

for in like manner explaining away the plain words of Scripture, rather than believe that Christ was God when the senses could recognize in Him no more than man? Who can affirm that the words, "Drink ye all of it," addressed to the Apostles, make it invariably the right of the laity to receive the cup if the charge, "Do this in remembrance of me," does not equally give them the power of consecrating? Who can be sure that the prophecy about antichrist refers to Christian Rome, and that the glorious prophecies in Isaiah, describing the Church in its visibility, its universality, and its unity, do not refer to the Roman Catholic Church? How can we be sure that a parallel exists between the destruction of the brazen serpent and that of the images of the saints, yet be sure also that no analogy exists between dispersed tribes who refused to worship at Jerusalem, and who, in losing unity, lost the faith, and the Protestant bodies who have set up rival altars? Who can be sure that Judah, selected from his brethren, and endowed with a promise, fulfilled at last by means which many might have thought human and accidental, was not a type of Peter selected from his brethren, and commanded to strengthen them? What is to be our guide in these matters? "The general tenor of Scripture," it will be answered. Just so. But on this principle a previous knowledge of the whole must determine the interpretation of the parts. Now such a knowledge is actually possessed by the Church, for She bears witness ever to what She has seen and known before one book of the New Testament was written. Individuals, on the other hand, who refuse to communicate in the divine knowledge of the Church, can become acquainted with Holy Scripture only by proceeding to a knowledge of the whole from a knowledge of the parts, that is, from a knowledge of what, on their own confession, must remain unknown. Men frequently speak as if the "general tenor" of the Scriptures were a thing easily understood, whereas a real appreciation of it, and of the general "analogy of the faith," is among the last attainments of the most mature Christian. What a Protestant mistake for this broad knowledge is his own particular theological theory or prepossession, which is to him a key for the elucidation of all doubtful passages. The rule of private judgment, then, is essentially a narrow, a superficial, and a crude method of interpretation. If we use it we shall lose not a portion merely, but far the larger portion of the meaning of Holy Writ. The draught which we secure must depend on the net which we use; and if we prefer our own to that of the Galilean fishermen we must take the consequences.

A true rule of faith must be an unequivocal one. That of private judgment has ever been equivocal. In theory every one is by it invited to form his faith for himself; but, in fact, when his private judgment happens not to coincide with that of the community to which he belongs, he has been too frequently persecuted by the State, and almost always is denounced by the clergy as schismatical, or, at least, disloyal and unfaithful. This is obviously unjust, for, on the principle of private judgment, a Dissenter must have at least as good a right to abandon the national church, as the early Reformers had to abandon the Catholic; and a Protestant has as good a right to become a Catholic as a Catholic to become a Protestant. The most contradictory theories prevail also as to the nature of private judgment. The principle is commonly asserted in its most unqualified form; but attempts are also made to combine it with that of authority. The theories respecting this mixed authority are equivocal also. Sometimes it means the authority of some particular national or established church over its own members. Such authority must, of course, be limited, since no Protestant community pretends to infallibility; but whether the line of limitation is to be drawn by the sect, or by the individual, no one can say. At other times the Protestant theory of authority means that the inquirer is to stand perfectly free as regards the decisions of any existing community, but that he is to take into account the judgment of ancient fathers and councils in determining the sense of Holy Scripture. What fathers and councils, however, he is to consult, on what principle he is to interpret them, and how far he is to be guided by their opinions except where they coincide with his own, the advocates of this theory have never determined. All such contending theories are, indeed, in one respect fatally identical, since private judgment, if admitted at all, must needs sit in the ultimate court of appeal; but while the common result of all must be uncertainty in divine things, the special doctrinal results to which each theory leads must be such as are condemned by those who adopt the rival theories respecting the rule of faith. Private judgment thus is not one rule but several, disguised in the masquerade dress of a common name.

(To be continued.)

REV. DR. CAHILL'S LETTER.

Dr. Cahill's letter to Prince Albert, which appeared in the TRUE WITNESS of the 23d ult., contained some severe strictures upon the English University system, which called forth a reply from a gentleman of the name of Walford, formerly an Anglican minister, and now a member of the Catholic Church. Mr. Walford, as an Oxford man, endeavored to defend his College, from the imputation of immorality, and was rather hard upon Dr. Cahill when he accused, in the Catholic Standard, of exaggeration, if not of misrepresentation. Dr. Cahill has given the following crushing reply:—

DR. CAHILL'S REPLY TO THE LETTER OF THE REV. EDWARD WALFORD, BAYSWATER, LONDON.

Blackburn, Jan. 24, 1864.

Rev. Sir,—From the sincere respect, and I shall add affectionate regard, which I feel towards a Protestant clergyman converted to the Catholic faith, I

must say that I have read your letter in the Catholic Standard in reference to me with indescribable regret. And this regret has been awakened entirely on your own account, and for your own sake. Your letter is the production of a bitter enemy, and not as it should be, of a devoted friend: it has all the appearance of a malignant rancor, and those who would be anxious to defend you, cannot conceive any justifiable motive for your precipitate publication of such imprudent documents. Before I shall have concluded this respectful, painful, but necessary reply, you will learn the extent of the singular and most unaccountable rashness which could have prompted you to pen a public communication, of which the principal parts are plain, culpable falsehoods, and which I sincerely regret to feel must soon expose you to the severest public censure of your friends, and to the stinging scorn of your former associates. Besides these unpleasant considerations, your letter smells so strongly of a bigoted Protestantism—and, in fact, it tastes so richly of the flavor of Exeter Hall Anglicanism, that it belongs much more appropriately to the inspiration of the former Oxford clergyman than to the humble heart of the late Catholic convert.

Firstly, you state, "As to the University, I am in honor bound to say that during the three years I passed within its walls I can scarcely recall a word uttered in the precincts of my own College (Baliol) which I should blush to hear uttered in the presence of a mother, a wife, or a sister." Of course I believe firmly both the fact and the spirit of these words of yours; but when we hear one of the Fellows of the same College declare on his oath, that "the immorality of the students of Baliol was sunk to a point so low, that he could not conceive an abyss of depravity lower," we must conclude that your testimony on the same subject cannot be received (except as far as you are personally concerned) as the criterion of the truth.

The evidence of Rev. Henry Wall, Fellow and Bursar of Baliol, the Principal of St. Alban's Hall, and Protector of Logic, is as follows (p. 148):—"I have resided in Baliol for the last twenty-two years, and I have some experience. I wish I could say that the discipline of Baliol had much capacity for becoming worse: I wish I could say that immorality had yet to be introduced among our students."

Your next statement is: "Now, Sir, whatever means God may bless to the advancement of the Catholic religion in England, it is quite certain that false statements are not among them; and I cannot but deplore, in common with many other converts to the Catholic faith, the reckless and unclarifiable assertions which Dr. Cahill, a priest of the Catholic Church, is not ashamed to utter against the Protestant clergy; and therefore, Sir, I beg, for one, openly to protest against them, as far as Oxford is concerned—I should be but an unnatural son of my own University if I did not do so."

Now, Rev. Sir, the public will learn what value must be attached to your words when they read the evidence of a second Fellow of your College, viz., the evidence of the Rev. Robert Scott, late Fellow and Tutor of Baliol. His evidence goes to show that the irregularities of the clerical students are so incessant, that he recommends a place of repentance, where they could have what he calls "breathing time," before they enter on their necessary duties; his evidence is as follows:—"I recommend Catholic Seminaries, the students themselves (clerical) would have a space of breathing time in a more retired air; before entering on their new and solemn calling! The separation from old social and local temptations would give to those who had yielded to such influences at the University, a locus penitentiae, and a favorable opportunity of putting good resolutions into practice."—page 114.

Your third statement is: "As for the neighborhood of Oxford, it is but due to state, that for miles around the University, the erection and restoration of parish churches, and the building of parochial schools and of parsonage-houses, betoken the presence of some good in this 'den of infamy'; and I must ask for some statistics far more accurate than those which Dr. Cahill employs, before I can bring myself to believe that the morality of the villages round Oxford is at a lower ebb than that of agricultural parishes in general, of which I had some little experience when I was a Protestant clergyman." There can be no doubt that this extract proves you are still the worthy son of your University, since you bestow such profuse eulogy on "the good" that must arise to religion from the restoration of parish churches where the Mass is declared damnable; from the building of schools where the children are taught to ridicule the Saints, the confessional, and the Blessed Virgin; and from parsonage-houses, which go to the support of the men who ignore your Bishop, spit in the face of the Cardinal of England, declare the Pope Antichrist, and your adopted Church the harlot of Babylon. Upon my word, Rev. Sir, I am beginning to feel that you are one of two things; namely, you are only half converted, or you have not read one page of theology!

But referring to the above statement, let us hear the evidence of a third Fellow of your spotless Baliol, where "no word is even uttered that could offend the delicacy of a mother, a wife, or a sister;" let us learn from his testimony, the reliance to be placed on any assertion of yours.

The evidence of the Rev. Frederick Temple, of Kneller Hall, late Fellow and Tutor of Baliol:—"The direct discipline of the University, is deficient in amount. The villages round Oxford, within a circuit of five miles, are now hotbeds of temptation (p. 127.) . . . The openings to vice, are at present the bane of the system: it is frightful to think of the large proportion of the undergraduates who are tainting their minds, not unfrequently through life, with the effects of an impure youth."—(p. 126.)

Again, hear the evidence of the Rev. R. Congreve, Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College, in speaking of the discipline of the University, he expressed a wish (p. 152), "that it could be raised to the standard adopted by Sir Charles Napier in India, that is, the discipline of an Indian barrack!"

Again, hear the evidence of Rev. Mark Paterson, Sub-rector and Tutor of L. C. (p. 42), "The three great temptations of the place, are, Fornication, Wine, and Cards. Without exaggerating the turpitude of the first-named vice, yet every one who is aware of the amount of moral and intellectual prostration traceable to it here must wish that every protection against temptation should be afforded to the weak and unsteady."

Your fourth assertion in reference to the course of theological studies at Oxford deserves more pity than anger, as your statements seem like those of a man who does not know the logical results of what he is saying, or does not understand the just value of his

words; your words are, "I have no great admiration for the course of Divinity and lectures in Theology at Oxford, of which Dr. Cahill speaks."

So, Rev. Sir, it appears you have some admiration—but "not great"—for the Divinity taught at Oxford; a Divinity which denies Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead; which brands Indulgences as a priestly invention; which denies the authority of the Church; which declares the Sacrament of Penance a horrid blasphemy; and which sets up a modern apostacy, and pasteboard Bishops, and pinchbeck ministers as true descendants of the Apostles. I assure you, Rev. Sir, you appear to me more attached to your former companions and their principals than to your newly-adopted brethren and their old creed. The old fire may be perhaps extinguished, but there lingers behind a living warmth that may yet be kindled into a pristine flame. Take care, Rev. Sir,—

..... Extinctus amabitur idem."

Your fifth statement will, I dare say, surprise yourself, when you read the culpable falsehoods which you have written. I call them culpable because you insinuated and asserted that you quoted from the Oxford Commission, whereas the public will learn from this letter of mine, that you have either not read the report, or you have suppressed the truth.

Your fifth statement is that only one Fellow out of ninety witnesses entered into any details as to the immorality of Oxford:—"One Fellow alone, out of ninety, so far as I can see—the Rev. Mr. Jelf—enters into any detail as to the morality of the University and its immediate neighborhood. Mr. Jelf's letter extends over six pages, and three of those he devotes to the subject of discipline. He alludes to the existence of houses of ill fame, but he says nothing of their number; and, considering the population of the city, it cannot be a matter of surprise to find that such houses exist."

The foregoing quotations which I have made will, I dare say, convince even yourself of your culpable falsehood and palpable misstatements, as eleven Fellows testified to the same point; and you ought to take a lesson from the exposure, which you have decidedly brought on yourself, to reflect on what you will write in future, and have the advice of some person of common sense, who has read some theology and will have the charity and the prudence to protect you against yourself. You have not only omitted the real facts of the case, but you have even mistaken the very pages; and in a subsequent part of this letter I shall point you out to society as making gross, and scandalous, and calumnious misstatements, in reference to myself personally, without even the shadow or the colorable pretext of a proof.

Surely I have no wish or feeling to expose the conduct of the students of Oxford, or the Church of the Protestant clergy as a body. But if the Queen has ordered a commission to inquire into the discipline of the University, and if eleven Fellows (as I have already stated) have stated on their oaths the various facts set forth in that report, on what principle of justice do you make a personal attack on me for merely copying these statements? But the most indefensible part of your case is, that in almost every sentence you have written, you have beyond all dispute either suppressed the truth or advanced culpable falsehoods. I am now arrived at a part of your letter for which I have in vain endeavored to find some excuse for your most inexplicable calumny of myself:—"Thus, when we urge upon them, the claims of the Catholic Church, and the superior fruits of holiness to be found within her pale, we are silenced by an allusion to the last speech or letter of Dr. Cahill, who surely, as a Catholic priest, would be doing equal service by tending some of the Church's children in our semi-heathen towns, as by delivering fierce controversial lectures, and writing letters of ignorant and unchristian invective."

Pray tell me, Rev. Sir, where have you learned that I have delivered fierce controversial lectures: tell the public in what place I have delivered them, before whom, on what subject, and at what time? And what must you think of your honor as a gentleman when I now tell you, without fear of contradiction, that in the whole course of my life I have never on any occasion, or in any one instance, delivered such a lecture. I have made an invariable rule, which I have never broken in any one case, never to discuss the creed or offend the conscientious feelings of those who differ from me in religion. I am a mere Catholic catechist, explaining the Catholic doctrine, but never, never uttering one sentence or one word on the creed of others. I believe that I can, under the grace of God, attract, persuade, and convince men, into faith; but I also believe that I can never insult men into faith. Besides, I have never delivered lectures except at the pressing invitations of Bishops, and the senior priests, of the various churches in England, Ireland, and Scotland.

Again, I have never discussed any subject till that subject has been first selected by them. You have, therefore, Rev. Sir, not only done a grievous injustice to me personally, but you have also uttered an irritating calumny against the Bishops and clergy of these countries. In order to mark you out as an object of pity to yourself, I now appeal to the dozens of Bishops who have invited me, to the hundreds of priests who heard me, and to the tens of thousands of the laity who listened to me, if any one has ever heard me say one fierce sentence from the pulpit.

Again, what opinion must be formed of your truth, when these clergymen who have invited me will tell you, that hundreds of converts have been the happy result of these lectures, that old prejudices have been removed from the minds of thousands of Protestants, and that weak or unsteady Catholics have conformed and reclaimed. And an additional advantage has been derived from these "fierce lectures," which, like other truths, has escaped the observation of your honor, viz., that during the three years I have been lecturing in England, Ireland, and Scotland, the average receipts have been something beyond sixty pounds a week—they have sometimes reached the sum of two hundred pounds a week, and at other times sink as low as thirty pounds; but the average is accurately what I have stated; and when it is recollected that I have been engaged during three years without the relaxation of even one week (with the exception of two months), it can be clearly calculated that the amount realised by these lectures has already reached the remarkable sum of ten thousand pounds. These various sums have been raised to build schools, to pay debts on churches, to clothe orphans, to feed the poor in the various towns where I have been engaged; and so zealous have I been in meeting the commands of Bishops and the invitations of priests, that, although I had been offered in some instances, twenty pounds a

night for lectures on Astronomy, I refused, because this sum was not given in the cause of charity, and because the engagement was not made by my superiors. And what renders your unexpected calumny so strange, is the appearance of zeal with which you make your mis-statement. Lord Byron has already described this genus of a character, and this kind of style; and hence he has spared me the pain of depicting your shameful letter—

"One thread of candor, and a web of lies."

My letters also have not escaped your condemnation. There must be some singular fatality *gaucherie* discolored your intellect and perverting your feelings, when you can neither see nor comprehend anything in its true light or natural shape. In reading over your wild assertions, I must always allow for a literary refraction in everything you say; your mind never travels in a straight line; you deviate, according to the medium in which you are placed; but depend upon it when you encounter me without provocation and speak gratuitous injustice against me, I shall set you right, and place before society the just equation of your errors. What must you think of your judgment in this case, when I assure you that I have received for these letters the compliments of the heir of a throne, the thanks of princes, ambassadors, dukes, marquises.—These letters have been copied into French papers, have been circulated throughout Austria, and are read in every hamlet in America by every one who detests the anti-catholic intrigues of a persecuting Cabinet and loves the triumphs of the Catholic Church. You are not aware, Sir, that my last letter was written at the suggestion of one of the first men in this country, in order to expose the restless intrigues of Lord Palmerston, who, being dismissed from his former revolutionary position, seeks to recover his place; and in his hostility to the Queen herself, would fain involve Prince Albert in a diplomatic difficulty. It is a strange fact to see a Catholic priest defending Prince Albert against one of the Queen's Ministers, but when Parliament shall assemble it will be seen whether I am right or wrong in these remarks of mine.

Nor are you satisfied with the speeches which I have made from time to time against the cruel extermination of my poor countrymen. I have seen these children of misfortune disappear from the land of their fathers—I have watched them, year after year, driven in tens and hundreds of thousands by a cruel and relentless bigotry from their ancient homes; I have read their sufferings, their trials, their death struggles in a foreign land; and I have wept over their hard fate, which has thus obliterated the most religious, the most pious, the most Catholic, and the most enduring people on the face of the earth. And because I have dared to make a speech in their favor, to console them in their ocean-heaves, and to bind their broken hearts—because I, their countryman, their kindred, and their appointed priest dared to tell the world the injustice and the cruelties perpetrated on all Catholic Ireland, I am brought to an account, calumniated, and insulted by an unfeeling neophyte, with a "scant Oxford degree," in a style of language more suited to the lying bigotry of Exeter Hall than to the burning charities of recent conversion. You are not a true-born Englishman, or you would feel for the victims of injustice. I have never yet met even one Englishman who visited Ireland, and read with his own eyes the traces of universal extermination in that unhappy country, who did not return home with his fine English heart overflowing with sympathy for our national woes, and with his tongue ready to publish our wrongs and defend us against our oppressors. Nor are you a real convert; you cannot belong to the illustrious, invincible, glorious band, who have sacrificed all the pleasures, and broken the dearest ties of this world, to join the ancient ranks of the old army of the Church. Their very looks inspire devotion, and my head and heart bow to them in the street when I meet them, in low and grateful veneration. They have edified, not scandalised the Church; they have infused new blood and fresh vigor into the old majestic body; and wherever they live, there you behold all paralysis disappear from the frame of Christian society, from the renewed life, and health, and strength which the excess of their devotion communicates to every one who comes within the reach of their sacred influence. You are not one of these converts; you publish calumny in place of truth; your letter in reference to me, contains more bitter falsehood than has ever been written against me by the Orange journals of this country: in fact, that production is just the expression of a proselytizing parson. By it you remind me of Baron Munchausen's coachman, where the breath of the coachman being frozen as he blew in it, on a severe frosty night, the sound was not heard till the following week during a thaw, when the horn began to blow of its own accord: and just so it is with you—you are now blowing out, quite unconsciously, I hope, the old Oxford rancor which had been frozen in your heart, and only wanted a favorable season to extricate its malevolence.

On that passage in your letter where you are pleased to call me "ignorant," I shall make no remark, except to tell you, that in this case you stand in opposition to my masters, most of whom are living Bishops, and who, during my course (and I did read a long course), had the bad taste (contrary to your judgment) to pay me much compliment as I passed through the classes of Logic, Physics, Scripture, Hebrew, and Theology, and to confer upon me, in spite of the opinion of the Oxford Convert, the highest honors which the College could bestow. You have also brought on yourself, by calling me "ignorant," the anger of my brother professors during many a happy day, who stood near me in college while I filled the varied chairs of Classics, Natural Philosophy, and Astronomy; and you have many enemies in Ireland, by calling me "ignorant," amongst the hundred of pupils who passed through my classes of Rhetoric, French, Italian, and German. You seem to take much pleasure in parading your "scant degree" of M.A.; but I beg to inform you that I have been for many a year a Master of Graduates.

I have now done with you, Reverend Sir; your personal rudeness to me has disentitled you to the expression of delicate courtesy in my hands; and therefore take leave to say, that as your assertions are clearly unworthy of credit, I shall take no further notice of any letter or communication which you may think proper to write in reference to me.

I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,
D. W. CAHILL, D.D.

The experiment of extracting brandy from beet-root has just been most successfully tried in this country; and with a result that cannot fail to be attended with the most signal results.—*Limerick Reporter.*