

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### THE SEVEN ARCHANGELS AND THE SEVEN SPIRITS:

#### A STUDY IN THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPEMENT, AND MESSIANIC ASSOCIATIONS OF THE TWO THEMES.

IN a former study<sup>1</sup> I advanced the theory that there were two chief schools of Messianic doctrine in Jewry, (1) that which looked for the coming of the Angel of Yahweh, and (2) that which expected a Spirit-endowed man, in the office of Messiah. The former school made use of Babylonian imagery to clothe its predictions of the Angel; the latter expressly avoided the use of it. Thus the presence or absence of this imagery is a distinguishing mark of the predictions of the two schools.

The following study applies the general theory to the two themes of the Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits. Both themes, as will be shewn, originated during the exile; but whereas the school which originated and developed the doctrine of Archangels made the fullest use of Babylonian ideas, the other school explicitly rejected Babylonianism. The two schools of thought thus shew the same differentiation throughout their history: they were in opposition in regard to (1) the existence and office of the Messianic Angel, (2) the existence and functions of angels, and (3) the employment of Babylonian ideas and terms in the doctrines of Yahwism. All these three the former school accepted, and the latter school rejected because it jealously taught the most rigid form of monotheism.

It is not the case, therefore, that the doctrine of the Seven Spirits differs from that of the Seven Archangels simply in terminology, as some scholars suggest.<sup>2</sup> The evidence of the Jewish sources goes to shew that they were opposed themes, both in origin and developement. The Archangels were a direct modification of Babylonian ideas concerning the planetary gods: the Spirits were a developement of the earlier Hebrew doctrine of the Spirit of Yahweh, though this developement was influenced by the pressure of Babylonianism.

It has been suggested that, since Zoroastrianism furnishes a heptad in its Amshaspands, the influence determining the developement—if not the origination—of the two themes is to be sought in Persian, rather than in Babylonian ideas. The Jewish doctrines, however, shew little, if any, trace of such Persian influence; but the influence of Baby-

<sup>1</sup> *J. T. S.* April, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Charles *Revelation* i pp. 11 ff.

lonian ideas is well marked. It would appear that both Zoroastrianism and Judaism were dependent upon Babylonianism, but that each religion fashioned its own conceptions according to its own genius.

*A. The Seven Archangels.*

I.

The Talmud states that 'the names of the archangels came from Babylon'; and since this order of angels is not spoken of in pre-exilic Jewish writings, it is to be presumed that the doctrine took its rise during the exile, and was developed in post-exilic Judaism.

The first band of exiles, of whom Ezekiel was one, journeyed to Babylon in 586 B. C. 'In the sixth year' thereafter Ezekiel was transported in mystical vision to Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> to see there the people of the city giving themselves up to heathen forms of worship. For their sin, he says, they must suffer Divine punishment, and he narrates a second vision<sup>2</sup> which he had seen of those whom Yahweh had appointed to inflict this punishment: 'six men came from the way of the upper gate which led towards the north, every man with his slaughter-weapon in his hand; and one man in the midst of them, clothed in linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side'. The commanding Figure, 'the Glory of Yahweh', gives orders to the 'seven men', and He bids the midmost of the seven to set a mark upon the foreheads of those who had remained faithful to Yahweh. These are to be spared from destruction; but the rest of the city's inhabitants are to be slain by the six who carry slaughter-weapons.

Now Ezekiel had been long enough in Babylon to have learnt the details of Babylonian polytheism. His seven men enter Jerusalem from 'the north', i. e. from the dwelling-place assigned to the gods by Babylonian thought.<sup>3</sup> The prophet, therefore, wished to teach the Jews that these seven 'men' of his vision were to be regarded as heavenly beings, the equivalents of the Babylonian deities, but messengers of Yahweh sent by Him to perform His bidding. Ezekiel gives them no names, but their number, seven, is significant; and the midmost—the man clothed in linen, and distinguished by the writer's inkhorn at his side—is easily recognizable.

In the religion of Babylon there were seven great deities, who were associated with the seven planets.<sup>4</sup> At the time of the exile the functions of these deities were assigned as follows: Marduk (the Sun) was

<sup>1</sup> viii.

<sup>2</sup> ix.

<sup>3</sup> Jastrow *Relig. of Bab. and As.* (1898 ed.) p. 558 and compare Isa. xiv 13, 'the mount of congregation (i. e. of heavenly beings) in the uttermost parts of the north'.

<sup>4</sup> Jastrow *op. cit.* p. 458.

the light-giver, the conqueror of night and chaos; Sin (the Moon) was god of the harvest; Nibir (Jupiter) was leader and commander of the stars, the host of heaven; Ninib (Mars) was the thrice-holy hero of heaven, and the healer-of diseases; Nergal (Saturn) was the god who reigned over the world of the dead; Ishtar (Venus) was the goddess of fertility who presided over childbirth and protected all life; Nabu (Mercury) was the all-wise preserver of the wisdom of the ages, the writer of the fates of men upon the starry heavens, and his symbol was the writer's stylus.

The midmost of Ezekiel's seven men,<sup>1</sup> the one who has the writer's inkhorn, is certainly to be identified with the god Nabu, who was held in special honour by the Babylonians at the beginning of the exile. He was spoken of as the 'son' of Marduk, and was accounted the special messenger of the gods. Three kings of the dynasty which reigned from 625 B.C. onwards bore names compounded from the name of this god, viz. Nabupolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, and Nabonnedos. Ezekiel's midmost man knows the secrets of the hearts of the men of Jerusalem; he knows, too, the fates that await them, and writes upon their foreheads the sign which preserves the righteous from the slaughter-weapons of his companions. Moreover, he is in every sense the chief of the seven.

If then this likeness exists between the Babylonian god Nabu and Ezekiel's man clothed in linen, it is probable that the remaining six men were suggested to the prophet by the other six Babylonian deities, and that here we have the origin of the archangels of later Jewish belief. The prophet was familiar with the dangers to which Babylonian polytheism exposed his fellow-exiles—apostasy from the monotheistic Yahwism which his predecessors had taught, and with it the loss of Jewish nationality. Accordingly he degraded the Babylonian deities from the rank of independent gods, and made them into angels appointed by Yahweh to destroy the idolaters who still lived in Jerusalem—a function which the Jews would have ascribed to them in any case, and in so doing would have made them more potent than their own God. Ezekiel therefore furnished the corrective to apostasy by preserving the integrity of the Jewish monotheistic faith: he taught his contemporaries that they were still, even in the midst of punishment for sin, 'the people of Yahweh', and that He was the sole Ruler of the world, though He used angels as His ministers to do His will.

<sup>1</sup> He was afterwards known as Uriel, and in 2 Enoch xxii he is the archangel who has special guardianship of Enoch's apocalyptic writings. See further, p. 238, *infra*, for the attribution of 'wisdom' to him, and cf. 4 Ezra iv. For Nabu as the god of wisdom, see 'The Babylonian Story of the Deluge' (Brit. Mus. p. 6), and Jastrow *op. cit.* p. 229.

The prophet gave no names to his seven men: he could not name them after Babylon's gods, and the idea of them was so new that he had no Hebrew names for them. These names came later; the first list of the names and functions of the seven is found in 1 Enoch xx, and is as follows:—

Uriel who is over the world and over Tartarus; Raphael who is over the spirits of men; Raguel who takes vengeance on the world of luminaries; Michael who is over Israel and over chaos; Saraqael who is set over spirits who sin; Gabriel who is over paradise, and the serpents, and the cherubim; Remiel who is set over those who rise.

Certain features which this list presents are noteworthy. Uriel is given the first, and highest, place—a position which, as we shall see, he occupied for some time after the archangel theme had begun to develop. No further mention is found of Raguel and Saraqael. Remiel is perhaps to be identified with Jeremiel, who is mentioned in 4 Ezra iv 36. Michael has been accepted as Israel's guardian angel, as he is also in the book of Daniel. Gabriel is spoken of in the book of Daniel as the angel who makes Daniel understand his visions, while in 3 Baruch xi he is called 'the interpreter of visions to those who pass through life virtuously': but in 1 Enoch he does not fulfil this function; it belongs to Uriel. Raphael is found as the healer of diseases in Tobit, in which book the number of the archangels is also said to be seven.

## II.

Ezekiel made no difficulty in equating his seven archangels with the Babylonian deities despite the sex and character of Ishtar; for he characterizes all his seven as 'men'. The matter of sex in regard to deities, however, was less distinctive than in the case of human beings; among the Southern Semites, for example, Ishtar was regarded as a male, while her counterparts elsewhere are sometimes depicted as wearing a beard.<sup>1</sup> Again, though the character often ascribed to Ishtar was that of a libidinous goddess, there was another side to her cult; and Ezekiel may well have been content to disregard objectionable traits when dethroning the Babylonian deities and making them into archangels subservient to Yahweh's sole sovereignty. It is demonstrable that Ezekiel's successors were fully aware that the archangels were the Jewish equivalents of the Babylonian deities, and of the difficulty which Ezekiel had raised by including among them an archangel-equivalent to Ishtar: they made an attempt, and a successful one, to displace Ishtar's equivalent, as the following piece of evidence shows.

Three texts of 1 Enoch x 1 are extant,<sup>2</sup> two in Greek and the third

<sup>1</sup> Jastrow *op. cit.* p. 75, note. The Syrian 'omnipotent and all-producing goddess', Atargatis, is so represented.

<sup>2</sup> Charles, A. and P., *Introd. to 1 Enoch*, and i p. 193, note.

in Ethiopic. The first Greek MS, which Dr Charles labels G<sup>s</sup>, gives the name of an archangel here as *Uriel*: the second Greek MS, named by Dr Charles G<sup>g</sup>, gives the name of the same archangel as *Istrael*: the Ethiopic text is, according to Dr Charles, 'corrupt'. Now MS G<sup>g</sup> is derived from a Semitic original, whereas G<sup>s</sup> is derived from a Greek version. We infer therefore that in the original Semitic text of this passage the name of the archangel was *Istrael*, and that Uriel was a later substitution. Moreover, when the name *Istrael* is written in Hebrew characters אִשְׂרָאֵל, the root is recognizable as the Aramaic form of *Ishtar*. Therefore the scribe of MS G<sup>g</sup>, or one of his predecessors, knowing this and feeling the difficulty of including an archangel whose name was formed from that of the Babylonian goddess, made the substitution of Uriel for *Istrael*. The Greek text also from which the Ethiopic version was made apparently contained the name *Istrael*, since the translator could not bring himself to regard this as the name of an archangel, and so left his text 'corrupt'.

The textual evidence for the suggestion that the name Uriel was substituted for *Istrael* is supported by another consideration. In the *Gilgamesh Epic*—the Babylonian Flood Story—*Ishtar* is the deity who is specially interested in the continuation of life upon the earth, and she bewails the sad fate of mankind drowned in the universal deluge: the Babylonian Noah, *Utanapishtim*, is the only person to be preserved.<sup>1</sup> Now the incident in 1 Enoch x is the sending of an angel—*Istrael* in MS G<sup>g</sup>—to Noah to tell him to hide himself from destruction in order that his seed may remain. *Istrael's* function therefore is the exact counterpart of that of the Babylonian goddess. We must suppose therefore that 1 Enoch x records a Jewish variant (possibly traditional) of the Babylonian story, or else that the writer gave this function to the archangel by modifying the heathen epic. In either case, the Jewish archangel is *Ishtar's* equivalent both in name and function.

### III.

Names<sup>2</sup> were eventually given to the Jewish archangels, and one purpose which these names accomplished was the severance of the theme from that of the Babylonian deities, and the attachment of these heavenly beings very closely to Yahweh. Yet the functions still attributed to the archangels were those which the Babylonians had attributed to their planetary gods. Thus Michael resembles Nibir in

<sup>1</sup> *Bab. Story of the Flood* p. 36. Only the 'lament' of *Ishtar* is given in the Babylonian story. The Jewish story would therefore seem to be an addition to the Babylonian inasmuch as it makes *Istrael* the agent in preserving human life. The dependence of the Jewish upon the Babylonian story is, however, direct.

<sup>2</sup> These were of late formation; see Buchanan Gray *Hebrew Proper Names* p. 210.

that he acts as leader of the heavenly host<sup>1</sup>; to Uriel as to Nabu was ascribed knowledge of the Divine secrets, and he was commissioned to impart this knowledge to Enoch<sup>2</sup>; Israël, as we have seen, reflects Ishtar's interest in the preservation of life. But since Jewry had learnt during the exile that Yahweh was the only God, the archangels were regarded as His agents—or agencies—the mediators between Himself and the universe over which He held undisputed sway; and their names suggest that these mediators might be regarded either as beings distinct and separate from Yahweh, as Ezekiel had taught, or as personifications or hypostases of His attributes and powers.

Possibly one of the earliest intimations of the latter view is to be found in the Septuagint version of Ecclesiastes v 6, which translates the Hebrew phrase, 'say not thou before the Angel', by 'say not thou before the Presence of God'. The Angel referred to in the Hebrew is the ancient Angel of Yahweh, i. e. Yahweh Himself in manifestation, not a subordinate angel. He is entitled 'the Angel of Yahweh's Presence' in Isaiah lxiii 9. Evidently therefore 'the Presence of God' in the Septuagint version of Eccles. v 6 is synonymous with the title 'the Angel of Yahweh's presence'. It follows that, by the time of the Septuagint translation of Ecclesiastes, the term 'the Angel of the Presence' (as well as its earlier equivalent, 'the Angel of Yahweh') had become difficult, if not impossible, to use. The Septuagint of Isa. lxiii 9 also shews this difficulty, for it definitely equates 'the Angel of the Presence' with Yahweh Himself, and asserts emphatically that it was no ambassador or angel from Yahweh who saved Israel. We conclude therefore that some development in the archangel theme had brought confusion, and consequent liability to misunderstanding, between the ancient Angel of Yahweh and one or other of the archangels, and that the Septuagint translators did their utmost to avoid it by calling the Angel 'the Presence of God', which afforded no ground for a mistake.

But the Angel of the Presence was regarded by the prophets, as I have shewn elsewhere, as the Messianic Angel. Consequently he was now becoming obscured and lost to view behind an archangel who, in popular regard, was displacing him. Our task, therefore, is to discover, if we may, which of the archangels was usurping the place of the ancient Angel of Yahweh in the Messianic office.

Now in the Book of Jubilees<sup>3</sup> it is said that 'the angels of the presence'—a new title for the archangels—were created on the first day. In 1 Enoch we are told that there were four 'presences', and their names are given as those of the four chief archangels, viz. Michael,

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xii 7; <sup>2</sup> Enoch xxii 6.

<sup>2</sup> Enoch Bk. III; <sup>2</sup> Enoch xxii.

<sup>1</sup> ii 2.

Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel in ix 1, though in xl 9 the name of the fourth is called Phanuel.

It is clear, therefore, that the 'four presences' have taken the place formerly occupied by the seven archangels, and that Phanuel and Uriel are equivalent names for the same archangel. But the name Phanuel is found here for the first time as that of an archangel. Whence had he come into the theme? His name means 'the Presence of God', i. e. it is identical with the title given to the ancient Angel of Yahweh in Isa. lxiii 9, and with the Septuagint phrase in Eccles. v 6. Can it be that this was his origin—that he was originally the Messianic Angel of Yahweh, and that he afterwards came to be regarded as one of the 'four presences' because of the popularity of the archangel theme?

It is curious that the original seven archangels should have become 'four presences'. Several reasons may account for the change. We have observed that Ezekiel fashioned his seven 'men' from the seven planetary gods of Babylonian worship, and that his successors when giving them names wished to sever the connexion because the heathen ideas tended to be preserved in regard to the Jewish archangels. But Ezekiel had also been the author of the conception of the 'four living creatures' which, while it was based upon Babylonian *astronomical* ideas, was free from all connexion with Babylonian *religious* ideas since, so far as can be ascertained, the living creatures were not developed from Babylonian deities. It would appear that Ezekiel's four living creatures were symbolized by constellations<sup>1</sup>—probably Leo, Taurus, Aquila, and Scorpio; but the Babylonians had never associated them with gods. Consequently Ezekiel's conception of these beings was free from the objection which could be brought against the archangels: it was a Jewish conception without heathen associations, and this may have induced Ezekiel's successors to mould the theme of the seven archangels into conformity with the theme of the four living creatures, and to call them 'presences' rather than archangels.

But this title 'presences' also brings us back to the ancient Angel of the Presence, the Messianic Angel, whose titles in Isa. ix 6 are four in number, indicating his future Messianic functions. It may be that the functions denoted by his four titles became dispersed among the four 'presences' who had, by this time, obscured him. If so, we can equate the titles with the names of the four presences thus:—

1. Wonderful Counsellor = Michael (who is like God).
2. Mighty God = Gabriel (El Gibbor, Divine Hero).
3. Everlasting Father = Raphael (The Comfort, or Healing, of God).
4. Prince of Peace = Phanuel (The Presence, or Countenance, of God).

<sup>1</sup> Charles *Revelation* i pp. 119 ff.

Thus a connexion is made between the newer archangels and the ancient Angel of the Presence. Taken together their functions are equivalent to his: he is the summary of their activities. But the important equation for our consideration is the last, which makes Phanuel the equivalent of the Angel of Yahweh in the capacity of Messianic Peace-giver to Israel.<sup>1</sup> As the representative of the (older) Prince of Peace, as well as by his name, Phanuel recalls Ps. iv 6 ff which ascribes 'the blessing of peace' to 'the light<sup>2</sup> of God's countenance'. Accordingly it seems unquestionable that the name Phanuel was given to this archangel because, as the archangel-equivalent of the Divine Presence, he was regarded as performing the function ascribed to the Messianic Angel of giving 'the blessing of peace' to Israel. But by the time that this name was fashioned for him he had become assimilated with Uriel,<sup>3</sup> as we have shewn above, and his derivation from the Messianic Angel of Yahweh, the Prince of Peace, had been forgotten. We have therefore to distinguish between (a) the Phanuel (early) who was the equivalent of the Messianic Angel, and (b) the Phanuel (late) who was Uriel, an archangel.

It is with the early Phanuel, the equivalent of the Messianic Prince of Peace, that we are now concerned. In the book of Daniel the term 'prince' is used as a description of the archangels who are there known as the 'princes' of the nations. In ch. viii 25 reference is made to a figure called 'the prince of princes' who is identified by commentators with the Most High. This interpretation is, however, very improbable,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Micah v.

<sup>2</sup> This passage seems to have some bearing upon (a) the formation of the name Uriel (from אור = light), and (b) the equivalence of Uriel with Phanuel in late Jewish angelology.

<sup>3</sup> The identity of Uriel and Phanuel in late Jewish thought is illustrated by a passage in 2 Enoch xxii 11, 12, a work belonging to the early part of the first century A. D. Two MSS of this work, both Slavonic translations of Semitic texts, are extant, and are called by Dr Charles A and B (see his Introduction in A and P vol. ii). In MS A, the name of an archangel who interprets the visions to Enoch is *Pravuil*: in MS B, the name of the same archangel is *Vretil*. Neither name is found elsewhere in Jewish angelology, so that the Slavonic texts fall under suspicion. But if transcribed in Hebrew characters, the name Pravuil becomes פראוויל, which is evidently a misreading of פאנוראיל. Similarly, Vretil becomes אוררתאיל, which again is a misreading of אורי-איל. We conclude that the name of the archangel in MS A should be *Phanuel*, and in MS B *Uriel*, which proves their identity, and incidentally corrects the Slavonic texts at this point. The equivalence of these two archangels in both 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch supports Dr Box's suggestion (A. and P. ii, p. 564 note) that 'Phanuel is, apparently, Uriel under another aspect'. In both MSS the archangel is commanded to give Enoch 'a reed' wherewith to write the apocalyptic books: he thus preserves his connexion, through Uriel, with the Babylonian Nabu.

since God would not be called 'prince' but 'King' of the archangels. Moreover, Daniel's usage in describing the ancient Angel of Yahweh by a title, and not by a personal 'name', was a usage which he had inherited from Hebrew thought, for the name of the Angel was 'unknown' to men; and other apocalyptists followed Daniel's example in this matter, as may be seen by comparing 1 Enoch lxix 14, and Rev. xix 12, which expressly state this doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Further, the title given to the Messianic Angel in Rev. xix 16, 'King of kings, and Lord of lords', reflects while it enhances the Danielic phrase, 'the prince of princes'. Thus to Daniel the title 'prince of princes' means that this Angel is something less than God, but something more than an archangel such as Michael or Gabriel.

For this reason I think he is to be identified with the great angel described in chs. x-xii, whom I have in former studies identified with the Messianic Angel of Yahweh, considering that he is Daniel's full-length portrait of the mysterious visionary figure of the 'one like unto a son of man'.

Daniel, however, seems to have regarded him as of the same being and nature as the archangels, though higher far than they. It may be that that idea of the archangels which made them personifications or hypostases of the Divine attributes had so far influenced the conception of the Messianic Angel as to make him one, though the chief, among them, just as in Philo at a later date 'the Logos' is but the chief of 'the logoi'. Not that Daniel has the idea that the archangels are mere personifications or hypostases; on the contrary, he keeps them as distinct personalities: and though he may have regarded his Messianic Angel as differing but little from an archangel in nature and being, yet that archangel remains what he had ever been, the one next in rank to God Most High, and so—if a name could be given to him at this stage—Phanuel, the Angel of the Presence, the Prince of Peace.

But even so, the process of degrading him from his earlier uniqueness as the Self-manifestation of God had begun by the time that Daniel wrote; for Daniel partly confuses him with another, viz. Ezekiel's 'man clothed in linen', the midmost of the seven archangels, and makes him fight battles against other 'princes' of the nations as if he were but one among their number. Though he is to Daniel the Messianic Angel, the Prince of Peace, he partakes nevertheless of some of Uriel's characteristics. In later works the confusion between these archangels grows until, in 1 Enoch for example, the angel-interpreter of the visions, who is called Uriel in one 'source' and 'the angel of peace' in another, is equated with Phanuel as one of the 'four presences'. Thus the later Phanuel is merely 'Uriel under another aspect', i. e. he has entirely lost

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S. Oct.* 1924, p. 6.

his former state as the Messianic Angel of the Presence, and has been absorbed in the archangel theme.

The archangel Phanuel had thus gone through three stages of evolution:—

1. *Pre-Danielic*. He was originally what his later name Phanuel implies, the Messianic Angel of the Presence, the Prince of Peace foretold by the prophets.

2. *Danielic*. He was 'the prince of princes', the Messianic Angel; but he was becoming confused with Uriel, the chief of the archangels, though the confusion is not complete since he remains nameless and is to be identified with the 'one like unto a son of man'.

3. *Post-Danielic*. He became one of 'the four presences' who, when taken together, were equivalent in functions to the Angel of the Presence. He was then fully assimilated with Uriel, possibly because Daniel's description of him as 'the man clothed in linen' had suggested the identity of the two.

I agree, therefore, with Dr Charles's suggestion that the great angel in Dan. x is 'the angel of peace', but with two reservations<sup>1</sup>: (1) that to Daniel he was still 'the Prince of Peace', the Messianic Angel of the Presence, and (2) that he had not yet been fully identified with the archangel Uriel, 'the (later) angel of peace', who was Enoch's interpreter, and is spoken of in the Testament of Dan as 'the angel who intercedeth for you, for he is the mediator between God and man, and for the peace of Israel he shall stand up against the kingdom of the enemy. . . for the angel of peace shall strengthen Israel that it shall not fall into the extremity of evil'. This description of this (later) 'angel of peace' ascribes to him those functions which had been formerly given to the Messianic Angel in his role of 'Prince of Peace'. He will still save Israel in all their afflictions, though he has now become Uriel = Phanuel. Thus he preserves, on the one hand, his connexion with the Angel of the Presence, and on the other, the characteristics of Uriel—as described by Ezekiel—who carries no slaughter-weapon in his hand but preserves the faithful from destruction by their foes.

This function makes Phanuel the special angel of the righteous in Israel. To protect the community of the righteous he has to preserve Israel from the extremity of evil. It is on this account that in Daniel he fights against the 'princes' of Persia and Greece, and is supported by Michael, Israel's 'prince'. But he really represents 'the people of the saints of the Most High', the Messianic community, the Chasidim, who will form the Messianic kingdom which, on their behalf, he will receive from God when his work of destroying evil is ended, and he ascends to the throne escorted by 'the clouds of heaven'.

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1926, p. 142, with references there given.

## IV.

Gradually, however, Michael came to be regarded as the chief archangel, and absorbed the functions of the others until he became almost—but not quite—the equivalent of the ancient Angel of Yahweh. The well-known passage in Philo's *On One Who is Heir*,<sup>1</sup> sufficiently demonstrates this: 'The Father, the Creator of the universe, gave to His archangel and most ancient Logos the privilege of standing on the confines separating the creature from the Creator. This same Logos is continually a suppliant to the immortal God on behalf of the mortal race which is exposed to affliction and misery; and is the ambassador sent from the Ruler to the subject.'

It must be remembered, however, that to Philo all angels were 'logoi', emanations from God, and that the 'Logos' is the chief of these. Though Michael is not here mentioned by name, he seems to be the 'archangel' referred to. If so, he is to all intent the equivalent of the ancient Angel of Yahweh, though he is but an 'ambassador', and not quite God in self-manifestation.

Probably because he ranked so high in late Judaism, Michael is found at length in the Antichrist theme of Rev. xii. In the original version of the legend, the fight with the dragon must have been assigned to Yahweh<sup>2</sup>; thereafter it was given to His Angel.<sup>3</sup> But when Michael had come to be accounted captain of the hosts of heaven—a title originally given to the Angel of Yahweh—he was sufficiently representative of the ancient Angel to be given the task of expelling the dragon from heaven.

## V.

But if the archangels thus tended to usurp the place of the Messianic Angel of the prophetic predictions, what became of this Figure in apocalyptic? Was he lost from the Messianic theme when Daniel's great angel had become 'the angel of peace'?

The continuity of Babylonian literary imagery in the 'Son of Man' theme of apocalyptic shews that this Messianic Figure in the 'Son of Man sources' of 1 Enoch and in 4 Ezra is the developed survival of Daniel's 'one like unto a son of man'.<sup>4</sup> But his identity with Phanuel is lost, for Phanuel is now the archangel-equivalent of Uriel. The Son of Man of these late apocalypses holds an unique position; while he is representative of God on the one hand, he is yet a heavenly being distinct and separate from God, though far above all angels, on the other. He has become a Divine person, though he is not Deity;

<sup>1</sup> § xlii.<sup>2</sup> Isa. xxvii 1.<sup>3</sup> Isa. li 9: 'the Arm of Yahweh'.<sup>4</sup> *J. T. S.*, April 1925, pp. 248-250.

and in this separation from Godhead we may perhaps trace the influence of the archangel theme; for the archangels were conceived as heavenly beings in the apocalyptic circles, though not in the rabbinical schools.

Probably it was because of this separation, which made the Son of Man almost 'a second Deity'<sup>1</sup>—as Philo terms his 'Logos'—that official Judaism felt itself obliged to reject the apocalyptic form of the Messianic Hope, though this form was the continuation of the prophetic expectation, and to centre its hopes upon the coming of a Son of David.

Yet the Messianic Angel at length found his rightful place in Jewish apocalyptic, where also the idea of the essential unity of his Being with the Being of God was preserved. While in the equation, 'The Son of Man = (the early) Phanuel', the latter degenerated into an archangel and so was extruded from the Messiahship, the former still retained his place and function as Messiah. But even more, in Wisd. xviii 15 the title 'Logos' was applied to the Messianic Angel of Yahweh, and thereafter passed into the apocalyptic 'Wisdom source' and 'Noah source' of 1 Enoch, as I have shewn elsewhere. Thence it was taken over into the Jewish 'source' underlying Rev. xix 11-16; and when the Christian author of the Apocalypse made use of this 'source' he identified 'the Logos' with the figure of the 'one like unto a son of man' whom he knew as Jesus, ascended and glorified.

It must be emphasized that the title 'the Logos' thus applied to the Messianic Angel was Jewish, and that the idea expressed by it was derived from earlier Hebrew thought. For it had been originally applied to the Babylonian god Marduk, and was taken over by his Hebrew equivalent, the Angel of Yahweh. Therefore we have here a further example of the persistence of Babylonian literary imagery in Jewish thought concerning the theme of the Messianic Angel; and this supports the theory that the presence of such imagery is a test of the continuity of this theme throughout Hebrew and Jewish Messianism.

It was therefore no mere personal choice of a term of mystic meaning, nor was it due to the influence of Greek thought, that the author of the Fourth Gospel and the writer of the Apocalypse applied this title to Jesus, the Messiah at length revealed. The title implied that He was the pre-existent Angel of the Lord, the Self-manifestation of God; it linked the Christian Messiah with the visionary Son of Man of apocalyptic, and through that figure, with the Messianic Angel of the Hebrew prophets; it claimed for Jesus that, as the Logos, He was 'living and active', and 'having become by so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they', that He was Deity incarnate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, to whom was given all authority in heaven and in earth.

<sup>1</sup> Questions, § 62.

### *B. The Seven Spirits*

The doctrine of the Seven Spirits of God was developed in that school of thought which, preferring the conception of the Spirit of Yahweh to that of His angel, was strongly opposed to the popular angelology of later Judaism. This school was concerned to present a pure and rigid monotheism to counteract tendencies which appeared to threaten the unity of the Jewish faith in Yahweh as the sole Sovereign of the universe. It refused to accept the teaching which made angels the intermediaries between Yahweh and the universe over which He ruled: it would have no delegation of His powers to beings less in rank than Himself: it believed that 'whatsoever He doeth upon earth, He doeth it Himself'. For this school the angels of popular thought had no existence. Moreover, the idea of Angel of Yahweh was too concrete, too anthropomorphic, to appeal to these thinkers: they looked for the evidence of God's presence with the nation and in the world, not to visions, but to the effects which His Spirit produced in the lives and actions of men. For the Spirit was the invisible and intangible Energy and Agency of Yahweh Himself, actively present in the universe, manifesting His presence and His power in producing righteousness of life. Being without form and substance, the invisible Spirit was capable of symbolic representation only, whereas the Angel and archangels were thought of as wearing the form of men and so making themselves visible to men's eyes on occasion. If therefore we would understand the origin and development of the theme of the Seven Spirits we must study the symbolic imagery which was employed to describe it. This imagery is found in its most exuberant form in the Apocalypse, and is of three types. Each type had its origin in earlier thought, so that if we trace the types back we shall cover the history of Jewish thought concerning the Seven Spirits.

#### *I. The Seven Lamps of Fire.*

In Rev. i 4 the Seer sends greeting to the seven churches 'from Him which is and which was and which is to come; and from the Seven Spirits which are before His throne; and from Jesus Christ'. Objection has been taken to the greeting from the Seven Spirits on the ground that they are created beings,<sup>1</sup> parallel in idea to the 'seven stars', i. e. angels of the seven churches, which Christ has 'in his right hand'. The Trinity thus fashioned has been styled 'grotesque', and the offending clause has been assigned to an interpolator upon whose character and workmanship Dr Charles passes very severe judgement.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Charles *Revelation* i pp. 11 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Revelation* Introduction, lv.

A parallel to this Trinity is to be found in Justin Martyr;<sup>1</sup> but since Justin knew the Apocalypse full well, and made use of it in teaching the doctrine of 'the hidden name' of the Messiah, he probably followed his authority here also: moreover, in estimating Justin's theology, regard should be had to the two renderings of his Greek proposed by the translators in the Ante-Nicene Library, renderings which are grammatically permissible, make good sense, and preserve Justin's orthodoxy. It is possible, therefore, that the Apocalyptist—or his interpolator, if he inserted the greeting from the Seven Spirits—was not so ignorant as Dr Charles suggests.

But to turn to the symbolism of 'the seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the Seven Spirits of God' (iv 5) from whom greeting is sent to the seven churches. This imagery is first found in the vision of Zech. iv, whence it is taken into the Apocalypse. In the vision, the prophet sees a seven-branched golden lampstand with a central bowl upon it; from this bowl the seven lamps are supplied with oil which runs into the bowl from two olive-trees. The trees are interpreted to the prophet as signifying Joshua, the high-priest, and Zerubbabel, the expected Messianic ruler of the house of David. Both are 'sons of the oil', i. e. men anointed by the Spirit for their tasks in the Messianic age which is about to dawn for the returned exiles. In particular, Zerubbabel is commissioned to rule 'not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts'.

By virtue of his endowment with the Spirit, he will be able to rebuild the nation, and to make it righteous: the Spirit will be 'the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel', his guide in the work of restoration, manifesting the Divine presence with him for all men to see. Further, the Spirit will reveal Itself to the nation through Zerubbabel, will exhibit sevenfold activity symbolized by the seven lamps. The new nation will be illumined and inspired by the Spirit's indwelling presence, for the Messianic Zerubbabel, Spirit-endowed, will make it the kingdom of righteousness and peace.

Now this imagery of the seven lamps set upon a golden lampstand to symbolize the Spirit's sevenfold energy is based upon the description of the seven-branched lampstand in Exod. xxv 31 ff and xxxvii 17 ff. Both passages belong to the P-stratum, and are therefore exilic or post-exilic in date, though they assign the fashioning of the lampstand to the time of Moses. There is no evidence, however, for its existence at so early a date. It is not mentioned in connexion with the first Temple, nor does Ezekiel speak of it. It would appear, therefore, that the priesthood of the latter part of the exile were the originators of the idea, and that in order to commend it to their readers they gave it the sanction

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* i 6.

of Moses's name. In reality the seven-branched lampstand was a new development of an old symbol, as we shall now shew.

In the tabernacle at Shiloh there burnt a single lamp which came to symbolize the presence of God with His people. Reference is made to this lamp in Exod. xxviii 20, which is thus probably of earlier (priestly) composition than the passages which speak of the seven-branched lampstand. In 1 Kings xi 36, xv 4, this lamp is associated with David and Solomon, and is said to be in Jerusalem, i. e. it is found in the Temple as the symbol of the Spirit's presence with the king, and through the king with his people. After the exile, when the monarchy ceased, there were still those in Judah who remembered 'the faithful oath which Yahweh had sworn unto David' that his throne should be established for ever, and these expectants still looked for a Messiah from the royal house, Spirit-endowed, the 'Branch' of Jeremiah's prediction, who should be all that the latter kings had failed to be, and should restore the kingdom to righteousness that it might receive the fulfilment of the ancient promises. One of these expectants, the author of Ps. cxxxii 17, again associates the Messiah to come, the 'new David', with the lamp: 'I have prepared a lamp for Mine Anointed', i. e. he shall be endowed with the Spirit of Yahweh. It would appear therefore that the lamp which burnt in the sanctuary had come to be the symbol of the Spirit who indwelt the kings and who would again indwell the Messiah in the new age.

Why then was the symbol of the single lamp changed to that of the seven-branched lampstand in Zechariah's vision which gives the Messiahship to Zerubbabel? Evidently because the idea of the seven-branched lampstand had replaced that of the single lamp as a Temple ornament. But what had brought about this change of idea?

Both Philo and Josephus state that the seven lamps represented the seven planets; and this interpretation accords well with the fact that the first mention of the seven-branched lampstand occurs in the priestly document of late exilic or post-exilic date.<sup>1</sup> The influence which led the priestly school to develop the idea of the seven-branched lampstand from that of the single lamp, the symbol of the Spirit's presence, was the regard paid by Babylonia to its seven planetary deities, and the consequent impression made thereby upon the Jewish exiles—an impression which threatened to disintegrate Jewish monotheism. Thus while one school of Jewish thought, following the lead of Ezekiel, subordinated the planetary deities to Yahweh by degrading them into arch-

<sup>1</sup> Dr Stanley Cook in *Enc. Bib.* art. '*candlestick*' suggests a connexion between the candlestick and the tree of life seen in Assyrian monuments. It may be added that kings are often portrayed near to this tree, which may have suggested the similar connexion between the candlestick and the Messiah to the Jewish teachers.

angels subservient to His will, the other school associated the planets with the idea of the Spirit, refusing to recognize any other heavenly being than Yahweh, and any other agency than His spirit active in the universe. Thus the idea of the One Spirit still remained, but of One Spirit in sevenfold operation symbolized by seven lamps upon the seven-branched lampstand.<sup>1</sup>

The priestly school thus had to come to terms with the new ideas which the Babylonian exile had deeply implanted in the minds of the people. These new ideas could not be ignored; their discords had to be resolved if Yahwism was to shew itself as the dynamic power in the life and thought of Judaism. Ezekiel and his successors pointed out one way in which this could be done; the priestly school of the latter part of the exile found another. It kept its own high doctrine of the sole majesty of Yahweh; it dwelt upon the ancient doctrine of Yahweh's Spirit as His sole Agent in the universe; but it developed that doctrine by assigning to the Spirit a sevenfold activity.

Thus the Messianic predictions of the priestly school differ very widely from those of the popular school which looked for the coming of the Angel. The Spirit, invisible and formless, would be embodied in, and donated to the nation through, a Messianic man, a scion of the royal house upon whom It would confer the gifts of wisdom and understanding, counsel and might, knowledge and holy fear,<sup>2</sup> thereby to make the nation in fact what it was in name, 'the people of Yahweh'. From the beginning of its development, therefore, the doctrine of the Seven Spirits—unlike the doctrine of the seven archangels—had Messianic associations. Consequently the Seven Spirits were both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Messiah. Therefore the Seer's greeting from 'the Seven Spirits which are before the throne' is quite orthodox: he understood full well the meaning of the clause which he wrote.

## II. *The Seven Horns and Eyes of the Lamb.*

The Apocalyptist describes the Lamb, i. e. the Messiah, as having 'seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the Seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth' (v 6).

(a) *The seven horns.* The symbolism is taken from Ps. cxxxii 17: 'there will I make the horn of David to sprout; I have prepared a lamp for Mine Anointed'. The 'horn of David' means his power, his

<sup>1</sup> Ezekiel makes the stars into 'lamps' (i 13) and 'eyes' (i 18).

<sup>2</sup> The Septuagint text of Isa. xi 1, 2 differs from the Hebrew, adding to it *εὐσέβεια*. One passage in 1 Enoch li 3 shows four of these gifts, viz. wisdom and might, counsel and understanding, and adds 'the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness'. In 1 Enoch lxi 11 the gifts are greatly modified, though they are evidently suggested by the Isaianic prophecy. Both the Enochic passages occur in the 'Elect One source' of the Similitudes.

strength; the verb 'to sprout' recalls the Messianic title 'the Shoot' (Isa. xi 1); and the parallelism of the clauses suggests similarity of meaning in 'the horn' and 'a lamp', viz. that the Spirit shall endow Yahweh's Anointed as It had once endowed David.

In the Apocalypse, the lamp has become seven, and the horn has similarly 'sprouted' into seven. Both typify the Seven Spirits which are given as gifts to the Messianic Lamb.

(b) *The seven eyes.* But the Lamb has also seven eyes, and these are said to be 'the Seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth'. The origin of this imagery is Zech. iii 9 and iv 10, the latter passage equating the 'seven eyes' with the 'seven lamps', and defining both eyes and lamps as symbols of the Seven Spirits. The former is a highly Messianic prediction of the coming of Zerubbabel. He is there spoken of as 'the Stone', i.e. the Messiah (cf. Gen. xlix 24), and upon the Stone Yahweh promises to 'engrave a graving of seven eyes', i.e. He will endow Zerubbabel with the Sevenfold Spirit, as is predicted of the Messiah in Isa. xi 1, 2. Moreover these seven eyes are 'the eyes of Yahweh; they run to and fro through the whole earth'. They thus symbolize the activity of the Spirit in the world; they are alike the Divine Agency in manifold operation, and the Messianic endowment.

The origin of Zechariah's imagery would again seem to be the revolving planets, conceived as the ever-watchful eyes of Yahweh over every part of creation. The application of the imagery to Jesus, the Messiah of the Apocalypticist, shews Him to be the Spirit-endowed Messiah of earlier prophetic and apocalyptic predictions. The Sevenfold Spirit is both the Spirit of God and, in Pauline language, the Spirit of Jesus.

### III. *The Four Winds.*

To complete this study of the contribution made to Judaism by the school which preferred the doctrine of the Spirit to the doctrine of the Angel, and chose to develop the theme of the Seven Spirits rather than the theme of the Seven archangels, we may observe that Ezekiel's 'four living creatures' find modification into 'four winds', or 'spirits', in the teaching of this school.<sup>1</sup>

The idea is first met with in Zech. vi 1 ff where 'the four winds (or spirits) of heaven go forth from presenting themselves before the Lord of all the earth'. They are symbolized by horse-drawn chariots which act as Yahweh's messengers. Ezekiel's complex imagery is altogether omitted: only in respect of their number do the winds resemble the living creatures. But that the four winds replaced the living creatures

<sup>1</sup> Zimmern identified the four living creatures and the four winds (see Charles *Revelation* i p. 122), but he did not dissociate the two schools of thought in which the two conceptions were formulated.

in the teaching of this school is shewn by 1 Enoch xviii 2: 'I saw] the four winds which bear [the earth and] the firmament of the heaven' (Charles's translation). Here the winds perform the same office as the living creatures of Ezekiel's vision.

There seems little doubt, therefore, that this school of thought in Jewry attempted to set forth a self-consistent body of doctrine founded upon its conception of the invisible and formless Spirit of Yahweh, which should take the place of the popular angelology. The parallels which exist between the two themes are complete: developements in angelology were met by similar developements in the theme of the Spirit. But if we may judge from apocalyptical writings, the more pictorial ideas of the Angel, angels, and living creatures had a larger sway over Jewish minds than the more difficult ideas of the Spirit, the Seven Spirits, and the four winds. The latter group of doctrines was preserved largely through the imagery with which these doctrines were clothed, the concrete symbols under which they were represented. But this imagery was of such power to influence men's minds that it survived to teach the early Christian church of the sevenfold gift of the Spirit of God donated to His kingdom through the Messiah of promise who, having led captivity captive, ascended up on high to give gifts unto men.

The Seven Spirits of God, therefore, are seven only in operation: they are One Spirit in essential Being. The Seven are extrinsically what the One is intrinsically, the Spirit of God and of Christ: they are 'before the throne' because the invisible Spirit cannot be represented as upon the throne.

G. H. DIX.

### THE COMPOSITION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CANON STREETER'S THEORY OF PROTO-LUKE.

THE purpose of the following essay is to suggest a modification of the theory of the composition of the Third Gospel propounded by Canon Streeter in his recent book on the Four Gospels, and further elaborated by Dr Vincent Taylor in his study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis.<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of the argument the Lukan authorship is assumed.

1. It is in Chapter viii of his book that Canon Streeter sets out his theory of Proto-Luke. He begins by calling attention to the two

<sup>1</sup> *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford, 1926).