

not determined and fixed when the Apostles wrote, though we see in their writings only hints and allusions, incidentally made, to familiarly known facts; and as to reasoning positively from total omissions, we may use the words of Dean Stanley, "No arguments can be drawn against a fact from the mere silence of authors, whether sacred or secular, whose minds were fixed on other subjects, and who were writing with other intentions.*"

It seems very strange that, although *a priori* reasoning in the realm of nature is exploded, it should still hold its ground in the realm of Revelation. And yet nothing is more certain than that we shall err most grievously if we set out with the assumption that such and such a point *ought* to have been revealed, and plainly too. That was the very error of the Ebionite Christians of the first century. They professed faith in Christ, but adhered to a strict compliance with the Levitical Law. Why? Because the writings of the New Testament were not explicit enough for them. If God, said they, who revealed Himself as an unchanging God, had intended the Mosaic Law to be only temporary, and prefatory to another system, He would have declared His intention as explicitly, and with sanctions as awful as He had originally promulged His Law from Mount Sinai. The argument, that if the system of Church government, referred to in the

*. Stanley's "Jewish Church," p. 556.