
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

WHENCE CAME THE QUOTATION IN HEBREWS I. 6.

Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ?

BY REV. EDWARD C. MITCHELL. ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews demonstrates Christ's superiority to angels by citing certain declarations of Jehovah respecting him. Among others is the following command (Heb. i. 6): *Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ*, "And let all the angels of God worship him."

Much discussion has arisen among commentators respecting the origin of this quotation. It so happens that our Hebrew scriptures do not contain any passage, the literal translation of which would precisely correspond with it. The nearest approximation to it is thought to be found in the seventh verse of the ninety-seventh Psalm; the last clause of which reads thus: הִשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לוֹ כָּל־אֱלֹהִים *worship him all ye Gods*, and which the LXX translate: *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, worship him all his angels.*

In the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy xxxii. 43, however, another passage occurs precisely similar to the one in Hebrews, but without the corresponding words in our Hebrew text. Now, upon the presumption, generally admitted, that we must look for the origin of this quotation in some part of the Old Testament scriptures which have come down to us, the question has arisen: To which of the above sources shall it be ascribed?

To English readers, until within a year or two, the weight of authority has been altogether in favor of Psalm xcvii. 7.

Professor Stuart, in his note on Heb. i. 6, says: "There is scarcely any room for doubt that the writer means to quote here from Psalm xcvii. 7," an opinion which he defends by a comparison of the two alleged sources in his *Excursus* on the passage.

Dr. Bloomfield, following Stuart, tells us that "the best expositors are now agreed that they [the words of the clause in question] are taken from Ps. xcvi. 7 according to the LXX." And Mr. Barnes (notes on Heb. i. 6), after stating three objections to Deut. xxxii. 43 as its source, remarks: "It is morally certain, that this was *not* the passage which the writer intended to quote. The probability is that the writer here referred to Psalm xcvii. 7, etc."

In Germany, however, scholars have ventured to maintain a different opinion, though by no means with entire unanimity. Among them none are more highly esteemed than Bleek (Commentar, Berlin · 1828–1840) and Ebrard (successor of Olshausen at Erlangen), the latter having been lately introduced to American readers through the excellent translation of his commentary by Professor Kendrick. Both of these eminent commentators give the preference to Deut. xxxii. 43 as the probable origin of our quotation, and the hints which they have given encourage us to attempt a brief re-examination of the subject.

It is agreed by all the parties to this discussion to whom we have referred, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Greek. It is also clearly obvious from internal evidence that the author, unlike many of the New Testament writers (especially Paul), made his quotations from the Old Testament with the text of the Septuagint[1] open before him, carefully copying his authority *verbatim*, evidently intending that his proof-texts should be studied and compared with the original.[2] It will moreover appear, upon an examination of the style, that the treatise

[1] See quotations everywhere, but especially Heb. i. 7 compared with Psalm civ. 4; Heb. x. 5–10 with Psalm xl. 7–9; x. 38 with Hab. ii. 3; xi. 21 with Gen. xlvii. 31, and xii. 26 with Hag. ii. 6, in which the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew.

[2] It is the opinion of Ebrard, as a conclusion to the very thorough and able discussion in his appendix to the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Luke wrote it in the name and by the direction of Paul, having received from him the material and plan of the work. Hence the peculiarity of style and accuracy of citation mentioned above. Paul usually cites freely, and for the most part follows the Vatican codex of the Septuagint (see Bleek, p. 361).

was intended for readers who were familiar with Greek,[1] and who, especially, were in the habit of using the Greek[2] version of the scriptures, as was indeed the prevailing custom in the times of our Saviour.

The point of view, therefore, most favorable for us, in looking at this question, will be by the side of one of those "Hebrews" who, Septuagint in hand, may be supposed to have commenced a careful reading of the argument which is here addressed to him.

He has read and assented to the opening proposition, that the Son of God is the heir of all things, the creator of worlds, the brightness of the divine glory, the true expression of the divine nature, and the upholder of all things (vs. 1–3). He has noted with interest the proofs of his superiority to angels, drawn from Ps. ii. 7 and 2 Sam. vii. 14, and now he comes to a third proof of the same point, drawn from the following words, said to have been uttered on an occasion when the divine being was introducing his only begotten into the world : *καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ.* He opens his Greek scriptures to find the passage. He does find it at Deut. xxxii. 43, and *only* there. To satisfy himself of its validity as a proof-text, his next step would naturally be to inquire whether the words were there designed to be applied to the Messiah. He examines its position, and finds it to form one of the concluding sentences in that sublime song of Moses in which, like the dying swan, he breathes out his life in strains of eloquent and triumphant melody. The song, like those of Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, and Micah, is a combination of history and prophecy. It is a prophetico-dramatic picture of Israel, from its beginning in the loins of Jacob to the culmination of its being and mission in the person of the Mes-

[1] See the play upon Greek words in i. 1 : *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*; v. 8, *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*; v. 14. *καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*; ix. 10, *βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι*; xi. 27, *ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν*; xiii. 14, *μένουσαν, μέλλουσαν*, etc. etc.

[2] Compare ii. 8 with Psalm viii. 7, Sept. and Heb.; also iv. 5 with Psalm xcv. 11 and Sept. xciv. 11, and x. 5 with Psalm xl. 6, etc., where the *argument turns* upon Greek words, the parallels of which are not found in the Hebrew.

siah. The Hebrew Christian, as his eye ran through its stanzas, and his lips instinctively chanted its music, would be carried again through the scenes of the bondage and deliverance, beholding the pillar of fire and of cloud, tasting the grapes of Eschol, and revelling in the milk and honey of the promised land (7–14). Yet over all these memories a cloud sweeps down, as, in soft and brief and mournful strains, the bard opens a glimpse of the unbelief and idolatry and iniquity which were intermingled with the reception of all these mercies (15–18). Then, in bolder, sterner lines, is pictured forth the terrible retribution which subsequent years and their continued obduracy was to bring upon them (19–35). In this vision is depicted, in true though dim and shadowy outlines, the trial of their faith and God's patience in the years of prosperity from Joshua to David (19–21), and the bitter experience of adversity from David to Zedekiah (22–28), followed, as a climax, by the cruel bondage among heathen nations — Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, Syria, Egypt, and Rome, which extended to the birth of Jesus (29–35). Then the future brightens, and we behold Jehovah's face again appearing. The people begin to be convinced of their helplessness and to acknowledge God as their only rock and refuge. His compassion is awakened. He comes to their relief. He comes, as of old, a Divine deliverer. It is Jehovah the Saviour, the long-looked-for, long-promised, almighty Saviour, who now appears, and, at the sight, the prophetic bard bursts forth in joyous exultation :

> Rejoice ye heavens, at once, in him,
> And let all the angels of God worship him;
> Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people,
> And let all the sons of God be strong in him:
> For he will avenge the blood of his sons,
> And will recompense his enemies with vengeance,
> And will requite them that hate him,
> And will make atonement for his land,—
> The land of his people.

Here, certainly, is evidence enough of Messianic refer-

ence to satisfy the mind of any common reader; and here, so far as we can see, our Hebrew Christian would rest the matter. A text has been cited to him from his own scriptures to prove a certain point. He has sought and discovered one place, and only one, which contains the precise words of the citation. He finds that here they have the bearing which is claimed for them. They prove the point.

If our supposition has thus far been fairly stated, we have obtained presumptive evidence that those to whom the epistle was addressed would generally understand the author to refer to Deut. xxxii. 43 in this quotation. If the Septuagint had been our authorized version of the Old Testament, it seems hardly likely that the question of its source would ever have been raised; especially since, as we have seen, it was our author's ordinary practice to quote literally from this version, even when it differs from the Hebrew. But, as we remarked above, it has been proposed and almost decided, in this country, to prefer Ps. xcvii. 7 as the probable source of the quotation. The reasons for this preference, as stated by Stuart and Barnes, are two: the condition of our Hebrew versions of those passages, and their comparative Messianic character.

I. It is objected to Deut. xxxii. 43, that our Hebrew scriptures contain no words corresponding to the clause in question. The objection presumes, first, that the writer of the Hebrews would have been divinely prevented from quoting any passage as a proof-text which was not actually written by Moses or the prophets; and, secondly, that our Hebrew scriptures contain the true version of this passage, to which the Septuagint copy has affixed a spurious addition.

The first of these presumptions seems fairly to admit of question. The purpose of the writer was to convince Jewish Christians, *from acknowledged Jewish authorities*, that their dispensation was inferior to, and superceded by, the Messianic; just as Paul proved to the Athenians the su-

premacy of Jehovah by citing one of their own poets. So long as the citation was from their authorized version, was suited to its purpose, and contained no error, it does not appear that we should insist upon anything further.

But even supposing we should demand that inspiration should have guided the writer into a selection of the precise words actually penned by Moses, or David, or some other inspired man, we are by no means certain that he has not done so in this instance. It is by no means certain that the Hebrew, in this and some other instances, contains the complete and correct version. So far as antiquity of manuscripts is concerned, the Septuagint here has the advantage of it, as our earliest Hebrew manuscripts date from the twelfth century, while we have copies of the Alexandrine Septuagint which were undoubtedly made in the fourth and fifth. The LXX must have had in their possession Hebrew manuscripts of the Pentateuch at least two thousand years older than any within our present knowledge, the Septuagint itself being the oldest version of the scriptures in any language. Our blessed Lord, on more than one occasion, quoted the Septuagint in places where it differs from our original.[1] Thenius, in his commentary on the Book of Kings (Leipsic, 1849), forming a part of the "Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handb. zum Alten Test.," regards the Septuagint version as a correct representative of the original text, in very many cases where the present Hebrew is, as he supposes, corrupt.

Though the LXX used great latitude in their version, it

[1] Compare Luke xviii. 19 with Isaiah lxi. 1; lviii. 6; Matt. xix. 5, and Mark x. 8 compare with Gen. i. 27, ii. 24, on which latter passage Olshausen remarks (com. in loc.): "This declaration, *καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*, is so much the more remarkable, as it is given by our Lord himself (though at the same time in the words of the Old Testament) and *is to be found only in the translation of the Seventy* (the original Hebrew text runs thus: וְיִדְבְּקוּ לְבַשָּׂר אֶחָד). We have here, therefore, a new instance of this translation being made use of even where it differs from the original. The view which these translators, owing to their correct perception [or more accurate copy?] of the Old Testament passage, introduced, is acknowledged by the Saviour as right, and confirmed by his divine authority."

will be found that in this song of Moses they have followed the original quite closely; and if our text be an interpolation, it is the only one, and a very wholesale and remarkable one, even for them. *Bleek*, in his commentary on the Hebrews, vol. ii. p. 137, remarks on Deut. xxxii. 43, "the Hebrew text has nothing indeed, in that place, answering to this [citation]; but that the words belong to the *original* Alexandrine version, and were not introduced by a later interpolater, from that Psalm [xcvii. 7], or from our Epistle (as Seb. Schmidt, Chr. F. Schmid, Pierce, and others maintain), cannot be doubted; for these words do not stand there isolated and alone, but as part of a large addition, in which nearly all manuscripts of the Seventy agree; presenting, at least, no considerable variations. The whole character [beschaffenheit] of this passage of the Seventy renders it also probable that it is not an arbitrary addition by the translators themselves, but found by them in their *Hebrew codex*,"

Mill (as quoted by Bengel)[1] supposes that the omission of this clause by transcribers was occasioned by the recurrence of the same word הַרְנִינוּ, *rejoice*, at the beginning of the line.

So much for the passage in Deuteronomy. And now how will Psalm xcvii. 7 bear the test of a similar criticism?

We answer: if the clause in Deuteronomy is wanting in our Hebrew text, in the ninety-seventh Psalm, it is wanting both in Greek and Hebrew. The clause, as quoted in the Epistle, is: *καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ.* The *καὶ* here is an essential part of the quotation. Indeed, it forms a prominent source of evidence that it is a quota-

[1] "Καὶ *προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ* (et adorent eum omnes angeli DEI); LXX, Deut. xxxii. ante versum 43. haec habent: *εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ*, quae in textu Hebraico et in paraphrasi Chaldaica desiderantur. Millius hiatum, recurrente verbo הַרְנִינוּ pridem admissum statuit. Inde sequitur apud Mosen, *εὐφράνθητε ὄχλοι μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*, הַרְנִינוּ גוֹיִם עַמּוֹ (ubi ב post מ *ἐλλείπει*), quod *Paulus* Rom. xv. 10, item ad Messiae tempora refert." — Bengeli Gnom. Nov. Test., ed. 3. Tübing. 1855. pp. 861.

tion. Unnecessary as it is to the connection in the Epistle, it shows that the author has taken the clause which it commences out of some other connection, and introduced it verbatim. But this *καὶ* is not found in the Septuagint of Psalm xcvii. 7. It is neither required by the context, nor *is it admissible as a translation*, since there is no corresponding ו in the Hebrew. Moreover, the structure of the sentence is different, the exhortation in the Psalm being in the second person instead of the third : *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*. Finally, even this imperfect resemblance to our clause is *obtained by a false translation* of the original.

הִשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לוֹ כָּל־אֱלֹהִים signifies "do homage to him all ye Gods;" and though some interpreters — partly in deference to the Septuagint here — have assigned to אֱלֹהִים the signification *angels*, Gesenius has shown this opinion to be untenable (see his Thesaur. Ling. Heb. p. 95). Hengstenberg remarks, in loc.: "the exhortation according to the Psalmist, here also, as in Isa. xlii. 17, is addressed to the heathen: *All who worship images shall be ashamed, and boast themselves of nullities; worship him, all ye Gods.* The false gods are called upon to worship him, through the medium of their servants. The gods are also, in other passages, frequently viewed as momentarily gifted with life and feeling, only for the purpose of exhibiting the Lord as triumphing over them; compare Exod. xii. 12. Num. xxxiii. 4. The LXX could not understand this representation, and subtituted *angels* instead of *gods*, to whom what was said could apply only by an inference, as *a majore ad minus.* As decisive against the *direct* reference to the angels, may be mentioned the whole connection and tendency of the Psalm, which is to enspirit the people of God in prospect of the approaching victory of the false gods, and also the *usus loquendi*, as the Elohim never signifies angels" (Hengsten. Com. on Psalm xcvii. 7).

Thus upon every critical point the passage in Psalms fails to satisfy us. It may safely be said that whatever be the source of the quotation in Hebrews, Psalm xcvii. 7 is not

that source. It could neither have been copied from the Septuagint, nor independently translated from the Hebrew of that Psalm.

II. Finally, the ninety-seventh Psalm is preferred to Deuteronomy xxxii. on account of its Messianic character.

We have already noticed (p. 303–304) the obvious allusion of the song of Moses to the times of the Messiah's advent.[1] It may be sufficient to add that Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (xv. 10) quotes from the very verse in which this passage is found (Deut. xxxii. 43), as an evidence that Christ was coming to redeem Gentiles and Jews together. Considering that the Epistle to the Hebrews is generally agreed to have been written after that to the Romans, and if not written or dictated by Paul, was at least the work of one of his companions or disciples, and prepared under his supervision, this quotation would seem to be conclusive. The author of the Hebrews must have regarded it as *Messianic.*

Now so far from there being superior claims to be urged in favor of Psalm xcvii, the only substantial basis for such a claim seems to have been derived from the presumption, hitherto hastily admitted among commentators, that the author of the Hebrews *made this quotation from it.* "On account of the application given to these Psalms in our Epistle," says Tholuck in some remarks on Ps. xcvii. 7 and cii. 26, as compared with Heb. i. 6, 10,[2] "the majority of commentators, it is true, down to A. Cramer (1756), have regarded the Messiah as their subject (cf. the controversy of Colov with Grotius); yet Michaelis, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews," concedes, on vs. 10: "I should say that it was inconceivable how expositors have been able to persuade themselves of this, had I not made a similar vain

[1] "Moses, in Cantico præsertim, de Christo scripsit."—Bengel Gnom. N. T., Heb. i. 6.

[2] "Citations of the Old Testament in the New," translated for Bib. Sacra, Vol. XI. p. 610.

attempt in the thirty-first note to Pierce." At least with reference to vs. 6, this expedient was resorted to by Storr, that the author had, as in Rom. x. 6–8, used the words of the Old Testament as a substratum for his own thoughts, in "order to express himself elegantly." Still these expressions are used as *proofs!* De Wette speaks of a typical application of them, but, says Tholuck: "If a typical exposition is to be thought of, the author must have recognized the primary reference of the Psalms to Jehovah; but is this probable, since he still uses them in his proof?" We are, then, brought back to the conjecture that, among the Jews, the Messiah was regarded as the subject of these two Psalms, and that the author could depend on the assent of his readers. But this has, from the outset, no probability, as it would hardly fall in with the dogmatic notions then prevalent concerning the Messiah. "Only from the idea of the incarnation of the λόγος," says Bleek, "could such a construction of the Psalm proceed." "It seems, then," concludes Tholuck, "that we must regard the Messianic application of those Psalms as the *peculiar possession of our author* (i. e. of the Hebrews), and this can best be explained from the rhetorical, homiletic character of the Epistle." Tholuck also remarks that Limborg seems to have resorted to this explanation, since on vs. 6 he lays stress on the fact that the author had to do, not with unbelieving Jews, but Jews become believers.

As we have already seen, each of these interpreters might have been saved their perplexity, at least in reference to the ninety-seventh Psalm,[1] by loooking again at the premises on which their reasoning was based. There is no good evidence that inspired authority either designed or interpreted the Psalm to refer to the Messiah. It is, in fact, as Heng-

[1] The two passages should not have been classed together. Ebrard has shown (Com. on Heb. i. 10) that Psalm cii. contains such a reference to Messianic redemption as is appropriate to the purpose of our author; and no such critical difficulties oppose the quotation of Heb. i. 10 from it, as pertain to the clause we are considering.

stenberg calls it, a piece of mosaic-work, leaning upon quotations from the more ancient sacred scriptures, and comprising a description of Jehovah's appearance in judgment against idolaters. Though Hengstenberg, influenced apparently by the same misapprehension about Heb. i. 6, endeavors to connect it, in some way, with Messianic hopes, he is obliged to confess that "judgment alone is brought prominently forward in this Psalm;" and he has conclusively shown, in our quotation from him above (p. 308), that it was *idols* and not *angels* (and we may add, *Jehovah* and not *Jesus*) to whom vs 7 refers.

From what has been said, we think it will appear: *First*, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whether correctly or not, did copy this proof-text from the Septuagint of Deut. xxxii. 43.

Second, that there is no decisive evidence against his having done this consistently, and with the sanction of divine authority.

ARTICLE V.

THE OLD SCHOOL IN NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.

BY REV. EDWARD A. LAWRENCE, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGICAL INST., EAST WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT.

When age had ripened his judgment with rich experience, the Rev. Dr. Humphrey expressed the opinion that evangelical writers differ more in their use of terms than in their views of truth. Many other good men, of every denomination, are finding that the principles that unite them are broader and stronger than those which separate them. Hence they are beginning to seek out and intensify their agreements, and let their divergencies disappear in the background. The late Dr. William Nevins gave fine expression