

# PRIMITIVE EPISCOPACY

STATED AND CLEARED FROM THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES AND ANCIENT RECORDS.

---

By the late Reverend and Learned DAVID CLARKSON, sometime Fellow of  
Clare Hall, in Cambridge.

---

London : Printed for NATH. PONDER at the Peacock in the Poultry.

1688.

## THE STATIONER TO THE READER.

---

THOUGH a preface be a civility due to the following tract, the name of the author is reckoned much more significant than any preface. Those that knew the calmness of his disposition, and his sincere desire of contributing all that he could to the composure of those unhappy differences that have so long troubled the Christian church, will think this work very suitable to his design; and being so esteemed by divers judicious persons of his acquaintance, those in whose hands his papers are, have been prevailed with to send it abroad into the world with this assurance, that it is his whose name it bears.

NATH. PONDER.

## THE CONTENTS.

---

### CHAPTER I.

THE benefit of this undertaking—What appears of Scripture times—Not a tenth part Christians in any city in the apostles' times; scarce a twentieth—Act. ii. 45, cleared from what is confessed by prelates—1. The number of the converted in the greatest cities were but small—2. That in those times there were more than one bishop in one city; it is also proved from Philip. i. 1—Philippi no metropolis—Objection from Act. xvi. 12, removed—Act. xx. 17, 18, vindicated—Acknowledged that one altar was sufficient in those times.

### CHAPTER II.

Bishops in villages, viz. Hydrax, Olbium, Zygris, &c.—Fuller's testimony in this matter—Instances of this kind in Cyprus, Armenia, Pontus, Lyeaonia, &c.—An account of the bigness of the places mentioned, Act. xiv.—Many bishops in Pisidia, Cappadocia, &c., yet but few cities—Three sizes of villages then—Bishops in villages made provincials by the synod of Laodicea.

### CHAPTER III.

Cities for their largeness were for the most part but like villages, or market-towns—That Πόλις signifies, in the Testament, a city no bigger than a village—Many instances of a city's bigness taken out of the Old Testament—Strabo's and Ptolemy's authorities and instances of the several sorts and dimensions of cities—The ancients understood bishops to be presbyters in the apostles' sense, Tit. i.—For one bishop, afterwards in a great city, ten or twenty—The reasons of lessening the number—What numbers of people accounted competent for an ancient bishopric.

### CHAPTER IV.

A consideration of the cities accounted great—How many cities a metropolis had under it—Some great cities had but few inhabitants, as Philadelphia, Laodicea, and others—Many of the great cities contained no more Christians than could meet together in one congregation—Instances in several cities, and the number of Christians—An account of the Novatians and Donatists of several cities in particular.

## CONTENTS.

### CHAPTER V.

Concerning the greatest cities of all—Proof given that they did not contain more Christians than could meet together in one place—Instances of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Carthage, Jerusalem, &c.

### CHAPTER VI.

Objections against what hath been insisted on, considered—1. From the largeness of the territories about that city—2. Such as credit the premises must think the ancient bishopries crowded so near as to be more like parishes than dioceses, that become the honour of a bishop.

### CHAPTER VII.

More objections answered—Several rules observed—Practices about receiving in of penitents—Duties to which the bishop was obliged—Of one communion table—Requisites in admission to church communion and reconciling of penitents—Reasons why bishops in after ages increased their churches as to largeness of jurisdiction.

### CHAPTER VIII.

The thoughts that some of the best and most eminent bishops of the fourth and fifth ages had of a very large bishoprie, and a flock exceeding numerous.

### CHAPTER IX.

The epilogue to the whole discourse; or, what things may be inferred from the premises.

# PRIMITIVE EPISCOPACY

PROVED FROM

RECORDS OF ANTIQUITY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

I AM sensible that a discourse representing ancient bishoprics as vastly differing from what they are and have been in latter ages, is not like[ly] to be well entertained with many ; when it must encounter with prejudice and interest, things that do frequently baffle the best evidence, in persons otherwise very discerning and judicious.

To those who take the measures of ancient times and things by their own, or are much concerned that they should not be otherwise than they now are, it will seem a great paradox to hear that a bishop of old was but the pastor of a single church, or that his diocese was no larger than one communion-table might serve, and contained no more than were capable of personal communion. But being also apprehensive that great advantages may be expected from a clear discovery of the truth in this particular ; since thereby not only many passages in the ancient writers may be cleared and secured from misconstruction, and divers mistakes corrected, into which men otherwise learned have slipped themselves, and drawn others after them ; but that it may contribute much to the deciding of the controversies amongst us about church government, and bringing them to a happy composure, I was encouraged to offer what I had observed to this purpose in the records of antiquity to public view.

As for Scripture times, there will be little difficulty, since as much is acknowledged by the most learned and judicious asserters of prelaey as need be desired.

First, It is confessed that the numbers of Christians, even in the greatest cities, was small. Archbishop Whitgift, concerned to make

the best of them, acknowledges this:“ after he had told us, “The gospel was preached in all parts: it was not generally received in any one part of the world; no, not in any city, not at Jerusalem, where all the apostles were, not in any the least town:” he adds, “There were Christians at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, at Rome, &c., but not the tenth part in any of these, or any other places in comparison to the Jews or Gentiles. In the apostles’ times, the visible church of Christ at Rome was but a handful in comparison. When Matthias was chosen, the whole church was gathered together in one place, and so was it when the deacons were chosen. — The election might be in the whole church when it was together in one place. — It might well be that the people in every city might meet in one place without confusion, when scarce the twentieth part of the city were Christians; but it cannot be so now.” So Bishop Downham tells us, “That at the very first conversion of cities, the whole number of the people converted (being sometimes not much greater than the number of the presbyters placed among them) was able to make up but a small congregation.<sup>b</sup> “At the very first, all the Christians in the city and country, if they had been assembled together, could have made but a small congregation.”<sup>c</sup>

No instance can be brought against this, but the three thousand converted at Jerusalem, Acts ii. 41, to which some would add five thousand more. But what may be argued from hence for great numbers of Christians in cities proceeds upon a mere mistake, which I shall clearly remove; for it is but a small proportion of those thousands that can in reason be accounted the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and so fixed members of that church: for they were converted at one of the great feasts, at which times the inhabitants were not by far a twentieth part of those that were assembled in the city. That this may appear, let us inquire both after the number of the inhabitants, and of those that from other places resorted to those solemnities. To begin with the latter of these; Josephus<sup>d</sup> tells us, and out of him Eusebius,<sup>e</sup> that Cestius Gallus, willing to represent to Nero (who contemned the Jews) the strength of that people, desired the priests to take an account of their number; they, in order thereto, at the Passover, when several companies (the least consisting of ten, many of twenty) were each of them to have their sacrifice, numbered the sacrifices, which came to 255,600; then reckoning as though each company had no fewer than ten, they collected the number of the people at the Passover to be 2,700,000, all legally clean; but allowing the families or companies their just number, it amounted to three millions; so Eusebius, *τριακοσίας μυριάδων*; and

<sup>a</sup> Defens. of Ans. tr. iii. chap. vi. p. 175.

<sup>d</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. vii. cap. i. § 5, p. 968.

<sup>b</sup> Def. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Hist. lib. iii. cap. v.

<sup>c</sup> Page 69.

Josephus elsewhere, *οὐκ ἑλάττους τριακοσίων μυριάδων,*<sup>a</sup> “not less than three millions.”

But then they were all in a manner foreigners, *πολὺ δὲ τοῦτο πλῆθος ἕξωθεν συλλέγεται.*<sup>b</sup> The inhabitants of Jerusalem were but 120,000, as we learn by Hæcateus,<sup>c</sup> *περὶ δώδεκα μυριάδες* (not *centum et quinquaginta millia*, 150,000, as the translator.) And it may be Hæcateus, or his informer, over-reached, as well in the number of the citizens as in the measures of the city. He makes the circuit of it fifty furlongs, whereas Josephus says, it was but thirty-three,<sup>d</sup> and the circumvallation of Titus in the siege but thirty-nine furlongs.<sup>e</sup> And when twelve thousand were slain in Jerusalem in one night, the loss is represented as though the greatest part of the citizens had been destroyed.<sup>f</sup> But there is no need of these advantages. Let us suppose the inhabitants to have been 150,000 (thirty thousand more than Hæcateus makes them) yet this will but be a twentieth part of three millions, (and no less were wont to be at Jerusalem at the three great solemnities,) and then in all reason no more than a twentieth part of the converted must be accounted inhabitants of the city, and so fixed members of the church. For that this happiness should fall in greater proportion upon those of the city than upon the foreigners at that time in it, both being in all the same circumstances, none can upon any ground imagine. And if but a twentieth part of the converted were inhabitants, let them be twenty, or forty, or eighty thousand, or as many as the myriads, Acts xxi. 20, amount to, the church at Jerusalem will not be so much greatened<sup>g</sup> by them, but that it might well meet in one congregation. If the converts had been a hundred thousand, the proportion of that church therein would have been but five thousand; and more have been in one congregation in the primitive times elsewhere, or else Eusebius could not have found *μυριάδρους ἐπισυναγωγὰς,*<sup>h</sup> “congregations of ten thousand.”

2. It is confessed that in those times, and after, there was more than one bishop in a city. And if the Christians in any city were but few, and those divided betwixt several bishops, how small a diocese would the share of each make up! D[r.] H[ammoud] (whom others follow) tells us, that there were two bishops at once in Jerusalem, in Antioch, at Ephesus, and at Rome.<sup>i</sup> He ventures to name the several bishops, and assigns the reasons why distinct congregations, under their respective bishops, in each city were necessary. He affirms it was so, not only in the four cities specified, but in others; and indeed upon

<sup>a</sup> Page 798. Edit. Genev. an. 1635.

<sup>d</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. xvii. p. 914.

<sup>e</sup> increased.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. vii. cap. xvii.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. vi. cap. 31.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. viii. cap. i.

<sup>e</sup> Josep. contr. Ap. lib. i.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iv. cap. xx.

<sup>h</sup> Annot. in Revel. xi. 3, p. 662.

this account it must be so, in all cities where a competent number of Jews and Gentiles together were converted to Christ.

But there is no need of this acknowledgment. Nor will I insist on the grounds on which he proceeds. There is evidence enough in Scripture for a plurality of bishops in several cities, which may be easily vindicated from the attempts of some who would deface it. That of the apostle to the Philippians is pregnant, Phil. i. 1: "To all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." To this it is said, that Philippi was the metropolis of Macedonia, and the bishops mentioned were not those of that city, but of the several cities of the province which was under this metropolis.

But that Philippi was then a metropolis, or long after, (which is all the support this opinion hath,) is a presumption without any ground, there being nothing for it in Scripture, or in ecclesiastical or foreign authors, yet produced for the proof of it. A very learned doctor thinks that one text, Acts xvi. 12, affords two arguments to evince it; it is *πρώτη*, "the prime city," and it was beside that, *κολωνία*, "a colony;" and of such colonies and chief cities, it is no question they were especially chosen to be the places of their assizes, whither the neighbouring cities resorted for justice, and so were metropolies in the civil account." But in answer to this, *πρώτη* is there the first, (as it is rendered by our translators) not the chief city; the first in situation, not the principal in dignity and pre-eminence; the first city that occurred in passing from Thrace to Macedon,<sup>b</sup> it being seated at the edge of Macedon, and so near Thrace, that some geographers count it a city of that country. And so it was the first city of Macedon, as Berwick is the first English town to one passing from Scotland, but far from being the chief town in England. The very notice of its situation, which the best geographers give us, leads us so to take *πρώτη*; but that it was the chief city, as he takes it, is not only without, but against, all evidence. For it is known with what general consent Thessalonica has the pre-eminence amongst the cities of Macedon; and that in Theophylact is taken notice of, where Philippi is called a little city, being under Thessalonica the metropolis: it is said that this was taken out of an old geographer, and belonged<sup>c</sup> to that city, as it was built by Philip, not to those latter times under the Roman empire. But even in the latter times, and under the Roman empire, when Macedon was made a Roman province, Philippi was a place so inconsiderable, that it was not thought worthy of mention by Livy, when he

<sup>a</sup> D[r.] H[ammond], Vind. p. 111.

<sup>b</sup> Or as Dr. Du Veil, "Such as go to Macedonia from the isle of Samothrace, the first city they meet that is a colony upon the coast of Edonis is Philippi."—Explan. of Acts xvi. 12, p. 57.

<sup>c</sup> referred.

gives an account of the principal cities in the whole country.<sup>a</sup> Paulus Æmilius divided it into four regions, and the metropolis in each is by him specified; *regionum ubi concilia fierent* (which shows where their courts of judicature or assizes were held) *primæ regionis Amphipolim, secundæ Thessalonicam, tertie Pellam, quartæ Pelagoniam fecit*, “of the regions in which courts are held, Amphipolis was fixed on for the first region, Thessalonica for the second, Pella for the third, and Pelagonia for the fourth.” So not Philippi, but Amphipolis, was the metropolis of that part of Macedon where it was situate; thither the neighbouring cities were to resort for justice, not to Philippi.

The other argument, viz. its being a colony, is of no force at all, unless none but metropolies were colonies, which is apparently<sup>b</sup> false, since colonies were commonly planted in inferior cities. So that oftentimes we find near twenty colonies where but one metropolis, as in Mauritania Cæsariensis, where there were nineteen; sometimes above twenty, as in Africa Propria, where four-and-twenty; and in countries where there were fewer colonies, they were placed in the meaner cities, rather than the chief. In Macedon, three of the four cities which in Livy are *capita regionum*, “capitals of regions,” were without colonies; Thessalonica, Amphipolis, and Pelagonia, if we may credit Ferrarius’s account of them; and in England, where there were four colonies, London had none. Onuphrius indeed will have it a colony, but Brierwood shows his mistake out of Tacitus, his own author.<sup>c</sup>

In fine, not only meaner cities, but villages, might be colonies. The Emperor Severus gave the honour of a colony to a hamlet. *Patavicentium vicus a D. Severo jus colonie impetravit*, “the village Petavicum has obtained the colonial privilege from the Emperor Severus.”<sup>d</sup>

Let me but add another text to this vindication, Acts xx. 17, “From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church,” who are said, ver. 28, “to be made bishops by the Holy Ghost.” To evade this, some by church will not understand that of Ephesus, but the several churches of Asia; and so by elders, not those of Ephesus only, but the bishops of the Asian churches; whereas, this sense, neither the text, nor other Scriptures, nor the ancients will allow. The text itself gives it no countenance, but rather refuses it; nor must it be admitted by the best rules expositors follow, of interpreting a text by itself. “He sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church:” of what church, but of that there mentioned—of the church of Ephesus? who would imagine other, but those who find it cross their pretensions? I need not say that the Syriac version, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ecumenius, Theodoret, and the whole stream of the ancients are against

<sup>a</sup> Dec. v. lib. v. p. 90.    <sup>b</sup> manifestly.    <sup>c</sup> Inquir. p. 19.    <sup>d</sup> Lib. l. Digest. [Tit. xv. sect. ix.]

this new sense, not any favouring it, but one<sup>a</sup> amongst them all; and he in such terms, as those who allege him will not admit the entire expression, nor that it crosses the Scripture in its constant style. Christians in a town or city are called a church, and still expressed singularly; whereas those in a country or province are called churches, and expressed plurally. I pass these as touched by others; that which I insist on is this:

The apostle Paul resolved to be at Jerusalem at the day of Pentecost, and made all haste possible that he might be there, Acts xx. 16, and accordingly was there at that day, as D[r.] H[ammond] tells us, Acts xxiv. 11; and the many myriads that he found there assembled, are an evidence of it. But he was not, he could not be, there at the day of Pentecost if he stayed long at Miletus; and he could not assemble the bishops of Asia there, unless he stayed long there. Let us make both these manifest. If he stayed longer at Miletus than three or four days at most, he could not be at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost; for there being but seven weeks betwixt that and the Passover, he came but to Miletus in the latter end of the fourth week, as is clearly discernible from Acts xx. 6, 7, 13, 14, 15 verses. He sailed from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread were past, ver. 6, and so when one of the weeks was past, he came to Troas in five days, and stayed there seven; and so departed from thence on Monday in the fourth week, ver. 6 and 7; in four days more he arrived at Miletus, in the latter part of the fourth week, ver. 13, 14, 15. And three weeks more we have an account of, after his departure from Miletus, before he arrived at Jerusalem, Acts xxi. ver. 1—4, 7, 8, 10, 15. From Miletus by Coos, Rhodes, Patara, in four or five days he came to Tyre. Chrysostom reckons them five days, *ἐκείθεν δὲ ἡμερῶν πέντε εἰς Τύρον*,<sup>b</sup> “thence it is a journey of five days to Tyre.” At Tyre he stayed seven days, ver. 4, at Ptolemais one day, ver. 7, and the many days he stayed at Cæsarea, ver. 10, *εἰς Καισάρειαν πλείους μένει τῶν ἄλλων*, “at Cæsarea he remains more days than at the other places.” And what was requisite to bring him from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, which was seventy miles distant, could not be less than would make up the other days forementioned, as near to three weeks as we now suppose.

So that hereby it is evident, that three or four days was all that can be allowed for his stay at Miletus; and this was not time sufficient to send summons to the several bishops of Asia, and for them to come to Miletus upon such summons. It was time little enough to send to Ephesus, and to have the bishops and presbyters of that city come to Miletus, being three or four days' journey going and coming; for in the

<sup>a</sup> [Iren. lib. iii. cap. xiv.]

<sup>b</sup> Homil. xiv. on Acts.

common reckoning, a day's journey by land was near twenty miles, 160 or 166 furlongs; or by a larger account, 200 furlongs, five-and-twenty miles, as Casaubon<sup>a</sup> observes out of Herodotus, Livy, Polybius, &c. Now Ephesus was fifty miles from Miletus, 400 furlongs, as Camerarius tells us, and so four days' journey to and fro, according to the larger reckoning; and if the messenger were accommodated for extraordinary speed, one day at least must be allowed for Ephesus, and no less than two for the bishops or presbyters, being usually aged persons, especially if they came on foot, as the apostles and their disciples were wont to do when they travelled by land; and a good part of the day might be taken up by the apostles' exhortation, prayer, and their conference with him. But it is not imaginable, that this time, that was little enough to bring the bishops from Ephesus, could be sufficient to assemble them at Miletus from many several and remoter parts; or if they will have us to understand the bishops through all the lesser Asia, all Natolia, as they sometimes express it,<sup>b</sup> many weeks' time will be little enough for the convocating so many dispersed through so vast a region: or if we understand it only of the Lydian or proconsular Asia, and of the bishops of the principal cities nearer to Ephesus, such where there are mention of churches in Scripture, many days (more than can be allowed) would be necessary for their assembling together at Miletus, as will appear by the distance of some few: for as Ephesus was fifty miles north of Miletus, so Smyrna was 320 furlongs (forty miles) north of Ephesus, as Strabo;<sup>c</sup> Pergamus further north of Smyrna, 540 furlongs, *i. e.* about sixty-eight English miles, and so 158 from Miletus going and coming. Sardis was three days' journey from Ephesus, as Herodotus,<sup>d</sup> and the bishops coming by Ephesus to Miletus, it will be twice more, besides what must be allowed the messenger going thither from Miletus. So that there is no possibility of assembling the bishops of Asia at Miletus in so few days, as would leave it possible for the apostle to be at Jerusalem at the day of Pentecost. And therefore the elders sent for could not be those of the several cities of Asia, but of Ephesus; and then it cannot be denied, but in that church there was a plurality of elders or bishops.

3. It is acknowledged, that both in Scripture times and long after, the bishop's diocese was so small that one altar was sufficient for it. See Mr. Mede, "Proof for Churches in the Second Century," p. 29. "Nay, more than this," saith he, "it should seem that in those first times, before dioceses were divided into the lesser and subordinate churches we now call parishes, and presbyters assigned to them, they had not only one altar in one church or *dominician*, but one altar to a

<sup>a</sup> In Strab. lib. xxi.    <sup>b</sup> [Dodwell] Diss. iv. cap. viii. sect. vi.    <sup>c</sup> Lib. xiv. int.    <sup>d</sup> Lib. v.

church, taking church for the company or corporation of the faithful united under one bishop or pastor, and that was in the city and place where the bishop had his see or residence ; like as the Jews had but one altar and temple for the whole nation, united under one high priest ; and yet, as the Jews had their synagogues, so perhaps they might have more oratories than one, though their altar was but one, there namely where their worship was. *Die solis*, saith Justin Martyr, *omnium qui vel in oppidis vel rure degunt in eundem locum conventus sūt*, “On Sunday there is an assembly in one place of all who live in the towns or in the country ;” namely, as he there tells us, to celebrate and participate the holy eucharist. Why was this, but because they had not many places to celebrate in ? And unless this were so, whence came it else that a schismatical bishop was said *instituere* or *collocare aliud altare*, “set up another altar,” and that a bishop and altar are made correlatives ?<sup>a</sup> And thus perhaps is Ignatius also to be understood in that forequoted passage of his, *ἐν θυσιαστήριον, unum altare omni ecclesie, et unus episcopus cum presbyterio et diaconis*, “one altar for the whole church, and one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons.” Where he extends those first times, before dioceses were divided, to the latter end of the third age, alleging Cyprian for proof. To the same effect D[r.] H[ammond],<sup>b</sup> alleging for it Ignatius, Cyprian, and other learned men. The same may be concluded from D[r.] T[aylor] citing Damasus speaking of the titles in Rome.<sup>c</sup> Hence he infers that there was yet no preaching in parishes, but [only in] the mother church, and so but one pulpit in a diocese. So that Damasus, and the Doctor out of him, leave us evidently to conclude that there was no communion celebrated, no communion-table but in the mother church. The parishes mentioned at Rome were only appointed for baptism, and penance, and burial, and this three hundred and five years after Christ, and at Rome too, the greatest and most populous church in the world. To these I might add Petavius, who had no superior for learning amongst the Jesuits, nor any to whom prelacy is more obliged. He is positive, that in the fourth age there was but one church or title ordinarily in a city, and proves it by Epi-phanianus, who speaks of more titles in Alexandria as a thing singular and peculiar to that city (there being no other instance thereof before

<sup>a</sup> St. Cyprian's Epist. xl. 72, 73, and De Unitate Ecclesie.

<sup>b</sup> Dissert. iii. cap. iii. sect. xv.

<sup>c</sup> Dr. T[aylor], (Episcopacy Asserted,) giving an account out of Damasus what Euaristus and Dionysius did, about dividing of parishes or titles in the city of Rome; adds, Marcellus increased the number in the year 305. *Hic fecit cæmeterium, et 25 titulos in urbe Romæ constituit quasi Dioceses propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur*: he made a sepulture or cemetery for the burial of martyrs, and laid out twenty-five parishes in the city of Rome. — And the use of parishes, which he subjoins, alters the business, for he appointed them only *propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum et sepulturas*, for baptism, and penance, and burial; for as yet there was no preaching in parishes, but [only] in the mother church.

but Rome,) *singalarem tunc temporis Alexandriae morem hunc fuisse*, &c.,<sup>a</sup> as also by the Council of Neocæsarea.<sup>b</sup> And Dr. Stillingfleet,<sup>c</sup> “For although, when the churches increased, the occasional meetings were frequent in several places, yet still there was but one church, and one altar, and one baptistery, and one bishop, with many presbyters assisting him; and this is so very plain in antiquity, as to the churches planted by the apostles themselves in several parts, that none but a great stranger to the history of the church can ever call it in question.”

So that this is not barely delivered by persons of excellent learning, and intimate acquaintance with antiquity; but proved by those records which are most venerable in their account; and the evidence reaches not only the apostles’ times, but divers ages after.

Hereby it appears that a bishop’s see of old was *ἐνομόνοπος*, “such as admitted of oversight,” as Nazianzen styles his own; and a diocese far from such a thing as hath now the name. For that wherein there was but one communion-table did not differ much from one of our parishes; and the bishop’s flock [was] but like the cure of one of our parsons or vicars, when one table would be sufficient for it; indeed, one is too little for divers of our parishes.

But to give fuller proof of this, let us view the bishops’ seats of old, and we shall find them either so small, or so few Christians in them, as will convince the impartial that we have not made their bounds too narrow. There were many bishops in villages; many in cities, no bigger than villages; most of them in cities which were but like our market towns; no more under bishops in those cities which were counted great, than could meet together for Christian communion; and scarce any of the few largest cities contained more Christians for some hundred years than are in some of our parishes.

---

## CHAPTER II.

THOSE that are concerned to extend the ancient bishop to the modern pitch and largeness, will not endure to hear, nor would have any believe, that it was usual of old to have bishops in villages, or such little places; and tell their opponents, that “the most learned amongst them

<sup>a</sup> Epiph. Hær. xvi. p. 276.

<sup>b</sup> Can. xiii.

<sup>c</sup> Sermon against Separat. p. 27.

have not been able, with great labour and hard study, to produce above five instances hereof;"<sup>a</sup> and that this is not enough, if none of them were mistaken, to prove it usual. But there are several things counted usual in the ancient church, of which no more instances can be given, nor so many. And yet more have been and may be produced for bishops in villages than some are willing to take notice of.

In the diocese of Egypt, Hydrax and Palæbisca, two villages (κῶμαι δὲ αὐταῖ Πενταπόλεως, "these are villages of Pentapolis," says Synesius,) had their bishops; he went thither, as he tells us in the same place,<sup>b</sup> πρόθεσθαι τὴν περὶ ἐπισκόπου σκέψιν, "to make a proposal about a bishop."

So had Olbium, a village in the same region; δῆμος εἰσὶ κωμήτης, "they are a village community;" after the death of Athamas, bishop there, ἐδέησεν αἰρέσεως ἐπισκόπου, the election of a bishop was needful, and Antonius was chosen.<sup>c</sup>

Zygris is an Egyptian village, in Ptolemy. Athanasius gives us the name both of the place and person that was bishop there. Μάρκος Ζυγρῶν.<sup>d</sup>

We meet with Ἀντίας κώμη, "the village Antia," in Diodorus.<sup>e</sup> And in the Council of Ephesus with *episcopus Anteensis*, "bishop of Antia."<sup>f</sup> I cannot find any other place that will suit him.

Schædia, in Strabo, is κατοικία πόλεως, rendered *pagus urbi similis*, "a village like a city."<sup>g</sup> Athanasius tells us who was the bishop of it, Αγαθοδάμων Σχεδίας.<sup>h</sup>

In the Breviary of Meletius, wherein he gives Alexander an account what bishops he had made; amongst the rest there is Κρόμιος ἐν Μετόλῃ, in Athanasius.<sup>i</sup> And a place called Andromene was the episcopal seat of Zoilus, as Athanasius informs us, Ζώϊλος Ἀνδρωμήνας.<sup>k</sup> Which two last (with divers others which I will pass by) are in all probability villages, since there are no such cities discovered in Egypt.

Ἕψηλις is a village in Stephanus. And Hypselis had two bishops at once, Arsenius of the Meletian faction, and Paul for the orthodox.<sup>l</sup>

Dracontius, ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρίων χώρα κατασταθείς,<sup>m</sup> being made a bishop in the territory of Alexandria, could have no city for his seat.

Secontarurus was a very small and contemptible village, that Ischyurus was made bishop of, containing so few inhabitants that there was never a church there before, as Athanasius,<sup>n</sup> κώμη βραχυτάτη, καὶ ὀλίγων ἀνθρώπων, "a very small village, with few inhabitants."

And that was little better, where the writers of the life of Chry-

<sup>a</sup> D[r.] D[ownham], lib. ii. cap. vii. pp. 132. 134, and J[eremy] T[aylor], Ep. Assert. p. 304.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. lxxvii.

<sup>c</sup> Synes. Epist. lxxvi.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Antiochen. p. 452. tom. i.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. i. [cap. ii.]

<sup>f</sup> Crab. Conc. p. 747.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. xvii. p. 550.

<sup>h</sup> Ad Antioch. p. 452. tom. i.

<sup>i</sup> Apol. ii. p. 612.

<sup>k</sup> Ad Antioch. p. 452.

<sup>l</sup> Athan. Apol. ii.

<sup>m</sup> Athan. Epist. ad Dracont. p. 736.

<sup>n</sup> Apol. ii. p. 622.

sostom tell us, Theophilus of Alexandria settled a bishop; they all call it *κωμῦδριον*, a small hamlet.<sup>a</sup>

In the Council of Ephesus there was *episcopus Bacathensis*,<sup>b</sup> “a bishop of Bacathum.” And Epiphanius calls *Bacathum μητροκωμίων τῆς Ἀραβίας*, “a chief village in Arabia.”<sup>c</sup> In that part of Arabia which was annexed to Palestine there was good store of bishops in villages, as appears by the ancient catalogue in Gulielmus Tyrius. There is no need to mention particulars, since Sozomen assures us that there *ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται*,<sup>d</sup> “bishops are consecrated in villages.”

In Syria, Theodoret tells us of Paul, a confessor, in the persecution by Licinius, one of the fathers at the first Council of Nice, and bishop of Neocæsarea, which he says is *φρούριον*, a castle or fort near Euphrates.<sup>e</sup> Maronia is described by Jerome to be a village thirty miles from Antioch, and we meet with a bishop there, and the name of him *Τιμόθεος Μαρωνείας*, in Georgius of Alexandria, in the life of Chrysostom, § 60, p. 236.

Athanasius gives us the name of a bishop in Calanæ, *Ευφρατίων ὁ ἐν Καλαναίς*; and of another in Siemium, *Δομνιὸν ἐν Σιεμίῳ*,<sup>f</sup> which were villages, or such obscure inconsiderable places as no geographer takes notice of. Particular instances are needless here. The council at Antioch, in their synodal epistle concerning Paulus Samosatenus, mention bishops both in country and cities, *ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων*.<sup>g</sup>

In Palestine, Jamnia was a village in Strabo's account, *ἐκ τῆς πλησίον κώμης Ιαμνείας*.<sup>h</sup> So is Lydda in Josephus,<sup>i</sup> yet both [are] bishops' seats in Tyrius's catalogue. So is Nais there, and Zoara, (in Ortelius, *Ζοάρα, vicus*, “a village.”) And in one of the three Palestines, there is an account of fourteen villages which were bishops' sees, *Comes* (Gr. *κώμης*) *Nais, seu vicus Nais, comes Charus*, and many more. Hence Miræus observes, *Comes idem est quod vicus Græcis, quo nomine multi episcopatus sub patriarcha Jerusalemæ prænotantur a Gulielmo Tyrio*,<sup>k</sup> “*Comes* means in Greek the same as *vicus* in Latin, and by this name are distinguished by Gulielmus Tyrius many bishoprics under the patriarch of Jerusalem.”

In the same list we meet with Pentacomia, in the province of Raba; with Tricomia<sup>l</sup> in that of Cæsarea; with Tricomia,<sup>l</sup> Pentacomia,<sup>m</sup> Hexacomia,<sup>n</sup> and Enneacomia<sup>o</sup> in that of Becerra, each of which probably was a precinct consisting of so many villages, as the several words denote, under the inspection of one bishop, who had no city, but such

<sup>a</sup> Georg. Alexand. p. 210. Anonymus Vit. Chrys. p. 345. Sim. Metaphr. p. 407. inter Chrysost. opera.

<sup>b</sup> Crab. t. i. p. 826.

<sup>c</sup> Anacephal. p. 141.

<sup>d</sup> Hist. lib. vii. cap. xix.

<sup>e</sup> Hist. lib. i. cap. vii. Ortel.

<sup>f</sup> Ad Solitar. Vit. Agent. p. 629.

<sup>g</sup> Euseb. lib. vii. cap. vii.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. xvi. p. 522. [Ed. Casaub. p. 1100 B.] Ed. alt. p. 759.]

<sup>i</sup> Antiquit. lib. xx. cap. v. p. 692.

<sup>k</sup> Notit. Episc. p. 301.

<sup>l</sup> Three-hamlets.

<sup>m</sup> Five-hamlets.

<sup>n</sup> Six-hamlets.

<sup>o</sup> Nine hamlets.

hamlets for his bishopric ; as of Præpedius it is said *πολλὰς ἐπέσκοπε κώμας*,<sup>a</sup> “ he was bishop of many villages.”

But there is no need to insist on this ; only it is to be noted what a friend of episcopacy speaks ingenuously of that region. “ But at this time,” says Mr. Fuller, “ bishops were set too thick for all to grow, and Palestine fed too many cathedral churches to have them generally fat. Lydda, Jamnia, and Joppa, three episcopal towns, were within four miles one of another ; and surely many of their bishops (to use Bishop Langham’s expression) had high racks but poor mangers. Neither let it stagger the reader, if in that catalogue of Tyrius he light on many bishops’ seats which are not to be found in Mercator, Ortelius, or any other geographer ; for some of them were such poor places that they were ashamed to appear in a map, and fell so much under a geographer’s notice that they fell not under it : for in that age bishops had their sees at poor and contemptible villages.”<sup>b</sup>

In Cyprus, Sozomen tells us it was usual to have bishops in villages, *ἐν κώμας ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται παρὰ Κυπρίους*, and also in other countries, *ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν*, without regard, it seems, of any restraint which some bishops endeavoured to put upon that practice. And thus it continues with the Cypriots to this age ; for whereas there are betwixt twenty and thirty bishops in that island, (and it is like<sup>c</sup> the number has decreased there as in many other places) there are but four of their seats which have the face of a city, *Potius pagi quam urbis speciem præ se ferunt*, says Ferrarius, “ They are more like villages than cities.” The Catholic of Armenia had above one thousand bishops under his obedience, as Otho Frisingius writes from the report of the Armenian legates.<sup>d</sup> And after him Baronius, *ad an.* 1145, [§ 23.] and our Brerewood ; yet both the Armenias in Justinian’s time (who made the most of them) made but four provinces ; and in the first, he tells us, there was but seven cities, in the second but five, in the third but six, in the fourth but one city, (Martyropolis) and a castle, (*τὸ Κεθαρῖζον φρούριον*, “ the castle Cethurizum,”)<sup>e</sup> [making] but twenty in all, and divers of them taken out of Pontus. If the Armenian bishops had not amounted to above the twentieth part of the number recorded, yet more than half of them must be village bishops. Justinian, giving an account how many cities there were in the provinces of Pontus and the regions near, in Lazica finds seven castles and but one city, and that made so by himself, [viz.] Petra, *ὅφ’ ἡμῶν τὸ πόλις εἶναι τε καὶ ὀνομάζεσθαι προσλαβοῦσα*.<sup>f</sup> Yet in the *διατύπωσις* of Leo Sophus, in Lazica, there are fifteen bishops belonging to one metropolis.

<sup>a</sup> Sozom. lib. vi. cap. [34.] p. 403.

<sup>c</sup> probable.

<sup>e</sup> Novel. xxxi. chap. i

<sup>b</sup> Hist. of Holy War, bk. ii. chap. ii. p. 45, 46.

<sup>d</sup> Chron. lib. vii. cap. xxxii.

<sup>f</sup> Novel. xxviii. præfat.

In Lycaonia and the parts adjacent we have more instances hereof, and confirmed by the best authority. The apostles having preached there, Acts xiv., and their ministry being successful to the conversion of many, so that there were competent numbers for the constituting of churches in the several places mentioned, they ordained elders for every church, ver. 2, 3. Those elders were bishops, as they assure us who have new modelled the principles by which prelacy may be maintained with most advantage, and without which (whatever their predecessors thought) they judged it not defensible. The places where those churches with their bishops were constituted, are mentioned ver. 20 and 21, viz., Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra. Now, if we take the account which the best geographers give us of these places, it will be manifest, that the apostles did fix bishops, not only in great cities, but in lesser towns, yea in country granges or villages. Antioch was the metropolis of Pisidia, says Chrysostom; a great city, and yet not so great but [that] all the inhabitants in a manner could meet together to hear the word, Act. xiii. 44. Iconium in Strabo is *πολίχνιον*, only *εὐσυνωχισμένον*, a small town, but well built.<sup>a</sup> By which we may judge of those places which were bishops' seats under it; there are fifteen of them in the *διατύπωσις* of Leo Sophus.

Derbe, in Stephanus, is *φρούριον*, a fort or castle of Isauria; it was, says Strabo, in the borders of Isauria; and agreeably with Stephanus, he calls it not a city, but *τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου τυραννείου*, the seat of Antipater, who, he tells us, was *ληστής*, a robber,<sup>b</sup> a *φρούριον* being the fittest receptacle for such a person; this could not be populous, being of no large compass. Polybius speaks of Tychos, such a fort, (in the territory of Elis,) which he calls also *χωρίον οὐ μέγα*, a small country place or grange but a furlong and a half in compass;<sup>c</sup> and in him, as in others, *χωρίον* is a village or castle,<sup>d</sup> a country place distinct from a city, *οὐ πόλις ἀλλὰ χωρίον*.

Lystra seems a place no more considerable; it is a small place in Isauria, in Ptolemy,<sup>e</sup> and Strabo, though not by that name. In Ptolemy it is *Αὔσιρα*, (which in the Greek manuscript in Selden is *Αύστρα*, (as is noted in the last edition of Ferrarius,) and in the Latin version which Ortelius used, Lystra,) and Ausira is the same with Isaura in Strabo, one of those two places in Isauria, which he says were of the same name with the country, (for Ausira and Isaura differ but in the transposition of two letters, as Casaubon observes) and both these with him are villages, *Ἰσαυρία κώμας δύο ἔχουσα ὁμωνύμους*,<sup>f</sup> "Isauria has two villages of the same name as itself." So that Lystra, which is Ptolemy's

<sup>a</sup> Lib. xii. p. 391.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. ii. p. 139.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. xii. p. 368.

<sup>d</sup> [lib. v.]

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iv. [c. lxxxiii.] pp. 345, 346.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. xii. p. 391.

Ausira, and Strabo's Isaura, was in his account but a village; though, it is like,<sup>a</sup> of a larger size, such as the Scriptures and other authors sometimes call a city, τὰς μεγάλαις κώμας πόλεις ὀνομάζοντες,<sup>b</sup> "Large villages are called cities." Hereby it further appears, that in Scripture and other authors, villages, and other such small places do pass under the name of cities; Derbe, a fort or grange, and Lystra, a village, are called cities of Lycaonia, Act. xiv. 6. Also that where there is a church, whether the place be small or great, there ought to be a bishop. And likewise that the apostle ordained bishops in villages and other places as inconsiderable, and left the practice warranted by apostolical example and authority.

Artemidorus, giving an account of all the cities in Pisidia, reckons but eleven, whereas there are twenty-two bishoprics in the catalogue of Leo.<sup>c</sup>

Strabo divides Cappadocia (that part of it which was called Taurica) into five στρατηγίας, or prefectures, three of which had no cities in them, δύο δὲ ἔχουσι μόνον στρατηγίαι πόλεις, "two only of the prefectures possess cities." One of these had Tyana for its metropolis, the other Mazaca, called Cæsarea; so that Melitene, Cataonia (which Ptolemy makes part of the lesser Armenia, though Stephanus and Pliny agree with Strabo) and Isauritis had not one city in them, and yet there were many bishoprics in them. In the other two prefectures besides Nazianzum, which in Gregory, who had his name from it, and best knew it, is not only μικρά, "small," but ἐλαχιστὴ ἐκ πόλεων,<sup>d</sup> "the least among cities," and so short of many villages; there was Doara, which is κώμη, a village in Basil, and met with a bishop poorer than the place, Δοάροις τε κώμη φθορὸν ἀνθρώπων, which Basil expresses his resentment of (as a disparagement of the episcopal name) in his epistle to Eusebius Samosatensis.

And Basil advises Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, to constitute bishops for that province in little towns and villages.<sup>e</sup>

Sasima, in Nazianzen is *angusta villula*, "a small village," who, by the importunity of Basil and the senior Gregory, was ordained bishop there, but with such reluctancy, that he would never settle there, being indeed a place far below a person of such eminency.<sup>f</sup>

Likewise a country place, where one of a servile condition, having been made bishop by Basil, Simplicia, his mistress, after Basil's death, forced him into her service again, which lady, Nazianzen is importunate with to restore him to his episcopal see; this he calls *χαρίον*,<sup>g</sup> which in him, as

<sup>a</sup> probable.

<sup>b</sup> Strab. lib. iii. p. 112. [Ed. Casaub. p. 247, B. Ed. Paris, 1620, p. 163.]

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Strab. lib. xii. p. 392.

<sup>d</sup> Orat. ix. p. 155.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. 406.

<sup>f</sup> [Carmen. de Vita sua. Ed. Paris. 1630, tom. ii. p. 7.]

<sup>g</sup> Epist. xxviii. p. 801. [al. Ep. xxxviii.]

in others, is a place inferior to a city, *καὶ οὐδὲ πόλις ἀλλὰ χωρίον.*<sup>a</sup> So he represents the Arians expressing the meanness of the place where he was bishop. Such also were those other places which Basil (when a great part of the province was rent from him upon the partage<sup>b</sup> of it betwixt him and Anthimus of Tyana) made bishops' seats (for the cities were taken up before): and those bishoprics were not a few, as appears by Nazianzen's expression of Basil's action, *πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις τὴν πατρίδα καταπυκνώσας*, "he studded the country with many bishops;" and Gregory applauds this multiplying of bishoprics, *ὡς κάλλιστα διατίθεται,*<sup>c</sup> as an excellent art, souls being hereby better looked after, *ψυχῶν ἐπιμέλεια πλείων,*<sup>d</sup> though others would have had this less regarded, and the bishop's honour more.

In Pontus Pohleniacus, Pityus and Sebastopolis were bishops' seats, yet they were not cities in Justinian's account, *Πιτυοῦντα καὶ Σεβαστόπολιν ἐν φρουρίοις μᾶλλον ἀριθμητέον ἢ πόλεσιν,*<sup>e</sup> "Pityus and Sebastopolis are rather to be counted castles than cities."

Coracesium is but a castle, in Strabo,<sup>f</sup> *κλικῶν φρούριον*, yet a bishop of it is found amongst those of Pamphylia, in Leo Sophus.

Thymbria is a village, in Strabo.<sup>g</sup> A bishop of Timbria under Ephesus we find in Conc. Chalced. Crab. p. 892.

Amyzon and Heraclea, (another in Caria besides that *ad Lathnum*) are both bishops' seats. Vid. Miræus. 107, 108, 237, yet no more than castles, as Strabo.<sup>h</sup>

Heraclea ad Lathnum, another bishop's seat, but *πολίχριον,*<sup>i</sup> "a little city." So are Ceramus and Bargesia, *πολίχρια,*<sup>j</sup> "little cities."

Docimia is a village, *Δοκιμία κώμη,*<sup>k</sup> a bishop's seat often mentioned in subscriptions of councils, [and] in Leo's Catalogue under Amoreus.

There is Nea, which in Suidas and Stephanus is a castle, and a Nea in Pliny<sup>l</sup> and Strabo<sup>m</sup> that is a village. In the council of Chalcedon there is a bishop of Nea under Laodicea, and another under Ephesus.<sup>n</sup>

Pannonion is a castle in the territory of Cyzicus, says Stephanus, and there is a bishop of that title under the metropolitan of Cyzicus, Leo, *διατύπ.* And such a bishop mentioned Conc. C. P.<sup>o</sup> vi. Crab. t. ii. p. 61.

There is a bishop of Gordi under Sardis, [and] of Midei under Synnoda in Phrygia, which in Strabo are *Μίδου* and *Γορδίου οἰκητήρια*—*οὐδ' ἔχνη σώζοντα πόλεων ἀλλὰ κῶμαι μικροῦ μείζους τῶν ἄλλων,*<sup>p</sup> "the habitations of

<sup>a</sup> Orat. xxv. p. 435.

<sup>b</sup> partition.

<sup>c</sup> Orat. xx.

<sup>d</sup> Page 356.

<sup>e</sup> [Nov. xxviii.]

<sup>f</sup> Lib. xiv. p. 459.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. xiv. p. 438. [Ed. Casaub. p. 943, B. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 636.]

<sup>h</sup> Lib. xiv. p. 453, l. edit. Atrebat. [Ed. Casaub. p. 942, C. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 635.]

<sup>i</sup> Str. lib. xiv. p. 437.

<sup>j</sup> Page 451. [Ed. Casaub. p. 969, C. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 656.]

<sup>k</sup> Str. lib. xii. p. 397. [Ed. Casaub. p. 805, A. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 577.]

<sup>l</sup> [Lib. ii. cap. xevi.]

<sup>m</sup> [Lib. xii.]

Crab. p. 892.

<sup>n</sup> Constantinople.

<sup>p</sup> Lib. xii. p. 392.

Midas and Gordias, which preserve no trace of being cities, but are villages little above the common size."

There were villages of several sizes then, as there are now.

1. Some very little, such as Zonaras calls *μονοίκια*,<sup>a</sup> or such as those mentioned in the constitutions of Isaac Comnenus,<sup>b</sup> which had but *είκοσι*, or *δέκα καπνοὺς*, "twenty or even ten hearths."

2. Some pretty big, as those of the Phocenses in Pausanias, when their conquerors had reduced their cities into villages, *εἰς κόμας ἠκίσθησαν*, (and stinted them that they might not be too great) which consisted of fifty houses.

3. Some greater, such as Justinian calls *μεγίστας κόμας*,<sup>c</sup> "very large villages."

It would be too tedious to give an account of all those particulars which are obvious. The synod of Laodicea, which forbade the making of bishops in some villages, gives evidence that in such places there were bishops, Can. lv., *οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κόμαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς χωραῖς καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους*,<sup>d</sup> "bishops are not to be ordained in villages or hamlets." This was the only synod in the east that prohibited bishops to be made in villages; and no wonder, since in those parts of Asia, where the authority of the synod reached, there were so many cities, and so close together, that there seemed no need of any in hamlets; and indeed the prohibition was understood of lesser villages, so the Latin version in Crab. lib. i. p. 380, *quod non oporteat in villulis vel in agris constitui episcopus*, or as Leo hath it, *in viculis*.<sup>e</sup> In Zonaras it is such places *ἐνθα μὴ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων*, when not enough to make a good congregation.<sup>f</sup> Elsewhere he observes, that it was not needful there should be great multitudes, but *μικραὶ παροικίαι καὶ οὐ πολυπληθεῖς*, "small and thinly-populated parishes," might have bishops, and they were allowed *ἐν ταῖς πάροικίαις ἢ γούν ταῖς μικραῖς ἐνορίαις*, in little parishes with the consent of him who had the chief seat.<sup>g</sup> Those mentioned by Nazianzen and Basil were made in the next diocese after this decree, and so in other places; so that this canon was either thus understood, or not regarded, or counted not worthy of observation.

However bishops that were in such country places before this synod, the words of the canon are plain for it, (*τοὺς μέντοι ἤδη προκαταστάθεντες*, those who are before this already made bishops in villages and country seats) nor does that which follows degrade them, enjoining them *μηδὲν πραττεῖν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπίσκοπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει*, "to do

<sup>a</sup> In Conc. Chalced. can. xvii.

<sup>b</sup> Cod. p. 283.

<sup>c</sup> Novel. xxiv.

<sup>d</sup> [In Hard. can. lvii.]

<sup>e</sup> Epist. lxxxv. c. ii.

<sup>f</sup> In Conc. Laod. can. lvii. [Bevereg. Pandect. tom. i. p. 480.]

<sup>g</sup> In Can. lx. Conc. Carth. [Bevereg. Pandect. tom. i. p. 592.]

nothing without the cognisance of the city bishop," no more than the provincial bishops were degraded by being obliged to do nothing without him who had his church in the metropolis;<sup>a</sup> nor he, by being enjoined to do nothing without them, *ἀνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης*.

For Europe, and the more eastern parts of it, not to insist on particular instances, such as Melanicus, a castle in Cedrenus, and Tzurulum in Zonaras, and Bisa or Bizia and Macroatichos in Æmilius Probus, and Diabolis, a castle in Macedon, as Nicephorus, and Alalcomenæ no great village of Bœotia in Pausanias, and Cenchrea a bishop's seat in Clem. Constit. lib. vii. cap. xlviij., as the rest are in others; that which is alleged against this practice will be a sufficient proof of it, viz., the council of Sardica held in those parts, and the only synod in Europe for six hundred years after Christ, that did forbid the making of bishops in some small towns and villages, if so be it can be counted a prohibition; for however it is in the Greek, yet in the Latin, which is the original, the restraint is laid upon foreign bishops, that they shall not erect such bishoprics in another province which is not their own, and into which they are occasionally sent.<sup>b</sup> Thus it runs in the Greek copies (though it was not received by the Greeks in Photius's time, if we may believe him,) nor known in Africa to Augustine otherwise than as a convention of Arians,<sup>c</sup> *μη̄ ἐξείναι ἀπλῶς καθιστᾶν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν κῶμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχεΐᾳ πόλει*, "it is altogether unlawful to ordain a bishop in any village or small city." They except such places where there had been bishops already, and forbid it to none for the future but such for which one presbyter was sufficient, (and it was less than an ordinary parish, for which they then thought one presbyter sufficient.<sup>d</sup>) In Leo's words, there was to be none *in viculis et possessionibus vel obscuris et solitariis municipiis*,<sup>e</sup> in hamlets and country farms or obscure and uninhabited towns. And so there is room enough left for bishops in large and populous villages. However hereby they signify sufficiently, that it was usual before this to have bishops in small places. For, according to Justinian's rule, founded upon the wisdom of ancient lawgivers, *Τὸ σπανίως γινόμενον (καθὰ καὶ ἡ παλαιὰ λέγει σοφία) οὐ τηροῦσιν οἱ νομοθέται, ἀλλὰ τὸ γινόμενον ὡς ἐπίπαν καὶ ὀρώσι καὶ θεραπεύουσι*,<sup>f</sup> "that which is rare (according to the saying of ancient wisdom) legislators do not guard against, but regard and provide for what commonly happens."

In Crete, they tell us, (more than once) there were a hundred bishops; no fewer suffragans must their metropolitan Titus have under him, when enthroned there by the apostle; yet Pliny, who writ in Vespa-

<sup>a</sup> Conc. Antioch. Can. ix.

<sup>b</sup> See Crab. tom. i. p. 331.

<sup>c</sup> Contra Crescon. [lib. iii. c. xxxiv.] and Epist. clxiii. [al. Ep. xliv. cap. iii.]

<sup>d</sup> Every place that had twelve families, was to have a rector, as is decreed by this synod.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. lxxxv. cap. ii.

<sup>f</sup> Novel. xciv. cap. ii.

sian's time, a little after the apostles' death, found but forty cities there, (only the memory of sixty more;) and Ptolemy gives an account of the same number. So that the far greatest part of Titus's suffragans, must have their thrones in country villages; and the most of the forty called cities were little better than villages. Strabo says, Crete had *πλείους πόλεις*,<sup>a</sup> "many cities," but only three of any great note (and one of those three lost its greatness before Titus knew it.) It is most like to be true which Julius Scaliger makes their character,

*Centum olim cinctas operosis mœnibus urbes  
Reddidit ad paucas imperiosa dies.  
Oppida parva tamen reor illa fuisse, sed aucta  
Quod deest ex reliquis Candia sola refert.<sup>b</sup>*

*In provincia et ditione Romana semel hoc loco indicasse suffecerit, oppida episcopali dignitate cohonestata quantumvis exigua ab Italis juxta stylum et phrasim curiæ Romanæ civitates nuncupari; reliqua vero ista dignitate carentia non nisi castella vel oppida nominari.* "Let it suffice to remark here, once for all, that towns invested with the episcopal dignity, and situate in the Roman province and jurisdiction, however small they may be, are called by the Italians, according to the style and mode of speech appropriate to the Roman court, cities; whilst others, which possess not this dignity, are designated but castles or towns."

In Italy it is known that almost every petty town has a bishop; and I cannot discover that there are more bishops now there, than of old: in that called in special the Roman province, there are now fewer by many than anciently, as, Miræus tells us, is evident, by comparing the old provincial code with the new,<sup>c</sup> and all the new erections that I can find, (discounting those which are upon old foundations,) amount not to the number of those which are either dissolved or united. And if that was the mode of other writers, to call every place a city which had a bishop, we need not wonder if they discover to us no more bishops in villages; we must go to some other author to know of what quality the place was, not to him who, calling it an episcopal seat, is obliged to style it a city, though it was otherwise nothing better than a village.

It is true those small towns (that diocese which had but five hundred souls in it was not the meanest of them) though no better than villages

<sup>a</sup> Lib. x. p. 328.

<sup>b</sup> "A hundred cities girt of yore with massive walls imperious Time has dwindled to a few. Yet were they small towns, I ween, though dignified; their poverty, this apart, desert Candia reveals."

<sup>c</sup> Notit. Episc. lib. iv. pp. 160, 161.

or our country towns, pass under the names of cities; but that is because every place which had a bishop was called a city upon that account, though it had nothing else to make it a city, but merely its being made a bishop's seat, as Miræus informs us.<sup>a</sup>

In Spain the twelfth council of Toledo<sup>b</sup> takes notice of one made a bishop *in monasterio villulæ*, "in a village monastery," another *in suburbio Toletano in ecclesia prætoriensis Sanctorum Petri et Pauli*, "in the prætorian church of Sts. Peter and Paul, in the suburbs of Toledo," and of others *in aliis vicis et villulis similiter*, "in other villages and hamlets in like manner." It is true the bishops there allow it not, (though such ordinations might be better justified than their consecration of Eringius in the place of Wamba, considering by what means he supplanted him; and they were approved while Wamba had the throne) but order it otherwise for the future, yet there is no mention of displacing any, but only of Convildus, who was made bishop in the monastery; but in this they were singular, since bishops were allowed in monasteries both before this synod and after. And so these also will be a proof of the question in hand, since monasteries were parts of a diocese, and also generally less than villages: let me give some instances hereof.

Barses and Eulogius had a monastery for their diocese, no city nor territory, ἐπίσκοποι οὐ πόλεως τινός, as Sozomen tells us, but χειροτονηθέντες ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις μοναστηρίοις,<sup>c</sup> "bishops of no city, but ordained for their own monasteries." And one Lazarus also, ὄν τρόπον καὶ Λάζαρος.<sup>d</sup>

To whom we may add those monastics which Epiphanius speaks of, one of them a bishop in the desert of Egypt, the other in Mount Sinai, ἐπισκόπων δεξάμενοι χειροθεσίαν, καὶ καθῆσθαι τε καὶ τὰ ἐπισκόπων πραττεῖν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπεχειροῦν,<sup>e</sup> "having received the episcopal ordination, used themselves to ordain and do the work of bishops."

In the council of Chalcedon, Act. iii. we meet with Helpidius, a bishop, *Thermensis monasterii*, "of the monastery of Therma," who gave his suffrage amongst the rest, for the deposing of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria;<sup>f</sup> and the same person, or another of his name and title, subscribes, amongst other bishops in the sixth œcumenical synod under Symmachus.<sup>g</sup>

In Theodorus Lector,<sup>h</sup> Timotheus of C. P.<sup>i</sup> ordains a bishop in the monastery of Studita, after the decease of another who presided there, τοῦ ἡγουμένου τῆς μόνης τοῦ στυδίτου τελευτήσαντος, ἀπῆλθε Τιμόθεος ὁ ἐπί-

<sup>a</sup> Lib. v. p. 297.

<sup>b</sup> [Can. iv.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. vi. cap. xxxiv. p. 402. <sup>d</sup> Id. ibid. <sup>e</sup> Exposit. Fidei, p. 1095. <sup>f</sup> Conc. tom. i. p. 851.

<sup>g</sup> Elpidius Thermensis Monasterii, in Crab. p. 1026. [Romana vi. in Hardouin.]

<sup>h</sup> Collect. lib. ii.

<sup>i</sup> Constantinople.

σκοπος εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον.<sup>a</sup> In Spain itself Dumium is an episcopal seat, *locus episcopalis in Hispania*, says Ortelius; adding, *sæpius ejus meminit ex conciliis*, "mention is often made of it in the councils." *Monasterium est apud Isidorum et Honorium unde<sup>3</sup> Martinus episcopus (qui scripsit de quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus) oriundus*, "In Isidore and Honorius it is said to be a monastery, whence Bishop Martin, who wrote of the four cardinal virtues, received his title." He tells us also of Hadrian, bishop of Niridanum, a monastery near Naples.

In Britain there were commonly bishops in monasteries, and such too as were in subjection to the abbot of the convent, (though but a presbyter) as appears by the synod of Hereford, cap. iv. *Ut episcopi monachi non migrent de loco in locum, hoc est de monasterio in monasterium, nisi per dimissionem proprii abbatis, sed in ea permaneant obedientia, quam tempore suæ conversionis promiserant*,<sup>b</sup> "Bishops who are monks must not wander from place to place, *i. e.* from monastery to monastery, unless dismissed by their abbot, but shall observe that obedience which they promised at their conversion." And this is one of the constitutions they made in observance of what was determined by the canons of the fathers, *quæ definierunt stare canones patrum*, as Theodorus, who presided there, shows in the preface.

For the rest, in general, Rabanus Maurus says, though there were fewer bishops at first, *tempore vero promovente non solum per civitates ordinati sunt, at (for sed) per singula loca in quibus nec adeo necessitas flagitabat*,<sup>c</sup> "in process of time bishops were not only ordained in cities, but in particular places where there was no such necessity."

And so let us come nearer home. I need not tell you how few cities there are in Ireland, yet Primate Usher tells us out of Nenius that St. Patrick founded there three hundred and sixty-five churches and as many bishops.

Afterwards the number increased; *multiplicabantur episcopi*, "bishops were multiplied," says Bernard, so that when Malachias went into Ireland (near six hundred years after Patrick,) an. 1150, *Unus episcopus uno non esset contentus episcopo, sed singulæ pene ecclesiæ singulos haberent episcopos*,<sup>d</sup> "bishops were so multiplied that one diocese was not content with one bishop, but almost every parish church had its bishop."

Yea, there was not only one bishop in such a little precinct, but more than one, not only in cities but even in villages, as Lanfranc writes to Terlagh, then king in Ireland, *in villis vel civitatibus plures ordinantur*."

<sup>a</sup> Page 188.

<sup>d</sup> Bernard. Vit. Malach.

<sup>b</sup> Spehm. p. 155. Beda, lib. iv. cap. v.

<sup>c</sup> Baron. ad an. 1089, n. 16.

<sup>e</sup> Tom. iv. p. 14.

Ush. Relig. of Irish. cap. viii. p. 79.

And their revenue was answerable, since some of them, as Dr. Heylin tells us, had no other than the pasture of two milch beasts.<sup>a</sup>

Pass we to Africa. There some (better acquainted with the state of the ancient church than those who have the conscience to tell us that bishops of old were only ordained in great cities,<sup>b</sup>) acknowledge, bishops were so plentiful that every good village must needs be the seat of an episcopal church.<sup>c</sup>

I need not stand to prove that which is too evident to be either denied or concealed ; only this in brief. In five of the provinces of the African diocese, Byzacena, Zeugitana, Numidia, Mauritania Cæsariensis, and Sitifensis, there were in Augustine's time near nine hundred bishoprics, taking those of the Donatists into the account, which we have reason to do, since the Catholics decreed, that when the Donatists were reduced, those places amongst them which had bishops should continue to be episcopal seats, (*sane ut illæ plebes quæ conversæ sunt à Donatistis, et habuerunt episcopos, sine dubio, inconsulto concilio, habere mereantur.*<sup>d</sup>)

St. Augustin, in his brief relation of the conference of Carthage, gives an account of near five hundred bishops of his side ; for he says the names of two hundred and eighty-five were recited, twenty subscribed not, *suam tamen exhibentes præsentiam*, "although they were present ;" one hundred and twenty were absent, *quidam eorum senectute, quidam infirmitate, quidam diversis necessitatibus impediti*, "some being hindered by age, some by sickness, others by various pressing necessities ;" sixty episcopal seats were vacant, *sexaginta quibus successione episcopi nondum fuerunt ordinati.*<sup>e</sup> And he denies not but in the conference the Donatist bishops were about four hundred ; elsewhere he makes their number more. For he says the Maximinianists were condemned in council by three hundred and ten bishops of the other faction, *damnaverunt in concilio suo Maximinianistas trecenti decem episcopi Donatistæ.*<sup>f</sup> And one hundred bishops of Maximilianus's party were condemned.<sup>g</sup> So that the Donatists were not out, *plusquam quadringentos per totam Africam se esse jactantes,*<sup>h</sup> "boasting that they had more than four hundred bishops in all Africa."

You see there wanted few if any of nine hundred bishops in this province ; but I cannot discover cities there which will make a fourth part of the number. Strabo having named about thirty, and divers of them destroyed before his time, having pursued his discovery to the

<sup>a</sup> Cosmogr. p. 342.

<sup>b</sup> J[eremy] T[aylor], p. 304.

<sup>c</sup> H[erbert] Thorndike, Right of Churches, Review, p. 53.

<sup>d</sup> Cod. Afric. Can. xcix. vid. Augustin. De Gestis cum Emerit. tom. vii. pp. 781, 782.

<sup>e</sup> Brevis Collat. Primæ Diei. / Contr. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. xi.

<sup>f</sup> Id. ibid. lib. i. cap. iv. vid. De Gest. cum Emerit. sec. ix. p. 785, et Contra Donat. post. Collat. cap. xxx. et Contra Crescon. lib. iv. cap. vi.

<sup>g</sup> Contr. Donat. post. Coll. cap. xxiv.

lesser Syrtis, concludes it thus, πολλὰ δ' εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλαι μετὰ πολίχνας οὐκ ἄξια μνήμης,<sup>a</sup> "there are many other small cities besides, not worthy of mention."

After Augustine's death, and the invasion of the country by the Vandals, the Africans continued their ancient custom, notwithstanding any novel restraint, and made bishops (as appears by Leo's epistle to the bishops of Mauritania) *in quibuslibet locis, in quibuslibet castellis, — ubi minores plebes, minores conventus*, "in all sorts of places, in all sorts of castles, — where the population and assemblies were small," where *presbyterorum cura suffecerit — in viculis possessionibus vel obscuris et solitariis municipiis*, "presbyterial superintendence was sufficient — in villages or obscure and deserted towns," which Postitutus, one of those bishops, liked not, *quod nunc in sua diocesi Postitutus episcopus factum esse causatus est*,<sup>b</sup> "which Postitutus, the bishop, censured as now done in his own diocese."

So that they were not only large villages which the Africans thought capable of bishops. Besides what Leo says, Gennadius, amongst his illustrious persons, mentions one Asclepius Afer, in *Baiensi territorio vici non grandis episcopus*,<sup>c</sup> "bishop of a small village in the territory of Baiæ."

*Obj.* It is said, though the town was small where a bishop had his seat, yet the diocese might be large and extended, and too great for a hundred parish priests. And you have an instance of it in Asclepius, whose chair was in a village, but yet he was *Vagensis territorii episcopus*, "bishop of the territory of Vaga," as *Johan. de Trittenham, De Script. Eccles.* "his diocese was that whole territory."<sup>d</sup>

*Ans.* They tell us, indeed, the diocese was I know not how large, when the town was small; but we must take their word for this; we never yet could see any proof, any instance of a small village, that had so extended a territory under one bishop. This is the only instance that I have met with to give any colour to their assertion; yet this is a great mistake either in them or their author. Trittenham wrote after Gennadius many hundred years, anno 1500; it is easy to discern which should have most regard. Gennadius says, this small village was *in Baiensi territorio*, (where it is like<sup>e</sup> (as elsewhere) there were divers villages beside;) he says not that it was the territory of that village, or that he was *Baiensis territorii episcopus*, "bishop of the territory of Baiæ." They or Trittenham (I have him not at hand to tell which) change both the word and the form of the expression, and say he was *Vagensis territorii episcopus*. But suppose, for once, the copy deserves more credit than the original. Let Vaga (as they would have it) be

<sup>a</sup> Lib. xvii. p. 574. [Ed. Casaub. p. 1191, B. Ed. Paris, 1620, p. 834.]

<sup>b</sup> Epist. lxxxv. cap. ii.

<sup>c</sup> Catal. Illustr. Vir. in Jerom. tom. ix. p. 183.

<sup>d</sup> Tritthem. lib. ii. cap. vii. p. 133, T. T. 305.

<sup>e</sup> probable.

this *vicus non grandis*, and Asclepius bishop both of the village and its territory, what shadow of proof have they from Trittenham or any other, that this territory was larger than that of an ordinary village? It is true, villages had *ἐνορίας*, their territories. Zonaras tells us there were *παροικία ἢ ἐνορία*, of several sizes, *μείζονες* and *μικραί*. And the small *οὐ πολυπληθεῖς*, not populous, are divided *εἰς ἀγροικικοὺς καὶ ἐγχωρίους*, then each of them described, *ἀγροικικας, φασιν εἶναι τὰς ἐν ἐσχατίαις κειμένας καὶ ὀλίγους ἔχουσας ἐν αὐταῖς οἰκοῦντας αἱ καὶ μονοικία λέγονται ἐγχωρίους δὲ τὰς ἄγροισ καὶ κώμαις πλησιάζουσας καὶ πλείονας τοὺς κατοικοὺς ἔχουσας.*<sup>a</sup>

Since it was but a small village, or no great one, the territory was like that of villages which were not great, and so *inter μικρὰς*, “amongst the small,” choose which of them you please.

---

### CHAPTER III.

COME we to their cities: those far the most of them (viz. those that were very little, and those that were not great) were but for their largeness like our villages or market towns.

*Πόλις* is not only a great town, but sometimes a village, frequently a place no greater than country towns with us; yea, many less than some of ours have the name, and are called *πόλεις*, cities! For such the word is used commonly both in Scripture and other authors. City, Luke x. 8, is not only city but town, Matt. x. 11. Acts xv. 21, city there is, Matt. ix. 35, not only cities but villages. *Πόλεις*, Luke iv. 33, are *κωμοπόλεις*, chief villages, Mark i. 38. So Bethlehem is *πόλις Δαβίδ*, Luke ii. 4, the city of David, but no other than *κώμη*, John vii. 42, which Epiphanius takes notice of, and says in one *καλεῖται πόλις τοῦ Δαβίδ*, “it is called the city of David,” in the other, *κώμην αὐτὴν καλοῦσι*, “they call it a village,” and gives this reason for it: because it was reduced to small compass, and had very few inhabitants.<sup>b</sup>

Many instances might be given in the Old Testament: take but two or three: Josh. xv. there are thirty-eight towns enumerated and called cities, ver. 21, yet all the cities are said to be but twenty-nine, ver. 32. Masius and other expositors remove the difficulty thus, the rest of the towns, though called cities, were but villages. *Cæteræ villæ aut pagj.*

<sup>a</sup> In Can. xvii. Chalced. [Bevereg. Pandect. tom. i. p. 134.]

<sup>b</sup> Hær. li.

So Josh. xix. there are twenty-three places reckoned by name and called cities, yet, ver. 38, there are said to be but nineteen cities; they resolve it as the former, *alia erant nomina vicorum obscuriorum*, "the others were the names of obscurer villages." So ver. 6, there are four called cities, yet those in the 1 Chron. iv. 32, are הַצְּרִי; in the vulgar translation *villæ*, in the Seventy-two, *κώμαι*, and in that verse they are called פְּרָז, both cities and villages; so frequently elsewhere.<sup>a</sup>

For other authors, Strabo says, that those who did account of more than a thousand cities in Spain gave the name of cities to great villages, *τὰς μεγάλας κώμας πόλεις ὀνομάζοντες*.<sup>b</sup> And when Polybius writes that Tiberius Gracchus ruined three hundred cities in part of Spain, Possidonius says, that castles were called cities by him, *τοὺς πύργους καλοῦνται πόλεις*; Strabo agrees with him. And Casaubon observes that historians often do so, *Turres sæpe ab historicarum Scriptoribus urbium appellatione honestari*, "Castles are often dignified by historians with the name of cities," as cities are often by poets called *πύργους*, from whence he derives *burgus*.

Ptolemy calls Avarum *πόλιν ἢ κώμην μεσόγειαν*,<sup>c</sup> "an inland city or village." In Josephus, Bethshura is called a city, *πόλις*,<sup>d</sup> but in the page before it is only *κώμη*, "a village." And Justinian says of Pityus and Sebastopolis, reckoned among the cities in that part of Pontus called Polemoniachus, *ἐν φρουρίοις μᾶλλον ἀριθμητέον ἢ πόλεσιν*, "they are rather to be reckoned castles than cities."<sup>e</sup>

And as *πόλις* is often used for a village or a castle, so very commonly for a small town. Bishop Bilson<sup>f</sup> tells us, as Doctor Field also,<sup>g</sup> that the apostle would have the city and places near adjoining to make but one church, and that herein they proposed the Jews as their exemplar, who had their synagogues in cities, Acts xv. 21. Now in what places the Jews had their synagogues (if it were not plain, Matt. ix. 35, that they were far from being always great cities) will appear by the seats of their consistories! In cities of less than six score families, they placed the consistories of three; in cities of more than a hundred and twenty families, the courts of twenty-three.<sup>h</sup> And it is well known that many of our country towns, with their precincts, have more than a hundred and twenty families, and our lesser villages are as great as the cities in the lower account.

In other places, where we meet with cities exceeding numerous, many very small towns pass under the name of cities.

In Egypt, Diodorus Siculus speaks of three thousand cities, not to take notice of more than six times as many which, Pliny says, were

<sup>a</sup> See Pagnin. Voc. צָרַי.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. xii. Jud. cap. xliii. p. 416.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. v. cap. xxvii.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Maimonides in Sanhedrim, cap. i. sec. v. and Selden, De Syn. lib. ii. cap. v.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. iii. p. 112.

<sup>c</sup> Novel. xxviii.

<sup>d</sup> Geogr. lib. v. cap. xvii.

<sup>e</sup> Perpet. Government, cap. xiv.

sometime in the Delta. In the tribe of Judah [there were] one hundred and fourteen cities, in half the tribe of Manasseh sixty, and in the other tribes proportionably. In Crete there were one hundred, therefore called Hecatompolis, and so was Laconica called for the same reason,<sup>a</sup> because it had some time one hundred cities in it; it was but in the whole a seventh part of Peloponnesus, the peninsula being but one hundred and seventy miles, or fourteen hundred furlongs in length and breadth, as Strabo, and four thousand furlongs in circumference, as Polybius. Paulus Æmilius destroyed seventy cities in Epirus, as Livy,<sup>b</sup> and this was most in one quarter of Epirus, as Strabo tells us. About the lake called Pontina, in the ancient Latium, one of the seventeen provinces belonging to Italy, Pliny says, there were twenty-three cities, which are more than now in all England. Agrippa in Josephus speaks of near twelve hundred cities in Gallia kept in subjection by twelve hundred soldiers, when their cities are well nigh more in number.<sup>c</sup>

Instances might be multiplied of cities that were but like our market towns, or no larger than villages. Cities they had of old little bigger than some houses, as that which Nero, in Suetonius, *auream nominavit*,<sup>d</sup> "called the golden palace;" the buildings about his fish-ponds were like cities, says that historian, *circumseptum ædificiis ad urbium speciem*. Yea, long before they came to the magnificence or excess of Nero, and were content with less buildings, yet amongst those they had divers comparable to cities. In Sallust's time, *Domos*, says he, *atque villas cognoveris in urbium modum ædificatas*, "you may see villas built like cities." And afterwards some private houses exceeded the dimensions of cities, so in Seneca's time and complaint, *O miserum si quem delectet — ædificia privata laxitatem urbium magnarum vincentia*,<sup>e</sup> "Alas, that men should boast of private houses exceeding cities in magnificence!" And yet they counted it an excessive great house which took up above four acres, as would seem by that of Valerius Maximus, *Augustè se habitare putat cujus domus tantum patet quantum Cincinnati rura patuerunt*, "A man thinks he is pressed for room, if his house is only as large as the farm of Cincinnatus," when three (as he had said before) of his seven acres were gone.

Emporia, a city of the Greeks, in Spain, was less than half a mile in compass, by Livy's account, *totem orbem muri 400 passus patentem habebat*,<sup>f</sup> the whole compass of the wall was but 400 paces. Phaselis, an episcopal city in Pamphylia, contained not so many souls as Pompey's ship (when in his flight, after Cæsar's victory, a small company and vessel was counted his security) if we believe Lucan.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Strab. lib. viii. [Ed. Casaub. p. 557, B. Ed. Paris, 1620, p. 362.]

<sup>b</sup> Dec. v. lib. v.

<sup>c</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. xvi. [Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 1087, lin. 30.]

<sup>d</sup> Lib. xxxi. in Nero.

<sup>e</sup> De Benefic. lib. vii. cap. x.

Dec. iv. lib. iv.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. viii. [v. 253.]

*Te primum parva Phaselis,  
Magnus adit, nec te mictui velat incola, rare  
Exhaustæque domus populus majorque carinæ  
Quam tua turba fuit.\**

Cucusus a city (the civility of whose bishop, Chrysostom, when he was there banished commends) was not so good as a market town, *μητὲ ἀγορὰν, μητὲ ὄνιον ἔχει ἡ πόλις,*<sup>b</sup> “the city possesses no market-place, or bazaar.” And Sasima, where Nazianzen refused a bishopric, was no better, if you will believe his character of it, though it pass for a city; he counted it but *angustam villulam*, “a very small village.” Nazianzum, where his father was bishop, and from whence himself is denominated, did not much exceed it, being *πόλις εὐτελής*, “a mean city,” in Socrates,<sup>c</sup> *μικρά*, “small,” in Sozomen.<sup>d</sup> Aradus in Strabo, and Antaradus in Pliny, were cities of seven furlongs; the whole island of Aradus was no larger, not so great as many of our country towns.

To proceed more distinctly, for better satisfaction herein; (where a little observation might prevent great and common mistakes about ancient bishoprics.) There were cities of several sorts and dimensions; those that were six furlongs in compass or under are called *πόλεις μικραὶ*, such was Pæanium in Ætolia, a city, but not great, says Polybius, being less in circumference than seven furlongs, *ἔλαττον γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ στάδιον.*<sup>e</sup> Those which had above six furlongs in circuit, to twelve or thereabouts, pass as *πόλεις μετρίαὶ*, not very little or great, but of an indifferent size; so Antioch upon Meander is *μετρία πόλις*, in Strabo.<sup>f</sup> Such was Jessus in Polybius, *τὸ δὲ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεις ἐστὶ δέκα στάδια,*<sup>g</sup> “the size of the city is ten furlongs.” Those which had sixteen furlongs in circumference, or near it, and so upward, were counted great cities, *πόλεις μεγάλαι*: for some of their prime cities (the metropolies of countries well stored with cities,) were no bigger. Nice is, in Strabo, the metropolis of Bithynia, and so it was in Ammianus Marcellinus’s time, long after,<sup>h</sup> yet it was but sixteen furlongs in compass, *ἐκκαίδεκαστάδιος ὁ περίβολος.*<sup>i</sup> No larger was Famagusta, the chief city in Cyprus, built in the place of Constantia, the ancient metropolis of that island.<sup>k</sup> About that bigness was the great and famous Tyre of old, before it was taken by Alexander: for he, having joined it to the continent, and upon its recovery not content with its ancient bounds, had much enlarged it, yet

\* “Thee first, little Phaselis, the great man approaches, and thy guest, and the fewness and poverty of thy dwellings, and his crew, larger than thy whole population, are little adapted to banish thy fears.”

<sup>b</sup> Chrys. Epist. xiii.

<sup>c</sup> Hist. lib. iv. cap. x.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. vi. cap. xvi.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iv. [cap. lxxv.] p. 329.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. xiii. [Ed. Casaub. p. 935, A.

Ed. Paris, 1620, p. 650.]

<sup>g</sup> Lib. [xvi. cap. xi.] p. 731.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. xxvi. cap. i.

<sup>i</sup> Strab. lib. xii.

<sup>k</sup> Sands. Trav. p. 219.

was it but twenty-two furlongs in compass, as Pliny.<sup>a</sup> And Sidon was of the like size, Tyre being *ἐνάμιλλος αὐτῇ καὶ μέγεθος*.<sup>b</sup> New Carthage, the principal city in Spain, while the Carthaginians bore sway there, was but twenty furlongs in compass when largest; it might be less than sixteen when contracted, as Polybius, not long after its erection, says it was.<sup>c</sup>

Consequently, their lesser cities were but like ordinary villages, (we have many as large, not less than four or five furlongs in circuit.) Their middle sort of cities were answerable to our market towns or boroughs, (we have some that may compare with their great cities,) or like their larger villages, such as Justinian noted in Pisidia,<sup>d</sup> and in Lycaonia.<sup>e</sup> Such were Lydda, in Palestine, *κώμη πόλεως τὸ μέγεθος οὐκ ἀποδέουσα*, “a village not less in size than a city,” as Josephus reports it,<sup>f</sup> or like their *κωμοπόλεις*, “village-cities,” as Amorea, in Strabo.<sup>g</sup>

Those villages, by being walled, or having *δίκαια τῆς πόλεως*, privileges of cities granted them, became cities without further enlargement. And so this sort of cities (far the most numerous) were but walled or privileged villages; therefore (to note this by the way) they that grant bishops to have been in those cities, (which who will deny? whereas few else in comparison had bishops besides those,) leave themselves without reason to deny bishops to villages; unless a wall or something as inconsiderable could be a reason, why one should be capable of them, and the other not.

Bethalaga, a village so called by Josephus, but Jonathan having walled it, immediately after called it a city.<sup>h</sup> Armenia, in Paphlagonia, was an unwalled place, till the inhabitants in their wisdom encompassed it with a wall to keep them warmer, and that may be the reason why to Strabo, Ptolemy, and Stephanus it is a village, to Pomponius Mela, Pliny, and Solinus, it is a city, as Ortelius observes. So Majuma, the port of Gaza being honoured with the privilege of a city, for its forwardness in the Christian profession, of a village became a city, says Sozomen; but being deprived of the privileges by Julian, it was turned again into a village.<sup>i</sup> And the difference being no more betwixt these, that may be the reason why the same place by divers writers is called both a city and a village. Cenchrea to Stephanus is a city, to others a village.<sup>k</sup> Yea, this is sometimes done by the same author; as Strabo calls Nelias and many other towns both cities and villages in the space of three or four lines.<sup>l</sup> And sometimes both words are joined in one,

<sup>a</sup> Lib. v. cap. xix.

<sup>b</sup> Strab. lib. xvi.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. iii. p. 109.

<sup>d</sup> Novel. xxiv.

<sup>e</sup> Novel. xxv.

<sup>f</sup> Antiq. lib. xx. cap. v. p. 692.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. xii. [Ed. Casaub. p. 864, A. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 576.]

<sup>h</sup> Antiq. Jud. lib. xiii. cap. i. p. 429. [Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 557, lin. 45.]

<sup>i</sup> Lib. v. cap. v.

<sup>k</sup> Strabo, lib. viii. [Ed. Casaub. p. 567, B. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 369.]

<sup>l</sup> Lib. ix. p. 863.

and one place hath both names at once, and is called *κομποπόλις*, “a village city,” a city because it wants not the bigness of this sort of lesser cities; and a village because it was not walled or privileged as cities used to be.

That there were and ought to have been bishops in small cities, if it be not evident already, may be further manifest divers ways. There are particular instances of it, and great numbers might be produced, but I will but instance a few episcopal seats, which were either very small or not great. Abidus is *parva habitatio*, “a small settlement,” in Strabo.<sup>a</sup> Tanis is *πολίχνη*, “a small city,” in Josephus.<sup>b</sup> Geræ πόλις μικρά, “a little city,” in Sozomen.<sup>c</sup> Ascalon is *πόλισμα οὐ μέγα*.<sup>d</sup> Joppa and Dora are *πορυμάνια παράλια*, “little port towns,” in Josephus.<sup>e</sup> Doliche is *πολίχνη μικρά*, “a very small city,” in Theodoret.<sup>f</sup> Cynna is *πολίχνη*, “a small city,” in Stephanus, bishop of it in the council of Nice. Hellenopolis, Basinopolis, and Petrea, in Lazica, villages turned into cities, one by Constantine, the other by Julian, the third by Justinian. Zeugma, a little town in Cicero, Hypepe, of which Ovid,

*Sardibus hinc illinc parvis venitur Hypepis.*<sup>g</sup>

with many others.

It is taken for a rule, that where there was a *defensor civitatis*, there was a bishop; but Justinian appoints such a *defensor*, which he calls *ἐκδικος*, in every city, enjoining the presidents of the provinces to prepare such officers, *καθ' ἐκάστην πόλιν*,<sup>h</sup> and expressly not only of the great cities, but in the less, appointing what they should have for every decree; in a great city more, in a less city less; and there is a law in the code, that every city should have a bishop. So it was decreed by Leo and Anthemius, *ἐκάστη πόλις ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον ἐχέτω*, “let every city have a bishop of its own,” without exception of little or great, but only two, Tomis and Leontopolis (which afterwards had its bishop, and Tomis before) so that none but those two being exempted, the privilege in Europa a part of Thrace, for one to be bishop of two cities, (which found some advocates in the council at Ephesus,<sup>i</sup>) was not now continued, otherwise the four cities there mentioned would have been within the exemption.

The ancients who understand bishops by the apostle's presbyters, Tit. i. ver. 5, understand also the apostle's order to reach every city, without exception of small or great, so Chrysostom; *κατὰ πόλιν*, is with

<sup>a</sup> Lib. xvii.      <sup>b</sup> De Bello Jud. [lib. iv. cap. xiii.] p. 903. [Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 1208, lin. 25.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. viii. cap. xix.      <sup>d</sup> Strabo, lib. xvi. [Ed. Casaub. p. 1101, A. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 759.]

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. lib. xiv. [cap. vii.]      <sup>f</sup> [Lib. v. cap. iv.]

<sup>g</sup> [Metam. lib. xi. verse 152.]

<sup>h</sup> Novel. xv.

<sup>i</sup> [Supplex libell. ab Eupressio Ep. Byges et Arendiapolis et Cyrillo Ep. Caelensi sanct. Syn. oblat. Conc. Ephes. Actio. vii.]      <sup>k</sup> In Tit. Homil. i.

him καθ' ἐκάστην πόλιν, "in each city," p. 386, and so again, p. 387, and Theophylact after him.

The ancient practice was answerable, in Cyprian.<sup>a</sup> *Janpridem per omnes provincias et singulas urbes instituti sunt episcopi*; since in all the provinces and every one of the cities bishops were instituted. And Origen says this was done too ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει,<sup>b</sup> "in each city." It is true there was none in some lesser cities, but there were none also in some greater; the reason was, not the smallness of the place (as appears by their making bishops in villages) but the want of Christians.

This premised, we may best judge of the apostle's meaning by the import of the phrase: He would have a bishop, κατὰ πόλιν, in each city, say the ancient Greek expositors; in every city, say our translators; in each of the cities of Crete, say our learned prelatists, not one of the hundred cities there excepted. Now the word πόλις (and what is equivalent to it) is, we see, used by the best authors, sacred and profane, to denote both a city and a village. And so much ground we have to conclude, that the apostle would have such bishops (as were then instituted) not only in cities but in villages. However it cannot with any reason be questioned, but that the apostolical intention was for bishops in places no larger than our boroughs or market towns, (since their middle sort of cities were but such as these for largeness or populousness:) yea, in places no greater than ordinary villages, seeing their lesser cities were but of the bigness of these, and, consequently, that the apostles designed the bishop to be generally no more than the rector of a country parish, and his diocese commonly no larger than the circuit of a country town or village; this was to be their ordinary stint, because these two sorts of cities (such as were either little or not great) were commonly to be their sees, and no other, but rarely; these being so very numerous that cities which were great, were rare and few in comparison, as might be further showed by many instances. Campania in Italy was a region ennobled with cities, being there so thick set, as they seemed to be one continued town, μίας πόλεως ὄψιν παρέχοντας,<sup>c</sup> and yet all were but little towns, besides Capua and Tianum, τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα πολίχνια.<sup>d</sup> So in Laconia, where were anciently a hundred cities, in that geographer's time but thirty, and all small towns but Sparta. The kingdom of Eumenes, left him by his father in a part of Asia, (as well stored with cities as any in the world,) besides Pergamus, the metropolis, consisted but of such places, as Polybius in Suidas calls λιτὰ πόλισμῆτια, "small fortified places." To add no more, Crete is the most pertinent instance, seeing the text alleged concerns that island, and the patrons of episco-

<sup>a</sup> Epist. lii. (al. 55.)

<sup>c</sup> Strab. lib. v.

<sup>b</sup> Orig. contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 428.

<sup>d</sup> Page 172.

pace make it the measure and pattern to other countries for the ordering of bishops. We are often told, that when Titus was there it had a hundred cities,<sup>a</sup> and that by the apostles' appointment he was to ordain as many bishops there. Now Strabo, who wrote immediately before, (viz., in Tiberius' reign,) finds but three very great cities, Cnossus, Gortyna, and Cydonia,<sup>b</sup> and Cnossus then shrunk into a little town, not six, besides these, thought worthy by him to be named; the rest must either be very little, or not great, either like villages or our fairer country towns. Such dioceses as these can afford, they must be content with commonly, who will be regulated by an intention of the apostle discoverable in this place.

For one bishop in a great city there was ten, sometimes twenty, sometimes more, in these lesser towns; and more there had been, if the ambition of following ages had not, with a *non obstante*, "notwithstanding," to the apostles' rule, judged a small place unbeseeming the honour and greatness of a bishop. Hence some places were waived as too little to be bishoprics; and in some such places where they had been settled they were extinguished; and in other places they were united. So Phulla was united with Sugdæa, and Sotyriopolis with Alama, as Callistus tells us; and too many to be specified in other parts. Let one instance suffice. In Sardinia the many bishoprics sometimes<sup>c</sup> there were reduced to seven; the bishopric of Bisaris being joined to that of Olgarium, St. Justa to Arboria, Phausania to Emporeæ, that of Turris Libyssonis to Sassari, that of Turris Alba to Eusellis, and no less than four or five to Calaris. And by such means as these forementioned, Ireland, which had three hundred and sixty-three bishoprics about anno 431, the number of which was still increasing till the thirteenth age, came in time to have but fifty, afterwards thirty-five, and now but nineteen. Yea, in Italy, where bishops are yet so numerous, there have been many bishoprics extinguished, and many united, and yet in Italy every baggage town hath a bishop, saith our learned Reynolds.

But this was in the more degenerate and corrupt ages of the church; there is no council for many hundred years after Christ [which] forbids bishops to be made in the least cities, but only that of Sardica, anno 347. I will not say that many bishops there were Arians, though the oriental prelates present there showed themselves immediately after at Philipopolis; and the Arians were branded for not being contented with small

<sup>a</sup> B[p.] H[all], Episc. by Div. Right. "Crete, a populous island, and stored with no less than a hundred cities, whence it had the name of *ἐκατόμησις*." D[r.] H[ammond], Vind. p. 116. "Titus—a whole island which had a hundred cities in it, and was there placed that he might ordain bishops under him in each of those cities." p. 100. "In Crete there was certainly many cities; Eusebius mentions a hundred, of all which he was made bishop, that under him he might ordain bishops."

<sup>b</sup> Lib. x.

<sup>c</sup> at one time.

bishoprics.<sup>a</sup> Nor will I allege that this synod was of little authority, not admitted by the Greeks into the code till the Trullan council, seven hundred years after Christ, nor by the Latins some ages after it was held, otherwise than the adjoining of its decrees to the other canons by Dionysius Exiguus, Ferrandus, and Isidorus Mercator, without any public authority for so doing, could be accounted an authoritative admission thereof, nor by the African churches, who rejected and would not be obliged by its canons for appeals to Rome. Nor need I say, that this synod is misunderstood, and that the restraint of making new bishops in small places is laid only on bishops of another province; and in a case which rarely if ever occurs, (viz. when all the bishops in a province but one are dead at once) as appears by the canon immediately preceding, and that clause in this canon, *Nec debent illi ex alia provincia*, &c. There is no necessity to insist upon anything of this nature, since this synod both allows bishops to be continued in any city, how small soever, where there was any before, and also to be made *de novo* in any city, for the pastoral charge whereof one presbyter was not sufficient. Now one was not sufficient, in the judgment of those times, for the cities we here most insist on, viz. those of an indifferent size, nor in the judgment of present times for divers market-towns, parishes, and some villages with us. Nay, in such cities it requires bishops to be made, as being *ἄξια τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*, “worthy of a bishopric.” It would be much for our satisfaction, if we could understand punctually<sup>b</sup> what numbers they thought sufficient for one presbyter; and we may have the best direction that can be expected in such a case from Chrysostom, who affirms that a cure of one hundred and fifty souls was thought as much as one pastor could well, and more than he could without great labour, discharge; his words are, *ἐπίπονον μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἑκατον ἀνδρῶν καὶ πενήκοντα προστῆναι μόνον*,<sup>c</sup> “It is a very laborious thing for one man to have the charge of a hundred and fifty.” Upon this account one presbyter was not thought sufficient for a place that contained three or four hundred inhabitants; and these fathers would not deny such a town a bishop. There are not many more in some Italian bishoprics in this age; the bishop of Capuccio, when he was concerned to make the most of his flock to the bishop of Paris, at the Trent council, reckoned but five hundred souls in his diocese.

Hereby we may judge what numbers were counted competent for an ancient bishopric. By the decree of a council more solicitous for the honour of bishops in the largeness of their sees, than we find any fathers or councils for several ages after Christ; straiter bounds and

<sup>a</sup> Synod. Epist. in Theodor. Hist. lib. ii. cap. viii. and Julius in Athan. Apol. ii. [Ed. Col. 1686, p. 744, tom. i.]

<sup>b</sup> exactly.

<sup>c</sup> Homil. in Ignat.

fewer people might be sufficient for an episcopal diocese, than many of our country towns can show, when yet all may and do meet together for communion. The canon runs thus: "There shall be no bishop in a city so small as one presbyter may be sufficient for; but if the people be found to grow so numerous in a city, (viz. that one presbyter is not sufficient for them, as the coherence<sup>a</sup> makes evident) let there be a bishop there, as being worthy thereof." And in all reason this is to be extended to villages as well as cities, when the people are as numerous in one as the other. And this council of Carthage decrees it indefinitely; wherever the people are numerous enough (without limiting this to cities) if they desire it they shall have a bishop, with the good-will of him that presides in the place.<sup>b</sup> *Dei populum, si multiplicatus desiderabit proprium habere episcopum, ejus voluntate in cujus potestate est diæcesis habere episcopum debere.* In fine, the canon forbids bishops to be made only in the least of these cities we are now speaking of, and these were but few, (as the great towns were also compared with those of a middle size;) and so it is of little concernment to the business before us, if either Greeks or Latins had thought themselves concerned to observe it.

However those cities, lesser or greater, the greatest of them being no bigger than villages with them, and market towns with us, there will be no question but they contained no more than what might meet together for Christian communion; and these being so many that the number of great cities was very inconsiderable compared with them; what we assert concerning the smallness of ancient bishoprics is clear, for incomparably far the greatest number of them.

---

#### CHAPTER IV.

THERE may be more question about the great cities, which we shall now consider. Those were counted great cities which had sixteen or twenty furlongs in compass or thereabout. Pelusium, a metropolis of a great part of Egypt, was twenty furlongs in circumference, as Strabo.<sup>c</sup> Phocæa, one of the greatest cities in Æolis, had no more, as Livy describes it, 2400 *passuum murus amplectitur*,<sup>d</sup> "the wall embraces a space

<sup>a</sup> context.

<sup>b</sup> Conc. ii. Can. v.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. xvii.

<sup>d</sup> Dec. iv. lib. vii.

of two miles and two-fifths." Sebasté, built by Herod, designing to make it comparable to the most eminent cities, was no larger, *εἰκοσι στάδιοις*,<sup>a</sup> "twenty furlongs." Byzantium was made by Constantine as large, at least, as two great cities, designing to have it *ἀντιῤῥωπον τῆς Ρώμης*, "equal to Rome," as Zosimus tells;<sup>b</sup> yet whereas it had been reduced to a village by Severus, as Herodian says;<sup>c</sup> the enlargement he gave it was no more than the addition of fifteen furlongs to its former compass, as the said Zosimus shows.<sup>d</sup> But hereof we have given instances before.

Such great cities (seeing the largeness assigned them was thought sufficient to make one a metropolis) were very few. For whereas there was wont to be but one metropolis in a province, yet sometimes in one province there were twenty or thirty or forty more inferior cities under it, (Conc. Chalced. Can. xii. declares it to be against the ecclesiastical rules to have two metropolies in one province.) Lesbus was the metropolis of thirty cities, as Strabo says.<sup>e</sup> In Phrygia there were above sixty cities, yet the same author mentions but two that were great, Laodicea and Apamea. In Laconica there were thirty cities in his time (a hundred before) but all *opidula*, "little towns," save Sparta.

Some of these great cities had but few inhabitants. Philadelphia, (which some will have to be a metropolis,) *pauci incolunt*, "few inhabit," says Strabo, being *σεισμῶν πλήρης*,<sup>f</sup> "subject to earthquakes," which reason reaches Sardis, and Apamea, and Laodicea, and all the region near it; likewise Hierapolis, Magnesia, Tralles, and all the cities near Meander, which are not few, both in Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria.<sup>g</sup> In Tiberius' reign, twelve famous cities were destroyed in one night by an earthquake in those parts.<sup>h</sup> It is probable Neocæsarea was not very populous, considering what Theodoret reports of those banished thither by Valens, (who was not wont to choose desirable places for the punishment of such;) they all died there in a short time through the hardships of the place, says he.<sup>i</sup> And it is strange if Cæsarea in Cappadocia were very populous, since the situation of it, as described by Strabo,<sup>k</sup> was neither safe, nor pleasant, nor fruitful, nor healthful, an unwall'd town, no way so accommodated as to attract inhabitants. Of Heraclea, one of the most considerable cities in Ætolia, Livy tells us, there was a castle by it, as well inhabited, *quæ frequentius prope quam urbs habitabatur*.<sup>l</sup>

A great city was counted sufficiently populous if it had six thousand inhabitants. So Herod, ambitious to have Sebasté not inferior to the most renowned cities, made it 120 furlongs in compass, and took care

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. lib. xv. cap. xi. [Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 690, lin. 47.]

<sup>b</sup> Hist. lib. ii.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. iii.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. ii. p. 62.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. xiii.

<sup>f</sup> [Lib. xiii. Casaub. p. 931, B. Ed. Paris, 1620, p. 628.]

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Strab. lib. xii. p. 231—234. [Ed. Casaub. p. 866, sq. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 578, sq.]

<sup>h</sup> Tacit. An. lib. ii. cap. xlvii.

<sup>i</sup> Hist. lib. iv. cap. xx.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. xii. [Ed. Casaub. p. 812, A. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 538.]

<sup>l</sup> Dec. iv. lib. vi.

that it should have six thousand inhabitants.<sup>a</sup> Placentia and Cremona, most eminent cities, had each of them six thousand persons decreed by the Romans for their inhabitants.<sup>b</sup> Thirty-seven cities yielded to Alexander near Porus' country, some of which had five thousand, some ten thousand inhabitants.<sup>c</sup> And that conqueror building a city near the river Indus, which he called (after his own name) Alexandria, thought it sufficiently peopled with a thousand persons.<sup>d</sup>

So that many of their great cities contained no more than might come together in one assembly, as Capernaum, Mark i. 22; Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 44; and Casarea in Mauritania, and Synnada in the Lesser Asia, of which more afterwards.

As for cities that were greater and more populous, where the inhabitants were more than could assemble in one place; yet in them the Christians for some ages, were no more than might so assemble, the inhabitants consisting most[ly] of heathen, with Jews, and those of the Christian profession that were not of the communion, nor would assemble with the bishop of the place. I can but meet with one city, small or great, for three hundred years after Christ, whose inhabitants were generally Christians, and that was Neocæsarea, of whose conversion Gregory Thaumaturgus was the instrument; he found but seventeen Christians in it, but turned the whole people, *ἔθλον τὸν λαόν*, unto God, says Basil.<sup>e</sup> He knew no more than seventeen that persisted in their old superstition, says Nyssen.<sup>f</sup> But for all this, it appears not that the Christians in that city (which we saw before was not very populous) were more than could meet together in one place: for Gregory built no more than one church there; yet having so much liberty, there being no persecution from his time till Dioclesian, and so much encouragement from the people's zeal and forwardness to assist him with their persons and purses in that work, (*πάντων χρήμασι καὶ σώμασι ὑπουργούντων*, as Nyssen tells us,) he would doubtless have erected more, if more had been needful.

There is another city in Phrygia, whose inhabitants are said to have been all Christians,<sup>g</sup> and all with the city burnt together; but this was in the fourth century, in the persecution raised by Maximianus, about anno 312, and all these were no more than could meet in one place; they had but one church, (when being all of one mind they might have had more, if more had been necessary,) and that one called *conventiculum*, "a conventicle," by Lactantius, who thus represents the same thing with Eusebius, *Aliqui ad occidendum præcipites extiterunt, sicut unus in Phrygia qui universum populum cum ipso pariter conventiculo concre-*

<sup>a</sup> Joseph. Bell. Jud. lib. i. cap. xvi.

<sup>b</sup> Symps. Chronol. pt. v. p. 112.

<sup>c</sup> Justin. lib. xii. cap. vii. Q. Curtius, lib. viii. cap. xx.

<sup>d</sup> Strab. lib. xv.

<sup>e</sup> [De Spir. Sanc. cap. xxix. Ed. Paris. 1730, tom. iii. p. 62, C.]

<sup>f</sup> Vit. Greg.

<sup>g</sup> Euseb. Hist. lib. viii. cap. xxv.

*mavit*,<sup>a</sup> “Some rushed headlong to the work of slaughter, as one in Phrygia, who burnt a whole populace in their conventicle.”

How predominant heathenism was in the cities of the Roman empire before Constantine, may be collected from what we find concerning it in and after his reign. If it was spreading and prevalent when the power of it was by him so much broken, it will be easy to infer what it was before. And that we may afford the greatest advantage to Christianity, let us instance principally in Palestine and the countries next to it, where the Gospel first moving, may in reason be thought to have made the greatest progress. Sozomen informs us, there were in Palestine, after Constantine’s death, both villages and cities exceeding heathenish, *ἄγαν ἐλληνίζουσαι*.<sup>b</sup> Particularly Gaza, Ascalon, Sebasté, were much addicted to idols in Julian’s time.<sup>c</sup> Anthedon also and Raphea.<sup>d</sup> And both at Sebasté and Neapolis, Jephtha’s daughter was worshipped as a goddess, and an annual holiday kept in honour of her, as Epiphanius tells us.<sup>e</sup> All these were episcopal cities; and Gaza, the greatest in those parts of that country next to Jerusalem, [is] stigmatised by all as most heathenish,<sup>f</sup> so that Jerome styles it *urbs gentilium*, a “city of heathens,” and calls the inhabitants the adversaries of God, which insulted over the church of Christ.<sup>g</sup> And Cæsarea seems not much better, being so forward to comply with Julian.<sup>h</sup> Both that city and Scythopolis are noted by Athanasius as generally deriders of the mysteries of Christianity.<sup>i</sup> And if the heathen in Jerusalem were not numerous, how came the temple of Venus to stand there so long, and the images of Jupiter and Venus to be worshipped with sacrifices and oblations, in such places too as could not but be most intolerable to Christians, the place of Christ’s resurrection, and where he was crucified?<sup>k</sup> Where the citizens were generally Christians, they were not wont to endure this, though in more tolerable circumstances. At Neocæsarea, Nyssen tells us, the Christians there prevailing overturned their altars, and their temples, and their idols.<sup>l</sup>

But enough of Palestine. We may be briefer with her neighbours. For Phœnicia, that of Theodoret may serve, who says, they were mad upon their idols and idolatrous rites,<sup>m</sup> and this observed by Chrysostom, in Arcadius’s reign, with which that of Jerome agrees, *Phœnicium gentes diabolum pati*,<sup>n</sup> “the nations of Phœnicia are possessed by the devil.”

<sup>a</sup> Instit. lib. v. cap. [11.]

<sup>b</sup> Hist. lib. iii. cap. xiii.

<sup>c</sup> Theod. Hist. lib. iii. cap. vi.

<sup>d</sup> Sozom. lib. v. cap. viii. lib. vii. cap. xv.

<sup>e</sup> Hær. iv. [n. 1.] lxxviii. [n. 23.]

<sup>f</sup> Sozom. lib. v. cap. iii. Theodor. lib. iii. [cap. vi.] [Ed. Reading, cap. vii.]

<sup>g</sup> Vit. Hilarionis. [Ed. Paris. 1706, tom. iv. pars ii. p. lxxx.]

<sup>h</sup> Soz. lib. v. cap. xx. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxi.]

<sup>i</sup> Socrat. lib. i. cap. xiii.

<sup>j</sup> Epist. ad Serapion.

<sup>k</sup> Hist. lib. v. cap. xxix.

<sup>l</sup> Vit. Greg.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. ii. Contra Jovinianatum. [Ed. Paris. 1706, tom. iv. pars ii. p. 197.]

Pass we to Syria. In Heliopolis, an eminent city, there was a bishop in Constantine's time,<sup>a</sup> and yet the inhabitants were all idolatrous, as Peter of Alexandria, in Theodoret, tells us,<sup>b</sup> and τῶν ἐνοικούντων οὐδεὶς, not one of them would endure to hear the name of Christ; so that this bishop had a smaller church than Ischyra, who had but seven that assembled with him. Arethusa was not much better furnished with Christians, as appears by the universal concurrence of the people, men, women, and children, in the torturing of Marcus (who had been many years bishop there) because he would not re-edify their idol-temple.<sup>c</sup> At Apamea, in Theodosius's time, (and this was a metropolis,) the multitude was only restrained through fear of the soldiers, from hindering the demolishing of Jupiter's temple, and the execution of the emperor's order for that purpose.<sup>d</sup> The inhabitants of Emesa (another metropolitical city) turned the Christian church, newly built, into a temple for Bacchus, in Julian's time, erecting in it for their worship a ridiculous idol, ἀνδρόγυννον ἄγαλμα.<sup>e</sup> Nor was this the unhappy temper of some particular places only, as appears by that of Sozomen; both that which is called Cœlosyria, says he, and the upper Syria, except the city of Antioch, was long before it came over to Christianity.<sup>f</sup> And at Antioch itself, the heathen in Valens's time publicly celebrated the idolatrous rites usual in the worship of Jupiter, Bacchus, and Ceres, and that in the open street, without fear or shame, in a high rant.<sup>g</sup> In Arabia, Moses being made bishop there in Valens's time, found very few Christians, κομιδῇ ὀλίγους;<sup>h</sup> but how few soever he found, he was more happy in his diocese than Milles, who being bishop of a city elsewhere, could not persuade one to Christianity, and got nothing from them but blows and wounds.<sup>i</sup>

And now, having viewed all the next neighbours of Palestine (and seen their posture towards Christianity) but Egypt; let us touch there also. Memphis, a metropolitical city, yet in Jerome's time it was the metropolis of the Egyptian superstition, (on Ezek. ix.) In Antinoe there was a bishop, but he had μάλα ὀλίγους, very few that assembled with him; the reason was, the inhabitants of the city were Gentiles.<sup>k</sup> The island into which the two Macarii were banished under Valens was worse peopled; it had not one inhabitant that was a Christian, says Socrates.<sup>l</sup> But these were remoter parts, and far from the place where Christianity was first embraced, and which had the greatest advantages

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. iii. cap. v. vi.

<sup>c</sup> Soz. lib. v. cap. ix. Theod. lib. iii. cap. vi.

<sup>e</sup> Theod. lib. iii. cap. vi.

<sup>g</sup> Theod. lib. iv. cap. xxii. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxiv.]

<sup>h</sup> Soz. lib. ii. cap. xiii. [Ed. Reading, cap. xiv.]

<sup>k</sup> Theod. lib. iv. cap. xvi. [Ed. Reading, cap. xviii.]

<sup>b</sup> Hist. lib. iv. cap. xx.

<sup>d</sup> Theod. lib. v. cap. xxi.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. vi. cap. xxxiv.

<sup>g</sup> Soz. lib. vi. cap. xxxviii.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. iv. cap. xix.

for propagating it. It may be expected that the region nearer Alexandria was happier, but it seems not. Bucolia, a region near Alexandria, in Ortelius; yet this is Jerome's character of it, *In Bucolia nullus est Christianorum*, "there is no Christian in Bucolia."<sup>a</sup> And that which Hilary fixes on the whole country is not much more favourable, *Ægyptus idolis plena est, et omnigena deorum monstra veneratur*, "Egypt is full of idols, and worships all kind of monsters for deities."<sup>b</sup> Look a little further into Africa: Julius Maternus Formicus, in Constantine's time, affirms, that a great part of the Africans did worship Juno and Venus, he means that part of Africa then known; and that was it in which the Gospel had found some entertainment; it was best received in the African diocese, yet one of their councils takes notice, that in most maritime places of Africa, and other parts thereof, idolatry was in use.<sup>c</sup> The most of their cities were maritime, and those usually most populous. And this may be the reason why there was but five bishoprics in the province of Tripolis, when they were so numerous in some of the other provinces; and it is suggested by one of their councils, *Quia interjacere videntur barbaræ gentes*,<sup>d</sup> "those parts of the country were taken up with heathens."

In the west but one instance or two, that I may not be tedious. In Turin the heathen were so prevalent that the Christians there were not suffered to choose a bishop after Gratian's decease.<sup>e</sup> To offer all the rest in one; in Rome itself, in the fourth century, the senate, the nobles, and the greatest part of the commons were given up to heathenish superstitions; see the Centuriators' evidence for it,<sup>f</sup> and it is to me very probable that religion in few or no great cities prevailed at that time, beyond the proportion it did at Rome. A little before, it seems, the Christians were but a small part of Rome, when with general acclamations the people cried out, *Christiani tollantur duodecies, Christiani non sint decies*; and the tenth persecution [was] decreed by the senate upon those clamours.<sup>g</sup> And long after this, when Constantine, after he had been emperor near twenty years, expressing his detestation of the heathenish rites used at the solemnity, for the celebrating of which the army was wont to go up to the Capitol, he thereby incurred the hatred both of the senate and people of Rome, and was reproached therefore in a manner, *παρὰ πάντων*, by all the people,<sup>h</sup> and the great disaffection of Rome to Christianity, expressed unsufferably, in an universal reviling the emperor for not complying with their heathenism, is assigned as the cause why he thought of transferring the imperial

<sup>a</sup> Vit. Hilary.

<sup>c</sup> Cod. Afric. Can. lvii.

<sup>e</sup> Greg. Turon. lib. x. cap. xliii.

<sup>f</sup> Baron. ad ann. 301. sect. [13.]

<sup>b</sup> Comment. in Matth. cap. i.

<sup>d</sup> Cod. Afric. Can. xlii. [Hard. Can. xlix.]

<sup>f</sup> Cent. iv. [cap. xv.] p. 1484. [Ed. Basil. 1624, p. 892.]

<sup>h</sup> Zos. lib. ii. p. 61.

seat to another city, as he afterwards did to Byzantium, as the same historian tells us. And long after it appears the people of Rome were generally addicted to heathenish idolatry, by what Jerome observed amongst them in his time, on Isa. lvii. "Rome itself, the lady of the world, in every of her houses worships the image of a tutelary deity," that all that come or go out of their houses may be [re]minded of their inveterate error.

And this is the first consideration which induces me to believe the Christians were no more in great cities, viz., because the heathen were so many, as they were (as is proved) in the fourth century, and much more so (as will be granted) in the ages before.

The Jews also were numerous in the cities; there was no part of the Roman empire without multitudes of them; so Agrippa in his oration, dissuading the Jews from war with the Romans, as likely to prove, not destructive to them only in Palestine, but to their countrymen in all cities through the world,<sup>a</sup> and Strabo, cited by the same author, says, they were planted in every city; Josephus himself says as much.<sup>b</sup> Thus it was in the apostles' time; Paul finds Jews and synagogues everywhere, and they are mentioned almost in every city where he comes, in Syria, in the Lesser Asia, in Macedonia, in Greece, in Italy; and so continued in Augustine's time, as he declares.<sup>c</sup> And Chrysostom says, they had their synagogues *ἐν πᾶσι πόλεσι*.<sup>d</sup> More particularly in Palestine, though the calamity which befel them under Vespasian was unparalleled, and greater than any nation under heaven had suffered, as Josephus affirms again and again;<sup>e</sup> and that the calamities of all from the beginning, *τὰ πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα*, were but small in comparison of that of the Jews; thereby giving a clear testimony to the truth of Christ's prediction.<sup>f</sup> Yet so far as I can observe, half of the Jews in Palestine were not then destroyed. The same historian gives a punctual account of all that perished in that war, and all the particulars put together amount not to half the number of those that he tells us came to the passover. And after[wards] in Adrian's time, they were possessed of above a thousand towns and garrisons: for above that number did Severus (Adrian's general) in that expedition take and demolish, as Dion relates. And though<sup>g</sup> Adrian forbade them any access to Jerusalem, (then called by him *Ælia*;) yet, if we believe the Jewish records, they had place in all other cities of that country: for Rabbi Judah took care that there should be scribes and teachers of the traditions in all the cities of the land of Israel; they had their San-

<sup>a</sup> Joseph. De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. xvi.

<sup>c</sup> [De Civitat. Dei, lib. vii. cap. xxxii.]

<sup>e</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. xi.     <sup>f</sup> Matth. xxv.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. lib. vii. cap. xxi.

<sup>d</sup> Demonstr. cont. Gent.

<sup>g</sup> Aristo Pelleus, in Euseb. lib. iv. cap. vi.

hedrim in one city after another, and great schools in many towns.<sup>a</sup> And in Constantine's time they possessed Diocæsarea (anciently Sephoris) and Tiberias, two of the greatest cities in Galilee; Diospolis also, and many other towns, and were so numerous as to raise a war against the emperor.<sup>b</sup>

In Chaldea there was not a few myriads of them, says Josephus; in Egypt a million, says Philo;<sup>c</sup> in Cyrene we may conjecture how many they were, by the tragedy they there acted in Trajan's time, slaughtering two hundred and twenty thousand Greeks and Romans,<sup>d</sup> and some myriads in Cyprus about the same time; yet Josephus tells us, there were more in Syria than any where;<sup>e</sup> they were planted in every part of the world, says he, but especially in Syria, for its vicinity to Palestine; and there Titus continued them in the possession of their ancient privileges, notwithstanding all the importunity of the Syrians for their exclusion.<sup>f</sup> As for their numerousness in greater cities, one or two instances may satisfy us. In Alexandria, the slaughter of fifty thousand Jews in that city did not extinguish them,<sup>g</sup> and yet the same author seems to intimate, that they were more numerous in Antioch than any city.<sup>h</sup> Chrysostom seems to signify, that in his time, they were as many as the Christians in that city: for he exhorts each of the Christians to reduce one Jew to the Christian profession, *ἕκαστος ὑμῶν*, &c.<sup>i</sup> To conclude this second consideration concerning the Jews, if these, with the heathen, took up so very much of the great cities, it need not seem strange, that we assign the Christians no larger a proportion therein, than is before specified.

There remains another sort of people inhabitants of these cities to be taken notice of, whose numbers made the Christian assemblies thinner, and the bishops' flocks less numerous. They are such who went under the name of Christians, but were not of the communion, nor did assemble with the generality of them; such as were called heretics, or sectaries; these were many, and had bishops of their own, so that there were several bishoprics in some one city.

But I shall only give a particular account of the Novatians. By the multitude of them we may conjecture, what all the rest put together would amount to. They had their rise about the middle of the third century; and were many from first to last.<sup>k</sup> They had a diocese in Rome itself, with public liberty, till Cælestinus's time;<sup>l</sup> another in Alexandria, till Cyril's time;<sup>m</sup> another in Constantinople, where it conti-

<sup>a</sup> Vid. D[r.] L[ightfoot], Fall of Jerusalem, sec. vii. viii.

<sup>b</sup> Soz. lib. iv. cap. vi.

<sup>c</sup> Legat. ad Caium. [Ed. Par. 1640, p. 1040, D.]

<sup>d</sup> Dion [Cass.] lib. lxxviii. [cap. xxxii.]

<sup>e</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. vii. cap. xxi.

<sup>f</sup> Antiq. lib. xii. cap. iii.

<sup>g</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. xxi.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. lib. vii. cap. xxi.

<sup>i</sup> Cont. Jud. i. p. 319.

<sup>k</sup> Soz. lib. ii. cap. xxx. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxxii.]

<sup>l</sup> Soc. lib. vii. cap. ix. x. [Ed. Reading, cap. xi. xii.]

<sup>m</sup> Socrat. lib. vii. cap. vii.

nued with public liberty longer.<sup>a</sup> They had bishops in all these places; as also in Cyzicus,<sup>b</sup> in Nicæa,<sup>c</sup> in Ancyra,<sup>d</sup> in Scythia,<sup>e</sup> in Nicomedia,<sup>f</sup> in Cotyæum,<sup>g</sup> and divers other places in Phrygia; they abounded there and in Paphlagonia,<sup>h</sup> and had their churches in Galatia,<sup>i</sup> in Mysia and Hellespont, as also in Thracia. At Constantinople the same historian mentions a long succession of bishops amongst them; the fifth is Chrysanthus, under whom their churches were more confirmed and enlarged: for he was a person of great place and honour, having been the emperor's lieutenant in Britain.<sup>k</sup> In Rome, Innocentius takes many churches from them,<sup>l</sup> Cælestinus deprived them of more, till which time they had mightily flourished at Rome, having very many churches and great multitudes of people.<sup>m</sup>

In the fourth age, as Christians did increase, so were sects and errors multiplied. I will not be particular herein, my design leading me no further into these times than the consideration of the churches then, may help us to discover their state in foregoing ages. I need not show how predominant Arianism was in the greatest part of the Christian world, *ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est,*<sup>n</sup> "the whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian," when it possessed the whole orient, having none to oppose it, as Jerome says, but Athanasius and Paulinus.<sup>o</sup>

Nor how the Donatists prevailed in Africa, when Augustin tells us from Tychonius, that they had a council, consisting of two hundred and seventy bishops in the beginning of the fourth age,<sup>p</sup> and that they were in many places more numerous than the Catholics. Nor how the Macedonians did abound, who carried away no small part of the people to their persuasion, both in Constantinople, Bithynia, Thracia, Hellespont, and the nations round about.<sup>q</sup> Nor will I so much as name the other numerous sects and errors which had their distinct churches and respective bishops in several cities, so that there was sometimes four or five bishops of several persuasions seated in one city.

It is probable the church scarce gained more numbers by the encouragement of Constantine than it lost by Arius, and those many other erroneous spirits, in which that age (as it every way more degenerated) was more unhappily fertile than any before it.

To draw this discourse to an issue; suppose we a city forty furlongs in compass, (than which there were very few bigger;) let us allow half

<sup>a</sup> Soerat. lib. vii. cap. xi.

<sup>c</sup> Id. lib. iv. cap. xxiii. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxviii.]

<sup>e</sup> Id. ibid. cap. xlv.

<sup>h</sup> Id. lib. ii. cap. xxx.

<sup>k</sup> Id. lib. vii. cap. xii.

<sup>n</sup> Jerom. Advers. Lucif. [Page 300. Ed. Paris. 1706, tom. iv. pars ii.]

<sup>o</sup> Advers. Jo. Jerus. [Ed. Paris. 1706, tom. iv. pars ii. p. 308.]

<sup>p</sup> Epist. xlviii. [sect. xliii. cap. x.]

<sup>b</sup> Id. lib. ii. cap. xxx.

<sup>d</sup> Id. lib. vii. cap. xxviii.

<sup>f</sup> Id. lib. iv. cap. xxiii.

<sup>i</sup> Id. lib. v. cap. xx.

<sup>m</sup> Id. ibid. cap. xi.

<sup>g</sup> Id. ibid.

<sup>q</sup> Soz. lib. iv. cap. xxvi. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxvii.]

thereof to heathens, (they had rarely so little in the three first ages;) allow then a third or fourth to Jews and Novatians, and other sects, and the proportion left the Christians will not exceed the dimensions of a small town, such as some of our market-towns, when yet the inhabitants, and those also of the villages about it, can and do meet together for communion.

But it may be more satisfactory, to make this evident, in some particular cities; let us do it in a few of the greater, and some of the greatest.

Berytus was an eminent city, and a special instance of the prodigious magnificence of Herod and the two Agrippas, in Josephus; thought fit also to be the seat of an archbishop; and yet it had but one church in Julian's time, which was then burnt by Magnus, τὴν Βηρυτιῶν ἐκκλησίαν ἐμπρήσας, it is not one of the churches, but the church of Berytus.<sup>a</sup> Tyre was one of the most illustrious cities of the East, the metropolis of Phœnicia, and the bishop of it so eminent as [that] he had place above all the metropolitans of the orient, next to the patriarch of Antioch. Yet Paulinus, bishop there in Constantine's time, had but so many under his episcopal charge (as the panegyrist in Eusebius informs us<sup>b</sup>) as he could "take a personal notice of their souls, and accurately examine the inward state of every one," ἐπισκοπεῖν τῆς ἐνδοτάτω τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν θεωρίας — ἕκαστον ἀκριβῶς ἐξητακóτι;<sup>c</sup> "acquainting himself thoroughly with the condition of all those souls that were committed to him," τὴν τῶν αὐτῷ κεκληρωμένων ψυχῶν εὐδαιγινοσκων καὶ φιλοκρινῶν διάνοιαν.<sup>d</sup>

Synnada, after the division of Phrygia into two provinces by Constantine, was metropolis of Pacatiana. There Theodosius, the catholic bishop, in the reign of Honorius and Theodosius junior, persecuting the Macedonians, (contrary to the custom of the true church, which was never wont to persecute any, as the historian notes, τοῦτο δ' ἐποιεῖ οὐκ εἰσθῶς διώκειν τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ,) Agapetus, the Macedonian bishop in that city, on a sudden turns orthodox, and calling together the people under him, persuades them to it; this done, with a great multitude, yea, with all the people, μᾶλλον δὲ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, he hastens into the church,<sup>e</sup> so that all the people were no more than one church would contain.

Cyzicus was a great city as any in Asia. Strabo says it might contend with the chief cities there for splendour and greatness.<sup>f</sup> Florus calls it the Rome of Asia. In Julian's time the greatest part of the citizens were heathens, the citizens sending their deputies to him (as about other affairs, so) for the re-edifying of their idol temples.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Theod. lib. iv. cap. xx.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. x. cap. iv.

<sup>c</sup> Page 279.

<sup>d</sup> Page 285.

<sup>e</sup> Socrat. Hist. lib. vii. cap. iii.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. xii.

<sup>g</sup> Soz. Hist. lib. v. cap. xiv. [Ed. Reading, cap. xv.]

Besides these, and the Jews, numerous here as in all other such cities in these parts, the Novatians had a church, which Eleusius having demolished in Constantine's time, Julian enjoins him under great penalty to rebuild.<sup>a</sup> The Arians had a bishop there, viz. Eunomius.<sup>b</sup> The Macedonians, the followers of Eleusius, did abound there, and it seems were the most considerable part of those that any way pretended to the Christian profession.<sup>c</sup> Now all these deducted, there will not remain for the diocese of the orthodox bishop near so many as we may allow him without prejudice to our hypothesis. Yet further, it seems all the Christians in this city were no more than could meet together in one place, to hear the recantation of Eleusius: for he being frightened by the threatenings of Valens, into a subscription to Arianism, thought fit, for his own vindication, to declare before them all, the force that was put upon him, and so he did, ἐπὶ παντὸς λαοῦ, *coram universo populo*,<sup>d</sup> "in the hearing of all the people assembled" ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας,<sup>e</sup> "in the church." And in an assembly upon such an occasion, we may reasonably suppose (if historians had not expressed it) an universal concourse.

Constantinople, which I reckon among the greater (if not the greatest) cities, because in the beginning of the fourth age it was but in motion<sup>f</sup> towards that vastness, which it afterwards arrived at. In Alexander's time, designed to be Metrophanes' successor in the bishopric there, about anno 317, the Christians were no more than could all meet together; so Theodoret informs us, *συναξίω σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπετέλεσεν*.<sup>g</sup> Afterwards, many falling off to Arianism, the remainder made but *ποιμνὴν μικρὰν*, as the same historian tells us.<sup>h</sup> So that in Valens's reign, when Nazianzen took the charge of them, a very little house did serve them for a church, *ἐν οἰκισκῷ ἐκκλησίασε*,<sup>i</sup> and Socrates agrees with him in the expression.<sup>k</sup> By Nazianzen many were reduced, and that church enlarged, says Theodoret. And Theodosius the Great discountenancing Arianism, contributed much to the augmenting of it; yet in the time of Theodosius junior, it seems, all amounted to no more than one church could contain, if Socrates deceive us not; *ὅλη πόλις μία ἐκκλησία ἐγένετο*,<sup>l</sup> "the whole city made one assembly," &c.

At Ancyra, the chief city of Galatia, besides the Gentiles and Jews there, the Novatians had a bishop,<sup>m</sup> the Semi-arians had a bishop there,<sup>n</sup> the Arians had a bishop also.<sup>o</sup> And besides these new sects, a prodi-

<sup>a</sup> Soz. Hist. lib. v. cap. v.

<sup>c</sup> Socrat. lib. iv. cap. vi. Soz. lib. vi. cap. viii.

<sup>e</sup> Sozom. lib. vi. cap. viii. / progress.

<sup>f</sup> Soz. lib. vii. cap. v.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. [vii.] cap. xxiii.

<sup>h</sup> Epiphani. Hæc. lxxiii. [n. 22.]

<sup>b</sup> Theod. Hist. lib. ii. cap. xxix.

<sup>d</sup> Socrat. lib. iv. cap. xvi.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. i. cap. xiv. <sup>k</sup> Lib. v. cap. viii.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. iv. cap. i.

<sup>m</sup> Soz. lib. viii. cap. i. Socrat. lib. vi. cap. xx.

<sup>o</sup> Soz. lib. iv. cap. xxiv.

gious swarm of the old sort mentioned by Jerome, viz. Cataphryges, Ophitæ, Borboritæ, Manichæi, &c., by which that church was all rent in pieces, as he complains.<sup>a</sup> *Scis mecum qui vidi Ancyram metropolim Galatiæ, quod nunc usque schismatibus dilacerata sit, quod dogmatum varietatibus constuprata*, “You know as well as I, who have seen it, how Ancyra, the metropolis of Galatia, is torn by schisms, and defiled with diversities of doctrines,” &c. By the state of which city, Baronius leaves us to judge what was the condition of the rest of the cities in the east, which had not such preservatives to keep them from this mischief, as Ancyra enjoyed under two holy bishops.<sup>b</sup>

The like may be said of Cæsarea, the chief city in Mauritania, in which St. Austin desires Emeritus, the Donatist bishop, [that] he might there, all the citizens being present, defend his communion.<sup>c</sup>

At Tiberias, a principal city in Galilee, Epiphanius tells us, that Joseph got leave of Constantine to build a church, where there was none before; and accordingly he raised a church, and that but a little one, *μικρὰν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτευχέσας*, as also he did at Diocæsarea, or Scephiris, and in other cities.<sup>d</sup>

At Diocæsarea, in Cappadocia, which in Nazianzen is *πόλις μεγάλη*, “a great city,” there was but one church, as appears by his epistle.<sup>e</sup>

At Constantia, the metropolis of Cyprus, and other cities of that island, there was no plurality of parishes or churches, as Petavius concludes, in that Epiphanius speaks of them in Alexandria as not elsewhere usual, nor known amongst the Cypriots. *Unam duntaxat ecclesiam extitisse in quam universi confluerent, cujusmodi Cypri urbes erant. Unde quod Alexandriae receptum erat, velut popularibus suis peregrinum et inusitatum adnotavit Epiphanius,*<sup>f</sup> “There was only one church, to which all resorted, as was the case with the cities of Cyprus. Hence Epiphanius remarks the Alexandrian custom as being foreign and unusual among his own countrymen.”

At Neocæsarea, a metropolis in Pontus, and other cities in those parts of Asia, but one church, as appears by the synod there,<sup>g</sup> which the same author observes.<sup>h</sup> *Siquidem initio oppidanis omnibus par esse poterat episcopus; hinc est quod in Neocæsar. can. xiii. unum duntaxat urbis κυριακὸν nominatur*, “in the beginning the bishop could serve the whole of the townsmen, hence we see why only one church is named in connexion with the city in the thirteenth canon of the council of Neocæsarea;” and he tells us, *plures in eadem urbe tituli*, “a number of

<sup>a</sup> Procem. in Comment. ad Galat. [lib. ii.]

<sup>c</sup> Possid. Vita August. cap. xiv.

<sup>e</sup> Ep. xlix. p. 810.

<sup>g</sup> Can. xiii.

<sup>b</sup> Ad ann. 373, sec. [xxxiii.]

<sup>d</sup> Hær. xxx. [n. 11.] p. 136.

<sup>f</sup> Animadvers. in Epiph. Hær. lxix. n. i.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 281.

titles in the same city," was then (when Epiphanius wrote, viz. about anno 376) either not to be found in other cities besides Alexandria, *vel saltem in paucis*, "or but in few."

I might produce like evidence for others of their greater cities ; but no more is needful, since by these (with the other before-mentioned) we may judge of the rest ; and the inference ariseth hence advantageously for the former ages ; if the bishops' stock were no greater in and after Constantine's time, what were they before, when all grant them to have less ?

---

## CHAPTER V.

COME we at last to the greatest cities of all. Concerning these there may be the greatest doubt, whether they contained not more Christians than we speak of in the three first ages. If we shall bring proof that they did not, there can reasonably remain no doubt concerning any of the rest. Indeed if our evidence should fail us as to these, yet it would be no considerable prejudice to our undertaking : for what are two or three too bulky and overgrown bishoprics to the many thousands that exceeded not the proportions of our parishes ? But I have not yet met with anything to convince me that the greatest of those cities, in the first ages after Christ, had more Christians under one bishop than there are in some one of our parishes ; but find enough to make the contrary seem probable ; which I shall now produce.

To begin with Rome, which was incomparably the greatest city in the Christian world, anno 236, or thereabouts, all the faithful in Rome did meet together in one place to choose a bishop in the place of Anternus, τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπάντων χειροτονίας ἔνεκεν — ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπικεκροτημένων,<sup>a</sup> and a dove resting upon the head of Fabian, in the place where they were assembled, thereupon all the people, τὸν πάντα λαόν, with all alacrity and one consent did place him in the episcopal seat. They were no more after anno 250, than could altogether in the church importune Cornelius for the re-admission of one of the ordainers of Novatian, who entered into the church lamenting, the whole people

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxix.

interceding for him, *πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ*.<sup>a</sup> They were no more than could concur in an epistle to salute their brethren at Carthage, *Salutant vos fratres*, “the brethren salute you,” say the Romans to those at Carthage, *et tota ecclesia*,<sup>b</sup> “the whole church.” They were no more than Cornelius could read Cyprian’s letters to in their numerous assembly; he always read them *amplissimæ plebi*, “to the people in full assembly,” and desires him to read that in particular which he then sent, *quanquam sciem* — *sanctissimæ atque amplissimæ plebi legere te semper literas nostras*,<sup>c</sup> “although I know that you always read our letters to the most holy people in full assembly.” They were no more than could all be present at consultations about matters of concernment; for such matters ought not to be determined (as the Roman confessors write) but with the advice of all, *Non oportet nisi ut ipse scribis caute moderateque tractari, consultis omnibus et ipsis stantibus laicis, ut in tuis literis et ipse testaris*,<sup>d</sup> “the matter ought to be discussed with caution and temper, all being consulted, even the laity themselves, who are stanch, as is your own view in your letter.” They concurred with Cyprian, and his way was, *hæc singulorum tractanda sit et limanda plenius ratio non tantum cum collegis meis, sed et cum plebe ipsa universa*,<sup>e</sup> “the matter must be treated of and settled in detail, in conjunction with, not only my colleagues, but the whole people.”

I meet with nothing that makes any show of a probability that their numbers were more at that time, but Cornelius’s catalogue of officers in his epistle to Fabius of Antioch, and the number of the poor, which were fifteen hundred.<sup>f</sup> As for the number of officers, the show will vanish, if it be considered that it was the custom of those ancient times to multiply officers far beyond what was necessary, yea, so much that, as Nazianzen tells us, the officers were sometimes as many as [those] they had the charge of, *εἴσι σχεδόν τι πλείους ἢ ὁπόσων ἄρχουσι κατ’ ἀριθμὸν*,<sup>g</sup> “they are well nigh more numerous than those they govern.”

As for the other, how to compute the numbers of the Roman church by the number of the poor, I know no better way than to observe what proportion there was betwixt these in other places. Chrysostom, in his time, computes the poor at Constantinople to have been half as many as all the other Christians there, these *δέκα μυριάδες*, “100,000,” those *πέντε μυριάδες*,<sup>h</sup> “50,000.” If it were thus at Rome in Cornelius’s time, we may collect the number to have been about three thousand. At Antioch the same father supposes the poor a tenth part,<sup>i</sup> where, dividing the whole into three ranks, he counts a tenth part rich, and a tenth

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xliii.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. xxvi.

<sup>e</sup> Orat. i.

<sup>b</sup> Cyprian. Epist. iii.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. xxviii.

<sup>h</sup> Acts, Hom. xi. p. 674.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. i. Epist. iii.

<sup>g</sup> Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xxxvii.

<sup>i</sup> Matth. Homil. lxvi. p. 421.

poor, καὶ τὸ δέκατον πενήτων τῶν οὐδέν ὄλως ἐχόντων, miserably poor (and so come their number to be less) and the rest betwixt both. Now it is probable that the proportion of the poor at Rome in the third age was nearer the former than the latter of these instances, rather the half than a tenth part. For if in Chrysostom's time, when Christianity had so much reputation, as to tempt the richest to profess it, the poor at Antioch was a tenth part; in all probability, at Rome in time of fierce persecution, when few of the rich in comparison received the Gospel, the poor were a far greater proportion than a tenth. But suppose what is not likely, that they were no more, the whole church would but consist of about fifteen thousand; and if one table could not possibly (for those times admitted not of conveniences) serve so many, divers of our parishes in England are ill provided for which consist of more. Besides, all were not communicants; and a great part of them of necessity were still absent, the sick, the decrepit, the little ones, those that attended such, those that looked to their families, and made provision for the rest; a third part may be abated upon such accounts. Indeed, Cornelius says there, that his people were innumerable; but then the expression must not be taken strictly for more than could be numbered, otherwise we shall make Cornelius speak that which is apparently<sup>a</sup> false: for all the citizens of Rome (in comparison of whom the Christians were but as it were a handful) were frequently numbered, every fifth year; but understand it as commonly to signify a very great number, and those that urge it will have no advantage by it; *amplissima plebs* in Cyprian is a full expression of it, who yet are no more than a letter might be read to when assembled together. So St. Austin says, in Galatia there were *regiones innumerabiles*,<sup>b</sup> "innumerable regions," and Galla Placidia *innumerabiles civitates Italiae*,<sup>c</sup> "innumerable cities of Italy." And the council of Africa, in an epistle to Celestine, speaks of innumerable bishops in synods, (the same word which Cornelius uses, *ἀναριθμητοί*, "innumerable,") whereas we find not above three hundred in any African synod, not seven hundred in any other; such a number will satisfy the expression which some would strain to their advantage; whereas, if we allow more than twice so many thousands intended by it, that will not make them more than are in some of our parishes.

Alexandria was counted the greatest city in the empire, next to Rome, *μεγίστη μετὰ τὴν Ρώμην*, as Josephus. Strabo calls it the greatest mart town in the world, *μέγιστον τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐμπόριον*. Ammianus Marcellinus calls it *verticem omnium civitatum*, "the flower of all cities;" and, when by Ausonius, Carthage and Antioch are preferred before it, that

<sup>a</sup> Manifestly

<sup>b</sup> De Unit. Eccles. cap. x. [Ed. Antw. 1700, tom. ix. p. 243, E.]

<sup>c</sup> Epist. ad Theodos.

was, as the same historian tells us, because it was much weakened by civil wars, under Aurelian the emperor.

Now to show that the Christians were not more there than could meet in one place, I shall not insist upon this, that Dionysius, bishop there in the latter end of the third age, calls that church *συναγωγή*, and that scrupulous member of it (whose case he is relating to Xystus) *τις τῶν συναγωμένων ἀδελφῶν*,<sup>a</sup> “one of the brethren who meet in assembly,” and that the place of their panegyric assemblies, (which was their greatest of all,) was in his time a place of no great reception, *πανηγυρικὸν ἡμῖν γέγονε χωρίον*, “a field became the place of our assembly,” not only a field, or a desert, but a ship, an inn, or a prison,<sup>b</sup> though these be fair probabilities.

But Athanasius, in his apology to Constantius, about anno 355, makes it evident beyond all contradiction. He being accused for assembling the people in the great church before it was finished or dedicated, *πρὶν αὐτὴν τελειωθῆναι*, makes this part of his defence, “That the confluence of the people at the paschal solemnity was so great; that if they had met in several assemblies, *κατὰ μέρος καὶ διηρημένως*, the other churches were so little and strait, that they would have been in danger of suffering by the crowd; nor would the universal harmony and concurrence of the people have been so visible and effectual, if they had met in parcels; and therefore he appeals to him, whether it were not better for the whole multitude to meet in that great church, (being a place large enough to receive them all together, *ὅντος ἤδη τοῦ τόπου δυναμένου δέξασθαι πάντας*,) and to have a concurrence of all the people with one voice. For if,” says he, “according to our Saviour’s promise, where two shall agree as touching anything, that shall be done for them of my Father, &c., how prevalent will be the one voice of so numerous a people assembled together, and saying Amen to God!”

So that hereby it is evident, that in the middle of the fourth age, all the Christians at Alexandria, which were wont at other times to meet in several assemblies, were no more than one church might and did contain, so as they could all join at once in the worship of God, and concur in one Amen.<sup>c</sup>

Further he tells him, that Alexander, his predecessor, who died anno 325, did as much as he in like circumstances; though there were several other churches in the city, yet being all strait and little, he assembled the whole multitude in the church called Theonas (which was then counted the great church; though it seems not great enough now,) before it was quite finished.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Athanas. Edit. Comelin. tom. i. p. 531.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. lib. vii. cap. xxi.

<sup>d</sup> Id. ibid. p. 532.

This is testimony clear enough ; but it is capable of another kind of proof, which might be as satisfactory to some, yet being prevented in it by a better hand, I waive it.<sup>a</sup>

I think the premises are so evident, that there is no need of the help of Dionysius's observation, that Alexandria in his time, (viz. the latter end of the third century,) was not by much so populous as of old,<sup>b</sup> and the old men more in number formerly, than both old and young in his days.

Antioch in Strabo's account was less than Alexandria,<sup>c</sup> but greater than any other city save that and Rome ; and so called by Josephus the third city in the world, *τρίτον οἰκουμένης ἔχουσα τρόπον*.<sup>d</sup> In Zosimus it is the metropolis of the whole orient,<sup>e</sup> and in Chrysostom, the metropolis of the world.<sup>f</sup> Herodian tells us, that Geta designed it or Alexandria to be the seat of his empire, coming but little short, as he thought, of Rome, *ὄν πολὺ μέγέθει ἀπολειπούσας*.<sup>g</sup>

The Christians there in the first age were no more than could all meet together in the house of Theophilus, as appears by the author of the Recognitions, which, though falsely ascribed to Clemens, is ancient ; nor will it be easy to find a reason why the following passage should be forged: *Theophilus ——— domus suæ ingentem basilicam ecclesiae nomine consecravit, in qua omnis multitudo ad audiendum verbum conveniens, credebat sanæ doctrinæ*,<sup>h</sup> "Theophilus consecrated the hall of his house, under the name of a church, in which the whole multitude gathered to hear the word, and was brought to faith in sound doctrine."

When Paulus Samosatenus, bishop of this city, was for heresy ejected out of the bishopric, he would not give up the possession of the house where the church did meet, *τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἴκου*.<sup>i</sup> So that one house, it seems, was then sufficient, otherwise they might have had more under an emperor so favourable as Aurelian, who upon their address to him restored them the possession of this. And that it was the church-house in which they assembled, not the bishop's house, as the translator renders it, appears, because it is presently after called the church, *ἐξελαύνονται τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, "he is expelled the church;" and elsewhere the place of the church assemblies is frequently called *ἐκκλησίας οἶκος*,<sup>k</sup> the "church-house."

In the fourth age, all the Christians there could meet together for the choice of Eustatius, anno 324, *ἅπας ὁ λαὸς*, says Theodoret.<sup>l</sup> After he,

<sup>a</sup> See R[ichard] B[axter], Church History, pp. 9, 10.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. xvi.

<sup>d</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. iii. cap. i.

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. lib. vii. [cap. xxi.]

<sup>e</sup> Hist. lib. i. p. 15.

<sup>f</sup> Tom. v. Homil. xxiv.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iv. p. 9. [Ed. Lugd. 1624, p. 160, A.]

<sup>h</sup> Lib. x. *ad fin.*

<sup>i</sup> Euseb. lib. vii. cap. λ.

<sup>k</sup> Euseb. lib. ix. cap. ix. De Vit. Constant. lib. iii. cap. xxxvi. and Hist. lib. viii. and cap. ult.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. i. cap. vii.

by the malicious practices of the Arians, was ejected about anno 328, there were no Christians visible there, but in the assemblies of the Arians, during the time that Eulalius, Euphronius, Flacellus, Stephanus, Leontius, Eudoxius, and Anianus were bishops, save those who, adhering to the truth and Eustathius, separated themselves, and were under the conduct of the presbyter Paulinus,<sup>a</sup> and these were no more than could meet together in a private house, (where Athanasius assembled with them,) *ἐν ιδιωτῶν οἰκείαις ἐκκλησιάζων,*<sup>b</sup> and, when they had more favour, in a little church: for so Euzoius the Arian bishop, who had some reverence for Paulinus, granted them *μίαν τῶν μικρῶν ἐκκλησιῶν,*<sup>c</sup> “one of the small churches.”

Paulinus, after he had governed them as a presbyter for above thirty years, was made bishop by Lucifer of Calaris, anno 362, having no other for his flock than those called Eustathians, nor Evagrius his successor; yet these the Egyptian, Arabian, Cyprian, Roman bishops, and the churches of the west and south, counted the only true lawful bishops of Antioch.<sup>d</sup>

But thirty-two years after the expulsion of Eustathius, another company who had hitherto joined in public with the Arians, Meletius, to whom they were addicted, being exiled about anno 350, and Euzoius substituted in his place, do withdraw themselves from the Arian assemblies, and met in a church in Palæa;<sup>e</sup> for the numbers of the Meletians, (so they were called) Theodoret's expression seems to make the Eustathians more;<sup>f</sup> however one church, and that no great one, would contain them; and one they had of Jovinian.<sup>g</sup> And since a private house and a small church, or two churches, and those not great, could hold both these parties, we may well conclude one large church would have contained them both, if both could have agreed to assemble in it; and yet the ages since acknowledge no true bishop at Antioch at that time, but he that was head of one of these parties. They all met in one church at the ordination of Chrysostom, if Georgius Alexandrinus do not misinform us,<sup>h</sup> and so they did five years after Meletius's death, says Chrysostom.<sup>i</sup>

It will be needless to add, [that] their numbers were lessened by Vitalius's falling off to Apollinarius, and drawing a great multitude after him called Vitalians, who had bishops of their own in this and other cities,<sup>k</sup> or to say anything of the Luciferians there, of whom Sozomen,<sup>l</sup> or of any other sects which were there numerous enough, since I suppose it is

<sup>a</sup> Theod. Hist. lib. i. cap. xxii.

<sup>b</sup> Soz. lib. iii. cap. xix.

<sup>c</sup> Soc. lib. iii. cap. vii.

<sup>d</sup> Theod. [lib. v. cap. xxiii.] Soz. [lib. vii. cap. xv.]

<sup>e</sup> Theod. lib. ii. cap. xxxi.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. i. cap. xxii.

<sup>g</sup> Theod. lib. iv. cap. xxii. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxiv.]

<sup>h</sup> Vit. Chrysost. tom. viii. p. 178.

<sup>i</sup> Tom. v. p. 537. Edit. Savil.

<sup>k</sup> Soz. lib. vi. cap. xxv

<sup>l</sup> Lib. vii. cap. iii.

clear by the premises, that the two main *τμήματα*, "sections," before they crumbled away by those divisions, comprised no more than might meet together for communion; the *aureum dominicum*, "golden church," which the historian speaks of there, might have held them.

Carthage was not counted so great by some as the three cities fore-mentioned; yet next to them, one of the greatest in the empire. Herodian says, that for riches, multitude of inhabitants, and greatness, it was short of Rome only, and contended with Alexandria in Egypt, *περὶ δευτερείων*, for the next place to Rome.<sup>a</sup>

That there were no more Christians in that church about anno 200, than could meet together in one place for church-administrations, there is evidence enough in Tertullian, which at present I shall not further take notice of, than in the observation of a great antiquary, the bishop of Orleans, who in his notes on Tertullian,<sup>b</sup> shows the ridiculousness of those who would prove the modern processions from Tertullian's *Si Procedendum*, "how many temples, how many churches must there be at Carthage for the performing of these rites;" *una tantum illis temporibus erat ecclesia et domus sacra, et ita certe humilis et parum ornata ut à privatis facile non dignosceretur.*<sup>c</sup>

In Cyprian's time, who lived till about anno 260, in all church administrations and transactions of moment in the church and bishopric of Carthage, *tota fraternitas—plebs universa—omnes stantes laici*, all the people were to be present, as he declares everywhere in his Epistles; and how all could be present, if they were more than could meet together, is not intelligible. I should transcribe a great part of those Epistles, if I should produce all the evidence for this, which is there offered; a few brief passages may suffice. All were present at reading of letters.<sup>d</sup> All were present at the sacrament, and therefore he would have it administered at such a time, *ut sacramenti veritatem, fraternitate omni præsente, celebremus,*<sup>e</sup> "that we may celebrate the sacramental verity in the presence of all the brotherhood." All present at exhortations, *nec universæ fraternitati allocutio et persuasio nostra defuit,*<sup>f</sup> "nor did we fail to address and persuade all the brotherhood." All present at censures, *causam acturi apud universam plebem,*<sup>g</sup> "intending to bring the matter before the whole people." All present at election of officers,<sup>h</sup> particularly a bishop was to be chosen *plebe præsente*, "in the presence of the people," *convocata plebe tota*, "at a meeting of the whole people," *sub omnium oculis*, "with the cognisance of all," *de universæ*

<sup>a</sup> Lib. vii. [cap. xiii.] p. 153.

<sup>b</sup> Ad Uxorem, p. 25.

<sup>c</sup> "There was in those times only one church and consecrated building, and that of so humble a description and so little ornamented, that it would not be easily distinguished from private houses."

<sup>d</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. xvi.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. Epist. iii. [Aliter Ep. lxiii. Ad Cæcilium.]

<sup>f</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. v. [Al. Ep. xiv. Al. xv. Al. xx. Ad Presbyteros, &c.]

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. xiv.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. ii. Epist. v. [Al. Ep. xxxiii. Ad Clerum et Pleb. de Aurel. Al. Ep. xxxviii.]

*fraternitatis suffragio*, “by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood,” and so ought to be, *de divina auctoritate*, “by Divine authority,” and so were *de facto* through the Christian world, *per univēsas fere provinciās*.<sup>a</sup> All present at debates and consultations, *hæc singulorum tractanda sit et limanda plenius ratio—cum plebe ipsa univēsa*, “the matter must be treated of and settled in detail in conjunction with the whole people;” so he writes to the people, *examinabuntur singula præsentibus vobis*, “the details shall be examined in your presence.”<sup>b</sup>

So long as Cyprian’s principles and practice were retained in that church, it did, it could consist of no more than might all assemble at one place; and we have no reason to doubt but they were retained the remainder of that age; and we find them acting conformably thereto in the next. For anno 311, the year before the decree for liberty to Christians was published by Constantine, the whole multitude concurs in the election of Cæcilian by joint suffrage, *suffragio totius populi Cæcilianus eligitur*.<sup>c</sup>

And after Constantine declared himself in favour of Christianity, many here, as elsewhere, came over from heathenism; yet there was no great alteration made hereby as to the largeness of his bishopric, since it is a question whether Carthage gained as many from Gentilism as it lost to the Donatists, who were so numerous here as to have a bishop of their own, and enough for another diocese in this city, and their bishops there successively, Majorinus (made by a synod of seventy;) Donatus, Parmenianus, Primianus, confirmed by a synod of three hundred and ten bishops.

Jerusalem was far inferior in greatness to the four cities forementioned, yet may be thought considerable in this discourse, because of the many thousands converted there by the apostles: from whence it is concluded, that they were more than could meet together in one place for communion. But I have showed this before to be a mistake, and that of those five thousand converted, the twentieth part cannot in reason be counted inhabitants of the city.<sup>d</sup> About forty years after, this church consisted of no more than Pella, a small city, could entertain, together with its own inhabitants; for thither they all retired, as Eusebius informs us,<sup>e</sup> being admonished from heaven to leave the city; and Epiphanius,<sup>f</sup> πάντες οἱ μαθηταί, “all the disciples,” being warned by an angel to leave the city a little before it was destroyed, obeyed, and dwelt in Pella, a city of Decapolis. And they deserved the title of ἐπιφανεῖς, (whether Josephus intended it for them or others,) who, he

<sup>a</sup> Lib. i. Ep. iv. [Al. lxxviii. Al. lxxvii. De Basilide et Martiale.]

<sup>b</sup> Lib. iii. Ep. xvi. [Al. xi. Al. xii. Al. xvii. Ad Plebem.]

<sup>c</sup> Optat. lib. i. [Ed. Paris. 1679, p. 19.]

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iii. cap. v.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. cap. i.

<sup>f</sup> De Poud. et Mens. cap. xv.

says, after the retreat of Cestius from Jerusalem, left the city as a ship ready to sink, πολλοὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν,<sup>a</sup> “many of the *better sort*,” &c. And from hence Archbishop Whitgift concludes the smallness of their numbers; “How few Christians,” says he, “were there at Jerusalem not long before it was destroyed, being about forty years after Christ? Doth not Eusebius testify,<sup>b</sup> that they all were received into a little town called Pella? and yet the apostles had spent much time and labour in preaching there: but the number of those that did not profess Christ in that city was infinite.”

Not long after the destruction of Jerusalem, if we believe Epiphanius,<sup>c</sup> they returned from Pella to Jerusalem, and settled in the ruins of a part of the desolate city, no fit place to entertain multitudes; and near fifty years after are found there very low and few: for, as the same author tells us, Adrian, in his progress through those parts of the empire, coming to Jerusalem, finds the whole city laid level with the ground, except a few houses and a little church, παρέκτος ὀλίγων οἰκημάτων καὶ τῆς Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας μικρὰς οὔσης,<sup>d</sup> and one would judge they could not be very many, whom so small a church could contain, and so few houses lodge.

After Adrian had raised the city Ælia out of the ruins of the old Jerusalem, the church there was so far from rising with the city, that it fell from what it was before, being in his time very much diminished, if not quite ruined, as to its ancient constitution; for Adrian, provoked by the rebellion of the Jews, by severe edicts excludes them all, not only from Jerusalem, but all the territory round about it.<sup>e</sup> And Sulpitius Severus<sup>f</sup> says, this prohibition reached not only those that were Jews by religion, but all that were Jews by extract, though professing the Christian religion; so that if the church then at Jerusalem were either wholly, or for the greatest part, constituted of such Jews, by this law it was either quite dissipated, or greatly diminished. Now Eusebius tells us, that from the apostles to this last devastation of Palestine by Adrian, that church did consist of such Jews, ἐξ Ἑβραίων πιστῶν,<sup>g</sup> which we must understand either absolutely, so as none else but believing Jews were members of that church, or else none but they in comparison, very few of the Gentiles; in the first sense by this edict it would be quite dissolved as to its being a church at Jerusalem; in the latter sense it would be reduced to a small compass, and very few members, viz. those only of the believing Gentiles. And in this sense I take it, because there was a church here still; but all of Jewish extract being excluded by the emperor's authority, it was constituted only of Gentiles, *cessantibus his qui fuerant ex Judæis*,<sup>h</sup> “those who were Jews retiring.” So

<sup>a</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. xl. [Ed. Oxon. 1720, p. 1105, lin. 15.]

<sup>b</sup> Lib. iii. cap. v.

<sup>c</sup> Ubi supra, n. xv.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. xiv.

<sup>e</sup> Aristo Pellicus in Euseb. lib. iv. cap. vi.

<sup>f</sup> Hist. lib. ii. [Ed. Lugd. 1647, p. 381.]

<sup>g</sup> Lib. iv. cap. v.

<sup>h</sup> Jer. in Chron.

Eusebius says, that that church was made up of Gentiles, and the reason he gives, because by Adrian's edict immediately before mentioned, the city was emptied of all the Jewish nation.<sup>a</sup> So that upon this constitution of Adrian, about the eighteenth or nineteenth of his reign, as Eusebius computes it, anno 135, the church of Jerusalem consisted only of those Gentiles, which were so few, as [that] they are not thought fit to be brought to account, by him who gives the best account of the state of the church in those times.

It is like<sup>b</sup> their numbers were increased before Narcissus was bishop there in the third age, yet then they were not so many, but that the whole multitude could meet together with their bishop at the paschal vigil, as appears by what we meet with in Eusebius.<sup>c</sup> The people assembled with Narcissus at the great vigil, and while they were watching, oil failing them for their lights, τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος, the whole multitude were greatly troubled, whereupon Narcissus procures them a supply in an extraordinary way, as it is there reported.

Nay in Cyril's time, which was in the fourth age, anno 353, it seems they were no more than could assemble in one place : for the people, as Sozomen relates it, being astonished at an apparition in the air, all leave their houses, their markets, their work, and men, women, and children, meet in the church, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπῆλθον, and there all together, *uno ore*, "with one mouth," join in the praises of Christ.<sup>d</sup>

## CHAPTER VI.

LET us consider what may be objected against that which is insisted on. It may be alleged, that not only the city but a large territory belonging to it and the villages therein, made up the bishop's diocese, so that the country inhabitants added to the citizens, might make those under the ancient bishops more numerous ; and some would persuade us, that it was the apostles' intention, that both the city and the whole country should be under one bishop.

*Ans.* If the Christians in the villages of the territory added to those of the cities, increased them beyond the numbers in some of our parishes, or beyond the capacity of holding personal communion together, this must be in the greatest cities where Christians were most

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. lib. iv. cap. vi.

<sup>b</sup> probable.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. vi. cap. θ.

<sup>d</sup> Hist. lib. iii. cap. iv.

numerous, or else nowhere ; when as<sup>a</sup> we see by the former instances, that it was not so in the greatest cities. It was not so particularly at Carthage, where all the people belonging to Cyprian, met frequently at once upon several occasions, which is plain beyond contradiction by near a hundred passages in his Epistles. Yea, in the fourth age, it was not so at Alexandria, (the greatest city next to Rome ;) for whereas at panegyric assemblies, all the Christians belonging to a bishop, were wont to meet, that assembly, of which Athanasius gives an account to Constantius, (of which before,) being at one of the greatest solemnities, was panegyric, and yet was held in one church.

And we showed before, that the Christians in such cities were no more in the first ages than the inhabitants of an ordinary town, such as some of our market towns ; when we know, that not only those of the town, but of many villages (sometimes near twenty) belonging to it, can and do meet together in one place for communion ; so that this is prevented and satisfied in the former discourse.

But to add something for more satisfaction, though what is premised may suffice, it may appear that no great access could come to the bishop's charge by the villages or territory pertaining to his city, nor was his flock hereby made much more numerous.

For, first, either the territory was little ; and so it was indeed for the most part. There are some [who] will have it taken for granted, that the territories of cities were very large ; and they challenging no more for a bishop's diocese than the city with the territory, had need presume it to be exceeding large, so as it may bear some proportion to a northern diocese, which else will appear such as the apostles never intended. The circuit of one of our large country parishes, (yea, or of two together,) they will scorn as unworthy the repute or name of a bishop's diocese ; yet it may be made manifest that ordinarily the territory of cities where the apostles and their disciples planted churches, and commonly through the whole empire, amounted not to more, if so much.

Shall we take an estimate of the territory of other cities, and judge what it was commonly by that of the Levites' cities ? (Why may we not, since divers of them were royal cities, and may be supposed to have had the largest allowance answerable to the very liberal provision the Lord made for them in other things ?) We have a particular account of the extent of their territory, Numb. xxxv. a thousand cubits, ver. 4, two thousand, ver. 5, that is, as the best interpreters take it, a thousand from the middle of the city to each quarter, and two thousand from one quarter to another, (viz. from east to west, and from north to south,) and so in circumference eight thousand cubits, (reckoning two cubits a

<sup>a</sup> whereas.

foot more than one pace,) that is, about five miles; this is far short of the compass of some country parishes; many of them are five, six, seven miles, some more in length, (exceeding the territory of Tyre, anciently the metropolis of Phœnicia, and the principal city next to Antioch, as Sands found it six miles in length, two in some places in breadth.<sup>a</sup>)

Or, shall we be determined by Crete, the place whither the text insisted on for the purpose leads us, and so the fittest to regulate us herein? We are told frequently that there were an hundred cities in it, and as many bishops ordained there by Titus; yet the whole island, when it was wholly Christian, and under governors of that profession, contained but two hundred and seven parishes, and was divided into so many, according to Heylin's account.<sup>b</sup> So that two parishes would make such a diocese, as by his reckoning the apostle intended for a bishop. Yet, such a territory will be contemned, as more fit for the scorned Italian episcopellus,<sup>c</sup> than the grandeur of a more western prelate, divers of these counting five hundred times more, not too much for a diocese.

If we go further, where cities were not great, (and such were far the most part of cities everywhere,) the territory was not large, these being, as cannot be denied with any reason, commonly proportionable; nor could it be large where cities were numerous and stood near together, (whether they were great or small,) no room [exists] there for a territory of great extent. Yet thus they were, many and thick set (for the most part as thick as they are said to be in Crete,) in those countries where we find the apostles planted churches, in Palestine, Syria, Asia, Greece, Macedon, Italy. I could out of historians and geographers give instances of hundreds of cities that stand but six, five, four miles, or less one from another; let me but give an instance in some mother-cities. In Ferrarius, Laodicea and Hierapolis, (both metropolies,) are but six miles distant. Nor can it be thought their territory was large other ways, though not where they were so near, for there were other cities which must have their territories too, nearer them any way than they were to one another.

But we need go no further for satisfaction than the notion of a territory, as it is universally agreed on. Pomponius so defines it, *Territorium est universitas agrorum intra fines cujusque civitatis, intra quos, prout ait Siculus Flaccus, jurisdictioni jus erat,*<sup>d</sup> "a territory means the whole of

<sup>a</sup> Travels, p. 216.

<sup>b</sup> Cosmogr. p. 263.

<sup>c</sup> bishopling.

<sup>d</sup> Digest. lib. l. tit. xvi. [n. 239. § 8.] De Verb. Signif. *Territorium est universitas agrorum intra fines cujusque civitatis, quod ab eo dictum quidam aiunt quod magistratus ejus loci intra eos fines terrendi, i. e. summovendi jus habet.* "A territory is the whole of the lands within the boundaries of any city, which word (*territorium*) some say to be derived hence, because the magistrates of such a place have the power of expulsion, (*terrendi*) i. e. of banishment within those boundaries." Cod. lib. x. [tit. xxxi.] lex. liii. *Decem virum impune non liceat extollere potestatem fascium extra metas territorii propriæ civitatis.* "It is unlawful for the Decemviri to extend the authority of their fasces beyond the bounds of the territory of their own city."

the lands within the boundaries of any city within which it had a power of jurisdiction, as Siculus Flaccus says." By which it appears, the territory reached no further than the jurisdiction of the city magistrates; and how many cities can be shown us in the Roman empire, where this jurisdiction reached further than it doth in our English cities? when shall we see any proof, that ordinarily it was of more extent? and with us it is known to be commonly of no more extent than the circuit of some of our country parishes: how much further does the authority of the mayor of Lincoln, or Winchester, or Canterbury, &c. reach? No more is their territory, and so no larger should their diocese be, if the apostles' intention (as themselves state it) were observed, designing no more for a diocese than the city, suburbs, and territory. What more they have than such a *χώρα*, or *περίοικις*, (and some have many hundred times more,) they have no right to from anything express in Scripture, or any pretended apostolical intention. Or,

Secondly, If the territory were large, yet the Christians were but few in villages for a long time; the Gospel prevailed not so soon, nor was Christianity so readily embraced there as in cities; its progress was from great cities to the less, and from both to villages. When heathenism was expelled out of cities under Christian emperors, it stuck in the villages, *in pagis*; hence heathen idolaters were called *pagani*, as Gothofred observes,<sup>a</sup> and *pago dediti* by Prudentius; and Chrysostom says of the heathen philosophers, the great supporters of that religion, *μεγάλοι εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκεῖνοι*,<sup>b</sup> "they pass for great men in the village."

After Christianity was too hard for the Gentiles in cities they retreated hither, and finding favourers and abettors, made good their retreat for some time, maintaining this post obstinately as their last refuge. So that, considering the state of cities themselves as before represented, we may well conclude, there were many villages in the fourth age, in which there were no Christians, very many in which there were but few, and but few in comparison in which all were Christians; and what then were they in the former ages? If a village wholly Christian had not been a rarity even in Jerome's time, why does he make it a singular observation of Jethura? *Villa prægrandis Jethura, habitatoresque ejus omnes Christiani sunt*,<sup>c</sup> "Jethura is a pretty large village, and all its inhabitants are Christians."

And when the Christians in the territory were many, yet being disposed (as they generally were) under other bishops than him in the city, his diocese had no enlargement thereby.

For though some would have us think, that it was the intention of the Apostles, that the territory, though large, should belong only to the

<sup>a</sup> In Cod. lib. i. tit. x.

<sup>b</sup> In Johann. Hom. p. 837.

<sup>c</sup> De loc. Hebraic.

bishop of the city; yet I see no ground for this, seeing neither do the apostles signify any such thing, neither do the fathers conclude any such thing from them. Nothing is pretended for it but the practice of the church, which they say speaks it plain enough; whereas, indeed, their practice speaks quite the contrary, and declares that they never believed the apostles had any intention that the territory, though large, should have no bishop but him in the city. For what more usual in the practice of the ancients, than to make one or more, sometimes many bishops in the territory of that city which had its bishops besides: villages being in the territories of cities? There needs no other evidence for this, than what was before produced to show that there were bishops in villages; and of this I have given instances, as a common usage in all quarters of the Christian world; and have discovered bishops, not only in the larger, but also, where it was thought requisite, in the smaller or ordinary villages. It were easy to add more instances hereof. In the territory of Hippo, Austin speaks of divers bishops,<sup>a</sup> *Ecce interim episcopos nostros, qui sunt in regione Hipponense, ubi a vestris tanta mala patimur, convenite*: “in the mean while confer with the bishops of our party, who are situated in the region of Hippo, where we undergo so many wrongs from those of your party.” He mentions a bishop in the castle Synica near to Hippo,<sup>b</sup> and yet would have another bishop made in the castle Fussala, *ad ecclesie Hipponensis parœciam*.<sup>c</sup> And in the territory of other cities, we find two, or three, or four bishoprics of new erection, besides what were there by ancient constitution. Two are mentioned in the territory of Milevis, two in that of Tigava, (though in Ferrarius it is but two miles distance from Oppidum Novum, another episcopal town,) four bishoprics in the territory of Casænigræ, four in that of Tacara.<sup>d</sup>

Basinopolis [was] a village honoured by Julian with the privileges of a city, being a place in Bithynia, in the territory of Nice, as Anastasius, bishop of that city declares, *Ego autem ostendo, Basinopolim sub Nicæa jam olim esse, nam regio, fuit ejus—sicut Tacteus et Doris regiones sunt sub Nicæa*,<sup>e</sup> “I show that Basinopolis was long ago subject to Nice; for it was a territory belonging to it, just as Tacteus and Doris are territories belonging to Nice.” But being made an episcopal seat in the fourth age, it was no longer under the jurisdiction of the Nicene bishop, either as part of his territory or province; for though he of Nice had the name and honour of a metropolitan, yet the power being not allowed in those times to two in one province, the fathers of Chalcedon adjudged it to belong to Eunomius of Nicomedia as the proper metropolitan.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Epist. lxxviii.

<sup>b</sup> De Civit. Dei, lib. xxii. cap. viii.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. cclxi.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Collat. Carthag passim

<sup>e</sup> Conc. Chalced. Act. xiii

<sup>f</sup> Conc. Chalced. ibid.

This appears also in the bishopric erected in the precinct of Cæsarea, when Basil presided there, and the contest was hot betwixt him and Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, concerning the places belonging to their respective cities; particularly in Sasima, then made an episcopal seat, which though afterwards counted a city, (as places were wont to be when they had bishops, though they were no better than villages,<sup>a</sup>) yet Nazianzen, who best knew it, being the first bishop it had, calls it a very little village, and on that account [it] must be in their account in the territory of some city, and so is another pregnant instance that the bishops of those times, particularly the great Basil, Gregory, the father of Nazianzen, and Gregory Nyssen, the brother of Basil, and Nazianzen himself, in whose ordination to that place these all concurred, had not any thought that the apostles intended, that the city and all its territories should have but one bishop. Nazianzen, who used all means, all pleas to avoid the bishopric, if he could have alleged this, would have easily satisfied his father and friends; his authority and their importunity (to which after much resistance he yielded) would not have been used in opposition to what was accounted the apostles' intent.<sup>b</sup>

Not to be tedious; if that was the territory of Rome, which was under the jurisdiction of the provost of that city, it was large indeed, (reaching one hundred miles,) none like it, nor it like itself, when it was but extended *ad quintum aut sextum lapidem*, "to the fifth or sixth milestone." But then the diocese of the Roman bishop was nothing hereby enlarged; for in that circuit there are now about forty bishops, and of old there were many more, viz. no less than sixty-nine, as appears by the ancient provincial in Baronius,<sup>c</sup> and taking those united into the reckoning, the number arises to seventy-five, (more in the territory of one city, than there are now in Great Britain and Ireland;) nor was there any one parish or church in this territory that belonged to the diocese of the city bishop: for all his churches were within the city, as Innocent the First declares, writing to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, concerning the *Eulogiæ*,<sup>d</sup> which were wont to be sent to all in the diocese, *cum omnes ecclesiæ nostræ intra civitatem constitutæ sunt*, "since all our churches are fixed within the city:" answerably, Leo's diocesan charge was, *tantæ urbis populis*,<sup>f</sup> "of the people of so great a city." And that of Chrysostom is true in this case, when he says, a bishop governs a city only, *τῆς πόλεως μόνως*.<sup>g</sup> It was in other places, as at Dublin heretofore, *episcopus tantum intra muros episcopale officium exercet*,<sup>h</sup> "the bishop exercises his episcopal function only within

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Mireus, p. 297.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Naz. [Orat. xx. p. 356.] in Laud. Basil. and Epist. xxx.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Mir. Notit. Episc. pp. 68 and 160.

<sup>d</sup> The *Eulogiæ* were portions of the bread and wine consecrated by the bishop, and sent to those who were unable to join in the public communion of the Church.—ED.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. cap. v.

<sup>f</sup> Epist. xiii.

<sup>g</sup> Hom. iii. in Acts.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Ush. Relig. of Irish, p. 63.

the walls of the city." So Bitectum, in Naples, whose diocese *non excedit muros urbis*, "did not extend beyond the walls of the city," as Miræus tells us.<sup>a</sup> And Ragusi, an archbishop's seat, *uisdem fere finibus quibus urbis mania*, in Bodinus. Accordingly, the *παροιμία*, by which they will have us to understand a diocese, is said frequently to be *ἐν τῇ πόλει*, "in the city," of which there are instances more than enough in Eusebius, *τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροιμίας ἐπίσκοπος*,<sup>b</sup> "the bishop of the diocese in Ephesus," and of the diocese in Alexandria,<sup>c</sup> and in Corinth,<sup>d</sup> and in Sardis, and in Hierapolis,<sup>e</sup> and in Cæsarea,<sup>f</sup> and so the diocese in Tarsus, in Iconium, in Jerusalem, in Laodicea.<sup>g</sup> Now those that profess a singular reverence for antiquity, cannot imagine that the ancient churches would have thus acted, if apprehensive of any intention in the apostles, that there should be no bishop in the territory but he who had the city. Indeed, it will be manifest, that the apostles designed there should be such bishops (as they instituted) in country towns, and not in cities only, if we may explain that to Titus, by Acts xiv. 23, "When they had ordained them elders in every church," as those prelatists do who make them equipollent, and by elders in both places understand bishops, and will have a city and bishop to be adequate;<sup>h</sup> inferring from the former, that every city should have a bishop: for why may it not as well be inferred from the latter, that church and bishop are adequate,<sup>h</sup> and every church should have such a bishop as the Scripture speaks of? I am sure there is as good ground for it, since the very reason why a city was to have a bishop, was, because there was a church in it, (inso-much as where there were not Christians enough in a city to constitute a church, it is acknowledged no bishop was placed in it,) and therefore when there was enough in a country town, (as there soon might be, considering how few were then accounted enough to make a church,) it had and ought to have a bishop: for the obligation of the rule extends as far as the reason of it teacheth.

The church of old was so apprehensive of this, that even in latter ages, when a country town was more addicted to the religion of Christ than a great city to which it belonged, they thought such a town or village as worthy of a bishop as a great city; an instance whereof we have in Majuma, (honoured upon this account with the name Constantia,) it was *λιμὴν*, says Strabo, the port of Gaza, in Palestine, seven furlongs from that city,<sup>i</sup> and counted part of the city, *παραθαλάττιον μέρος τῆς πόλεως*,<sup>k</sup> "a part of the city bordering on the sea." That being better affected to Christianity than Gaza, (which is noted as very heathenish,) though the city had a bishop for some Christians in it, yet

<sup>a</sup> Notit. p. 267.<sup>b</sup> Lib. v. cap. xxi.<sup>c</sup> Lib. ii. cap. xxiii.<sup>d</sup> Lib. iv. cap. xxii.<sup>e</sup> Lib. iv. cap. xxv.<sup>f</sup> Lib. vi. cap. xxi.<sup>g</sup> Lib. vii. cap. xxxii. xxvi.<sup>h</sup> correlatives.<sup>i</sup> Lib. xvi. [Ed. Casaub. p. 1101, A. Ed. Paris. 1620, p. 759.]<sup>k</sup> Soz. lib. v. cap. iii.

the village was thought as worthy to have one. And when the bishops of Gaza would have reduced the place under their jurisdiction, and left it without a bishop, (being disfranchised by Julian,) and urged that it was not lawful for one city to have two bishops, *μη θεμιτὸν εἶναι μίας πόλεως δυὸ ἐπισκόπους προσεστᾶναι*; a national council decrees in favour of Majuma, ordains it a bishop, and so it continued an episcopal seat, with distinct altar and territory, as Sozomen declares.<sup>a</sup> Yea, when a city was replenished with Christians, as Corinth, if the town belonging to it had as many as would make a church, which Cenchrea had, (one of the ports of Corinth,) it was thought fit to have a bishop also. Thus, the author of the Constitutions, (a writer of credit enough with prelatists in other things,) naming the bishops made by the apostles in several places, tells us, that Lucius was by Paul made bishop of Cenchrea.<sup>b</sup>

It may be said further, that those that will give credit to the premises, must think the ancient bishoprics crowded so close together, as to be more like our parishes than such dioceses as became the honour of a bishop; but they will not be so credulous, who see instances enough in their own country, and other parts of Christendom near us, viz. Germany, the Netherlands, &c. of bishoprics of another size, to evince the contrary; those of another world must be persuaded to believe this, since they see nothing like it in this.

*Ans.* This is because there is so little or nothing of the ancient bishop now to be seen, (unless amongst those who have seen the thing so abused, as [that] they shun the name.) The instances touched, are of bishoprics of a later erection, and not conformed to the more ancient model. The bishop's *παροικία*, "diocese," of old, was but like a modern parish. The modern dioceses are now as big as the ancient provinces: for a province was the same with them that a shire is with us. A bishop's jurisdiction of this latter edition extended further than many a metropolitan's of the former; such a precinct of ground as had a hundred bishops in the elder and better times, was thought little enough for one or two in those corrupter and more degenerate ages. When bishops were planted in the parts here objected, it was expected bishoprics should be richly endowed, (a thing neither known, nor looked for by the ancient bishops,) and such a bounty being rare, the bishoprics must be fewer; more respect was had of the state and grandeur of the bishop, than regard of his duty and charge. So he had but territory and revenue enough, there was little or no consideration whether there were a possibility to perform the duty of a pastor to the hundredth or thousandth part of those committed to his pastoral charge. There were more of that humour than those whom Leo complains of, *dominari*

<sup>a</sup> Lib. v. cap. iii.

Lib. vii. cap. xlviii.

*magis quam consulere subditis quærent*, “they seek to domineer over their subjects rather than to advise them.” What Anthimus was charged with, was the character of too many, τὸ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης μέγεθος καὶ ἀξίωμα οὐ πνευματικὴν ψυχῶν ἐπιμέλειαν εἶναι λογισάμενος· ἀλλ’ οἷα τίνα πολιτικὴν ἀρχὴν διὰ τοῦτο τῆς μείζονος ὀρεγόμενος,<sup>a</sup> “he did not regard the grandeur and dignity of the episcopal office as the spiritual cure of souls, but as a certain political power, wherefore he lusted for more.”

Some of the first of this latter edition, were our Saxon bishops; their number was designed by Pope Gregory in the beginning of the seventh age, but not settled in his time, nor till after his successor had assumed the title of universal bishop; no nor then neither, according to the first designment: for Gregory appointed twelve bishops in the province of York, where for many ages after, there were but three; and he would have them placed so near together, as [that] they might easily meet when there was occasion.<sup>b</sup> *Ita volumus episcopos ordinare ut ipsi sibi episcopi longo intervallo minime distinguantur.* “Thus we wish you to ordain bishops with as short distance as possible between their sees.” And the synod at Heradford in that age, collecting some heads out of the ancient canons, which they determined should be observed in England, this is the ninth of them, *In commune tractatum est ut plures episcopi crescente numero fidelium auferentur;*<sup>c</sup> “It was ordered in council that as the faithful increased, bishops should be multiplied.”

The difference betwixt the modern and ancient models, is apparent in England and Ireland. Patrick, in the beginning of the fourth age, establishes three hundred sixty-five bishops in that lesser island; whereas England in the seventh age must not have twenty. I need not add, that the German establishment of bishops was long after the English, though this was after the ancient mould was broken.

It was the humour of those latter ages, instead of multiplying, to reduce bishoprics. In Phœnicia, there had been at least fourteen bishops; the western Christians, when they had conquered those parts, were content with four; and whereas there had been an hundred and five bishops under the patriarch of Jerusalem, by William of Tyre’s catalogue, in his time they were satisfied with nine, or (taking in those under Tyre into the reckoning, being then subjected to that patriarch,) thirteen; of which Vitriacus gives the reason, *ne dignitas episcopalis vilesceret,*<sup>d</sup> “lest the episcopal dignity should be lowered.”

Under the patriarch of Antioch, there had been above one hundred and sixty bishops; but then under the Latins they were reduced to six metropolitans, and six bishops.<sup>e</sup> In Crete they will have us believe

<sup>a</sup> Conc. C. P. sub Menna.

<sup>b</sup> Respons. ad viii. Interrog. [Hardouin. tom. iii. p. 512.]

<sup>c</sup> Spelm. p. 153. [Conc. Heradf. cap. ix.]

<sup>d</sup> Hist. Orient. lib. i. cap. liii.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Mir. Not. p. 82.

there were anciently one hundred bishops, yet in the account of Leo Sophus the emperor, about anno 880, there were but twelve, and the number lessened afterwards.<sup>a</sup> In Sardinia, belonging to the prefecture of Rome, there is not half so many as formerly; nor half the number in Sicily; and the retrenchment in Ireland I need not speak of.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

It may be said, that the bishops' church consisted of no more than could personally communicate together, merely because there were no more Christians in the first age, than could meet in one place; not because they held themselves obliged to admit no more. And this appears, because, when Christians in the bishops' precinct were multiplied beyond the capacity of holding personal communion, (as they were in the greater cities, at least in after ages) yet they still continued under one bishop, as one church.

*Ans.* Till the state of the church was greatly corrupted, there are but few instances hereof in comparison of those who retained the primitive form of churches. And the reason why they did not transgress the ancient bounds, was not merely for want of temptation, or because (as is suggested) they had not numbers to enlarge their churches beyond the primitive limits; but because they thought themselves concerned, not to have them too large for personal inspection and communion. There are several rules which they would have observed, by which this is sufficiently declared.

The council at Sardica,<sup>b</sup> anno 347, determines that a bishop should not be made in a village, or little town, for which one presbyter alone is sufficient, and gives this reason, because it is not necessary to place bishops there, lest their name and authority be rendered despicable. Thereby signifying, that it might be necessary, and no disparagement to episcopacy, to have a bishop in such places for which one presbyter was not enough; they add, that when the people in a town shall grow so numerous, (viz. that one presbyter will not suffice, as the coherence<sup>c</sup> requires us to understand it) that the place is worthy of a bishop, and ought to have one. So that in the judgment of above three hundred and forty bishops, in any place where a presbyter needs an assistant, there a bishop should be constituted.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Mir. p. 283.

<sup>b</sup> Can. vi.

<sup>c</sup> context.

Secondly. The people under a bishop were to meet altogether upon many other occasions, besides assembling with him for worship. A bishop was not only to be chosen by all the people, but was to be ordained in the presence of them all. *Requiritur in sacerdote ordinando etiam populi presentia*, “the presence of the people is requisite to the ordination of the bishop,” says Jerome, cited by Gratian.<sup>a</sup>

Those that were in the state of penitents, were to express their repentance not only before the bishop, and all the ministry, but in the presence of all the people, *in notitia multorum, vel etiam totius plebis agere penitentiam non recuset*,<sup>b</sup> “they will not refuse to express their repentance before many, or even the whole of the people.” So did Natalius, as Eusebius declares, *in lacrymas et miserationes, omnem provocavit ecclesiam*,<sup>c</sup> “he excited all the church to tears and commiseration.” And thus does Tertullian describe a penitent,<sup>d</sup> *omnium lacrymas suadentem, omnium vestigia lambentem*, “asking the tears of all, kissing the footsteps of all,” &c.

When they were reconciled, this was done by imposition of hands, not only of the bishop, but the whole clergy, and that when all the people were present: *Cum omnes fideles interessent*, says Albaspineus,<sup>e</sup> or, as Sozomen describes it, τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πλῆθος, “the whole multitude of the church shedding tears;” so Jerome, of Fabiola, *episcopo presbyteris et omni populo collachrymanti*—*recepta sub oculis omnis ecclesie communionis*,<sup>f</sup> “the bishop, presbyters, and all the people joining in tears—being received to communion in the presence of the whole church.”

Thirdly. The bishop was obliged to such duties, and so many, in reference to the people under his charge, that it was impossible for him to perform them, to more than a single church. Let me point at some few of them.

He was to be careful, that those who sought admission were duly qualified, and to suffer none to enter, but such as upon trial showed themselves to be real Christians.<sup>g</sup>

He was to observe those who walked disorderly, and to admonish, reprove, or exclude them as he saw occasion.

He was to take notice of the temper of such as were in the state of penitents, and what fruits of repentance appeared in them, and accordingly to reconcile them sooner, or to prolong the course of their repentance.<sup>h</sup>

He was to feed the whole flock, preaching to them frequently. Cyprian says he failed not to do this to all the brethren, *nec universæ fraternitati*

<sup>a</sup> Caus. viii. Quest. i.

<sup>b</sup> August. Hom. xlix.

<sup>c</sup> Hist. lib. v. cap. ult.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. de Pudicit.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. p. 410.

<sup>f</sup> Ep. ad Ocean. [Ep. lxxxiv. (al. xxx.) Ed. Paris. 1706, tom. iv. pars ii. p. 659.]

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. lxiv.

<sup>h</sup> Conc. Nic. Can. xi.

—*allocutio et persuasio nostra deficit.*<sup>a</sup> And so the ancient bishops were wont to do, more than once a week, sometimes every day.

He was to administer the Lord's supper frequently, to all in full communion, they all receiving *nec de aliorum manu quam presidentium*,<sup>b</sup> "from the hands of the bishops alone."

He was to watch over the souls of those under his charge, as being accountable for them all. Thus the ancients thought bishops concerned in that passage of the apostle, Heb. xiii. 17.<sup>c</sup> And Chrysostom says, this was it that made his soul to tremble continually, *ὁ γὰρ φόβος συνεχῶς κατασείει μοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν.*<sup>d</sup>

He was not only to observe their conversations, but to acquaint himself with the state of their souls, *περιεπισκοπεῖν πάντοθεν τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἕξιν.*<sup>e</sup>

He was to accommodate himself, not only in public, but in private, to the exigencies of their several conditions. Many of the duties he was obliged to on this account, are enumerated by Isidore of Pelusium; who having specified abundance, concludes, that there were many more than all these, *καὶ πολλῶ τούτων πλείονα.*<sup>f</sup> And he gives a large account of more.<sup>g</sup> And we shall see Chrysostom offering more full and punctual evidence of the premises, in the next chapter.

Fourthly. There was to be but one communion-table in a church. This was long continued; so that when their churches were overgrown, and become too numerous for one table to serve them all with conveniency; yet they used divers shifts, rather than they would seem quite to abandon it, and such as better ages were not acquainted with. Whereas of old, the whole church, pastor, and people were wont to join together in the eucharist every Lord's-day; it was now thought sufficient to communicate with the bishop at some special solemnities.<sup>h</sup> And when there were so many assembled at such a time, as [that] one church could not hold them all at once, they thought it advisable to celebrate twice in one day, rather than all the people should not communicate at the same place. It was Leo's advice to Dioscorus of Alexandria, consulting with him about that case, wherein it is like<sup>i</sup> both Rome and Alexandria, two of the greatest churches in the world, were specially concerned, *Cum solennior festivitas, conventum populi numerosioris indicerit, et ad eam tanta fidelium multitudo convenerit quam recipere basilica simul una non possit; sacrificii oblatio indubitanter iteretur, ne his tantum admissis ad hanc devotionem qui primi advenerint, videantur hi qui postmodum confuixerint, non recepti,*<sup>k</sup> &c. "When a high festival bespeaks

<sup>a</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. v.

<sup>b</sup> Tertull. De Coron. Milit. [cap. iii.]

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Isidore, lib. v. Epist. cccxxiii. Prosp. De Vita Contemplativa, lib. i. cap. xx.

<sup>d</sup> [Hom. xxxiv. p. 602. in loc.]

<sup>e</sup> Id. De Sacerd. Orat. ii.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. ccxvi.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. i. Epist. cxlix.

<sup>h</sup> Concil. Agath. [Can. xviii.]

<sup>i</sup> probable.

<sup>k</sup> Epist. lxxxii. cap. ii.

an unusual concourse of people, and so great a multitude of the faithful come to it, that one church alone cannot hold them, let the sacrificial oblation be unhesitatingly repeated, lest if those only be admitted to this service who come first, those who arrive later should seem to be cut off." Another device invented for this purpose, was the Eulogiæ, parts of the consecrated bread sent to those of the bishop's flock, who did not or could not communicate in the same place with the bishop, and the rest of his church. This is said to be the invention of Melchiades, bishop of Rome, about anno 313, as Baronius reckons. So that it may seem from hence, that the Christians at Rome were not so numerous before this, but [that] they might communicate together. The end of it was, as Innocent ad Decentium, cap. v. expresses it, that those to whom it was sent might not think themselves parted from our communion on that day, *Se à nostra communione maxime illa die non judicent separatos*. They thought all that belonged to the same bishop obliged to communicate in one place; but when they were grown too numerous to observe the primitive order, the people must be satisfied with this expedient, and think it enough that they had the same bread, the same day, though not at the same table. Some sense of the obligation for personal communion still remained, which kept them from running quite out of sight of it at first.

There were other principles derived from Scripture, by which their churches were regulated in the best ages; which, if they had not been neglected afterwards, the churches even in the greatest cities, where they were most numerous, had been kept longer within compass. Let us view this only in two instances, and observe how they thought themselves obliged to proceed, in admitting members, and excluding scandalous sinners from communion.

For the first, they thought none fit for Christian communion, but [those] whom they judged to be real Christians; and counted none such without competent knowledge and visible holiness. These qualifications they required in all, before they were initiated.

In order to knowledge, those who desired admission were first placed in the state of catechumens; and in that station, order was taken for their instruction, both privately<sup>a</sup> (*κατ' ἰδίαν*) and publicly in the Christian assemblies; in reference to which they are called *audientes*, "hearers," by Cyprian,<sup>b</sup> and *inter auditorum tirocinia deputati*, by Tertullian,<sup>c</sup> "those reckoned to be passing through their noviciate as hearers." And before they were initiated, they did give an account of their proficiency in the knowledge of Christ to the officers of the church, bishop, and presbyters.

<sup>a</sup> Orig. contra Cels. cap. iii. [p. 142.]

<sup>b</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. xvii. [Al. Ep. xii. Al. xiii. Al. xviii.]

<sup>c</sup> Lib. de Pœnitentiâ, [cap. vi.]

They required also a holy and unblameable life ; such a conversation as had visible holiness in the face of it, in those whom they admitted to communion. Justin Martyr says, they initiated none but those who would βιοῦν οὕτως, “live according to the rule of the Gospel.”<sup>a</sup> And he concludes, that all else were but nominal Christians. Origen declares, that they admitted none as probationers, but those who did sufficiently show they were fully resolved καλῶς βιοῦν,<sup>b</sup> “to live a good life.” It was not only a reformation of greater enormities, but unblameableness in respect of smaller sins, which they counted necessary. So Chrysostom, “I have said it before, and now I speak it ; I will not cease to assert it, that if any one have not reformed τὰ ἐλαττώματα τῶν τρόπων, the failings of his ways, let him not be initiated.”<sup>c</sup> Origen tells Celsus, that “amongst Christians, those only might be initiated, who were pure, not only from heinous crimes, ἀπὸ παντὸς μίσους, but also those that are counted smaller offences, τῶν ἐλαττόνων νομιζομένων ἀμαρτημάτων.”<sup>d</sup> Lactantius, comparing the heathen religion with the Christian, makes this one principal difference, that the heathen admitted all promiscuously ; reckoning up divers counted more flagitious ; *hic vero*, amongst Christians, says he, *levi communique peccato locus nullus est*, “light and common offences are not tolerated.” What then is required, he had said before, *bona mens, purum pectus, vita innocens* ; “a good mind, a pure heart, and an innocent life.”<sup>e</sup> And St. Austin signifies, “That according to the ancient custom, grounded upon the most evident truth, *ex illa liquidissima veritate veniens*, (i. e., the word of God,) none were admitted into the church of God on earth, who were visibly such as the Scripture excludes from the kingdom of God in heaven.”<sup>f</sup>

They required innocency and unblameableness of life, proceeding from inward renovation ; so Tertullian.<sup>g</sup> *Non ideo ablui mur*, &c. “We are not initiated, that we may give over sinning, but because we have left it, our hearts being already cleansed, *jam corde loti*.” And Origen thus delivers it ; “After those that are converted, make such proficiency, as that they appear *κέκαθαρθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου*, to be sanctified by the Divine word, and to the utmost of their power, to live in a better manner ; then at length we call them to our mysteries.”<sup>h</sup> And a little after, “the mysteries of the religion of Jesus, are duly delivered to those only who are holy and pure, *μόνοις ἀγίοις καὶ καθαροῖς*.”

Nor did they think it sufficient, that those who desired admission into the church, did make some profession of what was counted pre-requisite ; nor would they admit them immediately upon such profession ; but it was thought needful to keep them under trial, and to continue them in

\* Apol. ii. p. 159, and p. 141.

<sup>c</sup> Homil. xxii. ad Populum Antioch.  
De Fid. et Oper. cap. xviii.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. iii. [p. 148.]

<sup>e</sup> De Baptis.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. lib. iii. [p. 142.]

<sup>e</sup> De Just. lib. v. cap. xx.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. [p. 147.]

the state of probationers for some time. The Council of Nice rectifying some disorders crept in against rule,<sup>a</sup> begins with this, that the catechumens were admitted too soon into communion; to redress this they decree, that no such thing should be done for the future, and give the reason for their decree, *καὶ γὰρ καὶ χρόνον δεῖ κατηχομένους*, there must be some time for probation, but how much, they determine not. The synod at Elvira, where the famous Hosius was present, is more punctual, and will have the time of their expectancy, if they be of good conversation, to be about two or three years.<sup>b</sup> And about two or three years did St. Austin continue in this state, as may be collected out of his Book of Confessions: he was converted about the thirty-first year of his age, and continued a catechumen till he was thirty-four years old, and was then solemnly admitted by Ambrose, at Milan.

But though the ordinary time of their continuing probationers, was about two or three years, yet it sometimes fell out to be much longer; for in case they gave offence to the church, by falling into sin, they were stayed<sup>c</sup> in the station where they sinned, or in one lower, (into which they were thrust down) more or less, according to the nature of the offence; sometimes three years, as the Council of Nice determines,<sup>d</sup> sometimes five years, as the Council at Elvira,<sup>e</sup> sometimes more.<sup>f</sup>

In this interval, while they were probationers, and in the state of expectancy, not misdemeaning themselves so as to be quite thrown out, their conversations were carefully inspected. Origen tells us, there were officers in the church for this purpose, *φιλοπευστεῖν τοῦς βίους*, to search strictly into the lives and demeanour of such who sought to join themselves to the church. And also care was taken that the state of their souls should be inquired into. The same author, to stop the mouth of Celsus, reproaching Christianity as entertaining the vilest of the people, gives an account of the church's strictness and circumspection, manifested in admitting any to their communion. The Christians, says he, to the utmost of their ability, *προβασανίσαντες τῶν ἀκούειν σφῶν βουλομένων τὰς ψυχάς*, "do first exquisitely search the souls of those who would be their hearers," viz., in order to a full admission; they bring them to the touchstone (*εἰς βάσανον*) to try whether they be counterfeit.<sup>g</sup>

They were strict, and showed great caution, especially where they had cause of suspicion. An instance we have in Eusebius.<sup>h</sup> Constantine, having put forth a severe edict against those who infested the churches, and opposed the doctrines and truths of Christianity; the pastors apprehended that this might occasion many to dissemble, and pretend the

<sup>a</sup> Can. ii.    <sup>b</sup> Can. xlii.<sup>c</sup> Can. xiv.<sup>d</sup> continued.<sup>e</sup> Can. lxxiii. and xi.<sup>f</sup> Can. lxxviii.<sup>g</sup> Cont. Celsum, [lib. iii. p. 142.]<sup>h</sup> De Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. lxiv.

embracing of Christianity, when they designed nothing but their own security : in this case they took this course ; they endeavoured with all accurateness to discern which of these were sincere, which counterfeits ; and as for those who sought to join with the church in hypocrisy, covering themselves with sheep's clothing, those they rejected ; but those who did this with a sincere soul, when they had tried them a competent time, *δοκιμάζοντες χρόνον*, after sufficient experience of them, *μετὰ τὴν αὐτάρχη διάπειραν*, they admitted them into the church.

For the second, I shall say the less of it, because more commonly insisted on. As they were careful not to admit any unworthy persons into the church ; so they thought themselves obliged to expel those who, after admission, did manifest their unworthiness. It was the sense of the universal church, that scandalous sinners were to be excluded from communion. Nor did they thus proceed only for the most atrocious enormities, but also for sins of less provocation ; this was their course *in minoribus peccatis*, as Cyprian declares again and again.<sup>a</sup> These so excluded were on no terms to be readmitted, till they gave evidence of a true repentance. Take it in the words of Dionysius of Alexandria, *τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ μετάνοιαν αὐτῶν ἴδοντες* ; “ having examined them, and discerning their conversion and repentance to be such as would be accepted by him who wills not so much the death of a sinner, as his repentance, they received them in.”<sup>b</sup>

It was not enough that they professed themselves to be penitent ; they were not wont to take their words, and reconcile them upon their bare profession ; but would have some proof of the sincerity of such profession ; and so kept them off from full communion, in the state of penitents, several years, in some cases for many years. This may seem too great severity ; but the Council of Nice qualifies it, first laying down this general rule, that the inward state of such, and the fruits of their repentance be observed : for whoever with all fear, and continued tears, and good works, do demonstrate their conversion, not with words only, but really and effectually, after some moderate stay in that state, the bishop may deal more favourably with them, that is, by admitting them more early, than the canons do in other cases allow.<sup>c</sup>

Such orders as these took place amongst Christians, while the honour of Christ and religion, the purity of the church, her peace with God, and security from contagious members, and reproach of adversaries, were more considerable than the greatness of a bishop. And if these rules had been conscientiously observed, and the practice of the churches in the best ages, so far as herein they followed the conduct of the Scrip-

<sup>a</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. xiv. [Al. Ep. ix. Al. x. Al. xvi.] and Epist. xiv. [Al. Ep. xi. Al. xii. Al. xvii.]

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. Hist. lib. vi. cap. [xlii.]

<sup>c</sup> Can. xi.

tures, had been imitated, the churches afterwards could not easily have grown to such an unwieldy and irregular bigness.

But there was another reason besides what is suggested, why the bishops in after ages would have their churches as great as possible; and that is an affectation of greatness; a humour, how much soever unbecoming pastors, who should be examples to the flock, as in other things, so in humility, and contempt of outward grandeur; yet this prevailed too much in part of the fourth age, though it was more predominant afterwards. By this they were instigated to transgress the ancient bounds, and to neglect the rules and practice of the churches in their purer state, and to innovate every way which tended to promote their greatness, and served to gratify that ambition, which was so common, even in persons otherwise of a good character, that it seems to have lost the resentment<sup>a</sup> of a crime. And those who have the greatest charity for them, that reason will admit, can scarce think those innocent in the particular before us, who were apparently guilty in instances just of the same nature, and of such connexion therewith, as one may well judge them unsevered, if not inseparable.

In the age we speak of, which seems too justly styled *ambitionis seculum*, "the age of ambition," (though those, whose designs agree with the humour of it, have esteemed it most imitable) scarce any in the church could keep their own, that had any there greater than themselves; (some bishops, and not only the presbyters found it so) the great still encroaching upon those, whose lower condition made them obnoxious to the ambition and usurpation of the more potent.

When some of the mother cities had got the bishops in the lesser towns under them by custom, they got it confirmed by canon in the Council of Nice; and so came the pre-eminence of metropolitans to be authorised.

When the empire was divided into dioceses, the bishops of the cities where the governors of those exarchates resided, advanced as far above the metropolitans as they had got above those bishops.

And then the bishops of the greatest cities soared as high above the exarchs and primates, as those had leaped above the metropolitans. All in little more than a hundred years, the time of the four first general councils.

In that unhappy time, what struggling was there in bishops of all sorts for more greatness, and larger power! What tugging at councils and court for these purposes!

A bishop of a country parish would be striving to get another parish under him. The third council, at Carthage,<sup>b</sup> takes notice of such bishops, and their attempts to enlarge their bishoprics beyond the

<sup>a</sup> odium.

<sup>b</sup> Can. xlvi.

bounds allowed them ; and makes a rule against such ambitious encroachments.

When a bishop had part of a city, he was unsatisfied till he had got the whole. Thus Flavianus, at Antioch, would not suffer a bishop to be made to succeed Evagrius over that part of the flock which he, and Paulinus before him, had ruled there ; that he might have the city entire to himself. And no wonder that he did not stick at this, if, as Sozomen says, he broke the agreement, and his oath which confirmed it between Paulinus and him, to make his way to the episcopal chair.<sup>a</sup>

When a bishop had a great city, yet some village in the vicinity he could not endure should be exempt from his power. Majuma found this to its trouble. This being a place near to Gaza, and by some counted part of that city, was by Constantine honoured with the privileges of a city, and the name of Constantia, for its affection to Christianity ; but being upon the same account reduced to the condition of a village by Julian, the bishops of Gaza took this advantage ; and leaving it no bishop, (as it had before) would have reduced it under their own jurisdiction.<sup>b</sup>

Not satisfied with one city, some would have two. So four bishops in Europa, a province in Thrace, got each of them two cities under him ; one of them both Heraclea and Panion, another Byze and Arcadiopolis, the third Celas and Calliopolis, the fourth Sabsadias and Aphrodisias. So Florentius, bishop of Tebur, would have wrested Momentum from the bishop of Ursus, which Innocent accused him of in his epistle to him. This was against the rule and general practice of the church ; but the bishops concerned, managed a plea for it in the council, at Ephesus, pretending it was a peculiar custom of those cities.<sup>c</sup>

Not contented with a city or two, they would have all in a province under them ; so Cyril contends with Acacius,<sup>d</sup> and his successors at Jerusalem, with those at Cæsarea, till they had got the province (nay three in one) and the metropolitical pre-eminence from them ; though Cæsarea was regularly the metropolis of Palestine :<sup>e</sup> Juvenal having after this attempted it in the general council at Ephesus, carried it in that at Chalcedon ; hereby he who was but a private bishop before, subject to the bishop of Cæsarea, got him and three metropolitans more under him, and about a hundred bishops besides ; and thus he also robbed two patriarchs, getting Rabba and Berytus from him of Alexandria, as he did Cæsarea and Scythopolis from him of Antioch, as William of Tyra tells us.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Sozomen. Hist. lib. vii. cap. xi. xv.

<sup>c</sup> Conc. Eph. Act. vii. ad finem.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Jerom. [Ep. lxi.] ad Pammach.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. lib. v. cap. iii.

<sup>d</sup> Soz. lib. iv. cap. xxiv. [Ed. Reading, cap. xxv.]

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Bart. lib. xxiii. p. 223.

When they had a province, they would yet reach at some more cities; whereby Anthimus of Tyana gave so much trouble to Basil.<sup>a</sup>

When they had no hopes of the province, and the compassing of it seemed not feasible, they would gape at the title, or part of the province; so he of Nice becomes titular metropolitan of Bithynia, when the council at Chalcedon<sup>b</sup> would not allow him the cities in prejudice of Nicomedia, the more ancient metropolis.<sup>c</sup> And this passed after into example; and hence we meet with so many titular metropolitans in the list of Leo Sophus, and others; in that of Nilus Doxopatrias, thirty-four; in that of the emperor Leo, thirty-nine; in that published by Carolus à St. Paulo, forty-one; all in one patriarchate, that of C. P.<sup>d</sup>

When they had got one province, they would stickle hard for another.

So that part of France, which was called Narbonensis, being divided into two provinces, and Proculus having got one of them under him, strives for the other, and a synod in those parts<sup>e</sup> so far favours him, as to grant him the pre-eminence there for his life.

As if one or two provinces had not been enough, they reached at more. Thus the exarchs, or primates, got a whole cluster of provinces into their grasp at once. Thus the bishop of Ephesus attempted to advance himself over all the provinces in the Asian diocese, and the bishop of Casarea over those in the diocese of Pontus, and he of Hecalea over those in the diocese of Thrace; but the bishop of Constantinople, being more potent, defeated them of all save the title: so the bishop of Antioch, who seems but reckoned amongst metropolitans by the Council of Nice, not content with his proper province, challengeth the rest of the provinces in the diocese of the orient, and seems confirmed therein by the council at Constantinople.<sup>f</sup> So Hilary, bishop of Arles, and metropolitan, not satisfied with his own province, strives also for the province of Narbonne, and that also of Vienna; he was indeed therein opposed by Leo the First of Rome, but with a more ambitious design than that which he appeared against.<sup>g</sup>

When they had got a whole exarchate or diocese, consisting of many provinces, yet one province more they would contend for: so Alexander of Antioch, not satisfied with all the other provinces of the oriental diocese, would needs reduce that of Cyprus too, and deludes Innocent the First, bishop of Rome, by misrepresenting the case, to give encou-

<sup>a</sup> See Naz. in Laud. Basil.

<sup>b</sup> So a considerable part of the province of Tyre had been wrested from Photius, bishop there, and settled upon the upstart metropolitan of Berytus, had not the council of Chalcedon (though it authorised many other usurpations) hindered it. Vid. Act. iv. Concil. Chalced. [Hard. tom. ii. p. 435.]

<sup>c</sup> Concil. Chalced. Act. vi. xiii.

<sup>d</sup> Constantinople.

<sup>e</sup> Taurinens. Can. [i.]

<sup>f</sup> Can. ii.

<sup>g</sup> See Leo Epist. [LXXXIX.] ad Viemenses.

agement to this ambitious attempt.<sup>a</sup> But the council of Ephesus would not be so easily deluded, which takes occasion from hence to declare against the ambition of prelates.<sup>b</sup> There were fifteen provinces in the diocese of the orient; the bishop of Antioch was so far from having all those subjected to him before, that he had not the whole city under him till the death of Evagrius, (Paulinus's successor, in a bishopric made up of one part of the city,) in the latter end of the fourth age, anno 394; yet when he had swept fourteen of them under his power, and invaded them without any authority, he would not be contented without that of Cyprus also.

Nay, two whole dioceses, though consisting of more than twenty provinces,<sup>c</sup> would not serve some.

He of Constantinople,<sup>d</sup> having usurped upon the diocese of Pontus, and Asia before; in fine, gets them, and those of Thrace, settled on him; near thirty provinces in all.<sup>e</sup>

And not only Eudoxius, Nectarius, Atticus Sicimius, Proclus, and Anatolius, are charged with these usurpations, but Chrysostom (the best bishop that city ever had) is said to have a hand in them. He ordained fifteen bishops in Asia, and deposed thirteen.<sup>f</sup> He deposed also Gerentius, metropolitan of Nicomedia, in the diocese of Pontus. This is owned in the Chalcedon council,<sup>g</sup> that they had reason to believe that his proceedings herein were not the issues of ambition, but of great zeal for the reforming those churches then intolerably corrupted in several ages after the Saracens' invasions of the eastern empire.

And the bishops of Rome, not content with the gobbets which filled the mouths of others, would have swallowed up all. That this was their design in the former part of the fifth age, is apparent enough; the edict of Valentinian the Third, procured by Leo I., signifies it plainly. And

<sup>a</sup> See Epist. xviii.

<sup>b</sup> Can. viii. [Bevereg. Pandect. tom. i. p. 104.]

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Theod. Hist. lib. v. cap. xxviii.

<sup>d</sup> He was but a private bishop, inferior to the bishop of Heraclea, a great part of the fourth age: but the council at Constantinople, giving him an honorary precedence, *πρεσβεῖν τῆς τιμῆς*, next to the bishop of Rome (the common rise of usurpations in the church) the bishops of that see were encouraged thereby to encroach upon the adjoining provinces; this they did successively, so that their usurpations grew customary, and custom was the plea they used in the council of Chalcedon, and prevailed for the authorising of their ambitious practices (as it had prevailed with the council of Nice, for the establishing of metropolitans): so that three exarchial dioceses are subjected to him, containing no less than twenty-eight provinces, wherein [were] eighty-one metropolitans, five hundred and seventy-four (six hundred and forty) bishops, and thirty-nine archbishops: for so many the *Notitiæ* give an account of in the declining time of the eastern empire, when in all probability the numbers of bishops were much lessened. Such a prodigious advance had the ambition of the bishops of Constantinople made in a little time, the interval betwixt the second and fourth general council! Nor were they contented with the power of consecrating the metropolitans of all those provinces, but challenged a right to ordain the inferior bishops, as appears by Ætius, Protest. in Conc. Chalced. Act. [xvi.] Vid. Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxviii. and to depose both them and the superiors.

<sup>e</sup> Concil. Chalced. Can. xxviii.

<sup>f</sup> Soc. lib. vi. cap. x. Soz. lib. viii. cap. vi.

<sup>g</sup> Act. xi. [Hardouin. tom. ii. p. 558.] xli. [Id. p. 570.]

what indirect arts, divers of those bishops before Leo made use of, to subject the African churches to Rome, is too well known to be mentioned.

There are too many such instances of the ambition of those times ; but these are enough to proceed on. It can be no wonder, that those who were still designing, and struggling for more and more, as if they never thought they had enough, were not willing to part with anything they had, nor distribute their overgrown churches under the conduct of other bishops, when they thought all little enough for themselves.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

LET us, before we conclude, take notice what thoughts some of the best and most eminent bishops of the fourth and fifth ages had of a very large bishopric, and a flock exceeding numerous : when they express their judgment and consciences herein, thereby we shall perceive, that if the church could have been ordered, according to the principles, desires, and endeavours of the most pious and conscientious, their dioceses would not have been so excessively numerous in the fourth or fifth ages, above what they were in the third. Chrysostom may satisfy us here ; and to avoid tediousness, I shall produce him only, whom Isidore of Pelusium styles *τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὀφθαλμος*, and elsewhere, *θεσπέσιος* and *θεοφόρος* ; and who deserves as much honour, for his generous and vigorous appearing against the corruption and degeneracy of his age, as Athanasius, for his opposition to Arius, *hic hostibus bellum intulit, ille vitiis*. First, he frequently declares, that it is incomparably better the church should consist but of very few that are good, than of multitudes that are bad, and walk not according to the rule of Christ. Secondly, that the enormous greatness of churches, and the scandalous multitudes which swelled them into such a bigness, was of mischievous consequence. Thirdly, therefore he concludes, that though a church were thereby reduced to a small number, yet the unworthy multitudes ought to be expelled the communion of the church, and deprived of the privileges of Christians.

For the first, *τὶ γὰρ ὄχλος*, &c. “ Tell me what can a multitude avail us ? Wilt thou understand that the (desirable) multitude are the holy, not the many—a great multitude (beloved) when it observes not the will

of God, is nothing better than none at all ; I pray, and desire, and would freely endeavour that the church may be adorned with many, but with many that are good ; but if this cannot be, I would have the good, though but few. Do you not see, that it is better to have one precious stone, than thousands of half-pence ? Do you not see that it is better to have an eye that is sound, than to have two encumbered and blinded with a swelling carnosity ? Do you not see, that it is better to have one sound sheep, than thousands full of the rot ? Do you not see, that a few good children are better than many that are naught ? Do you not see, that in the kingdom there are few, in hell there are many ? What care I for a multitude, what advantage in them ? None at all.”<sup>a</sup>

Elsewhere, “ One” (says he) “ that does the will of God is better than thousands of transgressors.—What care I for a multitude ? it is but a more plentiful fuel for the fire ; and this you may know by the body, how that a moderate diet with health, is better than luxury with a mischief,—the one is nourishment, the other a disease. And this may be seen in war,—it is better to have one expert and valiant man, than many thousands that are unskilful ; for these not only effect nothing themselves, but hinder those that might. And this one may see in navigation ; it is better to have two skilful mariners, than an innumerable multitude of them that have no skill ; for these will sink the vessel. Let no man tell me, that we are great multitudes,—and that it is so, observe, he that has many servants, if they be untoward, how many grievous things will he suffer ! To him that has none, this seems a grievance, that he is not waited on ; but he that has those that are naught, ruins himself, together with them ; and the mischief is greater, for it is not so intolerable for a man to serve himself, as to be beating and fighting with others. This I say, lest any should admire the church for its numerousness : let him rather study to make it good.”<sup>b</sup> Again, says he, “ It is better to offer the usual prayers with two or three that observe the laws of God, than to congregate a multitude of transgressors, and such as corrupt others.”<sup>c</sup> And so he prefers the state of the church in former times, when under persecution, the number of Christians was small, but the persons better ; before the condition of it in his age, when they were many more, but much worse.<sup>d</sup>

Secondly. He declares the excessive greatness of the church through the scandalous multitudes which swelled them into such a bigness, was of intolerable consequence, yea was highly dishonourable to God ; a stumbling-block to the heathen, hindering their conversion, opening their mouths to reproach the Christian name ; pernicious also to the

<sup>a</sup> In Act. iii. Hom. viii. pp. 655, 656. Edit. Savil.

<sup>b</sup> In Matth. Hom. xvii. pp. 125, 126.

<sup>c</sup> In Acts, Hom. xxiv. p. 752.

<sup>d</sup> In Act. Hom. xxiv. p. 752.

better part of the church ; likewise extremely dangerous to the pastors, exposing them to punishment hereafter, and shame here ; and in fine, that it tended to ruin and subvert all.

First. This in his account was a high dishonour to God.<sup>a</sup> Secondly, a reproach to the Christian name, the far greatest part of those which constituted their churches being unworthy the name of Christians ; the whole was denominated from the major part ; and the church, says he, (*βουστασίον οὐδὲν διηγήνοχε καὶ ἐπαύλεως ὄνων καὶ καμήλων*),<sup>b</sup> “ differs nothing from a fold for beasts, or a stable for camels and asses ; they call us the pests of the world, *λοιμὴν ἡμᾶς καλοῦσι*.”<sup>c</sup> The Christian name upon this account was both hated and scorned.<sup>d</sup> Thirdly. This hindered the conversion of the heathen, opening their mouths to reproach the Christian name,<sup>e</sup> reproving the corruption of the generality of Christians. “ We, we are the cause,” (says he,) “ that they persist in their error, *ταῦτα ἑλλήνας κατέχει* ; so that we must give an account of this, not only for the evil ourselves act, but for that the name of God is blasphemed.”<sup>f</sup> Elsewhere, “ Thus they always answer, when we say we are many, yea, but such are naught, say they.”<sup>g</sup> “ These are occasions of more blaspheming God, than if they were not Christian,<sup>h</sup> for God is not so blasphemed by a flagitious heathen, as by a debauched Christian.<sup>i</sup> For when we have ten thousand times confuted their opinions, they upbraid us with the lives of the many congregated with us, *ὀνειδεῖζουσιν ἡμῖν τὸν βίον τὸν τῶν πολλῶν*.<sup>k</sup> And a little after, when we say that Christ has done great things, making angels of men, afterwards an account hereof being required, and we called on to give a proof of this in the flock, *ἐπιστομιζόμεθα*, our mouths are stopped : for I fear, lest instead of angels, I should bring forth hogs out of the sty, or wild horses.” And<sup>l</sup> “ we are derided by the heathen, and all that we say seems a fable to them.” Fourthly. It is pernicious to the better part of the church. The admitting so many that were corrupt, and folding them together with the few that were sound, tended to infect the whole, and debauch all. *Τὶ ἐμοὶ καὶ τῷ πλήθει*. “ What care I for a multitude ? What advantage is it ? None at all, but rather a plague to the rest : for it is all one, as if he who might have ten sound (sheep) rather than thousands that are diseased, should mix those thousands with the ten.”<sup>m</sup> Fifthly. This tended to ruin the church utterly and overthrow all, when pastors affected to have multitudes under their charge, though they were naught. “ By this,” says he, “ all is subverted, all is turned topsyturvy, because even as in the theatres, we desire multitudes, not only

<sup>a</sup> Vid. in Act. p. 752. <sup>b</sup> In Matth. Hom. lxxxviii. p. 544. <sup>c</sup> In Johann. Hom. lxxii. p. 858.

<sup>d</sup> In Coloss. Hom. vii. p. 128.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

<sup>f</sup> In Johann. Hom. lxxii. p. 857, 858.

<sup>g</sup> In Act. Hom. xxiv. p. 752.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> In Johann. Hom. lxxviii. p. 840.

<sup>k</sup> Hom. in Matth. lxxxviii. p. 543.

<sup>l</sup> In Coloss. Hom. vii. p. 128.

<sup>m</sup> In Act. Hom. xvii. p. 656.

those that are good." <sup>a</sup> Sixthly. This was extremely dangerous to the pastors. "The many," (says he,) "that are not good, procure me nothing but punishment (hereafter) and shame at present." <sup>b</sup> More particularly, a bishop could not take cognisance of the various conditions of so many, nor could possibly discharge all the duties he owed them, and so could give no comfortable account of them, though he be accountable for every soul, whereby it came to pass, that it was "almost impossible any bishop should be saved."

A bishop at the peril of his soul is to take exact notice of the spiritual state of all under his charge, and constantly to perform all pastoral duties to the whole flock. Ἐπισκοπή, &c. "The episcopate," (says he,) "is so called from the inspecting all." <sup>c</sup> He ought to be an overseer of all, bearing the burdens of all; <sup>d</sup> μυρίων (δει) ὀφθαλμῶν πρὸς τὸ περεπισκοπεῖν πάντοθεν τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἕξις; he had need of many thousand eyes to look into the state of every soul under him, which of them cannot digest bitter remedies, and who for want of them grow careless. <sup>e</sup> He ought to leave nothing unobserved, but to search into all accurately: <sup>f</sup> no speck in his flock should escape his notice; he ought to train up his charge to an excellent temper, to admirable comeliness, looking everywhere about him, lest there be any spot, or wrinkle, or blemish, which may spoil that beauty and comeliness." <sup>g</sup> He will be cast into hell if he be not thus accurate about every one; all exactness as to himself will not secure him. "A bishop," says he, "though he order his own life well, if he do not exactly take care of thee, and of all that are under him, to hell he goes with the wicked. And often he that miscarries not by his own concerns, is ruined by yours, although he very well rectify all that belongs to him." <sup>h</sup>

The pastoral duties which he is to perform to all his flock, are many, and painful, and hazardous. "When the apostle says, ἀγρυπνοῦσι, they watch for your souls, it speaks thousands of labours, and cares, and perils, <sup>i</sup> διεγγέρεθαι δεῖ, he ought to be up still, and to be ardent in spirit, and, as I may say, to breathe fire, (πῦρ πνέειν,) and to go the rounds night and day, more than any commander in an army, and to labour, and to toil, and to take care of, and be very solicitous for all. <sup>k</sup> Λόγον μὲν δώσομεν, &c. "We must give an account of all your souls, when we have been defective in anything, when we have not comforted, or not admonished, or not convinced." <sup>l</sup>

This should be done, not only publicly, but privately also, both to men and women; "For a bishop," says he, "who regards all his flock,

<sup>a</sup> In Act. Hom. viii. p. 655.

<sup>d</sup> In Act. Hom. iii. p. 626.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. Orat. iv. p. 24.

<sup>f</sup> In 1 Tim. Hom. x. p. 286.

<sup>b</sup> In Act. *ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> De Sacerd. Orat. ii.

<sup>g</sup> In Johann. Hom. lxxxvi. p. 922.

<sup>h</sup> In Eph. Hom. xi. p. 824.

<sup>i</sup> In 1 Tim. Hom. x. pp. 285, 286.

<sup>j</sup> Ibid. p. 10.

<sup>k</sup> In Rom. Hom. p. 226.

must not take care only of the men in particular, and neglect the women, but of necessity must visit them when distressed, and comfort them when in sorrows, and rebuke them when they are careless, and relieve them when under pressures." <sup>a</sup> Unless he daily go to their houses—he will be much exposed. <sup>b</sup> Further he is, says he, accountable for all and every soul, for all their sins, for the damnation of every one that perishes any way through his default. In Heb. xiii. 17. *ὁ γὰρ φόβος*, "The dread of that threatening," says he, "continually shakes my soul; for, if he that offends but one (Matt. xviii. 6) shall suffer so much, what then shall they suffer, what punishment shall they endure, under whom so many miscarry? &c. Want of experience will be no excuse, nor ignorance, nor necessity, nor force. One of the flock may sooner be excused for his own sins, than bishops for the sins of others; and therefore punishment is unavoidable, if any one (in his charge) happen to perish. We must be accountable for a business that requires the virtue of angels." <sup>c</sup> "He is exposed to so great danger, though what concerns himself be in good condition, if what belongs to thee be not well ordered, he is obnoxious, and must give a double account." <sup>d</sup> "He that has the charge of a great city, see to how great flame he exposes himself; he shall be called to account not only for the souls that perish, (and he destroys them being one that fears not God) but for all the things that are not acted by him he shall be responsible. Of all the sins that are committed by him, yea, by all the people shall he give account. And if he that offends but one, &c., he that offends so many souls, whole cities and people, many thousand souls, men, women, children, citizens, husbandmen, those in the cities, those in places belonging to it, what shall he undergo? If thou say thrice more than the other, thou sayest nothing; so very great is the punishment and suffering that he is liable to." <sup>e</sup> *Ἀγροπνεῖ*, &c. "He watches, he hazards his own head, he is liable to the punishment of their sins; and for this is his condition so fearful." <sup>f</sup>

Hence it is marvellous to him if any bishops escape damnation. *Θαυμάζω*, &c. "I wonder," says he, "if any of the bishops can ever be saved, considering the greatness of the threatening, and their negligence, any of them especially who are greedy of so great a charge, who run upon it, *ἐπιτρέχοντας*." <sup>g</sup> He calls them miserable wretches that desire it, and is astonished at them, *τὶ ἄν τις εἴποι*, &c. What can one say to those wretches, who plunge themselves into such an abyss of sufferings? Thou must give an account for all whom thou rulest, women, men, children; into so great flame dost thou thrust thine own head. If those that are forced

<sup>a</sup> De Sacerd. Orat. vi. p. 49.

<sup>d</sup> In 2 Tim. Hom. ii. p. 336.

<sup>f</sup> In Heb. Hom. xxxiv. p. 602.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. Orat. iii. p. 29.

<sup>e</sup> In Tit. Hom. i. p. 384.

<sup>g</sup> In Heb. *ibid.* and in Act. Hom. iii. p. 627.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. Orat. vi. p. 44.

on it, be unpardonable, not well ordering it; how much more those that labour for it! Such a one does much more deprive himself of all pardon; he ought to fear and tremble." <sup>a</sup> Elsewhere, "I am astonished, says he, "at those who seek such a weighty charge. Wretched and miserable man, dost thou see what thou seekest? canst thou answer for one soul? When thou hast got this dignity, consider to the punishment of how many souls thou art liable." <sup>b</sup> He cries out astonished at the greatness of the hazard, *βάβαι πόσος ὁ κίνδυνος.*" <sup>c</sup>

Before I proceed with this excellent person, let us look a little back on the premises. If there must be so much care and watchfulness in a bishop over every soul; if so many duties in public and private are to be performed by him to every one, and if when any sin is committed for want of his care and watchfulness, or due measure thereof, or any neglect of, yea, or remissness, in any of those duties, it will be the bishop's guilt, if any soul perish through omission, or defectiveness, or undue performance, the blood of it will be required at his hands; <sup>d</sup> well might he prefer a diocese with one communion-table, before the biggest *βουστάσιον* that a large country can afford; well might he say as he does, <sup>e</sup> *ἐπιπονον*, &c. "It is very burdensome to have the charge of a hundred and fifty souls." But it had been too little if he had said a thousand times more than I have alleged, against the desperate wretchedness and blindness of those who are forward to take charge of so many, as [that] it is impossible they should be duly watchful over an hundredth part of them, and never perform any one of those duties to many thousands of them. But he thought it to no purpose to speak to such (*οὐ γὰρ μοι περὶ ἐκείνων*, &c.) who come to such a charge as their ease, and give themselves to sloth and remissness; and yet take a charge, and admit but one there to be a pastor, which requires the utmost diligence of a thousand pastors. What does the guilt of millions of sins, the blood of myriads of souls weigh upon such heads?

Moreover, hereby it is evident that Chrysostom (the best writers in those times concurring with him) would have a church no larger, and could not count it tolerable for any one to have a flock consisting of more than he could take exact and particular notice of, and discharge all pastoral duties to, and be accountable for, without apparent hazard of his soul. Such principles would not admit of very large bishoprics, when the measures of them were set out, with respect to duty and future account; these would confine them to narrow bounds. When these measures were laid aside, they grew larger; but how little this great person would have been satisfied with such enlargement, and what

<sup>a</sup> In Heb. Hom. xxxiv. p. 602.

<sup>b</sup> In Heb. Hom. [xxxiv.] p. 602.

<sup>c</sup> Hom. in Ignat.

<sup>d</sup> In Tit. Hom. i. p. 384.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Orat. vi. de Sacerd. p. 44

methods he thought needful to retrench some excess in his times, (though little compared with that in after ages) will appear by what follows. He apprehended the excessive greatness of a church under one bishop, to be of pernicious and damnable consequence to all sorts. Churches were not such then generally, but in a manner only in very great cities, (such as that wherein he presided ;) that which swelled them so big there, was the admitting and tolerating in their communion all that called themselves Christians, though they neither were such indeed, nor lived like such. Against this, he resolves to bend all his endeavours, though the church were thereby like to be reduced to a small number. This is the next head of those before propounded.

Thirdly, He is peremptory, that the unworthy multitude should be expelled, *Kaì γὰρ*, &c. "For the sheep that are full of the scab, and abound with diseases, should not be folded together with the sound, but driven from the fold, until they be cured."<sup>a</sup> And by the expressions he uses frequently, he signifies that it was his opinion, that the church would lose nothing by such an evacuation, but that corruption which both endangered and defaced her ; that though the tumour fell, and the body were lessened, yet it would be more sound and healthful, parting with nothing in the loss of such bulkiness, but the matter of their disease, and the cause of their deformity. That through the neglect of such a course, by those who were concerned to pursue it, all went to wreck and ruin. That this indulgence was such a sin, as could scarce expect pardon ; and for his part he resolved not to involve himself in that guilt, as apprehensive that he could never answer such a neglect of Christ's laws, before his dreadful tribunal ; and though he lost the most of his people by it, yea, though he should lose his place for it, yet would he empty the church of those corrupt multitudes.

"Through the neglect of such a course all went to wreck, *πάντα οἴχεται* ; all goes to wreck and is ruined, and the reason is, because those that sin are not censured, and those that rule are distempered," citing 1 Tim. v. 22.

"This indulgence was such a sin as could scarce expect pardon, *τίνα ἔξομεν συγγνώμην*, &c. What pardon can we expect, corrupting all by such indulgence ? there was reason to look for greater severity than Eli met with."<sup>b</sup>

He resolved not to involve himself in such guilt, because he could never give an account of it. "I will not," says he, "tolerate, I will not admit you, neither will I suffer you to come over these thresholds ; let who will withdraw ; let who will complain of me. For what need have I of a multitude that are diseased ?—I will forbear none : for when I

<sup>a</sup> In Johann. Hom. lxiii. p. 824

<sup>b</sup> In Matth. Hom. xvii. p. 125.

shall be judged before the tribunal of Christ, you will stand afar off, and your favour will nothing avail me, when I am called to account.<sup>a</sup> Ἀπαγορεύσω, &c. I will forbid you hereafter to pass over these thresholds, and to partake of the immortal mysteries, as if you were fornicators, or adulterers, or accused of murder : for it is better to join in prayer with two or three that observe God's law, than to assemble a multitude of transgressors, and such as debauch the rest. Let no rich man, let none that is potent swell here, and show his superciliousness ; I regard these no more than a tale, or a shadow, or a dream ; none of the wealthy will then relieve me, when I shall be challenged and accused, as not having vindicated the laws of God with due severity."<sup>b</sup>

He would empty the church of those refractory multitudes, though he lost many of his flock by it. " But there are, say they, other sects, and they will turn to them, (if they meet with such severity as before he had threatened,) ψυχρὸς οὔτος ὁ λόγος, this is a foolish saying ; it is better to have one doing the will of God, than ten thousand transgressors. And which had you rather choose, (tell me,) to have many fugitive and thievish servants, or one that is well disposed ? Let who will withdraw, let who will complain, I will spare none. Such words spoil all, that he may depart, (they say) and turn to another sect."<sup>c</sup>

Yea, though he should lose his bishopric by such a course, the fear of it should not hinder or retard him : " I will expel, I will interdict those that are not obedient ; as long as I sit in this chair, I will suffer none of his commands to be neglected. If any one displace me I shall then be unaccountable ; but so long as I am liable to an account, I cannot connive, not only in regard of my own punishment, but of your salvation."<sup>d</sup>

And what great numbers would have been excluded the church by this course, considering the great degeneracy and corruptions of those times, which he so often, so pathetically complains of, will appear by the particulars in his account liable to this process, and the vast extent thereof. He would have excluded from communion, " Not only murderers, adulterers, fornicators, swearers,<sup>e</sup> but the unmerciful,<sup>f</sup> the covetous,<sup>g</sup> the envious,<sup>h</sup> the profuse otherwise, but uncharitable to the poor,<sup>i</sup> the superstitious,<sup>k</sup> symbolisers with foreign rites, either Jewish,<sup>l</sup> or heathenish,<sup>m</sup> frequenters of plays,<sup>n</sup> those that neglected sermons to follow their sports.<sup>o</sup> And not only those that neglected what was good, and

<sup>a</sup> In Coloss. Hom. vii. p. 128.

<sup>c</sup> In Coloss. Hom. vii. p. 128.

<sup>e</sup> In Matth. Hom. xvii. p. 125.

<sup>f</sup> In Matth. Hom. [lxxxii.] p. 514. and [Hom. xv.] in I Cor. p. 337.

<sup>h</sup> In Matth. Hom. xl. p. 269.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 134. <sup>l</sup> Cont. Jud. tom. vi. p. 373.

<sup>n</sup> In Johann. Hom. i. p. 558. and tom. v. p. 39.

<sup>b</sup> In Matth. Hom. xvii. pp. 125, 126.

<sup>d</sup> In Act. Hom. vii. p. 656.

<sup>g</sup> Page 515.

<sup>j</sup> In Coloss. Hom. vii. p. 128.

<sup>k</sup> In Heb. Hom. iv. p. 454.

<sup>o</sup> In Gen. Hom. vi. p. 33.

acted what was evil, but evil speakers too.<sup>a</sup> "Whosoever was wicked,"<sup>b</sup> ἀμαρτωλός. "Whosoever was not cleansed from his sin, ἀκαθάρτος.<sup>c</sup> Whosoever was not a true disciple, but a counterfeit, as Judas was.<sup>d</sup> Whosoever is not καθαρός, pure.<sup>e</sup> What then, whom shall we admit? says he, neither those that come but once a year, nor those that come often, nor those that come seldom; but those that come with a pure heart, and with an untainted life; let such as these have access always, but those that are not such, not so much as once at any time; because they receive judgment to themselves, and condemnation, and punishment, and severity," &c.

Whosoever is not holy, ἅγιος, which is more than the former; and he took it to be the sense of the church, expressed of old in their solemn communion, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις; and so he explains it. "If any one be not holy, let him have no access; he says not only, if he be clear of wickedness, but if he be holy, for freedom from wickedness does not make one holy, but the presence of the Spirit, and plenty of good works." "I would not only," says he, "have them freed from dirt, but to be white and beautiful."<sup>f</sup> In fine, all that are under the guilt of any sin, which excludes from the kingdom of heaven.<sup>g</sup> "It seems to me the speech is concerning the leaven, and it reaches the priests, who suffer much of the old leaven to be within, and do not purge it out of their confines, that is, out of the church; the covetous, the extortioner, and whatsoever excludes from the kingdom of heaven."

Now taking this course to which he was drawn by the authority of Christ, the enforcements of conscience, and so many and so cogent reasons; what a thin church would he have left himself, (though he presided in one of the most populous cities in the world,) we may easily discern by the premises, if withal we add what he tells his auditory.<sup>h</sup> "How many do you think in the city will be saved? It is an odious thing I am going to say, but I will say it notwithstanding; there is not amongst so many myriads (which he tells us elsewhere were one hundred thousand) a hundred to be found that will be saved,<sup>i</sup> yea, and I question," adds he, "whether so many." He alleges the general corruption of all sorts, old and young, as the reason why his charity was no more extensive. "And<sup>k</sup> all things," says he, "are ruined and corrupted, and the church differs little from a stable of beasts, or a fold of asses and camels; and I go about seeking to find one sheep, but I can see none." Affording these passages the allowance which is requisite in like cases,

<sup>a</sup> [Hom. xvi.] in 1 Cor. p. 540.

<sup>c</sup> In Matth. Hom. lxxxii. p. 515. and Hom. [I.] in Tit. p. 384.

<sup>e</sup> In Heb. Hom. xvii. p. 523.

<sup>f</sup> In 1 Cor. Hom. 15. [p. 337.]

<sup>h</sup> Page 753.

<sup>b</sup> In 1 Tim. Hom. v. p. 270.

<sup>d</sup> In Matth. ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. pp. 524, 525.

<sup>g</sup> In Act. Hom. 24.

<sup>i</sup> In Jo. Hom. lxxxviii. p. 544.

and understanding, by not one, very few, and we have the church to which Chrysostom's principles and conscience confined him ;—principles too severe indeed, for that dissolute and degenerate age, into which he was fallen; and so his pursuing them, was the occasion of his fall, if that may be called a fall, which exalted him to an honour, little less than that of martyrdom.

But suppose the multitudes in his diocese had been such, as he endeavoured to make them; it may be inquired, whether then he would have been content with so numerous a flock.

*Ans.* This was never the happiness of any bishop, and so it is not to be supposed; but to proceed upon it: his principles before specified, obliged him to grasp no more for his particular charge, than he could perform all pastoral duties to, so as he might give a comfortable account thereof; yet he might have been better satisfied with a very numerous flock, if they had been qualified according to his desires; and a large diocese of such a constitution had been more tolerable, in the circumstances wherein he and others were at that time: for there were many more pastors within that place where he presided; he was not so strangely arrogant as to count himself the sole pastor of so large a city; all sense and conscience of a pastoral charge was not then lost; there were very many who were both to rule and feed that flock, not he alone; and betwixt him and them, he declares there was no difference at all, but only in point of ordination.<sup>a</sup>

For their number, there is reason to judge them above an hundred; the great church had sixty presbyters at its first establishment, and those increased till Justinian's time, as he shows.<sup>b</sup> And in all the rest we may well suppose there were as many. The number of Christians, good and bad, the sects also included, was one hundred thousand, as he tells us.<sup>c</sup> Now allow a fifth part to the sects, no more will remain for the charge of one hundred or one hundred and ten pastors, than has been made account of in one parish in London; and being divided among so many, the charge of each would be no more than a small congregation.

This may be said to be a query, grounded on a supposition, which had no place there nor elsewhere, but in imagination. But in the condition wherein he really was, he would have had a church in his and their charge, more than a hundred times less, than the corruption of that age (which he so much laments) had swelled it to, since he thought himself obliged to exclude so many from the privileges of Christians, so that one of the greatest churches and bishoprics in the fifth age con-

<sup>a</sup> Hom. xi. in 1 Tim.

<sup>b</sup> Nov. iii.

<sup>c</sup> In Acts. Hom. xi.

tained not many more *de facto*, than some one of our parishes; but *de jure*, Chrysostom being judge, too few to be spoken of, if it had been pruned as he thought it necessary.

## CHAPTER IX.

LET me, in the last place, take notice of something which may be inferred from the premises, or which they otherwise offer to our observation.

The change of the primitive form of churches made a great alteration in the government of the church, dissolving it in a manner by degrees, and reducing it very near to anarchy.

For when the bishop could not be content with a moderate charge, such as he was capable to manage, but extended it to such a largeness, that it became ungovernable by him, τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀναρχίαν εἰκότως κεκλήκας, (as Isidore,<sup>a</sup> of a bishop of his time,) “this pretended ruling was no longer government, but anarchy.” When one church, though consisting of as many as the church of the ancient bishop did ordinarily comprise, and of more than new or old was any way sufficient alone to govern, would not suffice him; but under pretence, that it was his office and prerogative to rule many such, he did not set himself to govern any one more than another, nor would admit any other ruler or pastor in all or any of them but himself; the churches were, and could not but be left without government. Thus, to use Basil’s words, ἀναρχία τις δεινὴ ἀπὸ φιλαρχίας ταύτης τοῖς λαοῖς ἐπεχώμασεν,<sup>b</sup> “through this ambition of governing all, all church government came to nothing.” As if a pilot, who can be but in one ship at once, and is not sufficient to steer that alone, should undertake to do this for twenty, or a hundred, or five hundred ships; and should get it ordered under severe penalties, that none else should meddle with a helm but himself; those ships will be steered, and those churches in like circumstances will be governed alike. It is all one in effect, as if there were no helm in the ships, no government in the churches. Zosimus, censuring the Romans for committing the rule of the empire (so large a diocese) to one man’s discretion, (though such a man as Augustus,) says, they minded not, that hereby they hazarded the hopes of the universe, as it were upon the throw of a die, ἔλαθον ἑαυτοὺς κύβων

<sup>a</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. cccix.

<sup>b</sup> De Spir. Sauc. cap. ult

*ἀναρρίψαντες ἐπὶ ταῖς πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἔλπισι*; adding, “that if he were minded to rule them duly and justly, it was impossible at so great a distance; if tyrannically, it would be intolerable; and in fine, there was necessity,” says he, “that the unreasonable authority of one man should prove *κοινὸν δυστύχημα*,” “a common calamity.” I leave the application of this to others, only take along herewith the judgment of Chrysostom, “that it was far more easy for a prince to rule the universe, than for a bishop to govern one town.”<sup>b</sup> But what might Zosimus have said, if Augustus ruling the place where he was, no more than the remoter parts, would have admitted no other governor in places near or remote, but himself alone; would not he and all have concluded, that the empire must unavoidably be left to the miseries of anarchy? It is true, there seems a great difference betwixt an empire and a diocese; but there is also a great latitude in impossibilities: as a man cannot possibly jump into the moon; so neither is it possible for him to spring up twenty miles into the air.

This clears up to us a considerable practice of the primitive church. In the apostles’ times, and divers ages after, all the people under the inspection of one bishop, were wont to meet together, not only for worship, but other church administrations; all public acts passed at assemblies of the whole people; they were consulted with; their concurrence was thought necessary, and their presence required; that nothing might pass without their cognisance, satisfaction, and consent. This was observed, not only in elections of officers, but in ordinations and censures; in admission of members, and reconciling of penitents, and in debates and consultations about other emergencies. There is such evidence for this in ancient writers, particularly in Cyprian, almost in every one of his epistles, (where we have a more satisfying account of the government of the church, and the exercise of in those times, than in many volumes of the following age,) that it is acknowledged by modern writers of all sorts, such as are the most learned and best acquainted with antiquity.

And when this is granted, it cannot be denied, that of old the bishop’s charge was as small as we represent it: for it may be easily conceived how all the people might use this liberty and privilege, when the bishop had but one church; but if his diocese had been of a modern size, or anything near it, this had been altogether impracticable.

In short, the enlarging of bishoprics so much beyond the ancient bounds, so as the people were deprived of their primitive privilege, and could not have the moderate liberty of intervening at all in church affairs, by themselves, or any to represent them, inferred a great, if not

<sup>a</sup> Hist lib. i. p. 4. [Ed. Oxon. 1679, p. 6.]

<sup>b</sup> In Act. Hom. iii. p. 626.

an essential change in the government of the church. Whereas before it was mixed, and had something of a popular cast, (as there is in the best forms of civil government;) hereupon the people's interest being excluded, it became absolute. It was no longer, as Plato says it was sometimes at Athens, and as Grotius tells us it was in the primitive church, *ἀριστοκρατία μετ' εὐδοκίας τοῦ πλῆθους*,<sup>a</sup> "an aristocracy ordering all things with the good liking of the people."

Hereby an account may be given of the great diversity of rites and usages in the ancient churches. A single congregation was a competent charge for a primitive bishop; so that episcopal churches were greatly multiplied; each of such churches had power to govern and order itself, and had so followed such orders as every church thought fit, without being obliged to conform to those of others. They had no rule nor order, in things of this nature, requiring invariable observance; nor did they regard such uniformity as others, many hundred years after, in ages as many times worse, seem fond of. None of those churches used the same prayers, nor the Lord's Prayer but only at the eucharist. All of them had not the same creed, nor used any at their public worship, but what was repeated by the catechumens at baptism. They had not the same rites in baptism, or the Lord's supper, nor the same way in confirming, marrying, or burying. They used not the same mode either in reading the Scriptures, or singing. They observed not the same methods in admitting members, or preparing them for communion, neither in proceeding to censures, nor reconciling penitents. They differed in their habits and postures. They varied in their fasts, both for time and manner. They observed not the same festivals; nor more, I think, than two of the many that are now observed. So very various were their usages in the primitive ages, each preferring their own, and declining others. Such as this, and what might be showed in more instances, was the uniformity of the ancient churches. That which is now admired appears hereby to be a mere novelty. How far were they from counting it worthy of Christian pastors, to make this more their business, than the suppressing of sin, and promoting of real holiness! And who can believe, that they design, or understand Christian peace and unity, who hurry all into divisions and confusions, for haste after that which the best churches thought not worth looking after? Those that have read the ancients, and observed their usages, will question none of this, and so there is no need to bring particular authorities to confirm it. Only this in general. In Egypt, Sozomen tells us, many cities and villages not only differed from the observances of Alexandria, and other towns in that country, but from all other churches besides.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Annot. in Act. vi. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Hist. lib. vii. cap. xix

In Africa, Austin expresses the diversities to be innumerable, *nec tamen omnia commemorari potuerint.*<sup>a</sup> In other parts of the Latin church, Italy particularly, Innocent the First says, that several churches had their several modes of celebrating, *diversè in diversis locis, vel ecclesiis obtineri, aut celebrari videntur.*<sup>b</sup> In the Greek church, and elsewhere, Socrates gives a large account of their different rites and usages,<sup>c</sup> where, after abundance of instances, he says, to reckon up all is not only difficult, but impossible, *ἐργῶδες μᾶλλον δὲ ἀδύνατον.*<sup>d</sup> And yet there was no hurt in all this, so long as there was an agreement in the faith, if we will believe one of the greatest prelates in the west, and that at no less than six hundred years' distance from Christ, *in una fide nihil officit sanctæ ecclesiæ diversa consuetudo*, saith Gregory the First; "where there is one faith, it is no harm to the church if there be diversity of usages;" that is, the church has no harm for want of uniformity. Nay, the faith has advantage by difference in rites, says Irenæus to Victor,<sup>e</sup> *ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησι*, "a diversity in less matters commends the church, when there is an agreement in points of faith."

This may restrain us from charging one another with schism for such things, wherein the ancient churches are like to be involved in the same condemnation.

In the best ages of Christianity, they were still erecting new churches in towns and country places, as appears by the former discourse.

The bishops did commonly consent that such churches should be constituted of Christians in their vicinity; or, if they refused unreasonably, it was done without their consent. The bishops of Gaza are instances hereof.

Those churches were single congregations, settled under peculiar officers of their own choosing, viz., a pastor or bishop, and usually one or more assistants.

By these they were governed and ordered without subjection to any rulers of other churches. Cyprian, in the middle of the third age, (who well knew the current sense and practice of those times,) declares, that none of them then did take themselves to be bishops of bishops, *neque enim quisquam nostrum se episcopum episcoporum constituit.* And when metropolitans got place in the churches, they had no ruling power over other pastors, but a mere presidency in their assemblies, where the rule was, (as the council that first authorised them decreed,) *κρατεῖται ἡ τῶν πλειόνων ψῆφος*, "that all should be carried by plurality of voices."<sup>f</sup>

Those single churches had severed<sup>g</sup> assemblies, and held distinct communion from other churches: they did not think themselves bound to

<sup>a</sup> *Retract. lib. ii. cap. xx.*

<sup>c</sup> See Sozom. ubi supra.

<sup>b</sup> *Epist. ad Decentium.*

<sup>d</sup> In Euseb. lib. v. cap. xxvi

<sup>g</sup> separate.

<sup>e</sup> *Hist. lib. v. cap. xxii.*

<sup>f</sup> *Conc. Nic. Can. vi.*

conform to any other church; either near to them, or further off, in rites, forms, or other observances of this nature. They owned no rule obliging them to use the same prayers, the same gestures, the same vestments or modes of administration; but every pastor had power to order himself in such things according to his discretion; and it was judged tyrannical for one to prescribe to another, and all power of imposing expressly disclaimed.<sup>a</sup> *Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suas adegit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis sue arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare.*<sup>b</sup> “None of us takes upon himself to be a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical intimidation to bring his colleagues to subserviency, since every bishop possesses a judgment of his own by virtue of his individual liberty and power; and as he cannot be judged by any other, so neither can he himself judge any other.”

*Nemini prescribentes aut præjudicantes, quo minus unusquisque episcoporum quod putaverit faciat,*<sup>c</sup> &c. “We neither dictate to any, nor forestall the judgment of any, in order that every bishop may act according to his own opinion.”

*Nemini præscribentes, quo minus statuat unusquisque præpositus quod putat, actus sui rationem domino redditurus.*<sup>d</sup> “We dictate to no one, in order that every bishop may decide according to his own judgment, as being to give account of what he does to the Lord.”

And thus those churches continued, though they were condemned by the civil laws, and forbidden by the magistrates, for three hundred years and more.

These severals<sup>e</sup> are either clear by the premises, or will not be questioned by any who are not strangers to antiquity. And if nothing of schism be found in all this, they are not to be charged with it, who are now in the like circumstances. This cannot be done with justice or charity, no nor with prudence neither; for those who accuse others of schism for dissenting from them, in those things wherein the accusers depart from the universal church in the best ages, will find the charge recoil upon themselves; seeing it is not to be doubted, but in time it will be counted less schismatical, to imitate the universal church retaining her integrity; than to differ from those who propose the wracks and ruins of the church for their exemplar.

Hereby it appears, with what judgment and charity, some amongst us will have none to be true churches that want diocesan bishops. If by a diocesan they understand one who is the sole pastor of many

<sup>a</sup> St. Jerom. p. 372.

<sup>b</sup> Cypr. in Conc. Carthag.

<sup>c</sup> Id. Epist. ad Jubian. [Ep. lxxiii.]

<sup>d</sup> Id. Epist. ad Mag. [Ep. lxxvi. (al. lxxix.)]

<sup>e</sup> particulars.

churches ; they hereby blast all the churches in the apostles' times, and the best ages after, as no churches, for none of these had any such diocesans ; and so herein they are as wise and friendly, as if one, to secure the height of his own turret, should attempt to blow up all the houses in the best part of the world. Nay, they blow up their own too : for hereby they deny both the beginning, and succession of churches for divers hundred years. And if there were no churches then, they will not dream there can be any now ; seeing by their principles the being of them now, depends upon the beginning, and uninterrupted succession of them. There can be no succeeding at all, where there is no beginning ; no uninterrupted succession, where there is a total failure for whole ages.

So likewise it is hereby manifest, that there were no diocesan churches in those ancient times ; I mean many churches united under one bishop, as their sole ruler and pastor. No such thing appears for divers whole ages after Christ. The ancient bishop had but one church, one temple, one communion-table, where all that belonged to him might communicate together. Petavius could discover no more churches in any city but one. In the fourth age there were indeed, in some cities, some other places where Christians held assemblies for other offices ; but none but one for the eucharist. Those places were called *tituli* at Rome, *lauræ* at Alexandria. I find them nowhere else, but in those two cities, so early ; but they were like chapels of ease rather than churches. Epiphanius reckons up above ten of them in Alexandria ; but we have more in some one parish in England, yet the vicar there was never counted a diocesan. Much less were there any diocesan churches of that largeness, whereof those that write for them amongst us, do usually take them, as comprising all the churches in a great shire, yea, in many counties together ; for such a circuit of old was a province, or more than a province, though that comprised multitudes of their ecclesiastical dioceses. No single bishop was then allowed to be such a pluralist. It was thought enough for a metropolitan, if not for a patriarch, to have the superintendency of such a country cantoned into multitudes of bishops under him. Yea, many metropolitans together had not so large a circuit for their inspection as some one modern diocese. The greater Phrygia, if I much mistake not, was scarce bigger than the diocese of Lincoln, and yet had in it seven or eight metropolitans, viz., of Laodicea, Synnada, Hierapolis, Amorium, Cotyæum, Apamea, Chonæ, &c. And to one of them, viz., Laodicea, belonged more bishops than all England has ; that, and Synnada only, had more bishops than England, Scotland, and Wales.

Those that plead for such bishops, plead for more than diocesans, prodigiously more extending their jurisdiction to multitudes of towns

and their territories, each of which would have been thought sufficient for a bishop's diocese of old. For divers had no territory in their episcopal charge; and others, and the most of them, had no territory larger than that of a parish, (such as we have many,) which will not be allowed to be called a diocese without laughter. And where the region was larger, and replenished with Christians, usually there was some bishop, or many in the territory, besides him in the city: for, as we showed before, to settle bishops in country places and villages, and towns no bigger than villages, was the free and frequent practice of the church, without any show of restraint till the middle of the fourth age; and if they had proceeded in that course, probably within the compass of another age, every country town, or handsome village, where Christianity prevailed, would have had its bishop, as M[r.] T[aylor] a learned prelatist (better acquainted with the state of the ancient church, than those who have the confidence to affirm, that here were never bishops in villages) tells us, it was in Africa. And why they should not have proceeded still in the same course in other places, no reason is given, (by those who gave some check to it) either from Scripture, or ancient constitution, or practice. But some solicitous for such honour for bishops, as former and better times showed no regard of, thought it not fit to have bishops so common, that they might have more honour. In short, since they will have a city with all the region to be a diocese, it is hereby manifest, that neither he that presided in the city, nor he that was bishop in the country, could be counted a diocesan, since neither had more for his share than part of a diocese, in the modern acceptation of the word.

Hereby also some mistakes about episcopal ordinations, of ill consequence, may be rectified. A bishop, in the best ages of Christianity, was no other than the pastor of a single church. A pastor of a single congregation is now as truly a bishop. They were duly ordained in those ages, who were set apart for the work of the ministry by the pastor of a single church, with the concurrence of some assistants. Why they should not be esteemed to be duly ordained, who are accordingly set apart by a pastor of a single church now, I can discern no reason, after I have looked every way for it. Let something be assigned, which will make an essential difference herein; otherwise they that judge such ordinations, here, and in other reformed churches, to be nullities, will hereby declare all the ordinations in the ancient church for three or four hundred years, to be null and void, and must own the dismal consequences that ensue thereof. They that will have no ordinations, but such as are performed by one, who has many churches under him; maintain a novelty, never known nor dreamed of in the ancient churches, while their state was tolerable. They may as well say the ancient church had never a bishop, (if their interest did not hinder, all the

reason they make use of in this case would lead them to it,) as deny that a reformed pastor has no power to ordain, because he is not a bishop. He has episcopal ordination, even such as the canons require, being set apart by two or three pastors at least, who are as truly diocesans as the ancient bishops, for some whole ages. He is also elected by the people; and of old, he could never be, nor be accounted, a bishop, whatever ordination he had, that was not so elected. And besides, he has as large a diocese as most in the best times of the church; and so makes it his business to feed and rule the flock, and exercise the power of the keys. But if it be said, he has no superiority over presbyters, nor any under him; it may be answered, that this is not necessary for a bishop in the judgment of the most learned prelatists; particularly D[r.] H[ammond] maintains, that there were no subject presbyters in Scripture times, but bishops alone without them; and supposes a great part of this church <sup>a</sup> to be of his persuasion. The council of Sardica taking care that a bishop should be no way lessened, allows a bishop to be made in any place for which one presbyter is not sufficient; so that in the judgment of those fathers, one assistant may be enough for a bishop. In the third council of Carthage, <sup>b</sup> Posthumianus inquiring whether, if a bishop had but one presbyter, he might be removed from him; Bishop Bilson <sup>c</sup> infers from thence, that bishops often had but one presbyter, and that one might be translated to another place. It was ordinary of old to have metropolitans, or archbishops, without any bishops under them. In the Greek church we meet with such almost in every province; and no reason can be given, why they might not as well be bishops without any presbyters under them. However, that superiority over presbyters which is challenged in later times, is quite another thing than it was of old; and may with more reason be thought to lift him who affects it above a bishop, than to leave him who declines it below one.

In fine, by this we may give an account why they admitted but of one bishop in a city. When the Christians were no more in a city than made up one church, which one communion-table would serve; one bishop, with some assistants, of the same power, though of another denomination, were counted sufficient. But this came afterwards to be drawn into other consequences than was at first intended. For when Christians were so multiplied, heathens and others being reduced, (as they were in some greater cities,) that it was necessary to distribute them into several churches, they would have but one bishop still, pleading for it ancient custom, when the reason of the usage was gone. However, this was less considerable while the presbyters, fixed to the several churches in such cities, retained the power of pastors or bishops, and

<sup>a</sup> The English Church.

<sup>b</sup> Can. xlv.

<sup>c</sup> Perpetual Government, p. 302.

there was no difference betwixt them and him to whom the title of bishop was appropriated, but only in point of ordaining others; as Jerome and Chrysostom affirm there was not: for the difference herein was but small, *οὐ πολὺ τὸ μεσόν*, says Chrysostom,<sup>a</sup> and Theophylact after him, *ferme nihil*, as it is rendered, “next to nothing.” For this power or privilege inferred<sup>b</sup> no superiority in him that had it, since inferiors did, in the ordinary practice of the ancient church, ordain their superiors; bishops consecrated metropolitans, or primates, or patriarchs. And though some now will have it to make that of bishops a different order; yet, then it made neither difference in order nor degree, as may be evident by an instance or two. The bishops of Cyprus, and other places, that were *αὐτοκέφαλοι*,<sup>c</sup> had power to ordain their own metropolitans.<sup>d</sup> The bishops of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, &c. had not the power to ordain them; yet all those bishops were so far from differing in order, that they did not differ in degree: besides, the bishop of Meletius’s party in Egypt were, by the council of Nice, denied power to ordain any officers, presbyters, or others, without the leave or concurrence of the other bishops in that region; and yet by the same synod were confirmed in the office and dignity of bishops; so that depriving them of that power of ordaining, which other bishops had, did neither degrade them, nor make them officers of another species.<sup>e</sup>

But it seems probable to some, that Chrysostom and Jerome speak only of the Greek church, (or some part of it,) where the former was bishop, and where the latter did most reside and write. Whereas in those places where the presbyters did impose hands in ordaining, as they did in Africa, and other parts of the Latin church, there is not anything which belongs to ordination, which the presbyters did not actually perform: for, that they imposed hands as consenters, and not as ordainers, is a mere shift, without reason to countenance it; and it may be said as reasonably, that when two bishops or more imposed hands with the metropolitan in the ordaining of a bishop, they concurred not as ordainers, but consenters. And in the Greek church, it is sufficiently signified by the synod at Ancyra,<sup>f</sup> that at the time when the synod was holden, and after, the city presbyters might ordain with the bishop’s consent, though he were absent; and that before this restraint they might have done more. However, hereby it appears, that the difference between bishops and presbyters, in respect of their power, was in some places in a manner nothing, in other places nothing at all; so that till the usurpations, beginning in the fourth age, proceeded higher, there were really more bishops in one city, though but one had the name.

<sup>a</sup> In 1 Tim. Hom. xi.

<sup>b</sup> argued.

<sup>c</sup> The *αὐτοκέφαλοι* were metropolitans who were independent of patriarchal jurisdiction.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> Council. [Trull.] [can. 39.]

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Epist. Syn. Nic. ad Alexandrin. [Haddoun, t. i. p. 439.]

<sup>f</sup> Can. xii.