

matters of ecclesiastical lore, and Richard F. Quigley, a barrister in this city who was previously known to be a devoted member of the Roman Catholic communion, much interested in theology, but had not yet made a reputation as a controversialist in theology. The discussion, which was carried on in the columns of the *Saint John Globe*, continued for many months, the disputants taking ample time for research, and receiving ample space for the marshalling of their evidence. At the close of the controversy Mr. Quigley gathered together his letters, with so much of those of Mr. Davenport as was needed to explain them, and issued them in permanent form from the printing house of Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati. He has furnished explanatory notes, supplied further references to authorities, and added an Appendix containing a letter of Bishop Strossmayer to Bishop Maes pronouncing the Strossmayer sermon, which has often been quoted against the Roman Catholic church, to be a forgery. The Appendix also contains a letter from Bishop Rogers of Chatham, and Dr. Lee's criticism of Littledale's "Plain Reasons," which last mentioned work has been extensively used in the discussion. The whole work as published is a solid book of 471 pages, got up in workmanlike style and, so far as Mr. Quigley was in a position to attend to it, carefully edited.

Following is the passage in Dr. Kingdon's lecture, as reported, to which Mr. Quigley took exception:

Sometimes the substitution of one letter for another made a vast difference, and, as an illustration, he referred to the words *Ipsa* and *ipsa*, the latter word in an important passage in the Douay Bible, being the foundation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

The passage referred to is from Genesis iii. 15, rendered in the Protestant version — "*It shall bruise thy head,*" and in the Douay version, "*She shall crush thy head,*" the latter following the Vulgate — "*Ipsa conteret caput tuum.*" The statements against which Mr. Quigley protested were (1) that *Ipsa* in the Vulgate was a misprint; (2) that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was founded on, or in any way depended on that reading. He affirmed that the reading *Ipsa* is much older than the Vulgate; that not only *Ipsa* and *Ipsa*, but *Ipsum* has been used in recognized Latin copies; that the Roman Catholic church has never pronounced in favor of any one of the three readings or based any doctrine on any one of them; that the Hebrew of the passage in Genesis is ambiguous and may be correctly rendered in any of the three ways; that the difference in gender makes no difference in the meaning or in the doctrine taught, the Immaculate Conception being set forth as clearly in the form *Ipsa*, or even *Ipsum*, as in the form *Ipsa*.

These propositions Mr. Quigley maintains with great force, and on the purely academic questions with undoubted success. With an amount of labor and research which seems almost incredible in a person situated as Mr. Quigley is, he has examined for himself nearly all the famous manuscripts and printed texts in the great American libraries which can throw light on this question. There is no gainsaying the proof that *Ipsa* in the Vulgate is not an inadvertent