

The differences of style in the various portions of the Pentateuch have been immensely exaggerated, even if they do not rest wholly on imagination. But one assertion is certainly incontrovertible. There is a marked difference between the style of Deuteronomy and that of the other books of the Pentateuch. Even the ordinary English reader can detect this in an instant. But the inference drawn from it, that the book is by a different author, must be dismissed as "not proven." So also must the allegation that the first three chapters are an introduction by a different hand. This last statement rests upon Deut. ii. 10-13. But this is an obvious interpolation of later date. So obvious is the interruption of the continuity of the narrative, that the English translator has himself interpolated a "said I" in ver. 14, to restore that continuity. There is no evident difference of style between the rest of these three chapters and that of the remainder of the book. Moreover, such interpolations are not uncommon.<sup>1</sup> As for the difference between the style of Deuteronomy and that of the other books, we may ask, Is there any reason to believe that the divergence is greater than would be found between an impassioned harangue by Sir Henry James or Sir Charles Russell and the *précis* of a legal document by either of these distinguished orators and lawyers? Or can it be proved that the divergence between Deuteronomy and the historical portions of the Pentateuch is greater than it is between that of an historian when he writes history and the same man when he makes a speech on a subject on which he feels strongly. Compare, for instance, Professor Tyndall when he is narrating the progress of scientific discovery, with the same Professor when he is inveighing against Mr. Gladstone. If his collected writings were put into the hands of a German critic some two thousand years hence, would not that excellent man be tempted to make Professor Tyndall into two persons—to distinguish between the hortatory Deuteronomist Professor and the dry, curt, matter-of-fact narrator of the progress of science?

---

<sup>1</sup> *Theological Monthly*, June, 1890, p. 374.