

of inconsistency against the narrative, inasmuch as the money is paid, as he alleges, without any census being taken, as he calls the numbering of the people; and when the census really comes to be taken, six months afterwards, as recorded in the 1st. chap. of Numbers, there is no account of any money having been levied.

This charge of inconsistency springs, either from a misconception of the passage, or from a design to misrepresent it. There were in reality two separate numberings of the people, each having its specific object: the first when the money was paid, and the second when they were numbered in tribes and families. In the first instance they were counted up as individuals only from 20 years and upwards, in order to collect the tribute money or poll-tax. That they were really numbered on that occasion is obvious from the language employed. Thus in the 38th chap. of Ex. 25th verse, the payment of the money is acknowledged and reckoned up, and it is called the silver of them that were numbered. And in the 26th verse, it is said, "half a shekel for every one that went to be numbered." The people were numbered, then, when the money was paid, and there is no inconsistency in the narrative.

6. Colenso brings another charge of inconsistency against the narrative in the Pentateuch, because in Ex. 16¹ 16, the Israelites, as he says, are there said to dwell in tents in the wilderness; while in the 23d chap. of Lev. the reason assigned for the institution of the feast of the tabernacles, was their dwelling, not in tents but in booths, made of boughs and bushes. And he says there is not the slightest indication in the story that they ever did live in booths, nor is it conceivable when they could have done so. In his opinion they must all have had tents. And then he asks with a well feigned expression of amazement, what a prodigious number of trained oxen would have been needed to carry these 200,000 tents! And he says farther, it cannot be said that the word booths here means tents; because the Hebrew words are different. He allows that the word for booth in several places is used or tents; but then he contends, it is *improperly* so used. What a pity this illustrious

bishop had not lived in that early age to give the sacred writers a hint how to use their own language. Succah, a booth, is employed to designate the magnificent tents of kings: it is translated pavilion, covert, tabernacle,—even the tabernacle of David. It is the genius of the language. It is not improperly rendered tent then. And as it is the genus while the other is only the species, it might be taken to designate the temporary habitations of the Israelites in the wilderness, though more than one-half of them had tents in the strictest sense of the word. Doubtless they had both, and thus what is branded as an inconsistency, becomes a life-like picture, and a strong confirmation of its historical accuracy.

7. The next difficulty is founded on the Hebrew word *chamushim*. Ex. 13: 18, the children of Israel went up *chamushim*, harnessed out of the land of Egypt. This is a word of uncertain meaning. Colenso affirms that it means armed, and that it was the author's design in using the word, to represent the Israelites as marching like a martial host fully provided with arms.—Then comes the charge of untruthfulness against the narrative: "It is inconceivable that these down-trodden, oppressed people, should have been allowed by Pharaoh to possess arms, so as to turn out at a moment's notice 600,000 armed men." There is however no ground for this charge. No proof can be brought from any quarter that the word means armed. The original verb is not in use. The cognate root *hamasa* in Arabic, does not mean armed. After consulting not a few versions in different languages, and the opinions of eminent critics, I am constrained to adopt our own word *harnessed*, as the best rendering, and agreeing best with the context. The Israelites marched out of Egypt as a company of travellers, or emigrants, with such articles of domestic use buckled on their backs, as they were able to carry. "The people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders." Colenso cannot prove that the word means armed: he is in fact not sure that it means armed, and yet on this groundless assertion, he founds his