

Joseph B. McCaul

Bishop Colenso's Criticism Criticised

BS1225
4.C7M13



PC 1111
A. 11. 13

BISHOP COLENSO'S CRITICISM

CRITICISED:

IN A SERIES OF TEN LETTERS

ADDRESSED TO

THE EDITOR OF THE "RECORD" NEWSPAPER.

With Notes and a Postscript.

הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו אֲדַמָּה-קֹדֶשׁ הוּא :

"The place whereon thou standest is holy ground."—*Exod. iii. 5.*

BY

THE REV. JOSEPH B. M'CAUL,

CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, ONE OF THE ASSISTANTS IN THE LIBRARY OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM, AND CURATE AND LECTURER OF THE UNITED PARISHES OF ST. EDMUND THE KING WITH ST. NICHOLAS ACONS, LOMBARD-STREET; LATE CENSOR, AND DIVINITY LECTURER IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

THIRD EDITION, WITH CONSIDERABLE ADDITIONS.


LONDON:

WERTHEIM, MACINTOSH, AND HUNT,

21, PATERNOSTER-ROW, AND 23, HOLLES-STREET, CAVENDISH-SQUARE.

1863.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.



“THE Law breathes the air of the desert. Enactments intended for a
“people with settled habitations, and dwelling in walled cities, are
“mingled up with temporary regulations, only suited to the Bedouin
“encampment of a nomad tribe. There can be no doubt that the statute-
“book of Moses, with all his particular enactments, still exists, and that
“it recites them in the same order, if it may be called order, in which
“they were promulgated.”—DEAN MILMAN. *History of the Jews*. Second
Edition. Vol. I., pp. 95, 96.

“WHO, born within the last forty years, has read one word of Collins,
“and Toland, and Tindal, and Chubb, and Morgan, and that whole race
“that called themselves *Freethinkers*? Who now reads Bolingbroke?
“Who ever read him through? Ask the booksellers of London, what is
“become of these ‘lights of the world.’ In as few years, their few suc-
“cessors will go down to the family vault of ‘all the Capulets.’”—EDMUND
BURKE. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*.

CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE	v
LETTER I.—WHETHER THE LAW OF MOSES ENJOINS UPON THE PRIESTS TO CARRY OFFAL ON THEIR BACKS	1
LETTER II.—ON THE SAME SUBJECT	4
LETTER III.—ON THE SAME SUBJECT	9
LETTER IV.—DR. COLENZO AND THE “NATIONAL REVIEW”	14
LETTER V.—WHETHER, IN ORDER TO THE HISTORIC VERACITY OF MOSES, THE DOOR OF THE TABERNACLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN TWENTY MILES WIDE, AND ON OTHER MATTERS	21
LETTER VI.—WHETHER THE ISRAELITES OFFERED SACRIFICES IN THE WILDERNESS *	27
LETTER VII.—DR. COLENZO’S OBJECTIONS AS TO THE CATTLE, COM- PARED WITH THOSE OF VOLTAIRE	35
LETTER VIII.—DR. COLENZO ON SHEEP-FARMING, AND THE BEASTS OF THE FIELD	44
LETTER IX.—DR. BENISCH’S OPINION OF BISHOP COLENZO’S BOOK	53
LETTER X.—HOW DR. COLENZO HAS BEEN “ENABLED MORE DECI- SIVELY TO ESTABLISH” SOME OF HIS POSITIONS	55
POSTSCRIPT, CONTAINING THE STRICTURES OF LEARNED JEWS	60

* Letters VI., VII., and VIII. were not forwarded to the Editor of the “Record,” in order to save time. Letters IV. and X. were not included in the former Editions. The writer desires to express his thanks for the courtesy shown to him, and also for the great accuracy, with one or two very trifling exceptions, with which his letters were printed.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST AND SECOND EDITIONS.

It will be observed that the following Letters treat exclusively upon points of scholarly, and philological criticism. I have endeavoured, as far as possible, to avoid pronouncing any opinion upon the theological merits of the Bishop's volume. I felt certain before I began to write—and the result has shown that I was not mistaken—that the question of his Lordship's orthodoxy would be abundantly discussed by abler pens than mine. Already a number of most conclusive, and fairly-written replies have made their appearance. The cause of religious certainty has gained a hundredfold, by so avowed an attempt to overturn all the ancient landmarks, at one fell swoop. Would that it might be granted to my clerical brethren henceforward to be in a state of readiness, and prepared to give an answer to every one that asketh, respecting the reasons of the hope that is in them! Mere piety and zeal are in themselves inadequate defenders of the faith. Had the study of Hebrew been hitherto made an indispensable portion of an English clergyman's education, I venture to say, we should not have now to mourn over the sad exhibition of rash incompetence, which the volume under consideration so abundantly furnishes. No one who has drunk into the spirit of the sacred writings, at the vernacular fountain-head, could speak lightly concerning their historic value.

There is a convincing grandeur and propriety of diction, in every line of the Hebrew Scriptures, which carry with them a general and preliminary conviction of their genuineness, and authentic chronological antiquity. The Rationalistic writers of Germany, and more especially Dr. Ewald (*Geschichte des Volks Israel*), afford in this respect a striking and a happy contrast to Dr. Colenso. Unsound, and fanciful as the conclusions at which they arrive undoubtedly are, they nevertheless handle these most ancient records of the human race, and of the ways of God to man, at least with an outward show of scholarly

reverence for what bears on its forefront the majestic tokens of a hoary antiquity.

In considering a book such as the one before us, it is exceedingly difficult for a clergyman to divest his mind of all theological bias, in weighing the merits of each several argument. But when I beheld the panic created even in clerical circles, I felt persuaded that mere exclamations of indignant astonishment would tend only to increase the alarm and distrust. It is quite true that the same shafts were before launched against Moses, years ago, by the English Deists, and refledged by Voltaire, dipped in the corrosive sublimate of sarcastic venom. It is also true that these attacks have been again and again so triumphantly repelled and refuted, that they for a long time fell into discredit and well-merited oblivion. But mere assertions to this effect, would go a very little way to calm the present excitement. Men would naturally inquire, "If these old-fashioned Deistic objections are really so invalid and so inconclusive, how does it happen, that a Bishop of the Church of England has not hesitated to stake his professional character, and his reputation for Christian candour and theological attainments, by restating them, as if they had never been disposed of, and not only so, but by taking no small credit to himself on the score of their originality?"

The question at issue seemed therefore to me, to limit itself to a very narrow compass. It is simply this,—Have Dr. Colenso's statements any intrinsic value, independently of their emanating from an Episcopal chair? In other words, does the weight of learning accompany the weight of exalted position?

If it can be shown that his Lordship is philologically and critically incompetent for the stupendous responsibility which he has voluntarily assumed, in declaring himself to be the apostle of a new Reformation, with the demonstration of such deficiency, the greater portion of our apprehensions must fall to the ground. An adversary at whom we can afford to smile, is no longer dangerous. To a cursory student of the ensuing pages, it will be apparent that neither Dr. Colenso's erudition, nor his powers of observation, are of a formidable character.

His Lordship's book is intrinsically weak. He has fallen into some blunders, which would be ludicrous, if the consequences were not so unspeakably grave, both to himself, and to those who shall receive the poison without receiving an antidote. And in this respect I make bold to say that his Lordship's partisans, who pushed forward the publication of the volume, proclaiming its advent long before it actually appeared, must bear a large portion of the blame. The public has been led to believe, that the present crude production has passed through the hands of several eminent scholars, who revised it prior to its publication. Either Dr. Colenso has been the subject of an ill-timed pleasantry, when he received the assurance that his volume was in a fitting state to be given to the world, or else the unhappy author had committed the task of revision, to hands no better qualified to prune, than his own to write.

Meanwhile, what is to be done to set our Church right in the eyes of Christian scholars all over the world? *I would earnestly call upon my clerical brethren publicly to disclaim the volume*, not only as a sample of English orthodoxy, but of that ripe scholarship and sound common-sense for which the Church of England has been so long and so justly celebrated. *By a public and united expression of disapproval alone, can the mischief be in some measure undone.* The adoption of such a course could not possibly be construed into persecution. It is a duty which we owe to Christ, to ourselves, and to our glorious Establishment.

St. Edmund the King, Lombard-street, Dec. 9, 1862.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A SERIES of letters like the present, treating upon dry topics of Hebrew, and other antiquarian criticism, and appearing chiefly in the uninviting shape of reprints from the columns of a newspaper, would, upon any ordinary occasion, have excited little attention, and found few purchasers. The rapid distribution of the First and Second Editions is a very encouraging

token that the interest excited by Dr. Colenso's book, is of a deeper and more intelligent character, than a mere craving after party polemics.

It affords to my mind, a pretty evident indication that the people of England are thoroughly aroused, and are prepared to take real pains, to sift the Bishop's allegations to the bottom. This is indeed a hopeful sign of the times. It shows that the Word of God has a deep hold upon the affections of the nation at large; that men are not indifferent spectators of the present organized combination to uproot the hallowed sway, which the Bible has exercised hitherto over the minds and the consciences of Christian Englishmen, to whatever shade of religious opinions they may belong. It demonstrates, moreover, that they have not yet arrived at the requisite point of mental obfuscation, which will qualify them for appreciating the zeal which seeks to secure for the Bible "*its due honour and authority*" (Colenso, p. xxxiv), by placing its teaching on a level with the cloudy nonsense contained in the writings of the Sikh Gooroos, or even of "*such living truths*" as those which cheered the Indian sage, who declares, with a touching sublimity, "*I take for my spiritual food, the water and leaf of Rám.*" (Colenso, p. 156). And again, "*God is my clothing and my dwelling. He is my ruler, my body, and my soul*"! (*Ibid.* p. 157.)

In the days of our former ignorance, such sentiments would probably have gone under the ugly designation of Pantheism. Their general adoption in Christian England, would doubtless enable us, as the Bishop significantly suggests, "to meet the Mahomedan, and Brahmin, and Buddhist, as well as the untutored savage of South Africa, and the South Pacific, upon other, and better terms, than we do now." (p. 150.) As to their present desirability I will not hazard an opinion. But I will venture to say, that had such enlightened sentiments of universal charity prevailed in the Apostolic ages, the preaching of the Cross must have lost much of its offensive dogmatism. Possibly its necessity would have been altogether superseded. Are ye ripe, O ye Christians of England, to adopt the comfortless rhapsodies of this clumsy eclecticism from the creeds of ancient and modern Paganism, in place of the glorious "Gospel which bringeth salvation"? Have ye "so learned Christ"?

BISHOP COLENSO'S CRITICISM CRITICISED.

LETTER I.

WHETHER THE LAW OF MOSES ENJOINS UPON THE PRIESTS
TO CARRY OFFAL ON THEIR BACKS.

SIR,—No one has looked forward to the publication of Dr. Colenso's critical examination of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua* with more painful anxiety than myself. After the most unwonted, and oft-reiterated flourish of trumpets which announced the concluding throes of the Episcopal labour, I confess I was duly prepared for the apparition of some hitherto undreamt-of prodigy in criticism—for something that would throw all foreign scholarship into the shade, and give the whole world of theologians subject for meditation for the next twenty years at least. On opening the volume, however, and tremblingly examining its contents, my astonishment waxed greater and greater, as I turned over each successive page. The book I found to be full of the most astounding inaccuracies and ludicrous mistakes. I confess that I felt devoutly thankful to see the nature of the objections which were brought against the historic trustworthiness of the sacred writers. Take, for example, Chapter VI. of Dr. Colenso's treatise. His palpable ignorance of the Hebrew idiom is calculated to excite a titter amongst true critics, to whatever shade of orthodoxy or unorthodoxy

* "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined, by the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal." *London: Longmans.* 1862. 8vo.

they may belong, all over the world. Foreigners will ask, Can it be possible that the author of such sciolistic trash is a Bishop of the far-famed Church of England? In the aforesaid chapter, Dr. Colenso draws a somewhat grotesque picture of the impossible labours imposed upon the priest in the discharge of his sacerdotal functions. The chapter is headed, "The Extent of the Camp, compared with the Priest's Duties, and the Daily Necessities of the People." In Lev. iv. 11, 12, we read the following, "And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head and legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock, shall he (the priest) CARRY FORTH without the camp unto a clean place," &c. Dr. Colenso inclines to adopt Scott's measurement of the camp, who computes it to have "formed a moveable city of twelve miles square." "In that case," says the Bishop, "the offal of these sacrifices would have had to be "carried by Aaron himself, or one of his sons, a distance of six "miles; and the same difficulty would have attended each of "the other transactions above mentioned. In fact, we have to "imagine the priest having himself to carry on his back, on foot, "from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the metropolis, the 'skin, "and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung, even the "whole bullock,' and the people having to carry out their "rubbish in like manner, and bring in their daily supplies of "water and fuel, after first cutting down * the latter, where they "could find it! Further, we have to imagine half a million of "men going out daily—the 22,000 Levites, for a distance of "six miles—to the suburbs, for the common necessities of "nature. The supposition involves, of course, an absurdity, but "it is our duty to look plain facts in the face." (Pp. 38—40.)

So it is, Dr. Colenso! But unfortunately your Lordship has not done so! If you will have the goodness to refer to your Hebrew Bible, you will there see not one word about the priests "carrying offal on their backs!" The word which we have translated "he shall carry forth" is in the original סָרַחְוֹ (*rehotzi*), "he shall cause to go forth," *i. e.*, have conveyed. It is the Hiphil, or causative conjugation of the verb סָרַחְוֹ (*yatza*) †

* "We lighted cowdung fires in every pot we had." W. C. Baldwin. "African Hunting," etc. London. 1862. Svo. p. 11.

† For many examples see Gesenius, "Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum." Lipsiæ. 1847. Svo. p. 397.

= exivit.* A very pretty specimen of scholarship this to go forth to the savans of the civilized world! Is this the *summa Theologiæ* of our great Episcopal arithmetician? It might be well for Dr. Colenso to read the Pentateuch at least once through in the original before he gives the promised continuation of his lucubrations to the world. So also, with respect to the 22,000 Levites, above cited. If Dr. Colenso will refer to his English Bible even, he will discover that he makes himself merry at the expense of a sanatory regulation intended for warriors in the field (Deut. xxiii. 12—14), and not for the general congregation. It only applied to a military detachment or army on active service. Does Dr. Colenso suppose that the 22,000 Levites carried the *weapon* with the paddle to it wherever they went? Were they men of war† or of peace? No doubt, to an impure imagination, there would be little difficulty in conjuring up a very comical picture of these Hebrew priests and warriors, starting daily for their six miles' pilgrimage, upon "urgent private affairs."

So also the notion of the priest staggering forth under his repulsive burden may not altogether be free from a touch of the ludicrous. But, to my mind, such pleasantries, at the expense of God's Word, savour somewhat of the buffooneries of Voltaire, and are doubly offensive when they lack the appearance of scholarship which made his sneering blasphemies so dangerously taking.

I am yours, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

St. Edmund's, Lombard-street,
Nov. 6, 1862.

* It is worthy of remark that to Moses *himself*, and personally, are addressed the commandments respecting the making of the altar, &c. See Exod. xxx. 1,—וַיִּצַו יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה לְעָשׂוֹת אֹתוֹ, "And thou shalt make an altar;" and, again, וַיִּצַו יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה לְעָשׂוֹת אֹתוֹ, "And thou shalt overlay it;" and yet we have no reason for supposing that Moses included, amongst his varied accomplishments, either the handicrafts of a carpenter or a goldsmith.

† I am quite aware that Michaelis considers that, for a time, the sons of Levi acted as a kind of body-guard to Moses. This, however, does not affect the general question of their peaceful and sacred calling.

LETTER II.

WHETHER THE LAW OF MOSES ENJOINS UPON THE PRIESTS
TO CARRY OFFAL ON THEIR BACKS.

SIR,—In my letter of Nov. 6th, I stated that Dr. Colenso's book was full of "astounding inaccuracies and ludicrous mistakes." I wrote strongly, because I felt strongly upon the subject. I felt, with many others, that, independently of the injury inflicted upon the cause of Christ and true religion, a grievous, however unintentional slight, had been offered to the Church of England, and her reputation for learning as well as orthodoxy had been deeply wounded by the publication of that ill-advised and worse-digested volume. Many people suppose that the mere fact of a man's possessing the rashness to revile the Word of God openly, is sufficient guarantee for the excellence of his intentions. For myself, I feel under no pressing obligation to take such a flattering opinion upon trust. Impugners of the Bible must not expect to be dealt with more tenderly than writers upon other subjects. Their motives must be measured by their performances; their candour by the impartial fairness of their statements. No preliminary appeals *ad misericordiam*, such as we find on p. xii. or p. xxxiv., ought to weigh for one moment in dealing with such an unpleasant task as Dr. Colenso has forced upon all his brethren in the Church. He has placed himself at the bar of public opinion, and invites the most searching criticism. If, therefore, he be weighed in the balance and found wanting, he has himself alone to blame for the deplorable position which he has voluntarily taken up. To my mind, the *tu quoque* style of self-exculpation which he adopts in the Preface, only aggravates his offence a thousandfold. He would have the world believe that the larger number of the clergy and laity of the Church of England are as far gone in scepticism as himself, and that it is for their sakes chiefly, if not entirely, that he has been induced to write. (See Preface, p. xxvi.) It is, to say the least, an impertinence to assume that the orthodox clergy, *i.e.*, the great bulk of the ministers of our Church, systematically suppress the truth and

keep back their own convictions that the discoveries of modern science and revelation are utterly at variance. "It is a miserable policy," writes Dr. Colenso, "which now prevails, unworthy of the truth itself, and one that cannot long be maintained, to 'keep things quiet.'" (P. xxiv.) Here, then, we have a direct insinuation of wilful fraud cast upon those who presume to differ from the Bishop and his misguided sympathizers! And in the note on the same page his Lordship illustrates his meaning, by instancing the omission of a remarkable passage in Col. Sabine's English translation of Humboldt's "Cosmos," "in which the expression of the author's views as to the origin of the human race from one pair, would have, perhaps, offended the religious prejudices of English readers"!

Would Dr. Colenso think me very uncharitable were I to instance the following passage from pp. 66, 67, of his own work before us, as containing a gross *suppressio veri*? The Bishop quotes Deut. viii. 15, to show that the Israelites were without water in the wilderness, and that "the rock did not follow them, as some have supposed." He gives the passage thus: "Beware that thou forget not Jehovah, thy God, who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions, and drought, *where there was no water.*" The italics are the Bishop's; and here he breaks off. Who would suppose that the very next words of the sacred writer are as follows:—"Who brought thee forth water out of the rock of flint"!!

Far be it from me to say the omission was intentional, but to say the least, it was the result of a most unfortunate accident!*

* A very glaring example of the injustice and unsoundness of making quotations from the Word of God from memory, and apart from the context (retaining the *sound*, but perverting the *sense*), is to be found in Professor Jowett's "Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture":—"It will not do to go 'into the world saying, 'Woe unto you, ye rich men,' or on entering a noble mansion to repeat the denunciation of the prophet about 'cedar and vermillion,' or on being shown the prospect of a magnificent estate to cry out, 'Woe unto them that lay field to field, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth.' Times have altered, we say, since these denunciations were uttered; what appeared to the Prophet or Apostle a violation of the 'appointment of Providence has now become a part of it.'"—*Essays and Reviews*, Ninth Edition, p. 362. In the first place they are not the words of an apostle, but of our blessed Lord Himself, that the Rev. Mr. Jowett thus

In my previous letter, I called attention to the trustworthiness of Dr. Colenso's assertion that (in Lev. iv. 11, 12) it is enjoined that the priest should "carry on his back" the "offal" of the sacrifices a distance of six miles to a clean place without the camp, the Hebrew word simply meaning, "he shall have conveyed" (*vehotzi*). The word סָרַף (*yatza*), of which $\text{סָרַף$ (*vehotzi*) is the hiphil or causative conjugation, signifying "to go forth," and not having the remotest necessary connexion with "carrying." I rejoice to see, from a letter addressed by his Lordship to the "Morning Post," that I have done his critical attainments no wrong. "Your reviewer, who finds fault with me for supposing that the priest was commanded to carry out in person the offal of certain sacrifices for a distance of six miles from the tabernacle in the centre of the camp to the place 'where the ashes were thrown' outside the camp, and who thinks that he might have ordered another to carry it, on the principle that 'qui facit per alium, facit per se,' has surely not observed the passage, Lev. vi. 10, 11, 'And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put on his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire has consumed with the burnt offering on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar. And he shall put off his garments,

parodies (Luke vi. 24), although it is evident that he fancies he is citing from the Epistle of St. James, who writes, "Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment-seats?" (ii. 6.) Now, were some rich Evangelical or Anglican member of the Church of England to institute a prosecution against the Rev. Professor, and "draw him before the judgment-seat," making use of his wealth to crush "freedom of thought," and cripple his resources with law expenses, I hardly imagine that such a line of conduct would altogether coincide with Mr. Jowett's present views of Providential appointments. So also, should any modern Jehoiakim (Jer. xxii. 13) set Mr. Jowett to work upon his mansion, "using his neighbour's services without wages," and "giving nothing for his work," I think our learned "Essayist" would be very apt to fall in with the Prophet Jeremiah's views as to the wicked injustice of the case; nay, more, that he might consider the "cedar" and the "vermilion" as an aggravation of the cruelty of revelling in splendour and luxury amassed by the unrequited labour of the defenceless poor! The Oxford Professor's method of quotation is also marvellously in the style of Voltaire, who first puts his own words into the mouths of the sacred penmen, and then proceeds to annihilate his own fabrications with a scoffing sarcasm. I had hoped that such a mode of argument had gone out of fashion amongst gentlemen and scholars with the eighteenth century.

and put on other garments, and *carry forth* the ashes without the camp unto a clean place.' If the priest was to carry out in person the ashes in this case, there can be no doubt that he was also to carry out in person the offal in the other." (Dr. Colenso's letter, as reprinted in the "Daily Telegraph.")

The Bishop, then, stands resolutely to his original blunder, already cited; and, most unfortunately, the Hebrew word in the second passage which he adduces in its support is *וְהוֹצִיָהוּ* (*vehotzi*)—"he shall have conveyed"—also! Indeed, some of the Rabbis assume that in the first case it was not necessary for the priest to be present at all; whilst, in the second, I think I have demonstrated that there is no reason whatever for supposing that the priests were degraded to "carrying ashes," not to speak of "offal," on their backs!

Before leaving the subject, I would venture to direct the attention of Dr. Colenso to the "waggons" (Num. vii. 3, &c.) which the princes of Israel offered to the priests that they might "be to do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation."

Probably these waggons were similar in construction to those represented upon the Nineveh marbles in the British Museum, a cursory examination of which would well repay his Lordship's trouble.

Before concluding this letter, I would advert to one other subject which has excited no little surprise in many quarters. The Bishop says, on p. xxi., "That the phenomena in the Pentateuch, to which I have drawn attention in the first instance, and which show so decisively its unhistorical character, have not yet, as far as I am aware, been set forth, in this form, before the eyes of English readers, may perhaps be explained as follows," &c., &c. (*See also p. xiv.*)

In other words Dr. Colenso intimates that his objections have the recommendation of novelty! Can it be possible that the names of Tindal and Collins, which are watchwords in the mouth of every "secularist" mechanic, are unknown to his Lordship? Has he never heard of Bolingbroke,* not to

* I would recommend to Dr. Colenso's serious perusal, a little pamphlet by my father, the Rev. Dr. M'Caul, "Rationalism and Deistic Infidelity. Three Letters to the Editor of the 'Record,' with a Postscript." Wertheim and Co. 1861. 8vo.

speak of R. Carlile and the Rev. R. Taylor in our own days? *

Has the English translation of the profoundly learned Abbé Guénée's † "Lettres de quelques Juifs Portugais, Allemands, et Polonais, à M. de Voltaire" never fallen into the Bishop's hands? This admirable work passed through no less than eleven French editions before the conclusion of the first quarter of the present century. I have before me the sixth French edition, published in Paris in 1805, and also an English edition, published in Dublin in the year 1777. But for the Bishop's own intimation of his ignorance of this work, I should have had no hesitation in saying that almost every objection he urges, which deserves the smallest attention, was adopted from Voltaire, as answered by the Abbé Guénée. ‡ A few indeed of Dr. Colenso's objections bear the unmistakable traces of originality; but, I regret to say, taking the one already discussed as a specimen of his reasoning, they are not calculated to add to his reputation, either as a critic, or as a logician.

* For an account of the Controversy, see Leland's "View of the Principal Deistical Writers," etc. London. 1754—1756. 3 vols. 8vo. A later edition of this work was published by Tegg and Co. (London, 1837), in one volume, 8vo., with an Introduction by Cyrus R. Edmonds, and the Appendix of W. L. Brown, D.D.

† M. Guénée died 27th Nov., 1803. M. Picot, in his article in the "Biographie Universelle," informs us that Voltaire himself in his wiser moments did justice to the merits of the Abbé Guénée: "Le secretaire Juif," said he, "n'est pas sans esprit et sans connaissances; mais il est malin comme un singe; il mord jusq'au sang, en faisant semblant baiser la main." ("The Jewish scribe is not without wit nor learning, but he is malicious as a monkey. He bites so as to draw blood at the moment that he pretends to kiss one's hand.")—*Lettre à d'Alembert, du 8 Dec. 1776.*) It is true that, after a while, Voltaire relapsed into his scurrilous gibing tone (*ton goguénard*), and launched his sarcasms against his adversary. But the public saw no reason to alter their opinion, and continued to receive the "*Lettres de quelques Juifs*" with the same favour as before.

‡ There is also a considerable similarity between the style and cogency of the Bishop's arguments and those of Tom Paine, in the "*Age of Reason.*" For example, Paine decides against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, because Moses always speaks in the third person! *Query*, how about the Commentaries of Cæsar?

But to these and other points, Sir, with your kind permission, I hope to advert upon a future occasion.

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

St. Edmund's, Lombard-street,

Nov. 13, 1862.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since writing the above I have been so fortunate as to purchase a much more recent French edition of this work, containing the learned author's four most remarkable Memoirs on the ancient fertility of Judæa, which were read by him, before the Académie des Inscriptions.

LETTER III.

WHETHER THE LAW OF MOSES ENJOINS UPON THE PRIESTS
TO CARRY OFFAL ON THEIR BACKS.* * *

SIR,—If your correspondent, "An Earnest Searcher after Truth," really desires to know whether the Bishop of Natal is

* * * This third Letter was written in reply to the one subjoined, which was transmitted to me on Saturday, Nov. 22, from the "Record" office. The latter seems to have been forwarded by the writer in duplicate to the "Clerical Journal."—See "Notices to Correspondents," for Nov. 27 and Dec. 4 :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "RECORD."

SIR,—Will you kindly permit one whose only object is the elucidation of truth, to appeal through your columns to the Rev. J. B. M'Cauley, whose letter was only this morning seen in the "Record" of Nov. 12, on the subject of the received meaning of the word in Lev. iv. 12, which, for your convenience, I will spell as he does (Vehotzi), and which is one of those aorist tenses of the Hiphil conjugation, usually called preterite, of the verb (Yatza). It is used in this tense and conjugation no less than ninety-four times in the Old Testament, according to Rabbi Mordecai Nathan's "Hebrew Concordance." The Rev. Gentleman says, truly enough, that one of its meanings is, "to cause to go forth;" but not at all in the sense in which he has further explained it—*i.e.*, to have conveyed by another. On the contrary, direct personal action is always implied. And these are my reasons for my assertion :—First, In every case of the whole ninety-four where the word is used, as I have above stated, direct personal action is implied.

right in asserting that the law of Moses (Lev. iv. 11, 12) enjoins that the priest should "carry forth on his back" (שׂוֹחֵטִי *vehotzi*) the offal; and again, in Lev. vi. 10, 11 (in the Hebrew, Lev. vi. 3, 4), the "ashes" of the sacrifices, a proof is within his reach more convincing than a thousand arguments. Let him take the chapter in question to some learned Jew, and ask him whether what the Bishop says is all true? If he comes back from his interview unconvinced, further discussion will be hopeless. I did not speak without well weighing my words, when I said that such "palpable ignorance of the Hebrew idiom is calculated to excite a titter amongst true critics, to whatever shade of orthodoxy or unorthodoxy they may belong." Let me tell "An Earnest Searcher after Truth," that unbelieving Jews are scoffing at the recent whimsical display of ignorance and audacity on the part of an English Bishop.*

In referring to Rabbi Mordecai Nathan's Concordance, your correspondent is somewhat antiquated in his sources of information. Buxtorf, quoting from the Tsemach David, assures us that Rabbi Nathan wrote about the year 1438. A good deal has been done in Biblical lexicography since the commencement

Further authorities against him are, Onkelos and Jonathan, both of whom, in the verse in question (Lev. iv. 12), use the Chaldee word equivalent to "educet." So also does the Syriac, so also the Persian.

The Septuagint has ἐξοισει. Vulg. "efferet." Luther uses the verb "Ausführen;" Simoni Heb. Lex. for the word in this passage gives "attulit." Cocceius Lex. gives "educere," "proferre." The translation of Junius and Tremellius gives "efferet." Sebast. Schmidt, "educet." Benisch, "Shall he bring forth." And finally, Littleton, in his Latin Dictionary, gives, under "Educo,"—*Hotzi*, "to bring" or "lead forth," to "draw out."

If Mr. M'Caul had read carefully, in the Hebrew, Lev. vi. 3, 4, he would scarcely have so dogmatically propounded his opinion; as in that passage, where the same word is used, there can be no question about the personal action required.

Surely, then, the Rev. Gentleman will not venture to uphold his unsupported opinion against all these authorities. He well knows that mere assertion is no more proof, than is a sneer, argument.

Trusting you will admit this letter for the "truth's sake,"

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN EARNEST SEARCHER AFTER TRUTH.

Ramsgate, Nov. 19.

* For Dr. Benisch's opinion, as expressed in writing within the last few days, to the author of these pages, see Letter IX.

of the fifteenth century. I would refer your correspondent to the second edition of the "Englishman's Hebrew Concordance," published by Walton and Maberly, 2 vols. 8vo., London, 1860. On pp. 553—555 of vol. i. he will find no fewer than 299 instances of the Hiphil of הִצִּיחַ (*yatza*). These comprise 104 examples alone of the preterite, as used in the above-cited passages of Leviticus.

Your correspondent insists, as far as I can understand his letter, that whenever the word הוֹצִי (*hotzi*) is used, it invariably implies "direct personal action." The rashness of such an assertion will be at once seen on reference to Lev. xxiv. 13, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Bring [thou] forth him that cursed." הוֹצִי (*hotzay*) is in this passage, the imperative singular, addressed personally to Moses. But, if "direct personal action" were implied, then Moses was guilty of a flagrant act of wilful disobedience; for, on referring to the twenty-third verse of the chapter, we find that he deputed his own duty to the congregation: and "Moses spake to the children of Israel that they should bring forth [וַיֹּצִיאוּ] *vayotzoo*, literally, "and they did bring forth"] him that cursed, out of the camp . . . and the children of Israel did as the Lord commanded (!) Moses."

The same word is employed concerning the damsel which her father and mother were to "bring" to the elders of the city. (Deut. xxii. 15, &c.) Surely it is not implied that the girl's father was to "carry her forth on his back;" besides which, her mother is also mentioned, and a difficulty might possibly arise as to which parent was designated to bear the burden! Look, again, at 2 Sam. xii. 30. It is there said of David that "he brought forth" (הוֹצִי *hotzi*) the spoil of the city in great abundance. The verb is in the singular number; and as, according to "An Earnest Searcher after Truth," "direct personal action is always implied," we may conclude that David had a pretty hard time of it. But the utter absurdity of your correspondent's assertion appears from the thirty-first verse. David is there stated to have performed a much more wonderful feat even than the preceding. "He brought forth (הוֹצִי *hotzi*) all the people that were therein (Rabbah) and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon" !!!

So much for the reliability of "An Earnest Searcher after Truth" on points of Hebrew criticism! But, I regret to say, I have a far more serious objection to make against another portion of his letter. He professes to have referred to the LXX. version, as to the meaning of Leviticus iv. 11, 12, in support of Dr. Colenso's assertion that "the priest was to carry the offal on his back." He says the LXX version gives ἐξίσει. So it does in Lev. vi. 11; but in Leviticus iv. 11, 12, the passage actually under dispute, the Greek word is ἐξίσοῦσιν— "they shall carry out." In other words, it is put impersonally, and triumphantly establishes my interpretation of the passage. Such an omission is, to say the least, very unhandsome. I might fairly decline to argue with an antagonist of such a kind as this. Then, again, my anonymous opponent brings forward Onkelos and Jonathan as using the equivalent to "*educere*" to translate וְהוֹצִיָה (*vehotzi*). He must have a very poor estimate of the scholarship of your readers if he thinks he can persuade them that "*educere*" means to "carry on one's back!" If he will refer to John x. 3, in the Vulgate, he will find the expression (referring to the Good Shepherd) "*educit eas*" (sc. *oves*). It would be rather a startling theory to propound that shepherds are in the habit of "carrying" their flocks "on their backs!"

Then, again, with regard to Luther's translation, "*ausführen*," it is very plain your correspondent is a very tyro in the German idiom. The same word is used in the authorized Dutch translation—" *uytvoeren*," and simply signifies to lead or conduct forth.

In conclusion, I would observe that, as your correspondent professes himself to be an "Earnest Searcher after Truth," he is altogether on the wrong track to find it. Hunting up authorities to establish the propriety of one of the coarsest sneers ever levelled against the inspired Law of Moses is not likely to tend either to truth or edification. Such inquirers as these, St. Paul assures us (2 Tim. iii. 7), will probably continue "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

I deeply regret that your correspondent has adopted the anonymous form of communication. I think that, in such a controversy, people should not be afraid to give their names to

the public, that we may know at once "who is on the Lord's side."

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

*St. Edmund the King, Lombard-street,
Monday, November 24, 1862.*

POSTSCRIPT.—The learned Dutch Professor, J. van Nuys Klinkenberg, writes on this passage of Levit. iv. 11, 12,—
"Ondertusschen mogt de Hooge Priester zelf den varre niet
"buiten het leger voeren en verbranden. Hy moest dit door
"iemand anders laten verrichten, om niet verontreinigd te
"worden.—*Ier gl. Kap. xvi. 27, 28.* (Meanwhile the High
"Priest durst not carry out the bullock himself and burn it.
"He would have to let this be performed by some one else, in
"order that he himself might not contract defilement.)"—
"*De Bijbel verklaerd*," Deel iii., p. 39.

And again:—"De Hoogepriester moest dan die opgesneeden
"en nu van vet beroofden varre en bok, door mannen daer toe
"bekwaem, laten uitdragen tot buiten het leger. Deze
"uitvoering van de zond offers geschiede, allerwaerschijnlykst
"gelijktijdig met dat de priester het brand offer begon te
"offeren. (The Highpriest must now have the dismembered,
"and divested of fat, bullock and he-goat, carried forth by suit-
"able persons without the camp. . . . This conveying forth of
"the sin-offering most probably took place when the priest com-
"menced offering up the burnt-offering.)"—*Ibid.*, Deel iii.,
p. 169. Since writing the above (on p. 12), I have learned
that the edition of the Septuagint, cited by an "Earnest Searcher
after Truth," is that of *Stier and Theile*. They have indeed
 $\epsilon\xi\omicron\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota$ in the body of the text, but give in a foot-note, *on the
same page*, $\epsilon\xi\omicron\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega$, as a various reading!!! The edition
that I employed was that of F. Field, Oxon. 1859, 8vo. The
reading $\epsilon\xi\omicron\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega$ is found in the Alexandrian MS., and also is
followed in Walton's Polyglott, in Cardinal Mai's edition of the
Vatican text, *Rome*, 1857; in Bagster's Polyglott, edited by
Dr. Samuel Lee, 1831, fol.; in Canon Holme's folio edition,
Oxford, 1798, fol.; and also in Bagster's edition of the LXX,
according to the Vatican MS. The Complutensian Polyglott,
and that of Plantin (Antwerp, 1569, fol.) are the only editions

of any weight, if indeed they possess any authority, in which I find ἐξόλοει. To these, however, it is apparent "An Earnest Searcher after Truth" had no access, as he has not pressed them into his service.

I have also examined the following editions of the LXX, all of which have ἐξόλοουσιν, viz., the Aldine (*Venice*, 1518, fol.), the Sixtine (*Rome*, 1587, fol.), that of Paris (Gr. and Latin, 1628, fol.), it has ἐξόλοουσιν "efferent," that of Grabe (*Oxford*, 1707, fol.), and lastly, that of Tischendorff (*Leipsic*, 1856, 8vo.). This latter edition is particularly important as having been collated with the "Codex Ephrem." The overwhelming weight of testimony,* therefore, including that of the three principal MSS., viz., Alexandrian, Vatican, and Ephraemi, is in favour of the reading ἐξόλοουσιν. The Complutensian text (closely followed, as B. Arias Montanus himself implies in his Preface, by the Antwerp edition of Plantin) was confessedly framed upon several MSS. Ussher, Walton, and Hody, accuse the Complutensian Editor of altering the text to make it correspond exactly with the Hebrew. This imputation Dr. Davidson stoutly denies. It seems to me, however, that Hody (*De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus*, p. 634, &c.) has a good deal to say for himself upon the subject.

LETTER IV.

BISHOP COLENZO AND THE "NATIONAL REVIEW."

SIR,—I was fain to hope that in my former letters I had set at rest the meaning of the word רִצְוֹזִי (*vehotzi*), "he shall carry forth." (Lev. iv. 11, 12.) Dr. Colenso would have us believe that it signifies in this passage, that the High Priest was "to carry a whole bullock on his back," a distance of six miles, to a place outside the camp! I endeavoured to show that such an interpretation was nothing more than an illiterate and impertinent burlesque upon the inspired Law of Moses. I supported my arguments by reference to the best commentators, by the

* And yet, in an article in the "National Review" for January, 1863, p. 12, I find the following extraordinary statement:—"No one ever dreamt of giving it (רִצְוֹזִי Levit. iv. 11, 12,) any other meaning in this passage, "but that of the English version." (!)

opinion of eminent living Jewish and Christian Hebraists, and also by adducing the testimony of the chief MSS. of the Septuagint version. All the best MSS. are unanimous in reading ἐξοίσουσιν, *i. e.*, "they shall carry forth."

In other words, *וְהוֹצִי* (*vehotzi*) is put impersonally, and the High Priest was *not* degraded to "carrying offal and ashes on his back," as Dr. Colenso would have his readers believe.

It would appear, however, that there are yet would-be Hebrew scholars and critics, who are unconvinced. In the "National Review" for January, 1863 (pp. 11, 12), I read the following:—

"It is by no means to be inferred that the volume is care-
 lessly put together, or that it is liable to such charges as those
 which have been brought against it in the pages of some of
 the Conservative journals. To one of them we cannot help
 referring, because it is more foolish and ill-mannered than any-
 thing that we ever remembered to have seen, as proceeding
 from one who claims to be a learned divine. The Rev.
 J. B. M'Caul declares, in a letter to a 'religious' paper, dated
 November 6, that on opening Dr. Colenso's work he was truly
 astonished; 'the book I found to be full of the most astound-
 ing inaccuracies and ludicrous mistakes. I confess that I felt
 devoutly thankful to see the nature of the objections which
 were brought against the historic trustworthiness of the
 sacred writers. Take, for example, Chapter VI. of Dr.
 Colenso's treatise. His palpable ignorance of the Hebrew
 idiom is calculated to excite a titter amongst true critics, to
 whatever shade of orthodoxy or unorthodoxy they may
 belong, all over the world. Foreigners will ask, Can it be
 possible that the author of such sciolistic trash is a Bishop
 of the far-famed Church of England?' For this charge the
 sole foundation (!) is a supposed mistranslation by the Bishop
 of Lev. iv. 11, 'The skin of the bullock, &c. . . he shall
 carry forth without the camp.' Rather, we should say, his
 acquiescence in the supposed mistranslation of the English
 version. Mr. M'Caul continues, 'The word which we have
 translated "he shall carry forth" is in the original *vehotzi*,
 "he shall cause to go forth," *i. e.*, have conveyed. It is the
 Hiphil, or causative conjugation of the verb *yatza* = *exivit*.
 A very pretty specimen of scholarship this to go forth to the

“ ‘savans of the civilized world!’ So writes the champion of the
 “ Mosaic narrative. We have above, urged the importance of
 “ courtesy at all hazards towards opponents. But if we ever
 “ were tempted to break the rule, it was when we read a
 “ criticism of so intolerable an audacity as the above. Mr.
 “ M‘Caul is right in his statement about the general sense of the
 “ Hiphil conjugation; though, if he means to assert that the
 “ Hebrew conjugations are invariably constant in their meaning,
 “ his knowledge of the Hebrew language must be far smaller
 “ than his name would have us to expect. But will it be be-
 “ lieved that the word in question is not a difficult and unusual,
 “ but a very common one,—that no one ever dreamt of giving
 “ it any other meaning in this passage than that of the English
 “ version (!),—that it occurs in numbers of passages where it
 “ could have no other possible sense,—that Gesenius, the first
 “ lexicographic authority, recognises it as unquestionable, and
 “ that he allows a causative meaning in one single passage of the
 “ Old Testament (!), and that one, in which a causative meaning is
 “ neither obligatory, nor indeed, in our (!) opinion, probable?”

In a note on p. 12, the “National Reviewer” writes:—

“ Since the above was written Mr. M‘Caul’s second letter has
 “ come before us. He supports his charge of gross ignorance
 “ against the Bishop, by trying to prove that in three instances,
 “ out of nearly 300, the word may perhaps (!) be used in a
 “ different sense from that in which the Bishop uses it.”

I would first call attention to the want of candour in the Reviewer’s quotation from the disputed passage of Dr. Colenso. The Reviewer writes, “The skin of the bullock, &c. . . . he shall carry forth.” Bishop Colenso writes, “In fact, we
 “ have to imagine the priest having himself to carry on his back,
 “ on foot, from St. Paul’s to the outskirts of the metropolis, the
 “ skin and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards and dung,
 “ even the whole bullock.”! (P. 40.) The “National Re-
 viewer” quotes from the Bible, abridging the passage as far as
 possible, so as to weaken the force of my objections, and to lead
 his readers to suppose that I ill-naturedly exaggerated his Lord-
 ship’s reasonable acquiescence in the words of the English
 version. I quoted the exact words of Bishop Colenso’s ridi-
 culous and unscholarly commentary thereupon. It is a poor
 cause that requires to be bolstered up by such slippery

evasions. With respect to the "National Reviewer's" quotation from Gesenius, I would simply remark that it is much to be regretted that our learned critic does not favour his readers with a specification of the particular edition of Gesenius's "Lexicon" which enabled him to make his remarkable discovery. I would refer my readers to Gesenius's "Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum . . . Editio altera emendatior, ab auctore ipso adornata, atque ab A. T. Hoffmanno recognita," Lipsiæ, 1847, 8vo., p. 397, and leave them to decide for themselves as to the justice of the Reviewer's aspersion upon the Hebrew scholarship of Gesenius. I would, however, further observe that the point really at issue is not, whether the "National Reviewer" is a Hebrew philologist or not, but whether Dr. Colenso understands anything whatever of the sacred vernacular which he pretends to criticise. I should be sorry to lose sight of the main question, as to the Bishop of Natal's personal attainments, in a general discussion upon the meaning of any Hebrew word whatsoever. His Lordship has ventured to translate *vhotzi* by "he shall carry on his back." The "National Reviewer" has judiciously kept this fact out of sight, and launches out into a diffuse discussion as to whether the Hiphil conjugation of *yatza* has a causative signification, or simply means "to carry." He, in fact, identifies himself with the opinion of an "Earnest Searcher after Truth," who alleges that "direct personal action is always implied:" in other words, that *hotzi* always means *literally* "to carry." The "National Reviewer" goes further. He insinuates, although he has not the courage to say so *totidem verbis*, that it does so in nearly 300 examples!

I have said that the Hiphil of *yatza* occurs 299 times in the Hebrew Bible. In ninety cases at least, the word is used respecting God's bringing up the children of Israel out of Egypt. Now, I would ask the "National Reviewer" whether the word in these ninety cases, is a literal or a figurative expression? Does it mean actually "to carry"? Or does it allude to the miraculous and human agency by which the Exodus was accomplished? If my memory serves me rightly, it is repeatedly said, that God brought forth the children of Israel "by the hand of Moses and Aaron." Is this a figurative or literal expression? Did Moses and Aaron carry two million

souls in their hand, or as Dr. Colenso might render it, "on their backs"? And, again, we read that they were brought forth, "by signs and wonders, by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm." Is "direct personal action" here implied? Let me now adduce a few other passages in which, according to the "National Reviewer," *Hotzi* always means strictly and literally "to carry." Let us look for instance at Deut. xxii. 19, "because he hath brought up (חֹטְזִי *hotzi*) an evil name upon a virgin of Israel." Again, verse 21, "Then they shall bring out (וְהוֹצִיָּו *vehotziou*) the damsel," according to Dr. Colenso and the "National Reviewer," "carry out on their backs"! Also, in verse 24, of the virgin and her seducer, "Then ye shall bring (וְהוֹצִיָּתֶם *vehotzaythem*) them both out," *i. e.*, "carry them both out, on your backs"? So also in 1 Kings xxi. 10, according to the above eminent Hebraists, Naboth was "carried out on the backs" of the elders of his city! In Ezra i. 7 we read, "Also Cyrus the king brought forth (חֹטְזִי *hotzi*) the vessels of the house of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar had brought (חֹטְזִי *hotzi*) forth out of Jerusalem." Rather an undignified proceeding for two such mighty potentates! In 2 Chron. xviii. 33, King Ahab says to his chariot man, "Turn thine hand, that thou mayest carry me [on thy back?] out of the host." (*See* 1 Kings xxii. 34.) And yet we read, "Howbeit, the King of Israel stayed himself up in his chariot," &c. In Ezekiel xlii. 15, "He brought me forth to the gate." In Ezra x. 3, "Now, therefore, let us make a covenant with our God to put away (לְהוֹצִיָּה *lehotzi*) all the wives." I wonder whether Sir Cresswell Cresswell would understand "carrying on one's back" as the equivalent to the sentence of a decree *nisi*! Further, in Gen. i. 12, "Let the earth bring forth (וַתוֹצֵא *vatozay*) grass." Numbers xvii. 8, Aaron's rod, we are told, "brought forth buds." It is quite evident that "direct personal action" is in these two passages as "always implied"!!! But to proceed. According to Dr. Colenso and the "National Reviewer," we learn the interesting fact that Rahab (Josh. vi. 23), "and her father, and her mother, and her brethren, and all that she had, and all her kindred," were carried out of Jericho on the backs of the two spies! A more perplexing case even still (inasmuch as "direct personal action is always implied") occurs in 2 Sam. x. 16:—"And

Hadarezer sent (!) and brought out (נָצַץ *vayotzay*) the Syrians that were beyond the river." Perhaps Dr. Colenso could explain arithmetically how Hadarezer succeeded in being in two places at once? In 2 Kings xv. 20, "And Menahem exacted (נָצַץ *vayotzay*) the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth." I would invite the "National Reviewer's" attention to Gesenius's explanation of this passage, "*exegit pecuniam sq. לַע, tributum imposuit. (2 Reg. xv. 20.)*" Again, in 1 Chron. xix. 16, "And when the Syrians saw that they were put to the worse before Israel, they sent messengers, and drew forth (נָצַצוּ *vayotzoo*—literally, "and they caused to come") the Syrians that were beyond the river," &c. Once more, 2 Chron. i. 17, "And they fetched up and brought forth נָצַצוּ (*vayotzoo*) out of Egypt a chariot for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred and fifty, and so they brought out horses for all the kings of the Hittites and for the kings of Syria, by their means" (נָצַצוּ בְּיָדָם *beyadam yotzoo*—literally, "by their hand they caused to go forth.") The same mode of expression, on the same subject, is found in several other passages. In Prov. xxx. 33, it is said, "Surely the churning of milk bringeth forth (נָצַץ *yotzi*) butter, and the wringing of the nose bringeth forth (נָצַץ *yotzi*) blood; so the forcing of wrath bringeth forth (נָצַץ *yotzi*) strife. In Jer. x. 13, it is said that God "bringeth forth (נָצַץ *vayotzay*) wind out of his treasures." See also Jer. li. 16, and Psalm cxxxv. 7. In Isaiah xl. 26, it is applied to the stars. It is said that God "bringeth out their host by number." So again in Job xxxviii. 32, "Canst thou bring forth (נָצַצוּ *hatotzi*) Mazza-roth?" These few examples must for the present suffice, but they might be multiplied far beyond the limits of a letter. And now, Sir, I would ask, in the name of common sense, whether the Hiphil of (נָצַץ *yatza*), as according to the "National Reviewer," means literally "to carry" (I will not press Dr. Colenso's interpretation "to carry on one's back" too closely!) in every passage of the Hebrew text, with the exception of the three passages in which I have in my former letter "tried to prove that the word may perhaps (!) be used in a different sense from that in which the Bishop uses it!"?

Either the "National Reviewer" is a very illiterate, or he is a very disingenuous controversialist. He either reckons upon

the inability of his readers to verify his statements, and hopes to produce an impression in favour of the Bishop, by affirming what he knows to be palpably incorrect, or else he is no better qualified than Dr. Colenso himself to criticise the Hebrew text. The approbation of such *ex parte* supporters is of itself sufficient to awaken serious misgivings as to the object and aim of the present attack upon the Pentateuch.

When Simon the gaoler of the unhappy son of Loius XVI., asked, "What is to be done with the young wolf's cub?" his employers, with ambiguous significance, answered, "He is to be got rid of." So it is at the present juncture with the inspiration of the Bible. Its Divine authority is "to be got rid of," if possible, by fair means, if not, by other and less legitimate methods of attack. We may feel devoutly grateful that the undissembled vexation of the conspirators, at the lamentable *fiasco* of their vaunted champion's first onslaught, is betraying them into the manifestation of their true colours. We may hope that the time is not far distant, when English "Neology" will drop its disguise, and, discarding its present pitiful protestations of zeal for God's truth, will stand forth in the sinister, but less dangerous semblance of avowed unbelief and atheism.

There is something that might pass current for a spurious manliness in the sceptical hardihood of R. Carlile and the Rev. R. Taylor, and which shows to signal advantage, when compared with the pusillanimous degeneracy of the new lights of the present day. The former unhappy men knew that fines and imprisonment awaited them as the inevitable results of their boldness, and yet they were not dismayed, by any fear of consequences, from speaking their minds. Whilst the latter, harbouring the very same animosity against the inspired Word of God, prefer, at present at least, "*ambiguas spargere voces*," to drop a word of doubt as to Moses' "historic" veracity here, and a sneer against the credibility of a miracle there, all blended down with honeyed words, and sugared with euphonious truisms, to suit the uncritical palate of the wavering and the unlearned. The sympathies of the English public are easily enlisted on the side of any champion, however mistaken his cause, whose courage and self-abnegation keep pace with his words. They are apt to look coldly upon propounders of strange doctrines, who stand shilly-shallying between blows and

blandishments, irresolute whether to strike or to parley; whose eyes are wistfully wandering in search of a loophole of escape, in case the tide of popular applause should run counter to their innovations; and who are evidently prepared to be blasphemously outspoken, or mistily Evangelical, in proportion to the amount of sympathy or support they may receive at the popular hands. Let Dr. Colenso and his friends, like honest men, lay aside their protestations of orthodoxy, and come forth into the theological arena in their true colours. Their fall will be deplored by the whole Church of Christ, but their names will be rescued from the present, well-merited stigma of treachery. They will be then mourned over, but not despised, by all truth-loving men.*

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

*St. Edmund the King, Lombard-street,
Jan. 12, 1863.*

* This fourth letter was not included in the first edition of the present pamphlet, and is inserted here (out of its chronological order) for the sake of convenience.

LETTER V.

WHETHER, IN ORDER TO THE HISTORIC VERACITY OF MOSES,
THE DOOR OF THE TABERNACLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN
TWENTY MILES WIDE, AND ON OTHER MATTERS.

SIR,—In my second letter I said that certain of Dr. Colenso's objections to the historical veracity of the Pentateuch bore the unmistakable impress of originality, although the least un-scholarly of his arguments were drawn from the English Deists and Voltaire. It is respecting one or two of the Bishop's own genuine performances that I would crave permission to say a few words in my present communication. Chapters iv. and v. of his Lordship's "Critical" examination seem to me to demand especial attention on account of their pre-eminent absurdity. The title of Chap. iv. is "The size of the Court of the Tabernacle compared with the Number of the Congregation." Its object is to prove arithmetically that because the door of the Taber-

nacle was not “*twenty miles!*” in width, that therefore “Jehovah “ spake [*not*] unto Moses saying.....Gather thou [all] the “ Congregation together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the “ Congregation. And Moses did [*not*] as Jehovah commanded “ him. And the assembly was [*not*] gathered unto the door of “ the Tabernacle of the Congregation.”—“Lev. viii. 14.”* In passing, I would observe that the verse cited is not the “14th,” either in the Hebrew or the English text; but a minor inaccuracy of this description is a mere nothing in comparison with the critical blunders with which the work abounds. The correct reference is Levit. viii. 1—4. When I first read these two chapters of the Bishop’s book I could not help feeling that his Lordship was far more indebted to the “simple-minded, but intelligent native” mentioned on p. vii., for some of his arguments than he has had the candour to admit. Surely, it is a little unhand-some in Dr. Colenso to deprive his swarthy fellow-critic of the honour justly accruing to him for discovering impossibilities of so novel a description in Moses’ narrative, and which have hitherto escaped the acumen and research of all the Ewalds, and De Wettes, and Eichhorns, &c., &c., collectively and individually. It is hardly fair that his Lordship should usurp the entire merit of the disclosure of such a remarkable blot upon the face of the Mosaic story, as the one upon which this fourth chapter is based. Feeling somewhat diffident at following the Bishop of Natal on to his own vantage ground of figures, I will neither attempt to prove that the door of the Tabernacle was twenty miles wide, nor yet that all “*the adult “ males in the prime of life,*” amounting to “603,550 men,” did find standing room in the Court of the Tabernacle, the area of which, Dr. Colenso informs us, was sixty yards by thirty yards. I would, however, ask permission to examine into some of the arguments upon which the Bishop’s most conclusive reasoning is based.

He proceeds upon the assumption that the whole male population is included in that expression “The Congregation.” Dr. Colenso evidently has not consulted his Hebrew Bible upon the present, as upon many other occasions. He would otherwise have observed that the words actually employed strengthen his own position. The actual words are קָל־הָעֵדָה (Kol haeydah),

* Compare Exod. xxix. 42, 43.

i. e., "all the Congregation." The first text which the Right Rev. Prelate adduces in support of his theory is rather an unfortunate one. "We read," says he, "for instance, with reference to the Passover, 'The whole Assembly of the ' 'Congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening.'" (Exod. xii. 6.) This happens to be a passage of Scripture employed by the Rabbis to prove the authority of a delegate! The "whole Congregation" did not, and could not, each kill a Paschal lamb, otherwise, instead of "200,000 lambs" (p. 58), the "whole Congregation" would have required 603,550 lambs, *i. e.*, one to each adult male!! Or does Dr. Colenso mean to insinuate that it took three men to kill one lamb?

The Talmudists rightly understood "the whole assembly of Israel shall kill it," in Exod. xii. 6, to mean, that a sufficient number of lambs were to be slaughtered to meet the wants of the entire people, by those persons upon whom the duty naturally devolved.

A little further on, Dr. Colenso continues: "So '*all the congregation*' stoned the blasphemer, Lev. xxiv. 14, and the Sabbath-breaker, Num. xv. 36." Does Dr. Colenso then mean to say, that in every case no fewer than 603,550 stones were hurled at the criminal?

I feel somewhat ashamed of propounding, even hypothetically, such puerilities, but they are the logical results of the Bishop's reasoning. Surely, Sir, I did not overstep the bounds of truth when in my first Letter I described certain portions of this pseudo-criticism as being "sciolistic trash."

Has the Bishop of Natal never been present, by courtesy, in the Upper House of Parliament, when the Commons were summoned to the bar? Who would be so insane as to doubt the historic veracity of the *Times*' reporter, who stated that the Commons did appear at the bar, because every individual Member, or even a majority of the Members, were not actually present?

Sir, I grieve and blush to think that the unparalleled reputation of the English Bench for sound scholarship should be thus burlesqued in the eyes of foreigners. Dr. Colenso's book will be translated into the continental languages. I have the privilege to be acquainted with several eminent foreign scholars. I

cannot describe to you the feeling with which I heard one of them, a most accomplished Hebrew gentleman, exclaim, on reading the volume in question, "It is the most foolish and unlearned work of the kind that I ever looked at!"

The names of Ussher, and Warburton, and Kidder, and Lowth, and Newcome, and Horsley, and Walton, have hitherto given our Church a proud pre-eminence amongst Biblical scholars; not to mention our Lightfoots, and Kennicots, and Blayneys, and Hodys, and Prideauxs. Our author may rely upon it that his own name will go down also as a critic. Few, however, would grudge his Lordship his own distinctive celebrity as a Biblical Commentator, judging from the specimens of criticism already disposed of.

But to pass on to chapter v.: "MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL."

The statements to which Dr. Colenso objects are as follows:—"These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel." (Deut. i. 1.) "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them." (Deut. v. 1.) "And afterwards he read all the words of the Lord . . . according to all that which is written in the Book of the Law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." (Josh. viii. 34, 35.)

The gist of Dr. Colenso's argument is this: "We must suppose that, at least, the great body of the congregation (between two and three millions) was present, and not only present, but able to hear (!) the words of awful moment which Joshua addressed to them." (P. 37.) And again: "How, then, is it conceivable that a man should do what Joshua is here said to have done, unless, indeed, the reading . . . was a mere dumb show, without the least idea of those most solemn words being heard by those to whom they were addressed? For surely no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle, of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people, as large as the whole population of London. The very crying of the 'little ones,' who are expressly stated to have been present, must have sufficed to drown the sounds at a few yards' distance."

Before proceeding further, I would observe that Dr. Colenso's sneer about the "little ones" וְהַיְלָדִים (*vehattaf*) again betrays his ignorance of the Hebrew text. "*Taf*" is a noun singular of multitude; it is sometimes applied to signify the entire "family." Gesenius instances a case (2 Chron. xx. 13) * where it includes the women as well as the children. $\text{וְהַיְלָדִים וְהַנְּשִׂאִים וְהַבָּנִים}$ *Gam tafam—n'shayhem oubeneyhem*—"etiam familia eorum (nempe) feminae et liberi eorum;" and, again, Gen. xlvii. 12— $\text{וְהַיְלָדִים וְהַנְּשִׂאִים}$ *Lepi hattaf†*—"pro ratione familia." (Gesen. Lexicon, *Lipsiæ*, 1847, p. 358.)‡ There is, therefore, no absolute necessity to decide that babies in arms, whose "very crying must have sufficed to drown the sounds at a few yards' distance," were present at all.

But I am not disposed to dispute the apparent superiority which Dr. Colenso's unacquaintance with a dead language gives him. I would submit for his consideration two parallel instances which modern history furnishes, and leave the Bishop to draw the inference as to the practical wisdom of his reasoning. On turning to the French "*Moniteur*" for July 16, 1790, I there read an account, from the pen of the accredited reporter of the journal, who signs his name M. Peuchet, of a similar commemorative festival—I mean the "*Fête of the Confederation*," intended to inaugurate the new Constitution of the French people. He writes as follows:—"The fête of the "*Fédération Générale*" presented yesterday the most imposing spectacle which a free people can offer. The Champ de Mars, destined to receive the ENTIRE NATION (*la nation entière*), had been put in requisition for this grand ceremony, and one saw with what zeal the citizens of all classes had devoted themselves to complete such works of this amphitheatre (*de ce cirque*) in which they were able to lend a helping hand. The same zeal animated the superintendents of the other works. In two days they were finished

* The English version reads, "And all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their wives, and their children."

† Gen. xlvii. 12. *Vulgate*, "præbens cibaria singulis." *Septuagint*, "*κατὰ σῶμα.*" Walton translates the Syriac, "pro ratione familiae eorum;" and Onkelos, "juxta familiam uniuscujusque."

‡ Other examples will be found in "The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance," 2d edition, vol. i., p. 484.

“ Arrived on the Champ de Mars, what a sight! what a sublime spectacle! Two hundred thousand men encircled the altar of their country! *They waited for their brothers, their legislators, their King, to cement (pour affermir) a liberty still unsecured (encore agitée) on the bases of justice, of faith, and solemn oaths.* Silence reigned supreme. The Major-General of the Federation pronounced in the name of the military deputies the federal oath. IT WAS REPEATED BY ALL, and received by the people, the legislators, and the King.”

After giving the words of the oath pronounced by the King, and the extraordinary enthusiasm which its utterance caused in the remotest portions of the vast amphitheatre, the writer proceeds to describe the effect produced by the Queen’s presenting her children to the multitude:—“ This movement of deep sensibility and grandeur was warmly appreciated (*vivement senti*) by the Federals, who simultaneously (*tous unanimement*) acknowledged it by their applause and acclamations. *They recalled with the oath, taken by all and in the name of all, the duties which it enjoined and the obligations which it imposed.*”

Even women and children (!) were present, and realized the importance of the occasion:—“ The women, the children (*les enfans*), the soldiery, invoked blessings on the King, the father of his people, and the friend of all.” This French journalist could see nothing absurd or out of place in so universal a participation in the feeling of joy at the common welfare. On the contrary, he exclaims, in fervid rapture, “ *Quel religieux sentiment domine cette multitude immense! Comme le peuple est sublime, lorsqu’il est tout entier au sentiment de sa propre grandeur!*”

It must indeed require the unæsthetic temperament of a Colenso to see anything incredible, or out of place, in the similar popular ratification of the Divine Hebrew Constitution, as described in such sober terms by Joshua. Lengerke does not object to its historic veracity upon any such foolish grounds as the Bishop.*

In conclusion, I would just refer to the “ *Moniteur* ” of June 10, 1794. In the impression for that day, I actually find a verbatim report of two speeches addressed by Robespierre to a similar assembly, on the occasion of the festival given in honour

* *Kenuan. Volks und Religionsgeschichte Israels.* Theil. 1, p. 642.

of the "Supreme Being." Surely this could not have been written by an eye-witness! "*The very crying of the little ones, who are expressly stated to have been present, must have sufficed to drown the sounds at a few yards' distance!*" (Colenso, p. 37.)

I am, Sir, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

*St. Edmund's, Lombard-street,
Nov. 19, 1862.*

LETTER VI.

WHETHER THE ISRAELITES OFFERED SACRIFICES IN THE WILDERNESS, OR NO.

SIR,—It is announced that the first 10,000 copies of the English edition of Dr. Colenso's book have already been sold. But, in common with many others, I desire to know why the Natal impression—the larva, or chrysalis, from which the present literary prodigy was elaborated—has been consigned to a fancied oblivion, after such a singular fashion. After giving unmistakable symptoms of animation, both at the Cape and in England, the uncanny little "disowned" is pronounced to have been still-born, and the report is industriously spread that it never breathed. Surely, Sir, such a palpable case of concealment of birth is fitting subject for "Crown's Quest." Witnesses are not wanting who can testify to its vitality and parentage;* in other words, that though it may not "contain the expression of Dr. Colenso's present opinions," it does throw very great light, not only upon the animus with which he wrote, but, also, upon

* The writer of these Letters might have availed himself, had it been needful, of two several opportunities of seeing copies of the Natal impression, in different hands, within the space of a week. This observation does not allude to the copy which was in the hands of the Editor of the "Record." This Natal edition has also found its way to the Continent.

the then position of his Lordship's literary qualifications as a Biblical commentator.

Meanwhile, Sir, the present volume presents ample subject for critical animadversion, even purged, as it is, from some of the more egregious crudities of its former self by abler hands, and wearing the splints and bandages, which the too sanguine skill, and partial manipulation of "Essayist" Shiphras and Puals have devised to give it shape and consistency.

In a very able article in the April number of the "London Review," treating of Dr. Colenso's Commentary to the Epistle to the Romans, his Lordship's position, as a scholar and a critic, is so appositely described, that I cannot forbear extracting one or two passages, as admirably illustrating the defects of his present "Critical Examination" of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua:—"Persistence of affirmation, a silent disregard of what has been alleged and proved against their views, and a frequent intimation that everybody else is in error, perhaps even absurdly so,—these are the characteristics of the volume. Broad Churchmen seem to ignore all that has gone before them, and remind us of the couplet in which the exclusiveness of the man of fashion is described:—

"The world polite, his friends and he,
And all the rest are nobody!"

"It might have been expected that a Bishop and Father of the Church would have been careful to do honour to the illustrious men of former times, as well as to fortify himself with the suffrages of his brethren and predecessors, but this is not our Bishop's temper. His many years' study of the Epistle has brought him to conclusions adverse to those of almost all who have gone before him, and he may well be shy of sending his readers to inquire of them. It answers his purpose better to forget they ever wrote, or to denounce them as in error."

And again:—"His (the Bishop's) appearances before the English public, since his elevation, have not tended to enhance his fame. He may be great in arithmetic and algebra, but is a very tyro in far weightier matters."

If the London Reviewer had had Dr. Colenso's present volume before him, he could not have more accurately described its attributes. Assertion is made to serve for argument, the

author's self-esteem and *ipse dixit* stand him in stead of patient labour and erudition. Take, for example, Chapter xx. (p. 122),—"The Number of Priests at the Exodus, Compared with their Duties, and with the Provision made for Them." The Bishop refers (p. 123) to the words of the prophet Amos,—"Have ye offered me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" His Lordship's commentary on these words is as follows:—"Which show that, in the prophet's view, at all events, such sacrifices were required and expected of them!" This is indeed a very cavalier way of dealing with the passage. Let it not be supposed that I accuse the Bishop of having made himself acquainted with the opinion of the Rabbis, far less, of distinguished Christian commentators, upon this passage. I only express my surprise at the rash temerity, and the off-handed, self-satisfied ignorance which he displays in the matter. *Petrus affirmat, quis negabit?*

Let me inform his Lordship, that most, if not all, of the Hebrew commentators believe, and assert, that sacrifices were not offered, except on rare occasions, in the wilderness. A host of learned Gentile critics are of the same opinion. Voltaire asserts, and bases an argument upon the assertion, that no sacrifices at all were offered during this period. (See "*Lettres de Quelques Juifs, par M. l'Abbé Guénéé.*" Tom. I, p. 150—196.) And if this be the case, I need not say that all that his Lordship has written, so much to his own satisfaction, as to the impossibility of finding cattle, not to speak of "turtle doves" (p. 125), in the wilderness, falls to the ground as a matter of course. And first I would remark, that it is the general opinion that the rite of circumcision was not practised in the desert. This of itself would disqualify a large proportion of the congregation from participating in the commemoration of the Passover. No uncircumcised person was to eat thereof. (Exod. xii. 48.) "It is "here important to remark," says Michaelis, "that the Israelites "did not circumcise the greater part of their children born unto "them in the desert, and yet we find, from Josh. v. 1—9, that "Moses had allowed this all along to pass unpunished." (Smith's Translation, Vol. IV., p. 42.)

But to proceed with the general question, viz., Whether sacrifices were required or no in the wilderness? And first let us hear what the Rabbis have to say in the matter. The learned

J. Meyer, in his "Tractatus de temporibus et festis Hebræorum," *Ugolini Thesaurus*, Tom. 1, col. cccxcii., writes:—"Doctores in Pesikta, nec non R. *Levi Ben Gerson*, *Chaskuni* et alij tradiderunt, non celebrasse filios Israelis in deserto Pascha, nisi hoc unum duntaxat, (Num. ix. 1., Seqq. et versu 10 seqq.) idque innuere Amosum, v. 25. Rationem adferunt quod in illo anno castra habuerint in uno loco, et masculos, qui eis nati erant, potuerint circumcidere, ne circumcisio eos impediret ab edendo Paschate," &c. (The doctors in the Pesikta have told us, that the Children of Israel did not celebrate the Passover in the desert except this once (Num. ix. 1, etc.), and that Amos implies as much (v. 25). They give as their reason, that during that year they had their camp in one place, and were able to circumcise the males which had been born unto them, so that the want of circumcision might not hinder them from eating the Passover.) And again:—"Abarbenel vero aliam adhuc rationem suppeditat (Num. ix. 1, seqq. in *Legem*. fol. 2852), cur in deserto non celebraverint Pascha. Quum enim adhuc essent in deserto Sinai, propinquo terræ habitabili, vicino Medianitis, ubi invenerunt agnos, placentas, et amaritudines, Pascha celebrare poterant statuto tempore. At vero omnibus reliquis annis, quibus in deserto errabant, a terra habitabili semoti; non potuerunt aliud facere Pascha, donec venirent in terram habitabilem, sive terram Canaan." (Abarbenel, however, gives this additional reason why they did not celebrate the Passover in the wilderness. As long as they abode in the desert of Sinai, in the neighbourhood of a habitable region, close to the Midianites, where lambs, cakes, and bitter herbs would be forthcoming, they had the means of keeping the Passover at the appointed time. But in all the remaining years, in which they wandered in the desert, remote from inhabited regions, they were precluded from celebrating another Passover, until they should enter upon a habitable region, to wit, the land of Canaan.)—*Ibid.*, col. cccxciii.

Of the same opinion are Castalio and Drusius. See "*Critici Sacri*," on Amos v. 25. So also Poole, in *Synops.* on the same text. Walton so understands the Hebrew, and also the Targum of Jonathan. He translates the interrogative (Amos v. 25) by *numquid* and *num*, instead of *nonne*, which latter would imply

an affirmative answer. So also Archbishop Newcome, "Did ye offer unto me sacrifices and an offering of flour in the desert forty years, O ye house of Israel? Nay! but ye bare," &c. Again: Peters on Joshua "thinks that they are not here reproached with a neglect which Moses would not have suffered, and that probably they had no cattle to sacrifice, and that therefore Jeremiah, when he saith (vii. 22, 23), 'God commanded not sacrifice when they came out of Egypt,' means that He did not immediately expect it."

Dr. Gill, whose ample Hebrew and Rabbinical erudition gives him especial qualifications for speaking upon Jewish topics, writes, "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings? No; they were not offered to God, but to devils, to the golden calf, and to the host of heaven, so their fathers *did in the wilderness forty years*, where sacrifices were omitted during that time, a round number for a broken one, it being about thirty-eight years," &c. And again, on Acts vii. 42, "They offered to devils, and not to God (Deut. xxxii. 17), and though there were some few sacrifices offered up, yet, since they were not frequently offered, nor freely, and with all the heart and with faith, and without hypocrisy, they were looked upon by God as if they were not offered at all."

Of the same opinion is the Danish Regius Professor Basse-dow:—"Du Haus Israel, hast du mir wohl 40 Jahr in der Wüsten geopfert? Ihr dientet vielmehr den Abgotten." ("O House of Israel, did ye then offer me sacrifices during forty years in the wilderness? Ye served idols much more.")—*Die Religion Israels*. Berlin and Altona. 1766. 8vo. P. 398.

So also Starcke, on Amos v. 25, says positively that there were no sacrifices offered:—"Weder freiwillige Opfer, noch alle schuldige Opfer" (neither freewill offerings, nor all the obligatory sacrifices); according to the prescription of the law, "Theils aus Mangel des Viehes, theils wegen des vielfältigen Reisen;" (*i. e.*, "partly from scarcity of cattle, partly from the frequent journeyings.")—*Synops. Bibl. Exeget. in Vet. Test.*, Theil iii., col. 228.

J. Spencer writes (*De Legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus. Hagæ Comit. 1686.**)—"Locum hunc præruptum et hiantem, sic in

* "I would suggest that the above abrupt and elliptical passage should thus be harmonized. Did ye offer me sacrifices and gifts during forty

“ planitiam redigendum existimarem. An Sacrificia et munus
 “ obtulistis mihi in deserto quadraginta annis? Minime sane,
 “ nam vitulum sacrificio coluistis.” (Lib. iii., p. 40.)

This passage, I admit, is not decisive. Rosenmüller also speaks dubiously and cautiously, adducing both sides of the argument. Marckius (*Analysis Exegetica*. Amst. 1698. 4to.) agrees with Grotius in believing that sacrifices were offered in the wilderness, qualifying his decision, however:—* “ Etiamsi
 “ tam frequentes non fuisse, et solennes oblationes omnes,
 “ quam postea in Canaan, lubentes agnoscamus.” (p. 434.)

De Wette inclines to this qualified opinion. Olshausen, on the parallel passage in Acts vii. 42, says, “ Ye served me not
 “ alone, not always.” (Clark’s F. T. L., vol. xix., p. 447.)

Ewald, however, speaks most positively on the subject:—
 “ Did then these Israelites not bring, for forty years long, any
 “ sacrifices to (Javeh) Jehovah! For, in the sterile, barren
 “ desert it was quite impossible for them to do so at all.
 “ (*Konnten sie solche gar nicht bringen.*) At least, private
 “ individuals (*einzelnen*) had not the means (*keine Kräfte dazu*)
 “ of so doing; although, perhaps, in the name of the congrega-
 “ tion, at times, a defective and meagre offering might have
 “ been brought, but not worthy of mention in comparison of
 “ the liberal (*fetten*) offerings made [at the time of Amos] by
 “ private individuals (*compare* Hos. ii. 5—16; Jer. vii. 22);
 “ and yet this was the golden age of Israel, so well pleasing to
 “ Jehovah! So little value was attached to sacrifices of this
 “ nature!”—“ *Die Propheten des A. B.*” Bd. I., p. 104.
 Stuttgart, 1840. 8vo.

To any one who has studied Ewald’s scholarly, albeit dangerous work, Dr. Colenso’s summary method of disposal of the erudite German’s conservative views will create no surprise whatever. Men of such different mental calibre and attainments would naturally have few sentiments in common. “ Any
 “ one who is well acquainted with it (Ewald’s book) will per-
 “ ceive that my conclusions, on many important points, differ
 “ materially from his.” (Colenso, p. xv.)

“ years in the wilderness? By no means; for ye honoured the calf with
 “ sacrifice.”

* “ Although we freely admit that the offerings were by no means so
 “ frequent nor so regular as afterwards in Canaan.”

But, to resume, Professor Noyes (*"New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets."* Boston, 1833. 8vo.) writes, on Amos v. 25:—"I led you and fed you in the wilderness, forty years without sacrifice. How, then, can ye imagine them to be a substitute for moral virtue?" (p. 256.)

So, also, in the *"Holy Bible,"* printed in Dublin in 1857, translated from the Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions, published with the approbation of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, I find the following categorical note on the above cited passage of Amos:—"Except the sacrifices that were offered at the first, in the dedication of the Tabernacle, the Israelites offered no sacrifices in the desert."

Last, and not least, I would adduce the testimony of the profoundly learned Dutch Professor, I. van Nuyss Klinkenberg (*"De Bijbel verklaerd."* Amst., 1780—1795), on Acts vii. 42:—"In our opinion, the Lord would declare that the usual sacrifices (*offerdienst*) were suspended (*opgeschort*), because they had no sufficient supply (*voorraad*) of cattle for the sacrifices (*slachtofferen*), nor corn for the meat-offerings. As if the Lord said, Have I required at your hands slain beasts and meat-offerings, during your wanderings in the desert? Emphatically, no! (*immers neen*) seeing that the usual offering was suspended." (Deel 21.)

And now, Sir, I would ask whether the Bishop's summary assertion, "The words of the prophet Amos show that, in the prophet's view, at all events, such sacrifices were required and expected of them," is not, to say the least, an extremely flippant one?*

His Lordship seems to ignore, if not to be altogether unaware, that upon this very passage of Amos, and its context, more has been written by scholars of every degree, than upon many other more important placés of Holy Writ.

I think Dr. Colenso might well have paused before he committed himself to opinions so dogmatically expressed, as to the unhistorical veracity of the Pentateuch, based solely upon

* See Deut. xii. 8, etc.,—"Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes. For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God giveth you."

arguments founded upon his own personal conjectures. No doubt it is a very pretty little disquisition to which the Bishop treats his readers, as to whether the expression בְּנֵי יוֹנָה (*Benay Yonah*) means “birds of the wilderness” or “young pigeons” (p. 125); but the sneer, in which he allows himself, as to the impossibility of the people carrying pigeons out of Egypt “when they fled in such haste, and so heavily laden, and as yet “knew nothing of any such law, . . . or how could they have “had them at all under Sinai?” (p. 124)—this sneer, I say, might have been altogether spared, had his Lordship approached to his most difficult task, either in the spirit, or with the credentials of a Biblical scholar.

The more I examine into Dr. Colenso’s claims to critical scholarship, or even to the ordinary theological attainments of a Divinity student, the more palpably glaring does the presumptuousness of such a self-delusive declaration become, as I find on p. xxxvi of his present work:—“It may be possible (!) to “represent some of the arguments in this book as invalid, “others as unimportant; but, if the main result of it be true, “as I believe it will be found to be, it seems to me impossible “that, five years hence, unless liberty of speech be granted on “these matters, any of the more hopeful and intelligent of our “young men will be able, with clear consciences, to enter the “ministry of the Church of England.”

I would fain believe that the scholarship of the Church of England has not yet ebbed so low, that her younger branches will be led away by so shallow a prophet, and unqualified a teacher of theology, as every page of Dr. Colenso’s “Critical Examination” abundantly demonstrates him to be. His Lordship has much of the merest rudimentary work before him, before he can hope even to gain a hearing amongst the Doctors, not to speak of leading a Reformation!

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M’CAUL.

*St. Edmund’s, Lombard-street,
Nov. 25, 1862.*

LETTER VII.

DR. COLENZO'S OBJECTIONS AS TO THE CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THOSE OF VOLTAIRE.

SIR,—In my preceding letter I adduced a number of authorities to show, that it is by no means so certain as Dr. Colenso asserts (p. 123), that the children of Israel offered sacrifices during their sojourning in the wilderness. The Rabbins are of opinion that circumstances precluded the people from fulfilling the Divine injunctions. They had neither cattle, nor other supplies, such as would enable them to observe the prescribed ritual with continuous regularity. When the congregation were upon the march, during their frequent wanderings and changes of station, further and obvious impediments would present themselves. That they had, however, at first a large number of flocks and herds upon their exodus from Egypt is a matter clearly asserted by the inspired penman (Exodus xii. 38), nor is, indeed, denied by the Bishop of Natal. “Having so large flocks and herds,” writes the Bishop, “‘even very much cattle’ (Exod. xii. 38), ‘many of them must have lived scattered over the large extent ‘of grazing ground, required under their circumstances, and, ‘accordingly, they are represented as still living in the ‘land of ‘Goshen.’ (Exod. ix. 26.) But how large must have been the ‘extent of this land? We can form some judgment on this ‘point by considering the number of lambs which (according to ‘the story) must have been killed for the Passover.” (pp. 57, 58.)

The Bishop computes that 200,000 male lambs of the first year (allowing one lamb to ten persons; or, if one to twenty persons, 100,000) would be required. 200,000 male lambs of the first year imply, says our author, an equal number of female lambs of the first year also. “So that 400,000 lambs of the ‘first year implies [*sic*] a flock of 2,000,000 sheep and lambs of ‘all ages. Taking, then, into account the fact that they had ‘also large herds, ‘even very much cattle,’ we may fairly ‘reckon that the Hebrews, though so much oppressed, must ‘have possessed at this time, according to the story, more than ‘two millions of sheep and oxen.” (pp. 58, 59.)

I do not mean, at present, to dispute the accuracy of these his Lordship's numerical conclusions, which, he assures us, are based upon the testimony of a "sheep-master, experienced in Australia and "Natal." (p. 58.)

The Bishop continues:—"What extent of land, then, would all these have required for pasturage? Having made inquiries on the subject from experienced sheep-masters, I have received the following replies. One informs me that, in New Zealand, there are a few spots where sheep can be kept *two* to an acre; in other places *one* can be kept per acre; but, generally, two acres are obliged to be allowed for one sheep."

"Another writes as follows:—

"In Australia some sheep runs are estimated to carry *one* sheep to an acre, and these I think of the *best* quality. Others are estimated at different numbers of acres to a sheep, until as many as *five* acres are allowed for one sheep by the Government, for the purposes of assessment. If these lands were enclosed in small farms or paddocks, they would keep a much larger number. But when shepherded in flocks, much grass is destroyed and trampled under foot, that, if the animal were kept in a state of comparative rest, would be available for its support. Natal is able to support a much greater number, principally from its climate, as well as from the fact that the proportion of good land is incomparably greater with reference to the extent of poor land. The small number of sheep kept here at present would afford no example, upon which an opinion could be formed. But I think that I am within the mark when I say that *three* sheep will hereafter be found to be supported by an acre of land.

"Let us allow *five* sheep," says Dr. Colenso, "to an acre, then the sheep alone of the Israelites would have required 400,000 acres of grazing land—an extent of country considerably larger than the whole county of Hertfordshire or Bedfordshire—besides that which would have been required for the oxen. We must then abandon altogether the idea of the people living together in one city, and must suppose a great body of them to have been scattered throughout the whole land of Goshen in a district of 400,000 acres, that is to say, twenty-five miles square, larger than Hertfordshire (391,141 acres)." (p. 59.)

Bishop Colenso judiciously abstains from informing us as to the nature of the pasturage in Natal, and also (*from hearsay*) in Australia and New Zealand. He does not tell us whether it is a scanty, tufted herbage, from which the sheep laboriously cull a sparse subsistence, or whether it is a rich meadowland, abundant in verdure, and luxuriant in the spontaneous produce of a bountiful nature. Surely the Bishop does not suppose that the Faunas of Natal, New Zealand, and Australia are identical, far less that the grazing grounds over the whole world are substantially the same in fertility and kindly productiveness. Is he unaware that New Zealand is considered, and justly so, to possess a far more advantageous climate for sheep-farming than Australia? But for the present let us look a little nearer home. On turning to the article "Dorsetshire," in Fullarton's "Gazetteer of the World" (Edinburgh, 1856, 8vo.), I find the following, "From the east to the west, through the central parts of the county, runs a ridge of chalk hills, declining on the south side into downs and valleys, which abound with a short, sweet herbage, nourishing, it is said, from 800,000 to 1,000,000 sheep, esteemed equally for their flesh and fleece"!

The Bishop, be it observed, has chosen to take his estimate from the comparative extent of Herts, Bedfordshire, and Middlesex, which are confessedly not sheep-farming counties. He cannot complain, therefore, if I draw my rejoinder from a "*ridge of chalk hills*" in the county of Dorset. What I have to complain of, in common with many others, is that his Lordship makes the most onesided statements, drawing his conclusions from the scantiest data, and then proceeds to raise objections as if they were insurmountable, and as if he had exhausted every reliable source of information before he propounded them. Dr. Colenso is great indeed at conjuring-up perplexities, but he never hints at the possibility of any solution being forthcoming outside his own semi-civilised Diocese of Natal. This is indeed one of the most dangerous features of his most-superficial treatise. It is an "anthology of difficulties." He blurts out his own crude theories as if they were oracularly unanswerable; nay more, as if a Solomon or a Daniel would be rash indeed were they to insinuate that all reliable sources of information had not been subjected to the exhaustive process of his own inexorable arithmetical calculations. Surely his Lordship for-

gets that sheep were bred in England before Australia or New Zealand were colonised, or even before Natal was raised to the dignity of an episcopal diocese. But what will my readers say when they learn that Voltaire has been beforehand with Dr. Colenso in this very line of argument, and with a result neither more lucidly shining nor successful?

I turn to the Abbé Guénée (*Lettre I., Tom. ii.*),*—“*In which the question is discussed, whether it was impossible that so many women, and so much cattle, could be found in the country of the Madianites as the author of the Book of Numbers mentions.*” Voltaire is incredulity itself at the statement “that the victors found in the camp of the vanquished six hundred and seventy-five thousand sheep, seventy-two thousand bullocks, sixty-one thousand asses, and thirty-two thousand girls.”†

“You add a note,” writes M. Guénée, “to this text, in which ‘you say, ‘Madian was not comprised in the Land of Promise. ‘ ‘It is a small skirt of Idumæa in Arabia Petrea, it begins ‘ ‘towards the north, at the torrent of Arnon, and ends at the ‘ ‘torrent of Zared in the midst of the rocks, and upon the ‘ ‘eastern shore of the Lake of Asphaltis. This country is now ‘ ‘inhabited by a small clan of Arabians. It may contain eight ‘ ‘leagues in length and somewhat less in breadth.’ This opposition between so great a number of girls and cattle, and the ‘small extent which you give this country, is probably brought ‘in with some view. You meant, it is likely, to ridicule this ‘story, and, consequently, the book which contains it.” (Pp. 364-365.) M. Guénée, in his Notes, cites three different works of Voltaire’s, in which he harps upon the same objection. He then continues: “As you repeat this difficulty so ‘often, and with so much confidence, it is probable you think ‘it extremely embarrassing. Let us look into it, and see

* In the English edition, Letter vii., pt. 2, Vol. I., p. 364.

† “Any one who has had an opportunity of visiting the great Arab tribes of the Syrian desert, can see that the Bishop’s difficulties are here purely imaginary. . . . On one occasion I rode for two successive days, in a straight line through the flocks of a section of the Anazeh tribe, 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 the cattle.” J. L. Porter. Letter to the “Athenæum,” dated Jan. 1, 1863.

“ whether this account is so incredible and absurd as you think
“ it.”

On p. 368 (*Translation*) the Abbé proceeds:—“ I shall grant
“ for a moment that your survey is just, and that the country of
“ Madian had the extent you say, would it be impossible that
“ thirty-two thousand girls should have been found in it? If
“ this number seems incredible, it must be doubtless because it
“ supposes too many inhabitants for so small a country. Let
“ us, then, form a calculation. Thirty-two thousand girls, sup-
“ pose about the same number of boys. There would be, then,
“ sixty-four thousand young persons of both sexes, which must
“ be reckoned from the birth to the age of matrimony (the
“ Hebrew text is clear with regard to this, and the Vulgate
“ says expressly, ‘ *Puellas autem et omnes fœminas virgines*
“ ‘ *reservate vobis.*’ See Book of Numbers xxxi.” (*Author’s*
“ *Note.*) “ These young persons, according to the common com-
“ putation, must have amounted to at least half the nation. . . .
“ which gives one hundred and twenty-eight thousand persons.*
“ Do you think, Sir, that a country eight leagues long, and of
“ nearly the same breadth, cannot support one hundred and
“ twenty-eight thousand inhabitants? A country of this extent
“ must contain about two hundred and forty-eight thousand
“ acres of land, and an acre of good ground can maintain *four*
“ persons; even if we limit it to *three*, forty-three thousand
“ acres would have been more than sufficient to maintain the
“ one hundred and twenty-eight thousand Madianites. Let us
“ add, if you please, fifteen thousand acres, as we may suppose
“ that the lands of Madian did not yield crops annually, and that
“ it was necessary to leave the third part of them fallow every
“ year, we shall then have in all but fifty-eight thousand acres
“ employed in the support of the inhabitants. Is it inconceiv-
“ able that out of two hundred and forty-eight thousand acres
“ there should be found fifty-eight thousand of common fertility?
“ Therefore, thirty-two thousand girls do not necessarily imply
“ that there were too many inhabitants of this extent. To
“ these proofs, by calculation, let us add examples. *Such a*
“ *number of inhabitants, you say, in so small a country!* But
“ do you forget, or pretend to deny, the population of Egypt,
“ which is still more astonishing in proportion, and yet attested

* Compare this with Dr. Colenso’s exaggerated arithmetic, p. 144.

“ by so many writers? The immense population of Judæa, “ yea, even under the Asmonean kings, and under the Herods, “ which is acknowledged even by heathen writers? That of “ Greece, and particularly of Attica, a country of small extent, “ very mountainous, stony, and yet very populous? And “ lastly, that of Rome, under Servius, that is at a period when “ the Roman State, which did not then extend to more than “ eight leagues in length or breadth, supported more than two “ hundred thousand souls? . . . How many provinces are there “ even now in China, England, Flanders, &c., of the same “ dimensions, which support more than one hundred and twenty “ eight thousand inhabitants? . . . One hundred and twenty- “ eight thousand persons, and more, may therefore live in a “ country eight leagues in length and breadth, allowing the “ ground to be of common goodness.” (pp. 368—372.)

With these computations of the Abbé Guénée contrast Dr. Colenso’s estimate of “ *the number of the Israelites compared with the extent of Canaan.*” (p. 82.) His Lordship computes “ the whole land which was divided amongst the tribes in the time of Joshua ” at 7,000,000 acres! And yet, arguing from Natal statistics, the Bishop cannot be persuaded that these seven millions of acres could possibly subsist two millions of inhabitants!!!* The Bishop is evidently a very poor agrono-

* The following letter appeared in “Public Opinion,” of Dec. 27, 1862. I give it a place as manifesting the Bishop’s total unacquaintance with all matters connected with farming statistics, observing at the same time that Dr. Colenso’s whole argument, respecting the number of lambs that would be required for the Passover, displays entire ignorance of the manner in which, Jewish tradition assures us, it was celebrated. The Paschal feast was not necessarily regarded as a meal, but as a symbolic commemoration, in which each person might partake of only a small portion of the lamb, as Christians partake of the bread in the celebration of the Holy Sacrament:—

“ TO THE EDITOR OF ‘PUBLIC OPINION.’ ”

“ SIR,—It does not appear to me that any thoroughly satisfactory reply “ has appeared in your columns to Bishop Colenso’s difficulty regarding the “ number of male lambs required for the Passover. Your correspondent “ ‘E. T.’ meets his objection in a way which I think is unsatisfactory, viz.,— “ by asserting that 40,000 would have been sufficient, instead of the 150,000 “ supposed by the Bishop.

“ As a clergyman officiating in a pastoral parish in the south of Scotland, “ I am prepared to take the Bishop on his own ground, and to show that

mical calculator, or else he suppresses the fact, that the colonial soil of which he speaks, is a very meagre and barren one, in comparison with that of some of the less-favoured countries of Europe. Of this topic I would, however, fain treat in my next letter. But let us now hear what the learned Abbé has to say about the cattle:—"We shall not look far back, or far distant, " for instances to show that an equal, or perhaps a less space of " ground may support such a quantity of cattle. England alone " will supply us with many such examples. Let us produce a " few out of an author of reputation. Sir John Nichols, a writer " very well versed in rural economy, informs us, that Dorset- " shire supports, besides other cattle, about five hundred " thousand sheep in a space of four leagues diameter. He " speaks of another place, too, of smaller extent, and marshy " ground, where may be found from four to five hundred " thousand sheep. And, lastly, he informs us, that in the " neighbourhood of Dorchester, he reckoned six hundred " thousand in the space of two leagues. Is not this number " greater in proportion than six hundred and seventy-five " thousand sheep, seventy-two thousand oxen, &c., supported " in a country eight leagues square? We think that your own " country might supply you with many such instances, and if

" even if a lamb had been required for each man capable of bearing arms— " *i. e.*, 600,000—there would have been no difficulty whatever in providing " them. The population of my parish is a little above 400 souls. The number " of lambs lambed every spring is, I believe, about 15,000. Let us, however, " suppose it 12,000, of which we may fairly suppose that 6,000 are males. " Thus the number of male lambs born every year in a part of our own " country, which is by no means famed for richness of pasture, as the land " of Goshen was, bears to the population of the district at the rate of 15 to 1. " As the Israelites were a pastoral people, it is not at all improbable that the " number of their male lambs bore a like proportion to their population. If " so we should have had 30,000,000 male lambs born within a year of the " Exodus, out of which the Bishop's 150,000 could be taken without great " difficulty!

" On the ignorance of pastoral matters displayed by Bishop Colenso, I " make no comment. I have already trespassed sufficiently on your valuable " space. The above figures speak for themselves.

" I am, Sir, &c.,

" A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND."

“ they are uncommon, we could readily tell you the reason of
“ it.” (p. 374.)

This closing remark, I presume, is levelled by the Abbé (speaking *as a Jew*) against Voltaire’s sneers respecting the bloodthirsty and warlike habits of the Hebrews! (See Colenso on the “Massacre”* of the Midianites, p. 144.) Let it not be supposed, however, that the learned Abbé calculates the capacities of the country only with regard to the support of the inhabitants and their sheep. He is comprehensive in his views, as he is inexorable in his arithmetic. He continues—“ How-
“ ever it be, such of your own countrymen as have written on
“ agriculture, lay down principles which are equally favourable
“ to our way of thinking. They tell us that an acre of land
“ can support three oxen. [See Colenso, p. 59.] Therefore
“ twenty-four thousand acres would suffice for seventy-two
“ thousand oxen, and ten thousand one hundred and seventy
“ acres for seventy-one thousand asses, even supposing that
“ an ass eats half as much as an ox. According to the
“ same writers, an acre of land can support twelve sheep,
“ therefore fifty-eight thousand two hundred and fifty acres
“ would suffice for six hundred and seventy-five thousand
“ sheep. Put these sums together, and you will find that
“ ninety thousand four hundred and twenty acres would be
“ sufficient for the whole stock of cattle. And if you add
“ to this the fifty-eight thousand acres, which were reserved for
“ the support of the inhabitants, you will perceive that the sum
“ of one hundred and forty-eight thousand four hundred and
“ twenty acres only, was employed for the maintenance of all
“ together. Now, we ask you, Sir, *was* it impossible, that out
“ of two hundred and forty-eight thousand acres, of which the
“ country of Madian consisted, there should be one hundred
“ and forty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty that were
“ fit for pasture or tillage? And may we not fairly conclude
“ from this, that it is no way incredible that this country sup-
“ ported so many men and cattle as Moses says, and that his

* “The Tragedy of Cawnpore, where 300 were butchered, would sink into
“ nothing, compared with such a massacre, if indeed, we were required to
“ believe it.”—*Colenso*, p. 144. “Here is an order to butcher the boys, to
“ massacre the mothers, and to debauch the girls.”—*Tom Paine’s “Age
of Reason.”* London: Holyoake. 1861. 8vo. P. 40.

“account cannot appear absurd to any *except those who are unacquainted with the resources of ancient or modern agriculture?*” (pp. 374, 375.)

These concluding remarks of M. Guénée’s contain a reproof which most felicitously describes the “stand-point” of the Bishop’s information. *Acu rem tetigit!* Dr. Colenso has lived so long in Natal, and is so apparently preoccupied and absorbed with the country of his expatriation or adoption, that he seems to overlook the fact that there may possibly be other portions of the world differing in climate, in fertility, and in natural productions. His Lordship’s conclusions, as to what is or is not possible in other latitudes, drawn from what is or is not possible in Natal, are about as logical, as it would be to assume, that the gorilla is never found in the forests of West Central Africa, because a suburban Du Chaillu has hitherto failed to encounter the hirsute anthropoid satyr, in his lair, amid the sylvan fastnesses of St. John’s-wood.

Dr. Colenso’s shortcomings seem, indeed, to be traceable to the same source as those of Reuben of old. His Lordship’s “too long abiding among” the colonial “sheepfolds,” has apparently impaired any “Sunny Memories” which he may once have taken with him from other lands. I think, Sir, you will agree with me that the Pentateuch is likely to survive the Bishop’s misgivings and objections, and that his predicted Reformation has been fixed for too early a period, when he points to the close of the five ensuing years, as the period of its completed triumphs over the old systems of exploded faith and credulity. (See Preface, p. xxxvi.) Meanwhile, from the numerous coincidences which I have pointed out in this single Letter, between the objections urged by Voltaire against the Law of Moses, and those propounded by Dr. Colenso, I think your readers will scarcely wonder at my expression of surprise contained in a former Letter, that the Bishop does not strengthen his own position, by adducing the concurrent testimony of his illustrious French predecessor in the paths of Biblical philology.

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M’CAUL.

*St. Edmund-the-King, Lombard-street,
Nov. 28, 1862.*

LETTER VIII.

DR. COLENZO ON SHEEP-FARMING AND THE BEASTS OF
THE FIELD.

SIR,—In my last Letter I endeavoured to illustrate the Bishop of Natal's objections respecting the number of the cattle possessed by the Israelites in Egypt, as compared with the extent of the land of Goshen (p. 59); and again respecting "the number of Israelites compared with the extent of the land of Canaan" (p. 82), by parallel objections of M. Arouet de Voltaire. I showed how exactly the conclusions of these two eminent Biblical commentators and philologists coincided. I also gave at length the Abbé Guénée's masterly refutations of Voltaire's sophisms, which refutations apply with equal force to the arguments of Dr. Colenso.

I will now for convenience' sake restate the Bishop's objections with reference to the cattle, as contained on p. 59, and then proceed to examine them, by the light of the statements of competent witnesses *who have resided* both at Natal, and in New Zealand, and also in Australia. Dr. Colenso writes, "What extent, then, would all these (two millions of sheep and oxen) have required for pasturage? Having made inquiries on the subject from experienced sheepmasters, I have received the following replies:—One informs me, that in New Zealand there are few spots where sheep can be kept *two* to the acre; in other places, *one* can be kept per acre, but generally two acres are obliged to be allowed to one sheep. Another writes as follows:—

"In Australia some sheep-runs are estimated to carry *one* sheep to an acre, and these, I think, are of the *best* quality. Others are estimated at different numbers of acres to a sheep, until as many as *five* acres are allowed for *one* sheep by the Government for the purpose of assessment. If these lands were enclosed in small farms or paddocks, they would keep a much larger number. But when shepherded in flocks, much grass is destroyed and trampled under foot, that, if the animal were kept in a state of comparative rest, would be available for

“ its support. Natal is able to support a much greater number, principally from its climate,* as well as from the fact that the proportion of good land is incomparably greater, with reference to the extent of poor land. THE SMALL NUMBER OF SHEEP KEPT HERE AT PRESENT WOULD AFFORD NO EXAMPLE, UPON WHICH AN OPINION COULD BE FORMED. (!) But I think that I am within the mark, when I say that *three* sheep will hereafter be found to be supported by an acre of land.” (p. 59.)

Dr. Colenso’s “sheepmaster, experienced in Australia and Natal,” speaks with exceeding caution and reserve. He warns the Bishop that he can only supply him with very inadequate data from which to reason; and yet, in spite of this salutary admonition, his Lordship at once proceeds to assume his premises, and to draw conclusions disparaging to God’s inspired Word therefrom!—

“ Let us allow five sheep to an acre; then the sheep alone of the Israelites would have required 400,000 acres of grazing land; an extent of country considerably larger than the whole county of Hertfordshire or Bedfordshire, and more than twice the size of Middlesex, besides that which would have been required for the oxen. We must then [*most disagreeable necessity!*] abandon the idea of the people living together in one city, and must suppose a great body of them to have been scattered about in towns and villages throughout the whole land of Goshen,” &c., &c. (p. 59.)

It is evident, therefore, that Dr. Colenso assumes that the pasture-grounds of the long, and highly cultivated Goshen, were identical in features with the wild and unfrequented “*sheep-runs*” of Natal, Australia, and New Zealand! He does so positively, in respect to the equally cultivated, and densely populated land of Canaan, with its hundred cities, its smiling well-watered plains, its oliveyards, and its vineyards—all of which, the Israelites were promised they should find standing, and take possession of, at their conquest of the country. “ But, perhaps, a still better comparison may be instituted with a country *which resembles, in many respects, in its natural features and other circumstances, the state of Canaan*

* This is contrary to fact—*glaringly* so with respect to New Zealand, as I shall presently show. See p. 47 of these Letters.

“*in those early days* (!). The colony of Natal has an extent of “18,000 square miles, and a population, white and black “included, probably not exceeding 150,000 altogether,” &c. (*Colenso*, p. 83.)

This offhand comparison, and its quiet tone of self-assurance, are in themselves something astounding, as coming from one who professes to have received a liberal education. We are to believe that Palestine, lying on the waters of the Mediterranean, colonized by the Phœnicians—a few hours from Damascus—above all, directly adjoining upon Egypt, then in her zenith, was in a position precisely analogous to remote, man-eating Australia and New Zealand, or to the sparsely inhabited, and not a whit less uncivilized Kaffraria? Really, Dr. Colenso, you presume a little too far upon the credulity, not to say the patience of your readers! Have you forgotten the pertinent advice of the Latin moralist,—“*Qui semel verecundiæ fines transierit, eum bene et naviter oportet esse imprudentem?*”*

Let us now hear a competent witness as to the *sheep-runs* and grass-lands of New Zealand. In a very ably written work, entitled “New Zealand, the Britain of the South,” by Charles Hartshorne, who describes himself as “a New Zealand colonist, and a visitor to the United States, the Canadas, the Cape Colony, and Australia” (second edition, London, 1861, 8vo.), I find the following:—“The wild grass lands of New Zealand, “it must be borne in mind, are of limited extent; perhaps in “both islands, there is not now left unoccupied, grass country “sufficient to form a hundred good sheep-runs. The average “area of acres at present occupied, coupled with that of the “whole of those, which by degrees may be discovered, may be “roughly estimated at from ten to twelve millions of acres, “capable, IN THEIR COMMON WILD-GRASS STATE, AND UNDER

* I fancy I can already hear a chorus of critics pronouncing this last word, “*imprudentem*,” to be an interpolation upon the *Textus receptus* of Tully, Epist. Fam. V. 12. I am quite free to confess that I have just dropped a “*liquid*” into it, with a view to make it rather more euphonious than the received reading of “*impudentem*.” And why should I be ashamed to admit the soft impeachment, when his Eminence Cardinal Angelo Mai does not blush to proclaim that he also has *adapted* certain passages of his edition of the Vatican Text, thereby rendering the edition completely useless as an exponent of the actual condition of the Codex? I think the Cardinal’s offence is greater than mine.

“ THE RUDE RUN-HOLDING SYSTEM, of supporting only one sheep to three acres ; or, in other words, of giving the colony a flock of only some three or four millions of merinoes. Experience shows that a large portion of these lands, LAID DOWN IN PASTURE at a moderate outlay, will support three or four sheep an acre.* And, I believe, no practical man would deny that, if the best wild-grazing lands in New Zealand were laid down in grass, and *run-holding* were partly, and by degrees, to be abandoned for field-grazing, the result would be that, in a few years, the colony might boast a flock of from ten to fifteen millions of sheep ! ” (pp. 329, 330.)

It is pretty evident that Dr. Colenso’s informant, so confidently cited on p. 59, and described as “ an experienced sheep-master,” was nothing more than a holder of one of the above-described “ *sheep-runs.*” But, on pp. 213, 214 of Hartshorne’s interesting volume, I find the following additional and most important testimony:—“ Near Auckland, 100 acres of Taranaki meadows have carried nearly 100 head of cattle through the year, many of them fat for the butcher. At New Plymouth, incredible as it may seem, *thirty-five acres of † fern land laid down in grass, have been known to carry nearly 300 sheep throughout the year (!).* Whilst bush-land, after bearing four heavy wheat-crops in succession, has been sown with grass in March, and afforded a good bite for cattle in May. Indeed, sufficient has been seen of the luxuriance of artificial pastures, to show that our *ordinary* lands laid down in grass, are quite equal to the grazing of four sheep per acre throughout the year ; and Mr. Weld, one of our largest graziers, is quite correct in saying, in his late admirable pamphlet on New Zealand ‘ Sheep-farming,’ ‘ that there is a good deal of land in New Zealand which, when grassed and fenced, will keep *eight* sheep an acre all the year round, and ‘ be proportionately good for cattle.’ ”

And now let me say one word as to the fallacy of comparing

* This is a very low estimate. It is said that many of the farm pastures, with a few turnips to help out, are capable of fattening six or seven sheep an acre the year through.—*Author’s note, ibid.*

† It is the prevalence of the fern that makes the *sheep-runs* so unproductive in suitable fodder for the sheep. Hence the enormous extent of acreage required.

the fertility of Natal with that of Australia and New Zealand—much rather, of carefully irrigated and highly favoured Egypt, or happy Palestine. Dr. Colenso does not allude to the fact, that all the year round, one half of the *sheep-runs* of Natal are lying absolutely fallow. It is found necessary to burn the land before the rains, in order to clear it, and to secure a new supply of fresh-green herbage. A graphic description of this custom of burning the Natal sheep-runs is given in Shooter's "Kaffirs of Natal," pp. 32, 33 (*London*, 1857, 8vo.), and also in "South Africa Delineated," p. 176, by the Rev. Thornley Smith (*London*, 1850, 8vo.), who also notices that "Kaffraria is by no means over-peopled," p. 64.

Such is Dr. Colenso's credibility as a witness, even in matters which must have been, a hundred times over, forced upon his notice, during the course of a single year! The same boldness of assertion* and looseness of authenticity pervades his entire volume. Indeed, the whole of his statements must be received with the most excessive reserve, judging by the specimens which I have already considered, and, I would fain hope, satisfactorily disposed of. But on pp. 19, 20 of "The Kaffirs of Natal, and the Zulu Country," by the Rev. Joseph Shooter, I find an equally singular commentary on another portion of chapter xiii. of the Bishop's book. His Lordship objects to the historic value of statements contained in Exodus xxiii. 27—30:—"I will send my fear before thee, and will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee. And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee. I will not drive them out from before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beasts of the field multiply against thee. By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land." "The

* A very comical instance of reasoning occurs on p. 66. The Bishop adduces the command, "Neither let the flocks nor herds feed before the mount," Exod. xxxiv. 3, and then writes, "It cannot be pretended that the [barren] state of the country has undergone any material change," &c., from that time to this. His Lordship overlooks the fact, that unless there had been something for the cattle to eat, there would be no occasion for the prohibition to eat it!

“ whole land,” says the Bishop, “ which was divided among the tribes in the time of Joshua, including the countries beyond the Jordan, was in extent about 11,000 square miles, or 7,000,000 acres ; and, according to the story, this was occupied by more than two millions of people.” (p. 82.) He then proceeds to show that the population of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex was, according to the census of 1851, one million one hundred and forty-nine thousand two hundred and forty-seven (1,149,247). “ Surely it cannot be said that these three eastern counties, with their flourishing towns and their innumerable villages, are in any danger of lying ‘ desolate ’ with the beasts of the field multiplying against the human inhabitants.”

Certainly not, Dr. Colenso ; for, since the days of Edgar, the wolves, and wild boars, and other wild animals have undergone a gradual process of extinction. That it was a very gradual one, we learn from Lord Macaulay’s very graphic description of the condition of England in the days of the Stuarts, even at no very remote distance from the metropolis. But does the Bishop of Natal forget that in certain districts of France, * not to speak of Poland and Hungary, the wolves do occasionally multiply against the inhabitants, and put them to very serious inconvenience and alarm ? So, also, in various densely-populated districts of India, the multiplication and inroads of tigers are not a very unfrequent matter of complaint. If my memory serves me, this very thing was lately made the basis of an argument against disarming the villagers, inasmuch as they would be rendered defenceless against the beasts of the field. But let us proceed to consider the Bishop’s objection in reference to Natal, that never-failing field for illustration with his Lordship. “ The colony of Natal has an extent of 18,000 square miles, and a population, white and black included, probably not exceeding 150,000 altogether. This population is, of course, very scanty, and the land will allow of a much larger

* After the wars of the French Revolution, the wolves increased so alarmingly in France, that the subject occupied the serious attention of the Legislature. No less a sum than 100,000 francs was appointed by the French Government, Nov. 1, of the year 1798, to be awarded as head money for the destruction of wolves. See “ *Les Loups dans la Beauce, par A. Lecocq.*” (*Chartres, 1860. 8vo., p. 29.*)

“one. Yet the human inhabitants are perfectly well able to maintain their ground against the beasts of the field; and, in fact, the lions, elephants, and rhinoceroses, and hippopotami, which once abounded, have long disappeared. Leopards, wild boars, hyænas, and jackals are killed occasionally in the bush; but many a white man may have lived for years in the colony, as I have done, and travelled about in all parts of it, without seeing or hearing one.” (p. 83.) This is probably a correct statement, as far as it goes, but it does not invalidate the testimony of earlier colonists and travellers, such as Pringle and others, as to a very different position of affairs existing in their days. The use of fire-arms,* which, I beg to observe, were not in

* “The population of that country (Palestine) at the present moment is about two millions, or about equal to the number of the Israelites at the Exodus; and I can testify that *more than three-fourths* of the richest and the best of the country lies *completely desolate*. The vast plains of Moab and Esdraelon and the whole valley of the Jordan are without an inhabitant. In the plains of Philistia, Sharon, Bashan, Cœlosyria, and Hamath, not *one-tenth* of the soil is under cultivation. In one section of Bashan I saw upwards of seventy *deserted* towns and villages. Bishop Colenso says that though the population of Natal is so small, most of the wild beasts have long ago disappeared, and the inhabitants are perfectly well able to maintain their ground against the rest. He forgets, however, to thank gunpowder and the rifle for this. Had the people of Natal contended against the wild beasts as the ancient Jews did, with spears and arrows and slings; had the chiefs of the colony been forced to fight African lions, as David fought the lion that attacked his sheep, when he caught him by the beard, and smote him and slew him (1 Sam. xvii. 34), the Bishop would have had a different tale to tell this day. Many of the wild beasts have disappeared from Syria, but many still infest the country. In the plain of Damascus wild swine commit great ravages on the grain. This is the case along the banks of the Jordan and in other places. On the sides of the Anti-Lebanon I have known the bears to destroy whole vineyards in a single night. When travelling through some districts of the country, my tent was surrounded every night by troops of jackals and hyenas, and more than once they have left me without a breakfast. With my own eyes I have seen jackals dragging corpses from the graves beneath the very walls of Jerusalem. Were it not that the peasants are pretty generally armed with rifles, the grain crops and vineyards in many parts of Syria would be completely destroyed by wild beasts.

“The public will now see how very little Bishop Colenso knows of Bible lands, and how wise and good was the Divine promise, ‘I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee.’”—(*Letter of J. L. Porter to the Athenæum*,” dated Jan. 1, 1863.)

vogue in the days of the Israelitish immigration into Canaan, has gradually cleared the more civilized portions of the Cape, of the *feræ* which, almost within the memory of man, had matters pretty much their own way. But what has Mr. Shooter to say upon the subject, after four years of personal observation?—"The crops are subject to great depredations. Quadrupeds, birds, and insects conspire to destroy them. To protect the gardens from four-footed depredators, two methods are employed, viz., fences and watching. The former, designed especially for protection against the wild pig,* sometimes surround the gardens, and they also appear in the form of a barrier between the cultivated lands and pig-infested regions.† When two or three kraals are situated near an extensive bush, the owners may agree to carry a fence along that side of the country whence the pigs approach, and so exclude them from the neighbourhood generally. . . . When watching is resorted to, a platform of poles and strong sticks is erected in the garden, with a small hut on the top. This structure, which corresponds to the 'lodge' mentioned by Isaiah, is for the accommodation of the watchers. In an extensive garden, two or three are necessary, and the women have sometimes to assist the men in defending their crops against nocturnal depredators. Though we have mentioned the pig as the especial enemy of the crops, he is by no means the only beast that assails them. The 'fretful porcupine' is a most undesirable visitor. Antelopes eat the young plants; and baboons, where they prevail, steal the ripe maize. In bushy districts, the buffalo does mischief; and, when a garden is situate near a river occupied by the hippopotami, it is liable to their visitations. Of all four-footed depredators, the elephant is the most destructive," &c., &c. (pp. 19, 20.) Mr. Shooter gives several anecdotes, in which he mentions cases of entire plantations being utterly devastated by these gigantic spoilers; and not only gardens, but *kraals* themselves, being entered, in order to purloin any produce to which they had taken a fancy.

* See Psalm lxxx. 13, 14.

† Drummond Hay gives a very amusing description of the predatory incursions of the wild boars, in the gardens and plantations of Barbary. These porcine invaders have a special *penchant* for cucumbers, melons, and other similar dainty produce!

It appears that the Caffres feel themselves utterly powerless to avert calamities of this nature, inasmuch as the elephants are exceedingly ferocious, and wreak summary vengeance upon the unfortunate husbandmen should they attempt to molest or drive them away. The kindling of fires apparently attracts these creatures, instead of terrifying them, as it does the feline denizens of the forest and the jungle.*

So much, then, for the testimony of the Rev. Joseph Shooter, "four years resident in Natal," *versus* his quondam Diocesan, nine years resident in the same colony. Surely Dr. Colenso might have spared himself his unbelieving sneer against Moses, inasmuch as, just outside, if it be so, his Lordship's own diocese, abundant demonstration is forthcoming as to the historical reasonableness, as well as the accuracy and credibility, of the words of the inspired penman, in the controverted passage of the Book of Exodus!

Let it not be imagined that I attach any weight to his Lordship's cavil. Objection, or argument, it does not deserve to be called. Weak indeed is the position of an assailant, when he is reduced to such pitiful shifts to find weapons of offensive warfare against the inspired Word of God! It is a trite legal aphorism—*De minimis non curat lex*. The Bishop of Natal has indeed, in his present work under consideration, established a sort of equivocal claim to be accounted a "special pleader." Well had it been for his reputation as a scholar, and a prelate of our beloved Church, if he had exercised his undoubted ingenuity in a less questionable cause—for the Truth, instead of against it! As the matter at present stands, seeing that "*littera scripta manet*," albeit repentance may be vouchsafed to him—albeit he may be convinced of the error of his ways, and the sad mistake which he has, in a moment of inconsiderate impulse, and by the advice of treacherous advisers, committed; yet he must carry with him, to his dying moments, the unenviable consciousness, that he has done more to shake the faith of his weaker brethren, than any bishop of the Church of England has ever done, or (let us fervently pray) will ever do again; and that the intrinsic weakness of his volume will go far to lower the high estimate, which the Church of England has justly

* See also, the very entertaining volume, just published by R. Bentley of New Burlington-street, entitled "African Hunting, from Natal to the Zambesi, from 1852 to 1860." By W. C. Baldwin, Esq., F.R.G.S.

enjoyed, for learning and theological acquirements, in the eyes of Jew and Gentile, all over the civilized world.

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

*St. Edmund the King, Lombard-street,
November 29, 1862.*

LETTER IX.

DR. BENISCH'S OPINION OF BISHOP COLENZO'S BOOK.

SIR,—The accompanying correspondence has passed between Dr. Benisch, the learned Hebrew Editor of "The Jewish Family Bible," and myself. I trust that it will convince "An Earnest Searcher after Truth" that, in alluding to Dr. Benisch in support of "*direct personal action*" (Lev. iv. 11, 12), he has made an unfortunate mistake, and reckoned without his host.

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

*St. Edmund's, Lombard-street,
Dec. 3, 1862.*

(COPY.)

"Dec. 2, 1862.

"DEAR SIR,—As your 'Jewish Family Bible' is quoted in support of Dr. Colenso's views that the 'high priest was to carry out the bullock on his back' (Lev. iv. 11, 12), and some people are so self-opinionated that nothing but a formal denial from your own pen will satisfy them, I venture to ask you to write me two lines to that effect, in order that I may append them to my forthcoming pamphlet.

"I feel that I owe you many apologies, for troubling so distinguished a scholar, about so egregious a piece of nonsense. I think, however, I may plead the freemasonry of literature as

my introduction to one who has hitherto been known to me only through his writings.

“ Believe me to be,

“ DEAR SIR,

“ With respect and esteem,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

“ *The Rev. Dr. Benisch.*

“ P.S.—An early reply will oblige me, as I have gone to press.”

(COPY.)

“ ‘*Jewish Chronicle Office,*’ 7, *Bevis Marks, E.C.,*
 “ *London, Dec. 2, 1862.*

“ DEAR SIR,—I am quite surprised to learn that any one who has consulted my translation of the Bible, should refer to it, in support of the grave mistake committed by Bishop Colenso in his comment on Leviticus iv. 11, 12. My rendering of this verse is as follows :—‘ Even the whole bull shall he bring forth without the camp unto a clean place,’ &c., &c. From this you will see that I have translated the Hebrew by *שׂוֹפֵר*, ‘ *He shall bring forth,*’ which, of course, does not imply that the priest had to carry the bullock in person. It might have been carried in some conveyance.

“ I shall have occasion myself to discuss this subject, as I am now publishing a series of articles on the Bishop’s attack in the ‘*Jewish Chronicle.*’

“ You had no occasion to apologize to me for any trouble, as it affords me sincere pleasure to be able to contribute my mite towards disabusing the public mind, in reference to the errors into which the Bishop has led it.

“ Believe me, dear Sir,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ A. BENISCH.

“ *The Rev. Joseph B. M'Caule.*”

LETTER X.

HOW BISHOP COLENZO HAS BEEN "ENABLED MORE DECISIVELY
TO ESTABLISH" SOME OF HIS POSITIONS.

SIR,—I have before me the second edition of Dr. Colenso's "Critical Examination" of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. In the preface to this second edition I read the following:—"I have carefully studied all that has been said upon my book by writers of every kind, my sole object being to arrive at truth. These examinations, however, have not led me to doubt the accuracy of any of my conclusions. On the contrary, they have enabled me to establish, in this edition, still more decisively some of my positions." Allow me, Sir, to adduce a specimen of the manner in which his Lordship has, to his own satisfaction, "*still more decisively established*" some of his positions. In chapter ix., "*The Israelites Armed*," the Bishop insists, that the Mosaic narrative asserts, that the 600,000 adults of the congregation of Israel were armed and equipped for war. Upon this manifest absurdity of his own creation, the Bishop builds an argument against the historic veracity of the Pentateuch. On page 50, in order to strengthen his former arguments, Dr. Colenso says, "We find Moses commanding the Levites under Sinai (Exod. xxxii. 27) 'Put every man his sword by his side.'" " ' every man his sword by his side.' "

Here again, I regret to notice a complete unacquaintance with the Hebrew text. Dr. Colenso evidently considers that the word "every" of our English Version, is emphatic. Unluckily it does not exist at all in the Hebrew. "Every man" is simply אִישׁ (*ish*), "a man"=each, LXX, *ἕκαστος*. But let us for a moment concede that "ish" does here mean every individual of the 22,000 Levites, and then read the passage in the context. It reads as follows: "Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me. And all the sons (בְּנֵי לֵוִי) of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. And he said, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man (אִישׁ *ish*) his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate, throughout the

"camp, and slay every man (שׂוֹנֵה *ish*) his brother, and every man (שׂוֹנֵה *ish*) his companion, and every man (שׂוֹנֵה *ish*) his neighbour. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses: and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men!" If we allow only one brother, and one companion, and one neighbour to each of the 22,000 Levites, there ought to have fallen, according to Dr. Colenso's arithmetic, 66,000 men!!! It is told of a certain enthusiastic Cardinal, that he was so carried away by his admiration for the revised Clementine edition of the Vulgate, that, in reference to its authoritative value, he assigned to the Hebrew and Septuagint a position analogous to that of the two thieves of Calvary. But surely Dr. Colenso's tacit neglect of the original text and of the LXX, cannot be attributable to a similiar superstitious reverence for, or belief in, the infallible authority of the English version. Meanwhile, Sir, I would repeat my convictions that experiments at Biblical criticism such as the Bishop of Natal seems to consider himself privileged to indulge in, unless speedily and publicly disowned by the clergy of the Church of England, will make her a laughingstock throughout the world. I grieve to see the supine indifference, with which not a few of my clerical brethren are contented to sit still under a public stigma of so damaging a nature. They may rely upon it that, unless Bishop Colenso's book is speedily repudiated by the collective voice of the clergy, our foreign brethren will attribute our silence to our inability (from want of scholarship) to discern the errors and absurdities with which it abounds.

I am, &c.,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

St. Edmund the King, Lombard-street,

Dec. 30, 1862.

POSTSCRIPT.—The uses of the word שׂוֹנֵה are so various, and it is employed in so many different significations, that in every case it must be read with the context, in order to arrive at its meaning. I would adduce the following examples in illustration of my assertion. It is said in Exod. xii. 3., וְיִקְחוּ לָהֶם אִישׁ אִשָּׁה "They shall take to them every man a lamb." Dr. Colenso himself has decided that on this

occasion only 200,000 lambs would be required, whereas the actual number of adult males amounted to 603,550 men. If איש therefore is to be understood literally, no fewer than 603,550 lambs would be the number required, if *literally speaking*, "every man" was to take a lamb. So also it is said in Deut. xxiv. 16 יִמָּוֶת אִישׁ בְּדָמָיו "every man shall be put to death for his own sin." Are we to take "every man" in this passage *absolutely*, as indicating that every individual Israelite had committed an offence worthy of death? I think Dr. Colenso himself would scarcely feel inclined to press his own method of interpretation to so manifest a *reductio ad absurdum*. (See 2 Kings xiv. 6.) Again it is said in Genesis ix. 5, "At the hand of every man's brother (אִישׁ אָחִיו) will I require the life of man." The Bishop's commentary upon this latter expression would be highly interesting. Further, I would ask the Bishop, whether the prohibition contained in Exod. xii. 16, "No manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat," implies an absolute command to the effect that a certain amount of cookery was to be performed for every single individual of the congregation, on the first and the seventh day of the Passover? The Hebrew words in this passage are much stronger than the expression איש. They are לְכָל-נֶפֶשׁ, literally "for every soul." Look again at Laban's words to Jacob in Genesis xxxi. 49: "The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from another." The Hebrew for these latter words is כִּי נִפְתָּר אִישׁ מִרֵּעֵהוּ. Literally "when we are separated, a man from his neighbour" (LXX ἕτερος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου). Further Gen. xli. 11, 12. The chief butler tells Pharaoh how Joseph interpreted to himself and the chief baker their dreams. "We dreamed each man (אִישׁ אֶכָּאֶסְתּוֹס) according to the interpretation of his dream. . . . and he interpreted to us our dreams; to each man (אִישׁ) according to his dream, did he interpret." We find in our English translation of Exod. xii. 44, "But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof." Now, looking at the passage from Dr. Colenso's point of view, we might argue that every Hebrew had a Gentile servant, and that here is a precise command, that this servant aforesaid should be circumcised. But what saith the Scripture? וְכָל עֶבֶד אִישׁ "And every servant of [any] man."

The LXX omits the word "man" altogether, and simply reads *καὶ πάντα οἰκέτην ἢ ἀργυρώνητον περιτεμεῖς αὐτόν.** In Exodus xxx. 33, we read, "Whosoever that (אִישׁ אִישׁ "The man that") compoundeth any [holy oil] like it," etc. (LXX *ὅς ἀν ποιήσῃ.*) The same expression occurs in verse 38 of the same chapter, both in the Hebrew and the Greek. Once more, does the expression in Leviticus xix. 3, "Ye shall fear every man (אִישׁ) his mother and his father," (*ἕκαστος . . . φοβείσθω*) imply, that *both* the parents of *every one* of the Children of Israel were alive at the moment that Moses spake; and further, are the daughters of Israel wholly exempted from obedience to parents?

In Numbers v. 10, it is said, "And every man's hallowed things shall be his." (אִישׁוֹ, LXX *ἐκάστου τὰ ἡγιασμένα.*) Does this imply that every single man of the congregation constantly had hallowed things?

A very striking instance of the use of אִישׁ occurs in Numbers vii. 3, etc. We are told that the princes of Israel presented six waggons to the Levites. "And the Lord spake "unto Moses saying, take it of them, . . . and thou shalt "give them unto the Levites, to every man, according to his "service. (אִישׁוֹ, LXX *ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ λειτουργίαν.*) And Moses took the waggons and the oxen, "and gave them unto the Levites. Two waggons and four "oxen he gave unto the sons of Gershon, according to their "service; and four waggons and eight oxen he gave unto the "sons of Merari, . . . under the hand of Ithamar the son of "Aaron the priest; but unto the sons of Kohath he gave "none." And yet we are expressly told that they were given "to every man according to his service."

How will Dr. Colenso and his supporters propose to explain this arithmetical puzzle? So also the command contained in Numbers xxxv. 8, "Every one (אִישׁ) shall give of his cities to the Levites;" and yet the whole number of the cities was to be 48 only!

Looking again at Deut. i. 16, from the Bishop's standpoint of interpretation, we should be compelled to infer that family litigation was rife in every household throughout the entire congregation, not to speak of legal disputes with

* Walton prefers the above reading, although he notices that *τινὸς* is also found. Field adopts the latter reading.

strangers. Moses there says, "I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear ye the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, (בֵּין אִישׁ וּבֵין אֶחָיו) and the stranger that is with him." (LXX ἀναμέσον ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀναμέσον ἀδελφοῦ. κ. τ. λ.)

Another curious example of the use of the word אִישׁ is found in Judges vii. 8, "So the people took victuals in their hands, and their trumpets: and he sent all *the rest* (these two words 'the rest' are not in the Hebrew nor in the Greek) of Israel, every man (שֵׁל-אִישׁ) into his tent (καὶ τὸν πάντα ἄνδρα Ἰσραὴλ ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἄνδρα εἰς σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ) and retained those three hundred men." It will be observed also that the LXX translates the Hebrew אִישׁ *literally*, by ἄνδρα instead of ἕκαστον. But a most singular employment of the word אִישׁ is to be met with in I Kings vii. In verse 30, speaking of the brazen laver, we read, "under the laver were undersettlers molten, at the side of every (אִישׁ) addition." And again, in verse 36, "For on the plates of the ledges thereof, and on the borders thereof, he graved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees, according to the proportion of every one (אִישׁ ἕκαστον) and additions round about."

The same word is used twice in the feminine gender in Exodus xxvi. 3, "The five curtains shall be coupled one to another," etc. (אִשָּׁה לְאִשָּׁה, literally "a woman to her sister," LXX ἡ ἑτέρα ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας), and in verse 17 of the same chapter we find it again. The same expression is found in Ezekiel i. 9, etc., respecting the wings of the four living creatures. "Their wings were joined one to another" אִשָּׁה לְאִשָּׁה (a woman to her sister).

In Isaiah xxxiv. 15, אִשָּׁה "woman" is applied to the vultures, "every one with her mate." Again, in Amos iv. 3, it is used, of the kind of Bashan "every cow" אִשָּׁה.

I have thought it not unnecessary to multiply examples of the various applications of the words אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה, because, in the article before cited of the "National Review," the writer has ventured to assume that in the case of the word אִשָּׁה, I had adduced all the examples, which could be found, of the employment of the Hiphil of אִשָּׁה with a causative signification. The reviewer's foolish assumption will only be ridiculous, in the eyes of any one fairly versed in the Hebrew language, but with

the uninitiated, the case is far otherwise. An absurdity boldly stated, and duly supported with the editorial "we," passes current for the most erudite scholarship.

A further example of Dr. Colenso's stupendous blundering in regard to the Hebrew, is found in his Lordship's reply to Kurtz, on p. 24. The Bishop asserts that the same "expression 'little one' is used in Gen. xlv. 20 of Benjamin," which is employed in Gen. xlvi. 5 of the "little ones" of the sons of Jacob. The truth is that two different Hebrew words, and of totally different significations, are employed in the two chapters!!!

In Gen. xlv. 20 the word used is קטן *katon*, LXX νεώτερος. (*Gesenius* "minor, minimus natu," *i. e.* younger, or youngest.) It occurs also in verses 12, 23, 26, of this same chapter. This is a very common signification of the word, which the merest beginner ought to know. It is found no less than ten times in Gen. xlii., xliii., xlv., and each time in reference to Benjamin!

In Gen. xlvi. 5, however, the word employed is the singular noun of multitude, with suffix, קטנֹת *taffam*, (LXX τὴν ἀποσκευὴν) which *Gesenius* renders in this passage "*familia eorum*." It occurs again in Gen. xlv. 19. And yet the Bishop, in delightful unconsciousness of his own egregious shortcomings, fears not to write, "If it were necessary to give any further reply to *so feeble* an argument, we might say," etc. I leave my readers to judge as to the respective "*feebleness*" of Colenso and Kurtz!

POSTSCRIPT.

A LEARNED and accomplished Hebrew gentleman and scholar, of my acquaintance, has placed in my hands the following short critique on Bishop Colenso's book, to which I have great pleasure in here giving a place in these pages, premising that the writer does not belong to the Christian faith. It is a fair, albeit, brief estimate of the Right Rev. Prelate's performances.

SPECIMENS OF LOGIC.

No. 1.

P. 12. "And it is, perhaps, God's will that we shall be taught in this our day . . . not to build up our faith upon a book, though it be the Bible itself."

P. 13. "It [the Pentateuch] . . . has all along been, and, as far as we

know, will never cease to be, the mightiest instrument in the hand of the Divine Teacher for awakening in our minds just conceptions of His character," &c.

No. 2.

P. 10. "I could believe and receive the miracles of Scripture heartily, if only they were authenticated by a veracious history; though, if this is not the case with the Pentateuch, any miracles, which rest on such an unstable support, must necessarily fall to the ground with it."

P. 150. "Then, instead of looking to it [the Bible] for revelations of scientific or historical facts, which God has never promised to disclose in this way, . . . we shall have recourse to it for that which God has there in His providence laid up in store for us:" which, however, as the concluding pages tell us, we might, without the aid of the Bible, learn from the books of the '*Sikh Gooroos*.'

SPECIMEN OF INTERPRETATION.

Chapter IX., "The Israelites Armed," contains a critical investigation, with many quotations from the Pentateuch and other parts of the Bible, references to Herodotus, Josephus, Gesenius, Alison, and opinions of modern theological writers, to show the impossibility of the Israelites having been able to turn out at a moment's notice 600,000 armed men: a conclusion as likely to be drawn from the words in Exodus xiii. 18,* as the telegram, "France is armed," would lead one to suppose that every Frenchman is provided with a rifle. Does Exod. xii. 35 † tell us that every Israelite borrowed from the Egyptians jewels?

CONCLUSION.

Thousands of honest believers, being, at the same time, great scholars and antiquarians, have read the Book of God, assisted by their faith when receiving the account of signs and wonders, and making use of their learning to explain the apparent difficulties in minor points. But if the Bible is to be accepted only by the test of statistics taken from London and the colony of Natal, and commented upon by total ignorance both of the Hebrew language and the style of writing used by the ancients, the reader will arrive at the conclusion that "God's providence" has allowed this book, which (p. 13) "has been the means of revealing to us His true name," &c., to meet with a more lamentable fate than any profane work ever known; that it has been falsified by the most clumsy inventions of a deceiver void of common sense; that these falsifications, obvious as they appear, have never been noticed through thousands of years; that Jesus and his disciples, founding their doctrine on the faith of those corrupted passages, had not the least misgiving about the truth or untruth thereof; and that, to open the eyes of the world to the true light, was reserved for Voltaire and Dr. Colenso.

* וַיִּשְׂאוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יָדָם (Exod.), "And the children of Israel went up harnessed," or "armed."

† וַיִּבְרְכוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה, "And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses, and they borrowed," &c.

In addition to the above, I would add the following remarkable testimony from a long-trying, and able Christian Jewish clergyman, the Rev. Alexander Levie, contained in a letter addressed to the Editor of the "Record":—

"SIR,—The Rev. J. B. McCaul, in his . . . reply to 'An Earnest Searcher after Truth,' makes the following observation:—'Let me tell "An Earnest Searcher after Truth" that unbelieving Jews are scoffing at the recent whimsical display of ignorance and audacity on the part of an English Bishop.' There can be no doubt of this fact; but there is another body who are not indifferent lookers-on, but painfully feel the consequences of the merciless onslaught on the volume of inspiration by would-be critics and Hebrew scholars, who have probably never once read through the Old Testament entirely in the original language, and yet fancy that they know the spirit of the Hebrew language. The class of persons I allude to is the large number of Jewish converts, both in this and other countries, amongst whom are men of the highest attainments in every branch of science and literature, as well as thorough Hebrew scholars. Some also are to be found as clergymen of the Church of England, to which number I myself belong. To speak, then, for myself, I feel pity mingled with sorrow for men like Bishop Colenso, who venture to criticise the Hebrew language, because they have a smattering of it.

"I do not intend, however, at present to combat Dr. Colenso's assertions. . . . But, hoping that 'An Earnest Searcher after Truth' is really in earnest, I would submit to him the following observation:—Supposing that, in the passages of Leviticus in dispute, there was no Hiphil or causative voice used, but the simple Kal or active voice, or that the Hiphil voice, in these passages, has not the causative signification, which Mr. McCaul ably proved that it has, would it then even follow that the High Priest was actually to perform those duties, menial or not, himself? I say that it does not follow that all the directions given to the High Priest to perform must necessarily be performed by himself, or were intended to be performed by him *in propria personâ*, though the command is directed to him. Some duties evidently could not be performed but by himself in person, but some he might as evidently delegate to others, and yet, being the responsible party, it would be as if he had done it himself; and such was evidently the intention, and therefore the command is to him.

"If a King orders a Minister to carry out a certain matter or law, is it meant that the Minister should do it himself, *in propria personâ*, or that he should direct others under him to do it?"

"Let Dr. Colenso and his followers prove in a satisfactory manner, and from historical facts, that my observation is untenable.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"ALEX. LEVIE,

"One of the Compilers of the 'Englishman's Hebrew Concordance,'

"Holloway, Nov. 27."

The following letter has been addressed, by Dr. Hermann Adler, son of the Chief Rabbi in London, to the "Athenæum" of Dec. 6, 1862, and serves further to illustrate the mistakes into which Dr. Colenso's unacquaintance with the Hebrew tongue has betrayed him. It also furnishes another example, *from a Jewish point of view*, of the sort of repute into which the learning of the Church of England is likely to be brought by experiments at Biblical criticism, such as the Bishop's volume so lamentably supplies:—

"BISHOP COLENZO AND THE BIBLE.

"16, *Finsbury-square*, Nov. 24, 1862.

"A crop of rejoinders will, no doubt, soon spring up to refute the various arguments used by Dr. Colenso for impugning the historical veracity of the Pentateuch. My object in writing this letter is by no means to vindicate the truth of the Bible. I consider Truth to be powerful enough in itself to triumph over presumption and injustice. The Bible has, indeed, stood more powerful attacks than Dr. Colenso has been enabled to make upon it. I would simply inquire, as one of those to whom a 'critical examination of the Pentateuch' is of special interest, how far the promise held out on the title-page is fulfilled in the body of the work. The author assigns as one of the reasons why it had been left to him to discover the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch, the little progress which Biblical studies have as yet made among the English clergy, and the neglect of the study of the Hebrew language. (p. xxi.) Dr. Colenso is not, I fear, much in advance of his brethren. In § 53, he says that Lev. xxiii. 40 ('Ye shall take you the boughs,' &c.) contains the description of the way in which the booths to be used during the Feast of Tabernacles were to be made!—a mistake which may be overlooked if made by the brilliant author of 'Coningsby,' but is unpardonable in one who is an eminent divine, and is anxious to be considered a learned critic. A Jewish child would set the Bishop right on this point, and inform him that the four vegetable productions were to be taken into the temple 'to rejoice before the Lord seven days,' and are in no way connected with the booths.

"We can easily see, however, why he has fallen into this egregious error. The author does not seem to have consulted the original; he suffers himself to be bound in the trammels of the Authorized Version, and servilely copies its mistranslations. פרי עץ הדר he renders 'boughs of goodly trees,' instead of 'the fruit of the goodly tree.'

"And further, throughout his criticisms the author wholly ignores the labours of the Jewish commentators in the same field. He devotes so much space (chaps. ii. and iii.) to show that the clumsy devices of Kurtz and Hengstenberg for reconciling the difficulty about the family of Judah are untenable, but does not allude to the simple solution suggested by the critical Ibn Ezra, that the idiom יהיה בנה הדין need not be taken literally, but that

the event recorded in that chapter may have taken place many years before, (just as in Deut. x. 8).

“A critical examination, according to Dr. Colenso, signifies, indeed, taking every word and every expression in its most literal sense, which an *unbiased* reader of the Biblical narrative never dreamt of. Who did ever think that the expression ‘the children of Israel went up armed,’ should mean that each and every one of the 600,000 possessed arms? Would the newspaper report, ‘The Russians have invaded Turkey,’ be explained by him to mean that every single native of Russia had joined the expedition?”

“Who did ever suppose,—unless, indeed, he were as absurd, as Dr. Colenso makes out the writer of the Pentateuch to have been,—that the *whole* of the congregation were gathered unto the door of the Tabernacle? Do we never speak of a nation, when we only mean its representatives?”

“Had the author studied the Bible with a little greater attention, *we* should not have been favoured with the outburst of his virtuous indignation, and the Zulu Kaffir would have been taught the true meaning of Ex. xxi. 20—22. Bishop Colenso would have discovered that the commandment does not refer to murder with malice *prepensè*, but to accidental manslaughter; and that still, if the slave died under his master’s hand, ‘it is to be avenged’ (for this is the true translation of עָקַבְתָּ עַקְבִּי, not ‘he shall be punished’). And this expression he would have found explained by the ancient commentators to mean, execution by the sword.

“But, in fact, there is scarcely one difficulty, one imagined contradiction or impossibility, raised and gloated over by him, which has not already been touched upon and satisfactorily explained by one of the Jewish expositors. Thus the prohibition in Deut. xxiii. 12, is explained by them to refer only to the outside of the camp of Levites, and the whole difficulty vanishes. His Lordship may, indeed, claim originality for startling discoveries, such as he makes, *e.g.*, about the Passover. Who but a smatterer in Hebrew would thus pervert the plain language of the text as to make it appear that a Commandment to be observed on the 10th would have been issued on the 14th of that month? But I must not encroach any further upon your valuable space.

“In conclusion, let me ask Bishop Colenso one question. He forbids us from indulging the imagination, that God could only reveal Himself to us by means of an *infallible* book. Will he have us believe, that God could reveal Himself through a book which contains such absurdities as he has discovered in it?”

“DR. HERMANN ADLER.”

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS,

THE CHRISTIAN’S SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTOR AND RULE OF DAILY LIFE.

By the Rev. JOSEPH B. M’CAUL, Chaplain to the
Lord Bishop of Rochester, &c., &c.

* * A few remaining copies on sale at Wertheim, Macintosh, and Co.’s.

BS1225.4 .C7M13
Bishop Colenso's criticism criticised

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00039 9602