

is the same. No real scholar would maintain that they are not distinct dialects. They claim that there are distinct features of style which show that you are dealing with a different writer.

If you read through a three hundred page book which I had written and a three hundred page book which one of my colleagues had written, you would probably notice variations of style in sentence types, words, and terminology. A word that you find used many times in my book might not occur at all in his, and vice versa. You would probably find distinctive features of preference for types of sentences, types of language, and particular words. One might say, “This style of house...,” and the other might say, “This type of building...” There will naturally be such diversity between the work of two writers, even writing about the same subject. There is also the fact that on many things they would have the same words and usage. There would be differences and also similarities. After you had compared these two books, if you then heard a few pages from another book you might be able to tell which of the two had written it. If you heard only a paragraph, it might be far more difficult.

The book of Deuteronomy consists mainly of Moses’ farewell address. Its style, naturally has many differences from that of other parts of the Pentateuch, but most of these differences are easily explained by the different purpose of the writer. By themselves they would not necessarily prove a different author. But it is quite different with the rest of the Pentateuch, most of which the critics claim to be able to divide into three main documents which they call P, J, and E. Here there is no complete document of which it can be said, this is all from P, or this is all from J. There is no clear proof that such documents actually existed; there is no solid basis on which to establish the peculiarities of the suggested documents. So the critic must go through what is there and try to divide it into sections on the difference of divine names or parallel passages, etc. Then, having created divisions, he tries to prove there are distinct styles, and then he attempts to divide the rest of the material according to the alleged distinctions. There is a great danger of arguing in a circle, because there is no solid basis on which it can rest. This is a very important point regarding the idea that the stylistic differences are sufficient to