

it just as it reads, without changing it in the least degree, and you see at once the sin against which it is aimed. "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife; it is thy brother's nakedness." It can only refer to the wife of a living brother. Am I wrong in my opinion of the meaning of this verse, and is Dr. Roe right in interpreting it to include also the wife of a deceased brother? We can test the soundness of his interpretation by applying it to the 20th verse, where the word "wife" occurs again. "Moreover, thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife, to defile thyself with her." I will credit Dr. Roe with an unwillingness to blow hot and cold with the same breath. "Wife" in the one verse must mean the same as the word "wife" in the other, or *widow* in the 16th must make word "wife" in the 20th also mean *widow*. It must follow then, if his interpretation be correct, that any man marrying a widow is guilty of incest, which is absurd and unscriptural, for Paul says that death puts an end to the law which bound the woman to her husband or the husband to the wife, so that either party set free by the death of the other, if married again, is not an adulterer or adulteress, as the case may be. Dr. Roe will hardly attempt to dispute so clear an Apostolic declaration. It must be, therefore, that any interpretation of Scripture which leads us to so clear a contradiction of Apostolic teaching, as well as of our own common sense, must be absurd and erroneous. The reader will be able to decide for himself which is the most reasonable interpretation of the passage now before us. It was the brother's wife, and not at all the brother's widow, the man was prohibited from taking to wife.

That Dr. Roe is mistaken in his interpretation of the 16th verse of the chapter containing the prohibited decrees, is evident further from the fact that a law was enacted to require the brother next in age, unmarried, to take to wife his brother's widow, if his brother had died without issue. There does not appear to have been any law preventing such a marriage, even if the widow had children. The parties seem to have been left to their own choice in this respect, but if she had no children, then this law came in to render such a marriage obligatory. It was designed for the purpose of continuing family names in connec-