

MARY

THE MOTHER OF CHRIST

IN

PROPHECY AND ITS FULFILMENT

"I will put enmities between thee and the Woman, and thy seed and her seed; She (He or It) shall crush thy head."
—Genesis iii. 15.

"Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel."—Isaias vii. 14.

"The Angel Gabriel was sent from God . . . to a Virgin . . . and the name of the Virgin was Mary."—Luke i. 26-27.

"When the fulness of the time was come, God sent His Son, made of a Woman."—Galatians iv. 4.

"And Mary said: My soul doth magnify the Lord; and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. . . . Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty has done great things to me, and holy is His name."—Luke i. 46-49.

CONTROVERSIAL LETTERS IN VINDICATION OF THE POSITION ASSIGNED BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TO THE EVER-BLESSED MOTHER OF THE WORLD'S REDEEMER IN THE DIVINE ECONOMY OF MAN'S SALVATION.

IN REPLY TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. KINGDON, COADJUTOR (ANGLICAN) BISHOP OF FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK, AND HIS VICAR, "JOHN M. DAVENPORT, PRIEST OF THE MISSION CHURCH," RITUALIST MINISTER, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

BY

RICHARD F. QUIGLEY,

LL.B. (HARVARD AND BOSTON UNIVERSITIES), DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (LEO XIII.), DOCTOR OF LETTERS (LAVAL), BARRISTER-AT-LAW, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK, CANADA.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.



FR. PUSTET & CO.,
NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

FOR SALE BY

NOONAN & CO., BOSTON; T. O'BRIEN & CO., ST. JOHN, N. B.; D. & J. SADLIER & CO., AND CADIEUX & DEROME, MONTREAL.

NOTICE TO SECOND EDITION.

KNOWLEDGE precedes Love. This volume is intended for intelligent lay readers—Protestant and Catholic—who are not content that their intellectual relations with their religious creed should, in these days, be simply mediocre, or below mediocrity; and who aspire to have such intellectual conceptions of their religion as befit self-respecting persons, in duty bound at all times to be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in them.

The title first given to the volume—*Ipsæ, Ipsa: Ipse, Ipsa, Ipsum: Which?*—did not sufficiently express its scope, and was strange and un-suggestive to the non classical eye: therefore the change to that which it now bears. I have added, too, by way of introduction to this edition a very able and lucid review by an Anglican scholar of the argument of the whole book. It is an admirable and judicial piece of criticism.

Nine months after the issue of the first edition my opponents published a "cheap pamphlet," which occasioned a series of Letters. These form an Epilogue to the present volume and will explain themselves. Bishop Kingdon's Vicar had committed his Hegira from Canada a few hours before the pamphlet appeared; the Anglican scholar above mentioned, having been referred to therein, gave the pitiable production such notice as seemed to him fitting. His short and 'smashing' review will be found in Appendix G.

There is but one substantial correction to be made in the former edition. The illustrious philologist and paleographer, Gerard Voss, was a Catholic, not a Protestant, as stated on pp. 113-132.

R. F. Q.

EASTER, 1892.

PREFACE.

THE occasion of writing the letters here republished, sufficiently appears from the "Report" of Bishop Kingdon's Lecture and the letter thereon in the first pages of this volume, and need not be foreshadowed in an introduction. The writer's motive, indeed, lay deeper, and he strikes the key-note in these words :

"What I desiderate in Protestant teachers is a knowledge of the Catholic doctrines they attack. In the conscientious discharge of their duties from their standpoint, they may feel themselves obliged to point out errors (so called) in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Of this no reasonable man can complain, but for heaven's sake, let them first learn exactly what these doctrines are. We will then have less of the wild figments of hysterical imaginations and pandemonium caricatures of beliefs, in defence of which the mightiest intellects that ever adorned our race have found their highest sphere, and of which genius allied with sanctity have ever been the most persuasive and enthusiastic exponents."

Here I appeal for "*more light*" on the part of virtuous and high-minded Protestants. I would excite a spirit of enquiry, create a distrust of impressions mechanically imbibed in youth, and perpetuated and permanently fixed by more serious studies *on the same lines*. I would force back the honest mind upon the sources of its knowledge, induce it to reconsider the process by which its religious convictions touching Catholic doctrine were formed, and, with a more matured knowledge of the conclusion, to re-investigate the premises on which it is grounded. The Catholic Church, I delight to proclaim, has nothing to fear from the closest and most minute investigation. It is ignorance which is the great Anti-Christ; and sincere inquiry and honest research are the only antidote. These we ceaselessly challenge—yet, for the most part, in vain. Why, we Catholics ask again and again, are we to be insulted and slan-

dered, calumniated and taunted, day after day, year after year, with doctrines which we have a thousand times formally and distinctly repudiated? Why are the insults, slanders, calumnies, and taunts repeated without even an allusion to the defence?

I shall have done all that I proposed if I have succeeded in satisfying thoughtful and fair-minded Protestants that the Catholic religion is very far different from the absurd and revolting caricature so long held up to their abhorrence and execration,—if I have not failed to show that the religion against which so many of their teachers and writers inveigh under the name of the Catholic religion, is a religion which Catholics themselves would detest most cordially—if such a religion really existed.

These letters, I need hardly say, were not designed to appear in a collective form. They are now, however, reproduced out of regard to the wishes, perseveringly urged, of known and unknown readers, Protestant and Catholic, who professed to have received them with much interest. They are republished, too, as originally issued, excepting a few verbal corrections and the addition of a few lines at the end of Letter XII., which I have enclosed in [], and which slipped out in the hurry of preparing the printer's MS. of that letter. I have, also, here and there throughout the volume, added postscripts, and a few notes, both as references and in further proof of the positions taken in the text. The more elaborate notes which I had intended to make, would but distract the general reader, and the learned in such matters do not need them.

The volume is made up of four parts, namely: the *Preliminary Letters*, *Résumé*, *Rejoinder*, and *Rebutter*. The first is intended to give the reader a general conspectus of the origin and progress of the discussion, and of the initial attitude of my opponents; the *Résumé* is a consideration of the arguments advanced up to that stage in the debate; the *Rejoinder* is my reply to their *Strictures* on the *Résumé*; and the *Rebutter* is my answer to their second series of *Strictures*. I can assure the reader that he will get from these letters a full and complete idea of the whole controversy; for, I have made it their especial feature to set out in my opponents' own words not

•

only their strongest positions, but every semblance of argument in the *Strictures*. Indeed, I do not hesitate to say, that a much clearer impression can be gained from these letters alone than if my opponents' confused and illogical jumble were in the hands of the reader—even when purged of the disgraceful blunders for which they had repeatedly to apologize.

In discussing such topics as have engaged us in this controversy, I had rather “bear my sword hid in a myrtle branch” and keep it there, than make a merciless onslaught on my opponents and scourge them “hip and thigh.” But the Vicar, though my *nominal* opponent only, has not allowed me to act in this courteous spirit. The combat must be what the adversary makes it. In his very first letter (the third preliminary), he deliberately surrendered all claims to participate in the rights of controversial chivalry. By the insolence, ignorance, stupidity, and malice there displayed, he forced the button from off my foil, and obliged me to thrust my weapon home. He compelled me to treat him as a knight of old would have dealt with a churl who had assailed him with base, ungentle weapons. In this particular, I trust to the candor and “sweet reasonableness” of my opponents, however multitudinously and multifariously *real*, for a hearty and whole-souled appreciation of my good-will in their regard.

There remains that I should say a word on the matter of these letters. The construction and logical order of the different parts was supplied by the tactics of my opponents; the substance was furnished by Catholic and Protestant Biblical critics, and Catholic theologians of the highest authority. *Huc undique gaza*. On the academic question involved in the discussion, the quotations made will speak for themselves. Here it is a most noteworthy fact, that in *no one instance* did my opponents dare to dispute them, while in nearly every case I have turned their relevant authorities against themselves, and with crushing force. But what is more remarkably disgraceful: they passed over in silence citations which are absolutely crucial, and everlastingly definitive of the questions which, in their ignorance, they had raised. While I do not profess to be exhaustive under this head, I can assure the reader he has before

him the results of some labor and careful research among many learned volumes. But I have not grudged it, and I am refreshed by the thought: *Et hæc olim meminisse juvabit.*

In the purely theological exposition of Catholic doctrine, I am reminded of, and desire to pay homage to the dictum of the old philosopher: *Alienas sarcinas adoro.* Here my occupation has been but to kneel and pick up the "gem(s) of purest ray serene" from the writings of Cardinals Wiseman, Newman, Manning; the giant Jesuits, Fathers Harper and Passaglia, and the illustrious Reviewers, Doctors Ward and Brownson. The extent of my indebtedness to them will be easily recognized by students familiar with their works. I have made the very freest use of their arguments and language, incorporating them with my own on occasions impossible to specify in detail. This is especially true of Father Harper's, and those of Doctor Ward in the *Dublin Review.* My obligations to other Catholic writers, whether in Latin or in English, I have acknowledged, each in its proper place, so far as I know them. I will make mention here, too, of the learned Nicholas' work: *La Vierge Marie d'après l'Évangile et dans l'Église,* and that of l'Abbé Petitalot: *La Vierge Mère d'après la Théologie,* from both of which I have also drawn. Specific and detailed acknowledgment of my obligations to learned Catholic theologians is, however, of the less consequence here, since my appeal throughout is to facts, and to reason in its legitimate, and, to me, imperative action on Christian principles admitted and professed by Protestants. For their instruction my exposition of Catholic doctrine, on the points in dispute, is written,—to them it is addressed. I pretend to no discovery, no invention. My aim has been but to focalize for the general reader a few scintillations of what the faith, and piety, and learning of some of the brightest intellects and the purest hearts among the children of the Catholic Church, have handed down on the religious topics discussed in these letters. If my readers derive from their perusal any profit at all commensurate with the delight I experienced in preparing them, I will feel amply rewarded for my labor.

R. F. Q.

Feast of the Assumption, 1890.

MR. QUIGLEY'S BOOK.—A REVIEW.

BY AN ANGLICAN SCHOLAR.

THE issue from the press of Pustet & Co., New York, of the letters of Mr. Quigley, marks an era in Canadian literature. The occasion of the original publication of these letters was the delivery of a lecture in Trinity Church Sunday-school room, on 22nd November, A.D. 1887, by the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, on the subject of "Misprints." After referring to errors in ancient manuscripts, which, although curious, were unimportant, he called the attention of his hearers to an alteration, made by the Roman Catholic Church in the language of Gen. iii. 15. That verse stands in the Authorized Version of the Bible as follows: "*I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; IT shall bruise thy head,*" etc.; and in the Douay Version: "*I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; SHE shall crush thy head,*" etc. His Lordship, ignoring the rendering "Ipsum" "*It*" in the version of the Church of England, asserted in effect that in all ancient Latin manuscripts the word "Ipse" "*He*," referring to Christ, was found; but that the Church of Rome had changed the final letter "e" to "a," thus teaching that "Ipsa" "*She*" (the Virgin) rather than "Ipse" "*He*" (Christ) accomplished the salvation of the human race by crushing the serpent's head. This misprint, he said, was the foundation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, defined at Rome in 1854. It is to be observed that His Lordship limits the controversy to the Latin language. But, in truth, manuscripts upon which learned theologians without exception rely, are found in the Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, Chaldaic, and other tongues. How could a literary forgery hope to be successful when it was found only in the last of a series of manuscripts, all of which were open to the inspection of the learned world?

Now the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is not founded on this verse. The doctrine is wholly independent of it. The

indirect support which it gives to the doctrine appears in the first clause rather than in the last clause of the verse: "*I will put enmities between thee and the woman—Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem.*" Where "enmities" are placed between these two persons, it is plainly implied that neither shares in the essential characteristics of the other. But sin is the essential characteristic of Satan. Therefore sin is wholly absent from the Blessed Virgin. Even if this verse had never formed a part of the inspired volume, the doctrine would still have constituted from the beginning a part of the faith once delivered to the saints, although it has only been defined in an explicit form in modern times.

But it may not be without value to define the dogma for the benefit of those who are not specially conversant with theological science. Mr. Quigley quotes Cardinal Newman on this point at page 441. His Eminence points out in a letter to Dr. Pusey that the doctrine has no reference to the parents of the Blessed Virgin, but relates simply to her own person; that it does but affirm that together with the nature which she inherited from her parents she had from the first moment of her existence a superadded fulness of grace. As Eve before the fall was clothed in a garment of righteousness, so the Blessed Virgin, by a special interposition of divine favor, was created in precisely the same sinless state by reason of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of the human race. The Evangelist, by quoting the statement of the Virgin, sets upon it the seal of truth: "*All generations shall call me blessed, for He that is mighty hath magnified me.*" Is it possible to cite any similar inspired utterance relating to Eve? Can any Christian attribute to Eve, at any period of her life, a state of sinless purity which he denies to the mother of our Lord? And Luther says: "As other men were conceived in sin, both in soul and body, but Christ without sin, either in body or soul, so Mary the Virgin was conceived, according to the body indeed without grace, but according to the soul full of grace. Such is the meaning of these words which the Angel Gabriel spoke to her: '*Blessed art thou amongst women.*' For it could not have been said of her, '*Blessed art thou,*' if she had ever been under the curse. It was also right and just that that person

should be preserved without sin from whom Christ was to take the flesh that should overcome all sin. For that is properly called 'Blessed,' which is endowed with God's grace, that is, which is without sin."

Having defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, it remains to consider whether the formidable indictment which the Coadjutor Bishop has drawn up against the Church is sustained by the arguments and authorities upon which his defender, the Rev. Mr. Davenport, relies. Mr. Quigley's contention in answer to the indictment may be thus defined. He undertakes to prove that the Church is not committed to one reading "*Ipsa*" She, but accepts as of equal authority the reading "*Ipse*" Christ, or "*Ipsum*" It—the seed, which is Christ. He contends that there is no difference in meaning between these three readings. Now, if in manuscripts, Bibles, and commentaries without end, the reading is various—"he," "she," or "it"; if the acknowledged leaders of theological opinion, Protestant and Catholic, adopt all three; if the dogma of the Immaculate Conception does not rest upon any one of the three, but is consistent with them all, then the charge of the Bishop that the Church recognizes one reading only "*Ipsa*," and builds the dogma on that reading alone upon the authority of corrupt manuscripts, must be held to be disproved, to state it mildly, at the bar of public opinion.

Can it be said after an attentive examination of the book that Mr. Quigley has made out his case? He declines, and properly as we think, to confine the discussion to Latin manuscripts. "*Melius est petere fontes quam sectari rivulos*—it is better to go to the fountain head than to pursue the course of rivulets," is his rule. Now the Hebrew text is the source. Upon turning to the reference made to Gen. iii. 15 by Maimonides, the greatest of all Jewish scholars, it will be seen that "*Ipsa*" "*she*" was the received reading among those who cannot be suspected of a leaning to any form of Christianity. The Hebrew Bible by Plantin, 1572, two editions of the Hebrew Bible at Venice, 1776, and several others have "*Ipsa*." Arabic and Chaldaic authorities might be added. What ground then remains for the imputation that the Church of Rome has changed "*Ipse*" to "*Ipsa*"? It would appear from the book before us that the Rev. Mr.

Davenport made no attempt whatever to controvert these statements. The Hebrew manuscripts cast no light upon the reading "*Ipsum*," for there is no neuter gender in the Hebrew language. The Greek and Latin manuscripts were necessarily copied from the Hebrew. Mr. Quigley proves not only from Catholic theologians of the highest eminence, but from Protestant Biblical critics, that the reading in the Greek manuscripts is various, "*autos, aute, auto*,"—"he, she, it." The writers of these manuscripts must have considered that the Hebrew pronoun was capable of a neuter interpretation.

To come at length to a consideration of the various Latin readings of which the Bishop undertook to speak, the challenge given by Rev. Mr. Davenport demands our attention. In his first letter (page 11) he asks: "Where, then, is to be found a *Latin version of the Bible* with 'Ipsum' in this passage?" The challenge was repeated four times. Mr. Quigley, in answer to it, cited seven Latin Bibles, each of which contained "*Ipsum*." Their names are found on pages 101-2, with numerous other authorities. He adds, in a postscript, Bibles and commentaries without end, including the Parisian, London, and minor Polyglots.

In No. 3 of Mr. Davenport's last series of letters (page 368), ignoring Mr. Quigley's full reply to his challenge, he changes his base and says: "It will be remembered that I set him (Mr. Quigley) to name a manuscript of the Latin Vulgate . . . which reads '*Ipsum*.'" Who can remember anything of the kind? A request to produce a *Latin version of the Bible* is not the same as a request 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 Revisers of the Vulgate, says: "The Vulgate is various here, for some Codices have '*Iipse*,' some '*Ipsa*'; and besides it is not contrary to the Vulgate should one be convinced that he ought to read '*Iipse*' or '*Ipsum*.'" The gravamen of the Bishop's charge was that while the word "*Iipse*" 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 "*Iipse*" 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—when the Catholic interpretation is properly understood. 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 "*Iipse*," "*Ipsa*," only—but "*Iipse*," "*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 idolatrous 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 paid to the Holy and Undivided Trinity alone, and the worship due to the Virgin is clearly marked in Catholic theology, and plainly taught from Catholic pulpits throughout the world.

Dr. Philip Schaff, the most learned divine of the Presbyterian Church in America, in "Creed Revisions," p. 34, protests against the clause in the Confession of Faith "that the Papists are idolaters"—as "a colossal slander on the oldest and largest Church in Christendom." With reference to the charge that the Pope is Antichrist and that Catholics are idolaters, he says, at page 49, that it is "untrue, unjust, uncharitable, and unchristian." The ambiguity of the term "worship" probably accounts for the confusion of thought which has prevailed on this subject. "Then shall thou have *worship* in the presence of them that sit at meat," says the Evangelist (Luke xiv. 10). "With my body I thee *worship*" is the language of the Office of the Church of England for the solemnization of matrimony. Nothing approaching adoration is implied in these passages. And yet they are constantly read without injury to their conscience by those who are horror-struck at the application of the same word in the same sense to the Virgin. The worship of the Virgin to the mind of a Catholic is separated by an impassable gulf from the worship of God. How, then, is it possible for a fair critic to sound a note of very marked disapproval when the charge of idolatry provokes language which, without reference to the exciting cause, he would be compelled to condemn? According to Dr. Johnson it was the use of abusive language by those who rejected the authority of the Church which led to the martyrdom of so many during the Reformation. "Do you not think it was very hard," said Boswell, "that the Reformers should have been burned because they did not believe that bread and wine were changed into the Body and Blood of Christ?" "Sir," said Dr. Johnson, "they were not burned for refusing to believe that bread and wine were changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, but for insulting those who did believe

it. Besides they never intended to be burned. As many of them ran away as could."

No one would suspect Lord Byron of a leaning toward Catholic doctrine. And yet it is sometimes given to men of extraordinary genius, such as he possessed, to obtain an intellectual insight into truth with which the general tenor of their lives is at variance. The whole Catholic doctrine relating to the Virgin is contained in the following passage from the *Siege of Corinth*, Canto xxx. :

"Darkly, sternly, and all alone,
Minotti stood o'er the altar stone;
Madonna's face upon him shone,
Painted in heavenly hues above,
With eyes of light and looks of love;
And placed upon that holy shrine
To fix our thoughts on things divine,
When pictured there, we kneeling see
Her, and the boy-God on her knee,
Smiling sweetly on each prayer
To Heaven, as if to waft it there."

Upon this question Byron and Cardinal Newman are at one. His Eminence says (page 307) : "It is Mary's prayers that avail, and her prayers are effectual by the *fiat* of Him who is our all in all."

Finally, with reference to the Invocation of Saints, there does not appear to be any difference *in principle* between the views of Mr. Quigley and those of the Ritualistic school in the Church of England. The language of the Ritualistic devotional books quoted by Mr. Quigley, pages 398-401, differs in no very marked manner from the language of Catholic devotional books. The Ritualists must choose this day which they will serve. If Article 22 of the Church of England, which condemns the Invocation of Saints, expresses Gospel Truth, then abandon Ritualism. But if it does not, then "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Rev. xviii. 4).

Mr. Quigley may adopt by "accommodation" the language which Baronius applied to himself, "I have trodden the wine-press alone." Without the assistance of any learned friends, he

has traversed the whole field of Catholic theology. He has examined the original authorities in all the great American libraries—the Astor, Lennox, Harvard, Boston, and that of Georgetown, Washington. He has added to his own extensive collection of books the great works on the subject from Europe. The readers of his work possess in it a golden key with which to unlock the treasures of Biblical and Patristic learning. He has shown that all Catholic doctrines bear the notes of the Vincentian Canon—Antiquity, Universality, Consent; that when heresy has arisen, the Church has suppressed it by defining what has been the faith from the beginning. The dogma always existed. Heresy has but drawn it out in an explicit form. Thus the Church is ever the same. The addition to the *confession of the faith* is not an addition to the *faith itself*. If the result of his efforts shall be to strengthen the faithful, and to comfort the doubtful, and to restore the erring, and to remove misconceptions from the minds of those who are without the fold of the Catholic Church, he will not have labored in vain.

PHILALETHES.

PRELIMINARY LETTERS.

EXTRACT from a Report in the *St. John Globe*, November 23, 1887, of a Lecture on "MISPRINTS," delivered by the Right Reverend Doctor Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, New Brunswick:

"CHURCH OF ENGLAND INSTITUTE.

"Rev. Canon Brigstocke occupied the chair in Trinity Church School-House last evening, and in a few graceful words introduced the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdon as the lecturer of the evening. The subject was 'Misprints,' but the lecture covered more than the title indicates, for it abounded in illustrations of errors of all kinds, having their origin in copying, in printing, in pronunciation, and in transposition, and in changes of form and in changes of sound.

.

"SOMETIMES THE SUBSTITUTION OF ONE LETTER FOR ANOTHER MADE A VAST DIFFERENCE, AND AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THIS HE REFERRED TO THE WORDS IPSE AND IPSA, THE LATTER WORD IN AN IMPORTANT PASSAGE IN THE DOUAY (SIC) BIBLE BEING THE FOUNDATION OF THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. . . ."¹

I.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of The Globe:

SIR,—I very much enjoyed the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdon's lecture on "Misprints," a short report of which you gave last evening. His Lordship made a strong appeal for accuracy and correctness, and yet, by a strange Nemesis, grievously erred in

¹ GENESIS iii. 15.—"I will put enmities between thee and the Woman, and thy seed and her seed; HE, SHE, or IT—IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—shall crush thy head," etc. Bishop Kingdon asserted (1) that the letter "a" in "Ipsa—She" was a "Misprint" for the letter "e" in "Ipsa—He," and (2) that the Catholic Church, in promulgating the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, founded it upon this "Misprint"! Such is the Anglo-episcopal idea of Catholic Theology!

his illustration of their importance, based upon the words *ipse* and *ipsa*, and his statement in connection therewith. Here, by a misprint of the letter "a" for the letter "e," said his Lordship, there lamentably resulted that thirty-three years ago the Roman Catholic Church was led to promulgate the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The inference, I assume, he intended his hearers to draw was that the alleged foundation for the doctrine being, in these days at all events, a clear and confessed mistake, the church had fallen into grave doctrinal error in declaring it to be a truth of the Christian religion. I aim to report the Bishop correctly, though only substantially, and in the criticism I propose to make I desire to avoid the very semblance of the *odium theologicum* and to treat him with the utmost respect and courtesy.

Now, I begin by saying that the Bishop's statement is not only wholly incorrect and baseless, but to me his misapprehension is simply appalling. The case for a misprint even, and quite regardless of the consequence deplored by him as resulting from it, is far otherwise than that stated by his Lordship. The discussion raised by him is not between *ipse* and *ipsa* alone, but between them and the word *ipsum*. Why did he not so put it, since this is the real state of the question? To make the points at issue perfectly intelligible I will here set down the *matter* of the dispute, viz.: *Genesis* iii. 15—according to the different versions. Protestant version: *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, etc.*; Douay version: *I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; SHE shall crush thy head, etc.*; The Vulgate: *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius; IPSA conteret caput tuum, etc.* This whole text has been called by the early writers in the church the Proto-Gospel, for it contains a promise of the future Savior. It is, therefore, to Protestant and Catholic alike of transcendent importance and very comprehensive application; but it will be observed that the present contention is over the *first word* of the second clause only: "It shall bruise thy head," etc.; "SHE shall crush thy head," etc. The Hebrew text from which both

translations *ultimately* come is according to the learned Cardinal Bellarmine ambiguous, and in consequence *three* different readings prevailed among ecclesiastical writers as follows: *IPSE conteret caput tuum*—HE (Christ) shall bruise thy head; *IPSA conteret caput tuum*—SHE (the woman, the Blessed Virgin, through Christ her Seed) shall crush thy head; *IPSUM conteret caput tuum*—IT (her seed that is Christ), shall bruise thy head. Why, then, confine the question of misprint to *ipse* and *ipsa* and ignore *ipsum*, the Protestant reading, which itself rejects *ipse*? The simple truth is that his Lordship's theory of a misprint and his statement thereanent is sheer nonsense. There is absolutely no difference *in sense*, to the Catholic mind at least, between these three readings. The learned commentator Cornelius à Lapide, says "all are true"—*omnes sunt veræ*. The Almighty promises that the triumph over Satan is to be complete and his power broken by Christ, who is the seed of the woman. The Protestant version adopts "*IPSUM*"—"IT," because it thinks it more literally in accord with the true Hebrew reading and that of some of the ancient fathers. The Douay version "*IPSA*"—"SHE" follows the Vulgate, which is sanctioned by almost all the Latin Fathers, including such names as St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, St. Bernard, Victor and Avitus, as well as by (the Latin translator of) St. Chrysostom, Bede, Alcuin, and many others. And thus it becomes a mere quillet of verbal criticism! So much for the academic aspect of the question.

And now what becomes of the Bishop's assertion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is founded on a misprint? It vanishes into thin air. Of course I am not now discussing the truth of this doctrine, but simply correcting an amazing misconception. Unfortunately such misconceptions are too common among our Protestant brethren where the honor of the Blessed Virgin, the mother of Christ—the "Woman! above all women glorified, our tainted nature's solitary boast," as the Protestant Wordsworth addresses her—is concerned. And while Protestant churches will resound with the praises of Sarah and Rebecca and Rachel, of Miriam and Ruth, of Esther and Judith of the Old Testament, and of

Elizabeth and Anna, of Magdalen and Martha of the New, the name of Mary, the mother of Christ, is uttered with bated breath lest the sound of her name should make the preacher liable to the charge of superstition. I do not think of imputing such views to his lordship, but the animus of Kemnitzius and others in discussing this translation in another connection is born of such ignorant prejudice, and I do imagine their interpretations led to his mistake. Catholics do not forget the Blessed Virgin's own prediction of that honor which the church in all ages should pay to her—"all generations shall call me blessed,"—Luke i. 48; and we believe with St. Epiphanius that "*it is no less criminal to vilify the holy Virgin than to glorify her above measure.*" But enough. I have tried to make the matter clear. There is nothing at all in the Bishop's point. I, as a Catholic, have no more interest in retaining "IPSA," "SHE," in the text than he has, so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned. Words have been corrected in the Vulgate since the Council of Trent by Popes Sixtus V. and Clement VIII.: so, if, by the discovery of new MSS. or otherwise, it be found that "IR" or "HE," and not "SHE" is the true reading the correction will no doubt be made. But the sublime doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and its definition will not be affected by the change, because it is not dependent upon nor founded on it. It will stand forever all the same, and, perhaps, his lordship and others who now grudgingly "give honor where honor is due" will then have learned to say: *Dignare me laudare te, Virgo Sacrata: Da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos.*

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building, }
 Thursday, Nov. 24th, 1887. }

[Mr. Quigley having signed his letter, no letters on this subject will be published unless the writers' names are given.—GLOBE.]

II.

LETTER FROM REV. MR. CAMPBELL.

THE RECTORY, DORCHESTER, N. B., Nov. 29.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—In last evening's issue Mr. Quigley quotes three Latin versions of Gen. iii. 15. I have a Latin version of the whole Bible, including the Apocrypha—but wanting the title-page and the date—which agrees with no one of the three quoted. I send my reading to you merely as a contribution to the literature of the discussion. On the main argument I say nothing in this communication; for it may be fairly assumed that his Lordship will make Mr. Quigley a fitting reply.

But I would like to ask whether any of your readers have a copy of the same version; and, if they have, whether they will kindly state what version it is, with the date of publication? The verse reads thus: “Praeterea inimicitiam pono inter te et mulierem hanc similiterq; inter semen tuum et semen hujus; hoc conteret tibi caput, tu autem conteres huic calcaneum.”

Yours obediently,

J. ROY CAMPBELL.

III.

LETTER FROM MR. DAVENPORT.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Surely Mr. Quigley is not correct in his criticism on Genesis iii. 15. He asks somewhat indignantly why Bishop Kingdon, in his lecture did not put the real state of the question before his hearers, and tell them the dispute was not between *Ipse* and *Ipsa*, but also between *Ipsum*. Where then is

to be found a Latin version of the Bible with *Ipsum* in this passage? I have never read of it in any commentary. Jerome's old Vulgate, made direct from the Hebrew, has the masculine *Ipsa*—the modern Vulgate in spite of this has *Ipsa*. Where is the *Ipsum*? Because the English version speaks of the "Seed of the woman" as *It*, it must not be supposed that the neuter occurs in the Hebrew original, or in either the Greek or Latin versions thereof. It is not true that in speaking of the promised offspring of the woman as *It*, the English translators rejected *Ipsa*, as Mr. Quigley says.

The "academic aspect of the question," to borrow Mr. Quigley's phrase, stands thus: The Hebrew has a masculine pronoun followed by a masculine verb "He shall bruise." It is true that if the pronoun stood alone without the vowel-pointing, as in the old style of writing Hebrew, it could not be told without looking at the verb what was its gender. About the verb (*y'shupheah*), however, there is not and never has been a doubt because it begins with the masculine affix. Therefore the translators of the modern vulgate are without excuse in adopting a feminine translation of the pronoun, and thus doing violence to the verb, more especially as they had the grand old vulgate of Jerome before their eyes to keep them right. So plain is the Hebrew here that the Septuagint translators (who accomplished their task three centuries before the coming of Christ), while adopting a neuter word *sperma* for "seed," nevertheless use a masculine pronoun *autos* here to represent it.

Bishop Kingdon's statement, therefore, it seems to me, is not as Mr. Quigley says, "wholly incorrect and baseless," even if his "misapprehension be simply appalling" to Mr. Quigley.

I confess that if the Bishop asserted that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was *founded* on a misprint, it was too bald and unqualified a statement. Many things helped to stereotype it besides this error. At the same time it must be borne in mind that this mistranslation has been long and much used in the Roman Church for the undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin, while it is very noteworthy that Pope Pius IX., when promulgating the Dogma in S. Peter's

at Rome, December 8, 1854, alluded for its defence to this very text, and, moreover, afterwards set up a memorial column of the event in the city, on the top of which stands a figure of the Blessed Virgin (without the holy child, mark you, in her arms) trampling the serpent under foot. This representation of the bruising of the serpent's head *by the woman*, everybody knows has been for years and still is very common among Roman Catholics. Therefore it is no exaggeration to say that the modern vulgate mistranslation of Genesis iii. 15 has largely helped to smooth the way for the promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

There is one other point in Mr. Quigley's letter I cannot suffer myself to pass over unnoticed. In my opinion he would have been wiser in his own cause had he been less satirical about the neglect of the Holy Virgin by Christians outside the Roman Church. Who is to blame, let me ask, for their present attitude towards her? Who has rendered it well-nigh impossible for them to yield her her proper place and dignity as chief of saints? None other than the Roman Church herself, with her exaggerated and too often idolatrous devotions offered to her.

I must prove such a serious charge as this. I will take two well-known books, in use among Roman Catholics of all lands. "Lignori's Glories of Mary," and "The Raccolta." The first named is a book approved by the highest authorities of the Roman Church, and formally recommended to Anglo-Romans by Cardinals Wiseman and Manning. In that book are to be found such instructions as these: "Mary is our only refuge, help and asylum." "Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon *her* name, *than we should be if we called on the name of Jesus, our Saviour.*" "Many things are asked from God and are not granted; they are asked from Mary and are obtained." "At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God." (Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, etiam Deus.)

"The salvation of all depends on their being favored and protected by Mary. He who is protected by Mary will be saved; he who is not, will be lost. Mary has only to speak, and her Son executes all." (See Littledale, p. 55.)

In the second book mentioned are to be found devotions to the Virgin in keeping with these impious utterances.

When on a visit to Rome, in 1880, I purchased an English copy of the "Raccolta," at the Propaganda, in order to test the accuracy of Littledale's quotations. The "Raccolta" is a popular Roman manual of indulgenced devotions. My copy is dated, Woodstock College, Maryland, 1878. About 130 out of 450 pages are devoted directly to the Virgin, while she finds mention in nearly all the devotions. The following impious acts of worship and prayer are taken from the "Second Novena in preparation for the Feast of our Lady's Nativity," p. 275 (the italics are mine): "We hail thee, dear child, and we *humbly worship* thy most holy body; we venerate thy sacred swaddling clothes wherewith they bound thee, the sacred cradle," &c.

Prayer: "Most lovely child, who by Thy birth has comforted the world, made glad the heavens, struck terror to hell, brought help to the fallen, &c. . . . We pray Thee with all fervent love, *be Thou born again in spirit in our souls*, through Thy most holy love; renew our fervor in Thy service, rekindle in our hearts *the fire of Thy love*, and bid all virtues blossom there, which may cause us to find more and more favor in Thy gracious eyes. Mary! be thou Mary to us, and may we feel the saving power of Thy sweetest name. Let it ever be our comfort to call on that great name in all our troubles; let it be our hope in dangers, our shield in temptation, and in death our last murmur."

Herein we find expressions of worship and supplication such as Christians are wont to present only to God, or the Incarnate Son, or the Holy Spirit. We could not say more at the cradle of Jesus, nor could we pay more honor to the Blessed Paraclete Himself than to beg Him to "rekindle in our hearts the fire of His love."

Now this book has on its title-page, "Published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. Translation authorized and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences"; while in the preface people are urged to use this book, because then they may feel perfectly assured the indulgences are all right

The Roman Church, therefore, is thoroughly committed to this book with all its enormities.

Surely it is the duty of all lovers of "the truth as it is in Jesus," *i. e.*, all true Catholic Christians, to come out of a church which puts its imprimatur upon such idolatrous worship as this, and it ill becomes one who accepts such extravagances to chide those who, for fear of them, fall short of their duty.

It ought to be remembered, in this connection, that the Church of England has preserved her balance well under the circumstances, and observes four feasts yearly in honor of the Holy Mother.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church,
Portland, St. John, N. B.

November 28, 1887.

IV.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Two communications have appeared in your columns anent mine of Monday last, from writers with whom I had no quarrel. One purports to be an answer and a defense (?) of Bishop Kingdon. Surely the Bishop must feel—*Non tali auxilio!* Save me from my friends: I will look after my enemies myself!

"*It may be fairly assumed,*" says the second writer, "that His Lordship will make . . . a *fitting* reply." I think so too. The Bishop, deservedly no doubt, gets credit for "pluck" in more departments than one. He is also a man of honor, and recalling his own thought—"humanum est errare—to err is human"—often expressed during his lecture, will not, I

think, hesitate to acknowledge his kinship with our common humanity, by making an *amende honorable* for his error touching the old church to which he owes at least fair play.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building,

Friday Morning, Dec. 2d, '87.

V.

LETTER FROM MR. DAVENPORT.

MR. QUIGLEY'S CRITICISMS ON BISHOP KINGDON'S LECTURE.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—It is as I suspected when I criticised hypothetically what was attributed to Bishop Kingdon by Mr. Quigley. The Bishop has been misrepresented.

Bishop Kingdon has not seen Mr. Quigley's letter, but he has kindly taken the trouble to give me the substance of his own remarks and also some quotations from his lecture. With regard to the Hebrew and Greek texts of Gen. iii. 15, he went over much the same ground as myself in my strictures on Mr. Quigley. He proved also from several of the chief Fathers of the Church that it was far from their mind to attribute the bruising of the Serpent's head to the Virgin; and simply said that the mistake *ipsa* for *ipse* had acquired a tremendous importance from being quoted in the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX.¹ He neither said nor implied that "the dogma was founded on a misprint." I

¹It is my duty to say that what is here attributed to Bishop Kingdon is utterly untrue. He attempted nothing of the kind. The writer, later on in the discussion, swallows his own falsehood and does his little best to prove that "the dogma *was* founded on a misprint."

hope, therefore, now Mr. Quigley has been proved in error on every point, he will see his way to act upon his own recommendation which appeared in your to-day's issue. Mr. Quigley seems somewhat indignant that any one should notice his letters besides the person attacked. Why then did he appear in public? and why reproach people in general who refuse to worship the Virgin Mary?

In conclusion, allow me to draw the attention of your readers to a quotation made by Mr. Quigley from S. Epiphanius (I have not verified it, but it will suit my purpose as it stands), which he thinks very telling against persons outside his church, but which, "by a strange Nemesis," points its darts against himself and co-religionists. "It is no less criminal," says the saint, "to vilify the Holy Virgin than to glorify her above measure." Now, I suppose that not even the most rabid protestant will dissent from the assertion that it is a crime to vilify the Blessed Virgin or indeed any other saint living or departed—it remains, however, for Mr. Quigley and his friends to tell us how much further we should go than Liguori and the *Raccolta* I quoted in glorifying the Holy Virgin before we become criminous. I have no doubt myself what the answer of S. Epiphanius himself would be.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 2d, 1887.

VI.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I am not, the public cannot be, satisfied with the latest *shuffle* in this matter of the writer in Saturday's paper.

It is quite "too thin,"—too *diaphonous* indeed and your interested readers will easily "catch on." To exhaust every obligation of courtesy to the Bishop I have had *all* the papers sent to him to-day. The talk about misrepresentation is simply absurd. Mr. Ellis, of the GLOBE, was present at the lecture, and the GLOBE's report (Nov. 23) sustains me. The Bishop said substantially what I have charged against him and *on the spot immediately after the lecture* I protested to Mr. G. Herbert Lee, Secretary to Lecture Committee, against the incorrectness and unfairness of the Bishop's statement. But Saturday's letter makes it even worse for the Bishop, and I cannot believe he will so stultify himself as to adopt it as a part of his defence. However, I propose patiently to await his action after he will have seen the GLOBE's report, my first letter and the subsequent correspondence. In this country, happily, no man in church or state is beyond the reach of fair criticism of his public utterances. If the Bishop is content with the defence made for him, I will not complain.

The Bishop's defender says I am indignant that any one besides the Bishop should notice my letter. Surely I have not manifested thus far any indignation. I regret if my inattention has unduly wounded his vanity. I did not mean it. I only desire to give the Bishop an opportunity to vindicate himself or to refuse to do so. In either case, I perhaps ought to assure his defender, I will not forget him. Meanwhile let him castigate somewhat his vanity and cultivate the spiritual temper by reading "Liguori and the *Raccolta*."

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building, Monday, A. M.

VII.

LETTER FROM MR. QUIGLEY.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A CHALLENGE.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—This matter has now assumed a new phase. I meant my criticism of Bishop Kingdon's statements, as set out in my first letter, to be a candid talk between gentlemen with you as my interlocutor. I sought, by the "sweet reasonableness" of a logic of facts and authority, at once simple and irenic, to lead his Lordship to avow and correct a mistake into which he might have unwittingly fallen. I was willing, even, to concede something to his iconoclastic research and fancy, by granting that *ipsa* might be a misprint for *ipse* or *ipsum* indeed, if he would only forego the luxury of creating a new anti-Catholic tradition in this city by connecting such misprint with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as cause and effect. I proved unanswerably that there is no difference *in sense* to the Catholic mind between the *three* readings, and consequently there is no choice so far as any matter of doctrine is concerned. I have waited a reasonable time for some sign. His Lordship, however, dies, and—*impenitent*, except so far as vicarious utterances can be made to do duty. The vicar is "John M. Davenport, Priest of the Mission Church." Why should I waste words here over the vicar's wretched attempt to deal with the "academic aspect of the question"? "Where, then, is to be found," he asks, "a Latin version of the Bible with *ipsum* in this passage? I have never read of it in any commentary." Therefore, of course, there is no such reading; though, after opening another bottle of fog, he straightway confesses that the statement charged against the Bishop was "*too bald and unqualified.*"

And now the vicar warms to his work! Verily 'tis the shriek of a lost spirit or the scream of a drunken Beelzebub! Sophocles was accused of madness and wrote the "ŒDIPUS AT

COLONOS" as his vindication. This yeapt "priest" is taxed with "*papistical inclinings*," by more consistent Protestants, and behold his answer: "Extravagances," "Enormities," "Impious utterances," "Impious acts of worship and prayer," "Idoltrous devotions," "Idoltrous worship!" Good God! What monstrous charges! And from such a quarter, my Protestant fellow-citizens will say—*Et tu Brute!* The creed of a Fenelon, Vincent de Paul, Aquinas, Xavier, De Sales, Augustine, Bute, Ripon, Lyons, Newman, Manning, Leo XIII., so characterized! But there is a compensation. One of the chief glories of our time is its abhorrence of bloated, spongy shams, religious or otherwise—mere show without substance. No creed can live in its stormy surf that will not bear its piercing light. It demands from every man "a reason for the faith that is in him." I thank God for this. No mere newspaper letters are, it seems to me, at all adequate to the proper discussion of the above charges. I love to meet my opponent on any important question face to face in the presence of my fellow-citizens. I have a profound trust in their intellectual honesty. Therefore, sir, through you, I now challenge the Right Reverend Dr. Kingdon, Coadjutor Bishop of Fredericton, and "John M. Davenport, Priest of the Mission Church," to a public discussion, in the Institute or elsewhere, of the position of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of the Redeemer, in Catholic theology, when I will undertake to vindicate that position to the intellect and conscience of my fellow-citizens from Tradition, Reason, and Holy Scripture.

To facilitate matters, I will request Rev. Dr. Bennet,¹ Dr. A. A. Stockton,² Dr. Alward,³ Thomas Millidge, Esquire,⁴ and Hon. R. J. Ritchie,⁵ to act as my committee to meet a like committee from my opponents for the purpose of arranging the details of the discussion. And may God defend the right.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. QUIGLEY.

Ritchie's Building,

Feast of the Immaculate Conception, Dec. 8, 1887.

¹ Presbyterian, ² Methodist, ³ Baptist, ⁴ Anglican, ⁵ Catholic.

VIII.

LETTER FROM THE VICAR.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—What would be thought of a lawn tennis player who, after choosing his own court, petulantly demanded a change before the finish of the set simply because after desperate efforts he had failed to score ?

I cannot accede to your correspondent's request, however polite and polished the style of his invitation may be. I see nothing to be gained by doing so. The public has an excellent view of our position and can fairly judge the issue of our contention more fairly and deliberately, I think, than if we adjourned to the limited area of the Institute.

The matter is very simple. Mr. Quigley has impugned Bishop Kingdon's scholarship, and has emphasized, in the title of his letters, what he considers an important emendation. He has also censured all Christians who do not worship the Blessed Virgin.

I have, therefore, asked him, in the first place, to mention some of those standard Latin versions of the Bible he accused the Bishop of overlooking. He has now had a fortnight for the search and probably the help of learned friends. Let him produce his witnesses—a few lines in your paper can notify them—or else let him make the *amende honorable*.

Again—if I made misstatements with regard to the meaning of the Hebrew or Septuagint renderings of Genesis iii. 15, a few lines of solid argument will ensure my discomfiture. If, moreover, I have misquoted Liguori's "Glories of Mary," or the "Raccolta," he can easily expose my deceit. If, however, he cannot do this, then I contend that the public are already in possession of facts (though I could easily multiply them) which amply justify the expressions I used about the worship of the Virgin in the Roman Catholic communion.

It would be an excellent thing if all your readers would secure for themselves copies of "Liguori" and the "Raccolta." I will make no further disclosures till occasion requires.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 9, 1887.

IX.

LETTER FROM THE VICAR.

IPSE, IPSA.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—Though the controversy on Genesis iii. 15 seems now over, the interest it has awakened is not. I shall feel obliged, therefore, if, for the benefit of Biblical students, you will allow me a little space for an extract from a famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of catacomb-inscription celebrity, De Rossi, on Genesis iii. 15. He enumerates thirty-five "most exceedingly and insurmountable original authorities and witnesses" in support of the masculine "*He* shall bruise the serpent's head." Among them (1) all trustworthy Hebrew MSS.; (2) the analogy of the "sacred context, in which the verb which follows and the pronoun suffixed are masculine; (3) the Samaritan text and Samaritan version; (4) the Greek version of the Septuagint, all the MS. editions and versions derived from it, Ethiopic, Coptic, and Old Latin, and those who used it, whether Greek-speaking Jews, as Philo, or Christian writers, agreeing; (5) all the Chaldee paraphrases, Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Jerusalem; (6) all the other versions of the East, the oldest Syriac, the Arabic of Saadias, the Mauritanian Arabic of Erpenius, the Persian of Tawes; (7) some MSS. of the Vulgate . . . ; (8) many editions of the Vulgate

on the margin, before those of Sixtus and Clement; (9) the pure version of Jerome in the *Bibliotheca Divina*, edited by the Benedictines of S. Maur, Opp. T. 1.”

Then follows a long list of the Fathers who quote the masculine.¹ He then asserts, “the masculine reading is better, by which the bruising of the serpent is ascribed *immediately* and *alone* to the Seed of the woman, and from which the redemption, power, and divinity of the Messiah are plainly elicited.”

His conclusion reads as follows: “To whomsoever, then, the present reading of the Vulgate (i. e., ‘She,’ the woman, ‘shall bruise,’ &c.,) belongs, whether to the interpreter, or (which is more probable) to the amannensis, it *ought to be amended* from the Hebrew and Greek fountain-heads, and to be referred to those passages of the Clementine edition, which yet can and ought to be conformed to the Hebrew text, *and to be amended by the authority of the Church.*” (The italics are mine.) De Rossi, Varr. Lectt. Vet. Test., Vol. iv. App. pp. 208, 209, 211.

Here, then, is overwhelming evidence of the accuracy of our translators of the Bible in this particular.

It must, however, prove very perplexing to those who have built so much upon the false reading.

Canon Oakley, an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes, says in his review of Dr. Pusey’s *Irenicon* (1866): “I now come to what we (Roman Catholics) regard as the *Scriptural germ* of every doctrine, and the *legitimate ground* of every authorized devotion on the subject of the Blessed Virgin. I mean the prediction of her office in the Christian Dispensation, uttered by Almighty God at the time of the fall,” (viz., Gen. iii. 15).

This is a very strong statement, and ought to be exceeding startling to those who accept it, now that such a great Roman Catholic authority as De Rossi has convicted the text of very serious fundamental error, especially when it is known that Liguori (*Glories of Mary*, Pt. II. Disc. 1), Pope Pius IX., and many of the Bishops who asked him to promulge the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, based their chief arguments in

¹“The Fathers” quote the masculine *and the neuter*.

favor of it on the false reading in some such terms as these: "She who was said to crush Satan could never have been even for a moment, even in her mother's womb, under original sin." Very startling, I say, since, in the apt phrase of Dr. Pusey, "the major premise of the argument is gone, when it appears that nothing is said here (Gen. iii. 15) of any personal victory of hers." It was to the Seed of the Woman, God Incarnate, directly and personally, that the crushing of the Serpent's head was attributed, not to the woman nor to Him in conjunction with her, but to *Him alone*, and it is in Him and through Him that all faithful Christians are enabled to crush Satan under their feet also.

Thanking you for your space, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,
Priest of the Mission Church.

December 15, 1887.

NOTE.

I beg to call the special attention of my readers to the above letter. The Vicar here commences with malicious earnestness that career of fraud, falsehood, and dishonesty which he ran so recklessly during this discussion. He has been guilty of the very grossest kind of literary forgery in dealing with Father De Rossi, while his calumny on Father Oakeley has branded him with the mark of Cain. I exposed his infamy here, and challenged him over and over again, but he dared not to open his mouth in reply. Of the statements made on his own authority in this letter, *not one is true*. I offer these preliminary remarks now to prepare my readers for the full—almost verbal—criticism which is given in the *Résumé* and *Rejoinder*. It is also referred to in the *Rebutter*, in connection with his confession of the crimes here charged against him.

I will but remark now on a further proof of my charges not noticed before. The Vicar makes De Rossi say that, "*All trustworthy Hebrew MSS.*" have *Ipse*; whereas what De Rossi says is: "*Almost all Hebrew MSS.*" have *Ipse*. Again he

makes De Rossi say: "All the Chaldee paraphrases, Onkelos, etc.," have *Iipse*; whereas on the very page in Pusey from which he took his shamelessly garbled quotation, De Rossi honestly admits that there is *one* MS. of Onkelos that has *Iipsa*.

Again, my readers will notice in the quotation, that De Rossi says: "Some MSS. of the Vulgate—(that is in the text), (and) many editions of the Vulgate on the margin, before those of Sixtus and Clement," have *Iipse*. Precisely. But this is simply what Cardinal Bellarmine, though himself in favor of retaining *Iipsa*, said to Chemnitz. "I reply," writes the Cardinal, "that the Vulgate is VARIOUS here; for some Codices have *Iipse*, some *Iipsa*, and besides IT IS NOT CONTRARY TO THE VULGATE EDITION should one be convinced that he ought to read *Iipse* or *Iipsum*."

The gigantic intellect of Bellarmine, a most devout and enthusiastic believer in the Immaculate Conception 300 years before its dogmatic definition, could neither see the "tremendous importance" attached to *Iipsa* by Bishop Kingdon, nor yet the "serious fundamental error" alleged by his Vicar! But then, you know, he never studied theology at Oxford, and unfortunately was born too soon to get the benefit of Littledale's *Plain Reasons*. Get away, you Liliputs, get away, and fly into space!

R. F. Q.

LETTER I.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

BY R. F. QUIGLEY.

ST. JOHN, N. B., }
New Year's Eve., Dec. 31, 1887. }

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—Since the declination of my challenge in this matter, many duties, private and professional, have conspired to push it simply aside from my attention. This, however, I do not now regret since Bishop Kingdon's Vicar has been thereby enabled to offer another installment of his case—a tremendous, critical cataclysm as he *perhaps* thinks, and which he submits for the benefit of “Biblical students” forsooth! I am not by profession either a Biblical Exegete or Theologue, but most heartily do I on their behalf thank him for his diligence and sagacity. The threatened “further disclosures” not being thus far forthcoming, I may now charitably “hope his blunders are all out,” and that he stands up for judgment.

Here I must refer, but only parenthetically, to my opponent's statement that I have “probably had the help of learned friends” in this discussion. Characteristic surely! The petty malice of the insinuation is amusing enough, but it witnesses to such insatiable vanity, solemn self-conceit and debasing egotism that it is positively pitiful. These weaknesses blind him to the fact that such an assertion is an unconscious tribute to the logic and force of an argument which a Bishop and a *soi-disant* “priest” are incapable of answering. I accept the tribute for the sake of the honor done to the truth which I espouse, but the simple fact is I have received no help from friends learned or unlearned, directly or indirectly. I asked no help, I needed none; and with the exception of a verification or two, I have relied entirely upon my own library. But

he does not believe in the truth of his own statement. Theological charlatan and religious dwarf that he is, he perched on the shoulders of the "armed strong man" of the Protestant prejudice against the Blessed Mother of our Redeemer, which he himself admits, and adopting the Chinese method of warfare, charged upon me with shield aloft, bearing the beast with seven heads and ten horns, with outcries and shouts of derision and vituperation, of "idolatry," "impiety," and "blasphemy." I thought the height from which he had fallen so frenzied him that he became profoundly unconscious of all demands of logical argumentation. Nevertheless, I offered to meet him on the public platform, where "the help of learned friends" would not avail me, but he threw his shoes into the air and took to flight, because he could "see nothing to be gained by doing so." A lawn tennis set he thinks more entertaining and *diverting!* Well, I shall be the last to dispute the correctness of his judgment.

Now, I suppose, at any rate, I hope, that this writer has his serious moments. His last letter gave *some* evidence of such. In Cardinal Newman's phrase I wish "to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober." I propose, therefore, to examine the strictures made by him, in his series of letters; upon my first letter, so far as they are relevant to the points at issue, and I am now perforce obliged to consider Bishop Kingdon as speaking in and through him, and consequently inculpated with him. Meeting my opponents with visor up I shall not hesitate to deal blows direct and heavy, and to indulge in such severity of comment as I think their errors at once so extreme and grotesque, imperatively demand. I am, of course, aware that with a certain class of my Protestant fellow-citizens in such a matter as this there is one obligation of honesty and decorum imposed on a Catholic and quite another on a Protestant. The latter may freely use invective, cowardly insinuation, perversions of meaning, vague declamation, insult and scurrillity, and the like appliances of a worthless cause, or a worthless advocate; the former must manifest towards his opponents a sweetness of disposition and temper almost angelic. Charges of "idolatry," "impiety" and blasphemy may

be made against us; men with pretensions to learning, with character and reputation to maintain, and with a cause to advocate, may repeat all the exploded calumnies and publications of frenzied fanatics against the Catholic church, yet we may not hurl them back with indignant defiance. From pulpit and platform, theological and literary pedlars may level against us the most sweeping and crushing accusations, in their crass ignorance draw the most atrocious pictures of our doctrines and religious practices, misrepresent and falsify the Catholic creed in every particular, and to many Protestant minds "everything is lovely." We are not men, we have not characters to lose, we have not feelings to be wounded, we have not friends; we have nothing personal about us, we are not the fellow-creatures of our accusers, we are not gentlemen, we are not Christians; and yet in spite of such provocation, in the "*style polite and polished*," in candor, generosity, honorable feeling, in manly and noble bearing towards our Protestant neighbors and straightforwardness in our dealings with them, we must simply surpass them as much as the Cedars of Lebanon outgrow the little shrubs before we get credit for the attributes of ordinary human beings. But enough. I hope I am, as I ever have been, too philosophic, too magnanimous, built on too broad a scale mentally at least, too impervious to the unbecoming, the indecorous, the petty and miserable, to be irritated or dispirited at being called names, or being treated with injustice or contumely for my religion's sake. Betimes it must be no mean tonic spiritual and intellectual. Thus much am I let to say in standing off for the first time before my opponent and taking a death grip of him, of course metaphorically speaking. It will serve to introduce the main subject and to clear the ground. I make to him no irenicism, nor will I pretend to exhibit a chivalrous courtesy to one who can play such shabby tricks with the sacred memory of our Mother.

I now charge against him that his attempted defense of Bishop Kingdon is a glaring and undeviating misrepresentation of the true position of the question—a gross, unpardonable and dishonest attempt to shift the ground measured for the lists in my critique on the Bishop's statement, and the

most boldly and impudently illogical shuffling I have ever known. Thus I begin, and I hold myself bound by the sacredness of my manhood and her honor who gave it me to make good my indictment.

To recapitulate then. Seeing it announced in the papers that Bishop Kingdon would lecture on "Misprints," I bought a ticket and took a seat a few feet from the lecturer in the public hall. The lecture was illustrated, so to speak. The words commented as "Misprints"—mostly Greek and Latin—were exhibited in large letters on sheets of paper attached to a large framework or blackboard. On one sheet were the two words "IPSE—IPSA," placed one above the other. After the lecturer had spoken about three-quarters of an hour on different "Misprints," he said substantially as follows: "Hitherto the errors or misprints of which I have spoken have been of no great importance, practically speaking; but I now come to one which *in these times* has been the cause of grave errors. Here (pointing to the sheet containing the words 'IPSE—IPSA') by a misprint of the letter 'a' for the letter 'e' there lamentably resulted, that *thirty-three years ago* the Roman Catholic Church was led to promulgate the dogma of the Immaculate Conception." The GLOBE'S report was as follows: "*Sometimes the substitution of one letter for another made a vast difference, and as an illustration of this he referred to the words IPSE and IPSA, the latter word in an important passage in the Douay Bible being the foundation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.*" We substantially agree on the Bishop's statement. He offered no argument in support of it. He said St. Bernard favored IPSA, but that while he was a "very devout soul," he was altogether "unreliable"! Had the Bishop stopped here his hearers might have fairly inferred that he meant to say St. Bernard was not an authority on Textual criticism, but he went on to prove the Saint's unreliability in such matters by saying that he prophesied a successful issue for a crusade which turned out disastrously! Wonderful logic! It reminded me of a school-boy speaking of Newton or Herschel as dunces in mathematics, or a blooming freshman after wading through Aldrich or Whately, speaking of Kant or

Hegel, St. Thomas Aquinas or Aristotle, as grossly deficient in their knowledge of logical science! I could not contain my astonishment and amazement at the Bishop's statement, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was in any way connected with or dependent upon a choice between IPSE and IPSA, such a dispute, if one, being absolutely irrelevant, and *on the spot immediately after the lecture* I protested to the secretary of the lecture committee against the incorrectness and unfairness of the Bishop's statement. Writing to the GLOBE a day or two afterwards I characterized it as "wholly incorrect and baseless." The first dishonesty my opponent commits is in connecting these words of mine with the question of "misprint," whereas, it is evident I used them to describe the Bishop's statement that the Immaculate Conception was founded on such, even assuming that a "misprint" could be made out.

Now, I do not propose that there shall be any doubt about the truth of this matter or about my view of the Bishop's position. "Mr. Quigley has impugned Bishop Kingdon's scholarship," says my opponent. That is just it. I do so, and most emphatically, and I characterize it as simply *slovenly* in this particular at least. This I consider mild to begin with. Much ought to depend on the Bishop's *animus*. As I have proved before, and will directly repeat, the Bishop is absolutely without a leg to stand on. Now, what was the drift and intention of his assertion? Was it the result of pure ignorance of what he was talking about, such as led Dr. Johnson to define "Pastern" as "the knee-joint of the horse," or was it a desire to commend himself to an audience naturally indeed fair and generous in their instincts, but educated in traditions and prejudices which predisposed them to credit the wildest charges against "Popery"; or did he come there with his diagram in his pocket prepared, and with malice aforethought, to attack the Catholic church and more especially in the honor paid by her to Our Blessed Lady? He can have his choice. He has stood by his Vicar and must be taken to adopt his line of thought and defense—perhaps, indeed, he gave the *innocent* the unfortunate extract, that edgetool from De Rossi! So

at least I opine. I will see that he gets all the comfort possible out of it.

Again : I accused the Bishop of suppressing the real state of the question on which he undertook to speak. I repeat it. The real dispute, such as it is, is between *Iipse*, *Ipsa* and *IPSUM*. There is no place for any question of "misprint." Such a designation of what is involved in this three-fold reading is wholly improper. It is simply a VARIOUS READING and fortunately like "many hundred thousand, probably upwards of a million of such" contained in Kennicott and De Rossi's Bible, absolutely insignificant, because it does not affect the sense. Did the Bishop know the real state of the question, or was he bent only on making a point against the Catholic Church, and discrediting the truth of the Immaculate Conception before an audience not more than six of whom knew what that doctrine was? I do not think the Bishop himself knows to this very hour. I never met a Protestant clergyman who did know it before I had explained it to him. So great a man as the illustrious Prof. Agassiz, of Harvard University, did not know it until I explained it to him one day. He was delivering a course of scientific lectures—strongly anti-Darwinian—on "The Natural foundation of Zoological Affinity," and one day he was discussing "Embryology." The audience in the gallery of the Museum was a distinguished one. Longfellow, with other noted *litterateurs*, was there. While speaking of a fact in connection with Bee-culture, discovered in Germany by the observations of Pastor Dzierzon, he suddenly stopped and said that he "never faced this fact without being reminded of the Church dogma of the Immaculate Conception." Even now I remember the scene so distinctly! I could not see where the Immaculate Conception, as I understood it, came in, and trying to think it out I heard little of the closing part of the lecture. I was not satisfied. Though studying law I lived in Divinity Hall quarters, and was thus brought into daily contact with the ablest Unitarian theological scholars of the United States resident at Harvard and those who visited there—Clarke, Hale, Bellows, Savage, Brooke, Bartol and others—notoriously the best educated Protestant clergy in the

world. I knew Agassiz's statement would evoke discussion, and I felt bound to get at the bottom of the Prof.'s thought before meeting my theological friends. I called at his room and the great Naturalist talked the matter over with me with the simplicity and condescension of a child. He simply did not know anything at all about the "dogma of the Immaculate Conception," as taught by the Catholic Church. What he meant was the Miraculous Conception of Christ—the Incarnation—and the physiological fact he referred to was a scientific tribute to its truth. As I had anticipated, the discussion came up, but my case was won before it commenced. Agassiz had been misunderstood through his loose or careless use of theological terms, with which like so many scientists of to-day he had not made himself familiar, but my friends had their compensation, for they learned what the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was. And so may it be in this present case! "Learned and devout men stumble at this doctrine because in matter of fact they do not know what we mean by the Immaculate Conception." So said Cardinal Newman to Dr. Pusey when answering his famous "*Eirenicon*" of 1864, and pointing out to him his ignorance of the matter. I am convinced, that the "ninety-and-nine" of religiously-minded Protestants who learn what this thrillingly beautiful and sublime truth is will say at least what some have said to me—"Well, it ought to be true." But this incidentally.

To return: For the sake of convenience I here set down again *Genesis* iii. 15, according to the different versions. Protestant version: *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, etc.*; Douay version: *I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; SHE shall crush thy head, etc.*; the Vulgate: *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius; IPSA conteret caput tuum, etc.* And just here in my first letter I expressed myself with the most careful and unexceptionable distinctness. "THIS WHOLE TEXT" or verse I said "*has been called by the early writers in the Church the Proto-Gospel because it contains the first promise of a future Savior. It is, therefore, to*

Protestant and Catholic alike of transcendent importance and very comprehensive application." Now, this statement about "THE WHOLE TEXT" or verse is very clear, and I ask the careful attention of my readers to it. I then proceed to say: "BUT IT WILL BE OBSERVED THAT THE PRESENT CONTENTION IS OVER THE FIRST WORD OF THE SECOND CLAUSE ONLY; IT shall bruise thy head, etc.; SHE shall crush thy head, etc." To this I now add the other reading: "HE shall bruise thy head, &c.," not adopted by either the Douay or Authorized Protestant Version, but common enough and recognized and established equally with the other two—"SHE" and "IT."

Here is the ring bolt of the whole matter! "The first word of the second clause only"—this is "the ground measured off for the lists." This is the thing discussed by the Bishop, and to that I have confined myself and propose to chain my opponent. Our readers will see that his vague declamations, his miserable fallacies, his wretched sophistries and fanfaronades are but the necessary result of his barefaced, cowardly and dishonest ignoring and malicious putting aside of my most definite and emphatic explanations right here, and that they run through his whole attempted defence of the Bishop and the attack on the Catholic church he made on his own account. How becoming in a "true Catholic (Caw-tholic) Christian"!

LETTER II.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—How does the question stand then? While a great many important things are daily discussed in the columns of the GLOBE, it is hardly the place to test by collation a thousand or two Hebrew, Greek and Latin MSS. Kennicott's magnificent Hebrew Bible alone gives nearly *seven hundred!*¹ Critico-

¹ I have examined this work in Harvard University Library.

Biblical disquisitions and deep linguistic athletics and exegesis are out of place here. We can reach such practical conclusions as we require without them. The question is not *absolutely* which of these *three* readings Moses used in Genesis—that may never be *proved* this side of eternity; but are there *three* and are they and have they been in use and recognized?

It is admitted on all hands that the Hebrew text, the fountain-head, such as we have it now, is hopelessly ambiguous. The learned Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius are my authority. (*I will refer later to what my opponent says about the determining effect of the masculine verb.* ABSOLUTE FEARLESSNESS IS MY MOTTO!) In consequence of this ambiguity, these *three different readings* prevailed among *ecclesiastical writers* as follows: IPSE *conteret caput tuum*—HE (Christ) shall bruise thy head; IPSA *conteret caput tuum*—SHE (the woman, the Blessed Virgin, by and through the power of her seed, Christ) shall crush thy head; IPSUM *conteret caput tuum*—IT (her seed, that is Christ) shall bruise thy head.

Here let me add an interesting fact. I do not forget what was done by the venerable Bede (died A.D. 735), and the good and great Catholic King Alfred (died 901 A.D.), to translate the Bible into the English tongue. Bede died while dictating his translation of the last verses of St. John's Gospel, and Alfred is credited in later tradition with having been a translator of the whole Bible. Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. *Auth. Vers.*, p. 1665. The Ormulum, too, is a specimen of the work done in this direction. John Wycliffe, D.D., the English Heresiarch, and lovingly called "The Morning Star of the Reformation" by the compatriots and blood-relations in religion of my opponents, died exactly *five hundred and three years ago* TO-DAY! Some time before the Immaculate Conception and before the Douay translation of the Bible in 1582 and 1609! He gave to the world the year before he died an English version of the whole Bible—perhaps the first *complete* translation into English. Dr. Roberts, member of the New Testament Company of Revisers, says "it is possessed of great merit." And Wycliffe's Version has this clause of our text as follows: "SHE shall tread thy head." My opponent will

probably say Wycliffe was an old *ignoramus*, did not know Hebrew, and more especially had not seen the quotation from De Rossi—"the *famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of Catacomb celebrity!*" How complimentary he can be to Catholic scholarship when he thinks it suits him! It is so profound!

My opponent admits the readings "IPSE" and "IPSA," but in his death throes, grasping at a straw, puts me to proof of the existence of the neuter form "IPSUM." I admit this is my case—the burden of proof is mine, and I accept it cheerfully. I will not let him go from the bolt on which he is impaled until I excoriate him—till he feels that in an evil hour he forgot the *ethos* of his religious "school," and came to the succor of a Bishop, though probably it was not through very profound reverence for the Episcopal Office.

But to the proof. The celebrated Jesuit commentator, Cornelius à Lapide (who died in 1637—*some time before the Immaculate Conception was defined*—1854 was that date), commenting on the words "IPSA conteret caput tuum—SHE shall crush thy head," says—(I translate): "The reading here is three-fold. The first is that of the Hebrew Codices which have '*Ipsum*'—'It,' to wit, *the seed* shall bruise thy head, and so reads St. Leo (the Great, Pope and Doctor of the church, died 461, I add), and after him Lipomanus. The second is 'IPSE'—'HE' (Christ or man) shall crush thy head. So the Septuagint and Chaldaic. The third is 'IPSA'—'SHE' shall crush thy head. So the Roman Bible and almost all the Latins read with St. Augustine, (the Latin translator of), Chrysostom, Ambrose, Gregory (the Great), Bede, Alcuin, Bernard, Eucherius, Rupert and others." So much at present from à Lapide on *the three readings*. I wish to confine myself first, exhaustively and overwhelmingly to the proof of "IPSUM," or the neuter form, which I also find as "Hoc"—"THIS, *the seed*," both simple pronouns of the same class, "*Hoc*" being the more emphatic.

My next witness is Kemnitzius, or Chemnitz (according to modern spelling), probably the ablest Lutheran theologian of the period immediately succeeding Luther himself (1522–1586). In his greatest work, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, he says:

“We should read *Ipsum conteret caput tuum*, *It shall bruise thy head*, seeing it was spoken of the seed, which was Christ, as ancient writers teach.” I take this from Ward’s “*Errata of the Protestant Bible*,” a work of the very highest authority. Ward himself was a man of marvellous linguistic attainments and an unfortunate “pervert to Rome.” However, I believe when he “came over” he was really quite sane, and in this respect, at all events, differed from those *drivelling idiots*, Faber, Newman, Manning, the Wilberforces, Allies, Mivart, the Harpers, Oakeley, Clarke, Shipley, the Bowdens, Caswall, Dalgairns, Ryder, Coleridge, Ward of the “*Dublin Review*,” the only man in England John Stuart Mill feared or was influenced by. There are a few other *dolts* of the same capacity as Ripon, Bute, and Hope-Scott, whom the church is tenderly matronizing and ’tis thought they will recover. This by the way. Chemnitz’s arguments for “IPSUM” are quoted by Cardinal Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei* (*Lib. 2, Cap. 12, 13, 14*). Was I not correct in saying that the Protestant reading “It” came from a Hebrew, Greek or Latin neuter gender? “Our translators,” the “English translators,” “the English version,” my opponent says, speaking of the “Protestant Version”—he scorns the word “Protestant” evidently, and will have none of it! He writhes and squirms to clear himself from its hated folds. He likes it as little as *one* is said to like Holy Water! The translators of the Protestant version certainly did not adopt the masculine “HE,” and if they did not reject it, as I claimed and asserted, how did they get “It” from the Greek masculine *autos*, if they followed my opponent’s version of the Septuagint? This is too clear to need a word more.

Again, the Catholic and “*Historic Dublin Review*,” Sept., 1856, has a great article reviewing the Jesuit Professor Passaglia’s wonderful work on “*The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*,” published the year after the definition of the Immaculate Conception. The learned writer says (p. 161), “the weight of authority is in favor of the *masculine* or *neuter*, ‘IPSE’ or ‘IPSUM,’” and he cites: *Passaglia, Par. 2, p. 916 et seq.*; *Melchior Canus, De Locis Theologicis, Lib. 2, Cap. 15*;

De Rubéis in App. de Var. Lect. V. T., p. 207, seq. Vol. 4, and Cardinal Patrizi's great work, "*De Immaculata Mariæ Origine a Deo prædicta Disquisitio. Romæ, 1853.*" Two Dominicans and two Jesuits! Does it not bring a blush of indignation to the cold, pale cheek of logic and truth, to hear an Anglican Bishop backed up by a PURITANICAL SYNCRETIST yeledped "Priest," declare that "IPSA" is a misprint, that the Immaculate Conception is founded upon it, and that all sorts of idolatries and impious jugglery have been and are being wrought by it—and here we have two great Jesuit priests, in the shallowest convolution of whose brain the Bishop and his Vicar might be stowed away—we have these two—one of whom, Passaglia, was called "the Theologian of the Immaculate Conception"—declaring, one *before* the definition of the dogma, and the other *after*, that "IPSA" had nothing at all to do with it, but that "IPSE" or "IPSUM," critically speaking, was a more correct reading!!! O for a few hours before a New Brunswick Pan-Anglican Synod to discuss the Prerogatives, Dignity and Relation to her Divine Son of the ever Immaculate, Glorious, and Sublime Virgin Mother, with Passaglia and Patrizi, "St. Liguori" and "The Raccolta" on the table!

Have I not proved the existence and currency of the reading "IPSUM"? A little more, however. Dr. Pusey was "kicking up some shins" in 1864 (the "*Eirenicon*" period), and getting off some of those inconsequent utterances for which he was so fatuously famous in his later years, and in this very connection. The *Dublin Review*, then Cardinal Wiseman's organ, had an article on "The Blessed Virgin and Apostolic Tradition," in which *Genesis* iii. 15, occurred. In a note at the bottom of the page, the writer (was it Wiseman?) says: "*It makes no difference, whatever, to the force of the Protevangelium, as an argument for Mary's exaltation, whether we read 'IPSA' or 'IPSUM,' which latter we ourselves believe to be the true reading. Let Dr. Pusey, therefore, not raise an outcry which has no meaning.*" I shall invoke this later, my readers. Please keep it sharply in mind.

Now for a nightcap for the Bishop and his Vicar! I hold

in my hand "BIBLIA SACRA sive Testamentum Vetus ab Im. Tremellio et Fr. Junius ex Hebraeo Latine redditum et Testamentum Novum a Theod. Beza e Graeco in Latinum Versum: The Holy Bible or Old Testament rendered into Latin from the Hebrew by Emmanuel Tremellius and Francis Junius and the New Testament translated from Greek into Latin by Theodore Beza." Tremellius and Junius were professors at Heidelberg (the former a converted Jew), and they brought out their Old Testament at Frankfort, in 1597. This is the Version from which the courteous Mr. Campbell quoted, and I am happy to give him this information in lieu of the "fitting reply" which the Bishop failed to make to my indictment. He has my sympathy in his disappointment! In this Bible the clause in question runs thus: "Hoc conteret tibi caput: THIS (the seed) shall bruise thy head"—as good as any can desire—as good as "IPSE," "IPSA," or "IPSUM." "This translation is preferred by the English Protestants," says a high authority—Rev. Alban Butler, Lives of the Saints, vol. 3, p. 804, N., and this alone may account for "IT" in the Protestant Version.

Again, refer to the annotations to the Douay Bible on this text, and what do you find? "IPSA" or "IPSUM," and the remark: "*The sense is the same; for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent's head.*"

I think our readers will now concede that I have proved my case so far as "IPSUM" goes, and answered my opponent's question. I can better this; but "enough is as good as a feast." My opponent admits the existence and currency of "IPSE" and "IPSA," and I presume we can now treat "IPSE," "IPSA," and "IPSUM" as more or less authorized readings. Alas! now, for the Bishop's little diagram of "*Ipse—Ipsa*," and his silly story in connection with it. It reminds me of that well-known method in German philosophy: first set things on their heads, and then amuse yourself at seeing them unable to walk! I wonder if the Bishop is an adept?

And now an independent word on "IPSA," supererogatory indeed, so far as the necessities of my argument stand, but yet furnishing a peg for some *tattooing* remarks. I confess

this is to me an enticing part of the discussion. It brings to mind the grand old Vulgate of the Catholic Church, whose history would require a small volume. Its text is a composite, eclectic one, so to speak, formed by the fusion of the old Italic and Latin versions in use in the Western Church before St. Jerome, and Jerome's translation. It needs no apology from me, for it remains to-day the most important means at our command for the final settlement of many critical questions connected with the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. This is the testimony of the ablest Protestant critics—Grotius, Cappell, Mills, Walton, Roberts, and others. "Jerome's old Vulgate," says my opponent, "made direct from the Hebrew, has the masculine 'Ipse'—the modern Vulgate in spite of this has 'IPSA.'" Yes, but he overlooks the fact that the reading "IPSA" of the present Vulgate is older than St. Jerome's reading "IPSE." *When, therefore, my opponent says that "the translators of the modern Vulgate," as he calls them, "are without excuse in adopting 'IPSA,' more especially as they had the grand old Vulgate of St. Jerome before their eyes to keep them right,"* he talks arrant nonsense. He puts the cart before the horse. 'Tis St. Jerome who is, in this particular, without excuse for attempting to make the change from "IPSA" to "IPSE"; and St. Augustine, his great friend, and St. Ambrose, two giants (with others mentioned above by Cornelius à Lapide) told him so, and refused to give up their old love "IPSA" for St. Jerome's "IPSE," and they have been sustained down to this very hour. In this connection let me state a remarkable fact, with an interesting episode, showing the relation of the present Vulgate, as well to the Old Italic or Vulgate and its sources, as to St. Jerome's Vulgate, and showing, too, the tenor of tradition in affecting and determining that relation.

The Greek word *epiousios*—meaning "daily," the Latin "*Quotidianum*,"—is found in the New Testament only in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, as given both by St. Matthew vi., ii., and St. Luke xi. 3. The Old Latin Version translates *epiousios* by "*quotidianum*—daily," in both Gospels, and it is rendered "daily" in both Gospels in the Protestant Version. When St. Jerome revised the Latin of the New Testa-

ment, he substituted "supersubstantialem—supersubstantial" for "quotidianum—daily" in St. Matthew, but apparently in doubt about his correctness he left "quotidianum—daily" in St. Luke, and so it stands in the Vulgate to-day and in the Douay translation. But the "quotidianum—daily" of the old Latin maintained, and still maintains, its place in the church service book and offices, in the Liturgies—Roman, Gallican, Ambrosian and Mozarabic—in the celebrated catechism of the Council of Trent even, and in the private devotions of Catholics to-day. They know no other, I may say. It is the remnant of a Version older than St. Jerome's, as "Ipsa" is such another remnant, and although Jerome's revision in this particular is the reading of the Vulgate to-day, it has been powerless to displace the ante-Jerome "quotidianum—daily." I ought to point out that both words appear together in that inexpressibly beautiful Post-Communion prayer of St. Bonaventure, beginning: "Transfige Dulcissime Domine Jesu," etc. The application here, however, is purely Eucharistic and refers solely to the holy and adorable Sacrament of the altar.

Anent these words a tilt took place between Abelard and St. Bernard. The Saint having occasion to visit the convent of the Paraclete, of which Heloise was Abbess, observed that in repeating the Lord's prayer at the daily hours a change was made in the usual form, the word "supersubstantialem" being substituted for "quotidianum" in St. Matthew's gospel. St. Bernard forbade Heloise to adopt the former word. As Heloise had made this change under the direction of Abelard, she told him of the prohibition, and thereupon Abelard wrote a letter of defense to St. Bernard, which is extant. The result was that the innovation was disallowed, and "quotidianum—daily" once more rang through the cloisters of the Paraclete. See Canon Lightfoot on Revision, etc. "IPSA" is the reading of the Vulgate to-day—"the best Version of all those that have come down to us from antiquity." These are the words of Scott Porter; Canon Westcott, in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible," is almost as strong, and they are certainly confirmed by the action of the Protestant Revisers a little while ago. They made several startling corrections in accordance with the

Vulgate. Let me give a very important one—they have restored the true reading of 1 Cor. xi. 27. For 200 years, to fasten on Catholics the charge of “mangling the sacrament,” as they put it, they read this text conjunctively: “Whosoever shall eat the bread *and* drink the cup, etc.” This they did to infer a necessity and obligation for the laity as for the priest to communicate under both kinds, as the conjunctive “*and*” may seem to do. The Revisers have done an act of justice to Catholics by restoring the true reading—“*or drink*,” and thus removed a corruption which Dean Stanley owned was due “to theological fear or partiality.” Other great tributes to the Vulgate I cannot stay to chronicle now, without expanding the letter too much.

This is not, as I said before, the place to argue nice questions of Textual Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics, but I cannot allow some very crude and shallow statements of my opponent to pass without correction. He must admit, that it is now absolutely impossible to determine from the Hebrew text direct, without merely spelling it out and, as he thinks inferentially, whether the pronoun is masculine, feminine, or neuter. This I have already proved by the testimony of Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius. There can be no stronger. *We have no Hebrew text older than the 9th century.* My opponent, however, labors to show that because the verb “*conteret*” is masculine, therefore the pronoun is masculine, and that settles the whole thing. Silly nonsense! Somebody must have told him this in a joke! What sort of studies has he made in Textual Criticism within the last thirty years? Giants in scholarship have tried to determine this very point, and have so far failed. Why should Liliputs presume! He ought to know that it is common in the Hebrew Scriptures, idiomatic, indeed, in certain cases, to have pronouns and verbs of the masculine gender joined with nouns of the feminine, as in Ruth i. 8; Esther ii. 20; Eccles. xii. 15. Again, there are in the Pentateuch several places in which the masculine pronoun is used instead of the feminine, although the antecedent is a noun feminine; and this construction, I read, occurs so frequently that there is every reason to believe that it proceeded

from the original author of the Books. See Kennicott's Bible *in loco* for the authorities touching the two celebrated texts: Genesis xx. 5, and Genesis xxiv. 44; also Porter's Bib. Criticism. I speak on authority, of course, as I do not know Hebrew well enough to set up my own judgment. But I refer the Bishop and his Vicar to Cornelius à Lapide, as above quoted, where they will find a critical and exegetical discussion on this grammatical point, eminently *jesuitical*, in the true literal sense of the term, that may somewhat enlarge their now apparently very contracted intellectual horizon. A LAPIDE concludes his argument thus (I translate): "WHEREFORE IT SEEMS TO ME THAT MOSES IN THE HEBREW HERE JOINED A MASCULINE VERB WITH A FEMININE PRONOUN, SAYING IPASCUPH, 'IPSA CONTERET—SHE SHALL CRUSH,' TO SIGNIFY THE WOMAN AS WELL AS HER SEED, AND SO THAT THE WOMAN BY AND THROUGH HER SEED, TO WIT, BY CHRIST, SHOULD CRUSH THE HEAD OF THE SERPENT." Now I am familiar with the critical literature in Greek and Latin touching all these three respective readings, and so profoundly convinced am I (catching, as I think I do, the very quintessence of the idea involved in the first clause of the text), that Moses wrote the feminine pronoun, that I will discuss the matter with the Bishop before a committee of Protestant clergymen in this city—say the Reverend Doctors Bennet, Pope, and Macrae, if these gentlemen will pardon my using their names—and at such time as may be arranged, when I will undertake to maintain that position. I can lay claim, indeed, to no special spiritual perception or illumination on such a matter, but there is to my mind a higher criterion of genuineness than MS. authority. There is what Griesbach calls an "interna bonitas"; there is what Bengel calls an "adamantina cohaerentia," which, he says, speaking of a matter very like this, "compensate for the scarcity of MSS." These words are almost untranslatable.

But I hear some one ask: What about the appalling critico-cyclonic cataclysm on "Ipse" from De Rossi, whom my opponent describes as "A famous living Italian Roman Catholic scholar of catacomb-inscription celebrity?" Ye Gods! Is it true, then, that whom you would destroy you first make mad?

Has this writer no friends—"learned friends" of course I mean, who, if they cannot help him, might save him from—*himself*? Verily "an enemy hath done this!" Has Bishop Kingdon "sold" his friend? Or can I trust mine eyes? Will it now be wondered at that, profoundly distrusting the honesty of this writer, I sought to meet him face to face before my fellow-citizens, where I could unmask his presumptuous pretentiousness, his little shifts and miserable subterfuges, and hold him up to the piercing gaze of every man who values truth more than empty semblance of victory, honesty more than mere vainglorious triumph over an opponent? I believed him to be a master in the art of suppression and misstatement, and, therefore, I preferred "the limited area of the Institute" which he so pathetically deprecated, the "Fifty Years of Europe"—"the audience fit though few" before whom castigation for dishonesty would be administered on the spot. I am magnanimous enough, however, to say that the religious position of a ritualistic minister, so-called, is intellectually simply so contemptible that honesty in a matter like this is too much to expect.

LETTER III.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—Here is a writer steeped to the lips in vanity and self-conceit, signing himself "Priest of the Mission church" (and I am told an Oxford graduate), anxious to instruct "Biblical students," barefacedly pretending to speak with knowledge of and to quote from a learned work which he evidently never saw, and about which he by his own confession—*habemus confidentem reum*—knows absolutely nothing! No, not even the name of the author! Good Heaven! The great and saintly Father John Bernard De Rossi, of Parma, "the last of the Tribunes" of that period in Sacred Criticism brought back

from Heaven and by a new ritualistic theory of Metempsychosis transformed into the great Catholic Archæologist, Commendatore G. B. De Rossi, now at Rome, aged about sixty-five!—and this by the “Priest of the Mission church!” Oh, no! Thaumaturgist though he fain would be thought, he cannot hope to do what the Pope and the whole college of cardinals could not do! The humble Priest and Professor, the learned Hebraist, the pet and pride and darling of Pope Pius VI. and all Europe for his Biblical scholarship, who spent his life and fortune in collecting MSS. and rare editions of the Hebrew texts, for which the Emperor of Russia, in vain, offered him an enormous price, and which Pius VI. delicately proposed to buy for the Vatican, but which De Rossi bequeathed to the library of his native city,—to attempt to rob him of all his glory, and by the “Priest of the Mission church!” Fie! O Fie! I may well say to him with Prince Hal: “What trick, what device, what starting hole canst thou now find out to hide thee from this open and apparent shame?” To conscientious readers of these letters I say: Thrust this shuffling witness out of court, and if you seriously wish to know the teachings of the Catholic church on any question, go to some duly accredited exponent of her doctrine, and not to a man who has shown himself to be one of those of whom St. Leo observes in forcible terms that “they have made themselves makers of error because they would not become the disciples of truth.” To “Biblical students” let *me* say that De Rossi published this volume just *one hundred years ago this very year*, as an *appendix* to Dr Kennicott’s great Hebrew Bible, and a fifth volume in 1798–9 and *he died in* 1831. Now, if it in the remotest way affected my position, or the state of the question at issue, I could not safely accept a quotation from De Rossi by my opponent—I would not trust him. But it just plays my hand—it establishes by strong evidence the currency of the third reading, “Ipsē.” This was a part of my case—to establish the *fact of three readings*, not *two only* as the Bishop and his Vicar alleged.

Let me dispose of De Rossi while I have him in hand. My opponent quotes him as saying: “The masculine reading is better, by which the bruising of the serpent is ascribed *imme-*

diately and *alone* to the Seed of the woman, and from which the redemption, power and divinity of the Messiah are plainly elicited." Perfectly Catholic doctrine, and exactly my position stated in my first letter and repeated often in this. Where does the comfort for my opponent and the Bishop come in? The masculine reading may be, *verbally* and *critically* speaking, the best—we are not now discussing that—and, no doubt, this is what De Rossi meant, and clearly enough said, too, had we his words before us in the original;¹ for as I shall make very clear directly, whether we read IPSE, IPSA or IPSUM, the result and meaning is absolutely the same—that is to say, the bruising or crushing of the serpent is ascribed *immediately* and *alone* to Christ, and *its whole significance for us comes from His Redemption, Power and Divinity*. This is the pure Catholic doctrine with which I have all through *scalded* my opponents; and will anybody believe that the *genuine* "Father" De Rossi did not know it and hold it, too? Yes, thank God! A Priest of the Catholic Church can never publicly deny her tenets and at the same time claim to be in full communion with her, and to teach doctrines whose true and logical home, if they are worth anything at all, is *elsewhere!* Can I point out to the writer in clearer terms the contradictions and confusion in which he involves himself, and those who fatuously follow him, by persisting in his concentrated calumnies against the Catholic Church and her teaching in this particular? But more anon.

Again De Rossi is quoted: "The present reading of the Vulgate ought to be amended by the authority of the church." Good Catholic sentiment again! I had already anticipated it when I said, *in my first letter*, that "I as a Catholic have no more interest in retaining 'IPSA'—SHE in the text than he (Bishop Kingdon) has, so far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned, and that if it be found that 'IT' or 'HE' and not 'SHE' is the true reading the correction will no doubt be made." De Rossi's words just quoted very well interpret and explain his view of the whole matter, and put it exactly in accord with "the pure Catholic doctrine" spoken of above. The proud boast of the Catholic church is that in matters of doc-

¹ See Appendix D.

trine affecting God's sacred truth she is *semper eadem*—To-day, Yesterday and Forever the same. Will anyone believe that a veritable and loyal priest of that church, in suggesting a merely verbal change in a certain document in her custody, meant to charge her with doctrinal error which he proposed to correct by the change? Bah! Tell that to the marines. De Rossi, as a learned priest, knew quite well, as we do now, that his proposed change made no difference *in the sense*, but as a stickler for critical nicety and absolute, literal correctness, merely for its own sake, he hoped the church, in which he expressly recognized the power, would make the change. Now Bible revision is not made every day in the church of God for a merely verbal whim, but Pius VI. might have obliged his friend De Rossi by making the change just as a delicate compliment to his great industry in collecting MSS.! It would not have made the slightest difference doctrinally speaking, and De Rossi would have been, what he no doubt was, a devout believer in the Immaculate Conception all the same, and long before it was defined; and, besides, the pardonable vanity of a pious enthusiast in merely verbal perfection would have been gratified by the Pope's adopting his proposed emendation. Pius VI., however, was not much of "a true Catholic (Catholic) Christian" anyhow, and it would appear that the good De Rossi's pet wish was not gratified, and the Vulgate remains *in statu quo*.

Anent De Rossi my opponent again says: "Here then is overwhelming evidence of the accuracy of our translators of the Bible in this particular." What must our readers think of such disgraceful muddling up of the question to be discussed? More than once have I pointed out that *we were not discussing the relative merits of readings or versions*, and yet at every turn my opponent tries his dodging and shuffling, but his Protean dishonesty will not save him from the scorn of all fair men. Now, while unfortunately for him and the Bishop the whole question over which they have made such hideous grimaces is, as I shall further re-state, the veriest verbal quillet, yet is it not the most solemn trifling with the intelligence of their readers to say that "It," the actual Protestant reading,

and "HE" are identical as *words* ! Of course, I offer no criticism on the alleged quotation from De Rossi. Did the logical requirements of this argument, however, permit it, I could very interestingly discuss the value of some of the MSS. mentioned when compared with those in favor of the other two readings, IPSA and IPSUM. Such a course on my part would very properly be taken as an insult by readers who have a right to expect, and I think demand from me a logical treatment of the subject in hand.

I will bunch the balance of his last letter with the first directly.

To sum up, I have now proved beyond cavil, I think, the existence of the three readings—IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM. The controversy over them between Catholics and Protestants, learned men on both sides have long since repudiated as unmeaning and useless. It possesses interest and importance as a question of Biblical criticism only, and that of the lower kind, but it in no way affects any truth of Revelation or any matter of Catholic doctrine, because, when properly understood, the sense is the same to Catholic and Protestant alike, to the Catholic at all events, which is now the important point.

I beg my readers to keep clearly in mind that the battleground is the first word of the second clause of the text, Genesis iii. 15, to wit: HE, SHE or IT shall bruise or crush thy head.

Now my case against the Bishop and his Vicar requires, to be submergingly complete, that I prove, that according to Catholic teaching and authority there is absolutely no difference in meaning between the three readings. I have already often stated the fact. Now to the proof.

My first witness will be Cornelius à Lapede already quoted. I translate: "*Note in the first place, that none of these three readings is to be rejected; on the contrary they are all true.*"

Tirinus—Commentary on the Old and New Testament—speaks of the three readings and then says: "*Sed in idem redit*—but it amounts to the same thing."

Suarez (1617), of whom the admirable and celebrated Protestant philosopher Grotius wrote: "So profound a philosopher and

theologian that it would be hardly possible to find his equal"—Suarez says, in speaking of the *three readings*: "*Sensus tamer idem est*—Notwithstanding (the three readings) the sense comes to the same thing." The lovers of Mary in particular owe the deepest gratitude to the truly illustrious and revered name of Suarez; for the whole body of Marian doctrine has never been drawn out with a fulness and accuracy commensurable with that exhibited in his second volume on the Incarnation. Could I be fairly charged with a design or a desire "to seethe the kids in their mother's milk," if I were to recommend to the Bishop and his Vicar a brain-bath in this volume, with frequent *douches* thereafter for those parts of their cranial anatomy that remained morbidly sensitive on the quantum of honor due the Blessed Mother?

I here beg publicly to thank my dear friend and old teacher, Father Dixon of Newcastle, for the use of Suarez. He sent it me *after* he had seen my letter in the papers, and in confirmation of my position. I am glad to have an opportunity to turn it to account in this connection. He is absolutely the only "learned friend" who has bothered himself about me. Doubtless, those of them who know me think I can be safely trusted with such a theological *chore* as this.

Again: I have in my hand the great work—*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura: On Divine Tradition and Scripture*—by perhaps the greatest theologian to-day in the Church, the Jesuit Cardinal Franzelin. Touching *IPSA* and *IPSE* he says: *The truth taught by both is the same, p. 536.*

Again: Ward's *Errata* says: "Whether we read 'SHE' shall bruise, or, 'Her SEED'—that is her Son, Christ Jesus, we attribute no more, or no less to Christ, or to his Mother, by this reading or by that."

Let me add to those authorities our own Archbishop O'Brien in his marvellously beautiful little book "*Mater Admirabilis.*" I can quote *twenty* more to same effect, but enough.

The tide has long since risen above their heads, submerged and engulfed my opponents, but I feel bound to show how outrageously wicked and malicious the Vicar can be in his disregard of all logic, and the violation of all the laws of manly

and straightforward polemic. Hitherto my criticism has been, from the exigencies of my case, mainly constructive, but hereafter I shall turn my attention to destructive work, and though the material in my path is abundant I will not loiter.

LETTER IV.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM—A RÉSUMÉ.

To the Editor of the Globe :

SIR,—The argument on the main question is finished, and I might here rest my case, satisfied, indeed, that I have fairly accomplished the task imposed upon me by Bishop Kingdon's wild statements, illustrated by his little diagram, and his Vicar's cachinations in support thereof. I have met my opponents—

“dareful, beard to beard,
And beat them backward home.”

The Vicar has, however, so encrusted the matter with irrelevant rubbish that might mislead the general Protestant public, and dim the clear impression I have sought to give, that I crave the patience of my readers while I disengage it from this encrustment.

Complaints have been made against me that I have been unduly severe in my language to “educated English gentlemen holding the Orders of the Church of England.” Now I said nothing about that apocryphal entity known as the “Orders of the Church of England,” but as to the “educated English gentlemen”—well, I had always been taught that education and station had their obligations—their *duties* as well as their *rights*. *Noblesse oblige*, my opponents and their apologists should remember. My walks in life have been sufficiently varied to give me some idea of ecclesiastical brawling and blackguardism in regard to the Catholic church, her teaching and her institutions. I have on my table a work of 606

pages, entitled "The Variations of Popery," by the Rev. Dr. Edgar, an Anglican clergyman in my own dear Ireland. I dip into this now and then when my brain is sluggish and in need of a tonic, when I wish to indulge in that *elan de l'esprit* which, from a merely natural and intellectual standpoint, floods my mind and heart at the very thought that I am a "Papist"—and by the pure mercy of God. But who commenced the "offensive" in this discussion? Did I not treat Bishop Kingdon with the utmost courtesy and respect? Turn to my first letter of Nov. 24th. The complaints against me well illustrate the truth of what I said early in this letter—"that there is one obligation of honesty and decorum imposed on a Catholic and quite another on a Protestant." Is it nothing, then, I ask fair-minded Protestants, that the church which I love more than my life is accused of "enormities," "impicties," "idolatries" and blasphemies, and that I am *personally* charged with "*accepting*" and practising the same? And by whom? By one of a so-called religious "school" (I cannot call it a Church) that in the face of history, in defiance of contemporary declarations on the part of the Anglican Bishops, and contemporary decisions of the Ecclesiastical Law Courts, proclaims the identity of the English Church of to-day with the Apostolic Church and the pre-Reformation Church in England, and maintains doctrines which are reprobated by the Bishops and three-fourths of the Anglican communion, and uses ceremonies which are condemned by its formularies, and prayers which are declared blasphemous and rites which are declared idolatrous! At present I refrain from illustrating these statements for my Protestant fellow-citizens by an account of what took place in London at the funeral of a leading Ritualist recently deceased. Yet in the face of all this I do not forget the Christo-centric teaching of patience and self-denial under insults, nor yet His own example in dealing with the desecrators of the Temple. He was the Prince of Peace, but I ween He sanctioned no methods for forwarding *peace* which did not uphold the supreme authority of the *truth*. I have sat at the feet of some of their ablest lecturers and teachers of Divinity, and am as familiar with the symbolic and doctrinal writings of the Prot-

estant denominations as most laymen, and I can appeal with absolute confidence to hundreds of my Protestant friends and associates when I say, that I never in my life maligned, slandered or misrepresented a Protestant creed, or *commenced* a religious discussion. I do not like religious polemic, and I have invariably acted only on the defensive, and I can again appeal to honored names among the Protestant clergy, even of this city, whose friendship I have the pleasure to claim. My motto has ever been, "Beware of entrance to a quarrel," especially a religious quarrel; however, I have just human nature enough in me to adopt the rest of this quotation: "but, being in (the quarrel), bear it that the opposed may beware of thee." I am emphatically a man of peace—but not "peace at any price." I am not content that any theological fraud or Boanerges who chooses shall by caricature, insult, calumny and outrage of Catholic belief "make a wilderness and call it peace." That would be subordinating *truth* to *peace*, and consequently traitorous. The distinction between Christ and Iscariot must be kept clear at least in matters of religion.

What I desiderate in Protestant teachers is a knowledge of the Catholic doctrines they attack. We will then have less of the wild figments of hysterical imaginations and pandemonium caricatures of beliefs in defence of which the mightiest intellects that ever adorned our race have found their highest sphere, and of which genius allied with sanctity have ever been the most persuasive and enthusiastic exponents.

In this discussion I ask no quarter from my opponents—I will give none. On them I will have no mercy, controversially speaking; and I have about as much sympathy for them as St. Paul felt for "Alexander the Coppersmith," for whom he desired "a reward according to his works." They have both maligned the Catholic church, and set off their own sect in opposition to their burlesque of her, but, nevertheless, in what I have hereafter to say, I will not "carry the war into Africa" beyond repelling their attack. Beside my opponents I have no quarrel with Anglicans or Anglicanism. There are many non-Catholic friends who will be pained by my course and my utterances in this matter. They cannot feel it more

keenly than I do, but the fault is not mine. The duty of speaking out has been cast upon me by a gross and wanton attack, wholly unprovoked in the quarter from which it came. Common justice, therefore, demands that the responsibility for unpleasantness be put on other shoulders than mine. So far as in me lies, I do not propose "to hold the truth of God in injustice." Religious systems are one thing—individuals quite another, and individual religious life I have ever regarded as the most sacred of things. I have hundreds of Protestant friends whom I respect and love, and to whom, as man to man, I am much indebted, but even in this so-called Protestant community, I want it distinctly understood I do not fear them. I will defend my religious creed when attacked, with their sympathy and approval of fair play if I can get them, but in spite of all, if I cannot. On the battle-field of pure theology, science and philosophy and not Biblical research nor mere ritualistic vagaries, must shape religious polemics in the future, for all at least who feel their responsibilities and grasp the importance of the issues.

So much have I been led to say by the criticism—written and spoken—on my style of conducting this controversy. I must now hasten to the work.

"It is much more easy," justly remarks a writer, "to catch popular approval by the brilliancy of an assault, than to command it by the steady virtues of a defence." "Error," says the Chinese proverb, "will make the circuit of the globe while Truth is pulling on her boots." An unscrupulous writer can make a statement in a half-dozen lines which it would require a volume to answer. The accusation or proposition may be short and stinging; the answer is apt to be long and dull. Everyone has felt the truth of this. Kingsley's charge, for instance, against the Catholic priesthood is contained in six and a half lines, and yet it drew from Cardinal Newman that epoch-making book, the "Apologia," which entombs Kingsley's reputation, and many other like things, for all time. To compare small things with great, it is the same here. The Bishop's Vicar has made a number of statements in his characteristically grandiose way—*hardly one of which is correct*. To make his

demolition as thorough and complete as any demolition can be, I am obliged to track him through all his sinuosities, and to expose his ignorance and recklessness, so that not one shred or tatter of truth will be left to cover his hideous nakedness. It is a wearisome affair, but truth obliges to it, and I have no choice; but I will make the journey as interesting as possible.

Now, in my first letter I said: "Of course I am not now discussing the truth of this doctrine (the Immaculate Conception), but simply correcting an amazing misconception." Here I expressly disclaimed the intention of discussing the doctrine, and I did not discuss it—such a thing was out of place then. The Bishop has stated that *Irsa* was a misprint for *Irse*, altogether ignoring the fact that there were *three readings* in good form here. His Lordship's way of putting the question was bad enough, and disgraceful and humiliating enough as a matter of mere scholarship; but to follow it up with the statement *so minutely worded* that *thirty-three years ago* such misprint led to the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by the Roman Catholic church, was unpardonable in a man with the honors of the Anglican Episcopate fresh upon him, and thus filling a position where, according to St. Paul, it behoveth him to be "a teacher": 1 Tim. iii. 2. In my innocence of what simple ignorance, iron-clad by prejudice could do, I mildly called the Bishop's proposition "an amazing misconception." But notwithstanding St. Paul's injunction again that a Bishop "must have a good testimony from them who are without," Dr. Kingdon seemed to stick to it. It became, therefore, logically necessary to reduce the matter to charge and counter-charge. I denied point blank both of the Bishop's assertions, *as matters of fact*, and, as I think, proved my case even in my very first letter, and *before* there appeared on the scene the "Priest of the Mission Chapel," that "true Catholic (Caw-tholic) Christian," the new KEEPER-IN-ORDINARY, in this city, of the types and blocks and chromo-process from and by which Popery is ever hereafter to be printed off; the traditional fictions, sophisms, calumnies, mockeries, sarcasms and invectives with which Catholics are to be assailed. In the language of Art he has now given us a "proof copy." He no sooner

enters the lists than, having told the Bishop his statement was "too bald and unqualified," he proceeds to create an adversary for his own little "lawn tennis set," and launches into an attack upon the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, the truth of which I had not discussed at all, because, not being involved in the argument I had to make against the Bishop, I was logically bound, and by respect for the intelligence of my readers, to disclaim its discussion. He begs the question by calling *IPSA* a mistranslation, raves about "the undue exaltation of the Holy Virgin" resulting from it, and walks straight into the yawning abyss of the most degrading indifference to all logical decency, truth, and self-respect, by asserting that "Pope Pius IX. when promulgating the Dogma in S. Peter's at Rome, Dec. 8, 1854, *alluded, for its defence, to this very text.*" The italics are mine. What monstrous perversion of the truth! Has this writer become so maniacal, so satanized in his hatred of the Catholic church, and the honor given our Blessed Lady therein, as to renounce all sense of responsibility for his utterances? Cannot others read as well as he? I hold in my hand the original Latin Decree on the Immaculate Conception known as the Bull "INEFFABILIS." It consists of twenty-eight sections. Let my readers remember that I asserted the importance of *this whole text*—Gen. iii. 15—to Protestants and Catholics alike and for the same reasons, altogether apart from any question about the Immaculate Conception, but I narrowed down the discussion to the *first word* of the *second clause*—HE, SHE, or IT, *shall bruise or crush thy head.* This is just where the Bishop put the matter by his statement, and this is just the very ring-bolt to which I shall hold him and his Vicar. The *first clause*—"I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed"—is outside of our discussion and altogether irrelevant to it. Yet it is the *first clause only* that is *quoted* in the Bull or Decree, and then only in a summary of Patristic teaching on the Blessed Mother! It occurs *twice* as follows,—I translate: . . . "but (God) also raised in a wonderful manner the hopes of our race, when He said: 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed.' They

(the Fathers) have taught that in this divine declaration was clearly and plainly showed forth the Merciful Redeemer of the human race—namely, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, &c., &c.” I translate from the Latin only enough to give the context, and I point it *exactly* as in the original. This is from the twelfth section of the Decree. Again, from the seventeenth section I translate: “Then, too, they (the Fathers) published their belief . . . that her (the Blessed Virgin’s) coming was foretold by God himself on the occasion when he said to the serpent: ‘I will put enmities between thee and the woman.’” Now this *first clause* of our text stands in the original in quotation marks *just* as I have given it and set off as that part of the text used, in both sections. And so the *first clause* is used by the great Jesuit Passaglia, called “the Theologian of the Immaculate Conception,” in his work already referred to, as well as by other eminent Catholic writers on this doctrine who have referred to this text at all. And some eminent theologians do not use in their argument for the dogma even the first clause. I have before me Hurter’s “Dogmatic Theology,” in three volumes—a work of the highest authority. The author is to-day a Professor at the University of Innspruck, and a son of the illustrious Frederick Von Hurter, called by Sebastian Brunner “the apostolic historian of the XIXth century,” and who, though a Protestant clergyman, undertook to write and did write, in four volumes, after *twenty-four years’ labor*, the famous history of that great Pope, Innocent the Third. He got his reward even here—Faith! For St. Paul says—“*Fides est donum Dei*: Faith is the gift of God.” The profound studies and investigation attending this stupendous work led him into the fold of the Catholic church. Father Hurter’s volumes are the text-book in most of the Catholic Theological Seminaries throughout the world. In his second volume, page 387, he is discussing in his enchanting way the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and says in a note—I translate: “Mayhap some one will look for an argument drawn from Genesis iii. 15: *I will put enmities, &c.*, which text Catholic theologians freely use. *But since we do not need this argument, &c., &c., &c.*,” and he then passes