

says so positively. This author would scarcely have made so positive an assertion if there were not some good reasons for so believing. However, it must be confessed that this is not the opinion of Naturalists generally.

The Colonel says there "are no four-footed birds." (P. 268.)

In Leviticus xi, 20, we read:

"Of things that fly, whatsoever goeth upon four feet shall be abominable to you." Call them birds if you will: the original has things that fly.

The wings of the *bat* are formed by a membrane stretched on the fingers and arms or fore-feet of the bat: so that the bat corresponds perfectly to the unclean animal described in Leviticus. So universal a genius as Col. Ingersoll should have thought of this. The colugo and the flying phalanger may likewise be included under the description given in Leviticus.

We are next told "one who frightens savages with loud noises is unworthy the love of civilized men."

I would say, frighten off the savages the best way you can.

Many of the remaining objections are mere distortions of the text. To evade detection in this, the Colonel takes care to give no references. This will not avail him. He says that according to the Pentateuch, "God was afraid of wild beasts." (P. 267.)

There is certainly no such statement in the Pentateuch. God declares that he will not drive out the Canaanite from the promised land immediately, "lest the beasts multiply against thee" (Ex. xxiii, 29,) but there is nothing like what Col. Ingersoll asserts. How could it be that God should be afraid of the beasts,