates; but [to be]
ordered only by Christ. Wherefore they urge the opposition
between heathens and them unto whom our Saviour speaketh.
For sith the Apostles were opposite to heathens, not in that
they were Apostles, but in that they were Christians, the

¹ [Adm. ap. Whitg. Def. 57. "inordinate request of the sons of
"The lordly lords, archbishops, "Zebedee, putteth a difference be-
"bishops, suffragans, deans, doc- "tween the civil and ecclesiastical
"tors, archdeacons, chancellors, "function. He placeth the distinc-
"and the rest of that proud genera- "tion of them in two points; where-
"tion, whose kingdom must down, "of the one is in their office, and
"hold they never so hard, because "the other is in their names and
"their tyrannous lordship cannot "titles. The distinction of the
"stand with Christ's kingdom. "office he noteth in these words:
"And it is the special mischief of " 'The kings of the gentiles, &c.'
"our English church, and the chief "Whereupon the argument may be
"cause of backwardness, and of all "thus gathered; That wherein the
"breach and dissention. For they "civil magistrate is severed from
"whose authority is forbidden by "the ecclesiastical officer doth not
"Christ, will have their stroke "agree to one minister over another.
"without their fellow servants. "But the civil magistrate is severed
"Matt. xx. 25, 26; xxiii. 8, 9; "from the ecclesiastical officer by
"Mark x. 42, 43; Luke xxii. 15, "bearing dominion; therefore bear-
"&c." Ans. 37-39, al. 13, &c.; "ing dominion doth not agree to
"T. C. i. 10, al. 22; Def. 61-75; "one minister over another."
"T. C. ii. 421-436.] ³ [De Brés, "La Racine, &c.
² [T. C. i. 10, al. 22. "Our Sa- "Des Anabaptistes, &c." p. 841.]
"viour Christ upon occasion of the

anabaptists' inference is, "that Christ doth here give a law, BOOK VII.
"to be for ever observed by all true Christian men, between Ch. xvi. 3, 4.
"whom and heathens there must be always this difference,
"that whereas heathens have their kings and princes to rule,
"Christians ought not in this thing to be like unto them."
Wherein their construction hath the more show, because that
which Christ doth speak to his Apostles is not found always
agreeable unto them as Apostles, or as pastors of men's
souls, but oftentimes it toucheth them in generality, as
they are Christians; so that Christianity being common
unto them with all believers, such speeches must be so
taken that they may be applied unto all, and not only unto
them.

[3.] They which consent with us, in rejecting such collec-
tions as the anabaptist maketh with more probability, must
give us leave to reject such as themselves have made with
less: for a great deal less likely it is, that our Lord should
here establish an everlasting difference, not between his
Church and pagans, but between the pastors of his Church
and civil governors. For if herein they must always differ,
that the one may not bear rule, the other may; how did the
Apostles themselves observe this difference, the exercise of
whose authority, both in commanding and in controlling
others, the Scripture hath made so manifest that no gloss can
overshadow it? Again, it being, as they would have it, our
Saviour's purpose to withhold his Apostles and in them all
other pastors from bearing rule, why should kingly dominion
be mentioned, which occasions men to gather, that not all
dominion and rule, but this one only form was prohibited,
and that authority was permitted them, so it were not regal?
Furthermore, in case it had been his purpose to withhold
pastors altogether from bearing rule, why should kings of
nations be mentioned, as if they were not forbidden to
exercise, no not regal dominion itself, but only such regal
dominion as heathen kings do exercise?

[4.] The very truth is, our Lord and Saviour did aim at a
far other mark than these men seem to observe. The end of
his speech was to reform their particular mispersuasion to
whom he spake: and their mispersuasion was, that which was
also the common fancy of the Jews at that time, that their

Lord being the Messias of the world, should restore unto Israel that kingdom, whereof the Romans had as then be-
reaved them; they imagined that he should not only deliver the state of Israel, but himself reign as king in the throne of David with all secular pomp and dignity; that he should subdue the rest of the world, and make Jerusalem the seat of an universal monarchy. Seeing therefore they had forsaken all to follow him, being now in so mean condition, they did not think but that together with him they also should rise in state; that they should be the first and the most advanced by him. Of this conceit it came that the mother of the sons of Zebedee sued for her children's preferment; of this conceit it grew, that the Apostles began to question amongst themselves which of them should be greatest; and in controlment of this conceit it was that our Lord so plainly told them, "that the thoughts of their hearts were vain:" the kings of nations have indeed their large and ample dominions, they reign far and wide, and their servants they advance unto honour in the world; they bestow upon them large and ample secular preferments, in which respect they are also termed many of them benefactors, because of the liberal hand which they use in rewarding such as have done them service: but was it the meaning of the ancient prophets of God that the Messias the king of Israel should be like unto these kings, and his retinue grow in such sort as theirs? "Wherefore ye are not to look for at my hands such preferment as kings of nations are wont to bestow upon their attendants, 'With you not so.' Your reward in heaven shall be most ample, on earth your chiefest honour must be to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake; submission, humility and meekness are things fitter for you to inure your minds withal, than these aspiring cogitations; if any amongst you be greater than other, let him shew himself greatest in being lowliest, let him be above them in being under them, even as a servant for their good. These are affections which you must put on; as for degrees of preferment and honour in this world, if ye expect any such thing at my hands ye deceive yourselves, for in the world your portion is rather the clear contrary."

[5.] Wherefore they who allege this place against episcopal

authority abuse it, they many ways deprave and wrest it, clean from the true understanding wherein our Saviour himself did utter it.

For first, whereas he by way of mere negation had said, "With you it shall not be so," foretelling them only that it should not so come to pass as they vainly surmised; these men take his words in the plain nature of a prohibition, as if Christ had thereby forbidden all inequality of ecclesiastical power. Secondly, whereas he did but cut off their idle hope of secular advancements; all standing superiority amongst persons ecclesiastical these men would rase off with the edge of his speech. Thirdly, whereas he in abating their hope even of secular advancements spake but only with relation unto himself, informing them that he would be no such munificent Lord unto them in their temporal dignity and honour, as they did erroneously suppose; so that any Apostle might afterwards have grown by means of others to be even emperor of Rome, for any thing in those words to the contrary: these men removing quite and clean the hedge of all such restraints, enlarge so far the bounds of his meaning, as if his very precise intent and purpose had been not to reform the error of his Apostles conceived as touching him, and to teach what himself would not be towards them, but to prescribe a special law both to them and their successors for ever; a law determining what they should not be in relation of one to another, a law forbidding that any such title should be given to any minister as might import or argue in him a superiority over other ministers¹.

[6.] Being thus defeated of that succour which they thought their cause might have had out of the words of our Saviour Christ, they try² their adventure in seeking what

¹ ["Horum verborum verus et simplex hic est sensus: Vestra gubernatio diversa erit ab ea quæ est regum propria. . . Si quis locus citari potest ex evangelicis scriptis ad probandam superioritatem inter evangelii ministros, hic unusest. . . ubi omnes sunt futuri pares, præcepto nihil opus quo moderatio mandatur in præcipua dignitate constituto. Sensus igitur hujus præcepti est, Quanto quis inter vos major erit tanto submissius inter suos fratres se gerat. Tametsi omnes Apostoli ejusdem ordinis et potestatis fuerint, ætatis discrimen et donorum Sp. Sancti magnum inter eos fuit." Sar. de divers. Min. Grad. c. 15. vid. etiam de Honore Præsulibus debito, c. 2.]
²T. C. lib. i. 100. [al. 76. ap. Whitg. Def. 361.]

aid man's testimony will yield them: "Cyprian objecteth it to Florentinus as a proud thing, that by believing evil reports, and misjudging of Cyprian, he made himself bishop of a bishop, and judge over him whom God had for the time appointed to be judge¹." "The endeavour of godly men to strike at these insolent names may appear in the council of Carthage: where it was decreed, that the bishop of the chief see should not be entitled the exarch of priests, or the highest priest, or any other thing of like sense, but only the bishop of the chiefest see²; whereby are shut out the name of archbishop, and all other such haughty titles." In these allegations it fareth, as in broken reports snatched out of the author's mouth, and broached before they be half either told on the one part, or on the other understood. The matter which Cyprian complaineth of in Florentinus was thus: Novatus misliking the easiness of Cyprian to admit men into the fellowship of believers after they had fallen away from the bold and constant confession of Christian faith, took thereby occasion to separate himself from the Church³, and being united with certain excommunicate persons, they joined their wits together, and drew out against Cyprian their lawful bishop sundry grievous accusations; the crimes such, as being true, had made him incapable of that office whereof he was six years as then possessed; they went to Rome, and to other places, accusing him every where as guilty of those faults of which themselves had lewdly condemned him, pretending that twenty-five African bishops (a thing most false) had heard and examined his

¹ Lib. iv. ep. 9. [ii. p. 166. ed. Fell. "Quis autem nostrum longe est ab humilitate? utrumne ego, qui quotidie fratribus servio, et venientes ad ecclesiam singulos benigne et cum voto et gaudio suscipio? an tu qui te episcopum episcopi, et judicem judicis ad tempus a Deo dati constituis?"]

² [T. C. i. 72.] "Ὅστε τὸν τῆς πρώτης καθέδρου ἐπίσκοπον μὴ λέγεσθαι ἑξαρχὸν τῶν ἱερέων ἢ ἀκρόν ἱερέα ἢ τοιοῦτότροπὸν τί ποτε, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας. Can. 39. [Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. 39. ap. Harduin. Conc. i. 884. or 3 Conc. Carth. can. 26. p. 964. A. D. 397.]

³ [S. Cyp. Ep. 49. p. 63. ed. Baluz. "Novatus, qui apud nos primum discordiæ et schismatis incendium seminavit; qui quosdam istic ex fratribus ab episcopo segregavit; . . . cum sua tempestate Romam quoque ad evertendam ecclesiam navigans similia illic et paria molitus est, a clero portio nem plebis avellens . . . Damnare nunc audet sacrificantium manus, cum sit ipse nocentior."]

cause in a solemn assembly, and that they all had given their sentence against him, holding his election by the canons of the church void. The same factious and seditious persons coming also unto Florentinus, who was at that time a man imprisoned for the testimony of Jesus Christ, but yet a favourer of the error of Novatus, their malicious accusations he over-willingly hearkened unto, gave them credit, concurred with them¹, and unto Cyprian in fine wrote his letters against Cyprian: which letters he justly taketh in marvellous evil part, and therefore severely controlleth his so great presumption in making himself a judge of a judge, and, as it were, a bishop's bishop, to receive accusations against him, as one that had been his ordinary. "² What height of pride is this (saith Cyprian), what arrogancy of spirit, what a puffing up of mind, to call guides and priests to be examined and sifted before him! So that unless we shall be cleared in your court, and absolved by your sentence, behold for these six years' space neither shall the brotherhood have had a bishop, nor the people a guide, nor the flock a shepherd, nor the Church a governor, nor Christ a prelate, nor God a priest." This is the pride which Cyprian condemneth in Florentinus, and not the title or name of archbishop; about which matter there was not at that time so much as the dream of any controversy at all between them. A silly collection it is, that because Cyprian reproveth Florentinus for lightness of belief and presumptuous rashness of judgment, therefore he held the title of archbishop to be a vain and a proud name.

[7.] Archbishops were chief amongst bishops, yet archbishops had not over bishops that full authority which every bishop had over his own particular clergy: bishops were not

¹ [Ibid. Ep. 69. p. 121. "Prævaluit apud te contra divinam sententiam et contra conscientiam nostram fidei suæ viribus nixam inimicorum et malignorum commentum, quasi apud lapsos et prophanos et extra ecclesiam positos, de quorum pectoribus excesserit Sp. Sanctus, esse aliud possit nisi mens prava et fallax lingua et odia venenata et sacri-lega mendacia; quibus qui credit, necesse est cum iis inveniat cum

"judicii dies venerit."]
² [Ib. Ep. 69. p. 122. "Quæ mentis inflatio, ad cognitionem suam præpositos et sacerdotes vocare, ac nisi apud te purgati fuerimus et sententia tua absoluti, ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit episcopum, nec plebs præpositum, nec grex pastorem, nec ecclesia gubernatorem, nec Christus antistitem, nec Deus sacerdotem."]

subject unto their archbishop as an ordinary, by whom at all times they were to be judged, according to the manner of inferior pastors, within the compass of each diocess. A bishop might suspend, excommunicate, depose, such as were of his own clergy without any other bishops assistants; not so an archbishop the bishops that were in his own province, above whom divers prerogatives were given him, howbeit no such authority and power as alone to be judge over them. For as a bishop could not be ordained, so neither might he be judged by any one only bishop, albeit that bishop were his metropolitan. Wherefore Cyprian, concerning the liberty and freedom which every bishop had, spake in the council of Carthage, whereat fourscore and seven bishops were present, saying¹, "It resteth that every of us declare what we think of this matter, neither judging nor severing from the right of communion any that shall think otherwise: for of us there is not any which maketh himself a bishop of bishops, or with tyrannical fear constraineth his colleagues unto the necessity of obedience, inasmuch as every bishop, according to the reach of his liberty and power, hath his own free judgment, and can no more have another his judge, than himself be judge to another." Whereby it appeareth, that amongst the African bishops none did use such authority over any as the bishop of Rome did afterwards claim over all, forcing upon them opinions by main and absolute power. Wherefore unto the bishop of Rome the same Cyprian also writeth concerning his opinion about baptism²: "These

¹ Concil. Carthag. de Hæret. baptizandis. [p. 329. ed. Baluz. "Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli quid sentiamus proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communicationis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare."] ² Lib. ii. Ep. i. [72. "Hæc ad conscientiam tuam, frater caris-

"sime, et pro honore communi et pro simplici dilectione pertulimus, credentes etiam tibi pro religionis tuæ et fidei veritate placere quæ et religiosa pariter et vera sunt. Cæterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordie vinculo quædam propria quæ apud se sunt semel usurpata retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in ecclesie administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus." p. 129.]

"things we present unto your conscience, most dear brother, as well for common honour's sake, as of single and sincere love, trusting that as you are truly yourself religious and faithful, so those things which agree with religion and faith will be acceptable unto you: howbeit we know, that what some have over drunk in, they will not let go, neither easily change their mind, but with care of preserving whole amongst their brethren the bond of peace and concord, retaining still to themselves certain their own opinions wherewith they have been inured; wherein we neither use force, nor prescribe a law unto any, knowing that in the government of the Church every ruler hath his own voluntary free judgment, and of that which he doth shall render unto the Lord himself an account."

[8.] As for the council of Carthage, doth not the very first canon thereof establish with most effectual terms all things which were before agreed on in the council of Nice¹? and that the council of Nice did ratify the preeminence of metropolitan bishops, who is ignorant? The name of an archbishop importeth only a bishop having chiefly of certain prerogatives above his brethren of the same order. Which thing, sith the council of Nice doth allow, it cannot be that the other of Carthage should condemn it, inasmuch as this doth yield unto that a Christian unrestrained approbation. The thing provided for by the synod of Carthage can be no other therefore, than only that the chiefest metropolitan, where many archbishops were within any greater province, should not be termed by those names, as to import the power of an ordinary jurisdiction belonging in such degree and manner unto him over the rest of the bishops and archbishops, as did belong unto every bishop over other pastors under him.

But much more absurd it is to affirm², that both Cyprian

¹ Ὡστε τὰ ἐν τῇ Νικαίων συνόδῳ ὁρισθέντα παντὶ τρόπῳ παραφυλαχθήσεται. [Conc. Hard. i. 868.]

² T. C. lib. i. p. 113. [al. 87. ap. Whitg. Def. 408. Whitgift (Answ. 72.) had quoted from S. Ign. interp. ad Smyrnæos, c. 9: Τίμα τὸν θεόν, ὡς αἰτίον τῶν ὄλων καὶ κύριον ἐπίσκοπον δὲ, ὡς ἀρχιερέα, θεοῦ εἰκόνα φοροῦντα: T. C. replies, "As for

"Ignatius' place, it is sufficiently answered before, in that which was answered to Cyprian his place: "for when he saith, 'the bishop hath rule over all,' he meaneth no more all in the province, than in all the world, but meaneth that flock or congregation whereof he is bishop or minister. And when he calleth him 'prince of the