

Let us look at this matter a little. This mode of staying discussion is plausible, captivating and formidable to encounter. It seeks to silence a man by placing him in a position in which he is exposed to the opprobrium of assuming a lordship over men's consciences, and claiming to be wiser than others. To many it has proved an effectual silencer. To the decision of any scriptural question left between your judgment and mind? Not at all. It is laid between your judgment and God's—between my judgment and God's. Your judgment, your thoughts are subjected to the Word of Life, and in the name of the Lord you demand the same subjection from others. "But others say, who differ from you, 'we have yielded that subjection;' and they have as good a right to their opinion as you have to yours." Shall we place Roman Catholics in the same category, and give them the benefits of the same concession? "They have as good a right to their opinion as you have to yours." Then there must be an end of discussion—the Protestant Alliance must be dissolved—the pulpit and the platform must be silent—we must not say there is an antichrist—that there is error, or that any man in the world is wrong. Still the question returns, "Who is to decide?" Is it come to this among Protestants? Must we have an interpreter after all, to make the word of God available? If he be not infallible he is useless. Must we have an infallible interpreter? Then have we unwittingly, captivated by the deceivableness of unrighteousness, gone over to Rome; and whilst we boast of an open Bible and our liberty to appeal to it, we retire behind the fortifications of Popish strength to secure ourselves from the assault of an adversary. This lamb-like inquiry of affected timidity or liberality is after all nothing but the suppressed roar of the dragon in the midst of us. We need no interpreter. The Bible is its own interpreter. If Paul or Peter stood before us, prepared to answer all our questions, what