



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

swifly assembled, promulgated such a decree, without force and issued, it would be in vain, we conceive, for any rationalist to contend that the universal Church, in the middle of the 5th century, recognized any right in the Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all other Churches, or to possess any other privileges, divine or otherwise, which it was not in the power of the assembled Church equally to bestow, if they saw just reason, upon any other.

The decree, if valid, distinctly recognized the first place in the Church as having been accorded to the See of Rome, by the consent of the fathers of the Church, and not as having been a divine institution of Christ Himself. It further assigned the reason why such privileges had been so accorded, viz.: that ancient Rome was then the seat of empire; and proceeded to confirm (what, in fact, had been already conceded by the General Council of Constantinople more than 60 years preceding) equal privileges to the see of Constantinople, upon the like grounds, viz.: that it was now the seat of empire, and ought, therefore, to have the same rank in ecclesiastical which it had in secular affairs, saving only the old precedence of ancient Rome, which it was intended should remain as before.

If the Bishops of Chalcedon were right in their views upon these matters, whatever reason the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch had to complain of the second place in the Church being assigned to the Church of Constantinople, displacing thereby their respective claims, as supposed to be recognized at the Council of Nice, it is obvious that the Bishops of Rome had none; and we shall find in the sequel that Pope Leo and his successors impeached the validity of this act (28th canon of Chalcedon) upon the only grounds which, upon our view of the real facts, it was possible for them to have opposed it with the slightest colour of reason, and not upon the grounds on which their modern advocates have thought it needful and expedient to dispute its validity for them.

Of this, however, more hereafter. The first question obviously is, was this canon really passed by the Bishops assembled at Chalcedon? and if so, next, was it done openly and "canonically," or "clandestinely," and by fraud or force? These are serious questions of the gravest historical interest and moment, and deserve the most candid and close investigation of every student who would honestly, and without fear of consequences, seek the truth.

The Roman editors of the Councils, following Binus, assert no doubt, *boldly* (not, indeed, that this canon was never passed by the Bishops of Chalcedon, for that would have been falsified by the letters of Pope Leo himself, which we shall hereafter refer to, but what, if true, would have been of the same practical importance, viz.: that it was clandestinely and fraudulently passed, or, as the pope's legates themselves asserted, as we shall see presently, enacted by force.

That we may not understate or misrepresent the grounds of impeachment, we think it right to refer to the very words of the Papal advocates, all of which are to be found in the learned work of the Jesuits already referred to.

In vol. IV., Labbe and Cossart, p. 997, the note of Severinus Binus (sub voce Sanctorum patrum decreta) asserts that this canon concerning the primacy of the Archbishop of Constantinople was *clandestine and surreptitious*, which Anatolius, with the rest of the Orientals, had procured to be constituted and decreed, in order to obtain for him the primacy of his Church, the Papal Legates being absent, and contradicting it!

The observation of the Roman editors is given at the foot of p. 784 of the same volume, in which they purport to account for Canons 28, &c., having been omitted from the collections of Dionysius Exiguus, and Isidore, and also some of the Greek manuscripts, by stating that these canons were proposed to the Fathers of the Council, and subscribed by them, through the *circumvention and fraud* of Anatolius of Constantinople, after the Legates of the Roman See had departed from the Council.

Having thus stated the charge (the Legates themselves, it will be seen, put the case somewhat differently), let us see what the records of the Council itself testify concerning the matter.

The 28th canon, it appears, was passed in the fifteenth session, held on the 31st October. The sixteenth session was held on the next day, viz., the Kalends (or first day) of November; and we have, fortunately, a full account of what took place on that occasion in Labbe and Cossart, (tom. iv., p. 792, et sequent). Anatolius the Master of the Horse, Palladius the Pretorian Prefect, Vincomalus Master of the Sacred Offices; Paschasianus, Lucentius, and Boniface, the three Legates of Pope Leo, therein styled

Archbishop of old Rome; Maximas, Bishop of Antioch; Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem; Thalassius, Bishop of Caesarea; Peter, of Corinth; Julian, Bishop of Coos, also an agent of the See of Rome (Subintendantis Apostolicae Seniores Romae), and the rest of the Council, being present.

We shall for the principal passages speak for ourselves, merely rendering into such simple English as we may (and probably some of our more fastidious readers may think too literally) what fell from the respective speakers in Latin and Greek. The Legates were unfortunately unable to speak anything but Latin, and what they said was consequently translated into Greek by Beronicianus, the secretary of the Divine Consistory, who acted as interpreter on the occasion.

The colloquy opened as follows (Labbe and Coss., p. 793):—

The Most Rev. Bishops Paschasianus and Lucentius, Vicars of the apostolic see, addressing the Imperial Commissioners, said—

"It is please your 'magnificence,' we have something to say to you."

The "most glorious judges" replied—

"Speak what you desire."

Paschasianus.—"Yesterday, after your lordships had risen, and our 'humility' followed your footsteps, certain acts are said to have been sped, which we consider to have been done contrary to the ecclesiastical canons and discipline. We demand, therefore, that your 'magnificence' may order these things to be re-read, that all the brotherhood may examine them, whether the things which have been done were just or unjust."

(Which words having been interpreted into Greek by Beronicianus, the Secretary of the Divine Consistory) the "most glorious" judges said—

"If any acts were sped after our departure, let them be re-read."

Before, however, they were rehearsed, Aetius, the Archdeacon of the "Holy" Church of Constantinople, said—

"It must be confessed; for those things which pertained to the faith took the proper, or more strictly, regular form—but there is a custom in the Councils, that after the principal things have been decreed, certain other necessary matters are also discussed and dealt with. We, that is, the most holy Church of Constantinople, had certain things which we had need of doing. We asked the Lords Bishops from Rome that they would communicate with us in these acts; they refused, saying, that they had not received such commands. We referred the matter to your 'magnificence,' and you ordered that the present holy Council should examine these matters. As your highnesses were going out, the most holy Bishops who were present, rising up, as if in a common cause, demanded that these things should be transacted, and they are here present; nor was this matter sped in secret, or by stealth, but canonically and in order."

The "illustrious" judges said—

"Let the acts which were sped be re-read."

And the roll having been produced by the Archdeacon Aetius, Beronicianus, the Secretary of the Consistory, read it.

[Here follows the 28th canon *verbatim*, with the formal signatures of above 210 bishops annexed, including those of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem.]

The Legate, Lucentius, then said—

"First, let your highnesses well deliberate, because this was enacted by *circumvention* with the holy Bishops, so that they were *compelled* to subscribe, the canons not having been enrolled, of which they made mention."

(These words having been interpreted by Beronicianus, the Secretary) the most reverend Bishops exclaimed—

"NO ONE WAS COMPELLED!"

The Legates, then, having referred to the Canons of the 318 bishops (the Council of Nice), and the Legate Boniface having, at the instance of the Archdeacon of Constantinople, read a portion of their instructions from Pope Leo, the Imperial Commissioners directed that each party should produce the Canons they relied on.

The canons of Nice and Constantinople, relating to the matters in dispute, were accordingly read at length. Paschasianus, however, reading the 6th canon of Nice, with an addition prefixed, which asserted, that the Church of Rome had always had a primacy; and Aetius, the Archdeacon of Constantinople, causing their copy to be read, which had no such addition. Whereupon the "most glorious" judges said—

"Let the Asiatic and Pontic bishops, who have subscribed the roll which has been re-read, say, if they subscribed it *voluntarily*, or whether they were *compelled* by any necessity imposed on them."

The Bishops of Pontus and Asia then passing over into the middle of the Council, Diogenes, the most reverend Bishop of Cyzicum, said, "Before God, I subscribed voluntarily."

Florentius, Bishop of Sardinia; Romanus, Bishop of Myra; Catogenes, of Claudiopolis; Seleucus, of Amasia; Eleutherius, of Chalcedon; Peter, of Gangra; Nanechius, of Laodicea; Mariniarius, of Synnada; Pergamus, of Antioch, in Pisidia; Critonians, of Aprodiasiadis; Eusebius, of Dorylaum; and Antiochus, Bishop of Sinope, successively said, "I subscribed spontaneously."

The rest of the most reverend Bishops exclaimed, "WE SUBSCRIBED OF OUR OWN ACCORD."

After some further statements connected solely with the forms of ordination by some of the subordinate Bishops, not bearing in any way on the present question, the judges commissioners then said—

"From what has been done and deposed to by each, we are of opinion that the first place before all (*πρὸ πάντων* *καὶ τὰ πρώτιστα*), and the principal honour according to the canons, should be preserved to the Archbishop of ancient Rome, beloved of God; but that the most holy Archbishop of Royal Constantinople, or new Rome, ought to enjoy the same privileges of honour, and is worthy of the same, and that he should have power to ordain the Metropolitan in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thracia, &c., &c. These things have been examined by us, but let the Holy and Universal Council deign to teach what seems good to themselves."

The most reverend Bishop Lucentius, Vicar of the apostolic See, then said:—

"This is a just sentence—we all say these things—they are agreed to by all. This is a just decree. Let those things prevail which have been ordained. This is a just sentence. All things have been decreed regularly. We beseech you dismiss us. By the safety of the Emperor dismiss us. We all remain of this opinion—we all say the same things."

The most reverend Bishop Lucentius, Vicar of the apostolic See, then said:—

"The Apostolic See ought not to be humbled in our presence; and, therefore, whatever things were yesterday done to the prejudice of the Canons, or rules, in our absence, we beseech your highnesses that you may order to be cancelled, but if otherwise, that our opposition may appear on these acts, that we may know what we ought to relate to the Apostolical and principal Bishop of the whole Church (*πάσης ἐκκλησίας πρόρχοντι ἐπισκόπῳ*), that he may be able to show it to be to the injury of hissee, or to the overturning of the Canons."

The most reverend John, Bishop of Sebaste, said, "We all remain of the opinion of your magnificence."

The most illustrious judges said—

"What we have spoken the whole Council has approved."

Thus ended the proceedings of the fourth General Council, on the 1st November, A. D. 451, and our readers, we suppose, will now be able to judge for themselves, from this only *extant record of these grave proceedings*, whether there be any pretence for saying with Binus, or the Roman Editors of the Councils, that the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon was the result of *force, circumvention, or fraud*!

The way in which the Popes were obliged to deal with it afterwards remains still to be explained and considered; but from the length to which the preceding matters have already extended, we think it will be more convenient to make it the subject of a future article.

THE "INDELIBLE CHARACTER" OF HOLY ORDERS

It is agreed among nearly all who call themselves Christians that Christ instituted a ministry in His Church, which ministry is to continue.

Controversies have arisen as to the nature of this ministry—in what it consists—how it must be obtained—whether it can be actually lost, or only suspended as to its exercise, and also as to its powers.

On all these points differences of opinion have existed among Protestant Churches and sects—not only between one Church or sect and another, but between members of the same Church or sect. But the differences which have existed in the Church of Rome on these points are more remarkable than any others; for all other differences sink into the shade in comparison with infallibility disagreeing with itself.

We have no question to move concerning that in which all are agreed—the Divine institution, and the perpetuity of the Christian ministry. But on the points on which opinions have been so varied, and assertions so confident, we wish to find some light for ourselves and for our readers, at least so far as may enable us to judge whether it be necessary to maintain, or even to entertain, some of the opinions which are most confidently asserted.

In matters in respect of which there has been so little agreement in the Church, we are not much moved by the assertions or opinions of any parties or individuals. In such a case we look to the word of God for what is certain and necessary; at the same time, we use the history of church law and opinion to refute those who exclaim that their own private opinions have always been held in the Church as private and necessary.

A leading question at the present day, as between Protestants and Roman Catholics, respects the nature of the Christian ministry.—whether it be an *OFFICE* to which men are appointed; or whether it consist in an operation performed, or a "character," or mark indelibly stamped or impressed in the soul of an individual, thereby qualifying him to be "a channel of grace" to other men, in a manner in which none can be; whose soul has not been so operated on or stamped.

We have taken the whole of these proceedings from the records of the Council in Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv., p. 792 to 800. Our learned readers may find a short epitome of this 16th Session in Dupin's Eccles. Hist. vol. 1, p. 678. Dulk's edition, 1723. They will do well also to consult Bishop Stillingfleet's works, vol. 17, p. 412, for a lively summary of the whole matter.

¹ Hic est ille canon clandestinus et surreptitius, quem Anatolius cum reliquis orientibus ad primatum ecclesie comparandum, legatis absentibus et contra iudicium, constituit, atque decerni procuravit.—Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv., p. 997.

² How the Legates could be absent, and at the same time opposing what was done surreptitiously in their absence, we think a problem worthy of solution by the great Bishops themselves! but alas! he died and made no sign.

³ Canones quisequuntur, non extant in codicibus Græcis manuscriptis quos habuimus: In his Conciliis, &c. Cujus rei causa et casus videtur, quia Anatolius Constantinopolitanus Episcopi circumventionem ac fraudem, sine sedis apostolicæ legatis Synodus expressit, petribus Concilii presentibus, æque ab eis subscriptis fuerunt: ex quorum primo, qui est xxviii. dicitur patriarcharum Alexandriæ et Antiochiæ privilegia a Concilio Nicæno eis data retractantibus, et primatus eius in Ecclesiâ sancti Romanorum pontificum statuatur.—Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv., p. 798.

This question is important in its consequences; for if the ministry be an "office," then it seems probable that men may be so deprived of the office that they no longer possess it. But if the ministry consist in a character or mark indelibly impressed by God in the soul, from which it can never be obliterated, then, although a man be lawfully forbidden to use it, he has still the power to use it, and to produce effects on other men's souls, even against the will and power of God Himself.

Now, if we regard the ministry as an "office," we shall be apt to reverence and obey ministers according as they perform their office; but if we regard them as possessed of a power which they can use even against the will of God Himself, we will naturally fear and obey them even when they go against God. We believe that this has much to do with the undue and superstitious reverence felt by many Roman Catholics towards "priests," especially towards priests degraded for drunkenness or immorality, commonly called in Ireland "Blessed Priests."^a

The Protestant doctrine is simple enough. Protestants generally hold that the ministry is an office, instituted by Christ, for the discharge of which He gives grace to those who are called to it according to His will. But if any appear to be wholly unworthy of this office and ministry, they are to be removed from it; and being so lawfully removed, they are no longer ministers of Christ, but are rather to be regarded as apostates from Him.

The Roman Catholic doctrine differs wholly from this, and leads to conclusions which our readers may find it hard to adopt.

The Council of Trent decrees, that "in the Sacrament of Order . . . a 'character' is impressed which can neither be blotted out nor taken away;" and condemns all who affirm that "persons once rightly ordained can again become laics." (Sess. xxviii., ch. 4.)

"If any one shall have said, that by sacred ordination . . . a character is not impressed, or that he who was once a priest can again become a laic, let him be accursed."^d (Sess. xxiii., can. 4.)

We must explain to our readers that the word *χαρακτηρ* (character) in Greek, and the word "character" in Latin, (in which language the decrees of Trent are written) does not mean what we intend when we speak in English of the "character" of a person; it means a mark or impression made on a subject. We have this use of the word in English also, when we speak of letters written, or stamped, or printed on paper, as "characters."

There is a good instance of the meaning of the Greek word *χαρακτηρ* in Levit. xiii. 28, *χαρακτηρ του κατακαυματος* (LXX); which the Douay Bible translates "the scar of a burning."

The word "character" is used in the Latin Bible only in the book of Revelation or Apocalypse, in which it occurs seven times; in each place it means "a mark in the right hand or in the forehead."^e

Previous to the Council of Trent the word was used to express the brand made on the flesh by a burning iron, a punishment then in common use.

That this is the sense in which the Latin word "character" is used by the Council of Trent, is explained in the "Catechism of the Council of Trent:"—"This power is denominated a spiritual character, which, by a certain interior mark impressed on the soul, distinguishes the ecclesiastic from the rest of the faithful."^f

Where that mark is stamped on the soul, there there is "order;" and where that mark is not stamped on the soul, there there is not order (according to the Church of Rome).

And the Council of Trent declares that mark or "character" to be "indelible;" that is to say, once impressed on the soul, it can never be rubbed out, or lost, or taken away.

We will now give a brief statement of the Roman doctrine respecting the indelible character of Holy Orders, showing how it tends to affect men's views of the priesthood.

(1.) The saying of certain words, and the performance of certain actions, by one (or more) who has the "character" or mark of a bishop stamped on his soul (provided he have the intention of doing what the Church intends), impresses on the soul of the person operated on, the "character" of bishop, priest, or deacon, as the case may be.^g

(2.) The set words and acts, when used by one who has the "character" or mark on his soul, do necessarily impress a "character" or mark in the soul of the ordained, even where the words or acts are impiously used, in wilful opposition to God, and contrary to common sense and reason.

Thus St. Paul forbids a bishop to ordain "a neophyte"—"that is, one lately baptized, a young convert." (1 Tim. iii. 6. Douay Bible.) And we think Roman Catholics must acknowledge that it is contrary to the will of God that an infant or an insane person, who have not the use of reason, should be ordained. Protestants would say that such an ordination, being contrary to God's will, was not confirmed, or made valid by Him, and was a mockery, and no ordination. The common sense and feeling of Roman Catholics, perhaps, prompts them to say the same; but let them hear the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—"The sacrament of orders is not to be conferred on very young, or on insane persons, because they do not enjoy the use of reason: if administered, however, it, no doubt, impresses a character."^h

(3.) According to the Church of Rome, this "character," when impressed or conferred, involves the power of "order"—it is power in itself; words spoken or acts done by one in whose soul this stamp has been impressed necessarily produce their effect. An idiot in a workhouse thus ordained, provided he were capable of "intending to do what the Church intends," would effect the miracle of transubstantiation, and would "make the body and blood of Christ," whenever he said the words "Hoc est enim corpus meum" over a piece of bread.

(4.) This character once impressed and the power attendant on it, is held by the Church of Rome to be indelible. A bishop or a priest may become a schismatic or heretic,—may be degraded, and excommunicated,—may renounce his baptism, and profess himself an atheist,—yet the "indelible character," and the "power of order," remains: persons consecrated, even in mockery, by that bishop, have the "character impressed," and can effect transubstantiation.

Some yet living may remember a case which illustrates this doctrine. It happened in the French Revolution, on the 7th of November, 1793, not quite 65 years ago. We take the account from Alison's History of Europe, vol. iii. p. 178. "Pache, Hebert, and Chauvette, the leaders of the municipality, publicly expressed their determination 'to dethrone the King of Heaven, as well as the monarchs of the earth.' To accomplish this design, they prevailed on Gobel, the apostate constitutional bishop of Paris, to appear at the bar of the Convention, accompanied by some of the clergy of his diocese, and there abjure the Christian faith." That base prelate declared "that no other national religion was now required but that of liberty, equality, and morality." Many of the constitutional bishops and clergy in the Convention joined in the proposition . . . crowds of drunken artisans and shameless prostitutes crowded to the bar, and trampled under their feet the sacred vases, consecrated for ages to the holiest purposes of religion. . . . During several weeks, daily abjurations by the constitutional clergy took place at the bar of the Convention."

Then followed a scene of impiety such as the world had never beheld. A French actress, divested of her dress, was exhibited on the altar of the cathedral of Notre Dame, in Paris (Bishop Gobel's own cathedral), to be worshipped as "the goddess of Reason," instead of the Creator! Another female, similarly exposed for worship in the Church of St. Sulpice, fainted for shame upon the altar. And in all these impieties and abominations, the apostate Bishop Gobel and other apostate bishops and clergy were partakers and actors. They deliberately renounced Christ and His Almighty Father, to adopt the worship of this infamous "Goddess of Reason," a fit deity for such infamous worshippers. We shall never wilfully do any injustice to the Church of Rome. That would be unworthy of our position, and contrary to our principles. We will do her justice now.

These constitutional bishops and clergy were, for the most part, ordained in schism from the Church of Rome. She never acknowledged their "mission" or "jurisdiction." She is, so far, not responsible for their impieties or their crimes.

But all this makes the illustration only the more forcible for our present purpose.

We, simple, ignorant Protestants as we are, do think that when these infamous men had renounced not only their offices as bishops and ministers of Christ—not only their profession of Christ and His religion; but had formally denied the existence of God, and had accomplished the inconceivable sin of ATHEISTIC IDOLATRY, theretofore unknown in the world—ignorant as we are, we suppose that these impious wretches were no longer "Ministers of Christ."

few, if any, were used or known in the early Church. And yet we believe that there was a Christian ministry in the early Church, before these "essential" and all powerful words were used or known.

Alison gives in a note the very words of Gobel: " . . . On this day, on which we should have no other public and national worship than that of liberty and sacred equality, since the sovereign (people) so wishes it, following my principles, I submit myself to it: will and I come before you here to declare openly that this day I renounce the exercise of my functions, as a minister of the Catholic religion."

But the Church of Rome corrects our ignorance, and tells us that these infamous men, though ordained at first in schism, though apostates from Christ and from God, had yet "indelible character," when committing the inconceivable idolatry of worshipping a prostitute instead of God, and were still the ministers of Christ; and their orders and acts, as His ministers, were valid!

About ten years after these events, the following statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting Ordination was published by John Devoti, Archbishop of Carthage, and secretary to Pope Pius VII. That pope acted a noble part in respect of the French Revolution; and the "Jus Canonicum" of his secretary, John Devoti, is now the standard work on Roman Canon Law among Roman Catholics in England. In that work, ten years after the infamous example of Bishop Gobel, and the other bishop and clergy who apostatised with him, we find this statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome about Holy Orders: "A consecrated bishop is the minister of ordination; and truly ordination is valid by whatever bishop it may be granted, who has the power annexed to character. Therefore, ordinations are valid and firm, though made by a bishop who is a heretic, a schismatic, excommunicated, suspended, even by one who has renounced at once his place and dignity; provided that all things are observed in it, which are necessary to its foundation and strength. But it is iniquity to receive orders from these bishops, and, therefore, although such orders have force, yet they are not lawful."^k

The Roman writers on Canon Law are all agreed in this statement. We take it from Devoti in preference to all others, because, from his connection with Pope Pius VII., he could not have been ignorant of the most striking events of the French Revolution. He must have had in view the apostate Gobel and other apostate bishops. His very words seem chosen to meet Gobel's case. Gobel was ordained in schism by "consecrated bishops, who had the power annexed to order;" Devoti maintains that this is valid. Gobel's words were: "This day I renounce the exercise of my functions as a minister of the Catholic religion;"—ordination is valid (says Devoti), "even by one who has renounced at once his place and dignity." It is infamous (says Devoti) to receive orders from such, but still the orders so received are valid. Devoti could not but have had in his mind the case of Gobel and his fellow apostates, and with that case before him he has deliberately chosen words which affirm that an apostate, an atheist, an idolater (incomprehensibly united in one person), is still a minister of Christ, and can exercise the powers which Christ has left in His Church.

In our next number we will inquire into the doctrine of Scripture, and of the early Church, respecting Holy Orders; and we will show that the laws and canons of the ancient General Councils are in direct contradiction to the doctrine of the Council of Trent and of the modern Church of Rome.

HOW THE FATHERS HAVE BEEN TREATED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME—No. I.

OUR readers must, by this time, be pretty well aware that we have never shrunk from the discussion of the question, did the fathers (or, in other words, the principal writers in the first five or six centuries of the Church's history)—did the fathers hold the same doctrines as are taught in the present day in the Church of Rome? Our pages have bristled with Latin and Greek to an extent which, we fear, must have often made them repulsive to some of our readers, who would, probably, like us better if they did not respect us quite so much, and if we had been a little more amusing and a little less learned. Even those, however, who are not competent to enter into the details of a controversy may often be very well able to judge of the result, and can form a correct idea which party has been successful. If we see the defenders of a fortress giving up post after post, and retiring in confusion, we can pronounce the assailants to have been successful, even if we do not understand enough of the military art to judge of the operations by which the success was obtained. Now, even a very general view of the state of the Roman Catholic controversy will disclose enough to make it pretty plain on which side success lies. Dr. Johnson remarks that Roman Catholics believe all that Protestants believe, and something more besides; and the question is, whether that "something more" is an original part of the doctrine taught by Christ and His Apostles, or a corruption added in later times. The best proof that Roman Catholics could give that their peculiar doctrines are a true part of Christian doctrine would be, if they could show that they were mentioned anywhere in those writings which have come down to us from the hands of the Apostles and Evangelists, and which all Christians agree to venerate as the word of God Himself. Accordingly, this is the first authority to which Protestants ap-

^k Ordinationis minister est Episcopus consecratus; et valet quidem ordinatio a quovis episcopo, qui annexam habet characteri potestatem, tributa sit. Itaque ratæ, firmæ sunt ordinationes factæ ab Episcopo hæretico, schismatico, excommunicato, suspendo, vel ab eo, qui loco simul, et dignitati renunclavit; modo in ea servatæ sunt omnia, quæ ad ejusdem firmitatem, ac robur sunt necessaria. Verum ab his episcopis nefas est ordines accipere, et ideo quantum hujusmodi ordinationes vim habeant, tamen licite non sunt. Devoti, Jus Can., Vol. II., 167, Rom., 1837.

^a In Ireland, a priest deprived of his benefice for immorality, often tries to support himself by pretending to work miraculous cures on human beings and cattle; hence such are thought "blessed prelates" by the ignorant and superstitious. We know of a "blessed priest" who made large sums by selling "blessed salt" to stop the potato disease—multitudes went to him to buy.
^b In Sacramento ordinis . . . character imprimitur, qui nec deleri nec auferri potest.
^c Semel rite ordinatus, iterum laicos effici posse.
^d Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem . . . non imprimi characterem; vel eum, qui sacerdos semel fuit, laicum rursus fieri posse, anathema sit.
^e Ch. xiii. 16, 17; xiv. 9, 11; xvi. 2; xix. 20; xx. 4.
^f "Character—Στίγμα, nota, stigmatis pœna." Du Fresne, Glossarium, Paris, 1733.
^g "Characterē adustionis inurebat." Odo Cluniac. de vita S. Gerardi, L. 1. c. 20.
^h Translated by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c., Maynooth. Dublin, 1829; p. 323.
ⁱ It is remarkable that of these so powerful words and actions, which the Church of Rome holds essentially necessary to confer orders,