

mis-print or mis-copy, and that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is not founded on a wrong reading.

Had the discussion been restricted to the original question at issue, as stated above, the result would have been obvious even to the comparatively unlearned. The controversy is, however, obscured by many side issues. In an early stage the charge of idolatry was made against the Roman Catholic church, which was accused of offering to the Virgin and to the Saints the worship that belongs to God only. Mr. Quigley denies and retaliates. He distinguishes between the high honor which may be worthily paid to the creature, and the adoration due to the Creator alone. Carrying the war into Africa, Mr. Quigley affirms that the charges of idolatry made by Mr. Davenport against the Roman Catholic church are no less applicable to the particular school of the Anglican church to which, as Mr. Quigley contends, Mr. Davenport belongs. This contention is supported by numerous quotations from Pusey and from books of devotion. The discussion as to the true import of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and Mr. Quigley's defence of this doctrine comprise a large part of the work before us. How successful Mr. Quigley may be in supporting the teaching of his church on this point, is an open question which as usual in such cases will probably be decided by the reader in accord with his own predilections. Mr. Quigley brings to the theme a devout mind, and a spirit enthusiastic to the verge of rapture. Readers trained in another school of thought, and regarding these doctrines from another standpoint, may not enter into the spirit of the author or be persuaded by what persuades him. It was long ago learned that great wrath can exist in celestial minds, and our controversialists have not kept themselves free from bitterness. Mr. Quigley's letters which are particularly the subject of review are blemished by passages of rather violent invective, by expressions of scorn and words of contumely. He claims that the provocation is great, as where writers whose works are difficult of access are quoted against him, and he finds on investigation that the passages have been so misquoted as to change the meaning, e. g., in the case of a passage from De Rossi, or where a spurious writing is cited, as the Strossmayer sermon. It is, however, fair to say that Mr. Davenport made the *amende honorable* when the facts were made known to him. There is orthodox precedent for violence in theological discussion, especially if one search the writings of the great scholars of the middle ages for examples. The gentle Milton and his adversaries were much more fierce in controversy than either Mr. Quigley or Mr. Davenport has ventured, or, let us hope, desired to be. Perhaps when Mr. Quigley publishes later editions of his letters he will follow the example of Cardinal Newman, whom he greatly admires, and eliminate from his work all passages reflecting on the other party to the controversy. The *Ipsa, Ipsa, Ipsum* controversy is said to be not yet quite ended, and possibly Mr. Davenport may publish a *résumé*, giving his side of the controversy with final reflections. The discussion as it stands in Mr. Quigley's book, with all its blemishes, is of great value to any person engaged in research along the lines of this controversy.