

conscience is to be a law-giver, or authoritative guide, as to religious principle and practice. There is a manifest contradiction, as well as an absurd inconsistency, in what he has said concerning the Bible. He calls it a "Supreme authority," although he had previously, and repeatedly, declared that conscience was the "supreme law-giver: making, reversing, and altering his code of laws," and was also the Judge, "with full powers, deciding upon the past, and legislating upon the future, without any appeal, except to himself." How, it may be asked, can all this, by any possibility, be made to agree with what he has said of the Bible being a supreme authority? We know that they are separate Tribunals, and he, himself, has stated them as such, and yet, he has made each of them *supreme*. Suppose a contradiction, or conflict, in their laws and decisions,—which, in fact, so very often occurs,—which is to have the preference, the Bible or conscience? Which is ultimately to possess the absolute *supremacy*? By the strain of his reasoning, and in accordance with his self-educating scheme, it would appear that he would give it to *Conscience*. Undoubtedly both such conflicting tribunals cannot be of *Supreme* authority, on the same subjects. The direct inconsistency of his statements on the point, are too palpable to admit of any rational reconciliation. But there is further, and, if possible, greater absurdity in what he has said, that the Bible is to us a supreme authority, and yet imposes on us no yoke of subjection. Now, who, it may be asked, ever heard of a supreme authority, to which there was no subjection by those who were placed under it. Not only in Empires and Kingdoms, but through all the forms of civil rule, down to the smallest municipal governing bodies, all the laws and rules they establish, claim and command the subjection and obedience of all living under their rule, to whom their laws are made to apply, and all but the lawless admit that subjection. But this Essayist declares,