

the way that we interpret it. We understand that God gave the Covenant in Exodus 20-24, and then took Moses up the mountain and gave him a full detailed law for the priests, including many details which it was not necessary to give when making the Covenant with the people. So we believe we have two distinct laws that fit together. Each of them is complete for the purpose for which it was given and they fit together. According to the interpretation of the critics these are two different laws, very different in type, and containing a great many small contradictions. They say, "There is a great contradiction in emphasis, with the one putting tremendous stress on details of sacrifice and the other saying very little about it. Consequently, if one of them thinks this is the law that was given, and the other thinks that was, they can not both be by Moses. So they must be by somebody much later."

But if they do not contradict each other, then you have no evidence for different documents. There would be no sense in Moses taking documents from other people with different styles, and combining them to tell about something that he himself saw when he was actually there.

Astruc and Eichhorn in their early days, did not necessarily hold to any contradiction, but as the theory developed it led to belief in contradiction, and once you hold that there are contradictions you give up the Mosaic authorship and the belief in divine inspiration. It was extended through the Pentateuch by Eichhorn's successors.