

FIVE-MINUTE SERMON

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT

SERVING THE DEVIL

"Again the devil took him up into a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and said unto him: 'All these will I give thee, if thou wilt adore me.' Then Jesus saith unto him: 'Begone, Satan, for it is written: The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve.' (St. Matt. iv. 8.)

This offer, my dear brethren, which the devil made to our Divine Lord, he repeats, in its measure, to each one of us. He is obliged to promise good wages to those whom he wishes to be his servants; he could get few, certainly if any, who would serve him on his own account.

Does the devil, then, ask us to adore or worship him? Yes, he does. He does not ask us to build churches in his honor or to say prayers to him, it is true; he knows that he cannot expect that. But he does ask us to be his servants, and to obey his commands; he wants us to take him for our master, though he does not care much whether we acknowledge him to be so. He asks for the substantial part of our worship, our money, our labor, our time and our life; if he gets that, may he not well be content?

But does he offer us all the kingdoms of the world? Oh, no! He is not so foolish as to offer his whole stock in trade for what can be got for a trifle. He named this price to our Saviour because, though he was, still he valued his services highly, and thought them worth any sacrifice to obtain; but for us very little out of his treasury suffices. Desiring us, he only promises us what he has good reason to think will be enough, a little sensual pleasure, a passing fame or notoriety, or even a few dollars, is the price which he generally names for our allegiance. Thirty pieces of silver he found to be all that was needed for one of the Apostles; what wonder that he is not disposed to bid very high for us!

Once the newspapers told us of a young man who shot an innocent passer-by simply to get reputation as a desperado. Fortunately he did not live to shoot another one; he met the fate he deserved on the scaffold. Perhaps he thought that a grand thing, too; but I question much whether, in his secret heart, it seemed to him at that moment worth while to be sent out of the world by an ignominious and painful death, and to go before God with murder on his soul, even for the sake of being considered an humble imitator of the lawless men of whom he had read.

And yet there are others following in his steps, many perhaps here in this city of ours; Christians, so-called at least, bought with the blood of Christ, and even having some knowledge of religion and its precepts, who would sell their immortal souls, and despise the crown of eternal life, to be distinguished as a burglar or a ruffian, or as the hero of a dime novel!

Now, this is absurd, foolish and contemptible enough certainly, to throw away salvation and the kingdom of heaven, not for a kingdom on earth, but for such inglorious things as these. We think, no doubt, that they would be no temptation to us; and, indeed, it is to be hoped that there are few, on the whole, to whom they would be. But, after all, what is the great difference, when we come to look at it fairly, between such things and those which do lead us to sin? Is the fame of a clever infidel much better worth the loss of the kingdom of heaven, than the loss of the kingdom of heaven, and takes us away from His service? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?

Or are riches worth possessing, if acquired by dishonesty, or if they take our hearts from the desire of true riches? Or is pleasure worth enjoying, if it takes away the happiness of the soul and the peace of God? Is the miserable pittance which the devil offers us, laughing at us for our folly as he does so, or is even all that he has to offer, worth the heavy price we must pay for it? Is anything worth loving and serving which puts out the love of God from our hearts? Or is any fame worth having, if we must sin to obtain it?



"I Can Get an Extra \$25 for that Mare of Yours"

You simply can't afford not to have an Independent Telephone on the farm. With the telephone, you know what prices are before you sell.

War scares—the death of a crowned head—financial rumors—all affect the market, and send prices up or down. You have got to be sure because, if it is too late after you ship.

The farmer who has his Independent Telephone has the world's market at his call. Buyers and commission merchants call him up. Friends put him in touch with possible customers. He hears of the money-making chances, because his telephone is instant and handy.

But the money value is only ONE value of your **STROMBERG-CARLSON** Independent Telephone.

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED OR MONEY REFUNDED

How long would it take you to drive after the doctor, if one of the children should be sick? How long would you get help if the house or barn caught fire?—or if you were snowed out of your market?

This is the real value of the Independent Telephone—its instant readiness in time of trouble—its hourly convenience—its saving of time.

Here you need "The Telephone" *"The Farmer"* Edition No. 2. It tells how you and the neighbors may use an independent telephone system. Think it over—enjoy the luxury of a telephone on the farm. Write for the book to-day.

STROMBERG-CARLSON TELEPHONE CO. 72 Victoria Street, TORONTO

seen among those who attend balls and dances during Lent. Innocent recreations and amusements of a private character, say at home or at the home of a friend—these are a virtual necessity. But public affairs we deem quite contrary to the spirit of the holy season.

Lent is a time of prayer; a time to increase and fortify our faith. In this respect the Lent is a strict and prime necessity to every Catholic; most needful in these days of spiritual slough and unrest. Hate and prejudice may be dying out in the world, but more subtle and potent enemies to our faith have taken their places.

Reason, unregenerated, blinded by conceit and self-admiration, a god unto itself, is at work, most bitter and unrelenting. The penny press is doing its deadly work, reaching even the poor and illiterate.

Catholics must be on the lookout; alert and resourceful; staunch and unwavering. Lent, with its devotional exercises, its special sermons, its great feasts culminating in Holy Week and the glories of Easter, is the period every soul needs; to retire within itself, to think, to meditate, to pray; to imitate Christ; to tone up the spiritual life of the soul; to make it vigorous, active and strong.

Catholics are urged by their priests to keep Lent strictly in this regard at least, however leniently the laws of fast and abstinence may apply to many of them.

They will be urged to come to the devotional exercises and sermons, and to live strictly up to the spirit of self-denial in their recreations and pleasures.

Lent is still Lent to the sincere Catholic.

The giddy, thoughtless throng will continue during these weeks to pursue the phantom pleasures; they will, as usual, eat, drink and be merry.

The sincere Catholic will retire from the crowd, will set up Christ in his heart, will curb his appetites and learn to deny himself.—Intermunicipal Catholic.

Lying before me, writes Canon Barry, D. D., is a page in fac-simile of the first book ever printed from movable types. The book bears no date; but it was created, as we may truly say, by Gutenberg at Mayence in Germany, and sent out before the year 1450. What, then, was the first printed book? It is known as the "forty-two line," or the Mazarin Bible; and it is nothing else than the Latin Vulgate, the official text of Holy Scripture approved by the Roman Church, and used by Catholics for at least nine hundred years previous to its appearance as the beginning of printed literature. All educated persons in the fifteenth century read Latin as a matter of course. A printed Latin Bible was, therefore, the most public and ready to hand of all forms in which the Sacred Scriptures could be given. So soon as movable types were invented, the Church hastened to put within reach of her children the treasures of Holy Writ in this new shape. The first volume printed with a date is the Latin Book of Psalms, at Mayence, 1457. The first whole Bible dated comes from the same city, 1462. Venetian presses began their work on Scripture in 1475, and sent out twenty-two complete editions of the Vulgate in not many years. Half a dozen large, or folio, editions were published before a single Latin classic had been committed to the printer's hands.

By the year 1500 no fewer than ninety-eight distinct and full editions of the Church's Bible in its Latin text had come forth, "besides twelve others which contained the Gloss Ordinaria, or the Postils of Lyranus."

But what of translations which those might read to whom Latin was either an unknown or a difficult tongue? I will deal with them in a moment. First however take note that Church authorities welcomed or even themselves brought out editions of Holy Writ in the original Hebrew and Greek, with which learned men might compare the Latin. Thus from 1477 onwards the whole Hebrew text was printed by Italian Jews; and in 1517 the Rabbinic Bible, issued in four volumes at Venice, was dedicated by its editor, Felix Pratensis, to Pope Leo X. The famous Greek text, called the Septuagint, was printed in its remarkable Polyglot by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514; but the first published Greek New Testament is due to Erasmus a priest, and appeared in 1517. Catholic ecclesiastics were evidently not afraid of scholarship as regards the inspired volumes, on which they spent their zeal, their resources and their labor.

Now let us look at what was done for the people at large. The name which casts a shadow upon this enquiry, as we all know is that of Luther. Luther was born in 1483, and died in 1546. Then, the Fatherland, to which, as the story once went, this man first gave a knowledge of the divine volume. Well, we possess the original German Bible printed in 1496, seventeen years before the miner's son of Eisenach saw the light. Twenty editions of the whole Scriptures followed, from 1530—the year in which Luther was condemned by Leo X.—these in Upper Germany; and four besides in Lower Germany. No fewer than ninety Plenaia containing the Sunday Epistles and Gospels, with fourteen editions of the Psalms in the vernacular, must be added.

A Luther's New Testament appeared in 1522, his entire Bible not until 1534. From a collation of his work with earlier German renderings it is certain that he made use of them, and so was not the pioneer whom Protestants take him to be. By 1534, in fact, as many as thirty editions of the whole Scriptures, or of portions of them, were issued by Catholics in Luther's native tongue. Since then, the German Bible of Dietenberg, and more recently that of Alibi, have kept the faithful acquainted with Holy Writ under orthodox approbation. These facts and dates speak for themselves. Luther was by no means first in the field of translation. And the very forms of these early versions, largely in miniature and pocket editions, indicate how wide-spread was their use.

Outside Germany the same work of translation, which had begun before printing was invented, went on apace. At Delft the Old Testament in Dutch came out in 1477; the French New Testament is dated Lyons, also of that year. The Spanish Scriptures, translated about 1405 by Bonifacio, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer the Dominican, were printed in 1478, and a reprint with license of the Inquisition in 1515. The standard French by Leveque, who was not entirely sound in the Faith, underwent revision at Louvain by Catholic divines and passed through fifty editions down to the year 1700. In 1471 two versions of the Bible in Italian were printed at Venice; eleven full editions with imprimatur of the Holy Office, are counted previous to 1567. Of the Bohemian and other outlying versions I will only make mention.

But I may add that a printer of Nuremberg had set up a warehouse in London for the sale of the Latin Vulgate in 1480; and that a complete edition, contained nearly the whole of the Pentateuch and a large portion of the gospels. Yet no English Bible was printed until the New Testament of William Tyndale made its appearance in 1525. Why was this? And how came there to be such an exception to the rule which elsewhere provoked Churchmen to scatter the Bible broadcast?

We may give the answer in one word and that word "Wycliffe." A hundred years before Luther was born the English nation had been fever-stricken by a great movement towards anarchy and communism, of which the great graduate, Wycliffe, had expounded the principles, drawing them, as he said, from Holy Scripture itself. London had fallen into the hands of a mob of fanatics, the Archbishop of Canterbury was murdered; and public order seemed to be on the brink of dissolution. The Bible in English translated by these "Lollards"

was thus made an apology for sedition, theft, and slaughter; it was wickedly wrested from its true meaning to become the Great Charter of crime.

We cannot marvel, then, if a few years later, in a convocation held at Oxford (1408), Archbishop Arundel enacted that "no man shall hereafter by his own authority translate any text of the Scripture into English," and that, none should read the versions "lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe or since," until the said translation "was approved by the Ordinary or a Provincial Council."

On this subject the latest comment will be found in the new Encyclopedia Britannica. The writer, Canon Hensley Henson, stands at the opposite pole to Catholicism; but he is thoroughly well-informed; and he says: "It would appear, however, as if at first at all events the persecution was directed not so much against the Biblical text itself as against the Lollard interpretations which accompanied it." And again, "It must be allowed that an enactment of the kind," meaning Archbishop Arundel's decree, "was not without justification. The Lollards, for instance, did not hesitate, to introduce into certain copies of the pious and orthodox Commentary on the Psalms by the hermit of Hampole (Richard Rolle) interpolations of their own, the most virulently controversial kind, and although the text of their Biblical versions was faithful and true, the General Prologue of the latter Version was interlarded with controversial matter." Nevertheless, Canon Hensley Henson goes on to remark, "For all this, manuscripts of Wycliffe's Revision were copied and recopied during this (the fifteenth) century, the text itself being evidently approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, when in the hands of the right people, and if unaccompanied by controversial matter."

It is certain that manuscript copies of an English Bible were in possession of such orthodox Catholics as Thomas of Woodstock, Henry VI., Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and the Brigittine nuns of Syon House. English Bibles were bequeathed by will, and given to churches or convents. From these

manuscripts, as we may truly say, by Gutenberg at Mayence in Germany, and sent out before the year 1450. What, then, was the first printed book? It is known as the "forty-two line," or the Mazarin Bible; and it is nothing else than the Latin Vulgate, the official text of Holy Scripture approved by the Roman Church, and used by Catholics for at least nine hundred years previous to its appearance as the beginning of printed literature. All educated persons in the fifteenth century read Latin as a matter of course. A printed Latin Bible was, therefore, the most public and ready to hand of all forms in which the Sacred Scriptures could be given. So soon as movable types were invented, the Church hastened to put within reach of her children the treasures of Holy Writ in this new shape. The first volume printed with a date is the Latin Book of Psalms, at Mayence, 1457. The first whole Bible dated comes from the same city, 1462. Venetian presses began their work on Scripture in 1475, and sent out twenty-two complete editions of the Vulgate in not many years. Half a dozen large, or folio, editions were published before a single Latin classic had been committed to the printer's hands.

By the year 1500 no fewer than ninety-eight distinct and full editions of the Church's Bible in its Latin text had come forth, "besides twelve others which contained the Gloss Ordinaria, or the Postils of Lyranus."

But what of translations which those might read to whom Latin was either an unknown or a difficult tongue? I will deal with them in a moment. First however take note that Church authorities welcomed or even themselves brought out editions of Holy Writ in the original Hebrew and Greek, with which learned men might compare the Latin. Thus from 1477 onwards the whole Hebrew text was printed by Italian Jews; and in 1517 the Rabbinic Bible, issued in four volumes at Venice, was dedicated by its editor, Felix Pratensis, to Pope Leo X. The famous Greek text, called the Septuagint, was printed in its remarkable Polyglot by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514; but the first published Greek New Testament is due to Erasmus a priest, and appeared in 1517. Catholic ecclesiastics were evidently not afraid of scholarship as regards the inspired volumes, on which they spent their zeal, their resources and their labor.

Now let us look at what was done for the people at large. The name which casts a shadow upon this enquiry, as we all know is that of Luther. Luther was born in 1483, and died in 1546. Then, the Fatherland, to which, as the story once went, this man first gave a knowledge of the divine volume. Well, we possess the original German Bible printed in 1496, seventeen years before the miner's son of Eisenach saw the light. Twenty editions of the whole Scriptures followed, from 1530—the year in which Luther was condemned by Leo X.—these in Upper Germany; and four besides in Lower Germany. No fewer than ninety Plenaia containing the Sunday Epistles and Gospels, with fourteen editions of the Psalms in the vernacular, must be added.

A Luther's New Testament appeared in 1522, his entire Bible not until 1534. From a collation of his work with earlier German renderings it is certain that he made use of them, and so was not the pioneer whom Protestants take him to be. By 1534, in fact, as many as thirty editions of the whole Scriptures, or of portions of them, were issued by Catholics in Luther's native tongue. Since then, the German Bible of Dietenberg, and more recently that of Alibi, have kept the faithful acquainted with Holy Writ under orthodox approbation. These facts and dates speak for themselves. Luther was by no means first in the field of translation. And the very forms of these early versions, largely in miniature and pocket editions, indicate how wide-spread was their use.

Outside Germany the same work of translation, which had begun before printing was invented, went on apace. At Delft the Old Testament in Dutch came out in 1477; the French New Testament is dated Lyons, also of that year. The Spanish Scriptures, translated about 1405 by Bonifacio, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer the Dominican, were printed in 1478, and a reprint with license of the Inquisition in 1515. The standard French by Leveque, who was not entirely sound in the Faith, underwent revision at Louvain by Catholic divines and passed through fifty editions down to the year 1700. In 1471 two versions of the Bible in Italian were printed at Venice; eleven full editions with imprimatur of the Holy Office, are counted previous to 1567. Of the Bohemian and other outlying versions I will only make mention.

But I may add that a printer of Nuremberg had set up a warehouse in London for the sale of the Latin Vulgate in 1480; and that a complete edition, contained nearly the whole of the Pentateuch and a large portion of the gospels. Yet no English Bible was printed until the New Testament of William Tyndale made its appearance in 1525. Why was this? And how came there to be such an exception to the rule which elsewhere provoked Churchmen to scatter the Bible broadcast?

We may give the answer in one word and that word "Wycliffe." A hundred years before Luther was born the English nation had been fever-stricken by a great movement towards anarchy and communism, of which the great graduate, Wycliffe, had expounded the principles, drawing them, as he said, from Holy Scripture itself. London had fallen into the hands of a mob of fanatics, the Archbishop of Canterbury was murdered; and public order seemed to be on the brink of dissolution. The Bible in English translated by these "Lollards"

was thus made an apology for sedition, theft, and slaughter; it was wickedly wrested from its true meaning to become the Great Charter of crime.

We cannot marvel, then, if a few years later, in a convocation held at Oxford (1408), Archbishop Arundel enacted that "no man shall hereafter by his own authority translate any text of the Scripture into English," and that, none should read the versions "lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe or since," until the said translation "was approved by the Ordinary or a Provincial Council."

On this subject the latest comment will be found in the new Encyclopedia Britannica. The writer, Canon Hensley Henson, stands at the opposite pole to Catholicism; but he is thoroughly well-informed; and he says: "It would appear, however, as if at first at all events the persecution was directed not so much against the Biblical text itself as against the Lollard interpretations which accompanied it." And again, "It must be allowed that an enactment of the kind," meaning Archbishop Arundel's decree, "was not without justification. The Lollards, for instance, did not hesitate, to introduce into certain copies of the pious and orthodox Commentary on the Psalms by the hermit of Hampole (Richard Rolle) interpolations of their own, the most virulently controversial kind, and although the text of their Biblical versions was faithful and true, the General Prologue of the latter Version was interlarded with controversial matter." Nevertheless, Canon Hensley Henson goes on to remark, "For all this, manuscripts of Wycliffe's Revision were copied and recopied during this (the fifteenth) century, the text itself being evidently approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, when in the hands of the right people, and if unaccompanied by controversial matter."

It is certain that manuscript copies of an English Bible were in possession of such orthodox Catholics as Thomas of Woodstock, Henry VI., Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and the Brigittine nuns of Syon House. English Bibles were bequeathed by will, and given to churches or convents. From these

manuscripts, as we may truly say, by Gutenberg at Mayence in Germany, and sent out before the year 1450. What, then, was the first printed book? It is known as the "forty-two line," or the Mazarin Bible; and it is nothing else than the Latin Vulgate, the official text of Holy Scripture approved by the Roman Church, and used by Catholics for at least nine hundred years previous to its appearance as the beginning of printed literature. All educated persons in the fifteenth century read Latin as a matter of course. A printed Latin Bible was, therefore, the most public and ready to hand of all forms in which the Sacred Scriptures could be given. So soon as movable types were invented, the Church hastened to put within reach of her children the treasures of Holy Writ in this new shape. The first volume printed with a date is the Latin Book of Psalms, at Mayence, 1457. The first whole Bible dated comes from the same city, 1462. Venetian presses began their work on Scripture in 1475, and sent out twenty-two complete editions of the Vulgate in not many years. Half a dozen large, or folio, editions were published before a single Latin classic had been committed to the printer's hands.

By the year 1500 no fewer than ninety-eight distinct and full editions of the Church's Bible in its Latin text had come forth, "besides twelve others which contained the Gloss Ordinaria, or the Postils of Lyranus."

But what of translations which those might read to whom Latin was either an unknown or a difficult tongue? I will deal with them in a moment. First however take note that Church authorities welcomed or even themselves brought out editions of Holy Writ in the original Hebrew and Greek, with which learned men might compare the Latin. Thus from 1477 onwards the whole Hebrew text was printed by Italian Jews; and in 1517 the Rabbinic Bible, issued in four volumes at Venice, was dedicated by its editor, Felix Pratensis, to Pope Leo X. The famous Greek text, called the Septuagint, was printed in its remarkable Polyglot by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514; but the first published Greek New Testament is due to Erasmus a priest, and appeared in 1517. Catholic ecclesiastics were evidently not afraid of scholarship as regards the inspired volumes, on which they spent their zeal, their resources and their labor.

Now let us look at what was done for the people at large. The name which casts a shadow upon this enquiry, as we all know is that of Luther. Luther was born in 1483, and died in 1546. Then, the Fatherland, to which, as the story once went, this man first gave a knowledge of the divine volume. Well, we possess the original German Bible printed in 1496, seventeen years before the miner's son of Eisenach saw the light. Twenty editions of the whole Scriptures followed, from 1530—the year in which Luther was condemned by Leo X.—these in Upper Germany; and four besides in Lower Germany. No fewer than ninety Plenaia containing the Sunday Epistles and Gospels, with fourteen editions of the Psalms in the vernacular, must be added.

A Luther's New Testament appeared in 1522, his entire Bible not until 1534. From a collation of his work with earlier German renderings it is certain that he made use of them, and so was not the pioneer whom Protestants take him to be. By 1534, in fact, as many as thirty editions of the whole Scriptures, or of portions of them, were issued by Catholics in Luther's native tongue. Since then, the German Bible of Dietenberg, and more recently that of Alibi, have kept the faithful acquainted with Holy Writ under orthodox approbation. These facts and dates speak for themselves. Luther was by no means first in the field of translation. And the very forms of these early versions, largely in miniature and pocket editions, indicate how wide-spread was their use.

Outside Germany the same work of translation, which had begun before printing was invented, went on apace. At Delft the Old Testament in Dutch came out in 1477; the French New Testament is dated Lyons, also of that year. The Spanish Scriptures, translated about 1405 by Bonifacio, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer the Dominican, were printed in 1478, and a reprint with license of the Inquisition in 1515. The standard French by Leveque, who was not entirely sound in the Faith, underwent revision at Louvain by Catholic divines and passed through fifty editions down to the year 1700. In 1471 two versions of the Bible in Italian were printed at Venice; eleven full editions with imprimatur of the Holy Office, are counted previous to 1567. Of the Bohemian and other outlying versions I will only make mention.

But I may add that a printer of Nuremberg had set up a warehouse in London for the sale of the Latin Vulgate in 1480; and that a complete edition, contained nearly the whole of the Pentateuch and a large portion of the gospels. Yet no English Bible was printed until the New Testament of William Tyndale made its appearance in 1525. Why was this? And how came there to be such an exception to the rule which elsewhere provoked Churchmen to scatter the Bible broadcast?

We may give the answer in one word and that word "Wycliffe." A hundred years before Luther was born the English nation had been fever-stricken by a great movement towards anarchy and communism, of which the great graduate, Wycliffe, had expounded the principles, drawing them, as he said, from Holy Scripture itself. London had fallen into the hands of a mob of fanatics, the Archbishop of Canterbury was murdered; and public order seemed to be on the brink of dissolution. The Bible in English translated by these "Lollards"

was thus made an apology for sedition, theft, and slaughter; it was wickedly wrested from its true meaning to become the Great Charter of crime.

We cannot marvel, then, if a few years later, in a convocation held at Oxford (1408), Archbishop Arundel enacted that "no man shall hereafter by his own authority translate any text of the Scripture into English," and that, none should read the versions "lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe or since," until the said translation "was approved by the Ordinary or a Provincial Council."

On this subject the latest comment will be found in the new Encyclopedia Britannica. The writer, Canon Hensley Henson, stands at the opposite pole to Catholicism; but he is thoroughly well-informed; and he says: "It would appear, however, as if at first at all events the persecution was directed not so much against the Biblical text itself as against the Lollard interpretations which accompanied it." And again, "It must be allowed that an enactment of the kind," meaning Archbishop Arundel's decree, "was not without justification. The Lollards, for instance, did not hesitate, to introduce into certain copies of the pious and orthodox Commentary on the Psalms by the hermit of Hampole (Richard Rolle) interpolations of their own, the most virulently controversial kind, and although the text of their Biblical versions was faithful and true, the General Prologue of the latter Version was interlarded with controversial matter." Nevertheless, Canon Hensley Henson goes on to remark, "For all this, manuscripts of Wycliffe's Revision were copied and recopied during this (the fifteenth) century, the text itself being evidently approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, when in the hands of the right people, and if unaccompanied by controversial matter."

It is certain that manuscript copies of an English Bible were in possession of such orthodox Catholics as Thomas of Woodstock, Henry VI., Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and the Brigittine nuns of Syon House. English Bibles were bequeathed by will, and given to churches or convents. From these

manuscripts, as we may truly say, by Gutenberg at Mayence in Germany, and sent out before the year 1450. What, then, was the first printed book? It is known as the "forty-two line," or the Mazarin Bible; and it is nothing else than the Latin Vulgate, the official text of Holy Scripture approved by the Roman Church, and used by Catholics for at least nine hundred years previous to its appearance as the beginning of printed literature. All educated persons in the fifteenth century read Latin as a matter of course. A printed Latin Bible was, therefore, the most public and ready to hand of all forms in which the Sacred Scriptures could be given. So soon as movable types were invented, the Church hastened to put within reach of her children the treasures of Holy Writ in this new shape. The first volume printed with a date is the Latin Book of Psalms, at Mayence, 1457. The first whole Bible dated comes from the same city, 1462. Venetian presses began their work on Scripture in 1475, and sent out twenty-two complete editions of the Vulgate in not many years. Half a dozen large, or folio, editions were published before a single Latin classic had been committed to the printer's hands.

By the year 1500 no fewer than ninety-eight distinct and full editions of the Church's Bible in its Latin text had come forth, "besides twelve others which contained the Gloss Ordinaria, or the Postils of Lyranus."

But what of translations which those might read to whom Latin was either an unknown or a difficult tongue? I will deal with them in a moment. First however take note that Church authorities welcomed or even themselves brought out editions of Holy Writ in the original Hebrew and Greek, with which learned men might compare the Latin. Thus from 1477 onwards the whole Hebrew text was printed by Italian Jews; and in 1517 the Rabbinic Bible, issued in four volumes at Venice, was dedicated by its editor, Felix Pratensis, to Pope Leo X. The famous Greek text, called the Septuagint, was printed in its remarkable Polyglot by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514; but the first published Greek New Testament is due to Erasmus a priest, and appeared in 1517. Catholic ecclesiastics were evidently not afraid of scholarship as regards the inspired volumes, on which they spent their zeal, their resources and their labor.

Now let us look at what was done for the people at large. The name which casts a shadow upon this enquiry, as we all know is that of Luther. Luther was born in 1483, and died in 1546. Then, the Fatherland, to which, as the story once went, this man first gave a knowledge of the divine volume. Well, we possess the original German Bible printed in 1496, seventeen years before the miner's son of Eisenach saw the light. Twenty editions of the whole Scriptures followed, from 1530—the year in which Luther was condemned by Leo X.—these in Upper Germany; and four besides in Lower Germany. No fewer than ninety Plenaia containing the Sunday Epistles and Gospels, with fourteen editions of the Psalms in the vernacular, must be added.

A Luther's New Testament appeared in 1522, his entire Bible not until 1534. From a collation of his work with earlier German renderings it is certain that he made use of them, and so was not the pioneer whom Protestants take him to be. By 1534, in fact, as many as thirty editions of the whole Scriptures, or of portions of them, were issued by Catholics in Luther's native tongue. Since then, the German Bible of Dietenberg, and more recently that of Alibi, have kept the faithful acquainted with Holy Writ under orthodox approbation. These facts and dates speak for themselves. Luther was by no means first in the field of translation. And the very forms of these early versions, largely in miniature and pocket editions, indicate how wide-spread was their use.

Outside Germany the same work of translation, which had begun before printing was invented, went on apace. At Delft the Old Testament in Dutch came out in 1477; the French New Testament is dated Lyons, also of that year. The Spanish Scriptures, translated about 1405 by Bonifacio, brother of St. Vincent Ferrer the Dominican, were printed in 1478, and a reprint with license of the Inquisition