

AUTHENTICATED REPORT

OF

# THE DISCUSSION,

WHICH TOOK PLACE BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MACUIRE AND GREGG,

IN THE

ROTUNDA, DUBLIN, IN MAY, 1838.

---

MONTREAL:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JOHN CORCORAN.

---

1839.



# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

FIRST DAY—TUESDAY, 29TH MAY.

---

TUESDAY, being the day fixed for the commencement of the discussion between the Rev. Messrs. Maguire and Gregg, at ten o'clock the entrance to the Rotunda was crowded with persons anxious to be present on the occasion; and very shortly after the door was opened, the room became densely crowded. At about a quarter to eleven the reverend disputants, accompanied by some friends, came on the platform. When the appointed hour arrived,

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—I challenge the Rev. Mr. Gregg for his proofs that the united Protestant church of England and Ireland is the true church of Christ—holy catholic, and apostolic—in these kingdoms.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, I beg leave, first of all, to dispose of one necessary preliminary; and that is, to propose that my reverend and respected friend, Mr. Edward Nangle, missionary of Achill, do act as my chairman.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I agree to that: and on my part, I announce that the Rev. Justin M'Namara, parish priest of Kinsale, is to act as my chairman.

Rev. Mr. GREGG then called upon either of the chairmen to read the propositions which he undertook to prove, and the regulations by which their proceedings were to be governed.

Rev. Mr. NANGLE read Mr. Gregg's propositions.

Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA—Mr. Maguire undertakes to disprove them.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Would it not be more satisfactory to the meeting if my reverend opponents answer were read?

Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA read Mr. Maguire's answer, in which he undertook to disprove Mr. Gregg's propositions, together with the regulations agreed to by both parties.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—I beg to trouble you with another additional preliminary; and that is, to fix the day on which ladies are to be excluded.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE left it entirely to himself.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—As it has been left to my choice, I think it better to say that Saturday is to be the day on which ladies are to be excluded. That, therefore, is to be understood as agreed upon.

And now, gentlemen, having settled the few preliminaries which I thought necessary, I would, in the first place, beg leave unaffectedly to say that it would be my pleasure, if my reverend opponent and his friends would have no objection, and I am sure my friends will have none, to supplicate the blessing of God previous to commencing the discussion, in order that its results may be good.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE had no objection—on the contrary, he approved of each one's lifting his heart in silent prayer, and a silent prayer he knew would be heard; but he thought it would be better not to pray as Mr. Gregg desired, lest, as there were people of different religions present, the feelings of some might be hurt.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Well, then, all I can say is, may the Lord, in his mercy, bless this discussion, and may it tend to the good of all present at, and engaged in it! ("Amen!" from several voices.)

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—And I say, may the Great God, in whose unity and trinity we all equally believe, assist him who has the truth on his side! (hear, hear, and "Amen!")

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, I should consider that I would be improperly treating you, if I delayed you by dwelling on the circumstances connected with this discussion, and the occurrences which brought it about, as far as they relate to myself or my opponent. I am quite sure that none of you consider either of the combatants in this matter as not worth us that you are occupied. I am sure the great objects of your attention are the principles which you respectively maintain, and that you will hear them without considering the individuals from whom they emanate. I shall therefore pass over this topic without further observation. I likewise consider it unnecessary to trouble you with my ideas as to what may be the result of this discussion; I have formed my own judgment on the point, and I will only say, that feeling I am in the discharge of a duty I have but little anxiety as to the result. Duty is ours—consequences are with God. Gentlemen, I do not stand here as the representative of any body; I stand upon my own responsibility to maintain my own opinions, in contradistinction to those of my reverend opponent. Yet while I say I stand here as representing no body, I would not wish you to think that I am alone in the opinions which I advocate. In fact I consider myself as acting upon my own responsibility with respect to representation, but not with respect to my opinions. I do not stand here as maintaining opinions solely my own, but as a member of the holy Catholic church established amongst us, to bring forward and lay before you, as it were, the mind of that church. There is no one more hesitating than I am in forming private opinions—I am not one of those who hastily adopt an opinion; but when I feel my mind incline towards one which is opposed to any taught by the church, I pray for patience, and in the end I invariably discover that the church is correct. I say again, then, that I stand not here representing my brethren, but, to assert and defend the opinions of the church to which I belong; open of course to correction from my brethren, if state I anything which is contradictory of the doctrines taught by that church. Gentlemen, the two propositions which I undertake to



prove are—first, that the united church of England and Ireland in this country is the true church of Christ, holy catholic, and apostolic—secondly, that the church of Rome is false and apostate. I desire, gentlemen, to impress upon you that there is a very close connection between these two propositions. For, in point of fact, our church is a branch of the Roman Catholic church, and has only laid aside those points of doctrine which indicated its apostacy, and those monstrous and superstitious practices which grew from them. Our church then is simply the reformed holy Catholic church. So that if it be holy, catholic, and apostolic, the church of Rome is schismatic, apostate, and injurious; and if the church of Rome be all this, ours is holy, catholic and apostolic. Therefore to prove the second proposition is necessary to the establishment of my first—namely, the holiness and excellence of our holy Catholic church. I now desire, gentlemen, to make you clear with regard to my letter, some expressions of which have been quarrelled with. The first is, the use of the definite article before “true church in this kingdom.” I say, I assert that the united church of England and Ireland is *the* true church of Christ, holy, catholic, and apostolic in this kingdom. Now, mark me, it has been mentioned that I should have said, a “true church.” I say that I disprove of that expression: for though no doubt it can be explained, it appears to run counter to the words of the creed, which are “one church.” I grant you the expression is not incorrect when explained; but I consider that the other is better. The next thing that is objected to in my letter is that I ought to have said, “a branch of the true church of Christ.” I grant you that expression would be correct, but the words which I use involve that meaning. Because when I add the words “in this kingdom,” it shows that it must be a branch of the true church, and not the entire of it. I might say “the true church in this village;” for it would not signify the whole church. Hence my language was defensible and proper. Now, gentlemen, in order to mention my propositions, I must go back, in a great measure, to first principles. Let us then consider what is the object of Christianity. I will briefly state it to you. Our world is in a state of ruin by nature. We were all children of sin, and were born to destruction, and totally unentitled to the grace of God or the enjoyment of heaven, on account of the apostacy of our first parents, and our own sins. But it became the pleasure of the Most High to relieve us from the guilt of the sin of our first parents, to redeem us from the curse which it brought upon us and to put us in a way of escaping eternal damnation, and of reaching heaven. The world was sunk beneath the deluge of iniquity, when God, in his mercy, came down upon earth to spread righteousness and godliness through the earth. To accomplish this, Jesus Christ began by establishing a small society. He taught them the doctrines of life, and he commanded them to increase and multiply, and they did, till at length they covered the entire earth. This is the church. The law by which it is increased is baptism; and the law whereby the officers of the church are appointed is called orders, and I think it will be found that my reverend opponent and I very much agree on

these points as far as they are essential. The church, when it was established, was pure and holy; and even in the life-time of the apostles it was extended, so that St. Paul said, "our sounds have gone into all lands, and our words even unto the end of the world!" It extended, in his time, even to Britain, which some say was converted by him, and others say by St. Joseph of Arimathea. That is, however, uncertain, and it is of no importance to either me or my opponent; that church was the Catholic and Apostolic church. But mark me now. Even in the very life-time of Jesus Christ—glory and honor to his name forever—there were divisions in this church. For we read in the gospel, that the apostles came to Jesus, and told him that persons not belonging to him were casting out devils in his name, and asked leave to forbid them not, for those that were not against him were for him, and those who did any thing in his name would not speak lightly against him. These men must have belonged to the true church, though they were separated from the apostles, for they acted in the name of Christ. This was a schism; and we read of other schisms in the see of Carthage, and of heresy among the Nicolaitans, and in the church of the Galatians. These heresies and schisms were useful to the church, for they served to make the truth brighter and more conspicuous. Along, then with the society established by Jesus Christ sprang up several small societies, some of which I have mentioned. These societies were called by the names of private individuals—Cyrentheans, Donatists, and other heretics, if heretics they may be called. All these different classes of Christians of course had, generally speaking, the same religion; and if asked were they Christians, the answer would be, "yes." It therefore became necessary to ascertain whether they belonged to the common body of Christians or to a private society. Hence the common body of Christians established by Christ was called Catholic, because it was the religion as if it were of the public, and the others were private societies. You can, I am sure, conceive these private societies propagating their doctrines, and sending their missionaries privately into other countries, where they planted the tree of corruption, till it spread and equalled the true vine which Christ planted. You will then, I hope, bear in mind this distinction, that the word Catholic, when applied to the church, is merely relative and not positive. It does not signify that the church is universal, and that it extends to every part of the world. The church is called Catholic to distinguish it from the other churches. The term is distinctive and relative; it is not absolute. Now, I call upon you, gentlemen, to listen and be attentive. I am ready to assert that Christ said that "the gates of hell should not prevail against the church;" but while he said so, the same Jesus foretold, that that standing holding of ground, and maintenance of doctrine, would be accompanied with an awful mystery; and that was the apostacy which was to overtake the church, so far as it was visible, so that it would spread over it, and the vine which Christ planted would bring forth the grapes of Sodom and the figs of Gomorrha. He told of this apostacy and the place where it would have its

seat. He told us how long it would continue, and that it should be the most dreadful, monstrous, and shocking evil that ever appeared upon the earth. All this is consistent with the gates of hell not prevailing against it; for we are told that while this apostacy should continue, while the blasphemous doctrines of idolatry and superstition would be teaching by the ministry of this church, a stream of life should always flow through the dark waters of superstition; and there should be found those who would raise their voices against apostacy, who would overcome their enemies, and bring the true church, holy, Catholic, and pure, from the midst of the apostate mass. I trust that you understand the view that I have taken. I know that it is always better, for the understanding of a subject, to bring it palpably before the eye, so that no mistake may be made about it. I have a plan illustrative of what I have endeavoured to explain. I know my reverend friend will approve of this plan, for he has in his own church something of the same kind—in the tree or vine I believe it is called. [He here displayed a map of what might be called a river, the upper part of it was painted gold colour; through it were some slight red streaks, which continued gradually to spread till they became larger than the gold part, which now became only a few gold streaks through a broad space of red. The gold towards the bottom grew more distinct, and finally separating from it, became large again.] You see, said he, in the gold the primitive church, as established by Christ in the days of the Apostles. The red streaks that you see through it are the streams of corruption and apostacy, which began to flow even in those days, and which are gradually spreading, overflowed and overwhelmed the primitive church. This is represented by the great sea of red; through it you see slight gold streaks, which represent the primitive church still existing, almost invisibly. The colour you will easily understand. It is scarlet, and I mean to represent the scarlet w—, Forgive, if my expressions are strong. I assure my reverend opponent and his friends, that I do not mean to offend in any thing that I may say—I only seek to speak the truth and forgive. Rev. Mr. Maguire, ~~hope~~, by that means that I will have you a convert to our primitive Holy Catholic Church. Mark me, this at the lower part is the primitive church, as it is in England and Ireland, flowing out from the midst of apostacy and corruption; and you see that the red is becoming darker and darker, and I solemnly say that it will become like unto the blood of a dead man, till all those within it die previous to the judgment, that will finally destroy it, and an awful destruction it will be.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Gentlemen, I suppose you are already more than half persuaded that the united church of England and Ireland is the true church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

Rev. Mr. GRIGG—In these kingdoms.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Well, then, in these kingdoms. Really I cannot perceive how anything which the reverend gentleman has said, bears directly or indirectly on the subject. It is true he displayed to you an admirable picture. At first I thought it was the falls of Niagara, (a laugh); and he told you that the original church

was the gold, and that corruption gradually came in. I perfectly agree with him. I agree with him that the vine which Christ planted was at first as a grain of mustard seed, which even in the time of the apostles spread over the world till all the birds in the air could nestle in its leaves. He then came to the nature of Christianity ; and did you mind how he winced and was shaken when he attempted to give you an idea of heresy and schism. I felt for my reverend friend, and the more, because I know his great talents and wonderful powers of mind, when I saw how feeble was his attempt to make anything of that part of his subject. He told you that Christ established a church, and that schisms and heresies sprang up in it, but he should also have told you how these schisms and heresies affected the original church, or how the true doctrines are to be discovered. But he tells you who were the first men that they established. He talks to you of Paul, Cyrenthus, Simon Magus, Apollus, and Nicolaus, but he never once said which of them was the best preacher, or how we were to know which was in the right. Now, what is heresy ? I will tell you. Heresy is derived from the Greek verb *HAIREO*, which signifies to choose for one's self. A heretic is then a self-chosen ; schism is also derived from the Greek verb *SCHIDZO* to cut off, and signifies a cutting or lopping off, or separation. St. John the evangelist says, "they went out from us, they were not of us, for if they were, they would not have gone out from us." Hence the church cannot bear heresy or schism, for Christ says, "if they do not obey the church, let them be unto thee as the heathen and the publican." They are not left in the church to create, as it were, a fermentation among its members. They were cut off, for the leaven will not be endured. Simon Magus, Nicolaus, Cyrenthus, Arius, and all the rest of the grand tail which he has displayed to you, were lopped off from the body of that church to which he seeks again to fasten them by spiritual excommunication. Now, I want to know, if no man is to exercise his judgment in despite of, and in opposition to that of the church (as the reverend gentleman mentions)—if no man has a right to choose for himself in matters of religion, how does he prove those ejected, cut-off members, instead of being a vessel of corruption, to represent all the holy purity of the original church, from which they were cut off on account of their impurity ? St. Paul tells us not to sit or eat with heretics or schismatics. St. John the Evangelist tells us not to eat with them—and Eusebius, whose history I now hold in my hand, relates that, on one occasion, when St. John went with St. Polycarp into a bath in Rome, and saw there Cyrenthus the heretic, he cried out to his companion to run out in haste, lest the bath should fall in and destroy them. These heretics who were banished from the church soon began to protest and establish churches of their own ; the only churches with which my reverend friend can possibly connect himself. In the book of Revelations, St. John recommends a certain bishop, because he condemned the Nicolaites. When Arius set up a school for himself—when he put his own private judgment in opposition

to the doctrines of the church—when he denied the divinity of Christ, a general council was called, by which he was condemned a heretic and schismatic, banished from the pale of the church, and cut off from all participation in her sacraments; and this very council is approved of, and adopted by my reverend friend and his church. I want to know will my friend join Arius and his followers? He is one of those to whom only his church can be traced; and there is the title which he has showed you that he has to purity, holiness and catholicity. He says that his church is a branch of the true church. I wish to know can a lopped-off branch flourish? I never felt so confounded for my friend; I never pitied him so much, (for I respect his talents, and I admire the manliness with which he came forward on this occasion,) as when he told you that Christ said, “that the gates of hell should not prevail against his church;” and then added, in the one breath, that the same Jesus Christ, who made this solemn undertaking, foretold that apostacy, the most awful and most general, should spring up in that church, against which the gates of hell were not to prevail. My reverend friend will tell you in explanation, that the gates of hell did not prevail against it; for though the apostacy was general, a stream of pure doctrine never ceased to flow, invisible indeed, but still it flowed, and he will tell you this, to excuse his church, though Luther has declared that not a single individual existed for one thousand years that was not sunk in the deepest and most damnable idolatry and superstition; and that during that period there was not a true professor of the word in the whole world. Next, my reverend friend says that catholic signifies that it is spread over the whole world.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—No, no.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I beg of you not to interrupt me. You can reply when I am done. He says that it signifies that the church ought to be spread over the whole world—but that it is not spread over it. I assert that the meaning of it is no such thing, but that it is a distinctive appellation by which the true church can be discovered and distinguished from among all other churches. What, then, is the meaning of it? That of all Christian societies the Catholic will immeasurably exceed all others in its extent. So that it is a mark set upon the true church so visible, so easily discerned, that even a fool cannot err in discovering it. But let me ask, how will a fool find out the truth by the many paths which the assertion of the right of private judgment has opened? will the map which my reverend friend displayed direct him? He would be as much at a loss as ever even with that. My friend tells you that the true church in this kingdom is the Protestant church as established in England and Ireland. But I tell you it is not. I refer you to

the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and there you will see that the Antiocheans and Judeans opposed Paul and Barnabas, who had been sent to preach amongst them. They were not convinced by the preaching of these apostles, and they appealed to a general council, of what my friend calls the officers (for he is dreadfully afraid of the word priest); but I tell him that every priest is an officer; but every officer is not a priest; and I wish he would give up his horror of the name, and speak more ecclesiastically. Well, then, they appealed to a council of the priests and bishops of the church assembled in Jerusalem. St. Paul acknowledged their right to appeal; but if the right of private judgment were allowed he acted wrong, and did what he ought not to do; and the apostles were worse for deciding upon the appeal and silencing the Antiocheans and Judeans who never said a word more on the subject, for they bowed to the authority of the church and the Holy Ghost, in whose names the council pronounced their decision. If the right of private judgment were allowed this would not have been the consequence; and this is a clear proof that that doctrine upon which my reverend friend's church is founded, was not the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. Next, gentlemen, he talks of converting me. If I am wrong, may the Lord convert me.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Amen.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—And if he be wrong, may the Lord signify it to us by some means—not that I pray for any visible judgment upon my opponent. What fools must have been the martyrs in Spain, in France, and Portugal, and Italy, and all over the world, to give up friends, and property, to submit to be given to wild beasts, and to undergo every species of the bitterest torture for the sake of a vile church that drank deep of the chalice of apostacy already, if we are to believe the words of my reverend friend. Or how foolish to imagine that that church for which so many have suffered was apostate? I ask why so many beautiful virgins have submitted to similar tortures if our church were not the true one. Let me ask why when locked up with the raging beasts in their den, they licked their feet and hurt them not? Let me ask in what other church have such miracles happened, or for what religion such sacrifices were made? I challenge him to show me any? He allows he had the true faith in the beginning—will he name when he lost it? What was the first heresy—when did it commence—under what Pope or Emperor, without the heretics having been excommunicated? Now, if he can name one heretic that was not excommunicated—now if there were any allowed to remain in the church, let him name them. There were none, though. Will he name any heresy, I ask again? does not Luther himself say that he was alone? (He cited a

passage from one of his writings.) Let me ask him, also, where was the church in existence in the religion of which Luther himself was bound under pain of eternal damnation to make an act of faith? Where was it? Does not Christ say—"He that does not obey the church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Where was the church which he was to obey? He says himself no where? and how could he obey a church which did not exist? The only church that then existed was ours. How is it consistent that he should obey a church which, according to him and his reverend friends, was apostate? Now I will show that it is utterly impossible that his church can convert a Jew; and if I do he must come to our side. The Jew whom he would seek to convert would say to him, "Why, for eight hundred years, according to yourself, there was not one in the church who was not sunk in idolatry. Here is the 2d chapter and 18th verse of Isaiah; Ezekiel, chapter 30th, verse the 25th; Micha, the 18th verse; and Zachariah, the 31st verse." According to these prophets, would the Jew say, "there never could be idolatry or superstition in the Christian dispensation; and before you presume to teach me the Christian doctrine, show me that it is consistent with our prophets who never preached what was false. Our prophets, who were not liars, and now independent of the New Testament, I will never be a Christian as long as Christianity is contradictory to them." Now, this is the natural consequence of his assertions and his belief. But I will ask him, what signifies it if he prove that our religion is wrong? It may be wrong, but that does not make his right. It is not necessary, I must remind you, for me to say one single word in defence of my own religion; first, because he advanced no argument against it; and next, if he did, it is not the subject of this day's discussion. The Dissenters, who are also Christians, are equally opposed to the monstrous grasping ambition of the established church, that puts her hand into every man's pocket, and seeks for every man's money, even though he may curse her doctrines—even though he would not join in her prayers; and she rejects the Dissenter from her, because he will not swear to twenty-two negative articles, and is not willing to pay her what she has not earned, in order to make her ministers roll in their carriages, to pension the daughters of her bishops, who are married to parsons, and to get benefices for their sons. There is not a single argument that he will advance that I will not retort with double force in the name of the Dissenters. I will show that his rule of faith has damned him, and them, and me, if I were fool enough to adopt it. He says, if he is right we are wrong, and if we are wrong he is right. It is a *non sequitur*. If his arguments were carried out it would go to this, that no man without the pale of

his church would be saved. This is not my doctrine. It is true that I believe no heretic or schismatic will be saved. But who is to say who is the heretic and who is not ? The man that lives in the wrong church and knows it to be so, is a heretic, and will be damned ; but who will tell the man that knows it ? I ask how could my reverend friend call the Rev. Mr. Burgh a heretic because he differed from him in opinion ? Has he not the right of private judgment, as well as my friend, according to his own principles ? Now, if I choose to broach a new heresy, (and I could broach one as well as many of those who have done so already)—suppose I was to say that my friend should not have a second coat—the Gospels say so—if I said, when you are asked for your coat, give your waistcoat also—if you are struck on one cheek, turn the other also—what right would he have to call me a heretic ? If he objects to the bible, I hold out its truth to him, and he admits that it is infallible.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, I entreat your attention once more. I thank my God I stand here as a member of the church of England and not as a private individual. I take up the last of my reverend friend's observations first. I, as a churchman, hold that the church is the judge in matters of controversy as to faith, and that she has the power of throwing out of her pale all heretics ; and my reverend friend and I very nearly accord on this subject. I admit that the holy Catholic church has the power of condemning heresy. I only say that the unholy church has not that power. I object to the errors of his church, but not to all her doctrines, and I grant that the holy church has the power of objecting to heresy. I do not stand on the paramount right of private judgment. I defend private judgment when it agrees with the public judgment of the church, and all that I blame is private mis-judgment. There is first, the public judgment of the church, and it directs the private judgment of individuals. Secondly, there is the private judgment, which, if well directed, will accord with the public judgment. Take mathematics, for instance. Who will deny that in mathematics every one has a right to private judgment ? If a man choose to say that three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles and a half I would say to him that he had a right to think so if he liked, but that all the rest of the world would laugh at him, and think him a fool, and that is precisely the way when the judgment of an individual is at variance with that of the church. Whenever my private inclination leads me to differ with the received doctrines of the church, I say let us wait awhile, perhaps we will see that the church is right ; and invariably I find it to be the case. Mark me, I condemn heretics, because they assert the right of private judgment, denying altogether public judgment ; and I condemn the Church of Rome for asserting



public judgment denying altogether the right of private judgment, for truth lies between them. You, therefore, see that the Rev. Mr. Maguire's fulminations against me on that head do not at all hold. He says also that our church cannot convert a Jew. Protestants, I say, have converted Jews. One fact is worth a thousand assertions, and I think I could adduce hundreds of facts. I once met a Jew. He was originally from Poland, and I was particularly anxious to know what was the state of his mind previous to conversion. I therefore asked him why he did not at first become a Christian? He told me that he saw so much blessing of holy water, and exhibition of images, and other species of idolatry, that he would not for anything become a Christian, but when he came he saw no such thing, and he immediately embraced Christianity. It is then notorious that the Church of Rome is the mother of every species of superstition; and, if I may use the expression, she is also the mother of the hard-heartedness of the unbelieving Jews. Mr. Maguire has said that there could be no idolatry in the Christian church, and has cited scripture to that purpose. I will point out to him in the scripture the most direct prophecies of that idolatry in the church. I will call his attention to the Prophet Zachariah, chap. 11, verse, 16, where he said—"I will raise up a shepherd in the land, which shall not visit those that he cut off, neither shall he seek the young one nor heal that that is broken, nor feed that that standeth still; but he shall eat the flesh of the fat, and tear their claws in pieces. Woe to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened." Here I refer Mr. Maguire to the raising up of the shepherd in the church. He objects to the use of the words heresy and schism, but in my opinion, he appears to confuse their meaning much. We all know that the word schism is derived from the Greek, and that it means a splitting. The apostle, writing to one of the churches, says, "let there be no schisms (*scidozo*, that is divisions) among you. Again, the word heresy means, I grant, a choice, but it is when that choice is made with an injury that it becomes wrong; and we find that the word *heresies* is sometimes taken in good sense. Thus the proper meaning of the latter word, as taken by the church, is a choice of error, as that of *schidozo* is a splitting or dividing, as well as a cutting or dividing, and also a cutting off, as Mr. Maguire takes it to be. My reverend friend blames me for not proving all at once that the church of England is the true church in these countries; that I will do; but had I the seven heads and ten horns, I could not do it at once, along with following the arguments of Mr. Maguire. He asks me to point out a time when the heresy of the church of Rome began. Now, to take a simple illustration, if I was to ask any gentleman here when his hair became grey, would he not be rather surprised at the question? and tell that it did not happen in one day, but that it became grey by degrees. In the same way, when I am asked when the church of Rome became corrupted and idolatrous, I answer, by degrees. I shall now refer Mr. Maguire to his favourite apostle, 2d Peter, chap. 2, verse 1, where it is said, "But there were

false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." In the next is described—first, the introducers of heresies and false prophets; secondly, the matter of the heresies, who *privily* bring in damnable heresies.<sup>7</sup> *Privily*, that is in the same manner that a man's hair becomes grey by degrees and imperceptibly; and, thirdly, the fatal and awful conclusion to which these heresies must lead, "they bring upon themselves swift destruction." Mark, then, my friends, the manner and the mode of introducing those heresies as pointed out in that text. But we are referred to the Old Testament, and there we have a fine field open to find out what the nature of these heresies, thus described, should be. I will now ask what was the nature of the heresies in the Old Testament, and were they not idolatrous ones? But then they were not a total denying of the Lord; they were, in some measure made subservient to the worship of the true God. The Jews, in truth, abandoned the true God on these occasions, though they thought not themselves, and might not have appeared to do so. Every part of the Old Testament gives us examples of this fact. Let us read that part in which is described the golden calf that was set up by Aaron. It will be found in the 3d chapter of Exodus, where it is said, when the calf was set up to be worshipped, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought them out of the land of Egypt." Mark, then, it was intended to represent Elohim himself. Now, this arose from the very sacrificial rites of the Jews, all of which foreshowed the Messiah, it arose from the sacrifices of oxen, misunderstood by those people. Now, is not this the identical thing of which we accuse the church of Rome? We have the sacrament, and blessed be God! we have the real presence with it, for he who receives it receives Christ, the hope of glory, giving him wealth, and power and energy; but the elements are not changed into Christ, as the church of Rome believes, by being transubstantiated into him—hence they got not the real presence, but they receive and adore a fiction instead thereof. Such, my friends, was the apostacy of the Jews; if we go over the whole history of the ancient church, we will find it the same on other occasions. Thus, in the Book of Kings, when the false prophet prophesied to King Ahab, and told him that his enemies would be delivered into his hands, they said at the same time that they served the Lord God, and indicated his will. This was the apostacy of the Church of Rome, the very same as that of the Jews. We find, as the Scriptures describe, the false teachers who were to be in the church, who would close their ears and eyes, and harden their hearts and the hearts of the people against the truth, and against the word of God. Mr. Maguire asks how is it possible that idolatry could exist in the Church of Christ. Now, we find in the 11th chapter of Revelations, while the church is likened to a temple, these words—"And the angel stood, saying rise and measure the temple of God and the altar, and them that worship therein; but the court that is without the temple leave out, and measure it not, for it is given unto the Gentiles." How then is the truth to be kept

alive in the church? Christ has raised witnesses for that purpose—"I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth." By means of those, will the people be enabled to escape from the midst of apostacy. Mr. Maguire asked, "Where was the church in the time of Luther?" The true church was in the midst of the abomination—it was in the heart of a monk. Luther himself tells us that when he groaned beneath the burden of sin, and laboured in every manner he could to get rid of it, he could find no peace for his soul in the midst of all his prayers and fastings, and other austerities. He then mentioned his distress to an Augustinian monk, who, he tells us, disgressed for a long time with him the remission of sins, and pointing out to him an article in the creed on that subject, he told him, "believe this not as if I said in general, but of *thy* sins." Luther then became comforted, and he said he felt that he was washed in the blood of Jesus. Thus there was an humble Augustinian monk in the midst of the apostacy, who was a silent witness of the truth. Mr. Gregg's half hour being out.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE said—My friends you have just heard that Luther was a silent witness! I thought quite the contrary, and I never heard of any man who made a greater noise in the world. Why he made more noise than Arius himself: but that is not to the purpose. I asked my opponent where was the true church in which Luther could make an act of faith, which he must have done under the penalty of damnation, and am I told where? *De non existentibus et non apparentibus eadem est ratio*. If the church was not visible, it was just the same for the purpose as if it did not exist at all; and if it ever had existed, where, when, and how did it disappear? Was there, in reality, after 1500 years no visible church on earth? And yet Jesus Christ has said the church which he established was a city on a mountain, to which all nations flocked—a light which could not be hid—a tree which overshadowed all the earth—a rock against which the gates of hell should not prevail. He said to his apostles, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and behold I am with you to the end of the world." With whom was he? With the bishops and priests of his church, to whom he addressed himself. How was he with them? Teaching and preaching, and baptizing. How long? To the end of time. Again I ask you—but I know that I ask you in vain—where was the church? Did not the apostles assert in their creed, "I believe in the holy Catholic church," as well as they did "I believe in the Holy Ghost?" How, then was it Catholic if it was invisible? How was it universal, if it was not to be seen on the face of the earth? Thus are those professors of a false creed driven into corners—thus have they recourse to subterfuge, and are put under the necessity of contradicting themselves. I reminded him of Paul and Barnabas, but to no purpose. He says he is for public and private judgment taken conjointly; but he holds that the Dissenters are not in the church, because making use of their private judgment they differ from him.

Mr. GREGG—I protest against Mr. Maguire taking on him the character of a Dissenter.

Mr. MAGUIRE—How can you protest against what all must acknowledge to be a fair argument? But I know, poor man, how you must feel it.

Mr. GREGG—I argue with you as a Catholic gentleman, and if you turn Dissenter, I must take a different course, (cries of chair, chair.)

Mr. MAGUIRE—The chairman will decide that question; but how came it that in my discussion with Mr. Pope that neither Mr. Pope nor I had occasion to resort to interruption or contradiction? But I will argue with you in this way. If two persons, both of whom say they have the Holy Ghost to direct them should disagree, who is to decide between them? Can the Holy Ghost contradict himself, or will he decide against himself? The Holy Scriptures of themselves cannot be an infallible guide. They are of course objectively infallible, that is with regard to God and to themselves, because all that they contain is true; but they are fallible with regard to us, because we may be deceived in the sense in which we understand them. Now, when any difference exists in matters of religion, before either public or private judgment can decide, by having recourse to the Scriptures, it must first determine whether that Scripture be uncorrupted and genuine. And, finally, if public and private judgment do not yield to each other, will it be said that the Holy Ghost, whom all pretend to have, is a spirit of contradiction? Mr. Gregg says that he gets out of the dilemma by asserting that private judgment is only right as long as it coincides with that of the church. Now I ask who gave his church any authority in matters of faith? Who ordained it to judge of the faith of Christ? If it derived not that authority from Christ, from whom did it derive it? Was it from Harry VIII., or Bess, or Meddy, or the cruel, avaricious, grasping, tyrannical Somerset? The question to-day is, whether or not the church of England is the church of Christ—

Mr. GREGG—In these countries.

Mr. MAGUIRE—In these countries, I say; and it is unnecessary to interrupt me. To-morrow the church of Rome will be on her trial. I again ask Mr. Gregg will he support the twenty-two negative and reformed articles of his church? I do not require him to prove those which he admits in common with me, and which relate to the doctrines of the Trinity and incarnation, &c. I challenge him to support the reformed articles of the Church of England, and I will endeavour to keep him to the question. I will now propose a few arguments to him. I say that church cannot be the true one which accuses Christ of having broken his promises; and the church of England accuses Christ of having broken his promises; therefore it cannot be the true church. I prove the minor proposition thus:—Christ has said that he would build his church on a rock—that he would make it the pillar and the ground of truth—that the gates of hell would not prevail against it—and that his Spirit would remain with it through all ages to teach it all truth. But the Protestants say that the church fell into apostacy and idolatry, and thus that the

gates of hell did prevail against it, and, consequently that the promises of Christ to his church did fail. Mr. Gregg refers me to the idolatry of the Jews, which I never questioned, to show me that the church of Christ also fell into idolatry. Christ said to his church, "As my father has sent me so do I send you—and I will remain with you for all ages;" but Mr. Gregg says that he did not remain with the church, and that the object of all those sacred promises fall into the grossest corruption and abomination, and apostacy. I call on him now to prove the 32 articles which he stands here to advocate from Scripture. Every one appeals to Scripture in support of his own opinions—every heretic and schismatic, and enthusiast, and ranter calls the Scripture to his aid; they all say that they are infallible in the interpretation of it; that the Holy Spirit dwells in them, and that they feel confident of it; but when they quote the Scripture they give their own gloss to it. I don't give any gloss to the Holy Scriptures when I quote it; but the gloss and interpretation of that church which has withstood the tempest of more than 1800 years, and those men who adorned it by their wisdom and learning, and holy lives—who studied the Word of God in the sacred cell, and in the rocks of the desert, and who sealed the testimony of its truth with the last drop of blood that flowed from their hearts. It is to the church of the primitive saints—the church which converted the whole world, that I appeal—and was it not, in truth, the Church of Rome which converted England and Ireland, and Germany, and many other parts of Europe to the truths of Christianity? We hear a great deal of the conversion of the Jews by Protestants. I myself heard Mr. Wolff tell in this room of his having converted a Jewish Rabbi to Christianity, but the truth of the matter was that when the Jew got the Bible, he lost no time till he tore the New Testament out of it. Indeed, the Rev. Mr. Wolff, a man of honor, but an enthusiast, stated in this room some years ago, that he had converted a Jewish Rabbi in Jerusalem. Now, Dr. Madden, a gentleman who has travelled nearly as much as the Rev. Mr. Wolff, informed him (Mr. M.) that he saw the Rabbi in Jerusalem, and put the newspaper into his hand, containing an account of his alleged conversion. The Jew smiled, and produced the bible in which Mr. Wolff's name appeared, and the New Testament was torn out of it. People may laugh when we say our church has the gift of miracles; but where is there another church which could boast like ours of miracles? Suppose a man should say that he works miracles, and in proof thereof should turn a flock of lambs into an open desert, some of the lambs would be slaughtered by the savage beasts; but, when, by their mildness, they should have changed the wolves and tigers, and made them as mild and harmless as themselves, would not that be a great miracle? Such has been our case—we have been sent among the wolves, and we have changed them into the lambs of Jesus Christ. I ask, did not St. Francis Xavier convert more souls to Christianity in India, during three years and a half, than all that were ever converted in any country by the exertions of the Protestant church? Even Protestant historians acknowledge the

miracles of that great saint ; for God knew that when he was sent to carry the gospel into an infidel country, miracles were necessary to attest the doctrines which he preached. Such conversion was not like that effected by Protestants, who say that when any one reads the Bible he is converted, whether he may not cast away the Bible in a moment after. To-morrow, my friends, you shall see how I will disprove all the arguments brought against my church. I will prove that Antichrist is yet to come—that his reign will be but three years and a half—that he is to be a single man, and not the whole race of popes, as Mr. Gregg will attempt to show you. I will prove that that interpretation of Scripture is nonsensical and ridiculous in the highest degree—I will make Protestants laugh at him for employing it; and now, in my turn, I call upon him to give, as he is bound to do, scriptural proofs of the reformed part of the Thirty-nine Articles. He believes them to be essential, and that without them there is no safety, for his church even compels men to swear to them. Now may it not be asked if the church being invisible for 1000 years could not men be excused for not believing in her existence ? Would she then be like the city on the hill, or that glorious tree which over shadows the entire earth, and in whose wide spreading branches and ample foliage, the birds of the air find a shelter and build their nests—and, if our Protestant brethren love to wander and romance, and cannot be brought to nestle among its leaves, then are they of those, of whom Christ speaks, when he says, other sheep and another fold have I which I must also bring back. Where was the fold, and where was the shepherd for a thousand years ? Did Jesus leave them so long alone ? Again, I argue thus : that the church which contradicts the evident truth is false and ignorant. But the Church of England contradicts the evident truth, therefore it is false and ignorant. I prove the minor. The Church of England contradicts the evident truth, if it asserts that the part is greater than the whole ; but this it does, when it holds that private judgment is not only as good, but even better than that of the whole church. Hence I argue that the Church of England is false and ignorant, and I challenge my antagonist to disprove it. Does not Christianity come by hearing, and how by hearing, unless by preaching ? And who sent the ministers of the Church of England to preach ? Again, do I repeat the question—though I know that I repeat it in vain—where did Luther get his mission ? Did you not get baptism from us, and did you not also get the right to preach ? What proof have you that you possess that right ? According to your own doctrines you cannot have more than a moral probability that you are in the true church ; but no act of faith could ever be made on a moral probability. God could never reveal any thing which was only morally probable. In the Church of England there is only a moral probability—therefore the Church of England cannot be the revealed religion of God. I challenge Mr. Gregg to answer that argument. You can never make an act of faith in a fallible church—you can never build infallibility on fallibility. Mr. Maguire's half hour ended here.

Mr. GREGG—I congratulate the people of Ireland that this dis-

cussion has taken place. I congratulate them because I feel assured that before it shall have terminated they will be convinced that the Church of Rome is false, and I have undertaken to prove it. Mr. Maguire has just spoken for half an hour, and I am sure that no one here who has heard him understands one word of what he has said. "He darkens counsel with words without meaning." He accuses me of not proving any thing; but it is he who proves nothing. He grapples with his own ideas—he first raises up giants, and then proceeds to kill them. He asserts that I stand up for private judgment alone; but I stand here as a member of the Church of England, and to support its doctrines, as I hope I shall do to the end of my life. I refer to the words of Luther, where, in speaking of private judgment, he says that the right of private judgment is impiously wrested by the pastors from the people. He speaks of the queen church, and I say that always existed. I undertake to prove every article of faith which I support on the scriptures. Luther says that the church was plunged for ages in idolatry, and I assert *cum intimo animo meo* to that proposition. There are two kinds of universality which are to be distinguished—moral and metaphysical universality. The church of England claims the former species of universality alone. Mr. Maguire employs an ingenious syllogism to prove that the church of England contradicts the words of Christ; but, until he divests his mind of mere complicated ideas, and becomes more simple, as a follower of the gospel should, he will not be able to attain the truth. He has told you, my friends, that, according to me, the church of Christ has been invisible. But here we are a glorious proof of the contrary—here is the united church of England and Ireland, a triumphant demonstration of the visibility of the church of Christ. I shall now come to the demonstration of my proposition—viz., that the united churches of England and Ireland is the true church of Christ in these kingdoms. First, they have a fellowship with the Apostles; for although a separate society, they profess the doctrines of the church, and, as the scriptures show, it is not necessary for such society to go over to any other. Secondly, I will prove that the doctrines of the church of England are the doctrines of Christ, and this I will maintain against the whole world. Before I will proceed to prove the first part, viz., that our church has a fellowship with the apostles—for which purpose I will make use of this book, viz., the Roman Catholic Directory for 1837—I will call your attention to this book which I hold in my hand, and which is called the *Pontificale Romanum*. Now, you recollect that Mr. Maguire asked me what nation did we convert? I answer the question very easily. Suppose I say we converted New Zealand, and New Holland, and many nations in the Southern Ocean, do I not give him a sufficient answer? But in this book I find a chapter, *De Benedictione Ensis*, the consecration or blessing of the sword; here we have all the solemn rites of a bishop sprinkling holy water—a man kneeling down, and the sword laid on his shoulder—the bishop pronouncing the words, "receive this sword in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to defend our holy church from her enemies." &c. This is the way, my friends, in

which the Roman Catholics convert nations—it is thus, by the sword, that they converted the Albigenses and they converted them with a vengeance, from wolves to lambs ; for a million of the persecuted people were extinguished. I hold in my hands two books—namely, a Protestant prayer-book, and a Roman missal. Observe this book well, my friends. There is always something curious in things which come from Rome ; but this is a very curious book—for you must know that it is one out of which the devil has been driven ! I do not wish to offend my Roman Catholic brethren, but I cannot help expressing my firm conviction that the devil is really in this book. I protest not against what good is in the Church of Rome, but I protest against her abuses, against her sorceries, her witchcrafts, her driving of the devil out of salt and water, and sticks, and old bones, &c. I do not deny that there is some good in the church of Rome, and with that I agree ; but I condemn her superstition, and idolatry, and apostacies. But to return to my argument. This Roman Catholic Directory contains lists of bishops ; and, by some chance, or that the Lord sometimes blinds men's eyes that good may come from it ; it also contains the list of some Protestant bishops. Mr. Maguire asks me where we got our mission ? I answer from our own primitive bishops it was handed down to us. A very great number of the Catholic bishops were converted at the Reformation, and came over to us, and through them was the mission handed down, and my reverend friend well knows that if only one came over in that way, it would be sufficient ; for St. Paul was but one when he went to convert nations and to ordain pastors. Here we have a list of the archbishops of Dublin, I suppose from the time of St. Patrick ; and we find that the last of the Catholic bishops, G. Brown, is the first of the Protestant bishops. He came over to us, just as if Dr. Murray should now cease making holy water, and he was put out of his see by Queen Mary, because he was a married man. Now, I wish that my reverend friend was a married man. I thank God that I am one myself ; and I don't see why I should be worse in the sight of God, because I can prostrate myself on my knees to adore Him, with my wife, and surrounded by my children, whom I teach to adore and worship him. Well, the next bishop to George Brown was Hugh Kirwan, who was placed in the diocese by the choice of Mary, and in the next line we find him cut off as an apostate, and the very second on the list of the Protestant archbishops of Dublin. He renounced the errors of his church, as the greater number of the Catholic bishops did ; and I might go on with the whole list, to show you that since that time there has been a regular and uninterrupted chain of bishops of the church of England in the see, while intervals of centuries occurred in the descent of the Roman Catholic bishops—intervals of confusion and disorder ; and while bishops and pastors were foisted over here from Rome to fill the places of those who embraced the reformed doctrines. We have got the regular descent, we have got the cathedrals, and the records and registries, and, I was going to add, the tithes ! There is our church emerging gloriously from the cor-



ruption of abomination. [Here Mr. Gregg again exhibited the roll of paper, which was daubed with red and yellow.] There you see it coming out from the midst of apostacy? We have the bishops—we have the apostolical mission—and we consider that as important, not for any humbug of parade, but as a striking proof of the truth. You all know Paley's argument for the truth of Christianity, drawn from the regular concatenation of cotemporary writers; and that argument has the same force here. It is we who have the truth with us; it is we who have come out of Babylon; and do you also, my Catholic brethren, come out from the Babylon of corruption. Take up our prayer-books, and you will find them teeming with the purest piety; take up those of your own church, and you will find them full of difficulties and obstacles, and passages which you are desired not to read. You will find in them a St. Agatha, and a St. Martha, and a St. Valentine too; for there was also a St. Valentine; and you will find a Dominick, the Grand Inquisitor. Good God, what men to raise to the throne of Christ? What consequences flow from all this corruption? Our country is a degraded nation—their principles are vitiated and lost. Behold Italy a degraded country, and Spain a degraded country, and Portugal, and every other nation where the religion of Rome prevails, a degraded country. The curse of God has fallen heavy upon them, and they are degraded and debased among the nations of the earth; and then turn your eyes on England, and ask, why is she glorious, and prosperous, and triumphant? Why, with Ireland, is she the greatest empire in the world? Because in her the purity of the Christian religion prevails—because no impious or improper prayers are there uttered before the throne of God. Yes, I will proclaim it—from the house-top will I cry it out—my Roman Catholic brethren, come out from Babylon. To-morrow will I take Mr. Maguire on his false miracles—miracles which they themselves do not believe in.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Fellow-Christians, and it is from my heart I call you so, I am not one who erects himself in a court of judicature, and sets himself up to pronounce judgment upon the religious belief of any man—I do not say that one man is right and another wrong. I have given my reverend opponent a few syllogisms, which I do not wonder at his disliking; they are tough customers. You have a major and a minor proposition, either of which you may deny, but the consequences you cannot touch, if it be logically and truly deduced. But I will stick to the syllogisms, and will let him keep to his assertions, at which he seems particularly powerful. He did not quote a single text during the whole half hour, and yet he says, and loudly, that he stands on the Bible. He tells us that the apostles of our church were the primitive bishops of theirs. I think

him for the admission, and I wish him joy of Bishop Browne, and the others whom we turned out of our church because they violated a solemn vow to the Almighty. He talks of our celibacy—why Christ, St. Paul, and St. John were all of the corporation of bachelors. All the rest of the apostles who had wives, left them upon being called by their Master. All those who had left our church on the contrary, have taken wives. Luther, not content with breaking his own vow, made poor Catherine break hers, and gave the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel liberty to marry two wives. He said that we have nothing to do with the ten commandments—the gospel, and nothing else, was all we had any thing to do with. My reverend friend has acknowledged that those who were kicked out of our church, like some of our modern heroes, became the primitive bishops of theirs. Though too bad for us, they were good enough for them. They violated a vow, and it is said that “every man who violates a lawful vow to God has damnation.” Yet those men who acted thus became dignitaries of their church without even ordination. They acknowledge our ordination by never ordaining again any priest who goes over to them, while we always ordain anew any who come over to us; and let me ask, did ever any clergyman of our church give up his calling and his religion without afterwards debasing himself with the lies and libels he heaped on the one he had left. But this is all talk. It is merely conversational. I will leave him assertion, and I will come to argument. What are the great principles of Christianity? First, that Christ gave a true religion to the Apostles—and, secondly, that they gave it as they received it to the world—thirdly, that this religion has certain marks to induce all to believe in it. What are those marks? Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. Our church has all of those. He has not shown that he has any of them. When I ask him what country his religion has converted, he answers “New Zealand.” Why, we have as many missionaries there as they have, and they make more conversions, for they are not satisfied with merely giving men a Bible, and hearing him say God bless you and no more about it. They go upon principle. Look at the ancient Christians—see what a trial the convert had to undergo previous to baptism—see the pains that were taken with him, and the instruction he received. Read St. Augustin *De civitate Dei*, and others of his works, and compare our manner of making converts with the method adopted with regard to the New Zealand converts by them. I will now proceed. He talked of Luther. I said before that Luther had not maintained the doctrine of public judgment. Well, Mr. Gregg quotes from him a passage to the effect that the hearers are the judges. Is

it *censu composito* or *censu divisio*? Is it all the hearers that are the judges? Then all must be united among themselves; if only each single hearer, then that is right private judgment, and that right Luther maintained. I asked him whether the Holy Ghost gave private or public judgment, or both. If the first, then private judgment was infallible; if the second, then it was infallible, and weighed down the individual judgment; if both, who is to decide between them if they differ? He admits no private judgment unless it accords with the public. But if it differ, who is to decide? With regard to the non-existence of the church for 800 years, he spoke of universality, moral and metaphysical. Mind the words of the church of England are, that there was no individual, young or old, clergy or laity, that was not buried in idolatry for 800 years. I called on him to show me the lawfulness of his mission; he did not do so. I called on him to show me that one link in the chain of bishops of his church was unbroken; he did not do so. I saw him hesitating and staggering, when endeavouring to explain the fact of the rejected bishops of our church becoming the bishops of his. With regard to the twenty-two negative articles of the church of England, he made a great flourish. He said he would prove them all from scripture; but he became appalled, and did not attempt to prove one of them. He quit the subject as a child would run away from a mad dog. Why did he not prove some of those reformed articles, which his church compels all its members to swear to? I call on him to do so now; but I'll hear as little of it as you will. Again he talks of the consecration of chapels, and of the consecration of a sword. My answer to him is, wait till the coronation comes, and you will see how they will bless the Queen's shawl and her dimity, and her crown, and pray that she may go on and prosper, and have a happy reign. Now, I will prove the lawfulness of that practice, to which my reverend friend objected from scripture. I refer you to the 19th chap. of Numbers, where, to cure the bite of a dog, water and clay were blessed and sprinkled on the wound. Again, I refer you to St. Paul, who says, "For every creature of God is good when sanctified by the word of God and prayer." We bless the marriage-bed to give a sanctifying influence to the connubial state. But not to lose time, do you not consecrate your own churches and altars? My reverend friend spoke of the abuses of our religion, as he was pleased to call them; and argued against it on account of them: Our blessed Saviour chose 12 apostles to represent him. One betrayed, another denied, and the rest fled from him. From this the Jew, the Pagan or the infidel would have a better argument against Christianity than he has against us, from all the

abuses he has enumerated. But viewing them in their most favorable light, they prove nothing. He argues from particulars to generals, and *a particulari ad generalum non valid conclusio*. He talked of the persecutions perpetrated by our church. I ask him when did she ever approve of the principle. It is true that when in alliance with the state her children have persecuted ; but, then, it was never approved of by the church, being always caused by what is called state policy. Remember that I need not say to-day a single word in defence of the Roman Catholic church. He has travelled out of his record. And I, because I wish to be all things to all, have followed him. But I will now bring him back to the point. He says there is a public judgment in his church. I ask him is that judgment infallible, or is it a hit-or-miss judgment ? If he says that she is not infallible, I ask him will Jesus Christ bind us to obey a church which is just as fallible as ourselves ? And is not that church better in proof of whose infallibility no less than 136 texts can be quoted ? I ask where were the Holy Scriptures for the 60 years after Christ died ? The church existed, teaching, preaching, and baptizing ; yet the first of the Scriptures were not written until 30 years after the Redeemer's death, nor was St. John's gospel written until 65 years after the event. And yet was not the church visible and flourishing at the time ? If Christ was with his church then, is he not with her now—or did he say to his apostles, the nearer you are to me the more you need me ; and the more you require me the more I will abandon you ? I have asked Mr. Gregg how he got the Bible, or how he knows it to be true, or how he will prove the divinity of the Apocalypse ? He has not answered the first two questions ; and the third will be before you to-morrow. I will now give him a syllogism—that is not the church of Christ which cannot on Christian principles prove the divinity of the Scriptures ; but the church of England cannot, on christian principles, prove the divinity of the Scriptures ; therefore the church of England is not the church of Christ. I prove my minor—the church of England denies tradition, and holds that there is nothing except the Scriptures that is not fallible. That cannot be proved by my opponent, without falling into a vicious circle, to wit—to prove that the Scriptures are infallible or divine, he must beg the question—namely that they are true. We both agree as to the divinity of the Scriptures. But I have reason for entertaining that belief—he has none ; but for that I would not have asked him to prove the fact he assumes.

The meeting then adjourned till Wednesday.

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

SECOND DAY—WEDNESDAY, 30TH MAY.

---

Wednesday being the second day of the discussion, it was resumed at the appointed hour. The room was much more densely crowded than on the preceding day. At eleven o'clock precisely,

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—My Christian brethren, the church of England is this day on her trial, and I am to accuse her. I did not take all this trouble for the purpose of attacking my reverend and respected friend ; but I came here to attack the church to which he belongs, and through him to expose her heresy and schism. The church of England is arraigned this day before the tribunal of public opinion. She shall be weighed in the balance of the holy scriptures, and shall be found miserably wanting. You, my brethren, will please to observe that when an antagonist is detected in a fundamental error he is bound by the laws of truth and of religion to relinquish all further opposition. Now, I think I will prove to your satisfaction, and the satisfaction of the reverend gentleman himself, that he has fallen into a very great error ; and if I do, I hope he will at once acknowledge it, and come over to our side. The Rev. Mr. Gregg has asserted that the true, holy, Catholic church was invisible for eight hundred years or more. Now St. Paul says, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 4th chapter and 3d verse, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them who are lost." The meaning of this is clear from the next verse : "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine into them." It signifies that the gospel of Jesus was to be preached everywhere, and the glory of religion was everywhere to be announced, so that the truth of it would become

so palpable and obvious that only those who were sunk in eternal perdition, and who could not, because they would not, see, would avoid beholding it. Now I want him to reconcile his assertion to this saying of St. Paul, and I defy him to do so. It is impossible. But I will go further. I never promise to prove any thing without doing so ; and I now undertake to prove, to a perfect demonstration, the absolute, perpetual visibility and indefectibility of the holy Catholic church ; and if, then, the holy Catholic church does possess a never-ending visibility and indefectibility, his church cannot be it, for he admits it was invisible for 800 years or more. Now, gentlemen, mark my proof. Let me, my Protestant brethren, call your attention particularly to this. I am now about to quote from the prophets in support of my proposition. You may, perhaps, say that all the prophecies which I will cite, relate to the Jewish church alone. But I deny this ; and I will prove to you from the New Testament that they refer to the Christian church, and to Christ, who was the son of David. I refer you to the 1st chapter and 1st verse of the gospel by Matthew—"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." This, then, proves that Jesus Christ was the son of David and of Abraham, and that the promises made in the name of David referred to him. But I will go further ; I will refer you to the 1st chapter of the gospel by Luke, beginning at the 30th verse—"And the angel said unto her, fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God ; and behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest ; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David ; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Now, these quotations show to whom the texts I shall subsequently quote must refer. You will also perceive that these promises could not refer to the Jews ; for St. Paul says, "The new church is established upon far better promises than the old." If, then, I prove that the church could not be invisible, and that it could never fail and become apostate, I will succeed in proving that my reverend friend has fallen into a fundamental error. I now proceed with my demonstration. I refer you to the 34th verse of the 89th psalm—"My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips. Once I have sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Again, (27th verse,) also I will make him, my first born, higher than the kings

of the earth." Now, you will bear in mind that the Bible I am reading from is not the Douay Bible, but the authorised version published in the reign of James the First, by command of the king. But to come once more to my texts. What does St. Paul say? "The children of the promise account for the seed." Again, look to the 73d psalm—"They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river even to the end of the earth." That cannot refer to the Jews; for their kingdom did not extend from sea to sea. Again, "All kings shall fall down before him—all nations shall serve him." I now refer you to the 49th chap. and 14th verse of Isaiah, "The Lord hath loved him; he will do his pleasure on Babylon, and his arms shall be on the Chaldeans." Now let me ask my reverend friend, what church, for the fifteen hundred years previous to Elizabeth, ever taught the Thirty-nine Articles? Let me ask, for the eight hundred years during which he says there was no one who was not sunk in some damnable idolatry, where were the watchmen that were to keep watch on the walls of Jerusalem? Did not Christ say to his church—"Thou shalt be the city sought for and not forsaken." Where, let me ask, was it to be sought for during the period referred to, and where was it to be found? Again, Isaiah says—and I beg of you to remark this, my brethren, that they are afraid to translate the names mentioned in the passage, giving them in the old Greek form. Isaiah then premises that the church shall spread through Italy, Spain, Portugal and France, "to the isles afar off;" and these islands are England, Ireland, and Scotland, which are called the islands afar off, because they were considered the most distant parts of the west previous to the discovery of America. Isaiah adds—"I will take of them to be priests and Levites;" and Jeremiah says, "I will give fear to their hearts, that they may not revolt from me." But, according to my reverend friend, these promises were all lies; for they did revolt from him, and their revolt continued for eight hundred years. Thus Christ had prophesied that he would leave after him a visible successor to himself on the throne of the church, and that none should ever be wanted, and that there should always be a priest in the new law, to offer sacrifice from the rising to the setting of the sun. Here I have Hezekiah upon the point—"And he will rise up over them one pastor." Thus Christ is the one pastor, and he has left his visible vicegerent upon the earth. The same prophet prophesies that there shall never be idolatry in the new church. I wish my reverend friend would tell me how many pastors there are in the church of England? The Queen is the pre-

sent pastor—God knows who will be the next ! The Lord has said that his kingdom will endure for ever—that is, that all heresies shall yield to the true church. The heresies of Luther, of Knox, of Calvin, and of Zuinglius, even as the heresy of Arius and other heresies, yielded to it before. Let me ask what Lutheranism is now to what Arianism was when it could number within its pale fully 3,000 bishops ? And where is Arianism now ? The true church has triumphed over it, and it will equally triumph over Lutheranism ; but not by the sword, as my opponent has insinuated. Oh, if he recollected the penal laws—if he recollected all the money and the blood which had been wrung from this country alone—if he recollected how England was proselyted by the plunder and persecution and robbery which were practised—the seizure of churches too, for they never built one cathedral of their own—he would never be so imprudent as to speak of our church using the sword or stretching forth the hand of violence. I should fatigue you if I were to give you all the texts which bear upon the proposition I have undertaken to prove. But having given you so many from the Old Testament, I shall now give you one or two from the New. You will find there that Christ said his church was a city built upon a mountain, and that it should never be hid ; but my reverend friend says that it has been hid, and hid for the space of eight hundred years or more. I leave it to himself to reconcile his assertion with the promise of our Saviour. I think I have now proved the perfect visibility and inflexibility of the true church. My friend admits that at one time our church was the true church ; but he says that it afterwards apostatised. But I have proved that it could not apostatise. I have adduced the promises of Christ himself in support of my proposition : and I therefore call upon him to retrace his steps, and acknowledge his error. But, if he does not do so, I call upon him to name a single church that has ever professed belief of the Thirty-nine Articles previous to the days of Elizabeth. I challenge him to prove the truth of the twenty-two negative articles, and he must give me scripture also ; for I take him at his own word, that there is nothing infallible except the scriptures. Now, my Protestant brethren, I take up your book of Common Prayer, and look at the 14th psalm. You will see that there it contains eleven verses ; look to the Bible, you will find but seven verses. Either then you have subtracted from the Word of God in the Bible, or you have added to it in the Book of Common Prayer. Now here is not a single one of your bishops who has not sworn to be truth of every word in that Book of Common Prayer ; and say that there is not one of them that has not committed perjury. Next, you exclude from the scriptures the Book of Tobit,



and the Second Book of Maccabees, because it recommends prayers for the dead. Luther excluded the Apocalypse, and the second epistle of St. Peter, and the epistle of St. James—the latter because it was in favor of good works. Now, I ask you on what principle you deny the canonicity of these books, or on what principle you can prove the inspiration of any book in the Bible? I challenge you to prove that the Book of Revelations is inspired. You may say to me—why, you admit the book yourself, and why do you ask me to prove it? I answer, that I admit the book on the infallible authority of Christ and his church, and on the authority of tradition. You deny the authority of tradition, and refuse to admit the infallible authority of the church; and I will try on what principle you admit the canonicity of the book in question. Thus, then, my friends, stands the case, as far as Protestantism is concerned. I have proved that it is not the true church. It may have the power and the pelf; but even that may be only for a time. And, for my own part, I will say, conscious that we may all soon die, “What is the whole world to a man if he should lose his own soul.”

Rev. Mr. GREGG—My friends, the Rev. Mr. Maguire has been arguing this last half-hour in the exercise of a vicious sophism, which, in the schools, is known by the name of an argument *a dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, that is, arguing from a thing taken in a certain sense to a thing taken absolutely. You know that a thing may be true in one sense that is not true in another. And that is just the error which the Rev. Mr. Maguire has committed. That very sophism is the one which has been the cause of the apostacy and overthrow of his church. St. Paul says, “the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” If I were to take the letter of the Bible, I might make it support doctrines most false and heretical. Now, let me give you one instance of this, and I will not have to go far for it. You will find it in the 1st chapter of Genesis—“And God said, behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed—to you it shall be for meat.” The infidel or the pagan may take up this text, and say it was most unjust for God to punish the whole world for the first man having eaten the forbidden fruit, when, in the text, he gave them liberty to eat all fruit. Now, mark me, it is true in one sense that the church was visible during the eight hundred years previous to the reformation. It is true, in another sense, that it was invisible. Now give me leave to illustrate this for you. Suppose a large corn field, in which tares and poppies sprung up along with the wheat—and the scarlet colour of the weed is most appropriate—at a distance the whole field will appear scarlet, but when you examine more closely, you will discover the wheat. Now I claim visibility, apostolicity, catholicity, and absence of idolatry; and if such superstitious practices as the blessing of holy water, and of clay, and of dead men’s bones, as among the glories of Christ’s everlasting church, I admit that the church was almost invisible; but still it existed. And now let me explain to you the nature of the mistake into which my

reverend friend has fallen. I grant him the correctness of every one of the texts he has quoted ; but still I think he is wrong in saying he took them from our Bible.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I quoted them from the Bible which was published by the King's authority, in the reign of James the First.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—That is not the authorised version.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I hold that it is.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—It is not our version. The word holocaust does not occur in the entire of our version, and it occurs in that. Now, my friends, he talks about our use of Greek words. But there is a word which does not occur in the whole of our Bible, but which is retained in the Douay Bible for the purpose of mystification. I refer you to the 49th chapter and 26th verse of Genesis—"The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills. They shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren." This was a promise ; and there are several other similar promises which are true only *secundum quid* ; so it is with regard to the visibility and perpetuity of the church, which are perfectly consistent with the apostacy which, I say, is foretold in the book of Revelations. In the Old Testament we find Elijah saying, "Behold I am alone in the worship of the true God," when at that time there were 7,000 knees that never bent to Baal, and 300 prophets hid in caves. There then was the church invisible, and one church was similarly situated ; for though our numbers were few, there were always some who maintained the truth as it is in Jesus. Now, my dear sir, pardon me, but I must express my wish for your conversion, and I believe that it will take place. Let me show you one text which you have greatly misunderstood, and the proper understanding of which lies at the foundation of the salvation of the soul of man. And, gentlemen, this is not the only text which he would fail in explaining. There is not a single similar text in the whole Scripture which he could possibly understand. He could not—I defy him ; and no man can that is not taught by the living spirit. The text to which I allude will be found in the 2d and 3d verses of the 4th chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians—"But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty—not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully"—and woe be to them who do handle it deceitfully, and I charge the Romish Church with doing so—"But by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." Mr. Maguire explained this as signifying that the Christian doctrine and church should be so easily discovered, that only the wilfully blind could avoid seeing it ; whereas it has no more reference to the visibility of the church than it has to St. Peter's at Rome, or St. Paul's in London. My reverend friend wants to have it implied that I had admitted that the gates of hell had prevailed against the church. I admitted no such thing ; I merely say that the Scripture foretels the apostacy that came upon the church, and I assert that

during that apostacy the church ceased to be gloriously visible. I do not bring forward one but a hundred texts to bear me out in my position. I refer you to the 11th chapter of Revelations, 2d verse—“And the holy city shall they tread under foot, forty and two months; and I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth.” Here, then, we have two single witnesses who were to show forth the truth among the Gentiles, and to continue the church. Thus when I said the church was invisible, I said in a certain sense, and not absolutely. Suppose the case of two wrestlers:—One gets the other down on his knees or haunches, the other struggles on, rises again, and overthrows his antagonist. Would any one in that case say that the wrestler who was thrown on his knees was overcome? That is precisely the way with the true church. Besides, at the very time of the apostles, there sprung up many other churches, besides that one which was established by Christ himself, and we read of one of them which has continued even from that time down to the present, still maintaining the doctrines taught by our Saviour. I hold in my hand a work written by a clergyman, it is “Buchanan’s Christian Researches in Asia,” in which he gives a description of the Syrian church, which has subsisted ever since its foundation by St. Thomas the apostle; and which complained very much of the violence of the Roman Catholic Church in establishing the inquisition at Goa. Thus the church is invisible in one sense, and visible in another. And so it is in this very moment, spiritually speaking, in the church of England. There are some who are truly converted to God, and truly impregnated with the spirit of the Holy Ghost, and those are not visible, though there are many such—the others, who are not so thoroughly converted to God, are visible—the former invisible, because they have nothing to distinguish them from the ordinary members of the church, as they wear no blessed stole or garment of peculiar shape. The reverend gentleman has alluded to the penal code. It would have been better for him not to have done so; for let me ask him from whom that penal code came—with whom did persecution originate? Come, answer me that. It came from the mother of abominations. I grant you, and I admit, that our church did persecute, but from whom did she learn the lesson—under what act of parliament did the persecution commence? Under an act of parliament passed in the reign of Henry the Fourth, a Popish king; and that statute enacted that any bishop—one of those that blessed the sword, and the clay and the water—might condemn any heretic. Mr. Maguire mocks at me about the Bible. “You come,” he says, “with the Bible, and put it into the hands of those whom you wish to convert, and then you are satisfied.” But you, I say, come with the sword, and you make those whom you visit as tame as lambs. Henry the Fourth, you all know, reigned in the year 1339, two hundred years before Luther’s time, and he passed a law that any bishop could convict any subject of heresy; and in case of his not abjuring, he could order the sheriff to conduct him to the flames, which

order should be immediately obeyed. That is the statute under which persecution commenced ; and it, you perceive, was enacted in a Popish reign. I admit that the texts which my reverend friend quoted have reference to the glory and perpetuity of the church, and that they are perfectly true in one sense, and the more especially when the church has come out from the midst of Babylon. For this one thing I tell you—the great check to the progress of the true religion is the Romish church. The Rev. Mr. Maguire alluded to the cathedrals and houses of prayer, which were built by bachelors. It is true we have them, and we will have those which they are now building, not that we will take them by force, but that they will come over to us as they did before. But while they are building their churches, we are building another, and a spiritual cathedral, the stones of which are living stones, and which shall for ever endure. View the labours of our missionaries, spreading on every side, and disseminating the truth through all quarters of the earth. Yet these are the married parsons at whom my friend sneers. But my Roman Catholic brethren, I do not want to disparage—

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My friends, I put it to you did the Rev. Mr. Gregg, during the last half hour, answer a single one of the many questions which I put to him ? Did you hear one single word about the Thirty-nine Articles ? Did he tell you of a single church, from the days of Christ to the days of Elizabeth, who also belonged to the corporation of bachelors ? I wanted to know where was the reformed church for eight hundred years. He told you that it was visible and invisible ; and then, in explaining the text which I quoted from St. Paul, to prove that it could not be invisible, he spoke of *dictum secundum quid* and *dictum simpliciter*—so that every poor Protestant who does not know the meaning of this *dictum secundum quid* must be damned. He talked to you of sophisms and sophistry ; but if I were to evade one hundred texts quoted against me by *dictum secundum quid* and *dictum simpliciter*, he would loudly cry out against me for my trickery, and stamp in indignation at my conduct. He says that no man can know the Scriptures without the grace of God. Who ever denied it ? But where is the grace and the spirit of God to be found ? What will he say to the Unitarians, the Quakers, the Presbyterians, and the Wesleyans, all of whom claim the spirit ? What will he say to the Quakers ? The Quakers have a far better claim, one would think, to the possession of the spirit than he or his church. Let him answer those questions. I thank my reverend friend for his good opinion of my understanding. I thank him for his rash judgment. The scripture says, “judge not, that you may not be judged.” I do not pronounce judgment on Mr. Gregg. I confess that I am a sinner, Mr. Gregg tells you that he has the spirit of God. You may, sir, have as much, or more, of the private spirit ; but it is impossible for a man to know it himself. Christ said to his apostles—“I have yet many things to tell you, which you could not bear, but when I am gone, I will send down the holy spirit, and he will teach you many things.” He endeavored to explain the saying of St. Paul—“But

four-gospel be lost, it is to them that are lost." But still he did not shake my interpretation, nor weaken the force of a single one of the texts which I quoted to support it. The true gospel, then, is only to be found in the true church, and Christ says—"He that believeth not shall be condemned," and "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." This was plainly telling where the gospel was to be found. My friend admits that the gospel was with us once. I have proved that it could not have left us. He has not contravened my proofs. Besides, as I have often said before, we have not heard a single word from him about the Thirty-nine Articles. After all I have said, he has not attempted to prove a single one of the twenty-two negative articles. With regard to the visibility of the church, he talks to us of Mr. Buchanan and the Syrian church. What business have I taking Mr. Buchanan's word for what he says he saw. *Gratus assertitur*—it is a gratuitous assertion—I don't believe a single word. Besides he does not show that this Syrian church, on which he so much relies, professes one single doctrine in accordance with his own church. Let him prove to me that the Syrian church denies the supreme authority of the head of the church, or that it professes its belief in the Thirty-nine Articles, and it will go to prove something for him; but until then the existence of such a church is of no consequence to him or to me. Christ said to Peter—"Peter loveth thou me," and Peter answered, "Lord thou knowest all things—thou knowest that I love thee;" and then Christ said, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep;" that is, he placed him over his church, both clergy and laity; and Peter's successors have ever since filled the throne of that church. Now, during the 1500 years that Christ's vicegerents sat in the throne and the church flourished, where was the church of England? Oh, it existed, he says, both visibly and invisibly; and to prove that it existed, he mentions some priest, named Soter, that was burned in the reign of Henry IV., just as if every one that was burned was a Protestant. Why he might as well say that every widow that was burned in India during that period was a Protestant on account of her having been burned. He says that our church converted nations by the sword. I ask was it by the sword that Boniface converted France? Was it by the sword Austin converted England—St. Patrick, Ireland—and was it by the sword that Xavier converted India? He admits that his church persecuted, I deny that ours did; though I admit that Catholics persecuted, and by persecuting proved themselves unworthy members of the church to which they belonged. We abominate the persecuting many. But I never yet heard a Protestant reprobate Elizabeth, who persecuted more in one year than Mary did during her whole reign. Does he recollect the case of Jenkins, the bookseller? He may read it in Baker, and other writers. When he was tried and sentenced to be hanged to a wall by his ears, and not to be cut down till he cut off his ears with his own hand, the Lord suffered a plague to break out on the spot, and judge and jury and witnesses, were struck dead in the court, and 15,000 individuals were carried off by the visita-

tion. But what was most remarkable, even the haughty Elizabeth was so appalled by the judgement, that she never had courage to carry the sentence into operation. But no more about abuses for they are no argument against the church in which they exist, or have existed. Any one may err, but the error he commits will prove nothing. I ask not to charge his church with abuses. I demand principles—I asked him could he prove, on principle, the canonicity of one single book of the holy scriptures. Did he give an answer? I ask now is not his religion that which condemns, in their heresies, the Unitarians, the Baptists, and all other heretics? Was it not his religion which first broached the doctrine of the right of private judgment, and is it not in the exercise of that right that the Unitarians maintain their heresy? I condemn, I anathematize, I abominate their doctrine as much as he, though I do not condemn themselves. But I tell him, the Unitarians are more consistent than he, for they assert the right of private judgment, and at once deny the divinity of the Son of God. I say it was his abominable lying church which created this heresy, and which set all the world mad that assented to its doctrine. My reverend friend talked of promises to Joseph, but that promise related to the church of Christ, and was prophetic, signifying that it should last for ever. There was nothing therefore in the argument which he founded upon that. He says if it was strictly taken, that it would go to support heresy. I do take it strictly, for I take it according to the direction of St. Paul. He says that his church is the Catholic church in this kingdom. I ask him, in what other kingdom is it catholic? Again, he tells us, and it is the only middling argument that he made use of since the commencement of this discussion, that Isaiah said, "even I only am a prophet of the Lord," and therefore the church was invisible. It is true he put it lamely enough, but then I will put it better for him. There was in the world at this time but the Jewish church. It was invisible, and if the church could be invisible under the old law, it could be invisible under the new law. I think that is putting his argument as strongly as possible, and I am rejoiced to have anything in the shape of argument to answer. It is the first he has yet given me, and I will now answer it. When he gave us the text he did, he did not give us the context. And if he looked a little lower down, he would find that not only were there 7,000 knees that never bent to Baal, but he would find in the prophet Ahab, that there were 300 other prophets concealing themselves in caves from the persecution that was raging at the time. How, then, could the Jewish church be invisible? Besides, where was then the entire of Israel, which professed the same religion? If he looked to the 1st chapter of the first book of Kings, he would find that the small tribe of Benjamin alone sent to Rehoboam no less than one hundred and fourscore thousand chosen fighting men. What, then, must have been the numbers of the other tribes, and with so many, how could the church be invisible? So much for his feeble interpretation of the scriptures. Now, I will tell you what is the proper meaning of the text, when the prophet said that he was alone, he meant that he was the only one who was not a worshiper of Baal.

stood out against the persecution, and that while the other prophets fled from the persecution, he alone boldly reprov'd the King, and represented to him what would be the consequence of his crimes. This hiding of the prophets was not blameable, for even by the example of Christ himself, who fled when the people sought to stone him, we find that it is not wrong to avoid persecution. The martyrs avoided it, but when they were obliged to undergo it, they willingly and boldly gave their lives as a sacrifice for their faith. Now, I have answered the only tangible objection which he has given me to answer, and I ask how has he defended himself? To-morrow I will be on my defence; to-day it is my business to attack; and, having charged him with heresy and schism—having called on him to give his reason for believing in the Thirty-nine Articles which his church obliges every one connected with it to swear to—how did he answer? What nonsense to require men to swear to the theological opinions. How can any one with a safe conscience swear that the mass is damnable? How can any one swear to what it is impossible to prove true? My friend knows that Luther first objected to the mass, and that it was the devil advised him to it. Luther himself admits that the devil, in five arguments, persuaded him to deny the mass, and he has even related, carefully, those five arguments. I would ask, how would that great dignitary, Exeter, defend himself from the charge of perjury, especially when he knows that three things are requisite to perjury—judgment, truth and justice? I do not say that he does not believe what he swears; but I say that he swears it rashly, and without having reason to believe what he swears. But from my reverend friend we have not heard a word about these articles. They are indefensible, and he does not attempt to defend them. I asked him could he convert a Jew? I quoted texts which the Jew might use against him, to show that there could be no idolatry in the church of Christ; whereas he says that it was buried in idolatry. The Jew would say, "If the church be established by God, how can you get out of this? You say that for 800 years the church was buried in idolatry, as far as could be seen. The prophecies tell me that the church shall last for ever, even to the end of the world. Christ, according to your Testament, said the same, and that it should be a city built upon a mountain, and that the Holy Spirit should be with it for ever. According to you, he has broken his word, and therefore he is not God. Besides your statement, if true, contradicts the prophets. I therefore reject your religion." To this his answer was that one fact was worth a thousand arguments, and that his church had converted a Jew. The fact of the conversion of a Jew does not controvert my proposition, which was, that it could not convert a Jew consistently with its own doctrine and belief. Well, I repeat it again. Oh, then he talks of wrestling. Suppose two men wrestling; suppose it foretold of one of them—

The half hour here terminated.

Just at this moment a gentleman connected with the press wanted to get a seat at the table allotted for the reporters, but it was so crowded with persons not connected with the press that he found it impossible. Accordingly he wrote up the chairman, and

The Rev. Mr. McNAMARA came forward and directed the table to be cleared of all those not connected with the press:

The persons who occupied the table hesitated, and did not comply at once.

Rev. Mr. McNAMARA—I insist upon every one not belonging to the press, leaving the table. It was allotted to the reporters, and I will take care that it shall be preserved for them:

Mr. NOLAN (ex priest)—You are delaying the time: it is not right.

Rev. Mr. NAMARA—I am doing my duty, Sir, Mr. GREGG has a chairman, who will take care that he shall have fair play. For my part I won't allow the reporters to be incommoded.

The table having been cleared, and order restored, the discussion went on:

Rev. Mr. GREGG—I dare say, my friends, you have all heard of an eccentric clergyman belonging to our church, named Rowland Hill. He was, I believe, a little light at one side of his head. Well, at one time a strange clergyman preached in his church, and his preaching was rather in the country style. After a wild discourse he said, "Well, I have been rambling about for half an hour, but I know you wish to ramble," and here the story ended. Mr. Hill then rose up and said, "this gentleman will ramble with you again this evening." The story just applies to my reverend friend. For I never heard so rambling a speech as he has given you for the last half hour, and I believe I may announce that he will ramble with you again the next half hour. Now, my Roman Catholic brethren, did I not give him a fine beautiful system, and instead of contravening it, has he not given us a rambling discourse? First he gave me the Thirty-nine Articles—I am going to answer the question on that point. Next, he gave us a list of heretics, and I must say that I never heard any Roman Catholic clergyman arguing that did not farther all the heresies in the world. Next, he gave us the shepherd and the lambs, Luther and the devil, Jenkins, Xavier, the marriage of priests, the thirty-nine articles again, and finally 100,000 fighting men. He says that Luther said he was alone for 1,000 years. I say he said that, in a certain sense, just as it was said by the prophet Elijah. That my friend is blind in this particular is ascribable to Popery. I hope he will excuse me for calling it by the name, as he has designated our church by the most opprobrious epithets. Now, I will prove that a single erroneous idea will affect the mind so as to render it impossible for it to judge rightly on any subject. Suppose a man take it into his head that he is a house-clock, he will go into the corner and wag his hand to and fro, and when his friends would remonstrate with him, he would say that he was minding his business. So it is with my friend. But I will stand by the articles of my church, and prove that they are the truth, as it is in Jesus, when the time comes. I will give him a system, a whole view, which I defy him to upset. But I come now to the thirty-nine articles. Here are what he calls the negative articles. They are those from the 6th to the 32th. He says that it is impossible to



prove a negative, and he alarms with his rule of logic. I allow that in some instances it is impossible, but in matters of religion, God allows us to see matters plainly, and then a negative can be proved. There is also another axiom in logic which I only partly admit, and that is, a *particulari ad generalem non valet conclusio*. That axiom is only relatively true. The first is a good axiom for general use, for it supersedes the necessity of any one proving the negative of a set of assertions which might be advanced by an antagonist. If that were necessary, a discussion would be endless. But in religion, negatives may be maintained. For instance—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image," is a strong negative, but it cannot be denied, and requires not logical demonstration. Now to come to the other axiom. That, too, is valuable in some respects, but it is not valid in scriptural or religious matters. For instance, from the care that God took in drawing his servant Joseph out of danger, I might argue the general care which he takes of all his children. To come now to the first of what he calls the negative articles—it is this;—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or thought necessary or requisite to salvation. In the name of the holy scripture we do understand those canonical books of the old and new testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church." Here follows the list of the books, and then "all the books of the new testament as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them as canonical." Now I will prove from Isaiah, and from Deuteronomy, the truth of this article. In the 4th chap. and 2d verse of Deuteronomy you will find, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you; neither shall you diminish aught from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." From these texts I think I have proved the sixth article; and I shall be equally fortunate with the rest. He talks of our not being able to convert a Jew. I hold in my hand the Douay Bible, and from it may be derived by the Jew a fine argument for not adopting Christianity on account of the Apocrypha being included in it. Now, remember, I speak to him as a priest, and not as a Unitarian or any other heretic—if so I may call them. I will not allow him to become a Unitarian. Now, Roman Catholic brethren, I call on you to come back to our ancient and holy bishops. I tell you that the prohibition to marry is a cruel and damnable restraint. It is wrong to keep men from the holy energy attendant on matrimony. Oh, blessed be God for holy matrimony. Mark me—I do not blame those that do not marry; I knew several excellent clergymen of my own church who lived in singleness; but they did not meddle with married people; they did not seek to pry into things about which they knew nothing, or to ask questions which it would be impossible to repeat. It is nonsense to say that the words "lambs and sheep" in the text, which my friend quoted, signify the clergy and laity. If the lambs be the laity, when they grow up to sheep's es-

tate they must become priests, and then we would have all the laity becoming priests. Besides there are more things than lambs and sheep in the fold, namely, the shepherd, and the wolf in sheep's clothing. It would also be nonsense to take a sheep or a ram from among the flock, to make it a shepherd. Now I will come to the next of the negative articles of my faith. "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man, wherefore they are not to be heard, which feigns the old fathers did look only for transitory promises, although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rights, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral." Now that is the 7th article, and I think you will agree with me that it requires but little demonstration. However, I prove it from the 1st chap. and 1st verse of the Epistle of the Hebrews—"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke unto the fathers in time past." If then it is only the one God spoke, he could not contradict himself, and therefore the Old and New Testament do not differ. With the rest of the article I need not trouble myself.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My friend has told me that he will not permit me to be an Unitarian. I never have been an Unitarian, and I don't think it likely I ever shall be one, (laughter.) But I use the argument, because he agrees with the Unitarian in his rule of faith, by admitting private judgment. The early reformers fixed the rule of faith to be judgment and conscience, and Mr. Gregg agrees with them. Now, I ask him, can an Unitarian be saved by that rule? I may be rambling in Mr. Gregg's opinion, but I am about to come to a conclusion from the premises which I have established; and it is, that his church has made the Unitarians. I charge her with it, and let him disprove it if he can. I will get no answer, but you will weigh his motives for overlooking it. Now, he talks of the Jews, and says he can convince them by putting the Bible into their hands, and telling them that it is the book of the Lord Jesus. He will tell them truth, but will the Jews believe him? He tells us that the Spirit of God will direct them; but what is that but appealing to individual inspiration? Will not the Unitarian, and Presbyterian, and Quaker lay claim to equal inspiration? And yet Mr. Gregg's favorite Thirty-nine Articles say, cursed be he that saith that a man can be saved in any faith if he conform thereto. Again, he compares Luther to the Prophet Isaiah. The prophet said, "I of the prophets was the only prophet that stood up;" and because Luther said he stood alone, therefore he was, in the eyes of Mr. Gregg, equal to Isaiah. But Isaiah had never said he stood alone. He said he was the only one of the prophets who stood openly forward to bear the brunt of persecution, while the rest were concealed in caves. Mr. Gregg chooses to be witty upon my allusion to the 100,000 men; but I quoted it from the holy scriptures, and I do not

think it a very proper subject for the reverend gentleman's jokes. He says our error is ruinous. I admit, one error of faith is ruinous; but believing a man a house-clock, which my reverend friend quoted as an illustration, is not an error of faith, (laughter). The cause why a single error of faith is ruinous to a man is, because he refuses to believe that which the Son of God revealed. Therefore is it fatal; but how can I quote along with such an error the absurd case supposed by Mr. Gregg? I belong to the only church which condemns all errors. The holy scripture said, "Every tongue that rises in error against you, that tongue shalt thou condemn." But what error had the Protestant church condemned? None, though she had persecuted so many for dissent. I now come to the wrestler, a fine and elegant parable, to prove that the gates of hell had not prevailed against the church. He supplies an illustration in answer to my case, grounded upon the prophecy that the church would not be overthrown, and imagines two wrestlers—the Rev. Mr. Gregg and Father Maguire, for example (laughter)—engaged in a contest in which it was foretold that Gregg would not be overthrown. Suppose Father Maguire had staggered his opponent, and again, by a strong exertion, thrown him upon that part sometimes called the haunches, yet the prophecy holds good, nevertheless, according to the case put, that Gregg was not overthrown (laughter). I suppose, so foolish and ridiculous—but, I will readily admit, harmless—an illustration was never introduced into a serious argument. It horders rather too closely upon the profane, considering that the matter under consideration was the blessed promise of the substantial Son of the Eternal Father, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his holy church. Mr. Gregg tells us that God said he would permit his church to be brought low. If he means, to be persecuted, I agree with him, but she is not accountable for the heresies of those who went out of her, nor is she stained with their errors. Christ himself said that scandal must come, but woe to those by whom it would come. And St. Paul foretold that there would be heresies, and pronounced that they would exclude from heaven those who would be guilty of them. Those who have left us did not, indeed, belong to us in spirit, or they would not have gone from amongst us. The gentleman travelled to transubstantiation. I expect before the discussion is over to break a lance with him on that subject; and if I do not bring him down, I expect at least to "bring him low." In reference to the Thirty-nine Articles, I have to complain of my reverend friend for misrepresenting me. I never said he could not prove a negative. I only called on him to prove, if he could, those of the Articles which I called negatives—not using the logical

term, but meaning negatives as against our positives. Where we say that the bread and wine are transubstantiated in the Eucharist, they say they are not. Where we say there are seven sacraments, they say there are only two. This is what I said, and I must complain of him for putting words into my mouth which are almost too childish for his own. If he proves those negatives, I myself will go over to him. [The Rev. Mr. J. L. Nolan, who kept up a running commentary upon the discussion, *sotto voce*, here exclaimed, "We will not have you!"] He claims apostolicity for his church; but how can he prove that? it was not visible for eight hundred years. Is it not a wonder that a church which has introduced so many errors as are attributed to the Catholic church would not be more tolerable of other people's backslidings? She might be expected to say, the less I speak of other people's errors, the less they will speak of mine. But she has never tolerated heresy in any instance. If she had permitted Henry the Eighth to take a beautiful young wife, when he became acquainted with Anna Boleyn, there would not now be a parson in the three kingdoms. If she had allowed Henry to do what Luther permitted him to do—separate from his wife Catherine—he would never have been struck with the necessity of change. He admitted her to have been virtuous; but affected to have a scruple of affinity, which it was remarkable, only arose after he happened to see Anna Boleyn. I will put one question to my friend, to which I crave a direct answer. He admits the validity of the first four general councils—he admits that they were right in condemning the Arians, and other heretics. He will probably say that at that time the church was in its primitive purity, but that it is now fallen into corruption. But, if private judgment be the inalienable rule, a pure church had no more right to interfere with that rule than a corrupt one. In such a case the very act of condemning was assuming a right they could never have received; and they would have proved themselves corrupt by the very act. The proceedings of these councils are admitted by the church to which Mr. Gregg adheres; and I now ask him what right had they to condemn these heresies, that the council of Trent had not to condemn Luther? That council included a larger proportion of the church, and she was aided by the wisdom of the earth. The emperors and kings were present, either in person or by their representatives, and though they could not interfere in the proceedings, yet they could do a great deal by inquiry. I ask, then, what right had the first four councils from Jesus Christ that this one had not? You will receive the four, but you will not receive this, because they condemn your own errors. I next come to the gentleman's digression with a view to prove me a horse. But I sup-

pose that requires no answer. He travelled from transubstantiation to holy-water; but I thought that I had given him enough of holy-water yesterday. He answered none of my arguments then or now. He makes a great deal to do about the sword, but I answer him, "Give that to Cæsar which is Cæsar's." If authority is to be submitted to, and if it must in some cases be enforced by the sword, it is then unlawful to bless it, and to pray that you may not deal wrongfully with it. St. Paul tells us that prayer blesses all creatures; and is not a sword a creature? Mr. Gregg blesses the meat and the wine on his table; and what actual difference is there between that consecration and that bestowed on the sword? St. Paul used the expression in reference to meat offered to idols. The heathens were accustomed, when they made sacrifices, to offer one part of the animal to the idol, and sell the rest in the market. The early Christians were afraid to purchase meat in the markets lest they should be led to partake of the sacrifice to idols. But St. Paul told them not to be too curious; for that every creature of God was good when blessed in prayer. My friend goes into one of the Church of England Articles at length, and quotes about the law and the testimony in reference to his church. But he is begging the question, for I ask him where has she got her authority? The law and the prophets belong to the true church, and his church is now upon her trial, to show that she has claim to them, and yet he would quote them against us. The question which he assumes is the one litigated, but I will not let him run away with it. When he goes to the scripture, never was there a man so much to be pitied. He appeals to the Old Testament to prove the new one—he goes to the scriptures to prove the scriptures. Was there ever such a blunder? When he did so, he assumed that which I put upon him to prove. Like St. Augustine, I would not believe the gospel if I had not the church's authority for it; but he has not the church, and can produce no authority. We heard a great deal about married priests, but I must remind him of St. Paul, who says that "he that giveth his daughter in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not doth better;" and he also says, "it is better to marry than burn." We do not degrade marriage; on the contrary we have elevated it to a holy sacrament; but for wise and just motives all are not permitted to be married. We know that if a clergyman be wedded, he thinks more of "the things that are of the world, and how he may please his wife," than of the gospel, or of administering the sacraments. Look at the parsons, when they are called to attend a case of contagion, is not their answer that they fear not for themselves, but that they fear to bring the disease among their family? Christ says that any one that will not give up his father and mother, and daughter and wife, and follow him, is not worthy of him. But there is nothing to give up now-a-days, for all ends in the comedy and marriage *a la mode*. I will discuss marriage upon the Peter Dens' day; and let the ladies recollect that it is not I who exclude them but Mr. Gregg. My friend talked of sheep and lambs, as if I had not presupposed a shepherd as well as a flock.

[Mr. Maguire's half hour ended here.]

Mr. GREGG—Before I proceed, I will ask the Rev. Mr. Maguire whether it be his wish that we should continue the discussion this day for an additional hour?

Mr. MAGUIRE—Whatever you please.

Mr. GREGG—Then let us proceed since you are willing.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Most willing. The longer we continue, the better.

Mr. GREGG—I thought it right to ask the question, as it would appear by a report which has gone abroad, that it was I who declined continuing it yesterday.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I am glad to have this opportunity of referring to a statement which appeared in the *Packet* of yesterday evening, of the very contrary nature alluded to by my reverend friend; for it asserted that it was I who declined, and that I said we need not tire ourselves, or something to that effect. I know that the *Evening Packet* is always abusing and libelling me, but I disdain noticing its libels or its abuse, and I only take this opportunity to contradict that statement which is most false. I could have had several actions for libel against it if I had chosen to proceed upon them, but I did not.

Mr. GREGG—It was right that I should have asked your consent to prolong the discussion, according to the rules, as we have agreed to act by mutual consent in such matters. I will now come to answer the speech of my reverend friend. My friends, Mr. Maguire has brought a charge against me of my having said that married men act with more energy, or some such expression. Now, I say to the pure, all things are pure, and it is only the degenerated and contaminated mind which can put a bad construction on the words which I employ. I said that the married clergymen of our church have acted energetically and successfully in raising the temple of the true church, and spreading its doctrines throughout the world, and in fulfilling the sacred duties of their religion. I appeal to my brethren, the Roman Catholic clergymen who hear me, and I mistake very much whether they will not agree with me, that a clergyman will not fulfil his duties with more single-mindedness, and more purity when he is not married than when he is. I appeal to them whether such is really their opinion, and I am sure that if Mr. Maguire himself would but make the experiment, he also would be of my opinion. He tells you that the clergymen of our church are deterred from attending on the dying, through fear of bringing the contagion into the bosom of their families; but nothing can be more unfounded than that assertion, and I could refer to innumerable examples where our ministers have fallen victims to the danger which they willingly incurred on such occasions. I need but refer to the case of the Rev. Robert Maguire, of this diocese, as one fact sufficient to refute him. But I will also say, that we Protestants prepare for dying before the death-bed—we do not leave that awful business to the last moment. I thank God that we prepare for death daily; we need not be running for the priest in the last moments of our dying friends. Blessed be God, we take timely precaution against that necessity! Mr. Maguire will say that I am not come here for preaching, but I tell him that my object in coming here is

to preach, and to endeavor to convert the hearts of those who are going astray from the ways of truth ! Oh ! my brethren, let me tell you that Popery is a spirit—it is impalatable, and cannot be detected by syllogisms and sophistical arguments, and the vain maxims of a false logic. Now it is my firm conviction that God caused this discussion to take place, in order that the clergymen of the Protestant church might be taught the true way in which the discussion between the two churches should be conducted. I caused a work of Dr. Meade's—a most useful work indeed—"The apostacy of latter times," to be republished ; and in this it is taught that it is not by standing on such topics as private judgment and the like, that the discussion should be carried on, but by taking a general view of the whole subject, and arguing on the general question, to prove that our church is the true church of Christ. My opponent attacks me again and again on private judgment. I never saw such hacking and hewing and trouncing as he has on the subject : but all this time he is only doing my work. He has imagined to himself that I stand solely for private judgment, and he challenges me to prove the canonicity of the church from scripture. Am I not proving every subject which I have undertaken to defend ? Now, to satisfy your private judgment on this subject, I will tell you what my doctrine is : use your private judgment, and defer to the judgment of the church. Mark me, I only say defer. I support the doctrine of the holy Catholic church, and it is because I stand on that firm foundation, and not from any powers of my own, that you behold me here, my brethren, triumphant and unanswered. To-morrow I will bring here to you abundance of our prayer-books, and hymn-books, and other books of piety, and I will show you that they contain nothing but purity—that they breathe nothing but the sincerest and most unsullied sentiments of Christian sanctity ; but if you take up any of the Romish books of devotion, you will be told, don't touch this and don't touch that ; you find something which you should not read—Hymns to the Virgin Mary, and Hymns to St. Valentine, and devotions to the cruel and tyrannical St. Dominick, chief of the inquisition. I will prove to you that they contain dreadful abominations. To-morrow will be my day of assault. To-morrow the church of Rome will be on her trial, and it will be my turn to show you that she is plunged in abominations and errors, and that it is for that reason that we have left her. When I argue with Mr. Maguire, I use a different method from that which I would employ if I had to deal with another class of opponents. When I tell him that I believe the scriptures to be the word of God, suppose I say that I believe so because I receive them from his holy church, what objection can he have against that reason ? What can he urge against a principle he admits himself ? But I also say that we have within us the holy spirit, which also tells us that they are true. Yes, I feel that I have that within my breast which dictates to me that that book is the revelation of the Most High. But if every one say that they have the spirit, it will be asked, how are we to know who has the true Spirit, and which is the false spirit ? I say one mark is, when we hear persons pretending to have the Spirit out of the

church of Christ, we may be sure, that it is a false spirit. It is not a private spirit which I have within me, and which points out to me the truths of God's word. Blessed be God, it is that spirit which acts in unison with the holy church of Christ itself; and I thank Heaven from the bottom of my soul for bestowing it on me! Mr. Maguire says that I and the Unitarians, and other sects, agree in the doctrine of private judgment as the rule of faith. I deny the assertion over again. We do not agree in our rule of faith, or in our acceptance of private judgment, because I reprobate the abuse of private judgment—I defer to the public judgment of the church. In the 8th Romans we find—"But ye are not of the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." And, again—"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Here you see how the spirit is known in those whom it possesses. Again, when he asks me how I convert the Jews, my answer is, that I would convert them in the same manner that I would the Christian—I would hold up Jesus to them from my pulpit, and I would cry out to them that he suffered and died for the redemption of them and of all mankind; and I would turn my eyes to heaven as it were to watch the descent of the Holy Ghost into their souls. Read the 10th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. There it is said—"And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, stand up, I myself also am a man." And in the 34th verse—"Then Peter opened his mouth and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him, and we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew, and hanged upon a tree," &c. Mark well, my friends, the simplicity and unglossed character of this narrative of the apostle; here there is no rant; nothing but simply telling the story of the Lamb of God. Mark the conclusion. "While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all of them which heard the word." This, and this only, was the way to convert the Jews, and to bring them out from the captivity of Satan; and do not deceive yourselves, any other way to convert the soul is but delusion. Observe well what I am about to say, and do not imagine that it is profane. I say it in the spirit of truth. The distinguishing marks of the church of Christ and of the church of anti-Christ are analogous. Do not be startled at the word; I say they are analogous. The mark of the church of Christ is that it casts out devils; that of the church of anti-Christ that it casts out God. I tell you that God is cast out of the soul of man when he is taught to believe that he should have any reliance on his works, or on the intercession of any but one. Mark how the Romish Church proceeds to convert the soul. Instead of looking to Jesus—I grant, indeed, that they do pretend to look to Jesus, I have it here in the bag—but they will tell you it would be very salutary for you to put on a hair-cloth shirt, and that it would be most useful for your salvation to apply a scourge to your back, and practice a hundred other tortures. Oh! these good works are all the seed of evil and apostasy from the true



merits of Christ ! You will find good works in the true church, but good works which are trampled under foot, and treated as rags and dust. I do not regard my good works ; it is the merits of Jesus Christ alone that work within me. This, my friend, is the contrast between the doctrines of truth and those of error. In the epistle of Paul to the Galatians, which was expressly written against Popery in its infancy, the Apostle says, "Oh, foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you ? This only would I learn of you. Receive ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith ? Are ye so foolish ? Having begun in the spirit are ye now made perfect by flesh ?" And who thus addressed the Galatians ? Paul, an apostle, and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia." Mark me, laity, mark your own privileges. You are fellow-laborers, and fellow-workers in the instruction of the Gospel. I must now go on to some other points ; however, I can only consider them at one time ; and while I am endeavouring to follow my reverend friend through his wanderings, he will ask me why do I not prove the 39 articles ? I come to the 140,000 fighting men, mentioned by the Rev. Mr. Maguire. I grant that there were 140,000 men in the church, but they were fighting men, and fighting men do constitute the church.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE.—Mr. Gregg has concluded by a flourish about fighting men. Why did I quote that passage ? The king of Israel intended to cut off the faithful, when the tribe of Benjamin sent out so many fighting men to protect them. I hope he will admit there may be fighting men among the faithful, unless he holds it unlawful to fight. I took up this statement, as it was his last, least I might forget it ; but I now go back and begin with the beginning. He tells you that my doctrine of marriage is erroneous, and that all should be free to marry (Mr. Nolan here indulged in a broad grin). I see a smile upon those who were not free to marry, but have married ; but I beg that I may not be forced to take up their case, for I must be charitable (applause). The apostle Paul says, when men are married they get entangled in the affairs of the world, their thoughts are turned from God, and they give more thoughts to their wives than to the Church. Let me not be accused of indelicacy when I quote from the scriptures, and remind you that St. Paul says, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman ; and the blessed scriptures tells us that some are eunuch from nature, some are made eunuchs by men, and others make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven. (More machinations from Mr. Nolan, with several most expressive winks.) I don't wonder that the apostles of the new school laugh at this, though it be from the Bible. Mr. Gregg says the vow of celibacy is not binding, since it is taken when he who makes the pledge does not understand it. This is the excuse of some half-shorn apostate who is at a loss for a subterfuge to disguise his iniquity. No person takes the vow till he is three and twenty or four and twenty, and I ask you if that be an age to misunderstand the nature of it ? Can educated young men, who have spent their years from their youth upwards at college, and who

have read the scriptures, and had professors of scripture to instruct them, have any doubt on such an undertaking, or can they be deceived into taking it? But it is needless to preach morality to some people, who, if St. Paul came down again from heaven, would not listen to his voice, if it warned them away from the seductions of diversion and impurity (applause). My friend talked of lifting up Jesus, I wish I could see him that I might join, for by no other name can man be saved. What does he mean by saying Protestants are prepared to die, and by insinuating that Catholics are not? I ask him to name a single Catholic who has died a Protestant, I will produce the names of a thousand Protestants who were violent persecutors and haters of Catholicity, who upon their death-bed were glad to come to the oils they ridiculed before they went to their God. But if he names one man who lived a decent Catholic and died a Protestant, he will do me more than any man that has gone before him for Protestantism. He quotes St. Paul to show that his fellow-labourers in the early Church were inspired. Does it follow because they were inspired that we must be so? They wrought miracles. St. Paul's apron, (for he was a tent-maker,) and his handkerchief were sent over the country, and cured the sick and maimed, and wrought various other miracles (laughter). You may laugh, but it is in the Scripture. When you show to me your people working miracles with their handkerchiefs and aprons, then I will believe you inspired. But I fear there is abroad more of the spirit in which Luther delighted, when he said he was a mere dry theologian without the aid of the devil, with whom he tells us he eat a ock of salt, and had various discussions upon matters of faith. Mr. Gregg referred to Meade upon a apostacy! Now, I happened to have been reading an elaborate work by my friend, in which he states that one of the points raised in favor of the Catholic church staggered him, and had nearly converted him, until he saw it answered in Meade. Now, it appears that only that Joseph Meade was born the Catholic doctrine would be unanswered; and where would have been my friend's reliance upon his apostolic Church? I come back to the Thirty-nine Articles; but there he cries *noli me tangere*—it's a dangerous subject. He ridicules our oil: let him look to James. He admits the canonicity of the book, though Luther doubted it—and he will find oil recommended for sick men, with which they were anointed. Let him look to that. Perhaps he will answer, with Mr. Pope, it was on account of the hot climate the oil was recommended. But he must not forget that the inspired writers spoke for the whole Church, and for all time and for all nations. Again, I ask him to prove that there are but two sacraments, as set forth in the thirty-nine articles. I never was more astonished than when I heard him admit that he would prove the Bible by the Catholic Church. If he takes it from her, how can he refuse to take her interpretation? Is not she who collected and preserved it, and handed it down to us, best able to judge of it? When he gave us the grand foundation, he may readily give us the stones with which to raise the edifice. He cannot prove the canonicity of the scriptures but by our Church, and he will tell you that the Church

has fallen into error. How, then, can he have an uncorrupted Bible from her? How can he make an act of faith upon a fallible authority? He quotes a text, "as many as are led by the spirit of God," but who are led by the spirit of God? They of the true Church only. Can that Church be his who, as I shall show you before this discussion terminates, added to the scriptures, subtracted from them, and mistranslated them? If the Church be the authority for the Scriptures, then is it greater than the scriptures, and that is my doctrine. If the scriptures be the rule of faith, then the rule should be complete. Yet Mr. Gregg knows that twenty-two books of the scriptures have been lost—twenty books of the Old Testament and two of the New. How can that be a rule of faith which is not a whole rule? He may say that a part of the scriptures is sufficient; if so, what part? Perhaps he will say the whole of the books we have. Let him show me the text for it. He quotes from the thirty-nine articles, and these be the canonical books of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church. I ask him does he not know that Luther rejected James and the Apocalypse? He knows that the Apocalypse was denied for 329 years. Eusebius, a learned critic of the church, declares that it is not true, and quotes Dionysius, who expresses a similar opinion. An early council said of it, "let the Church beyond the sea (meaning Rome) be consulted, whether adding this book be canonical." How, then, without the authority of the Church can he prove the Bible—and how can he take the authority of the Church if it ever could have apostatised? I hope these objections will be answered. What security has he, I ask again, that the Bible is faithful? I shall give you hereafter a history of the variations and mistranslations of the Protestant version. I want Mr. Gregg to answer me this question—how can an ignorant Protestant make an act of faith? He cannot read for himself; his parsons are fallible; his bishops are fallible; his church collectively is fallible, and he cannot examine the original and satisfy himself of its authenticity, and yet without faith it is impossible to be saved. St. Chrysostom and Jerome accuse the Jews of corrupting the Bible; how do you, sir, know that the Church of Rome, which you accuse of so manifold errors, did not corrupt it? I will expect an answer to these questions, particularly the case of the poor Protestant who can't read, and who, making the Bible his sole act of faith, knows nothing about it. Mr. Gregg talks of holding up Jesus to convert the Jews, but his flight was unworthy of a reasoning Christian. If the Bible be the sole rule of faith, will Mr. Gregg tell me how he will prove infant baptism, or his authority for aspersion instead of immersion. How will he prove the Holy Ghost is from the

Son as well as the Father—or what is his authority for changing the Sabbath from Saturday ? Let him show me the Trinity or consubstantiality in the Scriptures ; but no, he cannot prove a tittle of them from the Bible—nor the Athanasian Creed, which he holds as firmly as the gospel.

[Mr. Maguire's half hour ended here.]

MR. GREGG—It gratifies me exceedingly that I speak before an intelligent audience. Were it not intelligent indeed, it might possibly be led away by mere words, sounds without meaning—flimsy, sophisticated arguments ; but I am safe in the correctness and justness of your judgments. Now, mark me well, my friends, I have particular arguments for particular persons. When, the Unitarian and the Socinian oppose me, I have arguments of a particular nature to meet them with ; but my reverend friend is not an Unitarian or a Wesleyan, and he must be content to be treated by me as a Roman Catholic clergyman. Really, my friend, when I hear the arguments which are urged against me, I feel almost inclined to use an expression of Luther's, and say, "I think I smell an Atheist." He attacks me as if I had no other argument than those which I urge against him, to employ on any other occasion ; but I tell him that on the subjects of the transferring of the Sabbath to the Lord's day, and, in fact, baptism, and of two sacraments, &c., I stand on the same ground that he does, and say, that I have received them from the holy Catholic Church ; it is on her authority that I admit them, and that reply shall and ought to be sufficient for him. But I could also refer him to many examples in the sacred Scripture, to illustrate and prove the authority of the Church of Christ in respect to these points, did I think it necessary to bring them forward. It is sufficient for me that I can prove my Church to be the Church of Christ, and then I receive those things on her authority. But, in truth, Mr. Maguire is only on the defensive himself to-day, and instead of attacking me, he is only endeavouring to defend himself from my attacks. To-morrow I shall again have the advantage of attacking him—for it will be my turn. Now, notwithstanding all that I have repeatedly said on the subject of private judgment, he will be at it again, and again assert that I hold it as the sole rule of faith. He says that a great portion of the scripture was lost. Now, that I admit ; but mark well my answer. I say that if there were five hundred scriptures like that volume, they would all accord with what that one volume contains, and contain nothing contrary to it : hence they would be unnecessary, and it is by the providence of God that they do not exist. Thus, I blame the Church of Rome, not because she has some doctrine which are not contained in that book, but because she teaches doctrines

directly and most distinctly contrary to it, I say that if the Church of Christ thought fit to institute a rule according to what is mentioned in St. James, in attending on the sick, she would be right in so doing, and I would agree in it ; and I do not blame the Church of Rome because she instituted such a rule, but because she erected it into a sacrament. Here is her ritual, and we have a description in it of the whole ceremonial of the occasion. How the priest enters the chamber of the dying man ; with his surplice and violet stole—how the cross is presented to the patient to be kissed—how the holy water is sprinkled, &c.—how the oil is rubbed to the organs of the different senses, and to various parts of the body, with the prayer, “ By this holy unction, and his own most pious mercy may the Lord indulge you what you have sinned, by hearing, smelling,” &c. Here we have the whole ceremony of superstition, with all its flash and trash ; and I ask you, can any thing be a more melancholy demonstration of what superstition will lead men to ? As to the lost books of the scripture, I again repeat that I am firmly convinced that it was by the providence of God that they were lost, because they were unnecessary, as containing only what we possess in this volume of the Holy Bible. The reason why we receive that book as the word of God is, because the spirits within tells us so. The same spirit tells us that those books called the Apocrypha are not the word of God, for in one of those books we find a man praised for having committed self-murder. Now, as to the 4th Psalm to which he referred as containing four verses more in the Prayer-book than in the Bible, I will only inquire, who told him that the Book of Common Prayer is infallible ? Have I said that it is ? The whole consists in this, that the Psalms in the Prayer-book are a different translation from those in the Bible, and that the verses which are not found in the authentic version of the latter are found elsewhere. Again, mark me, my friends, I do not say that the Church apostatised so that the gates of hell prevailed against it. The true Church of Christ ran like a stream of pure water in the midst of the fallen Church, until, at length, it burst out from the midst of it, and now stands, as you behold it, glorious, triumphant, and spotless. As to the apostacy of the Church, we have the description of its real nature in 1st Timothy, chap. 4 :—“ Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils ; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron ; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God had created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.” We find it also described in several parts of Eze-

kiel, and in the Apocalypse we read—"And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names and blasphemy having seven heads and ten horns; and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations, and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, "Mystery, Babylon the Great, and the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth; and she was drunken with the blood of the saints," &c. Thus, a drunken harlot is the figure of the apostatised church. "And the seven heads are seven mountains. Now, do we sit on seven hills? Do we forbid to marry, and to eat meats? Are we the Church described in the Revelations? or is it not clearly the Church of Rome which is pointed out? It is she that is clothed in purple and scarlet—she that forbids marriage—she that is seated on seven hills. But, my brethren, what are we come here to argue on? We are come to discuss the way to heaven. I appeal to you, my friends, Judge of the three by the fruit. Judge from the books of pure and unsullied piety which I shall exhibit to you. Judge from the fallen and degraded state of Ireland. Look at her miserable condition—her people, wretched, and ignorant, and superstitious at home, and degraded and despicable abroad. Is not the Romish religion the cause of all this? Are not those her fruits?

Mr. GREGG's half hour being out, the discussion concluded for the day. When the reverend gentleman sat down, his friends commenced clapping hands, and other noisy demonstrations of approval, which lasted for some minutes.

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

THIRD DAY—THURSDAY, JUNE 1ST.

---

Mr. MAGUIRE rose a few minutes after eleven o'clock, and said, I call upon Mr. Gregg to prove the Roman Catholic Church is the Church of Anti-Christ, and the great apostacy foretold.

Mr. GREGG—I shall feel great happiness in responding to the challenge of my reverend opponent, because I expect that my demonstration will have a salutary effect upon many present, and among others, I trust, upon my reverend opponent. But very miserable will I feel in showing, as I must show, that an unhappy calamity has fallen upon so large a portion of Christendom. Now, my dear friends, keep in mind one thing, that I now stand up against one of the very ablest advocates that has appeared in those days for the Church of Rome. One whose acumen is great, whose skill and tact exceeding, and whose natural abilities are unequalled. My dear friends, recollect that I have opposed to me a man whose powers of reasoning are more complete than any man's in his Church. But my Rev. friend, in consequence of his apostacy, has his admirable natural abilities diminished, and his reason shackled down. It weighs upon his wings, which else, like the eagle's, would soar upwards. He is like Sampson, shorn of his strength when he cowers before the test of truth. If I prove that in this present discussion, that many of his arguments have been merely subtleties, and most of his conclusions non-sequiturs, I think I will have done much towards demonstrating our cause. First, I will convict him of a heresy, not only against the rules of the holy Catholic Church, but even against those of his own. He has pronounced the union between the Church and state corrupt; but I shall prove that it is Christian; and further, that it is bordering upon a dangerous heresy to say the contrary. The rev. gentleman brought forward as a proof of holy water the use of the waters of jealousy, which being given to persons suspected of adultery, produced certain physical effects. This usage he referred to as a demonstration of the legality of holy water. Now, holy water is used for driving out the devil from places where it is sprinkled, and the waters of jealousy were used to detect a sin by causing the belly to swell and the thigh to rot—and he says the one is a proof of the other. He produces one case as an argument in favor of another not a bit like it. Thus I

might say, Jesus rose upon the third day, therefore—what conclusion do you think I shall come to—therefore we all shall rise upon the third day; John the Baptist was beheaded, therefore we should not eat meat upon Friday. Is not one as much a *sequitur* as the other? Again, he quotes a water which was used by those who were bit by the mad serpent; but we know they were cured by looking at the brazen serpent, which is a type of Jesus Christ.—Would he have used arguments so inconclusive, if apostacy had not blinded the eyes of my rev. opponent? There is not a man in the empire who more thoroughly understands the uses of logic. Indeed his fame for logical subtlety is so great, that in a late periodical he was represented as being prepared to prove anything. I gave you, as an illustration, the case of a man believing himself a house-clock, as a familiar way of showing how one error would be ruinous to a man's reason; for as the scripture tells us, "One deceit causes Israel to err, in every work thereof." Thus when a man is taught that a piece of bread is not a piece of bread, he may next imagine that in a fly he sees satan, or that an egg at his table is an evil spirit. Why is Ireland called a blundering nation?—and why famous for making bulls, but that she is blinded by apostacy? So fine a nation—I will not say a finer, but so fine a nation exists not in the world, if her eyes were opened to the truth of the gospel, and turned away from the delusions of heresy. If I had been in Mr. Maguire's place, instead of attempting to ridicule the illustration, I should have contented myself with saying, "You are mistaken; a man may believe himself a house-clock, and yet be a very good member of society." I would have disproved, if I could, instead of laughing at, a case in point. The rev. gentleman puts himself into every position but his proper one. He argues as an Infidel, a Unitarian, Presbyterian, or anything but a Catholic. He was scandalised yesterday when I spoke of running a sword into the belly.—The spirit of Dens broke out in him, and he commenced to anticipate Saturday. I blushed for the ladies, and I am sure they blushed for themselves. Mr. Maguire asks how can we rely upon the Bible, if we do not rely upon the Church we got it from. What! would he have me disbelieve a letter because it was conveyed to me by a drunken postman? I shall now proceed to show you that our Church is holy and apostolic, and consequently that his is apostate, as both cannot be right. Why is Popery amongst us? Because God permitted Antichrist to come, and he shall soon demonstrate himself. He is with us or with you; and if we be holy, there then is the beast (looking expressively at Mr. Maguire, which caused much laughter). I shall give Mr. Maguire hard work before he is done. He will find that he has caught a tartar. I will now proceed to the consideration of the negative articles, respecting which Mr. Maguire said so much. The following is the 10th article:—"The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable unto God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a



good will and working within us, when we have that good will." The proofs are as follow: 2d Corinthians, iii. 3; John xv. 3—"Now you are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;" Eph. ii. 3; Canticles i. 4; Rom. viii. 9. I now proceed to the 11th article on the justification of man—"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—by faith, and not by our own works and deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification," see Rom. iii. 20—"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin;" and 25—"When God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God," Rom. v. 1. "Therefore, being justified by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. I now proceed to article 12, on good works:—"Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment—yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring up necessarily of a true and lively faith; inasmuch as by them a lively faith may be evidently known, as a tree is discerned by the fruit." Eph. ii. 10—"For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus, unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" James ii. 17, 19—"Luke xvii. 10, "So likewise ye, when ye have done all those things which are commanded, you say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do; Gal. v. 22, 23; Matt. vii. 17, "Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." Let us now look to the 13th article, on works before justification:—"Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his spirit are unpleasant to God; forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ. Neither did they make men meet to receive grace; or, as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather for that they are not done as God willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin." The proofs are—John xv. 5; Matt. xvii. 7; Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iii. 17. I now proceed to works of supererogation, article 14—"Voluntary works beside, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required. Whereas Christ sayeth plainly, 'When you have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.'" Now for the proofs I refer to, Matt. xv. 9; Col. ii. 8; Luke xvii. 9—"Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not;" and 10, "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded, you say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which it was our duty to do." I now proceed to the 16th article of

sin after baptism—"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable; wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives; and, therefore, they are to be condemned which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here or deny the grace of forgiveness to such as truly repent." For proof of this, I rest upon Gal. vi. 1, and Matt. vi. 16, 17. It is not necessary that I should deal with the affirmative articles, as the negative ones were the objects of my reverend opponent's attacks. I hope the reverend gentleman will not say any more that I have not defended the Thirty-nine Articles.

[Mr. Gregg's half hour ended here.]

Rev Mr. MAGUIRE—Gentlemen, I am glad that I have prevailed on Mr. Gregg at length to venture even to mention the Thirty-nine Articles. God knows I badgered him long enough before he did so; and still see how he defended himself. He contented himself with reading over an immense number of tracts, which have as much to do with the proper subject of controversy as they have to do with the question whether a man can be a house-clock. But look, I pray you, at the desultory warfare which he is carrying on. He undertook to prove the apostacy of the Roman Catholic Church. He says that either his Church or mine must be apostate. Now I say that neither is apostate. He may say my religion is a heresy. I assert that he is heretical. But then heresy is not apostacy. Apostacy consists in the denial of Jesus Christ, and neither of us deny him, therefore neither of us are apostates. Now, let me ask you, Sir, what have you done? You have overwhelmed me with a multitude of texts not bearing on the subject, because I have all along been challenging you to quote from the holy scriptures. Now I do not accuse you of disingenuity, though if you had another sort of an antagonist, he, perhaps, might, with some appearance of justice, do so. You say that I quoted the example of the waters of jealousy, and that I might as well argue that because our Saviour rose from the dead on the third day, all of us would likewise arise from the dead—as draw any conclusion from it in favor of my views. Now, I did mention the waters of jealousy without any view to its effect upon the woman, but merely to show that, as water and clay were blessed under the old law, so might they be blessed under the new. The argument about arising from the dead is none of mine; such nonsense never came out of my mouth. I know, and you admit, that the bite of the fiery serpent was cured by looking on the brazen serpent; but that is not all, it was ordered to be burned, and its ashes were wet with water that was blessed, and whenever any one fell into unfaithfulness and idolatry, this was sprinkled upon him, and he was purified from his crime. Now, is not this another strong argument in favor of the lawfulness and propriety of blessing water. Yesterday you made a great speech about the bug-a-boo question of anointing; I ask you, now, was not Christ himself anointed previous to his death—and are you aware (I don't

think that you are) that you yourselves anointed down to the reign of James the First—and that in your own Book of Common Prayer, there is a form laid down for the ceremony. My reverend friend admits that this is a divine ordinance, and that it would be followed in his Church if it were recommended by the bishops. That is to say, James, the inspired apostle, or, in other words, God himself; has instituted this practice, but the Church has not recommended it, and therefore it is not adopted. Therefore the Church is greater than God. But his Church is, according to himself, fallible, and God is infallible. Now, I ask him—and let him answer me fairly—if an angel (and an angel, mind you, is infallible, otherwise it would cease to be one) were to come down from heaven and say, “You have robbed the poor of a sacrament—you have abolished a divine institution: restore it”—would he do so if the Church did not recommend it? Would he believe that angel? St. Paul says, “If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other doctrine than that which I preach, let him be anathema.” Now, I say to you, Sir, you would be bound to receive this infallible angel, for your Church and your preachers are fallible; but we would not be obliged to receive him, for we belong to an infallible Church, are under an infallible head, and have infallible scriptures. I now refer you to the ritual of Edward VI., where it says—“Then the priest anoints the infant on the head, and then prays as follows.” [He read the prayer, which was to the effect that the Almighty God might anoint him with the unction of divine grace and the Holy Spirit.] First he puts on the real oil, and then he implores of God to anoint him with his grace. There is the custom set down in the ritual, and it was long practised in his Church; yet now they have abandoned it. Why, because they are guided by no Christian principle, and are driven about by every wind of doctrine. Next, there is the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which was long preserved in the reformed Church. In the Rubric it is laid down that if the sick man desire extreme unction, then he should be anointed with the sign of the cross, and it gives the prayer to be used on the occasion. And the preservation of these very things in your Book of Common Prayer it was that made the Dissenters leave you, for they said that you smelled of Popery, and that is the very reason why you get angry when I throw these Dissenters in your teeth; because you know that any argument which you may advance against me, I can retort fifty-fold in the name of the Dissenters. Now, you think you have made a wonderful discovery with reference to the doctrine, that faith alone is necessary to salvation. You have quoted several texts, and I heard you, with pity, endeavoring to draw your inferences from them. I admit the full force of your texts, but not in the way in which you would explain them. I say that faith alone never saved any one, that it never will save any one, and that whoever relies upon it only for his salvation is deceived, abandons Jesus Christ, and is not in the way to heaven. But then it will be objected to me that our Saviour, in dying, did all that was necessary for our salvation, and that nothing is wanted afterwards. I admit that nothing was wanting on the part of our Saviour, but on our part

there was, and is much wanted, both to make atonement for sins which we commit and to avoid. This that was wanted was good works, the works of penance and mortification, fasting and alms-deeds. Now, let me give you a few texts directly to the point, and I shall convince you that good works are necessary to salvation, and that faith alone is not sufficient. Our Saviour himself says—"If you would enter into life keep the commandments." Therefore, faith alone will not do, for the commandments must also be observed. Further he says—"Amen, amen, I say unto you, unless you do penance you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"—and this very text has been translated wrongly by the Protestants, who have put *repentance* instead of *penance*, into their testament.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Where is that text to be found ?

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—In the Gospel of St. Luke.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—What chapter and verse ?

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I did not ask you for chapter and verse. I would have to look for it in order to tell you. It refers to the repentance of the Ninevites, who, he said, should rise up in judgment against the Jews, because they did not repent. And let me ask, was it not in fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes, that Jonas did penance with the Ninevites, for three days. I now refer you to St. James the 2d chap. and 21st verse—"Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar," Luke 7th chap. 47th verse—Matt. 7th chap. and 21st verse—"Not every man that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father who is in heaven," Matt. 22d chap. and 12th verse—where he was punished who did not go to the wedding feast with a wedding garment, which is interpreted to signify good works. 1st Corinthians, chap. 19, verse 2, "And though I have the gift of prophesy, and understand all mystery and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, it availeth me nothing." This proves not only that faith alone is not sufficient for salvation, but that many have faith without good works, therefore that good works are not a necessary consequence of faith. Now, though my friend may have great faith, and notwithstanding he has the private spirit, it will take him a long time before he convinces me that his faith is as great as that of the inspired apostles ; yet if he has not charity, it signifies very little to him. I refer you to the 13th verse of the same chapter, "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity." It is true that "without faith it is impossible to please God;" but I add that without good works it is equally impossible to please him. Again, Colossians 3d chap. and 14th verse, "And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." Matt. 22d chap., 37th, 38th, 39th, and 40th verses. Galatians, 5th chap. 7th verse.—"For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love."—1st Corinthians, 7th chap. 19th verse. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God." Ephesians, 1st chap. 4th verse. "According as he hath

chosen us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." It is clear, I should think, from all these texts, that faith alone is not sufficient for salvation, and that charity, and good works, and the keeping of the commandments is equally necessary. Luther it was that put the German word *alien* into the text; and when he was spoken to about it, he said that he was an apostle as well as Paul, and it was retained for the purpose of inveigling the unwary, by making them believe that the way to salvation was easier by their Church than by ours. I will give you one or two texts on the subject. Hebrews, 5th chap. 9th verse—"And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." That proves that obedience is necessary for salvation. The whole epistle of St. John proves that faith is not the only requisite. I might quote many more texts, for there are no less than thirty-nine which bear on this point. In the 2d chapter and 14th verse of the epistle of St. James, you will find, "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Doth faith save him?" And lower down, in the 17th verse—"Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone;" and verse 18, "Thou believest there is one God: thou doest well. The devils also believe and tremble." Now, why was the word "alone" inserted after "faith" by Luther? and why has it been preserved, thus making a liar of the Holy Ghost? I have before said, in order to make the easiness of their way to heaven contrast with our prayer and fasting and mortification, and all those holy practices which to them appear so much balderdash. Now, I will tell you what has been the consequence of this Protestant doctrine of all faith and no works. It has created the heresy of the Antinomians. It has made those heretics broach the damnable doctrine that the more sins they commit, the more glory do they give to God by so doing; for they say, "Faith alone is sufficient to justify us altogether;" forgetting that it has been said, "For by works, and not by faith, can man be justified." Now, I want my friend to answer it.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Where is the last text from?

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I do not ask for yours, because I know where to find them. Now, I will not content myself with having proved that faith alone is not sufficient; I will prove that good works are meritorious before God. For that purpose I refer you to the 18th Psalm, verse 20, "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness; according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me." And again in 1st Kings, chap 8, verse 32, "Then hear thou in heaven, and do and judge thy servants condemning the wicked, to bring his

way upon his head, and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." And 2d Chron. chap. 15, verse 7, "Be ye strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded. Now, Sir, I could go on with fifty such passages ; but where is the use ? You undertook to prove our apostacy. I need not speak of any thing else if I do not chose. But I am to prove that we are apostate ; and I do say that it is blasphemy to assert, that an apostle inspired by the Lord foretold the apostacy in the Church, and that not a single true Christian should be left in the world, when Christ himself said that the Church should last for ever. All I could get from you as to the invisibility of the Church is that it existed in the hearts of some though it could not be seen. In answer I have said *de non existentibus et de non apparentibus endem est ratio*. He could not answer that. Now I think I have followed him all through his rambling speech, though I was not bound to do so. It was my business solely to reply to the charge of apostacy. You, Sir, have talked of the Unitarians. I am not a Unitarian. I am ready to meet them on their own ground, and to discuss with them their religious belief. But you cannot do so, for you have no principle on which to convince them ; and this meeting see that, for they see that you have never attempted to answer any of the arguments which I have advanced relative to them. Therefore, I say, Protestantism is without any principle. I do not call on you now to prove the authenticity of the Revelations. You reply to me that I believe them, and ask me why I require you to prove it. I say, I do believe it ; but I believe it on principle. You do not. You say common sense leads you to believe it. You talked to me a while ago of a man fancying himself to be a clock, or a horse, and attempting to act like them. Why, common sense would tell any one who saw him that he was a man ; but I ask can you bottom your faith in the scriptures or in the doctrines of the Church upon common sense ? St. Paul says, "Faith comes from hearing, and hearing from the words of Christ. Now, as I have often asked before, I ask now how could the words of Christ be heard when they were not preached, namely, during 800 years in which there was no true Church ? And if Christ could not be heard how could there be faith ? Again, how could you hear without preaching, and how could there be preaching where there was no one to preach ? I also ask you who sent you ?—from whom have you your mission ?—There was previous to Luther no Church of yours ; you were only a few individuals separating from the Church, and you had no authority.

Mr. MAGUIRE's half hour ended here.

MR. GREGG—You have all heard, I believe, of a person who was under the discipline of a drummer. He was tied to the tail of a cart, and the drummer, in applying his lash to his back, happened to strike him between the shoulders. O, strike me lower, cried the man ! the drummer complied, but the man again exclaimed, strike me higher. Well, said the drummer, I am doing all I can to please you, but you will not be satisfied whether I strike you high or low. 'Tis so, my friends, with Mr. Maguire ; whatever way I meet his questions, he will not be content. He called on me again and again, to prove the Thirty-nine Articles. I brought abundance of Scripture to do so, and he says I have done nothing. He won't take a single text from me. But, I trust, we shall have no more about the Thirty-nine Articles. Now, I really do admire the great talents of my reverend opponent, and I hope he will yet see his errors ; and I pray to the Almighty God to convert him from his wanderings. But mark the way he argues with me. He says that we deny the necessity of good works. Now, I totally deny the truth of that assertion ; we on the contrary, insist on the necessity of good works after justification—"accursed be the man who says that any man is justified in sin." We hold that there is no venial sin mentioned in the scripture, and that all sins are mortal ; and if a man continue in sin to death, we pray not for him. I undertake to prove that there is no distinction to be found in scripture between moral and venial sin, and that they are all equal, as they are offences against the law and will of God. Mr. Maguire objects to my proofs *in globo*, he objects to all my texts without showing any particular reason against any of them ; but I would take them *seriatim*, and show how they apply to the argument which I support, were it not too tedious, and that I fear the public would tire of it. But if Mr. Maguire will write a work on the question between us, and there endeavor to show that I am wrong, I undertake to write a work in reply, and to disprove every argument which he will bring forward. Now hear what the articles of the true Church say on this subject. "Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily from a true and lively faith may be as evidently known as the tree discerned by the fruit." You see, then, my friends, that we condemn the abominable anti-nomian heresy—and, in reality, that heresy springs from the very doctrine of the Church of Rome, of salvation by works. I will prove to you that from that very doctrine all sorts of licentiousness springs ; for every one will have a standard of works for himself, according as it may best

suit his own mind and disposition. I recollect having once spoken on the subject of her conversion to a poor Irishwoman who went to the chapel, and she only said to me, "What sins did I ever commit—I have a good heart and injure no one, and I have nothing to answer for." Such was her standard of good works, and every man may thus have one of his own. I assent to this proposition that works performed in Jesus Christ are good; but it is through the merits of Christ that they have their merits. Now mark, my friends, the dreadful error into which the followers of the Church of Rome are liable to run. They calculate on vain works and ceremonies, and they put off their conversion to the hour of their death. This is an awful mistake. When Christians think so, and run to us for succour, and for the sacrament, we discourage them, and we preach to them of the danger of such a practice. But if they do insist on it, we do comply, and administer the sacrament to the dying. Were we to administer the rite of unction by authority of the Church, we would have as good ground for so doing as if we had it from an angel from heaven; but I deny that Mr. Maguire will find that right in our *reformed* prayer book. It is one of those relics which we had not shaken off when we came out of Babylon, but which we have since cast away. I will now come to a text much dwelt on by my reverend friend, and on which he seems to have placed great reliance. As he did not give the verse in quoting it, I shall, I fear, be at some trouble to find it out.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I shall most willingly assist you.

A voice in the crowd—The 19th chapter of Matthew, verse 16th.

Mr. GREGG—Oh, then, here I have it: "And behold one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Mark me, my friends, I take the whole context, for it is only thus that we can arrive at the real meaning of the passage relied on by my rev. friend. Here we have a weak-minded man coming to Jesus, who sees into his heart, and tries him as it were on the very threshold, thus: "Good Master," said he. "Why callest thou me good?" replied Jesus, "there is none good but one, that is God." Jesus paused, but the man could give him no answer; then Jesus again said, "but if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." He saith unto him, "Which?" Jesus said, "Thou shalt not do murder; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness; honor thy father and thy mother; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" that is, let no things of sin be on thy soul; thou hast the law before thee, behold the condition you have to fulfil. The man should have said, "Lord I have tried all my life to fulfil the law, but I



could not do it." This would be that sorrow of soul which would become him, and would be meet in one approaching the Lord, for no man can ever come to Jesus until all hope but evangelical and lawful hope is banished from his soul. He said, "Which?" Jesus replied—now observe, observe, Oh observe the wisdom of the Lord Jesus! he doth not give him the first table of the law; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole soul!" he deals with him more gently in the beginning—he takes him to the second table and forbids him to commit any sins. Mark the answer:—The young man evidently moved in a respectable circle, and when he did not commit the grosser sins he thought that he was perfect, and Jesus saw that, like many in his circumstances of life, he was blinded by his riches, and gave him a precept according. "The young man saith unto Him, all these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet?" Jesus said unto him, "if thou wilt be perfect go and sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me." Then you will discover what you are yourself—that there is no righteousness in you except that which cometh to you through another. Thus do we explain this text, not by taking it alone, but in connexion with the context—thus will any one who pretends to understand the Scripture, when he takes it piece-meal, deceive himself; for there is a height and a depth about the word of the Lord which obliges us to read it again, and to ponder over it, and consult the Holy Spirit on it, before we can pretend to ourselves that we understand it right. Perhaps it would be well to take another of my rev. friend's favorite texts, and try whether it could not be explained to your satisfaction. Let us take the following: St. Paul says, "If I should have all faith so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, it profiteth nothing." Now, I will not be drawing vain distinctions, but I will ask him one question before I proceed to the explanation of the text. He asks he to prove that he is not a house-clock, and he appeals to common sense that he is not. Now, if common sense tells us that a man is a man, I also appeal to common sense that bread is bread. Again, he says, *De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, that is, things which do not exist are to be considered as alike. Now, I fasten on him his own principle, and retorting his ridiculous maxim, I say things which do not appear do not exist, and what does not appear in the bread does not exist. Again, he asks, how can I make an act of faith? This was for a long time a bugaboo to me; but I ask him what does he mean by it? If it is to do good in Jesus Christ, I answer that we do it—we do it through the Holy Ghost who operates within us; but if he only means by it, forming his belief on a list of Popes or such external circumstances, I say we do not make such an act of faith; and I further say and mark it, my friends, if the truth of the bible were proved by the strictest demonstration, even that would not enable us to make an act of faith without the influence of the Holy Ghost. But, my friends, there is a saving faith which is to be distinguished from that other kind of faith which resembles much the force of imagination, and might be such as that which moves mountains and

effects mighty works.—Thus do we find in the case of Jehu, that he rose up as if he had the Spirit of the Lord, and drove furiously over the land, and overcame the kings of the earth ; and yet he was rejected by God, and was an idolater ; nor was it by the saving faith which he was moved.—And so in the case of Saul, when the hand of Samuel was on him, he went abroad with a mighty emotion and dashed through his enemies with more than mortal power. Thus, I have no doubt, that in an apostate church some may be found with that kind of faith which actuated Jehu and Saul—with that faith which would move mountains ; but that is not a saving faith. The devils believe and tremble—mark that, my friends the devils believe and tremble, but theirs is not a living or a saving faith. Now then for the apostacy. I come now to prove the apostacy of the Church of Rome ; I do not know at which end of such a subject I should commence ; but as I have but a minute remaining perhaps it would be as well for me take some other of my rev. friend's points. Let us take the case of Abraham, who, it is said in St. Paul, was justified by works. The Apostle, in writing to the Hebrews,—

Mr. Gregg's half hour here ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My reverend friend, Mr. Gregg, has told you that faith is the evidence of, and produces good works ; but I say that good works are the evidence of faith. He told you yesterday that he came here to preach and not to argue. I tell you that I came here to argue and convince. I agree with him in the conclusion which he drew ; for it was that faith would not save without good works ; but I say that that was not the doctrine of Luther, and to this day, is not the doctrine of many, if not all, the members of his church. He relied much on his interpretation of the texts concerning the young man seeking for instruction from Christ ; but I will now explain them, for I saw how he staggered when endeavoring to make his meaning correspond with his own opinions. The young man said unto him—" Good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have everlasting life ?" And he said unto him, why callest thou me good ? there is none good but one ; that is God : but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, " which ?" Jesus then explained to him the commandments he was to keep. " The young man saith unto him, all these have I kept from my youth up—what lack I yet ?" Jesus said unto him, " if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me." From the address of the young man it is evident that he was sincere ; and one of the gospels, which gives a fuller account, says that Jesus " looked on him lovingly," when he told him what more was necessary after observing the commandments which he had enumerated. So that our Lord must have known that he spoke the truth in saying that he had observed them. If this, then, be the case, my friend's argument falls to the ground. Oh, but then, I am sure, he does not much relish the precept, " Go and sell that thou hast." Oh, no ; the parsons do not like to give up anything, especially the tithes. Oh, no ; they will not give them up. They will kill and shed blood for them. Well, he gives his own gloss. I give another evangelist to explain the

text. He talked much of this passage. If it be incumbent on a man to give his goods to the poor, the precept was a work of supererogation. Now, I think I have convinced you that Mr. Gregg has not been enlightened by the Holy Ghost, at least so far as the interpretation of the Scripture is concerned. Our Saviour says, in the gospel of St. Luke, "Amen, amen, unless you do penance, you will all equally perish." And what was this penance? The penance of the Ninevites. My friend may cry out, "Oh, Popery, I abominate you." Let him say so. Yet this church recommends, nay, enforces restitution and satisfaction both to God and man. If you rob a man of his character, you must make him restitution. But such is not the case in his church, I have been told by my friend that works are not good in themselves. Did I not admit that faith was also necessary; but at the same time I proved that faith without good works was of no avail, and that without the latter no one could be saved. Why has Christ given us sacraments? In order to our salvation; and he has said, "Amen, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you, I am the bread of life which came down from heaven." If, then, sacraments were necessary to our salvation, how can it be said that faith is sufficient? You will admit that baptism is necessary. I know that it is generally admitted to be necessary by the members of your Church. How can it be necessary, if there were no condition to the sacrifice on Calvary, I have proved now that you do not understand the doctrine of your own church, and that those doctrines are contrary to each other. I ask you now as I asked you before, what kind of warfare is this? Did we not come here, you to prove the apostacy of my church, I to contradict your proofs? You have not said one word as to the apostacy. I would willingly go over all the texts you have quoted, but it would be endless work, and it would be as useless as endless. I have proved to you that good works are necessary. Do you show me from any expression of mine, or from any Roman Catholic work, that it is our belief that they alone are sufficient for the salvation of the soul? You would not recommend those works; you say that they are meritorious, and that they are the consequences of faith. Your doctrine on the subject may pass current elsewhere, but it would not do here. You perceive, my friends, that his observations oblige me again to say something with regard to the political union of the church and state. I say again that it is corrupt, and whatever by it the church gains in grandeur, it loses in integrity and spirituality. The gospel says it is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. I wonder what the bishops and parsons of the Protestant church, with their 10,000*l.*, and 20,000*l.*, and 30,000*l.* a year, will do. Oh, but in this age there is no such thing as a rich man. He is not rich that has a large income and rolls in a splendid carriage, and has all the luxury and the grandeur of the world about him. Oh! as the parson can never be rich while he gets his tithes, and no matter what money he may have, it is always easy for him to enter the kingdom of heaven. My reverend friend said that I mentioned the validity of holy water. I only talked of the legality and usefulness of it. You yourself, Sir,

yesterday, talked of the church running through a stream of fire and holy water. So that you have holy water, it appears, yourself, as well as we. But the blessing of water is not a modern innovation, as you would seem to insinuate. Read Tertulion, and he will tell you not only that holy water was used, but how it was used in the primitive days of the church. My friend says that the heresy of the Antinomians sprang from our doctrine of good works. Why, we maintain the necessity of good works. They say they are totally unnecessary—they laugh at and mock them. They maintain that faith alone is necessary. How, then, can they derive that doctrine from us, who say that faith is idle without good works? They cannot, but I tell you, as I told you before, that they have sprung up from Luther, who said that by faith alone was a man's salvation secured. I ask my reverend friend did he ever read the work of Mr. Richards, member of parliament, in which he says that if he had committed a thousand murders, a thousand incests, and a thousand robberies, he would be saved, if he had but faith, for that Christ would say, come to me with faith, and I will save you." I have challenged him repeatedly as to the Unitarians, and other heretics; but he has not answered me, for he is too wise in his generation. Now, I ask him how can the Unitarian, who denies the divinity of Christ, be saved? He gave me a number of texts, proving that good works were necessary with faith. I admit them all. But then he adds that the doctrine of good works is the ruin of mankind. That is, for I can interpret it no otherwise, he says, "Sin on, and sin valiantly, and a fig for satisfaction, for if you acquire faith, you will be saved, as good works follow." We say just the contrary, and allege that no matter how good your works, or great your faith, satisfaction is necessary for sin. But this doctrine of satisfaction will be better for Den's day than now. On that day I will gladly compare those who go to confession with those who do not. I will gladly institute a comparison between those married women who go to confession, and the Bible-reading ladies of England, and then we shall see who quit their husbands, and who exchange husbands with another. We shall see that in England no less than 600 every year fly away from their husbands, or exchange with each other, Oh! these ladies must have ghostly advisers. They must have some before whom to lay the inmost inclinations of their hearts, and the temptations to which they are exposed and which they feel, and no one to give them advice how to overcome these temptations—how to avoid these dangers. Mr. Gregg knows as well as I that they cannot tell their husbands; that would make them run the risk of being locked up as are the Turkish ladies. Who, then, are they to advise with, if not with a confessor? But this is properly the subject of discussion for Saturday. My friend says he is going to the subject of apostacy. Why does he not go to it at once? All of you must now be tired of his fumbling. It is principle I want, and I have not got it as yet. He told me an act of faith is nonsense. He plays upon the word "act" as if it is not equally applicable to the mind and body. Now, I will tell you what I say. I say you have no faith. You cannot possibly make an act of faith.

An act of faith consists not merely in any outward action, but in the inward motion of the heart, or the outward motion of the tongue, declaring your belief in the religion which you profess. No man belonging to your religion can make an act of faith, for you admit that your church is fallible. God's faith does not, and cannot, depend on fallible testimony, for it is more than metaphysically certain. Is it from scripture you have your faith? Whence have you the scriptures? How do you know that they are authentic? How can you prove them authentic? Not the most learned man in your religion can prove it, for he has not the scriptures in the ancient languages, nor have they a good copy in any modern language; I say then that Protestantism is without principle, and that it is nonsense for a man to be running always to the Holy Ghost when he does not know and cannot prove that he possesses his spirit. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, the Bible, and every single prayer that they have, are stolen from us. I am prepared to prove that there is not a single prayer in the common prayer book that they do not get from us. Where was your Bible, let me ask you, during the 800 years that you were invisible? You may tell us it was with the Jews. I thank you, and I wish you joy that it is from the Jews you derive your faith. You may tell me with the Waldenses and Albigenses. I wish you joy, then, that you derive your faith from excommunicated heretics. And I will show you Protestant authors who speak more severely against these heretics than any Catholic writer ever had done. If you have it not from any of those, you have it from us. Then you have got it out of the Babylon whence you have got everything. Now I have got you in a fine stew, and the only way you can get out of it is by giving it a *transent*, and by quoting a paecel of texts which have nothing to do with the subject. I say that the Bible is mine, and that it is not yours, and you have nothing to do with it. Mark me, the gospel was not finished for 91 years after the death of our Saviour. How does he know, then, that it is authentic? He cannot know, therefore, he cannot prove it. He tells you he is a Catholic. Suppose a letter was directed to the Catholic priest of Swift's-alley, does he think it would go to him? It would not. It would be sent to the parish priest. Oh, but the title of Protestant priest is a very fine one, notwithstanding the contradiction which it implies. He did not give you a single argument hardly since the commencement of this discussion. It is true he showed you a map, the upper part of which is gold, and out of the gold flowed a scarlet color. Why, Sir, your own friends laugh at it. Here you are running from one doctrine to another, from transubstantiation to faith, from faith to works, from works to hundreds of other things, and not staying at any one single point. But this is nothing. Such a discussion will satisfy no one—

Mr. Maguire's half hour here ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, I think that a letter directed to the "Catholic minister of Swift's-alley" would reach me. But now, let me ask you, if any of you went into Lucan and ask for the church, would he be directed to the Roman Catholic chapel?—or suppose a letter were directed to the minister of Ballinamore, do

you think it would be sent to my reverend friend. It is not necessary that I should prove that the term "Catholic" is used positively; nor is it necessary that it should be so used. It is merely a distinctive term, and the word "church" implies it. Hence if any one inquires for a church, he is directed to our place of worship. My reverend friend says we got the Bible from him. Yes, we did; and I hope that he himself will soon come over to us. He asks me to prove to him that I have the Holy Ghost. I say, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." Then he talks of an act of parliament Bible. I say our Bible is not an act of parliament Bible. We gave it to the parliament, and persuaded the parliament to pass a law for its support, and may we never see the day when the holy union between our church and the state may be broken. Oh, then he speaks of our bishops rolling in carriages. I wish I was to dine with the Bishop of Toledo, and then, indeed, I would see the riches and the splendour of a Popish bishop. He taunts me with the Unitarians, and asks me will they be saved. I answer that any one who denies the divinity of Christ cannot be saved. The time is coming, when my Roman Catholic brethren will come out of Babylon as well as ourselves. We did not separate. The original bishops and priests were ours. I have here the Roman Catholic Directory, and I have marked it, and I find that in the sees of Clonfert, Kilmacduagh, Ardagh, Waterford, Raphoe, Dromore, Killala, and many others, there has been nothing but confusion and disorder. In our church is the true succession; in theirs, there have been breaks of hundreds of years. Next, my friend lies under a great mistake. Salvation is present. I can now say, "I am saved, and my sins are blotted out." Good works are the consequence of faith, and are produced by salvation, not the cause of it. Good works are the consequence of faith—but if I expected that I would be saved by them alone, without faith I would be damned. He says that on Saturday he will go to England, and establish a comparison with the ladies there and those who go to confession. If he does, I shall be happy to hold up the ladies of Spain and Italy, who have their bachelors, as a contrary example. He says we do not require restitution; I am happy to be able to contradict him there. I have known hundreds of pounds to be restored; but then they are not pharisaically mentioned in the newspapers, with the clergyman's name attached to them. Oh, if my reverend friend would but confine himself to the reading of books of controversy it would be better for him and he would soon see the truth and the glory of our religion. If he would but read the lives of some of the saints of our church, of Cecil, Martin, Cranmer, Ridley, and Taylor, he would see the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. It is true they had spots upon their fame, and so had David. But for that we are not to cry them down. Suppose I entered a magnificent building and the interior of it struck us as truly grand and without a blemish, what would I say to the man that would come up to me and tell me that there was a flaw in the wall. Now the first book I bring him to in order to prove his apostasy is the prophet Daniel; and I first tell him that if

he be right I am apostate, because I say his rock is not as our rock, and his God is not as our God, for he entirely mistakes, and cannot see his nature. Now I refer you to Daniel, the second chapter, and there is described the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. He saw "a great image whose brightness was excellent and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of miry clay. "And a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon its feet, which were of iron and miry clay, and brake them to pieces; then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away that no place was found for them, and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Now let me come to interpretation. The vision described the Gentile world under four kingdoms. The gold signified the Assyrian empire. The brass signified the Grecian empire. The breast and arms signified the Lydian and Persian empire. The fourth empire was the Roman. The feet part of iron and part of clay, signified the Romish apostacy. The stone that grew into the mountain was the true church, which was of the finer clay which is the composition of a mountain. The very clay of the feet was a bad foundation, and easily destroyed; and mark it had a connection with the worldly kingdom; for papal Rome is no more than a continuation of pagan Rome. The feet were first iron—that is Paganism; and next clay—that is, Popery. I assert that the miry clay was Rome in its apostacy. Now, it is not from Dens that I will sustain this apostacy, but from De Sales, St. Thomas, Aquinas, Camburni, and others, who were what Bailey, another of their writers, calls *latiores casuistæ*. But even this same Bailey I will prove to be the most shocking, abominable writer that ever wrote, and to contain the most horrid unmentionable things. Now, I rejoice to say God has designed to destroy Babylon. Now is the time, my Roman Catholic brethren to go out of it, lest you be defiled with its abominations. Now, fly when you see the abomination of desolation in the holy place, and let no man go up to this roof-top, but go to the holy mountain, where he may see. [Here the reverend gentleman became so excited, and thumped the table so unmercifully, and created such a noise by stamping on the platform, that it was impossible to ascertain what he was saying. The only words we could hear were, "fly, fly, fly!" repeated very often; and we really thought that he feared the roof would fall in upon the heads of the devoted assembly. Almost every one in the room was convulsed with laughter. There were

some few who loudly applauded him. When the reverend gentleman had recovered his breath and his spectacles, he continued.] Excuse me—my friends—excuse me—but I have such a love for your souls, it has led me away—I was saying that papal Rome was a continuation of pagan Rome; and I have in my hand a letter written by a worthy Protestant divine, which shows that the superstition of modern Rome are merely slightly changed from those of ancient Rome. Even the miracle of melting blood when approached near the head of St. Januarius, he shows to be derived from a magical feat mentioned by Horace, who tells us of a man who used to melt incense without fire. Thus are the superstitions of paganism continued in order to deceive the people.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Gentlemen, my opponent has told me that I did not answer a single point which he made during the discussion. All I say is, you are the judges, and with you I leave it. I think myself that it is as true as everything else which he has said. The more I push him the more he avoids me. I cannot bring him to answer me at all. He has now given you a speech very similar to all the previous ones, in its not being directed towards any one specific point. You have heard him talk of venial sin, relics, miracles, and God knows what. He defies me to prove that there is any venial sin; well I am content to take up his challenge, and on this single point let his knowledge of the Bible rest. I shall quote now from the Bible printed by authority, in the reign of James the First. He may tell me that is not the authorised version; but I tell him that it is better authorised than any which have succeeded it. I refer him to Exodus, 1st chap. 16th verse—he will there find that the midwives, having been ordered by Pharaoh to strangle all the children who had become too numerous—just like us poor Irish Papists—and who flourished the more, the more harshly they were treated, just as we flourish on our potatoes; and the midwives having disobeyed his orders, because they feared God, were brought before him, when they gave as their excuse—"the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women, for they are lively, and are delivered ere the Egyptian women come in unto them;" and it is added, "therefore God dealt with the midwives, and the people multiplied and waxed very mighty; and it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them houses." Thus we have the midwives telling a lie, and yet it is said that they feared God, and that God rewarded them. Now, if this lie were a mortal sin, God would not have rewarded them. Besides it would just have been as great a crime as if they had murdered the children, and equally punishable with eternal damnation. My friend will also recollect what St. Paul says of Rahab, when she concealed the spies on the top of the



house, told the soldiers when they arrived, that they had just gone out at the door. And St. James, chap. 2, verse 25, says of her, "And was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way." If that lie were mortal it was damnable, and not a whit worse than it would have been to give the spies up to death. Yet you see she was rewarded by God for it. Therefore all sins are not mortal, and there are venial sins. I refer him to Matthew—where it is said that "whosoever is angry with his brother is worthy of the judgment, and whosoever despiseth his brother is worthy of the council, and whosoever hateth his brother is worthy of hell's fire." Thus showing that there are gradations of offences. And does not Christ say of hypocrites that they strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Or suppose one was to say that he saw a cow with horns eleven feet long, would that be a mortal sin, and as great a one for me as if I were to murder you on your way home, and thus put an end to the discussion. I tell you God is just and merciful, and he would not be either were he to punish all sins alike. If God reward a man according to his works, how can you or I, for such a lie as I have mentioned, be as bad as Claudius or Caligula, or Nero or Domitian. I refer him further to Luke, chapter 12, verse 47 and 48—"And that servant which knew his master's will, and prepared not himself according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall get but few stripes." That is, the one will receive temporal punishment, the other will be damned for ever and ever. And that is the reason why I do not pronounce all not agreeing with me in religion, heretics. Because, for heresy it is requisite that there should be a knowledge and contumacy preventing one from joining what they know to be right. It is only those that go directly out of the church that I would call heretics or apostates, but I would call them so. Again, it is said, "The just man falleth seven times." If he fall mortally, how can he be just? If he do not fall mortally, he must fall venially. Therefore there is venial sin. Besides, there is hardly a single action, hardly a single thought of ours, in which we do not sin. If these were to be punished, what would become of us? What would become of me, if every foolish smile I give when I hear my reverend friend make use of a humbug argument, were it a mortal sin? Well, then, I have done what he defied me to do. I have proved that there is venial sin.—Now, I come to another part of his speech. He has canonized himself before he is dead. He has asserted that he is saved, and for so doing I arraign him of blasphemous impiety. You remind me, Sir, of the man who had his grave-stone brought to him when he was dying, and got engraved upon it. "Victory, victory, victory, through Christ Jesus." Now, did the Holy Ghost authorise that man to do this! If he did he was infallible as well as you, and was right. But if he were not inspired he was blasphemous, though not more so than yourself. Why, you are ignorant of the principles of religion. You must be aware of the difference between presumption and hope. If you had said, "I hope I am saved," I would have added, "I hope so." But now that you say positively that

you are, I accuse you of presumption. Do not imagine, my friend, that you will cajole this intellectual assembly. Such things may go down well enough elsewhere, but they will not go down here.—Why, if you be a saint, if you be inspired, convince me of it by a miracle, and I will believe you, but not till then. You say you are inspired, and yet I have shown that you do not understand the scriptures. How do you reconcile that with your inspiration?—You have told me Unitarians will not be saved. Well, they will say to you, you are the cause of our damnation—for it was you that introduced the doctrine of the right of private judgment; and in the right of that private judgment, they will give their gloss for your gloss, and will decide which is right. They will go with you to mathematics and metaphysics. They will tell you that three gods in one is a contradiction in terms, and that you have no right to interfere, for they are only exercising the right which you yourself first exercised. “If,” they will say, “private judgment must stand the public judgment of the church, which you left should stand, and you therefore had no right to leave it. And now having disposed of all these, I will come to the apostacy, and I shall set it aside altogether in a very short way, and then I will prove from scripture, and from your own writers, that St. Peter is not Anti-Christ, and that he is the centre of Christian unity. We have Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Whittaker, and many others, all of whom have written on the prophecies, and each of whom differs from, and contradicts the others, and all are contradicted by Faber, who has written a work on the difficulties of Romanism, and another on the prophecies. I refer you now to the 12th page of his work, and he there says, “I have not been able to see how the name of anti-Christ has been applied to the Catholic church.” And again, “St. John is the only one of the apostles who uses the term apostacy, and there is nothing that he says which would warrant us fixing it on the Papists.” Again, “He is anti-Christ, who denieth both the father and the son. But the church of Rome never denied either. Therefore, the church of Rome is not anti-Christ.” There now is a syllogism from an honest Protestant rector of Durham, and a syllogism, too, which I would like much to hear my friend answering. He then read several long extracts from the same writer, and went on to say, I will now quote from several other celebrated Protestant writers. Melancthon says :—

The half-hour having expired here,

The Rev. Mr. Nangle announced that both parties had agreed to conclude at two that day.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE said, that though the next day was his day for attack, he had consented to allow Mr. Gregg to continue on the subject of apostacy, as it was one of which he (Mr. Maguire) was fond.

Rev. Mr. GREGG wished to explain, that though this was the fact, yet it was optional with him either to do so or not. The fact was, he did not wish to enter on a subject which he would have to give up in an hour or so, as it was impossible he could dispose of it in that time.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Then I give you the whole day. (Cheers.)

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Then I accept the offer.

The meeting then separated.

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

FOURTH DAY—YESTERDAY—JUNE 1ST.  
(Continued.)

---

Yesterday the discussion commenced at the usual hour by Mr. Maguire calling upon Mr. Gregg to proceed with his proofs, that the Roman Catholic Church is the church of Antichrist.

Mr. GREGG—I am rather astonished at this call, after the agreement we entered into last night ; and after some conversation I had with the reverend gentleman a few minutes ago. I cannot consent, by commencing, to sacrifice my last half hour, which is most important. But if he consents to allow me my last half hour, I am quite willing to commence. I this moment agreed with him, at least so I understood it, that I was not to lose my half hour. I, being the attacking party, would labour under a great disadvantage, if I had not an opportunity for rejoinder. He said he would continue upon the apostacy ; and as he has my arguments of yesterday to apply to, I could subsequently proceed with fresh proofs.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Your total mistake of my meaning, Sir, shows the necessity of a witness to any conversation between us. I said to you that if I allowed you to commence and conclude to-day, you would have three half hours for my one—the one half hour which you closed yesterday, the half hour commencing to-day, and the half hour closing the proceedings. If I commenced to-day what would I have to reply to ? You have entered into no proofs, and I have nothing to answer. Our agreement yesterday was, that you should proceed with your case. I appeal to the public if it was not so.

Mr. GREGG—I, too, appeal to the public. If I chose to insist upon my right, I am quite willing to commence, if I am allowed my concluding turn.

Mr. MAGUIRE—It is better to leave the matter to the chair.

Mr. GREGG—I am quite willing to leave it to the chair ; and I am sure the decision will be in my favour.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You should not prejudice the decision, if you are willing to submit to it.

[There was here loud cries of chair, chair, from all parts of the room.]

Mr. GREGG—I claim to be allowed to finish my address to the public. Now, mark—I commenced an attack upon the Roman Catholic church yesterday. I proved that apostacy to a demonstration from Daniel. Mr. Maguire made no reply. The reason is clear enough—he went home to consider it. Therefore, it is most unreasonable, that I should be called upon, at an inconvenience, and out of our usual routine, to proceed, and lose the advantage of the closing reply. He has a fair opportunity of upsetting all I have said of his church now if he can.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I would be perfectly satisfied, and ought to be satisfied with this course, if we had not entered into an arrangement yesterday. What necessity was there for a specific arrangement, if every thing was to go *pari passu* with the regular course of things? I agreed yesterday that he was to get leave to go on with his apostacy case. Stopping as we did yesterday, an hour earlier than the day before, he had not concluded it, and I was willing to give him an hour, or even a whole day, for the purpose.

Mr. GREGG—We stopped early to oblige Mr. Maguire.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I know the reason you are so little anxious to go on. You are not so sure of the apostacy.

Mr. GREGG—As sure as Christ was saved:

After some further conversation, it was agreed that things should go on in their usual course—Mr. Maguire commencing. Mr. MAGUIRE began by saying—My chairman has recommended me, rather than give up this discussion, to forfeit my claim upon our agreement, and I shall do so for peace sake. Permit me, commencing, that if artificial and capricious glosses upon the prophets could carry my friend to an apparent victory, there is no doubt that he would not have failed for the want of assertions. But I will show him that this glossing is not his own; I will prove to him, incontrovertibly, that Protestant glossers look upon every man who holds his opinions as either a knave or a fool—(there was here some confusion and mingled hisses and cheers.)

The Rev. Mr. NANGLE came forward and requested there should be no marks either of approbation or disapprobation. Such conduct, he said, was a violation of the terms of agreement between the contending parties.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I beg my friends to show no symptoms of approbation. I want none. I seek their attention, and nothing more. The great question we have to decide could be concluded, upon my part, in twenty minutes. But I will go into it at length, and leave no cavil unanswered. I will have first to make an observation or two upon his last

speech yesterday ; but three minutes will suffice for it. He first quoted a text from St. John, to prove that every sin is mortal. He read, "There is a sin unto death." I hope the oversight was unintentional ; but, my friends, he omitted what the holy evangelist continues to say, "There is a sin not unto death"—that is, there is a sin that killeth the soul, in a spiritual manner, and there is a sin that killeth not the soul, in a spiritual manner. Now, either this proves venial sin, or, as I will prove to a demonstration, it shows the necessity for prayers for the dead. I will go no further upon this subject now ; but if my friend chuses to touch upon it again, I will leave nothing I have promised unproved. He next spoke of the book of Maccabees, which, he said, was rejected from the canonical scriptures, because it sanctioned self-murder. But I deny that it sanctions self-murder. It says that Maccabeus chose rather to die nobly than fall into the hands of his enemies. But the dying nobly had reference to what was passing in his own mind, and not to the opinion of the inspired writer. He died nobly, in his own opinion ; but his mode of death is not sanctioned. But if the book is to be rejected because it relates an historical fact, why not reject that book too which tells us that Jephthah slew his own daughter ; and that which relates of Sampson pulling down the pillars of the temple of the Philistines, killing himself and many others. Now, I take the octavo edition of the bible, published at Oxford, which cannot be rejected, it being a great Protestant authority ; and on the authority of this book I will show that a feast was established in honour of the self-sacrificial act of Maccabees, with an octave of eight days. It is said in John, that our Saviour and his disciples went up the mountain to this feast—clearly proving that the commentator held the connection between the texts. If, then, the Maccabees be not a canonical book, why was this feast established on its authority ?—and how will it be said that Jesus gave his countenance to a superstition ? I ask Mr. Gregg what authority he has for rejecting the book of the Maccabees ? None but his own private authority. What authority has he for condemning the Arians ? None but his own. Again, what authority has he for condemning the Unitarians ? His own private authority alone. Why did he condemn the Rev. Mr. Burgh ? Because he differed from him on the meaning of the book of Daniel. Did the Catholic church ever condemn any person without a trial ? No, neither Luther, nor Wickliff, nor Huss, was held guilty without having an opportunity of making defence. But my reverend friend, because he looks grave, and wears a pair of spectacles, I suppose, deals about condemnation with a more unsparing hand than ever did the malignant Vatican. You will observe that in one of the gospels it is expressly said of the Blessed Virgin, "Behold from henceforth, all nations shall call me blessed." How was this promise to be fulfilled ? Where were the nations to call her holy, and to hold her name blessed, when the whole Christian world was sunk in dark, and dismal, and damnable heresy for 800 years ?—Now, my friends, I shall proceed to show that the Babylon, spoken of in the Revelations, is not the Church of Rome, and that the city

is not the Christian city, nor the Papal city, but pagan Rome. Saint Peter wrote to the elect church, which is in Babylon. Now, he was presiding over the Christian Church which was in Rome at the time, and he could only have spoken of it as in Babylon, because among the heathens. Indeed, Doctor Hammond, a celebrated Protestant commentator takes this view of it. [The Revd. gentleman here read an extract from Hammond, in which he holds that the vision of Saint John in the Revelations referred to heathen Rome, and that the hallelujahs of the nations were the joy of the people at seeing the Christian church overcome it.] Thus the fall of Babylon was the fall of the pagan city of Rome, and the joy of the nations was for the conversion of it, or, as Doctor Hammond writes, for the conversion of pure and Christian Rome. But I will ask Mr. Gregg if he does know of another city situated upon seven hills besides Rome? Mark what Doctor Heyland says in his Cosmography—Doctor Heyland, whom no one will doubt, as a learned and grave authority—(The reverend gentleman here read an extract from this work, in which it was stated, that Constantinople was built upon seven hills, each of which was crowned by a mosque, or some other public edifice; and on the seventh of which was seated the temple of St. Sophia. Hence it was called the city on seven hills.) Mr. Gregg will travel far before he will show that Constantinople was not the Babylon foretold. It was called Nova Roma, or New Rome, and has quite as clear a title to be called the Babylon; so that if there be any mystery in the number seven, and if Babylon the Great be situated on seven hills, it is more likely, as Doctor Heyland observes, that the Grand Turk, the professed enemy of Christ, should be the Antichrist; and it would be more reasonable to look for him in the temple of St. Sophia, which is now a Turkish mosque, than in St. Peter's Rome, which is still a Christian temple. I have already shown that Faber differs from Newton, and declares that Joseph Meade and Bishop Newton are wrong in their application of the term Babylon the Great. To proceed—idolatry was not entirely routed out until the fifth century. It still uplifted its head even under Constantine the Great, and it was only under Theodosius that it was quelled. Well, according to St. John the devil was to be chained with all manner of chains for a thousand years after the fall of Paganism. This will bring us, as I shall hereafter show, to the time of Luther and Calvin, when hell was again let loose upon the world. (The reverend gentleman then read another extract from Dr. Hammond, who held that the meaning of the passage in Revelations about the angel sent to chain down satan, meant that the imprisonment of the arch enemy should continue for a thousand years after the fall of Paganism. The writer went on to show that paganism continued to the invasion of the Goths, when the city of Rome was destroyed, and Christianity became victorious.) Our blessed Saviour forewarned that he would send his lambs amongst wolves; and did not suffer his lambs to be persecuted under Valerian, Domitian, Caligula, Nero, and the other scourges and tyrants, which were foretold, till the patience and meekness of the followers

of Christ overcame the persecution, in 445, when Paganism was destroyed. Was it not the Roman Catholic church that overcame the pagans and idolators? And was not the Pope then in Rome, and is he not there still? (The reverend gentleman then read an extract from Dr. Cave, a Protestant writer, to show that he held that the Babylon referred to in Revelations was pagan Rome.)—Now, then, having given you these proofs, in refutation of Mr. Gregg, I will not at present proceed to show that Luther is the fallen star referred to by St. John. (Mr. Maguire next referred to Whiston, a Protestant writer in the reign of Anne, who held that the Pope was Antichrist, and prophesied and proclaimed that Popery would be done away with in the year 1716.) If (continued Mr. Maguire, amidst great laughter,) the prophecy has been fulfilled, I am content to submit to his authority. Now, to proceed to his quotations about forbidding to marry, and to eat meat. The Protestant church acknowledges the general council of Chalcedon. It was admitted by the first parliament under Queen Bess. Now, one of the canons of that council declares that any priest or monk who marries shall be publicly excommunicated. You have your own church admitting that council, which forbids to marry, and marrying in contradiction to it. We have the authority of St. Paul for believing that the married disciple is more ready to fall away from the faith than he who is single. But I will proceed to show that the prophecy did not refer to the Catholic church. The Gnostics and other early heretics, my reverend friend must know, totally forbid marriage, saying it was brought in by the devil, and that marriage was fornication. The same doctrine was held by the Marcionites, who said there were two principles in human nature, the evil and the good, and that marriage proceeded from the evil. With these the Eneates and the Manicheans forbid the use of flesh. Some of them held that swine's flesh only was objectionable. But many of the early heretics declared that all flesh was an evil. (The reverend gentleman then quoted Tertullian, to show that the Marcionites regarded marriage as evil.) But does the Catholic church do this? No. It has elevated marriage to a sacrament. Nor do we forbid the use of meat. We use it, and I can tell you, we are very glad to get it. We only hold that during times of penance, the use of all kinds of meat is not advisable, for which we might plead the line of Horace. "*Sine Cerere et Baccho fugil Venus.*" We know that eating and drinking luxuriously foment the worst passions; and that a cessation from them is necessary to penance.

Mr. Maguire's half hour here ended.

Mr. GREGG then rose and said, I beg leave to ask my reverend friend where did he get all his wisdom about the Scriptures? or whether was it the voice of Rome, or a voice from Leitrim, or Ballinamore, that we have been listening to for the last half hour?—Was it the voice of Legion, or the voice of the Rev. Mr. Maguire himself? I would be glad to know is he quite sure that he has given the true interpretation, or whether that interpretation is his own, or that of his church? I don't care which he may chose—it

is all the same to me. If it has come from Rome, it is all the same as if it came from himself; for, he being the child of Rome, it is quite right that he should copy after his parent. He says he is consistent. Now, I say that I am consistent, and truly consistent. I am a true Catholic; I belong to the holy Catholic church of England and Ireland as it is, and as it has always been; for I say, and I have already proved, that the present united church of England and Ireland has been always the same church in these countries, and that it is the same now that it was when Christianity was first established here and in England. I will read for you an extract from *Magna Charta*, which shows that the Christian church in England was the same then that it is now; that she enjoyed the same religious liberty then that she does now. Our church is the church of Ireland as established by the Apostles. I do admit that St. Patrick came from Rome, and that he preached the gospel here; but he did so before Rome was fallen, and sunk in the grossest idolatry and superstition. He came from Rome when Rome was respectable, and not when she was the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth. He came from her before she became the apostate harlot. But what has she done since? She has since her fall, which has been plainly foretold in the revelations, and which I shall come to by-and-bye, sent as missionaries, not of peace and of truth, but of crime and dissention, which have made us the mock and jest of the nations of the world; and, oh! my Roman Catholic friends, I tell you, in affection, that you will be so until you come out of her into the true holy Catholic church in all its poverty and simplicity, as it was first established by Christ and his apostles.—My reverend friend said, when I produced this map the other day, that he thought it was the falls of Niagara; well, it will answer his purpose perhaps to call it the fall of Rome, and I shall this day treat him to another view of it. The reverend gentleman referred to the downfall of Pagan Rome, and would have you believe that Constantinople is the Babylon spoken of in the Revelations. He did that which I think was not fair, and he must now suffer the awful consequences of it. He read you a portion of the text, without reading the context; and, my friends, when you hear it all read, you will see how impossible it is that Constantinople can be meant, or that the church of St. Sophia, which is a Mahomedan mosque, can be the temple to which he directed your attention. You will see, from this text, a description of the struggle that was going on in the church between those who were true to the faith and those who had corrupted it with their crimes and abominations. Michael and his angels fought with the devil and his angels. Here, from the 12th chapter of Revelations, is a description of Rome when sunk in her abominations. “And there appeared a wonder in heaven, and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon these crowns were written the names of blasphemy, and his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth; and the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a



man child who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron, and her child was caught up to God and to his throne, and the woman fled into the wilderness where she had a place prepared by God, and that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three-score days." Yes, my friends, the true church, the primitive Christians were banished into the wilderness by the crimes and abominations of Rome, but she did not cease to exist. She was preserved by God, and by the blood of the Lamb. And the text goes on to say, "There was war in heaven. Michael and the angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was there place found any more in heaven; and the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, 'Now is come salvation and strength and the kingdom of our God, and the power of Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night; and they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and by the testimony, for they loved not their lives unto death.'" Yes, my Roman Catholic friends, the true servants of God overcame by the blood of the Lamb and by love, as I expected to overcome you, and to awaken you to a sense of the awful errors in which you are plunged. The text goes on to say, "Rejoice ye Heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth and the sea, for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." The woman banished to the wilderness was, as I have remarked, the true church. She was persecuted for the mysterious time of 1260 days or years mentioned in the text. The beast is again described as a leopard, beautiful in outward appearance, but cruel, deceitful, and treacherous, as is the church of Rome and her institutions. My reverend friend quoted a great many Protestant authorities, but what care I for individual opinion. Here the reverend gentleman read the 33d homily on obedience, and in proceeding to do so, he said—I will put on my spectacles and read for my reverend friend what he will not like to hear. I am waxing old, and do not belong to the corporation of bachelors. I have a family of children, and I am sure no one thinks me the worse man on that account. Now, what does my reverend friend say to this? What does he say to this bull of excommunication? I say it is a dangerous, roaring bull, and that it is a murdering bull, which has produced anarchy, and war, and bloodshed upon the earth. Will he say the power was from Christ, when the Pope put the kingdoms of the earth under anathema? How dreadful were the consequences, and how unlike were they to any thing that could result from the mind, the pure and holy doctrines of the primitive Christian church? I will now read for my reverend friend the 43d homily on idolatry. [Here the reverend gentleman read an extract.] He then proceeded to say,—Will Mr. Maguire stand up in defence of the adoration of sticks and stones and senseless images? My reverend opponent told his hearers about a great many names, for which the people cared not

a straw. It was not what Faber said, what Dr. Heylon said, what Whistone said, or what any man said—the question was what did God say. Mr. Maguire speaks of Constantinople as the great city mentioned in the Revelations. How, I would ask him, can that apply; do the Turks forbid marriage? No. He said Luther recommended ten wives—why the Turks went farther, they allowed fifty or sixty wives, or as many as a man can keep. Here the reverend gentleman read another extract from Revelations, and continued by saying—now, reverend Sir, see the advantage you would have gained, if you had read the whole text. I say that it is here clearly shown that the Roman Catholic church is the pagan church of Rome mentioned in the text—that it is Rome with all the abominations of paganism revived. I will ask my reverend friend, and I think he will answer the question in the negative—how can he say that Constantinople, or the Turkish empire, is a continuation of the empire of Alexander the Great? The Pagan Rome mentioned in the Apocalypse is clearly a continuation of the Roman empire. And what childishness it is to endeavor to make Constantinople and the Turkish dominions the Pagan Rome mentioned in the Scriptures. I deplore that such a man as Mr. Maguire should be driven to such straits. Can anything be so pagan as the practice of the church of Rome? Is it not pagan to give beads to men to pray with? We give beads to children to amuse them; and those trumpery are given to the professors of the Popish creed to amuse them, and lead them off from the truths which are to be found in the gospels of the living God. I grant you that the Popish dominion at one time nearly overran the earth, and had liberty and religion trodden under foot, and is not quite consistent with the description given of it in the Apocalypse. He has brought forward the differences amongst Protestant writers as a proof that the spirit of truth cannot be amongst them. I draw from those differences quite contrary conclusions; and I will show you that I am right. Now, Mr. Maguire will, no doubt, exercise his wit—for there is no man better at a jest—at my saying that I prove the truth of our religion from the differences which occasionally arose amongst its teachers. He will say—oh, there is a theologian for you, who undertakes to prove that differences in religion are a sign of truth, I say, that they are conducive to truth. I ask you, my friends, is it not to be hoped that the differences here between Mr. Maguire and myself will lead to truth. The prophet Daniel says many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be multiplied. It is by making experiments that truth shall be established. It is those differences that have led me, and led you, my friends, to the truth. Had the reverend gentleman read the book correctly, he would have answered me differently. It is from those differences which arises from enquiry after the truth, that I have derived the admirable system of assaulting the greatest enemy to human happiness that the world or society ever saw—that is the church of Rome, (partial applause from a portion of the audience.) Mr. Maguire says that the church of Rome is not the great apostacy, and that the Pope is not Antichrist. Now those are the questions which we have under consideration, and I under-

take to prove them to the mind of any man who will listen to argument and the truth. He accuses me of presumption, assurance, and almost blasphemy, when I say humbly before my God that I have the spirit of truth with me. Now I will go farther and say that I could put my hand upon a hundred humble men, cobblers, tailors, tinkers, and so forth, who have the spirit of God with them. Can that spirit be traced to the Pope, to the Grand Lama of modern paganism? Mr. Maguire objects to the word spirit. I say we, who belong to the true church, have the spirit with us; and, brethren, I here call on you and implore you to stick to that church in which is life, and truth, and happiness. He quoted Faber as a Protestant authority to show that the Pope was not Antichrist, because he did not deny the faith of Christ. I don't care what any man asserts—and that was a mere assertion. If a man asserts a thing to which all the senses give the lie, he is not to be believed. If I say that this sheet of paper is black, I deny that it is white, and no one will believe me.

MR. MAGUIRE—If all was as clear as that we could have no difference.

MR. GREGG—I will make my proposition quite as plain. If a man tells me that the church of Rome is not idolatrous and opposed to Christ, am I to believe him when he tells me at the same moment that she calls upon her followers to believe that the eternal God is cased in this little box? [Here the reverend gentleman produced something like a snuff box.] Am I to believe a man who will tell me that the Church of Rome is not opposed to Christ, while he says at the same time that God has reduced himself into that position that would render him odious and contemptible in the eyes of mankind, (applause from some of his hearers.) Forgive me, my friends, it is hard to talk on such subjects, but I am defending the truth and I must speak it, (here the reverend gentleman held the box up to the view of the crowd.)

Here his half-hour ended.

REV. MR. MAGUIRE—My friends, I shall endeavor to run over the wide course which my reverend opponent has taken, just for the mere purpose of rendering it difficult, if not altogether impossible, for me to follow him, or to connect so much matter into the small space of half an hour. But I tell him I am accustomed to do a great deal in that time. What shall I begin with? I shall begin with the argument as to the possibility of putting God into a box. I ask him was not Christ on the cross, and when he was, was not God confined to that spot? I ask him was not Christ in the room with Pontius Pilate, and during that time was not the Godhead confined there too? If not, then, was our Saviour a mere man? I ask, when

our Saviour says, holding out the bread, "This is my body," will he say he is a liar? Will he say to him—"It is not your body?" as if the words of the Most High are to be judged by us. And from whom does this doctrine come? From the devil. Luther says he got it from a ghost in the night, but that he did not know whether it was black or white. The Jew will have an argument against your religion, in your calling to account the word of God, and confining its meaning to what comes within the range of your own limited capacities. I tell you, Sir, you have no right to pronounce upon God's words that such is their meaning, because you cannot understand the one that is most obvious. You admit that there is something more than the mere bread and wine in the sacrament. If there be not, why do you gull, and humbug, and deceive the people by saying that there is? If there be something more, I will thank you to tell me what it is. Let me ask you, when Christ entered the door of the room where the apostles were assembled after the resurrection, was not God in that room? I tell you, Sir, God is in your pocket this moment. God is everywhere. Nowhere is there a vacuum for him. Now, gentlemen, mind the dishonest charge, not that he intended it as such—I am sure he did not—he has brought against me. He tells you that I wanted to make out that Faber was on my side. Now, I don't want to show any such thing. I don't care on what side he is. I quoted him to show that all the Protestant writers on the Prophecies, as well as Mr. Gregg himself, differed in opinion, and that not one of them knew what they were doing, or the meaning of a single verse of the Revelations, and they confused rather than threw any light upon them. I quoted Gregg against Faber, and Faber against Gregg—I quoted Grotius, and many other divines, and now, Sir, you turn round on me and say, they were no churchmen. Oh, no, they were no churchmen, because they had too much common sense and too much Christian charity to hold that nineteen-twentieths of the inhabitants of the world were damnable idolaters. They were not mad—they did not require strait-waistcoats, nor did they ever make such an exhibition as you made yesterday when you roared, and thumped, and stamped, and were near being dumb with inspiration. You talk to me of tailors, and nailors, and sailors; and you say that they know as much of the true religion and of the scriptures, as the cardinals of our church. The cardinals are, I think you will admit, some of the most learned men in the whole world, and I tell you that neither your tailors, nor your nailors, nor your sailors, nor yourself, can know one single word of the scriptures. I tell you, you cannot prove their authenticity—you know not that they are correct. Why? Because you have not the Syriac lan-

guage in which they were originally written—you have only a smattering of Hebrew. Let me ask you do you know the Hebrew without points? Under these circumstances, how can you know that the scriptures which you have are the true scriptures? You cannot know it. You may tell me that you know it by the church. I ask you what can the church know about them during the 800 years or more, for which she was invisible? Your church never was in existence before the days of Luther and Calvin. It therefore never had the scriptures before then. I have challenged you repeatedly to tell me what church, what man, or set of men ever believed in or heard of the Thirty-nine Articles previous to the reign of Elizabeth. I say, no church. Therefore your church invented the twenty-two negative articles. My reverend friend next went to other subjects. He came once more to beads, and relics, and miracles. He tells me he has the spirit. Now there is not a single liar or humbugger whose object is to fool mankind that does not say the same. Now, if I were to boast as loudly as he does that I have the spirit (and indeed I have a much better right to do so than he,) it would at once be said, and justly, that I wanted to impose on you. If he has the spirit let him show me that he has, and I will believe him; but until then I cannot help thinking that it is rank nonsense. He told you that disagreements and differences as to matters of religion only served to confirm the truth, and he quoted the words of the prophet Daniel to support his position. He mentioned that they were applied to the faithful hiding from Antichrist; but I say they were not. They were meant, as St. Paul meant the words—“They were driven to and fro, and rocked about by every wind of doctrine.” What, is it to be said that being driven about by every wind of doctrine is a confirmation of the truth? Then the more differences as to religion—the more Ranters, the more Socinians, the more Jumpers, the more Muggletonians we have, the more will the truth be confirmed. Next, my friend turned to the invisibility of the church. Oh! why did he remind me again of that question, I had wished, for his sake, to be done with it. When I pushed him for an explanation of his belief on that point, he spoke at one time of its visibility, then of its invisibility, then of both, then he staggered and returned to the invisibility again. I asked him then if the church was invisible, how could it be Catholic? He did not tell me. He quoted against the Book of Revelations, but I tell him that neither he nor any one else knows anything about it, or will know, till the prophecies it contains are accomplished. He quoted the text about the two witnesses. Now, he knows, as well as I know, that these two witnesses have not come yet; that they will not come till the days of Antichrist, and that they are Enoch and Elias, who are to be restored to life to preach the doctrine of truth to the Jews, who, in those days, will once more be brought within the pale of the church. He knows, as well as I know, that Antichrist has not come yet, and that he will not come till fire has fallen from heaven, and till there are other awful and visible signs of his approach, and I will prove to him that the “time, and times, and half a time” which he is to reign, will be but a period of three years and

a half, and I will earnestly beg your attention while I demonstrate that the Pope, or the continuation of Popes, is not, and cannot, be Antichrist. I will retain this demonstration for the last demonstration for the last half hour, and if I don't prove it, and convince every one in the room that is not wilfully blind of the truth of my argument, I will be content to give up the discussion, and carry it no further. My reverend friend has asked, is it not the greatest nonsense that St. Sophia, in Constantinople, should be taken as having anything whatsoever to do with the part of the Revelations relative to the beast with seven heads and ten horns. Why, I beg leave to remind him that I do not give that as my own opinion, but as the opinion of Dr. Heylon, Dr. Hammond, and other Protestant writers. I have their word, their honor, and their conscience for the fact. I take it upon their word, and it is little matter what my own private opinion might be if I exercised it; and yet, notwithstanding the authorities which I quote, you tell me that my assertions are childish, while you yourself have scarcely given me anything since the commencement of the discussion, but bare unsupported assertions. I agree with you, Sir, in reproaching the man who attempts to give his own words for the words of God; and I charge you, Sir, with doing so. You give me your own gloss. You tell me you have the word of God; prove it to me, and then I will believe you. You tell me that our Saviour, Jesus Christ, had not a single being to glorify his name, to kneel to him suffering on the cross of Calvary, or to give honor to him by his life for 800 years or more, and yet Christ promised that his church should last for ever. Is not that giving me your own words for the words of God? Oh, that will stick in your throat; and remember I will tell you that it will draw upon you the judgment of God unless you repent. Oh, I wish you would do what on a former occasion I advised another to do. Sir, let me ask you did you ever read Dr. Middleton's "Free Inquiry?" This now is coming to my proofs. Dr. Middleton undertakes to prove that no single miracle has been performed since the time of the apostles up to the present day. Yet we know from the scriptures that miracles will be performed by Antichrist, and that the devil will be let loose for the performance thereof. But Dr. Middleton, a Protestant divine, says none have been wrought since the days of the apostles: therefore Antichrist has not come, and therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. So much therefore, for your interpretation of the Scriptures. At one time you would not give a straw for the church. "Phoo," say you, "my hands were not tied; I was not given over to the church, bound neck and heels." At another time you become—oh! how orthodox—and cry out to your brethren to stick by the church; no matter what may come to pass, not to leave it. The fact of it is, you are so puzzled how to make out your cause, that you actually do not know what course to steer. It is said of Antichrist and his followers that he will overrun and conquer the whole world, and on this account many excellent Protestant divines were of opinion that Napoleon was the Antichrist, and you, Sir, I suppose, are aware that it was the opinion of Faber that France, in the days of her infidelity, was the apostacy

mentioned in the Revelations. We are told that they shall not buy and sell with us, and that those of the true church will fly into the wilderness. Why, if that be a mark of the true church, God knows we have it in poor Ireland. Oh! we were hunted into the wilderness, and persecuted with the bitterest persecution; and if that be a mark of the true church, it is certainly here. And I will show by-and-bye who were the locusts that swarmed the land when the bottomless pit was opened, and who drove these locusts from the land. he says that such arguments as mine are just fit for Ballinamore, and not for this spot. I tell him that the men of Ballinamore are accustomed to hear nothing but sound common sense. They never see any fanaticism, or madness, or jumping, or stamping. They are not used to hear men boasting of inspiration, or get into a state as you did yesterday; when I am told it was a miracle, you did not become quite mute with inspiration. Hence it is that my arguments are adapted to their understandings, and glad I am to say, that they are fit for them. You tell me that I do not quote the chapter and verse of my texts. I will tell you why, Sir, because I quote from my memory. I am not so little acquainted with Scripture as to be obliged always to be referring to the book, and, yet, Sir, I defy you to show me a single mis-quotation of mine. If you do, I will acknowledge that you have done something. Oh, was there ever a man so confounded himself, my friends, as he, when he spoke of Magna Charta Pray, Sir, will you tell me where were Luther and Calvin at the time of magna charta. Where were the locusts then? Oh, there was not a single one in the world. Hell had not yet been let loose, and as yet we were all benighted Papists. Now, what has he proved by quoting the magna charta? Why, that was established in a Catholic age and a Catholic kingdom, under a Catholic monarch, by Catholic barons and Catholic bishops, every one of whom consented to this charter. Therefore, we are the primitive church—ours are the primitive bishops, for at that time there was not a single Protestant in the world. Why, I ask, was he so imprudent as to quote magna charta? It entirely destroys his claims to the primitive bishops and priests, and it shows that the first step towards liberty was taken by Catholics. Why, my reverend friend, if you go on this way you'll never get promotion. I am sorry for you, for I really do not want to ruin you, but to exhibit you as a very clever, talented man. But I will proceed. Gentlemen, my reverend friend tells you that I quote from Protestant books. Oh, he says—“Is there one word of that doctrine his own? Is he giving you Popish doctrine? No; he is giving you the doctrine of Protestant writers, and I don't care a straw for them.” If I quote my own writers, he will laugh me to scorn. He will say, “a fig for Ballinamore logic.” But when I quote from the highest authorities of his church, there's the rub. Oh, he would say, “what a bad logician—what an insignificant reasoner to quote against me the authors of my own church.” But, my friend, notwithstanding your dislike, I will continue to quote them, for they will always furnish the best *argumentum ad hominem* I could use. Now, if you were to quote the Fathers against me, how could I consistently deny anything they con-

tain. If they be adduced in support of a position to which I am opposed, how can I refuse to agree with them? And will you now make liars of Heylen, and Faber, and Hammond, and Taylor, and Grotius. If you do not make liars of them, then is your argument of our apostacy and of the Pope's being Antichrist upset, and all the little brains in your head are scattered to the wind, (hissing and clapping of hands.)

Rev. Mr. McNAMARÁ called for order. He begged of the meeting not to create such interruption.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I quoted Protestants relative to the prohibition of eating meat on certain days. It is true I ought to quote the Fathers on all the points on which I have preferred the testimony of Protestants, but then I know that he looks on them as half heretics, and a certain gentleman was procured, I will not say by him, to write to me in order to induce me to give up the Fathers. But I never will give them up. I will stand by them. But at the same time I will use the Protestant writers. Thus I stand upon the scriptures, not as interpreted by me or my church, but as interpreted by the divines of his church. He talked of my not giving the context—I ask why did he not give it, and show that it in any manner changed the nature of the text. He quoted much from the Apocalypse—now I say, there is not a lady or gentleman here that can understand the exact meaning of that book, and yet you quote a passage, according to which all our forefathers for 800 years are damned to all eternity. A grateful and a natural son of the primitive church you are, indeed. I have already proved that it was to the Manicheans and Priscianians that St. Paul alluded when he spoke of those who mentioned that it was unlawful to eat meat, and that to join one's self to a female in marriage was unlawful. These were the only sects who mentioned such doctrine. The Manicheans held that it was the devil who join man and woman in marriage. We never believed that marriage is unlawful. We acknowledge the dignity of marriage. We say that it has been raised to a sacrament by Christ, and that any one and every one may marry, unless he has taken a vow to the contrary. But if any one who has made a solemn vow not to marry, then he is guilty of a damnable sin. He quoted a passage from a letter of St. Leo's the Great to show that he condemned the Manichean heresy. If, then, this heresy were condemned by our church, on account of the very doctrine which he ascribes to us, it is a proof that we differ from them as much as he. So much, then, for the truth and correctness of my friend's glossing interpretation.

Here the half-hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, I say, if a single unkind or disparaging expression, with regard to my reverend friend, has fallen from me since the commencement of this discussion, I admit that it is ground for saying that I am wrong. I trust that I have all along acted, and that I will all along act towards him as one gentleman should act towards another; and if I do sometimes laugh a little at his arguments, which I consider no sin, I will do so with kindness and with respect. I leave all the personalities to him—I will have nothing to do with them. Well, here now are eighteen



volumes—which of them shall I begin with ? Come, I will take the Magna Charta. Now, what will you say if I prove that in giving this charter our ancestors acted as Protestants. It is a fact. I will prove it. Our ancestors gained this charter from the tyrant John, and he, after being forced to sign it, appealed to the Pope, who put the kingdom under an interdict on account of the barons having refused to give up the charter. They kept it up though, in spite of all that could be done, and this, in my opinion, was something like a bursting out of the Protestant spirit which was latent in the country. But see what a wretched charter it is. How meagre was the liberty it gave when compared with the freedom which we now enjoy. It continued the existence of bondage and slavery, and gave but the shadow of liberty to be enjoyed by the subject ; that is because it did not emanate from a Protestant people. Oh yes, it is to the Protestants that we owe the liberty we enjoy. It is to them that my friend, Mr. Maguire, owes the power which he has of thus freely expressing his opinions. Now let me ask him could there be such a discussion in Popish Spain or Italy ? Oh no ; if I were to speak there as I have spoken here, they would soon produce the long blessed sword, and make me as tame as a lamb. Then, I ask, is there free expression of opinion there ? No ; they have their *liber exurgatorius*, and they expunge everything from a work which they do not wish to reach the public ear, or they entirely suppress it, and only allow to get abroad such publications as may tend to keep the people under their yoke. Let my friend, then, be careful how he speaks of liberty coming from the church of Rome. A word to the wise. He says that miracles will be the mark of Antichrist. I agree with him ; and that is the very reason why I fasten the name upon his church. True miracles are wrought in our church—false miracles in yours. Now, remember, I say I do not care one fig for another's opinion. I do not mean, however, to say that I set up my own as infallible. I know it signifies but little what my own opinion is unless it is supported by scripture, and by the public opinion of the church. But when that is the case, I care not for any man's opinion. I promised you a map. Here it is. [Here he displayed a map painted in the same colour as, and somewhat similar to, the map which he exhibited on the first day. There was the gold colour at the upper part, intersected with streaks of scarlet, which spread out, and was in its turn intersected with streaks of gold, which separated at length from the scarlet, and became again a large mass of gold. Out of the upper gold were two small streaks of gold, intersected also with scarlet. This scarlet spread in the same way as on the other part, and was intersected by streaks of gold, which also separated from the scarlet, and formed a distinct gold body.] You see (said he) this gold is the true, primitive, holy, Catholic church, which I love, admire, and glory in. Here, emanating from it, is the primitive Irish church established by St. Patrick, which, you perceive, bore within it the seeds of corruption, and grew as scarlet as the great body of the church. About the year 606 it began to be corrupt, and continued so till about the year 1,500, when our primitive bishops saw their error, and the church

returned to its original state, which is again represented by the gold colour. Into that gold from the scarlet of the great body, there is a stream as it were of scarlet, which represents the mission of monks, and friars, and bishops sent over here by the head of the apostate church. This scarlet joins the gold, which, however, is still to be seen in a body ; and you perceive that it is getting darker and darker, like the great body, and it will meet with a similar destruction. There, you see, is the primitive Irish church pure as gold ; next is the church corrupted ; then we were drunk, and knew not what we did ; but, recovering, we returned to the faith ; and then we have the Pope sending over the missionaries. You all see it. I trust you understand it. It agrees with the other map, which I call a stream, while I denominate this a platform. I wish, Sir, I could get you to understand me. If you would but examine, you would see that I have reason on my side. You see now that I have reason, and that I also have powerful arguments from scripture in my favour ; and besides I am privileged to say that I have individual communications from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. If I have failed in convincing you of this, be not severe towards me, but give me a little indulgence. I do not say, mind you, my friends, that I can convince him ; but I say I can prove my propositions. I may demonstrate a thing so that it is as clear as light ; but unless God giveth his grace, faith will not follow. You tell me, Sir, that I have an interest in your prayers ; I tell you that you have an interest, not merely in mine, but in the prayers of all good Protestants in this kingdom. Now, my friend, bear kindly the observations I am about to make. I only do so for your good and the good of all those around me. I say that the miracles of your church are false and nonsensical. Only think of a man carrying his head under his arm a distance of twelve miles, or two miles, it does not matter which ; and think of a child who was so wonderfully pious, that though he used to suck well on every other day never sucked more than once on Fridays, and, I believe, Wednesdays twice. Miracles, my friends, are of two kinds, as I conceive. First, there is a supernatural operation—that I call a miracle of power. Secondly, there is a supernatural interference—that I call a mystery of Providence. The first embraces all those which Jesus Christ wrought to convert the people to Christianity. The second kind of miracles are those which no external change is produced, but the effect of which is still visible and great. The scripture gives numerous examples of both. Of the first I have mentioned an instance—for one of the second I refer you to Scripture—to the various passages where God's particular care of individuals is recorded. Take the history of Joseph as an example, see him plotted against by his brethren, in order to be put to death—see him in the pit, just about to be killed, and see the Ishmaelites approaching just at the moment when the hearts of his brethren were disposed to be softened, and when they were inclined to spare his life. See him borne into Egypt—see him entering into Patiphar's house—see the temptations he endures, and how he overcomes them—see him cast into prison, and again triumphant over his enemies—see him the first man in

Egypt ; in that situation see him preserving his friends and the whole world. Here we have a miracle of Providence, and is not that as great a miracle as any miracle of power ? Such miracles as this, however, are not fitted to convert an infidel, but they do tend to confirm the Christian, and make him glorify God for his wisdom and beneficence. Now, Sir, take up the scriptures, examine them, and say are not all miracles of either of those classes, and say if the order which I have described be not preserved. You will see that previous to conversion, the Lord used the miracles of power, and afterwards the miracles of Providence, to confirm them in their conversion. This was the case with the miracles of Moses before Pharaoh, and afterwards till the Israelites had crossed the Red Sea. It was necessary at first to convert Pharaoh to the will of the Lord, and to convince the people of his greatness, but when the people were fully established in the faith, their only miracles were those of intervention. First Moses had to change his rod into a serpent ; that was not sufficient. The magicians did the same, and Pharaoh and the people were not convinced. He then made his rod eat up their rods, and performed several other miracles of power ; but when these became unnecessary they were not continued. Now, I ask you, Sir, is this my gloss, and may I not argue from this that a similar order is observed under the new law ? We have now no true miracles of power, because they are unnecessary ; we are convinced ; we need now only such miracles as may confirm us, and we have such miracles. Look to the testament and you will see—"Is it not the Lord that healeth your diseases ?" When a physician discovers a cure, either in the shape of medicine, or something else, for the diseases of our frame, do we not see in it the finger of God as it were revealed to the world. Now, Sir, look at Protestantism—look at Protestant England and Protestant America, and see is it with them the greatest number and the most magnificent discoveries are made. I grant you that occasional discoveries have been made in the flourishing days of Popery, and that occasional discoveries are still made in Popish countries ; but it is now that our eyes have been opened to true religion ; that the flood of wisdom and science is flowing over the world. Now, I ask, does not this incline us more to glorify God and give him praise, than reading any such absurdities as that about St. Denis and his head, and the man who came to a river, and not being able to cross otherwise, put his cloak on the water and sailed gloriously over ? This is not the time when such miracles are wanted, and I deny their performance in these days. If there be any miracles performed in the Romish church, they are false miracles, and can only be performed "in sight of the beast." But the miracles in our church are true, though they are not miracles of power. By us the mountains are levelled, the winds are outstripped, the waters are overcome, and light is sent into the bowels of the earth, and the kingdom is exalted to a pitch of glory which makes her the envy and the wonder of the world ; and which may well justify us in saying, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen." I now say that the holy Ca-

tholic church does not believe in such miracles as the Romish priests allege to be performed in modern days. She does believe in the miracles mentioned in the scriptures, and her ministers bring them forward, and preach on them, on every possible occasion, in order to confirm the faithful in their belief. The miracle of Elijah's making the hatchet float on the water I have preached upon, and I often impress such miracles on the minds of my flock. It gives them a confidence in God, and shows them that in the hour of sickness and of death he is able to assist them; and he will do so, for he who filled the widow's empty pitchers will never desert his servant in the hour of need. We leave modern miracles of power to Rome. And how are they related? They are put into Latin, and when translated into English, they are magnified, and parts of them suppressed. Now, I appeal to the Breviary in proof of this. I have it now in my hand. It contains the story of St. Denis carrying his head under his arm. Now, Mr. Coyne, a highly respectable book-seller in this city, has published the *Lives of the Saints*. I got the work, looked for the life of St. Denis, and found it; but it did not contain a single word about his carrying his head after death. In Middleton's *Rome* I find that it is believed there that St. Paul's head jumped three times on the scaffold after he was beheaded. I searched Mr. Coyne's *Lives of the Saints* for that, and it says not a word about it. There again we have St. Patrick. Lots of miracles and wonders performed by him are related; but some of these are kept back in his life. And why are these miracles kept back? Lest they should meet the eyes of Protestants, who, they know, would never believe them, and would laugh at the faith that encouraged such mockery. Now, I do not think this is acting quite consistently. If these miracles be true, why not publish them? why keep them back? I put it to the candour of the reverend gentleman if what I say be not correct? If my conclusions be not correctly drawn, let him still bear with me. I mean not to misrepresent his religion or its doctrines. He has told me that I am to meet with some visible judgment. So have the old Irishwomen in Sheffield told me. "Oh," they would say, "if the priest were here he would fasten you to the ground." Now, if he can do so, let him. If Mr. Maguire can fasten me to this spot, let him confirm his brethren by doing so; or let him change me into some animal—let him change me into a goat if he can. False miracles are then the proof of Antichrist. We hear of some of them occasionally in this country. We heard of one the other day in England; but they thought it better to say very little about it. But I will show you that they are as thick as ever they were in Rome. Only the other day one was proved by a great number of witnesses, in the usual form, and with the usual number of oaths. Mark, now, what is said of those miracles in the Revelations, "and I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spoke as a dragon, and he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth, and them that dwell therein, to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed; and he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh pitchy fire come down from heaven on the earth in

the sight of men ; and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." Mark me, he had power to do them in sight of the beast, but not out of his sight, and so they continue to be done in anti-Christian Rome. Now, I won't call upon Mr. Maguire to work a miracle. No, that would be unfair. But I call upon him to observe the length, and breath, and depth of my arguments, and to say if common sense be not on my side. If he think not, still I beg of him to bear with me. The reverend gentleman must excuse me in going further with his propositions. He says that I objected to the second book of Maccabees, because it recommended self-murder. Now, I did not say any such thing ; and mark me, I am very cautious in my expressions, as those who have seen my use of the definite article *the* in my letter have, no doubt, seen what I said was that the spirit of the passage would seem to recommend self murder. I grant you that taking the letter of the passage, it is in your favour, But I shall quote it, and that shall set us right.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I dare say, my friends, it would be rather unkind of me to refuse rendering any possible satisfaction to the Rev. Mr. Gregg, if he conceived that any of my remarks have been personal. I do confess he has taken me on my weak side, and I declare there is not a single man who entertains a better feeling or less hostility for him than I do. I commenced this discussion by saying that if any hasty or warm expression dropt from me during the progress of it, it should not be considered as having proceeded from anger or ill will. And now, though I may appear to have been personal, I wish the reverend gentleman would try what my feelings are by coming to Ballinamore, and that he would see that he should have the best potato and the best sup in the house, and a welcome, (laughter.) After all, God knows it is natural enough that one should feel excited when he hears the head of his church described as Antichrist—the religion which he professes as damnable and idolatrous, and a long line of glorious ancestors spoken of as they have been. Imagine to yourself, reverend Sir, what you would feel if I said your religion was damnable and idolatrous, and that it was the offspring of the beast with seven horns. Let us not be angry with one another for any hasty expression we may use. For my part I shall be sorry to offend you—for I do say I never met a man with more perfect honor or candor than you have proved yourself to be ever since the commencement of this discussion, (cheers.) I shall say very little now about the book of Maccabees. I have given you from scripture proof of its canonicity. You say that the spirit of the passage which was in dispute is with you, and that the letter of it is with me. It is about the spirit that we have been quarrelling since the commencement of this discussion. I believe it is about the spirit we will be quarrelling to the end, though if you had not been so presumptuous in claiming it, I do not think I would have interfered with you. Now, then, my brethren, I shall go like a crab backwards with my notes. My reverend friend talked at the end of his speech of not calling on me to work a miracle. Why, if he did call on me, I would tell him plainly, I would not have had faith suffi-

cient to do so. Though I believe that Christ left the power in his church of working miracles, yet I do not think that a miracle can be wrought by any individual belonging to that church whenever he pleases. The apostles got power from our Saviour to perform miracles, but they could not perform them whenever they liked. I beg of him to recollect that they can only be performed now and again, as it may seem good to the Holy Ghost. He talks of the miracle of St. Denis carrying his head under his arm after he was killed. Now I tell him for his information, that I may or I may not believe in that or any other miracle not mentioned in the scriptures. Our church does not bind us to believe in those miracles. I hold in my hand Eusebius, Theodoret, and a writer of his own church, Doctor Caius. All of these relate to miracles that were performed. The last of them says that Gregory Thaumaturgus moved a mountain. How many also are related by St. Augustine, who tells us of innumerable miracles performed at the shrine of one saint alone? I think I saw a Jew, or something very like one, in the room a while ago. Now, this Jew taking up your own argument, might argue against the miracles performed by Christ and his apostles, for you could not prove to him, as I have often said before, the divinity of the scriptures. He would tell you that these miracles were performed by the power of the devil; for you will recollect that the Jews, when the same judicial blindness was on them which is now on you, said that our Saviour cast out devils by Belzebub, the prince of devils. I have said that you are labouring under a judicial blindness, and so you are, for notwithstanding that you know that the best of your writers have acknowledged the performance of miracles in our church since the days of the apostles, you attribute them to the devil. Suppose now I wanted to make a humbug of a miracle, have I not a fine opportunity to do so, with our Saviour's miracle of turning the devil, Legion, out of a man that was possessed, into the herd of swine. Could I not say, here's a humbug? Imagine our Saviour's setting a parcel of pigs mad, and finally begging the owner of them by driving them into the sea. It was foretold that there should be no false miracles till the coming of anti-Christ, and I will prove that he has not come yet; and further that the duration of his reign—the "time, and times, and half a time" is only three years and a half, instead of the long period which you would make out; and I will show you that when he does come, the two witnesses who are to preach the true church are Enoch and Elias, who will be restored to the earth for the salvation of the Jews. He talked of the miracle of Moses before Pharaoh. The very example which he has quoted, serves as an argument for me; for we see there that God would not allow false miracles to appear true, and, therefore, he gave Moses power to make his rod swallow up the rods of the magicians, after they had all been changed into serpents. Now, Sir, I think I have proved that I know something about the doctrine of miracles, and I think I will show that I know something of the nature also. I admit your talents and the clearness of your mind; but then, whenever you come to speak about Protestantism, you are completely blinded by prejudice. Let him not any longer,

gentlemen, humbug St. Denis's miracle of carrying his head under his arm. I think he would have a better one in St. Dunstan pulling the devil's nose. I repeat again that I may believe these miracles, or I may not; and though I am not bound, I do believe them. You, of course, are at liberty to be incredulous. God gave his church power to work miracles. He also gave power to Antichrist to perform them, though his days will be short, lest any of the elect should be deceived. Recollect that this demonstration is to come. You tell me, Sir, that you could not get the story of St. Denis in the English Lives of the Saints. I will tell you why: because the Breviary was never yet translated into English; but if you wish to translate it, I shall be very happy to lend you my assistance, and if you wish to have a miracle to laugh at, I think I can help you to one. A certain Pope once went over to Portugal, and while he was there, he used to borrow the queen's mare, and ride it about every day. When he went, the mare had become so conscious of the high honor conferred on her, and the holy burden she had borne, that she never permitted the queen to mount her any more. You may be surprised at the story, but I tell you it is related. We may believe it to be a miracle, or we may not. The friars at once set it down for a miracle. The fact is undoubted; but it is not so certain that the animal may not have learned new tricks from a bad rider. My reverend friend tells me that my Protestant brethren have very kind feelings towards me. In all my life I never experienced anything otherwise. I fear now that their feelings will be a little soured on account of this discussion, during which I have used some harsh and disagreeable terms, for which I am now exceedingly sorry. But I trust that they will recollect that I am forced into this discussion—that I was bearded to my very face, till I was obliged to engage in it: not that I seek to throw any blame on my reverend friend for acting as he has done. On the contrary, I think that his conduct has been most proper. But let us proceed. My reverend friend says that all liberty comes from Protestantism. Now, let me ask you, before I go any farther, do you seriously hold that Thomas a Becket was a Protestant? You must know that it was he who called together the conservative bishops—for there were conservatives, and rank Tories, too, amongst the Catholics in those days. Who, in conjunction with the barons, resisted the tyrant John, and forced from him the magna charta? You will also see that at this time the church needed a little persecution in order to purify it. Now, if you say that Thomas a Becket was a Protestant, though you are a man of undoubted veracity, and have acted throughout this controversy as a man of honor, I would never again believe your theological word. Well, then, it was a benighted, priest-ridden, Popish bishop that was the means of obtaining the magna charta; and this same bishop, you will recollect, died at the altar while celebrating some Popish ceremony, a martyr to liberty. You say that this was the outburst of Protestantism, which was latent in England. Well, then, if you wish, John was the head of the Protestant church—if so, why did he appeal to the Pope? Why did he acknowledge the authority of the sovereign pontiff on more than one

occasion? You have talked of relics and images, and idolatry. I tell you, Sir, you worship that map which you produced, and the members of your church in this kingdom worship the image of William of Orange as much as I or any Catholic ever worshipped the picture, the image, or the relic of a saint. I tell you I could prefer against you, with a greater semblance of truth, the charge of idolatry for your reverence to the statue of the murderer of Glencoe, than your charge of a similar kind against us, for adoring images could wear. You may say that I want to impose upon you. You see in this room not less, I am sure, than five hundred Roman Catholics. What an impostor—what a villain—what a hypocrite would they think me, if I spoke not the truth in this particular. “Oh” they would say, “the monster—the wolf in sheep’s clothing, he shall not again be admitted into the fold. He taught us to love, to honor, to glorify, to adore these images, and pictures, and relics; and yet he comes, and has the audacity to say in our presence, that they are no more than the statue of the murderer of Glencoe, or than the commonest picture. I tell that this is the case. We worship the picture of a saint, or of our Saviour, just as much as you would worship the picture of a near relation or a dear friend. We honor and respect the images, and pictures, and relics of Christ and his saints, because they remind us of them, and for no other reason; nor do we pay them greater honor. Now, Sir, if you do not believe me after this solemn declaration, in the presence of God and of this assembly, on you will be the consequences. Do not, then, in God’s name, let me hear of relics any more. We have had enough of them. I solemnly say I would be an idolator if I worshipped them; but before God and man, and high heaven, I protest that neither I nor any Roman Catholic ever did. I believe I have now rambled over all the parts of your rambling speech, from the end to the beginning. In order to finish the question of apostacy, I propose that we shall stay till three o’clock to-day.

REV. MR. GREGG—I agree.

REV. MR. MAGUIRE—Hear now what Bishop Montague, one of your first rate divines, says on the subject. I refer you to pages 74 and 75 of Montague’s “Guide.” He read a passage from the work, which was to the effect that he was not of opinion that the name antichrist was applicable to the Popes, either personally, or in continuation. I know, he continued, that your belief that the Pope is antichrist is not contained in any of your articles; but then I know it is in your homilies. It is true one-half of your divines don’t believe a single word in those homilies, and a great many of them don’t believe half your articles. You yourself may remember there was a deacon in your church who said he only believed 18 of the 39 articles. Thorndike, another of your divines, in the 1st chapter of his “Just Weights and Measures,” says—“They that separate from the Church of Rome as idolatrous are schismatics.” There is the opinion of one of yourselves for you. He quoted several long passages from Bishop Parker’s “Reasons for Advocating the Test.” They were to the effect that before bringing so bloody an indictment as apostacy against a large majority of the human race, the



question should be well weighed. That "apostacy and anti-christ were too big for scolding words." That "after all we have no grounds for affixing the name antichrist to the Roman Catholic Church, save the crude opinions of some popular divines." That "it is a piece of inhumanity that outdoes the savageness of cannibals, and claims the body and the soul," &c. &c. There, said he, is a Protestant divine for you. Oh, Lord bless us. So you outdo the cannibals.

After a few more remarks, the half-hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Well, gentlemen, I have stated before what my views are as to miracles. Now, he has spoken as if I had argued against the validity of true miracles and in the true church. Now I have not done any such thing. But I do say that the miracles of the Roman Catholic Church are not true miracles, and it is against them I argued, and the reasons which I have for believing in the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles are the very same which induced me to say that the Roman Catholic miracles are damnable. I do not deny that these miracles have been wrought, but I say if they have, they have been wrought by the power of the devil, and that God has nothing to do with them. The great majority of those impostures have been performed immediately "in the sight of the beast," that is, to say, in Rome. The bible says that there are both true miracles and false. And the Revelations tell us that antichrist, or rather the apostate church, shall have power to perform miracles. That apostate church, as I have often said, is the church of Rome, whose miracles, we know from the Bible, are delusions. I believe and I glory in true miracles, because the Bible tells me to do so. I do not mock at them; and I tell you, Sir, that I saw some faces in this room that did not seem to think that it was a subject to be treated so lightly as you have treated it in palming upon us the story of the Pope and the horse, or the ass—for I really forget which animal it was. And I also tell you, that if you believe in these miracles you should defend them, or if you do not believe in them, you should raise your voice against them, and not trust them as matters to be believed or disbelieved, just as one may choose. I tell you, Sir, this will not answer. It does not look well. You should either say they are true, and uphold them, or false, and reject them; otherwise it would seem that you are making a joke of the question. I beg of you to give up reading solitary texts with a view to the support of a particular question, and to read the whole Bible, comparing one part with another, and not drawing your conclusions from isolated facts. If they were to support in what is good and holy, it would be a different thing. But they do not. They maintain you in a delusion the worst and most abominable that ever man was in, and

that is, the delusion and the falsehood that God rewarded any one for committing a venial sin. I beg, gentlemen, to ask, is not that blasphemous? Is it not dreadful doctrine? What is the object of the entire Bible? To convey an enlarged idea of the greatness of sin of every kind. Talking of sin—let me ask you what sin was it brought death into the world, and made every one in it liable to damnation? The sin which produced such awful effects was, according to your doctrine, but a venial sin. Yet for such a sin, producing such consequences, and exciting to such a degree the wrath of God, you say that God rewarded any one. Oh, the saying blasphemises and defames the character of the living God. But let me come to the passage concerning Rahab. But before I do, I must have the privilege of an innocent laugh at your expense. He must, gentlemen, excuse me. I can't resist it. He says that Thomas a Becket lived and was put to death in the reign of King John. Whereas every one knows that he lived and died in the reign of Henry the Second, and had as much to do with magna charta as I had. Now there's Popery for you! There's the effect of Popery. See how a single error in a man's mind will affect him in every thing he says and does, just as I have said, as if a man were to imagine himself a houseclock, all his actions would be tinged with that belief. He says, if I catch him in a misquotation I will have done something. Yesterday, in speaking of the midwives before Pharaoh, he said that St. Paul referred to them. Now I say he did no such thing—and is not that catching him in a misquotation? I do not mention this for the sake of disparaging him, but for the sake of exposing the system which he supports, which is not merely negatively bad, but which teaches the most monstrous and most abominable doctrines. Now I come to the case of Rahab. And, oh! Rev. Mr. Maguire, I again repeat, I wish you would not confine yourself to the studying of particular texts with a particular view, but would study the whole Bible, and try and grasp its general meaning, which, with your powerful mind, you could well do. I tell you it may do well in social places, but it never will answer when you have caught a tartar. It may do in Ballinamore, but it will not do here. Let us come now to Rahab. She had the gift of faith beforehand, and she had that gift by observing as well as hearing. She observed the feelings of her countrymen, and she saw what the effect would be if she told the truth to them. She saw that they trembled and were afraid, and she knew from the gift of that faith which was revealed to her that she should have concealed them, and told a lie with respect to her knowledge of them. My friends, things are easily discerned—future events are easily discerned by signs. One of the reasons by which I know that Popery is to

be destroyed is, that I observe men's hands tremble when they stand up in defence of it. In England, when I stood forth to oppose Popery, I saw this tremour and this trembling. It was after the manner in which devils tremble before the spirit of God. Popery will be destroyed, and Protestantism, that is now dispersed and humble, will be in the ascendant. But to return to Rahab and the question about venial sin—it was one of those occasions where the just man may fall seven times a day, and still stand justified in the eyes of God. She was justified when she told the lie. But I say it would have been better had she told the truth, and left the consequences to God. But mark me, my friends, I say that the faith which justified her in telling the lie existed before the act. Is it not horrible to hear the reverend gentleman talk of what he calls venial sins, and parade them as mere jokes, and openly declare that those sins are fit objects of reward from God? He says that I have assurance and presumption when I assert that I have the spirit of God with me. I glory in the possession of that spirit which he seems to disregard. I wish that the result of this discussion were to depend upon this spirit. He says that I have assurance when I assert that I have the spirit with me; but does he not give absolution; and ought not the person who receives absolution have an assurance that the person who gives it has the spirit of God with him? Mark here the traces of apostasy, and the dilemma into which these people are driven. Again, do not the Roman Catholics receive the eucharist as the body and blood of Christ?—and ought not the priest who says that he changes these elements by consecration, believe that he has the spirit of God with him?—and ought not the persons receiving it believe that they have the spirit of God with them? No, my friends, they receive it doubting whether they have the spirit of God with them; and there is a dreadful vacuity in the mind, and they become every day worse and more steeped in sin. On the other hand, I and the Protestants who think with me, look in reality to the true Christ. The human soul that is in want, and is as it were in search of a deity, is comfortable and happy in the contemplation of the true spirit which comes from God. Without it, it is like a fish out of water. But, my friends, what do we see on the other side? What are Roman Catholics content with? Satan is constantly deluding them with bits of rags, nails, bones, scapulars, and trumpery of that description. Let me have something I can look at. Let me have the true and living God, whom I can contemplate. The reverend gentleman asked me to show him a miracle. Let him turn to his Bible and he will find that the spirit of prophesy is the testimony of the Lord. He will find there that all is not worth anything without the spirit, until

the soul is made complete in Christ. I object to his image, worship and to the doctrine that sins may be rewarded. (Here the reverend gentleman took out a piece of paper having a heart painted on it in red.) He said—Now, my friends, I will show you idolatry—gross idolatry. Here is a picture—a thing ; and here is a prayer, which I will read to you, addressed to this thing. The reverend gentleman then read as follows :—“ O adorable heart of my amible Jesus ! I adore thee with the most profound homage I am capable of. I beg thy pardon for all my past offences, irreverences, and sacrileges. I acknowledge their injustice and enormity ; and also for all the sins and ingratiitudes which have hitherto ever been committed against thee,” &c. &c. He then continued—I say that this is idolatry, and that all the sophistry and false reasoning of my reverend opponent will never be able to convince rational men that it was not rank idolatry. If I went into a room and saw a man committing murder—cutting another man’s throat—would I, although he denied the fact, believe contrary to the evidence of my senses ? You have heard the silly argument of my reverend friend about the statue of King William in College-green, or the statue of King George, in Stephen’s green. It would lead you to believe that because these statues are exhibited in public, we are all idolaters. Really, it is deplorable to see the subterfuges to which he is obliged to have recourse. Here the half-hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—My friends, you perceive after all that this spiritualized Protestant has said about himself, and all the tact he has manifested, he has done everything but grappled with the question proposed to him. So much the better for me—for he has left me little to do, and I promise you that, in less than five minutes, I will meet everything that he has said, worthy of notice, within the last half-hour. I will begin first with his last sentence, and I tell you, my Protestant friends, that I don’t accuse you of idolatry, because you go around King William, and I never did—but I say that we could accuse you of idolatry on as good grounds as you could the Roman Catholics ; but we all eschew idolatry. He must be foolishly blind, if he did not see that I made no such accusation ; but he that is blind, let him be blind still ; and he that is foolish, let him be foolish still. I proved from the scriptures that there could not be idolatry in the Christian religion. I showed you, when he spoke of false miracles, that he accused God of having broken his promise to the church—but Mr. Gregg does not understand this part of the scripture. I said after all that he is a bad theologian. He ought to have known that God would not have given the broad seal of his approbation to imposture and deceit—that there could be no such thing

in the church as false miracles. Now, Mr. Gregg, you admit miracles ; but how can they be found in your church until you prove that she is infallible ? You say that she is fallible, and that you yourself are fallible, although you pretend to have the spirit of God with you. How then can you build up anything infallible on that which is fallible ? for, according to your own showing, you have neither the scripture nor the church with you. Here I put the question to you—can you build up an infallibility upon that which is fallible ? Give your answer. You have no answer to give ; and that fact will be recorded against you before God and man: You talk to me of miracles ; but you could not prove to me that ever there was a miracle wrought in your church. This shows to me that your attack was deistical. I tell your church, not yourself—for it is your church that I wish to attack—Mr. Gregg, that you have not the power of miracles, and that such a power could never belong to a church that was fallible. There is the dilemma, Mr. Gregg, get out of it if you can. You accuse me of quoting St. Paul wrong about the midwives. I quoted him in the same way I did with respect to Rahab. St. Paul said that by faith Rahab persisted in not giving up the spies. I will come now, my friends to show the ignorance of theology of this spiritualized Protestant. He says that Rahab ought to have told the truth, and left the consequences to God ; although St. Paul says that by faith she persisted in receiving the spies, and refusing to acknowledge she knew anything of them. Now, I will ask him can a person commit a mortal sin by faith ? Answer that short preparatory question, Mr. Gregg, before I go further, or acknowledge that you cannot, and doing so your whole argument falls to the ground, and here I stand triumphant. St. James says of the apostles, “ in many things we offend : ” will you, reverend Sir, say that the apostles were in the habit of committing mortal sin ? Here now I show up your Protestant ignorance—here now I reduce you to a dilemma, and let Trinity College get you out of it if they can. You thought you had a great triumph over me because when I got into history my memory failed me and I made a mistake ; but will you be able to show me that since I commenced this controversy, with regard to the church or the scriptures, my memory has failed me, or that I have fallen into the slightest error. This, if I were presumptuous, would be enough to show me that I have the Spirit of the Holy Ghost with me. In things relating to the church I am invincible, *ecclesia immutata res est*. I asserted that Thomas A’Becket had nothing to do with magna charta. I asked was he a papist or a Protestant, but the reverend gentleman was not able to answer me. Christ made a promise to his church and to his apostles that

he would be with them to the end of the world. Did he make any such promise to the new apostle, Martin Luther, or to any of the kings of England—and by the way Martin wrote a book against one of these kings, these heads of the church, "*Contra maledictum regem Anglicæ*." It is evident, my friends, that I have the spirit of truth with me, for I have not been seduced to rambling about. I have kept close to the points at issue. The Rev. Mr. Gregg said he would keep close to the points at issue. The Rev. Mr. Gregg said he would keep close to the question of apostacy; but I ask you did he say one word about it for the last half hour. Let that be recorded. He has been begging the question. He says we are idolaters; but the question is—have we worshipped idols? He says that the Pope is antichrist—and here, my friends, I beg of you to offer up your prayers to God that he may give you ears to hear and hearts to understand what I am about to state. I will prove that the Pope is not antichrist—and if the Rev. Mr. Gregg answers my proofs seriatim, I shall give up the whole of the controversy, and acknowledge that I have done nothing. My first proof is from the second chapter of St. Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians, and third verse—"Let no man deceive you by any means, for unless there come a revolt first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition."—The adversary. Now, I will ask him can "that man" be applied to a succession of men? If the Popes were meant, the text should be these men—those sons of perdition. Again, it is said of antichrist, that he shall cause an image of himself to be made and set up and worshipped, and that men shall be put to death if they do not worship it. Now, did the Rev. Mr. Gregg ever hear of any Pope causing an image of himself to be made and set up; or any man being put to death because he would not worship it? Again it is said in Revelations, thirteenth chapter and eighteenth verse—the number of the beast shall be six hundred and sixty-six—the number of a man—"A man," not the number of men—here is the indefinite article distinctly, and directly, and unequivocally pointing out to a man, and not to men. Again, in the 5th chapter of John, 43d verse, Christ, in speaking to the Jews, says—"I am come in the name of my father, and you receive me not; if another shall come in his own name him you will receive." Now, I ask the Rev. Mr. Gregg have the Jews received the Pope? No; therefore the Pope cannot be antichrist until you show that the Jews receive him. Does the Rev. Mr. Gregg believe the scriptures? Here are the words of Christ himself—let him deny them if he can. Hear again the 13th of Mark, 24th verse—"Put in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light." Well now has the sun been darkened.

ed, or has the moon ceased to give her light? They have often been darkened by an eclipse; but this is a natural event, and the reverend gentleman won't say that it is a proof of the coming of Antichrist. Again, Daniel, 7th chapter and 25th verse—"And he shall speak words against the High One, and shall crush the saints of the Most High; and he shall think himself able to change times and laws, and they shall be delivered into his hand until a time, times, and half a time." Again, in the Apocalypse, 13th chapter and 5th verse—"And there was given to him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies; and power was given to him to continue forty and two months." This agrees exactly with "the times, a time, and half a time"—the three years and a half spoken of by the prophet Daniel. Now, I will ask my reverend friend, in quoting Daniel, why did he change the days of those months into years? He told you that the devil was to ride rough-shod over us for 1,260 years. There is an exposition of the prophet Daniel for you! The time has been distinctly pointed out in various parts of the Scripture. In Daniel it is mentioned "times, a time, and half a time," two years, a year, and half a year. In another place it is stated to be 1,260 days. In another place two and forty months, all agreeing to the period of three years and a half, by the old calculation, not the Julian calculation. This is the period given to Antichrist to reign, and after that "his days shall be shortened;" and after this the devil was to be loosed. Again, Apocalypse, 11th chap. 3d verse. "And I will give unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth." Follow me, now, my friends, and attend well to my conclusions. I shall read another passage from the Apocalypse with regard to these two witnesses, who are to prophesy in the days of Antichrist. "And when they shall have finished their testimony the beast that ascendeth out of the abyss shall make war upon them and shall overcome them, and kill them, and their bodies shall lie in the streets of the great city" (Jerusalem.) Now those two witnesses are Enoch and Elias. Have Enoch and Elias been killed, and have their dead bodies lain in the streets of Jerusalem? If they have not, Antichrist has not yet come, and the Pope cannot be Antichrist. Again, we find in the Apocalypse, 13th chap. and 17th verse—"And that no man might buy or sell but he that hath the mark or name of the beast, or the number of his name." Now, I will ask the Rev. Mr. Gregg has it ever come to pass that a man has ever been prevented to buy or sell, because of the mark or number of the Pope. The mark of the Pope, and of the whole Christian world, is the sign of the cross, and will the reverend gentleman tell me that the sign of the cross, the symbol of our redemption, is the mark of Antichrist? The Pope acknowledges himself to be the agent of Christ, yet the reverend gentleman calls him Antichrist. Oh, what an Antichrist we have got. I have here seventeen holy fathers acknowledging the Pope to be the head of the church—the viceregent of Christ upon earth. But I won't trouble you with them. I will give you some of the Protestant holy fathers. The mild Melancthon, in his epistle to Leo, acknowledges him to be the

head of the church, and it was only when Luther was excommunicated by the Pope that he denied that he was the head of the church. Will the Rev. Mr. Gregg set any value on what the Great Bacon says. He says that in the opinion of the holy fathers the Pope was the head of the church. Such, too, was the opinion of the Protestant writer Leibnitz. What did the Calvinists of France say, and what did Thorndike say? But I perceive that my half-hour is ended, and I must have done.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG then proceeded—I ask you, my friends, has Mr. Maguire answered me? O, I pray that the grace of God may deliver him from the human authority to which he endeavors to cling, and which he would fain substitute for the word of God. Mr. Maguire must not allow himself to be led away by human authority and false reasoning. He must come to the simplicity of the child before he can receive the word in spirit and in truth. He told you in his last speech that I did not stick to the question of apostacy; but I promise him that unless he be very hard to please I'll give him enough on that subject. He calls upon me to answer his questions *seriatim*, with regard to the Pope not being Antichrist. Now, I promise him that I will answer him. First, he says that the "that man" of sin pointed out in the second chapter of Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians must be an individual. I refer to the original Greek, and I appeal to you who are scholars here, if Mr. Maguire has not mistranslated the passage.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I read from the authorized version of your Bible.

Mr. GREGG—I shall quote from the original Greek. The passage runs thus:—" *Metis humas exapatese kata medena tropon: hoti can me elthe apostasia proton, kai apoluphthe ho anthropos tes hamartias, ho whios tes apoleias.*" Now, I say that " *ho anthropos tes hamartias*" fairly translated is the man of sin, and not that man of sin.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Is there any difference between the man of sin and that man of sin; and if there be, blame your own Protestant translators, who translated the Bible by authority (cries of order, order.)

Mr. GREGG—I don't care about that. I appeal to those who know it if my translation be not the right one—for, in Matthew, 16th chapter and 18th verse, where he says, "Upon this rock I will build my church," the pronoun is used in addition to the article, to express this—" *kai epi tante te petra.*" I ask, does that satisfy you, Mr. Maguire?

Mr. MAGUIRE—It does not.

Mr. GREGG—Well, I cannot help you. I give you facts and arguments, and if you are not to be convinced that is not my fault. But I see by the countenances of many present that it is a clench. He says the Pope cannot be Antichrist, because he calls himself the servant of the Most High; but are we to believe him when he says so?—are we to believe the wolf, when he puts on the coat of the lamb, that he is mild and innocent?—am I to believe the Pope



that he is mild and innocent when I find him blessing the long sword, and sending war and desolation through the earth?—when I find him converting the Albigenes, who were lambs, into wolves, exterminating them from the face of the earth. It is no proof that the Pope is not Antichrist, because he says he is the agent of Christ. Rev. Mr. Maguire says next that Antichrist must be a man, an individual, because his number—six hundred and sixty-six, is the number of a man. But, my friends, I will give you a treat:—Apostacy is the name of a thing, apostate is the name of an individual—labour is the name of a thing, a labourer is the name of an individual—Roman is the name of a man, for Roman let us substitute *Latinus*—then the number of *Latinus* makes six hundred and sixty-six. The Pope is again called *recte reverendus*, and the number of that is 666. He is called *Rex sacerdos*, and the number of that is 666—he is called *doctus deceptor*, and the number of that is 666—he is called *doctor papa deceptor papa*, and the number of that is 666. He is called in the Greek, *to mega therion* (the great beast,) and the number of that is 666. Various other titles he has, all of which make up in *globo*, the number of 666. He says that the Pope cannot be antichrist, as Enoch and Elias have not come, and that they have not been slain in the streets of Jerusalem. Elias was to come at first, and in reading the text he did not quote it all or quote it fairly—he left out the middle of it—he said that the two witnesses were to be slain, and be dead in the streets of Jerusalem. Now Jerusalem is not mentioned in the text at all—it says the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt. The Lord who was Elijah was put to death by the Romans, and Roman is the name by which the reverend gentleman and his party go. Is not the sway of the Pope as great as that foretold of antichrist? and I warn you against the delusions which Popery throws out to seduce mankind. You see the reverend gentleman with all his great powers labouring in support of those delusions. You see him labouring against the current of the stream of truth of the living God. It is deplorable to see it. You heard his silly argument that the Pope could not be antichrist, because he did not order an image of himself to be made and worshipped. I refer him to some of the texts of scripture he has quoted. St. John says, “I saw another beast like unto a lamb, but was as a dragon.” There is the Popish church, the image of the beast, the likeness of the original Pagan Roman empire. He says his church is not guilty of apostacy from the truth, or of idolatry—is not prayer to the Virgin mary apostacy from the truth of Christianity? Can that church be the true church, which ascribes virtues to such rubbish as this? (Here the reverend gentleman produced something like a woman’s old gown, and holding it up to the audience, said)—Can the church be anything but that of antichrist, which says that such old trumpery as this can do good to a man’s soul after he is dead? [Here the reverend gentleman brought to the front of the platform a large parcel containing pieces of old clothes, bones, beads, scapulars, pieces of candles, &c., and commenced dashing them over his head about the platform. The

act at first seemed to excite some merriment ; but a loud cheer from one party called forth some groans and hisses from the other.] He then said—You will bear with me, my friends ; I do not this to give offence to any ; but I do it to show the contempt in which our church holds such trumpery and abominations. The religion which can sanction things that must be detestable in the sight of the God of purity and holiness, is the religion against which I protest—and it can be no other than the religion of antichrist. My friends, to-morrow the ladies will be excluded, and that exclusion is connected with an exhibition of more trumpery,

Here his half-hour ended, and the business of the day closed.

# THE DISCUSSION.

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

FIFTH DAY—SATURDAY—JUNE 3D.

---

Shortly before eleven o'clock the reverend disputants appeared on the platform, and, when that hour arrived, the Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE rose and said—I call upon the Rev. Mr. GREGG to proceed with this day's discussion.

Mr. GREGG—I most cheerfully correspond to the call, but before I proceed I would ask my reverend friend will he agree to a small matter of arrangement which I propose. It is that Tuesday be the day on which we proceed instead of Monday.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I think it will be better not to depart from the arrangement we have agreed upon and that we proceed on Monday.

Mr. GREGG—Very well, I am content. I am only anxious on account of others who wish to be present but who cannot attend on Monday. Now, my dear friends, I proceed with the business of the day, and I appear before you as a clergyman of the church of England, (the reverend gentleman had on his canonical gown); and I wish to explain to you the course I took yesterday in deprecating the use of the trumpery that is sanctioned and revered by the Popish church, and to explain the difference between them, and the decent ceremonial of the true church. And here, before I proceed further, I will take leave to correct an error which has been published with regard to things which I exhibited here yesterday. It was said that I announced them to be relics. I did not do so. I brought forward a habit and cord of St. Francis, to which the church of Rome ascribes particular virtues. I brought forward a holy candle, a beads, a scapular, and other things, to all of which the Romish church ascribes virtues and miraculous powers. There are certain powers attributed to those worthless things, and that is the error which I wished to expose. I wished to hold up to ridicule and scorn that unholy system which, by reliance on, and attributing virtues to, those filthy things, sets at naught the power of the pure and holy one. Mark me, my friends, I don't disclaim the use of decent ceremonies and appropriate dresses, for here I am in the canonical of the church of England. But our canonicals are not blessed by bishops, nor do we attribute to them miraculous powers. We do not provoke the Lord by calling on him to pour down his holy spirit upon those inanimate things. In our church we would consider the man an infidel who would do so. We dress for decency,

not for awe. If a member have a bad coat, it may be very decent and proper that he should wear a white linen surplice. White linen is an emblem of the righteousness of the saints. But we don't bless the white linen, nor endeavor to inspire the people with a fear and an awe of it. I will, my friends, give you a specimen of the length to which this blasphemy is carried, and I will give it to you upon their own authority, and out of their own books. I have here the Catholic Directory, as it is called—a work to which I am indebted for much information upon these matters. It is there stated that there is a goldsmith licensed by the church to touch holy things. This goldsmith makes, I suppose, the sacred utensils of the church, and he could not make them without touching them, and he could not touch them without a license to do so. Oh, my friends, I ask you, and my Roman Catholic friends, in particular, I ask can this be in the spirit of true religion? No, it is at variance with the gospel and the law, and a mockery of the power of the living God. I will, before I proceed further, say one word with regard to a lapsus into which I fell on yesterday evening when quoting the Greek text. I find that it is our Bible that has “that man of sin,” and I am willing to admit that “that man of sin,” and “the man of sin” have equal force in argument, or at least that it was nothing to draw an argument from. So much in the way of explanation. My reverend friend said that he made a mistake in history, but that in divinity and regarding the scripture, he was invincible, and that he could not err. I will say that it appears rather strange that he who claims to be infallible on one subject should not be infallible upon every subject. I do not say that our church is infallible nor do I say it is fallible; what I say is, that it is the pillar and the ground of truth, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. The reverend gentleman may take whatever meaning he pleases out of that. I tell him that I don't know the meaning of the word fallible—that there is no such word to be found in the Bible: that I stick to the Bible, and that I believe the church to be the pillar and the ground of truth. But the word of God is paramount to all, and that eternal word is my guide. But I tell him, and I hope he will excuse the harshness of the language, that he has made a most flagrant mistake even in divinity and the scriptures, in which he declared himself invincible. Where he spoke of the hundred and forty-four thousand fighting men as belonging to Elijah, he made a great error; those men were of the tribe of Benjamin, and did not belong to Elijah at all. So far he has tripped in divinity—this advocate of an infallible church. I say that it is not an infallible but a bungling and apostate church. He attempted to prove to you that the city of antichrist must be Constantinople, whereas, if he looks into his own Bible, which I here hold in my hand—it is the authorised version published with the *imprimatur* of his bishops—he will perceive that Rome, and not Constantinople, was the city meant. Here is the text and note to the passage, Apocalypse, chap. 17, verse 5th, “And on her forehead a name was written—a mystery. Babylon the Great, the mother of the fornications and the abominations of the earth.” The

note says, "this may be either the city of the devil in general, or if it may be understood as any particular city, it may be *Pagan Rome*, which then, and for three hundred years, persecuted the church, and was the principal seat both of empire and idolatry." There is not one word there about Constantinople. Then again see, you will find in Mr. Maguire's Douay Bible in Daniel, 17th chap., and 3d, 4th, 5th and 6th verses. "And four great beasts, different one from another, came up out of the sea. The first was like a lioness and had the wings of an eagle. I beheld her till her wings were plucked off, and she was lifted up from the earth, and stood upon her feet as a man, and the heart of a man was given to her. And behold another beast like a bear stood upon one side and there were three rows of teeth in the mouth thereof; and thus they said to it—arise, devour much flesh, and power was given to it. After this I beheld in the vision of the night, and lo, a fourth beast, terrible and wonderful and exceeding strong, it had great iron teeth, eating and breaking in pieces, and it was unlike to the other beasts which I had seen before it, and it had ten horns." Now, in the note to that it says, "those four great beasts are the Chaldean, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman empires." You see, now, that there is not one word about Constantinople being the city of antichrist, or being at all connected with the last of those great empires which evidently refers to that of antichrist, or the beast mentioned in the Apocalypse with the ten horns. You see the shifts to which the reverend gentleman has been driven to make it appear that the empire of antichrist is not Pagan Rome revived. You have in the present Roman church all the paganism of ancient Rome—cutting their crosses on the idol pillars—making images to bow down before, and all the other abominations which can in no wise be allied to Christianity. I now come to Mr. Maguire's argument about venial sin, and mortal sin, and I will show there is no distinction with regard to sin at all. The first passage I shall quote is Matthew, 5th chapter and 27th verse, where it is said—"You have heard that it was said to them of old—thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say to you that whosoever shall look on woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart," and 22d verse—"You have heard that it was said to them of old—thou shalt not kill—and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment—and whosoever shall say unto his brother *Raca*, shall be in danger of the council—and whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Now, here it is distinctly pointed out that there is no difference with regard to sin, for the text says that whosoever says unto his brother *Raca*, shall be in danger of the judgment—that is the day of judgment—in the same way as if he committed murder—and that whosoever shall say to his brother, *thou fool*, shall be in danger of hell's fire, in the same way as if he had committed the most abominable crime. Now, *Raca* is a Syrian word which is synonymous with *mollis*. Mr. Maguire knows the meaning of that word—it means an effeminate person—a person who . . . . . I see some young persons here; I wish to know

will they go out ? It was publicly announced that females were to be excluded this day, and I am astonished that parents should allow young boys to come here. I wish they would go out. I appeal to Mr. Maguire if the regulation is not a proper one. The suggestion has not originated with me ; I have seen it suggested in the "Morning Register;" and I perfectly concur in it.

Mr. MAGUIRE—My idea is, that as far as I am concerned, I don't ask any one to go out, for I don't intend to introduce any blackguardism whatever.

Mr. GREGG—If I bring forward blackguardism, it will be from Mr. Maguire's own books.

Mr. MAGUIRE—You may do as you think proper.

A voice in the crowd—Don't be taking up Mr. Gregg's time. (Loud cries of "turn him out.")

Mr. GREGG then proceeded—Well, I see these young boys won't leave that though they have no business here whatever. Mr. Gregg then gave an explanation of *mollis*. Then you see, my friends, the man who called his brother by this bad name was deserving of damnation ; and here I maintain, notwithstanding all Mr. Maguire may say to the contrary, that there can be no distinction in sin ; and it is the greatest error to imagine that any sin can be committed that is not highly displeasing. But Mr. Maguire argues that some of his venial sins are not only not displeasing, but that they are some of them objects of reward from heaven. I now come to a portion of one of the books of Mr. Maguire's church, which I intend to read to the meeting, should Mr. Maguire decline to read it here. Mr. Maguire, will you read your own book ?

Mr. MAGUIRE—No ; you may read what you like.

Mr. GREGG—Those are extracts from the work of Peter Dens—and I feel the greatest reluctance to bring them before the public ; but the cause of truth impels me onward. Here are some of the abominations of the confessional. [Here he read extracts, and commented on the manner of examination suggested for females in confession.] Here are pretty questions to be put to females by men who are themselves unmarried. Thus, my friends are your wives and daughters subjected to this horrible inquisition ; and don't suppose for a moment that in the abominable extracts I have read for you it is Dens that speaks—it is the Romish church, for they are all sanctioned by it.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Gentlemen, it is right that I should inform you that my reverend friend has travelled back in his last speech to subjects which have been most amply handled three days back, and which we might have considered as decisively discussed. But ~~it is~~ because he has reinforcement of argument, for which he is indebted to some friendly lucubrations, he thinks fit to return to them ; and he is at perfect liberty for all that I care, to do so. He returns to the "I even I" of the prophet Isaiah, and accuses me of a gross ~~mis~~ take in quoting the passage of scripture. He said that the 144,000 were only fighting men. I answered that they were of the tribe of Benjamin, that they belonged to the true church of God in the old

law ; no matter whether they belonged to the kingdom of Judea or the kingdom of Israel, for both were of the Jewish church ; they were 44,000 men of the tribe alone : how, then, I repeat, could the Jewish church have been invisible at their time ? But the Jewish church was the type of the new church of Jesus Christ. If the former was not invisible, neither could the latter be. So much for your spiritual knowledge, reverend Sir. In your last half hour yesterday you committed a gross error, and one unworthy of fair discussion. In speaking of venial sin, you said that I wanted to make it appear that God rewarded venial sin because he rewarded Rahab. I said no such thing, Mr. Gregg ; but I wanted to make it appear that Rahab did not lose the grace of God, because he rewarded her although she committed venial sin. But according to you, Sir, God rewarded her for mortal sin ; because you hold that the sin committed was mortal. Hence it stands thus :—I maintain that venial sin does not kill the soul, which mortal sin does, as its name signifies. And you say that God rewards mortal and venial sin, while I maintain that he rewards neither. Let me now come to the parable of the unjust steward, and I say that if you explain that for me, I will explain the circumstance of Rahab for you. I again refer you to the Epistle of St. John, where it is said that there is a sin unto death, and a sin which is not unto death ; and I say that this either proves the distinction between mortal and venial sin, or else it proves the doctrines or prayers for the dead. St. John says that there is a sin unto death ; now if I understand that rightly, it signifies a sin in which a man perseveres without repenting to death—and that the sin which is not unto death is that in which a man does not die impenitent. You know, Sir, it is unquestionably lawful to pray for a man while living, no matter how great his sin may be. In the same way is it proper to pray for him who shows no signs of repentance at death, that is in the case of sin unto death, if it be right to pray for a man while in the state of sin. Now, Sir, allow me to ask you how you will get over the midwives of Egypt ? Why did God reward them, if they were guilty of mortal sin ? The King of Egypt issued an order commanding them to put to death all the male children of the Israelites as soon as they should be born. They did not, however, comply with his commands, and they told him that the women of Israel took care to be delivered before they sent for them. Thus they told a lie to the king, but the scripture says that “because they feared God he built unto them dwellings.” But if they had committed a mortal sin—an act which placed them in a state of damnation—why should God have rewarded them by building dwellings for them ? My friends, Mr. Gregg has told you a great deal about the word “Raca,” a great deal also which was very edifying, and he expended a vast deal of learning in it. What a waste of learning that was ! I proved that he was wrong in his quotation about “the man of sin,” and he, endeavoring to show that he was right, had recourse to the original Greek, and told you a great deal about the force of particles. What are the poor ignorant Protestants to do who do not know Greek as my reverend friend does ? If they cannot make an act of faith without having recourse to the

Greek original. I ask you what are they to do? The scripture most distinctly points out three sorts of sin, namely, that which is subject to the judgment, that which is subject to the council, and, finally, the third, which is alone condemned to hell. The first is that slight feeling which may break out between brothers or friends—that difference which may exist between children, and which does not destroy charity. If it were not venial, how should it be distinguished from the highest outbreak which is designated in the scripture by calling a brother “thou fool?” In the first case, there is not, as it were, any overt act of passion; in the latter is denoted the highest pitch of anger. I quoted the Apostle James, where he says, “in many things we all offend.” Therefore the Apostles offended in many things. But will Mr. Gregg say that the Apostles were in the habit of committing mortal sin, and that they were very often in the state of damnation? If so, how should they be inspired? Every hour and moment of our lives we do commit those small offences to which St. James alludes; and are we every hour and moment of our lives in a state of damnation? And were the Apostles, according to the words of St. James, constantly committing mortal sins? What a beautiful specimen of pure Protestant doctrine, that those who may be called the second founders of Christianity—those to whom Jesus Christ with his own mouth gave the commission to establish his church—should have been every moment of their lives in the state of damnation? But what need we wonder; the Protestant church has no principles. My reverend friend says that it is infallible, and again that it is fallible. What beautiful divinity is in that hesitation—that difficulty to decide whether she is fallible or infallible? You see, my friends, that he does not wish to lay aside the superiority which he claims for his church of being judge in matters of faith. His church is too fond of high tory principle, and he knows well that he dare not give that privilege up, with all his liberty of private judgment. What a church, and what a fine theology he has! He says he does not understand the word infallible, because he can’t find it in the Scriptures. Now, I ask him does he find the word procession in the Scripture, or the word trinity in the Scripture, or the word consubstantially in the Scripture? And yet, all these doctrines, the names of which are not to be found in the Scripture, are matters of faith to his church. What a church it is which teaches that the whole of Christendom was in a state of damnation for more than 800 years. Now his saying that his church is fallible and infallible reminds me of a man who would not drink whiskey in a public house nor outside a public house, but who would drink it on the threshold. If he takes it outside he is afraid of the church, and if he goes inside he is afraid of me, so he prefers the little horn of the dilemma. He tells you very triumphantly that I contradict myself, and he quotes me against my own Bible. Was it not Dr. Heyland in his *Cosmography* whom I quoted, and not any opinion of my own which I brought forward? I quoted Dr. Heyland’s *Cosmography*, and other Protestant commentators to show that, in their opinion, it was not Pagan Rome which was referred to in the *Apocalypse*. I quoted them to show



that Constantinople was built on seven hills, that on one of them was the great mosque of St. Sophia, and the Turkish *seraglio*; that it was the *Nova Roma*, and was likely to be the Babylon of the prophesy as Christian Rome. You said, Reverend Sir, that you hold both public and private judgment to be the rule of faith? Now, I ask you is the Holy Ghost the author of both? And if they should come in collision; if you should differ with each other, as you have often done, and must, in the nature of things, be liable to do, how can you bring the Holy Ghost out of the difficulty? You talk, Sir, with an infidel sneer of Rome having converted nations from Paganism. O, Sir, I ask you to look back to the stream of blood which flowed from the holy martyrs, who carried Christianity into distant lands, and fixed the standard of the cross triumphant over the ruins of Paganism? Believe me that infidelity will triumph at this contest between Christianity and Christianity—for I don't deny that you have Christianity—I don't deny that you retain much of what you borrowed of the faith of Jesus Christ from us, still in common with us. I will not dwell at any length on what you have said of morose delectation, for it is not a subject which I would introduce before any audience; but it appeared to me that you derived the word *morose* from *moralis*, whereas it comes from the word *moror*, a delay, that is, a dwelling on a sinful thought. But, my friends, according to the principle of my reverend opponent there is no sin in such delay. You may dwell as long as you like on a sinful thought, for there is nothing in Protestant morality to prevent you, and you will not be advised to the contrary. You may do what you please, provided it be not done openly and before the world. Now I say that if all that ever was written by Peter Dens on the various distinctions of certain sins, and all that was ever written on the same subject by other compilers of moral theology—and observe, that which was never intended for any but those who sit as judges in the tribunal of confession—that which was intended to guide the priest in the direction of souls has been collected in a volume, and translated into English, and I have known it to be received through the post by ladies in remote parts of the kingdom—it has been brought within the reach of every wife and of every daughter in the British empire. I say, if all that were as infamous, and as disgusting, and as villainous, and as abominable, as my reverend friend, with his false and corrupt English translation, could wish to make it, what is that to me? I differ with Peter Dens in many things; and what of that? He holds that the Pope is above the councils; I say the contrary. He says that the Pope *ex cathedra docens* is infallible. This he holds with the Italian divines while the theologians of France, and

and other countries, who, being on this side of Italy, are called by them *ultra montanists*, and who, I agree, do not subscribe to that opinion, and the church has always left the question open to us for free discussion. I have nothing to do with any peculiar opinions of Peter Denis. But let us come to the point. I argue thus:—Suppose that Jesus Christ did, in reality, as we, Roman Catholics say, and as I am prepared to prove, establish the sacrament of penance, that he did institute the tribunal of confession as a medium to apply the merits of his sacred blood to our souls, and as a glorious and most beneficent means of restoring us to the purity which we lose by actual sin. Suppose he did institute that holy tribunal, are not the necessary consequences which flow from the work of Christ as much as the sacrament itself? Are they not the work of Jesus Christ, and not of Peter Denis, or any divine of the Roman Catholic Church? Suppose, then, I prove that Christ did establish confession, of what use would it be if the ministers to whom he had given the power of absolution were unacquainted with the nature of the crimes from which they were to absolve—if they knew not those secret thoughts and acts which defile the soul before God, and which, to be forgiven, the ordinance of Christ requires to be confessed—if they were not instructed how to advise the penitent that he may escape those dangerous precipices? And what has Peter Denis done but give such assistance to the ministers of religion as might guide them in that arduous and unpleasant duty? He did not intend it to be handed about among the people in their native tongue, and divested of the cloak which a dead language and the austerity of religion cast over it, but which those who think with my reverend friend have torn off, that they might place it in the hands of every gal and of every innocent boy that speaks the English language. He did not intend it to be made the subject of public discussion before such an audience as that which is now before us. Now, my friends, I will give you the fullest opportunity of seeing this question in its true light. I undertake to prove the sacred origin of confession, first from the sacred scriptures; secondly, from the practice of the ancient church; thirdly, from the wisdom and beauty, and mercy of such an institution, which immediately stamp it with the character of its divine origin; and, fourthly, from the admission of its utility and necessity, made by the most eminent Protestant divines. I shall first then show whether the principle of confession be itself divine; and, in the second place, whether its practice and the results which flow from it be not justifiable, thus putting it to you in the most tangible point of view possible, that sacred institutions were left, as the holy fathers were accustomed to call it, the second plank after shipwreck. But as the time which now

remains to me is too short to enter into the demonstration, I shall occupy the few minutes I have with an observation on the other side of the question. Suppose for a moment that Jesus Christ did not establish confession, what invention more damnable or abominable—what more abhorrent to human nature was ever devised by man or demon? And how could so anti-human, so diabolical an institution, have become established in all Christian Europe, in Greece, in Italy, in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in Germany, in the kingdoms of the North, in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland? What! was the whole civilized world so debased as to receive that abominable and disgusting invention of depraved man, and that without any history that reached us mentioning one word of the time of the revolting innovation? History tells us of other heresies when they appeared and when they disappeared; but this one, the foulest, the most diabolical of all the heresies that were ever broached, or that ever issued from the bottomless pit, not one word of even the age or the whereabouts it first made its appearance! The half hour having terminated here,—

Mr. GREGG—How should it have been enforced all over the world, enquires Mr. Maguire. Why, does he not recollect that it is said of antichrist that he shall brand men with his mark all over the world? How should it be done unless the devil brought it about; and I shall prove as clear as noon day, that the devil is the author of confession. Mr. Maguire is very angry with me. So is the seducer very angry with him who discovers him. It is thus that Mr. Maguire asks, why were all the delicious things we enjoyed in our studies of divinity brought before the world? I answer, because the last days of Babylon are nigh—because the time for bringing its abomination to merited infamy, is by the will of God arrived—and, filthy and detestable as it is, I shall denounce it to the whole world. Perhaps the publisher of this work, (Extracts from Dens), had, without being aware of it, a divine commission, which made him an instrument in the hands of Providence, to do a most meritorious work. He conferred a great benefit on society. The translator has also, undoubtedly, by Divine Providence, conferred another great benefit on society; for Popery demoralizes the world, and he has torn from it the veil which covered it. We now see it as it really is—it is no longer concealed from us by a mask, and we disclose it in all its hideous deformity to the world. When men first burst the bonds of Popery nature ran riot—but the spirit of Protestantism soon curbed and purified it. Thus, in the same manner if the publication of Dens spreads demoralization, it is but for a time, and good fruits will come from it. I must observe that Mr. Maguire was mistaken in saying that I derived *morose* from *moralis*; I said that it was derived from *morari*, which is all the

same as *woror*, as both have the same root. Then he says that Protestantism is without principle ; and yet he says that all we have of Christianity we derive it from his church. Thus we derive some of our religion from him, and yet we have no principle. Did I not say that your church was pure in the beginning, and that what it had of pure Christianity we have retained ? Why, my dear Sir, how can you fall into those mistakes ? are you not ashamed of your errors ? Mr. Maguire says, in speaking of Constantinople, that he quoted from Thorndike, and others. Did I not say before that I do not care a straw about Thorndike and the whole of them ? I take my authority from the laws of the land ; because I quote from the homilies of our church, and the homilies were established by the laws of the land. I said that the Douay Bible points out Pagan Rome as the Babylon of the Apocalypse ; and it is very strange that he should follow Thorndike and others, and abandon the authority of his own Bible. Again, with respect to *Raca*, he says of the different sins pointed out in that passage only one is liable to hell fire ; yet I have shown most clearly that the first is liable to hell fire as much as murder ; that the second, being subject to the council, is equally bad ; and that the third, which ought to be considered as less than the two former ones, is subject to hell fire. Is there not common sense in that ? He says that the word *procession* is not to be found in the Bible. Now I rather think that I remember having seen in some passage the expression that the Holy Ghost *proceeds* from the Father ; but I shall make myself sure. Yes, here I have it. John, chap. 15, verse 26, says—"But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, &c." Here we have the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father. Again, he says—the word *trinity* is not to be found in the Bible. I say, if it is not in the Bible, it is in the Athanasian Creed, which accords with the Bible ; but I don't recognise the word *infallible*, because it is neither in the scripture nor in the Athanasian Creed, though I grant you will find it in Johnson's Dictionary. Ah ! the Roman Catholic church has got an able advocate in my reverend opponent. You perceive how he wants to put off Peter Dens ; he absolutely disowns him. O, he does not recollect his speech in Glasgow—where he undertook to prove Peter Dens not less pure than the word of God itself. It was, I admit, a very clever speech—it was cried out in every corner of the kingdom. when I heard an old woman cry out "the celebrated discussion between the Rev. Hugh McNeill and Father Maguire," I bought it ; and lo ! it was the speech in Glasgow ! Again, the discussion between the Rev. Mr. Magee and Father Maguire was nothing but the self same speech in Glasgow ! (Here Mr. Gregg read

extracts from Mr. Maguire's speech in Glasgow, containing his challenge, beginning, "Let one of them come forward," &c.) He said that he would prove every thing to the satisfaction of honest John Bull. I know that John Bull is kind-hearted, but it is not to Protestantism that he is indebted for that quality. Now, I come to Mr. Maguire's answer to my arguments on Dens' Theology. He says that the whole question depends on this—namely, whether Christ instituted confession. I say it is not so. Here we have in the Protestant Book of Common Prayer, in the visitation of the sick, the following rubrick :—"Then shall the minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world, &c. \* \* \* Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort." And here follows the form of absolution :—"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners, who truly repent and believe in him of his great mercy forgive thee thy offences ; and, by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—Amen." Here then we have our church admitting the form of confession ; but does that prove that we should follow the system of Peter Dens, or that the corporation of bachelors should pry into the secrets of our wives and daughters ? Confess your sins, says Christ ; question the young women says Peter Dens ; examine them on such circumstances as must corrupt them, and pollute your own souls. There is no more reason why you should question females because Christ instituted confession than there is that you should refrain from eating meat on Friday because John the Baptist was beheaded. You know that the great object of the devil has always been to torment men, and he torments the Catholic priests with a vengeance. He first prevents them from marrying, and then he exposes them to the most inconceivable torture. Mr. Maguire says that they are not allowed to make their vows before the age of 23, and that they are then old enough to judge whether they should do so or not ; but I deny that that age is sufficient, or that a man could, at any time, possess sufficient knowledge of himself to enable him to come to such a resolution. They invariably find that they were wrong, and I appeal to every Catholic priest who hears me, if he has not felt that he was wrong in making the sacrifice that he has done. I assert boldly that there could not be a more meritorious or more excellent act than for all the priests in Ireland to marry all the nuns in Ireland (hisses, followed by cheers from Mr. Gregg's party, and loud cheers from the Rev. Mr. Nolan.) There could be no greater demonstration of good sense, and I am convinced that no circumstance in the life of the great Luther was more noble than that of his having carried off the nun Catherine. My friends, the character of the great nun has been most vilely mistaken and misrepresented. There was a height, and a breadth, and a depth, and a vastness about her which exceeds anything I ever knew in any other ; he was greatly superior to his times, and I doubt very much

whether it be true that he would allow a man to marry ten wives together. However, I don't care a straw about Luther. Formerly, when I came to know him better, I felt the highest admiration for him. As to his deriving some of his doctrines from the devil, you must be aware that that is only a calumny; it was no more than a temptation, and you know that Jesus Christ himself was tempted. Now, let us proceed to see how our bachelor priests are instructed in their seminaries—in what their infamous system of divinity consists. [Here Mr. Gregg read a great many of the translated extracts from Dens' Tract on Matrimony, where he treats in the chapter, *de usu matrimonii* on the sins incidental to the married state.] Remember that it is a Roman Catholic Doctor who speaks; they are not my words—blame me not. Oh! what a foul and infamous abomination! You, bachelor priests, you talk of the ————, you pry behind the consecrated curtains of the married bed! O, my Roman Catholic brethren, if you would but open your eyes—if you would but consider what I have laid before you, you would, every man of you, withdraw your wives and daughters from such a system. [The reverend gentleman read some further extracts of the same nature.] Fie on it for an abomination! What a nice discussion for bachelors! Why, Sir, what do you know about those things? (Loud cheers from all parties.) Where should you get your knowledge? I know well that the Roman Catholic priests of Dublin will say that Mr. Maguire should, instead of having come to this discussion, have staid at home with his dogs, (hisses, followed by cheers). It is a delusion—a most unaccountable delusion—if you do not feel that the whole of that which I have but commenced to read—that the whole system of Romish confession—the whole of the ecclesiastical education of your clergy, is most monstrous, most abominable, most infamous—

The half hour terminated here.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Gentlemen, I beg leave to say that I would rather go out to the fields with my dogs to take rational exercise than to occupy my time with reading the lying, infamous, and ignorant translation (I assert it to be such, and I will prove it so,) which he has quoted. (Here was some noise and confusion at the lower part of the reporter's table.) Now, is it not a shame that you cannot behave yourselves, and act in a rational manner, during a rational discussion. See I do not get disorderly.

A voice—Not I.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Why, then, make this noise. Are you not ashamed, and do you not remember that you are told to bear with one another. I implore of you for the future to be quiet. Now, gentlemen, you will bear in mind that I did not bring about the abominable exhibition of this day, and that whatever injury is done to our common Christianity, and whatever scandal is given to the faithful, that I, who occasionally go out with my dogs to enjoy some rational exercise, rather than read such passages, as it has pleased my reverend friend to read, am not to be blamed. I tell you, my friends, notwithstanding the quotations which you have heard, that this is a glorious day for the Roman Catholic religion, (hisses.) Give

me none of your hisses. I made you hiss yesterday, and I rejoice at it, for it is the sign of a better feeling having taken possession of you. The snake, when it hisses, is harmless, and it is the snake that bites in silence that is to be feared. Still, I say, let there be no hissing. My party, if I have any party here, do not hiss him. Why should you hiss me? I beg of you not to continue it, but to exhibit towards us and towards one another a Christian feeling—(cheers, and clapping of hands). Now, I will ask the Rev. Mr. Gregg a question, and I beg of you, my Protestant friends, to bear it in mind. Will he take the book of Genesis, and read of the sin of Oniah, and several other passages in the holy scriptures which I can point out to him worse than any he has read, and which I would not take all the money in the world to read here to-day? Now, what good did all the quoting to-day do his cause? I speak now of Peter Dens in the original, not of my friend's false translation. I deny that Dens avows that a single one of those questions which you complain of is put in the confessional; but I leave that with you and him; you seem to agree very well with one another. Now, I say the great question to be decided is, did Jesus Christ establish the necessity of confession? I pledge myself to prove that he did. Now, if he did, are you, when confessing, to select what sins to tell, or are you to tell all? We see what kind are your youth, who either never acknowledge their faults, or acknowledge only such as they like. If they were instructed as ours are, you would not have them growing up in the commission of sins such as you have named. You would not have your bishops hanged for bestiality, or flying from the country to avoid the punishment of Sodomy. You know, and I know, that in all the transports leaving this country, not a single crime of this nature is ever known; and, on the contrary, it has been proved that none of those leaving England, are ever without it. This has been distinctly proved before the commission of inquiry. I can bring the report of the Poor Law Commissioners to prove that in England, Protestant England, no less than 74,000 bastard children are born every year, and that there is not one married woman out of 500 that has not had a bastard child. I will read you this, and show you that we have it in evidence, and that evidence is the evidence of Protestant clergymen. I will show you, by the same testimony, that there are women who have nine children by nine different fathers, and that the more children a woman has, the sooner will she get a husband. We have it on similar testimony that in Ireland, if a woman had an illegitimate child, she might as well leave the country, for she never could get a husband. There's a contrast to moral and Protestant England, with its 74,000 bastards annually. But this immorality is not confined to the lower orders, as I shall prove. How many women of the first rank and fortune annually run away from their husbands, and not merely that, but exchange husbands with one another. Read Doctors' Commons and it will tell you. Now name to me fifteen women of rank in this country, from the time of the reformation down to the present day, that have ever run away from their husbands, or exchanged with each other, and I will give up the case? We know,

Sir, how your men proceed. Sir, it is well known that we keep our youth from crime, and that the detestable habits you enumerate are not among us but among you. I will produce Dr. Sherlock's table of sins, which contains all the crimes you named, and worse, all of which he recommends to be confessed, and he is a Protestant divine. I will show you that your church approves of confession while it throws away the best and most valuable part of it, in discountenancing the telling to the clergy all your sins in private. It is known that your flocks go to receive the sacrament at your altars with all their sins upon them. I myself have known them, after a night's debauch, to go from the scene of it to the church, and there receive the sacrament without a question being asked or an inquiry made as to the state in which they were. St. Paul says, "Let a man try himself, and then eat of that bread." Now, I will come to the point, and unless I transfer the blush of shame and confusion which he endeavored to cast upon us upon himself, never believe a word that I say. You will read in the scriptures where our blessed Saviour had the paralytic let down to him by cords through the roof of the house, because there was too great a crowd around the door for him to enter, and when he saw him he had all the scribes and pharisees around him, who were just of the same character that our modern scribes and pharisees are, and entertained exactly the same opinions with regard to the forgiveness of sins. And when he saw the paralytic he said to him, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." But there were certain of the scribes sitting there and reasoning in their hearts, "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but God only?" And Christ, knowing their hearts, said, "Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, thy sins be forgiven thee, or arise, take up thy bed and walk! But that you may know that the son of man hath power over earth to forgive sins—he saith to the sick of the palsy—I say unto thee—Arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine own house; and immediately he arose, took up his bed and went out before them all;" and it is added that "the multitude gave glory unto God who had given such power unto man." Mark, then, here we have, first, the scribes and pharisees holding, like those of modern days, that man has not the power of forgiving sins. Next, we have Christ, the son of man, forgiving the sins of the sick man and performing a miracle to prove that he had such power. Now, is not that a proof of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins? I address myself in love and charity to my Protestant brethren, and I beg of them to follow me through my demonstration. Our Saviour said to the apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost—whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven," and before, "As my Heavenly Father sent me so I send you." That is, he gave them all the power that his Heavenly Father gave him, and he sent them to do all that he himself had been sent to do. He had the power of forgiving sins. Therefore that was among the powers that he gave them. Again, when after his resurrection, he met eleven of the apostles, St. Thomas being absent, he gave them the same power. He also said to them, "Whose sins you shall for-



give they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained;" and let me ask how could they forgive sins unless they knew them, and how could they know them unless they were confessed? Let me ask any physician how could he know the disease of a patient unless that patient minutely detailed all its symptoms, and all the circumstances accompanying it? Our health depends on the care we take of our body, and our salvation depends on the care we take of our souls. It is also my belief that my salvation depends on the care which I take of the souls of the flock that has been committed to my charge: and how can I take that care if they do not tell me their sins? Now I will prove to you that sacramental confession was practised by the apostles. You, of course, have read in the Acts of the Apostles of Ananias and Saphira. Their fate proves that if you tell a lie before the tribunal of confession, God will either visit you with some immediate judgment, or what is worse, he will treasure it up against you for the awful day of judgment. Ananias went to St. Peter to confess unto him, and he told him a lie with regard to the money, the produce of the sale of his property, and St. Peter said that he lied to the Holy Ghost, and he was immediately struck dead. Saphira came in just as his body was borne out; she knew not what had happened her husband—she also lied to the Holy Ghost, and was also struck dead. Now, that confession must have been sacramental, otherwise they would not have lied to the Holy Ghost, but to a mere man. Ananias might have done what he liked with the money, for it was his property, and if he had told a lie about it to St. Peter, not in confession, God would not have visited him with so signal a judgment. There was no law compelling him to give up his property, but when he denied having kept any of the money, he lied to the Holy Ghost, because the confession was sacramental, and St. Peter was there as the representative of Christ. You will not deny that there is a great difference between a lie to a mere man, and to the Holy Ghost—therefore, you must admit that it was a sacramental confession. You read also in the Acts, "That many came to the apostles, confessing their sins." And what were these sins? Among other things, the reading of improper books, and after their confession, they went and burned those books, to the value of 5,000 pieces of money. Now, I will prove—and, gentlemen, it will be worth your while to hear the demonstration, that there was auricular confession in the old law, and that the people were obliged to confess their sins. If then, now mark this—if then there were confession in the old law, it follows that there should be confession in the new, for the old law was but a type and figure of the new, which was "founded on far better promises." Now, you will find it laid down in the old testament, that God said to Moses, "Say to the children of Israel, that if any one shall commit any of all the sins"—(now, mind that expression)—"that happen between man and man, he shall make confession thereof;" and then he provides for the sins of theft, if confessed, and says, "And he shall make restitution thereof, and the one-fifth part over." There, now, is confession, restitution, and satisfaction in the old law—and then recollect the expression "any of

all the sins." That is to say, that any sin, no matter what it is, must be confessed. Now, I will give you another text—St. James says, "Confess your sins, one man to another"—that is, they were to confess their sins to man, but the men to whom they were to confess were the ambassadors of God. Now I ask any man of common reason to make sense of these words, "Whose sins you forgive they are forgiven," and "Whatsoever sins you shall loose on earth, they are loosed in heaven—and whatsoever sins you shall bind on earth, they are bound in heaven." Now, how can it be known what sins are to be loosed, or what are to be bound, unless they are told? I put that to you, Answer it. Suppose, again, one were to go to confession to a minister of the church of England, and suppose he were to confess, for example, some of the sins which he enumerated, would it not be necessary for the clergyman to find out whether that was his first offence, a falling-off to which all are liable, or whether he was an habitual sinner. If it were his first offence there would be good reason to suppose that he was worthy; but if he had committed it one, two, three, four, five times—if he were an habitual sinner,—give me leave to ask am I to throw pearls to swine?—am I to absolve him, and suffer him to receive the divine sacrament? Have I not evidence in the one case that the penitent has fallen, through the common weakness of humanity, and that he will be likely to avoid sin for the future. Have I not evidence in the other that the man is swallowed up in depravity? and am I to treat them both in the same manner? But I would treat them in the same way if I did not know particulars. Would you not consider there was a difference between the young man who would rob but 1*l.* and him who would rob his master, say, 2*l.* a month regularly? You would. But then your doctrine says, "Go on; rob on regularly; persevere; you do it with impunity." Now, he talked of our advertising the fact of restitution. We do it, not for the sake of publishing it to the world, but to convince the person who makes it that we restored it, and the man to whom it is restored that we have given all we got. And is not that a legitimate reason? Now, to come again to the point. Will he name a single person from the second century down to the present, except when the locusts came upon the earth, that ever denied the validity or propriety of confession? Will he name a single individual, until the bottomless pit was let loose," until Luther and Calvin's time, that ever raised his voice against it except heretics?—no, I do not even except them, for they admitted it. Now, "let the galled jade wince." I will now refer you to some of the ablest of your own divines. I refer you to Montague's "Guide," and his "Appeal," page 312. (He read the passages.) There it is for you. Priests have power not only to pronounce the words of absolution, but to give remissions. What do you say to that? I refer you now to Bishop Andrews' sermon to the English court. (He read a passage directly in favour of auricular confession.) I will now read Doctor Dowd's work—"Innovation unjustly charged on Papists." (He read several passages.) And now for the celebrated Luther, who never said a word against confession till he had five conferences with

the devil, which he has preserved, and which he got translated into English. Here it is.

The half-hour ended here.

REV. MR. GREGG.—Gentlemen, I will tell you that among my reasons for coming here in my canonicals, the chief one was, that you might see that I considered myself engaged in a holy work in revealing to the world the abominations of the church of Rome, and submitting it to your opinion whether such an examination as I have in part read, be a proper and suitable exercise of Christian piety and priestly rights, and I trust that God will bless my endeavours, and make them be productive of good. I shall now go over his arguments. As for his reason for advertising restitution—is it not very wonderful that in all cases a receipt cannot be given and received? I tell you that the true reason for thus advertising the cases of restitution is, in order to induce the people to believe that it is not required or practised in any other church. But I say that it is both required and practised in our church, and that I have known many instances of it. My reverend friend has been fighting with shadows. The propriety and legality of confession I admit, but from its propriety and legality it by no means follows that it is either legal or proper for married or unmarried females to be examined by bachelors on subjects about which they know nothing. Is there not a great difference between the legality of confession and the legality of bachelors pumping young women for their secrets. This very custom, I tell you, is a striking proof of the apostasy of Rome, of which, by-the-bye, my reverend friend has taken care to say nothing. In quoting the text, “As my father sent me even so I send you,” he forgot to give what immediately follows, which would show that the mission had nothing to do with confession. He speaks of the comparative morality of the people of England and Ireland. He speaks unguardedly, as if he does not see with a thinking eye. Now I was living in England. I went over there greatly prejudiced against the country on account of the calumnies which I heard heaped upon it here, but I do say that there is no country in the world that, in point of true Christianity and morality affords so eminently high, and glorious an example of, the religion which we teach. Again, I appeal to your common sense. The reverend gentleman says that there are a great number of women in England who have children before marriage. I have observed that 99 out of 100 of these women invariably get married to the fathers of their children, and that they make chaste and prudent wives. As for my own country-women, even if I could, I would say nothing against them. But I believe Ireland to be an exception among the nations that profess the Roman Catholic religion. I say that that religion increases immorality and impurity, and maintains them in all the countries where it exists. He tells me of our bishops. We have had bad bishops. They were banished from among us, but even if they were not, how can he bring them forward as examples of the nature of our religion. Why I will show him that it is his religion that produces and encourages such crimes. I will bring forward a long list of English bishops and abbots before the Reformation, who were

punished for them. Now he has brought me to England, I will bring him to Italy, Spain, New Orleans. I myself met a traveller who had been in the last place, and he told me that he was at a ball there, at which there were 2000 females, not a single one of whom was a modest woman. I can show from Italian authors what the state of morals is there. Not a single married lady, even though she does confess to the bachelors, but must have her *cara sposa*. Now it is principles I want. He talks of practises. I told him his church does not know the way to heaven, and that it cannot and does not teach it. He said nothing to that. He asks, how can we remove sins unless we know them? I say you can't remove them at all. And therefore your mode of examination can't enable you to do it. The way of removing sins is by preaching Jesus Christ and his doctrines; by showing the sinner the nature of sin, and giving him a true idea of it. This is the way to remove sin. This is the way the Scripture teaches us to remove it. His way is not the ministration of righteousness and of the gospel: but it is the economy of iniquity—it is just as if a man wanted to get his house cleaned out because it was in a filthy condition, and when it would be cleaned out would go about asking, "What kind of dirt is this!—what kind of dirt is that?—what is the nature of that filth?" Now, would such questionns facilitate the cleaning of the house? I tell you the questions which I find in Dens, and Bailey, and others of their writers are merely intended to gratify the prurient, foul and unclean inclinations of the human heart, and not for any good purpose. He speaks of removing sins. I tell him, with every respect, that he is the minister of antichrist, and that his religion is not the religion of Jesus Christ. I tell you, my brethren, that our absolution is valid, and I have felt it so while I knelt before the altar of my God, and heard it pronounced by the minister of our church; and I have felt the Lord communicating inwardly with me, and I have received "a peace which the world cannot give." (He here went into a train of observations, and cited some passages from Bailey's Theology, which it would be impossible to report. He also quoted from St. Francis De Sales.) Now mark (he continued) he has not touched a single one of my arguments. He has not denied anything I said. You cannot, my friends, close your eyes to facts. Compare Protestant America, descended from England, with Spanish America. See the one celebrated for morality, and learning, and liberty; see the other in a state of anarchy and barbarism, drinking of the phial of the wrath of God. See Ireland, its wretchedness, its poverty, its disunion. Look at Spain, lately the seat of despotism, now the theatre of a wasting civil war. Look at Portugal. Contrast them with the nations that profess the Protestant religion. Another consequence of the Romish religion is that it encourages filth and dirtiness. Some of their saints were noted for being covered with vermin and living in dirt. I can produce the life of one whose most remarkable distinction was his filthiness and the number of vermin that covered him. I call upon you, gentlemen, to acknowledge that the Roman Catholic religion is apostate, that it does not teach the way to heaven, and to judge between us. Let me

now show the slavery to which a married woman is reduced by the system of confession. Here I have the "Introduction to a Devout Life," which has gone through an immense number of editions, the 17th having been published in 1803, and the 24th in 1830, with five or six others. Therefore it must have been in a great many hands. I have also the "Mauline Manual." (He read a passage from it, and proceeded to make observations, which could not be laid before the public.) He then gave a picture of the happiness of the Protestant clergy with their wives and children, contrasting their condition with that of the priests, who are forbidden to keep much the company of women.

The half-hour having expired.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE then proceeded—Mr. Gregg has spoken to you of the immorality of Catholics and of Catholic countries, and he has denied that persons should devote themselves to celibacy ; but he seems not to know that in the Bible it is set forth that certain privileges were granted to those men and women who consecrated their virginity to God. He talks of unmarried priests keeping company with women, and of the sins and temptations to which they are thereby subject. We do keep company with females ; we keep company with them in public, but not in private, because our vows forbid us. But are we the more subject to temptation ? We believe in the promise made by Christ to his church, and by faith we preserve our vows. But you, doctor don't believe in any such thing. It was the difficulty with bad men of keeping these vows that brought forth the whole spawn of locusts, which have been cast out, but are perpetually assailing the church of Christ. You say you have the spirit of God with you ; but I fear it is the spirit of the cloven foot, and not the spirit of the cloven tongues. We believe that our church has the spirit of the Holy Ghost with her ; that she is the church of Jesus. If yours be the church of Jesus, where was the spirit for 800 years when that church was asleep, or when she was invisible, as you say. She was asleep ; she was in a lethargy, as you, Sir, are in a spiritual lethargy, from which no power of argument or of reasoning can awaken you. I ask you again, Sir, where was the spirit which you boast of for 800 years while your church was asleep ? You cannot answer me that ; the lethargy is over you. You are asleep, and I pray that the spirit of God may raise you up from that lethargy, and that you may yet come to understand the truth. You spoke of Saint Sales. Now you don't know any thing about saints. It was the first time we heard of a Saint Sales. You meant St. Francis de Sales. Now, if you prove to me that you ever had such a man in your church, you will be doing something ; but no, you will prove nothing, for I never could yet bind to a principle. You pretended to prove the apostacy of the Catholic church, but you proved nothing ; you did no more than make assertions. I replied to those assertions about apostacy, and appeal to the assemblage if I did not reply successfully ; for if I have failed in that I have failed in every thing. You talked of the parable of a filthy house, but you dropped the metaphor. You found you were caught in your own meshes, and you stopped short on that point.

No, no; you would not search it, and sweep it, and pry into every filthy corner, and clean it out; but you would sweep it *in globo*. You say to the housemaid—don't mind searching the rat holes, the corners, and crevices; give it a hasty brushing out, and it will do very well. Why, Sir, your own friends are pitying you while they pretend to applaud you. You say that you have Jesus with you. The Arians, fools, Baptists, Old Lights, and all the new lights of the world have said so, but did ever any one believe them. But you were caught in your own net, and there you are entangled without a possibility of release. You brought me to this discussion, and I here proclaim before Heaven that I am glad of it. Our arguments are before the world, and let all who have understanding judge of them. You have dragged into this discussion the females of England, and I am sorry for it, for I never make a useless attack upon any party, sect, or people; but as you have forced me to a comparison, let the consequences rest on your own head. You say that the females in England, until married, remain pure and undefiled. You institute a comparison between them and the Catholic females who resort to the tribunal of confession. Now, I will hold you to that comparison, although I must repeat again that I am sorry you have forced me to it. The witnesses I shall bring to my aid shall not be little travellers or paid liars, who write books for payment to degrade Catholic countries. I appeal to your own clergy, and not even to their bare word, but to their oaths. All the testimony I shall give you shall be on oath; nothing from your little venial liars. Here, then, is the testimony of a clergyman of your own church, who was examined on a commission of inquiry into the causes of bastardy in England. It is to be found in Messrs. Pilkington's reports. The Rev. Mr. Creswell stated that in sixty-two cases of bastardy which came to his knowledge in one parish, he found that three sisters were all with child by one man, a married man. They applied for parochial relief, and they all got one shilling and sixpence per week each. Two of the sisters were with child again by the same man. Again, in the case of a woman named Mary White, having eight bastards by six different men. By this report (page 241) it appears that in one year in England 74,000 cases of bastardy came before the parish authorities. A case is recorded when a man named John Carland was about to be married to young woman, but when the marriage was about to be celebrated, he found she was with child by another man, and it appeared that his affection for her was so great, that he was considerably affected by the circumstance. However, at the end of two years, he married her, and in applying to the parish for the loan of a paltry sum of money, he offered to give as security the allowance that was made for the bastard child of his wife, thus making a traffic of his wife's disgrace, and of his own heartlessness and degradation. Don't you know reverend Sir, that Protestant gentlemen handicap for their wives, and that dukes, marquises, and lords exchange wives, and yet there are no instructions given to them in the tribunal of confession; and that countesses and duchesses, and others of high degree, leave their husbands, and live in open adultery with others,

though they are not instructed at the tribunal of confession. But, Sir, I will read a few more passages for you, and from Protestant authority—a Protestant clergyman on his oath—the Rev. T. D. Birkett, rector of Norfolk. He says that promiscuous intercourse among the sexes takes place from an early age. Here, Sir, is another Protestant authority for you; the Rev. John Monks found bastardy so prevalent in his parish, that he offered a premium to any girl who would come to be married without being with child. In the course of some time afterwards seventy-two came to be married, and how many do you think were entitled to the premium?" Two! But even these two were not really entitled, for they deceived the worthy rector who sought to encourage morality—for it was afterwards discovered that these two were three weeks pregnant before they came to be married. But shall I proceed with my extracts? If I do I shall astound you and confound you. But no—I shall proceed no further; and I ask you, Sir, why were you so rash as to provoke me to compare country with country, or to draw a comparison between the Protestant women of England and the Catholic women of this country, or any other country on the face of the earth? Again I say, let it be remembered that I do not stand up to attack England. I deplore the immorality and licentiousness that prevail in it. I have been forced to the comparison, and I attack the system that leads to those crimes. Look at the cotton mills of England, what sinks of iniquity they are. There is not an Irishman who goes over from this country who is not shocked at the immorality he witnesses; and the Roman Catholics of Lancaster would as soon see their children drop dead as send them into the cotton factory. Here the reverend gentleman referred to a letter written by Lord Byron with regard to convents and the state of female morality in Catholic countries as compared to that of England. Don't these facts show that your system is defective, and that there are among your spiritualized Protestants greater crimes than ever was spoken of by Peter Dens? Now Sir, I will refer you to St. Paul, and show you what he says of marriage and celibacy—and I shall, if you like, continue this discussion for six months with you, for I know that when your little budget about Peter Dens is empty, your whole stock in trade is gone. But before I proceed to St. Paul, I shall read for you some passages from Luther; they are to be found in tome 5th of Luther's works. Here the reverend gentleman read an account of Luther's temperament, as described by himself as such, that he found himself unable to controul it in any respect. He then read a passage from Melancthon, who said that he trembled when he thought of the passion of Luther. He also read passages from Erasmus, Calvin, and others, contemporary with Luther, who all coincided in giving a similar account of him. He then pro-

ceeded. Now, Mr. Gregg, I shall read for you a passage from Dr. Sherlock, one of your own Protestant divines—here it is, and you will be surprised to hear that it is no more than a table of sins—a preparation for confession—that is for Protestants coming to confession—and there is hardly a crime alluded to by Peter Dens that is not set forth in this catalogue of sins. The Doctor adds that fasting and abstinence are necessary to overcome them, and that eating too much and drunkenness encourage them. But you, Mr. Gregg, don't believe in fasting or in abstinence, or that such things are necessary to overcome our evil propensities. You rely upon the spirit. But what right had your Protestant divine to give a table of sins and instruction for confession, when, according to his own church, he had no power to absolve man, woman, or cat? He could not claim a right to that power, because the church was in possession of it—and man cannot make a title to confer an estate until he first proved his own possession. You have ordination, but where does it come from? Hear this, Mr. Gregg, and be ashamed of your frontless assertions with regard to the Church of Rome being the church of antichrist. Your ministers have ordinations from that church—ought the ministers of Christ have their ordination from the ministers of antichrist? Such is your Protestantism without principles. Look, then, at your damnable doctrine about adultery. If a young man is married to an old woman, and that he wishes to get rid of her—he will send his spies about her—prove that she committed adultery—put her away, and take a young one more to his fancy. Or, if his taste be like that of some of the heads of your church, he may take one fat, fair, and forty. Look at the impiety of the system that marriage is dissolved by adultery. I shall now, Sir, from the Bible, convict your damnable system. Hear what St. Paul says in his lessons relating to marriage and celibacy. (Here he read extracts.) Now, does Peter Dens say any thing more than that? Then, again the apostle says—“Defraud not one another, except, perhaps, by consent for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer, and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency.” Now, Mr. Gregg, do you take that advice; do you give yourself up to fasting and prayer, and abstinence? And since you have come here to-day in your canonicals, I hope you have taken the advice of the apostle. St. Paul then goes on, “But I speak of this by indulgence, not by command, for I would that all men were even as myself.” Now, Mr. Gregg, you know that St. Paul was unmarried, and here expresses the wish that all who dedicated themselves to God were as he himself was. The apostle then says, “But I say to the unmarried and the widows, it is good if they continue even as I. But to them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from



her husband, and if she depart, that she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband." Here now is the scripture in opposition to your damnable doctrine which sets a premium on adultery—for by your law if fifty adulteries were committed fifty marriages might follow. I say, Sir, that you have no power to allow them to marry again. They made the vow at marriage that they were to remain man and wife until separated by death. I made a vow of celibacy that I would devote myself to God when I was twenty-three or twenty-four years of age—and for the honor and glory of God I shall observe it unto death.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Mr. GREGG—Shall we continue on Monday the question of vows and celibacy?

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I am quite ready to meet you on any subject you please.

Mr. GREGG—Then it is understood that the ladies are to be admitted on Monday? I should think they ought to be excluded.

Mr. MAGUIRE—In that respect I am quite ready to submit to the authority of the chair.

Mr. MAGUIRE's Chairman—I think it is better to adhere to the rule which has been made—namely, to confine the exclusion of the ladies to one day.

Mr. GREGG—Well, then, let it be known who refuses to exclude them.

Here the day's proceedings terminated.



# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

SIXTH DAY—MONDAY—JUNE 5TH.

---

At the usual hour the disputants were at their post.

Mr. GREGG rose and called on Mr. Maguire to proceed with the discussion, and inquired of him if he would consent to protract it until three?

Mr. MAGUIRE— I meet the proposal with a distinct negative.

Mr. GREGG—Then let it be understood who refuses.

Mr. MAGUIRE then proceeded. He said he hoped that his reverend friend was renovated by the intervention of the Lord's Day, and that he had come to the discussion with those feelings which ought to belong to a Christian minister. After some prefatory remarks, Mr. Maguire thus proceeded. I am now come to the business of the day, and I tell my reverend friend that I have no objection to prolong the discussion to any period he may think proper, or at least not to give it up till there is nothing in the shape of argument to be brought forward. I will continue it while there is any fresh proof to adduce; but I must implore of him to deal more in proofs and in arguments, and to lay aside idle assertions and declamation. Had he done so from the commencement, this discussion would have been ended long before this. I come again to his assertion, for he has given no argument upon the subject, that the church of England and Ireland is the Catholic church.

Mr. GREGG—With its branches in the East Indies and other places.

Mr. MAGUIRE—So I understand you in that sense, and will give you the full benefit of your assertion; and I pledge myself not to make assertions, but to stick to arguments, and the assembly will give me credit when I say that whatever I have pledged myself to I have fulfilled. The reverend gentleman gives as one of the signs by which his true Catholic church, with its branches, shall be known, that it repudiates vows and celibacy. I quoted scripture for him on Saturday—I quoted St. Paul and other of the apostles, to show that such was recommended in the church of God from the very time of

our Saviour himself. But that has not satisfied him ; and here now I will take up the subject of vows ; and I undertake to defend them from the attack made upon them by my opponent, and if scripture be against me I will give up the whole argument upon this part of the case, and acknowledge Mr. Gregg triumphant. There is a fair proposition made him. He calls upon me to abandon the vows I have made. Now I rely upon the scripture for having done so ; and if it be against me, I will give them up ; nay, more—I will go farther—I will try the whole strength of our case upon the issue of this point. He says that splendor and glory are of the signs by which the true church shall be known in latter days. He proclaims himself the champion of that great church—no doubt it is very respectable in point of temporalities and riches, but he will not say those are the characteristics of the true apostolic church. I will even join issue with him on this point, and compare church with church, and see which has the scripture with us as to poverty, fasting, and self-denial. I will compare them, too, for the purpose of seeing which is most supported by the scriptures. Although I tell him that my church is more ancient than the scriptures themselves, and that the scriptures could not exist without her—what will the reverend gentleman say to that ? He knows it to be truth—but perhaps he will say, oh, no, it was not your church but mine that preserved the scriptures—it was the Protestant church that handed them down to us in all their purity, and it is by the Protestant church you are to prove their canonicity and authenticity. But will any rational man believe him ? Oh, there is the dilemma he is in, and we won't have one word in the shape of answer upon that point. I will put him on his rule of faith, and show you that he has no rule at all. I tell him that poverty is the mark of the true church ; he says that the splendour of his rank is a mark of the truth, although he has repeatedly told you since this discussion began that his church was partly, if not entirely, invisible for 800 years and more. Where was all the splendour and glory of his church during that period ! Strange and inconsistent man—how difficult it is to deal with him ! But if splendour be a mark of the truth, what does he think of the Great Bear of the North—the colossal, and powerful, and splendid empire of Russia, with her church, including countless millions ? If splendour be a mark of the truth, what does he say to France under Napoleon Bonaparte ? What does he say of the Mahomedan empire when it extended over the fairest and most glorious portion of the earth ? But I will show him that poverty, abstinence, and self-denial, and vows dedicating people to God, are marks of the true church, and I will quote for him from his own Protestant Bible. I refer him then to

Num. 30 ch. v. 2. It says if a man vows a vow to the Lord, or swears an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, but he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth, and if a woman also vows a vow unto the Lord, and bind herself by a bond, being in her father's house in her youth, and her father hear her vow and her bond wherewith she hath bound her soul, and her father shall hold his peace at her—then all her vows shall stand and every bond wherewith she hath bound her soul." Now, my friends, mind the condition alone under which she could break a vow. If she made it in her youth, when under age, and in her father's house, when she could not be legally said to be her own mistress—then she might break the vow, if the father did not approve of it. But if the father heard it, and held his peace—said nothing against it—then every bond wherewith she had bound her soul should stand. And again, my friends, the text goes on to say—"And if she had an husband when she vowed or uttered aught out of her lips wherewith she bound her soul—if she had at all an husband, and her husband heard it, and hold his peace at her in the day that he heard it, then her vows shall stand, and her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand." There, again, my friends, if a wife make a vow and the husband say nothing against it, she is bound to keep it. But in no case whatever are vows made by those arriving at the years of understanding, and master of themselves, to be broken. What does my reverend friend now say upon the subject of vows? I implore of him that when he comes to reply he may give scripture authority, and that he may deal in arguments not in loose assertion. I do implore of him to follow me regularly, and to take up the points of scripture which I refer to, and to give something in the shape of argument. I promise him if he do that he will facilitate the great end for which we commenced this discussion, and that if he do not, all our controversy will be rendered useless. The reverend gentleman next read a text from Leviticus, and proceeded—That you will admit is pretty strong with regard to vows, the necessity of keeping them, and their being approved of by God; and I shall now bring you to something equally satisfactory. You see, my friends, that I defend all the rights and ordinances of my church from the Scriptures, and show that they are founded on the Scriptures. Here is the 23d chapter and 21st verse of Deuteronomy, "When thou shalt vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not lack to pay it, for the Lord thy God shall surely require it, and it shall be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep, and perform even a free will offering, according as thou hast vowed to the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth." Again, in Ecclesiasticus, 4th chap, 4th verse—"When thou vowest a vow unto God defer not to pay it—for he hath no pleasure in fools; pay that which thou vowest. Better it is thou shouldst not vow, than to vow and not to pay." Again, in Matthew, 19th chapter verse 12, it is said—"There are some eunuchs who were born so from their mother's womb, and there are some eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men, and there are

eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." There, my friends, is not only the approbation of God expressed with regard to those who devote their virginity to God, but it is imperatively said he that is able to receive it—that is the necessary grace to keep the vow, let him receive it. What does the Rev. Mr. Gregg say to that? Now, mark me again; as I rely on the Scriptures, let me be answered from the Scriptures on this subject. Again, in Luke, see what is said of those who leave house, parents, brethren wife and children, and devote themselves to God. I refer the reverend gentleman to the 18th chapter and 29th verse. The apostle says—"Verily, I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house and parents, and brethren, and wife and children, for the sake of God, who will not receive manifold more in the present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." I ask the Rev Mr. Gregg would he recommend men to leave house, and home, and riches, and parents, and kindred, and give themselves up to the kingdom of God? No, he would recommend the very contrary, and in direct opposition to the Scriptures. Oh! Mr. Gregg, the Scriptures are against you. and you neither know them nor understand them. I don't say that any man is bound to leave is wife, and goods, and friends. There is no obligation that he should do so; but hear what the Scriptures say. Should he do so for the sake of the kingdom of God—he shall receive manifold more in the present time—he shall receive the peace of God in this life and his everlasting glory in the life to come. These are the glorious rewards pointed out in the Scriptures to those who dedicate themselves to God, and make vows of chastity and poverty for his sake, and most assuredly will the eternal God fulfil all his promises. Again, in the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, chap. 7, the apostle says—"Now, concerning the things whereof you wrote unto me, it is good for a man not to touch a woman—but, nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, but I would that every one were even as myself—but every one hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say to the unmarried, and the widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I." Again, in the 25th and 32d verses, the apostle says—"Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord, but he that is married careth for the things of this world, and how he may please his wife." Again, my friends, the apostle says of widows—"The wife is bound by the law as long as the husband liveth; but if her husband be dead she may marry whom she will, only in the Lord. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment, and I think I have the spirit of the Lord; and younger widows are to be avoided." Here, my friends, are my Scripture authorities in support of vows and celibacy. But have I done with them? No. But it is unnecessary that I should go further. I

might still quote St. Paul, and others of the apostles, until I would weary you out, and you declared that I had carried my proofs too far. Again the apostle says, that honor shall be given to those who preserve their first faith—and I have nineteen of the holy fathers to show that by this first faith was meant the state of widowhood. I refer the reverend gentleman to the Council of Carthage, which, ludicrously enough, he calls a Protestant council, because the church was then pure and Protestant. Well, then, he cannot quarrel with what he calls one of his own councils. That was the council at which St. Augustine was present, and in that council, in the 104th canon, he will find that that was the interpretation put upon first faith. What do you say to that Mr. Gregg? Mark me again, I expect to be followed distinctly and *seriatim*, and to get direct answers to the arguments and authorities which I am bringing forward, and let the world see what your arguments are against vows, celibacy, chastity, and self-denial, in support of which I am giving the most irrefragable scripture proofs. Again, in the Apocalypse, the glorious and distinctive privileges which the chaste enjoy are pointed out to the apostle, when he asks of the spirit who showed him the wonderful things which are recorded in that prophecy, “who were the thousands that were clothed in white garments!” “Those are they who have followed the lamb through all tribulation, and who are pure and undefiled by women.” So much for this part of my case, and the scripture authorities by which I overwhelm him. I come now to the sixth article of the Protestant church, and upon this article I put that church upon its trial. I will show that by that article she rejects the scriptures, or annihilates her own existence, at a time when it is pretended that she did exist, or that the church of Christ existed in all its original purity. Mark me, in the arguments that I shall bring forward, I don’t seek to reject any portion of the scriptures, but I mean to show up what this Protestantism without principle is. That article says, that no book is to be deemed canonical, which was ever doubted of by the church of God. I refer you, my friends, to the article in question, and see now what a dilemma I have him driven into. I have here a translation of Eusebius by a Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and I believe it is one of the best translations that was ever made. In this book it goes on to prove that the Apocalypse was never written by St. John the Evangelist at all, that it was written by another person, and that its canonicity and authenticity were doubtful. This was in the 4th century, before the Christian religion, according to Mr. Gregg, became corrupt. Eusebius also relates that the church doubted of the authenticity of their books of scripture, and thus, according to your sixth article; you are bound to reject all those books as not being canonical. And, mark me now, I call upon you, Mr. Gregg, to show that those books were never doubted by the church; and if you do not do that your church is bound to reject them. Such is your Protestantism without principle. Now, who was Eusebius? He it was to whom the world is indebted for preserving what has remained of the great Alexandrian library. These books were doubted by the council of Carthage, in the year

397, when the church was pure and without error; and I would now be glad to ask him what became of his rule of faith, founded upon the articles of his church? He talks of my church having an *index purgatorius*—so it has; here is one printed in Rome in '38, and what does that fact show, but the care with which the church watches over every thing pertaining to her rights and her canons. I refer him to page 119 of the work, where he will find that in the fourth century Dionysius of Alexandria, one of the ablest critics that lived since the days of Longinus, in speaking of the Pope, calls him the blessed Pope. The name of the Pope was known then, Mr. Gregg, and he was called the blessed Pope. The people did not believe that he was antichrist. It was not odious at that time. I will not talk of that article of his church which passes sentence of eternal damnation upon men, inasmuch as it says that by the eternal decree of God every man is born to be damned or saved. I will not trouble my friends in combating that monstrous, that horrible doctrine. He says that the true church was invisible for 800 years—aye, 800 years and more. Here, again; see the wretched dilemma into which he has fallen. How, I ask him, could the sacraments have been administered—how could baptism, ordination, and all other Christian rites and sacraments have existed in a church that was invisible for 800 years and more? Let him answer that. I have called on him before to answer it, but he has been deaf to my call. How could a church have unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, which was sleeping for 800 years and more? Where will he show me a single trace of this invisible church, not for 800, but, according to Luther, for a thousand years! Ah, my friends, if I sought to merely triumph over my adversary, my triumph would be complete. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Corinthians, says that the spiritual body of Christ, which is his church, can never die, or become corrupt; but, according to Mr. Gregg, it was invisible—it had no existence—it had no existence—it was therefore dead; and, as to becoming corrupt, according to him, it became the most corrupt thing in the world. Again, the church was to be visible—it was to have a visible head; and how could it have a visible head if there was not man, woman, or child in the world who knew where that head was to be found?

Here the reverend gentleman's half-hour terminated.

#### FIFTH DAY—SATURDAY.—(CONTINUED.)

Mr. GREGG then proceeded. He said—My friends before I come to answer some of the propositions brought forward by my reverend opponent, or to remark upon the misapplication of his passages from scripture, I will tell you a story. There was a churchman once who was a great sportsman, and he was going out to shoot, although he was no great things of a shot; and a friend who was with him saw a number of birds on a bush, and desired the sportsman to let fly. He did slap at them, and when the friend asked did he kill anything, "Why," said he, "if I did not kill them I made them leave that." (a laugh.) So it has been with my reverend oppo-



nent ; although he hunted a great deal out of its proper place, he killed nothing. He caught no game. He has wandered over the scriptures, the councils of the church, his nineteen holy fathers, and a whole host of authorities, and he calls upon me to answer all within the space of one half hour. I ask him is it just or fair to do so ? You heard him talk of the scriptures being doubted ; oh, I tell him that I smell an Atheist. I do smell an Atheist. Did you hear him calling on me to prove the canonicity and authenticity of the book of the Apocalypse ? I tell him I will do no such thing. Could it even be imagined that the canonicity of the Revelations should be doubted by a Christian minister, or that one Christian minister would call upon another to prove it ? I do not say that Mr. Maguire doubts it ; no, he admits it, and I cannot, therefore, be called upon for such proofs of it. But if the infidel called upon me for such proof I would give it to him. My Christian friends, am I not warranted in saying that I smell an Atheist, when I find a man endeavoring to cast scorn upon the works of the living God ? If ever there was a book which proves itself beyond all question and dispute, the book of Revelations is that book ; and let those who would attempt to cast doubt or scorn upon it, tremble at the fulfilment of the prophecies which it contains. This is an evidence of Popery, which would set it at naught. I will refer you to a work which is unanswerable and which contains proofs of the authenticity of all the books of scripture. It is a work which has been approved by all parties. It is a scholastic essay, proving the authenticity of the scriptures, by Dr. Cousins. I do this that I may not fritter away the time of this great assembly, in doing that which there is no necessity to do, which would, in the language of the gentleman's own church, be a work of supererogation. I, therefore, dismiss that part of the subject, for he has not shown that any of the books of the scripture we deem canonical was ever doubted by the church of God. The reverend gentleman still continues to misrepresent what I have said. He says that I acknowledged that the church of Christ was dead for 800 years, or that it was invisible. I will just say that she might be invisible without being dead, but I did not say that she was dead, far from it—neither did I say that she was invisible. I said that she was respectively invisible. I said that the church had the living soul of truth, and that although she was respectively invisible, she never died. Now I will illustrate my argument upon the part of the case thus. Suppose the sun be covered with clouds do we not say that it is invisible ! but will any one say that it ceased to shine, much less cease to exist ? Suppose that Father Maguire said something so offensive to all the persons at this meeting, that they all but one or two walked out and left him there, might not the morning papers fairly state that the meeting was dissolved, that no one remained at all, for the one or two who might remain would be invisible to all the world ? He talks of the kings of England being the heads of the church, and that Henry VIII. was the first visible head of the Protestant church. Luther threw Henry VIII. overboard, and that monarch lived and died a victim of the corruption which he was instrumental in overthrow-

ing I never said that the church was dead, and let it not go abroad that I said so.

Mr. MAGUIRE—I refer to the notes.

Mr. GREGG—So do I. You may have misunderstood me, and I am sure you did. Our Lord said, “Many are called, and few are chosen.” No doubt, many of the Papists are called, but few are chosen. The Lord again says, “difficult is the road and narrow is the way that leads to salvation, and few there are who enter by it; but straight is the road and wide is the way that leadeth to destruction, any many are they that go in thereat.” The reverend gentleman talks of the Book of Revelations, lightly, but better it were that a millstone were about his neck than that he should do so; and I tell you, Sir, that it shall be a millstone about your neck, and that I will cause it to sink you to the earth before I have done with you. We have this paganised Christianity, where the inner court is occupied by a few, and the outer court trodden down. Those who are of the inner court are the two witnesses spoken of in the 17th chapter of Revelations; and the great beast, who was to ascend out of the bottomless pit, and kill those witnesses, whose bones were to be dead in the streets of the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt—I say that your church is the great beast foretold in Revelations—that she is the great husk which covered the true kernel of Christianity. But let it not be fathered on me that I ever said the church of Christ was dead. I have proved your church to be the church of antichrist, and I feel that I get strength and grace for the task as I go on. The intervening Sabbath has given me additional strength to get through the labour in which I engaged. Now, what part of the reverend gentleman’s assertions shall I commence with? Whether his vow, or the articles of my church? It is impossible that I can answer all he has advanced within the space of less than half an hour. I shall take the vows first; but let it not be said that I decline answering his arguments about the articles. But I have answered them already. Look at the way in which I met him on the subject of miracles, and I shall proceed in the same way now with regard to vows. First I assert that vows being allowed under the old dispensation is no reason why they should at all exist under the new law. This is my first proposition. I will show that what was necessary and commanded under the old law was not allowed at all under the new dispensation. Water was commanded to be used under the old law in ablutions and the offering of sacrifices; but it was a type of the blood of the Redeemer, which was to wash mankind from their sins, and under the new law it was found totally unnecessary. All those things which were typical of the coming of Christ and his law were no longer necessary under the new dispensation, and when you back to Ham, you are going back to the old dispensation and overturning the new. Under the old law oil was used, but it was symbolical of the unction of the holy spirit, which was to descend to the church under the new dispensation, and it became unnecessary in the new law. There is the legal dispensation and the evangelical dispensation. The legal dispensation is a dispensation of the vows mentioned in

the Old Testament. The dispensation of the Old Testament was the law to bring us unto Christ—to show man his weakness until the coming of Christ; and if vows existed under the old, it is no authority why they should exist under the new. All that is contained under the old law has been abrogated by the new, particularly that which is opposed to the spirit of the New Testament. Before I give you the text, I will show you the nature of the new dispensation of the New Testament. That dispensation confers on the church powers by conferring on it the gift of the Holy Ghost. Men receive this dispensation that they may receive the Holy Ghost, and thereby obtain as it were a new nature and be born again. It has been said in those days, I will pour out my spirit; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and men shall run in the way of the commandments of God. It is the delight of the Lord to behold his people running in the way of his commandments. I will now take a few texts of scripture to show the liberty in Christ, and the freedom from the dispensations of the old law, which was given to man by the new law. In the 8th chapter of St. Paul to the Romans the apostle says—"Because the creature also itself shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." Again, in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, the 8th chapter, 9th verse, "But take heed lest, perhaps, this your liberty became a stumbling block to the weak." Then the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians 3d chapter, 17th verse, "Now the Lord is a spirit, and where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." Then in James 1st chapter, 25th verse, "But he that hath looked into the perfect law of liberty, and hath continued them, not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed." Thus do I show you, my friends, the contrast between the two dispensations and the perfect liberty and freedom from all vows under the new law and true liberty in the faith of Christ Jesus. I will come now to some of the passages quoted by my friend, and indeed I think upon this part of the case, as ladies are not excluded, we ought to hold the discussion in Latin. Here the reverend gentleman, forgetting the language he was about to speak in (as well as we could hear him, and we afterwards appealed to others who were near us, and they agreed that we were right) said, *Lisons*, thus using the imperative mood of the French verb to read, instead of, we should think, *Legamus*. He then proceeded, "anne Sacerdotes Romani se faciunt eunuchos? Lege libros eorum—anne sacerdotes Ramani sunt eunuchi? Vide tractatus eorum de theologia, ubi versatur de effusione seminis. Imo hi eunuchi etiam lasciviores sunt," (cries of oh! oh! shame, shame, from such as understood the passage.) My friends, I

stand in the liberty of Christ, and I must deal in unpleasant truths when fighting for that liberty. But I tell you this, and I am sure you will admit I make a startling concession, when I tell you that I would have no objection to nunneries and monasteries, provided the monks and nuns might come out and marry whom they pleased. I think that religious communities of that kind would be capable of doing a great deal of good. I will come now to the Epistle of Paul to Timothy, and I will cut the reverend gentleman down with his own sword. Yes, I will hew him to pieces before the Lord, (laughter). I will take his very texts, and show that they prove the contrary to what he would have you believe. What is said there with regard to widows, has reference to public alms-houses; for in those days the pious had alms-houses for the widows, and it was prohibited that the young widows who were taken in there should marry; if they were to marry, they should stay out of the alms-house, and let their husbands support them; and no doubt if there was any old widow in the alms-house, to whom some old gentleman took a liking, there would be nothing to prevent him making a match with her, and taking the burthen of her support off the parish. I go to principles. I speak in the spirit of a man who feels that he is right. I see the things as they are in God's holy word, and I put no false construction on them. Let any one then who wishes to consult the text, do so, and they will find concerning those widows, who were recommended not to marry, were such as applied to be supported at the alms-house—for in the following part of the text we find—"If any widow who has children or nephews to support them—"

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE then proceeded—My reverend friend has amused you in the commencement with an old story—and, indeed, since the commencement, he has done little more than amuse you with old women's stories—but, alas, he has not followed the arguments I laid down, nor grappled with one single proof, which I brought forward, of the subject under discussion to-day—namely, vows. Truly, my friends, it is melancholy to have to deal with such a man. I called upon him distinctly and repeatedly to follow me *seriatim* through my arguments; but he has been at his old trade of wandering about from one subject to another. He says he stands to principles, but he has not maintained a single principle since the commencement of this discussion. And here I am obliged to follow him—indeed I cannot separate from him. We are like the Siamese Twins. He wants to break up the union. I'm glad to find that he is so much of an antiunionist even in that respect. I said in my last speech, that abstaining from meat and drink, and making vows of poverty and celibacy, were lawful and commendable

in the sight of God. This was the principle upon which I went, and my opponent, although he tells you that he clings to principle, has not met one single argument that I brought forward in support of my principles. He told you a story about a theological sportsman. Now, with regard to self, a subject upon which all men are fluent, but few men agree, I will only say that I indulge in the harmless amusements of the field, and in innocent sports; and that so long as my conscience tells me there is no harm in doing so, I shall so continue. He said it was unfair that I should make reference to so many texts of scripture, and said that it was impossible he could answer all that I adduced in the space of half an hour. Now, he never in the course of his life uttered a greater truth, and instead of saying that he could not answer them in half an hour, if he had said that it would take him to the last half hour of his life, he would be perfectly right. He spoke of holy water and oil, and said that the use of them was abrogated under the new law. He forgot the waters of Baptism. He cried, "Oh, I smell an Atheist; here is a man scoffing at and doubting the canonicity of the scriptures." Now, I ask you, Mr. Gregg, as an honest man, did I do so? No, I would sooner sacrifice my life than deny one word of Revelation. I did not attack revelation, and, Mr. Gregg, you must know that—but I attacked one of the 39 articles; and in order to attack it and to show what Protestantism without principle was, I proved that the Book of Revelations was doubted in the early days of the church, and that according to your 6th article you were bound to reject as not being canonical, any part of the Scripture which ever had been so doubted. My friends, you will recollect that I called on him to apply himself particularly to that point; he saw the dilemma into which he was forced, and he has not said one word in reply to me. I ask you is that candid—is it fair? Here is the dilemma, and I give him again an opportunity of getting out of it; he must reject the 6th article of his church, or reject the Book of Revelations. Come, Sir, no fencing or evasions, but try your hand again. I told you your negative articles would not stand, and I now ask you where is there a principle in your church to prove the canonicity of Revelations. There is Protestantism without principle. Do you understand now whether I attempted to mock God's word or not? Ah! you must know full well I do not; and I have given you more credit for sincerity than you deserve, for it is evident that you raised that cry against me in order to escape from the dilemma in which you are entangled. I gave you the authority of that church which has been visible, and of her councils. I gave it to you on that church from which you have all that you possess, and from a council held at the time when you say that the church was pure. Can you,

I ask you, dispute such authority? It is from our church that you have every thing which you have that is worth possessing, and I believe that you are coming back to us by degrees. I hold in my hand a book printed in Oxford, in which are the hymns of our breviary that was lately printed in Paris. I have never denied Revelations. You talked of the stream of truth, but I ask you how could there be stream, when, according to your own account, the fountain was run dry; the church was invisible? But the fact is, Mr. Gregg, you are run dry, completely run dry, and I believe there is not a man in this assembly that does not see it, (cheers). The Rev. Mr. Maguire said, I beg of you, my friends, for God's sake, not to give me your cheers. If I get off well with God, it is all I want, and I beg of you to elevate your hearts to him, and to pray that he may give your hearts to understand the truth. I don't want your applause. If I make truth triumphant, and that good results may follow, give the glory to God; pray to God to assist you, for if we survive this discussion it is a moral miracle. The reverend gentleman talks of the pure gold and of the dross of the church. Now, I tell him there can be no dross in the church. There may be individual dross; but the church with which Christ promised to remain, is still pure gold. He will find no pure gold in his church unless he robs it from mine. Where do the ministers of his church get their ordination—where do they come from—if they do not scale the wall and come down through the roof like robbers? He said that his church was invisible, and then that she was visible. The last assertion gave the lie to the first—for she was invisible—that is, she had not existence at all. I ask, can the church of God be invisible to man? and his church was invisible for 800 years—where was she? Do you think that that which was to be the largest body of believers that ever existed in the world, was to be for 800 years invisible? And I ask you was not the Roman Catholic church the largest body of believers in the world, and was she not through all ages visible? And this mark of visibility was acknowledged by Luther himself, who said he called to witness that it was by accident, and not by design, that he separated from that which was the only visible church in the world. Here are Luther's own words again—*"Primo solus eram, et certe ad tractandas has res indoctissimus et ineptissimus."* He spoke of the old and the new dispensation, and of the liberty by which Christ made us free. Yes, Christ made us free, not to attack one another, or to call his church that of Antichrist. But though we are free, and not bound by the legal rights of the Jews, still in many things we are bound by the old dispensation. We are bound to keep the ten commandments, though Luther said they were a hum,

bug, and that we were not bound by them. Will you say so, Doctor Gregg? You are the disciple of Luther, and do you agree with him there? I think I might retort, and say that I smell an Atheist, but I will not do any such thing; I shall not deal in hard names. I showed you that it was lawful to make a vow in the old law, and that vows were approved of—nay, commanded in the new law. I brought such a host of Scripture authority to my aid, that I may fairly ask you, did I not prostrate you in your arguments against vows. I showed you that it was good for a man to quit parents, friends, and home, and dedicate himself to God—and I shall now give you more Scripture authority on that point. The young man who was rich, came to our Saviour, and asked what should he do to be saved? He told him to keep the commandments. This I have done, said he, from my youth—well, saith our Saviour, “Go sell whatever thou hast, and give it to the poor, and follow me.” How many in our church have done so—have given up riches, and rank, and honor, and dedicated themselves to poverty and to God. I would be glad you could show me any in your church that have done so. I would be glad that you would instruct your bishops to do so, and also to give some of their wealth to the poor curates of the establishment, who are going about among the few followers that they have, and striving to make their church in some way respectable. I quoted Eusebius to show that the authenticity of several books of Scripture were doubted by the church—and this upsets your whole rule of faith founded upon your articles. You acknowledge Eusebius as authority—that he existed when the church was pure. There are not four pages of his works—of his theological works, that do not mention miracles. The fire refused to burn St. Polycarp, and other things equally miraculous are fully authenticated—but show me where there ever was a miracle performed in your church, and you will have done something. God has left us certain commandments which it would be impossible to observe in a state of nature I admit; but if Mr. Gregg says that with the grace of God we could not do so, I will take him up on that point when this discussion is over. He says he has the spirit; but how are we to know who has the spirit or who has not? It is God alone who knows. He says that his church has the marks which accord with the true church of Christ; but has she the marks which accord with our glorious church? He makes a comparison. He says if I were to speak in such a way as to offend every one in this assembly, and that they all went out, still, though the assembly might be invisible, it did not cease to exist. Now, if he can name the one or two to which his church was reduced, or show one man, woman, or child that knew anything before the days of Luther, he will have done something. He quoted texts from St. Paul to show that under the new law we are free. I never denied it. Jesus Christ made us free from the devil, and from the crimes of the Jews. He attacked the church of Christ as being that of Antichrist because Rome was built on seven hills. Now, London is built on seven hills—Dublin may be said to be built on seven hills—and other great cities of the world are also built on seven hills. He

next entertained you with a schoolboy's trick of making up the number 666 from the Greek numerical letters contained in a variety of names. Now there is Mahomet, and hundreds of names from which you can make up the number 666. But the thing is so puerile that it should be noticed only to be laughed at. When he writes a book against Pastorini, let him give a better exposition of the Revelations than he did. But synonymously speaking, have not I the patience of Job, to sit here listening to a man who evades every thing I put to him in the shape of arguments. Where is his answer, I ask again, to my arguments founded on his Thirty-nine Articles? He has given none. Next, with regard to the question of the validity of ordination in his church, has he given me any answer? No; from Martin Luther back to the 5th century, he was not able to show that one single minister was ordained but those that belonged to the Catholic Church. Dr. Brett, in writing upon this subject, admits that from the commencement of Christianity down to Martin Luther, there was no ordination but in the one church. Will you now, like an honest man and a Christian, answer, which was your church, which was invisible for 800 years and more, the marks of the true holy Catholic Church, or my church, which from the commencement of Christianity can boast of Catholicity and apostolicity? Whether has the church which contained within it 150 millions of believers, or your church which was invisible, or reduced to the one or two, who were also invisible, the distinctive marks of Catholicity about it? Answer this; or if not, all your raving and mountebanking goes for nothing; and although you boast of having the Spirit with you, no one will believe you. I belong to a church which proves that she has the Holy Ghost with her since the days of Christ, and that his promise to her that she should be like a city on a mountain, has been fulfilled; and I prove by sound Scripture that the Holy Ghost will never leave her. You admit that our church was once the spiritual body of Christ, and here again see the dilemma into which you have driven yourself; for you never can prove that the spiritual body of Christ could become corrupt. These arguments are founded upon the plainest portions of scripture, and every one can understand them. Hear again to this my last proposition. I tell you candidly that if I do not get an answer, it is not worth my while to be standing here listening to your idle talk. You say we were pure for 500 years, and when I asked you when we became corrupt, you drew down a simile of a man's head becoming grey—that he could not tell when it became so; that it became so by degrees. Now, that was a silly argument. A man's head becoming grey is an affair that concerns no one but himself; and no one will take the trouble of noticing it. But to talk of a church containing, as I have said, upwards of 150 millions within it becoming corrupt without any body noticing it, is the rankest folly that ever was uttered. It was an affair in which all the Christian world was interested, and yet it remained unreformed and unnoticed, until the chaste, and pious, and pure Martin Luther accomplished the task. Where were you all, Protestants, for the thousand years that our church was corrupt and practising



all those frauds ? You never said a word ; your watchmen on the towers of Jerusalem were dumb dogs ; you were amongst the seven sleepers. Suppose she had been corrupt in England and Ireland, and here practised these frauds, how did she do so all over the world without any person being able to give any account of them ? I can show where Calvin, Beza, Luther, and the whole of them, admit that during all that time there was no man to point out those errors or frauds.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Now, gentlemen, did I not say that I would cut off Goliath's head with his own sword ? The Rev. Mr. Maguire said he would give me the time and date of all the heresies that sprang up, and of all the new doctrines that were introduced into our religion. Now, I say that that is a plain proof that we have not apostatized, that the apostacy is not with us but with them, and I will give you scripture for it. You will read in Revelations, " There shall be false teachers among the people, who will privily bring in false doctrines." Now, our doctrines were not brought in privily, or he would be unable to give them date ; but the doctrines of the Romish church were, hence the time of their introduction cannot be pointed out. There she possesses the privacy that was foretold as a proof of the falsehood of her doctrines. He says that he defies me to point out a single church in the world that ever held the Thirty-nine Articles. I say that there never was a Christian church that did not hold them in principle. Oh, but it appears that the number is every thing—at least so says my reverend friend. I say that it is not their being 39 in number that is essential, but it is the principle that it is so ; and I tell you, my friends, that the principles of them are to be found in scripture. But he says that I ought not to receive the book of Revelations, because they were objected to by Dionysius. Was Dionysius the whole church ? I have nothing to do with Dionysius. Let him show that the whole Christian world, or at least the entire true church, either denied or doubted the Revelations at any time. He might as well tell me that I should reject the gospel of St. Luke, because in the 19th century it has pleased Mr. Belcher to doubt the first chapter of it. Show me if you can, Sir, that any single one of the councils which we acknowledge ever doubted it. If you do, you may draw your conclusions. You say you hold the Apocalypse because your church holds it, and you ask me why I hold it ; I say I hold it because my church holds it, and my reason is a good one, for your church is apostate, and teaches not truth, and has no authority. I have proved that she is apostate ; and, gentlemen, let me ask you has he taken up a single one of my arguments on that point ? I have proved it from Daniel, 2d chapter and 7th verse ; from the book of Revelations, and from the epistle of St. Peter. He has not even attempted a refutation of one of these texts, and the conclusions which I draw from them. Again, he asks me where do I get my mission ?—where do I come from ? Well, I do say that I am astonished that he should ask such a question, when he knows as well as I do that all our bishops who were in error renounced those errors, came out of the church of

Rome, and returned to the primitive church. I say again I am astonished at you, Sir, for our church is no separation. You might as well say that a man who was a drunkard and gave up drunkenness became a different man altogether. You say we admit your ordination. I say we admit it in part, and only in part. We would as soon let the devil himself into our pulpit as a Romish priest who had not renounced his abominations. I say that your ordination is a corrupt ordination ; it is partly corrupt, and partly pure and valid (a laugh.) You have derived it from the authority which Christ gave to his apostles, but you have sold yourselves to the Devil, (hisses.) Your ordination is made invalid by the corruption which has crept into your church, and hence it is we never allow a priest to preach in our pulpits till he has renounced these corruptions ; but when once he has done so we receive him with open arms, and we rejoice at the nobleness and purity of his conduct. He calls upon me to give a single text to show that his church is corrupt, just as if I have not already given one hundred. I say that we are not corrupt. Our church has not been defiled, but yours has ; and I refer you, since you demand a text, to the 17th chapter of Revelations, where you will read of the great whore riding on the empires and driving them on. There you have the Popish priesthood riding on the people of the earth. There you have the very language with which the power of the priests and the infatuated state of the people would be best described. There it is. The great whore sitting upon the beast, and drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus ! Then he tells us that his church is of amazing extent. Why that is another proof of its apostacy for it is said in the 16th verse of the 13th chapter of the Apocalypse—" And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bound, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads." Thus the very extent of the church to which he belongs is a strange proof of its apostacy. Again, he speaks of the names which describe his church, and make up the number 666. Why if I have not given him enough I will double them. But I defy him to give me a single name belonging to my church which will constitute the same number. They are innumerable, however, in Popery. *Vicarius filii Dei in terra*, the vicar of the Son of God upon earth, makes 666. *Vicarius Generalis Dei in terra*, the vicar-general of God upon earth, makes up 666. *Divinis infallibilis*, the divine infallible, constitutes 666. *Latinus lingua sele veste*, Latin in language, capital and dress, makes 666 ; and a hundred others of the titles which are given to the Pope and the Catholic church. I say, Sir, tremble for your connection with an apostate church. You tell me that Luther got his doctrine from the devil. Now, I do not stand up for Luther. He was in some respects a paltry character, though in general he was a noble-minded man. But even admitting the man to have had his faults, it is not fair, I say, to judge him by them. What great building would you judge by its defects ? What man should be judged by his failings ? You tell me, Sir, that Melancthon relates of Luther that he used to have ever so many devils about him. I have not the slightest doubt of it. I

am sure that no mortal was ever so beset by the devil, because he knew that that noble-minded man was about to overturn the foundation of his dominions. Luther was remarkable for a certain species of appetite. He says himself that he was torn asunder by that particular desire. But the question is not, whether he was beset with devils, or whether he was torn asunder by desire, but whether he surrendered or subdued them, and see what Melancthon says immediately after. (He read a quotation which was to the effect that though Luther was ardent and passionate, yet it was never shown but in his teaching, that he always abstained from persecution, and that though the virtues of the man were worthy of praise, yet thanks should be given to God, because through him he restored the doctrines of the true church, and that the perpetual consent of the holy church of Christ spoke the voice of those doctrines.) Therefore, continued he, let him not attempt to judge of Luther by his defects alone. I myself translated his letter to Henry VIII., and published it in a pamphlet. I would recommend it strongly to you, and would advise you to bring it with you to Ballinamore, and I promise you that you will very soon change your opinion of that wonderful, noble-minded, holy man. He asks me am I not bound by the ten commandments? I tell you I am. The Holy Ghost has imprinted them on my soul, and he has taught me to obey them. I walk in the way of the commandments of the Lord, because he has given me liberty. I run in the way of the Lord. He objects to my preaching, but I say he must have it. Yes, yes, I will preach. I come here to persuade you, and to induce you to embrace the truths of the holy Catholic religion, and I will proceed as I have begun. I would say to you, Sir, as I have said to an infidel. I was brought to see Carlisle in jail, and after we had spoken together and I had completely stopped his mouth, as I have stopped the Rev. Mr. Maguire's, I asked him "Are you happy now in your belief. We all look for happiness, you look for it by the good works which you do. Are you happy?" He stammered out, after some hesitation, "Why, why, why, yes I am happy." "Then," said I, "if you are you do not want Christ. You are whole and therefore do not require the physician." Now, I say to you, Sir, if you are happy in your good works and in your mixture of good works and faith, you do not stand in need of Jesus Christ, and go on then, as you are. But if, when you go home from this, you find yourself shaken; if you shall exclaim in the bitterness of disappointment, "Oh, why did I come up to this discussion at all? Oh, how I have sunk my popularity. What scandal have I not given, and what injury have I not done my religion?" Ascribe that to its true cause, and cry out with a true spirit of repentance, "O, Lord Jesus, I have blasphemed thee by thinking I could accomplish my salvation by any action of my own. I now see that I must look to thee, and thee alone, and that of myself I can accomplish nothing." Then, Sir, will you come over to me, and the conclusion of this discussion will be as happy as I could wish, (cheers.) But I will touch your heart. I tell you, you are not happy. I tell you, you cannot be happy. I once held your principles. I once imagined, that I

would be saved by faith and good works, and I was unhappy. I flung off the belief. I went to my Saviour as a bankrupt, devoid of all merit. I found out that he was the Alpha and Omega—the first and the last, the beginning and the end, and I found peace and happiness; He objects to me when I say I have the spirit that Martial the heretic said he had the spirit also, and therefore that we are on the same footing. No; I say that Martial is a heretic, and I abominate him as much as you do. But I must not detain you by wandering. Though if I am wandering I call upon him to bear testimony that I am following him. I am, I say, Sir, following you as fast as I can, and I am now going to answer every argument that you have advanced. Oh, Sir I tell you your battle is against Christ. You have not justice or truth upon your side. He talked about St. Paul's epistle to Timothy with regard to widows. Now, I tell you he mistakes the meaning of what he quoted, as every one may perceive from the context. I will give you the entire of it—"But if any widow have any children or nephews, let them learn first to show piety at home, and to requite their parents; for that is good and acceptable before God." But now, mark the kind of widows that were to be relieved—"Now, she that is a widow indeed and desolate trusteth in God, and continueth in supplication and prayers night and day." But, mark, my friends, she was not bound to do so. There is yet another thing connected with this which I must observe. The reverend gentleman asks me are vows allowed. I say that any who chooses may take a vow, but I deny that he should be bound neck and heels to oblige him to observe it. I object to your anathematizing and driving out from among you those who choose to break a vow which they had voluntarily taken. I say a man that breaks his solemn vow you should not interfere with him but leave it between himself and his God. St. Paul goes on—"But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." To be sure she is, but that proves nothing in his favour. "And these things give in charge that they may be blameless. But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. Let not the widow be taken into the number under three score years old, having been the wife of one man." That is of one man at a time, for you are all aware that under the old law polygamy and bigamy were allowed. But here she should be the wife of only one at a time, that is, she should be a respectable woman—"Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints's feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have followed every good work." Now, remember, my brethren, that you are not to interpret this last part according to the cavils of Rome, but according to principle. "Washing the saints' feet," is not to be taken literally. You are not required absolutely to do so, though they do it in Rome. Now, instead of washing people's feet, let me ask, would it not be better if they would build houses and furnish them with towels and soap, where they could wash themselves. I tell you that it is possible, nay, probable, that by the ostentatious display of the Grand Lama (which is

the name that should be given to the Roman Pontiff,) he may ask to make lighter the bonds and chains with which he blinds his followers. I differ with them on that point, and I differ with my reverend friend on the general meaning of the passage. The epistle goes on—"But the younger widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry." It is more than probable that it was found that the young women did not observe the rules, and, therefore, it was best to get old. For there were alms-houses, and if a person were able to support herself either by marrying or otherwise, it would not of course be right to get for her charitable support. "And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house, and not only idlers but tattlers also, and busy bodies speaking things which they ought not." And what does he then say—"I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, and give no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." Now, there is the whole context; and does it not make the meaning plain and obvious. Now, he tells me that what is said relative to forbidding to marry, was addressed to the Pricilianists, Manichæans, Montanists, and other heretics he named, for I did not mind them. You might as well say that the prohibition to worship graven images was addressed to the Jews, and not to you. I don't care about whom St. Paul spoke; what he said suits you, and that is all I care. Therefore your argument as to the original purpose of the text falls to the ground. Now, I think I have done as much as I could do. I do say, my friend, candidly and in honor, that I am endeavoring to answer every word you said, and I beg of you to keep in mind what I have said about the beast. I tell you again that your beast will be a living witness when all else is silent.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I am happy for my friend's sake that his half hour is out. I never saw a man more puzzled to waste one than he was. It was clearly evident to you that he wasted as much time as he could in preaching, in order that he might come near the close before he would touch on any of the points which were the subjects of my observations. I now, in the first place, would say that I am perfectly satisfied that he should continue his preaching as long as he chooses. It answers me very well. I will now begin with his last observation, because it is the freshest on your memory. He says that we forbid to marry. Now, I would remind you, Sir, of an observation that I made the other day, and which applies equally now as when I made it. It is that when any topic has been discussed and disposed of, and when all parties are satisfied with its finale you return to it again with a new fund of information, and with all the courage of a representative of Trinity College. Did I not quote to you St. Dionysius, St. Irenæus, and St. Augustine, to show you that the observations of St. Paul were directed against the Manichæans, the Montanists, and others, who held that marriage was an invention of the devil. They taught that there were two principles, the good and the evil one, and that marriage was the invention of the latter. After those fathers I quoted several Protestant writers of note who were of the same opinion. But, even if I did not, let me ask how can the text refer to us. Do we forbid

to marry? We do not. On the contrary, we esteem matrimony so highly that it is one of the seven sacraments. You cut off five of those sacraments, and gutted another—I mean the blessed Eucharist. So that, in point of fact, you have but one sacrament. We have still, and ever will have, the seven, and matrimony is one of them. Is not that a very curious way of forbidding marriage? You talked of my losing my popularity. I did gain some popularity by a former discussion. You never did. Therefore I had something to lose—you had nothing. God knows I bear you no malice, nor do I think you bear any against me; but I must say that it was bad for you to say that we forbid marriage, when all the Catholics here present know the instructions that we give to the wife to love and be dutiful to her husband; and to the husband to be affectionate to his wife. St. Paul says that this is a “great sacrament.” It is true, you translate that “mystery.” I would tell you, Sir, that every sacrament is a mystery, though every mystery is not a sacrament. The Trinity is a mystery, but it is not a sacrament. Now all we say with regard to marriage is, that it is perfectly lawful and laudable, except when a person makes a solemn vow to God not to marry. We say that the church requires clergymen—she does not force any person, to become so; on the contrary, she is obliged to reject a great many. But if any one come to her to look for holy orders, she tells them that they must marry the church, the body of Christ, and that they cannot have two wives. St. Paul says, “he that has a wife is solicitous that he may please her.” But if he has none, of course he can’t be so. Now let me ask you why do you make the Fellows of Trinity College remain single? Are they allowed to marry, and if not, why and by whom are they prevented? Why keep them from marrying who never made a vow against it, and require us to marry who always make a solemn one. You have read of the sect of Harmonists established by Dr. Pau, in America, and you know what happened them. Now, Sir, with regard to the passage from St. Paul, you entirely mistake me. I was certainly talking of widows, but not of such as marry. I quoted St. Augustine’s work, “De Virginitate,” which agreed with me, but you gave me no answer. Oh, but you, Sir, are inspired—you possess the Holy Ghost, and poor St. Augustine must hide his diminished head when the minister of Swift’s-alley pronounces his opinion. Did you mind, gentlemen, when reading the texts from St. Paul how he stumbled upon the washing of the saints’ feet. Oh, he did not like that at all. If he knew he would have met it, he would not have read so far. It was not pleasing to him, and when he came to it, he could not pass it over without saying something about it, though he gave you no explanation. Yet the thing is very easily appeased. St. Paul says, “Have we not power to carry about with us a woman as well as Cephas?” You say that the translation is a “wife.” I say it is not, but it refers to the holy women called deaconesses, who used to receive a certain kind of orders, and go about with the apostles in order to instruct the women who were converted when the apostles, who could not be with them night and day, had brought them to the true religion, and to explain to them what the

apostles could not explain in public, and teach them that they were not to act as they had done in Paganism and heathenism, and that they should be far different from the women who were not illumined by the light of Christianity. When this instruction was over, these deaconesses used to wash the clothes and beathe the feet of the apostles, and these women were not discountenanced till some scandals had occurred. But it was not palpable to my reverend friend to explain all this, because the washing of the feet was a corporal work of mercy, and a mark of holiness that he does not much relish. It is contrary to the spirit that is in him, and I never saw a man taken so much aback as he was when he stumbled on the passage. My reverend friend talks of alms-houses in the days of St. Paul; but I tell him that the text does not refer to any such institution for there were none such then. There were no parishes and district houses in these days, for the Christians were too poor; but I will tell you to what the passage refers. When the apostles were done preaching they used to make a collection for the poor Pagans and Jews who had given up all their means, and whose relations abandoned them on account of their joining the new religion. My brethren you will see how I dispose of the next point—he says, we anathematize and drive out from us those who break a solemn voluntary vow to God, and he blames us for that. Surely if they have made a vow in the sight of God, and if they break that vow, you would not have us tolerate them! Oh, but I understand you: Your church that has its days for fasting; its Fridays and its Saturdays; and its feasts and its holidays, in honor of saints and angels, but whose precepts are laughed at in practice, would not like to say that solemn vows and undertakings must be observed. I know, Sir, well what you mean. You would not criminate your church. You would excuse her. It reminds me of the motto of King William the Third, which was—“*Non rapui sed recepi.*” “Oh, but,” says Dean Swift, “the receiver is as bad as the thief,” (laughter.) “We,” you say, “have got our fasting from you, we have got our sacraments from you, we have got our prayers from you, we have got our scriptures from you,” and you’ve got all these from antichrist—Bravissimo. A pretty church yours, with your prayers, your sacraments, your churches, your ceremonies, your very scriptures from antichrist. Oh, but you recollect the great picture he showed you. It was broad at the top, and it became gradually narrower till it ended in something like a serpent’s tail. That is as good as argument, I suppose. You admit you have four councils from us—you admit that from us you have your baptism, your ordination, your prayers, and your scriptures: and from whom? Antichrist. Now, that’s a sensible man for

you. It just proves what I have often said that Protestantism is without principle. My reverend friend cares not for St. Augustine. He is all-satisfied with his inspiration and with his belief, that faith is the only thing that saves. I grant you that every thing must be done in faith. But it does not follow that faith alone is sufficient. However, if such be your conscientious belief, you must follow the dictates of your conscience. Even a false conscience must be followed, but you are bound to do all you can to correct it—and when corrected you must follow it still. But how is it to be corrected? By reason and obedience to the will of God. Suppose you came a voyage in a steam vessel, or a journey upon land, and arrived at the end of either on a Sunday, but are firmly convinced that it is Saturday—if you do not fulfil those duties which you are obliged to do on that day—if you do not keep it holy, I maintain that you commit no sin, because you thought it was Saturday. But if you discover your mistake in time, and do not comply with the ordination of God and the church, you commit a sin; for you are bound to follow your conscience be it right or wrong, and a man cannot commit a sin who has not deliberation and will, both of which would be absent in the instance which I have mentioned. Now you talked in a wonderful manner of the passage of St. Paul, and you spoke in Latin. Now I suppose I will have to speak in Latin too. But no. The words are that some men should do so and so. Now I proved to you from St. Augustine that the expression “eunuch” was not to be taken literally, but in a spiritual sense, and thus it is possible to all men. By what you say, you would make chastity impossible to all. Now, you spoke a great deal about Luther—you said he was a holy and a noble-minded man, and that it was immaterial whether he was tempted by the devil if he did not yield—You know that Cæsar Otway, a clever and a learned man, has translated Luther, and in his translation you will read a description of Luther’s interview with the devil. You will see that he trembled, and the very hairs of his head stood on end with terror when he saw him, and the devil said to him, “Mighty Luther, why dost thou fear me?” and then their arguments about the mass began, and Luther stood out stoutly for it for along time. You asked me did he yield to the devil? I say he did, and he admits himself that he was overcome by him after five conferences, and that he gave in. I will bring you the book if you choose. I will ask you to translate it, and if you do not admit that they were real conferences (that is if you believe the words of Luther) and that he was overcome by, and yielded to the devil, I will give up the discussion. His own disciple, Justus Jonas, has translated it into Latin, and I have the book here if you wish to see it. If you desire



I shall be most happy to accomodate you with it. And again, to come to the apostacy. You have cited the Revelations to prove it. Luther says "crepitus ventus longius fugit diabolium quam sacra scripturi!" There's Luther for you. Now I ask you, did I not call upon you to show that the two witnesses mentioned in the Apocalypse were not Enoch and Elias? Did I not prove that they were, and that they were to come again upon earth in the time of antichrist, and to convert by their preaching 144,000 Jews? Are they not to be put to death by antichrist in the very city where our blessed Lord was murdered? Are they not to be exposed in the streets three days and three nights in the sight of man, and then to come to life again and ascend visibly into heaven? And did not our Saviour say, "When another shall come in my name you will receive him." Has any other come? None. Thus is one link in the chain of your demonstration wanted. Is not antichrist to bring down fire from heaven? and is he not to be empowered to work most surprising miracles? Is not, therefore, his reign to be shortened lest the faithful should be deceived? And, I ask, must not "the time and times and half a time" during which he is to reign, signify three years and a half, and not as you would have it) 1265 years. Talk no more then of the Apocalypse. It will not and cannot be understood till the things that are foretold in it have come to pass. I have proved to you from the prophet Daniel that "the time and times and half a time" are but three years and a half. You did not, for you could not, contravene my proof. You talk of us as being priest-ridden. Well, I am glad you are using the word priest. At first it seemed to frighten you, and you called us nothing but officers. I am glad you are coming back to the old and proper names. To the confusion of Potestantism be it said, the words priest, or bishop, or deacon, or church, or altar, during the early days of the Reformation, were not to be found in your entire scriptures. Why so? Because you were then Puritanical. You were no church—you were afraid of old associations. The "church" was then "congregation," "priest" was "elder," "deacon," was "officer," "altar" was "table," and "bishop," was "overseer." Every bishop is an overseer; but every overseer is not a bishop. You rendered the text, "he that will not hear the church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican," "he that will not hear the congregation!" It would not have been over and above convenient to have it asked "what church?" for it happened there was but one. But when you did come to be a church—when the Anabaptists and Baptists, and Presbyterians, and Puritans seperated from you, and when the Quakers went into the narrow way, then you came back to the old titles of church, altar, priest, bishop, and deacon, because you had the power of the state at your back. There's

the honesty of Protestantism for you. I tell you candidly the only argument, and it is an argument, that you have advanced, is this:—You say, Sir, you quote Dionysius to prove that the Apocalypse is doubtful. But “somebody” (a Unitarian, I suppose,) “denies the first chapter of St. Luke, therefore I must throw it overboard.” Now, Sir, to expose the sophism, you know that when I said that if any of the scriptures were at any time denied, I meant that the church should know of it. Now, I quoted St. Dionysius, St. Irenæus, and Eusebius, who though not so pious, was more learned than the others, and the most celebrated historians of the times in which he lived. All three tell us that the canonicity of the Apocalypse, and all other books which I mentioned, was denied at the time, and not merely that, but they were refused to be read in the churches until their canonicity was acknowledged by a council. Now you surely would not compare these men with your obscure member of a small conventicle, who, besides, is anathematised and not acknowledged by the church. Here, then, we have in the one case the whole church cognizant of the refusal to admit the canonicity of the books I named: on the other, an obscure individual not belonging to the church, doubting the canonicity of that part of one of the gospels. Therefore there is no analogy, and consequently your argument falls to the ground. The church was unable to collect the evidence of the canonicity of those books. The members of it were scattered about, and hunted like wild beasts and mad dogs, but as soon as the persecutions were over, as soon as breathing time was given; as soon as Constantine became emperor, a council was called, and the question was settled. Now what a difference is there between this and Mr. Belcher’s questioning a part of the testament that was never before doubted? Besides, Sir, I did not quote Dionysius to prove that the Apocalypse was not divine, but to prove that you should give up either it or the 6th of the thirty-nine articles. I don’t want you to reject the book, but the article which was never heard of until after the days of Luther. Oh, but then you say that I would seem to think, that their being of that number is every thing, and you answer, “I admit that we never had them in the same shape or number before, but then we had them in substance.” Now I don’t mean any such thing.

*(To be continued.)*

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

FIFTH DAY—SATURDAY.—(CONTINUED.)

---

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Gentlemen, The Rev. Mr. Maguire does well to tax us with our sects and divisions. It furnishes me with a good argument against him, and you will see how differently he will speak just now. For let me tell him, this lies at the very marrow of the question. On Saturday, he brought the most gross charges against the morality of the Englishwomen—

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I object to Mr. Gregg's saying one single word on the subject which was discussed on Saturday, (loud cries of "chair, chair," and great confusion).

Rev. Mr. McNAMARA—I beg of you to be quiet. The Rev. Mr. Gregg will be allowed all the time that is thus occupied, (hear). The Rev. Mr. Maguire has a perfect right to object to anything he thinks proper.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I put it to the meeting, have I not a right to take up any point that was mooted this day, (cheers and groans, mingled with cries of "yes, yes.")

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I merely say quietly, we are here as rational men, let us decide this rationally, (cheers, and cries of "chair, chair.")

Rev. Mr. McNamara—I admit that Mr. Maguire did mention the subject, but he drew no argument from it. Now, I will allow Mr. Gregg to mention it, so that he also will found no argument upon it, relative to the last day's discussion.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I really think our conduct on the last day was very disgraceful. I am heartily ashamed of it.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I assert, before the world, that Mr. Maguire's accusations of the Englishwomen were most false and calumnious, (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. Maguire—And I hereby assert that if that be the case the parsons are forsworn perjurers (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. McNamara—I won't allow any observations, Mr. Gregg, on Saturday's discussion.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I have drawn up an apology, which I require Mr. Maguire to sign. It was to the effect—"I hereby retract all the allegations I made on Saturday as to the morality of the Englishwomen, confessing that they are false and calumnious." Will you sign that, Sir?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Will you sign a paper, retracting your impertinent, insolent, filthy observations with regard to priests in the confessional ?

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I will—no, I won't; I have proved every word of what I said.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—And I have proved all I said on the testimony of sworn parsons.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—Will you sign this ? Am I not to stigmatise and refute the false and infamous charges you made ?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Did you not stigmatise my religion ? Do I want to reply to you now ?

Rev. Mr. Nangle—I propose that there shall be another day appointed for the continuation of Saturday's discussion, (cheers.)

Rev. Mr. M'Namara—I do not think that it is in the reverend gentleman's power, or in mine, to interfere with the regulations that have been laid down. We received the law and have only to administer it ; and for myself I protest against the renewal of the infamous, unchristian, and disgraceful discussion of Saturday, (cheers and hisses.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—What made it unchristian and infamous ?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Gentlemen, you will recollect that I apologised for being obliged to mention the Englishwomen as I did. I had authority for every word I said, and I am bound to give that authority if I be called on—a duty which I will fulfil with pleasure, (hear, hear.)

Rev. Mr. Nangle—All I say is that my proposition was made in the spirit of fair play, (cheers.) Let the onus of the odium lie on those that rejected it, (groans and cheering.)

Rev. Mr. M'Namara—For my part I will feel honoured with the odium of having prevented so infamous and disgusting a discussion as that of Saturday from being continued, (great cheering, mingled with hisses.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—And I feel honoured with the odium of exposing Dens, (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I would like a month's discussion of the subject, if it were worthy of Christianity.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—It is unworthy of Christianity, therefore we should have it, (great confusion, with cries of "read the terms.")

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Were you not talking of Irish immorality.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—No, of Popish immorality ; I don't know what decision the chairmen have come to, The Rev. Mr. Maguire says he apologises for the charges he made.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I said no such thing ; I said I apologised for being forced to make them ; but I have no doubt of the truth of the facts I mentioned, (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—Let me expose their falsehood.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—If my chairman consent I will give you a day (cheers) if you provide not to use any indecent words.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I won't use a word that is not in Dens' (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. Maguire—No ; I won't use one word that is not sworn to by parsons, (cheers and groans.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I agree ; let to-morrow be the day.

Rev. Mr. McNamara—I won't agree to any day being appointed.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I won't betray my cause for any man.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—This is a regular bear-garden. Go on with your half hour.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I claim to proceed with the topic. It is fair and proper if Mr. Maguire agree.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Oh, but I won't agree, (cheers and hisses.)

Rev. Mr. Gregg—See who runs from his colors now, (groans and cheers.)

Mr. Maguire—Why did you not go on with it the first half hour ?

Mr. Gregg—Because I did not like.

Mr. Maguire—Then I don't like to accommodate you now.

Mr. Gregg—I claim the right. Here is a gentleman who argues in favour of celibacy, which I say is the fount of abomination and vice ; I claim liberty to prove it ; I claim a day to be appointed. The whole room is in my favour, [cheers, and very loud cries of no, no]. Roman Catholics, tremble for your principles, [hisses, groans, and cheers].

Mr. Maguire—This is made a party question. A very pretty mode of carrying on a Christian inquiry.

Mr. Gregg—Gentlemen, I tell you I will make my assertion ring, if not in this room, to the four corners of England ; I will go over there, and I will keep my word. I will make my assertions tell on the public mind, so as fully to expose those abominable, false, and lying assertions. I say, that after having taunted us with the origin of such numerous sects, he must prove that the people are guilty of the crime against modesty and morality, which he detailed were belonging to the church of England ; for I say sectarianism is the book written by Robert Ware, the son of the celebrated Irish historian, and published in 1683. It is entitled, "A treatise to show how Rome is instrumental in creating sectarianism in the church of England." He read from page 93 a narrative of a priest named Summers, who was beheaded in 1583, in Gloucester, because having pretended to be at one time a Protestant, and at another a Presbyterian, he was discovered to be a priest. Now, then, my reverend friend taunted us with division. Here is a proof that this division is caused by Rome ; and I assert that Protestantism would be pure but for the tares of Rome. But to come to the point—I defy him to prove by any means in his power that any of the demoralization of which he mentioned is in the church of England. If there be any, it comes from the Popish mother—the old whore—the mother of all abominations. Now, my friends, it is for you to say how far forth you consider his explanation of the chapter of Timothy the true one. I assert that mine is true, and that his is a gloss from old Rome. I told him he did not answer a single one of my arguments as to the question of apostacy. He asked me did he not prove that Enoch and Elias were the two witnesses men-

tioned in the Apocalypse, and said that I had not replied to him. Now, I said, and I say still that our church stands in the place of them, and that the words, which are not to be taken literally are theologically true, though our number exceeds two. He says I did not answer him with regard to where our Saviour was killed, or to the text, "When another shall come in my name, him will you receive." Let the report say whether I did or not. Then as to the three years and a half, he says he wishes I would show him from scripture that he is wrong and I am right. Now, I say that, according to the ordinary language of the holy scriptures, we must interpret the expression "A time, and times, and half a time" as signifying 1260 years; for, in prophetic numbers, days are always taken for years. It is according to the analogy of scriptures, for throughout them we find the prophets using days for years. In the prophecy of the 70 weeks of Daniel every day was a year—that is, the period altogether was 490 years, and therefore at the end of that time the prophecy was accomplished. Again, in Ezekiel, the 4th chapter and 6th verse, you find "And thou shall bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days. I have appointed thee each day for a year." Now, what do you say to that? That is specific. Take all that down and I hope you'll feel the force of it. In Leviticus you will find the expression of "seven sabbaths of years." Now is not that days for years? Now, then, he tells you that because the Fellows of Trinity College belong to the corporation of bachelors, the church of Rome is right in forbidding her priests to marry. Why her fellows are not bound by a vow, nor is it a mortal sin for them to marry. Their hands are not bound by the provost as are the hands of the priest by the bishops—so far as their not marrying, the analogy is good, but no further; and the conclusion sought to be drawn does not stand. Then he says the church does not forbid to marry, but if a young man come to be a priest, he is told that he cannot marry if once he is in holy orders, but he need not enter them if he does not like. Now, let me ask, when they do become priests, are they not bound to the observance of a rash, unchristian and diabolical vow? I am convinced that there are some of the priesthood in this room who will agree with me in this, and I tell them that if there were no other reason for their leaving their apostacy and coming out of Babylon, it is the unchristian custom of forbidding them to marry. Now don't you admit they are forbidden?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—They forbid themselves.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—Don't you admit they are forbidden when ordained?

Rev. Mr. Maguire—Yes, when they take a solemn vow before God.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—No, to antichrist (hisses). Now doesn't that follow the visibility and invisibility. They are forbidden and they are not. I say it is a damnable custom. I say it is unchristian to force young men to observe a vow which they take at a time when they know not whether they are capable of keeping it or not, [hear hear, from ex-priest Nolan]. Now, mark well, he has not said

pled with a single one of my arguments, whereas I have grappled with his, and detected him in blunder after blunder, all of which he committed because he belongs to a church, the essence of which is error. You said, Sir, we could not absolve a cat. No, we cannot absolve a cat; nor have we the power of reading the gospel to cure sick beasts. But this much I tell you, when we say "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved," we impart strength, and peace, and comfort to the soul. Our absolution is first declaratory. When we have investigated into the state of the penitent, and seen that he is a true believer, we give him the pardon of his sins, and tell him he may go in peace. Secondly, it may be instrumental in raising the soul to Christ, and producing the holiness. When talking of confession the Rev. Mr. Maguire made a flagrant and horrid misquotation of the holy word. He said that the text was, "Whosoever sins shall be loosed on earth are loosed in heaven," &c. Now, I tell you there is no such thing in the bible. There's your Ballinamore texturian for you.

Rev. Mr. Maguire—I leave it to the notes.

Rev. Mr. Gregg—I have notes of my own; it is "whosoever sins you shall loose." Next we have calumnies against the church on account of Henry the Eighth; it is a great proof of the interference of God in pulling down the church of Rome, by inspiring with a sense of the casuistical nice distinctions of the church. Next, with regard to the city of the seven hills; he talks of Dublin being built on seven hills, and London, and Constantinople, and Ballinamore, for aught I know——.

It being two o'clock, the meeting adjourned till Tuesday.

---

#### SEVENTH DAY—TUESDAY.

---

The disputants were at their posts at the usual hour—the room was densely crowded, and the proceedings seemed to excite, if not great interest, at least, great curiosity.

At eleven o'clock Mr. Gregg rose, and said—I beg leave to ask you, Mr. Maguire, will you consent to prolong the discussion of this day to three o'clock?

MR. MAGUIRE—I am not inclined to depart from the rule laid down, and if I were, my health would not permit.

MR. GREGG then proceeded—My friends, you will give me credit when I say that I feel sincere regret that the state of my opponent's health is such, as not to permit him to continue the discussion till three o'clock, and I am sure that every man in this assembly, Protestant and Catholic, feels with me. I regret, on the Rev. gentleman's own account, and I regret it for another reason, namely, that I had laid down four subjects

for myself to discuss this day, which it will be impossible to enter fully into in three speeches. I must, however, content myself with taking up but two or three of them. I will commence with the apostacy of the church of Rome, and I glory in that religion which denies her power. I will refer the reverend gentleman to the 2d of Timothy, 4th chap., to show that his doctrines about abstaining from meat, and forbidding to marry, is without foundation in the Scriptures, and that it applies to those, who, in the last times shall depart from the faith, and have all the marks of apostacy about them. The apostle says, "Now the spirit manifestly saith that in the last times some shall depart from the faith giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils—speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared (here the reverend gentleman paused, and looked earnestly into Mr. Maguire's face,) forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats which God had created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them who had known the truth; for every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." You do not do that, Mr. Maguire. You order fasts; you forbid to marry; and you have apostatised from the truth which the Lord has commanded. In the original, the apostacy is clearly pointed out, *APOSTESONTAI* is the term used in the original Greek, where marriage and the use of meats are forbidden. Mr. Maguire said that those things were not only recommended by the Lord, but commanded. Now the word commanded is not to be found in the original, which evidently refers to the Montanists, and others of that time. And such an omission of the word is frequent throughout the scriptures; and I will here turn to Chron. xxix. 20 verse, where it says—"And he worshipped the Lord and the king; wherever it ought to have been he worshipped the Lord and revered the king." I remember a passage in Lucian, although I cannot exactly repeat the original Greek, where it said—"I have neglected the affairs of the dead, doing injury to the kingdom of Pluto." Using but the one verb to express two ideas, so it was in the texts which Mr. Maguire quoted with regard to abstaining from marriage and the use of meats. I say that this forbidden to marry, which is called in the Greek, *APOSTESONTAI*, is directly applicable to the Catholics of the present day, who cause young people to make vows, who are incapable of judging the propriety of what they are about; and then curse and anathematize them if they afterwards break them. I do not mean to object to rational vows, made by people capable of judging; but those may be called resolutions. And indeed every resolution may be termed a vow. When I resolved to meet Mr. Ma-



guire in this discussion it may be said that I vowed to do so; but where is the man that dared to say to me, 'you must meet him, or you must not do so.' Those vows are anti-Christian, and they are productive, as I will show, of the very worst results. I shall read for you now what is said about bishops and priests marrying, in the Bible, and I will beg to tell Mr. Maguire that I shall meet him with the scriptures. Here is the 3d chapter of the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy; I shall read it for you.—“If a man desire the office of a bishop he desireth a good work. It behoveth, therefore, a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, prudent, of good behaviour, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher.” There, my friends, you see the bishop was to have a wife. But some of the commentators of Mr. Maguire’s church say that that wife is to be the church. But hear what is further said with regard to the duties of a bishop; “Not given to wine, no striker, but modest, not quarrelsome, not covetous, but one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all chastity.” My friends, you see that he was not only to be married, but also to have children, though I by no means say that every married man must have children. The command to have one wife related to the bigamy which was prevalent in those days. Mr. Maguire says that those children mentioned in the scripture are the lambs and sheep of the bishop—that they are his flock—his spiritual children. I wonder how Mr. Maguire could so misrepresent a portion of scripture so plain to every understanding, for the text goes on to give the bishop directions how he shall rule his house and his family, and adds, “if a man know not how to rule his own house how shall he rule the church of God.” What do you say to that, Mr. Maguire? (loud cheers from a portion of the audience). Suppose he would say that it was only the bishops who were to marry and have one wife, I shall show him the directions given to priests and deacons with regard to marriage, for I am not afraid of using the word priest, though I don’t use it in the same sense as Mr. Maguire, for priest is from *prester*, which is a contraction of *presbyter*, and means an elder. I come now to the priests and deacons:—“Deacons in like manner chaste, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of faith in a pure conscience, and let these also first be proved, and so let them minister, having no crime. The women, in like manner, chaste—not slanderers, but sober and faithful in all things;” and here let Mr. Maguire mark the next passage—“Let deacons be the husband of one wife, who rule well their children, and their own houses: for they that have ministered well will purchase to themselves a good degree and much confidence of the faith that is in Jesus.” I don’t won-

der at the priests being confounded at this text ; and I am astonished at Mr. Maguire that he could take such sense out of any portion of the scriptures as that the marriage of the clergy was not allowed in the times of the apostles, and the earliest days of the church. He makes this assertion, and then he comes on with what he calls proofs against his apostacy, whilst the scriptures directly contradicts him. I shall give him further proofs that the marriage of the clergy in the days of the apostles was not only approved of but commanded. (Here the reverend gentleman read a portion of Paul's epistle to Titus.) I put these two questions to him, and let him answer them distinctly. Do you deny that the clergy in the early days of the church and in the times of the apostles were married, and that your celibacy leads to the greatest crimes and immorality ? He talks to me of the crimes and vices of the Protestant people of England and the Protestant clergy ; but I think every rational man will admit that the Protestant clergyman, with his wife and family about him, is less liable to fall into vices or crimes of any description, than the priest, with his niece at home before him—aye, his niece. You have all heard of the priests nieces (cries of disapprobation.) Those are plain, manifest observations. As I have mentioned, he has spoken of the immorality of the people of Protestant England, but I will show him where real vice and immorality are to be found ; and I won't go hunt about the scum of society, and among the poor and the wretched, to look for those vices. I have here a history of the state of religion in England in the time of Henry VIII., which has been translated from a work in the Bodician library, and which presents the most horrible and appalling pictures of the vices, the crimes, and abominations of Popery. Here the reverend gentleman read the report of a commission instituted by Henry VIII., to inquire into the state of religion in the monasteries and convents throughout England. He therefore read a list of crimes and criminals so disgusting that he was repeatedly interrupted with cries of "shame, shame." He then continued—Will the Rev. Mr Maguire, who has talked of the immorality of England, venture to guess how many bastards were to be found in it in them days ? He says that confession is necessary—that they must go into the corners of the house to search out the crimes and the sins of offenders. I have gone into the corners of the house, and of many of his religious houses, and what a picture of vice and villany have I presented to your view. I will read a little more for you, and give you some of the results of Popery and of confession. Here is a pleasant story for you—there was a certain lady who wished to have the services—the spiritual services of a

fine jolly friar who was in the neighbourhood—she pretended to be sick, and the friar was sent for; when he came in he told the people in the room that he must first begin by hearing her confession, and they were all ordered out. The husband came home rather sooner than he was expected, and before the lady was done with her confessor, and having gone into the room in a hurry, the friar was found completely *sans culotte*, and when asked what he was about—why he was in that condition—he replied that his inexpressibles were a relic of St. Bernard, and that he was going to leave them with the lady lest she might get a relapse. The lady said she felt quite recovered and that she wished them to be left; but even that was not the finish of the business; he came back with lighted candles and ringing of bells, to carry away the holy garment in procession; and caused the people to kiss it on its march, and among the rest the noodle of a husband; and, by-the-bye, the husband was a physician, and he was the first to set the example. Now is not that a good story; but it is nothing to others that I could read for you. In point of fact that's one of the decenterest in the collection, (laughter.) Why I could read for you from the attested confessions of monks, nuns, abbots, priests, and friars of that period, a list of abominations and crimes which would shock the hardest heart. It is nothing but the truth of Christ Jesus, and a wish to expose the abominable impostures of the church of Rome that could induce me to bring them before you. Go to foreign countries, and see what has been the result of the confessional, and of Popish practice. See what was the state of religious houses in England in the time of King Henry the Eighth. What I have read for you is but a small portion of the crimes and abominations which then existed. As I have told you, nothing but a love of Christ, and the truth, could have induced me to bring them before you, and I call upon you to ponder upon the consequences of forbidding marriages. He talked of England and its immorality, but look upon Protestant England, which is so distinguished above all other nations for the delicacy of the intercourse between the sexes. Mr. Maguire abuses England, and he goes to the scum of the country, the very outcasts of society, to prove that crime and immorality exist. I don't do that. I go into his religious houses and I search them out. I take the very cream—the apple of the subject. I go to that quarter where, if perfection exist at all, it ought to be found. I think now I have, my friends, satisfactorily settled the question about forbidding to marry, and shown you the horrible consequences that result from it. I will go to the very beginning of the subject. I will go to first principles, for I am fond of principles, although Mr. Maguire says he cannot bind me to my principles. I will show you the plain meaning of the Scriptures upon this subject. The word employed in the original Scriptures for meats, is the word *Bromata*, which means any kind of food. I refer you to Matthew, chapter 14th, verse 15th, where the passage runs thus in the Greek, “*agorasosin heautobis bromata*,” where the word *bromata* evidently means victuals. In like manner the Greek word *artos*, literally bread, is used indiscriminately for food or any kind of victuals. See Matthew, 6th chap.

and 11th verse, "Give us this day our daily bread." The word here translated bread is in the original Greek *artos*, and manifestly means bread or meat, or any matter of human substance. Again, in the 2d Samuel, chapter 9, verse 10, by the bread is meant the whole produce of the earth. Again, in Matthew, 10th chap. and 10th verse—"The workman is worthy of his meat;" the words of the Greek are, "*axios gar ho ergates tes trophes autou eslin*"—*trophe*, translated meat, signifying food in general, although you, Mr. Maguire, in your translation, call it hire. From all this it is evident that provisions of all kinds are meant. I shall now proceed to show the application of the prophecy in the Apocalypse, and other portions of scripture, with regard to the practices of the Romish church, I refer to rules drawn up for the guidance of monks and nuns, which are acted upon in monasteries and convents. It is expressly laid down that they shall abstain from all species of flesh—*e carnibus quadrupedum omnium*. No monk hath leave to eat any flesh meat, and others who are not monks, are forbidden to eat it except upon certain feast days. I will come next to the *votum paupertatis* of the monks and nuns.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE then came forward—Well, my friends, I may truly say that I require great patience to listen to the calumnies, the foul language, and the filthy stories of this man. Did I not agree with him out of the holy scriptures, and call upon him distinctly to meet those arguments by scripture or by facts? But instead of that he runs to his party, and he heaps abuse and calumny upon the Catholic religion from the works of hired liars, who have been a thousand times convicted of the grossest lies. I appeal to the scriptures of the living God, and I call the apostles and early saints of the church as my witnesses; but he appeals to Henry the Eighth, and to the pack of hired liars and robbers who were employed by that monster, who assisted him in robbing, plundering, and devastating the religious houses of England, and devoting their spoil not to the service of God but to the most beastly and abominable purposes. I ask you, my friends, as rational men come here to listen to this great discussion, involving the fundamental truths of Christianity, if this be a way to meet my arguments? Let it go forth and be recorded that I appeal to the scriptures, and that he appeals to liars, murderers, and robbers. You heard the foul and filthy language he made use of. I shall not follow his example; the presence of ladies in itself prevents my mentioning facts connected with the founders of his religion and with Protestantism which would shock morality and decency. But those things, after all, have little to do with the great question at issue, and an indecent expression shall not pass my lips—(cheers). I may again remark that the work out of which he quoted is the report of a commission of robbers, got up by Henry the Eighth when he set his heart upon plundering the churches, and reducing England from a state of ease, happiness, and comfort, which she has never known since that day. I will produce Protestant authority in abundance to show that the more barefaced calumnies were uttered against the

Catholic religious houses, that they might be plundered with the more ease and security. I could also give you Protestant authority that in no country in the world was there ever so much crime and immorality as in England after the destruction of the religious houses. I refer you to Heyland's history of the times of Edward the Sixth. I will give you Protestant authority, too, with regard to the character of the first reformers. Hear what Henry the Eighth, one of the patrons of the Reformation, says in parliament. "What love or charity is there among them—they are grasping, griping, immoral, lascivious—one teaching against another—they rail at the bishops, speak slanderously of the priesthood;" precisely what you do, Mr. Gregg. "That most precious jewel, the word of God, is sung and rhymed and jangled about in every tavern by people who do not understand it." Much after the fashion of the present day—"riots, folly, and soforth." I give you Protestant authority, Mr. Gregg. If I quoted Catholic historians, you would not, perhaps, believe me. I give you as an authority for all this the first visible head of your holy church. But now, is it not too bad that I must go over the same ground again for him? He has again attacked vows and the celibacy of the clergy; but I ask him did I not quote almost all the holy fathers of the church, including Eusebius, Tertullian, Iræneus, to prove that the same meaning with regard to marriage and vows was deduced from the scriptures, and that they were held in the same sense in which I quoted them in this discussion? Have I ever attempted to prove that marriage was unlawful. Has not our church elevated it into the dignity of a sacrament, which we believe to have been instituted by Jesus Christ himself? Have not all the holy fathers held it in the same sense that we do? We forbid no man to marry, but we hold that he who forbids himself, and dedicates himself to God, shall be rewarded, as the scriptures say, much in this world, but much more in the world to come. We hold that it is lawful and good in the sight of God to abstain from marriage for the kingdom of Heaven's sake, and that it would be damnable in those who have vowed to do so to break that vow. As I have said, is it not lamentable that I must be going over the same ground again with Mr. Gregg? He will not have the scriptures. I quoted them for him before—here they are again. Mind the way in which I argue. Mark the difference between his mode of arguing and mine. St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, 7th chapter, 7th, 8th, and 9th verses, says—"For I would that all men were even as myself; but every man hath his proper gift of God—one after this manner; another after that. I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I;" and then again, in the 32d and 33d verses—"But I would have you without carefulness—he that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things of the world and how he may please his wife." This was the sense in which the fathers held this portion of scripture when the church, according to Mr. Gregg, was in all its golden purity, and is the same which I hold it is now. It is surprising to think how he should say that we hold it in any other

sense. We honor marriage, and we recommend it as an holy union between the sexes. The Saviour recommends it—and as I have said we have elevated it to the dignity of a sacrament. I have quoted the same texts before, and gone over the same arguments, and we are doing nothing more now than giving our reporters the trouble of taking down the same things over again. How many passages have I quoted before about vows? But I ask him does he mean to say that men may break their vows? I gave him 19 texts of scripture and the authority of all the holy fathers in support of my principles; and what does he do in return? He quotes passages in which I perfectly agree, but which do not bear upon the subject at all. Why, man, you are only duping and humbugging the entire meeting. Will you ever come to close quarters, and take up my arguments *seriatim*. Here, now, I will give you more scripture authority for fasting. When the Pharisees came to our Saviour, they said to him, “Why do the disciples of John the Baptist fast, and thy disciples fast not?” Our Saviour replied to them, “Shall the children of the bridegroom fast while the bridegroom is with them? But when the bridegroom is taken away from them, then shall they fast.” The bridegroom has been taken away, and we do fast just as the Lord foretold—by abstaining from such meats as the church points out. Mr. Gregg, I ask do you admit the fast of Lent; or were the fasts of Lent observed when the church was in all her purity? Give me a direct answer to that question—that is, if you can give a direct answer to anything. If you do not admit it, I will prove it—and here again is Eusebius, an authority upon that subject. He says that flesh was forbidden, and that Lent was observed with fasting and great prayer. Again, he accuses us of adoring images, and paying honor to senseless things, and prostrating ourselves before them. We adore only God alone. The honour or adoration which we pay to anything but God alone is such as is mentioned in the scripture as having been paid to the staff of his son Joseph. We honour our father and mother—it may be said we adore them, but not as God. But the original word in Greek—*proskuneo*—literally means paying honour to our evincing affection. When a man is married he says to his wife, “With my body I do thee worship”—but is it the worship which is paid to God? When Jacob came before his son Joseph, it is said that he adored the top of his rod. Joseph was a lively emblem of the new law, and when his father came before him he adored the sceptre, or rod, which he held in his hand. Now I ask you, Mr. Gregg, is your heart so callous, or are you so insensible to the truth, as to continue in your assertion, that we, Roman Catholics, are idolaters, or that we worship anything but the true and living God? You would prostrate yourself before your king if you went into his presence, when no one would say that you adored him as a god. You would even prostrate yourself before the Grand Turk, as is the custom of the country, but would not I be a false and insincere man, if I said you adored him as a god? And yet how much more callous and hard-hearted you must be, when we tell you that we adore none but the living and true God, and you yet persist in charging us with idola-

try. But this is the way in which you deal in calumnies, which are wholly without foundation. Now, Sir, I must come again to your assertion about the Pope being Antichrist, although I have gone over that ground repeatedly before, and if I were not a patient and enduring man, I would long since have entirely given you up as a person quite insensible to the force of argument—the truth of the scriptures, and right reasoning. I will now give you Protestant authorities, that you may see what they thought of the Pope. Here is the 557th epistle of Grotius. He says that it is idle, worse than folly, to call the Pope Antichrist—though some there be who persist in doing so. No doubt there be people who do so, Mr. Gregg—the idle and foolish. But hear what Voscius says—“We do not believe that the Pope is Antichrist—no such thing—no man of learning or sense would believe it; but we think it good for the Protestant religion, and to upset Popery, to make the people believe it.” And in writing to a clergyman of his church, whom he called “thick skull,” he says, “you must not leave off inculcating this doctrine, but keep it as a secret that is not to be divulged.” Dr. Hammond laughs at the Protestants who would say that the Pope was Antichrist. He says the church does not resolve it; but Protestants do not less firmly believe that the Pope was not Antichrist. Some said he was, but scripture and facts were against it. Mr. Gregg said that he was sure the Pope was Antichrist.

As well as we could hear, Mr. Gregg here said that he did not say that the Pope was Antichrist, but that the Romish church was.

Mr. MAGUIRE—Well, then, there is no use in my going further. I have proved that the Pope cannot be Antichrist. But if you persist in saying that the Roman Catholic church is Antichrist, I accuse you of wilful and judicial blindness. Well, again, all heard my arguments founded upon your charge of apostacy against my church. I have shown who were the apostates. Luther, who said that he was instigated by the devil to leave the church. Henry the Eighth, who was instructed by Anna Boylen and by Luther, were the first apostates. But let me come to scripture. He spoke of *the* man of sin. I said it was *that* man of sin; and so the text is in his own Protestant Bible; but he did not know it. I really never met a man who was less acquainted with the Bible, or who has more assurance in making assertions; for he said that day, when arguing on the text, falsely quoted from his own Bible, “there, my friends, is a clencher.” But I care not one pin whether it be *the* man or *that* man—it is all the same in the Greek. Again—our Saviour, speaking of Antichrist to the Jews, said that if another would come in his name him they would receive. I ask him now, and I asked him before, did the Jews ever receive the Pope? The Jews were to receive Antichrist; and until you show that the Jews received the Pope, all your assertions are at an end. You argue that the 1260 days mentioned in the Apocalypse are 1260 years, and that the reign of Antichrist is to continue for that space of time; and you quote the text in Daniel to prove this part of your argument. Now I do admit that the seventy weeks mentioned in Daniel are seventy weeks of years; and why do I admit it? Because the pro-

phet himself declares that they are years. And why do I insist that the 1260 days mentioned in the Apocalypse are days ? Because the inspired writer himself declares that they are, and on this point there can be no mistake. The apostle calls it times, a time, and half a time—that is three years and a half. Again, he says 1260 days ; and in another place, two-and-forty months, all coinciding in making the reign of Antichrist to be three years and a half, whilst Mr. Gregg asserts that the period of his reign will be 1260 years. He will be a tolerably long-lived man. I refer him to the Apocalypse, chapter 11th, verse 3d, and I will again quote for him the text with regard to the witnesses : “ And I will give unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth.” Now, if Antichrist was to be one thousand two hundred and sixty days in the world, would we not have a pretty time of it ? And mark me, if he were to continue that vast number of years, we are to have the two witnesses preaching the whole time for it is said my two witnesses shall prophecy one thousand two hundred and sixty days. Now, Mr. Gregg, will you insist that those days are years ? And again it says, “ And their bodies shall be in the streets of the Great City, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where the Lord was also crucified.” Now, Mr. Gregg, I ask you have these two witnesses preached, have they been slain, have their bodies lain in the streets of Jerusalem ; and have they gone up to heaven in the sight of their enemies ? And if they have not, then the days of Antichrist have not as yet come. Now, if you have a particle of honor or honesty, sound sense or reason, at once admit that the Pope or the Roman Catholic church cannot be Antichrist. Again, I say, if you have common understanding, answer me, and say—are those 1260 days, mentioned in the Revelations, years ? Here are my arguments against your assertions with regard to Antichrist—here is what I call a demonstration—here is reasoning founded upon principles. And why is it, in the name of God, that you do not answer me or acknowledge your error ? Any man can rail and brawl, and make assertion, and use foul language. But meet me on the scriptures—and now, once for all, answer these three questions in your next speech, for if you do not, there is not a man in this assembly who will not acknowledge that I would be right in discontinuing any further controversy with you. First, are the 1260 days mentioned in the Apocalypse, days or years ? Second—are not the two witnesses, Enoch and Elias, to preach during that period ; are they not to be slain, their bodies to lie in the streets three days, then go up to heaven in the sight of mankind ? And thirdly, are not these things to occur in the days of Antichrist ? Answer them any way you like, but let us have an answer. You say that those days are years, and the world, according to your calculation, has about sixty years to run. Oh, what a prophet you are. Answer now those three points, and until you do, I shall give no further reply to your assertions about apostacy. Answer me or I will reply to nothing.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG proceeded—My friends, I would be content.



ed to let the controversy between us be decided upon the question, whether I answer his arguments with regard to the Romish church being Antichrist. Let the question be decided now whether I answered him or not; and if I did not answer him, I will proceed to do so now (loud cries of "you did answer him, you did" which were responded to by still louder cries of no, no, you know that you did not"). Mr. Gregg—Well, it has been decided that I have answered him (loud cries again of "you did not answer it").

Mr GEGG's chairman here requested that order might be preserved.

The Reverend gentleman then proceeded. My friends, I have answered him, and he knows I have answered, and his calling on me to go over the same ground again, is for the purpose of drawing me away from the subject now under consideration. I took up the question with regard to Antichrist being an individual which he pointed out as that man of sin. I told him that *ho anthropos* was the man of sin. I showed him from the scriptures that John the Baptist was the Elias spoken of. I showed him from the book of Daniel, that what he pointed out as days were years, during which time the church, the true servants of God, were to suffer persecution. He says that the book of Daniel explains itself, and describes those weeks to be years. Now, here is the book of Daniel, and I find no such explanation in it from the prophet Daniel; but I find a note to the passage by another Daniel, namely, Daniel Murray, the Romish bishop of Dublin—at least it is sanctioned by him, for here is the Bible published under his authority and that of his confreres, a whole batch of Romish bishops. Now, I tell you, Mr. Maguire, that I will not be diverted from my subject. I shall first say a word or two about my authorities of which you complain, and of the language which I was obliged to make use of in describing the abominations of the Romish church in the time of Henry VIII. How could I find Sodomites and adulterers, and criminals of that description, if Henry VIII. had not brought them to public view? He told me to go to scripture for my facts; but I could not find such facts as those in scripture. I go to history for my facts, and to scripture for my opinions. I ask Mr. Maguire has he not repeatedly gone to history, and quoted authorities for which no one in existence cared one straw, I quote facts from public record, and I bring them forward as a proof of the consequences which result from Popery. He quoted Dr Hammond a Protestant authority. He seems very fond of the doctor. But what do we care for Dr. Hammond or his opinions? Protestants are stiff fellows, and care not for the opinions of any man. If a man speak to us the truth we know how to treat him; but if he advance any-

thing contrary to facts or to the word of God, we laugh him to scorn. I beg of you, Sir, not to go to Dr. Hammond for authority, but go to the scriptures. The reverend gentleman talked of worshipping a sceptre. He may, with all my heart, worship any sceptre he pleases; but Protestants will never worship anything but the true God. Don't you see, my friends, about him evidence of defeat? The whole thing is defeat. I do say that the practices of his church lead to idolatry. I have proved it. Has he met my proofs? If a man, through want of study or through ignorance, be blind, and refuse to hear the truth, he is guilty before God, and shall answer for his wilful blindness. I shall leave the question of idolatry for the next part of the discussion, and I will come now to meet him by quotation from scripture on the subject of marriage. I refer him to the 7th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and 9th verse—"But if they cannot contain let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn. Mr. Maguire quoted the 7th verse, but it appears he did not understand the context—"For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that." If all men had the gift I should have no objection that they should receive it; but if they have not the gift it is quite another thing. If the unmarried have the gift to remain single I have no objection. Has Mr. Maguire the gift? He knows best himself. I would ask, are there any men better Christians, more energetic in the service of God than married men? It is better to be married with one's wife and family than be groping at the confessional. I speak as a married man, and I would not value female virtue if my wife or my daughter was to be clawn by the hands of these bachelor priests. I tell you, Sir, that I have a chaste wife, and that I would not value that chastity if she were to consult the bachelor priests, and to be polluted by their abominable examinations (here there were loud hisses and cries of shame, shame) I hear hisses. I suppose you who are hissing are in the habit of having your  
 ——(continued uproar).

A voice from the distant part of the room—Nobody ought to listen to the dirty blackguard.

REV. MR. GREGG—I say if you are in the habit of sending your wives there, why continue to do so (hisses). The question with regard to marriage has been fully answered; take it down, note-takers, that it has. How much better it is to marry than live such lives of lewdness as we have recorded of those monks, many of whom have made vows of poverty. I go to principles, for that is the way I begin. I go to the young man who came to our Lord, and asked what should he do to be saved. The Redeemer told him to sell his goods and give the money to the poor. Did I ever say that it would be

wrong to do so? There are some who cannot have a knowledge of themselves and of the truths of the living God, while they enjoy prosperity. And I have not a doubt on my mind that were it not for the abominable Church of Rome, and the tendency of her doctrines to multiply poverty and crime that this example of the rich young man would be acted upon by many wealthier Protestants, by bishops and by others anxious to part with all the wealth of the world for the sake of God! Yes, I say that this would be acted upon in the Christian church all over the world. And this will be acted upon when the faith is purified, and when the truth of Christ shall be triumphant. But Popery so demoralizes the world, that if the rich were to give their substance to the poor, there would be nothing but strife and licentiousness, and the country would be turned into a field of blood. And if all the wealth of the kingdoms were scattered amongst them, they would still be poor. I say that if there was a general sprinkling of those holy principles of the gospel over the world, men would be found who would give up their riches for the sake of the poor. Look at Protestant England for instance. I am astonished to see the liberality with which the English people part with their wealth to relieve their brethren who are in distress, and I have known these holy men, and holy women, who have their purses open night and day, and who are expending their wealth in the service, and at the command of the people of God. Yes, Sir, this would be general, were it not for the abominable principles which Popery inculcates. Do not say, Sir, that I do not quote scripture, I referred you to Scripture for everything. I read for you St. Paul to Timothy, to Titus, and to Corinthians, with regard to marriage. I now refer you to Acts, 4th chapter, and 34th and 35th verse—"Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands and houses, sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostle's feet, and distribution was made to every man according to his need." Now this would be the state of things all over the Protestant world, were it not for Popery. Look again, I say, at England. See the state of things there. No man is poor; the people insist upon the laws there for support, as a matter of right not of charity. Go into their houses and see the comforts they possess. I tell you, Sir, again and again, that prevents the general prosperity of the country, and the application of the rule of Scripture which I have quoted. I now come to illustrate what Popery does for its professors. Here is the breviary of St. Hilarian—I shall read you some extracts from it. There is an account in it of a friar who was clothed in sackcloth, and lived in such a state of filth that he refused all the decencies of life, or, as it is called

in the latin original, *munditiæ*. He scourged himself with a rod of iron, he fasted and did such violence to his body that he was reduced to such a state that it could not be said that he more than barely existed. I am glad to see that my reverend friend has not reduced his body by fasting and prayer, and violence of that description. There are other stories of persons living in dirt and filth, which I could give to you *usque ad nauseam*, and show that the idolatries of India do not devote their followers to more degradation than does Popery. I shall, however, read for you another work. (Here the Rev. gentleman went to search for the book, and was occupied in the search for a couple of minutes. Aye, here is the book. I have found; it is the life of Benedict Joseph Lavori, published by John Coyne. This contains an account of this worthy friar who has been deemed a saint in the Catholic church, whose old clothes worked miracles. It states that he placed what is called a barrier of disgust between himself and mankind; that he lived in such a disgusting state that he could hardly be looked at; that he abandoned himself to bites of disagreeable insects; that he would not suffer his clothes to be washed, nor his cell cleaned out; that his head was uncombed—his head uncombed, gentlemen. What do you think, that this filthy being has had miraculous powers ascribed to his remains, and to the remains of those duds which doubtless were not free from the disagreeable insects. Here we have it attested by the Rev. James Barnard, president of the College of Lisbon, and vicar general of the district of London, that 163 miracles were performed by barely touching his remains, or the remains of his garments. Yes, my friends, Popery, which makes it a virtue to live in filth and poverty, is the cause of the beggary of Ireland. The attestation of those miracles took place before the Pope, and when you have miracles attributed to dirt, lice, raggedness and filth, and approved of by a church which calls itself Christian, what are you to think of its doctrines? The reverend gentleman then proceeded to read some of the miraculous cures attributed to the remains of this Benedict Joseph Lavori, as certified before the Pope, July the 6th, 1783.

Here the half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—I do not wonder at my reverend friend's ridiculing mortification and fasting; I do not wonder at his being unwilling to give up the pomp and luxuries which his church allows him to enjoy. Oh, no, that would not do. It would certainly be contrary to the spirit of the new gospel, and he has a right to object to it; but I find fault with him because he blasphemously tells you that they are contrary to the laws of Jesus. I ask him did not John the Baptist live upon locusts and honey? Did he not retire from the world to the wilderness, and

get food from the trees. And was not that mortification—and did not God approve of his mode of life, and hold him up as an example to the Scribes and Pharisees? Oh my friends what a blessed, fine, glorious example of gospel liberty is it to humbug John the Baptist and all the holy fathers who have lived lives of mortification and self-deniel for living as they did? Oh, it is no wonder that the new locusts make a humbug of John the Baptist. Now, he talks of the miracles of Benedict Joseph Labré. Now, I challenge him to deny miracles. He has not attempted to deny them yet. I have showed you that Dr. Cave, a writer of your own church, recounts several of them. I have read them from Eusebius, a celebrated historian. There are not three pages in his works in which you will not meet with the recital of some miracle. It is related by him that Narcissus, who was once a priest, but apostatized and broke his vow, was visited in the night by an angel and scourged from the top of his head to the sole of his foot, and the next morning he went to the bishop and showed him the marks of the scourging, and begged on his knees to be received again into the church. You laugh at the story, but if you do you laugh at Eusebius and at all the ancient historians of the church, and I leave you to the enjoyment of your scepticism, in which I do not envy you. Why, I have innumerable texts of scripture in favour of mortification and fasting. St. Paul says—"I chastise my body and keep it in subjection, lest when I preach to others I may myself become reprobate." You translate it "a cast away," but it does not matter. Now, what is the meaning of that? There are several other passages to the same effect to be met with throughout St. Paul's epistle; and now, let me ask you, if St. Paul chastised his body, was it wrong for Benedict Joseph Labré to do so? besides, you know, Sir, that the word *manditie*, though it literally signifies cleanliness, yet it is generally used by all writers to signify the luxuries of life. You will observe, also, that the motives of these men cannot possibly be known to you. You should not, then, attack them for their acts when you do not know the springs of those acts. Some may live in the grace of God without punishing themselves; but if others feel that they cannot retain the grace of God, nor live a life of chastity without punishing themselves, then they are justified in doing so—nay, they are bound to do so. You have read, I suppose, of the saint who was so strongly tempted by his passions that he used to roll himself in whitethorns to subdue them; and if that was necessary he was right. Would you say that it was an ungodly act? You would, for you hold that no man can observe the commandments; therefore all are free from them. You tell me—following the example of the arch-heretic and

founder of your church, Luther—that the observance of the commandments is impossible to every one. But I tell you that there are hundreds of ladies and gentlemen in this room who both can, and do observe them. I will give you Luther's words in the original German, or in the Latin translation by his disciple, where he makes the assertion which I have mentioned. You next talked of fasting. I tell you, Sir, I do not fast to become faint, though I mention that fasting and abstinence are both right and necessary. Now, let me ask you, Sir, is it right to ridicule what our blessed Saviour, the apostles, and all the holy fathers and saints have both preached and practised? You want to force me again into a comparison of Roman Catholic with English morality. I tell you all such comparisons are invidious, and I will not enter into them. But I will tell you one thing. There never was a necessity for the introduction of poor laws into England until Henry VIII. destroyed the Roman Catholic monasteries and abbeys, where the poor were fed and clothed, and where they received not only spiritual but corporal support; and transferred their property to others not for the good of the poor, who originally benefitted by it but for the purpose of enriching those who backed him in his irreligious actions. I tell you that it was only when the reformation was introduced to satisfy the lechery of the prince, and when the religious property was given to men who looked to their wives and their children, and grand children, neglected the poor, that Elizabeth was obliged to introduce poor laws; and I tell you that she would have been shaken from her throne if she had not done so. Look to history, and you will see that there was no poverty in Popery, and that it came in with the coming of Protestantism. You will find that our religion is practical Christianity. We practice what you preach (cheers and hisses.) He tells us that but for the blasted Popish religion his parsons and his bishops would give up their 60,000*l.* and 30,000*l.* a-year and that the bishop of Derry would give up his 90,000 green acres and sell all, and give it to the poor. Now, is not that a very modest assertion? (Laughter.) Now, if you believe that I give you full liberty to believe every word he has said since the commencement of the discussion (cheers and groans.) But the fact is, he has given us nothing but assertions. He gives us the lying stories of a parcel of infamous writers. He says that the work of Dr. Coussins was never answered. But I say that it was ably answered by Howardine, and torn to pieces by Manning. But why should I imagine that he reads the works of Roman Catholic authors, when I know that he reads only, those of one side of the question, and that he does not endeavour to eradicate the prejudice

which he derives from them. He talks of bachelors, and mocks them for being so. Why, our Saviour was a bachelor, Paul was a bachelor, Luke was a bachelor, John the Evangelist was a bachelor, and every single one of those who followed our Saviour were continent from the time that they were called. We are told by the fathers that this was the case, and the fathers themselves were unmarried men. But you tell me that the vow of celibacy was abused; and, let me ask you, even if it were, is that a reason for crying against it? Why, if I were to say Judas betrayed our Saviour, Peter denied him, and all the other apostles deserted, might I not, as an Infidel or a Jew, derive a better argument against Christianity from it than you derive from the abuse of it against celibacy? Would not that be a far better argument in the mouth of Voltaire or of Rousseau against the Christian doctrine than yours is against the celibacy of the clergy. I have quoted Dr. Grier, a Protestant divine, against you on this head. You took no notice of him. I showed that St. Paul, and all the apostles recommended celibacy, both by writing and example. I quoted to you the text, "he that giveth his daughter in marriage does well, but he that doth not does better." Thus, both marriage and celibacy are good, but celibacy is better. Are we to follow the example of the apostles or are we not? Is the head to set example to the feet or the feet to the head? You quoted the text, "Let every bishop be the husband of one wife," and you say I did not answer you. I quoted St. Augustine *de virginali*—I quoted Gregory Nazianzen, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and others of the fathers, to show that the meaning of the text was, that any one who had been married twice could not be a bishop, because it was an evidence that he was too much inclined to worldly indulgence to observe celibacy.—It meant that suppose a man was married, and his wife died, if he married again he could not be consecrated a bishop. And is not that a perfectly correct regulation? Do you not know that if a man had been married twice he could not even become a deacon. Surely the same liberty that is allowed men should not be allowed clergymen, whether priests or bishops, who are constantly handling the sacraments and using the sacred things connected with the church and the altar. You know also that in the old law, if a certain thing occurred to them the priests could not even enter the temple till they had bathed themselves in the evening. Why? Because the old law was to be the perfect type in point of purity and holiness of the glorious sanctity in the new. I shall not say anything of the married clergymen of your church. I know that many of them have very great virtues; but I do say that riches and luxuries are not among the marks of the true church of Christ. No; the church of Christ has been always subjected to persecution, and it ever will be persecuted as long as it exists. He then speaks of priests living with their nieces. If a clergyman keeps a house, and cannot marry, what housekeeper can be better than the daughter of his brother or his sister? Who could he have living with him that would less excite the suspicions of the evil minded? It is not

that they fear what their flocks would say or think of them—for they live among them, and are known by them, and they fear not for anything they may imagine. But it is to prevent you, and such as you, from having unjust suspicions. Our Saviour, when he went to convert the woman of Samaria, would not allow his disciples to be present, lest they should hear him when he told her that she was the wife of nine husbands; I say it is only for fear of the easily-excited suspicions of such men as you, that the clergymen of our church live thus with their near relations. I now pass over such slanderous insinuations and attacks, and I come to another of your arguments. I ask you, even suppose there have been the abuses you advance, would it prove anything whatever against me? We came here to argue the unity, apostolicity and Catholicity of our respective churches, and he turns the question to their abuses. How did Robespierre and Voltaire in France upset the true religion and spread infidelity, but in the way he has adopted—namely, in attacking the abuses which have crept into Christianity by holding them up to ridicule and scorn. But though no doubt there have been abuses in our church, I fearlessly tell him that there is no other church in the world in which there are fewer than in it. We do not tell the people that we will shoot them for money—we do not shed the blood of the son of the widow for mammon, and spread disorder through the land for the sake of pelf. You have, unblushingly, quoted to me an act of parliament, and for what? Why to prove that we are heretics and apostates. What do I care for an act of parliament passed by a set of fanatics who upset all order and over-turned everything in the shape of order? I care not for an act of parliament but for the acts of Christ. But yours, as I told you, is a parliament church. It is supported by the state, and linked to it, and it could not stand without it. Ours is independent of the state; and God grant that it may continue so. For I tell you that all connection between church and state is, if not for adultery, at least adulteration, (cheers and hisses). You saw him when he spoke of apostacy. You saw how he wriggled and was shaken. He showed symptoms of his descent from the old dragon. When he came to speak of the Thirty-nine Articles, he said he had answered all I had said about them before, and, therefore, would not waste time by speaking of them now. I tell you he never did answer what I said, and he never will, and the old dragon himself could not help him to do so. He quoted Daniel, and relied on his own explanation of the prophet, that the “time and times and half a time” mentioned in the Revelations meant 1260 years. Daniel says that the sacrifice which Christ was to establish would be done away with by Antichrist. Tell me what sacrifice is to be done away with. You have none. We have, and it has not been done away with. Christ said—“This is my body, which shall be given up for you; and this is my blood, which shall be shed for you. Do this in commemoration of me.” We have done it in commemoration of him, and we will always continue it. Now, Sir, you have quoted Daniel; tell me what sacrifice is to be done away with? Again, has he answered a single word with regard to what I said



about the two witnesses mentioned in the Revelations, or about the 1260 days or years, as he would have it ? Now, mark me, it is said also by Jesus Christ that he will shorten the period of the reign of Antichrist on account of the elect. "You give me," says my reverend friend, "your false gloss, instead of the scriptures. I say the period is 1260 years." Oh ! there's a short period. Oh ! Sir, you are not in earnest. I declare before high heaven, and before this meeting, that I do not believe you are in earnest. You have not the appearance of conscience while you speak thus, (hisses ;) conscience appears in the face, and it does not appear in yours, (hisses and cheers.) Now, will you hear the holy scriptures without hissing. Don't make me attack you again, or you may be sorry for it, (hisses.) I feel honoured by your hissing, for it convinces me I make you feel, (hisses and cheers.) I now refer you to Matthew, chapter 18, verse 17. "And if he shall neglect to hear them tell the church, and if he shall neglect to hear the church let him be unto thee as the heathen and the publican." Now, I ask you if the church commands us to fast, are we not obliged to obey her. His church tells him to fast, but he puts out his tongue at her, and will not obey her, for what she commands in this respect is but the remains of the superstitions of Popery, and the abominations of Antichrist. Luke tells us, "Obey those who have rule over you." Again, did not Christ say to his apostles, "I have many things to tell you which you are not able to hear, but when I am gone I will send you the spirit of truth who shall teach you all truth." And it is the Holy Ghost that has taught the church to give us the commands which she has given, and we are therefore obliged to obey her. I refer you now to Hebrews, 13th chapter, and 17th verse, where it is said—"Obey them that have rule over you, and submit yourselves." Who have rule over him ? He admits that our church was the true church for three or four hundred years after the death of Christ ; but during that period she ordained fasting, and therefore he should obey her ; besides, his own church, as I have said, ordains it. In Joel, 1st chapter, 14th verse, you find it is said—"Sanctify a feast, call a common assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your God, and cry unto the Lord." Now, then, if fasting were lawful under the old law, why should it be unlawful under the new ? Give me a single text to show it is unlawful, and I will yield. You cannot, for there is no text. I would now refer you to Matthew, chap. 9, verse 38—"Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of harvests that he will send forth labourers into his harvest." And how were these labourers to be employed ? What was to be their work ? They were to work even as Aaron and Paul worked, in teaching the people and converting them to the Lord. Here now I refer you to the Acts of the Apostles, to show you how the bishops were consecrated. Go to the 13th chapter and 3d verse—"And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away ;" and again, chapter 14, verse 23d—"And when they had ordained their elders in every church, and had prayed with

fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Now, Sir, are you not ashamed of yourself? There are the scriptures directly in favour of fasting; fasting was necessary in every ceremony, and yet you condemn it. Now, Sir, besides these texts the history of the church proves that she had authority, and that authority was recognised. Martial, Apollinarus, Montanus, and other heretics, were all condemned by her, as the councils show. Hence you must acknowledge that her authority existed in earlier ages. Tell me what has put an end to it since?—you cannot. Now go to the 1st Corinthians, chap. 9, verse 27, and to 2d Corinthians, chapter 6, verse 5, and several other texts which it would be but waste of time to quote. Now, then, I ask you once more was not the custom of fasting primeval with the apostles, or was it in the first, the second, the third, or the fourth century that it was introduced? I have Eusebius here to show when if necessary. Remember, also, I beg of you, that it is said, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." There is another thing of which I would remind you. The council of Jerusalem, the first that ever was held in the church, ordained fasting, and ordained it also in the name of the Holy Ghost. You receive that council, you must therefore admit fasting. Why then do you not practice it? Was it not absolute?

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended,

*(To be continued.)*

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

SEVENTH DAY—TUESDAY.—(CONTINUED.)

---

REV. MR. GREGG—Now, my Roman Catholic brethren, I call on you, I entreat of you, not to allow yourselves to be led into delusion by my reverend opponent. He has arguments to prove a thing that I never contended for, having only reprobated the abuses. He talked with so much violence and heat that you must, ere this, be convinced he has not the spirit of Jesus—the spirit of truth. He brings forward things which I allow, and he calls upon me to admit either that the fast of Lent was an institution of the church, or to prove that it was not so. I allow it; it is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer; and, with respect to the subject of fasting, he quoted a text which he did not understand (a laugh)—either that, or he was under a delusion. That he was so I'll prove to your hearts content. And oh! my brethren, come to Jesus Christ, and be cleansed from your sins! He quotes the saying of our blessed Saviour—"Woe unto ye scribes and pharisees!" Aye, there's the rub! Tremble, my Roman Catholic brethren, tremble for the consequences!—they were the men that fasted—the men who were denounced by our blessed Lord. He next refers to the text which says, "The children of the bridegroom can't fast when he is with them; but when taken away, then they shall fast in those days." That is the text, gentlemen, which fathoms the depth, the profundity, of the glorious mysteries of our religion. The bridegroom is Christ—we have him present within us, the life of glory; when we lose him, then is the time for mortification and prayer; when the soul is in the midst of agony, because of her iniquity, and when she can scarcely support herself, then is the time for penance. I have known circumstances of this kind under which my soul laboured, that I have been obliged to refrain from many of the comforts of life, which I would otherwise be disposed to take, (loud laughter). This it is which shows me that the Church of Rome is the church of Antichrist—the lady seated on the seven hills—which tells you to fast. I say when the church of Antichrist tells you, my Roman Catholic brethren, it is a different thing, and it is that agony of soul which I have described that arises from such fasting, it being not in accordance with the spirit of God. The scriptures tell us we must have the spirit, and it is in consequence of the foul doctrine taught by Popery that we cast out Christ. Let them torment their bodies as they please, they cannot cause the torture of the soul of which I have been speaking, for it is not that which

would satisfy the cravings of an immortal appetite ; and, **Rev. Mr. Maguire**, when you go home this evening, examine whether you have got that peace, which is better than whipping your body with a cat of nine-tails, or quilting a petticoat for the Blessed Virgin Mary, (hissing and groaning, which lasted several minutes). Think of a Popish king quilting a petticoat for the Virgin Mary, (hissing). Think of a man going to commit sin who rejoices like a bridegroom ; is not that as good as making a petticoat for the Virgin Mary, (hissing and groaning, and cries of shame continued for this abominable blasphemy, which lasted for several minutes). You may hiss and cry shame ; you do well to cry shame at such an abominable practice. The reverend gentleman quoted the words of our Saviour, "He that despises you despises me, and he that despises me despises him who sent me." I, Sir, belong to the Holy Catholic church of Ireland, (loud laughter)—and you are interlopers, just lately imported from the harlot of Rome ; we have your Catholic archbishops and bishops who deserted her, and sent down the stream of truth to us, and undefiled. There is one thing I am delighted at, which marks the inconsistency of the reverend gentleman, this beaten man, (laughter). See what it is to beat a Popish priest, (hisses). I can't go into the streets in consequence, without a file of police being with me, like Daniel O'Connell. I say, Roman Catholics, mark this inconsistency and tremble for your religion. He said the other day that neither of us were apostates, and yet he talks of the prophet Daniel, of whom he knows no more than of the Arabian language. It is a principle in his church to take the scriptures according to the sense in which Holy Mother Church (as he calls her, but which I call an unholy church and a harlot church) interprets them. On that very thing I have him, just as if I had a cord tied round his neck. How could he have the unanimous consent of the church for 1000 years that Martin Luther was wrong, or the opinion of the holy fathers and grand fathers, when they were all dead before he was born ? But I'll prove to you that Luther was the angel who came forth from the bottomless pit ; and I ask you was there ever such absurd abominations as these ? Who is of the church of Antichrist ? Who is the apostate ? Mark—the great woman is the Babylon, who is drunk with the blood of the saints. Yes, the seat of the apostasy is in Rome, and I tell you—oh ! mark me when I tell you, that Christ, my master, tells me to warn you of the consequences which will come upon your souls. He says I did not answer one of the questions he put to me—I'll leave that to the room, (groans and cheers). I know the reason he says so. He wants me to go over the same ground again, in order to entangle me in difficulties, but he shall not do so. He said that Voltaire, who had desecrated France, is analogous to me, because one of the first arguments he used against Christianity was to deny the miracles of Jesus Christ. If ever there was an example which should make you tremble, that is it. Popery is the mother, and was the instigator, of the mighty and bloody French revolution. She was the cause of all the blood that was spilt, and the curse of God came upon her. Why ? Because when Protestantism was making rapid strides in that country, in the reign of Charles IX., the then king, they destroyed a number

of the unhappy victims on St. Bartholomew's day—they drove pure religion out of France—and hence the confusion which pure Protestant principles, mixed with Popery, brought about, that Voltaire was enabled to deride religion. He laughed at the pretended Popish miracles, and brought about that state of things which scourged that country, and deprived the descendant of that very king, who was the cause of the murder of the Protestants, of his own head as a punishment inflicted by God, for the persecution of his people. Very well, mark that. Bonaparte gained power in France—he was dislodged, and the people suffered ten thousand times more than ever their ancestors had, many years before, inflicted on the Hugonots. Bonaparte as you have seen, was put out—the Bourbons were again placed on the throne—the present king's (formerly the Duke of Orleans) father was the principal person who hurried on the death of Louis XVI. Attend to that. Things went on well for some time with the old Bourbons, but the vengeance of God was not complete, it was coming to a close. The powers of Europe placed them on the throne, but another hurled him from it, and put the Duke of Orleans in his stead. Look at that punishment which was inflicted by the divine power on the descendants of him who was the exterminator of Protestantism, (a laugh). There, Sir, is your allusion to France for you. He tells me that I talk of abuse, and not of principle. What are principles? They mean beginnings. The word comes from the Latin *principia*. Now, suppose the reverend gentleman took two seeds—they are principles—or two eggs; and suppose we continued to argue that one egg was as good as the other—that the Popish egg was as good as the Protestant egg. These are principles, (a laugh). I will make you, reverend Sir, hatch your own eggs, and make your goslings come to perfection, (a laugh). Then, Sir, the cockatrice will displace the fire-flying serpent, hatched by the seven-headed monster in Rome, (a laugh). I was arguing also against celibacy, and he talks and makes a bluster, as if I did not allow that it was a better thing than if a man had a wife, if it be his calling. But I deny it can be when he has not that gift. I say persons taking on themselves to keep a vow, without knowing for what, is an abomination. I shall now read some passages from a book which speaks of the notorious practice which existed.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—As a man of honour you are bound not to read that in the presence of so many ladies. That subject has been already discussed, and this day has been for another purpose.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Then I will bow to the decision of the chairmen.

Rev. Mr. NANGLE and Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA then consulted for a short time; after which,

Rev. Mr. NANGLE said—In my opinion, Mr. Gregg is perfectly in order, as the subject under discussion is celibacy; and if it may be judged of by its effects from facts which he is going to state, it is perfectly legitimate for him to do so, (cheers and groans).

Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA—I submit to this meeting whether he is in order, or is he justified by the arrangements which have been en-

tered into to follow this course. It was fixed for last Saturday, and disposed of; and, in my opinion, he is departing from the original rule.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—I appeal to you whether Saturday was only set aside to discuss Dens.

Mr. McNAMARA—Dens was not mentioned; and, Sir, it is my duty, while I sit here, to protect the females who are present, from being insulted.

Mr. NANGLE—It rests with the speaker whether he will use improper language or not.

Mr. GREGG—I shall not do so. (The reverend gentleman then read a passage which related to some abuses said to exist in Spain sometime or other, and so gross and filthy was the language used that several ladies left the room; notwithstanding which his reverence went on to the end of the chapter.) The common sense (continued the reverend gentleman) of mankind is against you. If a man marry, and has a wife, it is a delusion to say that he cannot serve his God as well as if he had not. But it is a part of the system of abomination which prevails in the church of Rome. You seem fond of perfecting the dreams in the Old Testament; but, Sir, it is an unfortunate protection, to say that under certain circumstances a man may excuse himself. That will not go down with the public; it will pull down your chapels over your heads, [laughter]. “They speak evil of the things they know not, and corrupt themselves.” In all these things we can easily perceive that God will punish the abominations of ———

Mr. MAGUIRE—This is keeping your word; it is just like you, though—

Mr. GREGG—An attempt has been made to stop my mouth, but what have I to care for? If there was corruption in our church in Latimer’s time, Popery is the mother of it.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—You will judge, my brethren of every denomination, though your feelings must have been hurt by the observations that have fallen from both sides during the discussion, who has been the cause of that. I say that he is the cause, and now I beg leave to say that I am surprised—very much surprised—at the conduct of my friend (for I call him so, and I do say, that notwithstanding this and my previous discussion, there is no man in the world whom I would call my enemy). I say that I am very much surprised at his conduct in bringing forward this subject, when he knows that my hands are tied, and that I can say nothing on it while the ladies are present, for I would rather lose every argument than for a moment offend the delicacy of the ladies present; [cheers and groans]. I tell you, Sir, there are hundreds of ladies and gentlemen here who go to confession, and who know well the nature of that tribunal, and of the examination of the priests. He admits the legality and propriety of confession. He says that his church admits it, and so she does. He says that the penitent must come before him. He tells us that in his investigation into the state of the penitent he would do so and so, and that if he saw he was worthy he would give him absolution. I ask him how would he

## SEVENTH DAY—TUESDAY.

know whether the penitent is worthy or not if he does not hear all his sins? Let him answer that. I ask him how will he be able to excuse the duties of his holy office if he does not know the condition of him who comes to him? The Catholic mothers, and fathers, and brothers, and sisters, and sons, and daughters, know well how we excuse it. Oh, he rings the changes often with regard to the mothers, and husbands, and wives and daughters. He imagines that by his filthy language he will effect a feeling of jealousy among them that will prevent them from allowing those under their care from going to the sacred tribunal to be cleansed of their sins. But I tell you, Sir, they are laughing at you in their sleeves. They know our conduct. They are witnesses of it. They have experienced it, and they know how pure and how sacred is the confessional which they frequent; and I tell you,—though I am sure you must know it already,—that the slightest impropriety—the least suspicion of the occurrence of anything like what you have hinted at in the confessional, would have the clergyman suspended for life, never to be restored. You must know that there is a bull making that decree, and it was a cruel bull to us. For we know that you have bribed persons [I do not charge it upon you personally]—we know that bribery has been practised to make persons watch us in our confessionals, and we know how easily a false tale might be got up which would subject us to perpetual suspension. Not the slightest fact has been proved against us, and yet we must be attacked in the calumnious manner in which you have attacked us. We are subjected to much the same trial that Athanasius was subjected to when the Arians bribed a woman to enter by his window to tempt him. But the saint screamed so violently upon seeing her, taking her at first for a spirit, that his attendants were alarmed, and having entered the room before she could escape, she confessed the whole plot and acknowledged who were the persons that instigated her to it. This was always the conduct of the heretics. They ever insidiously attacked the church, and they ever will continue to do so. Yet they say they are inspired. Martin Luther said he was inspired, and Dr. Gregg says he is inspired, (hisses and cheers.) I told you what was the saying of St. Polycarp to him. It is related in Eusebius, who wrote when the church was fresh and beautiful, and when you acknowledged that the purity of her doctrines was unsullied. We are there told that upon Marham asking the saint did he acknowledge him—Polycarp replied, “I acknowledge this to be the first born of the devil” (hisses and cheers). Now, I say unto you, my friend, that though you are not the first born of Marham; yet you have got a little pedigree of your own, which may be traced back to him. You are not, to be sure, a direct and lineal, but then you are a collateral descendant of his, (great hissing and cheering). Now, let me ask you, what right had Polycarp to give the name heretic to Marham if he had not the authority of the church to do so. You yourself told me that he was a heretic, and that yours is the true church. O, holy church whose primitive bishops were apostates from our church !!!—a true church that got everything it has from Antichrist !!!—hisses and cheers. —And that

when Pope Pius—the Antichrist!—was confined a prisoner by Napoleon, he released him from his confinement, and gloried in giving him liberty! You may guess, my friends, what sort of a religion that is. You may see how consistent it is, and you may see what a Fushos is my reverend friend, (laughter and hissing). I wonder how he would get out of the charge of apostacy after all this. You take, Sir, your bishops and priests from us, and you never consecrate nor ordain them again, [“no, no,” from Mr. Gregg]. Why, Sir, I say it is the fact. You never do give new orders to any priests that may go over from us to you—and they, I am sure, bring nothing new with them; therefore, Sir, the ordination and the priests of Antichrist are good enough for you, (no, from Mr. Gregg; cheering and hissing). Again he talks of Voltaire and Rousseau in France, and he gives us along dissertation on that point, much to my satisfaction, for it leaves me the less to answer. Now, why did I mention Voltaire? To show that the very arguments which you have used against us derived from alleged abuses, were used by Voltaire, and Rousseau, and Diderot, against Christianity. Oh, but he gives another turn, and he tells us he has little pity for poor Charley dix—poor Charles X.—because he happened to be the next in name to the king that perpetrated the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Now, I will not say whether he mistook the king or not—for it is in theology alone that I claim to overcome him—but I will tell him one thing, that the massacre of St. Bartholomew, (which, however, God forbid I should defend) was preceded by the murder of 1,700 Catholics. You, Sir, have admitted that your church persecuted. Therefore even if you proved that our church also persecuted it would be but a dead ball. But you have proved no such thing, and I utterly deny it, though I admit, and have already admitted, that Catholics have persecuted. You will not venture to say that because the persecuting persons were Catholics the Catholic church approved of their persecution. I told you that it was Henry's desire to be married to Anne Boleyn that caused the Reformation. I told you that it was his disgust at the Popish distinction that told him he might marry his brother's wife that caused it. Now, I ask you, Sir, is it or is it not lawful to marry a brother's wife when the marriage is *ratum sed non consummatam*? You know that at the time of his marriage to Catherine Arthur was not sixteen years of age. You know that he died suddenly, and that Catherine herself, before the parliament, appealed to Henry if she was not a virgin when he married her. If it be wrong to marry a brother's wife, you have a Fellow in Trinity College who is married to the wife of his brother, (shame, shame, from Mr. Gregg). No, Sir, it is not a shame. I do not want to cast any odium on the man. I have not named him, nor am I about to do so. God forbid that I should attack any one who is not present to defend himself. I merely mentioned the fact to ask you, if it be wrong, why, then, does your church permit it? And if you permit it, why do you blame us for allowing it also under certain circumstances! Arthur and Catherine were married when he was not sixteen. He died suddenly before the marriage was consummated. She was then married to



Henry, who never complained of the marriage till he saw Anne Boleyn, and wished to marry her, which, according to Luther, he might do if he chose, ("no," from Mr. Gregg.) What! Sir, do you deny that Luther gave Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, liberty to marry two wives? Why, I can show you from his own works that he did. You quoted from a set of authors passages relative to a meeting in Spain with regard to confession. What care I for these authors? You know yourself that they are not considered faithworthy even by Protestants, and that they are always classed with Fra Paulo, and others of his class, who have written nothing but a collection of abominable lies. I showed you, sir, from the scriptures, that Christ instituted the forgiveness of sins. He said, "Whatsoever sins you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, and whatsoever sins you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Now, I ask you how would you know what sins to bind or to loose unless they were confessed to you? and how could you absolve the penitent unless you know his sins, if you would not throw pearls to swine, or suffer the unworthy to receive the sacrament, as does happen in your church? Therefore I say the penitent must tell the state of his soul, and relate his sins to the confessor, just as the sick man relates the circumstance of his disease to the physician, in order that medicine should properly be prescribed. Now, I will come to another point. You spoke of Louis Philippe. Now, I am not going to speak of him in his absence; nor will I institute a comparison between him and Charles X. He talks of hatching my own eggs. Now, I know that this is an allusion to a gentleman to whom I was bound by the strictest ties of friendship, and whose talents far outweighs your's and mine. But, notwithstanding the strict and warm feelings of friendship that were between us, that gentleman, I am sorry to say, has been caught in a trap, and has been induced to take a certain part in connection with this discussion which it is not for me now to mention; nor will I blame him for what he has done, for I believe he is not present and even if he were, I know that he could not defend himself. It would then be highly unworthy of me to speak of him in any way but respectfully and with decorum. But I say to you, sir, if I hatch my own eggs, they are those of the church, and the chicks of them were in existence for 800 years that your church was not known or dreamed of; like yours, they have not been brought into the world only since the days of Luther and Calvin. But now I will be done with this point, and I will bring you back again to the holy father of your church—noble minded Luther. I refer you to the Jena edition of his works, tome the 6th, page 480. I have it here in his favourite German—you can read it if you like; and I have it in Latin, as translated by his disciple, Justus Jonas; and there is nothing so remarkable in the commencement of the reformation, as that this work should have thus been preserved to plant the mark of Antichrist upon his church, as if with the finger of God, by making him thus display his folly by acknowledging his conferences with the devil. You, Sir, I say, are a follower of

the man who was instructed by the devil [no, from Mr. Gregg], and I tell you that the finger of God is visible in this acknowledgment of his evil author, and has left you no excuse. Here, then, are the words of the man himself, in the year 1584. He then read several passages from Luther's works to the effect that his gospel would prevail, so much so that in two years, no popery, no Popish priest, no nuns, no Pope, no mass no Popish ceremonies will be in the world). There's a prophet for you. (He read on other passages to the effect that the pious man never sinneth—that Christ has declared that his entire body and blood are contained under one species—that the decalogue was given to the Jews, and was not intended for Pagans or Christians). There's for you—so we need not observe the commandments? [He went on to the effect that we should abstain from sin, and from good works for that all good works are mortal—that it was impossible to abstain from sin, for the Scripture tells us we are slaves to the devil—that if he was blamed for obscenity, he would say that he should obey necessity—that this buisness [*i. e.* the reformation] was not begun on God's account, nor would it ever end on God's account—again *per sepe an vere loquor neene nescio*—that if Peter and Mary and Christ were upon earth they would prostrate themselves before him and acknowledge him a God. Now, I ask, he said, can this be the religion of God, of Christ, of the apostles, which had such a founder, and which, for 1500 years after the death of our Saviour was never heard of? I challenged him to show any church that ever professed the Articles. He says that the number is nothing. Well, I defy him to name any that professed the principles contained in them. Luther says that the true gospel was never preached till his days, not even in the days of the apostles, and that for 1000 years there was not a single true believer in the world. The Homilies say that for 800 years and more [they say that to come as near as possible to Luther] there was not a single human being in the world who was not sunk in the most dark and dismal idolatry, hateful to Christ and damnable to man. I will now give him a proof from the councils that were assembled that there never was a heresy which was not condemned by the church. He then gave a list of all the councils, with the Popes that preceded, and the heresies that were condemned, from the first council of Nice, in the (year) 325, to the second council of Lateran in the year 1122. That council, said he, was held for the purpose of raising an outcry to banish the infidels from the Holy Land; and was that an unholy work? I am sorry I cannot go on to the council of Trent.

The half hour concluded here, and it being two o'clock the meeting separated.

## SEVENTH DAY—TUESDAY.

(CONTINUED.)

At eleven o'clock Mr. GREGG called upon Mr. MAGUIRE to proceed with the discussion. It may be observed that the interest in this extraordinary controversy has not, in the least, abated, notwithstanding the length of time that it is going on. The round room of the Rotunda was densely crowded before eleven o'clock, and hundreds were congregated outside the building.

Mr. MAGUIRE proceeded as follows :—My friends, before commencing the great work of the day—for this is my day of attack—I shall make a few observations upon the gross and the scandalous matter contained the last half hour's speech of my reverend opponent yesterday, and upon the grossness and malice generally with which he has thought proper to attack monks, nuns, friars, priests, and religious houses ; and in doing so I shall refer him to his own Protestant historians, to show him that more base, false, and calumnious charges were never made in the world than those made against the Catholics and religious houses about the time of the Reformation. Here the reverend gentleman read extracts from various Protestant authorities to show the falsehood of those accusations. He then proceeded—I wonder the reverend gentleman did not bring forward Maria Monk ; but her lies and slanders are too recent ; there are living witnesses to prove their falsehood, and it would not suit his purpose to quote her as an authority. In a couple of centuries hence, it may answer in the hands of some assailant of the church of Christ, but at present it would not do, although it is equally as true and quite as disgusting as the authorities which he has quoted. The whole foundation for all the abominable slanders with which the Rev. Mr. Gregg has so long occupied the time of this meeting, rest upon a vile pamphlet entitled “ Henry Stephen's Wonders of the World.” There is his authority for you, gentlemen ! “ Stephen's Wonders of the World ! ” and wonderful enough are the stories contained in it ; but not one of them is true. In Burnet's History some of those falsehoods are set out ; but he does not tell you upon what authority he gives them ; and Fuller, who wrote upon the subject, tells you that Burnet himself did not believe them, although he put them into his history. He laid aside truth, and justice, and charity, which he should have strictly observed, with regard to memories of men who were gone to their account ; and Battersey, in commenting upon this history, and examining the grounds upon which it was given, says they are wholly unworthy of credit. There is no foundation for them ; the writer gives no authority ; and hereupon let us lay aside all such stories

about religious houses, priests, nuns, &c. I can read you, Sir, a host of respectable Protestant writers, and other competent witnesses, all acknowledging that there is neither truth nor charity in those extracts which Mr. Gregg has thought proper to read. Again, Thorndike, in speaking of them, refers to the passage in Timothy where the apostle says, that heed should not be given to fables and genealogies without end, which minister questions rather than the edification of God, which is in faith. Such, my friends, is the authority upon which my opponent has brought forward his charges against the Catholic church. Next, my friends, I will say a word about the question of apostacy, and then have done with it for ever; and mark me well, my friends, in this part of my case. Mr. Gregg says that my church is Antichrist, and he makes the acknowledgment then that either his church or mine must be the apostacy; and I have given such irrefragable proofs that he was overwhelmed and stood in confusion. He was not able to show the time that my church apostatized; but I showed him that it was impossible she could ever apostatize, unless Christ had broken his promise to her. I shall again refer him to scripture. In Matthew it is said that when our Saviour was sitting on Mount Olivet the disciples came to him privately, and said to him. "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and the consummation of the world? And Jesus answering, said to them, "Take heed that no man seduce you, and many will come in my name, saying I am the Christ, and they will seduce many." And our Saviour adds, "That his church is the pillar and the ground of truth, and that he shall be with it all days, even to the consummation of the world." The church was not seduced—she could not be seduced—she was the city on the mount; but many of her members were seduced, and went out of her. Luther and Calvin, and the whole spawn of locusts were seduced—they were seduced by their own foul and ungovernable passions, and they went out—they apostatized—the church cast them off, and they founded a new religion, and preached new doctrines. So much for the apostacy. The Saviour says, "I will be with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." At the consummation of the world shall come the time of Antichrist. There is my demonstration, and I am done with the subject for ever. I now come to the subject of the day. I must say that I have frequently argued, since this discussion began, that Protsantism was without principles, and that no Protestant, according to the articles of his church, could make an act of faith, and that it was totally out of the power of a Protestant to prove that he had a true copy of the scriptures, or that there was a true copy of it in the world. I ask you now again, Mr. Gregg, how do you know, or how

will you prove to me that the Bible is not falsely translated—whether your translations be honest or not—whether it has not been falsely and maliciously interpolated by the wretched hands of the monks and priests with whom it was for so many ages, and to whom the world is indebted for the preservation of the scriptures? Here the Reverend gentleman read Doctor Greer's answer to Doctor Milner upon the canonicity of the Scriptures. He then continued—How now, Sir, will you show me by your church, or by any authority upon earth, that the scriptures are the genuine word of God, and that they have been preserved in all their original integrity? Doctor Milner asked him to prove the scriptures, and he answered as Mr. Gregg will answer, and as every Protestant is bound to answer, let the scriptures prove themselves. Prove the scriptures by the scriptures. Now, I tell you, Sir, that the scriptures do not prove their own inspiration. There is not a single passage throughout the whole Bible which says that all the scriptures are inspired. How then, Sir, will you prove them, if you do not trace up their safekeeping through the church to the very hands of the apostles. But I will show the malice, and roguery, and villainy of the first Protestants who attempted a translation of the Bible. I will show you the base and wilful perversions which they have made in the word of God. Here, to wit, the celebrated text about the Holy Trinity, where it is said there are three who bear witness in heaven. Upon this passage the Unitarian argues against the divinity of Christ; and how, Sir, will you meet the Unitarian, and argue with him upon this text when you say you have no proof of the canonicity or integrity of the scriptures but your own assertion? There was more roguery, villainy, and malice exercised in the translation of your Protestant Bible than ever was known in the whole world; and the higher you go up the more fraud you will find to have been practised—the more you will observe the retrograde motion—the more, Sir, will Protestants be astonished at the work of those impious hands which have perpetrated such blasphemous outrages upon the scriptures of God. These men say they give you the gospels, they recommend them to your perusal; they are to be read by all the world; whilst at the same time they have filled them with fraudulent and wilful errors, wholly opposed to the letter and the spirit of God's holy word. My Protestant friends, I would not wish to wound your feelings. And I am sure I will not do so by bringing before you the fraud and blasphemy with which the apostles of your church have dealt with the Bible. But I implore and beseech of you to reflect upon those daring perversions of the word of God—to open your eyes to the truth, and, having heard and seen those facts, to judge for yourselves. When the first translation of the Protestant Bible took place,

the errors were so glowing and so palpable that they alarmed the first reformers; and in another translation which followed some of those errors were corrected. There have been upwards of eight thousand corrections in the Protestant Bible from the time it was first published up to the present time, and there are twenty-nine corrections yet to be made. Mind, my friends, I do not talk of errors arising from the construction of language, or the difficulty of certain texts; but I talk of wilful and gross perversions of the word of God by these early reformers, for their own purposes. Here the reverend gentleman read the names of some of the translators of the Protestant Bible, amongst which were Luther, Calvin, Coverdale, Baza, Zuinglius, Walton, &c., and then read extracts from the works of each, all condemning each other's edition of the Bible, pronouncing it hellish and blasphemous. Calvin said Luther's translation was the work of the devil. Luther condemns Calvin, Calvin Beza, Beza Zuinglius, Zuinglius Coverdale, Coverdale all the others, but each and all maintaining that his own was the correct version, or that it was, as Luther said what was best suited for the purposes of the reformation. Every man was then, as some of our fanatics now pretend to be, wise in the scriptures; so that Mr. Walton, the celebrated author of the Polyglot remarked that it was once said by Anctarctus, that there could not be seven wise men found in Greece, but that it might then be said that there could not be seven fools found, for that all pretended to have a perfect knowledge of the scriptures, which, above all things else in the world, were most difficult to understand. Here Sir, I produce your own writers, who acknowledge that it would have been better that the scriptures were never published, with the errors and gross perversions which the reformers were guilty of with regard to the translation of the Bible. (Here the reverend gentleman read from Whittaker and others). Now, my friends, I come to some of the frauds of Luther. He acknowledged that the word "alone" was not to be found in the text of St. Paul, but he introduced it, and had it so in the Bible, and when spoken to and told that it would give a handle to the Papists to attack his doctrines—he said, no matter about the Papist, they won't undersand it, for Papist and ass are synonymous (a laugh). This infamous attempt of Luther to pervert the word of God is to be found in the 5th tome of his works. Hear what Zuinglius says of Luther, I will read it for you, my Protestant friends. Zuinglius was one of the founders of your church as well as Luther. Hear, my friends, what he says—"Luther was a foul and wilful corrupter of the word of God. He has so perverted the scriptures that we are much ashamed of him for corrupting the word of God in such a manner." This will be found in his book *De Sacerdotibus*, Tom. 2. On the

other hand, Luther condemned the translations of Zuinglius, and I will give you an extract of what he says upon that subject. There was a printer at Amsterdam, named Proconius, who brought a copy of Zuinglius's Bible to Luther for examination, and he told him to take it back to his master, Zuinglius, and to tell him that he had wilfully mistranslated the holy scriptures, and that it was most false and corrupt. He was there paying him in his own coin. Another of the reformers, Beza, in speaking of Calvin's translation, thus describes it after this fashion :—" Calvin makes the text to jump up and down, not only grossly perverting it, but adding to it wherever it suits his purpose." He then goes on to point out various places where these additions and perversions were made. Here the reverend gentleman read further extracts from the comments of the early reformers and translators of the Bible, where all accused each other of the perversion and corruption of the text. He then proceeded—But what apology do you think has Luther given for adding to the text, that is, introducing a word that is not to be found in St. Paul at all? "Why," said he, "am not I an apostle as well as St. Paul, and if he wrote the whole text, have not I a right to add one word at least, or, for that matter, as many words as I like," (a laugh). There was Luther for you; but do you think any one believed him that he was just as good as St. Paul? No, my friends. Now I have here Parker's edition of the Bible, where he quotes the 6th commandment; but I will not mention what is expressed in it in the presence of ladies; and I trust that since I began this discussion, notwithstanding all the provocation I received from my opponent, that I have not made use of any language calculated to offend decency. I should pass this over, and point your attention to a few of the glaring errors and perversions which those men have introduced into the Bible. Here they are in the editions printed in the years 1566, 1567, 1577, 1579: and mark me, all these differ from the present translation, and every translation coming nearer to that which is approved of and sanctioned by the Catholic church. Here, then, in the first place is "ye" substituted for "we." The apostle says we shall take those who are fit for the church; but the Protestant Bible has it, "ye shall take those," &c; meaning that the portion of the church were to be chosen by the people and not by the church—that the people were to choose their own preachers and pastors, and take all out of the hands of the church. There is Luther for you! Again, in Matthew, where the Saviour of mankind says to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The Protestant Bible has, "Upon this congregation will I build my church," &c. Now, who ever pretended to say that such a word as congregation is to be found in the text or context from which this is taken? The words are plainly and palpably "upon this rock," and the Protestant Bible of the present day has it so. See, then, the wilful and corrupt perversions of those apostles of a church which Mr. Gregg would maintain is the true holy Catholic and Apostolic church. Ah, Mr. Gregg, those were the apostates, and your church is the apostacy. Again you have it, instead of "he that will not hear the

church," they have it "he who does not hear the congregation;" thus turning rock and church into the word congregation alternately. This again is corrected in the present Protestant Bible, for they would be ashamed that such glaring perversions should now go before the world. Again, where it said "my dove is alone," they have it "my dove is one." In the passage about the Eucharist, where it says that "Jesus took bread and blessed it," &c., they have it "Jesus took bread and gave thanks." Oh, Protestants, will you, I implore of you, open your eyes to the fraudulent and wilful perversion of the word of the most High God, by those who were the founders of your religion, or, as Mr. Gregg has it, the reformers of the old religion? The reverend gentleman quoted various other texts to show the wilful perversion of them by Protestant translators, and concluded by saying, I may be told that these have been corrected; but that is nothing to the point which I want to establish. I want to show you that the founders of your church practised gross and wilful frauds upon God's holy word—that they were the apostates who went out from the truth—who were cast out from the true faith; and I ask you what confidence can you have in your Bible, coming from such roguish and polluted hands?

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG then proceeded as follows—You heard Mr. Maquire talk of Dr. Greer and Dr. Milner, and say that Dr. Greer could not answer his question about the scriptures proving themselves. Now I ask you what has this discussion to say to that, or what have we to say to Dr. Greer or his opinions of the church? If Dr. Greer spoke nonsense, that is nothing to us; and I make no doubt there would be Protestants, in plenty, found who would speak ridiculously enough. But, Sir, when you find that I or any other Protestant form our faith to the opinions of Dr. Greer or any other doctor who chooses to talk nonsense, or contrary to the letter and spirit of the scriptures, then you may boast of a triumph in quoting them against us as authority. Would the reverend gentleman think it fair if I found some strange concessions in Dr. Milner, that I should quote them against his church? No, my friends, I would do no such thing; I go to his church for my authorities to show her spirit and her practices, and I go to the Scriptures to show that that spirit and those practices are opposed to God's word. That is the way in which I go to work; that is the manner in which I proceed, whilst, on the contrary, my opponent is wasting his strength and frittering away his time in quoting authorities against me for what I, nor any human being, probably, care not one pin. He should not waste his valuable strength in acting in this way; he is assailing the church of England, and I promise him he has a tough job in his hands, and that all his strength, and much more besides, will not be able to shake her in the slightest degree. He says that I stand up as the champion for Protestantism *in globo* but I stand up for the church of England and her glorious religion. He quotes Luther against Calvin, and Zuinglius against Beza; and shows strife and contentions and quarrellings among the early reformers, about which we don't care a straw. I put it to you if I show perversions



of the scriptures by the Greek church, and quarrelling and dissensions amongst the founders of it, would you deem it fair that I should quote them against you ? No, but if I did so, you would have Mr. Maguire glad to see me at such a job ; he would be glad to see me running a way from the point at issue, and I must admit that I am glad to see him at such a job. He has got a certain task in hands, and why does he not stick to it, and not take up another. Now, if I gave a man a pair of shoes to make, and that instead of them he made a pair of breeches, would you not think him a stupid silly fellow ? But, Sir, keep to the question. You cannot retreat from the fleecing that I will give you. You talked of errors in the Protestant translation of the Bible ; but see, my friends, what the whole turned out to be ; no more than this—that there were errors, and that we corrected them ; that is something. He stated that the farther you go into Protestantism the more perceptible was the retrograde motion ; and that there was nothing but fraud and rapacity at the head of it. No doubt the farther you go up to the head of Protestantism the nearer you come to the tail of Popery. Those who were the first Protestants came out of Popery, and it might fairly be expected that they should bring along with them much of its darkness and its vices. You call them apostates, but they came out from you on account of your crimes and abominations. You are the apostates, and I verily believe in my soul that every Roman Catholic in these kingdoms, particularly every priest, is a rank apostate, (loud cheers on one side, and hisses on the other). My friends, I speak to you in affection ; but I am bound to speak to you the truth. If I find a man in a fever or an ague I am bound to represent to him the true state of his condition, and although he may rise up in anger against me, I am nevertheless bound to tell him the truth, and if I tell you the truth don't count me an enemy. I ask Mr. Maguire does he understand this text of Scripture—"Whosoever shall fall on the stone shall be broken, but he on whom the stone shall fall, shall be ground to powder." Will you tell me, Sir, the meaning of that ? but before I tell you the meaning I shall tell you a story. Dean Swift, at one time, who was a wit in his way, was told that a tailor, who wished to separate from the church, wanted to speak to him. Very well, said the Dean, show him in. The tailor was introduced to his presence, and he told him that he wished to separate from his church, and gave him various reasons for doing so. "Well," said the Dean, "you are a surprising man Have you ever read the Apocalypse ?" "I have," said the tailor. "Well," said the Dean, "do you remember having read there of an angel who stood with one foot on the land and the other on the sea ?" "I do," said the tailor. "Well," said the Dean, "would you be able to tell me how much cloth it would take to make a pair of breeches for that angel ?" There is a question for you ; answer it if you can, and then I'll answer your cavils against religion. It is in this way that Mr. Maguire puts his questions, and declare that he will proceed no further until they are answered. But I put questions on the scripture to Mr. Maguire, but I hardly could expect he would answer them. If I wanted to be instructed in the

scriptures, it is not to the Romish church I would go for instruction. But if I wanted to be instructed about holy water, and beads, and clay, and such things, I might go there. I will come now to an explanation of this passage. The man who stumbles in his walk is the man who sins, and the man who sins is he who falls against the rock. The just man may sin and rise again, but not without being broken and suffering for that sin. But the man who shall go out from the truth of Christ Jesus is he upon whom the rock shall fall and grind him to powder. I tell him this text in Daniel has reference to Popery. You have apostatized and gone out from the faith, and I tell you when the storm of Christ Jesus thunders against Popery then it is that those who are members of the apostasy shall repent in vain—and my prayer to God is, that the Rev. Mr. Maguire, and those who think with him, may repent in time. I would put my hands under your feet to save your souls. It is not by single texts of Scripture that we are to discover the word of God—no attempt of apostasy can corrupt the text, and what have errors in the translation, with regard to certain passages, to do with the letter or the spirit of the Scriptures. If the text of John, to which the Rev. Mr. Maguire alludes, were out of the Bible, it would make no value whatever, and if it were out, the doctrines of the Trinity would still be the same. He talks of errors which are no more than verbal, but it is not a verbal consideration of the Scriptures which leads us to a knowledge of them. I really did not know what the reverend gentleman was to be at to-day. I did not know that he was to have attacked the Protestant translation of the Scriptures, and I am not prepared with documents, to show that the Catholic translations have been most foul and abominable, and monstrously corrupted. To-morrow I shall be prepared, and I shall make the hair of your heads stand on end. I will show you when they introduced holy water, saint and image-worship, with all their other abominations, into the Scripture. I know some of my friends whom I see opposite will assist me in procuring these translations, (here the reverend speaker looked over anxiously towards where the Rev. Mr. Nolan, late Catholic priest, was seated). He talks of errors in our Bible—but look at our version and you will see various words printed in italics which shows that there is no corresponding term for them in the original, and so it was with Luther when he made a translation of the Bible—he believed in his soul that if he brought the sense with him, mere verbal alterations did not signify. There is an old proverb, and though I don't pay much regard to proverbs, I believe them when they speak the truth—*haud decit quod subintelligitur*. I don't want to say that you have not cause to cavil with those things; but they have nothing to do with doctrine. Did you see, my friends, when he came to read his sixth commandment, what delicacy he evinced; he would not read it because the ladies were present. Oh, “the spotless, pure Maguire,” as the ballad says. But although he was too delicate to read the commandment for you, he did not tell you that his church left out the second commandment in the catechism—which second commandment says “thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing that is in

heaven above or in the earth beneath, or of those things that are under the earth—thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them, for I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, and visiting the iniquities of the fathers unto the fourth generations of them that hate me and shewing mercy unto thousands, in them that love me, and keep my commandments." He did not tell you that his church mutilated the terrible commandments of God, and left this out of the catechism from which youth is instructed. That omission is the reason that he has as the sixth what we have as the seventh commandment; he would not read for you that commandment, but I ask him did not God's justice flash before him as a sword, when he read—"Those who take away from the prophecies of this book, their names shall be taken out of the book of life." Although this would seem to relate directly to the prophecy of the Apocalypse, it relates also to all the scriptures. But Mr. Maguire, by showing errors in our translation, which have nothing to do with our doctrines, is endeavoring to turn the question into an Infidel question, by casting doubts on the Bible. The question he seems to raise is, is the Bible the Book of God? Instead of meeting the arguments which I raise against the corruptions and crimes of his church. He tells me we can't prove the Bible, because we separated from the dross and corruptions of the Romish church, and flung off the husks. Will he tell me that the gold and silver brought by the Israelites out of Egypt was all hay and stubble, or that it was not pure because it came out of that land of crime and corruption? We have our apostolic bishops and our clergy—we have had our faithful witnesses, who kept the faith alive for ages; and I believe that it has been by some fortuitous circumstance, by the special interference of God, who blinded the eyes of the Roman Catholics and the friars, that the Bible was preserved to us. I come now to your *liber expurgatorius*, for I like to be running into your rat holes after Popery. I will show something out of this. Here the reverend gentleman commenced reading a chapter on celibacy, when his half hour ended.

The Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE then proceeded—Now, my friends, I ask you candidly has my reverend opponent adduced one single argument during the last half hour? You will perceive that the question which I proposed to him was this—Was there any principle in the Protestant religion by which a Protestant could satisfy a Jew, Infidel, Atheist, or Pagan, of the canonicity of the scriptures? Was there any means left to him under Heaven by which he could prove that the Bible was the book of God? And if he could not prove that, was there anything left to him but to return to that church in whose possession it has been from the days of the Apostles to the present time, or else to reject it altogether? Did he grapple with the question—did he say one word about it at all? Has he given you any proof beyond his own mere *ipse dixit* that the Bible is the book of God? Again I say, let him answer that if he can, and let him bring all Trinity College to his assistance. When I quoted Protestant authority in support of my arguments, and Protestant clergymen, and bishops too, he turns round and throws them all overboard and says he does not care one straw for the opinions of the

whole of them. With him they were all as bad as the Rev. Mr. Burgh. I gave the authority of a man in Trinity College, a man high in the church, and at present enjoying a living under the church, the Rev. Dr. Greer. But he tells you that he does not care a pin for him. Why, he cares for no authority that tells against him, whether they be Catholic or Protestant, because, forsooth, he hath the Spirit. He refers to our *Index Expurgatorius*; but it would be well for his church if she had an *Index Expurgatorius*—if she watched with greater care over doctrine and discipline. Why, if she even did that, there would be something in the shape of authority to refer to—some barrier beyond which the ranting fanatics could not go—some standard against which every man could not raise his private opinion. But, no; no matter what any man says—no matter what strange doctrines or absurdities are introduced—your watchers on the walls of Jerusalem are dumb dogs. You say nothing against anything but Popery, and after all, what are we the worse—here we are strong and well, notwithstanding all the assaults that have been made on us. You said that I had a tough job in assailing the Protestant church. Well, I shall leave it to the public to judge if you will not have full as much to do in assailing the Popish church. But come, Sir, I want to bind you to principles, even now, at the eleventh hour. Will you answer the question I proposed to you in my last address? Will you try your hand at it again? Will you show the Unitarian, the Jew, or the Infidel, or Pagan, how you prove the integrity and truth of the word of God? Will you even attempt to do it, or candidly acknowledge that you are unequal to the task, and if you once make that acknowledgment, then the whole of your church is crumbled into dust. You said that you would quote a passage from Milner, which would tell against the Romish church; I dare you to do it, Sir. Milner, nor any other Catholic ecclesiastic, never wrote anything against the doctrines and canons of the Catholic church; if they did, they were no longer of her community—they were expelled from her bosom. But you and the swarm of locusts that are gone out from her, would rend the seamless garment, and create apostacy, schism, and dissensions. Now, Sir, this is my day of attack; and I am sorry that you have forced me to the expostitions which I now find necessary to make. You say that you are not prepared to defend the attack until to-morrow. Now, this is the only solid truth you uttered since you commenced this day. I know, Sir, you are not prepared to make a defence; but what is more, I can tell you that you never will. Now, Sir, throughout the whole range that you took in attacking my church, did I ever tell you that I was not prepared to defend her? Now, I call upon the Protestant gentlemen who are present, to not be thrown off their guard by your manœuvring, and evading the questions at issue. Now, my Protestant friends—and why should you not be my friends, for we all worship the same God, and I never uttered a personally offensive word to Protestant or any other on religious grounds, and if I am obliged by the recital of stern truths to wound your feelings or your prejudices, I have been forced to the task. But as you are reasoning men—men of sense, of candour, and of honor, you will

be the better for it, you will judge for yourselves, and when you see the wilful and the fraudulent perversions and the abominable mis-translations of the word of God, which have been introduced by the founders of your religion, you may, under God, awaken to a sense of your error. Mr. Gregg sincerely called me a man of delicacy, pure and spotless ; it is for God to judge. I am, however, a man of delicacy—and, as I have said before, I trust that nothing shall escape my lips to offend against morals and propriety. My opponent said if he were to attack the Greek church, and bring her perversions of scripture as an argument against me, that it would be unfair ; but what parallel is there between the two cases ? Mind me, I do not make any attack on these translations or perversions on account of any verbal errors ; but I attack those who brought you lies, and blasphemy, and corruption into the word of God. My opponent said, “To be sure, the farther you go up into Protestantism the nearer you come to the tail of Popery, and the more corruption, darkness, and vices you will find.” Now, I must admit that this is another truth ; for the outcasts, and vagabonds and liars, the defamers and renegades—men who, from their bad passions and licentiousness, were unfit to remain in the Catholic faith—“they were cast out and they became Protestants.” See what a damning admission he has unwittingly made—that the apostates, who were blinded by their dark passions, and were cast out from Popery, were the heads, the fountains of Protestantism. Those men, when cast out, had no alternative, but to repent and return to the bosom of the Catholic faith, or to set up an opposition against it. But, like Satan, they preferred the latter alternative ; they raised the standard of rebellion and apostacy and they and their followers have ever since been wandering in the mazes of error, and are to this hour unable by any one single principle to prove the truth of God’s word. Here is Protestantism without principle—here is what I have been combatting with since the discussion began ; and how have I been met ? By calumny, by loose assertions, and abuse of that religion which you, Sir—no, not you—but your ancestors basely deserted. You say that you have apostolic bishops. Be kind enough to inform me who ordained your first bishops ? I told you, Sir, that you had nothing but what you got from us—what you either took by force or by stealth. You say that your apostate bishops were the first fathers of the church. Now, is it not more likely that they were the locusts foretold by St. John—the apostates from the truth. But now, my Protestant friends, hear me, and I come to a passage in this man’s speech within the last half hour. What do you think of the man pretending to be a scholar and setting himself up to be your champion, the champion of the Protestant church—to openly declare in the face of this assembly that he believed it was owing to some fortuitous circumstance that the word of God was preserved and handed down to the followers of Jesus Christ—that it was by mere accident that the countless millions who are contained within the church of Christ had the word of God preserved to them. Now, don’t I require more than superhuman patience to argue with a man who says he has all his doctrines by

chance? Here is a beautiful specimen of a Protestant theologian for you. Now, Protestants, what do you think of your chance champion? I push him hard. I call on him for proofs. I quote authorities. He casts all the authorities overboard, and finally asserts that he has the Bible by chance—that he can give no further proofs concerning it. Hear him again. Why the man is completely confounded and bewildered. He tells you that he does not care a farthing if the text about the Trinity was out of the Bible—that it would be all the same to him. Oh, good God! is not this too bad? How can I argue with such a man? Here is a man who turns about upon millions of men, and says to them: “I don’t care about the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, whether they be in the Bible or not. I care for no man’s authority—for what any man says or writes. I have the tribunal of my own private judgment. I have the spirit with me—I am superior to the whole world besides.” Oh, Protestants of the united kingdom, if these be the doctrines he publicly advocates, your church has got a blow from which she can never recover. There he stands—his words are taken down—there he is arraigned before the public judgment of your church; and if this be Protestantism, it is a thousand times worse than I ever previously thought it. It is an old saying, “save me from my friends, and I will save myself from my enemies;” and I tell you, Protestants, that he is the greatest enemy you ever met with, and that he has done your cause irreparable injury. Again, my friends, he says he admits at one time private judgment, at another time public judgment. When I seek to tie him to one, he will fly to the other, and take refuge with each alternately. But when sorely pushed on both, he throws all overboard, and sticks to chance. I asked him for a rule of faith in the commencement of the discussion. The whole of the week passed over, and he has not given it to me yet. I never could bring him to that point—he merely said that he founded his rule of faith on the Bible. I called on him to prove the integrity of the Bible, or to show any principle of his church by which he could convince any sceptic that it was the book of God, and what has he done in the end, now near the end of the discussion? He tells you all is owing to some fortuitous circumstance. This is my day of attack. During his days of attack I showed that I could answer him. But what answer does he give me when I attack his church, and show the malversion, the perversion, the fraud, the villany and corruption with which the early reformers dealt with the word of God? He turns round on me and says—I have no more to do with those reformers than you have to do with the Greek church. There is again your champion for you. He throws overboard all the holy apostles, the shining lights and pure reformers of your church, and then he stands bewildered and amazed at the intricacies into which he has fallen. Oh, my friends, if I were personally solicitous for a triumph, I might appeal only to the judgment of rational men. I will boast of no triumph—I only wish that what is said may go abroad and be read, and that those who read it may understand. Oh, my Protestant friends, your grand Reformation, with your Protestant reformers, have been thrown overboard by

your champion; and I tell you that the Protestant church never had an enemy until she fell into the hands of Gregg. You have heard the great noise he made, and the maledictions of heaven he invoked upon those who dared to meddle with the word of God, forgetting at the same time the founder of his church, whom I proved to have not only changed the text, but added to it. Those thunders were directed against the Catholic church, for leaving out a portion of the ten commandments—out of what do you think? I suppose you all thought it was out of the Catholic Bible. No; not one word of them was ever left out of the Catholic Bible, but there was an abridgment of them in a half-penny catechism, for the use of children four or five years old. We left out “his ox or his ass” in the tenth commandment, and put in “thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s goods,” which included oxen, asses, and everything else he might have. He did not complain of this being left out, but he says we left out the second commandment. Now, I will just ask him, by way of experiment, how does he know that the portion to which he refers, was the second commandment? Who made the division of the commandments? Moses never divided them. Whatever division was made was made by the Catholic church. But can he say that the Catholic church ever omitted one single sentence of the Holy Scriptures from beginning to end in their Bible? No; but in the elementary books for children, they gave the heads and extracts of the Old and New Testaments. I ask you, Sir, did you ever read Origen on the commandments? But I know you did not, and if I was to quote him as authority, you would throw him overboard with all the rest. But your church, Sir, made a division of the commandments. You put the ninth and tenth together into one, to uphold your damnable doctrine that there is no distinction in sins, and you have it—“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his.” Thus you put the man’s wife and his ox on a level. We have it, Ninth—“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife.” Tenth—“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s goods.” Now which of those two divisions was the more rational and proper? I come now, gentlemen of the church of England, again to the mis-translations and corruptions introduced into the Bible by the early Reformers. First, I will ask you was my opponent able to accuse my church of adding to or taking from one word in the Scriptures? But see again what Luther does; it is not that he adds a note to the margin, or makes any observation on the text, but he brings a passage into the body of the text wholly at variance with the entire spirit of the gospel. When Luther was spoken to on the subject, he said, “I am an apostle as well as Paul; and if Paul wrote the whole book have not I a right to put in a word.” He said I made no observation about the miry clay; but I will stake my credit if I did not answer him completely on that point. It appears that he is most anxious about saving my soul. Why, it appears then that he believes in the intercession of saints, and that my soul might be saved by timely interference. He says that he would do all in his

power to accomplish that object—he would put his hands under my feet. Now, if he believes that a living saint could do so much to save my soul, what right has he to complain if I believe that St. Paul, who is in heaven, enjoying the glory of God, might intercede for the salvation of my soul? St. Paul, who is in heaven, knows what is going on here; and it is not at all unlikely that he may be praying to God that his glory may be made manifest on earth. The devil, too, knows what is going on, and he may be holding a jubilee and rejoicing at the perpetual attacks that are being made on the church of Christ. But there will be a greater jubilee in heaven, for the truth and glory of God will be triumphant, and that church with which he has promised to remain shall still continue as the city on the mount. I ask you, Sir, why you are compelling me to knock the brains out of Protestantism—to anatomize it, and leave it bare in all its deformity to the world? I did not choose the task; you compelled me to it. I wanted to bind you to the Scriptures, to pin you to a rule of faith; but you had no principle to go by, and you evaded me, and had recourse to the most base, slanderous, and lying authorities, to defend your church. I don't do so. I rely upon the Scriptures for doctrine, and upon credible witnesses of your own church for facts. In your last speech, as if to kill time, you treated us to a story from Dean Swift. You merely did it for the purpose of evading me. That is the way you have been going about, creeping into holes and corners, and under the doors into the houses of old women. But ought not the old women to ask you where you came from—where you got the Bible which you offered them to read, and if you cadidly said to them, "I got it from the corrupt Papist," why, there is not an old woman in the country that would not tell you begone, that she would have nothing to do with you. On the other hand, if you told her you got it by chance, why she would tell you begone as an impudent impostor. And I tell you, Mr. Gregg, that when this discussion is over you will not be able to creep into as many houses as you used to do. And come now, Sir, I will put a clear question to you again; and I beg you will not say, in attempting a reply, that you smell an Infidel or an Atheist, who is throwing doubt upon the word of God. I have, Sir, repeatedly declared before high heaven that I would suffer a thousand deaths before I would deny the holy Scriptures; but I use those arguments to show that you have nothing but what came from the church which you basely deserted. Now, Sir, is my question, to wit: Where is your proof of the authenticity or integrity of the Bible, unless you take that proof from the Catholic church? If you fail in giving a proof of the Bible, how can you make a rule of faith? and if you fail in the rule of faith, you must acknowledge that your church is the apostacy. I have put these questions repeatedly. Now, that the discursish is drawing to a close, I ask you you, will you attempt anything like an answer? You attempted to prove that we were the apostacy; and, I will grant you this, that if you did not fail in that attempt you failed in nothing. Here, now,



my friends I refer to other passages which have been grossly perverted in these Protestant translations. In the passage "drink the wine which I have mingled for you." This Protestant translation has it, "drink the wine which I have drawn for you." Now, in no language that ever was written, do the words mingle and draw bear any affinity. But it was done for a purpose. Again in the passage where it said, "she hath immolated her host," the Protestant translation has it, "she hath killed her beast." Where the passage appears, "shall serve the altar," the Protestant version has it "shall serve the table." For "church," there is substituted the word "temple." For the word "priest," they have substituted "elder;" and for "church," congregation." For in the passage where it is said, "if any one be sick among you, call in the priests of the church," they have it, "call in the elders of the congregation." Thus if a man were sick all the old men of the congregation were to be called in to him in place of the priests of the church.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

---

#### EIGHTH DAY—WEDNESDAY.

---

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Now, Sir, to begin with your last proposition first, for I have not taken it down. You talk about using the word "elder" for "priest." Now, I ask you, and answer these people if you can, is not the word in the Greek *presbuteroi*, and does not that signify elder? *Presbus*, *presbuteros*, *presbutatos*—is not that the comparison of it? Now, does it not signify elder?—And even if we do use the word, is it not perfectly and strictly correct? And is not our English "priest" derived from "elder?" He says we exclude the word "altar" from the scriptures. Why, here we have in Revelations—"On the horns of the golden altar." (Here he mentioned several other passages in which the word is to be met.) Yet he pretends that we leave it out, just as if we would be afraid of it. No, Sir, it is you who are afraid of retaining the true and original words in the Bible. Let me show the tendency and character of the Popish Bible. The entire spirit that pervades it is evidently an attempt at mystery and mystification. You retain hard words, which cannot be possibly understood. Now, mark me. Why do you call the book of Chronicles *Paralipomena*? Now, what is the use of adopting such a word? Does any Irishman who hears it understand its meaning? No; and that is what you want. We use the proper, easy, intelligible name. Why do you use the other? Because you seek to put the brand of mystery upon every.

thing connected with the Bible, and to persuade the people that it cannot be understood. Why do you call the book "the Apocalypse" instead of "the Revelations"? Why do you not translate the phrase? For the very same reason—to keep the people in the dark. Why do you use the word "holocaust" instead of "whole burnt offering"? Why retain several other unintelligible phrases which we translate? That the people may think that the Bible is beyond their comprehension, that it is a mystery, and that therefore they may not desire to read it. Well may you shake and tremble (laughter). You ask me to prove the canonicity of the scriptures. Why, I could prove them to any Jew, Pagan, or Infidel, in the world. I ask, you, who are they that convert the Pagans? Look, Sir, at the church of England missionaries, even at the present day, labouring for the conversion of the Pagans in Asia and in the islands of the Indian Ocean. They go abroad from their friends and their country to redeem from darkness those who have never heard of, and who do not believe in, the true God and the doctrines of revealed religion. The missionaries in Asia alone have translated the Bible into sixty different languages. We have translated the Bible into Irish for the benefit of our poor countrymen. Can you show any such work as that done by the clergymen of your religion? He asks me to prove the canonicity of the scriptures. Now, Sir, I will give you but one proof, and that proof you must be contented with, for I will give you no other. It is, that the church is the witness and keeper of the holy writ: and it is on her authority that we receive the scriptures. She tells us that the scriptures, as she gives them to us, are those that she received from the apostles, and we receive them as such. Now, I could give you other proofs, but I will not (groans). I will not give them to you, but I will give them to those people for their satisfaction (great cheers)—but to you I won't. We have the one Catholic and apostolic church, and its authority I will give to you, and you must be satisfied with it, for I will give you no other. But, my friends, the canonicity of the scriptures can be proved in various ways. First, look to ancient history, and you will find that the very canon of the scripture was agreed to just as we have received it by the primitive church, before it was defiled by superstition and absurdity—before bones and nails were blessed, and devils were driven out of sand and mortar (groans and cheers). We can refer to the apostolical bishops of our church—a long line of sacred men, without whose knowledge the scriptures could not have been foisted upon the world, and all of whom tell us that the canon was as it still continues to be. We can refer to a long line of writers and historians (entirely irrespective of the bishops), that touched one another, preserved the connection—so that there could be no

lapsed interval—and rendered it equally impossible that any false scriptures could have been foisted upon the world. Secondly, and it is by far of the greatest importance, the holy spirit has been given to us, and when we read the holy Bible we are enabled to understand that word. I tell you, Sir, that the divine scriptures contain in themselves such evidence of their canonicity, that if a savage would once compass the reading of them, he would without the interference of any human being, be fully convinced of their inspiration, and be persuaded of their truth. Thus do I prove the canonicity of the scriptures. Further, I am asked how could I convert a Jew, a Pagan, or an Infidel? I will tell you, and how I convince them of the truth of the scriptures. I stand up before them, and I preach to them in the language of God, the holy truths which he has taught us. I picture to them the state of their own hearts as depicted in them. I hold out to them the promises of our divine Saviour. I hold up to them Jesus as he died on the cross for their salvation. I tell them of the happiness which will be theirs, and of the destitute, naked condition in which they are; and as I preach, the holy spirit, being a witness, enters into their hearts, and by its divine inspiration brings home to them the truths which I speak, and persuades them to embrace them. This is the way, that by simply preaching and holding up Jesus to the unbelieving, and by impressing upon them his greatness and his mercy, we change them, not into pillar worshippers or men who dress up their idols in petticoats, and call them the Virgin Mary (hissing and cheering), but into true Christians. Thus, we teach them to bow before the altar of Jesus, and to raise up their souls to him in confidence that as he has purchased for them everlasting salvation by shedding his blood upon the cross, he will give them that peace which the world cannot give. You ask me, Sir, how can an ignorant Protestant make an act of faith, when he is not able to read the Bible? I will tell you how. We preach to him the word of God from that Bible. We impress upon him strongly the truths which it contains, and by the blessing and inspiration of the Holy Ghost our words come home to his mind, and he knows almost as much about the Scriptures as if he had read every word of them. The uneducated man then feels, Sir, with far greater force than you can feel (for he belongs to the church of God) that he is a sinner and that of himself he can do nothing; and he looks to his Saviour upon the cross, convinced that through him alone he can be saved. Thus, Sir, without reading one single syllable from the Bible the ignorant man is taught by the Lord, and enabled to comprehend what it contains; and thus, Sir, I answer your question. But let me give you facts which are always better than assertions, I will bring you to England, and I will show

you there a great many poor men who have never read a single syllable from the scriptures, who will kneel before the altar of God and pour forth their souls in prayer with such a power of divine eloquence, such faith, and in such correct scriptural language, that I have said when I have heard them thus raising their voices in praise and thanksgiving to the Most High, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be world without end—Amen." So that, my good Sir, the man who has never, and in all probability, never will read the word of God, could teach you true theology (laughter and cheers). And, as I have said, when they address themselves to God their prayers are entirely and beautifully made up of the language of scripture. Why, Sir, I tell you I could give you the very names and residences of many and many a poor man in England, who, though circumstanced as you have supposed, have every word of the sacred scriptures engraven on their hearts, and whose prayers are so dignified, whose language, when addressing God, is so refined, and eloquent, that it would shame the aristocracy of any Popish country (laughter), and put them to the blush because of their inferiority. And why is this? Because they are taught by God, and are not connected with Antichrist. Oh, Sir, let me tell you that if you go into Protestant England you will there see men truly holy and given to God. You will there see ardent and truly Christian faith, beautiful example of the effects produced by religion, pure and undefiled by superstitious abominations. I will now pass from this topic and I will come to your next point. I will come now to your veiled prophets of a luxuriant religion. Oh, he does not say a word more of them; but we have him turning and twining and saying everything over and over and over again. He cannot say one word in contradiction of what I have advanced. He cannot say a single word in defence of his apostate church, and therefore he is only kicking against the pricks, and knocking his head against the rocks of ages, which I tell him will knock out not only his brains, but the brains of all those who continue in your church when they have heard the warning of its approaching dissolution. "But then," says the Rev. Mr. Maguire, "the apostate bishops of our church are the primitive apostles of yours." What, Sir, is it because they leave your church they are apostate? I tell you this is not the case; but I say that your church is apostate (hisses and cheers); aye, and that every one who does not leave your church is apostate. You belong, Sir, to the apostate church, and you have not attempted to refute my arguments, proving that such is the case; I say again, Sir, (and tremble when I say it) that you are, and that it is only when you will cease to belong to the Roman Catholic church, that you will cease to have the brand of Antichrist upon your forehead.

You tax me with Henry VIII., and the priests and bishops who then left your church. Why, Sir, they are leaving your church in numbers up to this very day. There is Mr. Crotty, with his whole flock—what do you say to him? There's Mr. Nolan, (tremendous hissing and cheers); and I could, if I liked, enumerate many others, who, in my own time, renounced the errors of Popery and embraced the truth, of the church of England. Why, Sir, young as I am in the church, I myself have been the means of restoring men to the true church, and inducing them to come out of Babylon. I have had many spiritual children who, under my care, have renounced Popery and come over to our church; and all this, remember, at a time when the church is persecuted, when the hand of man is raised against her, when her ministers are reduced to poverty, and are refused that which is allowed them by the laws of the land. I tell you, Sir, that they will continue to leave you, till you are left nearly alone, to be blown up with Rome, the city of abominations. He tells me not to say that I smell an Atheist or an Infidel, or to use any other expression of that kind. Oh, no, that is coming to close to him. Instead of going on with the argument, he wants me to compare swords. He does not go on with the battle, but stops to measure blades, but I will thrust my blade right through him, (laughter and cheers). And then he tells me I throw Protestantism overboard. I do not. I deny it. If he has anything to say to Protestants, let him go to Dr Urwick, I'll engage he has something to say for himself. If he has anything to say with regard to Presbyterianism, let him go to Dr. Steward or Dr. Cooke, I'll engage they will answer him. But I have nothing to do with them. I insist, Sir, upon your being consistent as I am, I will not let you wander. I will keep you to the point. Bring forward the veiled prophet of a luxuriating establishment. Oh, no, you will say nothing about them, and I must follow you in all you say. But when I have disposed of you, you may be sure I will attack you. Yes, I will, and I will not waste my time in answering frivolous objections. He says I introduce a new rule of faith. I say I do not. But I care not for private witnesses to the faith. I hold the faith which the church holds. She is the keeper of the holy word, and I obey her, and receive the doctrines which she inculcates. You ask me to reconcile private and public judgment. I say they are easily reconciled. For if the private judgment be well regulated, it will defer to the public judgment, and in the end will invariably coincide with it. He ridicules the idea of a public and private judgment. Now, I ask, is there not a private and a public judgment in the mathematical world, and does not a well-regulated private judgment always coincide with the public judgment, and if any one imagine that he has discovered some new principle which is completely opposed to the common sense of the entire mathematical world, and if he will not yield, is he not laughed at and scouted by them? I am, I say, for the right of private judgment, but then that private judgment must defer to the public judgment of the church. He talks next of the division of the commandments; and, oh, I pitied him when he came to speak on the subject. You saw how he winced. Oh, that is a sore point, I know; and when he calls to mind her blessing of stones, and bones, her worship of idols

and her consecrating of tabernacles, and all the collecting of pence, and shillings, and pounds from the poor people, and the degradation to which they are reduced by the superstitious ceremonies, I do not wonder at his shaking, trembling and perspiring, (loud laughter and cheers). Now, let me ask, how has he divided the commandments himself? Oh, what a mare's nest he has found. It is like the man who, when walking in the streets, saw a stable open and came back to his friends and told them he had found a mare's nest. That's just the way with the reverend gentleman. Now let me ask him what we have left out of the commandments? He has left out part of them, and besides he has boldly divided them. He knows that the seventh commandment in our church includes the ninth commandment in his. He knows that the command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," is included in the seventh commandment; and how then will he get out of the charge of making them synonymous? You say you care not for the number of the commandments. If you do not, and if you be anxious as to their division, you should reduce them to nine? But, Sir, your church is a false and lying church, (hisses and cheers). Again he says that they turned out their bishops when they became apostate, and we took them to ourselves without again ordaining them. But that they always ordain anew those who go over from us to them. If so, is it not marvellous that in the reign of Mary those bishops who had left them and returned again were not consecrated anew? But let me tell you that they turned your church as I turn you now, (laughter). I tell you, Sir, that you are guilty of idolatry, and the proofs of it are plain (question, question). It is the question. I am not wandering from it. You charge me with saying that we owe our scriptures to fortuitous circumstances. I did; but by that you are not to understand chance. I hold that there is no such thing as chance in the world. So much am I opposed to the doctrine of chance, that in my first letter with regard to this discussion, the words I used are, "It came to pass." But when I used the words "fortuitous circumstances," I had the authority of scripture for doing so; for in the scriptures it is used to signify providence, and I used it to-day in the same signification. He says I am the champion of Trinity College. Now, I'll tell you what I am—I am the little David that will overcome the boasted champion of apostacy (cheers and hisses). I am a man with no power, no skill, no reputation to lose, and my only qualification is, that the spirit of God is with me. But poor as I am in those respects, I will stand against him, and I will show him, that though I am but little, he has caught a Tartar (cheers and hisses). Come, now, I challenge you, sir, to come to common sense, and to give up such cavils as you are using. Now, hear me—I say the doctrine of the intercession of the saints is damnable. Defend it if you can. He calls me "defender of the faith," and says I am a pretty defender. Why, sir, you have given me nothing to defend myself against. On the contrary, I will prove that you are guilty of idolatry, and that your church teaches none but false doctrine. But here I am now without anything to answer. Why, I protest I might have sat down a full quarter of an hour ago, (laughter). The man is beaten (cheers and laughter). He is a beaten man, (renewed cheers and laughter).

# THE DISCUSSION,

BETWEEN

THE REV. MESSRS. MAGUIRE AND GREGG.

---

EIGHTH DAY—WEDNESDAY.—(CONTINUED.)

---

Mr. MAGUIRE—Well you certainly made out the half hour as well as you could, and I perfectly agree with you that you would have done yourself and your cause much more service if you had sat down a quarter of an hour ago. Now, Mr. Gregg, in the face of this assembly, I challenge you to-morrow to meet me on the intercession of the saints. I accept your call, Sir, (great cheering).

Mr. GREGG—And I'll meet it (cheering from Mr. Gregg's friends).

Mr. MAGUIRE—Don't make such a noise; you know the chairmen will allow me any time that I may lose by your interruption. You have all heard the proofs which he has given of the canonicity of the Scriptures—First, he says he has them on the authority of the church; but then, what church he will not define, because he knows well he has no such authority. He then runs to the primitive fathers! The primitive of what church? of ours—to prove Protestantism and Christianity. Now, Sir, I ask you is not that admitting the very authority which you have denied all through—namely, that of the tradition of the holy Catholic and Apostolic church—you have nothing else to prove your own Scriptures, but the authority of the holy fathers. Of what church were they! Who canonised them? In whose communion did they live and die before Protestantism was ever heard of! Oh, Sir, you know well it was the holy Roman Catholic church. You talk, then, of corruption and apostacy, and yet you are driven to prove the divinity of your Bible to this apostacy and corruption. Your friends ought to congratulate you on going back again to Popery. You deny your apostacy, and going back again to Popery. You deny your apostacy, and when you were put to the proof did we not see that you were obliged to admit you took the whole Bible from us; and—oh! look at him—there is the man who defends Protestantism. What a pretty champion! What an accomplished divi! He goes to ancient history—to profane history. Good God! was ever such a thing heard of? Who ever knew that in order to prove sacred history it was necessary to have recourse to profane history in order to prove the sacred history of the eternal word of God? What! find out that which is an infallible medium of God's Revelation to man by means of profane history. Is it not monstrous? Is it not blasphemous to prove the existence of the Holy Spirit of God by such means, as if any of the other books of Cicero, Tertullian, or any other writer, to prove the existence of Divine Revela-

by the spirit of God, but the baseness and villanies of man, when it becomes an instrument of the devil, to drive mankind into confusion. Look at what has occurred in Canturbury the other day, where a man told the people he was the Saviour of the world—that he would rise again in three days, and that nothing could molest him. There's Bible-reading in England for you, (laughter), where you can get sacks of them for nothing, (continued laughter). This persuaded his deluded followers to resist the Queen's forces, under the persuasion that he would do what Antichrist will be allowed, namely, to work miracles; and that they could not be touched by a bullet. Look to the miserable consequences which resulted from that unfortunate fanaticism—numbers of unfortunate men shot dead, and others wounded, the wretched man who deluded the poor people having sacrificed his life. Look at Johanna Southcote, how many props of Protestantism did she seduce?—about sixty or seventy parsons were continually dandling after her tail, (laughter), as if she were their Saviour. Did she seduce a priest? or would she were she now living! There's your apostacy for you! What care you for apostacy! Be the sect anti-Baptist, Quaker, Jew—anything, even the devil himself, and he is safe, provided he is not a Papist. You say nothing against the Unitarian, who denies the divinity of Jesus Christ. You say nothing against the Deist; and I regret there are too many of them. No, Sir, but Popery is opposed because the children of Israel in Egypt cannot be put down. If you could sink Ireland into the Atlantic in forty-eight hours you would be satisfied. That is the alpha and omega of your orisons, and this it is which shows the holy spirit of which you are possessed, and that love of your neighbour which characterises you. O, we would sell all we have, and give it to the poor, only for Popery, (laughter). Stick to that, and you will continue in the spirit of error, from which, from my heart, I beg of God to remove you. The reverend gentleman says he defers his judgment to that of the church, and then he admits the right of private judgment to every individual in that church. I will leave you to judge of the consequences which must arise from that doctrine. I shall not give myself much more trouble on that head. You will recollect whether he ever explained, if a disagreement should arise what was to be done. I now ask him, and I hope he will remember it for to-morrow, whether the Holy Ghost is the public judgment or the private judgment? Which is the rule of faith? and, if either should come into collision, who is to decide? or who is right, or who is wrong? If the public judgment of the church should set up one opinion, I want to know would Daddy Cooke, or Dr. Urwick, or Mr. Pope bend to that opinion? O, no, they would laugh at you. They have already refused your best benefices, and despised your mandates. Would the Unitarian bow to your authority? Would the Trinitarian? the Moravian? the Southcotonians? Not they. They despise you as much as they do the Pope himself in this respect. Will you explain, therefore, who is the Holy Ghost? He then talks of mathematics—to please your imagination, I suppose. I ask you, gentlemen, is not revelation above the capacity of man? God



revealed his sacred mysteries unto us ; but they are above our comprehension, and are not to be proved by mathematical calculation. God has revealed certain articles, and insists as a condition of our being saved, that we shall believe in them on his divine authority ; and, as St. Paul says, God captivates our understanding to the obedience of faith. To understand them, we must have some motive for doing so. First, whether God has revealed them ; and the moment we arrive at that conclusion we are bound, under pain of eternal damnation, to believe them. The question is, then, is that the Bible in which God's holy word is ? I have asked him to prove it. He will not do so ; but, like your honest reformers of old he says he twists and turns, and presumptuously asserts that he has the spirit of God, instead of quoting one single argument to prove its divine origin. Was not this the case with Courtenay at Canturbury, the other day ? and perhaps he had as much claim to the spirit as he has. He then talks of images—to-morrow will be set apart for the discussion of that doctrine, and we will see whether he will prove from the holy scriptures that it is erroneous. It will be the last day, and it will be seen who does or who does not belong to the Catholic church of Christ, which was always visible on earth since the days of the apostles, holy and apostolic. I ask you this question, sir, what church condemned all the heresies that ever appeared in the world ? I read for you yesterday the council, the year, the name of the Pope who presided, the name of the heresy condemned from the last general council of Trent, which condemned your church to St. Peter. I call on him to prove that that was his church. O, no ; he says it could not be seen. What ! can the church be the united, holy, and apostolic church of Christ on earth, and be invisible ? Was there ever such a contradiction as he was guilty of ? He then talks of our bishops in the time of Mary, how they turned round when she came on the throne, and then turned back when Elizabeth succeeded her. I ask him were they ordained over again by Elizabeth—was it not from us they got their ordination, and did you ever deny its validity ? This I tell you, sir, that if you came over to us, we would not receive you until you denied your ordination and consecration, and be ordained anew. Your great Archbishop Cranmer told the king that he had nothing to do round the heads of bishops, and they were consecrated ; and when in the time of Elizabeth the Catholic bishops refused to ordain Matthew Parker, she gave Baile and Storey supreme power to do so, saying she would give them a dispensation for any defects which took place in the consecration. We know you forged the words of Lambeth, and it was not until you were attacked by Gregory Martin that you did so ; and even then they were not brought forth for thirty years. It is now evident you forged them, and no one is hardy enough to deny it. When Lingard was attacked for stating in his history of England that Matthew Parker was consecrated, he was obliged to state that he was consecrated, but that he did not say it was lawful consecration. Thus, sir, are we watchful over the fold of Jesus Christ, and when any of our priests go over to you, you require them to do no penance—you do not call upon them to

perform good works, holding that faith alone is sufficient. The moment they come, you send them to preach against Popery—you take them from Antichrist, without any preparation, nor do you even instruct them as catechisiers.

MR. GREGG—We demand a recantation.

MR. MAGUIRE—Without a trial of any sort, you take the scum of the beast (a laugh)—although St. Paul says—"let a man prove himself."

The half hour ended here.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—We take them without restitution, without consecration, without consubstantiation, and all the other ations; but did we take them back without recantation (cheers and hisses). I tell you we don't take them back till they have acknowledged that their original ordination was false and devilish; that it was mixed up with the worst of poisons—that they were obliged at the time they received it to acknowledge they gave themselves up to the devil, and as it were sold their souls, like Judas, for 30 pieces of money; and before we suffer them to enter the pulpit, we oblige them to renounce all the abominations of that consecration or ordination which is foul, and the ceremonies attendant on which are but other proofs of your apostacy before God. Sir, you are a skilful, able, clever man. You know how far to go, and you take care to go no farther. Hence you took right good care not to mention recantation. That was cunning of you, Sir, but I tell you that if you should come back to us we will not receive you till you have read as big, nay a bigger recantation, than any man has read this many a-day (cheers and laughter). You have not hardly said anything during the last half hour. You know Juvenal says—"Crucis repetitæ miseros occidit magistros." You go on "Turn about and wheel about," but you never stop a moment at anything. But now I must have a triumph. Who displays the cowardice (loud cheers and hisses)? Who shrinks from the contest? What, Sir! so the discussion is to conclude to-morrow (cheers and hisses). To-morrow is then to be the last day (renewed cheering and groans). Oh, who is it that runs away? I tell you that if I were not restrained by a sense of what I owe to the chair, I would so cover you with shame (laughter, and loud cries of "question"). Mark my time, Sir. Oh, Sir, you are now beaten (laughter and cheers). There will be no more dragging of coats through our towns, asking who will tread on them. There will be no more challenging, no more browbeating (cheers, laughter, and groans, with cries of "ha, ha," from ex-priest Nolan). Here, now, I have twenty-one questions to answer, and I believe I may scratch my pen over the whole of them. He began by knocking his head against a mistake, which pervaded his entire speech—namely, that we believe the scriptures on the authority of the fathers alone, when I merely brought them in as accidental (a laugh). He talks of his church canonizing these

fathers—I tell you, sir, that your canonization is a mark of damnation. When any man is approved as a saint by your church, it is an excellent proof of his reprobation. You may talk as long as you like of your canonization, I will give you a specimen of some of the nice people on whom it was conferred, and an example of the virtues and distinctions which entitled any one to it. He read from the lives of the saints an extract of the life of St. Simon Stilex, who lived upon a pillar twenty-two cubits high, for twenty years, with a chain round his body. Now, there, said he, is one of their saints, and there is a specimen of the sanctity for which they were canonized. What a pity my reverend friend is not living on the top of a column, twenty-two cubits high (laughter and hisses). Why, I appeal to the common sense of my Roman Catholic brethren, is such a life as that the life of a saint? What should the life of a saint be? It should be coming forward as I do (laughter)—and as he does, for he has better claims to sanctity than St. Simon Stilex, with his long ears, by going about preaching the word of God, and doing practical good to men, not sticking one's self to a pillar, with a chain about his body, making a show of himself for the amusement of mankind. Now, I ask the Roman Catholic ladies what would they think of their husbands, if they went and lived at the top of a pillar, instead of remaining at home with themselves (cheers and groans).

Rev. Mr. NANGLE—It is perfectly useless to act in this manner—for, if I were to sit here all day, I would not stir till Mr. Gregg spoke for his half hour.

Rev. Mr. GREGG read another extract from the life of the same saint, to the effect that he concealed a sore in his foot, which was swarming with maggots. Now, said he, I entreat you to look at what is considered sanctity by Rome. Oh, I tell you that it is true that their canonization is a mark of damnation. Now, does not this beat out the comical stories he told us the other day. Now, I will refer you to a Protestant saint, and the man I will choose is a poor weaver in England. Although an old man, he rose every morning at an early hour, and knelt down to lift up his voice in praise of the Almighty. Many a time have I called in to him at the morning's dawn, with the smile of piety and the light of religion lighting up his countenance, and I have seen him at his work, even at that early hour. He used to work but for little, and the pittance he obtained was barely sufficient to support existence. At breakfast time he used to come home and assemble his children about him, read to them the word of God, and raise his voice in a hymn to his holy name. At dinner time he would come again to his home, and again raise his voice in prayer in the midst of his little family. This was a man, whose pittance was insufficient to support him, but he never was in want, for none

would refuse to give him assistance, He was but a labouring man, but I tell you, you would stand in awe at the dignity and sanctity that were visible in his countenance, and he was known to be so—for when walking along, the people would make way for him, knowing that the holiness of the Lord was moving among them. Now, is he not more like a saint than St. Simon Stilex, who made a fool of himself by sticking himself on a pillar, whereas he should be stuck in the pillory, and pelted with rotten eggs (question). So much for their canonization. There is also old Labré who was mentioned by us yesterday, he never combed his head, which was so overrun with vermin, that his confessor was obliged to put a barrier between them, lest they should crawl from his head upon him. Yet a miracle is related of this so-called saint, and the miracle was, that his body, which during life was foul and filthy, and disgusting at death, emitted the odour of sanctity, and his hand moved. It happened, I suppose, by some chance, to be on the edge of a chair, from which it slipped, when the silly bystanders cried out “a miracle, a miracle.” Now, then, canonization is, I say, a brand of apostacy. Oh, you perceived how he laboured; and what evident pain he feels, when I come to speak of lifting up Jesus. I do not wonder that he should feel when I speak of the spirit of God, because he knows that it is not with him. You blaspheme the Lord who made you, and you blaspheme Jesus Christ, who said that he would save every one who believed in him. You protest against the lifting up of Jesus, and you encourage the adoration of saints and images. It is not, then, a matter of wonder that Ireland should be so divided, degraded, and disgraced—it is little wonder that my countrymen should be in filth and beggary, when we see the example that is set them, and the doctrine which is taught, (tremendous groaning and cheering).

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Why he is doing you all possible service, my friends, and will you not let him go on?

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Their misery is from your blasphemy of the Lord, and their beggary is from the doctrine which you teach them. But you say that your church is universal, as if I had not proved over and over again that its very extent is a great proof of its apostacy. It is said in the Revelations, “and he caused all, both great and small, rich and poor, free and bond to receive a mark in their right hands, or in their foreheads,” and that mark was the number 666. Now, I have given you scores of names belonging to your church, that make up that number—“The Latin Priest,” “The Pope of Rome,” “The Bishop of Rome,” “The divine infallible,” and many others that I gave you before, compose that number. Now, I will give you a fact. A friend of mine saw the other day a

number of priests getting on a car, and, when he looked at the car, the number was 666—just as if it was said “here they are,”

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—There is inspiration for you (laughter).

Rev. Mr. GREGG—He cites a text to prove that it is lawful to bless anything. Yes, I admit, that when necessary, anything may be blessed—aye, and you will bless the long sword with which you will make us all as tame as lambs, and you will drive the devil out of sand and mortar. I don't object to the thing in the abstract; but I say it is a mockery in the way that it is treated in your religion. I preached a sermon at the time of the consecration of Aranquay, to prove that that consecration was a giving of the chapel to the devil, and who came forward to contradict me? No one. If any one had the hardihood to say that of the consecration of any of our cathedrals, I would have dragged him before the public and made him prove what he had said. I tell you that we are the true shepherds of the flock, and that the doctrine which we preach is the true doctrine. You say that I prove the scriptures from profane history. No, Sir, I do no such thing. I told you that we have the scriptures from the apostles, and from their time to this the church has continued through all the witnesses which were murdered by you, and through them they were given to us. We did not take them from your church; but we wrested them out of your hands, and revealed to the world your abominations, and the manner in which you corrupted them. Did we not reveal your retaining the Apocrypha by which self-murder is recommended? I tell you, Sir, that everything which you have is manifestly corrupted by the devil. But observe again how he treats my illustrations. He takes them by distinct topics, and labours at them as if I meant anything more by them than to explain the meaning of what I say. Thus he treated what I said about the mathematical world. He laboured strenuously to prove that mathematics are not divinity. I never mentioned that they were. You accuse us of not translating certain names to be met with in the scriptures which you say are Africa, Italy, &c. You know as well as I that there is much doubt with regard to places that are thus named, both in the scriptures and in classics, and we acted on the best principles of wisdom in not translating them lest the people should be deceived by what might be a mistranslation. But I have nothing more to say, because you have left me nothing to reply to—(laughter). You came back once more to public and private judgment. You say I do not attack the Unitarians. No, I do not; but I will tell you why. Because we do not attack any but the mother of all evils and abominations, in hopes that when your apostacy is exposed, they will perceive their errors and

abandon them. You ask me would Mr. Pope, or Dr. Urwick, or Dr. Cooke, or other dissenters acknowledge our public judgment—would they come into your church? No, they would not. They would not embrace either yours or mine. You argue thus—"They would not come into your rule of faith because it is the wrong one; therefore ours is the right one." Why, Sir, are you not ashamed of yourself? Prepare for judgment—come ye out of Babylon, and flee lest ye be defiled with the abominations. I know, Sir, you will answer me as I have been answered by my poor countrywomen in Sheffield, in order to instruct whom, I studied the Irish language, instead of studying Greek and Hebrew. When I have said to them, "Babylon will be destroyed," they have answered, "No, Babylon will not be destroyed—it will not fall." There is your answer. I tell you, Sir, your seven-hill city is about to be blown up. Rome, it is well known, is built on a volcanic foundation (laughter), and when the Lord will give the word, the whole city will be blown up (great laughter).

The half hour having concluded, and it being two o'clock the meeting separated.

---

#### NINTH DAY—THURSDAY.

---

The interest on Thursday seemed in no way abated. The room was densely crowded long before the hour of commencing the proceedings arrived.

At eleven o'clock, Mr. MAGUIRE rose and called upon Mr. GREGG to go on with the subject of the day—the invocation of saints.

Mr. GREGG—Before we proceed with the business of the day, there is some preliminary matter to be disposed of. I wish the correspondence which has taken place on the subject of closing the discussion may be read, that it go before the public.

Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA—I don't see any necessity for it.

Mr. GREGG—I think, with respectful submission, there is a necessity that it should make a part of the proceedings; and, as you have been instrumental in breaking up the discussion, I think you should have no objection that the correspondence which has taken place on the subject should be read. I must, Sir, acknowledge that throughout the whole proceedings your conduct has been that of a gentleman and a man of honor. I appeal to you, Mr. Maguire, if you do not think the correspondence should be read.

Mr. MAGUIRE—The only objection I have is, that it will impede the business of the day.

Rev. Mr. NANCY, Mr. Gregg's chairman, then read the cor

response between himself and the Rev. Mr. M'Namara, which has been already published. The reverend gentleman then read his answer to the last letter, the substance of which was that he could not see any impropriety in prolonging the discussion, or appointing a tribunal to judge of the extracts from Dens, with regard to the instructions for confession of females—that, in his judgment, such a proceeding would be calculated to do great good—that the fathers, brothers, and husbands of Ireland might be left to judge whether their daughters, sisters, and wives should still be subjected to such a course of examination—that, as to the accuracy of the translation, he was quite willing to abide the judgment of those competent to judge—he further added that this discussion ended without the concurrence of his friend Mr. Gregg.

When the correspondence was read, the reverend gentleman said he could not sit down without making his acknowledgments to the Rev. Mr. M'Namara, for his courtesy, candour, and gentlemanly bearing throughout the whole proceeding.

The Rev. Mr. M'NAMARA said he felt bound to make a similar acknowledgment to his reverend friend, Mr. Nangle.

The Rev. Mr. GREGG then came forward, and said—I beg leave, my friends, first publicly to declare, that this discussion has been brought to a conclusion without my concurrence (long and loud cheering). I will say to you, my Roman Catholic friends, that, if I have uttered anything to wound your feelings, I did so through affection, and as an act of duty. And although I was against your religion, I admit that there are many virtuous and amiable people among the Roman Catholics (cries of hear, hear). There are many of them whom I would be sorry to accuse, more particularly the reverend gentleman before me; and, if they be guilty of crimes, they are the crimes that spring from their religion. If we go to the Pagans we will find among them a great deal of natural amiability of character and manly virtues deserving of respect and admiration; and I must say that in the gentleman with whom I have had to deal in this discussion there is much manliness of character to admire, and he possesses many virtues entitled to respect; and from my soul I declare that I could hold out the right hand of Christian fellowship to him if I did not conscientiously believe him to be the enemy of my master—the enemy of my soul—the enemy of Christ. I believe that, notwithstanding all his manly virtues, he is the wolf in the fold of Christ Jesus—the destroyer of the souls of men. When I believe him so I must refuse him the high privilege of that Christian fellowship which my soul would otherwise delight to enjoy with him. I believe he has the mark of Antichrist—I believe that I have the spirit; and it is almost with tears in my eyes that I proclaim to him that apostacy which must separate us. The spirit tells me that on the last day I shall stand on the right hand of God; and I here lift up my voice against the errors by which you are led astray. I call upon you, come into the church of Christ, that we

may all enjoy together the manifestation of the glory of God (loud and long continued cheering). I now come to the subject of the invocation of saints, which is a leading feature of the apostasy. It is said that in the latter days some shall apostatize from the truth, and by the spirit of devils they shall cast out devils. Now, my brethren, I shall lay before you a picture of the rites and worships of the Pagans, and you will see how exactly it corresponds with Popery. They believed that there was a God—they believed also that there were Gods of a lesser kind—they had their *dii penatis* and *dii minorum gentium*. They believed that those little gods could introduce them to the great God and make intercession for them. There, my friends, is Popery plain and palpable. I shall point out to you the marks of the apostasy into which I believe the Lord has led them for their blindness. See St. Paul to the Colossians, 2d chap. and 18th verse, "Let no man seduce you, willing in humility and religion of angels, walking in the things which he hath not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh." I shall now read for you a note appended to this by a self-constituted tribunal: "Willing—that is by self-willed, self-invented, superstitious worship, falsely pretending humility, but really proceeding from pride. Such was the worship that many of the philosophers, (against whom St. Paul speaks, verse 8th,) paid to angels or demons by sacrificing to them as carriers of intelligence betwixt God and men, pretending humility in so doing, as if God were too great to be addressed by men, and setting aside the mediatorship of Jesus Christ, who is the head of both angels and men. Such also was the worship paid by the ancient heretics, disciples of Simon and Menander, to the angels whom they believed to be the makers and the lords of this lower world." Here is a condemnation of Popery in their own Bible. Here is the old Pagan worships pointed out, where more Gods than one are recognized. It is an exact—a perfect description of Popery in the present day. I shall now read to you a prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary, from one of the Catholic prayer books, wherein she is invoked to intercede with God, and that without her aid the supplicant would be lost. The reverend gentleman then continued. Is not this much gross idolatry, destroying the mediatorship of Christ. Here is another of these dreadful prayers to the Virgin Mary, and here are some of the names by which she is designated, "Seat of Wisdom, Spiritual Vessel, Tower of Ivory, House of Gold, Ark of the Covenant, Gate of Heaven, Morning Star." There is doctrine unsupported by scripture. We have, too, images, and crosses, and a form of consecration of those images by ringing of bells, sprinkling of holy water, and other Pagan ceremonies. I take it from the *Pontificale Romanum*. Here is a description of the form of consecration of the holy cross: it is sprinkled with water, prayers are recited over it, there are ringing of bells and offering of incense, an invocation of the holy Spirit to descend into the wood. Then the consecrating bishop says, "Let it be sanctified—let the spirit be in this wood—that through prayers before it we may obtain health of body and soul." The consecrating priest then says, "*Ipse devote odorat*," himself devoutly adores it—*hæc is genibus devote adore et*



*oculat.\** All this, my friends, is at variance with the true spirit of the scriptures, for throughout the whole of God's word you will find that for no crime under heaven does the jealousy of God blaze forth more terribly than for that of idolatry. Hear the words of the Lord God, "Thou shalt not bow down to any graven image, nor make the likeness of anything in heaven or earth." The mind of the Lord flasheth forth, and his anger kindleth against these who make idols, who bow down to them or worship them. Here you have the minister of that church involving the spirit of God to come down and abide in wood or stone. How must the wrath and indignation of God be kindled against such abominations? The only home of the Spirit of God on earth is in the heart of man, and awful is the blasphemy to desire its dwelling in senseless stone or wood. The reverend gentleman will tell me that his worship does not terminate in the image, but I say why place it up between man and his God; between man and the only mediator, Christ Jesus. It may be urged against me as an argument, that the golden calf was set up as an object of worship for the Israelites; but that was a type of the Saviour—and there was not one of the Pagans so sottish as to think it was God. Oh, how awful must be the wrath of the Great Jehovah, and woe to them that say to wood and dumb-stone, the spirit of God is in thee, and I give thee external worship. How can any man be so senseless as to worship senseless things, when he has God given to him. I tell you that there is no sin under heaven so abominable as the Roman Catholic worship of saints and images, and none so much at variance with the spirit of God's word. All those practices are Pagan, purely Pagan, even the word Pontifex, used in the consecration of those images, was Pagan. You may, Sir, deny that you are guilty of idolatry, and go on with your equivocation as long as you like. But what care I for your denial while I have those damning facts against you. If I go into a room and find an assassin plunging a dagger into the breast of his friend, and that he tells me he is not guilty of murder, am I to stop to listen to his arguments or syllogisms. Oh! no; I am bound to seize him and drag him before the proper tribunal. Again, I say, there is no greater crime under heaven than what the Roman Catholics commit in this image and idol worship. Here the reverend gentleman read from the Old Testament the most awful denunciations of God against those who make idols, bow down before images, or worship them. The Lord pronounced that they should be accursed. "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field; cursed shalt thou be, thou, thy basket and thy store; cursed shalt thou be the first of thy body, and the first of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep; cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. The Lord shall smite thee

with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew ; and they shall pursue till thou perish. Thou shalt carry much seed out into thy field, and gather but little in, for the locust shall consume it. The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high, and thou shalt come down very low." Yes, my friends, the stranger was lifted up above you, and what made my heart bleed when I was in a foreign and a strange land was, to see the universal contempt that was poured upon my countrymen. I found my Roman Catholic countrymen degraded and despised wherever I went. Have not those curses fallen upon our country ! Are there not beggary, misery, and vice, where God intended it should be universal happiness, prosperity and peace ! Look to all the Roman Catholic countries in the world, and see how they are accursed with poverty. Look at Italy, the land of immorality and assassination—a den of thieves. Look at Spain, formerly the land of despotism and bigotry, now the land of anarchy, confusion, and bloodshed, where it may be truly said that every man's hand is raised against his brother, and his brother's hand raised against him. Look at Portugal, the clime of degradation and ignorance. Austria, bound up in the thralls of despotism and ignorance, through which no light can break, the home of hopeless, mental, and national slavery. Look at Naples, where the poor die in the open streets unheeded by the veiled prophets of a luxuriating apostacy. Go into England, and see what a different prospect meets the eye. Every man there stands erect in the dignity of manhood. There there are no beggars : the poor man demands as a right a maintenance in the land of his birth. They have poor laws, against which so much has been said. The reverend gentleman says that before the Reformation there was no need of poor laws—that the poor were fed. Aye, they got the cold cabbage from the monks ; but I make no doubt that any den of thieves, who would be allowed to plunder the people, would dole out to them a miserable pittance as long as they were allowed to continue their robbery. This, Sir, is Popery. In effect the spirit comforteth me. I feel that I have the true spirit within me ; and I call upon you to mark the consequences of this dreadful apostacy. I call upon you to come out from this fearful apostacy ; and I point out the way to you, and show you that nothing can cleanse you from your sins, but what is found in the true church of Christ. I am sorry that the discussion draws to a close, or I would go more into detail.

Here the half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE then proceeded as follows:—You have all, my friends, heard a most admirable diatribe, and a most fierce and noisy scolding, from my opponent. You have heard him again dealing in his loose and empty assertions, totally disregarding all sound scripture proof and authority. I am glad of it ; for when this discussion appears before the world, it will be seen who it was that relied upon the holy scriptures and upon the most unimpeachable authority for his proofs, and who it was that dealt in loose assertion and idle declamation. Again, my friends, you will see in a minute

or two who it is that relies upon the scriptures for his proofs; and who takes from those scriptures the true meaning. He read to you all the long list of curses contained in nearly the whole of the Old Testament; and he had the hardihood to assert those curses were intended for Popery and the church of Antichrist, whereas, in the very text from which he read, it is expressly mentioned that curses were directed against the Jews, for their hard-hearted obstinacy, idolatry, and ingratitude to God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt and of bondage, and gave them bread from heaven. Yes, Sir, I charge you with having deliberately misquoted and misapplied the holy scriptures. Those curses, which you have impiously dared to say were to fall on the head of Popery, were all expressly and plainly directed against the idolatrous Jews who, notwithstanding that God brought them out from under the tyranny and oppression of Pharaoh, and revealed himself to them in all his glory, they were still worshipping idols, and sighing to get back to the flesh-pots of Egypt. They would rather live with Pharaoh, and have the flesh-pots of Egypt, than to follow God through the slightest tribulation or suffering. So it is with you, Mr. Gregg, and the founders of your church. You would rather have the flesh and the flesh-pots every day you could get them, than live in the church where there was anything like self-denial or abstinence. The founders of your church would rather live the slaves of their own ungovernable passions, than belong to the church of Christ, where they should be under control; and so they went out from us, and they are the apostates. You talk, Sir, of our leaving out of the catechism the second commandment. Here, Sir, is our catechism in full: see is there anything left out there. There is our Christian doctrine, an abridgment of which are put into the hands of young children. Here, Sir, is our catechism for you; and here is the commandment which you say is left out—"I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage; thou shalt not have strange Gods before me; thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things which are in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not adore them nor serve them." And now, by the way, let me here remark upon another glaring perversion of the text with regard to this commandment, which appears in the Protestant Bible. It is a fraudulent and wilful mistranslation, and makes nonsense of the passage. The Protestant version has it—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image." Now, *Hekel* is the word in the original Hebrew, which every body knows who knows anything of that language, to mean a thing, and our Bible says, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in the heavens above, &c., and thou shalt not adore them, nor worship them." But you say thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image, an image is a likeness, so that you are not to make a graven likeness, nor the likeness of that likeness, (for if it be an image in one place it is so in the other), nor bow down to it, nor worship it. There, Sir, is a Protestant absurdity, and a Protestant perversion in the very command-

ment which you dared to say we meddled with. We left it as we found it in God's holy word, but you impiously and blasphemously meddled with it. Thus, Sir, I retort upon you, and show up at the same time your ignorance, and the groundlessness of your assertion (cheers). I beg, my friends, there may be no manifestations of applause. You do not more than waste my time. Just leave him to me quietly. This is the last day. The reverend gentleman then continued. So much, Sir, for sacerdotalism and the 2d commandment, which you have said we have left out of our Bible. No, Sir, we adore nothing but the one true God, and there is not a professor of the faith all over the world who worships anything else. Now, I proceed with my demonstration with regard to the real nature of our invocation of saints; and I beg of you, my Protestant friends, to attend to me and judge for yourselves who is it that is best supported by the scriptures. He told you a great many columnious stories without giving one single proof with regard to them. He told you we worshipped idols. Now, we hold there is no crime greater than idolatry; but we hold that no Christian who believes in the Revelation, can at all be guilty of it. We pay honor to saints and angels, but it is the honor that we pay to our fathers and mothers; we call upon those holy intelligences, who are ministering before God, to intercede for us; and if I do not show you that we are borne out by the scriptures in doing so, I will give up this part of the case. If, further, I do not show that the communion or invocation of saints was the doctrine of the church at the time when Mr. Gregg admits it, I will acknowledge that he has triumphed. We invoke the Virgin Mary and the saints; and now, Protestants, attend to my demonstration and mark the difference between us. He turns up his eyes to heaven, and talks of syllogisms and of idols, of Pagans and of Popery. He deals in loose assertions, in curses and imprecations against the whole Christian world who are not within the church of Luther. I deal in the scriptures, and in authorities which, if he had common consistency or common honesty, he could not reject. I deal with the fathers of the church, at a time when he admits it was pure. I deal in the authorities of his own church; but he has the heart to stand up in the face of a Christian assembly, and say, that he casts the scriptures overboard. He told us yesterday evening that he had the Bible by chance, and it is not unlikely that that assertion was preparatory to his throwing it overboard, and setting up his own opinion, guided by the Spirit, as paramount to all. Should he do so, there will be no cause of surprise for it. But now, my Protestant friends, to my proofs, and follow me whilst I produce them in rapid succession. First, in the Apocalypse, 1st. chapter, "Grace be unto you, and peace that is, that was, and that is to come, and from the seven spirits that are before his throne." Now I will ask if these spirits in heaven, which are represented by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, had no regard to what was going on on earth as well as in heaven, would they have been thus invoked by the apostles? My friends, I promise you that before I am done with this part of the subject, short as the time is, that my opponent shall be in a most pitiable con-

dition. I will show him the difference between supreme worship and religious worship ; and if he have the smallest particle of common honesty he will give up his charge of idolatry against the Catholics. Again, my friends, I refer him to Genesis, 23d chapter 7th v. ; there he will find the following : “ Abraham rose up and bowed down to the children of the land, to wit, the children of Heth.” Again, in Genesis you will find that when Jacob went before his son Joseph, he bowed down before him ; and in Genesis, c. 43, v. 26 : “ Then Joseph came into his house, and they, offering him the presents, holding them in their hands, they bowed down with their faces to the ground.” Again, Genesis, 33d chapter 3d v.—“ And Jacob went forward and bowed down with his face to the ground seven times until his brother Esau came near.” Now, will Mr. Gregg say that Jacob committed an act of idolatry in bowing down or paying homage to his brother ? Next, 1st, Chronicles, ch. 29 v. 20, “ And David commanded all the assembly—Bless ye the Lord our God, and all the assembly blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and they bowed themselves and worshipped God, and then the King.” Now, will any say that they paid the same worship to the King that they did to God ? They worshipped God and honoured the King. We worship God, we honour the holy saints who are in heaven before him, and we pray to them to intercede for us. The whole of the act is in the intention. If we bow down before the shrine of a holy saint we worship God, whilst we honour the memory of the saint. It is not in the act of bowing down that idolatry consists ; it is in the intention the whole of the crime is ; but I tell you that no Christian can be an idolater. We prostrate ourselves before a King, we do the same before God, but what a fanatic and wilfully malignant being must any man be who would say that on that account we were guilty of idolatry ? Again, my friends, I will bring you to Joshua and the angel ; and let me tell you before I go further, that I am quoting all from your Protestant Bible. “ And Joshua fell on his face to the ground, and worshipping said, ‘ What saith my Lord to his servant ? ’ ” The Angel, mark you, had described himself as a Captain of the host of the Lord. Well, and what do you think the Angel said to Joshua ? He said to him, ‘ loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground.’ You will not admit that any place can be holy. Oh, Sir, you must come to me to be instructed, and I will give you that instruction from out the Bible, which you pretend so well to understand. Again, I refer you to the Book of Kings, where, in two distinct passages, where David fell down and adored Saul, flat to the ground. Oh, if Mr. Gregg were to see any of us doing that, how he would bawl and bellow. Here is honour to be paid to the kings, and is no honour to be paid to the saints and martyrs of Jesus Christ ? Again, I refer you to St. Paul to the Romans. The apostle there says—“ Give unto all men their due—tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.” Read again, Apocalypse, 3d chapter and 9th verse—“ Behold I will make them come and adore before thy feet.” Mr. Gregg spoke yesterday of the

the prophet Daniel, and referred to the stone hewn out of the mountain, but he omitted one part of the passage. Now, my friends, I will show you how they manage the Holy Bible, and how he, as well as the founders of his church, can pervert it. Here is the passage from Daniel entire, "Thus thou sawest well a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and it struck the statue upon the feet thereof, that were of iron and of clay, and broke them in pieces—then was the iron, the clay, the brass, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of a summer's threshing floor, and they were carried away by the wind, and there was no place found for them, but the stone that struck the statue became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." It is lamentable that he did not mention to you that before the passage concerning this stone being hewn out, there is another passage which shows that it refers to the Christian church. Who can ever doubt or ever doubted that this stone referred to the Christian church? The stone hewn out was Jesus Christ, and the great mountain was his church, which struck against the Pagan nations of the earth, and broke them into clay. Now, Sir, arises out of this passage a question which I again demand of you to answer—where was this stone for the 800 years and more? Where was the stone which he yesterday threatened to fling against my forehead and crumble me into dust? It was no where to be found; there was no Goliath to sling it. Now, Sir, I again refer you to Matthew, 11th chapter and 11th verse—"Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." If it was lawful to pay honour to John the Baptist, is it not lawful to pay honour to the saints in heaven, the least of whom is greater than he who was the greatest prophet the world ever saw, who was, when on earth, the next to Jesus Christ himself. Again, in the Apocalypse, 19th chap. 10th verse, where the angel of the Lord is showing all the things that must come to pass to the apostle—he says, "I fell down at his feet and worshipped him, and the angel said, 'see thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus; worship God, for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.'" Will Protestants say that this is conclusive as to worshipping saints, for that the saint would not allow Saint John the Evangelist to worship him. But mark you, my friends, what follows—but first let me remark that the angel who showed those things to St. John, tells him that he was his fellow-labourer on earth, and having besides the spirit of God with him, and being a prophet, that he was his equal, and ought not to worship him. But did this prevent St. John, who was inspired, and full of the Holy Ghost, from falling down at the feet of the angel a second time and worshipping him; for in a second place in the Apocalypse, St. John falls down again at the feet of the angel to worship. Here is the passage—"And I, John, saw those things and heard them; and when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then said he unto me, see thou do it not, for I am

thy fellow-servant, of thy brethren the prophets, and keep the sayings of this book—worship God.” Now, will Mr. Gregg say that St. John, who was full of the Holy Ghost, would commit an act of idolatry, he having been previously admonished by the angel not to worship him? He was the beloved disciple, and had reclined on the bosom of Jesus, and was the greatest among prophets, and the angel considered him his equal, yet told him not to worship him, but God. Now, I put a question, and this assembly will expect an answer:—Would the evangelist fall down a second time to worship him if it was not lawful to do so? I now quote for you Colossians, 2d chapter and 18th verse,—“Let no one beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshy mind.” Again, Isaiah, 63d chapter and 16th verse—“Thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer, for everlasting is thy name. Why hast thou made us to err, O Lord, from thy ways? why hast thou hardened our hearts, that we should not fear thee? Return, for the sake of thy servants, the tribes of thy inheritance.” You have read of Dives calling to Abraham to send Lazarus, who was in Abraham’s bosom, to wet his finger, or to warn his brethren; and Abraham replied, “They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.” Now, how did Abraham know of Moses and the prophets, when he lived so many hundred years before they appeared; for it was not until several years after the death of Abraham that Moses and the prophetic books were given. It is plain that Abraham was looking down upon the earth and knew what was passing. Perhaps Mr. Gregg will say that though there may be invocation of angels, there cannot be invocation of saints; but I promise you that if there be invocation of angels, I will prove the invocation of saints also. He may tell me that there is not a word in the Old Testament about the invocation of saints; but how could there? Heaven was not then open. Jesus Christ was the first who ascended into it. Now, with regard to the New Testament, the end of it came down only to the time of the first saints, and if there was not one word in it about the invocation of saints, there would be no argument against me. But I tell you that there is; and that as sure as I prove the invocation of angels from the Old Testament, I will prove the invocation of saints from the New. Now, I again refer you to the passage about the witch of Endor. There we read that the witch of Endor, a sorceress, was able to bring down the prophet Samuel to hold an interview with Saul. If a witch was able successfully to invoke a prophet, and that prophet answered her call, why should not the faithful more successfully invoke the saints? I shall also quote to you from Tobias, though he rejects that book as not canonical. Again, look at the passage where Jacob is described as wrestling with the angel; he would not allow him to depart until he blessed himself and his children. Again, David, psalm 98th, says, “Exalt ye the Lord our God, and adore his footstool, for it is holy—Moses and Aaron among his priests, and Samuel among them that call upon his name”—Luke, 15th chapter, 10th verse. “Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the

presence of the angels of God, even for one sinner that repenteth." Can anything be more strong than this, or more forcible and conclusive? It is evident that the saints in heaven know what is passing upon earth, for if they did not know how could they rejoice at the conversion of sinners upon earth. Again, 2d Chronicles, 21st chapter and 12th verse—"And then came a writing to him, from Elijah the prophet, saying, thus saith the Lord God of David thy father, because thou hast not walked in the ways of Asa, King of Judah." Now Elijah the prophet had been taken up into heaven seven years before the writing of the letter to Jehoram, and he must have known what was passing upon earth. 1st, Corinthians, 13th chapter, and 9th and 10th verses—"For we know in part and prophecy in part—but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." In Acts, 5th chapter, we read of Ananias being charged by Peter—"Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost." Here it is manifest that Peter knew what was passing within the breast of Ananias at the time—and if Peter, while yet on earth, could thus know the secret thoughts of another's bosom, how much more justly may we believe that he would know what passed here after his glorious removal to heaven? The saints are not ignorant of what is passing here on earth, and from these passages it is plain that they can and will help us. Apocalypse, 2d chapter, 26th verse—"And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations. And he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers." Your church, Mr. Gregg, is the vessel of a potter, and here herself and her doctrines are broken to shivers. Again, Apocalypse, 3d chapter, 21st verse—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my father on his throne." Now, my friends, I have given you all these, and I could give you many more passages to prove that the invocation of saints is recognized in the Bible—and I could refer to the writings of the earliest fathers of the church, when yet she was pure, as acknowledged by my reverend opponent here—to prove that such was her doctrine throughout all ages.

Here the reverend gentleman's half hour ended.

Rev. Mr. GREGG then proceeded—I am most happy to take up my adversary on the last subject referred to, the Eucharist. He wants me to go refer to the fathers for authority, but he need not do that whilst he has his *liber expurgatorius*. Oh, indeed, if he could get me into the fathers, it would be all over with me; but I will go to the great grandfathers, I will go up to the apostles themselves; and lastly, I will go up to the great father of all, your Christ. I will go to the great God, who has given us his holy word for our instructions and directions. You see, my friends, that he has produced a catechism to you to-day out of which he read the ten commandments. I will only say that it is the decenterst catechism I have ever seen come out of the hands of Popery. Whether it was prepared for the occasion or not, I will not venture to say, but I would be very glad to know is that the catechism that is used at Ballina.



more—indeed I greatly suspect that it is not. However I must say that it is more near the Protestant catechism than any I have ever seen before; and I may hope that you are coming round to us; and, my dear sir, if you open your eyes to the truth, you must come round to us. The catechism, I admit, is a good one, for it is nearly the same as the Protestant, and I only advise you to use it at Ballinamore. Now, sir, to come to the first passage in Revelations, which you quoted. I will take the opinion of the meeting if my memory of it be not the true and rational one. The text is—"Grace be unto you, and peace from him who is, who was, and who is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ who is the faithful witness." Now, my friends, is it not quite plain that here the Trinity is pointed out. There is first he who is, who was, and who is to come; there is next the seven spirits, which means the Holy Ghost, and then there is Jesus Christ, the faithful witness. There is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. There is grace to the people from the three-fold origin, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We are told that the graces of the Holy Ghost are seven-fold, and here we have them distinctly pointed out. This passage is no more than a paraphrase on the Holy Trinity, and does not it appear clear to you that by the seven spirits is meant the Holy Ghost, and that nothing else could be meant. The Father and the Son are invoked, and it would appear rather strange that the Holy Ghost should be passed over, and the angels or seven spirits, substituted in its place. So much for Mr. Maguire's argument founded on that text. Mr. Maguire is fond of adoring Jacob, and kings, and what not. He may adore kings and great men as long as he pleases; but we shall adore God alone. With regard to the text quoted by Mr. Maguire about worshipping God and the king, the worship paid to them was very different.

MR. MAGUIRE—That is exactly what I say.

MR. GREGG—But when we have the spirit invoked to come and possess an image, when we have men kneeling before them, and adoring them, it is quite a different thing. That is the dross which is opposed to true religion, to the Spirit of God. He quoted the text of Joshua falling down and worshipping an angel. Now, I am satisfied to let the whole issue of this discussion rest upon that text; and I promise you, sir, to convict you of a darkness of intellect, or a perversion of understanding that will make your friends ashamed of you. Don't you know, sir, and if you don't you ought to know, that the angel was the great Jehovah—it was the angel of the covenant, Jesus Christ; the very reading of the text should have told you so, for he says—"Loose the shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground;" and again, the Lord said unto Joshua—"See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the King thereof, and the mighty men of valour," (loud cheers from Mr. Gregg's friends, with some hisses). I hear some hissing there. I wish I had some holy water to sprinkle the hissers. Again he quotes the Apocalypse when St. John falls down before the feet of the angel to adore him—and I was really afraid that when he had got thus

far, he would stop like Dr. Doyle, and go no farther ; but you were compelled to go on, sir, and read, " see thou do it not." Here, sir, I tear you to pieces with your own weapons. Suppose he fell down again to worship—it was such an adoration as he would give to a king. How, sir, could you fall into this deplorable error—to quote this passage to support the adoration of saints or angels. I have answered all your questions. Now, sir, look at that, (holding up his map. There were loud cries of " no, no ; you did not answer any question : take your map out of that, and answer the question.") Here the reverend gentleman suspended the map to the table on which he was sitting, and said—no, indeed, I will not. There it shall hang until the business of the day is over (loud hisses and shouts of laughter.)

Mr. MAGUIRE—Oh, my friends, will you let him go on with his folly.

Mr. GREGG then proceeded—Look at that, Sir. There is the true church ; here is the Irish Church infected by the apostacy ; here is the great harlot spouting out her filth. Mr. Maguire tells you that the great stone is the Roman Catholic Church ; but here is the great stone—here is the rock (a laugh.)

Mr. MAGUIRE—Can't you be easy my friends. He is going to show you a curiosity—a great stone struck invisible !

Mr. GREGG—What is going on in the world, it is said, may be known in heaven, for it is said there is joy in heaven at the conversion of a sinner. But even if that were the case, does it follow that we are to adore saints and angels—where is the sequence ? I may ask my brother Nangle to pray for me while here ; but I cannot ask him when at Achill to pray for me, for he won't hear me. Will Father Maguire, while here, ask Doctor MacHale down to Connaught, to pray for him ? The Doctor would not hear him. Do you think, Sir, that Heaven is like a square room over this Rotunda, that those who were in it might hear everything that was passing ? We know nothing of Heaven in its immensity—those spiritual intelligences to which you pray may be placed in a star ten thousand miles off. I tell you, Sir, that it is disparaging the intercession of Jesus to pray to saints or angels at all. How, Sir, could you bring forward as an argument that as Dives prayed to Abraham we ought to pray to saints ? Here is the damned spirit of Popery. But should you not have told that Alcham rejected the prayer, instead of founding an argument upon it. What am I standing up here for. I am pointing out the Lord Jesus to you, who is the alpha and omega. I preach the salvation of souls, and that the spirit of God which can make the vilest character pure and holy may pour down upon you. I preach to you one mediator, whilst he preaches up a thousand mediators, and tells you there is no spirit to be sent down, but to depend for salvation on the intercession of saints and angels. What I call the pouring down of the spirit he calls fanaticism ; but what he preaches I

call Antichrist. He quotes Job, and then again he perverts the text—for Job says to which of the angels am I to turn, which evidently mean that he was to turn to any angel at all, for no angel would hear him. As a man in disease may say to whom shall I turn—knowing that he could turn to no one to give him relief. With regard to the letter written by Elijah, I ask the reverend gentleman will he prove to me that it was not written before his death ! Most of the commentators say that it was, and that being the most rational interpretation, I agree to it. My friends, did you mark what syllogisms he had recourse to—he actually brought paganism to his aid. It is written that when the wrath of God is kindled, these figures and images are overthrown, and there, Sir, you are overthrown, and which of the saints will you turn to ? You talk of Samuel and the witch of Endor ; and don't you know, Sir, that is the general opinion of the best commentators that ever wrote, that it was not Samuel who appeared at all, but the devil. The witch was guilty of lies, and she could not draw down a prophet, but she could raise the devil whose sole purpose was to drive Saul to despair. If you now, Sir, appeal to the interference of the devil, you are rather more hardly driven than I even thought. As to Tobias, I throw him overboard. I shall now quote for you the 1st epistle to the Corinthians, 13 chapter—"For we know in part, and we prophecy in part ; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

The reverend gentleman was proceeding to give his explanation of the passage, when his half-hour ended.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE.—I beg leave to tell you, gentlemen, that it is of us he has been speaking. It is we that only know and prophecy in part ; but when we come to the mansions of glory in the presence of our God we will know and understand the entire. And did he not quote a text which exactly went to prove that ? He asks me to prove that the saints both hear and can help us, and I will do so ; but before I proceed to that I will convict him of perversion of the holy scriptures. You tell me, Sir, that it was Christ Jesus that Joshua worshipped ; why, Sir, is it not said that the angel whom he worshipped was a Captain of the Hosts of the Lord, and is that a proper title for the Lord of Hosts himself ? You say that it was the same angel that spoke to Moses. Why, did not the Lord say to Moses, when giving him the commandments, "I am the Lord thy God ;" and is it not expressly declared that it was only an angel that spoke to Joshua ? Now, how could he be only a Captain of the Hosts of the Lord, if he were the Lord himself ? I would be glad you would satisfy the meeting on that head. You talked of commentators. I wish you would produce them. I wish you would give me any reason for saying that it was not Samuel himself that was raised by the

witch of Endor. Now, as to our using a number of mediators, we all hold, Sir, that Christ is the only mediator. You admit, that the saints can hear us, and yet you say they know nothing about us. What good is their hearing if they can't understand? You talk, then, Sir, of asking a fellow creature, miles away from us, to pray for us; as ridiculous. Why, did not St. Paul ask people thousands of miles from him to pray for him to the Lord. Oh, Sir, you may turn up your eyes in surprise, as you do at most that I say. Did he not write to the Colossians to pray for him? did he not write to the Ephesians and Galatians for the same purpose? He did not know if all that he wrote to were alive, but he knew that even if they were not, they knew what was going on on earth, and that he would have their prayers before the throne of God. Now, Sir, you want a text to prove that the Saints do pray for us. I refer you to Zachariah, chapter 1, verse 12—"Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah against which thou hast had indignation these three score and ten years." There is an angel praying to the Lord for Jerusalem, and now, gentlemen, I beg of you to attend. Mind what the Lord says in answer, "And the Lord answered the angel and talked, with good and comfortable words." Thus the angel of the Lord having prayed for the city of Jerusalem, and the entire Jewish nation, the Lord heard his prayer, and gave him a favourable answer. Now, there's a text that goes directly to prove that angels do intercede for men, I would be glad that you would answer it. It would give me great satisfaction, and no doubt it would be pleasing to all the gentlemen present. Now, what was the precise answer of the Lord? and remember that I take all these texts from the Protestant Bible. Therefore, thus said the Lord of Hosts. "I am jealous for Jerusalem and Sion, with a great jealousy. And I am very sore displeased with the heathen that are at ease, for I was but a little displeased and they helped forward the affliction." "Therefore," saith the Lord, "I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it," saith the Lord of Hosts, "and a hue shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem." Thus the Lord yielded to the prayer of the angel, and because of it had mercy upon Jerusalem, I now defy you to produce a single text contradictory of that in the whole Bible; and is it not clear proof that the Lord listens to the prayers of his angels in favour of man. Now I refer you to 1st Kings, 15th chapter, and 4th verse, "Nevertheless, for David's sake, did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem to set up his son after him." Thus you see, for David's sake, who was long dead at the time, the Lord did this. Again, did not the Lord

protect Jerusalem from the Assyrians on account of his servant David? Again, he says I quoted from Job, and he maintains that the answer from Job's friend, Elias, means that the angels could do nothing for him. Well, I care not if it does mean that, for I quoted the passage only to show that it was a very ancient and general practice to invoke the intercession of angels—Sir, I will soon retort your arguments upon yourself. I refer you now to Jeremiah, chap. 15, verse 1—"Then said the Lord unto me, though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth." Now attend to this, my brethren. Moses and Samuel were both long dead, yet the Lord said if they were before him, that is, if they prayed to him, he would not hear them, clearly showing that they could pray for the people. Let me ask you also, would God Almighty say that he would not hear them in that particular case, if he never heard them in any? How did the Lord act when Moses interceded for the Israelites? He begged him not to interfere between his wrath and the people; but Moses did pray for them, and for the sake of one man, and that a man whom he did not permit to enter the Holy Land, for his want of faith, pardoned the entire nation. But remember also that Moses was then a human being like ourselves; and if God will listen to and grant the prayers of a sinner who was deficient in faith, how much more effect may we expect to be produced by the intercession of saints and angels. When he said of St. John the Baptist that he was "more than a prophet," and that "among them that are born of women, they had not arisen a greater man than John the Baptist." What may we not expect from the prayers of that saint, and of others, when they have entered the kingdom of heaven. I now refer you to Ezekiel, chap. 15, verse 15—"Though the three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness." Now mark here how he mixes one dead with two living persons, to show that the dead can intercede for their fellow men as well as the living; but so offended was God with the Jews that he would not hear them. Again, I refer you to the Apocalypse, chap. 5, verse 8—"And when he had taken the book the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." There now, Sir, what do you say to that? The prayers of the saints are contained in the golden censor, and they were presented to God by the four-and-twenty elders. Is not that a glorious proof of the communion of saints? Is it not a proof that the saints in heaven intercede for their fellow-creatures on earth? And now, Sir, is it a dishonour to God to beg of the saints and angels to intercede for

you ? I say it is not. We acknowledge that Jesus Christ is our Sovereign mediator, and that on him alone we depend. How, then, is it derogatory to him to have mediators under him between him and man ? If he has saved them by shedding his blood for them, is it not likely that he will listen to their prayers for those for whom also he shed his blood ? There now are the scriptures for you. Oh, you may laugh and gnash your teeth as the Jews did at our Saviour (laughter, hisses and cheers.) That is your answer to me for whatever authority I give you for my doctrines (laughter and cheers.) Again, gentlemen, you will find what he says, and how he proves it. You have heard him talk of commentators, and he says he has them to produce in favour of his interpretation of the scriptures. I wish he would produce them—I defy him to do so. Now, gentlemen, I beg of you to be attentive for a moment. I refer you now, Doctissime Domine Gregg (laughter) to Luther's work on the first commandment. [He read a passage from it to the effect that he objected to using the intercession of the saints in temporal affairs, and that the church said to Paul, *ora pro nobis*.] Now, Sir, there's a passage from the father of your church. I refer you now to tome 6 of the German edition, page 31, on the *Magnificat*. (He read another passage to the effect that the Blessed Virgin should be prayed to.) Now, there's making a petticoat for the Virgin Mary. There's Luther making a petticoat for you (cheers and hisses.) Now, Sir, where is your blasphemous language about the mother of God ? I tell you, Sir, we have the true respect for things holy, though we do not worship any but one God. But I know you will say, "What is Luther to me ; I don't care for him." Well, Sir, listen to him again—listen to what he says of a man *in articulo mortis*. (He read for him a passage the effect of which was, that in the hour of death a man should call upon Mary and all the saints to intercede for him.) Now, Sir, I will refer once more to Bishop Montague, for whom you have such little respect, and whom you relish so little, though he was a sufficiently bitter enemy of the Roman Catholics. (He read a passage from a work of his to the effect that the saints do interpose and mediate between God and Man.) Now, Sir, where is your orthodoxy—where is your piety—where is the strictness of your doctrine ? You will find in "The invocation of the Saints," page 118, the following (He read a passage to the effect that it is no impiety to say "Mary, or Paul, or Peter, pray for me.") Oh, Lord, do you hear that ! There's a Protestant for you. What will you say now ? The translators of an ancient work say that the invocation of the saints was practised in the fourth century, and that Pope Gregory, by whom half Europe was converted, and who sent Austin into England, practiced and recommended it. Prudentius also tells

us that it was the practice of the church in those early days. So much, Sir, for your pure church—so much for your gold. What answer will you give to that, I'd like to know? In the rejoinder to Bristoe you will find this—(He read a passage admitting that Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, Basil, both the Gregories, and many others used to practice the invocation of the saints.) Now I refer you to Thorndike, whom I have so often quoted before. (He read a passage to the effect that Basil, Nazianzen, Austin, Jerome, and all the saints, mentioned the doctrine of the intercession of saints.) Now where's your Protestant authority? where's the impudence with which you accuse us of apostacy, when the members of your own church—yes, and distinguished members—acknowledge and adopt the very doctrines on which you ground your charge? Now, Sir, I'll give you another quotation from your own book, one word in which you dare not deny, and to the truth of every word of which you are bound by a solemn oath. Now, Sir, I will give you a prayer from your own prayer book, (we read a prayer beginning with "O everlasting God," and ending with a prayer to send his holy angels to watch over and succour and defend us through Christ our Lord)—(cheers and hisses,) "That they may succour and defend us" (cheers.) Now, Sir, indeed, what do you say? Where's your genuine Protestant piety? Now, Sir, you must adopt this, for to every word in the book you have to swear ("no," from Mr. Gregg.) Now, Sir, where's your blasphemy? Now, how can you, a wretched, withering member of an heretical church, dare to attack the religion of, I may say, the whole world, (great groaning, hissing and cheering.) Gentlemen, recollect that these expressions have been extorted from me, and I am exceedingly sorry for having used them. You must, however, admit that I have had provocation—when I am told that my church and its doctrines are damnable—when you tell me that I am damned (no, from Mr. Gregg.) Why, Sir, you told me that you and I would be separated in heaven; that is, that you would be on the right and I on the left. I tell you that to use such language is blasphemous presumption and ignorance. Now dare you, sir, presume to say who will be saved, or who will not? Now can you presume to say that you are inspired? Will you show me any text of Scripture that says that the Rev. Mr. Gregg, of Swift's Alley, will be saved? We are told that "no man knoweth whether he is worthy of love or hatred?" Now, where is your damnable parallel? (The Rev. Mr. Gregg here shook one of his maps at the reverend gentleman) (roars of laughter and hisses.) Now, he speaks of Daniel. Let him look to the very verse before that which he quoted. I say our church is the stone which was to grow into a large mountain; and the poverty with which you upraid us is a never-failing mark of the truth of the church, and the persecution which she has suffered on account of the doctrines which we teach is a convincing proof of their truth. Let him read in Daniel, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never

be destroyed ; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people ; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand for ever." Now, Sir, tell me what church but ours can be signified by that ? Our church is the church that has broken to pieces all the heresies that have ever sprung up in the world. I have eighteen councils, which I will read to you, with the Popes that presided at them, and the heresiarches who were condemned by them. Ours, then, is the stone signified in the prophecy, and it has indeed grown into a mountain. Christ said, "Thou art Peter," that is a rock, "and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now, Sir, who condemned Simon Magus, Menander, Parcelian, and the rest who held that *latría*, or divine honour and sacrifice should be given to the saints. Who condemned the Eunomians, Miceans, Manichæans, and the rest ? I ask you now where was the stone which was to grow into a mountain if your church was the stone for the 800 years that you say it was invisible. During that 800 years, according to you, there was no Protestantism ("no," from Mr. Gregg.) I say yes, and tell me where was the stone then ? (the Rev. Mr. Gregg again displayed, and shook the map.) Oh ! Mr. Gregg, I don't see your invisible church in that map, (cheers and hisses, amid which Mr. Gregg held up the other map.) You see, gentlemen, where he has produced these pictures for the condemnation of himself. The scriptures says that a man shall tell a lie to his own condemnation. He would not be satisfied till by showing the picture he made it clear that he was telling a bit of a fib in saying that the true church was invisible when it never was. That map is indeed a picture of the true church, and it exhibits it as being purged of the dross of heresy. I tell you, Sir, we are the true church, and in everything which you advance as a proof of the truth of your church's doctrine, Simon Stilectes, talk as you like, was a holy man ; and in our church all the holy men of every age are to be found. Christ said that he would preserve his church immaculate—he would preserve it for ever. How could he do so, if he gave it over into the hands of the blasphemous Luther and Calvin. I have given him a vast number of proofs of various kinds of doctrines of the intercession of saints and angels. I could give him the holy fathers also, but he hates them ; for he knows right well they would be against him. Why, Sir, I thought that at least they would be honest witnesses, no matter on what side. That's another proof of his consistency. He refuses to receive the doctrine of the very saints that he has in his own calendar. He blames us for honouring the saints. Does he not consecrate his own churches to their honour and in their names ? Does he not consecrate them to Michael, and Peter, and Paul, and others innumerable of the saints and angels ? I do not appeal to the fathers as infallible, but I did think, and I do think, that they are honest witnesses. They were holy martyrs, and glorious confessors, and yet one of the new infidels refuses to receive their testimony. Why, Sir, you are like Voltaire, and Rousseau, and Diderot ; you will believe nothing. You care not for Dr. Taylor, Bishop Montague, Dr. Parker, Purdon, or any other of the Pro-



testant writers that I have quoted. No, no, you care not for any individual because you are inspired. Thus are heresy and infidelity dovetailed together. [Here a book was handed up to the Rev. Mr. Gregg, which he put off the table.] I object to any book being handed up in this way. We will have nothing surreptitious—we will have every thing fair and honest, and open (cheers and hisses.) Now, gentlemen, hear me for a moment, and I will give you one other text. Since the cross has been blasphemed, I will give you a text to show you that it should be honoured. Now, I refer you to 1st Corinthians, chapter 1, verse 18, “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us who are saved it is the power of God.” You laugh at us for making the sign of the cross on our foreheads, but I say we will preserve the cross and honour it in spite of all that is done to the contrary. Again, to Galatians, chapter 6, verse 14—“But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me and I to the world.” You talk of bowing to Jesus. How do you bow to him? Do you bow to him in the sacrament? I ask you what is in it but bread and wine? If there be any thing I ask you what is it but Jesus? If there be nothing there you are guilty of what you charge against us. I tell you, sir, that the Dissenters charge you with it, and therefore they leave you. I tell you that every argument which you advance against me, I retort with double force in the name of the Dissenters. Lactantius, a great and pious man, and the instructor of the son of Constantine the Great, says—

Here the reverend gentleman's half-hour ended.

MR. GREGG—Then, the reverend gentleman has talked of transubstantiation. Now, sir, I propose that we have another day for discussing that subject. Will you (turning to the Rev. Mr. Maguire) meet me upon that occasion? Where does truth lie? He talks of being in a rage. Oh! that is evidence that he is standing on a shaking bog. He talks of bowing to the name of Jesus. He says, hail master, like his prototype, Judas, and then sells him for thirty pieces of silver. Then again we have the cross. Oh, sir, these are the delusions which are the destruction of our country, (laughter). You will think it very odd when I tell you that in his quotations from Luther he read passages from his works written before his conversion. I have his sermons on the commandments here where he expressly says that he wished his former theology should be burned. He quoted the text where God said he would spare the Israelites on David's account, as if God would not promise mercy to the third and fourth generation of the just man; and he therefore concludes that the invocation of saints is lawful. There is a *non sequitur* for you. I never said the saints heard us or our prayers, but I said that I had reason to believe there was joy in heaven for the conversion of a sinner. So far from saying that they did hear us. I gave an illustration with regard to the heavenly bodies to show that they could not, by any possibility, hear us. Again, he says that the angel before whom Joshua fell down, was captain of the Lord's hosts, and that therefore he could not be, as I argued he was, the Lord.

Is not Jesus invariably called captain in the Old Testament ; and is he not the Saviour of our souls ? He then quoted the following text from Zachariah -- "Here the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judea, against which thou hast had indignation three score and ten years." I say if he knew anything about the Hebrew language, he would know that the angel spoken of in this way is the Jehovah, and that that language is common in the Old Testament, when any passages occur which have reference to Christ. Now, sir, I have answered all your questions, (great laughter.) I have answered them, and my proof is, that the reverend gentleman runs away, (a laugh). This fact will be known in Ireland, and throughout the world for ages yet to come, who will see the effects and mischiefs of Popery. The reverend gentleman tells us about saints and images, and that to reverence them is not idolatry. I wonder that he labours under such a delusion. Here I have a book, printed in 1796, which gives an account of prodigies performed in Rome. The work is published by Keating, a bookseller in London, and translated from the French, by the Rev. Mr. Raymond. In that it is stated that images in the chapels at Rome used to lift up their eyes and look at the congregation. One on the high altar of St. Nicholas used, during the sacrifice, to open its eyes and look upon the people, and, at the time of consecration, look towards the altar. These things are said to be attested and sworn to by a great many witnesses. Another statue of the Virgin Mary was seen to have a clear colour, and used also, during the time of sacrifice, to open its eyes and move the pupils. I could give you a score of instances of the same kind, got up to delude man. There we have the ground for the assertion made of miracles being performed in the church, which show that the church of Rome is the church of Antichrist. I was going to speak of the spirit of the true religion, and to show you what the infernal mind of man can do to enslave his fellow-man, and send him to perdition. In the 2d book of Kings, we find that Naaman came with his horses and with his chariot, and stood at the door of the house of Elisha ; and Elisha sent a messenger, saying, 'Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.' But Naaman was wrath, and went away and said, 'Behold, I thought he will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his wand over the place and cover the leper.' No, gentlemen, Naaman would not do that ; the washing himself in water was too simple a cure for him. He wanted some show, just like that which is practised now-a-days, and commonly called priest-craft. We have the true religion springing from the fountains of Jesus Christ, and it is not so with Popery. Look to that, (exhibiting a scapular, amid the laughter of all present)—there is something to cure the soul of man, and to satisfy blind and dark human nature, (loud cries of "question, question"). This is the corruption which gives a plenary indulgence to the devotees of the holy abbot or the holy friar, as he is called, who founded that institution. That scapular will deliver the person who wears it, from

hell fire, and from any accident in this world. Indeed it is said that at one time a cannon ball was fired at a man, and that this scapular stopped it, and prevented him from being killed. My dear friends, observe the trickery and the nonsense which the people of Ireland are called on to believe. Here is a miraculous medal, which, I suppose, they will say performed more miracles than Christ himself. This is to be hung on the tester of a bed, from which great advantages are to be derived. They call the Virgin, the Queen of Heaven, but I shall not do so—I shall not give her a character which she is not warranted in receiving. You say she has ascended into heaven, although the scriptures have not one word about it; and oh, sir, it is here we find the character of Popery. Of course we can't prove a negative—we can't allege positively that such an occurrence did not take place; but all we say is, it is not in the scriptures, and therefore we don't believe it. You talked of idolatry. What is this (taking up a Breviary)? *Festum coeni Domini*, the feast of the supper of the Lord; and then there's blessing oil, and other mixtures, &c., out of which the devil is to be put. The bishop says *Sancta Chrisma*, Hail holy Chrism! and, after repeating it three times, he kneels down and kisses the bottle which contains it. Is not that sufficient to excite the wrath of a jealous God, who would not allow Moses, for being guilty of a want of confidence in his power, to enter the Holy Land. And here we have the priest saying, "Hail, holy oil!" and bowing down to adore it, (here the reverend gentleman imitated the bowing down, amid great laughter). I ask you, gentlemen, in the face of the living God, is not that blasphemy, and are not such practices dreadfully injurious to the honor of the Lord Most High? They have holy oil, and holy water, and holy salt, and holy ashes; and I tell you your very baptism is invalid—it is corrupt. You make crosses, you anoint, and you profane, as if to drive away ten thousand devils, (roars of laughter). You tell me that it is lawful to bless any of God's creatures. I grant you that—but not to make them the occasions of blaspheming the Lord Most High. It is done to make him drive the devil out of things. How comes it that you do not proceed with a different course? Why not begin at the beginning (laughter) let me ask? Why did you say we admit the invocation of saints in our Book of Common Prayer? We do not, sir. Here is the prayer—[The reverend gentleman here read it out of the book, and proceeded.] Oh, sir, it is a beautiful example of the wisdom of the church of England that it is a prayer to God alone, and not to any other creature or thing. You cannot find where it is either in our Book of Common Prayer, or in our misquoting history, which I find, on investigation, I have not, although at the time I only depended on my memory: but it is not so with you. You have misquoted history and the holy scriptures, which shows, beyond any possible doubt, that the Lord God has visited you with judicial blindness, (laughter). Rise from it, rise from it—run away, run away from the abominations of Popery. You have spoken of Luther, and you said he had a conference with the devil, who persuaded him to leave off saying private masses. No, sir, that is not the case, he was persuaded

to do so by the living God, and not by the devil, who, on the contrary, pressed him to continue, but he refused, and was exceedingly right in doing so. I now come to my question. Why don't you begin at the beginning (great laughter?) Do not the laws of the land declare that your religion is impious and idolatrous, and that your church was sunk in superstition throughout the world for eight hundred years and more? Why do you not come forward and insist that the law shall be repealed—why do you not insist that you are no longer to be stigmatized as an idolater, instead of which you allow yourself to be branded with that appellation? I tell you, Sir, that if I were branded with idolatry, I would protest against it (laughter); and you should do so likewise, if you were in the right, and insist that I should have no ascendancy over you, I tell you more, Sir, that if I were arraigned before an idolatrous judge, I would not plead before him, and I here protest against any authority being given to idolaters. Why, Sir, and I put it to you—why have you been branded with idolatry?—because you are an idolater (laughter.) What has been your whole business during this discussion? You have been disparaging Christ, by calling for proofs of the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures—you have been guilty of infidelity—you condemn me because I believe them, and because I rejected every thing and place reliance on Jesus Christ alone, through whom we are to get peace and pardon. Your whole business has been to attack and condemn the power of his holy church. You run away from the question; if not, then, I dare you to continue it. Oh, my Roman Catholic countrymen, tremble for yourselves; and I now give notice that, as soon as my strength shall be restored, I will give a public lecture in this room, for which I got a requisition some time since, when I will point out to the government of the country the best mode of converting you all (great laughter;) and convincing you that the truth is in Jesus. I was a weak man commencing this contest. I was nobody; but you, Sir, have gifted me with a power calculated to give ten thousand overthrows to the great apostacy—(laughter.) That has been my constant prayer to God for many years—prayers which I have recorded in my journals (laughter.). I have seen the miseries which you were subjected to, and I prayed for you. I begged of the Lord to give me power to remove the evils, and he has gifted me with the power. I am certain he'll grant me grace to exert that power, whereby I may be enabled to serve Ireland, and rescue her from her wicked ways, when you will abandon your apostate bishops, and your consecration, and your religion, and come back to us (loud laughter.) Do as Mr. Crotty did, come back to the Church of Christ, where you'll find peace in that Saviour, and glory in your own righteousness. I pray God that my labour

may have that effect, I could not be better employed. It would be a great deal better for you to be out sporting with your dogs than be sitting with females ; and if every priest gave up that sort of work, and would take and enjoy his field-sports, we should have our country better than we have at present. Your efforts do nothing but spread damnable doctrines. They demoralise the people, and inflict serious injury—injury on the church of Christ. Babylon the great is fallen ! fallen ! fallen ! Come out of her, my people. Sir, the discussion is now ended, because you ran away (laughter.) Take my advice, and stay at home at Ballinamore, for there is not a clergyman into whose parish you may hereafter go that will not drag you forward and expose you.

The half-hour here ended.

MR. MAGUIRE—Now, gentlemen, you will be pleased to observe that my friend here has given you a great deal of abuse and vituperation, and an immensity of assertion, but no proof (cheers and hisses.)

MR. NANGLE—I beg of you to be quiet, and of every policeman in the room to bring out any one who gives any sign either of approbation or disapprobation.

REV. MR. MAGUIRE—He told you most distinctly that he came here to preach, and in all his life he never said a truer word. He blames me for enjoying recreation, innocent and harmless, for the sake of my health. What right has he to interfere with my mode of disposing of my leisure time. To what straits must he be driven when he begins to upbraid me for enjoying harmless recreation with my dogs, when I have discharged my duties.

REV. MR. GREGG—I approve of it.

REV. MR. MAGUIRE—Why, I ask, upbraid ; why blame me. (Here there was a great confusion, caused by the police bringing out a person who had created some disturbance.)

REV. MR. M'NAMARA—This is highly improper ; I exclaim against any one creating a noise.

REV. MR. MAGUIRE—I thank my God I am not a man who declares my own righteousness ; nor am I so fanatical as to boast that I recorded my own prayers in my journal. Oh ! it is not that I want. I want to argue and to reason from the holy word of God—I give you no assertion of my own (laughter and cheers.) As far as I open the book of the scriptures and quote the word of God, I have a claim upon your attention, upon your judgment, and upon your intelligence. But when I gave you my own assertion, I have no claim whatever upon you. I ask you was there ever any body of men who had a greater claim to sanctity than the Scribes and Pharisees, and what did our Saviour say of them ? Why, that was the very rock upon which they split ; and our Saviour never lost, if I

may use the word, the mildness of his nature save in abusing them. I ask you now, as a gentleman, as a man of honour, and as a brother-clergyman—since I believe you admit the ordination of antichrist (“no,” from the Rev. Mr. Gregg,) well, then, I appeal to you as a man of honour, a gentleman, and a man of truth, what right had you to put it into your letter to the Rev. Mr. McNamara that I declined the discussion, and that I should give you another day for the discussion of Den’s Theology? I say before this meeting, and I call upon the note-takers to take it down, that there were never grosser mistranslations, misquotations, and perversions than there are in the pamphlet which has been published; and I would undertake to prove it (“oh, false,” from ex-priest Nolan, and great cheering and groaning.) If it be not the fact, I will give up the discussion and acknowledge myself beaten. Now, I challenge any one to prove the contrary. My friend tells you that I am running away and avoiding the continuance of the controversy. I ask, am I to continue here till Christmas arguing with a man who never answers a single argument which I adduce? (cheers and laughter.) I ask, when I quoted two-and-thirty texts, what answer did he give? He attempted to answer two texts, and “now,” he said, “I have answered all his texts.” A pretty way he answered them (cheers and hisses.) With regard to the angel mentioned in the Revelations what did he say? Why, that the saint worshipped him in the same manner as the king that I mentioned in the other text in the book of Kings (“No,” from Mr. Gregg) I assert that that is the fact.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—I deny it (great confusion.)

Rev. Mr. MACUIRE—I assert that what you said was the worship of the saint to the angel was the kind of worship that was given to the king. Now that is just what I say. It was just the kind of worship which you would give the archbishop while you want a benefice. That is the only kind of worship we pay to the angels and saints. What honour he gives the one we give the others. Now, then, let me go through the topics touched upon by the reverend gentleman. You accuse me of misquoting both history and scripture. Now, I challenge you to point out a single misquotation in either. The report of this discussion will go before the world. Let us both review it, and then let the world judge. But, gentlemen, you will see the difficulty I will find to get him to publish the report (cheers and hisses.) Oh, he will be unwilling indeed, for he knows that the world will be astonished when it sees it, and perceives the manner in which he argued. He talks of Antichrist. Why Sir, Henry the Eighth, the introducer of your religion into this country, got his title of “Defender of the faith” from Antichrist, and your kings and queens are so fond of it that they

have retained it ever since ; and you delivered Antichrist from the power of Bonaparte. There's consistency for you ; What do you say, or what have you said to that. He tells us, in common with all the veiled prophets of a luxuriating establishment, that the doctrine of the invocation of saints is damnable and idolatrous. How many Protestant divines have I not quoted to prove that the invocation of saints is lawful and good ? Besides them, here I have the holy fathers ; but he throws them overboard. Now, he says that I quoted Luther previous to his conversion. Sir, you have made a blundering mistake (no, from Mr. Gregg). But I assert that you did, and what's more, I tell you that he wrote the work from which he quoted, in order to become reconciled to the Pope. So I say when Luther, the heretic, says anything, in contradiction to you, have I not a right to quote him against you ? (hisses and cheers). Gentlemen, I have good reason to use these expressions. He may contradict you, sir, but I am to reconcile that contradiction ? No ; I leave it to you to do so, and I defy you to it. I have given him all kinds of authority for my doctrine. and I would have given him all the fathers also, but that he, knowing they would be against me, would not receive them. " Oh," he says I am inspired, and I don't care for them." Why, sir, I told you before that was folly. He talked of miracles. He told us that he did not know whether the miracles were performed or not, (no, from Mr. Gregg). Why, sir, you said that you did not know whether they are true or false miracles ; but that if they were wrought, they were wrought in the anti-christian church. He talks of our blessing holy water, and other things. Don't you bless your own Pontificals ? (No, from Mr. Gregg). Well, then, sir, if you do not, give them to me and I will soon knock the devil out of them, (laughter, cheers, and hisses). You may laugh, but I tell you, you will read in the the oldest and best authors of exorcism—I tell you, sir, that anything you have said is contradicted by a hundred different examples in both Testaments. Did not Moses cause the cherubim and seraphim to be set up on both sides of the ark ? Did he not set up the ark itself, and did not David dance before it, because it was the figure of the Lord ? Let me ask you, is not the Bible a mere representation in words of the will of God ? You honour the Bible with a great horror, and now I tell you that we honor the saints and angels just in the way you honour the Bible, and no more. You ask me will I meet you on transubstantiation ? Why, do you think I am fool enough to remain here till Christmas, and to argue with a man who does not reply to my arguments, except by telling me that he will hold up Jesus, and that he is inspired by the Holy Ghost ? cheers) Why, sir, do as you say and I'll believe you. But I will not take your word for it unless you convince me by ocular demonstration. I tell you I don't believe in your inspiration, for Simon Magus and Menander, and Martial, said they were inspired. Now, sir, I ask you when I put the question to you, where was the stone that grew into a mountain and broke to pieces all other kingdoms during 800 years that you say your church was invisible, what answer did you

give me. None. Secondly, when I asked you to prove the 22 negative articles, what did you do. You attempted to prove two of them, and there you stopped; and you'll never, nor could you ever, go farther. Thirdly—I asked you if public judgment were the sole rule of faith, how could he have left the church. You gave me no answer. Fourthly—I asked you if private judgment were the sole rule of faith, how do you excuse St. Peter, and the rest of the apostles for condemning the Antiocheans and Judeans. You gave no answer. Fifthly—I asked you where was the religion in which Luther could make an act of faith, which he was bound to do under pain of damnation, at the time he separated from the Roman Catholic church. You gave no answer. Sixthly—I asked you could you convert a Jew on Protestant principles. The answer you gave me was, by holding up Jesus, and preaching the scriptures, just as if that would not be begging the question, which he would have to prove. Seventhly—I asked you how could Christ be with his church teaching, preaching, and baptizing, and doing other corporal and visible works, if the church were invisible for 800 years. That you answered not. Eighthly—I asked you how could your church be Catholic if it were invisible for the 800 years. Your answer was at one time that it was invisible, at another that it was not. Ninthly—I asked you how you prove the 22 negative articles from scripture. the result was the same. Tenthly—I asked you to point out a single church that ever held the Thirty-nine articles as a part of its belief till the days of Elizabeth. You never attempted to do so. Eleventhly—I asked you whether his ordination was ordinary or extraordinary. You did not tell me. Twelfthly—I asked you whether your church was fallible or infallible, and if it were fallible, how could he make an act of faith on a fallible authority. You say that you will not declare whether it is infallible or not (no, from Mr. Gregg). Thirteenthly—I asked you how could you prove the uninterrupted succession of your bishops from the days of Peter and the apostles, if the church were invisible for 800 years. The result was equally unsatisfactory. Fourteenthly—I asked you how could you prove on Protestant principles the inspiration of the Apocalypse. You did not answer. Fifteenthly—I asked you how a lopped off branch could flourish, or a stream cut off from its fountain, continue to flow. Where is your reply. Sixteenthly—I asked you, as according to you, Rome is heretical when she became so. who was the heresiarch who introduced the heresy, and what was the particular heresy he introduced. You gave me no answer.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—I did.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Oh! yes; you said something about grey beards and grey heads, and some other nonsense of that kind (laughter.) Seventeenthly, I asked you as you admit the four first general councils of the church, did they not violate the right of private judgment, in condemning heretics, if that right were the rule of the church. You did not answer me. Eighteenthly—if they had a right to condemn the heresies, had not the Council of Trent a right to condemn Luther and Calvin? You never replied to me.



Nineteenthly, I asked you to show me a Catholic, that had been so all his life, that became a Protestant in the hour of death. You could not mention. I told you how many. Twentiethly, I asked you to prove that there were two sacraments only, and not seven. You did not attempt it. Twenty-first, I asked you how you got out of the charge of apostacy, as you admitted the Scriptures on our authority, whom you accuse of apostacy. Did you answer me. ("I did," from Mr. Gregg.) Twenty-second, I asked you how could you believe the holy Scriptures to be entirely infallible, unless you received them through an infallible medium. But you say you received them on the authority of your own church, which you admit to be fallible. Did you answer me. Twenty-third—I asked you how could an ignorant Protestant, on Protestant principles make an act of faith. You did not say. Twenty-fourth—I asked you to prove from the bible the validity of your doctrines. You did not attempt it. Twenty-fifth—I asked you to prove the necessity of aspersion in baptism from the scriptures. You did not do so. Twenty-sixth—I asked you to prove the trinity from the scriptures. You told me that you did not care if the text which proved it were struck out from the bible. Then I would be obliged to you, if you would try. The Unitarians would be obliged to you also to prove it. Twenty-seventh—I asked you to prove the consubstantiality of the son of God with the father, from the scriptures. You did not do so. Twenty-eighth—I asked you to give some authority from scriptures for changing the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. You did not; and I would be obliged to you to tell me when the Lord commanded that it should be observed on the last and not the first day of the week. What authority changed it but the church. Twenty-ninth—I asked you if faith be by hearing, and hearing by the words of Christ, how could there be faith during the 800 years that there was no one to preach the word of Christ! and no one to hear them. You did not attempt to give an answer to that. Thirtiethly—I asked you for a text to prove that it was unlawful to fast. You did not give me one, but I gave you several to prove that it was not only lawful but proper. Thirty-first—I asked you where was the perpetual sacrifice in your church, which Daniel foretold was to be destroyed by Antichrist. You did not answer me. Thirty-second—I asked you, as you admit the council of Jerusalem, which recommends fasting, why do you not fast, and why does your church reject it, though it is recommended in her Book of Common Prayer. You did not answer me! Thirty-third—I asked you, having driven you to admit that the fast of Lent was observed in the primitive church, which you say was pure, why it was rejected by your church, though recommended also in the Book of Common Prayer. You did not tell me! Thirty-fourth—I asked you for a Protestant principle to prove the canonicity of the scriptures. You did not give it to me! I asked you who it was gave you the scriptures, and the commandments, and how you defend the division of the first and the second commandments. You answered none of these! Thirty-sixth—I asked you which was the private or public judgment to be preferred, and which came from the Holy Ghost.

Rev. Mr. GREGG—Both.

Rev. Mr. MAGUIRE—Both. Then, I ask you, in case of a reference, how will you reconcile them? Take that down now. Then I obliged you to admit the divine origin of extreme unction and confession, and I asked you why you did not practice them? You did not tell me. I obliged you to deny the right of private judgment, (no, from Mr, Gregg). Oh, let the notes prove that. I'll engage it will be found that you did. I asked you to account for the fourteenth psalm being longer in your Book of Common Prayer than in your Bible, and you admitted you could not account for it. Now, I ask you am I running away? I have been here now nine days, and am I to stay here for ever to carry on a discussion which has resulted in the manner I described? (great confusion). I hope, at all events, that we separate in good feeling, (hear, hear). I protest that I hold every human being in love and charity, even as before this discussion, (hear, hear). I tell you I regret the observations which have been wrung from me, not that I believe them false! no, I protest before God, I would not utter them if I thought so, but that I would not hurt the feelings of any class of men, (cheers). But when the language that has been used with respect to my church and its clergy, it is no wonder I should feel heated. When the charge of apostacy was attempted to be fastened on my church by a man whose church, according to himself, was not in existence for 800 or 1,000 years before Luther, it is no wonder I should retort. We were the only church in the world then. From us they have got their ordination, their perpetuity, their visibility, (great cheering and groaning). He comes and shakes his instruments at me, and makes a mockery and a laugh of our miracles.

The reverend gentleman here concluded, amid loud cheers, hisses and groans. While the meeting was separating, the shouting was continued, with occasional cheers for both the reverend gentlemen. The "Kentish-fire" was raised. The Rev. Mr. Gregg stood for some time waving his maps about his head, and Nolan, the ex-priest, exhibited one of the articles used on the Roman Catholic altars, amid shouts of disapprobation. Notwithstanding the noise, the meeting separated without any violence on either side.

THE END.