

everlasting love of God. We have an analogy in human life. 'Take the case of a man who has been a culpable spendthrift in his youth, and so reduced himself to penury for the remainder of his life. His poverty is his punishment, and as long as he resents it he is in misery. But no sooner does he recognize its justice than he can bear it with cheerful acquiescence as God's will. Yet the punishment remains; he has all the incapacities of poverty, and he

can never now do the good that he might have done with his wealth.'

Can we not conceive a similar process in the life to come? May not men awaken there to recognize that, by their earthly conduct, they have brought themselves for ever to a lower state than might have been, and are they not to that extent everlastingly punished, even though they accept their position as divinely just and be at peace?

## The Logos in the Chaldaean Story of the Creation.

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

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of May 1900 (pp. 341-345) I have already dealt with the Chaldaean list of the patriarchs, as reported by Berossus and as underlying the duplicate accounts in Gn 4 and 5. My reason for returning to the subject is that I am now in a position to prove that in the *Adapa* [fuller form *Adapad*, Berossus *Alaparos*], which stands second in the Chaldaean list, we have an intermediate form betwixt God and man, which signified originally 'Word of the Father.'

In the first place, I would once more remind my readers that, in the list of ten patriarchs (Berossus and Gn 5), before 'man' proper (called in Gn 5 'ēnōsh, not 'ādām) there are two divine forms, namely, 'ādām = Alorus (= Bab. *Arūru*, the consort of the creator god Ea, who, like Ea, kneaded man from clay and blood), and 𐎠𐎡 = Alaparos (Bab. *Adapada*). It is only then that we encounter the first man, who is called in Gn 5 'Ēnōsh, but in Gn 4 *hā-'ādām*, 'the man' (Berossus *Amelon*, i.e. *amēlu*, 'man'). Now follow in Gn 5 the first seven descendants of Enosh-Adam, who, together with 'Ādām, *Shēth*, and 'Ēnōsh, make up the so-called ten primeval kings. A comparison with Gn 4 exhibits the following arrangement:—

Gn 5.	Gn 4.
Ḳēnān.	Ḳain.
Mahalal'el.	Enoch.
Jared (יָרֵד).	'Irād (עִירָד).
Enoch.	Melhuja'el.
Methū-shalah.	Methū-sha'el.
Lamekh.	Lamekh.
Nōah.	[Nōah].

In Berossus these last seven are called—

'Αμμένων, Ammenon,	cf. Gn 5	Ḳēnān.
Μεγάλαρος, Amegalarus, <sup>1</sup>	,, ,,	Mahalal'el.
Δάωνος, Davonus,	,, ,,	Jared.
Εἰσέδωραχος, Edoranchus,	,, ,,	Enoch.
'Αμέμψινος, Amempsinus,	,, ,,	Methū-shalah.
'Ωπάρτης, Opartes, <sup>2</sup>	,, ,,	Lamekh.
Ἴσιουθρος, Nisuthrus,	,, ,,	Nōah.

As long ago as March 1893 (*P.S.B.A.* 'The Ten Patriarchs of Berossus') I pointed out that the *Ammenon* of Berossus must be based upon a cuneiform *ummanu*, 'artificer,' 'master-workman' (exactly the same meaning as 𐎠𐎡 has in Arabic), and also that the original name of the son of this Ummanu-Ḳain was Amil-Arūru. This furnished the key to the understanding of the whole, and Professor Zimmern afterwards discovered also the original Babylonian form of the patriarch who answers to the biblical Enoch, namely, *En-me-dur-an-ki*, king of Sippar (this last place appearing in Berossus as Παντι-βίβλα, i.e. *Putū-Sippar* or Agadi-Akkad, west of the Euphrates, in Chaldaea). That 'Αμῆλων = *amēlu*, 'man,' and 'Αμέμψινος = Amil-Sin, was suggested by Friedrich Delitzsch (*Wo lag das Paradies?*, p. 149), but the latter of these identifications is still very questionable.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These forms must go back to an original 'Αμῆλ-άλαρος (cf. No 1 'Αλωρος = Bab. *Arūru*), i.e. Bab. *Amil-Arūru*.

<sup>2</sup> So corrected by Lenormant, instead of the meaningless *Otiartes* (Ὠτιάρτης); the name is preserved in Babylonian in the Deluge story as *Ubara-tutu*. The by-form 'Αρδάτης will go back to a Bab. variant *Arad-tutu*.

<sup>3</sup> It is more likely that AMEMIICINOC was written by mistake for AMELNICINOC (= 'man of Nisin').

The patriarchal list of Berossus, which emanated from Chaldæan (not Babylonian) priestly circles, may accordingly be restored as follows:—

Arîru (the earth) . . . . .	10 <i>sars</i> }	= 13 <i>sars</i> .
Adapad . . . . .	3 ,, }	
Amêlu (man). . . . .	13 ,, }	
<hr/>		
Ummânu (=Kain) . . . . .	12 ,,	} = 18 <i>sars</i> .
Amil-Aruru . . . . .	18 ,,	
Dawinu <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	10 ,,	
En-me-dur-an-ki . . . . .	18 ,,	
Amil-Nisin . . . . .	10 ,,	
Ubara-tutu . . . . .	8 ,,	
Pir-napišti . . . . .	18 ,,	

These ten primeval kings are followed, according to Berossus, by Eue-choos (Bab. *En-me-kuu* or the like, the biblical *Ham*), to whom are assigned 2400 years; Chomas-belos (Bab. probably *Kimaš-bêlu*, the *Cush* of Gn 10<sup>6</sup>. 8), with 2700 years; and other 84 kings, the first of whom must have been Gilgames (= Nimrod), which is confirmed also by Aelian's statement that Gilgames (Bab. *Gibilgal-gamiš*, with by-forms *Gišdubar* and *Nârîdu*) was the grandson of Sevechorus (cf. the above *Eue-choos*). Then follows the so-called Hammurabi dynasty (of Arab origin), from the commencement of which down to the time of Alexander the Great there is said by Berossus to have been a period of 1909 years.<sup>2</sup>

It may here be remarked that the biblical figures, both those of the ten (or seven) patriarchs and those of the period from the Deluge to Terah, must be increased, just as the Chaldæan ones must be reduced. In this connexion the circumstance discovered by Julius Oppert deserves attention, namely, that the biblical number 1656 (from the Creation to the Deluge), if divided by 72, gives 23 years (*i.e.* 8400 days or 1200 weeks), while the corresponding Babylonian number, 120 *sars*, or 432,000 years, divided by 72 gives 6000, *i.e.* 1200 *lustra* or Babylonian year-weeks. Both numbers are also divisible by 60; namely, 1656

<sup>1</sup> *Daōnos* (*Davonius*) can answer only to a cuneiform *Dapinu* (to be pronounced *Dawinu*?), the usual appellation of Mercury (Nebo, Nusku, fire-god). This is confirmed by the fact that 10 (see above) is the sacred number of Gibil the fire-god.

<sup>2</sup> That is, from Eue-choos to Alexander the Great 10 *sars*, or 36,000 years, which would allow the 86 kings between the Deluge and the accession of Hammurabi, 34,091 (or in round numbers, 34,100) years. In the Bible the period between the Deluge and Terah is about 200 years.

÷ 60 = 27·6 (length of the moon's period), and 432,000 ÷ 60 = 7200, which, again, will be no fortuitous result. Let us assume, for instance, that the 34,000 years from Shem to Terah were in reality 3400 (*c.* 5600–2200 B.C.), the years from the Creation to the Deluge would correspondingly amount to 43,200. A smaller reduction would probably be scarcely safe, since the 86 kings between the Deluge and Hammurabi must be taken into account. An interesting allusion to the 120 *sars* of the patriarchs may be discovered, further, in the hitherto unintelligible *crux interpretum*, Gn 6<sup>3</sup>. Here הוּא בִּשְׂרָה must be a gloss (cf. the glosses in Gn 14, which are regularly introduced by הוּא) to בִּשְׂרָה, and the whole passage will read: 'My spirit shall not always (as hitherto) rule in man for great spaces of time (cf. Aram. שָׂרָה, סָרָה, "to be numerous"), but his days shall be (henceforward) only 120 years' [*i.e.* The maximum life of any one man shall henceforward be only 120 years or 2 *sosses*, instead of the 120 *sars* of the ten patriarchs combined]. בִּשְׂרָה collectively = 'in *sars*' (Bab. *šâru* = 3600, *σάρω*) is thus a gloss to בִּשְׂרָה, an antiquated expression which needed explanation. Further, the year of their life (the 35th, 34th, 32nd, 29th) in which their first son was born to those mentioned in Gn 11 (cf. my *Aufsätze u. Abhandlungen*, p. 222, n. 1) points rather to a life of about 120 years than to one of several centuries. This implies, to be sure, that in the additional years (403, 430, 207, 119) assigned to their life we have an arbitrary exaggeration. I should prefer to restore the list thus—

- Shem, 100 (+ 500; cf. Noah 500 + 100 before the Deluge).
- Kainan [LXX], 35.
- Shelah, 34.
- Re'û, 32.
- Naḥor, 29.
- Terah, 70.
- Abram, 100 (cf. above, Shem?).

Besides these, there should be three times 30 unnamed patriarchs from Arpakshad (Chaldæa), 'Eber-Peleg, and Serug. For, as it is manifest on the one hand that Shem (shortened from Shemu'el), Kainan, Shelah (cf. Methû-shalah), Re'û (cf. Re'û'el), Naḥor,<sup>3</sup> Terah, and Abram are personal names, on the other hand Arpakshad, 'Eber-Peleg, and Serug are names of districts; and the series

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Nakhar*, the name of a priest of Ningirsu, found on a seal-cylinder from Telloh, in the Louvre.

100, 35, 30, 34, 30, 32, 30, 29, shows clearly enough that the thrice interrupting 30 demands another explanation. We have thus originally from Shem to Terah 96 patriarchs (namely, 6 and three times 30), which now agrees remarkably with Berossus' 86 kings (between the Deluge and Hammurabi); if we might venture to correct one of the thirties to twenty, the coincidence would be even complete.<sup>1</sup>

Before turning to the two divine predecessors of the patriarchs, the special theme of this article, I should wish merely to note briefly that the last seven patriarchs, Kain—Noah, or Ummānu—Xisuthros (Pir-napišti or Chasis-atra), are brought by the Chaldæans into relation with the *seven planets*, and then apportioned by the Babylonians among the ten months of the so-called *world-year*. This also explains surprisingly how in Gn 4 Enoch comes immediately after Kain, but in Gn 5 stands three places after him. In Gn 5 we have the ancient Chaldæan order: the moon, Venus, Mercury,<sup>2</sup> the sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn; but in Gn 4 the specially Babylonian order: the moon, the sun, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn (cf., further, my *Aufsätze u. Abhandlungen*, p. 446). For the same reason, the sun stands in the fourth place also in Gn 1, where the order of creation is as follows:—

- |                         |                       |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Light                | The moon.             |
| 2. Firmament            | Mercury. <sup>3</sup> |
| 3. Earth and vegetation | Venus. <sup>4</sup>   |
| 4. Sun, moon, and stars | The sun.              |
| 5. Fishes and birds     | Mars (eagle).         |
| 6. Animals and man      | Jupiter (bull).       |
| 7. The Sabbath          | Saturn.               |

We should have expected the heavenly bodies

<sup>1</sup> This course, however, is not necessary, since the kings of Berossus are Ham and his successors, whereas in place of those the Bible enumerates Shem and his successors. There might thus be quite well 86 members of the one series answering to 70-100 of the other, but in no case to 7-10.

<sup>2</sup> We should expect, properly speaking, the order Mercury—Venus (instead of Venus—Mercury), but see my *Aufsätze u. Abhandlungen*, p. 458. On the interchange of the same two planets, cf. also *ib.* p. 448, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Bah. *an-pa* is the ideogram alike for Mercury (the heavenly messenger) and for *elat shamê*, 'height of heaven,' 'midday.'

<sup>4</sup> Istar is admittedly derived from the root עשר 'to be luxuriant' (*Aufs. u. Abhandl.* p. 156); cf. also ♂ = the earth, and ♀ = Venus; and note, further, Amil-Arûru ('servant of the earth'), the patriarch to whom the planet Venus is sacred.

to make their appearance immediately after the firmament (as is the case in the Babylonian Story of the Creation, which is not arranged upon the principle of various days' work). Gn 1 is thus derived from a Chaldæan (W. Semitic), not from a Babylonian source. The above-mentioned Babylonian *world-year* will now stand thus—

12th month, Adar	} The first three patriarchs. <sup>5</sup>
1st ,, Nisan	
2nd ,, Iyyar	
<hr/>	
3rd ,, Sivan (moon), 'brick month' Kain.	
4th ,, Tammuz (sun)	Enoch (365 !).
5th ,, Ab, month of 'the descent of fire' (Mercury)	'Irad.
6th ,, Elul (Venus, Istar)	Mehuja'el.
7th ,, Tishri	Methû-sha'el.
8th ,, Arakh-samna (Jupiter)	Lamekh.
9th ,, Kislev (Saturn)	[Noah ('rest')].
<hr/>	
10th ,, Tebet	} The Deluge (commencing 1st 11th ,, Shebat ) Tebet = 21st Dec.).
11th ,, Shebat	

Here, as in Gn 4, it is only the order of the planets that is Babylonian,<sup>6</sup> whereas there are many other clear indications that a Chaldæan source has been utilized. [On the testimony of the inscriptions to the apportioning of the seven planets to the months Sivan—Kislev, see H. Winckler, *Altor. Forsch.* ii. 367 f., and also the further details in my *Aufs. u. Abhandl.* p. 447 f.]

By way of commentary on the above list I would note also the following points, from which it will be evident at the same time that the element of chance is quite excluded here. (a) The 'brick month,' Sivan, corresponds to the building of the first city by Kain (Gn 4<sup>17</sup>); the zodiacal sign Gemini, again, answers to Kain and Abel; moreover, F. Lenormant (*Origines*, i.) has shown how the founding of the first city is always connected with the murder of a brother (cf., e.g., the story of Romulus and Remus). That the moon is sacred to Kain the 'artificer,' finds its explanation in the circumstance that Ea, too, who was identified with

<sup>5</sup> Creation proper falls upon 1st Nisan (see, more fully, below). As to Adar, which stands at the head of our list, there was at the time of the kings of Ur a calendar which commenced with Adar (cf. Radau, *Early Bab. History*, p. 299).

<sup>6</sup> It is worthy of note that as late as about 2500 B.C. (the time of the kings of Ur) the 4th month did not yet bear the name Tammuz. On the contrary, the 6th month (Elul) was then sacred to Tammuz (the sun) and was called 'Tammuz' month.'

Sin, was the patron deity of the goldsmith's art and in general of all kinds of skilled labour.—(b) Tammuz or Adonis is the sun, and Enoch with his 365 years, as also En-me-dur-an-ki, king of Sippar (the city of the sun), are brought into relation with the sun.<sup>1</sup> The sun-god and Rammân (or Hadad) impart to En-me-dur-an-ki the secrets of heaven and earth, *i.e.* astrology and magic (Zimmern, *Ritualtafeln*, 117 f.); and all astrologers and enchanters (*barû*) trace their genealogy back to this patriarch.—(c) The god of the month Ab is Nin-giš-zidda, a manifestation-form of Nabu-Nusku (Mercury), who is also called Gibil (fire-god). But in Sargon (Cylinder, l. 61) the month Ab is called the 'month of the descent (*arad*, ירד) of the fire-god (Gibil).' Now the full form of the name of the patriarch Jared, as found in Gn 4, is עֵיֶר. This name is made up of עי 'fire' (cf. יָעִים 'fire shovels,' perh. also Is 11<sup>15</sup> בָּעֵי מְרֹחוּ; further, Eth. *wé'eya* 'burn'; and the proper names עֵירָא, עֵירָם, עֵירָ [MT wrongly עֵירָ]) and יָרָד 'descend.'

In harmony with this is the circumstance that the corresponding name in Berosus is *Daōnos* = *Dapinu* (an appellation of Mercury).—(d) The month Elul or 'Istar's month' (zodiacal sign Ear of corn of Istar) corresponds to the patriarch Mehuja'el or (in older form, Gn 5) Mahalal'el (Chald. *Amil-Arûru* 'servant of the earth-goddess Arûru'; cf. what has been said above on the earth and Venus).—(e) Next comes Methû-sha'el, older form Methû-shalah, in Berosus *Amempsinos*. Since we expect here an allusion to Ninib (Mars) or the god of war, *shalah* = 'javelin' (esp. one that brings death) would suit better than the שלח = *Sarrakhu*, an appellation of the moon-god, the explanation formerly assumed by me. In that case also *Amempsinos* is of course not *Amil-Sin*, but in *-psin* there is some as yet unknown reference to the planet Mars.<sup>2</sup>—(f) The month Arakh-samna (Marcheswan) was sacred to Marduk-Jupiter. The name of the corresponding patriarch is Ubara-tutu, *i.e.* 'protected of Marduk.' It may accordingly be supposed that in *Lamekh* we have a mutilated form of *Marduk*, perhaps לִמְךָ 'belonging to Makk.'—(g) The month Kislev had

for its patron deity the seventh and last planet, Nergal-Saturn, and, as the Noah of Gn 5 must be placed here, with his name (= 'rest') reminiscent at once of the seventh week-day, the Sabbath, no doubt Berosus' *Xisuthros* ('the very wise,' *Chasis-atra* or *Atra-chasis*), who is called in Babylonian *Pir-napišti* ('sun of the soul'),<sup>3</sup> also stands in some reference to Nergal-Saturn. As a matter of fact, Tammuz, whose death dirge was performed on 21st June, and whose proper dominion lasted from 21st March to 21st June (Nisan to Sivan), must have, corresponding to him, before the beginning of winter, Nergal, whose death fell on 1st Tebet, and who exhibited his chief power from Tishri to Kislev. Hence also the Sakkut festival was celebrated in Tishri or in Marcheswan,<sup>4</sup> and the last month of the god's life was Kislev. That Noah stood not only for Saturn but also for the sun is plain also from the circumstance that, like the sun in his bark, so Noah in his ship sails for exactly 365 days (from the 17th day of the second month to the 27th of that month in the following year, Gn 7<sup>11</sup> 8<sup>14</sup>).<sup>5</sup> This representation contradicts the other, which supposes a two months' duration of the Flood, namely, during Tebet (*abba-uddu* 'proceeding from the sea,' cf. Gn 6<sup>17</sup> מַיִם) and Shebat ('curse of the rain,' and month of Bel-Rammân or the weather-god), but it attaches itself to the sun nature of Noah, which he shares with Enoch, being also at last, like him, translated to Paradise to the gods (Nimrod epos, close of the Deluge episode).

It is only now, after we have made acquaintance with the whole context of the list of patriarchs, that it will be fitting to look more closely at the

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the proper name *Sin-napišti* ('moon of the soul'). Nergal is also the underworld or night sun, or the autumnal (in contrast with Tammuz, the vernal) sun.

<sup>4</sup> Moses transformed this into a feast of booths (*sukkôth*), in order to destroy its astral character.

<sup>5</sup> The sun's bark appears, by the way, to be a specially Egyptian conception, a circumstance which is of extreme importance in its bearing on the date and the composition of the so-called P, which certainly preserves in Gn 5 older forms of names than Gn 4 (so-called J). In harmony with this is the further circumstance that the number 365 here and in the case of Enoch likewise points to Egypt, for the Babylonian year had 360 days, the Chaldaean 354, the Egyptian alone 365 (namely 360, with an annual intercalation of the 5 *epagomena*). Moreover, the above-mentioned transformation of 1200 year-weeks into 23 years (which then, multiplied by 72, give 1656) presupposes the year = 365.2 days.

<sup>1</sup> *Dur-an-ki*, 'band of heaven and earth,' also points to the sun, for various ancient Babylonian temples bear this name.

<sup>2</sup> I suggest *Amel-Nisinos*, for Nisin was the sacred city of Ninib-Mars.

two divine forms which in Berosus and in Gn 5 precede the first man. The first three (Arûru, Adapad, and the 'man') form a special group in relation to the other seven. This is owing to the circumstance that the oldest Chaldæan tradition, to which the whole list goes back, meant by these three names to set the whole story of the Creation symbolically before the eye or to indicate it to the ear.

First of all, as to *Arûru*, there was undoubtedly a Chaldæan word *arûru* ('the accursed,' the very idea expressed in Gn 3<sup>17</sup>) for the earth, and indeed such a common term for the latter that the etymology was no longer thought of. Otherwise the name Arûru could hardly have been given also to the consort of Ea, who elsewhere is called Damgal-nunna or Dam-kina. It is very remarkable now that, in place of this name, Gn 5 has not, as might have been expected, אֱלֹהִים but אָדָם. The latter cannot of course be אָדָם 'man,' for man appears only third in this list under the title אָנוּשׁ; the word must also have the signification 'earth' (אֶדְוִם, only without the fem. ending, which is wanting also in *Arûru*). But in that case it is very probable that it should be vocalized אֶדְוִם, and that the bēnē-Edom, who were descended from Esau, called themselves *Edomites* on account of their origin from mother earth (Gn 5<sup>3</sup>).<sup>1</sup> In like manner the Edomite king and seer, Balaam, calls (Nu 24<sup>17</sup>) the Ammonites 'the children of Seth,' which shows that Edomites and Ammonites must have had quite similar patriarchal lists, namely 'Edom, Seth,' etc., or 'Ammon (*i.e.* the moon-god Amm), Seth,' etc. Further, the Egyptian inscriptions of the so-called New Empire were acquainted with a Palestinian goddess *Atum*, in whom W. Max Müller (*As. u. Eur.* 316) has rightly recognized Edom. Why is it now that the Chaldæans and, following them, the Hebrews (Edomites, etc.), place at the head of the patriarchs not the moon-god but 'mother earth'? That originally the moon, the ancient father god, occupied the first place in this list, is clear from the fact that *Adapad*, to whom we shall turn presently, is always called elsewhere the son of Ea (not of Arûru). The reason is to be

<sup>1</sup> That there was a word 'ēdōm = 'earth' is proved also by the proper name *Obed-edom* = 'tiller of the earth,' a name similar to the Arab. *al-Harīth* (Aretas) or the German name *Bauer*.

found simply in the reverent, almost superstitious, fear of pronouncing the name of God, a fear which we may clearly observe already in the name-system of the W. Semites. In these names we encounter such circumlocutions for the moon-god as 'my father,' 'my god,' 'my uncle,' 'my fear,' 'my righteousness,' etc. etc. (see ch. 3 of my *Anc. Heb. Trad.*). So, too, among the Chaldæans the 'sacred name of Ea' (*i.e.* once more, the name of the moon-god)<sup>2</sup> dissolved every spell. It may be noted, further, that, according to Babylonian notions, Bel or Bel-Marduk (*i.e.* the ancient sun-god of Nippur or Babel) created the world and men; whereas, according to the Chaldæan notion, it was Ea (who on that account is also called 'the potter') that formed men, fashioning them from clay mixed with the blood of a god. Very frequently, however, where in the Chaldæan records we should expect the name of Ea as creator, it is the name of his consort Arûru that appears. Arûru (the earth) bears also the name *Mami* ('mother'), so that we have here the notion of the mother earth which recurs so frequently among other peoples. She, too, is called 'the potter goddess,' and in the Sumerian story of the creation of the world is mentioned side by side with Gilimma (= Marduk?) as creatrix of men. In the Nimrod epos she forms Nimrod's friend, Ea-bani, from clay, and, in an ancient Babylonian text (Zimmern, *ZA* xiv. 280 ff.) is said to have made men from clay and the blood of a god. It is no wonder, then, that in Gn 5 also 'the earth' (אָדָם) stands for the creator god.

We come now to the second divine form, which occupies the second place in the patriarchal list both of Berosus and of Gn 5. If 'the earth' (Arûru, Edom) stands for the creator God, and No. 3 (Amelu, Enosh, the *ha-'ādām* of Gn 4) is the first man, it is clear at the outset that here in No. 2 (Alaparos = Adapad, the Seth of Gn 5) we must see a species of intermediary between God and man. I have already fully discussed and illustrated this point in my article on 'The Apoca-

<sup>2</sup> Among the Sumerians the deity who in the genealogy of the gods answers to Ea, was called *En-ki* 'lord of the earth'; Ea ('house,' *i.e.* 'moon-station'), on the other hand, was an appellation of the supreme god of the Chaldæans, Ai or the moon, which was only by a secondary process (certainly, indeed, prior to 2000 B.C.) transferred to the ancient 'lord of the earth.' Then the earth (Arûru), conceived of in Semitic fashion as feminine, was made the consort of Ea.

lyptical origin of the expression "Son of Man" (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, *l.c.*), but I am now able to contribute further material regarding this remarkable Chaldæan prototype of Christ, which will place it beyond doubt that Adapa is at the same time the archetype of the Johannine λόγος, the 'Word of the Father,' who was at work at the beginning of the world. For—and this is above all important—*Adapad* (*var.* Adapa) means in fact nothing else than 'father's announcement,' 'father's word.' It is a word formed according to the analogy of the ancient sacred Sumerian language, a so-called composite, whose second element *can* mean nothing different from *nabû*, 'proclaim,' or *zikru*, 'word,' and whose first element is simply the well-known Sumerian word *ad-da* or *ad-da*, 'father,' written phonetically, because there is absolutely no other Sumerian word sounding *ad* which would yield sense in this context. Moreover, the father of Adapa, Ea-Sin, was actually the 'father' *κατ' ἐξοχήν* with the ancient W. Semites. There is at most only one other rendering of *Adapad* whose possibility can be taken account of, namely 'announcement of the (divine) decree,' or 'word of the (divine) decree' (cf. *ad-gi*, 'take counsel,' *malâku*), but, seeing that also the synonym of Adapa, namely, *mirri* (sign 'dwelling-place,' with inscribed sign *ši* or *lim*), includes the name of the father god Ea, namely, *Lim* (= 'ram'),<sup>1</sup> everything is in favour of our not seeing in *ada* such a sense as 'decree,' but simply the more usual word *ad*, 'father.'<sup>2</sup> But, be this as it may, this 'word' or this 'proclaimer' (whether directly of the 'father' or of the 'decree' of the divine father) corresponds in any case to

<sup>1</sup> Meaning thus, perhaps, 'dwelling-place (=manifestation) of the ram-god.' Since the son of the latter would naturally be symbolized by a lamb, this is perhaps the origin of the Messianic title 'Lamb of God.' It is this god *Mirri* (*Girri*, A-sa-ri, *i.e.* Agirri), the son of Ea (also 'son of Eridu'), so often named in the Sumerian texts as mediator between Ea and men, that is uniformly represented in the Semitic interlinear translation by Amar-uduk (*Marduk*); a fuller form is 'Mirri, the good man' (in distinction from Ea, 'the good God').

<sup>2</sup> When one considers that at the time of the kings of Ur the form *atu* as well as *ada* occurs, and that at the same period a masc. proper name *A-tu-kal-la* ('the father is guardian angel') has a fem. proper name *Ama-kal-la* ('the mother is guardian angel') corresponding to it, and that we meet there also with the proper names *A-da-îbbu*, and *Ai-îbbu* (written *A-da-lal* and *Ai-lal*), both = *Abî-îbbu*, it may be safely held that the only sense to be attached to the *Ada* in *Adapad* is that of 'father.'

the Logos or the Memrâ of later tradition, for Adapa too played the part of an intermediary in the work of creation, although the creator proper was always considered to have been Ea or his wife Arûru. Additional support is given to this by the fact that Adapa (as Zimmern has shown), like Xisuthros, bears the epithet 'the wise' (*Atrachasis*); for in the same way, *e.g.* in the Book of Sirach, the 'word of God' is called 'the well of wisdom' (cf. Sir 1<sup>5</sup> 24<sup>1</sup>). It is most remarkable that Gn 5<sup>3</sup>, in speaking of the birth of Seth, *i.e.* Adapa, lays special emphasis upon his being begotten in the likeness of his father (cf. the image of God in 1<sup>27</sup>), and that the Bab. *zikru* (ideogr. *pad*) means both 'likeness'<sup>3</sup> and 'word' or 'name' (finally even 'man'; in this sense, indeed, for the more usual *zikaru*). 'Likeness' and 'word' (λόγος) were thus synonymous notions with the Babylonians.

Viewed in this new light, much of what is related in the Adapa legend becomes doubly interesting. I shall first recapitulate what I said in May 1900, and then add some important points by way of completing our view of the subject. We there saw Adapa dwelling in the garden of Paradise, namely, in Eridu, with his father Ea, who had bestowed upon him the highest wisdom indeed, but not yet everlasting life; in company with an angel he there baked the sacred loaves,<sup>4</sup> and fetched daily the holy water. The most realistic trait of the Babylonian idea of him is his daily embarking on the sea, to catch fish (which were sacred to Ea). While thus occupied, he was one day assailed by the south-wind demon, but by his 'word' he broke her wings, so that for seven days she was unable to blow. Then comes the familiar story of Adapa's being cited before the god of heaven, Anu. The latter offers bread and water of life to Adapa, who, however, in obedience to the command of Ea, declines them.

Unfortunately, at this point there is a considerable *lacuna*; where the legend resumes, Anu is, indeed, still conversing with Adapa, but the situation appears to be quite a different one. There it is said that Ea 'made his (Adapa's) breach,'<sup>5</sup> but that he fixed it as his destiny to

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Jensen, *Keilschr. Bibl.* vi. p. 401 f.

<sup>4</sup> As the mention of the table shows, what is meant is the 'shewbread' (*akalpani*).

<sup>5</sup> *Šu-ba-ra-Šu-iš-kun*, with evident allusion to the before-mentioned 'breaking' (*išbir*) of the wings of the south wind.

glorify his rule 'for the future of the days,' *i.e.* for ever (Fragm. iii. l. 11, cf. K.I.B. vi. 100 f.). What now had happened meanwhile that Adapa should after all obtain everlasting life, and what kind of 'breach' must he have suffered with a view to this end? The only possible answer is that the Adapa legend, in which (Fragm. iii. l. 12) Adapa is expressly called *sir awiluti* ('seed of mankind' = the apocalyptic 'son of man'), must have related how he came by this title. Now it can be no accident that alike in Berosus and in an ancient Bab. text recognized by Zimmern as belonging to the Hammurabi dynasty (*Z.A.* xiv. 280 ff.; cited also by Jensen in *K.I.B.* vi. 274 f., note), Bel (originally, however, according to the Chaldean account, probably Ea) or Arūru, wishing to people with men the still vacant earth, caused the head of 'one of the gods' to be cut off, mingled the flowing blood with earth (or clay), and formed the first man from the mixture. The whole context shows that this sacrificed god, whose slaughter is portrayed also on ancient Bab. seal-cylinders, can be no other than Adapa. Only now that he has given his life to bring men into being can his apotheosis take place, and now it at once becomes clear why Ea did not *from the first* bestow everlasting life upon his only well-beloved

Jensen, indeed, takes the word to be *šubāra*, 'abundant care' (from *barā*, 'to be satiated'), which, however, appears to be less suitable here.—It is also to be noted that, according to the close of Fragn. 2, Adapa is again brought back to earth, but in Fragn. 3 he appears once more in heaven.

son, the Word of the Father, the Divine wisdom. Because it was from the first in his Divine counsel to form from Adapa's blood mixed with earth a new being between whom and himself Adapa should be the mediator, therefore he forbade Adapa to accept of Anu's food of life. Now it is clear also why in the world-year (see above) it is Nisan that is Adapa's month, for it was in it that the creation of the world and of the first man took place. We can explain in the same way the sacrifice of a lamb in the spring-time among the W. Semites (cf. above, on the 'Lamb of God'), as a memorial of the sacrificial death of the *lóγos* at the beginning of the world. The fact also that the Gnostic sect<sup>1</sup> of Sethites saw in Seth (= Adapa) the Messiah, and in Jesus a reincarnation of Seth, is now set in its proper light.

In conclusion, I would once more note with emphasis that it is no fortuitous circumstance that it was not in Babylonia, for instance, with its cult of the sun (Bel-Samas), that these ancient anticipations of the Christ were current, but in Ur of the Chaldees, with its cult of the moon (Ea-Sin)—Ur of the Chaldees, the home of Abraham the friend of God.

<sup>1</sup> Gnosticism in general has preserved much ancient Chaldean material, although often in a bizarre and confused form, a point which is always emerging with greater clearness. It is a pity that the author of the interesting *Fragments eines verschollenen Glaubens*, Mr. G. R. S. Mead, had not the opportunity of making acquaintance with the contents of the present article when he was writing his book on Gnosticism.

## At the Literary Table.

### WHAT IS RELIGION?

THE late Professor C. C. Everett of Harvard published a book on the *Theology of St. Paul*. It was richly stimulating and even largely original. Other theological books were looked for, but they did not come. When he died, all his pupils cried out that the Lectures were there. They at least could be published, and they were worthy.

Alas, the Lectures were not there. Professor Everett had delighted and enlightened thirty different classes of students with his lectures on theology, but he had never written them down.

He had never, apparently, had even notes of them. For his memory was good and his mind full, and he loved to drop when he pleased into a less formal speech than the manuscript permits, a speech that suited 'a certain playfulness of thought which was habitual with him even in his more serious moods.'

But there were the students' notebooks. Many admirably kept notebooks were offered,—Professor Horne and Professor Ropes were among those who offered,—and Professor Edward Hale was chosen to make up the lectures out of them. His work is published. It goes by the title of