

rience to decide the point, we shall have little difficulty in declaring in favour of the indirect and inferential method. There would seem to be something in human nature which attaches it more warmly to a doctrine or a polity which it has reasoned out for itself, by an analysis of Scripture, than to the most detailed and minute commands, even though perfectly plain, and prefaced with the solemn formula, "Thus saith the Lord." We cannot then but think that the statement is most illogical which asserts "that on any point in which it was designed that all Christians should be at all times, and everywhere bound as strictly as the Jews were to the Levitical Law, we may plainly conclude they would have received directions no less minute than had been afforded to the Jews."\* For why should we draw any such inference? The great point after all, is not the form or shape of the directions, but the giving them in the way best calculated to secure an obedience as universal as possible. The sharp and precise character of the Levitical code did not secure general obedience at all times. The commands to observe the Sacraments of Circumcision and the Passover were frequently violated. The denunciations against idolatry were constantly disregarded. And in the New Testament we can find illustrations which prove that plain, direct precepts do not command our obedience a whit more, nor even as much as oblique and indirect

---

\* Whately's Kingdom of Christ, page 75.