

subject, there is often an inferential teaching of a very suggestive and even conclusive character. It will be seen that our Lord does, from time to time, inferentially return such answers to our inquiries in reference to the Old Testament as may equitably be claimed to be authoritative, and as justifying us in arriving at definite conclusions as to the tenor of His teaching. We cannot, then, assign to the objection any greater weight than this—that it correctly states an admitted fact, viz. that the questions relative to the composition and structure of the Old Testament, which are the subjects now mainly before us, did not form any special and defined part of our Lord's teaching. This comparative silence, however, is no warrant whatever for affirming that our Lord would not have entertained such questions if they had been definitely brought before Him: still less will it justify the denial that His teaching does, from time to time, involve inferences and even opinions as to matters of Biblical criticism which have the closest possible relation to our present controversies. More need not now be said. The passages in which such inferences or opinions are supposed to be involved will be specified and carefully analysed, and then be left to speak for themselves.

The question, also, whether Christ may not in

some instances have spoken, either by way of accommodation, or only seemingly, and not actually, on our present questions, must not be summarily dismissed. The dulness or hardness of the hearts of those to whom He was speaking may be thought to have necessitated forms of expression which may be claimed as resulting from some principle of accommodation; but here, again, each place and each passage must speak for itself. This only do we unhesitatingly deny, that the Lord's general teaching as to the Old Testament, and those characteristics of His teaching on the subject which all reasonable interpreters would be willing to recognise, could by any possibility be attributed to any principle of accommodation, in the ordinary sense of the words. That He who was the Truth and the Light, as well as the Way, could have systematically so taught in reference to God's Holy Word, out of deference to the prejudices or the ignorance of His hearers, is utterly inconceivable.

The teaching of Christ on the subject of the Holy Scriptures must now be ascertained in detail. We have proved that such an appeal as we are about to make to Him is rightful, and that the results can be unconditionally relied on. To that appeal we devote the following articles.

## Archangels.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL G. C. M. DOUGLAS, D.D., GLASGOW.

1. I MUST start from the basis that angels do really exist. "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both" (Acts xxiii. 8). Some writers are so keen in their polemic against the Pharisees, that they forget to say a word against the much worse positions of the Sadducees; in this point we hold with the Pharisees. And I believe in the existence of angels, in the plural, as Scripture often speaks in this way, and as plurality is necessarily implied in many of its statements; see, for instance, Gen. xxviii. 12 (with John i. 51), xxxii. 1; Matt. xiii. 39, 49, xxii. 30. In Matt. xxv. 31, there is emphasis put on "all the angels with Him," when the Son of Man shall come in His glory; and it can scarcely be doubted that an army of angels is at least included in the meaning

of a favourite title of God in the Old Testament, Jehovah of hosts. In Heb. xii. 22, the Revised Version notes that the original speaks of "myriads of angels." And in Rev. v. 11, John speaks of those whom he saw and heard, as in number "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;" with which compare Ps. lxxviii. 17, though the original is somewhat obscure.

2. Among these multitudes there certainly exist varieties; for we read of "a strong angel" again and again (Rev. v. 2, x. 1, xviii. 1, 2; compare Ps. ciii. 20, 21; 2 Thess. i. 7). It is an old and common opinion, not to be easily disproved, that there are different classes of angels, which Paul enumerates, Col. i. 16, as "thrones," "dominions," "principalities," "powers" (compare Eph. i. 21); and in Eph. vi. 12, he uses similar language in

reference to evil or fallen angels, "principalities," "powers," "the world-rulers of this darkness," "spiritual [hosts] of wickedness in the heavenly [places]" (compare Col. ii. 15). I do not go into the question whether the seraphim and the cherubim are or are not two of these classes. If numbers and classes exist, however, we can scarcely think of them as destitute of order and organisation. Indeed, our Lord speaks of those who might have been at His disposal had He said the word, as "more than twelve legions of angels" (Matt. xxvi. 53). And some have traced a "disposition" of angels, in the sense of an arrangement of them, in Acts vii. 53, with which, however, compare Gal. iii. 19.

3. If there are classes ranged in order, like soldiers in a legion, we think of leaders at the head of these; and this may have given rise to the name "archangel." Yet it must be observed that, while we have angels often mentioned in the plural, Scripture speaks of only a single archangel, "the archangel," the term occurring twice (1 Thess. iv. 16; Jude 9). To the latter passage I shall return, when I come to speak of the name given to him, "Michael the archangel." In the meantime I call attention to this name, only to connect it with the other passages in which we read of Michael, namely, Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1, where he is described successively as "Michael, one of the chief princes;" "Michael, your prince;" "Michael, . . . the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people:" and again, Rev. xii. 7, "And there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels [going forth] to war with the dragon," etc.

4. With one exception, to which I shall afterwards advert, this is the only heavenly being (exclusive of Jehovah) to whom a name is given in Scripture. Can we identify him? I see no opinion so natural as that which makes Michael a title of our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, and which connects the descriptions of Michael with those given of him who is variously styled the angel of Jehovah (or of God), the angel of His presence, and the angel of the Covenant. This outstanding angel appears first of all to the outcast and perishing, in the case of Hagar (Gen. xvi. 7-11, xxi. 17); then to Abraham at the greatest trial of his faith (Gen. xxii. 11, 15); then he is described by Jacob as "the angel which hath redeemed me from all evil" (Gen. xlviii. 16). He appears to Moses at the burning bush, giving him his commission, and

he reappears in critical times of the history of the redemption from Egypt (Ex. iii. 2, xiv. 19, xxiii. 20-23, xxxii. 34, etc.). He appears to resist Balaam, who was truly the most dangerous enemy of Israel at that period (Num. xxii. 22, etc.). And to Joshua (chaps. v. 13-vi. 2) he appeared, in some respects as to Moses at the burning bush, yet with differences suiting the work to be done in conquering Canaan, as "the captain of the host of Jehovah," in this character bearing a closer resemblance to the descriptions given of Michael. In his appearances at the critical points in the history of Israel, as recorded in the Book of Judges, he reminds one even more strikingly of those descriptions of Michael. The appearances to Gideon and to the parents of Samson indicate that those early Old Testament saints had great difficulty in settling for themselves whether this helper was divine or was a fellow-creature, which is what we might expect under that Dispensation; in this respect it harmonises with the mystery about his name (Gen. xxxii. 29; Judges xiii. 18). Even in the New Testament, the lofty subject of the summing up, under the headship of Christ, of all things in the heavens and upon the earth (Eph. i. 10), and the union of angels and redeemed men organised for His praise and service (Rev. v.), is handled with so much reserve, that we may understand how difficult it was before He came into the world to have any clear conceptions of this Head of men and angels.

The texts which name Michael are most easily explained when we identify him with the second person of the Godhead. The tenth chapter of Daniel has many difficulties, which I do not need to discuss. There is an angel in it who talks with Daniel, and occupies a position identical with, or very much akin to, that of the so-called interpreting angel in the visions of Zechariah. This angel says: "The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me: and I remained [margin, I was not needed] there with the kings of Persia." If this prince of Persia and the prince of Greece (ver. 20) were individual men, or if they were the abstractions and ideals of the whole royal line in each case, Michael, the messenger from the Father in His purposes of grace towards men, comes in to secure the victory for His people, and divides the spoil with the strong (Isa. liii. 12). Nor does it make any material difference to my argument, if the nations are supposed to be under

the guardianship or guidance of some spiritual beings, angels good or bad. "Michael, your prince" (ver. 21), is that angel who appeared from time to time throughout the history of the Patriarchs and the early history of Israel. He is Head of the angels, and they give way before Him; for He is also "the ruler of the kings of the earth," with His name written, "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Rev. i. 5, xix. 16), whose magnificent pre-eminence over all things, "in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," and in the Church which is His body, is celebrated in Col. i. 15-20. In the old conflicts it was this presence of Immanuel, God with us, which had given confidence to the messages of the prophets (see Isa. viii. 9, 10), and there is nothing beyond it in the most cheering promises of our Lord Himself (John xvi. 33; Rom. viii. 35-39; 1 John iv. 4, v. 4, 5); but if Michael were a mere created angel, the anxieties of Daniel would have been enhanced rather than allayed by this revelation of struggles for and against Israel in the spiritual world.<sup>1</sup> The words of Dan. xii. 1 still more plainly suit the Lord Jesus Christ: "Michael, the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people;" "a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time;" "thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book," followed in ver. 2 by the prediction of the resurrection; all these expressions suggest a host of parallels in what is written of the person and work of Christ. The title of Michael here, "the great prince," points us to the universal and eternal ruler, of whom this Book of Daniel has much to say, like the other prophetic books, so that at the coming of His kingdom all His rivals must pass away. "He shall be great, . . . and of His kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 32, 33). Read with it 1 Cor. xv. And observe in Dan. x. 5, 6, that besides the interpreting angel there is another being, "A man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with pure gold of Uphaz: his body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his

feet like in colour to burnished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude." I cannot avoid connecting this language with that which describes the divine manifestation in somewhat of a human form in Ezek. i. and x., which I take to be the second person of the Godhead; the more so on account of the resemblance to "the man clothed in linen" (Ezek. ix. 2, 3, etc.), which is the name given to this mysterious being at the end of the vision (Dan. xii. 6, 7), where he is carefully distinguished from the interpreting angel; I recognise in him the high priest of the heavenly temple, clothed as the Jewish high priest was when he went into the most holy place on behalf of his people (Lev. xvi. 4). Nor can I avoid identifying this mysterious being with the glorified Redeemer, as described in Rev. i. 13-15; the more so on account of the similar effects produced by the two visions upon Daniel and upon John respectively. Who else than this being can be intended by Michael, who is almost immediately named, as if Daniel knew all about him? Yet he is nowhere else named in the Old Testament; nor in the New, except twice. Identify Michael with that being, the vision of whom filled the prophet's mind at the time, and all is simple; refuse to do so, and there is no clue whatever to guide our exposition.

The passage which tells of the war in heaven, Michael and his angels against the devil and his angels (Rev. xii. 7-9), assuredly rests on the passages in Daniel, and refers to the same subject. I need say no more than this, that the victory attributed to Michael in vers. 8, 9, is attributed to Christ the Lamb who shed His blood, and those who trusted in Him, in vers. 10-12. There remains for consideration only Jude, ver. 9: "But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing judgment, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." For my purpose the chief interest in the sentence lies in its identification of "Michael" with "the archangel." But it bristles with difficulties which I need not now handle, unless one that possibly bears on the interpretation I approve. If Michael be the second person in the Trinity, how can it be said that he *durst* not bring a railing accusation against the devil? I answer that the name "Michael the archangel" is an official name, that an angel (archangel though he be) is one sent, "the messenger of the Covenant" (Mal. iii. 1). Standing in a

<sup>1</sup> It is surely a complete mistake to interpret the words in Dan. xi. 1, "And as for me, in the first year of Darius the Mede, I stood up to confirm and strengthen him," as if "him" meant Michael: it is Darius who is helped.

position of subordination, which he had assumed for our redemption, he had emptied himself, taking the form of a servant; and he who lived a life of prayer and of dependence as long as he was in the world, manifested this in that he, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed [himself] to Him that judgeth righteously" (1 Pet. ii. 23). His not rebuking the devil, but restricting himself to saying, "The Lord rebuke thee," reminds us of his replies to Satan's temptations by merely quoting Scripture. Indeed, the opposition of Michael and the devil, in this contention of which Jude writes, has no parallel in Scripture if Michael be a created angel; but it is an opposition very familiar to us if Michael be Christ. And manifestly Jude 9 somehow refers to Zech. iii. 1, 2, where the opponent of Satan is the angel of Jehovah, whom I take to be the Son of God: and as in other cases, so in Zechariah, "the angel of Jehovah," in ver. 1, passes into "Jehovah" Himself in ver. 2, where it is Jehovah that says, "Jehovah rebuke thee, O Satan!"

5. The only other name in Scripture that is analogous to Michael is Gabriel (Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21). He is called in the second passage "the *man* Gabriel," but no doubt only because of his human appearances, since he is expressly called an angel in both of the other passages where alone he is mentioned again (Luke i. 19, 26). This has led to Gabriel also being called an archangel; but he is not so named in Scripture, which speaks only of the one, the archangel. These two names Michael and Gabriel are found in this book of Daniel, which is equally remarkable for its discoveries of the future, especially in chap. xi, and for its unveiling of the present unseen world in chap. x. It seems to me the safe course to keep closely to what is revealed in Scripture concerning matters of which we have not and cannot have any knowledge, apart from revelation; all the more so since the subject of angels has proved very attractive to the imaginations of men, and in dangerous directions, against which the apostle warns us in Col. ii. 18, whichever of the readings we adopt there.

6. When men have gone beyond Scriptures in this field, it has been difficult for them to stop, and it does not seem profitable for us to follow. Some have thought of four archangels; and besides Michael and Gabriel, they have added Raphael, who appears repeatedly in the fables of the apocryphal book of Tobit iii. 17, v. 4, viii. 2, ix. 1, 5, xii.

15, though the name "archangel" is never given to him there. A fourth has been found in the angel Uriel in the Book of Enoch, and again, in the visions of the book 2 Esdras iv. 1, v. 20; also, according to one reading in iv. 36, whilst another makes the name to be Jeremiel; but whichever is the true reading, he receives the title of archangel. Seven, however, has been a more favourite number, though this speculation has run in two channels. Sometimes six are spoken of, under the one foremost or original being, whom they serve; and these six have even been resolved into one, contemplated in different aspects. Sometimes, again, we read of seven archangels on one level; though the names, after the first four given above, are very uncertain. In 2 Esdras v. 16, we read of "Salathiel the captain of the people," who has been conjectured to be a fifth; and there are others like Ruhiel, Phanuel, and Zadkiel.

The sole direct scriptural (so-called) support for the belief in seven archangels is the text, Tobit xii. 15, though the name archangel is never used in the book: "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the *prayers* of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One." This statement is authoritative within the Church of Rome: Protestants do not feel bound by it, and many rather regard it as an example of the corruptions of later Judaism, which may be paralleled by expressions in other apocryphal and unauthorised writings.

Again, there have been inferences drawn, as I believe without justification, from one or two scriptural expressions. One of these (Luke i. 19), "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God," is not a proof. The expression suits all the holy servants of God, in heaven and on earth; a special emphasis, laid upon it in any particular case, must be judged by the circumstances otherwise known to us. In ver. 26, we read simply, "The angel Gabriel was sent from God." More weight has been attached to what is written in Rev. viii. 2, "And I saw the seven angels which stand before God; and there were given unto them seven trumpets." But it may well be doubted whether this number seven is not due to the symbolical structure of the book, in which we have, i. 4, 5, "Grace to you, and peace, 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," etc.: and iv. 5, "And [there

were] seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God." Both of these statements are, as I understand, descriptive of the one Holy Spirit in His active working; compare v. 6, "A Lamb standing as though it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." I alluded to the circumstance already that the seven archangels are by some writers, ancient and modern, resolved into one, especially when one is reckoned at the head; compare the seven-fold energy of the Spirit resting on Messiah (Isa. xi. 2); and the six men with slaughterer weapons accompanying the man clothed in linen (Ezek. ix. and x.). So in Rev. xv. 5, 6, "I saw, and the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened; and there came out from the temple the seven angels that had the seven plagues," etc.

It is easy to suggest things which might lead to this speculation about seven archangels: the sacredness of the number seven; the seven planets and astrological notions connected with them; the

seven counsellors of the king of Persia (Ezra vii. 14), "the seven princes of Persia and Media, which saw the king's face, and sat first in the kingdom" (Esther i. 14); and, perhaps, "seven men of them that saw the king's face" in Jerusalem (Jer. lii. 25), though the parallel (2 Kings xxv. 19) speaks of five.

The Jehovistic and Elohistie discussions may have some bearing on these names, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, Salathiel, Ruhiel, Phanuel, Zadkiel; there are several corresponding Jehovistic forms in Scripture, Micaiah, Rephaiah, Uriaah, Zedekiah.

Possibly some side light may be thrown on the names of the holy beings Michael and Gabriel, by the name Satan being given to the devil, the leader of the hosts of evil angels, and Beelzebub. But the evil side of these mysterious subjects had need to be handled with extreme caution, since it is on the good side that revelation is ever fullest and most explicit; and yet in the present case this does not amount to very much.

## Renderings and Readings in the Revised New Testament.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR ROBERTS, D.D., ST. ANDREWS.

It is a remarkable fact that neither the word "damn" nor the word "damnation" appears in any part of the Revised New Testament. In this respect, it contrasts strikingly with the Authorised Version. As every reader is painfully aware, there are not a few passages in the current translation which contain the dreadful words that have been mentioned. "Dreadful," I say, for so they undoubtedly are to modern ears. It may have been that they bore a much softer meaning when the A.V. was formed, but they inevitably suggest nothing less than hopeless perdition to English readers at the present day. We cannot, therefore, help feeling that it is well worth our while to inquire into the true signification of the original Greek, that we may satisfy ourselves whether the idea suggested by the A.V. is justifiable, or whether we are warranted in accepting the milder rendering presented in the R.V.

Let us look, first, at the well-known passage, 1 Cor. xi. 29. That verse stands as follows in the text of the A.V.: "For he that eateth and drinketh

unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." It is perfectly impossible to conceive of the amount of mischief which has been wrought by these words. No matter that "judgment" stands on the margin, and no matter that that word is almost invariably substituted for "damnation," when the passage is read in the pulpit—the fearful term still stares the devout reader in the text, and necessarily excites a thrill of apprehension in his heart. Who can tell how many humble souls have shrunk back with terror from the Lord's Table under the horror of that awful word, and have thus been prevented from carrying out the precept of their Saviour when He said: "Do this in remembrance of Me?" And then to think that not the slightest ground for such feelings is to be found in the original! The word which is translated "damnation" is a singularly mild one (*κρίμα*), and is regarded by all critics as having no reference to spiritual consequences at all, but as simply pointing to those temporal judgments—sickness and