that respect said\(^1\) to have had the care and charge not only
of the city of Constantinople, “sed etiam totius Thraciae,
“qua sex prefecturis est divisa, et Asiae totius, quae ab un-
“decim praedibus 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. Je-
rome\(^2\) reproueth his breach of the order of the Church
herself, saying, “Tu qui regulas quaeis ecclesiasticas, et
“Nicen concilii canonibus uteris, respondes mihi, ad Alex-
“andrinum episcopum Palestinæ quid pertinet? Ni sallo,
“hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palestinæ metropolis Caesarea sit, et
“totius Orientis Antiochiae. Aut igitur ad Caesariensem epi-
“scopum referre debueras; aut si procul expetendum judi-
ciam erat, Antiochiam potius litérae dirigendiæ.” Thus
much concerneth 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 Anierius and his fol-
lowers. Aierius 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\(^3\) deliver the opinion of Anierius:

\(^1\) Cassiod. in Vita Chrysost. [Hitt. Eccles. Tripart. lib. x. c. 4.
from Theodoret. H. E. v. 18.]

Joan. Hierosolym. § 37. t. ii. 447.
Ed. Vallarsa.]

\(^3\) Aug. de Hær. ad Quodvult-
deum. [l. viii. 18. Hær. 53.] “Aier-
an: ab Aierio quodam sunt, qui
“quum esset presbyter, doluisse
“ferent, quod episcopus non potest
“ordinari; et in Arianorum here-
“sin lapsus, procula quoque dog-
“mata addisse nonnulla, dicens,
“offerti pro dormientibus non or-
“tene, nec statuta solenmeter cele-
“branda esse jejunia, sed cum
“quisque volumerit jejunandum, ne

Epiphanius\(^1\) not so plainly nor so directly, but after a more
rhetorical sort. “His speech was rather furious than con-
venient 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,
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
Anierius enforced that they ought not in any thing to
differ.

[2.] Are we to think Anierius 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 Anierius in this point be a plain error of
that nature: there is no remedy, but Anierius, 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 Anierius 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

\(^1\) Epiph. Hæres. 75. c. 3. ὃν
Debe aitno ὁ λόγος μακαρίας μάλλος,
θετών καταστάσεως διδασκάλους, καὶ
ψηφι, τι ἔσθε ἐνίκοισα ὁ πρεσ-
βίτορος λουτρον δώσων ἐν ἐπίσκο-
ποι, ὅμως καὶ ὁ πρεσβίτορος τὴν
ὁκομοίαν τῆς λατρείας ποιεῖ ἐν πρε-
σβίτορος, καὶ ὁ πρεσβίτορος ὑπάρχει
καθίσει τοῦ ὀπίσω, καθίσει τοῦ ὀπίσω,
καθίσει τοῦ ὀπίσω, καθίσει τοῦ ὀπίσω.]
Epiphanius' Reply to him.
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not differ, it was concluded by Aërius that the Church did ill 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; for which cause somewhat was convenient to be said against it. And in that very extemoral slightness which Epiphanius there useth, albeit the answer made to Aërius be in part but raw, 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 answerable. 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 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 ordre be distinguished from a presbyter, would the Apostle have given as he doth unto presbyters the title of bishops? These were the invincible demonstrations wherewith Aërius did so fiercely assault bishops.

[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

1 Ecce nos cogitata societas. [Hær. 75. § 2.]
2 [Hær. 75. § 5.]
3 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 later 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?
4 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.

1 Phil. i. 1. "To all the saints at Philippi, with the bishops and presbyters or deacons." For as yet in the church of Philippi, there was no one which had authority besides the bishops, but their presbyters or deacons were all both in title and in power equal.
be able while the world doth stand to find in some [so many?], believing antiquity, as much as one which hath given it countenance, 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 then 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.

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 same thing. Which so indifferent and common use of these words for one and the selfsame office, so constantly and perpetually in all places, 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 in Scripture but one and the same that was committed to the Apostles, without any difference of committing to one pastor more, or to another less."

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 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."

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; 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 answerable 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

---

1 Marsilius of Padua, [a Franciscan canonist, who defended the claims of the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria, against Pope John XIX]; [T. C. i. 70. al. 103. ii. 515, i. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2; [See this argu- &c. Comp. Calvin, Instit. iv. 3, 8.]

2 [Can. 6, 7.]

3 [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 is 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 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 episcopal1; 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.2

[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

1 Acts i. 20.  2 Rev. ii. 1.
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things wherein judgment, wisdom and conscience is required, he carefully admoniseth 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 bad, 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 soon 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, "Against a presbyter receive thou no accusation, saving "under two or three witnesses;" Scripture which likewise hath said to the other, "For this very cause left I thee in "Creté, 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 all which had had 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
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