

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

by a slow and ignominious extinction. But to think that the Papacy will reform itself voluntarily, from above, shows very little intelligence in the present direction of the *Times*, and a singular incapacity in some of those who provide its news and articles.



"Lord of Hosts."

BY THE REV. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.

IN the CHURCHMAN for September, 1900, an article appeared by the present writer on "The Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts' in its Bearing on the Theories of the Higher Criticism." Attention had never before been called to the point which was raised in that article—namely, that the total absence of this title from the Pentateuch would seem to be irreconcilable with the Graf-Wellhausen theory. Articles on the subject have since been contributed by the present writer to various periodicals, and to some of these articles replies have been made on the critical side. Such objections and criticisms have been met in a booklet, "A Problem for the Critics: the Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts'" (Marshall Brothers).

More recently, in the January number of the *Expository Times* of this year, there appeared a short contribution on the subject by the present writer, which in the issue for the following month was adversely criticized by an anonymous contributor signing himself "X." A rejoinder to this was sent to the *Expository Times* early in February, but was not admitted, although the editor's attention was more than once called to the matter. By not publishing that rejoinder, the editor left it open to his readers to conclude that there was no answer to "X's" criticism. The present article is written to set that matter right. The following is the original contribution :

As long ago as the year 1900, in an article contributed to the CHURCHMAN (September, 1900), I called attention to the significance of the fact that the Divine title "Lord of Hosts" never occurs in the Pentateuch, and I pointed

out the bearing of that fact on modern theories of the composition of the Pentateuch and Joshua.

The title "Lord of Hosts" occurs for the first time in the Bible in 1 Sam. i. 3: "And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh."

The following table shows the number of times it occurs afterwards in books of the Bible, and shows also the relative positions according to the critical theories of the supposed writers of the Hexateuch:

OCURRENCES OF THE TITLE "LORD OF HOSTS" IN THE BIBLE, AND
RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE ASSUMED WRITERS OF THE HEXATEUCH.

1 Samuel . . .	5 times	
2 " . . .	6 "	
1 Kings . . .	2 "	
2 " . . .	2 "	
1 Chronicles . . .	3 "	
Psalms . . .	14 "	
<i>Jehovist</i> . . .	0 "	Early centuries of the monarchy (Driver)
<i>Elohist</i> . . .	0 "	Same period (Driver).
<i>Jehovist</i> . . .	0 "	850-800 (Kuenen).
Amos . . .	9 "	760-746.
<i>Elohist</i> . . .	0 "	c. 750 (Kuenen).
Hosea . . .	1 "	746-734.
Isaiah . . .	62 "	740-700.
Micah . . .	1 "	727-697.
<i>Deuteronomist</i> . . .	0 "	Not later than reign of Manasseh (Driver). 640-621, reign of Josiah (Kuenen).
Jeremiah . . .	81 "	626-582.
Zephaniah . . .	2 "	626.
<i>JE United</i> . . .	0 "	621-588 (Kuenen).
Nahum . . .	2 "	610-607.
Habbakuk . . .	1 "	608-597.
"P" . . .	0 "	Age subsequent to Ezekiel (Driver).
Haggai . . .	14 "	520.
Zechariah . . .	52 "	520-518.
<i>P²</i> . . .	0 "	500-475 (Kuenen).
<i>P² + P¹</i> . . .	0 "	475-458 or 458-444 (Kuenen).
Malachi . . .	24 "	450.
	281 times	
<i>P² + P¹</i> Promulgated		444 (Kuenen) <i>Rp.</i> From 406.
<i>Hexateuch United</i> .		444-400 (Kuenen) into third century.

Here it can be seen at a glance that at no matter what particular point of time any of these supposed writers may have been assumed by the theories of modern critics to have lived, each one of them would have been in contact with writers who frequently—in the case of some, it may be said, constantly

Daniel	o times
Joel	o "
Obadiah	o "
Jonah	o "

Two of Mr. Robinson's statements would also be put more exactly thus :

Chronicler	o times.
142 Psalms	o "

For the three occurrences in 1 Chronicles (xi., xvii. 7, 24) are simply transcribed from 2 Sam. v. 10, vii. 8, 26 : the author of Chronicles, when writing independently, never uses the expression. The Psalms in which the title occurs are xxiv., xli., xlviii., lix., lxix., lxxx. (four times), lxxxiv. (four times), lxxxix. Ps. xc. will probably be attributed by Mr. Robinson to Moses. Excluding this, therefore, as a Psalm written *ex hypothesi* before the time when the title is known to have come into use, there remain 141 Psalms, representing in any case a good many separate writers—we cannot, of course, say how many—who, unless, indeed, he regards any of them as living before 1 Sam. i. was written, Mr. Robinson must admit *might* have used it. I, naturally, do not attach any importance to the fact that the title does not occur in such books as Obadiah and Jonah ; but the fact that so many different writers, notwithstanding that the great majority of them, upon any view of their dates, lived in periods when the title was current, and by some writers was being copiously used, nevertheless did not use it, seems to me to neutralize altogether the force of the argument which Mr. Robinson bases upon its non-occurrence in the Hexateuch.

Why the title does not occur in the Hexateuch (upon the critical view of its origin) it does not seem to me that critics are called upon to explain, any more than either they or Mr. Robinson are called on to explain why the many other writers who, as we have seen, might have used it, do not use it. It may, however, be worth remarking that, whatever may have been Ezekiel's reasons for not using the term, it is pre-eminently a title used by the prophets ; and so the four occurrences in Kings are all in the mouths of prophets (Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 15, xix. 10, 14 ; and Elisha, 2 Kings iii. 14). This fact, if it is a reason for our not expecting the title in such books as Job and Proverbs, is also a reason why we should not expect to find it in those parts of the Hexateuch which are ascribed by critics to a priestly hand. Prophets, however, are not prominent even in JE ; and in Deuteronomy, which, it might be objected, is regarded by the critical school as the work of a prophet, the favourite Divine title, in accordance with the leading parenetic motive of the book, is " Jehovah, thy (*or* your) God."

A rejoinder in something like the following terms was sent on February 9, 1908, to the editor of the *Expository Times* for insertion :

Your contributor " X "—who in concealing his identity does what I think is rather unusual in the *Expository Times*—observes that, while I specify so precisely the number of occurrences of " Lord of Hosts " in many books of

the Old Testament, I do not specify with equal explicitness the books in which it does not occur. When treating the subject more fully in a booklet published in 1906 I gave a full list of the books in which the title does not occur; but in my contribution to your periodical I had to study brevity. However, as the question has been raised, it is best to set out these books, and note what sort they are.

It is important to observe that three of the books which are without this title intervene between the Pentateuch and its first occurrence, making a chasm between. These books are Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. The following are the remaining books:

- 2 CHRONICLES.—Forms one book with 1 Chronicles, in which the title does occur, whether "simply transcribed" or otherwise.
- SONG OF SOLOMON, ESTHER.—In neither of these books does *any* Divine name occur.
- ECCLESIASTES.—A book of very marked individuality, which strikes out a line for itself. Does not contain the title "Lord"; "God" is always used.
- JOB.—Another book of very marked individuality. Uses the apparently archaic Divine title *Shaddai*="Almighty," 31 times (only 16 times elsewhere in the Old Testament). Has the title "God" 114 times, "Lord" 31.
- JONAH.—Another very peculiar book, which does not treat of Jehovah's dealings with His own people, but with Nineveh, an alien city.
- DANIEL.—Another peculiar book, which also is concerned in great part with peoples alien to Israel—in this case the Babylonians and Persians. It is only in one chapter—the ninth—that the prophet uses the Divine title "Jehovah," which occurs there six times in the expressions "Lord my God" or "Lord our God" (*Jehovah Elohi*).
- PROVERBS.—Another peculiar book.
- OBADIAH.—Very short, consisting of only one chapter. Threatenings against Edom. Concerned only indirectly with Israel. "Lord" occurs only five times.
- EZEKIEL.—Dominated apparently by the influence of the Pentateuch. Has a particular name for God, "The Lord God"—*Adoni Jehovah*—and a peculiar phrase, "Ye shall know that I am the Lord," which occurs over fifty times, and seems to be an expansion of a similar expression in Leviticus, occurring also nearly fifty times, "I am the Lord."
- LAMENTATIONS, JOEL.—Might be expected to have the title; but it is absent from these two books.
- EZRA, NEHEMIAH.—Practically one book.

Thus it will be seen that in the case of the great majority of these books from which the title is absent the peculiar character of each of the books is sufficient to account for its not falling in with the prevailing fashion.

"X" observes that the title is "pre-eminently a title used by the prophets"; but this would not be any reason for its non-occurrence in the Pentateuch, because the critics hold that in a considerable portion of the Pentateuch the "standpoint" is "the prophetic." Dr. Driver writes:

"The standpoint of E is the prophetic, though it is not so prominently brought forward as in J. . . . Abraham is styled by him 'a prophet,' possessing the power of effectual intercession (Gen. xx. 7). Moses, though not expressly so termed as by Hosea (xii. 13), is represented by him essentially as a prophet, entrusted by God with a prophet's mission (Exod. iii.) and holding exceptionally intimate communion with Him (Exod. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 6-8; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 10)."—*Introduction*, p. 118.

And of J he writes:

"The character of Moses is portrayed by him with singular attractiveness and force. In J, further, the prophetic element is conspicuously prominent. . . . And in order to illustrate the Divine purposes of grace as manifested in history, he introduces—at points fixed by tradition—prophetic glances into the future."—*Introduction*, pp. 119, 120.

In point of fact, a considerable portion of the Pentateuch is named "The Prophetic Narrative of the Pentateuch"; and to the writers of that portion no prophetic phrase ought surely to appear unsuited to the narrative. The reason, then, suggested by "X" for the non-appearance of the title in the Pentateuch is really a reason why it might have been expected to occur.

"X" refers to the Psalter; and the Psalter is an apt illustration of the argument in regard to the Pentateuch which I press. The Psalter, understood according to the "traditional" view, as extending from David down to the time after the Exile—say 500 years and more—corresponds in general conditions to the Pentateuch according to the critical theory, extending from the early times of the monarchy down to beyond the days of the Prophet Malachi. Both have *ex hypothesi* run the gauntlet of the same 500 years at least of the prevalence of the use of the title "Lord of Hosts." One—the Psalter—bears the natural mark of having passed through this period by having this Divine title; the other—the Pentateuch—bears no mark whatever of having run the gauntlet of those centuries, for in it the name is never found. In the Psalter the title is not apparently a very favourite one, but *it is there*; in the Pentateuch *it is not*. The Psalter is marked with the fire through which it passed; the Pentateuch would seem to have come out of the ordeal scatheless and unsinged. Why? Because it never passed through the fire at all.

It seems strange that publication should have been denied to this rejoinder. The usual principle, surely, which rules in such cases is that, if a criticism by one writer on an argument put forward by another is published, the original writer is entitled to a fair opportunity of reply. It might have been expected that, in the interests of fair play, free discussion, and the threshing out of a debatable point in Old Testament criticism, such a course would have been adopted in the present case. On the contrary, however, the closure was put in force, all further discussion stopped, and the question shelved.