

## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
United States & Europe—\$2.00.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Editors { Rev. James T. Foley, B. A.  
Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Associate Editors { Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan,  
H. F. MacIntosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc. 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

A—proved and recommended by Archbishops Falcinello and Sharrett, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent S. Cox, and Miss Helen O'Connor, Resident agents: George B. Howerton, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Bride Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Herlinger, Winnipeg; E. A. Costello, 2254-4th ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 211 Rochester st., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKenney, 149 D'Agulion street, Quebec; Mrs. George B. Smith, 238 St. Urban street, Montreal; M. J. Mervin, Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, 1847 Montague st., Regina, Sask.; and E. J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the condensed form. Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

In St. John N. B., single copies may be purchased from M. A. McQuinn, 249 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co., Pharmacy, 109 Brunel street.

In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Millor, 241 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1917

### A BIT OF ANGLO-IRISH HISTORY

It is extremely interesting at the present moment, and may be not a little instructive as well, to glance over the history of Catholic Emancipation.

In 1782 the legislative independence of Ireland was acknowledged and confirmed by a solemn Act of Parliament which read:

"Be it enacted that the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom in all cases whatsoever . . . shall be, and is hereby declared to be, established and ascertained forever, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questionable."

But that "scrap of paper" was not allowed to stand in the way when the time suited to bring about the Union. Every one knows the disgraceful story. We call attention to only one foul page, strangely like that which records the recent history of Home Rule, and like this blotted with shameless bad faith and broken promises.

It may, perhaps, be well to quote authorities for the statement that, in order to carry the project of legislative union, the Irish Catholics were promised emancipation.

"We have seen," says Lecky in his History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, "that it had been the first wish of Pitt and Dundas in England and of Cornwallis in Ireland to make Catholic emancipation a part of the Union; and when this cause was found to be impracticable, there is good reason to believe that Canning recommended Pitt to drop the Union until a period arrived when it would be possible to carry the two measures concurrently. Wiser advice was probably never given, but it was not followed, and a Protestant Union was carried, with an understanding that when it was accomplished the Ministry would introduce a measure of Catholic emancipation into an Imperial Parliament. It was this persuasion or understanding that secured the neutrality and acquiescence of the greater part of the Irish Catholics, without which, in the opinion of the best judges, the Union could never have been carried."

Lord Cornwallis, who had been made viceroy of Ireland expressly to bring about legislative union, was the intermediary through whom this promise to Catholics was made. "In public life he was distinguished by independence of character and inflexible integrity; a notable distinction, indeed, at that time, or at any time amongst English statesmen where Ireland is concerned. Lord Cornwallis, however, we are further told, 'gained the respect and good-will of both Roman Catholics and Orangemen.' Character and integrity would simplify the statesman's problem today.

It is not surprising then to find in his Correspondence, vol. III., p. 238, that he keenly feels the disgrace of his position if his promises are not redeemed:

"I cannot leave them [the Catholics] as I found them. I have raised no unauthorised expectation, and I have acted throughout with the sanction of the Cabinet."

But in England at that time of rotten boroughs and restricted franchise public life was the exclusive monopoly of the class which still clings tenaciously to its menaced privileges; and "inflexible integrity" was not an outstanding characteristic.

In 1800 Pitt promised Emancipation. In 1805 the Catholics asked him to present a petition to Parliament in support of their claims. He refused to have anything to do with

it, or with them. The petition was presented by Fox only to be rejected with scorn.

The struggle went on until, like the Home Rule fight in recent years, the battle for equal civil rights for Catholics became the most interesting and arresting political event in the wide world.

The opponents' arguments have a strangely familiar ring; but there is an absence of hypocrisy, a refreshing directness and sincerity about them, that are seldom found in the arguments of present day opponents to Home Rule.

In 1813 Sir Robert Peel, that model English statesman of the nineteenth century, said:

"I protest against the principle of this bill, because it confers on those who admit an external jurisdiction the right of legislating in all matters connected with the Church of England."

If Protestants exceeded the Roman Catholics in number I should have much less objection. But it is impossible to consider that the Catholics so greatly preponderate without feeling alarm at the consequences of such unlimited concession.

How can we hope, under such circumstances when it is admitted that there are 4,000,000 of Catholics to 800,000 Protestants, to maintain the Protestant ascendancy. This is a point which, I think, we ought well to consider."

There is a delightful straightforwardness about all this that is painfully lacking in present-day "democratic" opposition to Home Rule.

In 1817 Peel voiced his objections to equal rights in these remarkable terms:

"Do you mean, *bona fide*, to give them [the Catholics] in Ireland the practical advantages of the eligibility you propose to confer on them? Do you mean to give them that fair proportion of political power to which their numbers, wealth, talents and education will entitle them? If you do, can you believe that they will, or can, remain contented with the limits which you assign to them?"

Note the significant query: Do you in *good faith* propose to give them the practical advantages of emancipation?

Appeals to the reason and justice of the English statesmen were in vain. Writing of the year 1824 Sir Spencer Walpole says: "The most hopeful politicians were beginning to despair of effecting the emancipation of the Roman Catholics."

In 1827 Peel told the House of Commons: "I can not consent to widen the door to the Roman Catholics. I cannot consent to give them civil rights and privileges equal to those possessed by their Protestant fellow-countrymen." In June 1828 he declared that his "sentiments upon the question remained unaltered."

In the meantime the heroic figure of O'Connell loomed on the political horizon. With "the strength of all the land like a falchion in his hand" he clove his way through the ranks of bigotry and prejudice and tyranny, and stood at the bar of the British House of Commons. The eyes of an admiring world were turned toward the scene, one of the noblest in the fight for human liberty that the history reveals. Naked and unashamed in their denial of civil rights to Catholics as English public men had been, they had now had it not the grace to feel ashamed, at least to pretend to what they did not feel. They granted Emancipation, but with the worst of grace, bad faith, and in so far as possible they nullified all its "practical advantages." They justified it to the petty tyrants of Parliament by declaring that it was necessary to prevent civil war, which was true. Peel, in a letter to the Protestant Bishop of Limerick, wrote:

"In the course of the last six months, England, being at peace with the whole world, has had five sixths of the infantry force of the United Kingdom occupied in maintaining the peace and in police duties in Ireland."

"There has been established an intimate union between the Roman Catholic Italy and the Roman Catholic priesthood; in consequence of that union the representation of the counties of Waterford, Monaghan, Clare and Louth has been wrested from the hands of the natural aristocracy of those counties; and if the present state of things continue, if parties in Parliament are to remain so nicely balanced that each can prevent the other, that one can prevent restraint and control, we must make up our mind to see *sixty or seventy Radicals* sent from Ireland when a general election shall take place."

"My firm impression is that unless an united Government takes the whole condition of Ireland into consideration, and attempts to settle the Catholic question, we must be prepared for the necessity of settling it at a future period in a manner

neither safe to Protestant establishments, nor consistent with the dignity of the Crown of England."

The italics above call attention to an impelling motive. They granted Catholic Emancipation; but at the same time disfranchised the bulk of the Catholic electors. So that in 1844, as Lord Normanby pointed out in the House of Lords, Ireland with a population of 8,000,000 had only 100,000 electors!

It was not until 1885 that the franchises of England and Ireland were put on the same footing. These generous and unselfish and liberty-loving statesmen did not "in good faith" propose to give Irish Catholics the "practical advantages" of Emancipation.

Mean and disgraceful as is the story of Catholic Emancipation, is it not paralleled, closely paralleled in the recent history of Home Rule? And has it not its lessons for the present day, the present hour?

The class with a predominant influence in the present government are as narrow and as unscrupulous as their political forbears of Emancipation days. If an enlightened and compelling public opinion and sense of decency and justice do not force their hands, if a sense of honest shame do not impel them to make an honest effort to remove the "blemish on British statesmanship," then better Home Rule deferred than an emasculated measure whose principal effect would be to prevent "Radicals sent from Ireland" from completing their work of wresting political power from "the hands of the natural aristocracy."

### WILL THE EFFORT BE SINCERE?

As we write there comes the cheering news that the British Government has been forced to recede from the hopeless and helpless position on the Irish question so recently announced by Lloyd George. Forced to—this is the cheering part of it—by the pressure of indignant public opinion in Great Britain which was voiced in Parliament by the motion of a Liberal member, Sir James Henry Dalziel. The despatch contains this significant paragraph:

"The Nationalists, considering that they had already stated their position, did not participate in the debate which manifested a strong desire for a settlement on the part of all the Unionist and Liberal speakers, with one exception. The exception was Lord Hugh Cecil, who declined to believe that war time was favorable to such an attempt."

There is a public conscience in England; the sense of justice and the sense of shame are not dead. Standing before the world for certain principles Great Britain does not feel clean while out-Kaisering the Kaiser in Ireland.

Sir Henry Dalziel had the courage to say in the British House of Commons what the world is thinking even if it is not always speaking out during the War:

"Great Britain had entered the War," said this decent Englishman, "for a scrap of paper, he added, but he was unable to forget the existence of an Irish scrap of paper, which was indorsed by the will of the British people."

Bonar Law's recent bluff, when he blusteringly threatened a general election because of Irish Nationalist obstruction, was thus quietly called by Sir Henry:

"It would be impossible for the Government to persevere with its motion to extend the life of the present Parliament, Sir James continued, if there was a solid body of opinion in the House of Commons against them, and every day's delay was recruiting a supporter to the physical force party in Ireland."

Bonar Law then declared he would "detest the idea of an election on the Irish question." That is, to preserve the figure of speech, "I had only a four flush and the draw gave me only a pair of two-spots."

Listen to this from Bonar Law:

"The present situation, however, was a blemish on British statesmanship, besides being a handicap in carrying on the War."

And this:

"He hoped that Ulster would prove less adamant."

Poor Lloyd George!

That Lord Hugh Cecil should oppose is an encouraging sign. If this Bourbon of the Bourbons, if this junker of the junkers, had taken any other stand the whole proceeding would be suspect from the outset.

Lord Hugh it was who accused the government with sacrilege, with robbery of God, in the Welsh Church Disestablishment debate. Lord Hugh did not know that the title to the broad acres of the house of Cecil rested in great part on sacrilegious robbery, or perhaps it never occurred

to him that the robbery of Papists would be cast up to him as a reproach. But it called forth that famous speech of Lloyd George in which he scathingly denounced the hypocrisy of a Cecil "with hands dripping with the fat of sacrilege" daring to accuse the government of sacrilege.

Did that incident of those stirring times flash across Lloyd George's memory as he listened to Lord Hugh Cecil on Home Rule? Or did he think the silence of his loyal Nationalist allies more eloquent than the ranting of the spokesman of the junkers? Did he even envy his contemptuous old opponent's loyalty to his friends and his class as he reflected that but for the silent Irish members over there the making of history during the past decade would have been in the hands of the house of Cecil and not in those of the cobblers foster son?

No one will envy, but many will pity the shorn Samson whatever his thoughts may have been.

We shall see what we shall see. If the Tories are sincere the Irish question will be settled; Ulster "adamant" will become plastic. If they think the Irish question may still be a winning card in the political gamble after the War there will be nothing come of the present move other than the attempt to put the Irish representatives in the wrong and exasperate the Irish people into courses that will alienate British sympathy.

It is a dangerous game to play but then Sir Herbert Holt had a glimpse of English War politics and said just what he thought of them and he has not retracted anything.

However, T. P.'s letter this week is distinctly encouraging; T. P. is a veteran at Westminster, and presumably knows whereof he speaks.

### CHANGE THE NAME, ETC.

"About three weeks ago a Citizen editorial, heralding the advance of Liberalism in Russia, provoked a local contemporary to apologize for the Russian oligarchy and to sneer at The Citizen in terms like the following:

"But 'the reign of the common people' is coming. Isn't this rather cheap stuff, when used in connection with animadversion upon a REGIME WHICH, WHAT EVER ITS FAULTS, IS AT PRESENT ENGAGED WITH ALL ITS POWER IN FIGHTING INDISTINGUISHABLY FOR THE CAUSE OF THE COMMON PEOPLE of the world, and in this particular case had done a worthy thing?"

"Yesterday, when it wakened up to the fact that the Russian people had put its Conservative government in jail, our local critic changed its tune as follows:

"This revolution, starting in Petrograd and Moscow with smouldering suspicion, bursting into flame that sweeps the whole country and in one week results in the abdication of the great Czar of all the Russias and the complete overthrow of a GOVERNMENT THAT WAS THE VERY PERSONIFICATION OF BUREAUCRACY AND ALL-POWERFUL INTRIGUE."

Mutatis mutandis we have here the stock defence of English junkerdom and Irish bureaucracy.

The gospel of liberty, however, has been preached from the housetops during the War; when peace is restored it will be difficult to put upon it a Calvinistic interpretation.

### WILL IT REACH IRELAND?

No purely military triumph, as we have already said and emphatically repeat, over the Central Allies, however complete and crushing, could possibly mean as much for human liberty as the overthrow of autocracy and bureaucracy in Russia. The Russian revolution, provided it issues in permanent and stable free government, will not only give liberty to two hundred millions of the Slav races, but in everwidening circles be a mighty influence in sweeping aside the last vestiges of absolutism, junkerdom, bureaucracy and minority rule in every part of the world.

One immediate effect will be to enable the freedom-loving people of the free Republic to the south to find themselves. Apart from all other considerations the unlimited financial resources of the United States thrown into the scale against Germany will remove the last lingering doubt as to the ultimate outcome of the great struggle. And Russia free makes wholehearted action on the part of the States certain.

At this juncture the following quotation from a speech the late Joseph Chamberlain delivered in 1885 will be interesting and to the point:

"I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule the sister country. It is a

system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently in a hostile country. It is a system as completely centralized and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as that which prevailed in Venice under Austrian rule. An Irishman at this moment cannot move a step—he cannot lift a finger in any parochial, municipal, or educational work without being confronted with, interfered with, controlled by, an English official, appointed by a foreign Government."

Our readers may point the moral for themselves.

### A REJOINDER

On another page will be found a letter from a gentleman who signs himself "Catholic Unity," and who takes us to task for views we expressed in an article entitled "Perpetuating National Sentiment." We gladly welcome this criticism because discussion will make the truth stand out in bolder relief, and because it affords us an opportunity to still further emphasize our contention.

When the writer states that perpetuating national sentiment is precisely the curse of Canada, what he has evidently in mind is nationalism, which is an excess or perversion of national sentiment. The very best medicine will do harm if taken in too large doses, and the very best things can be turned to an ignoble use. Religion is a good thing; and yet it is often made a cloak for malice. Patriotism is a good thing; and yet there is eminent authority for stating that it is the last refuge of a scoundrel. Would we, for this reason, be justified in having recourse to the very drastic measure of eliminating both religion and patriotism from our national life?

Here is the ideal of nationality set forth by our friend: "The blending of her races into one grand nation developing the best qualities of all the peoples within her borders, while eliminating the weaknesses of each, and forming a Canadian Nationality superior to that of any one of those who come to make for themselves new homes in this country." Now that is a lovely dream but only a dream. So far this new type of Canadian citizen has not been produced even in embryo. We have met French Canadians and Scotch Canadians, and we met a Canadian who remarked to us "Isn't it wonderful the number of farmers that are coming to these parts?" All of which induces us to conclude with the Irishman, when he first set eyes on the giraffe, "There is no such animal."

In the Globe which has just come to hand we notice an article headed "Canadianizing Foreigners." A Presbyterian minister named Murray has been telling the people of Orangeville how foreigners in Winnipeg are being Canadianized by being taught English and hygiene and by being given a copy of the Protestant Bible. That combination—Murray, Orangeville, hygiene and the Bible—does not smack of orthodoxy. "Catholic Unity" must beware of his associates.

Suppose that on the fancy table at a bazaar there is a very beautiful sofa cushion cover made of many pieces of cloth of different colors artistically arranged. One of the ladies in charge asks a clergyman to purchase it. He inquires if the colors are fast or if they would run. "Oh Father," she replies, "I do not think that they would stand washing." "All the better," says he, "and now what I would advise you to do is to take it home and put it in boiling water, and then it will be all one color that will represent the quintessence of the beauty of all these and be more exquisite than any in the spectrum." Regard for the clergy might deter the lady from expressing her opinion of this new idea; but we feel assured that when the priest is at safe distance she will confide to her neighbor that she thinks his Reverence is getting queer.

Let us now advance a step higher to the animal kingdom. There was a poultry show in our town recently. The various types of birds of different form and color presented a very pretty picture. There were Italian Leghorns, Spanish Minorcas, Dutch Campines and English Plymouth Rocks, all loyal Canadian hens each doing her bit to keep down the H.C.L. We can imagine the look that a poultry fancier would give a lover of uniformity who would suggest to him that, instead of having all these varieties, it would be better to evolve from them a genuine Canadian fowl that would possess all the good qualities of these foreign breeds.

The plan is opposed to nature. It does not work in the vegetable kingdom nor in the animal kingdom. Now will it work in the human kingdom? Are we going to evolve a greater Canadian poet than Shakespeare or Dante, a greater orator than Bourdaloue or Father Tom Burke, a greater patriot than O'Connell or Sobieski, a greater artist than Raphael or Murillo, a greater churchman than McHale of Tuam or Cardinal Mercier? We think not. At all events he will not be a composite production. The history of nations assures us of that. The reference to the Phenicians and the Milesians scarcely points a moral as their history is lost in the twilight of fable. But when the writer mentioned the Jutes, Angles and Saxons he could not have hit upon an example that lends itself better to the proof of our thesis. The Angles, from whom England gets its name, came from Schleswig-Holstein, the Saxons from Hanover, and the Jutes from Jutland. They were all Teutonic tribes, and it was not more difficult for them to fuse than for a number of families from Cork and a group from Connaught to form an Irish settlement. The significant fact is that the Celtic race never fused with the Anglo-Saxons, although more closely associated with them for centuries than are the different races in this country. Far from the blending of the Saxons and the Angles, giving us the England of today, if it had not been that the Celtic race maintained its individuality and its traditions there would be no England today; for it was a man of the Celtic race, supported by soldiers, that had perpetuated their national sentiments that saved "the nation of shop-keepers" on the field of Waterloo; and today it is the men from the Celtic fringe that are the brains of the nation, directing its parliament, its fleet, and its army. Would the Belgians of whom Caesar wrote nineteen hundred years ago "Horum omnium fortissimi sunt Belgae" have given to the world such an example of heroism and of patriotism if they had not perpetuated their national sentiments.

We hope that Parliament will not forbid holding a St. Patrick's night or a St. Andrew's night. Life in Canada is dull enough, the Lord knows, without making it any duller. If the Scotchmen do exaggerate a little on such occasions, let us smile complacently, remembering our own hyperboles, and let us not be so malignant as to try to drown their refrain by singing

Scots wha hae on haggis fed,  
Scots wha hae frae Flodden fled,  
Scots wha sold King Charlie's head  
For a base baubee!

No, let each nationality retain the best of its own traditions and assimilate what is to be admired in its neighbors; let it try to understand them and cultivate friendly relations with them. That is the only way to bring about a united Canada, the only way to realize the motto "E pluribus unum."

THE GLEANER.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE PRESBYTERIANS of the United States have been planning a nationwide celebration next October of the fourth centenary of Dr. Martin Luther's defection from the Church of his fathers. Our contemporary, The Presbyterian (Canadian), commenting approvingly upon the project, suggests as the best way of celebrating "Luther's service in giving the open Bible to the people," the endowing of chairs of the English Bible in Presbyterian colleges. We had thought that the "open Bible" already formed the sum and substance of study in such institutions. That such was the case has been the proud boast of the brethren for several centuries. But, apparently, it has fallen somewhat from its high estate in that particular in late years, else why the necessity of endowing anew "Bible departments" in the colleges? Perhaps German higher criticism, which until the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, was in high favor in said colleges, has had something to do with the change!

It is somewhat surprising, however, to find that in a journal which prides itself on its scholarship, the exploded fable about Luther and the "open Bible" still finds credence. The silly story never had any foundation to rest upon, and to English-speaking Protestants of any degree of receptivity it was robbed of respectability even by the Caxton Exhibition of 1877. In that Exhibition there were displayed Bibles in the German vernacular by the score, translated and printed, and proved to have had wide circulation, years before Luther was born. And not in

Germany only, but in France and Italy—even in Rome, under the very shadow of the Holy See itself, vernacular Bibles were printed and sold before Luther was ever heard of. Perhaps the foundation of Bible professorships in Presbyterian colleges, as suggested by our contemporary, may have the good effect of dissipating the fog, and helping our friends to a more enlightened state of mind in this regard.

THE PET historian of the Reformation among Presbyterians, Methodists, and the like, is J. H. Merle D'Aubigny. He is continually cited in their schools and his deliverances are usually accepted as final, which fact possibly accounts for the uncritical character of their ideas on Luther and the Reformation period. D'Aubigny is perhaps more than any other writer responsible for the vitality of the Luther Open Bible legend. He dwells upon it with much unction in his "History," and the delectable fable as amplified by him is about as familiar to the average Protestant as the Bible itself. He tells it in this fashion:

"THE YOUNG student (Luther) passed at the university library every moment he could snatch from his academic duties. Books were still rare, and it was a rare privilege in his eyes to be enabled to profit by the treasures collected in that vast collection. One day (he had then been studying two years at Erfurt, and was twenty years of age) he opened one after another several books in the library, in order to become acquainted with their authors. A volume he opens in its turn arrests his attention. He has seen nothing like it to this moment. He reads the title—it is a Bible! A rare book, unknown in those days. His interest is excited to a high degree; he is overcome with wonder at finding more in the volume than those fragments of the Gospels and Epistles, which the Church had selected to be read in the temples every Sunday throughout the year. Till then, he had supposed these constituted the entire word of God; and now behold, how many pages, how many chapters, how many books, of which he had not before had a notion."

ABOUT THE middle of the last century a clergyman of the Church of England, a man of great erudition, a painstaking student, and somewhat of a recluse, chanced to see these words. They came to him on a waste sheet of paper from a printing office, as a wrapper to some proof-sheets of his own. This Dr. S. R. Maitland, Librarian at Lambeth Palace, and author of one of the sanest and most scholarly books in the English language, "The Dark Ages." This was Maitland's first introduction to D'Aubigny's "History" and as he was at the very time engaged in kindred studies, he turned aside to comment on the passage quoted in this manner:

"REALLY, one hardly knows how to meet such statements, but will the reader be so good as to remember that we are not now talking of the Dark Ages, but of a period when the press had been half a century in operation; and will he give a moment's reflection to the following statement, which I believe to be correct, and which cannot, I think, be so far inaccurate as to effect the argument (that the Bible was a familiar book in the centuries before the Reformation, or, in other words, in the Dark Ages). To say nothing of parts of the Bible, or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible printed in Germany before Luther was born."

THE REVELATIONS of the Caxton Exhibition in regard to vernacular Bibles, it may be here remarked, were still in the bosom of the future, but—to continue the quotation. "Some may ask," proceeds Dr. Maitland, "what was the Pope about all this time? Truly, one would think, he must have been off his guard; but to these German performances, he might have found employment nearer home if he had looked for it. Before Luther was born the Bible had been printed in Rome, and the printers had had the assurance to memorialize His Holiness, praying that he would help them off with some copies. It had been printed, too, at Naples, Florence and Piacenza; and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions. No doubt we should be within the truth if we were to say that beside the multitude of manuscript copies, not yet