

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

he had expended much on the buildings of his diocese. In *Notes and Queries*, vii. Series, xii. 345, there is an interesting note about the library which he founded for the use of the clergy during his Lincoln Episcopate. He left a very valuable collection of coins and medals, as well as his library, to his college, Christ Church, Oxford. There are good portraits of him at Lambeth, at Oxford, at St. James's, Piccadilly, and in the National Portrait Gallery. Mr. H. B. Wheatley says that he was the last Archbishop of Canterbury who crossed from Lambeth to the House of Lords in the state barge.

W. BENHAM.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. III.—THE DIVINE TITLE “LORD OF HOSTS”
IN ITS BEARING ON THE THEORIES OF THE
HIGHER CRITICISM.

THE bearing of this Divine title for God, *Jehovah Tsebâôth*, on the theories of the Higher Critics as to the composition of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, the “Hexateuch,” as they call it, appears to have hardly attracted the attention which the subject deserves. Any argument based on some particular title for God, or on the presence or the absence from certain parts of the Bible of some particular expression, may be pressed, it would seem, with peculiar propriety against the theories of the Higher Criticism; because these theories may be said to have taken their rise originally in the person of the physician Astruc, through his noticing that two different names—“Elohim” and “Jehovah”—were used for God in the Book of Genesis; and, further, because it may be said generally that the critical theories in the present day are based in a great measure on the occurrence or the non-occurrence of various words and expressions in some one verse or passage in the Old Testament, as compared with some other.

The title for God, “Lord of hosts,” “Lord God of hosts,” “God of hosts,” never, as is well known, occurs in the Pentateuch, nor in the Books of Joshua, Judges, or Ruth. The first occasion on which it is used in the Bible is in 1 Sam. i. 3, in the passage, “And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh.” The pre-Samuelitic period of the history of Israel is thus differentiated from the post-Samuelitic period by this circumstance, that in connection with the former period this title

"Lord of hosts" is never used, whilst in connection with the latter period it is used—and with growing frequency—at all stages of the history, even down to the end of the book of the prophet Malachi.

In this condition of things there is, of course, nothing anomalous on the "traditional" view of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. The fact of this title for God not occurring in the Pentateuch or Joshua would merely mean that at the time these books were virtually composed—that is to say, in the pre-Samuelitic age—this expression "Lord of hosts" was not in vogue as a title for God, and consequently was not employed by the writers. But, on the other hand, from the point of view of the Higher Criticism, which attributes the composition and perpetual manipulation of the "Hexateuch" to writers all of whom lived, *ex hypothesi*, in the post-Samuelitic age, through various periods of the history down to, and even beyond, the latest period over which the Old Testament Scriptures extend, the non-occurrence of this title for God in the supposed work of such writers seems to constitute a curious anomaly. That fragments of work done by so many different hands at so many different points of time, at each of which the title for God, "Lord of hosts," was in vogue, should, when pieced together in the "Hexateuch," exhibit this peculiarity of being without this title for God is certainly a curious result. But when, over against such result, the fact is taken into account that persistent Israelitish and Jewish tradition seems to have regarded the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua as the work of the period antecedent to the first recorded use of the title "Lord of hosts," that, namely, in the first Book of Samuel, then this state of things seems to arise, that the tradition indicates a condition of things that would be natural, the theories of the Higher Criticism indicate a condition of things which would be unnatural, and that in a very high degree.

Amongst the hypothetical writers, whose hands the critics claim that they are able to detect in the composition or manipulation of the "Hexateuch," the two which at the present moment are held to be the earliest in date are known as the "Jehovist" and the "Elohist." They wrote, according to Dr. Driver, in the "early centuries of the monarchy." The remaining writers of the critics' imagination have been distributed through the later centuries, the writer of the "Priestly Code," so called, being placed in the "age subsequent to Ezekiel," and certain of the various manipulators of that code later still. Now, as all these different writers are conceived as having lived in the post-Samuelitic period of Israelitish history, during the whole of which this title for

God, "Lord of hosts," was in vogue, the question seems naturally to arise, How was it that they each and all resisted, as to this particular title for God, the influences of their environment, and never even once employed the expression "Lord of hosts" in all their handling of the "Hexateuch"?

How strong and persistent that environment was can be readily seen from the following table, which shows the number of times which the expressions "Lord of hosts," "Lord God of hosts," "God of hosts," are used in the books of the Old Testament. It also indicates the position of those authors of the "Hexateuch" according to the theories of certain representative critics. The critical theories, it need hardly be said, cut up the books of many of the prophets, and also the Book of Psalms, into fragments, and scatter the *dissecta membra* over various periods. Thus, Dr. Cheyne, in the case of the Book of Isaiah, has almost exhausted the resources of colour in his efforts to depict the theories; whilst of the Psalms he will only allow that one at most may possibly date from before the Exile ("Origin of the Psalter," p. 258). But, for the purpose of the present argument, these views of the critics make no particular difference; they merely distribute the fragments of these books over the later periods of the history, in which, equally with the earlier ones, these assumed writers of the "Hexateuch" will be seen to be embedded.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF TIMES THAT "LORD OF HOSTS," "LORD GOD OF HOSTS," OR "GOD OF HOSTS," OCCURS IN THE BIBLE.

These titles do not occur in the Pentateuch, Judges, or Ruth. The position of the assumed writers of the "Hexateuch" according to Kuenen and Driver are also shown.

1 Samuel	5 times.	
2 Samuel	6 "	
1 Kings	2 "	
2 Kings	2 "	
1 Chronicles	3 "	
Psalms	14 "	
<i>Jehovist</i>	0 "	Early centuries of the monarchy.
<i>Elohist</i>	0 "	Same period (Driver, <i>Int.</i> , p. 125).
		B.C.
<i>Jehovist</i>	0 "	850-800 (Kuenen, <i>Hex.</i> , p. 248).
Amos	9 "	760-746.
<i>Elohist</i>	0 "	c. 750 (Kuenen, <i>Hex.</i> , p. 248).
Hosea	1 "	746-734.
Isaiah	62 "	740-700.
Micah	1 "	727-697.
<i>Deuteronomist</i>	0 "	Not later than reign of Manasseh (Driver, <i>Int.</i> , p. 87).
<i>Deuteronomist</i>	0 "	640-621, reign of Josiah (Ku., <i>Hex.</i> , p. 220).
Jeremiah	81 "	626-582.
Zephaniah	2 "	626.

<i>J. E. united</i>	0 times,	^{B.C.} 621-588 (Kuenen, Hex., p. 249).
Nabum	2 "	610-607.
Habbakuk	1 "	608-597.
Ezekiel	0 "	593-570.
<i>Priests' code</i>	0 "	Age subsequent to Ezekiel (Driver, Int., p. 142).
Haggai	14 "	520.
Zechariah	52 "	520-518.
<i>P²</i>	0 "	500-475 (Kuenen, Hex., p. 306).
<i>P² + P¹</i>	0 "	475-458, or 458-444 (Kuenen, Hex., p. 303).
Malachi	24	450.
	<hr/>	
	281 "	all in the post-Samuelitic age. ¹
	<hr/>	
<i>P² + P¹</i>	promulgated 444 (Kuenen, Hex., p. 272).	
<i>Hexateuch united</i>	444-400 (Kuenen, Hex., p. 314).	
<i>Rp</i>	from 400 into 3rd century B.C. (Ku., Hex., pp. 308, 317).	

The titles do not occur either in Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Ezekiel, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, or Nehemiah.

Here it can be seen at a glance that, at no matter what particular point of time any one of these supposed writers may have been assumed by the theories of the Higher 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—used this title for God, "the Lord of hosts." And yet none of these supposed writers of the "Hexateuch" employed it. How did it happen that, in respect to this particular point, they one and all, with a curious unanimity, resisted the influence of their own contemporaries, and ignored the religious phraseology so much in vogue in their own day? The Deuteronomist has been usually represented by the critics as having been very intimately connected in sentiment and in the point of view from which he regarded the people of Israel with the prophet Jeremiah. So much has this been the case that it was the opinion of Colenso ("Pentateuch," p. 267) that Jeremiah was actually the author of the Book of Deuteronomy. Dr. Driver, too, although he says that this view of Colenso is "certainly incorrect," nevertheless considers that

"Jeremiah exhibits marks of it"—the influence of Dt.—"on nearly every page; Ezekiel and II. Isaiah are also evidently influenced by it. If Dt. were composed in the period between Isaiah and Jeremiah, these facts would be exactly accounted for. . . . The *prophetic teaching* of Dt., the dominant theological ideas . . . approximate to what is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel" (Introduction, p. 88). (The italics are Dr. Driver's.)

Yet, although the "Deuteronomist" is thus supposed by Dr. Driver to have written subsequent to Isaiah, in whose

¹ In which the assumed writers of the "Hexateuch" are supposed to have lived; yet the titles never occur in the "Hexateuch."

book this title, "Lord of hosts" or "Lord God of hosts," occurs sixty-two times, and to approximate in dominant theological ideas to Jeremiah, who uses this title eighty-one times, the title never even once occurs in the supposed composition of Dt. and his redactors, the Book of Deuteronomy.

"JE" united, somewhat later than the "Deuteronomist" (Kuenen, "Hexateuch," p. 249), exhibits the same abstinence from this expression, "Lord of hosts," although the union of the two documents, "J" and "E," is supposed also to have been manipulated within the lifetime of Jeremiah. The same curious phenomenon is exhibited in the work of the assumed writers of the "Priestly Code," which according to Dr. Driver was probably

"the work of the age subsequent to Ezekiel" (Introduction, p. 142).

With this Wellhausen ("Prolegomena," p. 405) and Kuenen agree, the latter placing (conjecturally, he says) the composition of those portions of the "Priestly Code" which he distinguishes as "P²" between the years 500 and 475 B.C. ("Hexateuch," p. 306). This time would commence only about twenty years after the prophet Haggai, who in the two chapters which contain his prophecies uses the title for Jehovah "Lord of hosts" fourteen times, and the prophet Zechariah, in whose book the expression occurs fifty-two times. The promulgation of the "Priestly Code" by Ezra is placed by Wellhausen and Kuenen in the year 444 B.C.—that is to say, in the days of Malachi. In the short book of the prophet Malachi the expression "Lord of hosts" occurs twenty-four times; in the so-called "Priestly Code," needless to say, it never occurs at all. Thus none of these assumed writers of the "Hexateuch" use this title for Jehovah, "Lord of hosts"—so much in vogue in the days in which they are supposed to have written—even once.

Amongst the older critics, Ewald long ago noticed this amongst other peculiarities which, according to his view, distinguished what he called the Great Book of the Primitive History from what he designated the Great Book of Kings. In the first volume of his "History of Israel," at the opening of his chapter on "The Great Book of the Kings" (Books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel and Kings), he wrote, p. 133:

"The first phenomenon that strikes the observer here is the marked difference in the language of this great Book of Kings in comparison of the preceding great book of the primitive history. Although both are equally made up of passages by the most diverse writers, yet on the whole each is distinguished by a peculiar cast of language. Many fresh words and expressions become favourites here, and supplant their equivalents in the primitive history; others that are thoroughly in vogue here are

designedly avoided in the primitive history, and evidently from a historical consciousness that they were not in use in the earliest times."¹ (The italics are mine.)

In "History of Israel," vol. iii., p. 62, Ewald wrote:

"In the course of the preceding centuries, when Israel had to fight to the death for its existence as Jahveh's people, the times had become more and more warlike, and Israel's entanglements with other nations more and more complex; and among the significant peculiarities of this age is the rapid popularity gained by the new appellation of the true God, 'Jahveh of armies' [A.V., 'the Lord of hosts'], in which the whole warlike spirit of the times, seizing on the higher religion itself, finds its most concise expression."

And in note:

"There is no intimation of the origin of this name in the Old Testament, but we may clearly see from Ps. xxiv. 10 that in David's time it was still full of living power, for it appears there as the most impressive and lofty title of Jahveh. . . . The most probable supposition, then, seems to be that the name arose on some occasion when the armies of Israel turned the enemy to flight in a great battle, as though they had been mightily strengthened by the armies of Jahveh coming down from heaven," etc.

It will be seen, then, that the best explanation which Ewald found himself able to give for the curious circumstance that this expression, "The Lord of hosts," and certain other words frequent in the later books of the Old Testament, do not appear in the Pentateuch, supposed by him, with the exception of some small ancient fragments incorporated, to have been composed and manipulated by writers of the later age, was that such words were by them

"designedly avoided in the primitive history, and evidently from a historical consciousness that they were not in use in the earliest times."

Now, as regards the expression "Lord of hosts" (not to enter into the case of other words not directly relevant), this surely seems an utterly insufficient explanation. The assumed "historical consciousness" of these supposed writers constitutes a rather vague—not to say light and airy—method of getting rid of what, however little Ewald may have realized the fact, would imply a most remarkable anomaly, and of accounting for the extraordinary consistency with which these writers, assumed to belong to so many different periods, would appear as having avoided this expression "Lord of hosts," which was so much in vogue in their own days—perhaps

¹ "This is especially shown by the name Jahveh T'sebaoth (1 Sam. i. 3, 11, iv. 4, xv. 2, xvii. 45; 2 Sam. v. 10, vi. 2, 18, vii. 7, 26 *et seq.*; 1 Kings xviii. 15, xix. 10, 14; 2 Kings iii. 14). On the other hand, the Books of Chronicles are again sparing in its use, and only use it in the life of David; it is entirely unknown to the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges."

the most majestic title of the God of Israel. It would not, of course, be unnatural that *some* writers under such circumstances might happen not to use this particular designation for God, and in point of fact it does not occur in certain writings even of the prophets—notably the Book of Ezekiel. But the circumstance which seems so curiously significant, and which appears to demand some really adequate explanation, is that such a large and scattered number of miscellaneous writers in the later age as are supposed by the critics to have taken part in the manipulation of the "Hexateuch" should one and all have resisted in this point the influence of the religious phraseology of their own day, and never once—even, as it were, by accident—have employed this title to designate the God of Israel. This is all the more remarkable when we bear in mind the fact that the Divine title "Lord" occurs in the last four books of the Pentateuch and Joshua more than 1,800 times. "Lord" 1,800 times, "Lord of hosts" not once! It is hard to see any adequate reason which would make such writers refrain of deliberate purpose from the use of this expression. They would not have been precluded from its use, so far as we are aware, by any recorded date of the origin of the name. Nor could any title surely appear more appropriate to have been applied to the God of Israel in recounting the history of those days of old, in which He led the hosts of His chosen people out of Egypt and through the wilderness into victorious possession of the promised land.

To the critics of the present day, however, many of the ideas and theories of Ewald are rather

"of those former things
Which all have passed away,"

and his explanation that the expression "Lord of hosts" was "designedly avoided" by these supposed writers of the Pentateuch and Joshua, through a "historical consciousness" that it, and other words besides, were not in use in the earliest times, would perhaps hardly commend itself to their approval. For the recent critics are not very ready to admit that in the Pentateuch there is any particular affinity with the earliest times. Thus, Dr. Driver writes, "Introduction," p. 124 :

"There is, at least, no *archaic* flavour perceptible in the style of JE."
(The italics are Dr. Driver's.)

And on p. 125 he writes :

"On some of the supposed 'archaisms' of the Pentateuch, see Delitzsch, 'Genesis' (1887), p. 27 f. . . . Were the occurrence of these and a few other exceptional forms . . . really due to antiquity, they must have been both more constant and also accompanied by *other marks of an*

ancient style. This, however, is not the case; the general literary style of the Pentateuch contains nothing more suggestive of antiquity than books written confessedly under the monarchy, and the affinities of P are with writings belonging quite to the close of this period," etc. (The italics are again Dr. Driver's.)

This would hardly fall in with the "historical consciousness" explanation of Ewald.

It may be asked, What *does* Dr. Driver say of the non-occurrence of this expression in the Pentateuch?

In his "Introduction to the Old Testament" (6th edition, 1897), p. 184, Dr. Driver has a brief note at the end of the Books of Samuel on the expression "Jehovah of hosts." After giving the references to the passages in the Books of Samuel and Kings in which the expression occurs, he merely adds the words:

"All in Gen.-Kings; often in the prophets, except Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Ezekiel."

"All in Gen.-Kings." From these words, taken in conjunction with the references to the passages in Samuel and Kings, Dr. Driver's readers are left to infer, should it occur to them to do so, that the title "Jehovah of hosts" is not met with in the Pentateuch; but no direct statement to that effect is made, nor is the attention of the reader in any way invited to the fact. The curious character of such a circumstance is quite unnoticed and ignored.

There has been published recently a commentary on "The Books of Joel and Amos," by Dr. Driver, and in this he has a note on the expression "the God of hosts" where it occurs in Amos iii. 13, and also a more elaborate "additional note" towards the end of the book, p. 231 *et seq.*, under the heading "Jehovah of hosts." In the latter note Dr. Driver refers with approval to the surmise of Ewald that the expression may have originated on the occasion of some great victory of the Israelites; but inasmuch as in these notes, the latter of which goes into much detail, Dr. Driver again, curiously enough, omits to make any direct mention of the non-occurrence of the expression in the Pentateuch, the notes contain no opinion of his as to Ewald's attempted explanation of that very remarkable fact, nor any theory of his own upon the subject. The importance of the point is once more unrecognised or ignored.

This non-occurrence, however, of the title "Lord of hosts" in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua would seem to be deeply significant: it differentiates the pre-Samuelitic from the post-Samuelitic age. In reference to the former the expression never occurs; in reference to the latter its usage covers the whole period. On the "traditional" view that

the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua were virtually composed in the age to which Moses and Joshua belonged, there is nothing unnatural in the non-occurrence in these books of a title for God which did not apparently come into use until the age of Samuel. But if, on the contrary, as the Higher Critics insist, the various fragments which they claim to detect in the "Hexateuch" were written, interpolated, and worked over by a number of different writers, all of whom lived centuries later than Moses, and many of them than even Samuel, and in times in which the Divine title "Lord of hosts" was much in vogue, then the non-occurrence of this expression in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua would seem to constitute a curious anomaly—one of the many anomalies which appear to significantly indicate the artificial character of the critical theories.

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.



ART IV.—THE ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION OF 1900.

CONTEMPORARY British painters seem to have in common several characteristics: independence, originality, sincerity, and a love of rich colour. The latter tendency may be due to the general greyness of the British climate, especially of London, where the majority of English pictures are produced. The melancholy skies and the few glimpses of bright days produce a reaction in favour of vigorous and brilliant tones. In warmer lands, where sunshine is predominant, art often has the opposite bias, as is seen in the textile fabrics of India and Persia. Sincerity is a quality strongly present in the British mind, partly through the moral and religious influence of the Reformation, which is still the prevailing ethical atmosphere of the country, even with those who do not accept the doctrines of Christianity; and it is reflected in the fidelity and directness of much of the work of British painters. Originality proclaims itself in the fact that it is difficult to speak of a British or even an English school. The differences between Leighton, Millais, Watts, Poynter, Orchardson, Leslie, Burne-Jones, Sargent, Herkomer, Oules, Alma - Tadema, Dicksee, Richmond, Rivière; between MacWhirter, Peter Graham, Leader, Davis, and the rest, are too varied to make it possible to classify them together. The note of independence is, again, a British characteristic. Although past and present masters are much studied, and now and again there is a fashion for Velasquez or Reynolds or