

pecially the Holy Scriptures as received by her; on that understanding, you receive from her high dignities and emoluments; yea, such confidence is placed in you that you are sent out as Bishop of Natal, to superintend the missions among the Zulus, to be the chief representative of the Church in that field; and then—while in that position, and enjoying those dignities and emoluments—you turn round, at the age of fifty, and, after a few months' enquiry, deny the authenticity of an important part of Scripture, and boldly proclaim that to be fabulous which the whole Church rests on as true. Such conduct is neither manly nor fair; it is the traitor's part. Think, speak, write what you like; but do not eat the bread of the Church, while you are undermining her foundation; and do not get up a whine about being persecuted, when we ask you to be honest. Oh! shame to Christianity when the *Saturday Review* is able to sneer at the prospect of a Bishop, rushing in hot haste to England, "across six thousand miles of ocean, to proclaim his spiritual overthrow by the first barbarian he encountered in his savage diocese!" And how much greater the shame, when such an one still fights in the guise of a Christian Bishop, and claims his salary, as a workman, worthy of his hire!

Although we have read much about it, we have not yet seen this wonderful volume, and therefore can only speak of its principles in very general terms. Its main position is that the narrative of the Pentateuch is not historically true, because many of its statements are opposed to the first principles of arithmetic. The first thing that strikes us here, is that Jews are just as much interested in this question, as Christians; and, accordingly, we find that in the "*Jewish Chronicle*," the Bishop is ably reviewed, and his objections rated at their due worth. This reviewer proves that every one of the objections was anticipated centuries ago by various rabbis, and most, if not all of them successfully answered; so that it seems the Dr. has only dressed up for us some old difficulties, long since dead and buried. He assigns three causes as having led the Dr. to his false conclusions;—(1st.) His implicit reliance on Our English translation of the Books of Moses, the looseness of which often misleads the critic. Should not the Doctor have rubbed up his Hebrew, before he rushed into print on such a subject? (2nd.) His unpoetical cast of mind, "which renders him incapable of divesting himself for the time of his modern western notions, and mode of viewing things, and sinking himself in the eastern mind and fashion, such as they were at the period and in the country, of the writer of the Pentateuch." Colenso is doubtless a great mathematician, but neither religion nor history is evolved mathematically. (3rd.) "His singular moral sense, over-refined to morbidity, which disables him from taking a proper view of the state of society, such as it existed in the age and the country of the Jew-

ish lawgiver." It is a good thing to be humane, but we are well-pleased that Neill was our general when we retook Cawnpore, and not Bishop Colenso.

As we have not read the book, we will only advert to one of its arithmetical impossibilities, because it is an old difficulty, lying on the very surface of the narrative, and because a highly valued friend writes to us, that it is the strong point of the book, and the real stumblingblock to him;—and that is, the plain, historical statement, that Moses, who was only the fourth from Levi, led out from Egypt a host which in 215 years had grown from seventy to over two millions. This is the unvarnished difficulty. Let us see if we cannot suggest some explanatory circumstances. (1st.) Remember that in the earlier stages of the world's history, population from various causes, increased with much greater rapidity than it does now. (2nd.) That even in modern times, under certain favoring conditions, the increase of a population is as marvellously rapid, as to be almost incredible. Thus, the Rationalist Commentator Kalisch refers us to the "authentic and interesting account concerning the Englishman Pine, who was, in the year 1589, by a shipwreck, thrown with four females, upon a deserted island South-East of the Cape of Good Hope, and whose descendants had, after seventy-eight years, (in 1667), increased to more than 11,000 souls," (on Exodus xii. 37). (3rd.) Moses nowhere asserts that the multitude who followed him at the Exodus, were descended from seventy persons. He tells us that such was the number of Jacob's "family," 215 years before, but he does not tell us the number of Jacob's "household," the number, that is, of the servants and dependants that must have been connected with such a patriarchal tribe. It was no part of his business to tell us that: he gives us the names of the heads of families, for the genealogies of the Jews required that to be told: but Scripture never goes out of its way, to give us information, merely that our scientific or historical knowledge may be nicely rounded off. But when we know that Abraham had 318 "trained servants, born in his own house, able to bear arms, we may be sure that the household of the wealthy Jacob contained as many, if not more, and of course all the males would be circumcised, and become part and parcel of the multitude, that afterwards went out from Egypt. And again, is it not highly probable that the same cause—the long, grievous famine—which forced Jacob down to Egypt, would also bring many of his Syrian kindred to the granary of the world, especially when they knew that they would have 'a friend at court, in Jacob's son, and if they did come, where else could they take up their abode but in Goshen, as kinsmen and followers of the patriarch. It may indeed be objected that those things are not recorded: but none but the veriest blockhead will stickle at this; for