

unravel. They of the present generation, and all their ancestors in religion since the so called Reformation, were born under the old Version. This Version was, so to speak, the star under which they were born, and the parent that begot them to their religious lot. It fed them in boyhood and in mature life. Pouring over its pages they breathed its air, and lived upon it, and formed their Christian manhood from it. There was no other rule of faith for them: they must stand or fall by it. The Revision comes too late: the Version, corrected or altered, is nothing more or less than the Version corrupted and profaned: it is not *the* Version, *the* Bible, *the* Testament, *the* Word of God. It may, as a translation, be an improvement on the Bible of three centuries, but it is not the Protestant Rule of Faith accepted and cherished by those who first protested against the Catholic Church. Their faith was bound up with the Bible of King James, of which they said in triumph:—"The Bible, the whole Bible, nothing but the Bible." The joy of that triumph must now be sadly damped. It is no longer the whole Bible—it contains somethings different from the Bible. In truth, what claims to be but a successor, is a supplanter, an annihilator. It ignores the old Version as a whole, and, if as a whole, therefore as the good original rule of Protestant faith. It follows from all this, that he who renounces the former Bible, renounces his former faith, which was the genuine Protestant faith, and he is no longer a genuine Protestant. Will he coolly disown his real parent and adopt a stranger and a false claimant to paternity? Let him remember that faith is unchangeable; and that, if hitherto he has been a believer he will by the change renounce belief and cease to be a member of the established Church, or of any old Protestant Church whatever. He must act with consistency: he is not absolutely free; he is confined, he is bound; he must not believe one particle either more or fewer than what are contained in that Bible with which his whole life has been identified. He is not at liberty to change his faith or deny the old Version, any more than he may change his race and deny his country. It is then an obvious truth, that he cannot justify his acceptance of the Revision, even if it shows no other backsliding than the strange *Or*; for "he that offends in one point becomes guilty of all." In one word, if he stakes his salvation on the Bible as the sole rule of faith, he must cling to the Version for better for worse, and apply to the Revisers the awful menace of St. John: "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city."

But let us pass to another class of Protestants; of a conservative stamp. Renouncing the substitute *Or*, they cling to their old persuasion and the use of the cup. The substitution though made by the sanction of the old codices, Latin, Greek, Syriac, &c., and of the authorised usage of the Catholic Church from the early ages of Christianity, grates on the ears and feelings of the

unwitty abettors of a heresy against the Word of God. We may fancy one of those narrow-minded men thus soliloquizing. "Well, my family and forefathers, my native parish and every adjoining parish have always read God's Word in the Bible of King James. It has always been the pride of the Church to which I belong, it has furnished me with reading from a boy and in many a bereavement it has ministered the comfort I needed. And what pretensions does this new-fangled Bible set up? It is a question not easily settled, which of the two sets of translators may claim the praise of superior learning. In such a doubt shall I betray a long-tryed friend and give my confidence to a stranger? Besides, I have a holy instinct of the truth of the old Word of God, a feeling of sweet acquiescence in the unction of its very words and forms of speech. It must be of the Holy Ghost:—it so overcomes me and gives me the foretaste of future bliss. In a word, I am too old to change in anything: I am content to be on the side of my fathers for three centuries back, and to be the last of the old stock."

M. M. M.

THE UNITY OF NATURAL FORCES.

VIBRATIONS.

What would be the surprise of the philosophers of antiquity if, suddenly awakened from their sleep of ages, they beheld the scientific wonders of our day!

How great would be the astonishment of Hero of Alexandria, who first utilised the force of steam, at the sight of a powerful locomotive; or of Thales of Miletus, if told that his curious experiments with the amber gave birth to a means of communicating the thoughts and voices of men, through great distances, with the rapidity of lightning.

To them, subject to their pagan proclivities, our progress would make us gods; in their eyes Morse of telegraphic fame would surpass as a messenger the fleet-footed Mercury; and no longer Jupiter, but Newton, would govern the universe.

Truly, to one who has considered the development of science from the days of ancient to those of modern civilization, our progress has been wonderful.

Modern genius has spread a net work of railroads over the land, has penetrated into the bowels of the earth, wresting from nature her treasures, and has even invaded the domain of the birds.

In this brief paper, we will give a general idea of the progress of science, and show the grounds on which scientists of the present day attempt to reduce to unity all the phenomena of nature.

I.

The first among the ancient philosophers who manifested a real scientific tendency, was Thales of