CHAPTER SEVEN

OPPOSITION TO GRAFIANISM

Having traced the Grafian Hypothesis to its establishment as the new orthodoxy, and thus reached the mid-point of this survey, it is necessary now to make a change in method. Up to this point contributions towards Grafianism, however meagre, have been recorded, while the much more numerous works representative of traditional opinion have been left unnoticed. From this point on it is the restatements of typical Grafianism that must be omitted so that attention can be paid to divergent views put forward in opposition to the dominant hypothesis. Only thus can one explain the situation of the present day.

It is convenient to make a five-fold division of the opponents of Grafianism—Conservative, Jewish, Catholic, archaeological and critical. ¹)

A. CONSERVATIVE OPPOSITION

Our survey appropriately begins with the work of the Orientalist James Robertson of Glasgow, who cites Robertson Smith on the conservatism of the Orientals and then says “one poor orientalist here and there may be pardoned for having so much in common with them when so many scholars are of another mind”. ²) His concern is mainly with the religious reconstruction proposed by Wellhausen—the growth of monotheism, the localization of deity, image worship (Chaps VII-XII)—which he finds to be inconsistent with the developed stage of faith and literary tradition in the eighth century prophets (Chaps III-V). When he comes to the question of the laws (Chaps XIII-XVIII), he seeks to show that Israel was under authoritative

¹) While in general agreement with J. B. Pritchard’s criticism of this kind of division in another work on the grounds that “results of research should stand quite independent of any racial, national or religious background” of the scholars involved (JQR XXXIX (1948-1949) p. 103), a history, like that attempted here, must take them into account. All the scholars to be reviewed were “conservative” but this word meant something different to Jew, Catholic and evangelical Protestant, and it is to the last-named that the term is specifically applied here.

institutions from the first, ¹) that non-mention does not mean non-existence,²) and that the theory of plural sanctuaries is not established.³) While refraining from drawing conclusions on the dates of the Old Testament books, it is clear that Robertson has profound misgivings about the new school.

These misgivings are shared by a small group of Continental scholars, among whom Robertson's book immediately becomes popular. Orelli becomes his translator, and Oettli follows his method of using Amos and Hosea as a pivot in an examination of their priestly terminology, ⁴) and religious ideas. His conclusion is that Amos and Hosea know a Pentateuch, which has both priestly narrative and priestly institutions and law.⁵) The analysis of the Pentateuch into sources is not denied, and this is true also of Gasser, who mounts a full-scale attack on the evolutionary theory in a work dedicated to Orelli.⁶) For him the issue is that of the idea of God, rather than just that of the history of the cultus.⁷)

More thorough-going in his rejection of the new school is Rupprecht, who between 1893 and 1897 wrote almost a thousand and a half pages in criticism. One of his works is dedicated to W. H. Green, constant quotations are made from him, and it is to this writer, rather than to Robertson, that there is the closest resemblance.

Although extended to inordinate length by later expansions,⁸) his essential position is already contained in the short work of 1893,⁹)

¹) He finds Wellhausen's application of his formula in Part I of the Prolegomena "these having not the law, do by nature the works of the law" illogical. He cannot at the same time argue from the non-observance of the laws to their non-existence and yet concede that although the codes are late, the praxis is early (p. 394).
²) Else there would be no circumcision in Islam, because the Koran does not mention it (p. 396).
³) For the prophets there is only one legitimate sanctuary, and for the Book of the Covenant very few (pp. 403-13).
⁶) C. Gasser, Das Alte Testament und die Kritik, Stuttgart (1906).
⁷) He notes that while König agrees with Wellhausen on the date of P, and de Wette and Nöldeke differ, and Vatke differs with Wellhausen on the identification of D with Josiah's law-book where Dillman, Driver and Baudissin agree, in matters of faith the radical critics are on one side, and the moderate critics on another (p. 95).
⁸) E. Rupprecht, Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose und seine falsche Lösung, Gütersloh (1894); Des Rätsels Lösung, 2 vols, Gütersloh (1896-1897).
⁹) Rupprecht, Die Anschauung der kritischen Schule Wellhausens vom Pentateuch, Erlangen (1893).