

just Lot in Sodom, or righteous Noah among that corrupt people who lived before the flood, he would have seen that, among other abominable things, the married woman often became the common property, for vile purposes, of her husband and her husband's brother or brothers, hence arose the necessity for the law contained in the 16th verse: "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife; it is thy brother's nakedness." Dr. Roe and his friends constantly make the mistake of substituting in their minds the name "widow" for "wife" in this verse, thus entirely changing its meaning, and so shooting wide of the mark aimed at by the enactment of the law contained in it.

That they are wrong in their interpretation of this verse, I think I shall have no difficulty in showing.

First of all, what right have they to substitute another word, mentally or otherwise? The man against whom the law stands is prohibited by it from approaching his brother's "wife;" not a word is said against the man marrying his brother's "widow."

Lest I weary your readers, I will stop here, and begin my next letter just at this point, viz., Dr. Roe's erroneous interpretation of the 16th verse of Lev. xviii.

Yours, &c.,

D. V. LUCAS.

---

No. 5.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

SIR,—I said in my last letter that Dr. Roe and his friends make the mistake of substituting *widow* for "wife" in verse 16 of Lev., chapter xviii. The sin against which the law in this verse was enacted, of which Herod in after ages was guilty, and for which he was rebuked by John the Baptist, existed among the many abominations, by which the very wicked Canaanites had corrupted themselves, and for which they had been severely punished by a righteous God. Read the verse just as it stands, and understand