

Hippicus cannot be taken as exact; but the solidity of its foundation was its marked feature. Yet Josephus describes other towers with this same feature, having different dimensions. Berggren argues that the ell of Josephus was the medium ell of six handbreadths, of which four hundred make a stadium; and, applying this measure to the several walls and towers, he reaches the following conclusion.

“If Josephus, in what relates to the number of the towers and their distance from each other on each of the three walls, is to be understood as I have pointed out above, and by careful analysis have shown to be probable, then must we allow to the wall of Agrippa a considerably greater circuit and northerly direction than hitherto, and even make it include the traditional sepulchres of the kings, whilst the pyramidal tombs of queen Helena and her son must be placed three stadia north of the king's graves. Accordingly we must allow the lower city or Akra to stretch across the Tyropeon, having on the other side of the valley an eastern and northeastern section, which includes Antonia; and therefore a very differently shaped and constituted lower city from the Akra of Dr. Robinson.”

That Zion stretched further north than the Jaffa gate, and that Akra lay wholly or in part to the east of the Damascus gate valley, are conclusions that are becoming more and more pronounced both in Germany and in England. Perhaps nothing but a thorough excavation of the modern city from the debris of centuries will settle the question.

ARTICLE VI.

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.¹

[In our April Number we inserted an Article from Professor Bartlett on the Historic Character of the Pentateuch. In our next Number we shall publish an Article from the same author on the Authorship of the Pentateuch. The following is Professor Bartlett's Notice of the work which has occasioned this discussion.]

DR. COLENSO has issued two parts of his discussion, and a third is promised.

Part I. has attracted much attention, for several reasons. It comes from a bishop of the church of England. It is bold in its statements. The positions are all palpable. Some of the points, moreover, are adroitly put, at least for immediate effect. The volume would have been more effective for the purpose in view, had a considerable portion of it been sup-

¹ The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part. I. 239 pp.; Part II. 303 pp. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863.

pressed inasmuch as many of its objections are too manifestly invalid or unfair. Christian readers also, however unlettered, would be placed on their guard by the final result which the writer reaches in his relations to Christianity. Men who cannot solve a historic difficulty, can yet know certainly the work and influence of a present Saviour and the unspeakable value of his religion. Christ and Christianity are living facts. Still this volume will be and is welcomed by a large class of persons, as a new accession to the popularized forms of cavil.

The proper method of dealing with such difficulties as are here raised, is to view them in connection with a broad discussion of the general subject. For it is always part of the logical legerdemain of such treatises to fix our attention on the pennyweight of difficulty which they place with much ado in one scale, and to hide the hundredweight of evidence which reposes quietly in the other.

If we were briefly to characterize the effective qualities of the volume we should specify : first, great boldness of unfounded assertion and assumption ; second, a deliberate refusal to understand the Pentateuch from its own points of view, — more particularly a determined refusal to recognize (1) common idioms of speech ; (2) the writer's own mode of conception ; (3) explanations found in the volume ; (4) explanations too obvious to require mentioning ; (5) explanations possible and plausible.

I. Among the unfounded assertions and assumptions which are made the basis of cavils are several statements in regard to tents. It is said (p. 97) that they must have been "made of skins," although various passages of the Pentateuch imply the art of weaving both linen and hair cloth (Ex. xxxv. 25, 26 ; xxvi. 7, etc.), and any collection of Egyptian antiquities will exhibit cloth older than the time of Moses. It is said (p. 96) that the Israelites "were not living in tents in Egypt," implying that they had no tents at all ; notwithstanding the shepherd life which a large portion of them certainly entered upon in Egypt (Gen. xlv. 34 ; xlvii. 1 - 7), a mode of life from earliest times associated with tent life (Gen. iv. 20 ; xiii. 5 ; xxv. 27). It is assumed from one passing allusion (Ex. xvi. 16) that the narrative declares *all* the people to be well provided with tents, notwithstanding the "dwelling in booths" mentioned Lev. xxxiii. 52 ; and that these tents were in readiness at their departure, though they are not mentioned for a month afterwards. It is assumed in this and other connections, that the Israelites at their departure looked forward only to a three day's journey into the wilderness (p. 96), contrary to the tenor of ancient prophecy (Gen. xv. 14), of Moses's commission from God (Ex. xii. 16), of his explanation to the people (iv. 31), and of the well-understood issue of the whole struggle (vi. 1 - 8), which was a struggle for deliverance from Egypt. It is asserted (p. 113) that "this vast body of all ages [was] summoned to start, according to the narrative, at a moment's notice, and actually started, not one being left behind, together with all their multitudinous flocks and herds," and (p. 114) "the order to start was communicated suddenly at midnight" ; that "in

one single day the whole immense population of Israel was instructed to keep the passover, and actually did keep it" (p. 105); that "when suddenly summoned to depart, they hastened, at a moment's notice, to borrow in all directions, and collected such an amount of treasure in a very short time that they spoiled the Egyptians" (p. 108). Now it would seem sufficiently captious to interpret a historian's record of the final order to march, as a denial of all preliminary arrangements. But the allegations here made are rendered unpardonable by the distinct previous statements that Moses had from the beginning expressly informed the people of the coming result (Ex. iv. 30, 31; vi. 5-9); that the order to keep the passover on the fourteenth day was given at some time previous to the tenth day (Ex. xii. 3); that the direction about "borrowing" [asking], which was communicated to Moses at the burning bush (Ex. iii. 20-22), was also communicated by him to the people (according to the order of the narrative, xi. 2) prior to the directions for the passover, and that on the same occasion the people were also informed of the hurried departure at hand (Ex. xi. 4, 8). No doubt the final notice was very short, since the people, or a large portion of them, occupied probably with other preparations, "had not prepared for themselves any victuals"; but it clearly was not so short as to create any absurdity in the narrative. Very likely the expulsion from the royal cities was quite abrupt. Again the writer insists (p. 98) that the doubtful word עֲשֵׂהוּ (Ex. xiii. 18) must mean "armed," though a word to which Gesenius, Ewald, Rosenmüller, Knobel, and the Septuagint each assigns a different meaning; and he further assumes that the whole six hundred thousand men over twenty years of age were armed, and apparently fully armed, in order to raise the question how they procured the arms. Whereas each of these three points is an open, if not doubtful, question. The fundamental word may mean (with Gesenius) "fierce, active, eager, brave in battle," or quite as likely (with Knobel) "in united ranks, or orderly bands," in opposition to a disorderly dispersion. Fürst gives the fourfold meaning "accincti, parati, instructi, armati," and De Wette the equally ambiguous translation, "gerüstet." The whole matter is of no great moment, as the principal armor of the age and region was exceedingly simple: bows and arrows the most common of all, a bull's-hide shield, a quilted helmet, a sling, a mace which was often nothing but a heavy club, a smaller curved club (*hissar*) which was carried alike by light and heavy armed troops and archers; a metal-pointed spear, short metal swords and daggers, battle-axes with metal blades, maces loaded with bronze, and rarely metal helmets and coats of mail. (See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*.) The more simple and common armor was easily procured. In much later days we trace the scantiness of the arming. The army of Deborah and Barak seem (Jud. v. 8) to have had neither shields nor spears. Saul and Jonathan only, at the opening of the Philistine war, had swords and spears. Colenso assumes (pp. 116, 117) that all the Israelites marched in a body from Rameses to the Red sea; that they proceeded without any interval of

resting; and that they accomplished the march of sixty miles in three days; —all of them, particularly the last, gratuitous suppositions. He assumes that the distance “without the camp” where the ashes and offal of the sacrifices were to be carried, was probably “six miles,” “through the midst of a crowded mass of people”; whereas the Pentateuch (Num. ii. 17) informs us that the Tabernacle was surrounded by the single tribe of Levi, and calls that body “the camp of the Levites;” besides which there was the “camp of Judah” east, “the camp of Reuben” south, the “camp of Ephraim” west, and “the camp of Dan” north, each of the last four containing three tribes. Without the camp of Levi will answer all the requirements of the narrative, and save the distant travel. The bishop even assumes that the direction found in Deut. xxiii. 12–14 required “half a million men to go out daily—the twenty-two thousand Levites for a distance of six miles—to the suburbs for the common necessities of nature”; although any respectable commentator as Rosenmüller (after Le Clerc), Gerlach, Knobel, or even Scott less clearly, would have pointed him to vs. 10, and informed him that this is “not to be understood of the Israelitish camps in the desert, but of the *military* camps” when on warlike expeditions. He assumes (p. 195) that the three priests were obliged *personally* to sprinkle the blood of one hundred and fifty thousand lambs at the second passover, though he is constrained to admit (on p. 202) that nothing in the Pentateuch requires or “implies it”; only in the time of Hezekiah, when the number of priests was greatly increased, they seem to have done so. He boldly asserts (p. 189) that around Sinai and in the wilderness “it would have been equally impossible for rich or poor to procure” turtle-doves or young pigeons according in the law (Lev. xii. 68). On what authority, he does not inform us, though naturalists declare that species of the great pigeon-family “are found in every part of the world except the frigid zones,” and we know certainly that turtle-doves are abundant on both sides of this region, in Egypt, Asia Minor, and Palestine, where their natural home is in the wilderness (Pa. iv. 5, 7) and in the clefts of the rocks (Jer. xlviii. 28. See also Thompson’s Land and Book I. 415.) The volume is full of such assumptions and assertions.

II. On the other hand, the writer utterly refuses to understand the statements of the book from its own point of view:

1. He deliberately misconstrues common idioms of speech. The direction (Lev. iv. 11, 12) that the priest remove the offal of certain sacrifices without the camp, furnishes to his luxuriant imagination the picture (p. 87) of “the priest having himself to carry on his back, on foot, the skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung, even the whole bullock.” The slightest consideration of the wide usage of the verb *לָקַח*, *to remove*, to say nothing of the fact that the Levites generally were appointed for the burdensome work of the tabernacle, to be at the disposal of Aaron and his sons “in all their burdens and in all their service” (Num. iii. 6–8; iv. 27), might have relieved his mind of this load of offal. In his corrections (in

part II), the bishop, while giving the priest "the help of others," still insists on his personal labor in the case. Perhaps we are to understand the ashes of the morning and evening sacrifice as being removed to a clean place by the priest himself (Lev. vi. 10, 11). Knobel, however, sensibly remarks, that this would "take place only from time to time"; and we find in Num. xix. 9, that some other person than the priest, in the case of the red heifer, gathered up the ashes. When a right understanding exists in regard to the camp no difficulty arises. In like manner the bishop insists that, when Moses or Joshua is said to have spoken to all Israel, the writer is thoughtless enough to state that his single voice was audible to two or three millions of people at once. Can it be necessary to say that as the Israelites were thoroughly organized and officered, not only by tribes and fathers' houses, with captains of tribes (Num. ii.), but also with rulers or captains of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, of tens (Ex. xxiii. 18; Deut. i. 15), Moses had only to proceed as the commander of an army communicating his orders now — through his subordinates? Still more ridiculous are the three pages of figuring (p. 78) to show that two and a half millions of people could not have been brought into the court of the tabernacle, an area of one thousand six hundred and ninety-two yards. A writer who could have repeatedly told so stupid a story surely would not be worth answering; his idiocy would be only the less astounding than that of a whole nation who for hundreds of years reverently received such a tale. Why should a man stumble over such assemblies of the congregation, any more than over the conventions of the Republican party of the United States, held representatively, even if such passages as Ex. xii. 3, 21, 28, and others did not distinctly in some instances identify the "elders" with the "congregation" and "the children of Israel"?

2. Dr. Colenso constantly refuses to enter into the writer's mode of conception. This is eminently the case in regard to the family of Judah (p. 60), and the points connected with it. He rigidly presses the phrase "came with Jacob into Egypt," notwithstanding the evident popular latitude with which the writer speaks, since, for example, he includes Jacob himself in the sum total among those which came out of his loins,¹ and even includes the sons of Joseph who, *as he informs us*, were "born in Egypt." Ewald, Kalisch, and others are undoubtedly right in understanding, from the intimations of vs. 12 compared with Num. xxvi. 19, 21, that Hezron and Hamul are reckoned as taking the place of Er and Onan, heads of families, and are here introduced, just as are Ephraim and Manasseh, heads of tribes, though born in Egypt. The whole statement is therefore a popular and inartificial mode of expressing an idea, which though obvious is not easy to state technically nor, when so stated, in keeping with the style of the composition. The writer contemplating the great nation which left Egypt, is moved to specify its insignificant number at its origin in Egypt. His explanation shows that the expression "which were with Jacob in Egypt" would

¹ "The fairest of her daughters, Eve."

have been more precise, though still inexact, as excluding Jacob himself. He would set forth *the nation's Israelitish ancestry in Egypt*, viz. the pure stock of Jacob, contemporary with him, and constituting the foundation of the nation, that is, its central head, the heads of its tribes, and the heads of its families (רִאשֵׁי הַבָּיִת). These persons were most of them, though not all, in existence at the coming into Egypt. The plan of the list therefore excludes from the reckoning, (1) the sons' wives, vs. 26; (2) servants, if any, as is probable, Gen. xxxii. 5; (3) descendants of Jacob born after his death, except perhaps the children of Ephraim and Manasseh. It includes, (1) Jacob the head; (2) the second generation, actual or virtual, (a) his sons, heads of tribes, (b) the two grandsons born in Egypt, but adopted as sons and made heads of tribes, (c) the daughter of Dinah, who as a matter of fact, was in the company; (3) the third generation contemporary with Jacob, viz. (a) his actual grandsons, heads of families, (b) other grandchildren (Obad, Gera, Rosh, and the sister Sarah), who either died without issue or were absorbed in other families, (c) certain numbers of the fourth generation made heads of families for special reasons, as Hezron and Hamul in place of their uncles, and Heber and Malchiel, grandsons of Ashu, perhaps because born in Canaan. The heads of families in the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh are not included in the list, probably because born after Jacob's death, though they became heads of families by virtue of standing in the place of grandsons. By simply recognizing some such underlying principle — whether we have correctly defined its *exact* limits or not — the statement of the writer is cleared of the alleged absurdity, and without resorting to the supposition of a special attempt to make out the number seventy.

The truth is that such a genealogico-historical table must always be looked at from the author's point of view, since its limits vary with his intention. Some of the facts in this case are well illustrated by Bradford's list "of those who came over first in ye year 1620, and were by the blessing of God the first beginners and (in a sort) the foundation of all the plantations and colonies in New England; and their families." Prince had numbered them as one hundred and one; Young, exactly one hundred; and Bradford calls them "about one hundred," while his list foots up one hundred and four; but the editor shows that it should be one hundred and two, two persons being deducted. Now Bradford twice speaks of them as those "that came over"; whereas one of the persons named died on the passage, one was born on mid-ocean, and one was born in Cape Cod harbor. The footing of one hundred and two was reached by the editor by dropping the last mentioned (Peregrine White) and counting the second (Oceanus Hopkins) *instead of the first*, William Butler. The editor, however, notwithstanding the verbal inaccuracy, still reckons the four who died on the coast before landing at Plymouth, among the "beginners" of that plantation. In later days (according to Young's *Chronicles of the Pilgrims*, p. 353) it has been customary to extend the list, and reckon all those who came over in the *Fortune* and the *Anne*, as well as the *Mayflower*, among "the old-comers or

forefathers"; much as this list in Genesis is brought down to a period seven-teen years subsequent to the entrance into Egypt.¹

3. This writer refuses to accept explanations afforded by the volume itself. Thus he insists (p. 154) that the coming out of Egypt "in the fourth generation" (Gen. xv. 16) must signify the fourth stage of genealogical descent, notwithstanding that the third verse previous (vs. 13) expressly fixes it as "four hundred years." Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Tuch, Delitzsch, Kalisch, and Knobel agree that a generation here is, in the words of the last-mentioned writer, "clearly a century"; while Rosenmüller explains that it is the sum total of the lives of contemporary men (e. g. Ex. i. 6). And when Dr. Colenso encounters the positive tracing of ten or (if Resheph be understood as the son rather than the brother of Rephab) eleven generations from Joseph to Joshua (1 Chron. vii. 23-27), for which interpretation such authorities as Knobel stand vouchers, he feels "justified in dismissing the whole account in the book of Chronicles about the genealogy as most probably erroneous" (p. 159). Meanwhile, however, Knobel still being witness, we find supplied six generations from Judah to Nahshon, six from Joseph to Zelophehad, and seven from Judah to Bezaleel, the builder of the ark. The genealogies, however, are commonly abridged so as to give only the landmarks of descent, — the tribe, family, immediate parentage, and a link or two between. Such abridgements cannot invalidate the positive statements of the fuller genealogy.

Here is also a full biblical solution of the difficulty concerning "the number of the Israelites at the departure," p. 162. The period of sojourn in Egypt — whether, with the Septuagint, Josephus, the rabbins, and many modern commentators, two hundred and fifteen years, or with Gen. xv. xiii. in round numbers, and with Ex. xii. 40 more exactly four hundred and thirty years, as firmly maintained by nearly all respectable late commentators on the Old Testament, except Baumgarten — actually contained *ten whole generations* from Joseph to Joshua, the latter being the eleventh in the line of descent from Jacob's youngest son but one. That fact is settled. If we then take Colenso's own data in other respects, viz. fifty-four males for the generation after Joseph, and four and a half as the ratio of increase, we shall reach a number far too large. But suppose we take only the forty-one grandsons of Jacob who are actually mentioned in Numbers as heads of families (exclusive of the sons of Levi), adopt four as the ratio of increase and even reject one generation on the ground that the generations in Joseph's line may be beyond the average, and we should still find a population of $41 \times 4^9 = 2,686,976$ souls at the Exodus, without reckoning "the mixed

¹ Professor Green, however, understands the list to be confined, in theory, to those who actually came into Egypt, exceptions being made in the case of Herzon and Hamul, who took the place of the dead, and Joseph's sons, whom Jacob adopted as his own. The lack of minute dates renders it difficult to determine the principle of reckoning in all its details, while it is very clear that there is an underlying principle.

multitude" who accompanied the people (Ex. xii. 38), and the remainder of the former generation still living, there ceases to be any difficulty on the score of increase. The only remaining difficulties on this point are : (1) the allusion by Paul (Gal. iii. 17), which speaks of four hundred and thirty years from the promise to the law, but which may be explained as a use of the Septuagint translation, not corrected (as also in Heb. x. 5), because the correction would make no difference in the argument, while the expression as it stands conveys no untruth. It was four hundred and thirty years — and more ; (2) the genealogy of Aaron, seemingly implying that his mother Jochebed was Levi's own sister, which has induced Ellicott, Alford, and some others to insist on the shorter period. The last difficulty, however, presses also on the theory of two hundred and fifteen years ; for as Levi was (see Ellicott on Gal. iii. 7) about forty-three years old at the coming into Egypt, and Moses was eighty at the departure, if Moses were actually the grandson of Levi, then, on the average, his mother must have been at least eighty-nine years old at his birth, and her father eighty-nine at her birth ! Some solution must be sought in any case. We can only say here that it is found in the supposition of omitted links of genealogy, either between Kohath and Amram (with Kalisch), or (with others) between Amram and Moses. Even Dr. Davidson declares in his latest work (Introduction, vol. I. p. 224) that "this solution is exposed to no serious objection." The former mode of supplying omitted links would hold that Jochebed, the mother of Moses, was another Jochebed than Levi's daughter, and one of her descendants — names being not seldom repeated even in biblical lines, and when so repeated always causing perplexity ; the latter would hold that Jochebed was the ancestor, but not the mother, of Moses, finding scripture authority to explain the mode of speech.

Dr. Colenso raises a difficulty on Ex. xxiii. 27–30, hinging on the small size of the promised land, which he declares to be but eleven thousand square miles, or twice the size of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex counties in England. Yet the very next verse (31st) defines the boundaries "from the Red Sea even unto the Sea of the Philistines, and from the desert to the river [Euphrates]" ; and a similar extent of dominion is promised in Gen. xv. 18 ; Josh. i. 4, and elsewhere. Rosenmüller would have informed the bishop that "these were in truth the boundaries" of the Israelites, a region five times as large ; Tuch and Knobel would have told him that "in its best days the Hebrew power had this specified extension" ; and Keith, that but for positive disobedience this dominion would have been both sooner and longer held.

4. This writer refuses to recognize explanations too obvious to require special suggestion in the text. As several cases have been involved in our previous remarks, and as other instances are obvious, we refrain from further specification.

5. He refuses to admit other explanations perfectly possible and admissible. The difficulty about the censers and the atonement money (p. 89) is in point. The *exact* correspondence of the two amounts points to the un-

avoidable supposition that both were the result of the same reckoning. The supposition is strengthened by the previous direction (Ex. xxx. 11-13), which connects the taxing with the numbering, by the evidence (Ex. xxxviii. 25, 26) that a numbering took place when the tax was collected, and by the fact that the actual payment of the tax and the returns of the military census were clearly within a very short time of each other, not more than six months apart. The only difficulty lies in the fact that the formal census-taking is mentioned as a new thing after the taxation. We answer, it is not only possible but probable that when the tax was collected it was done with the Egyptian accuracy of a registry of names. No classification was made, however. But the materials were now in existence for an accurate military classification by tribes and families. The direction for such a military census was accordingly given, and on the same day on which the direction was given the thing was done, (Num. i. 1, 18). This certainly looks more like an inspection of records by "the congregation" (vs. 18, i. e. their representatives) than an assemblage of people personally, on each short notice, to be numbered. In truth why should not a fresh record, careful enough for tabernacle taxation, be sufficiently accurate for military registration? Would not a further census be superfluous?

In this entirely illogical mode does this writer pass through the Pentateuch, confounding simple incompleteness of statement with inconsistencies and absurdities. It is idle to attempt to fasten such charges on any narrative, so long as some wanting brick can be supplied which would form a perfect coherence. All that is necessary in such a case is, not that we *know* the wanting fact, for the loss of the fact constitutes the difficulty, but that we can suggest a supposable fact. It is a principle of constant use in judicial investigations.

In many other instances, likewise, had the narrative given us but one additional remark the cavil never could have been raised. Suppose that in connection with the relative small number of the first born (p. 141), it had been simply stated in the scriptures that this number includes only those born after the enactment of the law; suppose that in reference to the Danites, though only the family of Hushim is mentioned as belonging to the tribe (p. 169), it has been added that Dan had daughters whose offspring were reckoned in the family of their brother, or that Hushim himself had three more children than his grandfather had, or simply that he had a large number of children and grandchildren, and the alleged difficulties vanish. Yet these explanations are perfectly possible.

The assertion of the impossibility of maintaining the cattle of the Hebrews in the wilderness, rests solely on our lack of knowledge, and not at all on any counter showing from contemporary facts. The difficulty is not a new one. We suggest the following heads of solution: (1.) The present desolation of the region is in effect somewhat exaggerated. Neither its degree nor its universality is so great as is implied in Colenso's entire statement. Let one fact suffice. Caravans of five thousand pilgrims from Africa to Mecca now pass directly through the desert of El Tih, "a region,"

says Stanley, "far less available for the resources of life than the mountains of Sinai," where the Hebrews tarried a long time. (2.) There is positive proof, given by Ritter and by Stanley, of a great deterioration in the character of portions of the wilderness within historic and even modern times. For example, the acacia (shittim) trees in the whole Sinaitic peninsula have been for years disappearing and even ruthlessly destroyed; so that while still abundant on the eastern and western clusters of mountains, yet on the central one, where the tabernacle and the ark must have been built of this very wood, not an acacia is now to be seen. Any person who knows what an effect the denuding of a mountain range of its trees will produce on the brooks and vegetation around and below in a very few years, will appreciate the significance of this single fact. Any New England farmer can understand it. We may boldly pronounce it impossible to say from the present nakedness and barrenness of such a mountain region that it could not have been vastly different two hundred, much more three thousand, years ago. Stanley and Ritter call attention to the numerous rock-inscriptions scattered through that region, on Sinai and Serbal, in Wady Mokatteb, and in a hundred other ravines, and on the tops of rocks and mountains; to the numerous remains of a former population in that region, and to the fact that before the passage of the Israelites four different nationalities, the children of Amalek, Midian, Ishmael, and on the east the Edomites, had their abodes in the desert; and Ritter concludes that "from the small number of its present population no certain conclusion can be formed as to its former condition." The theme admits of great enlargement. (3.) It is probable that the flocks and herds were widely dispersed from the central camp, like those of the Bedonins. J. L. Porter in the Syrian desert "rode for two consecutive days in a straight line through the flocks of a section of the Avazeh tribe of Arabs, and the encampment of the chief was then at a noted fountain thirty miles distant, at right angles to my course; yet the country was swarming with men and women, boys and girls, looking after their cattle." The camp would be but the central nucleus for the flocks. (4.) It is not necessary to suppose that they retained their herds undiminished. We find the tribes of Reuben and Gad specially mentioned at last as seeking a home east of the Jordan on account of "the multitude of their cattle." This too was after the capture of a great number of cattle and sheep from the Midianites (Num. xxxi). (5.) It is manifest from the narrative that great hardships were experienced. It was "a great and terrible wilderness," where they suffered at times both from hunger and thirst. Once at least God interposed by miracle to sweeten the bitter water, and once to bring water out of the rocks, "whereof the congregation drank and their beasts" (Num. xx. 11). (6.) It is therefore not to be forgotten that the narrative declares the people to be under the special guidance of God; and though Colenso may regard all such statements as "unhistorical," we hold that he who could in the last resort bring miraculous supplies, could also shape the action of natural

causes themselves to yield unwonted supplies. The special guidance and guardianship of Israel by God throughout is the burden of the story.

On the whole there is nothing of which this book so much reminds us as the persistent efforts of a wily advocate to mislead a jury by impudent assertion and deliberate misconstruction of the testimony. And there is no process before which it would so shrink into nothing as the searching examination of a legal mind fully informed on those subjects.

Part II is devoted to a consideration of the age and authorship of the Pentateuch. It deals more with questions of scholarship and criticism, and is much less popular in its cast. As a discussion of the subject from that point of view, it bears no comparison with those of German scholars, or with that of Dr. Davidson in his Introduction (1862). As the whole subject is undergoing a discussion in this periodical; and the objections will be probably met more at large than can be done in this place, we refrain from further comment.

ARTICLE VII.

THE TERCENTENARY JUBILEE OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

[This Article was prepared by Dr. Philip Schaff, and forms a fit appendix to Dr. Gerhart's Article, published in our January number, on the German Reformed Church].

THE Heidelberg Catechism is the most generally received doctrinal symbol of the Reformed Confession, as distinct from the Roman Catholic, and the Lutheran. It is more particularly the creed of the German Reformed and Dutch Reformed churches in Europe and in this country. It was prepared at the request of Frederic III., justly surnamed the Pious, Elector of the Palatinate, Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus, the former a pupil and intimate friend of Melancthon, the latter a pupil of Calvin. After being examined and approved by a synod of the Palatinate convened for that purpose at Heidelberg in December 1562, it was first published January 19, 1563, at Heidelberg, the seat of the oldest German University, and at that time the capital of the Palatinate on the Rhine. Hence it is called generally the Heidelberg Catechism, after the city of its birth, or also the Palatinate Catechism, from the electorate of that name for which it was originally intended. It soon found extraordinary favor, and threw all the older Reformed Catechisms, even that of the great Calvin, into the shade. It was introduced as a guide of catechetical instruction and as a confession of faith into the various Reformed churches of Germany, into several Swiss cantons, into Hol-