
A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

'IT IS HIS ANGEL.'

THERE are sundry passages in the Old Testament and in the New where the word *angel* seems to be used in a sense decidedly different from that which we usually assign to it. An angel is in Scripture an entirely heavenly being, albeit manifested to men in a human form as God's 'messenger' to them. In the passages I propose to examine he is rather a *representative* of men, dwelling in the heavenly world. The common term 'guardian angel' tends to bridge the gulf that lies between these two classes of spirits. If I may state my conclusion first and present the evidence later, I should describe the 'representative angels' as spiritual counterparts of human individuals or communities, dwelling in heaven, but subject to changes depending on the good or evil behaviour of their complementary beings on earth. I will first bring forward the Biblical passages in question and interpret them on this assumption, and then advance some suggestions as to the origin of this belief, which I hope to show is closely connected with a strongly developed tenet of Zoroastrianism.

The only clear Old Testament passages are found at the end of the Book of Daniel: see Driver's note on x 13. Here the term *prince* (שַׂר) is exclusively used. These 'princes' represent Persia, Greece, and other nations. They are certainly not 'messengers of Jehovah,' for we find the 'prince of Persia' actually restraining for three weeks the messenger sent to Daniel, and it is only the intervention of a mightier 'prince' which enables the messenger to pursue his journey. It would be natural to infer that these princes were simply the old gods of the nations, with their status adapted to the later monotheism. Such a view would suit Ben-Sira excellently (xvii 17, where ἡγούμενον presumably represents שַׂר, as it does in eleven Old Testament passages[1],

[1] But not in Daniel *l. c.*, where LXX has στρατηγός, Theodot. ἄρχων.

according to Hatch and Redpath). But for Daniel there is an objection which seems absolutely fatal, in that Israel's prince is not Jehovah but Michael. It is natural to infer that Ben-Sira represents the native Jewish standpoint, while Daniel shows the influence of a foreign idea. If we suppose that this idea involves the existence of counterparts or impersonations of the nations in the supersensual world, we are free to regard 'El Triumphant' (Michael, 'who is like El?') as the heavenly 'double' of Israel, 'El strives (?),' on earth. In Weber's *Jüdische Theologie*[2], pp. 107 f, there are cited Talmudic passages showing the solidarity of each nation with its heavenly prince[1]. Before God punishes a nation He humbles its angel, whom He will at the last judge before He judges the nation. That the conception of guardianship was not by any means excluded, either in Daniel or in the Talmud, shows that the foreign element was thoroughly assimilated; it is not till New Testament times that we find angels purely representative.

Whether there is anything else in the Old Testament which may be set with these passages in Daniel and Ben-Sira is very hard to say. Deut. xxxii 8 would be closely parallel to the latter if the LXX reading were accepted. Ps. lxxxii can be interpreted as addressed to representative angels, if the postulate of a decidedly late date be granted; cf. Ps. lviii 1, if אֵלִים be read. The only really probable addition to be made is Isa. xxiv 21 ff (so Delitzsch, Cheyne, &c.). As Prof. Bevan observes, 'the fact that in Dan. x this belief is rather presupposed than definitely stated shows that the author is here dealing with a conception already familiar to his readers.'

The inclusion of these 'ideas'—to use the obvious Platonic phraseology—under the same name as the angels properly so called, is first found in the New Testament. It is immediately manifest that the conception I have described exactly fits what we desiderate for the 'angels of the seven churches' in the Apocalypse. At the very outset (i 20) they are identified with the 'seven stars' seen in the glorified Redeemer's hand; and, as we shall see later, there is a close connexion between these 'angels' and the stars in popular creeds of Asia. In the messages to the Seven Churches the being addressed is an 'angel' who

[1] See also Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum*, i 814 f (cited by Delitzsch).

concentrates into his own personality the virtues and the sins of the community he represents. He is commanded to repent, to be faithful unto death, to be watchful, and so on. In two passages (ii 10, iii 11) he is promised as a reward for faithfulness 'the crown' —that is the στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς of the Agraphon preserved in James i 12. But the penalty for unfaithfulness falls mostly on the earthly partner of his being. The Lord will 'come[1]' in displeasure at him, and move his λυχνία out of its place; but the λυχνία is the church, of which the star is the angel. If he does not repent of harbouring the Nicolaitans, the Lord will 'come'— —again ἔρχομαί σοι—'and make war against *them*.' ἥξω ἐπὶ κλέπτης . . . ἐπὶ σέ is the only threat directed against the angel of the all but dead church at Sardis. In the last letter we have 'I will spew thee out of my mouth'; but even this is followed by renewed offers of Divine grace which seem to emphasise the extreme unwillingness to conceive of the 'angel' as capable of final ruin, whatever might happen to his 'lampstand' on earth. The connexion of this with the general doctrine we shall see later (p. 521).

The 'angels' of individuals appear twice in the New Testament. In Acts xii 15 Peter's angel is imagined to have spoken to the girl Rhoda who answers the door. We cannot deduce much from this, except that the incredulous Christians, if they meant Peter's ghost, must have thought of a 'phantasm of the living,' for there is no suggestion that they supposed he was dead without their having heard of it. The conditions are best satisfied with the assumption that they imagined Peter's angel or heavenly counterpart to have taken his shape and appeared as his 'double.' Incomparably more important, of course, is the saying of our Lord, reported in Matt. xviii 10, in which it seems to me clear that He meant to set His seal upon the doctrine now under consideration. That doctrine is not, however, the existence of '*guardian* angels.' The importance of the *debita pueris reverentia* is not especially inculcated by the statement that angels charged with their care are always near the Throne; we should rather expect to find them 'encamping around' their charges. Substitute the idea of the heavenly counterpart[2], and we get at

[1] ii 5 ἔρχομαί σοι, not πρός σε: it is *dativus incommodi*.

[2] Mr. Murray supplies me with an interesting quotation from F. D. Maurice

once a profound reason for their presence nearest to the Father. They represent *those who have not yet learned to sin*, despite the potentialities which time will develop. The 'angels of the little ones' are nearest to God for the same reason as their earthly counterparts are typical members of the kingdom of heaven. As sin asserts its power over the child, its angel must correspondingly lose its privilege, to be regained only when stern conflict has for ever slain the primal enemy. It was not mere poetry when Wordsworth sang of the heaven that 'lies around us in our infancy,' and how the 'vision splendid' fades with the advance of life—to have its second rising, we may thankfully add, in the dawn of what shall never be a 'common day.'

There do not seem to be other Biblical passages making clear reference to this kind of 'angel.' It seems just possible that an explanation of 1 Cor. xi 10 may be deduced from the conception. In the world where all things are done *κατὰ τάξιν*, the 'angels' of the women keep their proper place relative to those of the men: wherefore let their earthly counterparts likewise bow to authority and wear its sign on their heads. This explanation is at least as simple as some that have been offered! In vi 3, combined with Matt. xiv 28, we may plausibly see God's servants pronouncing His judgements on 'angels' of communities or individuals, just as the Prophets pronounced them on Ephraim or Judah of old. Stade (*Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, ii 241) finds *guardian* angels of individuals in Job v 1, xxxiii 23, the latter passage, however, being obscure. It may be questioned whether these passages go much beyond the ordinary conception of ministering spirits; obviously they have nothing in common with the representative angels with which we are here concerned. As we have seen, even in Daniel the representative angels are not free from guardian functions; and it is not till the New Testament period that the conception is found quite unmixed, and there only in a few passages. Indeed the case for treating the

(*Unity of the N. T.*, vol. i p. 183): 'The little child, the humblest human creature, was dear to His Father in heaven. He did not look upon it merely as a fallen corrupted thing. Its Angel, its pure original type, that which it was created to be, was ever present with Him, was ever looking up into His face.' Maurice is, however, interpreting Scripture more from Plato than on the lines developed here: neither the 'angels of the churches' nor the Zoroastrian conception to be described later have anything 'ideal' about them.

phenomenon as essentially due to foreign influence is greatly strengthened by the evidence which shows how little hold the conception had in Judaism, and how easily it glided into the thoroughly native idea of 'ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation.'

I am not competent to essay any systematic effort to trace this doctrine in post-apostolic Christianity. I may, however, quote some suggestions which were made by members of the Cambridge Theological Society when I read this paper in its original form. Dr. J. P. Arendzen compared a passage in the 'Testament of the Lord,' which stands thus in Rahmani's translation:—'Quae enim [*sc.* uiduae] probe ministrauerint, ab archangelis glorificabuntur. quae uero sunt intemperantes, loquaces [*etc.*], simulacra ipsarum animarum, quae stant coram Patre luminis, peribunt et adducentur ad habitandas tenebras. cum enim opera ipsarum, quae quidem uisibilia sunt, ad excelsum ascendent, facile ipsas impellent in abyssum, ut post mutationem et interitum huius mundi ipsa simulacra earundem animarum surgant in testimonium contra ipsas, impediantque illas, quominus sursum adspiciant. *cuiusuis enim animae simulacrum seu typus coram Deo ante constitutionem mundi stat*' (p. 97). The existence of these archetypal souls with God before the beginning of the creation is a cardinal feature of the Zoroastrian doctrine which will be presently described. Mr. Glover mentioned a passage in the Latin *Visio Pauli*[1], where angels inhabiting human beings go up to heaven to report their good and bad deeds to God; note also that there are angels of communities—'angelus uniuscuiusque populi et uniuscuiusque uiri et mulieris, qui protegunt et conseruant eos.' These are, however, *guardian* angels, and in any case the caution noted lower (p. 525, note) must apply. A certain similarity was noticed by Professor Chase between the πλήρωμα and κένωμα of the Valentinian system and the heavenly and earthly counterparts here under discussion; we may presume Eastern as well as Platonic elements in this Gnosis. Neoplatonic parallels were suggested by Mr. Glover, in the divinity who, according to Porphyry, visited Plotinus[2]; and by Mr. Hart,

[1] M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, i p. 13.

[2] *Vita*, ch. 10: τοῦ συνόντος αὐτῷ οἰκείου δαίμονος καλουμένου. *Ib.* ἔστι γοῦν αὐτῷ . . . καὶ βιβλίον γραφὲν περὶ τοῦ εἰληχότος ἡμᾶς δαίμονος. Cf. Augustine *C. D.* x 9.

in Iamblichus *De Mysteriis*. The closest parallel adduced was the 'Heavenly Robe' in the *Hymn of the Soul*. Mr. Burkitt drew attention to line 91 in Prof. Bevan's edition, which in his own paraphrase runs:

> 'I heard it [the Robe] cry aloud to them that carried it:
> "There is the Paladin, for whom they reared me up!
> Have I not known that with his toils my stature grew?"'

The Robe has been previously described as the image of the soul, which is finally to be united to it. This is pure Parsism: cf. the passage from Darmesteter quoted below, p. 522 note. We may also compare the exquisite picture in *Yasht* xxii of the good man's Conscience coming to meet his soul after death, embodied as a fair maiden, whose beauty has been growing with every one of his good thoughts, words and deeds. But there is indeed in the *Hymn* at least as much Parsism as Christianity. In expressing thus my own first impression on reading the Hymn I am glad to find myself in agreement with the latest writer on the relations of Judaism and Parsism, E. Böklen, in his careful study of the eschatology of the two religions[1]. There is in fact the same ambiguity as in the case of Mani, whose heresy is variously claimed as Christianity tainted with Parsism, as Parsism with a strain of Christianity, and as Chaldaeism with elements drawn from both. It is interesting to notice that Syriac literature has given us our two best parallels to the Parsi conception. How much more Parsism lies buried in Syrian Christianity the experts in this field might with great advantage inquire.

Before passing on, I should like to mention a remarkable appearance of the 'representative angel' in a region lying rather aside from the path of the specialist in patristics. In the *Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei*, vol. iii, there are catalogued about forty Christian tombs from Thera with the inscription ἄγγελος τοῦ δεῖνος. Once or twice the formula has ἀγγέλου, but (as Professor Ramsay notes in a letter to me) never ἀγγέλῳ, in marked contrast to the similar-seeming *dis manibus sacrum*. In one inscription (946) we have ἄγγελος Καλλινόης καὶ Εὐφραντικῆς. No. 1238, the only one

The daemon in question would answer to the Greek conception rather than the Persian.

[1] *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1902), pp. 46 f., 64.

outside Thera, has the following legend:—καὶ ἐπὶ γέμι τὸ θηείων τοῦτο, ἐνορκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν ὧδε ἐφεστῶτα ἄνγελον μή τίς ποτε τολμήσῃ ἐνθάδε τινὰ καταθέσθε. This suggests that the angel was supposed to be hovering over the tomb, so that we translate the Theraean formula, 'Here is the angel of so-and-so.' In other words we have a veneer of Christianity overlying the immemorial belief of the Pelasgian race, that the soul of the dead man remained in or near the tomb which was his home: see Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece* i pp. 510 f.

We proceed to ask how this belief arose within Judaism. The essence of it is, as I have said, that the 'angel' is not the *guardian* but the *representative*, the 'double' of the person with whom he is associated. If I am right in my exegesis, it is not easy to attach this idea naturally to the ordinary Old Testament conception of angels. It is not enough to call in Talmudic passages which show that angels, like Homeric gods, sometimes assumed the form of certain human beings: for examples see J. Lightfoot on Acts xii 15. The mere assumption of a man's form and likeness may explain that passage fairly, but it does not help Matt. xviii 10, and still less does it throw light on the 'Angels of the Churches,' which have to be (in Professor Gwatkin's words) '*personifications* of their Churches.' It seems reasonable to ask whether foreign influence will account for the rise of this doctrine, and, if so, whence that influence came.

The grounds on which I fix upon Parsism as the influence in question cannot be exhaustively discussed within the limits of this paper. Perhaps I may refer to the article *Zoroastrianism* in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, in which I have discussed in detail the alleged Parsic traits in Jewish angelology, demonology and the doctrine of the Resurrection. That the Zoroastrian *Fravashis* answer exactly to what we desiderate as the original hint for these representative angels will be easily shown. That they actually supplied the hint is not so easy to prove; but we may fairly call in as evidence the coincident fact that the latest Jewish developments of doctrine, as seen in the New Testament, are remarkably parallel with the doctrines of Parsism. We must probably admit that the ultimate similarity was largely reached by different roads. But the Jews of the last centuries B.C. undeniably knew that the

Persians, to whom they owed their deliverance from Babylon and the protection of their infant community after the Return, believed in the resurrection and in hierarchies of angels and spirits. It seems fair to conclude that this knowledge may well have afforded a stimulus to Jewish thinkers, prompting them to recognise such beliefs as latent in the first principles of Judaism.

The Avestan title of the angels under discussion is nearly always *ašaonam fravašayō*, 'fravashis of the pious.' There is no trace of fravashis of the wicked; and only in one late writing is there an allusion to the fate of the fravashi when a good man fell into sin. We gather that it fled away to Ahura Mazda, and practically ceased to be. The attributes of the fravashis are not very easy to define consistently: it would seem that the concept includes elements from different sources. Many of their features are those of *manes*, 'the good folks,' who from the tenth to the twentieth of March revisit the earth and are feasted by the living. It is easy to recognise here the *Pitáras*, 'fathers,' of the Rigveda. The conception is one found largely among Indogermanic peoples; but while the dependence of the dead upon the living, which leaves a bare trace behind in the Feast of the Dead, is a common idea, the Iranians have emphasised much more considerably the manifold beneficence of these spirits on earth. We are told that they were once located in heaven, but came down eager to fight against the powers of evil and promote the ultimate triumph of Ahura Mazda. Moreover we find that they belong not only to the dead but to the living and to those who are not yet born. Ahura Mazda himself has his fravashi[1]; and in a passage of the long Avestan hymn especially addressed to the (*Yasht* xiii 21 f) we find probably fravashis of communities[2]. Clearly therefore

[1] Professor Barnes remarked on the apparent identification of Jehovah and His angel, in Judges vi 11–24, and other passages. It is certainly tempting to connect this with the fact that Ahura has his *fravashi*, or double; but it is very hard to see how there could be a historical connexion so early. I am inclined to agree rather with those who find Parsi influence only in the *later* Jewish angelology. The native Hebrew doctrine would give no names to angels and no individuality, regarding them merely as manifestations of Jehovah. The Jews preserved the tradition that 'the names of the angels came up with them from Babylon,' that is from the exile generally.

[2] 'We worship the *fravashis* of house and family and clan and township and high-priests [lit. 'highest Zarathushtras'—the prophet's name in a superlative form], past, present, and future, who are pious.' The words are virtually repeated in *Yasna*, xxvi 1 and xvii 18. In the last passage, cf. Mills in *S. B. E.*, xxxi 259,

they are not only *manes*, and only a part of their attributes can be explained from such an origin. Here comes in therefore the analysis of the 'Rabbis' of later Parsism, who define man as made of body, life, soul, form, and fravashi[1]; the soul at death becomes immortal by union with the fravashi, which is described as the part of man which is in the presence of Ahura. The fravashi is therefore not a guardian spirit, something detached from man and watching over him. It is an inseparable part of him, the part which is hidden with God. The origin of this conception may well be entirely independent of the belief in the spirits of ancestors. Nothing seems clearer in the history of Zoroastrianism than the fact that we have to recognize three distinct strata, due respectively to (1) the primitive Iranian nature-worship, (2) the reform of Zoroaster, (3) the modification of this reformed, but partially relapsed, Iranian religion by the Magi. The general description of this Magian counter-reformation would be that they introduced ritual into a religion which before them had hardly any at all. To them we should probably ascribe the mechanical division of actions and creatures between the Good Spirit and the Evil, the endless ceremonies by which demons are exorcised, the extravagant sanctity assigned to earth, water, and especially fire, the magical efficacy of prayer-formulae punctually repeated in a dead language. Antiquity moreover expressly connected with them two characteristic practices, one the most obvious feature of Parsi settlements to-day, the other vehemently repudiated by Parsis for many centuries, and successfully shown

whose translation agrees with mine. Darmesteter differs, but his rendering seems rather forced.

[1] The whole passage is thus translated by Darmesteter (*Le Zend-Avesta*, ii 500): 'Auhrmazd a composé l'homme de cinq éléments: le corps, la vie, l'âme, la forme, et le *fróhar* [fravashi]. Le corps est la partie matérielle. La vie est l'élément lié au vent ... L'âme est ce qui, dans le corps, avec le secours des sens, entend, voit, parle et connaît. La forme (litt. "le miroir," "l'image") est ce qui est dans la sphère du soleil. Le fróhar est ce qui est devant le Seigneur Auhrmazd. Ces éléments ont été créés de telle nature que quand sous l'action du démon l'homme meurt, le corps retourne à la terre, la vie au vent, la forme au soleil, et l'âme se lie au fróhar, de sort qu'ils ne peuvent faire périr l'âme.' Darmesteter observes, 'Autrement dit, le fróhar est l'élément divin de la personne humaine, et il est le seul élément immortel de nature puisque l'âme n'échappe à la mort que par son union au fróhar.' The return of the 'image' to the sun seems to account for the shadowless character of the resurrection body (Theopompus *ap.* Plutarch *Isis et Osiris*, ch. 47). For ideas connected with shadows see Frazer, *Golden Bough*[2], i 290 f.

to be absent from the Avesta, viz. (1) the exposure of the dead on 'Towers of Silence' to be devoured by vultures, (2) the supreme religious merit of incestuous marriages. There is not much else that we can gather about the Magi, apart from the religion with which they became so completely identified. We know from Herodotus that they were one of the five tribes of the Medes, from him and the Behistan Inscription that under Gaumata the pseudo-Smerdis they made a bold bid for political power, and that the feast of the Μαγοφόνια was instituted to commemorate their defeat. In Jer. xxxix 3, 13 we have the title Rab-Mag, apparently denoting the official head of a sacred caste at Babylon. Another pre-exilic reference to them must be traced in Ezek. viii 16 f. Parsi priests may be seen to-day adoring the sun, with the branch held to their face—the *barsom*, or 'bundle of fine tamarisk boughs,' as Strabo calls it. The 'abomination' which Ezekiel beheld in the Temple was presumably a rite of Magianism pure and simple, before the conflation of Magianism and Zoroastrianism proper, which seems to have been completed in the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon, early in the fourth century B.C. Finally, we have the considerable ancient testimony connecting the Magi with astrology and with magic, both practices absent from the Avesta, and the latter definitely banned.

This scanty evidence does not give us very decisive help in recognising Magian elements when we meet them in Parsism or elsewhere. But, such as it is, it justifies our making the Magi stand sponsors for the treatment of the fravashi as an immortal part of man's nature, dwelling in heaven, and sharing all the changes of its mortal counterpart on earth. With this goes the allotting of a fravashi to a community, and even to the Supreme Being. I would even conjecture that the purely Magian conception originally assigned a fravashi to a bad man: the restriction to the good clearly is a trait derived from the other conception, in which the fravashis are the *Manes*, and it only introduces confusion into the psychological idea just described. Now during the Exile Hebrews at Babylon and 'in the cities of the Medes' were brought into close contact with the Magi. There they picked up the Median folk-tale—especially permeated with Magianism, as I have tried elsewhere to show[1]—which one of them adapted for

[1] See *Expos. Times*, March, 1900; Hastings, *D. B.*, 'Zoroastrianism,' § 4.

purposes of edification in the romance *Tobit*. There, on my theory, they learnt the Magian notion of representative spirits in heaven, subject to moral development or degeneration with the individual or community on earth to which they belong. There too, from Magians who were not careful to square their doctrines with the Avesta, they may have learnt to identify these representative spirits with the stars. And from the Jews at the same time these Magi may have learnt enough of their national hopes to account for the event of Matt. ii, where the appearance of a brilliant new star is interpreted by these skilled ὀνειροπόλοι as the fravashi of a king new-born in Judaea. I must only briefly indicate the bearing of what I have said upon this event. Classical testimony is decisive as to the astrology of the Magi, and the traces (very scanty, I admit) in Parsi literature of an identification of the fravashis with stars are so much in keeping with what we know of their doctrines that we are fairly justified in regarding it as a genuine Magian belief, whether or no it was ever a part of Parsi orthodoxy. In that case we can see what would happen if a brilliant new star suddenly appeared [1], like that which flashed out in Perseus in February 1901. It would be the fravashi of a great man just born. Why of a *King of the Jews* does not appear; but, since we know that a dream guided them before their return, it is not an extravagant supposition that a dream prompted their first interpretation of the phenomenon to which their astrological study directed their attention. It might be added that we are not obliged to restrict ourselves to phenomena which happen to have been recorded. Careful watchers of the skies like these Magi would recognise the appearance of a star like Nova Persei, just reaching the first magnitude, but it is highly doubtful whether such a phenomenon would be noticed at all by ordinary people: scores of temporary stars as bright as that may have escaped observation in the last nineteen centuries.

The conception of 'representative angels' would almost inevitably glide into conceptions closely akin to it. On the one side there is the notion of a 'double,' the heavenly counterpart visualised on earth [2]. On the other side there is the idea of

[1] A conjunction of planets will not do, for the planets were malign in what was presumably the Magian system: their retaining the names of angels shows that the pure Persian creed had not so regarded them.

[2] On these 'doubles' see Frazer, *Golden Bough*[3], i 249.

a 'guardian' angel, which would be naturally developed in a Jewish atmosphere; the already noted syncretism in the Parsi idea of the fravashi prepares the way for it. The part played by Raphael in *Tobit* does not exclusively come under either of these heads. In the Median folk-tale already alluded to, the young man's travelling companion must have been the 'Grateful Dead Man,' who takes the same part in a story found over a very wide area, from Hans Andersen to Kashmir. The Jew who re-wrote the story has substituted an angel, who is at once the 'double' of the dead man buried by Tobit, and a ministering angel sent to help Tobit's son because of his piety.

Before treating as provisionally proved this indebtedness of Judaism to Magianism, I ought to deal with the counterclaim on behalf of the Greek δαίμων or the Roman *Genius*, usually made by commentators on our text from the *Acts*. Horace (*Epp.* ii. 2. 187–9) has a well-known picture of the Genius, man's comrade who rules his natal star, lives and dies with him, and shines or lowers in countenance as the man does well or ill. Orelli's note on this passage gives us an excellent collection of classical illustrations, and there is a long and detailed account of the Genius in the third-century writer Censorinus, *de Die Natali*, chs. ii, iii. One sentence from this writer will go far to decide the question we are asking now:—'Genius est deus, cuius in tutela ut quisque natus est uiuit.' True, he is defined by Varro as a man's 'animus rationalis,' but that does not suffice to contradict the clear evidence that the Genius is a *guardian* deity [1]. When we add that he can hardly have been known in Palestine early enough for the purpose, even if Roman religious ideas had been as welcome there as they were unwelcome, we have presumably disposed of his claim. Greek ideas had a fairer field, but the δαίμων has even less in common with the 'representative

[1] It is remarkable how great the general similarity is between the Genius and the Fravashi. The Genius, with his female counterpart the Juno, is the special patron of birth, a function which markedly belongs to the fravashis. Both seem to combine the ideas of an inborn part of the individual and a power which watches over him. And both from belonging to individuals acquire relations to communities, the Genius very markedly. See Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (in Iwan v. Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, v 4), pp. 154 ff. The close similarity would have to be taken into account whenever the source of a late Christian conception is being sought: in such cases, development from N. T. doctrine ought not to be assumed as a matter of course.

angel.' Take Dion Chrysostom's definition, 'that which dominates a man, in accordance with which he lives,' or again 'something outside, which rules the man and is lord of him.' It is true that, like the fravashi, the δαίμων is ἀγαθός; but we may fairly conclude that like the Genius he is ultimately an ancestral spirit taking a kindly interest in a descendant who is his ward.

If I have not already travelled too far, I should like to conclude with a conjecture as to the source of this Magian fravashi. The idea seems to me essentially identical with that of the External Soul, expounded very fully by Dr. J. G. Frazer in the *Golden Bough*[2], iii 351–446[1]. It is shown there that primitive peoples in various parts of the world imagine the soul or life of a human being to reside somewhere outside him[2]. Sometimes it is no further away than his hair, but in a great many cases it lives in some distant object—animal, plant, or inanimate thing—which must be destroyed before the man's life can be taken. In a large class of folk-tales embodying this belief, the life of a giant or a witch is safely stored in some absolutely inaccessible place, and the hero's triumph lies in his finding and destroying it, generally by the help of friendly animals. It is unnecessary to say that the Magian fravashi is a conception immeasurably loftier than this naïve savage notion—though if we are inclined to despise the latter too heartily, it is well to remember that our German and Keltic ancestors must have held it in all good faith centuries after the Magi had risen to their development of this primitive germ. It seems just the kind of idea which the speculative East would naturally evolve out of such a primitive inheritance. If this be so, the theory of the present paper becomes a study in religious evolution, as applied to one corner of a field which may well show many similar examples[3]. It

[1] I am very glad to have Dr. Frazer's approval in this suggestion.

[2] That something like this idea survived among the Israelites of the early monarchy, at least to such an extent as to suggest a figure of speech, may be inferred from 1 Sam. xxv 29, to which Prof. Bevan called my attention. David's life, says Abigail, is kept safe with Jehovah in the 'bundle of life,' as a householder makes up a bundle of the things he most wishes preserved: the lives of his enemies He will 'sling away.' Another Biblical example of the separate soul may be seen in the magical ceremonies with which the prophetesses denounced by Ezekiel (xiii 17 ff) 'hunt souls' (Robertson Smith *ap.* Frazer *G. B.*[2] i 285 n).

[3] I have endeavoured to trace some further examples in an article in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1902.

appears that a belief which actually has the seal of the Lord Christ's approval had not been a special revelation to Israel, but was derived originally from the Magi, the very people whose representatives, generations later, were destined to offer the first tribute of the Gentile world before the infant Son of Man. And they in their turn developed the doctrine, if we are right, from the child's idea current among savage ancestors. Those who have read, however slightly, in the works of modern scholars who are reducing to scientific form the tangled tale of primitive custom and superstition, will perhaps be ready to accept this as one of the paths by which God brought to men the knowledge which is life. We have long ceased to be afraid of evolution in the physical world; and if the Creator thus worked there, why not in the moral and spiritual world as well? Among the follies, the superstitions, the barbarities of man in his childhood, a childhood blasted by the shadow of sin, we see the silver thread of a Divine purpose which issues at last in the Redemption. We see how various elements of truth came to the nations, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, till Truth became incarnate to correlate them all, 'to bring together every joint and member, and mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection.' And when that work is complete, 'in that day shall Jehovah be one, and His revelation one.'

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.