

dence of the historical fact, and Colonel Ingersoll's denial of it is of no weight.

The Colonel objects to belief in Pharaoh's dreams. He does not give a single reason to show that God may not by means of a dream send knowledge of an event. Dreams are not usually to be credited; but when God wishes to make a Revelation by this means, He will undoubtedly also supply means by which it will be certainly known that the Revelation is from Him.

He objects that "widows were commanded to spit in the faces of their brothers-in-law." (Num. xxvi, 9.)

When we consider that this was only done when the brother-in-law refused to give the widow her just due in accordance with the law, it will be acknowledged that the punishment was not excessive.

Some of the Jews, however, maintain that "*in the face*" merely means "*in the presence*" of the brother-in-law.

The next difficulty is that in Lev. xi, 6, the hare is pronounced unclean, "because it cheweth the cud."

Zoology as a science was not studied in the time of Moses as it is to-day, and the scientific classification of animals was not made. Hence the words of Moses "it cheweth the cud," *mahaleh gerah* must be taken in the sense in which they were used in ordinary conversation, not in the modern scientific sense. A certain muscular motion which is habitual with hares was commonly considered as the chewing of the cud, and was so named, and for this reason it is said that the hare "cheweth the cud."

There are, however, some Naturalists who assert still that the hare is a cud-chewing animal. Valmont de Bomare in his "Dictionary of Natural History,"