

the omission of the article, or its insertion, the use or non-use of the personal pronoun where the sense is not at all affected by it, or of a different particle, not in the least varying the idea, and dialectical changes in the verb. The few of a seemingly larger kind, we find to be the omission of unimportant words, and, now and then, of a brief clause, neither contradicting nor changing the sense conveyed by the full expression, and generally traceable to some other contiguous or parallel passage, to or from which they may have been misplaced. Then there are, especially in the Old Testament, a few cases where numerals are differently stated in some versions, and in some manuscripts of the original. It may be safely said that there is not a single example that would make the least difference in any dogmatic controversy between contending sects, or in regard to any thing disputed, or even likely to be disputed, between Romanists and Protestants. The diversities of translation, the different shadings that may be given to words and figures, the choice of phrases as influenced, to some degree, by theological bias—all these, we may boldly affirm, are still less in their catholic bearing; we mean in their bearing upon the great question whether taken as a whole (various readings, translations, and all else that can be alleged), there is in the world one Bible, one body of Holy Scripture to which all Christendom may appeal, as the one substantially unchanged and unchangeable authority.

The reason of so little actual diversity in modern translations comes from the fact, that they were made by *scholars in the face of scholars*, who would immediately detect any thing like forgery, interpolation, or the least departure from the substantial, and readily ascertainable text and grammatical sense of the original writings. Ignorant Romanists may make such a charge of falsifying; it may be connived at by reckless Jesuits; but no truly learned Catholic would venture the assertion, or dare to accept a challenge in such a controversy. Men like Dupanloup and Montalembert know better; the learned Catholics of Germany would never think of facing their learned Protestant compeers on such wholly untenable ground. Infidelity here may bluster, as it has always done; it may call to its aid the ignorance, or superficiality, of an unbiblical literary world; but the fact remains—the wonderful preservation, the wonderful unity and agreement of our written Scriptures, amid all outward diversities of form, and all changes of language. What would we think if we heard men talk of a Protestant Homer, and a Catholic Homer, a French Homer, a German Homer, an English Homer, with allusion to translations of the old Greek poem into the respective languages? And yet it could be better justified than any thing of the kind in respect to the Holy Scriptures.

We venture the assertion, that a candid man of good education, and whose mind has never been prejudiced on the question, might read chapter after chapter of the Old and New Testament, in the common English version, in the Douay, in the Reims, in the German of Luther, the Latin Vulgate, etc., without discovering any difference that would arrest his attention. He might, in this way, read through the whole Scriptures without finding any thing that could bear the name of a dogmatic contradiction. As the original texts, Hebrew and Greek, have ever been jealously guarded by rival keepers of the Sacred Writings, so the translations have had an equal safeguard in the watchfulness, on all sides, of learned opponents. Such men as Abner Kneeland, or Joseph Smith, might make a dishonest or insane attempt of the kind, or some Jesuit priest might hope to escape detection in his adulteration of the Sacred Writings to accommodate them to Brahminism, or Buddhism, or some distant superstition, from which he might thus win converts with impunity; but to suppose such a thing of the great scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when Biblical investigation was so thorough and so keen, or even of the century preceding, argues the greatest ignorance as well as the greatest unfairness. To think of Scaliger and Melancthon falsifying the Scriptures in presence of Cajetan and Erasmus; or Cassaubon, Usher,