

# The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1925

NOTES AND STUDIES

## THE HEAVENLY MAN.

IN various documents emanating from Gnostic and allied religious movements of later antiquity we find a myth of a heavenly Man, from whom the actual human race and sometimes the present world is derived. This paper reviews the principal documents in which this myth appears, considers the possible sources of the idea in oriental speculation, and discusses its possible relationship to the conceptions of the Son of Man or of a heavenly Man in later Jewish and early Christian thought.

### I.

The Apostate Julian's Fifth Oration—'On the Mother of the Gods'—gives a quasi-philosophical explanation of the myth of Attis. Here, as elsewhere, the last Pagan emperor (361–363), is concerned to oppose to the triumphant progress of the Christian Church a systematic exposition of Paganism. A pagan myth, a pagan cult, and a pagan philosophy reinforce and interpret one another and thus offer emancipation from the Christian 'darkness' in which Julian himself had been brought up and from which, by the favour of the Mother of the gods, he has escaped.

The Oration opens with a historical section dealing with the introduction of the cult of Attis and the Great Mother in Greece and Rome (159–161 B). Julian then proceeds to explain his own understanding of Attis. Attis is 'the substance of the generative and creative mind, which begets all things down to the level of the lowest matter, and possesses in itself all the principles (λόγοι) and causes of the forms which inform matter (τῶν ἐνύλων εἰδῶν)'. There follows a philosophical exposition of the relations of matter (ὑλη), of the forms immanent in matter (εἶδη ἐνυλα), of the forms in themselves (εἶδη ἄνυλα), and of the creative power (φύσις), identified with Attis, which imparts the forms to passive matter (161 D–165 A). Julian now turns to the myth (165 B): Attis was exposed by the river Gallos, but he grew to man's estate and was loved by the Mother of the gods, who gave him a star-spangled hat. Now, if the head of Attis is covered by the visible heaven, we must understand

by the river Gallos the Milky Way (*γαλαξία*), for this is the point at which the passible body mingles with 'the impassible revolution of the fifth body'.<sup>1</sup> To this point the Mother of the gods allowed Attis to proceed. But Attis transgressed the limit, and went 'to the extremities' (*ἄχρῃ τῶν ἐσχάτων*) where, as the myth says, he entered into the cave and was united with the nymph. The nymph represents, not matter itself, but the moisture of matter, which is the last immaterial cause. Thus Attis, an intelligent god (*νοερός θεός*), who holds together the immanent sublunary forms, enters into union with the immediate cause of matter. But the Mother of the gods, she who is the source of the intelligent and creative gods, who in turn rule the gods which appear (i. e. the stars), was filled with a passionless love for Attis and wished to recall him from the world of becoming to love herself. Korybas, therefore, who is the great Sun and the colleague of the Mother in creation and providence, persuades the Lion to carry the Mother's message to Attis. The Lion, who is described as *αἶθων* 'fiery', is the cause of warmth and heat, and he is sent to fight with the nymph who represents moisture. The Lion discovered Attis and caused him to castrate himself. The meaning of this mutilation is the arrest of infinite progression (*ἐποχή τῆς ἀπειρίας*) 'for the world of becoming stood still in appointed forms, being arrested by creative forethought—not without the so-called madness of Attis'. The coincidence of the Festival of Attis, when the tree is cut, with the equinox, is further testimony that the mutilation is to be understood of the *στάσις τῆς ἀπειρίας*. Again, the cutting of the tree signifies the offering to the gods of the best gift which we can secure, and that is virtue with piety. Thus 'the ordinance bids us who are by nature heavenly, but have been carried down to earth, to reap from our earthly citizenship virtue with piety, and so to hasten to the generative and life-giving goddess' (169 B). We, too, must cut out the infinite progression in ourselves and hasten upwards to that which has a defined and single form, and, if it be possible, to the One Itself. Hence the appropriateness of the Hilaria which close the Attis festival, for 'what can be more joyful than a soul which has escaped from the tempest of impiety and becoming, and has been borne upwards to the very gods? One of these gods it was—Attis—who approached nearer than was right, but the Mother of the gods did not neglect him, for she turned him back to herself and bade him stay the infinite progression.' In the next section (170 A–171 D) Julian explains that the myth is not to be under-

<sup>1</sup> i. e. the aether, the *πρῶτον στοιχεῖον* of Aristotle, later called *πέμπτον σῶμα* 'the fifth element'. Plotin. *Enn.* ii 1. 2. The sphere of the *πέμπτον σῶμα* was usually regarded as beginning with the Moon. So below in this Oration 176 D. But Julian has to work in his etymology *Γάλλος—γαλαξία*. See Bogner *Philologus* 1923-1924 p. 275.

stood as a historical occurrence, but as the symbolic expression of an eternal truth. 'Let no man suppose', he says, no doubt with Christianity in view, 'that these things were once done and really happened, as though the gods were unaware what they were going to do, or were correcting their own mistakes . . . Attis is ever servant and charioteer to the Mother, his impulse ever leads towards becoming, ever he cuts away the unlimited from himself through the appointed cause of the Forms.' Further paragraphs give reasons for the dates of the festivals and justify the traditional restrictions on food. The Oration closes with a Prayer to the Mother of gods and men to grant to all men and especially to the Roman people happiness through knowledge (*γνώσις*) of the gods.

For Julian philosophy is a handmaid to religion. 'The theories of Aristotle', he writes, 'I consider to be somewhat deficient, unless they are harmonized with Plato's doctrines, and these again need to be harmonized with the prophecies which have been given us from the gods' (162 c). Julian's philosophy is, in fact, borrowed from Iamblichus. In the Fourth Oration—*On King Helios*—the Emperor avows his complete dependence upon Iamblichus (156 D) who, 'though later in time, is yet not inferior in genius to Plato himself' (146 A). In the Fifth Oration he claims to be original: 'I had read nothing beforehand, nor speculated on the matter; indeed I had not even decided to speak on this subject, before asking for these tablets'. But here, too, the philosophy is clearly dependent upon Iamblichus<sup>1</sup>: Attis is 'the substance of the generative and creative mind which begets all things down to the lowest material plane' (161 c). The 'generative and creative mind' is the Ἡλῖος Μίθρας of the Fourth Oration who controls the *νοερός κόσμος* and the *θεοὶ νοεροί*.<sup>2</sup> Hence Attis, himself a *νοερός θεός*, is compared to the sun's rays (165 c). Julian claims that this identification of Attis is his own idea (*αὐτὸς οἰκοθεν ἐπινοῶ* 161 B), and indeed it is unlikely that Julian is here following his master, who seems to have equated Attis, among other deities, with the Sun itself.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, there are signs that 'the prophecy given from the gods', which Julian here adopts, contained intractable elements which have been imperfectly harmonized with the Neoplatonic philosophy. Thus the nymph with whom Attis is united is interpreted as the moisture of matter (165 c), and by thus

<sup>1</sup> Bogner *Philologus* 1923-1924 p. 270 f suggests that Julian's source was a lost commentary of Iamblichus upon a work of Julian the Theurgist—also lost—which dealt with the planetary spheres. Hence the abrupt introduction of the *πέμπτον σῶμα* in the philosophical section of the Oration.

<sup>2</sup> On the *κόσμος νοερός* and the *θεοὶ νοεροί* interpolated by Iamblichus between the *κόσμος νοητός* and the *κόσμος αἰσθητός* of the earlier Neoplatonists see Zeller *Phil. d. Gr.* iii<sup>4</sup> 2 p. 748.

<sup>3</sup> Bogner *op. cit.* p. 260.

entering into relations with the moisture of matter, Attis was transgressing the ordinance of the Mother of the gods. It was an act of madness (*παράφροσύνη* 167 D); and by overstepping the appointed limit Attis lost power over himself, and grew weak. The underlying idea is clear: by entering into relation with matter Attis fell from his proper sphere. A dualistic philosophy is implied. But the Neoplatonist Julian is obliged to tone this down. It is indeed admitted that 'the world of becoming stood still in appointed forms . . . not without the so-called madness of Attis'; but Julian explains that had Attis obeyed the Mother of the gods and looked to her alone, he would have been an even mightier <sup>1</sup> creator than he actually was (166 D), 'since in all things the turning to that which is mightier, is more effective (*δραστήριος*) than the declension to that which is worse'. This is good Neoplatonic doctrine. It is on this line that Plotinus criticizes the Gnostic dualism which derives the created world from the fall of *Sophia* and *Psyche*. To Plotinus the universe is good. Creation proceeds from the 'overflowing'<sup>2</sup> of the One, and the world-soul creates, not by a fall into an alien substance, but by contemplation of that which is above. 'In the perfect beauty that soul rests, free from all solicitude, not ruling by plan or policy, not redressing, but establishing order by the marvellous efficacy of its contemplation of the things above it. For the measure of its absorption in that vision is the measure of its grace and power, and what it draws from this contemplation it communicates to the lower sphere, illuminated and illuminating always'.<sup>3</sup> But in Julian the introduction of this doctrine is a transparent attempt to cover up the obvious implication of a Gnostic and dualistic myth, not dissimilar in idea from the conception opposed by Plotinus in his polemic 'Against the Gnostics'.

There was no one recognized interpretation of the Attis myth. Macrobius,<sup>4</sup> in all probability following Iamblichus, identified Attis with the Sun, and the Mother of the gods with the Earth. Proclus, who wrote a book on the subject<sup>5</sup> which has perished, likewise identified Attis with the Sun, 'whose rays descend to the lowest depth of matter'.<sup>6</sup> Porphyry also wrote a book on Attis to which Julian refers, though he says he has not read it. The book has not survived, but we know from Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* iii 11, 12 and Aug. *De Civ. Dei* vii 25 that he interpreted the story of the growth of the flowers. The castration symbolizes the falling of the flowers before they seed. Thus Julian differed from the greater Neoplatonists in his interpretation of the Attis myth. But he was not original. We know from Hippolytus *Refut.* v that in

<sup>1</sup> Accepting Hertlein's emendation *κρείττων* for the unintelligible *κρείττον* of the MSS.

<sup>2</sup> *Enn.* v 2. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Enn.* ii 9. 2 Mackenna's translation.

<sup>4</sup> *Sat.* I xxi 7 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Marinus Vita Procli* 33.

<sup>6</sup> *Hymn.* i 25.

the second century the Naassene Gnostics, probably following a pagan source, had identified Attis with the heavenly Man who descends into chaos, creates the world, and imparts life to the as yet lifeless ancestor of mankind. Although Julian does not use the name 'the Heavenly Man', yet his idea is essentially the same: Attis descends to the world of matter, and thus imparts order to chaos. Furthermore, the descent and ascension of Attis is really a symbolic version of the descent and ascension of the *ψυχή* of man (169 B). Thus we may fairly surmise that Julian knew a divine 'prophecy' about Attis as the heavenly Man, like that used by the Naassenes. The originality which he claims will lie in his combination of the Gnostic 'prophecy' with the philosophy of his master Iamblichus.

'The Naassenes', says Hippolytus,<sup>1</sup> 'pay honour to a Man and a Son of Man'. This Man, whom they call Adamas, is bisexual. Hymns have been composed in his honour, one of which Hippolytus quotes: 'From thee is the Father, and for thy sake is the Mother, the two immortal names, the progenitors of the Aeons, O citizen of Heaven, O man of many names'. The exposition of the doctrine which follows is very confused, and there can be no doubt that either Hippolytus or his source has misunderstood the original. The Naassenes, Hippolytus tells us, claim that their teachings were given by James the Lord's brother to Mariamne, but in reality they were derived from Greek and barbarian religious rites. The Man Adamas is the foundation of their doctrine, and to him they apply the text 'And his generation who shall declare?' From this heavenly Man is to be distinguished the first historical man. Who he was, and when he came into being, it is hard to say. Different nations give different accounts. Some say he was Alalkomeneus who sprang from Lake Cephisos in Boeotia, others give the priority to the Idaean Kouretes, and so on. The Chaldaeans says he was Adam. But this first man, whoever he was, was only an image of Adamas the heavenly Man and lay at first like a lifeless statue on the ground. The passage which follows is obscure:—

*ὃν οὖν τελέως ἢ κεκρατημένος ὁ μέγας ἄνθρωπος ἄνωθεν, "ἀφ' οὗ", καθὼς λέγουσι, "πάσα πατριὰ ὀνομαζομένη ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς" συνέστηκεν, ἐδόθη αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχή, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς πάσῃ καὶ κολάζηται καταδουλούμενον τὸ πλάσμα τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ καλλίστου καὶ τελείου ἀνθρώπου καὶ γὰρ οὕτως αὐτὸν καλοῦσι.*

Reitzenstein, who regards all the N.T. texts as later interpolations, proposes to omit ἀφ' οὗ . . . συνέστηκεν (= Eph. iii 15) and to construct ἄνωθεν with ἐδόθη. The original meaning of the last part of the sentence, he holds, has been obscured by Hippolytus or by his source. The sense required is that the *ψυχή*, which descends to the earthly body,

<sup>1</sup> *Refut.* v. 6.

is 'enslaved'.<sup>1</sup> The *ψυχή* is clearly identical with the heavenly Man Adamas.<sup>2</sup>

Dr Reitzenstein has shewn that the exposition which follows takes the form of an interpretation of a hymn to Attis which was then, as we gather from Hippolytus's account, popular in the theatres (ch. ix). The text of the hymn, quoted in ch. ix, is as follows:—

Εἴτε Κρόνου γένος, εἴτε Διὸς μάκαρ,  
εἴτε Ῥέας μεγάλας, χαίρει (ὦ) τὸ κατ-  
ηφές ἄκουσμα Ῥέας Ἄττι· σὲ κα-  
λοῦσι μὲν Ἀσσύριοι τριπόθητον Ἄ-  
δωνιν, ὅλη δ' Αἴγυπτος Ὀσριν, ἐπ-  
ουράνιον μνηδὸς κέρας Ἑλλη-  
νὶς σοφία, Σαμοθράκες Ἀδαμ(να) σε-  
βάσμιον, Αἰμόνιοι Κορύβαντα, καὶ  
οἱ Φρύγες, ἄλλοτε μὲν Πάπαν, ποτὲ  
δὲ (αἰ) νέκυν, ἢ θεὸν ἢ τὸν ἀκαρπον ἢ  
αἰπόλον, ἢ χλοερὸν στάχυν ἀμη-  
θέντα, ἢ τὸν πολύκαρπος ἔτικτεν ἀ-  
μύδαλος, ἀνέρα συρικτάν.<sup>3</sup>

The Naassene document identifies Attis as Adamas, the heavenly Man, and interprets *seriatim* his equivalents and titles as given in the hymn in the sense of the myth. Homer, Anacreon, the LXX, and the N.T. are all drawn upon and expounded, fantastically enough, to confirm the doctrine. Dr Reitzenstein holds that behind our text lies a heathen Gnostic document which has been later interpolated by a Jewish and then by a Christian hand, and he has attempted to reconstruct the supposed original by omitting all of the N. T. and most of the O. T. references. The result is not in detail convincing. For example, he is obliged to leave in his hypothetical original three O. T. citations, and if the author knew Isaiah xxviii 16 on 'the foundation of Sion' (*Poimandres* p. 89) and Isaiah xxxv on 'the children of the barren' (*ib.* p. 95) and Daniel ii 45 on 'the stone cut out without hands' (*ib.* p. 89), it is not clear why he may not also have known the 'three swelling words' Kaulakau, Saulasau, and Zeēsar of Is. xxviii 10 (*Poimandres* p. 90), of which we are told that the first signifies Adamas, the second lower mortal man, and the third the River Jordan, which flows upwards; or Benjamin's cup, which, it is implied, corresponds to the 'crater' of the Timaeus in which God mixed and mingled (κεκέρακεν) all things; which, again, is referred to in the words of the Attis song

<sup>1</sup> *Poimandres* p. 84 nn. 6 and 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. ch. vii 10 *ψυχῆς γὰρ πᾶσα φύσις, ἄλλη δὲ ἄλλως ὀρέγεται* with ch. ix 4 *οὐτός (i. e. Attis) ἔστιν ὁ πολυώνυμος, μυριόματος, ἀκατάληπτος, οὐ πᾶσα φύσις, ἄλλη δὲ ἄλλως ὀρέγεται.*

<sup>3</sup> Wilamowitz (*Hermes* xxxvii p. 329) detects an artificial archaizing style and assigns the hymn provisionally to the reign of Hadrian.

ἐπουράνιον μὴνὸς κέρας. Nevertheless it may well be that Reitzenstein is right in the main point and that behind these chapters there lies an essentially pagan Gnostic document which has been superficially Christianized. In any case it is certain that the Naassenes held a doctrine of a heavenly Man which they discovered in the various gods of the mystery religions and expounded by references to Homer, the Septuagint, and the New Testament.

On the strength of this passage it is sometimes suggested that the Gnostics derived the conception of the heavenly Man from 'the literature of the Attis Mysteries'.<sup>1</sup> But it is more than doubtful whether the evidence points in this direction. There is nothing whatever about the heavenly Man in the Attis song<sup>2</sup>; he appears only in the commentary. The commentator starts from the myth which he must at all costs extract from the song. Hence the far-fetched derivation of the Phrygian divine title Πάπας (ch. 8. 22) Πάπας-παύει. This is the nearest approach the commentator can discover to an essential element in the myth—that the heavenly Man by his manifestation brings order into the pre-existing chaos, παύει τὴν ἀσυμφωνίαν. Hippolytus too, himself, writes of the 'actions', not of the literature of the mysteries, as attracting the Gnostics—διὰ τούτους καὶ τοὺς τοιοῦτους λόγους παρεδρεύουσιν οἱ τοὶς λεγομένοις Μητρὸς μεγάλης μυστηρίοις, μάλιστα καθορᾶν νομίζοντες διὰ τῶν δρωμένων ἐκεῖ τὸ ὅλον μυστήριον (ch. 9. 10).

It was Dr Reitzenstein who first pointed out the close resemblance in idea between the Naassene document and a passage in Zosimus the Alchemist.<sup>3</sup> In a letter to his sister Theosebeia Zosimus quotes from a Hermetic document not otherwise known, in which 'Hermes' contrasts with the false way of salvation by magic, the true way by means of knowledge of God and of self. Knowledge of self involves recognition of the distinction between the earthly and the heavenly Man. The earthly man is variously named Thot and Adam. The proper name of the heavenly Man is known only to Nikotheos,<sup>4</sup> but his common name is φῶς (= φῶς 'light'). From him men are called φῶτες. The

<sup>1</sup> So Bousset *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* p. 186 followed by J. Kroll *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos* p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> The God worshipped by the Samothracians is not referred to in the song by the name Ἀδάμας, as Bousset asserts (p. 185) but as Ἀδαμνα. So the edd. following a brilliant emendation by Bergk for the MS reading Ἀδαμ. See Hesychius s. v. ἀδαμνεῖν: τὸ φιλεῖν, καὶ Φρύγες τὸν φίλον Ἀδαμνα λέγουσι.

<sup>3</sup> Berthelot *Les alchimistes grecs* p. 201. Zosimus flourished early in the fourth century.

<sup>4</sup> An Apocalypse of Nikotheos was used by Gnostic Christians referred to by Porphyry *Vita Plotini*. 16. See also the Gnostic document in Codex Brucianus, ch. vii; Schmidt *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften* i p. 342. Cf. Reitzenstein *Poimandres* p. 268.

heavenly Man clothed himself with the earthly Adam, and thus man, as he is, came to be. This is the true meaning of the story of Prometheus, Epimetheus, and Pandora. Pandora is Eve, Epimetheus the fleshly Adam, and Prometheus the heavenly Man. The text of Zosimus, as it stands, further teaches that the Son of God, who is definitely named Jesus Christ, 'became all things, God, angel, suffering man' in order that he might enlighten men's minds, and enable them to give up the earthly man to death and to raise in safety their shining spirits to the place where they were before the world began. Here, as in the Naassene document, Reitzenstein maintains that the explicitly Christian elements are later insertions.

Among the Hermetic writings known to Zosimus was the *Poimandres*<sup>1</sup> which now stands at the beginning of the 'Corpus Hermeticum'. *Poimandres* differs from most of the extant Hermetic literature, but agrees with other Hermetic writings known to Zosimus in being unmistakably dependent upon the Old Testament in Greek, nor is it certain that it is uninfluenced by Christian conceptions. *Poimandres* gives us a clearer and more coherent presentation of the descent and the redemption of the heavenly Man than any of the other documents which we have noticed. The following is a summary of the relevant sections (11-26).

*Poimandres* relates how, after the revolution of the spheres had brought birds from the air, fishes from the water, four-footed beasts and creeping things from the earth,<sup>2</sup> Mind, the Father of All, who is Life and Light 'begat Man equal to himself and him he loved as his own son, for he was exceedingly beautiful, having the image<sup>3</sup> of his Father'. To Man God gave authority over all created things. But Man became filled with the desire himself to create, and with the Father's permission he entered the sphere of creation. He passed in turn through each of the seven planetary circles which wheel around the earth. The *διοικήτορες* of the seven spheres loved him, and he in turn received from each of them a part of their nature. After he had thus descended through the *ἀρμονία* of the spheres and broken their might, he revealed the fair form of God which he bore to Nature beneath, and Nature beholding his divine beauty enhanced by the powers derived from each of the spheres, loved him, and he beholding his own image reflected in water loved it. Thus Man and Nature were united, and so it came about that man alone of all animals is possessed of a twofold nature: he is mortal because of his body and immortal because of the essential (*οὐσώδης*) Man. In consequence of his union with the heavenly bisexual Man, Nature brought forth seven men corresponding to the

<sup>1</sup> Berthelot *op. cit.* p. 244.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gen. i 20, 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gen. i 26.



natures of the seven rulers of the planetary spheres. These likewise were bisexual. When the cycle of time was completed God loosed the bond uniting male and female characters. Man, and all other animals, who till then had been bisexual, became males and females and God gave forth the holy word 'In increasing increase, and in multiplying multiply,<sup>1</sup> all ye that have been created and fashioned, and let man, for that he has reason, recognize that he is immortal and that love is the cause of death'. After this all living creatures increased 'after their kind',<sup>2</sup> and the man who recognizes his immortal origin comes to the supreme good, while he who loves his body falls a prey to death and vice and the avenging demon. God the Father is Light and Life. Man has been begotten from Him. He who has learnt this truth will himself return to Light and Life. Poimandres then explains the ascent of Man. The physical body and the senses are dissolved into their elements. Passion and desire return to the irrational. Man mounts through the *ἀρμονία* of the spheres, restoring to each sphere as he ascends its appropriate *ἐνέργεια* which he had absorbed at his descent—to the sphere of the Moon the power of growth and diminution, to the sphere of Mercury the contrivance of evil and deceit, to the sphere of Venus the deception of concupiscence, to the sphere of the Sun the pride of rule, to the sphere of Mars unholy courage and reckless daring, to the sphere of Jupiter the evil opportunities of wealth, and to the sphere of Saturn the crafty lie. At last he reaches the *φύσις ὀγδοατικὴ* and approaches the Father. 'This is the good end for those who have won knowledge and deification.' The number closes with an account of the writer's mission to his fellow men and his prayer and praise to the supreme Father who is Light and Life.

The heavenly Man appears in other Gnostic systems, but except in the Manichæan system, which we will describe later, he is not, as in *Poimandres*, an essential element in the doctrine of redemption. According to the Barbelo Gnostics, as represented in the Coptic Gospel of Mary,<sup>3</sup> the highest god was named *Πρωτόανθρωπος* and the same title was also applied to Barbelo. In Irenæus's description of this sect, however, 'the perfect and true man whom they call Adamas' appears at the end of the heavenly genealogy as the offspring of Autogenes and Aletheia.<sup>4</sup> Here it is the Holy Spirit, or the Sophia or Prunicus, which descended to the lower parts and produced the creation of the world. Again, the sect described in Irenæus i ch. xxviii (Harvey) makes the First Man the highest God who produces as son the second Man or Son of Man, and they, by union with the Holy Spirit, who is the First Woman, begat

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gen. i 22, 28.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gen. i 21, 24.

<sup>3</sup> See Schmidt *Abh. d. Ber. Akad.* 1896 pp. 843 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Haeres.* i ch. xxvii (Harvey).

the Christ. In this case Sophia or Prunicus is an aeon flowing from the Spirit which descends and becomes mother of Ialdabaoth and the other planetary rulers. In the Pistis Sophia, which is associated with the Barbelo Gnostics, the Aeon Jeû is referred to as the First Man. The various Valentinian systems likewise contain the figure of the 'Man', but his position differs in the different versions. Some Valentinians, like the Barbelo Gnostics, made the 'Man' the supreme God.<sup>1</sup> In the Valentinian systems, again, there is no descent of the heavenly Man into matter. It is Achamoth, or the lower Sophia, who falls from the Pleroma and forms the demiurge Ialdabaoth and Adam, the first earthly man.

## II.

'The Gnostics', wrote Harnack in his *Dogmengeschichte*, 'are those Christians who, in a swift advance, attempted to capture Christianity for Hellenic culture, and Hellenic culture for Christianity, and who gave up the Old Testament in order to facilitate the conclusion of a covenant between the two powers' (*E. T.* vol. i p. 227). Historical research during the last generation has, on the whole, moved away from this position.<sup>2</sup> It is not only that the details of Gnostic systems can often be explained from oriental sources—this Harnack always allowed—but the fundamental ideas of Gnosticism—its dualism and its conception of redemption—betray its oriental origin.<sup>3</sup> It is no accident that the last in the succession of the great Greek thinkers, Plotinus, engaged in earnest polemic with the Gnostics—'those who say that the creator of the world is evil, and that the world is evil'. Platonists always find difficulty in avoiding an element of metaphysical dualism, but the aim and spirit of Platonism is monistic. The phenomenal world, though imperfect, is good and beautiful, and depends for its existence upon the ideal. The Gnostic was of a different mind. The wheeling planetary spheres, which to Plotinus were 'full of graciousness', to him were the inexorable and cruel rulers of an evil world from which he sought redemption. The Gnostic world view, it is now generally held, was derived in the main from Babylonian astrology combined with Persian dualism. The conception of the heavenly Man is not, as we have seen, a central feature of most of the later Gnostic systems, but in *Poimandres*, in the Naassene document, in Zosimus, the fundamental Gnostic ideas are embodied in the myth of a heavenly Man who descends into the dark lower world and in some way combines with the forces of the lower

<sup>1</sup> Iren. I vi 3 (Harvey).

<sup>2</sup> See the Preface to Bousset's *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*.

<sup>3</sup> See Carl Schmidt's excellent study *Plotin's Stellung zum Gnosticismus u. kirchlichen Christentum*. T. & U. Neue Folge Bd. v Heft 4.

world to produce man as we know him, or sometimes the whole world-order as it is. Bousset is in harmony with the general tendency in historical criticism when he turns to Persian religious literature for the source of the conception of the heavenly Man.

We find in the Avesta occasional references to Gaya Maretan, the first man.<sup>1</sup> He it was who 'first listened unto the thought and teaching of Ahura Mazda', and of him 'Ahura formed the race of the Aryan nations'.<sup>2</sup> He is referred to as the type of human strength and virility.<sup>3</sup> He was the first, as 'Saoshyant the victorious'<sup>4</sup> will be the last, of the Saints.<sup>5</sup> But there is nothing in the allusions of the existing Avesta which implies a myth of a primal heavenly Man.

It is otherwise when we turn to the Pahlavi texts of the Parsees. Here we find a doctrine of Gayomard as a heavenly being who falls a victim to the powers of evil, and from whose seed the human race is derived.

*Bundahis*,<sup>6</sup> the Pahlavi work in which this myth is elaborated, cannot be earlier in its present form than the Mohammedan conquest of Persia, A. D. 651, but 'many passages', writes West, 'have the appearance of being translated from an Avestan original, and it is very probable that we have in the *Bundahis* either a translation or an epitome of the *Dāmdad Nask*, one of the twenty-one books into which the whole of the Zoroastrian scriptures are said to have been divided before the time of Darius' (Introd. p. xli). Thus *Bundahis* may be used, though with some reserve, as testimony to the religious conceptions of ancient Persia.

In this book Gayomard, or 'the righteous man' as he is sometimes called, is a quasi-divine being. He and the 'labouring ox' were part of the original beneficent creation of Aürharmazd. For three thousand years the Evil Spirit and his confederate demons were kept in a state of impotent confusion 'owing to the righteous man' (ch. iii). At last, the three thousand years being ended, the wicked Gêh (the spirit of unchastity) thus addressed the Evil Spirit: 'Rise up, thou Father of us, for in that conflict I will shed thus much vexation on the righteous man and the labouring ox, that through my deeds, life will not be wanted, and I will destroy their living souls.' At this the Evil Spirit

<sup>1</sup> The passages are collected and discussed by Windischmann *Abh. f. d. Kunde Morgenlandes* Bd. i p. 73 f.

<sup>2</sup> Farvardin Yast 87.

<sup>3</sup> Tir Yast 13.

<sup>4</sup> The future saviour, who is to be born of the seed of Zarathustra at the end of the world and to inaugurate the Resurrection.

<sup>5</sup> *Yasna xxvi 10* = Farvardin Yast 145.

<sup>6</sup> I have used West's translation. *Sacred Books of the East* vol. v Pahlavi Texts pt. i.

was delighted and kissed Gêh and said, 'What is thy wish?', and Gêh shouted to the Evil Spirit 'A man is the wish and give it to me'. The passage which follows is very obscure. West translates as follows:— 'The form of the Evil Spirit was a log-like lizard's body, and he appeared a young man of fifteen years to Gêh, and that brought the thoughts of Gêh to him.' But Windischmann and Justi interpret the passage to mean that the Evil Spirit formed a youth for Gêh out of a toad's body. The Evil Spirit then launches his attack upon the creation of Aürharmazd, including Gayomard and the ox. The ox, as it died, spoke thus: 'The cattle are to be created, and their work, labour and care are to be appointed.' But, 'before his coming to Gayomard, Aürharmazd brought forth a sweat upon Gayomard, so long as he might recite a prayer of one stanza; moreover, Aürharmazd formed that sweat into the youthful body of a man of fifteen years, radiant and tall. When Gayomard issued from that sweat he saw the world dark as night, and the earth as though not a needle's point remained free from noxious creatures.' Before he was killed, Gayomard spoke thus: 'Although the destroyer has come, mankind will be all of my race; and this one thing is good, when they perform duty, and good works.' How Gayomard is finally killed we are not told.

It is not necessary for our present purpose to follow in detail the account in *Bundahis* of how beasts, birds, fishes, and vegetables sprang from the seed of the ox (ch. x), and mankind from the seed of Gayomard (ch. xv),<sup>1</sup> nor the account of the Resurrection of the dead which Soshyans is to bring about at the end of the world, when the bones of Gayomard will be raised first (ch. xxx 4).

Thus in *Bundahis* we find a Primal Man who falls a victim to the power of evil, and thus becomes the originator of the human race. It remains obscure how exactly the death of Gayomard is brought about. Bousset has followed Windischmann in adopting a highly speculative reconstruction of the myth in *Bundahis*. Taking his start from a phrase describing Gayomard in ch. xxiv § 1, which he translates 'welcher in das Wasser schaut', Windischmann suggests that the enigmatic 'sweat' in ch. iii § 19 quoted above, out of which Aürharmazd formed the beautiful youth of fifteen years, was originally water into which Gayomard, like Narcissus, gazes, thus, like Narcissus, falling a victim to his love for himself. This, again, would lie behind the equally obscure reference to the beauteous youth of fifteen years whom the Evil Spirit provides for Gêh (ch. iii). If this were allowed, we should have a close parallel to the fall of the heavenly Man in *Poimandres*. But Bousset has not noticed that the later editors, Justi and West, both follow Spiegel in rejecting

<sup>1</sup> Bousset has noted that the seven pairs of human beings that spring from Mashya and Mashyoi, the first humans, recall the seven pairs of *Poimandres* 16.

Windischmann's reading of the one phrase which positively supports this solution of the riddle. In ch. xxiv § 1 for *mia* 'water' they both read *mas* 'great'.<sup>1</sup> This is unfortunate, for it appears to dispose of the one real parallel which has been adduced from Zoroastrian sources to the Gnostic doctrine of the descent of the heavenly Man into the material world. Bousset and other scholars may be right in thinking that the Gnostic supreme God of Light derives from Ahura Mazda, and that Gayomard lies behind the Gnostic heavenly Man, but we have no evidence that the Zoroastrian Gayomard was thought of as falling into the material world like the heavenly Man of the Naassenes and of *Poimandres*.

One other passage in Pahlavi literature should here be noted. In Dinkard iii 82<sup>2</sup> Gayomard is spoken of as the son of the Father of all by his own daughter Spendarmad the earth. This is adduced as divine authority for the practice of Khvêtk-das or marriage of next of kin. In this passage Gayomard is the third member of the recurrent divine triad—Father, Mother, Son. A close parallel to this double relationship of the Father to the Mother is found in the teaching of the Gnostic sect referred to by Clement of Alexandria iii 4, 29: ἐν ἧν τὰ πάντα: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔδοξεν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνόητι μὴ εἶναι μόνη, ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπίπνοια καὶ ἐκοίνωσεν αὐτῇ καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸν ἀγαπητόν, ἐκ δὲ τούτου ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπίπνοια, ἣ κοινωνήσας ἐποίησεν δυνάμεις μήτε ὄραθῆναι μήτε ἀκουσθῆναι δυνάμενας: while Irenaeus i 27. 1 (Harvey) in describing the system of the Barbelo Gnostics, after giving the Triad Autogenes, Aletheia, Anthropus, 'whom they also call Adamas' adds: 'Hinc autem dicunt manifestatam, Matrem, Patrem, Filium.'

The chief Gnostic theologians flourished and worked in the Roman Empire, and they wrote Greek, though, as we have seen, their ideas were derived from the East. Manichaeism may, on the whole, be classified as a type of Gnosticism, but it arose a century later than the systems usually described as Gnostic, and its founder appears never to have known the Graeco-Roman world. Mani was born in Babylonia and began his mission in Persia. He is said to have travelled as far as India and China. He finally fell a victim to the jealousy of the Zoroastrian priesthood and was put to death by the Sassanian King of Persia, Bahram I (reigned A. D. 274-277). He wrote in Aramaic and Persian. In the case of Manichaeism we may probably assume a more direct dependence upon Zoroastrian ideas than is probable in the case

<sup>1</sup> Spiegel's criticism of Windischmann is quoted by the latter (*op. cit.* p. 89). Justi translates: 'welcher in das grosse (Gestirn, in die Sonne) blickte (ohne geblendet zu werden).' West: 'with eyes which looked out for the great one.'

<sup>2</sup> West *S. B. E.* vol. xviii p. 401 quoted by Bousset *op. cit.* p. 335 f.

of the earlier Gnostics.<sup>1</sup> 'Mani derived his doctrine', wrote Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, 'from the Magians and from the Christians'.<sup>2</sup>

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq's *Fihrist*, a sort of Arabic literary encyclopaedia composed towards the end of the tenth century, appears to give the most trustworthy account which we possess of the Manichaean system. The essential element in that system is the Primal Man. The following summary is extracted from Flügel's German translation of the Manichaean section of the *Fihrist*.

Mani taught that the Primal Man was begotten by the King of the Paradise of Light 'with the spirit of his right, his five worlds and his twelve elements', in order to repel the onslaught of Satan, the primaevial devil, upon the earth of Light. The Primal Man armed himself with the five elements of the earth of Light: the breeze, the wind, the light, the water, and the fire. Satan arrayed in the five elements of the earth of Darkness—smoke, flame, darkness, the scorching blast, and the cloud—encountered the Primal Man, and after a long conflict overcame him. By his victory he secured possession of portions of the Light and enclosed them within his own elements. Thereupon the King of the Paradise of Light with the other gods intervened, rescued the Primal Man, and defeated darkness. The Spirit of Life summoned the Primal Man with a loud voice from the depths of Hell, and he became another god. Meantime the five elements of Light which had formed the panoply of the Primal Man had mingled with the five elements of Darkness, the panoply of Satan. But the Primal Man, before his apotheosis, had descended to the lowest region of the world of darkness, and cut the roots of the five dark elements so that they could grow no more, and, on his return, had ordered one of the angels to draw the mingled elements towards that side of the earth of Darkness which marched with the earth of Light. Thereupon the king of the earth of Light gave orders to one of his angels to create this present world out of the mingled elements of light and darkness, and so to contrive it that the light should be able to escape out of the darkness.

It is not, for our present purpose, necessary to follow further the exposition of Manichaean doctrine in the *Fihrist*. One or two supplementary points which are found in other sources must be mentioned. According to the *Fihrist* the King of the Paradise of Light begat the

<sup>1</sup> Cumont *Recherches sur le Manichéisme* p. 172: 'Bien que [Mani] a pu faire des emprunts de divers côtés et invoquer même l'Évangile à l'appui de ses théories, un fait essentiel se dégage du commentaire succinct que nous avons fait de ses fragments; c'est l'étroite filiation qui rattache la doctrine manichéenne au mazdaïsme "chaldaisant" qui était pratiqué de son temps en Babylonie.'

<sup>2</sup> Flügel *Mani seine Lehre u. seine Schriften* p. 85. This book contains a text and translation of the section of the *Fihrist* which deals with Manichaeism.

Primal Man 'with the spirit of his right, his five worlds, and his twelve elements'. In the presentation of the system by Theodore Bar-Khouni,<sup>1</sup> it is said that the Father created the Mother of Life, and the Mother of Life the Primal Man. The *Acta Archelai* vii<sup>2</sup> agrees on this point with Theodore. Probably we may identify the 'Mother of Life' of Theodore and the *Acta Archelai* with the obscure 'Spirit of the Right' in the *Fihrist*. Here, again, we have the triad, Father, Mother, Son, and the heavenly Man identified with the Son, as in the Parsee *Dinkard*, in the Gnostic system of Iren. i 27 and, probably, in the original Naassene document behind Hipp. *Ref.* v 1 f. A further point of interest is that some Latin and Greek authorities for Manichee doctrine speak of the Primal Man as  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ,<sup>3</sup> thus recalling the identification of 'Αδάμας and  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  in the Naassene document, the teaching on  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  of the Gnostics attacked by Plotinus, and Julian's interpretation of the myth of Attis. In the *Acta Archelai* ch. vii it is not the Primal Man but his panoply—the five elements of Light—which is called  $\eta\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , i. e. the world soul. It seems likely that Manichaeism in Europe tried to commend itself by translating its Oriental mythology into the language of metaphysics. In a similar fashion our western authorities associate the Manichaeian  $\sigma\acute{\kappa}\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  with  $\epsilon\lambda\eta$ , but 'whether Mani ever attained to the conception of matter may be doubted'.<sup>4</sup>

There are essential differences between Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism: 'the aim of the Zoroastrian is to banish evil from the world; the aim of the Manichaeian is to extract from the world that which is good' (Bevan). But there is a strong family likeness between the two faiths. Mani held that Zoroaster, like Buddha and Jesus, was one of the true prophets who had preceded himself.<sup>5</sup> In both faiths we find a Primal Man. The Primal Man of Manichaeism is not, like Gayomard, slain by the power of Evil, and his relationship to the creation is quite differently conceived; but it seems likely that the two conceptions are in some way connected.

Bousset traces the myth of the heavenly Man yet further afield. In the *Rig-Veda* x 90 we have an account of how the gods sacrificed

<sup>1</sup> Pognon *Inscriptions Mandaites des coupes de Khouabir* p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> The Greek version of this section is preserved by Epiph. *Adv. Haeres.* II lxvi 25.

<sup>3</sup> Titus of Bostra i 29; Alex. of Lycopolis ch. iii; Aug. *De Ver. Rel.* ch. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Bevan *E. R. E.* art. *Manichaeism* p. 397.

<sup>5</sup> See the quotation from Mani's work *Shābūrkan* in Albirūni's *Chronology*, trans. Sachau, p. 190. Mani and his disciples appear to have known books which bore the name of Zoroaster, but not the *Avesta*. Cf. Alfarc *Les écritures Manichéennes* II p. 206: 'Ces livres sont, sans doute, distincts de l'*Avesta*, qui n'offre rien de chrétien ni de Manichéen. Ils doivent se confondre plutôt avec des écrits plus ou moins teintés de gnosticisme que nous voyons attribués au même personnage par des auteurs anciens.'

Purusha, the Primal Man, and from him created the universe and mankind: 'When born, Purusha extended beyond the earth, both behind and before. When the gods performed a sacrifice with Purusha as the oblation the spring was its butter, the summer its fuel, and the autumn its (accompanying) offering. This victim, Purusha, born in the beginning, they immolated on the sacrificial grass. With him the gods, the Sādhyas, and the rishis sacrificed. . . . When (the gods) divided Purusha, into how many parts did they cut him up? What was his mouth? What arms had he? What (two objects) are said (to have been) his thighs and feet? The Brāhman was his mouth; the Rājanya was made his arms; the being (called) the Vaiśya, he was his thighs; the Súdra sprang from his feet. The moon sprang from his soul, the sun from his eye, Indra and Agni from his mouth, Vayu from his breath. From his navel arose the air, from his head the sky, from his feet the earth, from his ear the four quarters; in this manner (the gods) formed the worlds.'<sup>1</sup>

This hymn does not belong to the earliest strata of the *Veda*. Thus the caste system is already developed.<sup>2</sup> But it is in any case earlier than the Avesta. Bousset suggests that this hymn embodies a more primitive form of the myth. In the Persian version Gayomard falls a victim to the power of evil: the Indian conception is Pantheistic, and Purusha is sacrificed by the gods themselves. Bousset suspects that the myth is ultimately a *rationale* of human sacrifice practised as a fertility charm, and that it belongs to the religious conceptions of the primitive Indo-Iranian group.<sup>3</sup> He suggests a further comparison with the myth in the Poetic Edda of the dismemberment of the giant Ymir by the gods who create the world out of the various parts of his body,<sup>4</sup> and thinks it possible that the myth is not only Indo-Iranian, but primitive Aryan. Speculations such as these, though by no means valueless, are, and are likely to remain, unverified.

<sup>1</sup> Muir *Sanskrit Texts* (2nd ed.) vol. i p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> This is said to be the only passage in the *Veda* where castes are referred to.

<sup>3</sup> *op. cit.* p. 211 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Poetic Edda *Vafthruthnismol* 20, 21, trans. Bellows:

Othin spake:

First answer me well, if thy wisdom avails,  
And thou knowest it, Vafthruthnir, now,  
In earliest time, whence came the earth  
Or the sky, thou giant sage?

Vafthruthnismol spake:

Out of Ymir's flesh was fashioned the earth,  
And the mountains were made of his bones,  
The sky from the frost cold giant's skull,  
And the ocean out of his blood.



## III.

We turn now to consider whether, as Bousset believes, this Iranian myth of an ante-mundane heavenly Man lies behind the conception of the Son of Man, which appears in the apocalyptic literature of late Judaism and in the Gospels.

Wellhausen has shewn<sup>1</sup> that the Aramaic phrase *barnasha* means simply 'man', and it is possible that in some passages in the Gospels the word originally had merely a generic connotation. 'The Son of Man is lord even of the sabbath day'<sup>2</sup> may mean only that man has authority to override the law of the sabbath. In a number of other passages, however, in the Gospels it is certain that the term 'the Son of Man' is used in a specialized sense of a heavenly Man who is to come with the clouds of heaven to pass judgement upon the world and to inaugurate the age to come. It is not for our present purpose necessary to discuss the question whether Jesus publicly spoke of Himself as Son of Man in this sense, or whether there was an intentional ambiguity in his language, or whether, as Lietzmann, Wellhausen, and Bousset believe, the use of the term by Jesus of Himself is not historical, but was read back into His words by the early Church. It is in any case certain that the Gospels imply a belief that the Son of Man is to come to judge the world, and that this belief is not propounded as a novelty.

The specialized usage of the term Son of Man in the Gospels finds its explanation in the remains of Jewish Apocalyptic literature, and in particular in the Book of Enoch. In the Book of Enoch by God's side there is a quasi-divine being like a man :—

ch. xlvi 1. And there I saw One, who had a head of days,  
 And His head was white like wool,  
 And with Him was another being whose countenance  
 had the appearance of a man,  
 And his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy  
 angels. (Charles's translation.)

To this being, who is often referred to as 'the Son of Man' or 'that Son of Man', God commits the judgement of the world :—

ch. lxii 2 f. And the Lord of Spirits seated [the Elect One] on the  
 throne of His glory,  
 And the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon  
 him,  
 And the word of his mouth slays all the sinners,  
 And all the unrighteous are destroyed from before his  
 face,

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* p. 123 f.

<sup>2</sup> Mark ii 28.

And there shall stand up in that day all the kings and  
the mighty,  
And the exalted and those who hold the earth,  
And they shall see and recognize  
How he sits on the throne of his glory,  
And righteousness is judged before him,  
And no lying word is spoken before him.

And one portion of them shall look on the other,  
And they shall be terrified,  
And they shall be downcast of countenance,  
And pain shall seize them,  
When they see that Son of Man,  
Sitting on the throne of his glory.

This heavenly Man, who is to judge the world at the end, existed before the creation:—

ch. xlviii 2 f. And at that hour that Son of Man was named  
In the presence of the Lord of Spirits,  
And his name before the Head of Days.  
Yea, before the sun and the signs were created,  
Before the stars of heaven were made,  
His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.

The heavenly Man appears again in 4 (2) Esdras, but the conception is here markedly different from that in Enoch. Esdras sees in a vision (ch. xiii) the sea blown upon by a wind and from the sea arises a Man who flies with the clouds of heaven; 'and when he turned his countenance to look, all things trembled that were seen under him'. A multitude of men gathers together to make war upon the Man that came out of the sea, whereupon the Man fashions a great mountain, and when he has flown upon it, he breathes out from thence a flood of fire, which consumes the multitude. 'Afterwards I beheld the same man come down from the mountain, and call unto him another multitude which was peaceable.' In the interpretation which follows, the Man is said to be 'he whom the Most High hath kept a great season, which by his own self shall deliver his creation, and he shall order them that are left behind'. He is further spoken of as God's son. The mountain on which he stands is Mount Zion, the multitude that is gathered against him is the Gentile nations, and the peaceable multitude which is received at the end is the lost ten tribes. The Man of 4 Esdras has much in common with the older conception of the Davidic Messiah. Unlike the Son of Man in Enoch, he is manifested *before* the Resurrection and the age to come, and his function is to destroy the heathen, and to reunite the chosen people in the Holy Land. From ch. vii it appears that his kingdom is to last four hundred years, after which he and all that have the breath of life are to die, and the world will be turned into

the old silence seven days. After this the dead will arise and the Most High will be revealed upon the seat of judgement.

It is generally agreed that both Enoch and 4 Esdras have been influenced by the famous vision of Daniel ch. vii. Daniel sees in a vision the four winds break upon the sea, and four beasts come up in succession from the sea—the first like a lion, the second like a bear, the third like a leopard, and the fourth a beast with ten horns 'diverse from all the beasts that were before it'. Among the horns of this beast there arose another little horn, with eyes like a man's eyes, and a mouth speaking great things. Then Daniel beheld one ancient of days, clothed in white, sitting upon a fiery throne, and before the throne thousand thousands ministered. Because of the words of the little horn, the fourth beast was slain and his body given to be burned. The other beasts were allowed to live on 'for a season and a time', but their dominion was taken from them. Then Daniel 'saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.' In the interpretation the four beasts are shewn to be four kingdoms, the ten horns of the fourth beast are ten kings, and the little horn another king 'diverse from the former', who 'shall speak words against the Most High'. But judgement shall be passed upon him, and his dominion shall be taken away and granted to the people of the saints of the Most High. It is plain that the being like a man who comes with the clouds symbolizes the people of the Saints.

There are obvious points of contact between the visions both of Enoch and of 4 Esdras and the vision in Daniel, but there are important developments in the later books. In Daniel the heavenly Man is not a personal Messiah or Judge; he is a symbolic figure who represents the kingdom of the Saints. Both in Enoch and in 4 Esdras, on the other hand, the heavenly Man is an individual personality who himself intervenes to judge and to save.

British scholarship, so far as I am aware, has confined itself to noting the dependence of the later visions upon Daniel and to pointing out the development in the idea of the heavenly Man from the symbolic figure in Daniel. But it seems doubtful if this literary treatment of the problem is adequate. How did the later apocalyptists come by their conception of the heavenly Man? If no such conception was originally implied in Daniel, we must at least recognize and account for the willingness of the later writers to discover it there. There is nothing, as far as

we know, in the older Judaism which would naturally lead on to such an idea, and there is thus a presumption that the conception entered Judaism from without.<sup>1</sup>

Gressmann,<sup>2</sup> who has forcibly stated the difficulty of the transition from Daniel as ordinarily interpreted to the later apocalyptists proposes a reconsideration of Daniel. He holds that the vision of one like a son of man was no original creation of the author to symbolize the kingdom of the Saints, but that, on the contrary, the figure of the heavenly Man was already given in the religious ideas of the time and was applied by the writer of Daniel to Israel. Gressmann supports his position by urging that the Man coming in the clouds of heaven does not naturally fit into the picture in Daniel. We should expect him to rise like the beasts from the sea, as indeed the Man does in 4 Esdras. The coming with the clouds is satisfactorily accounted for, if we suppose that it was part of the traditional picture of the heavenly Man. If Gressmann's interpretation of Daniel be allowed, the later writers are not so far removed in idea. They no doubt knew Daniel and were influenced by it, but they did not construct their own heavenly Man by an artificial misinterpretation of Daniel vii; they are rather to be thought of as drawing upon and variously developing a widespread mythical idea, which the author of Daniel had already associated with the eschatological hope.

Gressmann believes that the conception of the heavenly Man entered Judaism from without, but he is not prepared to maintain any definite theory as to its sources. Bousset believes it to be derived from the Iranian myth of Gayomard.<sup>3</sup> There is nothing inherently improbable in the suggestion. There are strong reasons for thinking that the belief in the Resurrection, the belief in a personal devil, and the elaborated

<sup>1</sup> Ezekiel xxviii represents the King of Tyre as a glorious being placed in Eden, the garden of God, from which he is expelled for his pride. 'It is probable that it is the history of the first man that floats before Ezekiel's mind. . . . It is not unlikely that he was in possession of traditions regarding Paradise more ample than those in Genesis, or different from them' (Streane *ad loc.*). But Ezekiel's language does not suggest the conception of a heavenly or pre-cosmic Man. The conception of a primaeval Man older than creation has been found in Job xv 7, 8. 'Art thou the first man that was born? Or wast thou brought forth before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?' But on the whole it seems easier to suppose that Eliphaz passes on from the thought of the first man to the thought of the creative Wisdom of God. See Driver and Gray *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ursprung der Eschatologie* p. 40 f.

<sup>3</sup> Reitzenstein quotes parallels to various features in the picture of the Son of Man in Enoch and 4 Esdras from Mandaean and Manichaean literature. This literature he believes to reproduce conceptions of earlier Persian religion, which had already influenced Judaism before the Christian era, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* p. 121 f.

doctrine of angels arose in Judaism as a consequence of contact with Persian religion. The conception of the heavenly Man might well be derived from the same source. If this is the case, it must be admitted that Gayomard has been effectively transformed. The Zoroastrian Man falls a victim to the power of evil before the creation of the present world, and is eventually raised from the dead as the firstfruits of the general resurrection, while the apocalyptic Man defeats or pronounces judgement upon the mighty at the end of the world. This transformation may in part be ascribed to the influence of the ancient Hebrew Messianic hope.<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to compare the heavenly Man of the Apocalyptists with the heavenly Man of a very different Jewish Theologian—the Alexandrine Philo. Philo makes the double narrative in Genesis of the creation of man the starting-point of a distinction between the heavenly and the earthly man (*De Op. mund.* 134f, *Leg. all.* i 134 f). The words in Gen. i 26 'Let us make man according to our image' are interpreted of an ideal immaterial man who is sexless and immortal. The εἰκὼν according to which he is made is the Logos. In *De confus. ling.* 146 Philo goes further and speaks of ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου as being one of the appellations of the Logos himself. The second man, whose creation is narrated in Gen. ii 7 'God fashioned man, having taken dust from the earth, and he breathed into his face the breath of life', is the first historical man. The man of this second creation is a sensible being compounded of body and soul, and endowed with sex. As a visible and sensible being man is mortal, but the divine spirit which is breathed into him is immortal. The conception of the heavenly Man in Philo, as in *Poimandres*, is part and parcel of a whole theory of human nature. Philo, like his successors the early Greek Christian theologians, does not distinguish between λόγος and πνεῦμα.<sup>2</sup> For him, therefore, the spirit which God breathed into the earthly body is no other than the Logos in whose image the heavenly Man was formed. This is the type of thought in which the early Greek Christian theologians worked out their Christology. There is a divine element in every man—the rational soul. This rational soul is akin to, and is a manifestation of the universal Logos. Thus the Logos is the archetype of essential human nature. This Logos, or archetype of the rational soul, became personally incarnate in Jesus Christ.

<sup>1</sup> The Son of Man of Enoch and the Gospels bears a closer resemblance to the Zoroastrian Sôshyans than to Gayomard. Sôshyans is to be born of the seed of Zorathustra at the end of the world order, and to usher in the Resurrection, after which, by order of Aürharmazd, he assigns to all men the recompense for their deeds. *Bundahis* chh. xxx-xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> See Gfrörer *Philo* p. 229 f.

The earlier apocalyptic Christology likewise identified Jesus Christ with the heavenly Man. At first sight it would appear as if the belief in Jesus as heavenly Son of Man might readily blend with a Logos Christology, and indeed it is possible that an interpretation of the term Son of Man on these lines was not absent from the mind of the fourth evangelist. He alone of the evangelists brings out the pre-existence of Him who is called Son of Man. 'No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man' (Jn. iii 13). It would seem, therefore, that the fourth evangelist was prepared, like Philo, to identify the heavenly Man with the Logos, and perhaps to suggest that the Logos was archetypal Man. However this may be in St John, the Son of Man had an entirely different connotation in Apocalyptic. Here the humanity of the heavenly being is in no way significant. Indeed, the heavenly Man is not really human. He is a divine or angelic being in the form of a man. For Philo, on the contrary, the heavenly Man was not in the form of a human being at all. A human form could only be predicated of that compound of spirit and earth which is the earthly man. On the other hand, the heavenly Man of Philo is the archetype of the truly human, i. e. the rational, element in mankind. The title Son of Man was originally applied to Jesus Christ in its apocalyptic sense, but in course of time the apocalyptic connotation was forgotten. With the possible exception of the fourth evangelist, Christian thinkers did not work in the idea with the Logos Christology, and, instead of denoting the supernatural function of the heavenly saviour and judge, the term by a natural misunderstanding came to be generally used of the incarnate, as distinct from the divine pre-existent Christ. Son of Man becomes an antithesis to Son of God. 'For this reason', writes Irenaeus, 'he calls himself Son of Man, because he sums up in himself that original man, from whom is made that creation which is born of woman, in order that, as through the defeat of a man our race went down to death, so again through the victory of a man we might ascend up to life'.<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus reproduces the Pauline doctrine of Christ as the second Adam. This doctrine has nothing to do with the heavenly Man either of Apocalyptic or of Philonic philosophy. Christ is second Adam in virtue of His incarnation. It is not impossible that St Paul actually combats the Philonic doctrine in 1 Cor. xv, where he maintains that the natural man was prior to the spiritual man. 'The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is from heaven'.<sup>1</sup> Later scribes interpolated the words *ὁ Κύριος*—'The second man is *the Lord* from heaven'. This gives St Paul's meaning. A heavenly Man would stultify his thought. He requires a divine being who *becomes* the Second Adam. This may be the reason why St Paul avoids the

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Haer.* v 21. 1 (Harvey).

term Son of Man, although he accepts the apocalyptic idea. It was too soon for the term to have acquired its specific association with the incarnation, while to speak of Christ as Man without reference to the incarnation would have been confusing.

It will have become clear in the course of this paper that the heavenly Man is no master-key to the mysteries of the history of religion. Historical affiliation between various presentations of the idea can be maintained with varying probability, but the idea itself was vague and lent itself to widely differing schemes of thought. The fundamental Gnostic doctrine of the redemption of a divine element from the hostile world of matter was, in some circles, elaborated in terms of the descent of the heavenly Man into matter and his subsequent redemption. More often, however, the same doctrine was presented in other ways. Usually it is not the Man but Sophia who falls from the heavenly state. Yet even then the conception of the heavenly Man is frequently retained. It was a given element in religious tradition and had to be worked in. Sometimes 'the Man' is the title of the supreme God, sometimes of a subordinate aeon, sometimes of both. In these cases the name seems non-significant. It is not unlikely that the Persian *Gayomard* was the original of the Gnostic, as of the Manichaean, heavenly Man, but the dualism of Zoroastrianism was moral rather than metaphysical, and we have no evidence that the Zoroastrian *Gayomard* was ever thought of as descending into an alien material world. If, as some scholars think, the Purusha of the *Rig-Veda* and the Zoroastrian *Gayomard* derive from an identical Indo-Iranian original, the original idea has been transformed in different ways and has been subordinated to two entirely different philosophies. The Vedas are pantheistic. Purusha is sacrificed by the gods, and becomes the source of gods, of men and of the world. In the Zoroastrian *Bundahis* *Gayomard* becomes the source whence mankind springs; but he is the creation of Ahura Mazda; he falls a victim to the Evil Spirit, and is eventually raised from the dead as the firstfruits of the general resurrection. It is conceivable, though it is certainly not established, that the Son of Man of Jewish Apocalyptic is another variant of the Persian Primal Man. If so, we have a further example of the complete transformation of the idea. The Man is now the future judge of mankind and redeemer of the elect. Finally, the term Son of Man enters upon a new history through its association with Jesus Christ. The apocalyptic idea remains: Jesus is to come with the clouds and judge the world. But first He came and lived a human life and gave Himself 'a ransom for many'. 'Son of Man' originally connoted the quasi-divine functions of the judge; later it is used predominantly to express the *human* attributes

of Him who humbled Himself to become 'the Son of Man'. With what meaning Jesus Himself used the term it is hard to say. It is an attractive theory that He used it with studied ambiguity.

J. M. CREED.

### A CRY FROM THE SIEGE: A SUGGESTION REGARDING A NON-MARCAN ORACLE EMBEDDED IN LK. XXI 20-36.

NEW TESTAMENT scholarship during the past half century has shewn a refreshing tendency to escape the trammels of traditionalism in method and outlook. But, while considerable progress can be registered, problems still remain which defy solution from the lack of readiness to approach them from a new point of view. Such a problem, I believe, is the origin of the very interesting oracle contained in Lk. xxi 20-36 ('But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies &c.').

It is the accepted opinion that Lk. xxi is no more than an editorial version of Mk. xiii; so much so that as a rule the question is hardly thought worth discussing. 'These sayings', writes Dr Burkitt, in reference to the Lucan Discourse, 'are nothing more than Luke's version of Mk. xiii 3-37.'<sup>1</sup> This statement is repeatedly made in a valuable chapter in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Pt. i vol. ii pp. 106 ff), where Dr Burkitt examines Lk. xxi 7-36 for the purpose of throwing light on the historical value of the speeches in Acts. His argument is that, while the style of Lk. xxi 7-36 is characteristically Lucan, the passage is none the less a version of Mk. xiii, and is thus 'a measure of the general faithfulness of "Luke" to his sources, and of the confidence which we may reasonably place in his reports of speeches in his second volume' (p. 115).

Now it is indisputable that St Luke has used Mark in the construction of Lk. xxi, but that the Lucan Discourse is simply an editorial version of Mk. xiii seems to me to be doubtful in the extreme in the light of facts which will be detailed in the present essay. I should not doubt that Lk. xxi 5-11, the first part of the Discourse, is a version of Mk. xiii 1-8. Regarding the second part, Lk. xxi 12-19 ('Warnings as to Persecution'), the issue is more uncertain. The third part, Lk. xxi 20-36 ('The Oracle relating to the Siege'), is the section I propose to examine here, and the conclusion to which the evidence seems to point is that this passage contains a fragment from a non-Marcian oracle, which was penned during the years A.D. 67-69, and which was subsequently enlarged by Marcian additions or insertions.

<sup>1</sup> See the chapter on 'The Use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke' in *The Beginnings of Christianity* Pt. i vol. ii p. 108. See also pp. 113, 115.