

## CONTENTS

Abbreviations. . . . .	xI
I. PROLOGUE. . . . .	1
The Tradition . . . . .	1
The Challenge. . . . .	4
The Defence . . . . .	10

### PART ONE

#### THE LAW BY MOSES

##### THE PRE-GRAFANS 1805-1865

II. BEFORE 1805 . . . . .	15
<i>Four Preparatory Steps</i>	
A. The Isolation of the P Document . . . . .	16
B. The Dating of the D Document. . . . .	18
C. The Dating of the Levitical Laws . . . . .	18
D. The Attack on the Cultic History . . . . .	19
III. THE YEARS 1805-1865 . . . . .	21
A. Grafians before Graf . . . . .	21
B. The Answer of de Wette . . . . .	24
C. The Conservative School . . . . .	26
D. The Supplementary Hypothesis . . . . .	27
E. The Return to Source Analysis . . . . .	31
F. The First Grafians . . . . .	32
IV. MOTIVES FOR GRAFIANISM . . . . .	35
A. Evolutionism . . . . .	35
B. Hegelianism . . . . .	37
C. Rationalism . . . . .	41
D. Romanticism . . . . .	45
SUMMARY — Descriptions of P. . . . .	49

## PART TWO

## THE LAW CAME AFTER

## THE GRAFIANS 1865-1925

V. THE FIRST DECADE . . . . .	53
A. The Early Antagonists . . . . .	53
B. The Early Advocates . . . . .	54
VI. THE VICTORY OF GRAFIANISM . . . . .	58
A. Wellhausen . . . . .	58
B. Germany . . . . .	60
C. Switzerland . . . . .	63
D. France . . . . .	64
E. Britain . . . . .	64
F. America . . . . .	68
G. 1890-1900 . . . . .	70
VII. OPPOSITION TO GRAFIANISM. . . . .	72
A. Conservative Opposition . . . . .	72
B. Jewish Opposition . . . . .	78
C. Catholic Opposition . . . . .	85
D. Archaeological Opposition. . . . .	91
E. Critical Opposition . . . . .	96
VIII. THE POSITION IN 1925. . . . .	102
A. The Negative Forecast . . . . .	102
B. The Positive Forecast . . . . .	103
SUMMARY—Difficulties of P . . . . .	104

## PART THREE

## THE LAW CAME BETWEEN

## THE POST-GRAFIANS 1905-1965

IX. NEW BEGINNINGS IN 1905 . . . . .	109
A. The Form-Critical Method . . . . .	109
B. The Tradition-Historical Method. . . . .	111

X. THE OLD METHODS CONTINUED. . . . .	113
A. Critical Contributions . . . . .	113
B. Conservative Contributions . . . . .	116
C. Jewish Contributions . . . . .	120
D. Catholic Contributions . . . . .	127
E. Archaeological Contributions . . . . .	132
XI. THE NEW METHODS APPLIED. . . . .	140
A. The Form Historical School. . . . .	141
B. The Oral Tradition School . . . . .	146
C. The Sanctuary Tradition Representatives . . . . .	149
XII. THE NEW METHODS APPRAISED. . . . .	153
XIII. THE POSITION IN 1965. . . . .	159
A. Views of the Religious Development. . . . .	160
B. Views of the Literary Development . . . . .	162
SUMMARY—The Date of P . . . . .	164
XIV. EPILOGUE. . . . .	166
A Look Back . . . . .	166
A Look Forward . . . . .	170
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	174
AUTHOR INDEX . . . . .	200
SUBJECT INDEX . . . . .	207