

that respect said<sup>1</sup> to have had the care and charge not only of the city of Constantinople, "sed etiam totius Thraciæ, quæ sex præfecturis est divisa, et Asiæ totius, quæ ab undecim præsidibus regitur." The rest of the East was under Antioch, the South under Alexandria, and the West under Rome. Whereas therefore John the bishop of Jerusalem being noted of heresy, had written an apology for himself unto the bishop of Alexandria, named Theophilus; St. Jerome<sup>2</sup> reproveth his breach of the order of the Church herein, saying, "Tu qui regulas quæris ecclesiasticas, et Niceni concilii canonibus uteris, responde mihi, ad Alexandrinum episcopum Palæstina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Cæsariensem episcopum referre debueras; aut si procul expetendum iudicium erat, Antiochiam potius literæ dirigendæ." Thus much concerning that Local Compass which was anciently set out to bishops; within the bounds and limits whereof we find that they did accordingly exercise that episcopal authority and power which they had over the Church of Christ.

IX. The first whom we read to have bent themselves against the superiority of bishops were Aërius and his followers. Aërius seeking to be made a bishop, could not brook that Eustathius was thereunto preferred before him. Whereas therefore he saw himself unable to rise to that greatness which his ambitious pride did affect, his way of revenge was to try what wit being sharpened with envy and malice could do in raising a new seditious opinion, that the superiority which bishops had was a thing which they should not have, that a bishop might not ordain, and that a bishop ought not any way to be distinguished from a presbyter. For so doth St. Augustine<sup>3</sup> deliver the opinion of Aërius:

<sup>1</sup> Cassiod. in Vita Chrysost. [Hist. Eccles. Tripart. lib. x. c. 4. feritur, quod episcopus non potest ordinari; [et in Arianorum hærese.]

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Ep. 9. [al. lib. contr. Joan. Hierosolym. § 37. t. ii. 447. ed. Vallarsii.]

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Hær. ad Quodvultdeum. [t. viii. 18. Hær. 53.] "Aëriani ab Aërio quodam sunt, qui

"quum esset presbyter, doluisse  
"fertur, quod episcopus non potest  
"ordinari; [et in Arianorum hærese.]  
"sin lapsus, propria quoque dogmata  
"addidisse nonnulla, dicens,  
"offerri pro dormientibus non oportere,  
"nec statuta solenniter celebranda  
"esse jejunia, sed cum quisque  
"voluerit jejunandum, ne

Epiphanius<sup>1</sup> not so plainly nor so directly, but after a more rhetorical sort. "His speech was rather furious than convenient for man to use: What is," saith he, "a bishop more than a presbyter? The one doth differ from the other nothing. For their order is one, their honour one, one their dignity. A bishop imposeth his hands, so doth a presbyter. A bishop baptizeth, the like doth a presbyter. The bishop is a minister of divine service, a presbyter is the same. The bishop sitteth as judge in a throne, even the presbyter sitteth also." A presbyter therefore doing thus far the selfsame thing which a bishop did, it was by Aërius enforced that they ought not in any thing to differ.

[2.] Are we to think Aërius had wrong in being judged an heretic for holding this opinion? Surely if heresy be an error falsely fathered upon Scriptures, but indeed repugnant to the truth of the Word of God, and by the consent of the universal Church, in the councils, or in her contrary uniform practice throughout the whole world, declared to be such; and the opinion of Aërius in this point be a plain error of that nature: there is no remedy, but Aërius, so schismatically and stiffly maintaining it, must even stand where Epiphanius and Augustine have placed him. An error repugnant unto the truth of the Word of God is held by them, whosoever they be, that stand in defence of any conclusion drawn erroneously out of Scripture, and untruly thereon fathered. The opinion of Aërius therefore being falsely collected out of Scripture, must needs be acknowledged an error repugnant unto the truth of the word of God. His opinion was that there ought not to be any difference between a bishop and a presbyter. His grounds and reasons for this opinion were sentences of Scripture. Under pretence of which sentences, whereby it seemed that bishops and presbyters at the first did

"videatur esse sub lege.] Dicebat etiam presbyterum ab episcopo nulla differentia debere discerni."

<sup>1</sup> [Epiphanius. Hæres. 75. c. 3. ἦν δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος μανιώδης μᾶλλον, ἤπερ καταστασίως ἀνθρωπίνης, καὶ φησι, τί ἐστὶν ἐπίσκοπος πρὸς πρεσβύτερον; οὐδὲν διαλλάττει οὗτος τοῦτου· μία γὰρ ἐστὶ τάξις, καὶ μία,

φησὶ, τιμὴ, καὶ ἐν ἀξίωμα· χειροθετεῖ, φησὶν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος· λουτρὸν δίδωσιν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος· τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς λατρείας ποιεῖ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ὡσαύτως· καθίεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καθίεται καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος.]

BOOK VII. not differ, it was concluded by Aërius that the Church did ill  
Ch. ix. 3. in permitting any difference to be made.

[3.] The answer which Epiphanius maketh unto some part of the proofs by Aërius alleged, was not greatly studied or laboured; for through a contempt of so base an error (for this himself did perceive and profess) yieldeth he thereof expressly this reason: Men that have wit do evidently see that all this is mere foolishness. But how vain and ridiculous soever his opinion seemed unto wise men, with it Aërius deceived many<sup>1</sup>; for which cause somewhat was convenient to be said against it. And in that very extemporal slightness which Epiphanius there useth<sup>2</sup>, albeit the answer made to Aërius be in part but raw<sup>3</sup>, yet ought not hereby the truth to find any less favour than in other causes it doth, where we do not therefore judge heresy to have the better, because now and then it allegeth that for itself, which defenders of the truth do not always so fully answer. Let it therefore suffice, that Aërius did bring nothing unanswerable. The weak solutions which the one doth give, are to us no prejudice against the cause, as long as the other's oppositions are of no greater strength and validity. Did not Aërius, trow you, deserve to be esteemed as a new Apollos, mighty and powerful in the word, which could for maintenance of his cause bring forth so plain divine authorities, to prove by the Apostles' own writings that bishops ought not in any thing to differ from other presbyters? For example, where it is said<sup>4</sup> that presbyters made Timothy bishop, is it not clear that a bishop should not differ from a presbyter, by having power of ordination? Again, if a bishop might by order be distinguished

<sup>1</sup> Ἐν τούτῳ πολλοὺς ἠπάτησε. [Hær. 75. § 3.]

<sup>2</sup> [Hær. 75. § 5.]

<sup>3</sup> As in that he saith, the Apostle doth name sometime presbyters and not bishops, 1 Tim. iv. 14. sometime bishops and not presbyters, Phil. i. 1. because all churches had not both, for want of able and sufficient men. In such churches therefore as had but the one, the Apostle could not mention the other. Which answer is nothing to the latter place abovementioned: for

that the church of Philippi should have more bishops than one, and want a few able men to be presbyters under the regiment of one bishop, how shall we think it probable or likely?

<sup>4</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 14. "With the imposition of the presbytery's hand." Of which presbytery St. Paul was chief, 2 Tim. i. 6. And I think no man will deny that St. Paul had more than a simple presbyter's authority.

BOOK VII. from a presbyter, would the Apostle have given as he doth<sup>1</sup> unto presbyters the title of bishops? These were the invincible demonstrations wherewith Aërius did so fiercely assault bishops. Ch. ix. 4. x. 1.

[4.] But the sentence of Aërius perhaps was only, that the difference between a bishop and a presbyter hath grown by the order and custom of the Church, the word of God not appointing that any such difference should be. Well, let Aërius then find the favour to have his sentence so construed; yet his fault in condemning the order of the Church, his not submitting himself unto that order, the schism which he caused in the Church about it, who can excuse? No, the truth is, that these things did even necessarily ensue, by force of the very opinion which he and his followers did hold. His conclusion was, that there ought to be no difference between a presbyter and a bishop. His proofs, those Scripture sentences which make mention of bishops and presbyters without any such distinction or difference. So that if between his conclusion and the proofs whereby he laboured to strengthen the same, there be any show of coherence at all, we must of necessity confess, that when Aërius did plead, There is by the Word of God no difference between a presbyter and a bishop, his meaning was not only, that the Word of God itself appointeth not, but that it enforceth on us the duty of not appointing nor allowing that any such difference should be made.

X. And of the selfsame mind are the enemies of government by bishops, even at this present day. They hold as Aërius did, that if Christ and his Apostles were obeyed, a bishop should not be permitted to ordain; that between a presbyter and a bishop the word of God alloweth not any inequality or difference to be made; that their order, their authority, their power, ought to be one; that it is but by usurpation and corruption that the one sort are suffered to have rule of the other, or to be any way superior unto them. Which opinion having now so many defenders, shall never

In what respects episcopal regiment is gainsaid by the authors of pretended reformation at this day.

<sup>1</sup> Phil. i. 1. "To all the saints which had authority besides the at Philippi, with the bishops and Apostles, but their presbyters or deacons." For as yet in the church of Philippi, there was no one bishops were all both in title and in power equal.

BOOK VII. be able while the world doth stand to find in some [so many?],  
Ch. x. 2. xi. 1. believing antiquity, as much as one which hath given it coun-  
tenance, or borne any friendly affection towards it.

[2.] Touching these men therefore, whose desire is to have all equal, three ways there are whereby they usually oppugn the received order of the Church of Christ. First, by disgracing the inequality of pastors, as a new and mere human invention, a thing which was never drawn out of Scripture, where all pastors are found (they say) to have one and the same power both of order and jurisdiction: Secondly, by gathering together the differences between that power which we give to bishops, and that which was given them of old in the Church; so that albeit even the ancient took more than was warrantable, yet so far they swerved not as ours have done: Thirdly, by endeavouring to prove, that the Scripture directly forbiddeth, and that the judgment of the wisest, the holiest, the best in all ages, condemneth utterly the inequality which we allow.

Their argu-  
ments in  
disgrace of  
regiment  
by Bishops,  
as being a  
mere in-  
vention of  
man, and  
not found  
in Scrip-  
ture, an-  
swered.

XI. That inequality of pastors is a mere human invention, a thing not found in the word of God, they prove thus:

i. "All the places of Scripture where the word *Bishop* is used, or any other derived of that name, signify an oversight in respect of some particular congregation only, and never in regard of pastors committed unto his oversight. For which cause the names of bishops, and presbyters, or pastoral elders, are used indifferently, to signify one and the selfsame thing. Which so indifferent and common use of these words for one and the selfsame office, so constantly and perpetually in all places<sup>1</sup>, declareth that the word *Bishop* in the Apostles' writing importeth not a pastor of higher power and authority over other pastors."

ii. "All pastors are called to their office by the same means of proceeding; the Scripture maketh no difference in the manner of their trial, election, ordination: which proveth their office and power to be by Scripture all one."

iii. "The Apostles were all of equal power, and all pastors do alike succeed the Apostles in their ministry and power, the commission and authority whereby they succeed being

<sup>1</sup> Titus i. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 5; Phil. i. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2. [See this argu-

ment urged, T.C. i. 79. al. 103. ii. 515, &c. Comp. Calvin, Instit. iv. 3, 8.]

BOOK VII. "in Scripture but one and the same that was committed to  
Ch. xi. 2. "the Apostles, without any difference of committing to one  
"pastor more, or to another less<sup>1</sup>."

iv. "The power of the censures and keys of the Church, and of ordaining and ordering ministers (in which two points especially this superiority is challenged), is not committed to any one pastor of the Church more than to another; but the same is committed as a thing to be carried equally in the guidance of the Church. Whereby it appeareth, that Scripture maketh all pastors, not only in the ministry of the word and sacraments, but also in all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority, equal."

v. "The council of Nice<sup>2</sup> doth attribute this difference, not unto any ordination of God, but to an ancient custom used in former times, which judgment is also followed afterwards by other councils: Concil. Antioch. cap. 9<sup>3</sup>."

vi. Upon these premises, their summary collection and conclusion is, "That the ministry of the Gospel, and the functions thereof, ought to be from heaven and of God (John i. 23); that if they be of God, and from heaven, then are they set down in the word of God<sup>4</sup>; that if they be not in the word of God, (as by the premises it doth appear, they say, that our kind of bishops are not,) it followeth, they are invented by the brain of men, and are of the earth, and that consequently they can do no good in the Church of Christ, but harm."

[2.] Our answer hereunto is, first, that their proofs are Answer. unavailable to shew that Scripture affordeth no evidence for the inequality of pastors: Secondly, that albeit the Scripture did no way insinuate the same to be God's ordinance, and

<sup>1</sup> [Marsilius of Padua, [a Franciscan canonist, who defended the claims of the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria, against Pope John XXII. † 1328.] Def. Pacis, pars ii. c. xvi. (vid. infra, § 8. note.) "Ostendemus, primum, Apostolorum neminem ad alios habuisse præeminentiam in essentiali dignitate sacerdotali. . . Ex quibus etiam per necessitatem deducemus, episcoporum sibi successorum neminem singulariter auctoritatem seu potestatem aliquam. . . in reliquos sibi coepiscopos seu compresbyteros habere." p. 241.]

<sup>2</sup> [Can. 6, 7.]  
<sup>3</sup> [Vid. supr. c. viii. 12. p. 199, note 1.]  
<sup>4</sup> T. C. lib. i. p. 62, [al. 83. Whitgift's Defence, 303.] "So that it appeareth that the ministry of the Gospel, and the functions thereof ought to be from heaven: from heaven, I say, and heavenly, because although it be executed by earthly men, and ministers are chosen also by men like unto themselves, yet because it is done by the word and institution of God, it may well be accounted to come from heaven and from God."

the Apostles to have brought it in, albeit the Church were acknowledged by all men to have been the first beginner thereof a long time after the Apostles were gone; yet is not the authority of bishops hereby disannulled, it is not hereby proved unfit or unprofitable for the Church.

[3.] First, that the word of God doth acknowledge no inequality of power amongst pastors of the Church, neither doth it appear by the signification of this word *bishop*, nor by the indifferent use thereof.

For concerning signification, first it is clearly untrue, that no other thing is thereby signified, but only an oversight in respect of a particular church and congregation. For, I beseech you, of what parish or particular congregation was Matthias bishop? his office Scripture doth term episcopal<sup>1</sup>: which being no other than was common unto all the Apostles of Christ, forasmuch as in that number there is not any to whom the oversight of many pastors did not belong by force and virtue of that office; it followeth that the very word doth sometimes even in Scripture signify an oversight, such as includeth charge over pastors themselves.

And if we look to the use of the word, being applied with reference unto some one church, as Ephesus, Philippi, and such like, albeit the guides of those churches be interchangeably in Scripture termed sometime bishops, sometime presbyters, to signify men having oversight and charge, without relation at all unto other than the Christian laity alone; yet this doth not hinder, but that Scripture may in some place have other names, whereby certain of those presbyters or bishops are noted to have the oversight and charge of pastors, as out of all peradventure they had whom St. John doth entitle angels<sup>2</sup>.

[4.] Secondly, as for those things which the Apostle hath set down concerning trial, election, and ordination of pastors, that he maketh no difference in the manner of their calling, this also is but a silly argument to prove their office and their power equal by the Scripture. The form of admitting each sort unto their offices, needed no particular instruction: there was no fear, but that such matters of course would easily enough be observed. The Apostle therefore toucheth those

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 20.<sup>2</sup> Rev. ii. 1.

things wherein judgment, wisdom and conscience is required, he carefully admonisheth of what quality ecclesiastical persons should be, that their dealing might not be scandalous in the Church. And forasmuch as those things are general, we see that of deacons there are delivered in a manner the selfsame precepts which are given concerning pastors, so far as concerneth their trial, election, and ordination. Yet who doth hereby collect that Scripture maketh deacons and pastors equal?

If notwithstanding it be yet demanded, "Wherefore he which teacheth what kind of persons deacons and presbyters should be, hath nothing in particular about the "quality of chief presbyters, whom we call bishops?" I answer briefly, that there it was no fit place for any such discourse to be made, inasmuch as the Apostle wrote unto Timothy and Titus, who having by commission episcopal authority, were to exercise the same in ordaining, not bishops (the apostles themselves yet living, and retaining that power in their own hands) but presbyters, such as the apostles at the first did create throughout all churches. Bishops by restraint (only James at Jerusalem excepted) were not yet in being.

[5.] Thirdly, about equality amongst the apostles there is by us no controversy moved. If in the rooms of the apostles, which were of equal authority, all pastors do by Scripture succeed alike, where shall we find a commission in Scripture which they speak of, which appointed all to succeed in the selfsame equality of power, except that commission which doth authorize to preach and baptize should be alleged, which maketh nothing to the purpose, for in such things all pastors are still equal. We must, I fear me, wait very long before any other will be shewed. For howsoever the Apostles were equals amongst themselves, all other pastors were not equals with the Apostles while they lived, neither are they any where appointed to be afterward each other's equal. Apostles had, as we know, authority over all such as were no Apostles; by force of which their authority they might both command and judge. It was for the singular good and benefit of those disciples whom Christ left behind him, and of the pastors which were afterwards chosen; for the great

good, I say, of all sorts, that the Apostles were in power above them. Every day brought forth somewhat wherein they saw by experience, how much it stood them in stead to be under controlment of those superiors and higher governors of God's house. Was it a thing so behoveful that pastors should be subject unto pastors in the Apostles' own times? and is there any commandment that this subjection should cease with them, and that the pastors of the succeeding ages should be all equals? No, no, this strange and absurd conceit of equality amongst pastors (the mother of schism and of confusion) is but a dream newly brought forth, and seen never in the Church before.

[6.] Fourthly, power of censure and ordination appeareth even by Scripture marvellous probable to have been derived from Christ to his Church, without this surmised equality in them to whom he hath committed the same. For I would know whether Timothy and Titus were commanded by St. Paul to do any thing more than Christ hath authorized pastors to do? And to the one it is Scripture which saith<sup>1</sup>, "Against a presbyter receive *thou* no accusation, saving "under two or three witnesses;" Scripture which likewise hath said to the other<sup>2</sup>, "For this very cause left I *thee* in "Crete, that *thou* shouldest redress the things that remain, "and shouldest *ordain* presbyters in every city, as I appointed "thee." In the former place the power of censure is spoken of, and the power of ordination in the latter. Will they say that every pastor there was equal to Timothy and Titus in these things? If they do, the Apostle himself is against it, who saith that of their two very persons he had made choice, and appointed in those places them, for performances of those duties: whereas if the same had belonged unto others no less than to them, and not principally unto them above others, it had been fit for the Apostle accordingly to have directed his letters concerning these things in general unto them all which had equal interest in them; even as it had been likewise fit to have written those epistles in St. John's Revelation unto whole ecclesiastical senates, rather than only unto the angels of each church, had not some one been above the rest in authority to order the affairs of the church. Scripture therefore doth most probably make for the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. v. 19.<sup>2</sup> Tit. i. 5.

inequality of pastors, even in all ecclesiastical affairs, and by very express mention as well in censures as ordinations.

[7.] Fifthly, In the Nicene council there are confirmed certain prerogatives and dignities belonging unto primates or archbishops, and of them it is said that the ancient custom of the Church had been to give them such preeminence, but no syllable whereby any man should conjecture that those fathers did not honour [did honour?] the superiority which bishops had over other pastors only upon ancient custom, and not as a true apostolical, heavenly, and divine ordinance.

[8.] Sixthly, Now although we should leave the general received persuasion held from the first beginning, that the Apostles themselves left bishops invested with power above other pastors; although, I say, we should give over this opinion, and embrace that other conjecture which so many have thought good to follow<sup>1</sup>, and which myself did

<sup>1</sup> They of Walden. Æn. Syl. "cum officium et servitium exercendum, et oblata distribuendum, ac reliqua disponendum convenientiori modo. . . Hic ex posteriorum consuetudine retinuit sibi soli nomen episcopi. . . Jam dicta electio seu institutio per hominem sic electo nihil amplioris meriti seu sacerdotalis auctoritatis. . . tribuit, sed solum ordinationis œconomicae in domo Dei seu templo potestatem quandam, alios sacerdotes, diaconos, et officiales reliquos regulandi et ordinandi." ap. Goldastum, Tract. de Monarch. S. Rom. Imp. t. ii. p. 240. Francof. 1621.] Nicl. [Wicl. ap.] Thom. Wald. [Thomas Netter, of Walden in Essex, † 1431, Provincial of the Carmelites: employed by Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V.] c. 1. lib. ii. art. 3. c. 60. [quoting Wicl. Trialog. lib. i. c. 10. for the following sentiment; "Unum audacter assero; quod in primitiva ecclesia ut tempore Pauli successerunt duo ordines clericorum, scilicet sacerdos atque diaconus. Secundo dico quod in tempore Apostoli idem fuit presbyter ac episcopus. . . . Tunc enim non fuit inventa distinctio papæ, et cardinalium, patriarcharum, et archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, et archidia-