

to produce a manuscript of the *Latin Vulgate*. His demand for a "manuscript" is an admission that a Latin Bible has been produced which sustains Mr. Quigley's contention.

Mr. Davenport must be well aware that ancient manuscripts are guarded with jealous care in the archives of Europe, and are not accessible to dwellers on this side of the Atlantic. As Bibles reflect manuscripts, it must be conceded that Bibles are proof as high as the nature of the case requires in support of "various readings." But that manuscripts containing "*Ipsum*" actually exist is proved at page 105. Mr. Quigley never claimed, and it is wholly immaterial to his argument to claim, that any manuscript of the Vulgate contains "*Ipsum*."

Cardinal Bellarmine, who himself was one of the revisors of the Vulgate, says: "The Vulgate is various here, for some voices have '*Ipse*,' some '*Ipsa*'; and besides it is not contrary to . . . Vulgate should one be convinced that he ought to read '*Ipse*' or '*Ipsum*.'" The gravamen of the Bishop's charge was that while the word "*Ipse*" was in the manuscripts from which the Vulgate was copied, the Church had changed it to "*Ipsa*" in order to sustain a doctrine which was wholly devoid of truth. Why then challenge Mr. Quigley to prove that the Vulgate contains "*Ipsum*?" Mr. Quigley has proved his case when he cites other Bibles and manuscripts to prove that the Church accepts "*Ipse*" and "*Ipsum*" as of equal authority with "*Ipsa*," all three having the same meaning for Protestant and Catholic alike. The great Protestant scholars, Grotius and Tischendorf, support the view that the difference in the readings does not in any respect alter the sense. The Virgin crushes the serpent's head, as St. Bernard says,—“by her co-operation in the mystery of the Incarnation, and by rejecting, with horror, the very first suggestion of the enemy to commit even the smallest sin”; and, in the words of the Bull *Ineffabilis*,—"by that virtue with which she was endued from on high."

The Polyglot Bible of the Anglican Bishop Walton, the greatest Polyglot in the world, contains "*Ipsum*" in this passage. Nothing appears to be wanting in the citations and in the reasoning by which Mr. Quigley sustains his contention that the various reading of Gen. iii. 15, is not "*Ipse*," "*Ipsa*" only—but "*Ipse*," "*Ipsa*" "*Ipsum*."

But while upon the particular point in controversy, an impartial critic must give judgment in his favor, it must be conceded that he has made use of some expressions which at the first glance seem to exceed the limits of fair comment. "The words of the wise are as goads," says Solomon. But a wise man will use his "goads" with discretion. A reference, however, to the occasion of the use of those expressions puts the matter in a very different light. His opponent clearly began the use of language of an objectionable character. He charged the Roman Catholic church with "exaggerated and too often idiotic devotions offered to her," i. e., the Blessed Virgin (letter of 26th November, 1887, page 13). Now, we know that charity endureth all things. And yet the charity of a Catholic who could endure such a charge with patience could hardly be distinguished from indifference. The distinction between the adoration