

=====
This of course contradicts the main principle of Ewald, as a Grundschrift consisting out of two different documents, stops to be a Grundschrift. This is a typical case of the means and the development found in the 2-document theories, that theories developing out of a certain theory and based upon it, contradict that, upon what they are based. Hupfeld is adding the time element, stating the early origin of J and E2 while E1 is later. This is in contrast with Ewalds view, who thinks that E is first, combined with J forms JE and is later combined with D.

3) Eichhorn in 1882, taking up the idea of Astruc, believes that ~~the~~ Gen. and early part of Ex. is made up from 2 documents J and E. The origin for the theory was the question, where Moses got his information about the first chapters of Genesis. Eichhorn believed in the authorship of Moses regarding the part of the Pentateuch which deals with the lifetime of Moses, i.e. all except Gen. and the early chapters of Ex. This view could be accepted as far as to say that Moses used written sources for the parts of the Pentateuch which deal with the time before him. Of course inspiration guided and guarded his work. Eichhorn bases his theory on 4 points.

- 1) difference in the names for God :Elohim and Jehovah.
- 2) Continuity of the narrative in each document.
- 3) Parallel-Passages (MOST IMPORTANT ARGUMENT!)
- 4) Argument from style etc.

The most important thing of Eichhorn compared with Wellhausen, is, that Eichhorn believed in the authorship of Moses, which authorship is testified to by the rest of the Old Testament, by the New Testament and as we have seen above, by the Lord Jesus Christ himself.

Wellhausen does not believe in the authorship of Moses, he rather believes in a number of documents, which were gradually put together in a development taking place over several centuries and starting several centuries after Moses.

Wellhausen does not believe in 2 documents but in several and very different ones from those, which Eichhorn brings.

Wellhausen does not believe in the authorship of Moses as Eichhorn did. Wellhausen breaks up all arguments of Eichhorn except argument from parallel-passages, but as parallel-passages are found in the same document this argument lost its value too. AND many of the "parallel-passages" are no parallel passages but simply divisions of verses or alleged parallel-passages, or simply based upon the Hebrew custom of giving first a short "headline" and then the details.

So we see again that Wellhausen, based upon Eichhorn completely breaks to pieces everything Eichhorn stated and upon which Eichhorn based everything. The old method: Building up a theory upon a basis, through demoliting the basis!