

if Scripture were to enter everywhere into all such minute particulars a dozen volumes would have been filled, and Moses, I presume, took for granted that his readers would have a share of common sense, and that they would not deny the same to him. (4th.) It is nowhere asserted nor implied in the Pentateuch, that there were only four generations of men and women, during the sojourning in Egypt. True, Moses and Aaron were fourth in descent from Levi: true, also, that God promised Abraham, (Genesis xv. 16), that in the fourth generation, his seed should come hither again," and so it did, for the Jewish leaders were the great-grand-children of Levi, who went down into Egypt, and the main body of the generation of which they were contemporaries, must also have been alive to go out at the Exodus; but how unthinking to argue so, if this proved that in the 215 years, there had only flourished four generations. Why, the very fact that Moses himself was old enough to be a great-grandfather, when he stood before Pharaoh, proves the absurdity of such a supposition. Even we Westerners, who do not marry at so early an age as they do in the East, allow only 30 years for the period of a generation; and it is our belief that in the 215 years referred to, there must have been more than a dozen generations of Hebrew parents, while we have the express testimony of Scripture, to the fact that the Israelites did multiply far beyond the common rate of increase. (Exodus i. 7.)

We throw out the above suggestions, to meet the difficulty. Others might be given, but these, in our opinion, are quite sufficient. Both the difficulty and the explanations are old as the hills; and had not Colenso been a Bishop, the re-stating of the question would have excited little attention. But even supposing that our knowledge of all the facts of the case is so imperfect that we are unable to explain fully this or any other of the objections, who but the shallow and irreverent sciolist would argue, therefore they cannot be explained, and therefore the Pentateuch is not true.

—o—

### Innovations.

"CALL no man father," is a divine precept, warning us against blind attachment to any leader, in any movement in general and religious movement in particular. To surrender ourselves implicitly to a guide of "like passions with ourselves" in religious matters is the lowest possible depth of slavery. It is not only unmanly but idolatrous, not only a degradation of ourselves but a dethronement of God, who commands our undivided homage. They who aspire to lead on the authority of names or other shiboleths, and they who are led, are both guilty of disobedience to this precept.

I envy not the man whose cant and self

glorification have collected around him a crowd of staring, gaping devotees, nor that crowd itself whose debasement of reason may be read in the popular howl. "great is Diana of the Ephesians" no, should the demagogue be as successful as Mahomet, and the crowd as numerous as his followers.

When the world was but very partially enlightened, and in a state of transition from the ignorance of ages to the light of the glorious gospel—when consequently the popular mind was very malleable, it is not to be wondered at that some men, dippantly clever, and ambitious of leadership, should introduce new doctrines and forms, to the great scandal of religion, and the sorrow of its enlightened adherents. No wonder an inspired apostle inveighed vehemently against such would-be prophets and false reformers, in these significant words; "but there were false prophets also among the people, even as there will be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, . . . . and many shall follow their pernicious ways. In those transition times, traffic in heresies was a lucrative business, for the mass of the people were long accustomed to the ascendancy of blind superstition, and the servile subjection which the priesthood imposed. To human nature thus gulleable, may be traced factions large and small, civil and religious—the dandified little clique, and the mishappen unwieldy, monster-creation of fanaticism. Such associations have been, and still are formed at the beak of charlatans.

Innovations are at present greatly in vogue. Were these confined to the department of politics or other sublunary affairs, I had been silent. Inroads they might be on our conservative principles, in matters of dress, or cookery, or household economy, but we could bear them, for "the life is more than meat and the body than raiment." With a view to test the charms of innovation, I ordered my tailor some years ago to furnish me with a suit of superfine, on the model of that of one whose taste was reckoned the beau ideal of perfection. Alone, and anxious I surveyed myself in my new rig, and suffice it to say, that the inspection confirmed all my predilections for suitableness and antiquity, and all my antipathies to arbitrary fashions and changes, so much so that when at any time I don the discarded habiliments it is as a caveat, or protest against causeless changes.

Imperceptible changes grow often into wide-spread revolutions. Before the French revolution, buttons of a peculiar shape and color, and other toys were the theme of conversation and objects of pursuit. It was outwardly a small indication of the ennui, and restlessness of that most restless of all nations; but read in the light of succeeding events, it was a national relapse into savagism, whose delight in beads and buttons is but a hairsbreadth removed from delight in scalp and tomahawks.