

ing enables him, if so disposed, to throw collateral light upon it by a full Introduction or by copious Notes, and who surely is no high-caste Brahmin that he should desire to keep this rich vein of gold covered from the eyes of his curious countrymen, should now devote a portion of his "elegant leisure" to preparing an American Edition of the *Bhagvat Geeta* for the many who would read it not only with liveliest interest, but with substantial profit.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE ANGEL OF JEHOVAH.

BY HENRY A. SAWTELLE, M. A., LIMERICK, ME.

IN the early time, when the revelation of a spiritual sphere was dawning upon the race, and God was impressing his rightful claims, by striking visitations, upon a stupid world, the new forms that appear are often mysterious above later manifestations. The twilight confuses shapes which would otherwise be distinct. The fleeting agents of the strange unfolding speak not of themselves. They, for the time, carry their beholders to what is upward and onward; and would not, as instruments, be thought of, any more than is the word which is the sign of a thought. Certain it is that an activity is going on, the mode and incitement of which are above the ordinary process of nature. Clear and unmistakable is the immediate and practical object of each new supernatural appearance. And yet the sensible agency producing the effects, the messengers of the revelation, are not so certainly recognized in every case. In what order of existence do these agents belong? Or, if there be but one, is he divine, or is he less than divine? Such questions arise to the inquiring mind, as it first begins to reflect upon the revealer as well as thing revealed. As natural as it is for the

human mind to speculate, so natural is it to inquire how, by whom, by what, God has acted in bringing the supernatural sensibly to our capacity.

Nor is the inquiry altogether vain. Those dusky forms of the past grow distinct as we gaze at them; and as we have clearer light, we possess greater joy. The search confirms the abstruser doctrines; and these, going more deeply into conviction, add fundamental strength to moral life. That which at first seems dark and confused in the shadows of God's movements, in his early discipline of mankind, is so only relatively, and yields clearer lines of order and definition to the patient investigator; just as the distant spheres have gradually taken their orderly positions before the astronomer's piercing look. If it be essential rightly to interpret some remote and difficult item in the ordinary development of human events, it must be regarded as of use to study well all that which even mysteriously appears in the course of God's miraculous dealings with his chosen people. Let us then turn our eyes towards the activity that is manifested in the horizon of sacred antiquity, encouraged if we may gain so much as an earnest of a better understanding in the world of light.

Among the objects which stand half-disclosed down the vista of revelation, is one of uncommon interest, which the sacred writers have styled *THE ANGEL OF JEHOVAH*. This character claims our present investigation. At one time manifesting traits not unfamiliar to common life, and again leaving proof of possessing a power and condition above men, and even above ordinary heavenly visitants; now appearing for an object apparently small; and now transacting in respect to the covenant of ages; his personality sometimes nearly concealed, and again expressed with startling authority, he hardly fails to leave an impression of mystery; nay, more, of mysterious grandeur. In the inquiry excited, one sooner or later suspects the presence of Divinity in him, in consequence of beholding, even in the concealment, the outcropping of Godlike attributes. For, as with God, there is glory in his very hiding. Our curiosity is

rather increased than relieved as to his position in the scale of existences, by the manner in which his earliest told advent is recorded on the sacred page, and by the merely passing notices he receives whenever subsequently introduced to the reader.

As we should already infer, there has been a variety of opinions in regard to the essential standing of this early messenger of God. The difference of view, however, as we apprehend, must be traced more generally to a subjective cause, since it has commonly expressed itself in accordance with the prior theological beliefs of those who deal with the subject. The statement applies especially to later times. But all may not come to the investigation with equal prejudice. One will prejudge the less as he admits a greater number of facts into his creed. The theologian, for example, who believes in a triune God capable of revealing himself, at the same time that he entertains the doctrine of angels, is less liable to an *a priori* judgment in the case, than one who believes in the visitation of angels while denying the Trinity. He has already, in possession, more categories with which to compare his new fact and prolong his doubt. Would that we might always come to the truth dispossessed of everything which prevents it from having its native power and normal effect in our minds!

The ancient Jews, with few exceptions, as evinced by their extra-scriptural writings, believed the Angel, now being considered, to be the revealing God mediating by his own limitation a supernatural revelation to the race of man. They called him the Metatron,<sup>1</sup> the Prince of the countenance of God, the co-equal Revealer of the Divine Being. The leaning of the Jews to a general view of the Angel's divinity is indeed slightly traceable in the Septuagint version, particularly in the passage in Isaiah (9 : 2), where so many Divine appellatives are attributed to the coming Messiah. The Seventy evidently regarded the Mighty God here promised, as identical with the great Angel of the past, since

---

<sup>1</sup> For a learned account of the history, use, and diverse derivations of this term, see Hengstenberg's *Christology* (English edition), Vol. I. p. 178 seq.

they translate what to us is "Wonderful, Counsellor, God," by "the Angel of great counsel." The Revealer, anticipated as coming in the future with peculiar tidings and power, was all the same as the Revealer, heretofore making his appearance. To the view entertained by a majority of the Jewish interpreters, have adhered, in the main, the Fathers of the Christian church, the Protestant theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the orthodox of the present day. These latter have, of course, better defined and more consistent views of the Revealer in his position with respect to God. His Divinity and distinct personality are regarded in the same way.

Others have maintained that the frequently-appearing Messenger of the old Covenant is absolutely identical, in person and substance, with the one God. He was, indeed, under the assumed conditions of manifestation; but such a manifestation as a Sabellian would regard the one God as capable of effecting in his own behalf, without violence to his absolute singleness of person. Supporters of this opinion hold the chief terms in the formula *Angel of Jehovah* to be appositional, and translate "Angel Jehovah," or "Jehovah Angel:" they think of God as his own messenger to his people. A few Hebrew scholars of some distinction contend for this translation. Mr. MacWhorter, in his recent work,<sup>1</sup> thus renders the formula, maintaining the absolute identity of the Angel and Jehovah, but, as our readers are aware, holding *Jehovah* to be a name everywhere in the Old Testament exclusively applicable to the future Messiah and the Revealer of God in all time. Thus in form he is attached to the Sabellian class, but in reality stands with the more numerous class in Christian history who have regarded the Angel as a second Person and Revealer of the Godhead.

Passing by the ignoble and *pachydermatic* naturalist, who seems to be destitute of any power to expand in his conceptions out of the trodden circle of the material and sensible, and who, consistently with his narrow position, regards this

<sup>1</sup> YAHVEH CHRIST; or the Memorial Name. Gould and Lincoln (Boston, 1857). See also Article in Bib. Sac., Jan. 1857, p. 98 seq.

Messenger as nought but the voice of nature, a visible sign, or the hallucination of a superstitious mind, we would mention, as the third leading class of expounders in this reference, those who discover in the Visitant of the Jews an angel merely, like others noticed in scripture narrative, who, appearing in the name and with the commission of Jehovah, and thus for the time standing as God's representative, utters language, performs acts, and receives attention as Jehovah himself. Origen and Jerome, as some maintain, although their language is susceptible of other meaning, and certainly Augustine, inclined to this explanation of the import of the Angel of Jehovah. The Socinians of any age would naturally embrace it. So also would Roman Catholics, who thereby produce a sanction for their angel worship. We may state, on the authority of Hengstenberg and Kurtz, that the view was entirely agreeable to the Arminians. The middle rank of rationalists would undoubtedly, as a whole, from what we know of a few, find their place in this class.<sup>1</sup>

A few passages of scripture, we admit, seem happily reconcilable with the view last indicated; and a greater number would harmonize with the second exposition above expressed, could that be made out, in spite of the testimony to the contrary. And yet, while allowing this to be true, and conceiving it quite possible for a sound trinitarian to incline to one or the other meaning, we are constrained to believe and so represent, that the great body of scripture testimony fairly compared and interpreted, together with the weight of the argument constructed on a legitimate inference from the hints and implications of the Bible, is surprisingly in favor of the opinion regarding the Angel which was noticed in the first place. To this conviction we have come from a careful study of the testimony in point, aided by the common laws of interpretation; while, in commencing our investigation, our bias was certainly in another direction. We pro-

---

<sup>1</sup> Among recent writers in Germany who stand in the interest of the view just noticed, might be named Vater, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schneider, Baumgarten, Stendel, and Hoffman. Gesenius, thought by Hengstenberg to belong to this class, certainly in later life held the orthodox view (*Lex.*, p. 570).

pose in the present case to adduce, to some extent, the argument derivable from the Bible, *first*, in confirmation of the deity of the Angel of the Lord as a real person, distinct from the One whose messenger he is; and, *secondly*, as showing the identity of this Divine Person of the olden time with the Messianic Revealer of the New Dispensation, in his higher nature. Without attending very minutely to the other views, we shall bestow upon them incidental notice, believing their surest refutation to be the result, or mere complement, of the positive establishment of the usual orthodox theory.

Let us turn first to the bare formula *מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה*, or *מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה*, and develop the import thereof, so far as we can, in disconnection from the context with which it belongs in the scripture. It occurs about seventy-five times in all, in a variety of circumstances. The adjunct of *Jehovah* is far more frequent than that of *Elohim*. The first word, translated *Angel*, is in itself, as all parties acknowledge, expressive of office or relation, and in no respect of nature or essence. Any existence capable of being sent forth upon service of any kind, in the economy of divine providence, or in the interest of any intelligence, may, in the capacity of being sent, be properly denominated an angel or messenger. In entire consistency with this apprehension of the case, the term is applied repeatedly in the Bible to men as well as to the higher order of created beings more usually receiving this designation. We might refer, by way of example, to 1 Sam. 11:3. 16:19. Job 1:14. Eccl. 5:5. (Heb.) Hag. 1:13. Mal. 2:7. 3:1. It is interesting also to note the compounding of the term in the name of *Mulachi*,<sup>1</sup> which Gesenius views as a compressed or apocopated combination of the Hebrew words answering to *Angel* and *Lord*. Our leading interpreters define *angels* and *ministers* in Ps. 104:4, as predicates, so that the idea obtains that God makes even the winds his angels. From all this it is evident that, in respect of use as well as derivation, our term can express nothing as

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg, Ewald, and Henderson find in this name the expression of Angel, but deny for it the remains of the name *Jehovah*.

to the substance of its subject, and hence that the initial name of the object before us can afford not the slightest presumption as to the order of his being.

But what is the significance of the fuller expression MALAK JEHOVAH, so far as it can be determined on the principles of grammar? The first word is plainly in the construct state with respect to the second. The second stands as some fuller definition of the first. But does the close construction of the words, thus indicated, imply on the part of the second word an appositional, or a more strictly genitive relation? MacWhorter very quietly assumes for his purpose that the relation is that of apposition. While admitting the possibility of this interpretation, since the Hebrew furnishes some instances that would be quite analogous, we are yet induced to regard the relation in question as more strictly *genitive*, with thereby a distinction of subjects in the formula. For,

1. It is the more common one. The appositional relation being the exceptional one, there needs to be something peculiarly decisive for it, in the nature or condition of the subjects, in the given case. But this condition, so far as the terms in themselves are concerned, does not exist. The decisiveness in this direction, if appearing at all, must rest on a course of proof drawn altogether from without.
2. The general analogy with respect to the term *Jehovah*, in its use with other words in the construct state, guides to the view, that the subjects in the case we are considering, are not ultimately identical. Compare, for instance, the phrases, "Sprout of Jehovah," and "Servant of Jehovah," in Isaiah, and "Glory of Jehovah," in Ezekiel.
3. There are several cases in which the same expression brings to view, in the most unequivocal manner, a separation between the construct word and its adjunct in their application, as in the prophecies of Haggai and Malachi, where the expression embraces the distinction as broad as that existing between man and the Being on whom he depends. This would seem to afford a presumption in favor of a distinction as real, if not so wide, between the subjects which are not, and cannot be, so fully known.
4. Finally, the evidence of the ancient versions of the scrip-

tures, together with the known treatment of the great majority of modern criticism, is for the translation "Angel of Jehovah," rather than "Angel-Jehovah," thus implying that the Angel is messenger with respect to and for Jehovah, and not simply as Jehovah. Such considerations, though, as we admit not entirely decisive, appear to be greatly in favor of the view which we are inclined to hold. They, at least, forbid a silent assumption like that with which Mr. MacWhorter is chargeable, and impose on him the burden of proof, if he persists in the comparatively novel rendering so convenient for his purpose.

The disuse of the article before the phrase in hand, is in accordance with the common idiom of the Hebrew language. The omission indicates by no means a want of definiteness on the part of the opening word in a combination like the present; since the limiting noun, or pronominal suffix, more usually dispenses with the use of the article, defining as it does, with more or less plainness, the limited word without further addition. So much as this we know to be defined, that the messenger, whoever or whatever he may be, has a particular relation to Jehovah. But whether he be of the description to be identified with some preëminent or well-known character, cannot, as Kurtz would seem to teach, be determined by the construct relation *per se*. Although, if such preëminence could otherwise be made out, the expression we have would be all the Hebrew would require to answer to it, and would in itself warrant the more special rendering of "the Angel of Jehovah;" while at the same time, under other circumstances, the precise expression is all the Hebrew has to reflect the less definite idea of "an Angel of Jehovah." It is perhaps true, that the combination in question more usually conveys the more particular idea; and that, at first sight, we should be more ready to introduce the article into our rendering, than not to do so. But confidence in such procedure can be gained only from an extensive comparison of the passages, and from a knowledge of the explanation in the text surrounding or introducing that which is spoken of in a particular manner. It is our further

historical and exegetical investigation which is to justify and determine the full and particular phrase, "The Angel of Jehovah," *par eminence*. Thus the German writer referred to just above, has not, we think, the warrant of a correct philology, when he would regard the formula as importing in itself the eminence of the Angel; and what is more, suppose the adjunct, in its relation here, to indicate attributively the nature or kind of the messenger; to suggest, in short, as he avers, "his essential Divinity." Its grammatical quality forbids the one supposition; its occasional application to men, forbids the other.

The next thing in order will be to examine critically several of the passages in which the words under discussion occur; and thus by our induction gain some corroborative evidence of the Angel's personality, in distinction from the Father's, as well as testimony in regard to his proper position in the scale of spiritual existence.

The earliest appearance of the Angel, now considered, in the sphere of sensible perception, of which the scriptures apprise us, was beside a fountain of the wilderness on the way to Shur, in the presence of Hagar the Egyptian handmaid, as she fled away from her sensitive mistress.<sup>1</sup> It is easy to trace the presence and operations of the same agent in the chapter preceding the first express mention of the name, where Abraham, in the vision, receives direct encouragement from God, and becomes party to the divine covenant. The covenant-watcher was the covenant-founder. In the account of the visitation to Hagar it is interesting to observe, in the first place, the abrupt and informal mention of the visitant's title. Unwarned we stumble at once on a name which, in view of its repetition again and again in the sacred narrative, seems to have been at the time a well-known designation. When we learn its succeeding frequent use and singular application, we feel a surprise at the simple introduction of it at this point. It looks as if the Angel was presupposed to be known, by the reader, in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 16: 7 seq.; compare 21: 17, 18.

eminent character which he maintains in the record; as if the entire designation was that of a proper name already known. The writer's previous acquaintance with the name and personage, seems also to be implied. We may notice, secondly, the frequent repetition of not a part but the whole title of "Angel of Jehovah," in the same general connection; which shows that, however other messengers might be named, this one has nothing less than the whole expression as his appropriate title. Hebrew formality cannot account for the full use, over and over again, in successive verses. There is a peculiarity in the naming; which must be founded on a peculiar character, and relation to God. One should mark the different manner of mentioning the recurring angel in the narrative of John's birth as well as in that of our Saviour's birth.<sup>1</sup> But the narrative in view, here in Genesis, reveals something more positive as to the dignity and quality of the heavenly visitant, if we will but make a natural inference. He comes indeed officially, as one sent of God. And yet he appears spontaneously to say, as it were on the foundation of his own inherent power, when encouraging Hagar, "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly." Such a prerogative we do not discover, in men or ordinary angels. The sacred writer intimates to us that the fountain by which the revelation was made, was named for the Revealer, and yet for him as one whose permanent character it was to *live*,<sup>2</sup> and bestow provident care on the outcast servant. Now, it is to nothing less than a Divine Being that we attribute pre-eminently life and causation, and ascribe an all-seeing disposal of the families of men. Finally, the inspired penman not only refers divine action to the Angel, but calls him directly *Jehovah*; while the maid herself, with no existing intimation of her being mistaken, addresses him as *God*. It is remarkable that these appellations, bestowed in so unstudied a way, by a transition which seems to occur as a matter of course, indicate to us the current estimation in point of essential rank in which this messenger was held even at the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Luke 1: 11—38, and 2: 9—21.

<sup>2</sup> Note the Hebrew, Gen. 16: 14.

time when Moses first expressly brings him upon the arena of action.

But proving the high nature of the Angel, do not such divine titles go further and prove his absolute personal identity with the ultimate God? We answer, No. For, 1. Though he be named with the becoming title of Deity, that is not the prevalent manner of the sacred writer. He is more usually distinguished by a name which marks not a false, but a true, relation, namely, such as is really involved in a ministry and commission. Though he be in fact Divine, he must not lose the consistency of his character in being one sent forth on an errand, and as such coming from a Source. The representation of his being a Messenger is not, we may suppose, a cheat. He would not be, absolutely and singly, Sender and Sent at the same moment. He is a minister not for himself alone; which fact must be rejected on any Sabellian hypothesis. Let us have a theory so broad and adequate as to embrace all and exclude none of the patent facts. The implied relation of the Angel, real for the time, so remains; since in the very character in which he performs his mission to Hagar, he lives and abides in order to execute the consoling prediction. 2. No man hath seen God at any time, i. e. the ultimate Person of the Godhead. Neither hath this one declared himself, i. e. in being his own representation to his creatures. But in the passage before us, as well as in others, as will be seen, appears a veritable Revealer, possessing, as we know, divine titles and attributes, and evidencing a real personality, formal and spiritual, to some extent comprehended by the befriended wanderer and the inspired recorder. Jehovah, or the one so called, was seen. Our conclusion then is, that while the revealing Person was true Deity, he yet subsisted in some positive distinction from the invisible and delegating Person of the Godhead. He was second to the one whom he, in a substantial way, represented. Such a view, scriptural as it is, is at the same time philosophical, for it takes into the account all the facts. The personal distinction may not have been so definitely thought of in the age which supplies our theme, as

we at present represent, nor may we comprehend it in its transcendent bearing; but to make these things a ground for silencing all inquiry and all statement in the case, is to suppose our relation to the facts and our convenience for studying them to be the same as were possessed by those ancients, and is to shut up our minds forever to an intelligible part whose complement may be above the reason.

All this however being allowed, is not, after all, the Angel of Jehovah entirely the same as the one properly named *Jehovah*? Though he be distinct, in a real sense, from the invisible God, is he not *Jehovah*; the latter term being strictly and only applicable to the Revealer of God? And is not such a conclusion forced upon us, in part, by the fact that the Angel, who is confessedly a Divine Revealer, is here and elsewhere called *Jehovah*? The author of "Yahveh Christ," to whom reference has already been made, would make an affirmative reply to these questions. We cannot, as yet, lend our assent to such an admission. We cannot receive the view that, in general, when *Jehovah* is referred to in the Bible, the Revealer and second person of the Trinity is meant, and by consequence that the Angel and *Jehovah* are one and the same. The reasons of our dissent are as follows :

1. The view of Mr. MacWhorter is forbidden by the most probable grammatical relation of the words in our formula. Some four considerations were offered above, which seemed to warrant the interpretation of a genitive and not an appositional relation of the second principal word to the first. If this conclusion is worth anything, it implies that the latter term in the phrase is logically the more generic one; and not only that it is distinct in its application from the other, but that it has, if the other belongs to one specifically Divine, a wider application to the Divine Genus, the comprehensive Godhead. We should thus apprehend that *Jehovah* is God in the most original sense; and while identified at times, in the conception, with one person of the Godhead, as with the Angel in the course of the record under examination, would more usually be identified with that person who

seemed to maintain the starting point of action, namely, the Father.

2. It is opposed, somewhat, by the easy interchange of the terms *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, in various instances,<sup>1</sup> as adjunctive to the one and same *Angel*. This interchange of the adjuncts occurs sometimes more than once in the same continuous narrative. No one would suppose that they mean anything different in the position which they thus, by turns, occupy. There would be something very awkward in the rendering "Angel God, or "God Angel;" partly, because one is unused to it; but more because it violates the usual conception that the whole of the idea conveyed by the term *God*, is not exhausted by that which is implied by the *Angel*. It is quite evident that the term *Jehovah* covers the same idea in the formula that the term *God* does; and an impropriety in the use of one attaches no less to the other.

3. The place taken and the character shown by *Jehovah*, in a number of Messianic passages, ought to disturb our contemporary's confidence in his theory. When *Jehovah* appears in revelation, conversing with him who is to be the Messiah, is not here a fact forbidding such a specific application of his name to the Revealer as has been assumed? Does not the fact go to show that the appropriation of the name to God the Father is the more natural? If *Jehovah* were so exclusively *He who will be*; if *Jehovah* is the "memorial name," just fitting to the promised Messiah, should we expect the Father to take away that name to himself, that name so very nicely and anciently applying to the Messiah, and that too at an occasion, in reference to events, in connection with which we should anticipate the very least inconsistency and confusion in the designation of the Persons? But the Father does, repeatedly, take the name in question at points when, if ever, it should belong to the Revealer. When the Sender and the One to be sent appear in the same exhibition of history or prophecy, the Sender is invariably *Jehovah*. Let us note, for example, the words of

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 21 : 17. 31 : 11. Judges 6 : 20. 13 : 6.

the Messiah, when, as one of the interlocutors in the second Psalm, stationed as it were in heaven's council-chamber, he says: "I will make proclamation respecting the decree. Jehovah hath said to me, 'my Son art thou, I this day have begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will bestow the Gentiles as thine inheritance, and as thy possession the ends of the earth.'" If any evidences of personality exist at all in the dialogues of scripture; if the representation here has any correspondence in reality, then is there, in this case at least, a distinction between Jehovah and the Revealer who declares him. But so is it, in repeated instances equally strong, as in Ps. 110: 1, 2, 4. 16: 2 (with Christ the speaker), 7, 8. 22: 20. Isa. 42: 5, 6. 53: 6, 10. Zech. 6: 12 sq., etc., where, to make Jehovah answer to the second Person in the Godhead, would be but to introduce a puerile confusion into the sublime transactions of Heaven.<sup>1</sup>

4. Finally, with all the rest, there is nothing in the etymology of the term *Jehovah*, even on Mr. MacWhorter's supposition, that *Yahveh* is the true form, to prevent its application fittingly to God the Father, who is unseen. The imperfect (or future) tense of the verb to *be* or *become*, on which the form is supposed to be founded, by no means necessitates an absolutely future translation. The idea conveyed by it is more commonly that of an action or state which is protensive, or continued. "The imperfect, in Hebrew, denotes the unfinished and continuing; that which is being done or coming to pass, and so is future, and often so called. It also denotes that which is in progress and in connected succession in past time" (Gesenius). Thus it is the imperfect idea which generates the future; and not the latter which is independent, or indeed prior, in its idea, to the former. Does this fact, however, seem to be well considered in our author's absolute and confident future rendering of

---

<sup>1</sup> It is due, perhaps, to the suggestion of a distinguished scholar, who may represent the wish of others, that we should present several instances more extensively, as the one in the second Psalm. The fear that we are taking already too much space must be our excuse for cutting short these convincing illustrations. We may say, *ex uno disce omnia*.

Jehovah, or Yahveh, as *He who will be?* We confess to a feeling that assumption lies in some of the fundamental definitions of Yahveh Christ. To regard *Jehovah* as meaning *He who continues to be*, and so applying to one who possesses and exercises, now, the resources and disposition of deliverance, as well as in the future, affords a more pregnant and embracing thought, and is an occasion, to men of all time, for repose on the continuous rescuing activity of a benign Deity. On such an idea was founded the grateful trust of Jacob at Haran, when he was feeling the blessing of Jehovah so much, that,

“ As wont,  
In the devoutness of that evening hour,  
He recognized the covenant fulfilled,  
A God still with him.”

These several considerations, then — the genitive relation, and frequent interchange of the adjuncts in the formula, “Angel of God” and “Angel of Jehovah,” the historical use of the term, and the etymology of it also, compel us to withhold assent to the hypothesis that *Jehovah* is the proper and exclusive appellation of God’s Revealer, whether in the person of the Angel or Messiah. It is indeed capable of expressing the all of the Angel, and may be and is applied to the latter just as *God* is used of the Son in creation, and of the Spirit in regeneration; but not hence is *Angel of Jehovah* co-extensive with it in the comprehension of relations, nor like it capable of an appropriation to the invisible God. It is gratifying to be assured by Mr. MacWhorter’s investigation, that Jehovah is the Revealer in the Old Testament oftener than has been supposed, thus confirming the impression of the Deity of the latter, already so strong.

But all this for a name, as regards the Angel; although, for an essential fact in respect to the active Person or Persons of the Godhead, in the progress of revelation. The Angel’s personal distinction was already established. That essentially is not denied by the author whom we have considered. This phase of the discussion, therefore, while legitimately

suggested by the attribution of the Deity's title to the Messenger in our passage, looks more to a question related, in a collateral way, to our theme, than to the furtherance of the dogma of the Angel's divine personality.

If it be objected that the name of *Angel* appears to be a derogatory title for a divine being, it may be replied that its peculiarly *constant* association with a distinguished adjunct, sets it off in the light of unusual grandeur and holy dignity. Nor is the term, in itself, an inferior designation; for, being a name suggested by office or relation, its whole dignity comes from the nature of the subject or mission, in connection with which it is employed. Not unlike is the propriety and significance of the name *Apostle*, as used of Christ, when it is said: "consider the Apostle and High-Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus" (Heb. 3:1).

If, once more, it be urged that the Revealer of the Lord, and hence the Angel, had to do, in olden times especially, with the covenant people of God, so that it is strange that his first named appearance should be to the Egyptian maid, it may be said that Hagar belonged to the house of Abraham in the capacity of servant, that at this time she had come under a special relation to him, and that the seed she bore was included in the general reference of the blessing of Abraham involved in the covenant now instituted. The visitation was besides, as Kurtz remarks, "humane, condescending, and saving in the highest degree."

We have thus endeavored to dispose of a variety of questions naturally arising as soon as the first account of the Angel's advent, with its strange relations and deep implications, is presented to our notice. These questions being at once attended to, with all the greater force will succeeding confirmatory passages take their place in the basis of our theory, and to some of them we briefly turn.

By collating several verses in the narrative of the Lord's visit to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, we learn that the "Lord," who appeared, was one of the "three men;" that

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xviii. *passim*; 19:1.

the one termed Lord is singled out for Abraham's address, as it would seem, from some superior dignity of person; that from all that appears, he may be called an angel as well as the two associates who are incidentally named thus as they journey to Sodom; that hence he is, no doubt, the Angel of Jehovah; that, as such, he receives freely the title of simple *Jehovah*, and is treated with great reverence and extreme self-abasement on the part of Abraham, who begs the Lord not to be angry with him, and in the comparison regards himself as but "dust and ashes." Under a divine name, the Messenger proceeds to bring judgment on Sodom; in allusion to which the sacred writer pens these striking words: "Then Jehovah [referring, as is supposed, to the Angel] rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah [namely, the final Divine Source] out of heaven" (Gen. 19: 24). Thus distinction is made, as Hengstenberg avers, between Jehovah and his Messenger. As says an old Jewish writing: In all these appearances, it was the Angel of the Covenant.

When the faithful patriarch was obedient to the yet unexplained requisition for the sacrifice of Isaac his son, in the midst of his dark and mournful service, the Angel of the Lord calls to him out of heaven, saying: "Now I know that though fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from ME" (Gen. 22: 12). As the Angel calls to Abraham the second time, in order to provide ground for assurance, he, like Jehovah, "swears by himself," as if there were none greater. He presents himself as the efficient executor of the Covenant with the servant of God and his seed; and for this, as well as for his succeeding agency in unfolding the now ratified covenant, receives afterward the suggestive distinction of Messenger of the Covenant, implying the same thing as Covenant God.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 22: 15 seq. Mal. 3: 1. Some doubt attaches to the designation referred to in Malachi, as to whether it arises in view of the Hebrew or Christian covenant, having reference as it does to the Messiah. Henderson (*Minor Prophets*, p. 457) is decided in the opinion that the reference is plainly to the old economy, of which the Angel was the founder and head.

We step forward to the first mention of the Angel's coming to Jacob. Here the Messenger of the Lord declares, for himself: "I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow unto me" (Gen. 31: 13). He identifies himself with God, who appeared in the vision of Jacob's ladder,<sup>1</sup> and whose angels ascended and descended before the patriarch. In that vision there are, thus, the Angel of Jehovah and ordinary angels, presented at the same time; and the former compared and rated with the latter directly by inspiration, to the entire confusion, as it would seem, of all such as contend for the Messenger's common angelic nature and order.

"And Jacob was left alone: and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day."<sup>2</sup> It is not said, in so many words, by the narrator of this, that the "man" was the Angel of the Lord. He seems, however, to be regarded as the immediate source of blessing; and two names, now only applied, indicate his essential rank: *Israel*, marking the power had with God, and *Peniel*, the remembrancer of a face divine being seen of man, stand as monuments of the recognized exhibition of the Divine presence. In allusion to this matter, Hosea<sup>3</sup> says that Jacob "had power over the Angel." Jacob's conviction that he was struggling with the Deity is confirmed by the prophet, who styles the strange Wrestler as the Lord God of Hosts, and supplies, what is not told us before, that he was treated as divine, in the act of Jacob's prayer. It would appear that the characteristics of the Revealer were more than usually concealed in this exhibition, since Jacob inquires his name; although this would not be inconsistent with a silent conviction of the high quality of his temporary Antagonist.

Heretofore the Being whom we consider, appears less in the character of practical kindness, than in that of authority, though the former is not rejected. But we now rise to a time when the constant benevolence of his course is more touchingly acknowledged. Israel, who himself bore a name of

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 28: 10—22.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. 32: 24.

<sup>3</sup> 12: 4.

wonderful testimony, approaching the hour of dissolution, bears affecting witness<sup>1</sup> to the goodness of his former Visitant. Stretching forth his drooping hands, and laying them on Joseph's sons, he utters a blessing in the Angel's name, and pronounces a high eulogy on his provident redeeming activity, such as is appropriate always and especially to the adorable God, and none other. It is matter of interesting observation, in this connection, that not a visible sign, nor any inferior representative person coming in the range of finite perception, with no higher life, is here termed the Lord's Angel, but a now invisible agent. This shows that, in conception, Jacob carried his whilom earthly deliverer facilely to the unlimited regions of spirit without denying to him, but rather implying for him, the permanency of the office and character which has been thus far insisted on.

In Exodus we have, in general, the miraculous revelation of God in connection with Moses and the chosen nation, in the progress towards entire emancipation. The superintending Medium of all this, alike in the call of Moses and the deliverance from Egypt; in the terrible legislation of Sinai, and the disciplinary advance to Canaan, was, by all testimony, in general terms, the Lord God; and, in more particular language, his consubstantial revealing Angel. At one time, in the sacred record, his distinctive traits on the side toward man is the ground to the title assigned him; while, again, without necessarily overlooking this reference of his character, the narrator is controlled in respect to the naming, by the more essential divine attributes recognized in the majestic Agent. Hence the alternation; which is sometimes the source of indefiniteness with respect to the spiritual relations of the invariable Deliverer, and of partial or one-sided conceptions, as we strive to shape him to our minds. Now we are prone to think of an object altogether too low: as of a limited, automatic, created agent of God, who, in himself, wins not our love or veneration; and, again, we are straining our gaze away upward, to comprehend one

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 48: 15, 16.

beyond the sphere and shape of intelligible manifestation. We may suppose that the subjects of the divine conduct in the wilderness had a more uniform and adequate apprehension of the proper nature of their Leader, as he revealed himself, than we are accustomed to have. They thought of him as divine, and yet as near, and in a measure apprehensible. That certain, revealed, perceptible, yet self-originating character which, in our clearest reflections, we ascribe to the Redeemer, of the later era, was perhaps designed to be suggested to those of old, in regard to the Angel, by the light which they had. And in some such character should we best contemplate him. By commingling the descriptions and ideas which the names suggest, as they occur, for example, in the book of Exodus, we rectify and symmetrize our conception of the ancient Revealed.

The following condensed statements present the prominent confirmation of the divine standing of the Angel as furnished in the book already introduced. 1. The usual title is bestowed, identifying him at once with the Visitant of the past; and that, too, as early as the call of Moses.<sup>1</sup> 2. He is, in all places, finely distinguished from the strange material phenomena which surround him; as a critical estimate of the language will impressively prove.<sup>2</sup> 3. In his conversation with Moses, he utters his voice on the ground of inherent authority, without for once legitimatizing his claim to be heard or obeyed by a "Thus saith the Lord," as God's inferior messengers would do. 4. His own person renders

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex. 3: 2 seq.

<sup>2</sup> This point deserves a fuller treatment, for it has been overlooked in quarters where we should not have expected it. That Herder, with his pantheistic tendencies, should confound or identify the Angel with the inanimate natural phenomena that accompanied his visitation, is not surprising; but that Dr. Whately should thus do, while entertaining his belief in the spirituality and absolute supernatural elevation of Jehovah, is matter of wonder, and with the scripture so explicit as it is in separating the Angel from the bush and the fire, reflects not a little upon the Archbishop's examination at this point. "It was the Lord himself," he says, "who held communication with his servants through the means of the appearance of the flame accompanied with 'thunderings and voices,' etc.; and the *flame* is thence called his messenger or angel." — *GOOD AND EVIL ANGELS* (Am. Ed.), p. 16.

holy the spot whereon he stands, and the very atmosphere of his presence. 5. The name itself, as well as prerogatives of Jehovah, are freely and naturally bestowed on him. This is done in the ordinary progress of cool narration, and not in the extravagant style or high-wrought mood of poetry. 6. In his call to Moses he proposes to deliver Israel out of bondage. Afterward, he who dispenses the law on Sinai identifies himself with him who delivers out of bondage; by which, as by the manifestations which he makes at the time of giving the law, he proves himself, without directly expressing it, to be the Angel. 7. With a pillar of cloud or fire for the symbol of his presence, he goes before the Israelites;<sup>1</sup> and they acknowledge him to be sent for this purpose by Jehovah.<sup>2</sup> But with the Messenger designated, as he sometimes is, we have the problem of Jehovah sent by Jehovah. "And this," says the older Michaelis, "is, according to my best power of understanding, the most ancient intimation<sup>3</sup> of the Trinity; or, to speak more properly, since the passage treats of only two, of the doctrine of two persons in the divine essence."<sup>4</sup> 8. In one place (Ex. 32: 34 sq.), the Angel of Jehovah is carefully distinguished from an ordinary angel whom the Lord threatened as a curse to the people on account of their disobedience. When they repent, he promises that his Presence (meaning his revealing Angel; comp. Isa. 63: 9) shall go with them, and this restores consolation. In the twenty-third chapter, obedience is demanded towards the Angel, because in him was God's NAME; that is, not simply the name, for that would be frivolous; but all that for which such a name stood—Jehovah's nature and character. 10. Near the close<sup>5</sup> of Moses' sayings, under the name of Jehovah, he is alluded to as he that dwelt in the bush, and from whom all blessings should be implored. 11. Finally the martyr Stephen,<sup>6</sup> in the Acts of the Apostles, alludes to events in Exo-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex. 14: 19.

<sup>2</sup> Num. 20: 16.

<sup>3</sup> Taking into the view also the Angel's entire history.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in J. Pye Smith's *SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH*, Vol. I. p. 485.

<sup>5</sup> Deut. 2: 16.

<sup>6</sup> Acts 7: 30 seq.

dus, and, while applying to the Deliverer there the name of Angel, does not omit to set down his inspired testimony to the legitimacy of his more God-ward title of Lord, or Jehovah.

In the narrative<sup>1</sup> of Balaam's perverse resistance, the old formula is instanced, in full, not less than nine times — a significant fact as regards its single and eminent application. There it is said that the occasion was unworthy of the personal interference of God. To which it can well be replied, that it was no less worthy of the Deity to restrain Balaam, by interference, from his mad effort against his people, than it was to appear to him in the first place and advise with him respecting the call of the Lord's enemies to do an unrighteous thing. It is not less noble to stay the perverse hand, than to question at the first the moral decision that bears it aloft; to check a headlong career, than to dissuade from first entering on it. The final object of the Angel was to protect God's people. We remark that the sin of Balaam was aggravated in being against the Angel who talked with him.

As it respects the touching passage in the early part<sup>2</sup> of the book of Judges, it is allowed that the Jewish commentators, for the most part have thought that the "angel" here denotes a prophet, commissioned as a messenger; whom they aver to have been Phineas the high-priest. A similar view must have been held by our translators, as may be inferred from their unprecedented translation of our phrase at this point. The connection of Gilgal with the Angel has contributed to this modification; while, in reality, it was adapted to inspire confidence in the rendering, here, of "the Angel of Jehovah" as the divine Messenger of the past. For Gilgal, at least one, was on the borders of Jericho, where it is said<sup>3</sup> that Joshua was met by the man (Israel's manifested Guide) with a drawn sword. As another miraculous manifestation of the kind is not mentioned before this account in Judges, how natural, nay how beautiful, that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Num. xxii *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> 2: 1, 4

<sup>3</sup> Josh. 5: 13—15.

sacred writer should bring his eminent Actor upon the stage, taking him, as it were, from the strange scene on which his eyes last closed ; especially as the present mission pertained to an object then treated, and would naturally call for similar qualities of authority on the part of God's Messenger. The scene at Gilgal being fresh in the minds of the people, and associated with the one now appearing, their feelings would be affected, in view of their sinful default, much more than under other circumstances. The peculiar reference to the past transaction would bring into view a side-figure by which to estimate the present leading object in the drawing ; or rather provide a rightly shaded background, which should bring into sharper view the subject-forms of present interest. The happy design is successful ; for the people weep, and *Bochim* is the memorial.

The Angel of Jehovah is commemorated in the immortal song of Deborah, as authorizing the bitter curse she measures out. He is present with Gideon in the seclusion of Ophrah's oaken grove, qualifying him to undertake for the children of Israel in their dire extremity as the slaves of Midian, and leaving the pledge of his accompanying presence. With more than usual mystery, he comes before Manoah's wife ; revealing the terrible countenance whose description appears to have been matter of current tradition, speaking strangely of the offering about to be made, and establishing himself in the eyes of the wife and husband as, in fact as well as in reputation, THE WONDERFUL<sup>1</sup> in nature and works. His wisdom, as a standard of comparison, is more than once<sup>2</sup> instanced in the books of Samuel, as a thing impliedly of well-known and confessed distinction. Instead of saying that David's wisdom was godlike, the narrator shows that it might be compared to the Angel's. He is evidenced at Araunah's threshing floor as the powerful Messenger of

---

<sup>1</sup> Compare Judges 13 : 18 in the Hebrew, with Isa. 9 : 6.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Sam. 29 : 9. 2 Sam. 14 : 17, 20. 19 : 27. Some who sympathize in the general theory we have maintained, think the references here to be to an ordinary angel. But while there is nought in the context to disprove, there is that in the history which favors, an allusion to the great Angel.

judgment on account of David's sins, and is confirmed by the prophet Isaiah,<sup>1</sup> as the self-reliant Smiter of the Assyrian camp. Elijah receives his gracious and efficient ministration in the wilderness, and his prophetic instruction with respect to the messengers of Samaria. In Zechariah's fruitful vision, he appears among the myrtle trees, distinguished from an inferior interpreting angel accompanying him; now possessing Jehovah's prerogatives, and again indeed praying to Jehovah of hosts, on whose level he stands. Finally, he is acknowledged by the piety of Israel's later age as the Protector of the righteous and the Saviour of his people;<sup>2</sup> and, as the Old Testament canon closes itself, is pronounced to be the great Messenger, who gathers up into himself the covenant process of the past, and who now gives promise of some new and clearer advent which shall better interpret his long activity and light up his mysterious relations to the world and to God.

The fact of there being such an application of divine titles and prerogatives to the Messenger of God as has been pointed out, is not so easily denied. But our immediate deductions therefrom, that they indicate certainly that their subject is the substantial God, a Person of the holy Trinity, have been evaded, sometimes by seeking to bring into play, here, the canon, *Quod quis per alium fecit, ipse fecit*. Under the shadow of this, it is said that the Angel, as the medium of the divine revelation, though himself altogether inferior in his essence, is revered, receives titles, and reliably acts, as Jehovah. It is said that passages like Ex. 4 : 16 and 7 : 1, where Moses is declared to stand in the place of God, and those instances in which the prophets seem to speak from Jehovah's person, are brought forward as plausible ground for such a view. As to the reference in Exodus, these two things may be taken as true, to begin with : 1. That Moses is not expressly named as the Divine Being; and 2. That if he were the one so named, he would be perfectly well known, so that there could be no confusion of persons; and

<sup>1</sup> Isa. 37 : 36; comp. 2 Kings 19 : 35.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. 34 : 7, "The Angel of the Lord encampeth," etc.; 35 : 5, 6; Isa. 63 : 6.

also, just the capacity or extent in which he acted as God, would be plainly defined. In respect to the instances adduced of prophets speaking as Jehovah, it might with some assurance be said, that they do not thus speak, or so pretend; that, where they seem to do so, they are simply uttering the *verbatim* inspiration, or a direct quotation of the words, of God; which, from the nature of the messenger, or other possible indications, patent to the times in which he spoke, and sometimes traceable by us, would occasion no misunderstanding or confusion. If, however, one persists in pressing the instances upon us, and feels not the force of our answer, we can do no better than to translate, and present in a condensed form, the rejoinder of professor Kurtz.<sup>1</sup> Those, he says, who think that the prophets do this without any express authorization, and suppose, accordingly, that a created angel might bear himself in the same way that the Angel of the Lord does, mistake entirely the import of the facts; which are:

1. That an entrance of the prophets without referring their message back to a divine commission, is the most infrequent exception to a general rule; while, in the case of the Angel of Jehovah, it is the common rule without exception. A particular expression of the prophets must be judged of by the general rule. If there occur a change, on their part, to Jehovah's person, at some infrequent occasion, we should ascribe it to a momentary oratorical passion, rather than to a permanent right like that which the rule in the Angel's case argues for him.

2. That in the case of the prophets there can be no ground for misapprehension leading to the deification of the creature, or a confusion of the representative and the represented with each other; while, in the case of the Angel, proceeding as he does from heaven, this would be liable to occur, if he was temporarily assuming Jehovah's prerogatives. He would endanger the first commandment.

3. That, in the instance of the prophet, such an enallage

---

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte des alten Bundes*, Band I. s. 124.

as is supposed, comes to pass only in the height of prophetic ecstasy, when his mind is caught away from his actual mediate position, by the force of his theme; whereas the Angel of the Lord speaks and acts in his high character in such a cool, dispassionate mode, that one cannot doubt his individual authority.

4. That supposing the prophet to forget himself so far as to utter Jehovah's decrees, as if he himself had determined them and would perform them; yet he never suffers himself, nor could suffer himself, to be worshipped and presented with offerings, as if he were God. Would, indeed, Jacob have received homage and offerings on the ground of a seeming assumption of Divine right in Gen. 49:7; or would Elias, from what is said in 1 Kings 17:1? Or would they not rather have done as did Paul at Lystra, when they would do sacrifice to him?

5. That, in fine, the Bible authors themselves, in cool historical narrative, call the Angel by a divine name, with no further qualification; whereas, in no case, does a historian call a prophet thus, without immediate modification.

Hoffmann strangely contends that the use of *ἄγγελος κυρίου* in the New Testament, for example in Matt. 1:20 and Luke 2:9 seq., in application to a confessedly inferior being as compared with God, casts suspicion on the relative position of the Angel of Jehovah. We remark that he does not claim for the Greek phrase the character of a proper name, nor regard the first term as denoting an object of which but one exists. Hence, probably,<sup>1</sup> the translation "*an angel,*" etc., is the proper one in the N. T. Hence the dispensing with the adjunct after the first introduction in a given connection. But we have seen that the Hebrew formula appears, from its frequent repetition in its entire shape, to be a title *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. The cases, therefore, do not belong to the same class. But beyond the philology of the examples, it may further be said: 1. That the business of the angel in the instances alluded to in the N. T. is known to be in the

<sup>1</sup> Winer, *Idioms*, § 18. On the Omission of the Article with Nouns.

service of the Revealer of God; which cannot be said of the Angel of Jehovah, even excluding the evidence of the especial exaltation of the latter; 2. That the descriptions of the record by which we are to ascertain the dignity of one possessing a merely official title, are entirely different in respect to the angel in the New, and the Messenger in the Old, Testament. To one is given great particularity and eminence; to the other, mere generality; and, 3. That, in view of the undeniable distinction of the Angel of the O. T., and his identity so plain in the progress of the ages, be his nature high or low, we should expect to find him, if presented in the novel relations of the N. T., expressly identified with the old representative of God and bearing in evidence the memories of the past in his connection with the people of God; or, if succeeded by one on the same level, we should look for his obvious exclusion. Apart, however, from these several points, the supposition of Hoffmann has plainly no weight at all in view of all the proof of the Angel's standing as already exhibited.

Thus far the personal deity of the Messenger of Jehovah. The course of argument offered does not remove all the darkness that attaches to a question of this kind, before stepping into the clearer light of the new dispensation. It is manifest that the distinctions and revelation of the Godhead are more definitely and gloriously presented in an age that is fitting, according to the plan of Him who bringeth forth everything in its season, and that which is most perfect in the fulness of time. We may not, however, be blind to the force of the phenomena attending a great doctrine as it was breaking its road; nor reject the natural questionings excited purposely in the early stage of events in order for the answering evolution of the future time to be better appreciated by the race.

It remains to glance at those facts and reasonings which assure those who adhere to our preceding view, of the identity of the Angel of Jehovah and the Logos, or higher nature of Christ. Our limits decide for us that these must be drawn in mere outline.

In the first place, taking into the account their divine nature, the fact that both are described as *sent forth on service* from God, is presumptive of their identity. They are alike commissioned by God; and thus far occupy precisely the same relation to him. They each come forth from the bosom of the Father. As in nature, so in the Godhead, action may be supposed to be in accordance with the conservative law of parsimony. Whom coëqual, the Father sends once, the same would renewedly receive his commission. In proof that both stand in the same relation of those who are *sent*, note the meaning of the term *angel*, the expression in Zech. 2:8, 9, and the testimony of John's Gospel (3:34) and his first Epistle (4:9, 14). Christ's being called *servant* in Philippians (2:7), refers to his relation to God in ministering to him, and not to man. So that this term, together with that of *Apostle* in Hebrews (3:1), may well be compared with the name applied to the Revealer of the old dispensation.

And not only is the one and the other put on service, but the kind of service they each do, is sufficiently similar to suggest the inference of their sameness of person. The work of the Angel has been such as to obtain for him, by general consent, the name of *Revealer*. He bore forth, into the sphere of human comprehension, somewhat of the will and attributes of Jehovah. His object appeared largely to be, to present God as a more definite and comprehensible object of service and veneration on the part of the ancient Jews. And this object was secured by exemplification as well as verbal revelation. In this character and for this object, as well as others, was the coming of the Logos. The only-begotten Son declares God. Besides the similarity of their work as regards revealing God and his will, we find a general sameness in it in respect to its subjects and its aim manward. The operation of the Angel had to do with the deliverance and direction of a chosen people of God; and this was involved, though indeed in the end less visibly and more spiritually, less prophetically and more consummately, in the work of Christ.

Again, the manner of each with regard to the people of God, over and above the fact of their leading the people, is strikingly alike. Now the Angel exhibits great severity towards the erring children of Israel. To Joshua he appears as a man of war; at Bochim, he makes the people weep; and in the case of David, he not only appears to him in the attitude of terror, but goes on to destroy the king's subjects, in execution of the divine vengeance. So our adorable Redeemer manifested, on various occasions, the severer traits, and is to come, in the final day, as a destroying angel, to all the wicked. Again, the Angel of Jehovah is characterized as peculiarly tender and protective; and so he acts. How benign his visit to Gideon! How Jacob recounts his goodness at the benediction of Joseph's sons! How touchingly beautiful the signaling of his benevolence, in the poetry of David :

Encampeth the Angel of Jehovah  
Around his pious ones;  
And he delivereth them.<sup>1</sup>

The prophet also says, in relation to the history of Israel : "In all their affliction he was afflicted; and the Angel of his presence saved them. In his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and carried them all the days of old" (Isa. 63 : 9). As the house of David to David, so was the Angel of the Lord a protection to the feeble and to those who stumble and fall. The counterpart of all this, in the Son of God, is too plain to require stating at this point.

Passing by the incidental proof to be gained from the comparison of the Angel to the Son of God and Son of Man, in the book of Daniel, we notice next that Michael the Archangel, who appears to be identical with Prince Emmanuel, is also shown to be, undoubtedly, the same as the Angel of Jehovah; and if so, the relation of the two latter is at once obvious. It is maintained by Hengstenberg, very fairly, that Michael, "that great Prince," is identical with the pre-existent Logos, because his name, signifying *who is like God*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ps. 34 : 8 (Heb.).

suggests this; because his appearance, as Daniel says, is like that of the Son of Man: and because his attitude, as the chief combatant of Satan, is like that of Christ.<sup>1</sup> To us, such a view seems entirely plausible of him —

“ Celestial, whether among the thrones, or named  
Of them the highest, for such of shape may seem  
Prince above princes.”—*Par. Lost*, xi. 296–8.

But with at least as much probability is Michael identified with the Angel of Jehovah. For, in the first place, the appositional appellation of *Archangel* appears to be germane with the eminent designation of the Messenger, in its entire shape. Secondly, the warlike office of both as leaders of the armies of heaven, is suggestive of their sameness. The Angel (Josh. 5 : 14) is represented as the Captain, or Prince, of the Lord's host, and presents the drawn sword. The Archangel bears also the name of Prince, and bears on the celestial war against the kingdom of Satan. One gets the impression, in reading the book of Daniel,<sup>2</sup> that he regards Michael as the Angel deliverer of Israel. Finally, eminent interpreters understand the ninth verse of Jude to recall the scene in the vision of the prophecy of Zechariah (3 : 1 sq.); and thus, on the ground of Jude's testimony, assert the oneness of the Angel and Michael. And hence the former, through the latter name, is seen to be attached to the higher nature of Christ.

Lastly, writers in the New Testament affirm, most strongly, the identity of the Logos and the Angel, by attributing acts, in a special way, to Christ, which the Old Testament writers, with as much particularity, have predicated of the Messenger of Jehovah. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers the shaking of Sinai, when the law was given, to Christ; while, as has been shown, it was, before, properly attributed to the Angel of God. Paul asserts<sup>3</sup> that the sup-

<sup>1</sup> Compare 1 John 3 : 8 with Rev. 12 : 7.

<sup>2</sup> See 12 : 1 seq., and before.

<sup>3</sup> Cor. 10 : 4. Prof. Hodge says: “ This passage distinctly asserts not only the preëxistence of our Lord, but also that he was the Jehovah of the Old Testament ” (on First Corinthians, p. 175). The latter clause here appears much too strong; for reasons heretofore adduced. See remarks above on Yahveh Christ.

plying Source, on the exodus of the Israelites, was Christ; whereas the Angel was the accompanying Provider in the record of Moses. It is said in Hebrews (11 : 26) that Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; while it is the Angel on whose account he acts, and whom he particularly obeys, in Exodus. Once more : Luke (1 : 15—17) tells us that John goes before the Lord Christ, in fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi; and Malachi says that it is the Messenger of the Covenant before whom the new Elias goes.

Such, then, are the Scriptural grounds for believing that our Saviour, in his higher nature, is one and the same with the substantial Theophany, which, under a peculiar title, we considered at length in the former division of our discussion.

We have now canvassed our subject in the various bearings purposed at the commencement; and we close the lengthened review with deepened convictions of our Redeemer's Deity, and with a brighter sense of his preëxistent relation to the people of God. The many interesting memories of the ancient days which cluster around his existence, the hallowed dignity which attaches to his dimmest manifestation, even in the remotest past, and above all, the abundance of his activity in deeds of grace and judgment from the earliest time, come unitedly to view, leaving an impression of grateful admiration and adding important interest to a Being whose evolving glories we can never exhaust. It is pleasing to know that God, who shadowed forth the pathway of his later Messianic people by the outward history of a nation especially related to himself, did also, by early manifestations of the Divine One, mysteriously limited to perceptible shape, prefigure the condition of the coming Christ; thus intimating the possibility, as well as promising the reality, of God manifest in the flesh.