

excluded from his communion, and considered as unworthy of being honoured with a conference.")

He then quotes Firmilian, whose letter, couched in terms of the most cutting irony (of all figures of speech the one least compatible with respect), proceeds as follows:—"Thus, whilst you (Stephen) think it in your power to excommunicate all the world, you have only separated yourself from the communion of the whole Christian Church; nor had the precepts even of an Apostle sufficient weight with you to keep you within the rules of truth and peace, though he hath recorded for your use the following exhortation, 'I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation wherewith you are called: with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace' (Ephesians iv. 1, &c.). With what exactness, now, and diligence, hath Stephen observed these salutary directions of the Apostle, especially in the first article thereof, concerning *lowliness* and *meekness*? For what could be more meek and lowly than his discord with so many Bishops all over the Christian world? Then, his breach of the peace in divers manners, now with his Eastern colleagues (wherewith we suppose you are by this time acquainted), and then with you in the South, from whom he received legates with great long-suffering and meekness, indeed! When he could not admit them to discourse a word with him even in common conversation; and when, in his great and deep regard to the rules of love and charity! he directed all the members of his Church not to receive them into their houses, nor to afford them the common civilities due to strangers! This, forsooth, is keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, to cut himself off from that unity which the law of charity would have obliged him to maintain," &c., &c.

Mosheim then proceeds:—

"The African legates were, therefore, obliged to return home without having accomplished their errand. By what other act than this it could have been rendered more clearly apparent that it was not merely Cyprian, but the whole African Church, whose representatives these Bishops were, that Stephen excluded from all communion with the Roman Church, I cannot possibly conceive"—p. 556.

Unfortunately, the letter addressed by Stephen to Firmilian is not extant—not improbably, as Mosheim suspects, put out of the way or destroyed by unscrupulous adherents of Rome, who wished to conceal the impotent arrogance of Stephen, as Manutius (or rather Cardinal Borromeo, his superior in the matter), attempted to suppress this very epistle of Firmilian to Cyprian by omitting it in the Roman Edition of 1564, "because of what he describes as his abhorrence of the *peritess* and *petulancy* of its writer" towards the Bishop of Rome; in other words, because every line of it proved that neither the Asiatic or African Churches acknowledged either the infallibility or supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

We cannot doubt, however, that Firmilian gives us Stephen's own words when he says, near the close of the letter in question, "Yet is Stephen not ashamed of dividing his brethren in aid and support of heretics; nay, nor of calling Cyprian '*false Christ, false prophet, and deceitful workman*,' all of which characters, his own conscience telling him, were deserved by himself; he hath first drawn out their lineaments, and by ascribing them falsely to another person hath put us in mind that he was himself the true original, with whom they best suited."

It was after all this, but, probably, before Cyprian had actually received Firmilian's letter (or he, no doubt, would have read it at the Council), that Cyprian convened the 3rd Council of Carthage, at which 87 Bishops attended, and at which Cyprian made the memorable address which we have already given (in page 29, supra; and which is well worth a reperusal), and all the proceedings at which are recorded at large in Cyprian's works, the earliest record extant, we believe, of the details of any Christian synod (see Ben. Ed., p. 697).

Having thus shown that St. Cyprian was engaged in a systematic, studied, and even bitter opposition to the judgment of a Roman Prelate and the customs of the Church of Rome—an opposition in which he persisted in spite of the most cogent reasons that Rome could command, and the most powerful denunciations and penalties which Rome could utter or enforce, we now proceed to inquire what is the evidence that he ever retracted his opinions, or was re-admitted before his death into communion with the Church of Rome. The candid and learned Dupin admits that he never did retract or succumb to Rome. "Be this as it may," says Dupin (Eccl. Hist., vol. i, p. 118), "it is certain that St. Cyprian never altered his opinion, and the Greek Churches were long divided upon this question." The onus of proof certainly rests on those who would account for his now being admitted into the canon of the Mass as a Saint, by alleging, in spite of all probability, that he did recant before his martyrdom. Without strong evidence that he did so, the improbability of it would be, with any impartial and

candid mind, decisive against such an assertion. But two years elapsed between Cyprian's most decisive act of opposition, when presiding at the third Council of Carthage, in Sept., A.D. 256, to which we have referred, and his martyrdom, which occurred in Sept., 258. Within that period he wrote many epistles, in none of which he makes any mention whatever of such a change of opinion. That he should, in so short a time, have changed an opinion taken up so warmly, and maintained so pertinaciously; supported, also, by the synods of Iconium and Synada in the East, and the decided support and cordial sympathy of his able friend the Bishop of Cæsarea, to say nothing of the concurrence of the 87 Bishops in the Council of Carthage, is most improbable, and the evidences of his conversion, if it had ever taken place, would have been so valuable to the Church, that it is in the highest degree improbable that, if they ever existed, they would have been suffered to perish. What, however, appears conclusive of the negative is, that no such evidence existed in the time of St. Augustine, who was himself a prelate in the same country, Africa, within little more than 100 years afterwards. St. Augustine, as we have shown in another page, was born in Numidia, A.D. 354, and was Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, from A.D. 395 to 430, while the memory of Cyprian was still held in the greatest veneration. He was warmly engaged in controversy with the Donatists, who boasted much of the authority of Cyprian as an advocate for their opinions concerning baptism. If Cyprian ever retracted his opinions on that subject and conformed to those of Rome, it seems to be impossible that his fellow-countryman, St. Augustine, should not have known of that recantation; yet that he did not is beyond a doubt, for he expressly says so in more than one passage of his works; nay, he uses his utmost ingenuity in *conjectures* where he failed in *knowledge*—conjectures, indeed, of the most improbable character, where he could not have failed in *knowledge*, if the fact had been so; for never was any man in more favourable circumstances for collecting evidence of the fact, or under stronger impulses to urge him to acquire it, if there had been any trace whatever of the existence of such a recantation. As to the suggestion that the Donatists had suppressed and destroyed the evidence between the date of Cyprian's martyrdom and the time of St. Augustine, it would be to believe that they were the dominant, instead of the heterodox and defeated party, contrary to the whole testimony of ecclesiastical history, and without the faintest colour of foundation or even probability.

The following are some out of many of the passages in St. Augustine's writings, bearing on the question now under consideration.

In his epistle to Vincentius, Bishop of Cartens, he says—"We find that Cyprian held an opinion concerning baptism differing from the rule and custom of the Church; but we find not that he corrected that opinion; but of so great a man it is not incongruous to suppose that he did correct it, and it may, perhaps, have been suppressed by those who were well pleased with his error, and were unwilling to do without the authority of his concurrence."¹

Can any one believe that if St. Augustine could have found the slightest trace of a rumour or tradition on the subject, that he would not have stated and relied on it, instead of putting forward two mere *conjectures* of his own, first, that Cyprian *might* have changed his views; and, secondly, the evidence of his having done so *might* have been suppressed; after the frank admission previously made, that "we don't find that he corrected it."

We shall only trouble our readers with one other passage equally decisive. In his treatise on baptism, written expressly against the Donatists, Augustine thus writes:—"Through the confession of martyrdom, he (Cyprian) ascended to the light of angels, so that *whether or not before, yet there he certainly knows, with the assurance of revelation, the truth of the contrary of his opinion.*"²

What a proof that St. Augustine was unable to assert, with the slightest colour of foundation, that St. Cyprian had changed his opinions on earth, when he says that *at least in Heaven he now knows his error!*³

We, too, believe that St. Cyprian is now in Heaven, where neither sin nor error of any kind can enter. And here we must now leave him, reluctantly closing our review of the works and opinions of this most eminent man, who was, at the same time, one of the earliest and most independent of the ancient Fathers of the Church, and one whose writings, when duly weighed and understood, render him one of the most decisive witnesses against the theory that the See of Rome had, by *divine institution, a supreme power*

¹ "Cyprianus autem sensissæ aliter de baptismo, quam forma et consuetudo habebat Ecclesie, non in canonicis, sed in suis et concilii literis invenitur; *correctissæ autem istam sententiam non invenitur*; non incongruenter tamen de tali viro existimandum est quod correcterit, et fortasse suppressum sit ab eis, qui hoc errore nimium delectati sunt, et tanto velut patricio carere noluerunt.—Ad. Vinc. Rogat., Ep. xciii., tom. ii., p. 216, Ben. Ed.

² Per martyrii confessionem pervenit ad angelicam lucem; ut si non antea, ibi certe revelatum agnosceret, quod cum aliter aperiret sententiam diversæ opinionis vinculo non præposuit unitatis.—De Baptismo, contr. Donat., lib. ii., cap. v. tom. ix. p. 99, Ben. Ed.

³ Optatus, also, it will be recollected, wrote against the Donatists, and his omission also to mention Cyprian's recantation is equally strong, that no such recantation was ever made or heard of. Optatus, it will be recollected, was also an African, and Bishop of Milveis, in Numidia, about the year 370, and could not have failed to have heard of and noticed it, had there been the faintest ground for supposing that St. Cyprian ever changed his opinions.

to regulate the faith and practice of universal Christendom. There, doubtless, are many passages in his earlier writings which show that he thought the See of Peter was a *type* of unity; but none that he thought the Church of Rome the *bond* or *instrument* of unity, much less the *ruling power* by which Christ intended unity to be perpetuated. We have proved that Cyprian taught the equal right of Bishops, and denied both expressly and by implication that the Bishop of Rome had any authority for compelling other Bishops to follow his opinions. Cyprian, making allowance for certain opinions in which he was not ultimately followed by the Church at large, may be safely taken as the representative of early traditions as to the relative positions of the see of Rome and other bishoprics; and, if so, there is no foundation for the claim of Papal supremacy in *tradition* any more than in the Scriptures. Therefore, if it be true that neither Scripture nor the earliest traditions support the claims of Rome to the universal authority and domination she now claims, we may come to the fearless conclusion that **ROME IS NOT, EXCEPT BY USURPATION, THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES.**⁴

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

In concluding our pages on the question of the Supremacy, we intended to have endeavoured to show *how* it was that, without any solid foundation in either Scripture or early tradition, the Bishops of Rome ultimately attained to that vast power which reached its climax in the time of Pope Gregory VII., the notorious Hildebrand, towards the close of the 11th century. We have, however, from time to time so far anticipated this part of our subject, that probably anything we can say now may be considered but a repetition or expansion of what has already sufficiently appeared in our pages.

When, indeed, we consider (to use the words of a writer already referred to) "how many necessary elements of greatness and influence must have coincided in the Roman Pontiff and his Church, we rather wonder that the domination of that See did not sooner assume its ultimate form and extent. Rome was the place of concourse, the centre of wealth, the fountain of honour, the school of literature, the mould of fashion, the court, the palace, the emporium of the whole western world; and the Church of Rome was, probably, at least as large a portion of the population, and sometimes even of the influence of that vast city, that heart of the world, as it was of any other place. The clergy of Rome would become necessarily the centre of communication to the whole Church; they would exceed all others in learning, and in whatever influence arises from accidental circumstances, and hence they *must* have acquired very great importance throughout the whole western world; their favour and recognition would be a passport to the confidence of a thousand Churches; and to be condemned by them would be to be cut off from the respect of all who took from them their tone of thought and feeling. For a while there was a high spirit of ecclesiastical principle counteracting in the Christian Church this influence, else it had not been so long in attaining its full strength; but nature at last prevailed; what we might have anticipated almost certainly, took place, and Rome became the *mistress* of the Church. Had she proved their *mother* also, and not their *step-mother*, she might never have had to lament the loss of so large a portion of the household of faith."⁵

There is still, however, much to say on what we may call the *philosophy* of this great phenomenon; but we find it so admirably treated of already by the eminent writer whom we have so often referred to, Dr. Isaac Barrow, that we think it much better to give our readers a part, at least, of what he says upon the subject in his own forcible, though quaint language, than attempt anything of our own, which must be much less effective; and we hope the sample we are about to give our readers will induce them to read the whole of his argument in the original work for themselves.

The passages we cite are taken verbatim from the celebrated work of Dr. Barrow on the Supremacy, which, in our judgment, is, perhaps, the most complete treatise upon any theological subject extant in any language.

"Having showed," says he, "at large that this universal sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome over the Christian Church hath no real foundation, either in Scripture or elsewhere, it will be requisite to show by what ways and means so groundless a claim and pretence should gain belief and submission to it, from so considerable a part of Christendom; and that from so very slender roots (from slight beginnings, and the slimmest pretences one can well imagine) this bulk of exorbitant power did grow the vastest that ever man on earth did attain, or did ever aim at, will be the less wonderful, if we do consider the many causes which did concur and contribute thereto, some whereof are proposed in the following observations.

"1. Eminency of any kind (in wealth, in honour, in reputation, in might, in place, or mere order of dignity, doth easily pass into advantages of real power and command

⁴ We recommend to our readers, who have not leisure to read the original, and who wish for further information about Cyprian and his writings, "The Life and Times of St. Cyprian," by Rev. Geo. Ayliffe Poole, M.A., published at Oxford by J. H. Parker, 1840; "The Testimony of St. Cyprian against Rome," by the same author, published by James Duncan, London, 1838; and a spirited translation of all the genuine works of St. Cyprian, by Rev. Nath. Marshall, London, 1717.

⁵ Rev. George Ayliffe Poole's Testimony of St. Cyprian, p. 151.

¹ Commentary, p. 544; also Dupin Eccl. Hist., vol. i., p. 117.

² There are several other passages in Firmilian's letter which are well worthy of notice, and which we sincerely regret being unable to give our readers, from want of space; see especially p. 351.

over those who are inferior in those respects, and have any dealings or common transactions with such superiors.

"For to persons endowed with such eminency, by voluntary deference the conduct of affairs is wont to be allowed; none presuming to stand in competition with them, every one rather yielding place to them than to their equals.

"The same conduct of things, upon the same accounts, and by reason of their possession, doth continue fast in their hands, so long as they do retain such advantages.

"Then from a custom of managing things doth spring up an opinion or a pretence of right thereto; they are apt to assume a title, and others ready to allow it.

"Men, naturally, do admire such things, and so are apt to defer extraordinary respect to the possessor of them. Advantages of wealth and might are not only instruments to attain, but incentives spurring men to affect the getting authority over their poorer and weaker neighbours; for men will not be content with bare eminency, but will desire real power and sway, so as to obtain their will over others, and not to be crossed by any. Pope Leo had no reason to wonder that Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, was not content with dry honour. Men are apt to think their honour is precarious, and standeth on an uncertain foundation, if it be not supported with real power, and, therefore, they will not be satisfied to let their advantages lie dead, which are so easily improvable to power, by inveigling some and scaring and constraining others to bear their yoke; and they are able to benefit and gratify some, and thereby render them willing to submit, those afterwards become serviceable to bring others under, who are disaffected or refractory.

"So the Bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem at first had only privileges of honour, but afterwards they soon hooked in power.

"Now, the Roman Bishops from the beginning were eminent above all other Bishops, in all kinds of advantages.

"He was seated in the imperial city, the place of general resort, thence obvious to all eyes, and his name sounding in all mouths. He had a most numerous, opulent, splendid flock and clergy. He had the greatest income (from liberal oblations) to dispose of. He lived in greatest state and lustre. He had opportunities to assist others in their business, and to relieve them in their wants. He necessarily thence did obtain great respect and veneration. Hence, in all common affairs, the conduct and presidency were naturally devolved on him, without contest.

"No wonder, then, that after some time the Pope did arrive to some pitch of authority over poor Christians, especially those who lay nearest to him, improving his eminency into power, and his pastoral charge into a kind of empire; according to that observation of Socrates, that 'long before his time the Roman episcopacy had advanced itself beyond the priesthood into a potency.'

"And the like he observeth to have happened in the Church of Alexandria, upon the like grounds, or by imitation of such a pattern.

"2. Any small power is apt to grow and spread itself. A spark of it soon will expand itself into a flame; it is very like to the grain of mustard seed, which, indeed, is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, 'so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.'

"Encroaching," as Plutarch saith, 'is an innate disease of potentacies.' Whoever hath any pittance of it will be improving his stock, having tasted the sweetness of having his will (which extremely gratifieth the nature of man), he will not be satisfied without having more; he will take himself to be straitened by any bonds, and will strive to free himself from all restraints.

"Any pretence will serve to ground attempts of enlarging power, and none will be baulked. For power is bold, enterprising, restless: it always watcheth, or often findeth. 'Never passeth opportunities of dilating itself.' Every accession doth beget further advantages to amplify it; as its stock groweth, so it with ease proportionably doth increase, being ever out at use. As it groweth, so its strength to maintain and enlarge itself doth grow; it gaining more wealth, more friends, more associates, and dependants.

"None can resist or obstruct its growth without danger and manifold disadvantages; for as its adherents are deemed loyal and faithful, so its opposers are branded with the imputations of rebellion, contumacy, disloyalty; and, not succeeding in their resistance, they will be undone.

"None ever doth enterprise more than to stop its career, so that it seldom loseth by opposition, and it ever gaineth by composition. If it be checked at one time, or in one place, it will, like the sea, at another season, in another point break in. If it is sometimes overthrown in a battle, it is seldom conquered in the war.

"It is always on its march for ward, and gaineth ground; for one encroachment doth countenance the next, and is alleged for a precedent to authorize or justify it. It seldom moveth backward; for every successor thinketh he may justly enjoy what his predecessor did gain, or which is transmitted into his possession, so that there hardly can ever be any restitution of ill-gotten power.

"Thus have many absolute kingdoms grown: the first chief was a leader of volunteers; from thence he grew to be a prince, with stated privileges; after he became a monarch, invested with high prerogatives; in fine, he

creepeth forward to be a Grand Seigneur, usurping absolute dominion. So did Augustus Cæsar first only assume the style of prince of the senate, demeaning himself modestly as such; but he soon drew to himself the administration of all things, and upon that foundation his successors very suddenly did erect a boundless power. If you trace the footsteps of most empires to the beginning, you may perceive the like.

"So the Pope, when he had got a little power, continually did swell it. The puny pretence of succeeding St. Peter, and the name of the apostolical see; the precedence by reason of the imperial city; the honorary privileges allowed him by councils; the authority deferred to him by one synod (Sardica) of revising the causes of bishops; the countenance given to him in repressing some heresies, he did improve to constitute himself sovereign lord of the Church.

"3. Spiritual power especially is of a growing nature, and more especially that which it claimeth to derive from Divine institutions; for it hath a great awe upon the hearts and consciences of men, which engageth them to a firm and constant adherence. It useth the most subtle arms, which it hath always ready, which needeth no time or cost to furnish, which cannot be extorted from its hand, so that it can never be disarmed. And its weapons make strong impression, because it proposeth the most effectual encouragements to its abettors, and discouragements to its adversaries; alluring the one with promises of God's favour and eternal happiness, terrifying the other with menaces of vengeance from heaven, and endless misery, the which do ever quell religious, superstitious, weak people, and often daunt men of knowledge and courage.

"It is presumed unchangeable and unextinguishable by any human power, and thence is not (as all other power) subject to revolutions. Hence, like Achilles, it is hardly vincible, because almost immortal. If it be sometime rebuffed or impaired, it will soon recover greater strength and vigour.

"The Popes claim to derive their authority from Divine institution, and their weapons are always sentences of Scripture. They pretend to dispense remission of sins, and promise heaven to their abettors. They excommunicate, curse, and damn the opposers of their designs. They pretend they never can lose any power that ever did belong to their see; they are always stiff, and they never recede or give back. The privileges of the Roman Church can sustain no detriment.

"4. Power is easily attained and augmented upon occasion of dissensions. Each faction usually doth make itself a head, the chief in strength and reputation which it can find inclinable to favour it, and that head it will strive to magnify, that he may be the abler to promote its cause; and if the cause doth prosper, he is rewarded with accession of privileges and authority; especially, those who were oppressed and find relief by his means do become zealously active for his aggrandisement.

"Thus usually in civil broils, the captain, if the prevalent party, groweth a prince, or is crowned with great privileges, as Cæsar, Octavian, Cromwell, &c.

"So upon occasion of the Arian faction, and the oppression of Athanasius, Marcellus, Paulus, and other Bishops, the Pope, who by their application to him had occasion to head the Catholic party, did grow in power; for thereupon the Sardian Synod did decree to him that privilege which he infinitely enhanced, and which became the main engine of rearing himself so high.

"And by his interposal in the dissensions raised by the Nestorians, the Pelagians, the Eutychians, the Acatians, the Monothelites, the image breakers, and the image worshippers, &c., his authority was advanced; for he, adhering in those causes to the prevailing party, was by them extolled, obtaining both reputation and sway.

"5. All power is attended by dependencies of persons sheltered under it, and by it enjoying subordinate advantages, the which proportionably do grow by its increase.

"Such persons, therefore, will ever be inciting the chief and patron to amplify his power, and in aiding him to compass it they will be very industriously, resolutely, and steadily active, their own interest moving them thereto.

"Wherefore their mouths will ever be open in crying him up, their heads will be busy in contriving ways to further his interests, their care and pains will be employed in accomplishing his designs; they, with their utmost strength, will contend in his defence against all oppositions.

"Thus the Roman clergy first, then the Bishops of Italy, then all the clergy of the West, became engaged to support, to fortify, to enlarge the Papal authority, they all sharing with him in domination over the laity, and enjoying wealth, credit, support, privileges, and immunities thereby. Some of them especially were ever putting him on higher pretences, and furthering him by all means in his acquist and maintenance of them.

"6. Hence, if a potentate himself should have no ambition, nor much ability to improve his power, yet it would of itself grow; he need only be passive therein; the interest of his partisans would effect it, so that often power doth no less thrive under sluggish and weak potentates, especially if they are void of goodness, than under the most active and able. Let the ministers alone to drive on their interests.

"7. Even persons otherwise just and good do seldom scruple to augment their power by undue encroachment, or at least to uphold the usurpations of their foregoers; for even such are apt to favour their own pretences, and

afraid of incurring censure and blame if they should part with anything left them by their predecessors. They apprehend themselves to owe a dearthness to their place, engaging them to tender its own wealth and prosperity, in promoting which they suppose themselves not to act for their own private interest, and that it is not out of ambition or avarice, but out of a regard to the grandeur of their office that they stickle and bustle, and that in so doing they imitate St. Paul, who did 'magnify his office.' They are encouraged hereto by the applause of men, especially of those who are allied to them in interest, and who converse with them, who take it for a maxim, 'boni principis est ampliare imperium.' The extenders of empire are admired and commended, however they do it, although with cruel wars, or by any unjust means.

"Hence usually the worthiest men in the world's eye are greatest enlargers of power; and such men bringing appearances of virtue, ability, reputation, to aid their endeavours, do most easily compass designs of this nature, finding less obstruction to their attempts; for men are not so apt to suspect their integrity, or to charge them with ambition and avarice, and the few who discern their aims and consequences of things are overborne by the number of those who are favourably conceited and inclined towards them.

"Thus Julius I., Damasus I., Innocent I., Gregory I., and the like Popes, whom history representeth as laudable persons, did yet confer to the advancement of Papal grandeur. But they who did most advance that interest, as Pope Leo I., Gelasius I., Pope Nicholas I., Pope Gregory VII., in the esteem of true zealots pass for the best popes. Hence the distinction between a good man, a good prince, a good pope.

"8. Men of an inferior condition are apt to express themselves highly in commendation of those who are in a superior rank, especially upon occasion of address and intercourse, which commendations are liable to be interpreted for acknowledgments or attestations of right, and thence do sometimes prove means of creating it.

"Of the generality of men it is truly said that it 'doth fondly serve fame, and is stoned with titles and images,' readily ascribing to superiors whatever they claim, without scanning the grounds of their title. Simple and weak men, out of abjectness or fear, are wont to crouch, and submit to anything, on any terms. Wise men do not love wrangling, nor will expose their quiet and safety without great reason, thence being inclinable to comply with greater persons. Bad men, out of design to procure advantages or impunity, are prone to flatter and gloze with them. Good men out of due reverence to them, and in hope of fair usage from them, are ready to compliment them, or treat them with the most respectful terms. Those who are obliged to them will not spare to extol them; paying the easy return of good words for good deeds.

"Thus all men conspire to exalt power; the which snatcheth all good words as true, and constructeth them to the most favourable sense, and allegeth them as verdicts and arguments of unquestionable right. So are the compliments or terms of respect used by Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, and divers others, towards popes, drawn into argument for papal authority; when, as the actions of such fathers and their discourses upon other occasions do manifest their serious judgment to have been directly contrary to his pretences; wherefore, the Emperor of Constantinople, in the Florentine Synod, had good reason to decline such sayings for arguments; for, 'if,' saith he, 'any of the saints doth in an epistle honour the pope, shall he take that as importing privileges?'

"9. Good men, commonly (out of charitable simplicity, meekness, modesty, and humility, love of peace, and averseness from contention), are apt to yield to the encroachments of those who any wise do excel them, and when such men do yield, others are ready to follow their example. Bad men have little interest to resist, and no heart to stand for public good, but rather strike in presently, taking advantage by their compliance to drive a good market for themselves. Hence so many of all sorts in all times did comply with popes, or did not obstruct them, suffering them without great obstacle to raise their power." Barrow's Works, vol. 6, p. 292, &c., Oxford, 1838.

SPAIN IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

It was not till the close of the 11th century that the forms of public worship used at Rome were introduced into Spain. The Roman Pontiffs, indeed, who, from the time their successful encroachments began to assume the form of a spiritual monarchy, naturally regarded all disagreement in rites as adverse to their authority, lost no opportunity and spared no pains to endeavour to get the Romish forms received in all the countries of Europe. Up to the period, however, of which we are speaking, the Hildebrandic period, when Pope Gregory VII. formed the grand design of becoming Lord Spiritual and Temporal over the whole earth, and reducing kingdoms and states, as well as bishopricks and archbishopricks, to his supreme will, no people in Europe had more resolutely and perseveringly opposed the wishes of the Pontiffs to bring about a uniformity of worship than the Spaniards, and no means could induce them to part with their own ancient ritual (which was known as

* See Dupin, Ecc. Hist. tom. ii., p. 211.