

or matters relative to their salvation. As to Catholics denying "infallibility," no Catholics would listen to even Dr. Hammond, a protestant writer on that subject.—"We do not believe, that any general council, truly such, ever did, or shall err in any matter of faith." Dr. Field's and Archbishop Laud, both protestant writers, convey the same idea. As to Catholics denying the power of priests to forgive sins" they were justifiable in saying so if the penitent had not the necessary requisites (see my quotation on that point,) I have shewn in my former communication, that on this essential point tending to salvation that protestants differ, that is, "the real presence of Christ in the sacrament," but the spectator says, "that bring real protestants together their belief is all one," which has already been proved a falsehood!! Christ himself says, "whoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him." But the protestants now-a-day, like the offended Jews, think the idea repugnant,—and Martin Luther, the St. Peter of their church, calls his followers so tenacious of disbelief, "a damned sect, a pack of liars, cursed, proud, and arrogant spirits,—bread-eaters, wine-drinkers, soul-murderers."—Wonderful consistencies of protestantism!!! What an unerring and happy succession, unbroken and unchanged!!! But the spectator next says, of Protestants "bring them together, and they are united in agreeing; that the Pope is that "man of sin," who was to be revealed the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. So that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. This is the *spectator's ipse dixit*—this is his prophetic definition of the text,—and he says, "all real protestants believe the same." O "private" judgement "what a galaxy of light you fling around protestant temples!!! But shall I stumble him with his own gauntlet—and make a protestant writer contradict him? Listen to what Mr. Thorndike, a protestant writer, says, in his "just weights and measures," chapter 2, page 155. Let not them who charge the Pope to be Antichrist, and the papists idolators, lead the people by the nose, to believe, that they can prove their supposition when they cannot. But I would have the spectator look to Grotius and Dr. Hammond, both protestant writers on the subject, & he will find their "private judgement, led them to a more just conjecture than what his, or these "real protestants" have done. I might also refer him to Dr. Heylen's cosmography, Liber 2, page 207 for information. These are all protestant writers: so I repel the *Spectator* with his own elements. But Mr. Whiston's dream of Antichrist, was the same as the *Spectator's*—but still more prophetic, whether from "self-judgment" self-inspiration, or self-impudence I know not, went to shew dates and foretold the downfall of Popery in 1716. But 1716 has past, and this modern prophet lived to see himself confuted. Catholics may always expect persecutions, and false prophets going out amongst them—wolves in sheeps clothing,—it has been so—and will be so—we would not be Christ's if it was not

so. As to "images" they are minor points, not being considered essential to salvation,—they are only to excite and render more fervid our devotions; for as an innocet picture disturbs the heart and fills it with obscene ideas, so does a picture of Christ or his saints increase our zeal and devotion. And since idolatry in the primitive state of the church was not totally eradicated in Rome, where some still espoused heathenish practices, their use was better dispensed with. Respecting "indulgences," and Catholics "dependance on their own works and sufferings for salvation:" I have already shewn from Catholic principles, the charge is false; they offer them with Christ's sufferings. As to St. Paul's forbidding marriage," no Catholic believes it was absolutely commanded by Christ or the Apostles, but being more suitable to the priestly office: they believe from Apostolic tradition, that marriage never has been in use in the Catholic priesthood—although many of the holy father's had been married before their ordination,—but as said of St. German, "his consort he changed unto his sister," St Augustine observes the same of married men ordained against their will, who by the grace of God, as he says, "continued in celibacy to the end." Lib. 2, and as St. Jerome says, the Apostles "were either virgins, or had no more to do with their wives. Bishops, priests, and deacons, are either chosen virgins or widowers,—or at least continent after priesthood, as long as they live—Ep. 50. Again, St. Epaphanius says, "He that lives as a husband with his wife, though he have but one, is not admitted by the church to the order of deacon, priest, bishop, or sub-deacon, unless he ceases to converse with her as a husband or becomes a widower.—Har. 59. But here I could quote hundreds of other proofs if requisite. Now I hope the *Spectator* will no longer wonder at the "consistencies of Romanism?" Since I have shewn authority from Saints whose names must be expunged from the protestant prayer-books, before their authority is questioned. And lest you should question the authority of our apostolic tradition, if you look to 2 Thess. ii. verse 15 you will find St. Paul says "therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have been taught whether by word or by our epistle." In Scripture we have sufficient authority to justify our invocation of saints and angels, as in Gen. xlviii, 16, Zachary. i, 12, and 1 Cor. xiii. 8. Heb. i, 14, Psalms xci, 11 11 and Psalms xxxiv, 7 &c. &c. Now since I have cleared up all points so far, my next point is to shew our "building on Peter" is no "chimera" "the baseless fabric of a vision" as represented by the *Spectator*. Now since the *Spectator* must admit tradition and cannot deny the authority of saints whose names grace the Protestant prayer book, and to whose honor their church have days devoted, for if he does, he must either question the authority of his own prayer-book, or admit that the alterations in his religion are not yet perfected, so as to render her invulnerable. Now to prove the Popes the successors of Saints, and St. Peter head of the church at Rome, (a thing long since admitted by Protestants.) In

the next age after the Apostles, St. Irenæus says, "The great church of Rome was founded and constituted by the glorious apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and that they delivered the Episcopal office to Linus, whose successor was Anacletus." &c. Lib. 3, St. Cyprian, the following century calls "Rome the chair of Peter, and the principal church." Ep. 55. So St. Augustine, writing against Potilianus, the Donatist Bishop of Certi, "what harm," says he, "had the Roman see done you, in which Peter sat, and in which Anastasius sits at present?"—Epis. 53, (in vet Edit. 165) and in writing to Gencrosus about the Bishops of Rome: "To Peter Linus succeeded Linus Cletus, &c." St Jerome says in his book of Ecclesiastical writers Cap. 15. "Clement was the fourth Bishop of Rome after St. Peter, For the second was Linus, the third Cletus &c." and in the 1st chapter of the same book he says, "Simon Peter, after he had been Bishop of Antioch, and had preached to the converts of the circumcision in Pontus Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia—in the 2d year of Claudius went to Rome to defeat Simon Magus, and there held the sacerdotal chair twenty-five years, to the last, that is the fourteenth year of Nero, by whom he was put to death at Rome." See also Eusubius—Lib. 3 cap. 15, page 52. But listen to St. Jerome, (whom the Protestants still retain in their calendar) he says in speaking of communion with the Roman see "whoever eats the lamb out of this house, is prophane; that, like Noah's ark, whoever is not in it, will perish in the deluge; that whoever gathers not with the Bishop of this see, belongs to Antichrist?" Epis. 57 ad damusum Papum. Now having answered all the *Spectator's* queries, I should like him to shew me the Protestant succession or church authority from the Apostles, for if she be the true church of Christ she must be visible from their time and have had a regular succession from the Apostles. I would like him to bring his scripture proofs to shew the Bible was written by the Apostles or whether it is the pure word of God. To shew that every man should construe the Bible according to his own private judgment; to shew that the Bible is the sole basis on which Christ's church is founded?" or to justify the protestant faith from being a heresy. Until he does this I shall consider him a simple querist unable to give an answer and unworthy to receive one.

CAVANUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC.

Sir,—You are not perhaps aware of the insidious methods resorted to, in this town by our would-be sole Orthodox and Evangelical gossellers; in order to decoy into their Sabbath schools and screaming conventicles the children of our poor Irish Catholics. A set of silly women, doubtless under the direction of their illiterate exhorters, go their rounds from house to house among our ragged and half-famished emigrants; offering, by way of charity, some old clothes, or spoiled provisions, &c. on the sole condition of their sending their children to be