

OR *versus* AND.

I.

In the physical world a spark has often kindled a conflagration. In the antiquarian world many a half-effaced inscription or passage in an author has raised a fierce controversy over the word or letter to be restored. It was long disputed whether in Genesis III. 15, the reading in a certain Hebrew codex meant, "she shall crush," or, "he shall crush." The appearance of a certain vowel-point over the first word favoured the first reading; but the mark was so faint that many would not recognize it as a vowel of any kind. Well, rubbing did what neither keen eye nor powerful microscope could: it effaced every vestige of the disputed mark. So closed the case of Point *versus* No-Point.

But vastly different are both the history and result of our case of Or *versus* And, and they may interest such of your readers as have a turn for exegetical studies. The case is this. King James' translators of the New Testament arriving in their work at 1 Cor. XI. 17, and encountering in the Greek text the disjunctive *ε*, which, as every tyro in Greek knows, means *or*, were pleased to render it by the conjunction *and*, the Greek word for which, as every Greek tyro knows, is *καί*. The monarch, who had as much respect for religious truth as he had for his mother, and who inherited the authority of Henry VIII as head of the State-Church, gave his supreme sanction to the presence of the conjunction in the passage mentioned, and to the new idea it conveyed. Who would ever gainsay the *ipse dixit* of so wise and learned a man? Who would spurn the sign-manual of a great King, the "Defender of the Faith?" The more learned of the English nation winked at the mistranslation,—with a smile. What knew the mass of Protestants about either connecting or disconnecting words either in Greek or in any foreign language? Too honest to suspect fraud, and too ignorant to detect it, they received the translation, with the impression that it was the pure unvarnished truth as inspired by God. And so the trick took. The teaching of St. Paul was shovelled aside, and the Apostle was made to lay down an erroneous principle, and to unsay his own saying. The sanction of three centuries lay upon the fraud, and for three centuries, the little intruder into the Word of God was made to cover a favourite Protestant innovation, and was turned as a battery against one of the practices of the Catholic Church. It affected the usage of communion given under the species of bread, which, in the days of King James, was universal over the Catholic world. The meaning of the Gospel text in question, as dictated by the Holy Ghost, penned by St. Paul, and is represented by the Greek text and Latin Vulgate, is faithfully given in the following Catholic translation of 1582: "Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." These words plainly show that the Catholic Church may, for just causes and

reasons, and without any error, give communion under the species of bread to laics at all times, and also to clergymen when not celebrating mass. The disjunctive *or* fully justifies the action of the Church. If an explanation may be ventured in accordance with the turn of the Ottawa mind for Grammar and Rhetoric, it is this. When two clauses in the protasis of a period are separated by an *or* and are connected with the apodosis as cause with effect, the whole force of the apodosis falls on each of those clauses taken singly. Hence it follows, that to be "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," is an enormity that falls upon him, who eating the bread, does not drink the chalice:—the same guilt would be incurred by him who should but drink the chalice. The apostle therefore teaches that whether a man unworthily eats only, or unworthily drinks only, he is in either alternative guilty of the crime mentioned. St. Paul's doctrine would have been different had he employed the conjunction *and* instead of *or*; for then the guilt would have been incurred not by communion made in either kind without the other, but by the concurrence of both kinds: the effect announced in the apodosis would not have followed, had not the two causes stated in the protasis combined to produce it. Were it written, "Whosoever shall take my apple or my pear, against my will, shall be guilty of theft," such men as King James' translators would stoutly maintain, that the apple taken without the pear would not be sufficient to constitute theft! But, as we shall see, a case nearly parallel to that of the text under consideration would be, "Whosoever shall steal my apple *or* its equivalent, without my leave, shall be guilty of theft."

To put this matter in a clearer light, let us dive a little deeper into the mind of St. Paul, and into the causes that account for the holy Sacrament given in one species. The Catholic Church, interpreting the words of Jesus Christ, has taught even from the beginning, that immediately after consecration, the true body of our Lord, and his true blood, together with his soul and divinity, are present under the species of bread and wine; the body indeed under the species of bread, the blood under the species of wine by virtue of the words of consecration. Moreover, the body itself is under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under each, by virtue of that natural connection and concomitance, by which the parts of Christ our Lord, who, being now risen from the dead, can die no more, are naturally joined together. The divinity also, on account of its wonderful hypostatic union with the body and soul, is under each species. It follows from these facts, that as much is contained under each species as is contained under both: for Christ exists whole and entire, under the species of bread, and whole and entire, under the species of wine.

It is obvious, that the Catholic communicant is defrauded of nothing; for, receiving the species of bread, he receives the body, blood, soul, divinity of Christ, all united in one. The translators, to secure the