

fact is, that the general principle having been established by the public promulgation of the universal law in the sixth verse, its application to particular cases is sometimes specified, and sometimes left to a necessary analogy; and thus, while the marriage of a man with his own daughter is necessarily included in the prohibition of his marriage with his granddaughter, the marriage of a woman with her uncle is included in the prohibition of the marriage of a man with his aunt—a relation forbidden in express words to the one sex being, by all fair rules of construction, forbidden to the other also.

But it is said, however reasonable and conclusive this argument may be, as applied to other degrees which may be included by analogy, it does not apply to the particular relationship, in respect to which the proposed legislation is directed. "It is true, indeed, that the particular chapter in Leviticus forbids the marriage of a man to his brother's widow, but you must not go on to extend the prohibition by analogy, and to forbid the marriage of one man to two sisters; since, even in the case actually forbidden, we find in the same Pentateuch not a mere dispensation in the case of individuals, but a specific injunction of such marriage as a general rule." The answer is obvious. That the prohibition was a part of the universal law, by which the whole Church of God is to be governed; the injunction, where it was an injunction, was a part of the municipal law of the Jews, arising out of their exclusive position, and which God accordingly issued in order that the name of no family among His people might be "put out of Israel." This is fully proved by the context, which, while it leaves a discretion to the brother to marry, or not to marry, his brother's widow—(a discretion which alone is sufficient to remove it from the class of injunctions)—transfers to the then next of kin the right and the duty of marrying such widow, as it was exercised in the case of Ruth and Boaz.

It is said, however, that the particular case was brought before our Lord Himself, and that He manifested no disapprobation of it; * which, if it had been contrary to the Book of

* S. Matt. xxii. 24. It must not be forgotten, however, even as to this point of the non-disapprobation of our Lord, that the very first words of His reply were, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures"—