great importance in the history of the theory and Astruc of very little. Yet today people speak of Astruc far more often than they speak of Eichhorn. Astruc did not present any destructive idea. He believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and his theory related only to Genesis, not to the material that dealt with matters with which Moses was directly connected. There is really no harm in anything that Astruc did. It is a matter deserving investigation. Nobody today thinks that Moses used the documents that Astruc suggested that he used. It would not be particularly important for us to know about him, if it were not for the fact that all the books written in recent years blame (or praise) him for being the founder of the higher criticism of the Pentateuch.

It is quite different with Eichhorn, although the ideas that he first presented were not in themselves particularly bad. When he presented his theory it received considerable attention in Germany and some in other countries.

Eichhorn's theory was quite similar to Astruc's. His reconstruction of the two supposed documents was essentially the same, but neither of them is really close to the theory as it came eventually to be widely accepted.

Eichhorn thought that the book of Genesis could be divided into two main documents, one of which uses the name Jehovah and the other the title Elohim (God). Eichhorn said that Moses used these two documents in writing the Pentateuch.

Up to this point there is no harm in the view. If you do not think Moses used documents, where do you think he got the material in Genesis? Do you think someone told him by word of mouth, what his father told him that his father had told him, and so on? Personally I think is it far more likely that he used documents.

Writing was common at least 1500 years before the time of Moses. It was far more common in Palestine at the time of Moses than it was fifty years ago and certainly many times more common than it was 200 years ago in Palestine. And therefore it seems to be entirely probable