

Hezron and Hamul, who were, according to his "assumption," in the *same condition*, would be such a contradiction as to prove the "story" incredible!

Again: if Colenso had looked at his Hebrew Bible he would have noticed that the preposition "with" is not the *im* or *eth*, but the *le*,* and the literal rendering of Gen. XLVI.: 26 & 27 would then be as follows:

"All the souls of (or belonging to), Jacob that came into Egypt, who came out of his loins, besides the wives of the sons of Jacob, all the souls, three score and six, and the sons of Joseph which were born of him, in Egypt, two souls, all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, three score and ten."

The narrative does not say that they were all born before Jacob came to Egypt, or that they came *with* him; but that they "came out of his loins?" As to the expression "came into Egypt,"—it applies to the sons of Joseph as much as to the sons of Pharez, and "the meaning is obvious," as Colenso admits.

But there is a reason why Hezron and Hamul are put in the record in this list. Why is it said that "all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were seventy? when it is evident there were others with these?" (e. g., Jacob's son's wives, and likely many servants.) Why does not Colenso peck at that expression? And why are Er and Onan mentioned at all; the *dead* among the *living*? Unquestionably, to show that the living took the place of the dead. Surely there were others that died in Canaan besides Er and Onan; but their places were not re-filled as theirs. We might expect, therefore, to find Hezron and Hamul by adoption, in the room of Er and Onan becoming the heads of tribal families, like Ephraim and Manasseh, who, in this way, became the progenitors of tribes. Turn to Num. XXVI.: 19 & 21, and there, after being again informed of the death of Er and Onan, we are told that they (Hezron and Hamul), were the progenitors of the tribal families that bear their names. Colenso asks why these two grand sons of Judah are mentioned in this list, when others are not. The answer is—because they had been adopted to fill up the place of the sons that died, and they gave rise to tribal families which others did not. The sacred historian does not profess to give a minute detail of *all* the events, and individuals concerned; but, like any other good historian, he notes those only that are important to the reader.

* As Hebrew types are uncommon, I shall use English letters.