

kept up "in order to propagate the public opinion, or to conciliate the good opinion of the Protestant Government, under which we are deriving our support," with a great deal to the same effect. Of the very same kind was the testimony of 1854. According to the Maynooth professors, never was the nation blessed with a more loyal institution; according to the Protestant witnesses, who had been students there, it was never cursed with one more disloyal. The Rev. Daniel Leahy testifies that while there was no direct teaching against the duty of allegiance,—that while the professors "steered clear of any direct instructions with regard to that," "the impression was constantly kept up in the minds of the students, that the reigning king, at any time was a heretic and out of the pale of salvation," with much to the same effect. While the Rev. Wm Burke, amongst similar statements, testifies that "it was not directly said" that we were not bound in allegiance; "but the professors told us that the reign of Elizabeth, the realm of England was placed under interdict, and that that interdict had not been removed, and that all Protestants were under major excommunication; and the impression on my mind was that I was not bound in allegiance to a heretical king, and to one under major excommunication."

Class books disowned.—Again, bearing in mind Maynooth's loud professions as to pure, liberal, and loyal training, we find that in 1826, its professors freely owned that in every important particular they closely followed the guidance of their class-books, and that these gave a fair view of their teaching. Now we take up these class-books which they follow so closely, and find them full of sentiments the most impure, bigoted, and disloyal! Did the Commissioners ask them to explain this marvellous phenomenon—by what device they contrived to follow so closely works so vile, yet teach from them things so excellent, to draw such pure water from such polluted fountains? Alas! no. Protestant ignorance saved Rome here, as it has so often done. But in 1854 things had altered considerably. Twenty-eight years had done much to dissipate the ignorance of Protestants; and with the vile contents of Maynooth's class-books the nation had become familiar. What now were the professors to do? To admit, with their predecessors, that they followed these class-books were in fact to confess the worst that had been charged against them; and to deny it, would, in the circumstances, be little better, as the whole world knew that the very object of having class-books was to follow, not certainly to contradict, their teaching. Here was a dilemma—at least for ordinary mortals. And so the President, Dr. Renihan, honestly admits, though with some hesitation, that the books used and referred to in Maynooth at present, do indicate "generally" what is taught, &c.; repeats this in substance three different times; and adds, "that possibly on one, or a very few freely controverted questions, and in several little minute details, the professor may not concur in opinion with his class-book." But how act the professors? Rather than make an admission so fatal, they prefer being impaled on the opposite horn of the dilemma—and boldly deny that the class-books give any correct idea of what they teach.

Mysterious Instructions.—The bewildered Commissioners naturally asked, "In what way could any person form an opinion—to what would you refer him as indicating the opinions at Maynooth, or the course of teaching at Maynooth, on disputed points?" To which Dr. Crollly answers:—"I could not refer the Commissioners to any book; and I have already stated that in my written answers. I do not know any course of theology that would indicate exactly the opinions taught at Maynooth. This, though everybody knows, and the President himself admitted, that Catholics do, and must agree on all dogmas; they agree in all matters of a dogmatic character, and in all the principles of

morals." What mysterious teaching, and what a mysterious place! And this is the superior instruction so confidently promised us in 1845, and which has since cost us so much in many ways! Even the little which, in 1826, remained visible in Maynooth, has since been disappearing like some mirage or dissolving view. The mists and darkness which began so early to envelop it, instead of diminishing, have only increased with its years and our outlays, until now it is boldly asserted, that amongst Rome's countless theological standards, they know of none that would indicate the opinions taught in Maynooth; and so Commissioners and all are lost in a fog! Or to change the figure, the water is effectually muddied, and the cuttle-fish makes its escape! Could this state of things be possible in any religious body, no matter how lax in its doctrinal views?—That the professors appointed to train its future ministers were, on their own admission, unable to point to any "course" giving a correct idea of what they taught? Yet such is the happy freedom enjoyed in a College belonging to a body of all others the most dogmatic, which permits not a hair's-breadth deviation from the strict letter of its whole doctrinal system, and settles all disputes by the word—*Infallibility!*

Further Contradictions.—Did our space permit, we might give many similar examples of attempted concealment, with the painful exhibitions to which these gave rise. Such as the Dunhoyne Professor O'Hanlon expressly stating that Cabassutius was the canon law "class-book used by the order of the Board of Trustees;" and Professor Neville as expressly affirming, that Devoti had superseded Cabassutius "for the last twenty years." Or such as Professor Furlong's admission:—"We have occasion to consult several of his (Liguori's) works; his moral theology is what I principally refer to;" and Professor Neville's admission, that he "recommends the study of Liguori's Moral Theology" to his students; while Professor Butler, in the most formal manner, clears the whole College of any such guilt as is thus avowed by his brethren by volunteering the statement,—"There is an impression abroad that the theology of Liguori is studied in Maynooth," "but it should be known that Liguori is not studied in Maynooth." But we rarely must not weary our readers, and shall close this section with three other samples.

Scavini's Compendium.—One of the most infamous books taught in Maynooth is, as we have found, Scavini's Compendium of Moral Theology; and one of its most infamous parts is its treatise, "*De Matrimonio*." Therefore, one of the best tests of these gentlemen's candour will be found in their evidence regarding it. What then do we find? We have seen the laudations which Rome has heaped on Liguori's Theology; and we might now show that she has said little less for Scavini's Compendium. It is dedicated to Pio Noni; and there is prefixed to it a letter from this Holiness, "most approvingly receiving" the work—"most vehemently congratulating" its author—"most cordially accepting" the dedication—and "most lovingly imparting" the apostolic benediction! Now, in a written document given in to the Commission, Professor Crollly boldly declares that the adoption of this book "does not imply the slightest approbation of this author;" and that he for one has "publicly objected to some of his teaching," and even "*reprobates* what he believes to be false therein." What a faithful Professor!—thus to reprobate what his own infallible Pope has so "vehemently" applauded; and this in a College which, out of mere deference to his Holiness, has discarded Bailly in order to adopt this Scavini! Are we then going to find a confessor to the truth in one of the professors in Maynooth? Alas! how soon may the brightest hopes be blasted; for the same professor, who thus writes on the 28th September, declares on the 4th October following, that the book was not yet in

the possession of the students, and, therefore, "it would be impossible to teach it!" What can be compared to this? To tell us to-day with what fidelity he taught this book, even to braving the thunders of the Vatican, and to-morrow to inform us that it was impossible he could have taught it at all, for the very good reason that the students had not got the book!

His Treatise on Matrimony.—Again Professor Murray, while informing us that Scavini has succeeded Bailly, uses these remarkable words, "with the exception of the subject *De Matrimonio*, on which we have no class-book as yet." Yet it appears that of this extraordinary omission Professors Crollly, Furlong, and Neville had never heard a word; while Professor O'Hanlon distinctly states, "the class-book on these subjects is Scavini's Treatise on Marriage." And to crown all, Professor Murray himself makes a return of the Course of Divinity, Moral and Dogmatic, taught in Maynooth, which contained twenty-nine treatises, and at the end of which he says, "On each of the preceding treatises, to which no author's name is subjoined, our present text-book is Scavini." Now the 18th treatise on the list is *De Matrimonio*—has no author's name subjoined, and is therefore shown to be Scavini's by the very man who had previously denied that they had such a treatise in the College!

Menochius' Commentary.—Again, one of the class-books in 1826 was Menochius' Commentary on the Scriptures. It would appear that even on the simple fact as to whether it continued to be so, still they could not answer correctly. For, first, Professor Gillie deliberately states in his written answers that "Menochius was the class-book appointed by the Board;" then in his oral evidence, eight days after, the same witness declares that he merely "understood" so, but "had no certain knowledge of the fact." Then up comes Professor Neville, who distinctly asserts "we have no regular class-book on the Scriptures," "Menochius was formerly in use as a text-book, but is scarcely ever read now." Here is marvellous testimony! Gillie, whose office it was to teach the book, declares one day that Menochius is his class-book; another, that he has no certain knowledge of the fact; and a third is flatly contradicted by a brother professor; both witnesses being, moreover, *ex-officio* members of the Board for arranging these very matters! We ask if these men cannot tell a straight story about a matter of fact, and one of which you would say it was impossible they could be ignorant, viz., what class-books they themselves use, how is it possible to believe them on matters which give such ample room for sophistry and evasion as the Pope's dispensing power, or his interference in the temporal affairs of this kingdom?

A Word of Reflection.—Such are a few specimens of Maynooth's attempted concealments. And fain would we hope, for the credit of human nature, that such another exhibition is not to be found in the annals of witness-bearing. Yet these are Rome's "Divines,"—her own chosen professors for her own future priesthood,—who had the amplest opportunities to prepare their story, for, as they well knew, the nation had long been clamoring for this inquiry,—who had the most indulgent examiners to whom to tell that story,—and who owed it pre-eminently to themselves and their case to be candid and open in doing so, for it was this very kind of testimony that many predicted they would actually give. Yet, despite these contradictions, such is the evidence they present, under obligations equivalent to an oath! We put it to Maynooth's warmest apologists whether they will pretend to say that there could be such fearful attempts at concealment, if after all there was nothing to conceal? And we ask all honest men, if such is the state of things laid bare by the very shifts employed to escape detection, what a condition would that College be found in if all its secrets were laid open to the sun.—*Dublin.*