and read to the people every ſeventh year@@(D). Sufficient care therefore was taken not only for the preſervation of the original record, but that no ſpurious production ſhould be ſubſtituted in its ſtead. And that no ſpurious production ever has been ſubſtituted in the ſtead of the original compoſition of Moſes, appears from the evidence both of the Greek and the Samaritan Pentateuch. For as theſe agree with the Hebrew, except in ſome trif­ling variations @@(e), to which every work is expoſed by length of time, it is abſolutely certain that the five books which we now aſcribe to Moſes are one and the ſame work with that which was tranſlated into Greek in the time of the Ptolemies, and, what is of ſtill great­er importance, with that which exiſted in the time of Solomon. And as the Jews could have had no mo­tive whatſoever, during that period which elapſed be­tween the age *of* Joſhua and that of Solomon, for ſubſtituting a ſpurious production inſtead of the original as written by Moſes, and, even had they been inclined to attempt the impoſture, would have been prevented by the care which had been taken by their lawgiver, we muſt conclude that our preſent Pentateuch is the ve­ry identical work that was delivered by Moſes.

The poſitive evidence being now produced, we ſhall endeavour to anſwer ſome particular objections that have been urged. But as moſt of theſe occur in the book of Geneſis, we ſhall reſerve them for ſeparate examination, and ſhall here only conſider the objections peculiar to the four laſt books. They may be compriſed under one head, viz. expreſſions and paffages in theſe books which could not have been written by Moſes. I. The account of the death of Moſes, in the laſt chapter of Deuteronomy, we allow muſt have been added by ſome ſucceeding writer; but this can never prove that the book of Deuteronomy is ſpurious. What is more com­mon among ourſelves than to ſee an account of the life and death of an author ſubjoined to his works, without informing us by whom the narrative was written? 2. It has been objected, that Moſes always ſpeaks of himſelf in the third perſon. This is the objection of fooliſh ignorance, and therefore ſcarcely deferves an anſwer. We ſuſpect that ſuch perſons have never read the claſſics, particularly Caeſar’s Commentaries, where the au­thor uniformly ſpeaks of himſelf in the third perſon, as every writer of correct taſte will do who reflects on the abſurdity of employing the pronoun of the ſirſt perſon in a work intended to be read long after his death. (See Grammar, n⁰ 33.) 3. As to the objection, that in ſome places the text is defective, as in Exodus xv. 8. it is not directed againſt the author, but againſt ſome tranſcriber; for what is wanting in the Hebrew is inſerted in the Samaritan. 4. The only other objection that de­ſerves notice is made from two paſſages. It is ſaid in one place that the bed of Og is at Ramah *to this day;* and in another (Deut. iii. 14.), “Jair the ſon of Manaſſeh took all the country of Argob unto the coaſts of Geſhuri and Maacathi, and called them after his own name, Baſhan-havoth-jair, *unto this day.”* The laſt clauſe in both theſe paſſages could not have been writ­ten by Moſes, but it was probably placed in the margin by ſome tranſcriber by way of explanation, and was af­terwards by miſtake inſerted in the text. Whoever doubts the truth of this aſſertion may have recourſe to the manuſcripts of the Greek Teſtament, and he will find that the ſpurious additions in the texts of ſome manuſcripts are actually written in the margin of others @@(f).

That the Pentateuch, therefore, at leaſt the four laſt books of it, was written by Moſes, we have very ſatisfactory evidence; which, indeed, at the diſtance of 3000 years is wonderful, and which cannot be affirmed of any profane biſtory written at a much later period.

The book of Geneſis was evidently not written by a perſon who was contemporary with the facts which he records; for it contains the hiſtory of 2369 years, a period comprehending almoſt twice as many years as all the reſt of the hiſtorical books of the Old Teſtament put together. Moſes has been acknowledged as the au­thor of this book by all the ancient Jews and Chriſtians; but it has been a matter of diſpute from what ſource he derived his materials; ſome affirming that all the facts were revealed by inſpiration, and others main­taining that he procured them from tradition.

Some who have looked upon themſelves as profound philoſophere, have rejected many parts of the book of Geneſis as fabulous and abſurd: but it cannot be the wiſdom of philoſophy, but the vanity of ignorance, that could lead to ſuch an opinion. In fact, the book of Geneſis affords a key to many difficulties in philoſo­phy which cannot otherwiſe be explained. It has been ſuppoſcd that the diverſities among mankind prove that they are not deſcended ſrom one pair; but it has been

@@@(d) “And Moſes wrote this law, and delivered it unto the prieſts the ſons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Iſrael. And Moſes commanded them, ſaying, At the end of every ſeven years, in the ſolemnity of the year of releaſe, in the feaſt of tabernacles, when all Iſrael is come to appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he ſhall chooſe, thou ſhalt read this law before all Iſrael in their hearing. And it came to paſs, when Moſes had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finiſhed, that Moſes commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, laying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the ſide of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God.” Deut. xxxi. 9—11. 24—26. There is a paſſage to the ſame purpoſe in Joſephus: Δηλγται δια των αναχειμενων εντω ιερω γρχμματον, *Josephi Antiquitot.* Lib. V. c. I. § 17. ed. Hudson.

@@@(e) See the collation of the Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch, in the 6th vol. of the *London Polyglot.* p. 19. of the *Animadverſiones Samaritica.*

(f) **To** mention only two examples. 1.The common reading, I Cor. xvi. 2. is μιαν σαΒΒατων; but the Codex Pitavian 1 3. has την χυριαχην in the margin; and in one of the manuſcripts which Beza used, this marginal ad­dition has been obtruded in the text. See his note on this paſſage. 2. Another inſtance is, I John ii. 27. where the genuine reading is χρισμα; but Wetſtein quotes two manuſcripts, in which τνευμα is written in the margin; and this marginal reading has found its way not only into the Codex Covelli 2, but into the Coptic and Ethiopic verſions.