

on the 25th of August 1837. During his College course he uniformly won high honors in his class. His demeanor was modest and cheerful; the friendship formed during his college course remained warm and unbroken to the end. At the end of his ordinary college course he became a student on the "Dunboyne Establishment. After spending one year in this department of the college he was appointed to the Chair of Rhetoric on the 21st of November, 1845. As yet he was too young for ordination to the priesthood, till 1846. He lectured in rhetoric with great satisfaction, and pursued his classical studies so assiduously that he became a thorough master of Greek and Latin, which he was to apply afterwards with such splendid success to the elucidation of the Sacred Word, in which department, we believe, he has not many superiors in the world-wide realm of the Church. On the 22nd of June, 1854, he was appointed to the Chair of Scripture and Hebrew, rendered vacant by the promotion of Dr. Dixon to the Primatial See of Armagh. This chair he continued to fill till his official connection with the college ceased upon his being promoted to the Bishopric. Dr. McCarthy published and edited several works. His commentary on the Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays throughout the year, is valuable and exhaustive. He has also published a full commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, which meets any exception which may be taken to the fragmentary character of the *plan* of his first books on the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays. He also edited the works of the late Dr. Renchan, as well as some papers on Irish Ecclesiastical history by the late and lamented Dr. Matthew Kelly, Professor of Church History in Maynooth College. For these facts we are indebted to the *Irish American*.

—:o:—

OR *versus* AND.

II.

The Revisers have done a bold deed: they have dared to be honest men: they have rendered the Greek conjunction *et* by its corresponding English word *or*.

Here are Version on the left, and Revision on the right.

"Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

"Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

Now what effect will this correct rendering produce on religion in general, and on Bible readers in particular? In the first place it is a step towards unity in religious truth; and this unity is of the very essence of religion. The Gospel is given that "we may all attain to unity of faith," "that we be not as children tossed about by every wind of doctrine." Now, is that religion kept together by a principle of unity which contradicts itself in essential doctrines, which hesitates and changes in its acceptance of such doctrines, or

which, when an article of faith comes in doubt, cannot maintain its independent individuality, but falls asunder into parts? Yesterday the cup was of indispensable necessity; to-day it is a matter of choice: yesterday all held but one doctrine and seemed to be united on the point; to-day they disagree, and, having no guide no arbiter to settle the difficulty, they split into two, three or more parties, that is to say, into so many distinct sects differing from one another on a matter, the right understanding of which is decisive of their eternal salvation. Therefore they have not that unity of faith which the great apostle demands. How low is the idea which those men entertain of God's immutability! They once believed that God had established the sacrament in two kinds; they are now willing to believe that He did not. They make Him unsay in the reign of Queen Victoria what He said in that of King James. Man may change with the age, the weather, or the force of any given circumstance, but what God has once said and fixed, He has said and fixed once for all. Neither old translators nor new revisers of His Word can change the doctrine which he has once revealed.

It is a humiliating fact that learned men often disagree and wrangle on points in religion, which in worldly matters would be either as clear as sunshine, or would be stripped of their obscurity by competent judges. Had the words of St. Paul, or their equivalent, been found in a book of law, either their meaning would have been obvious, or a judge would have set them in their true light. But, in the various Protestant sects, a passage of Sacred Scripture, once misinterpreted by him who spurns any judge or interpreter beyond his own private judgment, meets a different fate. The error, once in the mind, settles down, takes root and gains strength by the force of thinking and rethinking; it becomes a favourite idea, and is often made a test of other men's orthodoxy. How is this state of mind to be rectified? Not certainly by reason: grace must interpose with its enlightening and stirring influences, to bring the erring back to Christian unity.

But what reception may the new translation look for among Bible readers? Welcomed by some it will be rejected by others; while some, compromising, will divide their praise and censure between the two rival claimants. But here a difficulty presents itself. It may be asked, how can any one of these three classes of men come to any rational conclusion in the matter, short of a complete surrender of the Bible as a sufficient Rule of Faith? In a dead lock they have no resource left but to shift their position, and look around for a guide that will lead them to truth and salvation. The first class consists of those who accept the change, and congratulate themselves on their escape from error. But, are such men justified in adopting the novelty? Have they a right to lay aside what has to them been hitherto true and sacred? Can truth change? Can what is sacred be tampered with and not be profaned? Here is a Gordian knot, which they may cut but may not