

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

Nor is Dr. Salmond quite satisfied with Professor Charles's new book. On the doctrine of a future state Dr. Salmond speaks with the authority of special and prolonged study. Professor Charles, he thinks, has not yet studied the subject long enough. His special subject is the pseudo-epigraphic literature of Judaism. 'In the present volume he ventures far beyond the province which is most familiar to him.' He has produced not a little that is enlightening and suggestive, especially has he placed a number of things in new relations. But—'the critical faculty would be all the better of a little more restraint. Conclusions drawn from critical positions of so hypothetical a kind, and so provisional a value with regard to the rise, order, and development of religious ideas, have to be taken with a very strong *caveat*.'

Dr. Salmond blames Professor Charles for not knowing that other scholars have followed the historical method in studying the doctrines of the Old Testament and the New. 'He speaks as if "very few" scholars have seen it to be necessary to study a passage in anything but its "textual context," and as if he were himself the opener of new paths in the respect he pays to the historical context. This sounds strange; no recognised scholar thinks of adopting any other methods

surely than those of historical exegesis and historical criticism.'

And especially he blames him that, when he does follow the new paths which he believes he has opened, he follows them to disastrous exegetical and critical results. Passages, especially in the New Testament, that do not fit into the right order of doctrinal development, must go. Christ did not teach a resurrection of the unrighteous as well as the righteous. If Luke 20<sup>27-40</sup> says He did, that passage is an interpolation. St. John taught only a 'spiritual' doctrine of the resurrection. If Jn 5<sup>28, 29</sup> speak against that, Jn 5<sup>28, 29</sup> must go, along with all the passages which use the words 'at the last day' in this sense. 'There remains St. Paul, and there is much in his epistles that is difficult to fit in with all this. But his doctrine is inconsistent. His eschatology passed through no less than four stages, and in the last of these it was very different from what it was when he began to write. His ideas were at first rude and Judaic, but at last they became spiritual. He thought, no doubt, that when he was writing his Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians he was rightly interpreting Christ's mind. But in this he was mistaken. There are modern theologians by the round dozen who know far better than he.'

## The Apocalyptic Origin of the Expression 'Son of Man.'

BY PROFESSOR FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., D.D., MUNICH.

In a very noteworthy article in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (Jahrg. xlii. = Neue Folge, Jahrg. vii. pp. 581-611), October 1899, under the title 'Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen,' Professor Hermann Gunkel of Berlin, the well-known author of *Weltschöpfung und Chaos*, has, *inter alia*, a detailed discussion of the Messianic title *bar-*

*nāshā* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 'Son of Man,' or rather, more correctly, 'the Man' κατ. ἐξ.). Gunkel rightly insists, against Wellhausen, that this expression is not meant to designate Jesus as the ideal man (say in opposition to the other expression 'Son of God'), but that it is one of the technical apocalyptic terms, which are still in many ways obscure to us, and that *it uniformly*

means the Messiah, and that consequently the passages in question need not, with Wellhausen, be denied to Jesus. Apocalyptic, whose beginnings are as yet so far from clear, had, in any case prior to Dn 7, terms for the Messiah such as 'one like a man,' 'one with the form or the appearance of a man.' When, accordingly, the apocalyptic writers spoke further of this heavenly figure, they naturally said quite briefly, 'the Man' (Aram. *bar-nāshā*), because the supra-earthly figure of that 'Man' was in the mind of every one acquainted with the subject. Gunkel closes the discussion thus—

'What may have been the nature of this tradition (which underlies also Dn 7)? This question cannot be discussed in this place. The conclusion, at all events, is assured that a tradition is present here, whether *we moderns* are acquainted with it or not. I may point out simply that elsewhere also speculations about "the heavenly Man," ("the first Man," and "the last Man"), who is identified with Christ, play a rôle in Christian and extra-Christian systems. "The Man" might be a mysterious abbreviation for "the Man of God," "the Man of heaven," "the first Man," just as "the end," "the affliction," "the sufferings," "the lamb" are abbreviations for "the end of the world," "the last affliction," "the sufferings of the Messiah," "the lamb of God." Perhaps it should also be taken into account that the Antichrist is called "the man of sin." As the "kingdom of God" and the "kingdom of sin" are opposed to one another, the same relation might hold between "the Man of God" and "the man of sin" (Christ and Antichrist). I break off here, in the hope that others will pursue the subject.'

Now, just as *Ar-magedon* is the Babylonian mountain of the world, under which *Arallu*, or the lower-world, lay (*i.e.* we have here some, probably Aramæan, further development by popular etymology of *har mō'ēd* of Is 14<sup>13</sup>), and as the mysterious number three and a half (Rev 12 and in Dn) goes back, as I can now prove,<sup>1</sup> to the Babylonian mythology, we may with equal right search the ancient treasures of the Chaldæan wisdom for the origin of the figurative expression

<sup>1</sup> These three and a half years are, according to Dn, sometimes 1150 days (nearly = three years, three months), sometimes 1290 days (= three years, seven months), and again 1335 days (= three years, eight and a half months); the 1260 days (= three and a half years) of Rev 11<sup>3</sup> and 12<sup>6</sup> are evidently the average of these other numbers. That the 1150 days come nearest to the original, is proved by the conclusion of the second Babylonian recension of the Tiamat conflict, where it is expressly said, 'Three years, three months flowed the dragon's blood.' That is to say, it was only after the lapse of that time that he was quite dead and rendered quite harmless. — By the way, the apocalyptic number 144,000 (= forty *sars*) is also of Babylonian origin.

*bar-nāshā*. From that and no other source the Jewish apocalyptic derived the most of its figures.

One of the most remarkable Babylonian legends of the gods, is that of *Adapa*, or, as his name is in full, *Adapad* (always written without the determinative for 'god,' precisely like a human personal name). The version of the story preserved in the Amarna tablets (see the appendix to Gunkel's book *Schöpfung und Chaos*) records how Adapa, the son of Ea, broke the wings of the south wind demon, as she annoyed him in his fishing, and was cited to answer for this before the god of heaven, Anu. But Ea warns him beforehand not to accept of either food or drink from Anu, for, although Anu will offer him 'bread of life' and 'water of life,' these are in reality 'bread of death' and 'water of death,' by partaking of which he (who hitherto had been entitled to consider himself one of the sons of the gods) would become a mortal man. In consequence of this counsel Adapa forfeits the immortality offered by Anu to him as the representative of 'unclean mankind,' and returns, without having tasted Anu's bread and water, to his own land, *i.e.* to the seashore, where he prosecuted his fishing.

Zimmern has already (in *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, ii. p. 170, 1899) compared this myth with Gn 3<sup>22</sup>, but thinks that 'neither here nor there is the thought quite consistent.' The identity, however, is as exact as possible, for Ea knew of course that the food offered by Anu would really produce immortality, but, evidently apprehensive that thereby Adapa would become the equal of the gods, he intended to prevent his eating of this food of life. So the complete parallel with the Biblical story of Paradise is clear; in the latter instance, as in the other, the deity prevents man from eating of the tree (*i.e.* the fruit) of life, for fear that man should thereby become altogether divine. Cf. also Gn 2<sup>17b</sup>, where the prohibition must have been related, through some conception that has not been preserved to us, to the tree of life already named in v.<sup>9</sup>.

The commencement and the prior history of this Adapa myth has been recently set before us in an extremely interesting text published by Father Scheil in the 20th vol. of the *Recueil de travaux*, etc. (Paris, 1898), which, however, is not quite correctly translated by him. It reads—

- ..... wisdom possessed he .....  
 his command like the command of the (sun?) god  
 caused he . . .  
 wide understanding wrought he for him, to trace the  
 relief<sup>1</sup> of the land,  
 he (the god Ea) bestowed wisdom upon him, but  
 immortality bestowed he not upon him.<sup>2</sup>
5. At this time, in these years, the illustrious, the son of  
 Eridu,<sup>3</sup>  
 Ea made him a kind of shepherd over mankind.  
 The illustrious, his command (cf. line 2) no one fulfilled  
 with pain,  
 the wise, very discreet (*atra-khasisa*), to whom the  
 Anunnaki (the angels of the deep) a name  
 named, he of clean hands, the anointing priest, who  
 is anxious to keep the holy statutes,
10. in company with a baker he attends to the baking,  
 in company with a baker of Eridu he attends to the  
 baking,  
 bread and water for Eridu he provides daily,  
 with his clean hands he presents the bowl,  
 and without him is no bowl given (lit. loosed).
15. A ship he launches, to fish every morning for Eridu.  
 At that time Adapa, the son of Eridu,  
 while the [*bar-]su* Ea stretched himself upon a couch,  
 as he daily closed the bolts of Eridu,  
 he (Adapa) boarded on the pure quay, the quay of  
 Nannar, the ship *Shakha* and
20. 'a wind bursts upon me,' cried he to him (Ea),  
 drinkofferings presented he to him, muttering  
 conjurations<sup>4</sup>;  
 so exorcised he her (the south wind demon), and  
 launched his ship (as he set sail) upon the wide  
 sea.

When we add to this that Assurbanipal boasts  
 that he has 'received equality of birth<sup>5</sup> with the  
 illustrious Adapa, a secret treasure, the whole of  
 the tablet writing,' or that Sennacherib says,  
 'Bêlit made fair my birth, Ea bestowed on me a  
 great soul, equal birth with the illustrious Adapa,

<sup>1</sup> *Ušurât mâtî mulumu*. What is meant is probably  
 the administrative division into districts, which is the pre-  
 requisite of all civilization in a country like Babylonia.  
 Besides the signification of 'limits,' 'borders,' *ušurât* might  
 mean 'sacred images of the gods' (relief figures). Or  
 should we simply render 'statutes' (cf. line 9 *paršî*)?

<sup>2</sup> Quite analogous with what was related before of how  
 Ea forbade Adapa to taste Anu's food of life.

<sup>3</sup> That is, as is clear from other passages, Adapa (with his  
 standing epithet *abkallu*, 'the illustrious'). Scheil wrongly  
 sees in the expression *ibni-shu* ('he made him') the creation  
 of a new being, different from the hero described in lines  
 1-4.

<sup>4</sup> The correct understanding of this difficult passage de-  
 pends on the following transcription: *shâru izîkanni-ma*  
*iššîb-šu* (not *ilippašu*), *ikki-šu ašpu*, *išir-ši-ma*, *ilippa-šu*  
*umahhar*. On [*bar-]su* as title of Ea cf. *WAI*, iv. 5,  
 line 58<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> That is, the same rank or power as Adapa.

the gift of awakened understanding, Assur put all  
 men under my foot,' we have cited all (with the  
 exception of one fragment to be noticed presently)  
 the most important passages about Adapa con-  
 tained in the cuneiform literature as yet known  
 to us.

As long ago as 1893, in my paper on 'The Ten  
 Patriarchs of Berosus' (*PSBA* xv. p. 243 ff.), I  
 identified Adapa with the second of Berosus'  
 primeval kings, namely, Alaparos (read Adapados,  
 and cf. above Adapad side by side with Adapa),  
 and this identification is now finally established  
 by the text then unknown, but since discovered  
 by Father Scheil. One expects at the head of  
 the list the father of Adapa, the creator-god Ea,  
 but instead of this we find in Berosus the name  
 Alorus, *i.e.* the wife of Ea, *Aruru*, who is known  
 to us from the Nimrod epos as the creatrix of  
 Ea-bani. Also in the bilingual Creation narrative  
 published by Mr. Pinches she appears along with  
 the there creator Gilimma<sup>6</sup> as the creatrix of the  
 'seed of mankind' (*i.e.*, as will be shown below,  
 of Adapa); cf. l. 20 ff., 'Gilimma created man,  
 Aruru created with (beside) him the *Zir-amilûti*,<sup>7</sup>  
 the cattle of the field, the living creatures in the  
 field created he.' Seeing that in other instances  
 as well we find that rarely used names of gods  
 recur with the Babylonians now in a male and  
 again in a female capacity (cf. *e.g.* *Nârûdu* =  
 Nimrod, or the moon-goddess *Ai*), it is not im-  
 possible that Aruru was originally simply a by-  
 name of the god Ea. In Berosus' list it is not  
 till the third place that we find Amelon or  
 Amillaros, *i.e.* *Amêlu*, 'man'; the fourth name is  
 Ammenon = *Ummânu*, 'artificer'; the fifth *Ameg-*  
*alaros* = *Amil-Aruru* ('man or servant of Aruru');  
 the sixth *Daonos* or *Daos* (perhaps = *Duvu*, 'child,'  
 cf. biblical *Jared*, 'descendant'); the seventh  
*Euedorakhos* = *En-me-dur-an-ki* (Zimmern, *Bei-*  
*träge zur Kenntniss der Bab. Religion*, p. 116,  
 note, 'king of Sippar or Pautibibla, founder of  
 the *barû* priesthood'); the eighth *Amempsinos*  
 (= *Amil-Sin*); and then finally, *Otiartes* (read  
*Opartes* = *Ubara-tutu*), and his son, *Xisuthros*  
 (*Atra-hasis*, Sumerian *Gišgug-dîr*, in vulgar pro-  
 nunciation *Gissu-tir*), the Babylonian Noah, who  
 is usually called *Pir-napishhti*, 'sun of life' (cf.

<sup>6</sup> In the Semitic translation = *Mardûk*, but originally = *Ea*,  
 who is called elsewhere *Alimma*, 'ram' (for *Ghalimma*).

<sup>7</sup> So according to the Sumerian. The Semitic has 'Aruru  
 (and) *Zir-amilûti* were created along with him.'

the old Babylonian personal name Sin-napishti, ('moon of life').

We have thus, confining ourselves to the first four members of the above group as the most important for our present purpose, the following remarkable agreement between the list of Berossus and that in Genesis:—

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Alorus = <i>Aruru</i> (or <i>Ea</i>).</p> <p>2. Adapados (see above) = <i>Adapa</i>.</p> <p>3. Amelon = <i>Amêlu</i>, 'man.'</p> <p>4. Ammenon = <i>Ummanu</i>, 'artificer.'</p> | <p>1. אֵלִים (here of course a divine name; cf. W. Max Müller, <i>Asien u. Europa</i>, p. 316, where evidence is brought from Egyptian inscriptions of the existence of a Palestinian divinity, <i>Adôm</i>, who appears sometimes as male and sometimes as female.</p> <p>2. חֵם (acc. to Nu 24<sup>17</sup> a synonym of Chemosh; cf. also the Egyptian god Set).</p> <p>3. אֲנָשִׁים, 'man.'</p> <p>4. מְבַרְכֵי, 'artificer' (= מְבַרְכֵי of the other source).</p> |
|--|---|

where, again, the most interesting figure is the second, that half-divine, half-human connecting link between the creator Aruru or Ea and the series of other primeval kings or patriarchs, commencing with 'man' (*Amêlu* = Enosh).

But now the third name on the list, *Amêlu*-Enosh, which is essentially identical with the Adam of the Biblical narrative, does not appear to be the prototype of the Messianic title *bar-nāshā*. This is to be found rather in a by-name which Adapa, the son of Ea, bears in another Adapa-fragment communicated by Mr. Strong in *PSBA* xvi. p. 274, namely, the epithet mentioned a little ago, *zir-amilāti*, lit. 'seed of mankind,' that is to say, he from whose seed the whole of mankind is sprung, he who in a sense includes the whole of mankind in himself germinally and represents them. If the Babylonian myth represented Adapa on the one side, as we have seen, as *mortal* (he must die before the other patriarchs, first amongst them 'man' himself, could succeed him), yet on the other side it equalized him with the god Marduk, with the early sun rising every morning out of the ocean, and in this way guaranteed his everlasting existence in heaven, and his future re-appearance among men; it is surely not too rash to assume that another portion of the Adapa legends gave direct expression to the expectation of such a reappearance. This, at all events, is certain that Adapa is simply a *Doppelgänger* (only

that he is half-human instead of divine) of the god Marduk or Merodach. It is not merely that both bear the title 'son of Ea,' but we saw that Adapa too is called 'son of Eridu,' which as a standing epithet for Marduk recurs so often in exorcising formulæ. Also the designation *abkallu*, 'the illustrious,' is used elsewhere only of gods, e.g. of the fire-god, of Ninib, of Assur, of Nebo, but most frequently of Marduk, for instance in the Creation epos, where the conflict of Marduk with Tiamat is described. Further, the expression *zir-amilāti* appears in another instance to be applied to an actual god, namely, Sin (*WAI* iv. 5, line 18<sup>b</sup>, if the correction rendering is 'Sin, shepherd, seed of mankind,' and not 'Sin, shepherd of the seed of mankind'). Adapa's rôle as *mediator* between Ea of Eridu, the creator proper, and man comes out with great clearness in Scheil's text, which was also the basis of Berossus' various Oannes-narratives.<sup>1</sup> A characteristic and now doubly significant Marduk parallel to this is found in the frequently translated dialogue between Ea and Marduk in favour of sick man. The oldest recension of this known to us belongs to the time of the Hammurabi dynasty (c. 2000 B.C.). See the *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, iv. pl. 8 = Bu. 88-5-12, 51. It is said there of the heart-sick who can bear neither food nor drink—

Then looked up him Marduk full of pity  
and to his father Ea speaks he:  
'O, my father, the heart-sickness has seized him.'

Ea makes reply thereupon to Marduk:  
'O, my son, what knewest thou not, what shall I yet add to thee,  
what I know thou knowest also,  
and what thou knowest I know also.  
Be it now man, or cattle, or lamb  
an incense offering (*kirban tabti*) . . . . .  
pour out, flour (?) as . . . . .

when thou then to the man whom I begat  
. . . . . [hast done this or that]  
Then shall his heart be calm again.'<sup>2</sup>

In the exorcising formulæ from the library of Assurbanipal the commencement always runs somewhat more fully, thus, 'To his father Ea he

<sup>1</sup> In these Oannes forms, as one can now clearly perceive, the action of Ea himself and what was attributed by the early Babylonians to Adapa, are combined in consequence of a later confusion.

<sup>2</sup> This text is Sumerian and Semitic, which shows that such interlinear translations were already to be found in the Babylonian libraries prior to 2000 B.C.

enters into the house and speaks,' and the reply of Ea always closes with the stereotyped words, 'Go, my son, Marduk (and offer such and such offerings, or use such and such conjurations to help the patient).'

If then the pre-Christian gnosticism and apocalyptic of which the Jews were so fond, and which were so widely diffused, went in search of extra-Jewish and at the same time primeval sacred elements to supplement or perfect their systems, were it even merely by way of support to the current pictures of the Messiah, they could certainly have discovered no field more fruitful than the Babylonian mythology. In particular, the divine-human figure of Ea's son, Adapa-Marduk, the *sir-amilūti* (cf. the various applications of אִרְיָ and צִמָּח in the Old Testament) offered a rich store of allied conceptions. Was there not here, on the part of the heathen world from the time of Abraham downwards, an unconscious anticipation of Him who was yet to bring redemption and true

peace to sinful man? And so even our Saviour did not disdain to apply to Himself by preference the title which had been borrowed from Babylonia by the circles referred to above, and stamped by them upon the expected Messiah—'seed of mankind,' or 'Son of Man.' Thereby He took the vessel of Babylonian mythology, otherwise so unclean, and hallowed it for ever in this matter where its searches had led to a presentiment of the truly divine.

I may still remark, in conclusion, that Pfarrer Dr. Alf. Jeremias of Leipzig, in a note to his article 'Oannes-Ea' in Roscher's *Lexicon of Greek and Roman Mythology* (iii. p. 586), calls attention in the following brief terms to *sir-amilūti* as an analogy to 'Son of Man':—

'The fact that Adapa was regarded as the first man is pointed to also by the designation "seed (spring) of mankind," an expression which corresponds to the biblical term for the second Adam, *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and might be of importance for the linguistic development of this conception.'

## The Priest and the Pilgrim.

BY THE REV. A. S. LAIDLAW, M.A., B.D., HUNTLY.

WE can form a tolerably complete picture of the worshipper represented in the Psalm. He was a pilgrim to the Holy City on some festival occasion. He lived in the country far, perhaps very far, from Jerusalem. A consequence of his distance from the capital was that he could very seldom visit the temple, perhaps not more frequently than once a year, and the Law permitted no local sanctuaries. To live at a distance from Jerusalem was, as it were, to be deprived of the means of grace. It is necessary to bear in mind this local limitation of worship. In Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship. The time was not yet when they should learn that God was not limited to Zion, but, as a Spirit, could be worshipped in spirit (that is, not here or there only, but wherever 'two or three gather together' in the name of the Lord Jesus). But the moment of

'Happy are they that dwell in Thy house! They can be always praising Thee. Happy the man who has Thee for a stronghold, such as are pilgrims on the highways with gladness in their heart!'—Ps. lxxxiv. 4, 5 (Cheyne's version).

fruition has come once more. He has arrived in the temple courts. His eyes are gladdened by the familiar buildings. He had been picturing them to himself on the way, and his mind and heart are full of them. Hence the sudden and ready eloquence with which the Psalm opens: 'How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My heart and flesh—my whole being sings for joy unto the living God.'

The first part of the Psalm closes with the words: 'Happy are they that *dwell* in Thy house: they can be always praising Thee.' The newly arrived pilgrim, in the ardour of his devotion, envies the ministers of the temple who spend their lives there. He lives far away, and has not their privileges. Only very infrequently can he have the happy experience of a close approach to God, which is never denied to them.