

ZARATHUSHTRA
THE ACHAEMENIDS
AND ISRAEL

ZARAΘUŠTRA, PHILO,
THE ACHAEMENIDS
AND ISRAEL

being

A TREATISE UPON THE ANTIQUITY
AND INFLUENCE OF THE AVESTA

for the most part delivered as

University Lectures

by

Dr. Lawrence H. Mills

Professor of Zend Philology
in the University of Oxford.

Translator of the XXXIst Volume of the Sacred Books
of the East, Author of the Five Zarathushtrian
Gâthas, etc.

Part I: **Zaraθuštra and the Greeks**

Part II: **Zaraθuštra, the Achaemenids
and Israel.**

Composed at the request of the Trustees of the Sir J. Jejeebhoy
Translation Fund of Bombay.

To be had of **F. A. Brockhaus** in **Leipzig**
1905 — 1906.

(all rights reserved).

Druck der Univ.-Buchdruckerei von E. Th. Jacob in Erlangen.

Zarathushtra, the Achaemenids and Israel

A discussion

of the Relation existing between the Avesta,
the Achaemenian Inscriptions and the Exilic
Semitic Scriptures

for the most part delivered as University Lectures

being

Part. II

of

Zarathushtra (Zoroaster), Philo, the Achaemenids and Israel,

Part. I

Zarathushtra and the Greeks

having appeared in 1904

by

the Rev. **Lawrence Heyworth Mills, D.D.**

Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford.

To be had of **F. A. Brockhaus in Leipzig.**

1905—1906.

(all rights reserved.)

Preface to Part. II.

I have little to add here to what was said in Part. I on pp. V—XIII except to repeat that, as before, several chapters have been rewritten from various Journals and Reviews, especially from the Asiatic Quarterly Review, and some from the Critical Review. I may mention however further items of work done as a reason for the delay in the issue of this second part.

The Pahlavi texts of the Yasna have been edited with the collation of all the Mss. in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, and in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* so far as to the *Srōsh Yasht* inclusively. Y. LVII—LXI (Sp.) have been also offered to *ZDMG*. LXII—LXXI, still remain to be edited with Y. II—VIII, Y. XXIII—XXVII, Y. LI (Y. XXVIII—XXXIV, Y. XLIII—L, LI, LIII (W.) having appeared in the *Gāthas*, of which second Edition^s is in request). That is to say, the Pahlavi Texts of Y. I, X—XVI, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXXV—XLI, LV, LVI (Sp.), have appeared in *ZDMG*, with Y. LVII—LXI, etc. to follow in 1906. Y. IX, 1—48 in *JRAS*, and Y. IX 49—103, Y. XVII (Sp.) in *JAOS*. The translations will be found in *JRAS*;

i. e. of Y. I, IX 1—48, X, XI, XII*, XIV, XV, XVI, XIX, XX, XXI, Y. XXXV—XLI, LV, LVI, with LVII—LXI, etc. to follow, and that of Y, IX, 49—103 in JAOS. Much other laborious work has been undertaken and carried through; but the Dictionary of the Gāthic Language of the Zend Avesta has suffered. Work upon this will be now resumed, and it is hoped completed. I must also ask the indulgence of the reader as to the omissions and some irregularities in the numbering of the Sections or Chapters in the present book owing to pressure through enforced haste. Surely petty oversights will be the less freely censured when it is remembered that I have devoted years of eyesight, patience and severity to the editing of my Pahlavi texts in all their minutest variants, feeling under obligations to probe the source of every error as well as to state my own views of the truth.

L. H. Mills.

Oxford, Dec. 1905.

* VIII Muséon.

Contents Part. II.

Zarathushtra, the Achaemenids and Israel.

	page
Section I. Preliminary remarks	210
Exhaustive treatment a necessity.	
Section II. The canonical Books of Chronicles, Ezra, etc., as sources of proof of the connections.	
An appeal to especial religious convictions should not be present	211
Sources of proof. The Exilic Scriptures with their Persian elements.	
Persian features of the Exilic Books	213
The merely historical statements in those Books have of themselves great weight	214
Section III. The Inscriptions as sources of proof.	
The Vase, or Cylinder, Inscription of Cyrus in its relation to the Jewish Scriptures	215
Chronicles, Ezra, and Isaiah.	
Searching doubts should not be discouraged	216
Section IV. This title of the Section has been unfortunately omitted in the text.)	
The Cyrus Vase, or Cylinder, Inscription in its Text	217
The capture of Babylon	218
Section V. This Title has likewise been omitted by oversight.)	
The Inscription ad Isaiah.	
The thronging troops.	
The reception of Cyrus.	210
Section VI. Consideration for the native Gods.	220
Ezra's expressions justified; and so Isaiah's	221
Section VII. Divinities restored to their temples	223
Section VIII. The Aryan Inscriptions and the Aryan Languages	
The Aryan Achaemenian Inscriptions. Their scenic and topographical characteristics. A Chapter in parenthesis	229
Wo can doubt the authenticity of Behistūn?	234
Section IX. The decipherment of Behistūn	240
The Jews and Persians conferred in Babylonia	
Beside affording irrefutable authority, the Aryan Inscriptions expand in a certain way the statements of the Assyrian-Iranian Inscription	242

The Inscriptions of Darius bear upon Cyrus	243
The elements of identity between the Monuments of Cyrus and those of Darius	244
The Inscriptions of Darius cast light upon Cyrus	245
Section X. The Biblical Edicts more closely compared with the Iranian Inscriptions	246
Subject matter of the Inscriptions. Extent of the Empire.	
The Empire in its constituent parts	247
The Divine sanction claimed	248
The Usurpation of the false Bardiya, Smerdes,	249
The Severity of Gaumāta and his Intimidations	250
The plea of Darius; the plot of assassination, and the Accession Darius establishes his Throne	251
The current oral reports are justified	254
With regard to Babylon	255
Section XI. Objections recalled and amplified	258
The God of Cyrus and Darius . . . upon the Tablets. Elohē Hashshāmayim is Devā.	
Ahura Mazda (Auramazda); meaning of the Name	260
Anthropomorphic imagery and plurality are not important as objections	261
Creative Energy as Ahura's attribute.	
Providential designations	262
The Divine providential support was continuous, and never intermittent.	
Darius' work was organisation and re-organisation.	
Section XII. The consideration of objections resumed and carried further	266
Dissimilarities.	
A pointed difference and a retraction.	267
Antithesis is present	268
Mutual exclusiveness is the Rule in all technical religious diction	269
A distinction surpassing most analogies.	
Section XIII. The doctrine of Isaiah XLV, i—7	270
Dualism an acceptance of two Deities in a theoretical sense only	
Where is the doctrine elsewhere to be traced?	271
Dualism in its fullest sense more closely analysed. Its especial Characteristic.	272
The two foci of ideas, God and evil elements were sifted, and multiplicities avoided.	
Was not an Assyrian Dualism the source of Isaiah's idea?	274
Was it Achaemenian?	275
As against both Assyria and the Achaemenians consider the Avesta	
Angra Mainyu. — The Interior of the matter	277
The origin of the distinctions again more closely considered	278

Ahura Mazda did not create evil	279
Was the doctrine of Dualism merely academic?	280
Section XIV. Dualism weighed	281
The depth of the great theory.	
Morning lights of the idea	282
The movements at the moment	283
The reversion to personification in the case of Angra Mainyu	284
The occasion for the personification.	
The Pandemonium abolished	286
The culmination of the idea	287
To test our pathway. Still further objections to be considered	289
Section XV. The connection between the Inscriptions and the Avesta pursued; some intervening points	290
Still further objections suggested.	
Complete identity not to be thought of	291
The natural necessity for difference between the related Lores	293
Section XVI. Elements of identity. Auramazda and Ahura Mazda; the Avesta and the Inscriptions	295
The Attributes	298
Auramazda the only really complete Deity upon the Inscriptions.	
Parallelism in language	301
Even closer linguistic forms are similar	302
The historical details and the spirit of the religion	303
Section XVII. Recurring objections. Angra Mainyu absent from the Inscriptions.	
Section XVII, a. The occurrence of the name was indeed to be expected	306
XVII, b. First answer to the objection.	
Absence of the name also from large Sections of the Avesta.	
Differing dates of Sections considered	307
Multiplicity of authors as of course	308
XVII, c. The Real point at issue	308
The most emphatic evil word in all the Inscriptions likewise the very same and most emphatic evil term in all Avesta, while it points out vituperatively the chief Agent of the Evil God, whose name was therefore needless upon the Inscriptions.	309
The Lie Demon had a »Chief« in the Avesta, Angra Mainyu. All such systems are pyramidal. Is it likely that the drauga of the Lie Demon upon of the Inscriptions lacked such a Chief? And would not this Chief be the self same Angra Mainyu of the Avesta in view of the facts?	311
XVII, d. Another omission	313
Where are the Devás upon the Inscriptions?	314
D(a)ēva was no unknown word.	

Mithra and Anahita mentioned; why not the D(a)ēvas as well? .	315
M. and A. mentioned solely because the particular Buildings were especially associated with their names. The occurrence possesses no antagonistic force in the argument.	
Section XVII, e. * (XVII, e erroneously marked in the Text) .	316
Where are the Ameshas upon the Inscriptions? . . .	316
Were they the »Other Gods«? Our Argument recurs . . .	317
Irrelevancy once again. — Our own usages compared . . .	318
The relative prominence of the Ameshas. — Did Darius care for them?	319
Darius in a predominating sense monotheistic	320
Section XVII, f. Extended sections in the Avesta in which the Ameshaspentas do not appear	321
Darius knew of the Ameshas — An Amesha possibly referred to.	
Time in executing the Inscriptions a serious element curtailing the citation of needless names, also space upon the Tablets	322
the citation of needless names, also space upon the Tablets	324
Section XVII, g. Zarafhusntra's name, where is it?	325
Vishtāspa's name	328
Section XVIII. Objections as to further interior elements of the Religion of the Inscriptions	330
Polytheistic tendencies, merely sympathetic	332
Instincts of chivalric courtesy. Respectful treatment of his subjects' Gods	333
His »Other Gods« were strangely limited	334
Section XIX. Objections continued; Darius's personal character as disclosed upon the Inscriptions	335
Cruelty of the executions. The executions acts of war, and done in self-defence.	
The international public must be struck with terror	336
Section XX. The answer to the charge of egotism	337
Lifelong adulations must in the end affect the balance of the faculties. Fixedness in statement	338
Extenuations; documentary expressions controlled by hereditary association. Further extenuations	339
The displeasing foible engulfed in the extraordinary circumstances. The situation called for self-assertion ^o	340
Sudden and extreme vicissitudes waylaid Darius's 'daily course	341
His self-assertion largely justified. Elements of truth. Modifications to be considered. The egotism, the expression of a sentiment for, or on behalf of, the Nation	342
Section XX, a. The altruistic element	344
XX, b. Inveracity supposable. The story of the false Bardiya. Was it genuine?	345
XX, c. Equivocations elsewhere	346

Some equivocation probably present in the extended political statements.	
Lyin _g was the universal implement.	347
The monuments are resonant with the well-adapted word.	
Some of the cases cited. The word is very frequent	348
The »Lie« self-limited	349
Veracity. An earnest desire for truth obvious	350
Section XXI. Was a disinterested motive present?	351
XXI, a. Sentiment doubtless existed, and it was deep	352
XXI, b. Was this sentiment fundamentally religious?	353
The personal piety of the Achaemenids as individuals. Pietistic sentiment expressed upon the Inscriptions; its iteration	354
This Sentiment in the case of Darius was genuine and passionate	356
Section XXII. The analogies pursued	358
Auramazda communicated commands	359
XXII, a. Was self-delusion present?	360
XXII, b. Superstition, if sincere, is not an adverse consideration here	361
XXII, c. Darius's religious sentiment, even if of an exaggerated is favourable to our conclusions	363
XXII, d. How as regards scepticism? The appeal to temporal rewards and punishments	365
Our answer. Dogmatic allusions and inferences were circumscribed owing to the great multiplicity of religious opinions prevailing in the Empire	366
Section XXIII. A glance toward the Result	367
XXIII, a. The rebuilding of the of the temples, recalled	368
XXIII, b. Restoration of populations to their homes, recalled	369
XXIII, c. The state of religious public opinion in Persia as all-important	375
Section XXIV. The age of the Gāthas and of the pre-Gāthic character, development	376
The antecedent of Avesta	377
XXIV, b*. The non-Gāthic Avesta	378
XXIV, c*. The Gāthic Documents	379
Internal and external evidence	380
XXIV, d*. The Gāthic Lore in its internal as well as in its external evidence	381
The esse _n ce of internal evidence	382
Are the Gāthas false?	383
Were they of artificial origin?	384
The motives for falsification abs _e nt.	
XXIV, e*. The Gāthas pre-existing in their predecessors	386

* should be XXIV, a, XXIV, b, XXIV, c, XXIV, d., etc.

All historical phenomena are recurring manifestations	387
XXIV, f. The underlying pre-existing force	388
Time indispensable for these developments	389
Iterations of religious sentiment	390
XXV. Was the Gāthic language a living one?	391
XXV, a. Latest conceivable date	393
XXV, b. The dialect of the Inscriptions as a gage for the Age of the Gāthas	394
A priestly language	395
Ancient forms linger even in a later language	396
The date of the spoken Gāthic relatively fixed	397
Gāthic and Vedic	399
XXV, c. How long before Darius were the mother-speech of the Achaemenian and the Gāthic spoken as living tongues	400
Exceptional influences not certainly present	401
The Gāthic as a spoken language	402
XXV, d. Internal evidence in external documents, Herodotus and his Successors	404
The Yashts before Herodotus	405
XXV, e. The Gāthas and the Yashts; were they contemporaneous Actual foreign Yashts in the Gāthic scene; a Vedic (?)	406
Mitrá then worshipped. Exclusion of Mithra; was it total?	409
The absence of Mithra from the Gāthas	410
Mithra could not have been forgotten	411
Rivalries not to be excluded	412
The one convincing point	413
Hypotheses as rhetoric	
Was Zarathushtra subsequent (?) to the Yasht period	414
The Gāthas as the latest (?) of the productions	415
Advantages in the opinion.	
Was he, on the contrary, pre-Vedic?	417
Was Mithra a post-Gāthic importation?	418
Reaction the pulse of history	419
Herodotus's works with their internal evidence	420
Deductions not avoidable	421
XXVI. The old extreme estimates once again	422
The non-Gāthic documents, their age	423
A thousand years' difference improbable	424
XXVI, a. The alternative to an early Zarathushtra	425
Section XXVII. Sketch of the facts resultant from the foregoing.	427
A word as to further restricted procedure	427
Positive or provisional conclusions	428
Section XXVIII. The Exilic elements in the Hebrew Scriptures	
What is Exilic and what is Postexilic?	429

XXVIII, a. The Pre-exilic eternal life	430
The classic Hades may be compared	431
Its conditions not resulting from a supernatural judgment	431
The Exile as a modifying force	432
The first formation of a Resurrection doctrine	433
XXVIII, b. »Resurrection« and »future bodily life« present in the original Iranian Lore	434
The two religious nationalities in their juncture	435
The development of the doctrines of the Resurrection, and of Angelology, also of Satan	436
The four world-periods of Daniel. — The distinction of clean and unclean. — Idol worship more severely censured in Iran than in Israel. — Sorcery condemned. — Soteriology	437
The Fire a symbol of spiritual purity in Iran and in Israel. — »The Seven Candlesticks«. Priestly Royalty	438
Section XXIX. The Literature of Israel surpasses that of Iran	439
Section XXX. The Question of »common origin«	440
Section XXXI. Semitic influence upon the Avesta to be expected	440
XXXI, a, particularly as regards the later Avesta	441
No Semitism in the Avesta texts; the Semitic Avesta Alphabet is mated with the Semitic Indian Alphabet	442
Where is the Semitism in the Avesta doctrines? Have we an all-important case? Is the Creationism of the Avesta of Semitic origin?	443
The Semitic system not so homogeneous. — The immemorial age of the Aryan race. — Aryan elements in leading Sumerian and Babylonian terms	445
The Ādar a Parsi month; presemitic Akkad and Sumer	446
Tēbeth an Iranian word	447
The source of sources our objective	448
The Avesta homogeneous; The Semitic scheme not uniform in the spirit of its doctrine aside from Exilic influence. If the Avesta scheme and the Semitic both arose from some common cause, that cause of origin was not itself Semitic	449
The Priestly Rewriters of the Semitic Mss. — The Avesta, barring the independent Devil, the One most prominent and most consistent representative of Monotheism in the ancient world	450
The Monotheism of the Exilic period was assisted in its main- tenance through Persian Associations. — Dualism itself a recoil from sin; all impurity was shut out from the idea of Deity	452

Section XXXII. Some of the striking coincidences in the reported expressions in the two sister Lozes, »King of Kings«, »Paradise«, etc.	453
The harps upon the willows	454
By the waters of Babylon	455
Resurrection and Forensic Judgment	456
The vital Services of Persian influence	458
Conclusion	460

Part. II.

Zarathushtra, the Achaemenids
and Israel.

Part. II.**Section I.***Preliminary Remarks.*

Having done what seemed to me to be possible to do to offer a full treatment of the question of the relation existing between the Greek-jewish *Lógos* and Zarathushtra. I must ask my readers to accompany me in another pioneer survey, viz. upon that of the question of the relation existing between Zarathushtra the Persian Achaemenids, and the once captive Tribes of Israel.

Exhaustive treatment a necessity.

The main object therefore which I have now immediately in view before me is to bring up all, or most of all the strong facts which stand out as solid proofs of the close connection of Jewish thought with that of Babylonian Persia, recollecting that Babylonia became Persian largely in its theology, and this even in the opinion of Assyriologists, at the Conquest of the Land by Cyrus. With these facts I must do more than merely allude to them.

Section II.*The canonical Books of Chronicles, Ezra, etc., as sources of proof of the connections.*

I wish to show that the statements in the canonical Books of Ezra, Chronicles and Isaiah really prove a close historical relation, and one which comes into marked point when we examine

the Biblical language which reports the Edicts of the Persian Kings, and compare them with the extant Inscriptions of Cyrus, Darius, and their Successors. And having shown that a community of thought existed between the two, or at least that this is to the last degree probable, I will then proceed to consider how intimately near the Inscriptions are to the Avesta. If I can succeed in accomplishing these objects, then the door would seem to be open between the hearers of the Avesta on the one side and the Jews of all time subsequent to the date of the Inscriptions on the other. And, in consequence, it becomes nearly certain that the Avesta, in its earlier parts at least, or some lore most closely kindred to it, must have leavened the thought with which Philo was familiar as well as much other occidental lore beside this, with the clear inference from it all that what traces of resemblance exist, if any, between Philo's details and the more prominent features of Gāthic doctrine were, if they were due to any historical influences bearing between the two systems at all, due to an influence originating from the Avesta and its sister lores and not to one originating from Philo.

An appeal to especial Religious Convictions should not be pushed.

In the course of what I have said elsewhere I have thought it best at times to appeal to certain readers upon the basis of their own strong religious convictions which induce them to adhere to the

supreme verity of what some of us call our 'inspired' Biblical statements.

In an argument addressed solely to experts in ancient critical history it would be entirely beneath the dignity of our subject to allude to such a matter; but of course this book, unlike its predecessors, is especially addressed to the larger public. If we could indeed rule-in such an element as the 'inspired' authority of documents and could prove our points, our task would come rapidly to an end. For if there are reasons for supposing certain especial passages in Chronicles, Ezra and Isaiah to possess supernatural claims to validity, then the question of the influence of Persia upon Jewish theology, as well as upon Jewish history would be settled at once without further discussion.

And as many of my Occidental, as well as some also of my Oriental, readers hold in various degrees of conviction to the doctrine of such a supernatural inspiration of their Sacred Scriptures, for the benefit of this class of minds, who are at times exceedingly sensitive upon the point, I pause here to make one single remark. It is merely to say that as there are important persons among the Christians and Jews on the one side, and among the Parsis upon the other who, while holding to the exceptional authority each of their own particular Sacred Scripture, do yet strenuously oppose such claims when made by the other party, it is obvious that nothing whatever would be gained by me if I should intrude at this place such a subject of discussion as the one suggested. We are therefore

neither obliged nor permitted to fall back upon such a source of supposed unquestionable certainty, unless it could be absolutely proved to the total satisfaction of all the parties concerned.

Sources of Proof.

The Exilic Scriptures with their Persian elements.

The facts with which we are attempting to deal seem to me to be absolutely immoveable, and provable, if any literary proof can be termed complete, by certain well accredited considerations, aside from any external corroboration. That is to say, they are proved by the internal evidence of certain surviving writings as corroborated by the notorious circumstances of the Jewish Exile and of the Return, which justly hold a prominent place in all our Occidental as well as in our Oriental religious history.

Persian features of the Exilic Books.

How many sections of the Bible, let us recall ¹, aside from all assertion of any especial religious authority for them based upon the fact, are actually dated from the Reigns of Persian Kings. How many books, both of the Bible and of the Apocrypha can only be described as Jewish-persian, and but for their immediate Jewish authorship as being almost as much Persian as they are Jewish; and what further interior affinities do the religious books of the Persians possess with those of the Bible, especi-

¹ See above, and later, upon the résumé.

ally as we include the familiar Inscriptions among the Persian documents!

The mere Historical Relation has of itself great weight.

That some of these works surpass some parts of the 'Bible' in certain significant particulars and vice versâ, has not so much at all to do with our point in the present investigation. It is *the close historical relation existing in general between the features and histories of the two lores* when considered in their entire extent, and this as proving a relation between the peoples which is the matter most of all in point.

Section III.

The Inscriptions as Sources of Proof.

Well did our great Sir Henry Rawlinson pronounce the now so well-known Cyrus Vase Inscription at present in the British Museum to be one of the most interesting that had yet been discovered¹. But his pioneer rendering can be read in a few minutes as worked over by his successors. So also of the Inscriptions found in Egypt²; while upon the Babylonian version of the Behistûn Inscription we have the pioneer work of the great Englishman also re-edited in a masterly manner by

¹ See also the Greek inscription found in '38.

² Dr. I. H. Gray has been reproducing these various items in a most interesting manner in JAOS, see the number for 1900.

his successors. And again once more we have the Scythian Version by Westergaard '40—'44, and following it the English Norris, 1853.

As regards the main matter of it all; that is to say, the Old Persian Sculptures at their known places, we have Weissbach and Bang in their edition (1893) of Spiegel's revised book, 1881.

The Vase Inscription of Cyrus in its relation to the Jewish Scriptures.

We must naturally first make use of the Inscriptions of Cyrus, as the Semitic documents on their side first deal with him, and in a manner so signal.

I refer of course to those memorable words, which, had we but read them now for the first time and with understanding, would produce so deep and startling an effect upon us, as well as upon all who value ancient historical science, for few indeed of the written records of the thoughts of man contain so much that bears upon the interior development of what many of us cherish as the guide to the other life.

Chronicles, Ezra, and Isaiah.

The words occur in the last chapter of second Chronicles and in the first of Ezra, also in the even more memorable terms of Isaiah XLIII, XLIV.

Let me cite the first of them (the Chief Edict) as from our English revised Version: »Now in the »first year of Cyrus, King of Persia, that the word

»of the Lord spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah might
 »be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of
 »Cyrus King of Persia that he made a proclamation
 »throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writ-
 »ing, saying: 'Thus saith Cyrus King of Persia: 'All
 »the Kingdoms of the Earth hath the Lord God of
 »Heaven given me; and He hath charged me to
 »build Him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah:
 »Who is there among you of all His people, the
 »Lord his God be with him and let him go up.«

Searching Doubts must not be discouraged.

Like all other items in evidence these statements challenge scrutiny. We read them for the thousandth time in their translations or in their language, and at each fresh glance they stir within us, that is to say, within some of us, sometimes curdling doubts. 'The people were indeed restored', so we may hear ourselves concede, 'and both with the consent, and at the command of the Persian authorities, but in no such spirit as we have here expressed'.

'The Persian Monarch could not have concerned himself personally at all so closely with the affair as we have it here set forth in these so full allusions'. 'They are wholly improbable as supposed to be what they pretend to be', — so we have often suspected —, and they were got up by the returning Exiles to strengthen their cause against the surrounding tribes. These daring settlers patched up this so-called decree, so we were wont so say, putting it forward as an inspired utterance from the mouth

of the great Gentile Ruler, or from his pen. For where, it might well be asked, could he have at all acquired such a connection of ideas? What ever happened like it? But we have a corroboration of it and one in a form most simple and accessible. We have also wondered, perhaps, how the Hebrew annalist could have been so very unguarded as to make Cyrus actually give orders for the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem, Artaxerxes also supplementing the announcement, as we see also from the Book of Ezra (VI), and lavishing assistance in the form of treasure, if not of men.

The Cyrus Vase Inscription in its Text.

But we take up the so-called Vase Inscription (which is deposited in the British Museum) with the pioneer renderings of Rawlinson and Pinches, emended by Winckler, Hagen, Schrader and Delitzsch, and also the Backstein Inscription, — and we see our Scriptural allusions at once made good, studying also the annals of Nabuna'id, in the same great Repository. This first of the Inscriptions of Cyrus which is applicable to my present purpose, and which was deciphered by Sir Henry, is a political decree, stamped doubtless upon hundreds of clay cylinders systematically distributed, as I think, in different parts of the Province, or of the Empire. This 'copy' has escaped destruction, and well did our great Bahnbrecher emphasise its interest. He was himself under the impression, I believe, that it was deposited in the archives by Cyrus himself, or at his

personal direction. This could however only indirectly have been the case; it was doubtless one of many widely scattered replicas. It was found, as we read, by one Hormuzd Rassam (evidently a Parsi) in a hill at Babylon. The transliterations of the transcribers differ of course very much, as our Pahlavi decipherments so often do; and the renderings also vary as they naturally must; but, as in the case of the Gāthas, the terms which carry the most valuable meaning are generally quite plain.

The Capture of Babylon.

»The great Lord Marduk, (so Kūrash dictated;
 »was he not thinking of his own Ahura Mazda?),
 »‘regarded propitiously the protection, that is to say
 »‘the protector’ of His people, his victorious work,
 »and his righteous heart, going toward his city
 »Babīl as a friend and as a companion at his side.«

The Inscription and Isaiah.

With this compare Isaiah »whose right hand I
 »have holden, in righteousness have I raised him up,
 »and all his ways will I direct. I will go before
 »them, and the crooked shall I make straight«.

The thronging Troops.

»His troops spreading out in numbers never
 »known, (so the Inscription proceeds), like the waters
 »of a stream marched weapon-girded at his side«. (This is even more graphic than the Prophet): »thus
 »saith Yahweh to Koresh . . . to open before him

»the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be »shut«, that is to say, »they shall be forced with »little effort«.

»Without battle, says the Inscription, »made »He (Marduk) him (Kūrash) enter Babil; my widely »thronging troops came in in peace'. 'Bars of iron »shall I cut asunder', said Isaiah; and in an isolated spot of the worn inscription, according to Hagen at least, occur the words, »the door was destroyed'¹ . . . 'I will loose the loins of Kings', said »Isaiah, . . . and the Inscription runs, 'Nabuna'id »the King who feared Him (Marduk, He, Marduk) »delivered him into his (Kūrash's) hand«. Recall Isaiah's words of Yahweh, »he, Koresh, shall do all »My pleasure.«

The Reception of Cyrus.

But the inscription goes further, and makes him out to be a 'pleasure' not only to the Deity, but to the captured population. In fact, he claims at once a plebiscite from the masses whom he had just conquered or from the Gods who represented them: »whose Kūrash's, (Cyrus's) sovereign authority they »desired to the joy of their hearts.«

The Hebrew records teem with terms describing the welcome; see the citations everywhere; and on his side, in the Inscriptions, Kūrash claims the fawning homage of the Babylonians and dubs it

¹ This need not have been a City Gate; but that it was some portal of importance seems certain: that is to say, if it were indeed anything at all; and it was 'cut asunder'.

genuine. It had however the meanest motives. »They rejoiced« says the ardent politician, »over his »assuming the kingdom, . . . their faces beamed (*sic*), »for the Lord who by force of His power wakes »the dead (a touch this of his Persian sentiment, if the translations have not hid the truth; he was used to speaking so of his Ahura), Who with »care and waiting protection, he continues, had done »all well, Him did they bless with joy, guarding and »maintaining His name.«

The Inscription seems to surpass our Hebrew texts themselves in the high colour of its delineations; and if the Babylonian words were not all so simple, we should hardly believe them to have been rightly read by the distinguished scholars who have so sagaciously and so laboriously worked upon them. We were also once uneasy, as we remember, at the suspicious statement that Koresh (Cyrus) was declared to have seriously professed some real regard for the (foreign) Yahweh. But all the same on the Inscription he never pauses in his steady movement forward:

Consideration for the Native Gods.

»Since I entered Babil (so he ventures to assert) »amidst exulting shouts (so), and established the »Throne in the Palace of the Princes, Marduk the »great Lord made the honourable hearts (so) »of the »inhabitants of Babil inclined toward me *because I »was daily mindful of His worship.*« Note well this most rational item which is to be compared with what is said below; see it expressing the courte-

ous and humane recognition of the other »Gods«, »the Clan-gods« or »all the gods«, whom the Successor of Cyrus so wisely and sincerely respects. »My widely thronging troops . . .« so he continues . . . (did something favourable, we may be sure) . . .

»I allowed no affliction to seize all Sumer and »Akkad, the honourable race. I justly took over all »the necessities of Babil and all its cities. The in- »habitants realised the satisfaction of their hearts' »desires (so), and the dishonouring yoke (n. b.) was »taken from them.« The orator goes on, and laments the sad condition of Babil under the man whom he had just relieved of his Crown and of his Capitol; not that Nabuna'id was faultless: »Their sighs I »hushed,« so he proceeds, »their anger, (as against »the deposed sinner(?)) I appeased (so). Marduk, the »great Lord, rejoiced over my works so full of . . . »beneficial results (?) . . . He blessed me, Kūrash, who »worship Him in grace, and also Kambuzi'a, my »body's son, since we in righteousness praise before »Him His sublime divinity'.«

Ezra's Expressions vindicated.

This forever annihilates the authority of all who too cynically treat our Bible-texts. If Cyrus spoke thus of these false Gods so inferior to his own Ahura, surely he must have said something like what Ezra records of Yahweh, so near his own great Deity.

And so Isaiah.

»Isaiah had said »thus said Yahweh to Koresh »His Messiah, to subdue nations before him«; and

according to Ezra we have: »Thus saith Koresh
 »King of Persia: all the kingdoms of the earth hath
 »Yahweh Elohim of Heaven given me« (see also the
 the terms of the Inscription, which heighten the expres-
 »sions). I am Kūrash King of the all (the then known
 »world), the great King, the mighty King, King of
 »Babīl, King of Sumer and Akkad (which he had
 »just conquered), King of the four quarters of the
 »world (compare Isaiah's expression 'from the East
 »to the West« not said of Koresh but in the im-
 mediate connexion and in consequence of his in-
 spired action). »I am the son of Kambuzi'a the
 »great King, the King of Anshan, grandson of (a
 »former) Kūrash the great King, King of Anshan
 »of all royal blood.« Here we have doubtless some
 diplomatic exaggeration, as this hardly agrees with
 Behistūn; nevertheless this Vase Inscription is prac-
 tically in line with that and the others. Isaiah
 proceeds, »thus saith Yahweh; the labour of Egypt
 »and the merchandise of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans,
 »men of stature shall be thine, they shall come after
 »thee; in chains shall they come and they shall fall
 »down unto the saying; 'Surely God is in thee'' (if
 said not of Koresh but of Israel, this was yet said
 in direct consequence of the deliverance of Israel
 as effected by Koresh (Cyrus)). And according to
 the Inscriptions not only did the dwellers in Babīl,
 all Sumer and all Akkad, princes and potentates,
 fall down before Kūrash (Cyrus) but »all the kings
 »of the heavenly regions (the four quarters of the
 »horizon) as well as enthroned as they were in palaces,
 »altogether from the upper sea (the Persian Gulf?)

»to the lower sea (the Mediterranean) the Kings of
»the West lands dwelling in tents (Arab-like), all
»brought their heavy tribute *and kissed my feet in*
»*Bab̄il* from . . . to Asha . . . and Shushan . . . to the
»cities on the other side of the Tigris.«

Divinities restored to their Temples.

Then as to the actual restoration of foreign Deities and the reinstatement of temple services, this seemed at our first glance upon it to be indeed a steep fence for us to charge; that is to say for those of us who do not simply fall back upon a supernatural 'inspiration'. 'Very likely indeed', so most alien critics have also said, 'does it sound', following upon all that Cyrus is said to have done in the matter of the restoration of the political status, 'very likely does it seem that this great 'heathen' Emperor should cite an order from this 'Clan-god', as he would most naturally have called Him, this Yahweh Elohim, Clan-god of his insignificant dependants, scarce worthy to be called 'allies'; — and this with reference to the reconstruction of that central religious Edifice the contemplation of which filled them with such fierce fanatical enthusiasm, for it offered the very most pronounced expression of their so exclusive religious party passions; — 'very ridiculous', as we might more openly have expressed ourselves; — but read the Inscription, and see what it says, alluding not to allies, except in the crudest sense, but to the cringing hordes just conquered. He (Cyrus) writes: »I brought back to
»their place (the Gods . . .) and made them dwell in

»an abode for ever.« And as to the actual rebuilding of the sacred City, see the Backstein inscription. Eshakkil was a temple city, as it seems, and the Inscription reads »Kū-ra-ash ba-ni-i(m) Ēshakkil u »Ē-zī-da apil mKambū-zi-ia sharru dannu a-na-ku. »Kūrash the builder of E. and E. son of K. the »great King I.«

And as to the notorious Return of the captive Tribes, if any one still hesitates at that, see the line: 'All the inhabitants I collected and then restored to their dwellings'; see also what is said later upon Behistūn. I cannot help noticing here what we would once term that 'romantic' item, where Artaxerxes, after fulsome commands for a Restoration, makes an appeal for himself to the Jews that they may »offer sacrifice of sweet savour unto Elo- »hīm of Heaven and pray for the life of the King »and of his sons,« reminding us also of Ahasuerus and the rest. Who has not at times thought this an especially feeble adjunct to the tale? — Yet it was one of the most sober of all serious statements, connected with all that went before, the one most naturally to be expected of all possible assertions in the connection. »May the Gods,« wrote Kūrash (Cyrus), after having fully restored Them to Their shrines, »may all the Gods¹, he wrote, whom I have »brought into their cities (just as Yahweh was restored »to Jerusalem); may all the Gods, pray daily »before »Bel and Nabu for long life for me . . . and speak »to my Lord Marduk for Kūrash the King who fears

¹ So both Hagen and Shrader as against the first personal.

»Thee, and Kambuzi'a his son.« Compare this also again with the urgent request of Artaxerxes cited just above.

All this piety was of course political to some extent. Nevertheless, as I take it, Cyrus was in a certain sense a man of faith; he really believed these Gods could help him, and this from the very nature of his convictions; and he sincerely desired their co-operation. Once again as to 'building', see a last isolated sentence, if it be correctly given, »I sought to make their habitation strong« (so Winckler and Hagen). If this refers to the demolished houses of the inhabitants, it refers to those of their Gods as well.

The language of Ezra is justified, as I maintain, and so is that of Isaiah, and fully so. It states what must almost of necessity have taken place. And not only was it not one of Cyrus's sudden points of policy, but it was so to speak, a steady business continued by his great, though not immediate, Successor, as we see also from Behistūn (Weissbach and Bang, i. 14). *The first thing that Cyrus thought of in Babylon was to rebuild the temples; and this as a matter of course.* Notice the presence of his son; cp. Ezra VI, 10. The two worked on together.

The Empire was as complex in its religious types as it was vast in its extent, and the amount of business entailed in administering it must have been phenomenal. Beyond a question there existed what was practically 'a Ministry of Public Worship', so to speak of it; and a part of its constant duty

was to restore the edifices and to see to similar needs of its most distant loyal subjects.

So far then from the records of the Hebrew chroniclers being what they might seem at our first glance to be, that is to say, an effect of childlike vanity, or a device of anxious policy mendaciously put forth, to build or rebuild temples proves on the other hand to have been one of the very first as well as one of the most necessary of all occupations of a Persian Emperor after victories. They were, all the time of it, continually building or rebuilding such like edifices. He attended to the reconstruction of cities and temples as a first point of humanity toward his humbled enemies; after the desolations of defeat. And the orders for the work were regularly 'personal' in form, just as our Bibles make them, issued in the King's individual name. Everything is even egotistically exuberant in the terms upon the records: In fact the Biblical edicts are restrained examples. Not only had the potentates no scruples in rebuilding temples, whether to Yahweh or to Marduk, but such scruples as they were conscious of were doubtless in the reverse direction. Nothing like the spirit of a Christian martyr, set with deathly desperation against the slightest recognition of any alien God, could have possibly found a place within the ideas of the Achæmenians, nor could they have understood such a thing, if it had been suggested to them by some adviser. These Achæmenids were men of business and practical to the finest point, and this from the very nature of their case. They

had undertaken to rule a formidable number of important and sometimes bulky nations dwelling in immense tracts on either side of them, even from Egypt to India, as well as from Turkestan to the Southern seas; — and they had no idea whatsoever of trifling with the situation as to any particular. These great multitudes of human beings had the common feelings of their race, and were sensitive, each one of them, beyond all reasonable doubt, as to his own individual religious convictions; and this these Rulers recognised with sympathy. Conscience, instead of urging them not to build for Gods whom they otherwise ignored, would, on the contrary, have led them to such acts.

This would be my first point: the Inscriptions prove amply that the Persian government rebuilt places of worship destroyed by military arson; and this as one of the first dictates of policy and honour. And if there had been no such passages as we find in Chronicles, Ezra and Isaiah, we should know from the Inscriptions alone that Persian gold, if not Persian workmen, had helped on the labour when the House of Yahweh was fully restored or re-erected at Jerusalem upon the Return.

From this we see that the most obvious items which were presented in evidence of the close connection between the tribes of the Restoration and the great Achaemenians were in no sense spurious, although we have claimed no exceptional authority for them.

Section VIII.

The Aryan Inscriptions, and the Aryan Languages.

The Cyrus Vase Inscription then beyond all shadow of a doubt, provides us with an effective and decisive parallel to the statements which are now forced once more upon our critical attention.

The detailed passages of Holy Writ are absolutely justified as proving to us that the Jews of the Return, I mean of course their leaders (chiefly), had exact ideas as to the animus of Cyrus, his customs and his power. The picture which they draw is no miniature nor an over-coloured caricature, but an extended canvas, in harmony with the real conditions of affairs, an image to the life; the Cyrus of Chronicles, Ezra and Isaiah is the self-same man whose long since recorded words have been so wonderfully preserved to us upon those few inches of material which we now most justly hold to be exceptionally precious.

But the Vase Inscriptions, though it is the issue of the great Aryan Ruler, is in Assyrian; and in this discussion the very shape of the words possesses point. Moreover (strange as it may seem to say it) the Vase Inscription lacks certain elements of confirmation.

The Aryan Achaemenian Inscriptions.

Their scenic and topographical characteristics.

A Chapter in Parenthesis.

And here I must bring in an element which at the first glance might appear to some superior readers to be quite of the minor class, and hardly telling at all upon this present side in the debate; that is to say, not upon the effectiveness of the Iranian Inscriptions as an element in the argument. And in some other stages of the investigation these details which I am now about to present become indeed once more subordinate.

Let this section be then regarded as being rather a meditation in parenthesis. For it is the physical substance or rather the lack of substance through the cutting out of stoney matter which I desire to recall here for a moment into view, as also the geographical considerations which adhere to them.

We have already read the so-called Edicts in the Chronicles and Ezra, (to linger for a moment once more here upon these particulars already cited) with their striking terms put chiefly into the mouth of Cyrus, but also into those of his successors. We have shown from the Vase writing (so far as that extends as a witness) how those records were possible to have been published by the Chronicler and by Ezra at the times stated, for this could not have been made certain except

through some contemporaneous authority. But the Manuscripts of ancient literature, inestimably precious as they are, have yet their limits, and so the vases and cylinders, for their claims are chiefly moral to the most of us.

Those claims are indeed acute and impress us with a sense of certainty, and they also stir a mental thrill within us when we consider the frail thread of mechanical life on which they hang. But when we turn to the Aryan Inscriptions we are met with something otherwise not comparable as testimony, appealing likewise directly to our aesthetic susceptibilities.

The Aryan Achaemenian Inscriptions have especial elements of Authority.

The clay Vase Inscription which possesses such a strong and almost irresistible intellectual hold upon us, though endowed with a sort of piquant charm to us from the very fact of its so delicate material and from the precarious existence through which it has persisted throughout a protracted period before it came into our possession, yet lacks some elements which our Iranian ones possess. It not only misses that impressive element which their physical dimensions and scenic positions give the Aryan Achaemenian Inscriptions, but to a certain minute degree a percentage of uncertainty inheres within the considerations which render it so valuable to us. Not at all because it has been for a long time hidden. This latter circumstance only enhances its

value, as it seems to me, in the acme of our interested search.

But if a Ruler of Babylonian Persia could write down such statements as we have in Chronicles and upon the Cyrus Vase at the time and place thereby of necessity indicated as the dates and homes of those so memorable writings, then of course any other person whosoever he might be could have done the same, and at any later date; that is to say, any person at all conversant with the more important transactions of the day, and possessing sufficient social status to secure the mechanical execution of the objects. The descriptions and traditions of the great supposed events must have flooded everything everywhere and for a long time after their supposed occurrence, and with the closest of details, and also (let us confess it) sometimes with the amplest of exaggerations. Every 'story-teller of Israel' and of Persian Babylon, whosoever he might be, could, even centuries after their asserted date, repeat these grand though simple annals; and if he repeated them at all he would most probably be more than willing to recall the imperial deeds of his country's former so eminent Ally, and with the usual inevitable result.

The very minor pupils of the schools, Assyrian or Jewish, in many a later period must also have often heard some intended echoes of the supposed events, and that as household words, if indeed there were such occurrences at all within the scope of public knowledge; and all this quite simply and as a thing of course.

But do we actually know from the Cyrus Vase and from the Scripture Edicts that the entire mass of these professed contemporaneous accounts is not really and in its bulk as original a complete imposture and altogether of a later date? For what have we at all as evidence approaching to an eye-sight upon objects to certify to us with ultimate effect upon us that those records were really so old, original and actual as they are now so thought without reserve by most of us to be? Where could the lot of them, the supposed authors of these writings (let us ask), the annalists, the reciters, the commentators and the engravers have got the incipient forms of their ideas as to these alleged colossal deeds at all, and at the dates and places which we have so freely claimed for them? I ask this question as referring to the entire classes living at the times in view, the monarchs, the nobles, the priests and the prophets. How do we actually know that such a state of knowledge was at all at hand with them as we have supposed to have existed in accepting the Vase Inscription, the Edicts, and the other literature of the time, and that which refers historically to it?

We believe indeed and fervently enough, nay we are critically convinced that the Vase is genuine as being contemporaneous with Cyrus and that it was engraved at his command, and that its Assyrian has been practically made out; and our scientific certainty is all the more refined because it is concerned with what is the reverse of gross, but is it

so completely justified as not to be conceivably erroneous? (Let us also not forget that all the supposed related facts which meet us in our Bibles and which are so very dear to many of us are themselves and most of all at stake). How then can we be so positively sure that Cyrus had expressed himself in the very singular manner narrated by the writers in Chronicles and in Ezra, and by the writers who prepared the statements which were engraved upon the Vase and upon its many replicas, if the Vase Inscription lacks any elements of certainty?

Many scholars, whether closely critical or not, may have been, and, as I believe, many were immovably sceptical as to most of the Scriptural details with regard to the Return and its Imperial subvention, doubting the whole account of it from its beginning on; see above on page 216.

The Biblical Edicts are indeed of themselves alone of a certain weight, and this whatsoever may have been their actual date when they were first recognised as documents in our oldest surviving Hebrew manuscripts; but they need themselves, and sorely, to be confirmed, and this also (although with greatly less persistence) we may say of the Vase Inscription.

As to the rejoinder; 'that the firmest conclusions of even the most advanced of specialists must be always somewhat subtle to the common mind in their chain of reasoning from premise to conclusion'; I will do nothing whatsoever but acquiesce in it. But the following facts remain.

These Bible passages, in spite of our previous life-long intellectual convictions, or pietistic confidence, might, as I would say, be one and all of them later inserted into the places where they occur in the Hebrew records. For there is literally nothing ancient upon paper, vellum or papyrus, which is absolutely entire as measured by what it originally was. Interpolation, hiatus, detrition have marred completeness everywhere. How then are we so absolutely sure that these people, the Kings, the Prophets and the Scribes, could have known those things at all and at Cyrus' time, or that these events in fact transpired. The Cyrus Vase Inscription itself, almost inestimably precious as it is, is more of a document than an absolutely certain monument, and this most positively.

That it is fragile of course enhances its acute interest in our eyes, and greatly so, as I have already said, but nothing dimensional confirms it. It might even conceivably have been falsified intentionally, forged in fact from its beginning to its close, finding its way also later in the course of time into some Babylonian Noble's library, where it has been (at last after so long a sleep) discovered, like the shoals of other counterfeits.

But who can doubt the authenticity of Behistūn!

Could an Persian Emperor, even if he had the wish to do so, have set a mass of architects, builders and sculptors to work to master that formidable

ascent, three hundred feet above the plain¹), and to hew out a series of falsifications concerning common public facts, of notorious import upon a well known mountain side (not that every individual item there chiselled was really intended to be executed as literally true).

The point which I am endeavouring to drive home upon the convictions of my readers is the unassailable fact of the authorship at the particular time and place of those magnificent details, and so also the full possibility that the others like them in their contents, that is to say, those in the Biblical Edicts and upon the Vase, can likewise be regarded as absolutely genuine and contemporaneous with the events which they are supposed, and which they profess so fully to describe.

Here are the very texts themselves engraved upon the open front of a conspicuous eminence in forms which must have taken months or even a few years in those slow days to cut out mechanically after arranging the surfaces for their reception, while the to them so deeply interesting process must have been watched by many a group from Darius's Government from the beginning to the completion, as well as by the passers-by.

So also of their well-mated sister records of Naksh-i-Rustem, Van, Alvand (while those of Persepolis and others within domiciles would be some-

¹ Diodorus Siculus, 2, 13, as Jackson recalls; see JAOS, 24, 78, 1903, wishes us to believe that Semiramis reached the summit of the Mountain through having masses of luggage heaped up from the level of the plain. Does this tend to show that some kind of scaffolding was used to assist the ascent at the time of Darius?

what less obvious to the public gaze). It really seems to me to be the fact, and I do not at all see how we can gainsay it that we have here in these Inscription some of the very excessively few original and therefore positively certified relics of the intellectual life of man, that is to say so far as regards these earlier dates, and the advanced character of their contents.

The existing evidence of the life of books is indeed impressive to us when we take a moment to consider it, and this just in proportions as the links in their identity from the earlier generations to the later ones may seem to us to be so slight. A little scrap of fibrous matter, brittle and exposed to destruction from a score of causes, it seems indeed to us to be almost trivial as the eye falls down upon it; but yet it has been to us an absolutely indispensable section in the long continued life-time of immortal thoughts, just as a single human being is a continuation of a precarious line, often at times with scarce a hope of its survival, from the remote ancestor to the just born descendant. So first from memoriser to memoriser and then later from copy to copy, or from replica to replica (in the case of vases, steles, and cylinders) its endangered existence has persisted through generations of the world's calamities. It is the frail life of human ideas which has been dependent upon a chip of clay, a shred of paper, or a scroll of vellum, and the very feebleness of this flicker of the mental breath makes what it is and what it announces to us all the more endeared, and likewise as we might

safely say of it, all the more sublime. A slender thread of human beauty it has stretched on to us in its precarious continuity unbroken in the very midst of arson, frauds, ignorance and above all of vandalism. It indeed affords us one striking proof the more of that so solemn circumstance, namely 'that the laws of life are really as inexorable amongst us as the laws of death'.

This has sublimity indeed, and I would be the last to point one sentence to lessen it, or mar its charm. *But there is another sublimity.* Amidst the now so indefinitely repeated masses of man's recorded efforts to carry on the knowledge of the world, with which devoted labour our presses have been groaning since the first use of types, no solitary specimen of an original handwriting back of a certain date has been preserved to us as absolutely fixed in its claims to be accredited as regards its time and place of origin.

The oldest Manuscript even of the venerable Veda itself is, strange as one might well consider the circumstance to be, comparatively new, the mere vibration of a note in an echo from the once mighty volume of early Indian song.

But here at Behistūn we stand in imagination beside our travellers and look upon an immoveable elevation bearing beyond all question the very characters which were cut upon its surface more than two thousand four hundred years ago. It is the Great Manuscript of Manuscripts (if we might permit ourselves for a moment so to speak of it). We see the very cavities carved out by the chisels

which were driven by the hands of men who were alive when the distinguished Ruler himself doubtless stood (and more than once) upon the timbers of the temporary structures, and watched the skilful touches of the hewers as they so deftly fitted in the shapes: surely this too has its grandeur; and it holds us silent, as much so as the little piece of pottery, with its truly formidable record (formidable in the immensity of its historical import). Here we have beyond all doubt existing products of 'the pen of iron' from human hands that were original at the work, and these results still stamped upon a mountain from the very body of the earth, at once a record and a portion of the Great Empire which arose, culminated and perished in its allotted periods.

The broken columns of the Palace upon the esplanade which spreads beside a valuable group of these Inscriptions at Persepolis are witnesses indeed to what is transitory. They tell us many a grand, if likewise also many a terrific tale of a once elaborated splendour and of its annihilation, but here is a living element like the soul of a departed body still speaking to us yet and from the self-same tablets as clearly as when the plains around them swarmed with the troops of the great Organiser, and the stately walls of the original edifices stood in the bloom of their artistic decoration. Strange witnesses indeed these are, as we may remark by way of interlude in passing, and from a very special reason, of the transitory state of human prominence, uttering as they do their magni-

ificent assertions of universal sovereignty (see the momentous passages repeated more than twice), each at the time of its execution expressing a mighty truth, namely that the very habitable globe, that is to say, the to them then known part of it, had been delivered by Almighty God to the Author of these writings to be ruled by him; while the fallen pillars, from these very facts, do but point out to us more vividly the fate of that same regal authority which has now for ever though not untimely passed away. While manuscripts and replicas are good indeed as hear-say evidence, these letters upon the walls of Persepolis and upon the living rock of Behistūn, (Van, Helvand Naksh-i-Rustem) seem to me to be like the hands of the ancient dead which we may grasp to-day as if they were present, and feel the very pulses beat within them as when they traced the great records which we have here before us, Terrestrial sites and scenic bearings as well as the relatively large dimensions of these impressive objects here assume an intellectual dignity beyond that which they originally possessed; for they make the texts which express the records of departed men for ever sure to us.

Manuscripts may vary through fraud or accident, and chasms of wholesale destruction may occur; but here are texts which a score of centuries could not have changed. All the vases of all the excavations might conceivably have been later written than at the time to which we would assign them, but here are characters cut upon a fixed substance from which they cannot move, and so high up upon

its surface that they could not be hid nor reached to ruin. Surely they and their sisters are alone in this their so exceptional authority.

The solitary still articulate voices (so they seem to me to be) from an otherwise now irrecoverable history¹.

Delapidation.

They have been mutilated slightly and in parts, and a little streamlet in the season's rains has obliterated here and there a syllable or indeed entire words, but these are fortunately for the most part easily to be restored from other places where the self-same sentences recur.

Section IX.

The Decipherment of Behistūn, etc.

The Jews and Persians conferred in Babylonia.

They have long since been deciphered and also gradually and elaborately worked up in translation from the early days of Grotefend just one century ago. Those of Behistūn have been rendered largely independently (let me say it with gratification), and sometimes first, by our own great Sir Henry Rawlinson, whose memory will last revered among us so long as genius is respected. Their phraseology is simple and austere; but it carries on the ideas with singular effect. Possibly we owe the suc-

¹ Not that we must forget the throngs of still extant fixed Inscriptions upon other themes. Yet even with these in view we may still ask 'what is there comparable to Behistūn and its Persian mates'.

cinctness of the style to this; for at Behistūn every distinct letter was cut out by workmen upon a narrow ledge, or upon some temporary structure erected for the purpose, perhaps on scaffolds laboriously placed, the surface of the rock having been beautifully polished for its reception; and observers say that the seams between the inserted stones fit in so well together that one can scarcely see at a little distance the lines of separation. These great Inscriptions were not so accessible of course to Jews as those in Babylonia; but the substance of them could not fail to have been known to the leading citizens when the precincts of Babylon swarmed with Persian troops as also with their new but sympathetic friends. And we know also from a later document of great value as at least an hearsay evidence, what we might well also have surmised quite a priori, which is that the so-called 'captive' Exiles were not at all confined to Babylon. The Book of Esther alone tends to prove to us that parts of them found their way as far at least as Shushan (so), a supposed summer residence of the ruling Family. The Persians, haughty as they were, and flushed with victory, would be all the more disposed to make their ideas known as well political as formally religious; and the more freely too although, of course, for the most part in general only, to these their now especial friends and dependants, in fact, to their sincere though comparatively so insignificant allies.

Let us then treat these Iranian Inscriptions just as we have treated the Vase Inscription, but

putting items here in the foremost place which do not occupy that position in our treatment of the Vase; and we shall soon see how the one set of writings corroborates the other.

Section IX, a

Beside irrefutable Authority the Aryan Inscriptions expand in a certain way the statements of the Assyrian-aryan Inscription.

As the Aryan Inscriptions absolutely certify to us their dates and the places of their origin, so they bring in with them all the related details of the contemporaneous history, exact as some of those items may be supposed to be, and also those which are not so closely in accordance with a probable or even possible sequence of events. For, let us not at all forget it, false history or history chequered with the various forms of familiar error (and what history is not like this) is, like our ancient Avesta Commentary, often most suggestive to us where the items of precious truth glint to our eyesight only from the midst of innumerable fabrications phantastic (some of them), to the verge of comedy, or subtle in their more rational suggestions.

As it is my object to develop as fully as may be possible a description of the general state of religious¹ sentiment among the Persians at the time of their intimate relation with the exiled tribes of

¹ I do not pause here upon the minor inscriptions found in '86 or '88, in, etc. etc.

Israel in Persian Babylonia, in order to do so I must endeavour to bring all our documents without exception as sources of evidence into line with one another.

And we can do this in the case of the Inscriptions of Darius and the Biblical Edicts of Cyrus, upon the strength of the many different facts. The Inscriptions of Darius, and his successors detail to us much valued religious sentiment of a peculiar kind as well as a large mass of historical facts (in outline) closely analogous to the events which occurred in the career of Cyrus; and we can for certain objects and within a certain range argue from these latter data most logically back to their predecessors; that is to say, we can most surely infer from these known annals of this Reign of Darius the past existence of masses of such records which must have been made at the command of Cyrus, but which have perished; and we can do this for the following reasons among others. If Darius continued on the impressive career of conquest, re-conquest and discipline so gloriously begun by Cyrus, we may be sure that these were practically identical in animus, as they were continuous in fact, with those of his Predecessor, only the obvious necessary superficial differences being held in mind.

The Inscriptions of Darius bear upon Cyrus.

We can therefore corroborate many general statements in the Jewish records concerning Cyrus by those upon the Iranian Inscriptions regarding Darius

within of course certain limits rationally defined. But we can do more, we can infer the religious animus of Cyrus from the expressed religious sentiment of Darius and with even greater precision than we can from Cyrus' own scanty relics. And this from a very particular and stringent cause, never yet, as I suppose, so fully stated elsewhere, if indeed at all. It will be better to describe it here at once, though I must revert to it later on.

Section IX, b.

The elements of Identity between the Monuments of Cyrus and those of Darius.

It is this; the religious sentiment in the Inscriptions of Darius and his successors, marked as it is, is only to be considered as being, in an exceptional sense *altogether really personal*. And *this is proved by the fact that its expressions are, so to speak, stereotyped*. Exactly the same syllables express precisely the same thoughts; and that within a large interval of nearly one hundred and fifty years¹, and these as adopted by the successive monarchs of distinctly differing characters and living under different circumstances, as the expression of their faith. If the religious terms were thus 'stereotyped', it proves that they expressed a traditional religious sentiment which was habitually professed by the Persian Kings; and this at once shows us that a certain sincere, or affected, religious sentiment was widely current at least among the upper classes of the vast communities, while it is impossible to say how far deep

¹ From Darius' date to that of Ochus, a period big with events.

down this sentiment may not have reached among the less susceptible inferior populations. If their Kings were constitutionally and officially religious the people must have at least professed to be animated by similar sentiments; and the young among them may often have experienced genuine religious convictions and compunctions. This being the case, we have the important result that we can argue from the expressed sentiment of Darius to that of Cyrus even aside from such statements as he Cyrus has himself so scantily left recorded for us to read and to explain.

We must also take the wider extent and greater bulk of the expressions in the Iranian Inscriptions at the same time into account; see above. Even their reiterations of the self-same sentiments have their effect upon us, and are justly significant.

These expressions; see them cited below; being so constant, uniform, and expected *actually cast more light*, as I would emphatically repeat, *upon the state of feeling at the time of Cyrus than the one extended Inscription left to us by Cyrus himself has done.*

With this interpolated preface we can at once proceed to re-examine the relation which exists between the Biblical passages which mention Cyrus, and the mighty Inscriptions which detail the deeds and thoughts of his great, though not immediate Successor, not of course losing sight altogether of what has been already said upon the Semitic phases of the subject.

Section X.

The Bible Edicts, now more closely compared with the Iranian Inscriptions.

The subject of the Vase Inscription belonged to Babylon; see above; and the leading Jews must indeed have heard the substance of its contents stated and discussed between their educated personages, and this more times than once. A very few of them may also have seen one or more of its many 'copies', if I am correct in my conjecture that our so greatly valued specimen is merely one replica out of a large 'edition'. But the Inscriptions of Darius were on extensive tablets; see above. They stand to-day on Mt. Behistūn, on the walls of the buildings at Persepolis, at Naqsh-i-Rustem, 15 kilometres N.W. of Persepolis, at Elvend (or Alvand), at Kerman, Susa, Suez, Van, Hamadan, or on temple pillars and prostrate columns, on seals and weights, and vases. The subject matter of these Inscriptions, like that of the Vase of Cyrus, could not fail to have been familiar to the Jews of the Babylonian Provinces for reasons at which I have already hinted. And what the great Iranian Inscriptions said, though few might actually read them in their letter, all officers of the King's Government must certainly have known, for though they are extensive when regarded as Inscription, their literary compass is necessarily but small.

Subject Matter of the Inscriptions; Extent of the Empire.

Upon one of them we have first of all the plainest and most exact details as to the extent of the Persian

sway in its relation to the expressions in Chronicles, Ezra and Isaiah. We believe from the Biblical Edicts that the vast extent of the Domain of Cyrus was common talk with the leading Jews, because that of his Successor was such, and we know this latter entirely aside from our mere belief, and with positive certainty from the Behistūn Inscriptions, the main contents of which must have been universally known to all prominent people of the day as well as to those who practically witnessed their execution. In fact these Inscriptions stand for us as an epitome of all the current historical political information of their period; and that is my chief point at this time just here in citing them. Here is a full, or at least an approximately full list of all the nationalities under the sway of Cyrus's near, though not immediate Successor.

The Empire in its Constituent Parts.

Behistūn, I, V, (l. 13). » Thus saith Dārayavaush (Darius) the King: These were the lands which fell to me: by the gracious will of Auramazda I was their King, Pārsa (Persia), Uvaja (Susa) Bābirush (Babylon), Athurā (Assyria), Arabāya (Arabia), Mudrāya (Egypt), tyaiy darayahyā, those of the Sea (the Islands), Sparda (Lydia (?)), Yaunā (Ionia), Māda (Media), Armina (Armenia), Katpatuka (Cappadocia), Parthāva (Parthia), Zarāka (Drangiana), Haraiva (Arīa), Uvārazmiya (Chorasmia), Bākhtrish (Baktria), Suguda (Sogdiana), Gādāra (Gandara), Saka (Sythia), Thatagush (Sattagidia (so)), Harauvatish (Arachosia), Maka (Mekran), in all twenty three nations... Through the favour-

able will of Auramazda they became subject to me«. Here is a literal statement in almost business language. It is of great scientific importance, if only for the establishment of ancient geography. That list comprehends what most Persians would then have called the *urbs et orbis*, or all of it that signified.

The Vase Inscription gave us only a few vague terms. Here we have a mighty catalogue which rests as the foundation stones of history upon the subject, and whose stately particulars beyond all doubt constituted the data for instruction upon the history of the Empire in every institute of learning, and it shows us also as convincingly that such information was spread also in other ways in the time of the Predecessor, Cyrus.

But we should especially note the close similarity of the religious formulas which accompany the expressions in the biblical edicts on the one side and those upon the tablets on the other.

The Divine Sanction Claimed.

»All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord »the God of Heaven given me,« this in this one place; and the list of almost the then known habitable Earth on the other, with the words »‘through »the might of Auramazda I became their King’«: »When Auramazda saw this earth confused (or ‘in »war’) He delivered it over unto me«, NR. a, IV. (l. 32).

In the same way we may treat the other expressions in our valued Scriptures. »Thus said »the Lord to Cyrus whose right hand I have holden »to subdue nations before him, and to loose the

»loins of Kings.« How did the writers get at these ideas, so natural as they seem to us; for every romancer would have used such words with little care or limit. We have the question: »did this most interesting Biblical statement exist at all as the reported saying of Yahweh, the Lord, through his distinguished Prophet, at any approximately corresponding date? Was the passage indeed contemporaneous with Ezra; and was it possible that it could be contemporaneous with him, or was it simply inserted later, and, as it were, spuriously into this place?« That it could have existed at the time of Cyrus we know positively first from the Inscriptions which carry on the Cyrus records, and from them alone.

The Usurpation of the false Bardiya; i. e. of Smerdes, and his Overthrow.

We turn to further parts of them and we read, Behistūn Inscription, A column, I, X (l. 26): »Thus »saith Darius the King: This is what was done by »me after I became King. One by the name of »Kambujiya (Cambyses) the son of Kuru (Cyrus) of »our family was formerly king here. This Kambujiya »had a brother, Bardiya by name, of the same »father and of the same mother. Kambujiya (Cain- »byses) slew that Bardiya. When this happened the »people had had no knowledge that Bardiya had »been slain. Thereupon Kambujiya went to Egypt, »and upon his departure the people revolted. The »Plotting Imposture (literally 'the Lie') made pro-

»gress in the provinces, as well in Persia as in
»Media also in the other provinces'«.

I, XI (l. 35)«. Thus saith Darius the King: After
»that a certain man, a Magian of the name of Gau-
»māta, revolted in Paishiyāvādā in the neighbourhood
»of a Mount Arakadrish. From there he began. It was
»in the month Viyakhna, on the 14th day of the month
»when he revolted. Thus he deceived the people:
»'I am Bardiya, son of Kuru, brother of Kambujiya'.
»Thereupon the entire population revolted against
»Kambujiya, Persia as well as Media and the other
»provinces went over to him, Bardiya. He seized
»the government in the month Garmapada on the
»ninth day. Thereupon Kambujiya died by his
»own hand¹. . . .«

The Severity of Gaumāta and his Intimidations.

»Then Gaumāta the Magian took Persia as
»well as Media and the other provinces from Kam-
»bujiya; he acted according to his own will; (that is to
»say, he attained complete success); he became King.«

I, XIII (l. 48). »Thus saith Darius the King: There
»was no one, neither Persian, nor Mede, nor any
»of our family who wrested the Kingdom from Gau-
»māta the Magian (God did not loose his loins) the
»people feared him much ('on account') of his
»daring impetuosity². He wished to put many to
»death who had known the former Bardiya. For this
»reason he wished to slay them, lest they should know
»me that I am not Bardiya, the son of Kuru (Cyrus).«

¹ See Herodotus, who however reports this matter as if it were an accident.

² His fury, or cruelty (?); so Rawlinson and Sp.; W. & B., sehr (?).

The Plea of Darius.

I, XII (l. 43). »Thus saith Darius the King:
»The authority which Gaumāta, the Magian, seized
»from Kambujiya (Cambyses) was from of old in
»our family«.

The Plot of Assassination and the Accession.

»No one dared to utter a word concerning
»Gaumāta the Magian till I came. Then I called
»on Auramazda for aid. Auramazda brought me
»help. It was in the month Bāgayādish on the
»tenth day; then I slew him and his principal ad-
»herents with a few men. There is a fortress Sik-
»ayauvatish by name, in a region Nisāya by name
»in Media; there I slew him, and took the Kingdom
»from him. Though the gracious will of Auhar-
»mazda I became King. Auharmazda delivered the
»Kingdom to me...«¹.

*Darius establishes his Throne; Pretenders are
subdued and executed.*

I, XVI (l. 73). »Thus said Darius the King: When
»I had slain Gaumāta the Magian, there was a man,
»Atrīna by name, a son of Upadarma² who arose in
»Susa, (Uvaja): thus he spake: 'I am King in Susa'.
»Thereon the inhabitants of Susa revolted. He was
»King in Susa«.

I, XVIII (l. 82). »Thereupon I sent my host to

¹ Recall once more the words of the Chronicler, cited above,
»all the kingdoms of the worlds hath the Lord the God of Heaven
given me.«

² So Weissbach; 'Upadarma'.

Susa: This Atrina was bound in chains and
»brought to me and I slew him«¹.

II, XXIV (l. 13). »Thus saith Darius the
»King: A man Fravartish by name, a Mede, arose
»against me in Media; thus said he to the people:
»I am Khshathrita of the family of Uvakhshatra (so,
»Uvakhshtra(?)): thereupon the Medish population that
»were in the Palace revolted (?) to that Fravartish.
»He became King in Media«.

II, XXV (l. 19). »Thus saith Darius the King: The
»Persian and Median host, which was with me was
»small, thereupon I sent the Army. There was a
»Persian, Vidarna by name, my servant; him I made
»my commander-in-chief, and I ordered him: 'March
»hence and smite that Median host that calls itself
»not mine'. Thereupon Vidarna marched with the
»host forth. As he entered Media there is a city,
»Marush by name in Media. Here he delivered
»battle with the Medes. The commander of the
»Medes did not persevere. Auramazda brought me
»aid; through the gracious will of Auramazda the
»host of Vidarna smote that rebellious host right
»sore. On the twenty-seventh day of the month
»Anāmaka was it.

II, XXVI (l. 29). »Thus saith Darius the King:
»('Armenia had revolted against him) I sent my
»servant, Dādarshish by name, an Armenian, to
»Armenia saying, to him: 'March hence and smite
»that rebellious army which does not call itself mine'.
»Thereupon Dādarshish marched to Armenia, and

¹ He seems to have executed these offending Monarchs with his own hands. Was this however really meant?

»the rebels assembled and marched against him to
 »deliver battle. There is a settlement Zuzza (? so)
 »by name in Armenia. There they delivered battle.
 »Auramazda brought me aid; through the gracious
 »will of Auramazda my host smote that rebellious
 »host right sore. On the eighth day of the month
 »Thuravāhara it was that the battle was delivered.«

II, XXVII (l. 37). »Thus saith Darius the King:
 »For the second time the rebels assembled to de-
 »liver battle against Dādarshish. There is a fortress,
 »Tigra by name in Armenia; there they delivered
 »battle. Auramazda brought me aid. Through the
 »gracious will of Auramazda my host smote that
 »rebellious host right sore. On the 18th day of
 »the month Thuravāhara was the battle delivered.«

Column IV Behistun, (l. 31). »Thus saith Darius
 »the King, what I have done, that was done through
 »the gracious will of Auramazda in all manner.
 »After I became King I delivered nineteen battles.
 »Through the favourable will of Auramazda, I took
 »prisoner nine kings. Gaumāta, . . . Atrīna in Uvaja
 »(Susa) • Nadi tabaira (Nidintu-bel) in Babylon, . . .
 »Martiya, a Persian (again) in Susa . . . Fravartish
 »a Mede, . . . Chitřantakhma a Sagartian . . . Frāda,
 »again a Magian, of Margiana, . . . Vahyazdāta, a
 »Persian, . . . Arakha, an Armenian.«

IV, LII (l. 31). »Thus saith Darius the King:
 »‘These nine kings have I taken in those battles«.
 No wonder that Isaiah could venture to write of the
 predecessor as he did, for Cyrus out-did Darius, as we
 understand. We might almost hope that the record
 was exaggerated; see Behistun II, XXXII (l. 73). »Thus

»saith Darius the King; Fravartish was taken and
 »brought to me. I cut off his nose, ears, and I
 »cut out his tongue, and stabbed out his eyes. He
 »was chained in my court; all men saw him, then
 »I had him empaled in Hagmatāna (Ekbatana).
 »His principal adherents I imprisoned, and had them
 »spitted in the fortress in Ekbatana.«

Of Chitřantakhma we have, Behistun II, XXXIII
 (l. 88): »They took Chitřantakhma and brought him
 »to me. Then I cut off his nose and ears and
 »stabbed his eyes out. In my court he was chain-
 »ed; all men saw him; then I had him empaled in
 »Arbaira (Arbela).«

The current Oral Reports are justified.

The hearsay which is supposed to have formed the substratum for all these expressions of the great Hebrew prophet or the Chroniclers is *justified*. It is absolutely sure at least that it *could* have been contemporaneous with the évents, and it is also probable to the last degree that it was so contemporaneous. For these dicta from the Inscriptions must have summed up the principal items of all learned teaching, if not indeed of all school history throughout the United Nations; see above. The Jewish scholars knew many a copy of these records, if not indeed with absolute accuracy; and beyond a question they all referred to them and to similar statements made by Cyrus, or in his name, which statements were mates, so to express myself, without doubt, to the solitary specimen which we so

luckily have found. And though it may seem almost superfluous to prove such an easily conjectured fact as that the passages in Chronicles, Ezra, and Isaiah are genuine, and that their authors wrote them from widely current beliefs founded upon documents, yet it is never so well to despise anything whatsoever in a cause like this; and the substantiation of this fact assists the substantiation of that other which I have named, and of still others which I hope to state.

With regard to Babylon.

We have also from these Inscriptions a welcome word of corroboration with regard to Cyrus and at Babylon; that is to say, unless we think an Inscription engraved upon a mountain side is of less importance than one cut on a portable clay vase, or indeed of less importance than a book! The Cyrus vase describes the capture of the great City; see also the historians; but the Vase might conceivably be spurious as we must not forget, and the historians false. It is far less conceivable however that Darius should falsify wholesale upon these tablets, or that others should have forged his name in such a place; see above.

The Cyrus Vase declares that Babylon was taken, and by Cyrus; so Isaiah also implies, not naming the fact however. But from Behistūn we become absolutely certain of it. It belonged to the Empire before Darius, and he, Darius, retook it, as we shall see. And indeed he seems to have re-taken it more than once. This proves that it was a part of Cyrus' conquests, for Cambyses did little in that

direction; and so it corroborates the Clay Vase, as well as the statements of the Greeks.

The passage in its detail is as follows: Behistūn I, XVI (l. 77): »Thus saith Darius the King: »There was a Babylonian, Nadi tabaira (Nidintu-Bel by name, the son of Anaira's (Aniri') he revolted in Babylon. Thus he lied to the people: »I am Nabukdracara (Nebukadrezar), the son of »Nabunaita (Nabuna'id). Thereupon the entire Babylonian population went over to him. He seized »the government in Babylon«.

I, XVIII (l. 83). »Thus saith Darius the King: »Thereupon I went to Babylon against that Nidintu-Bel who called himself Nebukadrezar. The army »of Nidintu-Bel held the Tigris. There he planted »himself, and was also by the vessels (Sp. 'in »boats' (?)). Thereupon I divided my army into »two parts¹. . . . Auramazda brought me help. »Through the favourable will of Auramazda we »crossed the Tigris, and I smote that host of Nidintu-Bel at will. It was on the 26th day of the »month Atriyādiya that we delivered battle. (19) »Thus saith Darius the King: Thereupon I drew »toward Babylon (itself). Before I arrived at Babylon there is a city called Zāzāna (Zazannu) on »the Ufrātāu (Euphrates). There was that Nidintu-Bel, who called himself Nēbukadrezar. He had gone »there with his army to deliver battle against me.

¹ So at least W., & B. better than Sp. 's useful explanation W. & B. conjecturally reading *Madyakāuvā*, Sp. has — *makāwā*. W. & B. read *usabārim akunavam aniyahyā aspā patyānayam*. 'One part I mounted on camels, I provided horses for the others'.

»Thereupon we delivered battle. Auramazda brought
»me aid; through the gracious will of Auramazda I
»smote that host right sore. The enemy was driven
»into the water ¹; the water carried him forth. On
»the second day of the month Anāmaka it was
»when we delivered battle.«

20 Behistūn II, XX (l. 1) »Thus saith Darius
»the King: thereupon (Naidītabaira (Nidintu-Bel)
»went with a few horsemen to Babylon (itself);
»through the gracious will of Auramazda I took
»Babylon and that Nidintu-Bel, and I slew him in
»Babylon.« Surely the Isaiah of the period might
venture to write as he did, for he must have had
in his mind's eye similar records, if he was not actu-
ally citing parts of these. Replicas of the con-
tents of every Inscription of course abounded on
every side, as well as oral reports. And here comes
in once more what I think is plainly deducible from
the facts, which is that earlier Inscriptions, if they
were made at all, must have been modelled upon
forms like those surviving to us, for those of Xerxes
(B. C. 485—463) are exactly uniform with those of
Darius (about B. C. 521—485), those of Artaxerxes
the II, 404—358 with those of Xerxes, while those
of Artaxerxes III (B. C. 358 (?)—338 (?)) have still
fuller sections of identical phraseology.

Isaiah does not mention Babylon here indeed,
but his words are unmistakeable at this most strik-
ing place. 'Babylon' was a ringing word with
exiles, to some of them, the commonest of painful
thoughts. He says 'the gates', but he never thought

¹ in time of flood?

to name the place ¹. The very essential increment which the above adds to the foundations of our knowledge needs hardly to be shown.

Section XI.

Objections Recalled and Amplified.

But objections must not only be met, they should be recalled, and where not otherwise reported; they must be constructed and suggested; and this even where they are not actually vital. Is it conceivable, so some of my Jewish or Christian readers might inquire, that a gentile Monarch could at all harbour in his mind such lofty conceptions as we see expressed as well in the Scripture texts as in the Vase writing?

To answer this we must inquire exhaustively into the interior character of Cyrus's Religion. What was then the nature of his God?, in theory at least and losing sight of the ferocious deeds done either by Himself or by His adherents in His name.

XIa.

The God of Cyrus and of Darius as He is described upon the Tablets. Elohē Hashshāmayim is Devā.

And here we come at once upon an item which is of some technical interest, if not indeed of a startling character, for it may well afford us that internal evidence which is so precious to a serious critic. It may help us to prove that the real author of the professed Edict in Chronicles and

¹ In Daniel we have it: see also v. 31.

in Ezra was indeed not a Semitic scribe patching up a falsified report, but an Aryan man, as the text asserts. The expression with which both Cyrus, and Artaxerxes after him, there designates the Israelitish Yaweh Elohim is, according to our Hebrew Texts, »the God of Heaven«, Elohē Hashshāmayim. But the name points at once to the one signal word for God among the great masses of Indo-germanic human beings. What is »the God of Heaven« but »the Heaven-God«, the Devá¹?, the most marked word of the sort in the entire Aryan speech. »God of Heaven« indeed occurs elsewhere in the Scriptures and is put into the mouths of Semites in Ezra, Jonah, and Nehemiah; and these are post-exilic. Is not the 136th Psalm post-exilic as well? At all events the term is mostly exilic and post-exilic, and it may well have later insinuated its way into some of those passages which were themselves really ante-exilic. The cast of the words may indeed have been an accident, but I say that there is a very serious percentage of probability that what I have suggested is indeed the truth. The words »God of Heaven« may very possibly add a weighty item to the details which go to prove the deeply pervading truth of the Chronicler. He may well have heard that Cyrus's native God was Devá, »He of the Shining Sky«.

¹ I allude elsewhere to the fact that the Zoroastrian Iranians abandoned this name for God, making it in fact a name for »Demon«; but they too beyond a question once used it originally for the happy spiritual Beings of the Heavenly world.

XI b.

Ahura Mazda (Auramazda).

Who then, on the other hand was this »God of Heaven« in His definitive Iranian name? Or rather what is the meaning of this latter?

As this treatise may of course be read by some who have no experience at all in this linguistic question, I have to say here that the name »Auramazda« would be a very worthy title indeed for any nation to use for its supreme revered Divinity.

The Meaning of the Name.

Ahura is Indian Asura, a word for God, but conveying in the Gāthic, more of the meaning »Lord«. As to »Mazda« I would not insist too urgently here upon my own once and indeed still preferred solution of it as »the Great Creator«, for my colleagues generally prefer referring the last part of it to a word for »wise«. The Lord »the Wise One«¹.

Whichever view we choose, the name is pre-eminently appropriate, even for the most devout of populations to sanction, and to revere. In some respects it is superior even to the Jewish Yahweh Elohim.

¹ I object to the »modern« sound of the »Wise One«. »Wisdom« is not at all so natural as an early concept; It sounds to me highly rigid, self-conscious, and factitious. The idea of »Wisdom« was first reported by Nēryōsangh, who however saw the meaning »Great« in »Maz-«. I personally hold to another Mazdā = »wisdom« as a feminine.

*Anthropomorphic Imagery and Plurality are not
Important as Objections.*

The figurative allusions to both are fortunately not such serious considerations as to need to be brought up in our counter-criticisms. We have no need to dwell upon »the Lord God walking in his garden«, etc. on the one hand; for if not the Auramazda of the Inscriptions, then at least the Ahura Mazda of the late Avesta is anthropomorphic enough indeed at times, though never is this the case with the original conception of Him as we have it in the Gāthas¹.

Ahura Mazda seldom if ever in the Plural Number.

The name Auramazda (with Darius), was to begin with, obviously not a plural². »Other gods« are indeed mentioned, but it was Auramazda alone who was really intended to be thought to be »Supreme«. But to pass beyond the question of the meaning of the name.

XI c.

Creative Energy as His attribute.

In one place in our Isaiah, to return continually to our Biblical Edicts, the Inscriptions again

¹ The truly astonishing rhetorical addresses to Ahura in Yasna XLIV, were later rather naturally regarded as the interrogatories of an actual conference between Ahura and Zarathushtra, I think, however, inaccurately. There is however an expression in Y. XXXII, which looks like a prayer for a vision in which the saint should behold his Deity and confer with him after the manner of Moses.

² See Elohīm. Ahura is no plural, nor is Mazda, though either might be duals, not however with singular verbs.

seem actually borne in mind in their substance at least, if not in their letter, for, speaking in the name of Yahweh Elohīm, he has: »Ask of me concerning my sons and the work of my hands; command ye me. I have made the earth and created man upon it. I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens.« To this the Darius Inscription, echoing, as we are radically sure, the faith of Cyrus, answers as a sort of reaffirmation: »A great God is Ahura Mazda who made this earth and yon heaven, who made man.« So with singular iteration in many places scores of years apart. The terms are curt; but remember that they were laboriously produced with difficulty, indeed at every disadvantage; see above.

XI d.

Providential Designations.

The God of Cyrus in a true biblical sense was represented in the Scriptures as concerned immediately with the affairs of His servant. Is this again out of all analogy and an accident? • »For this cause (it is written) have I raised thee up for to make My power known.« Was this again pure folly, a mere rude thrusting of Israelitish religious concepts bodily into the public life of Persia, a flattery which neither Cyrus, nor Darius so soon after him, could even have understood? Far from it. As we continue to read, not only did the God of Cyrus's near Successor »make this earth and yon heaven and man«, but he watched over the destiny of His creature; and the Inscriptions state a far-

reaching and indeed supreme doctrine when they add that God created »civilisation«, so I would prefer to render the word ¹. For Darius at once follows up his statement with a direct application of this gracious power of God to himself and to his political system and adherents. »A great god is Auramazda »who made civilization for man, and who made »Darius King; and (therefore, so he evidently implies, therefore) I am Darius the great (meaning »‘the supreme’) King, the King of kings ², the King »of lands of many tribes, the King of this great »earth« ³ (because, as we may well supply, Auramazda made it).

Ten times in the course of these necessarily so short Inscriptions, and at intervals separated by many years, this statement is repeated; and naturally the sculptors would not waste their elaborately chiselled words.

The assertion was a Formula of the utmost sanctity ⁴; and it suggested a real monotheism in worship as the essential condition of national success and also of the very validity of the royal title, as »divine by right«. Darius was King of all the lands simply because God who created them made him so, as he believed, and as he so fervently asserted.

¹ Others render the word merely »happiness«, or »abundance of good things« which latter seems to me to convey an idea rather too flat ever to have had a place on the Inscriptions; yet even this, if the proper literal meaning must be understood, is in a wide sense, »optimism«.

² Remember the 23 Lands beneath him.

³ Practically true, for he ruled the greater part of the to him known civilised world, a kind of Eastern Hemisphere.

⁴ Commonplace itself becomes tragic or sublime upon these columns.

»As Auramazda created this great earth He gave it over to me«; so he reasserts, with what seems to us to be a fine insanity, but with what is precisely in accordance with the Book of Ezra and the Chronicles, accrediting indeed their extraordinary remarks about the man next but one before this Darius in the line; »*He ... has made me King*«.

The Divine Providential Support was Continuous, and never Intermittent.

Nor was there any intermission in the support of his Divine Patron. He was at no crisis left with his mere title conferred upon him and with his work in its detail set before him. Auramazda »brought him aid«, as he states, at every conceivable juncture. And if ever a true word was spoken by a devout affirmer, it was just this last when the great Organiser slowly spoke out to his penman what he wished to be made perpetual upon the selected places upon the tablets.

His Work was Organisation and Re-organisation.

»Through the grace of Auramazda, have I placed this earth in order« he declares imperially, though not imperiously. And in using the words »this earth«, he hardly meant »this land« alone, but more probably he seriously thought of what the Romans did when they spoke of the 'City and the Orb'; see elsewhere. And *who that knows what he accomplished can deny that he was simply stating what was a pre-eminent truth?* In fact some might almost suppose him to have been unequalled as an originator (considering his

time and his circumstances) in the entire line of previous or indeed of subsequent history. (He or his Successor(?), even dug a Suez Canal, as we have much right to believe, or at least he began one, and that if not exactly at the Isthmus, yet not so far away from it; see the Suez Inscription ¹).

The nature of this Aryan Deity, even as it is only in so far laid open to us, already vindicates the expressions of our Bibles, and shows their origin.

»All the Kingdoms of the earth hath Yahweh, »the God of Heaven, given to me«, was then no impossibility at all with Cyrus, for Darius his near successor has left almost, if not actually, its equivalent cut upon the rocks, and his successors in their turn repeated these startling assertions upon the walls of palaces and upon temple columns ²; and, as I hope to show before I finish, there is every reason to suppose that Ezra was really aware of these same facts. And this interlacing of ideas which exists in the religious conceptions of the two nations, the Iranian and the Jewish, even in so far alone as we have expounded it, may well have established a certain harmony of motives; that is to say, a kind of mutual national good-will between the two.

For certainly the extraordinary devotion of the Hebrew writers to these Persian Kings needs more than mere fear or selfish eagerness to account for it.

Such was in general and in the first rough

¹ The Darius there claims to be the son of Hystaspes; possibly however a Darius Nothus took on the Title »son of H.«. I should add however that most critics simply accept these statement of the Inscription.

² I will return later to this.

outlines of a statement, the nature of the God whom Cyrus worshipped as shown in the Inscriptions of his near, but not immediate, Successor, as also in those of his later followers ¹; and such was the close affinity of this Deity to the Yahweh Elohim of the Jews.

Section XII.

The Consideration of Objections Resumed and Carried further.

Dissimilarities.

Distinctions should be freely made.

But it will be only honest to pause here once more, and to discuss a serious modification which presents itself amidst the detailed considerations in our argument; and which also, so far as religious sympathy may be involved, offers an especially great objection. What I have to present now is indeed an obstacle only to the acceptance of a sentimental sympathy between the two Religions, the Jewish and the Iranian, while my proper business is to establish simply a practical Interchange of Ideas between them, and not at all so necessarily a religious sympathy. Yet it is sufficiently obvious that an interchange of ideas is far more probable between two nations in cases where a community of religious feeling also exists; for the bitterness of controversy among those alone capable of it, that is to say, among the intellectual leaders of the people, would have done all that it was possible to do to keep

¹ I must return to this subject later on, developing it.

a knowledge of the rival Theory from the apprehensions of the masses. When therefore anything presents itself which shows that there existed a bar, however slight or serious, to such a community in religious feeling between the two politically allied races, there that something constitutes a hindrance to the opinion that there existed between them also such a community of ideas as I am endeavouring to prove, and which are in themselves conceptions altogether independent of mere sentiment. I refer to an element in the inferable doctrine of Cyrus which is of a marked character indeed.

XII a.

The Objection, a pointed Difference and a Retraction.

As we examine the curious texts of Isaiah XLIV-V, the Prophet seems to us to be really under an apprehension that he may have gone too far in his so flattering assertions in regard to the Great Persian Restorer of his People, and to be hastening to make himself once more secure. And there was little wonder, we may add, that he should not have delayed to make his chief motive prominent. For it was not to be understood, so he implied, that these astonishing expressions ¹ were to be put on record for any unpatriotic or religiously unworthy purpose, surrendering the precedence of his own sacred national Deity even to such a »God of Heaven« as Auramazda. »All this was done«, he is careful to explain, »that thou (Cyrus) may'st know that I am the Lord (Yahweh) which call thee by thy

¹ See above.

name«, (not alone »thy God of Heaven«) 'but »even the God of *Israel*«.

XII b.

Antithesis is Present.

Here we have evidently an antithesis; for what else could the Prophet have meant in addressing a Gentile Ruler with such a significant exaltation of the God of Israel? The terms form a distinct protest against the too pronounced assertion of any claim on the part of Cyrus for his Devá(?)¹, God of Heaven, the Auramazda whom Cyrus's Successor indeed so gloriously names as having placed within his power the twenty-three great nations which included half of the to him then known habitable earth, or even the greater part of it, 'the God who made this Earth and »yon Heaven« while »all the nations of the Earth« expresses the subject matter in the Jewish records; see above. It was as if Isaiah had said, as in the name of the Author of his inspiration: »This Cyrus must not assume too much upon these recognitions which I am expressing, most decisive though they be. These signal words of my Prophet must not detract from the act of our omnipotent Yahweh Elohim. An especial reason exists for this His interference. It was »for Jacob my servant's sake and for Israel my chosen«, that He, Yahweh, says thus and now to him, Cyrus: »I have called thee by thy name. (And this in spite of the words of your Auramazda¹, »God of Heaven«,

¹ Urgent Probability enforces the duty of these allusions. Even Possibility alone demands suggestions. How else can historical science make its way in discovery?

to you«); »I, Yahweh Elohim, have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known Me, (so, by these words, superseding all claims of Him your Aurmazda¹ whom you have worshipped«). This seems to be a »retraction« indeed, as we recall the terms of the Chronicler, which were these: »Yahweh stirred up the spirit of Cyrus«. It, this modification on the part of the later Isaiah, seems to me to mean: »Be not too confident in that God whom we ourselves have come so near to recognise¹. Thou hast known Him indeed; but He is but an imperfect revelation of Myself¹; I am the Yahweh and beside Me there is none else«.

Mutual Exclusiveness is the Rule in all Technical Religious Diction.

This is all very natural as against the claims of any foreign God whomsoever; and it is pretty nearly identical with what Darius himself would most emphatically have reciprocated against any God or godling who asserted for himself the slightest claim to supremacy, domineering as such a supremacy must necessarily have been.

A Distinction Surpassing most Analogies.

But what shall we say to the following: »I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil; I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things«?

¹ Such possible connections of ideas possess imperative claims to be mentioned; see above.

What is the meaning of this? Or has it any special intelligible meaning at all? Is it anything beyond a mere flat assertion that 'the Lord' 'made all things'; 'good' and 'evil'. It would indeed sound strange enough to us that the 'Scriptures' should present any such a proposition here as an abstract discussion, even one concerning »the origin of evil«, and we should view such a supposed discovery with a suspicion almost sardonic. And if the passage, with its bearings, were at all of the ordinary type, we should not hesitate for a moment to discard the possibility of any reference to such profound interior distinctions. Yet the whole matter when viewed in connection with one great characteristic of a certain Religion, becomes peculiar to the last degree. What then at least, let us ask, may it *possibly* have meant, or we may at once make bold to say »what *did* it probably mean?«

Section XIII.

The Doctrine of Isaiah XLV, 1—7.

As I have said above, it has long been thought by some expositors that the words meant exactly what they seem to mean, although I am at this moment not able to state who those expounders precisely were ¹. That is to say, the opinion has long been held that they assert the claim that Yahweh was empowered to control »evil« in its entire mass and for the reason that He »created« it, whereas the words imply that the God of Cyrus

¹ I apologise for this neglect; but the critical reader will easily see that, it is an omission rather technical than fundamental.

was bereft of this function. But where could such an idea have come from?; and is it indeed, let us doubt once more again, any especial idea at all? Or is it the result of a fortuitous concourse of syllables?

We should say at the first glance that the passage probably meant nothing more; see above; than to assert that »the Almighty controlled the misfortunes of His saints as well as those of their opponents, the wicked«.

But upon more careful examination such an hypothesis vanishes at least as an opinion, which excludes the possibility of other elements; and it is to be rejected as not being the most probable solution of these extraordinary statements. For we discover that they refer to something which is distinctly technical, significant to the last degree, historical, contemporaneous, and extremely notorious.

Where is the Doctrine elsewhere to be traced?

We may indeed search both the Inscriptions and the Scriptures throughout, and yet get no further answer. But another witness arises once more upon the scene to explain the doubtful language of the Prophet. The curious words express a doctrine of Dualism, not indeed such a dualism as exists between nature and a transcendent »God« with Plato and his set ¹, but a simpler and a downright »Two-god« view.

¹ Properly first suggested by Anaxagoras; see above.

XIII a.

Dualism in its Fullest sense more Closely Analised.

But what was this Dualism in its interior characteristics? Let us treat the doctrine for a moment as if it were an entirely new one to us, and quite aside from all question as to its presence in or absence from the text of Isaiah from which I have quoted.

The Especial Characteristic of such a Doctrine.

It seems certainly to have been, in its definitive and formulated shape, one of the boldest and most singular suggestions that had ever been formulated, and aside from its theosophic elements, one of the most profound.

The two Foci of Ideas; Good and Evil Elements were sifted, and Multiplicities avoided.

It was a scheme which focussed all the evil influences or personal forces in the Universe on the one side and all the good ones on the other, instead of frittering the great thought of »universal conflict« away by leaving its elements an unsifted tangle of never-ending wranglings among a multitude of Gods and godlets. And it emphatically objected to seeing »all things« so hopelessly involved¹ in confusion and antagonism as they are, while those thus believing in such a confusion should yet hold at this same time to the doctrine that those same con-

¹ The *gūmezeshn* (i. e. »the mixing«) was abhorrent to Zoroastrian instincts even in the later literature.

fused and mutually antagonistic elements were the product of One universally Supreme and unchangeably »good« Creator. This our Dualism as now considered would hear nothing whatsoever of. It coolly announced that there were *two* Original Forces in the Universe which were wholly antagonistic the one to the other; and it implied a sharp denial that there was any One Supreme Being who was half-evil and half-good. The good Deity not only *did* not, but He *could* not, create 'evil', which was the work of a separate Cause. There were two separated and original Forces contending together in the commingled mass of existing things, the one wholly good and the other wholly evil; and they were also *personal*; *there were two First Spirits*. And this hypothesis became notoriously recognised in history later; and it is very familiar in its results to us all as critics¹.

If this be indeed the secret of Isaiâh's texts, then we have a statement of doctrine in our Biblical passage which could not well be surpassed in its interest or importance. But where did it come from? and by what means was it communicated? The first question hardly needs to be answered; but the rejoinder should be made at once: »Have we not a better certified source for it?«

¹ It was reproduced notoriously in Gnosticism, or in some sects of it, and also by the Manichaeans. Cp. the Christian Satan.

*Was not an Assyrian Dualism the Source of Isaiah's
idea?*

We have welcomed the Iranian Inscriptions as a means to assist us in our conscientious attempts to understand the Bible, for they evidently prove even to the profoundest sceptic that the drama depicted in the Jewish books had indeed a background that was real, and they have shown us beyond all question that there actually existed a Religion believed in by Cyrus which corresponded up to a certain point with what the annalists make Cyrus say. But, if such a dualism were seriously present in the thoughts of the Author of Isaiah XLV, was not its source Assyria? as that ancient country takes precedence at least in the matter of dates.

Assyriologists most properly put forward the vague dualism which appears upon the Inscriptions which they have so laboriously studied, and, to some extent, have so ably succeeded in explaining. But with all earnest sympathy with their arduous work and its brilliant results, both they and I would class that dualism of that ancient country with the great mass of such like doctrine scattered everywhere.

It is most certainly a significant point, if indeed it be thoroughly made out, that the Babylonians could never arrive at one single original principle¹. And to my mind the two principles »water« and »chaos« are most engaging. But they (Apsu and Tyāmāt) become at the next step the symbol of »sexual union«, and the »conflict« proper

¹ See Jastrów, p. 412, fig.

only begins with the advent of the later Gods, their product. The first two of the »three classes of »deities each consist of a pair, while the third is »the well-known Triad of the old Babylonian theology, Anu, Bel and Ea . . .« On a certain tablet ten pairs of Gods are enumerated. To each one »an associate is given in accord with the established »doctrine of *duality* (!) that characterises the more »advanced of the ancient Semitic cults in general.«

This has indeed the greatest interest and value in itself considered, but what has it in any conceivable sense to do with our present question? That »pairing« is totally dissimilar to either a philosophical or even to a mythical dualism. Valuable as I again cheerfully admit such a »dualism« as this to be, we can find it everywhere. There is not a cult which has ever been known which does not possess similar traces of this familiar feature. All forms of faith group good and evil gods on opposing sides. If we had nothing else but this, we should indeed have to be content with it; but here we are seeking something definite, pronounced and plain, a great historical intellectual circumstance.

Was it Achaemenian?

As for the Iranian Achaemenian dualism, we can only indirectly and by inference claim it as the source of these ideas expressed in the language of Isaiah. Darius names indeed a devilish personified abstraction, the »drauga«; and he reiterates in thunder tones his detestation of his (?) work, using it as the substance of a verb 'denominative' (adurujija); but where is there any hint whatsoever that his Auramazda did

not «create evil», or could not have created it, if He had so willed, or that there existed any other uncreated source of it, on the Inscriptions; and what right have we as yet to postulate such a limitation of Auramazda's power as there expressed?

To find such an idea we must turn to a still sublimer (if yet more painful) theory than any which we can critically report as being positively present in the terms of the Inscriptions, and that to one which, as I hope to prove, is closely related to those sculptured pieces, and which is almost built up upon the sought-for concept, both in the structure of its foundations and in the completion of its fuller frame.

XIIIb.

*As against both Assyria and the Achaemenids
consider the Avesta.*

Our Avesta is the only surviving system anywhere which has any original bearing upon the subject. That is to say, it is the only lore of the needed antiquity and of a distinctly religious cast¹, which throws light upon the expressions in Isaiah's texts. Its God is the Auramazda of the Inscriptions, though in an older and verbally separated form; and its Demon is on the other hand the evil God, who, as Isaiah feared, might wrest from Yahweh the sad prerogative referred to².

¹ Not only did Heraclitus deal in a dualism (within a Monism) later, but the very Platonic scheme is such (see above), the transcendent God being essentially divided from existing substance; but unless we personify both this »being« and »non-existent« God on the one side and »inert« matter on the other, the dualism of the Academy is not Zoroastrian. We have in the Avesta a wholly Good God on the one side and a wholly evil One on the other; see Y. 45, 2.

² That of being in any original sense »the author of evil«.

The Dualism which we have supposed to be referred to by the later Isaiah, and which is not traceable upon either the Assyrian or the Achaemenian Inscriptions is familiar to us all as owing its real origin to those singular fragments which under the name of »Gāthas« are so valuable a heritage to the intellectual religious history of man. The actual name of the fell Creator of all evil is not so important to us as the fact that He exists. Still it has its value.

XIII c.

Angra Mainyu.

Angra Mainyu was the »evil« or »torturing Spirit«. In the later forms of Zoroastrianism, and even in the later, but still genuine, Avesta the ideas become overgrown with the weeds of myth; but in the older and original Avesta they are hard and clear. These ancient pieces, if reason does not belie itself, are of earlier date than the Inscriptions; and they are of such a character as to introduce us at once to great thoughts. In them we have an actually definitive statement of the concept under question which we only gain by inference from other sources.

The Interior of the Matter.

That severe question which, though it may not always be put into words, must yet be ever present where capable men engage in speculative reflection¹ not only existed as a problem among the people

¹ The origin of evil.

who first heard the Gāthas chanted, but it was obviously to them the underlying thought; and it led them to a conclusion at once astounding and enlightening.

It is not indeed stated in technical terms because the Gāthas, as their name implies, were metrical hymns, and in a secondary sense intended for the people.

XIII, d.

The Origin of the Distinctions again more Closely Considered.

For ages groups or hosts of unseen evil beings had been believed in and reported, but nowhere, so far at least as my information extends, had any such definite statements with reference to the supposed facts involved been made before the date of these hymns with their now long lost companions.

There were Gods in plenty which were »goodish«, but who sometimes erred immoderately, and there were some evil Gods who were at intervals capable of better things, but where was the God ever good? (there of course I except the modern view of a Supreme Deity). And with this where is the description of One pre-eminent Being ever evil, so much as bruited¹ at the dates involved, these supposed Deities being also »twin« concepts.

The God of the Inscriptions »created the heavens and the earth, man, and civilisation for him«; and beside Him there was no deity, great or little, on those columns who could compare with

¹ The doctrine of Mani does not intervene here, as it was extremely late.

Him as to this function; but whatever else He made, His creative energy paused at one dire juncture which was unhappily the second great circumstance in the existing Universe. If we can connect the Theology of the Inscriptions with that of the Avesta, He, the Auramazda of the Inscriptions, had nothing to do with the source of either the lesser or the supreme agonies which we suffer or inflict.

He did not create Evil.

This great attempt to save the honour of our God for us modified the first formula which attributed »creation« to Him, and this with an antithesis which, when we soberly appreciate it, becomes immense.

The Maker of Heaven and Earth, of man and his culture, was not *Alone* in a supreme activity during the great originating actions.

Blasphemous as the tone of it may sound to some of us in the West and to the orthodox everywhere (if indeed it does not seem to some of us to be ridiculous), it is still none the less maintained as if self-evident »There were indeed *Two First Spirits*, »a better, they two and evil, as to thought, as to »word, as to deed. And when these Two Spirits »came together they made life and non-life, and how »the world at the last shall be ordered, for the »saints (in the end) the Best Mind, but for the »faithless the worse mental state . . .«¹ And the

¹ See Gāthas, 1892—94, pp. 40, 41, pp. 220, 221; pp. 435—441; p. 540, New Edition, English Verbatim, etc., 1900, p. 40—43.

better One had no share in either originating or permitting the more painful of these two alternatives.

XIII, e.

Was the Doctrine merely Academic?

But was not this a mere jugglery of thought worked out by dreamy doctrinaires, and vaguely held by a few vain hearers under exceptional circumstances, and for short periods of time? *There is every reason to believe that it was held most seriously by hundreds of thousands at least, if not by millions*¹ *throughout a large part of a great Empire, and for successive generations.* And in every one of these epochs highly gifted men came doubtless to the fore in those early centuries, — and such as these must have grasped the whole intellectual situation and felt themselves deeply stirred by the character of the idea². Popularly the external features of the theory degenerated with the passing-on of time, as of course they were necessitated to do till they finally became the familiar hypothesis of a God and a Devil with the latter thoroughly subordinated. But the case which the Babylonian Isaiah refers to was not originally that. »I make light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil« was levelled at no »Satan« however promoted. A Rival God was thought of.

¹ Not that the bulk of the masses had any interior understanding of it, or of anything else of the kind.

² Just as the disciples of Mani were later moved by similar considerations.

And much as this may shock us, we must look closer into the interior of the question, not recoiling from the recognition of possible elements of great value in it, however false we may believe it on the whole to be.

XIV.

Dualism weighed.

There is no doubt whatsoever that between the colossal errors, real or supposed, of such a scheme there arose *a column of imperishable truth.*

The Depth of the great Theory.

Aside from all recognition of personalities, real, or supposititious, who does not see that generalising ideas of a searching nature began to form themselves within the minds of those who created the beginnings of such a theory, and this from a deeply seated underlying necessity of the case¹.

Could such minds as those of Zarathushtra and his comrades have avoided a vague consciousness of the one ever indispensable necessity which lay beneath it all; see also above.

Did he not personally and palpably feel what we all now so clearly see to be the truly awful fact, which is that discord is necessarily inherent between all consciously existing things, the clash of opposing forces being inevitably heard in a freed antagonism out of which ferocity with its miseries must inevitably arise, but with it also progress and

¹ Need for these concepts began to be felt only gradually at first, till at last their full formation crystallised.

at last amelioration. To put the sad point further in the language of another still greater than a Zarathushtra, »must it not needs be that offences come?« Did not he, Zarathushtra, first feel this, and then more consciously define it?

Many items unite to prove that thoughts were subtle even then and there. Those attributes, for instance, the immortal Six, selected from a mass of lesser ones, were no mere accident, at least not altogether that. Antithesis was also felt or at least suspected, though accidental discovery doubtless went on hand in hand with recollection, induction, and intuition. The doctrine of 'limit' was foreshadowed plainly. For the terms of which these serious doctrinaires made use show also that they had thought much upon many, if not upon all of the details which later actually developed, though not then and in Iran, within their interesting theme.

They became aware beyond all question from what these ideas arose, as well as whither they were tending; for their sequence and results are adumbrated everywhere within the older documents.

XIV, a.

Morning Lights of the great Theory.

There where doubtless other keen constructors associated likewise with them in their unconscious task, many of them, there and then, and some before them. These may indeed have offered the initiative to this entire train of thought, while Zarathushtra, with his associates, in their turn no doubt contributed some impulse to those striking systems

which arose so near, and at a time not so long later on.

Did he indeed give the clue to that fine idea which absolutely expressed the combining unity of opposites from the necessary effect of mutual limitation as by the well-known example of light and darkness.

Did Zarathushtra ever reach the later so clumsily expressed ¹ but simple fact that a thing only exists because of its contraries, sorrow being but a part of happiness. That he helped on the crystallisation of that thought seems really probable, for surely Avesta is the original of Gnostic dualism, as the Gnostics helped on the thoughts of Jakob Boehme ², from which the later elaborations took their rise.

The Movement at the Moment.

But our business is not so much with those just now and here. Zarathushtra beyond all question felt the interior force in the names of the great Attributes, the Holy Law, the Good Mind, the Sovereign Power, Zeal (the ready mind), Healthful Weal and Deathless Long Life, each one literally an abstract, and at one time each alone conceived of as an idea of that character; — and from this we hold that he was also moved in his dualism by equally interior and fundamental considerations. There was an awful antagonism within the very make-up of the Universe, so he saw. It was the spirit Fury, dimly seen also

¹ Cp. Hegel; but better Fichte.

² See Zeller's *Geschichte der deutschen Philosophie*.

in the Veda, fixed co-eternally within existing things, and there was opposing it a force for Good. Why did he not leave them each a principle or force?

The Reversion to Personification.

Personification is, of course, as we should understand it, at once a lowering of idealistic concepts in this momentous case, momentous not only *in spite* of the evil present, but *because* of it.

Why did not Zarathushtra then refrain from it, avoiding a sequence which deprived his conception of all its finer point? He did not; he proceeded; and the co-eternal Force, or Spirit, Mainyu, the Fury in all existing things, became with him a colossal Being. The name indeed remained with an addition; Mainyu which might and did express the Power of Heaven in both Veda and Avesta, for Ahura was a »Mainyu«, became an »Angra Mainyu« who was the very Soul of Hell.

A dualism purely speculative arose and maintained itself somewhat, or much later on in Greece, beginning from the Nous of Anaxagoras¹, as opposed to matter; why did not Zarathushtra pursue a similar course in developing his system, and leave his evil principal still impersonal, as the great Counterpart² in Nature.

The Occasion for his Personification.

The reason in this case, as in so many another like it, is not indeed so very far to seek.

When deep turmoils disturb our very lives,

¹ See above.

² Used in an original sense.

we look out fiercely for things tangible, sometimes even for a scape-goat. A Force, clear and marked out as it may be, will yet never do for us to wreak our outraged vengeance on. Who ever cursed a principle?; and we must curse sometimes, for the very sense of justice, in the whirlwind of our calamity. Zarathushtra, like the rest of us, saw days which tried men's souls. Everywhere in the Gāthas we see the marks of it. The fine but yet pathetic effort to maintain a State devoid of lying, theft and murder bade fair, as so many another like it deeply meant, to fail ¹. It was the first of its character perhaps ever as yet made seriously in the history of those remote and otherwise barbaric (?) regions, if not indeed the very first in the records of the ancient world; and its success itself brought on its partial ruin. As usual, the accumulating results of steady thrift did but add fuel to the flames of greed. With, or without warning the storms came on, the raids of Aēshma ², with their scenes of frenzied havoc. Crops were destroyed by infuriated hordes rushing headlong in, houses wrapt in flames, and the labour of years destroyed in brief campaigns.

How could a »Principle« suffice the sufferer amidst such scenes, or offer any scope for his anathemas? God, if He had been powerful and good, would surely, so he must inevitably have thought, and often uttered (to himself), God would infallibly

¹ The settlement of New England by Puritan reformers bears a strong analogy.

² The Fury Demon of the Raid.

have stood by him. *Something* had disarmed his very Deity. That something must be conscious, if even only of his own deep personal abhorrence. Passion blended with his reason till at last it overcame it. His evil principle became a Co-eternal Person; and Philosophy gave way to Creed.

The Pandemonium abolished.

He would indeed hear nothing of a throng of co-equal devils, frittering the effect away. One terrific Being alone could satisfy him; he sought and seized the image, and having personified it, he loaded it with imprecations; that is to say, with solemn words of hatred long pent up, and so the more intensified.

The terminology indeed continued speculative to some extent; »a better« and »a worse« both occur in the neuter, and they are even apparently applied also to the »Two Primeval Ones«¹.

The Good God chooses »Asha«, here undoubtedly the interior essence of the Law.

»As to word, as to thought and as to deed« describes the scope of the two Deities. »Two worlds«, one »mental« and the other »bodily« are distinctly spoken of, and »the laws by which at the first (all) life into being entered«. But this is not technically speculative with close particularising distinctions. Still less was it the language of an Anaxagoras, philosophically so passionless. It was indeed a deep suggestion, that of the »two Spirits«, taken even in

¹ Even if they were intended to be understood adverbially, they are deeply significant.

its lowest aspect, and it was a high refinement upon a crowded Polytheism, the confused creed of their fathers; while Zarathushtra was also on the other hand not approached in this depth of his originality by any of his Iranian successors. Yet his results are theosophical for the most part rather than philosophical.

The Culmination of the Idea.

The pervading miseries of strife manifested in the myths of their early annals, as in the signal experiences of their later human life, had been all thought out and traced to their ultimate sources as being in no respects adventitious or reducible, though they might vary or diminish in delusive periods termed »peace«. These *things were a necessity, the creation of an Original separate and quasi-independent* evil Being, of a Satan who did not »fall«, nor was he ever in his turn created.

This was the doctrine. Not only were the acute sufferings which they personally met in their bloody, conflicts with free-booting neighbours so accounted for, but at last all things heavenly and earthly were involved in the idea of it, the greatest as the smallest. The Universe was a scene of »love« and »murder«; and the senses of man were the vehicles to convey the fell effects of these so necessary evil influences upon himself.

Whole classes of the animal creation were called »unholy« or »unclean« because supposed to be created by, or associated with, the evil God (this is my solution); others were clean because

made by His Antagonist. The very planets belonged to Angra Mainyu, at least in the later Parsi Books, while the fixed stars seem to have been Ahura's.

Not only did the tribes live in the midst of a religious war; but there was also 'War in Heaven', as they believed; and the later books depict it; see the Yashts.

The faint glimmer of a great philosophical truth, which must have flickered brightly before the thoughts of Zarathushtra, went out at last amidst a group of contending supernatural beings. Shall we regret it, or be glad of it? — who shall say? We can therefore return to the Biblical Edicts once more, and say in passing, and as it were »aside«, that we have not been muddling on for half a century while we thought that the writer in Isaiah alluded to an actually established belief.

When the Almighty is represented as saying: »I form the light and create darkness. I make peace and create evil, I am the Lord who do all these things; and beside me there is no God«; these sentences are not mere verbiage.

In the light of the Avesta with its most marked feature, the whole passage becomes clear and extraordinary to the last degree. For the Avesta produced a Devil mighty beyond all precedent; or sequent. If not absolutely certain, yet it is extremely probable that the passage in Isaiah alludes to this Angra Mainyu, whom we have here made out, and seizes away his supposed fell prerogative. It is no longer the Angra Mainyu alone, who creates the woe of Evil, according to the

prophetic sentences as thus understood, Yahweh Elohîm now holds that power.

Say what we may of it, the possibility alone of such an explanation is striking; for it definitively offers the one discussion of ideas between Jew and Iranian which has ever been recorded. It is reported in a few broken words indeed, but still it is present, and in the sublime Prophet of the Exile, whatever his real name may have been supposed to be. Whether as Parsis, Jews, or Christians, the passage should be regarded as revealing to us a glimpse into the contemporaneous combined Persian and Israelitish intellectual religious life, so far indeed as this expressed itself upon such a subject, and at its most central point of action. And if our exposition of it be indeed defensible, it casts side-light by many a startling inference upon other significant particulars as to which these old Iranians must have been familiar with the current intellectual convictions of these Semites.

But as I have penned these last chapters in answer to possible objections as to creed, I must in fairness still push on to consider every alleged, or even every conceivable argument against the documents which I put in as evidence.

To test our Pathway. Still further Objections to be considered.

Before then we go any further at all into such questions as touch more deeply upon the origins of the various doctrines let us pause to examine well the ground upon which we have been tread-

ing; and to do this we must suspend for a moment our inquiry into the analogies existing between the Biblical Edicts and the Inscriptions, and devote our whole attention to the question of a connection between the Achaemenian Inscriptions and the Avesta in which latter alone at the period referred to, this doctrine of Isaiah was to be found. Is this connection then between the Two great Iranian Lore actual and real?

Section XV.

The Connection between the Inscriptions and the Avesta pursued; some Intervening Points.

Are we then indeed quite sure that our Avesta is so closely kindred to these most impressive monuments? The latter are relevant enough, as all admit, to any discussion of the Edicts, for they make Darius, Xerxes, Artaxerxes and the rest speak much in the way that the Scriptures make them and their predecessor, Cyrus, express themselves. But, as we have just most emphatically admitted, a negative difference, at least, existed between the Avesta and the Achaemenian Inscriptions which is most serious unless the gap of it can be filled up, and we must push on our criticism still further, and see whether this chasm and other differences may not be closed by considerations sufficiently sound and solid to satisfy the most exacting scrutiny.

XV, a.

Still Further Objections Suggested.

So far from wishing to avert the closeness of the investigation, I have on the contrary virtually

put arguments into the mouths of my opposers; and I will continue on to pursue this plan throughout.

Complete Identity not to be Thought of.

But first, in due justice to the whole case, as in so far presented, let me say that I sincerely hope no serious person will ever suppose that I am aiming at establishing anything like an identity between these two Lores, even though I strive to lessen their divergence, and closely as I may endeavour to explain them as they approach each other in their interior elements and in their historical developments. Upon *absolute identity we must not waste a thought.* I have myself, for one, no doubt whatsoever that many of the ideas on the Inscriptions and those in the Avesta and in the Veda also, were plainly one in the main and decidedly identical in their origin. But it is to be hoped that we know enough by this time of such questions, not to look for any continuous and undeviating unity.

And in order to be thoroughly fair, I will myself start a question which could hardly by any possibility have suggested itself to the mind of any of my readers who has not gone through a long course of study upon the matter involved. It is this. On page 259, above I call attention to the predominant use of the expression »God of Heaven« as being most probably Exilic or Post-exilic, and show what can be said for the theory that the turn of the words is due to the idea of »Heaven god« as Devá, a name for Aryan deities. D(a)ēvas (Devás) are literally »Heaven ones« and a generic Indo-

Iranian name for »Gods«. But there is a circumstance to the last degree peculiar about it, and just here I am chiefly addressing readers who may be wholly unfamiliar with the Iranian Lore, for to all who know anything closely upon the subject what I have now to say, would be like the first fact for a beginner. The name, though a most appropriate one for God and prevailing everywhere in the thousand Hymns of the Veda, was, strange to say, though very familiar, yet absolutely inverted in its application in the Avesta; for there it became the universal name for »Demon« and even for the Archdemon of them all, for Angra Mainyu. However this seemingly so curious result may have come about, I will not pause just here to argue¹; but the fact is most marked; and if the words »the God of Heaven« were really used by Cyrus in the highly religious »good« sense which we have in Chronicles, it shows plainly enough that his Religion, at least, was not completely in harmony with that of the Avesta if only upon this one most important particular of usage. We have also no trace of this Avesta use of the word D(a)ēva for »Demon« upon the Inscriptions, for the word does not occur there.

A »thing« is indeed more serious than a »name«; but a »name« used for such a purpose as to designate a people's God, or Gods, cannot be considered to be a matter of little importance. And if my suggestion be valid, it certainly shows that the personal religion of Cyrus, slightly antedating that

¹ See my essay, »The Veda and the Avesta« in East & West, Feb. and March 1902.

of Darius, was out of harmony with the Religion of the Avesta as to this very interesting item; and the fact should be allowed to have its full due weight upon our minds. The Answer to this objection which I have myself originated is this, namely; that the fact that the name Devá, whether as the equal of the »God of Heaven« or not, does not occur within the Achaemenian Inscriptions, Baga only being the term made use of, is positively significant within a certain range. It looks indeed as if the name Devá *were only just beginning* to lose credit with the generation of Darius, that generation having only then begun to feel the distant throes of that great theological schism which dethroned the holy word.

For why otherwise is it thus absent, it being, outside of Iran from the time of the earliest Avesta on, an universal Aryan name for God. But anything which more definitively illustrates the development of this singular and most valuable item of usage gathers interest of itself.

XV, b.

The Natural Necessity of Difference between the related Loree.

So far indeed from wishing to conceal discordant elements, as I would emphatically repeat, I would even affect an extreme attitude as to the general subject of the relation between the Avesta and the Inscriptions. Not only do the Inscriptions differ as much from the Avesta as, say, the Old Testament differs from the New, and as one sect of Christians differs from another, though hardly so

much as the Sadducees differed from the Pharisees, we should rather on the contrary say that *of course* they (these related systems) differed from each other upon the gravest points. In the Inscriptions themselves, short as they from their very nature necessarily are, the first and perhaps most prominent feature is a bloody episode which accentuates a difference between the Religion of the Inscriptions and another closely related form of the same general faith.

The Magian usurper destroyed the Temples doubtless from excess of pretended religious zeal, regarding them as profane; for according to Herodotus the Magians had no temples; nor had the early Zoroastrians; and while the Fire Altars may have had some protection from the weather, we have also no traces of proper »Temples« in the Avesta.

Here then is a difference between two forms of Mazda worship itself which protrudes even from the surface of the sculptured writings.

Of course, and as beyond all question, the Inscription must have differed from the Avesta upon essential elements of detail, for they were widely separated as to time, and even as to locality, from the scenes of that Lore. To suppose that the two were completely identical in all their particulars, even as to some interior characteristics, would be to suppose that the two systems were not subject to the influence of otherwise invariable laws.

And at the first glance we might regard these differences as indeed more incisive than they really are, for not only is Angra Mainyu not named upon them (the Inscriptions) on the one side; but the very

Amesha¹ Spenta seem to be omitted on the other². These seeming discrepancies may be indeed quite explicable; see below; but they exist; and I should be the last person to deny them, and would be willing enough to accept for discussion any further divergencies which might be demonstrated.

But these differences, even if they may be considered to be fully established, would by no means negative the fact that the two systems show unmistakable signs of common origin, as of important contemporaneous identities in their elements. I have already alluded to some of these marked features, and I will now cite some others.

Section XVI.

Elements of Identity. Auramazda and Ahura Mazda, the Avesta and the Inscriptions.

»A great God is Auramazda«³; and this latter name has been justly regarded as the most striking proof of identity in ultimate origin between the Inscriptions and the Avesta; for this name Auramazda was one of the words which first led to the vocabulary of the Avesta as being the proper key to the decipherment of the Inscriptions, not one of the *very* first indeed, but one of the first. I have dwelt above upon the meaning of the Name; and we saw that it did not vary whether viewed in Avesta or Inscription.

¹ Properly 'amersha'.

² See below.

³ See the Inscriptions at many places.

There is indeed one element of difference which turns out to emphasise the identities, and which I only pause to mention as it were aside, and as if in parenthesis. It is an interesting side feature in the history of the two words alluded to, »Ahura« and »Mazda«. If it could be regarded as one target more for objectors, then let it be one proof the more that I wish to make the delineation of the particulars here as open to attack as it may be feasible to make it, inviting opposition at every step. It is not very possible that any initiated student should point adversely to the fact that the name of the Iranian God, the word Auramazda, never appears as a single term in the Avesta; — that there it is 'Ahura' = 'aura', and 'Mazda', words seldom brought into closer contact, and each always, separately declined, while the word Auramazda appears undivided upon the Inscriptions. No one, however young a novice, could say that this has any conceivable weight upon the questions arising; but then some readers are not even novices. My real object in alluding to this matter is to point out just here in a short excursus what a linguistic historian would call a singularly »beautiful« distinction; and I make us of an extreme hypothesis, that of exceptional inexperience in my reader to secure the opportunity. Yes; the two grand old names stand quite apart from each other in the Avesta, old and new, and became welded together by constant usage only later, and throughout many generations. »Ahura«, and »Mazda« made at last one word »Auramazda«, and this a few centuries still later on was twisted into

the Pahlavi Aūharmazd, and then finally, into the New Persian, Ormuzd, Hōrmuzd, or Ahōrmuzd. But what expert in Linguistik will not be keenly interested when we inform him that we have upon the Inscription the plain proofs of a »*transition period*« in respect to this most important designation which also points almost infallibly to *other instances of change*.

While we have no Auramazda in the Avesta and no Ahura Mazda in either the Pahlavi or the New Persian each enduring for centuries and apart, we have even within the narrow compass of the Inscriptions both Auramazda, with the words united, and Aurahya Mazdāha with the words separated, and separately declined ¹, so that what I have perhaps wantonly called a »quasi-objection«, I confess for a special and perhaps too trivial a purpose, turns out to be a signal illustration of a most expressive fact brought once again to light in the course of the discussion; namely, that the Inscriptions *actually represent this formative, or transformative, period when the very usages in the language were changing*. That is to say, even within the moderate vocabulary of the Inscription we have »transition« caught, as it were, »upon the wing«, whereas, generally speaking, we can trace such a condition only in an extended literature; compare the dialects of Greece. The circumstance adds 'life' to the entire interlude. It is like some startling sign of personal emotion, and altogether an incisive, though

¹ We now think that we have also an instr., or a voc sing, »Aurahya Mazdāha« by itself.

a minor item among the grave considerations which force themselves upon our view.

XVI, b.

The Attributes.

Next to the Name, then the Attributes of the great common Deity, Auramazda; i. e. Ahura Mazda, mentioned in the two Lores, most eminent as they are in the history of religious philosophy, should be considered.

And first »Creation«. The *Creative Function* among those attributes of Auramazda is referred to with emphatic iteration upon the Inscriptions; see above; and it presents a very marked peculiarity; for the terms persist unvaried from Reign to Reign, and on tablets also far apart the one from the other as to locality as well. This supreme Attribute also distinguishes Auramazda by an immeasurable distance from any other Deity referred to at the time upon them. And in fact, but for the suspected presence of the dualism, this creative energy in activity would determine the sculptures as being quite monotheistic in the ordinary acceptation of the term, lesser deities like the Archangels of the Church being reduced by it to insignificance, so much so that the recognition of them hardly constitutes a claim to a rival existence as serious divinities in a distinctive sense.

Auramazda the only Real Deity.

Auramazda might well be said to be the One real God in our own pietistic sense upon the entire.

Inscriptions, the presence of Mithra, Anahita, and the »other gods« with the »clan gods« or »all the gods« to the contrary notwithstanding. Some critics even suppose that Mithra is the original of Saint Michael ¹.

And so in the Old Avesta, Ahura is pre-eminence Creator (of the good Creation). As to the later Avesta, however, that is, as to parts of it, see below; yet in the later Avesta Ahura is said to be the Creator even of Mithra.

Further; the detail of the descriptive ideas, if not indeed of the very terms, is similar. He is »the Greatest of the Gods« in the Inscriptions, and in Yasna I. he is the »Greatest and the Best«.

He is »maker of this earth« in the one Lore, as we have seen so often, and so also abundantly in the other ². The Inscriptions speak of »yon Heaven«, and so does the Avesta ³.

In the Inscriptions we have the creation of man, and so in the Avesta we have Gaya Maretan, »the lifeman«; and his creation is alluded to.

In the Inscriptions the word »civilisation« ⁴,

¹ See the valuable paper read by J. J. Modi Head Priest of the Parsis at Colaba before the R. A. S of Bombay in May or earlier in 1903.

² See such words as »O Ahura Mazda, Maker of the corporeal worlds, Thou holy One« which occur some score or more times in the Vendīdād alone.

³ »The Ahunaver was uttered before the creation of »yon« Heaven. In Y. XLIV it is also asked: »who gave the suns, and stars their way, save Thee?, etc. who spread the auroras, the noontides and midnights?« And in Y. 30: »He clothes on Himself the firm stones of Heaven«.

⁴ Or »refreshing abundance«, recurring several times. Others prefer »happiness«; see above.

occurs (as I have rendered it), »Who made man and civilisation« (see above); and in the Avesta the *hushiti*¹, and the *hujīti*, the amenities of civilisation, are as pleasing as they are familiar.

The first moral characteristic of Auramazda in the Inscriptions is His »Truth«; see everywhere the condemnation of its opposite. And in the original Avesta² Asha (properly »Arsha«) as the »undeviating Law« is the first of His personified attributes. He is »beneficent« upon the Inscriptions; see above; and *Vohu manah* »the good mind« is the second of His attributes in the Avesta. *Vashnā* = »through the gracious will of A.« is characteristic upon the Inscriptions³, and in the Avesta also it is very marked.

The Inscriptions describe a God who searches the »thoughts«, and we may notice the immediate anxiety in the Avesta to bring the whole question within the intellectual domain⁴, and *it probably led the world at that time in such distinctive conceptions.*

The »right path« is an expression figuratively applied upon the Inscriptions, and alone of itself it proves the depth of the practical religious ideas. And the same words »right paths« in a figurative sense are also conspicuous in the Gāthas.

On the Inscriptions we have a report of Auramazda's utterance, His »command« being said to be »this«, the particulars following; and throughout the

¹ Not that the two words are etymologically related.

² The Gāthas.

³ The places are cited elsewhere. *Vasnā* in the Av.

⁴ See the expressions »in thought«, »in word« and »in deed«, etc., »the prizes of the bodily and mental worlds«.

Avesta Ahura Mazda »answers« and »speaks«. In the One Auramazda is said to have granted His supplicant »aid«, and the word is frequent in the Other. Of the few inferior Gods which come to light within the Inscriptions, the only two there named seemed to have stepped bodily forth out of the Avesta ¹. »Magu« the all-important priestly term reproduced upon the Inscription appears as »moghu« (so quite exactly) in the Avesta ², and we have, I think, its origin in the frequent »maga« of the Gāthas ². Bactria is of course mentioned as one of his subject nationalities by Darius ³, and Bactria has been largely regarded by scholars as the scene of a part at least of the Avesta ⁴. Some of the cities mentioned upon the Inscriptions are also familiar to the Avesta, but one of them, Ragha, is so prominent that many think it to have been the earliest seat of Zoroastrianism, as it was indeed certainly an important centre later on ⁵.

Parallelisms in Language.

The parallelisms in the two languages above all arrest attention. *Aura* as *Ahura* ⁶ needs hardly

¹ Mithra and Anāhita. As to demons, see below.

² The »o« instead of »a« is the result of epenthesis, moghu = ma(u)ghu, the »u« in »o« = a + u is anticipated from the »u« in the termination. I mentioned this in the Nineteenth Century Review so long ago as '94.

³ The only variation being in the termination which is of slight account.

⁴ Among the 23 at Behistūn; as Bākhdi in Vendīdād I.

⁵ For the great Prophet's name had become a title there, see elsewhere.

⁶ *Aura* as against *áhura*, shows that there was an accent on the first 'a' *áura*; so the Veda *ásura* = *áhura*, *áura*. This accent, being verified, confirms all the other analogies as to the matter of accent.

to be named again, though it is no longer certain that it refers even once to an inferior god upon the Inscriptions, while in the Avesta it refers also to human chiefs at times. But what could be more striking than *yāna* in the sense of »boon«. This is its meaning in the Avesta; but we look in vain for such a sense in the Vedic occurrences of the word, whereas in general the Avesta language is almost purely Sanskrit. As we however glance at our Inscriptions again, we behold it once more before us in the very prominent Avesta sense.

And so of the Avesta word *jaidhyāmi* = I »pray«, we again expect to find our Avesta words in definition in the Veda, but as yet no such meaning is reported for an Indian *gadami*¹. We turn however to our Inscriptions again, and there it is. Now both these last occurrences are especially very marked indeed, and carry with them great convincing force; and they should be firmly borne in mind by all who discuss these subjects.

I have just alluded to *vashnā* while pointing its doctrinal sense and to *upasta* = »aid«, and both are common property to the two languages as forms**, or infact to all the three.

Even closer linguistic Grammatical Forms are Similar.

The nominative plurals as in *-āsas*² are common to Inscription, Veda and Avesta, but they are seldom found in the later Sanskrit. And so of important

¹ Gadati is however suggested upon the high authority of Justi.

² As against the later Sanskrit termination *-ās*; the Avesta forms are *-aoñhō*, Indian *-āsas*; The Achaem. is *-āha*. ** Av. *vasnā*.

pronouns. *Ava*, scarcely known to the Sanskrit, is familiar to both Avesta and the Inscription; and the pronoun *dim*, unknown to Veda, is common to Old Persian and Zend. The infinitives in the two agree; and here again the Veda shares peculiarities with both Avesta and the Inscriptions little known to the later Indian. As to the identity of the two lores in their ultimate origin, we have yet to find the man who holds a doubt.

The Inscription language is, if we may so express ourselves, almost »broken« Zend.

The Historical Details, and the Spirit of the Religions.

And the historical details also, so far as they are indicated, correspond. That the *spirit* of the two Religions also had much in common I may regard as already proved. Let us now turn once more to the objections. We have sufficiently answered our questions as to the absence of the very widely used term *devá*; but let us ask definitively: »where is Angra Mainyu, the »Evil Creator« of the Avesta upon the Inscriptions?«; and where is Dualism upon them? Where too are the Ameshaspentas?; and might we not even expect to see the name of Zarathushtra?

Section XVII.

Recurring Objections. Angra Mainyu absent from the Inscription.

In the name of reason let us first of all remember that we are dealing with *Inscriptions*, on

the one side at least of our discussion; that is to say, with letters cut painfully upon rocks or walls in places sometimes only accessible with difficulty, and at one spot, as already said, elevated hundreds of feet above the level of the land; and that these characters are cut at times with excessive care.

Surely common modesty, if not indeed common honesty, should forbid our expecting to see everything which was current orally, or even written upon skins or other substances at that date, repeated upon such kinds of records as these now under our consideration.

The name of Angra Mainyu appears nowhere upon those sculptures. Does this defect then prove that the name was not at all in vogue at the time of the execution of those records, or that it was unknown to their authors. This question is of acute interest to us as biblical critics; and this I have often urged; for if it were conceivable that the name of the great Avesta Demon-god was never known to Darius, nor to his Successors, then the quite vital point of the connection between the three Lore, the Achaemenian, the Avesta, and the Jewish would be to a corresponding extent obscured. The Inscriptions, as we hold, are almost an integral part of our Bibles, so to express oneself, for the reasons which no intelligent person can dispute. We have the Edicts of Cyrus, Darius, and their Successors as reported by our Scriptural Authors in Chronicles and Ezra; and we have a closely analogous one cut upon the Babylonian Vase Inscription of Cyrus, as upon Behistūn, etc., in work, or in handwriting, as it might well be

called, and so done contemporaneously with the original authors and at their personal command; see above. Surely no serious expositor can for a moment henceforth think of putting pen to paper upon those passages without having learned all that it may be possible for him to learn from these succinct annals upon the Tablets. So much is absolutely sure and clear beyond all cavil. The Edicts of Cyrus, Darius, etc. in Ezra, etc., and the inscribed Records of those same Kings upon Behistūn, etc., are almost parts of one and the same thing. Of the two, the Inscriptions and the Edicts, in the eyes of critics the Inscriptions possess indefinitely the greater force and claims to credence; but the Edicts are likewise justly treasured. Is then the Avesta as near to the Inscriptions as the Inscriptions are near to the Edicts? If they are, then every Biblical critic has a new source of information and illustration in his hand which it is both his privilege and his duty to use. But the most important name in the Avesta next after that of Ahura Mazda does not appear upon the Inscriptions. If this is omitted there because it was not known, then that would certainly show that the Avesta was just in so far totally strange to the Authors of the Inscriptions, and the external historical connections of expressed ideas would be most certainly broken in one of their catenae. Was then the name absolutely unknown to these Authors and to their public? Was such an ignorance as this probable?; this is the question before us; nay, »was it possible?«

Section XVII, a.

The Occurrence of the Name was indeed to be Expected.

There is no doubt at all that there existed very especial reasons why this name, or one very close akin to it, should have been made use of in these severe denunciations; for such many of the sentences in the Inscriptions can only be described to be.

The very diction seems to tremble with a fury which it but half expresses in the vehemence of the writers, concentrated as it was in their doubtless justly provoked animosities.

Section XVII, b.

First Answer to the Objection.

My first answer to the Objection is this; viz. that the needed and so expected name was *substituted*, as I will shortly show below, by one immediately kindred to it; and for this we have a close analogy in the case of the work which it is our very object to bring in as a basis for our evidence. The striking Avesta name of Angra Mainyu is replaced by a most effective representative in the columns of the great Tablets; but so it is in the very Avesta texts themselves, and in passages within them where we should most of all expect to see it in its immediate expression.

Absence of the Name from large Sections of the Avesta.

Do objectors who contravene the connection of the Inscriptions with the Avesta by urging upon

us the absence of Angra Mainyu from the latter as an argument against all analogy between them and the Avesta, really know what indeed every incipient inquirer who takes any interest in these pursuits ought to know, which is that there are *lengthy passages in the Zend Avesta, page on page, and chapter after chapter*, where that name does not occur, and this in a Book of the Avesta whose very title describes it as most of all concerned with Satan's work, the Counter-devil Book ¹, and in parts which are almost violent in their denunciations of demoniac things? Did the authors or re-writers who gradually compiled that Book from Chapter IV to Chapter IX, 12 inclusive, nearly one hundred pages of the translation in the Sacred Books of the East, not *know* that there existed in any Iranian man's religious beliefs and fears any such supposititious person as he whose name occurs in the very first Chapter, say some 16 times, and with an emphatic and graphic iteration which should make the passages memorable even as mere literature?

Differing Dates of Sections considered.

Or shall we establish a distinction such as most necessarily prevails as to parts of Genesis, and say that the two or more sets of composers were so wide apart as to time and space that the one, the later, actually did not *know* the other, the prior, so presenting us with an additional reason for the omission?

¹ The Vi-d(a)ēva-dāta, Vendīdād.

Multiplicity of Authors as of Course.

The Vendidad and all the rest except the Gāthas, had authors and re-editors enough, as we need not mention; but no respected expert anywhere would think of suggesting that the re-writers of Vendidad IV to IX, 12 which are without the name of Angra Mainyu, were not familiar with their own first Chapter, striking beyond measure as it is, and this simply because they do not continue on to re-echo the revolting Chief Demon's word?; how much more completely would we stultify ourselves, if we reasoned from his absence from these necessarily so shortened chiselled columns¹.

The Name of the great Iranian Devil which would be expected in denunciations was omitted because it was substituted.

Section XVII, c.

The Real Point at Issue.

What was the nature of this substitution? This is the decisive point at issue; is it effective as an asset in my argument?

¹ Angra Mainyu does not occur once in the first eight chapters of the Yasna, and only three times as a proper name in the entire Book. From Yasna IX, 8 (19) where a new section begins the name does not occur, not even in the Gāthas until, Y. LVII, XII, where it occurs once: from there on it does not occur until Yasna LXI, (Spiegel LX), SBE XXXI from page 233 to 312); see the index which was not my work, and which I can therefore cite the more confidently. And from Yasna LXI (LX) to the end of the Yasna it never appears. It does not seem to occur once in the Visparad, and but once in the Srōsh Yasht. It does not occur in the Haptan Yasht, nor in the Ardibehisht Yasht, nor in the Khordād Aban, nor in the Srōsh Yasht Hādōkht, nor in the Rashn Yasht, not in pp. 252—291 in Darmesteter's Yashts, SBE XXIII; see the Index. The generic d(a)ēva is frequent.

He Darius, to name him as representing the the other Authors of the Inscriptions, had a point of infinite significance to make; and he went straight to his mark, not dawdling over needless sounds. There was one chief work indeed of a leading Demon with which he had to do, and he fills his Inscriptions with it. He even uses the denominative verb-form, as said before. That word is »*lied*« and it reverberates in cursing tones from the granite¹ everywhere. We may simply claim that Angra Mainyu without the name *is* recalled, for the Lie personified is his peculiar attribute, and as personified, his chief Agent in Avesta. The Drauga of the Old Persian represents that »falsehood« which is the one thing so bitterly opposed in the fierce, though clumsy, sentences; and the author works up its infamies, as Avesta does its sister's, for all that they are worth.

Adurujiya means literally »He did the lie«, »acted Druj-like«. And this Drauga of Behistūn is Avesta »draogha« slightly varied, as draogha itself is but another form of »druj«. And of all the evil names in the entire three sections of Avesta this was the most severe and common. *Here then is the most emphatic Evil Word in all the Inscriptions likewise the very same and most emphatic Evil Term in all Avesta, while in this last extended Lore it points out vituperatively the chief agent of the Evil God, whose name was needless upon the Inscriptions.* In the Inscriptions, as I have said, we have the verb-form of the name (the Druj), seldom the noun-form

¹ Or other rock of Behistūn.

Drauga, and we have it everywhere. Is it likely that the Authors of the Inscriptions were ignorant of an Angra Mainyu when they were making use at every column of the word which appears also everywhere in Avesta to express his essential characteristic?

In the Zoroastrian Books we have it throughout where evil is denounced. We have nothing, of the worst kind of sin or sorrow, I was almost about to say, without the *druj* in verb, noun, or participle; and in parts the repetitions become most vehement. Is it likely that while the Inscriptions and the Avesta are thus actually one as to the very chief effect of Angra Mainyu, the Author of the Inscriptions had never *heard* of that great God-devil, whose dreaded deeds and doubtless also whose very name was* spread from India almost if not quite to Greece, and by his (the author's) own mighty conquests as by those of his Predecessor? For wherever he sent the name of Auramazda, there beside it he hurled his curses upon the »*Lie*«, see the Inscriptions in their bulk.

Among the names which appear so conspicuously at Behistūn stands Raga distinguished, in the Avesta as Ragha. Here a great Rebel was defeated, and events of signal political importance of course took place; but for leagues around Raga the name of Angra Mainyu was continually uttered while Darius's forces were still there. It was a *centre* of Avesta influence, and Avesta ideas were dominant, and with these the name and attributes of Angra Mainyu were necessarily familiar, being bound up even with their thoughts of »deity«.

Did none of Darius's officers become conversant

with a word used frequently enough, we may be sure, by bands of the broken enemy to emphasise their fury. They, Darius and his Officers, were having close political business with that locality very frequently; and possibly at the very moment when the Inscriptions were being cut dispatches from that Province were coming daily in.

Is it not moreover likely that a believed-in Personal Spirit, the Drauga, kindred to the Druj, who had a notorious Chief, in fact a separate Creator in Avesta, should not have had *any chief at all* in the religious scheme of the Authors of the Inscriptions?, a lonely Sub-devil as it were, and all without a friend; and this in a lore which was otherwise so close to the Avesta where every angel, as well as every Devil, has a Chief?

I should say that it would be out of all proportion for us to suppose that there was no chieftain at all over this Drauga of the Inscriptions. He, or she, had a Chief Demon over him or her, we may indeed be sure in the Inscriptions just as »the Draogha« and »Druj« of the Avesta City, may represent the Chief par-eminence in their related Lore.

And is it then probable, so I submit, that this Demon Chieftain should not be the *same Angra Mainyu* who figures in the Iranian Books, and whose name had lived for ages. Recollect what has been said already upon the various terms which are common to the two compositions, all marked as they are, and, so to speak, exceptional Avesta words, and yet so familiar to the language of the Inscriptions, and so called-for within the subjects handled,

that they could not even be kept out of the narrow compass of the Behistūn columns; see above.

Conclusion as to the Points.

Can we therefore avoid the conclusion that the Chief Demon of the One book was altogether known to the authors of the other writings, though often out of mind? Is it natural for us to suppose that two records which could coincide in a startling manner upon the name of God and upon His character; that is to say, upon His justice, His beneficence, His grace, etc., in expressions all singularly characteristic, having also the same endeared and venerated name for Him, Ahura Mazda, should differ otherwise than accidentally or mechanically upon such a subject as His notorious »Counterpart«, His fell and necessary Companion, nay His very »*Twin*«¹.

Above all are we to suppose that the later Persian Governments, not only the Functionaries of Darius but those of his entire Dynasty much later on, even up to the year 358 B. C. about, should actually have not known of the existence of such a title, a very curse-word or swear-word sounded in anathemas throughout the entire Middle North of the Empire. For we must of course remember that with every additional century, so much the fuller became the Zoroastrian ritual and the Zoroastrian Lore, the Priesthood too, after the first degeneration from Gāthic days, would be becoming more and more enlightened, as we see from the tone of the Avesta documents.

¹ »Counterpart« is here used only in an etymological sense.

All the while let us recollect that a manyu, if not an Angra Ma(i)nyu, was also at times a hated name in another great Dependency of Persia, for manyu has an evil sound even in Vedic Hymns. ¹

What short of a Bureau of Information could Darius, and the rest have had?, if they had never heard those syllables! To suppose that the entire Dynasty from Cyrus to the last Ochus was originally ignorant of the name of the chief evil Spiritual Being believed in by very large portions of the population of their empire, and this merely because the Name of this Being is absent from these sparse writings, which yet reiterate their execration of His fell work, and of His chief characteristic, and of that of His most conspicuous servants, is merely to manifest an incapacity in judgment upon the subject, and upon all similar questions in their detail. *The Government of Darius could not have been ignorant of such a Name, nor of its meaning.* The reason why that Name was omitted was therefore *not* because it was unknown, but because it was *substituted* and so for the moment out of use.

Section XVII, d.

Then there is another Omission.

This time it is again a word which meets us at every turn in the sister Lore to the Inscriptions,

¹ See above upon Philo's *dunámeis* and the Amesha (Amersha) Spentas.

and one which may even be represented in the Semitic Scriptures as already hinted at above ¹.

Where are the Devás upon the Inscriptions?

Devá is utterly absent from these Sculptures in whichever sense, in the evil, the Avesta sense, as in the »good« Vedic one. Were Darius, Xerxes, and even Artaxerxes III (B. C. 358 about) ignorant of a word which was as familiar to India as the name of »God« is familiar to us, and which in one of their cities Raga (Ragha), was as familiar to their people as the word »Devil« is to us? It is simply »silly« for us for a moment to suppose such ignorance to have been possible. As we have seen from the text of Chronicles ¹, there are considerable grounds for us to believe that Cyrus was actually in the way of using the word there in that Semitic form, but in the »good« sense of it which is familiar to well-nigh all Indogermanic speech ².

D(a)ēva was no unknown Word.

I do not think that these adverse inferences are justifiable. The Name of d(a)ēva was generic. In all conceivable sound reason not only did the Authors of these almost Avesta - Inscriptions originally know of the name of D(a)ēva, as of Angra Mainyu, but they knew of a throng of cognate Gods, Demon-gods, or god-lets, whose names they

¹ See above where I call attention to »Cyrus's« reputed remarks about the »God of Heaven«, and below where I consider the objections.

² See below where I return to this.

could not at all, under the circumstances, be expected to transcribe.

Mithra and Anahita.

It may then be said, that both Mithra and Anahita; see above, appear upon an Inscription of Artaxerxes as if they coloured a very natural scene. And they are two of the very most prominent of the secondary Avesta names of Gods. If these then are mentioned, why were the D(a)ēvas omitted if they were known, and with them Angra M.? The columns were not too »narrow« (it might be hinted) to admit those two; and they were indeed less prominent than the giant Aryan Demon, or the generic God-word, D(a)ēva in literatures where they were recognised; why then should these, the D(a)ēvas, as well as Angra Mainyu have been left unnoticed, unless because they were unknown? Precisely. The familiar names of Mithra and Anahita appear here just for a reason which emphatically helps on my case. While scores of Gods and Angels are not alluded to, these two are brought in for the very same reason that the Drauga and all his (or her?) deeds are cited; see above; and for a reason even stronger; for Mithra and Anahita could not possibly have been omitted.

The words were in all human probability inscribed within a building *because their consecrated images had been solemnly brought into it, for they are especially invoked for protection, and in close association with Ahura Mazda* ¹.

¹ As in the Yashts.

So the Drauga is cited, and his or her?, acts are summed up in the repeated »adurujiya« because the terms were *indispensable, filling to repletion the composer's* sense of wrong, and expressing the *one chief point* of all his hostile statements, like the »oppositions« of Vendidad I. The Persian King had little need to name the Devás approvingly or otherwise, since he had another word; but Mithra and Anahita could not have been avoided in cutting a »dedication« within that Building. Artaxerxes accordingly ordered those names to be inscribed.

So Artaxerxes Ochus mentions Mithra doubtless from some such stringent cause.

XVII c.

»Where are the Amesha Spenta?«

In the like spirit we may ask and answer: »where are the Amesha Spentas upon the Columns, next to Ahura externally the grandest Concept of the Avesta? Again let me plainly say that it is perhaps conceivable as a possibility that Cyrus and Darius with the rest of the Achaemenids, had never even heard such sounds as express those names. But in view of the facts of the case, this is again to the very last degree improbable. Not only may we cite once more the close presence of Avesta ideas upon the Inscriptions, but the names also occurred in the Rig-Veda centuries before Darius or Cyrus, as many believe, and as I have already somewhat elaborately shown above¹.

¹ See above, Part I, pages 196 ff.

And just as Angra Mainyu must have been included within the terms which expressed the activity of his chief servant, so the Ameshas must have been present at least to the mind of the man who was so familiar with Ahura, while we recall again the names of Mithra and Anahita, for these were also closely associated with the Ameshas in the Avesta texts ¹.

The Ameshas and the Other Gods.

It would indeed be hardly fair for us to say that the Ameshaspentas were quite absolutely necessary as included precisely among the »other Gods« mentioned in the Inscriptions; for we do not contend that *every* Avesta name was positively known to Darius or his successors. To bring in other Gods ² is not necessarily to adduce every conceivable cognate Deity.

Our Argument Recurs.

But we have only to apply the same kind of arguments already used. No one supposes, let us hope, that the Ameshaspentas were not worshipped in the land of the Gāthas at least as early as Darius, seeing that they were actually old ideas of ante-vedic origin ; nor will any one contend that the place where they, the Gāthas, were first sung was not afterwards at least within the Empire, nor that

¹ In fact Mithra, as already hinted, is most intimately associated with Ahura, his name occurring with that of Ahura in the double form mithra-ahura like the Vedic Mitrāvárūṇa.

² See below.

³ See above upon Philo's *dunámeis* and the Amesha Spentas.

Raga (Ragha), where those Gāthas formed the central document of a wide religious culture, was not a well-known site; see above, where I allude to the subjugation of Fravartish.

Irrelevancy Once Again.

But why should they have been mentioned in the Inscriptions, save in a case of some close and immediately pressing need?, as was the fact with the names of Mithra and Anahita. Again let me protest against the almost insolent ignorance with which too many of us approach such subjects. If we do not know, we should be at least ashamed that we do not know, while engaging in these discussions, that (as in the case of Angra Mainyu) there are very wide sections of the Avesta Books themselves where none of these great Names appear, though they are those of the August Immortals, the very personified Attributes of their God. The Avesta is now one Book through printing; but it was then on scattered MSS., or partly an oral lore, and not a rock Inscription, yet it consisted of extended parts or documents. If then the Avesta could omit the words from so many lengthy parts of it, why should we wonder that the Inscriptions do not bring them in?

Our Own Usages Compared.

Do we, let us ask again and in the name of common fairness, always, or so often, mention *our* Archangels in our Edicts, or even such a pre-eminent Personification as a member of our Trinity Itself?

In military or political Inscriptions where do we ever say any other such word save »God«?, at least in lands called »protestant«. And this even intentionally, for there are many Christians who do not hold with their brethren as to the full details of current beliefs.

The Relative Prominence of the Ameshas.

And this last meets another just objection to my argument, for some one should say that the Amesha Spentas were far more prominent in the Mazda Faith of the Avesta than our Archangels are in ours at the present stage of our development, though not indeed more prominent than the »Son of God«, or »the Third Person of our Trinity«, and so they should appear upon the Inscriptions, if they were a kindred Lore. Well said again!; but is it true? Was it at all the fact that the Ameshaspentas were so prominent in Darius's creed?; and is it at all necessary to our argument for us to suppose that they were indeed so essential to his Religion?

Did Darius care for the Ameshas?

Did Darius believe in the Ameshaspentas at all, let us seriously ask, in such a sense as to induce him to indict their Names at every turn? My argument depends on no such supposition. Mazda-worship like our Christ-worship, had many sub-divisions beyond all doubt. Darius's faith may well have been of a kind which made him lukewarm toward what were these otherwise most holy supernatural Beings of the Avesta. They may well have been

too »Magian« for him, just as the very Virgin is too »catholic« for some of us ¹?; I refer of course to her »Cult«.

Darius was in a Sense Monotheistic.

Let us not forget that Darius was in one sense monotheistic, and passionately so; for one is never so radical as after crushing rival fallacies; I meant and mean only to assert that the Ameshas were not *unknown* to him. *His belief in them or his non-belief is totally indifferent* to me in my argument just here. Otherwise he is most serious in his devout expressions. Notwithstanding some minor allusions to inferior spiritual beings made doubtless also conscientiously to please his subjects, he approaches even the Gāthic spirit in the strong torrent of his words. And the »Gāthic spirit« is otherwise unique.

He had no disposition at all to divert his pre-occupied attention with extraneous detail. Auramazda was with him »the Greatest of the Gods«, meaning by this that He was the only real One in our modern sense, the »Creator of this Earth and of yon Heaven«; so, in the Avesta, Darius had no time at all to pause over the lesser Gods, sub-gods or angels, arch- or otherwise, whichever we may choose to call them, and however much or little he may have believed them to exist, except as sublime conceptions. He may indeed again like us, have at times forgotten them.

¹ As to some particulars of the belief in her among Protestants.

XVIII.

And so even in the Avesta there are extended sections in which they, the Ameshaspentas, are not seen.

Take up even the Vendīdād once more, and in all the Books, pretty nearly one third of the Avesta, only one of the »Greater Ameshaspentas,« names occurs from chapter I to chapter XIX, II, a mass of writing perhaps ten times as great as the Inscriptions. Not Asha, nor Vohumanah, nor Khshathra, nor Haurvātāt nor Ameretatāt appear there, only Aramaiti, and that in her sense of »earth«. Even in the Yasna we have chapters bereft of some of them.

Instead then of carping at their absence from these rough but earnest sentences of the Persian Kings, common sense should rather say to us that the men were simply thinking of other things, and for the very best of all good reasons, namely that what they had to occupy their attention was greatly more pressing upon their immediate needs than such things as the names of minor gods or other theological distinctions.

If then Darius was, or »since«, as we might more confidently say, Darius was, so far as his ideas appear upon the Inscriptions, a sort of Unitarian¹ as Mazda-worshipper, and therefore one of a caste of devotees who detested multiplicity in his adored divinities; — and if he were likewise a vehement Antimagian as well; — and if also, as we know, the Avesta was

¹ »Unitarian« is the name of a Sect which denies the usual doctrine of the Trinity, holding only to a Unity.

distinctly Magian on the other side ¹, the Avesta being actually called in its very oldest part a glorification of the same Magian Ameshaspentas, then this abolishes the argument from the absence of the Ameshas, and it leaves the Inscriptions and the Iranian Books as to other particulars still very near akin.

And this is the point of my argument just here. As Darius had lately crushed the false Magian Bardiya, (that is, Smerdes), we have here at once a reason why he should not take pains to engrave upon his Tablets the names of those Spiritual Beings whom he, that Magian, had most probably worshipped with a fervour all too zealous; for his Ameshaspenta Magianism was presumably the reason why he, Bardiya (Smerdes), destroyed the sacred temples of Darius's cult. We reverence the Virgin doubtless, but is it not the fact that one third of the Christians now alive scarcely utter the yet so beloved name except in frigid formulas, while on the contrary, two thirds of the rest of us almost make her »God«, and some again most vehemently oppose her worship. So Darius was lukewarm over these »Magian« Archangels whose influence carried his prime enemy on to his so strangely usurped throne.

An Amesha possibly Referred to.

I will not indeed press the possibility that we have actually an Amesha referred to in the separated áura of Behistūn I, 24 (Sp.) where it may be used like »ahura«, which in the Avestas refers at times to the Ameshaspentas, and once at least indeed

¹ See the curses on the mōghu-ṭbīsh, the magian-hater.

to the expected Prophet in the sense of »Lord«; see Yasna XXIX, 2, for we now prefer to regard that áurā in the Inscriptions as an instrumental of the chief God's name. But none the less the two occurrences of áurā and áurahyā, instrumental and genitive, as separate words from Mazda; see above; show at least that the first part of the combined name in, Aura-mazda still *retained significance, its sense not having been, as so often, lost in the united sounds; and this still vigorous meaning of the separated word points certainly to the Avesta where the separated word is universal, and where it also applies* at times both to the Ameshas and even to the human subject, as well as to the supreme (good) Deity as I have said above, and that in passages nearly side by side. How little possible, let me say with reference to this point as well, is it then that Darius knew nothing of those most august religious Personifications whose names, like that of their great Adversary, were at that very moment of his writing being still sung in many a hymn in that Town and throughout that Province¹ where his successful general had so lately taken decisive military action; and whose names also with little doubt, not so long later on, resounded through the Achaemenian territories even to the very shores of Greece.

If the one Lore, even in its chief document, was almost made up of homage to the Immortal Six, with Ahura, the great Seven; — if these were also sung, though in dimmer allusion, in the earlier Indian Hymns, how is it conceivable that Darius,

¹ Raga (Ragha).

his Successors, or any of their corps of learned men had never even heard the syllables?

And this, again let us recall it, when officials must have been coming and going without intermission from the closely related Zoroastrian Provinces, not to speak of a Pandit here and there from the more distant Indian dependencies.

Even non-Zoroastrian agents from the North could only have avoided general descriptions of the sectional cult *upon the understanding that it was familiar.*

»Time« even should be considered in the Matter of extended Sculptured Inscriptions as well as the carefully acquired »Space«.

It may seem singular that we should mention the requirements of »time«, even as a minor reason for all such omissions upon the tablets; but when we recall how very many such items the Achaemenids may have desired to mention, even »time« itself should not be left unnoticed ¹.

Men worked slowly doubtless in those parts then, though quicker possibly than now, above all artistic persons. And Darius was not the man to think that he was born to live forever. Two years, or three, were no slight item, as we may well conceive, with him in his views of any situation whatsoever, just as they are not that now with most of us. Time for completing the interesting work was not therefore to be thrown away. No successor, he

¹ Recall that most significant, if not pathetic, circumstance, the rough-hewn tablet on Behistūn which seems to have been prepared for further Inscriptions; but »time« failed the intending annalist.

might feel sure, would take such care to record his deeds as he himself, and details of angeliology and the like were, we may be certain, the very last of possible considerations which engrossed, even if they crossed, his mind.

Matters of political importance were, as we so clearly see, life and death to him in his eventful moments, for he presents them on a scale of such vast magnitude that we are quite oppressed as we trace them on the stones. These, he thought, and not unnaturally, were controlled by God Himself; see above. And so far as »divinities« were concerned, he dealt with their expected help alone.

Would we then, let us ask again, to close the point, have named our Gabriel and Michael, our Raphael and our Uriel in such a case as this? supposing in fact that we could, all of us, instantly or at all recall each and every name of them at will?

XVII, g.

Zarathushtra's Name. Where is it?

Its absence as an Argument against the Association of the Inscriptions and Avesta.

And so of Zarathushtra; — I mean of course the name. All things, negative, are certainly possible; — as we may often say — »with God« at least; or rather, led us add, »all things intellectual«; that is to say, »possible«, when we take into our consideration the immensity of human apathy. No relative of Cyrus, nor any functionaries in his employ, may have ever heard the sound of such a title as I have named above. But

the Zoroastrian Town with its surrounding territory comes in, and with perhaps an added force, once more. If the Inscription Religion had any counterpart, so far as our records of such a circumstance can extend, then that counterpart existed, as no one, reading the Inscriptions, will any longer question, at that ancient site. Ragha is a marked Avesta name, let us recall it again; see above. There an Ahura Mazda was worshipped beyond any shadow of a doubt, as all men see, just as the King's own Auramazda was »God« in the more Southern site. We have no inscriptions there at Ragha, but we have what is nearly as convincing, an imperishable Book. The sources of that Book were at that instant extant there, as all should know, and its chief pieces were then in all human probability actually used in worship; and the name of »Zarathushtra« lives throughout them everywhere. Had nothing ever then been heard, let us as before inquire, of a name which was so familiar in the Northern town at the moment when Darius wrote at his more central Capital or at Persepolis? Here was a name, let me say it again, with which a great Province actually rang. Did no lingering echoes of it reach the place where other priests of lesser magnitude were standing in consecrated fanes before altars doubtless all aflame with the same venerated element which shone from scores of Sanctuaries in the Ragha Province, while worshipping the identically same Deity, Auramazda, Darius's God? It does not seem to me to be at all a probable idea that a name so greatly celebrated at Ragha was never

even heard at the central seat of Government; for it became at last so prominent that like »Caesar« in another application in imperial politics, it actually gave title to officials. The Magnates of various places began to take on »Zarathushtra«, till at last their Chief assumed the very form superlative, so, curiously. Others were »Zarathushtra«; but *he*¹ became »most Zarathushtra«, hardly so early however as Darius, but quite probably indeed before the last of these Inscription writers prepared their edicts for the chisels.

Why does not then the name occur upon the Tablets, upon the Rocks and Palaces?

Really it is time that we should begin to hesitate before we protract these queries; see above upon the Ameshaspentas. I have carefully avoided any such idea as the too close association of this extremely conspicuous name with the Southern portion of the Empire. That name is to be sure absolutely embodied in Avesta; — and Avesta in its related lores was widely spread over the North, North-East, and North-West of Iran; but not necessarily so much so toward the South. Both it and the name with it could not have well failed to be known at the Capital for the reasons above given as to Angra Mainyu and the Ameshas.

Perhaps one simple explanation more might here be put in at once to account for its omission, which is, not

¹ Zarathustrōtema. »The Rāgha Province had no formal fifth ruler's name, or title »Zarathushtra«; doubtless because the real or supposed descendants of Z. still lingered there. And the office was hereditary with their head without especial appointment; see Y. XIX.

that the name was too familiar; but that it was perhaps abhorred. Zarathushtra, was of course also »magian« like the Ameshaspentas if he was anything; see the condemnations of the »magian-hater« in Avesta. He belonged to the detested form of the rival Mazda-worship; and just as Catholic hates »heretic« in our times of Reformation, so did Darius hate the Magu and with all the vehemence which could lead to slaughter. How then could Zarathushtra be named (with veneration) by the man who overthrew the chief Magian of the period, the zealous Smerdes, Bardiya, the so-called, or real, pretender and impersonator, if all that story can be believed ¹.

If Darius had cited Zarathushtra, it would have been in an hostile sense. No name that could be named would be less likely to be found among such records of a dynasty ostentatiously founded upon the execution of a person of his sect.

The absence of the name »Zarathushtra« from the records proves only that Darius was not insincere, or, – not demented. There is one name indeed upon Behistūn and the rest, which is identical in terms with a conspicuous one within Avesta. It is Vishtāspa. If we could identify the Vishtāspa of the Inscription with the Vishtāspa of Avesta, this would put the Avesta at once into the hands of every Bible-Scholar in the land, which is a leading object of this present book, and a result in practical literature of acute significance and far reaching in

¹ I personally beg leave to hesitate a little before I accept the whole of it; all others however seem to absorb it as it stands.

its effects; for no one knows how widely conclusions like these may one day bear. We must pause however here at this a little, in default of completed evidence. It seems really in our especial sense of it, to be »too good« to be among the things called »true«.

As to »Zarathushtra« however, we have not the slightest intimation of the name.

From the word Auramazda however, as well as from the words »Mithra« and »Anahita«, [and also from the continuous tone of the religious sentiment together with the linguistic analogies, we know for sure that the forebears of Zarathushtra and those of Darius once worshipped the same Ahura Mazda as their God in the self-same local tribe; for then those Deities and worshippers were each the self-same persons, and lived in the common home. No one doubts, so far as I am aware, who understands the subject, that there was once a time called that of »Iranian Unity«, and further back in the gray dawn of the early world there was a period of Indo-Iranian, and even of Indo-Germanic Unity. Already in those immemorial days, so well-nigh inconceivably remote, the same Gods whose names we trace on the Inscriptions, in the Avesta, and in Veda were reverently adored with no thought as yet of difference, Áhura as Ásura, Mithra as Mitra, Agni, Atar and the rest; see above; and out of the primeval lore in which those religious thoughts were then embedded emerged the three later branches, the Vedic, the Zarathushtrian, and the Daric. Surely it is mere incompetence for us to suppose that the masses who worshipped under the Persian successors

of Zârathushtra were ignorant, originally so, not only of the very chief Gods revered, and of the One chief Demon feared by the masses taught by their own first predecessors, but of the leading Prophet's name as well. Momentary forgetfulness was beyond all question the chief cause, next to the non-relevance of a citation, why the names were not hewn out, but *original ignorance* is totally aside; — more especially as it involved an unaccountable absence of information on the part of Darius's officials actually appointed by him to report upon the general business details of the public Cults.

It becomes now my duty to notice some criticisms which might be made on Darius as regards his personal character and creed. For a direct indictment of these is next in point; and first as to his Creed; for this naturally falls in as an appendix to the last item. It is indeed quite true that my argument neither directly nor fundamentally depends upon the excellence or inferiority of either the man or his convictions in themselves alone considered; but, as I have more than once implied, there are subordinate elements among those considerations, which bear most seriously upon the results which I am endeavouring to make good.

Section XVIII.

Objections as to further Interior Elements of the Religion of the Inscriptions.

Darius's Creed more closely considered. Allusions to other Gods.

And what of the allusions to »the Other Gods?« Are these not an objection to the comparison of

the Avesta religion with that of the Inscriptions, and upon the ground of the »polytheism« involved in such ideas?, a point not yet so very well thought out.

My answer is that »polytheism« as an accusation just here has fortunately, or the reverse, but little point, for, while in its mass monotheistic, barring the independent Satan, parts of the later Avesta themselves cannot be described as anything but such-like, though from the earlier Avesta this polytheism is absent. Indeed the difference between monotheism and polytheism is no by means always so easy for us to trace in the forms of our own Religion, not to speak of those of the Avesta. We, Christians, are ourselves also reckoning quite without our host if we think that independent critics would always call *us* Monotheists, that is to say, not without some very serious reserves. We are positively the contrary in the eyes of many, though falsely so, as we may be well assured; and this in regard to what some would call the most vital elements of our Faith. Our very Tritheism, (? so, badly named) would make us such in the view of many a cold critic, not to speak of »our God's Mother«, our Angels and Archangels. To defend Avesta from this charge of »many gods«, we can indeed make clear the astonishing refinement of the Gāthas, showing that their Dualism resulted from a recoil against just this many-godded belief, degrading as they evidently thought it to be, while even in the most polytheistic passages of the late Avesta the one good God stands out unusually distinct from the company of lesser divinities. Yet there are isolated

passages in the later Avesta where another Deity closely approaches Ahura in the degree of honour accorded him.

Avesta is indeed, in its later portions, almost Veda in these picturesque particulars. See where in the Yasna Ahura and Mithra are linked together quite as *Mitrāvárūna*¹. A distinct crying back had taken place from the Gāthic age to some still earlier common primeval lore; — for the later Avesta seems to call up again a throng of once-venerated primeval Deities strictly ignored within the Gāthas, one of the strangest and most significant facts yet known to our ancient literature². The Gāthas banished even the time-honoured Mithra with the rest; — or did they actually foredate them?. This polytheism of the isolated passages might however indeed be said to be the merest flicker³.

But in view of it why should not Darius and the rest, though essentially monotheistic in their spirit, be also tinged with this same veneration for »the many Gods«, such as the later Avesta at times reveals. Personally I think that Darius was singularly free from »many-godded-ness«; — but why should this have been the case? Is there any particular reason why he should not have been deeply infected with

¹ Y. 2, 44 Spiegel, *ahura-mithra* as dual — Y. 1, 34 Sp. *ahura-ēibya-mithraēibya*, — while yet at another place Ahura is said distinctly to have »created« Mithra; see above.

² If Mithra, Agni, and the rest were ignored in the Gāthas, because they were then unknown at the time when the Gāthas were first sung; and never known before that time, the result would be well-nigh stupendous as a circumstance in early history. It would show the Gāthas to be indeed by far the oldest of all surviving books, which indeed some now think them, as it is, to be. ³ But it exists.

it, seeing that it was so common? Why should he not have been at least as much tinged with it as the Rishis of the Yashts? or as *we*, some of us, are ourselves supposed to be.

Instincts of Chivalric Courtesy were moved to Action.

Darius, though fervent in his faith, was no Christian martyr of the early type under the Gentile Emperors, regarding the smallest recognition of other Deities though well accredited, as being quite a heinous crime; see above. His convictions and sense of proportion on the contrary would have urged him to be decent toward the religious feelings of his subjects ¹.

He was a politician doubtless, and somewhat ruthless often from the very nature of his aims; — but he was none the less a man embued with sentiment. The religious cults of the various races within his care were dear to him, each of them, as we may be very sure; and every cult involved the deepest interests of human lives, domestic social and political. These creeds, he doubtless saw, as we all see, were in themselves both really innocent and also honourable, as gropings toward the light, the best that their adherents knew. And he himself too shared them personally and most sincerely in a certain sense, for he was glad to hope that the lesser Gods would help him on in his arduous tasks with all their magnitude together his own great worshipped Central Force.

¹ See above upon Cyrus.

Conscience, let me repeat it with emphasis, instead of restraining him from such words and acts of reverence, would on the contrary urge him to say every word and do every deed of respect and sympathy towards his sincere and pious fellow-countrymen; see above. Consideration for the Gods even of another nation would really in the end, as always,² conduce to a better attitude toward his own.

His »Other Gods« indeed were strangely Limited.

We should in no wise ask why Darius names these »other Gods«, »all Gods« or »clan Gods?« but rather »why he names so few«. Our reason given for this and all such like omissions will never vary. Space, time and attention were only left for things immediately practical; that is to say, for things imperatively urgent.

If this last question then is all that keeps the Inscriptions from Avesta, our task is over. Of the Inscription and the late Avesta, the last is the more »pagan«¹ of the two, teeming with accredited divinities, half-gods and angels.

Great as may be the essentials upon which the two resulting lores may differ, the elements on which they are one still keep all our reasonings valid. The facts remain unmoved.

¹ »Pagan« is here used in no uncomplimentary sense. In Rome the stateliest houses remained most »pagan«.

XIX.

Objections Continued.

Imperfections in the Ideals of Personal Character as manifested in the Recorded Acts and Sentiments of Darius aside from his professed Religious Policy.

The defect which makes the deepest impression upon every one who first glances over the Inscriptions whether hurriedly, or otherwise, is the inhuman cruelty revealed in the few passages of the Behistūn already cited; see above; see also below.

Cruelty.

The execution of the captive rebel »Kings«, see above, leaves little for the imagination to supply.

In extenuation of this I have nothing whatever to put forward at this moment except that poor attempt at a palliation; viz. that it was in accordance with the customs and opinions of the age in which the enormity transpired. Darius doubtless glutted a brutal desire for revenge in these barbaric acts, so far indeed as these Inscriptions are personal at all, and whether he himself really dismembered his captive enemies, as he seems so callously to assert, or not.

The Executions were largely acts of War and in Self-defence.

Aside however from the revolting methods of the executions, we must of course understand that they were constructively acts of war, and might well be so described; see also elsewhere; as done in

»self-defence«. Those enemies had, on their side, risen upon him for his destruction. All that he held dear they had endeavoured to annihilate, and had they been successful in their revolt, then they beyond all manner of a doubt, would have treated Darius precisely as he did them.

The International Public must be Struck with Terror.

Aside also from the slaking of vindictive fury, it was the current opinion of the Period that other insurgent princes must be »struck with terror« by the severe chastisement of conquered enemies. Frightful details might deter them (those others) from the same careers of conspiracy and attack. Even Zarathushtra could urge on his followers to executions¹; and it would be wholly unphilosophical if I should fail to add that some Christian executions of discordant fellow-believers and of criminals show details quite as demoniacal². Those of Darius were however savage acts indeed beyond all question, as recorded on the Inscriptions, if not indeed the acts of savages. Perhaps Darius really never did them, - not personally at least. At all events let us sincerely hope that he exaggerated their low details to deepen the horrific effect upon intending imitators who might hear the rumours of them.

After this the Egotism of the Inscriptions is what strikes us most in our preliminary perusal. Such a peculiarity indeed is not fatal to Darius's his credit; but it has it serious bearings.

¹ See Yasna XXXI, XXXII, etc. ² Cp. the Inquisition.

XIX, b.

Egotism as a Gross Foible in the Writers of the Inscriptions.

The defect is at times so glaring as to seem to us to be quite diseased in its ever-recurring manifestations, and also, at the same time, strange to say, curiously out of keeping with the religious fervour of the Inscription writers themselves as expressed in other parts of their statements. And this may well nullify all favourable effect which may have been produced upon us, being also in harsh contrast with the tone of their political action toward the Israelites as recorded in our own Semitic Scriptures.

All is »I« and »me«, as we report with some disgust, upon their writings as transferred to the Inscriptions. »I am Cyrus the King, the Achaemenid« are the only words which have really survived to us of the Iranian Incriptions of one Cyrus, though it is doubtful whether that unique sentence belongs to Cyrus the Great, or to a later pretender; and it is hardly necessary to recall the extreme self-consciousness of his Successor. »I am Darius the great King; Auramazda made me king. As Auramazda made this earth he delivered it over to me, etc., see above and below. From of old were my family kings, etc.«

XX.

Answers to the Charges.

My answer to the lot of it is first and again a frank concession. Like most other reigning Oriental

families in ancient, and shall we say also, in modern times, the Achaemenids must have been well-nigh not quite mentally sane on such a subject. So far as their expressions were really personal, they certainly show what must inevitably take place in the case of all persons situated as they so necessarily were.

Lifelong Adulation must in the End Morbidly affect the Balance of the Faculties.

Alexander perhaps naturally lost his dignity, as we remember, so far as seriously to consider whether he should, or should not, assume the honours of the Gods. But then I must recall what I have already said above; see upon page 244, which is that even these expressions may have been really little else but formulas; and, if such, they would have been so written by confidential representatives and even in certain cases without the previous knowledge of the Master.

Fixedness in Statement.

»The laws of the Medes and Persians«, as we understand from the Expressions in Ezra and Daniel, had later at least taken on a certain proverbial »fixedness of character«, and the dynastic claims of their Monarchs formed of course the very centre of their system, which was that of an autocracy quite absolute. Xerxes, we are certain, was in many of his expressions, not only upon the Inscriptions but elsewhere, using terms which had been set by custom at least from the time of Darius; and Artaxerxes was following on in the same manner with

sayings from the time of Xerxes; see above. And perhaps the very word so familiar to us, as the »unchangeability«¹ of »the laws of the Medes and Persians« came from the fact that they were first thus chiselled in the stone on hillsides, tombs and palaces, and so from a very natural cause outlasted every other sort of record.

Documentary Expressions controlled by Hereditary Association.

Very many other expressions beside those which I have noticed bear strong traces of having been controlled by customary forms, decades and half centuries back, as they certainly were so »stereotyped« during the time from Darius to Ochus; see above. And to this thought I must once again return.

Further Extenuations.

But let us, on the other hand, grant for a moment that these writers indicting the texts for their Inscriptions were in fact consciously as personally egotistic as they really seem, from their statements, to have been, and that the fact that they followed fixed precedents or formulae stereotyped for a century and a half at least, has little if any force to shelter them from such an imputation as I have, in the name of my opponents, brought against them, a very great deal, let us say in passing, for us to grant.

¹ See the Book of Daniel.

The Displeasing Foible Engulfed in the Extraordinary Details.

No one, let us hope, who has the smallest sense of proportion in his estimates of history or of politics, can read the Inscriptions without feeling that »personal egotism« is absolutely engulfed so to speak, as an element in the situation by the extraordinary nature of the acts reported.

The Situations called for Self-assertion.

Do we indeed for a moment fully realise what the situation of Darius actually was? For many an untrained reader of our Oriental documents, fails, as I fear, too often to take in what is one half of the matter presented for his consideration. Does it seem to us to be a circumstance of little breadth or moment that Darius actually claimed to possess and govern the greater part, *of the civilised Earth?* twenty three nations large and small as we have seen, but for the most part great, in their extent of territory at least, including how many cities, towns and villages with their totality of inhabitants.

Surely they numbered many millions? Self assertion is no longer the familiar characteristic in view of that. Assertion in terminology in such a case and in such a period was absolutely unavoidable. How could a Persian Emperor govern one half the world in BC. 500—400 without maintaining such an attitude.

In all such cases also there is much that softens our harshest judgments toward the Person, as we ponder them, for they actually move our pity, if

they do not indeed show him to have been hardened to adversities.

Sudden and extreme Vicissitudes waylaid Darius's Daily Course.

This Monarch's life was evidently one long nightmare of Revolts. *He scarcely reigned, as we might almost be induced to say, he wrangled.*

One after another of the mighty peoples, whom he claimed to own and govern was almost always on the eve of insurrection; and sometimes several of them together at a time. Civil war, as a condition of things, was almost chronic.

Can we wonder then that Darius chiselled up his self-assertions everywhere? One never becomes so self-assertive as in the face of danger. The terribly distracted man then hardly knew what a normal peace could be. His domestic administrations were daily struggles, and as to foreign politics his life was one long tumult. Babylon revolted as we saw; and when he turned to put it down, nine great nations rose up against him in his rear. And for a second time it revolted, later. Legal points had likewise to be refuted, with these however a Persian Emperor might doubtless make short work; but vast details of business continually occupied his thoughts; and conquered nationalities were remodelled.

Every foreign State would be quite as imperious toward him as he could possibly be toward it. Whatever he had said and done, that all others would have matched, we may be sure, if only for the

briefest intervals, could they secure the power. No wonder that he sent his sculptors everywhere which such-like texts, a few of which alone may have lingered on the monuments. Events of every calibre, great, little or mediocre crowded in upon him, including within them those which we are studying, year by year, or more probably month by month, startling him if he were indeed susceptible of shock, and baffling him wherever possible, and interrupting everywhere the vast machinery of Government, even where they did not indeed threaten his very Throne; his tasks were endless.

Elements of Truth in his Assertions.

And were there not after all elements of truth in his assertions?; as they pointed his solid claims to be considered so exceptionally prominent, if not indeed, »supreme«? Was it not essentially, as well as obviously and practically, the fact that in times like those Kings, their families and their dynasties were all that stood between the world and anarchy. And was not God indeed his helper, as he, Darius, so constantly and so earnestly declared. Did not the Almighty indeed »raise his predecessor up« as our own Bibles so solemnly assert? I am of the opinion that he needed all the egotism that he could muster, in the course of his immense career. An inhuman age needed a scarce human tone.

Modifications are to be Considered.

But in this case we have a circumstance which certainly modifies our severe censure of his self-

assertion aside from the considerations just mentioned. This ruler, for an exception, was not solely lost in a blind maze of egotism, nor does he think of his fellow countrymen solely in regard to their immediately present interest, nor again in regard to an indefinitely distant personal future with the particulars of which he was at each moment morbidly engaged. He is thinking definitively of his Successors; and this alone here half nullifies our charge, condoning a colossal self-esteem; for an egotism which looks out upon the still enduring life of others, after one has oneself forsaken life, is half redeemed already by the fact.

Beh. IV, 64—65. »Thou who hereafter shalt »see this Inscript«; so he ordered to be cut; »which »I have written (that is to say, in the document »which was to be sculptured), or who shalt see »these figures (which were to be carved out), do »not destroy them (so, fearing vandalism) ¹, but so »long as thou livest, preserve them. When thou »seest this inscribed tablet and these images, and »dost not destroy them, but so long as thy family »lasts dost preserve them for me, may Auramazda »be thy friend; may thy family be abundant, and »thy life long ²; and what thou doest may Auramazda make great for thee (i. e. »prosper«) ³.

¹ The Inscriptions, some of them and especially those of Behistūn, were placed in situations only with difficulty accessible and for this reason. It is none the less exceedingly interesting to observe how keenly sensitive Darius is upon the subject, and how well he gauges the danger to all such kinds of monuments.

² Remember Ameretatāt.

³ Behistūn. Col. IV, l. 64—65 (W.B.), l. 69—76.

Behistūn IV, 66 — (W. B.): »Thus saith Darius
 »the King: »if thou seest this Inscription and these
 »figures and dost mar them, and so long as thy
 »family lasts dost not preserve them for me, but
 »dost mar them, then may Auramazda smite thee;
 »may thy family be brought to naught, and may
 »Auramazda confound what thou doest«.

XX, a.

The Altruistic Element.

Naksh i Rustem, a, 4 (W. B.) »When thou now
 »thinkest: how manifold are the lands which King
 »Darius possessed, then look upou this image: it
 »bears my Throne, then wilt thou know them, and
 wilt also know (what? — any further self-laudation?,
 nothing of the kind), — but thou wilt know that
 »*the Lance of the Persian has reached afar; —*
 »*then wilt thou know that the Persian has fought*
 »*battles far from Persia.*«

Egotism like that going out upon a future when he, the speaker, should be no more, is only healthy, virile for the times, and to be praised, not pardoned. His mind was on the future glory of the Empire evidently, and this long after all immediate personal interests should have disappeared; though he doubtless wished much for the immortality which he has since received among us. Our charge of egotism is therefore on the whole hardly fit to be sustained.

But to offer another attack upon the Achæmenid, and this time from a slightly varied point of view. Did not Darius *lie*?

XX, b.

Inveracity Supposable.

And here indeed we have a consideration which is well calculated to unnerve our most resolute defence, as well as to make the most ardent panegyrists of the monarch, pause.

Lying is indeed one of the most damnable of all our human infirmities, how much more so when it is linked with actual or intended murder.

The Story of the False Bardiya, Smerdes.

Take the very first and most important of all the dense throng of these serious and most fateful statements. Was Darius truthful as to his account of the deeds and words of the man whom he claims to have succeeded after having justly put him to death?

Was it Genuine?

No one, so far as I am aware, has hitherto ever uttered one word to challenge that strange tale which Herodotus confirms. The successful impersonator and his many murders quickly plotted to conceal the fact of a falsely assumed identity, has passed, so far as I am aware, for current coin. But is it not possible that this great Reign like so many of the lesser ones, was begun in fact with a deed of faithless assassination excused by a ruthless falsehood in a most improbable detail of so-called history? If this were so, who has anything to say in its excuse. Let us hope that there was no inaccuracy there.

XX, c.

Equivocations Elsewhere.

And if lying is to be suspected elsewhere in the assertions of Darius, a lying age should not be the first to say anything against this great Monarch on account of any other possible exaggerations. Political necessity then, as too often since, recoiled but little before streams of blood or storms of perjury.

If Darius first murdered the so-called Gaumāta and then later lied to conceal the nature of his crime, and to gather in its fell results, it was a record horrible indeed, — I rejoice that no one has ever harboured a suspicion of it. But did not he, Darius, exaggerate, equivocate, or categorically falsify in many, or any, of those other grand, though rough and simple statements which deal so majestically with whole Kingdoms in a word, and with myriads of human beings, sentence after sentence? Is everything which he wrote out to be engraved upon the tablets to be at once and forever absorbed by each and all of us, with no reserve and little criticism.

Some Equivocation would naturally be present in these extended political Assertions.

I, for one, am quite willing to concede that he may not have been always accurate. Let us acknowledge it, at least for the sake of argument, and once for all, that he may not have been faultless at every turn of those great observations upon these Columns. I have indeed often wondered why historians, and even we, who work upon

the foundations of our histories, should engulf at wholesale each and all of the assertions which we find carved on stone, or stamped in clay by the order of these Oriental Rulers, simply because they are so old and bear the marks of official authorship. Is it then the fact that mankind have only lately entered upon the daring race of competitive deceit, in a word that they have only lately learned the way to speak untruth? Exaggerations must certainly be present in the secondary detail of those great records somewhere; and here and there doubtless a gross untruth maintains its concealed but hideous existence.

Lying was the Universal Implement.

Darius lived, let us once more note it, in a tumult of large events, each of which was charged with all conceivable disasters to himself and with quick or long since organised conspiracies. He suffered from the »Lie« perennially. There was one especial form of the so hated imposture to which he was even month by month, not to say, day by day subjected.

The Monuments are Resonant with the Well-adapted Word.

Political Lie followed upon Lie, as we read, and we need never doubt it. In nine terrible Revolts, Deceit, at first insidious and then barefaced, recurred. Every adverse statement, as it seems, with almost absolutely no exceptions begins with the scathing words . . . ; . »He Lied!«

The Cases, Some of Them.

First of Guamāta himself: thus he lied to the people (B. I, XI (l. 39): »I am Bardiya, Cyrus's son, »Cambyses' brother; — so of Nadi'tabaira (Nidintu-Bel) (B. I, XVI, l. 78) »thus he belied the people«; in B. IV § 51 (W.B.): »This one lied« is repeated nine times of the nine rebellious potentates; so in B. IV § 53 (W.B.): »thus said Darius the King: »it was the plotting Lie which made those lands »rebellious . . . , as they (the kings) lied to them, »thereupon Auramazda gave them into my hand«¹.

B. IV, § 54 (W.B.) Thus saith Darius the King: »Thou who hereafter shalt be King here, guard »thysel carefully against the (Plotting) Lie; a man »who is a (Plotting) Liar, do thou punish well . . . »if thou thinkest: »my land shall go unscathed«. (Notice in passing that this last sentiment is adverse to Egotism.)

The Word is elsewhere Very Frequent.

And count the occurrences on the other Inscriptions, if you care for such a thing. What wonder then, if the man so assaulted by the Lie in its most awful form, at last retaliated with a similar detested weapon. He may have counterlied; if I may so express myself.

Our Own infatuated Falsehood.

Do we politically so often hesitate in similar prevarications upon the plea that the »public good

¹ These references are not at all intended to be absolutely fulsome; for such reference see Sp's. Edition, Glossar. p. 226.

justifies the evil means«, not to speak of the trivial »Te-deums« intoned for false victories in the middle ages, nor of our still lower false market news flashed across the wires to deprive the unwary of their property? Darius doubtless, with the rest of them, felt bound upon his own rough principles to Lie in return again, if we might so say, and forsooth also »for the sake of others!« He had little hesitation, as I greatly fear, in penning many a pretence to put down a conjured-up assailant, absorbing also many a weak province »for the greater good of all.« Yet he spoke, we should not forget to say, especially and pre-eminently *for others* as well as for himself, and that not in a vague general drift alone. Beyond all question his thought was on the welfare of great masses as well as upon himself; see above.

XX d.

The Lie self-limited.

If, on the other hand, he had vapoured too flagrantly in the detail of his important narratives, with too egregious an egotism, would not his own Nobles, themselves soon alienated, have ridiculed his blatant edicts, openly, or surreptitiously, teaching every passer-by to do the same? His engraved words were often literally and really a public voice and in a closer sense than I have remarked before, recording as they did the nation's annals. What are they but a people's history?, written also as of course with the view to moulding its near future in development?

Is it probable then that he should have ordered

notoriously perverted facts, and those in too great numbers, to be graven up »with a pen of iron, upon the rock« where they would stand for ages as witness both to his turpitude and to his folly?; see above.

But aside from all this mass of possibility, which it has been so necessary to reproduce, who does not see that Darius longed to speak the very truth, and was fully conscious that what he wrote might be so gravely doubted? Read the following.

*An earnest Desire after Veracity and Intention
to Preserve it.*

B. 10, § 55, (B.W.) »Thou who hereafter wilt read this Inscription, let what I have done appear credible to thee.«

(56). »Thus saith Darius the King; as Mazda-
»worshipper (I swear (?)) that this is true, and not
»lied, that is to say, it is what I have done of every
»kind.« 57. »Thus saith Darius the King: Accord-
»ing to the will of Auramazda much more has also
»been done by me which is not written in this In-
»scription. For this reason is it not written, that
»no one, who will later read this Inscription, shall
»consider what I have done too much, and shall not
»believe it, and shall hold it to be falsified.«

59. »Thus saith Darius the King: Does what
»I have done appear to thee to be credible, — do
»not for that reason conceal it.«

After that who will deny that this Great Per-
sian spoke more truth than most rulers of his day,

if not more than those of any other day, when he ordered what he did to be engraved upon the mountain side of Behistūn or upon the walls of his Tomb and in palaces?

XXI.

Still Other Considerations. Was a Disinterested Motive present?

Applying our criticism more closely and to a definite circumstance, let us turn once again to the Biblical edicts for a moment, and ask whether their motives, those of Cyrus, Darius and their Successors, were not in themselves wholly political as regards those notorious steps which they took so prominently in behalf of Israel; and for which Cyrus at least was so highly lauded in Chronicles, Ezra and Isaiah, inspiration even of a certain kind having been attributed to him. Were not the motives present altogether those of mere political Expediency? Did not Cyrus find it strategically convenient to himself, and tending toward the aggrandisement of his Empire, to have a vigorous moiety of the impassioned Jewish tribes, now firmly associated as allies with himself, replanted at their old home in Jerusalem on the main high road to the rich Nile territory soon destined to become one of his Provinces or one of those of his Successors, and so to make use of their religious patriotism for his own State ends? If this were indeed the truth, would there be anything so very sinister in the fact?; —

I have some hesitation in discussing so trivial a suggestion; but let us ask:

Could He ignore State Interests?

Would not Cyrus, and Darius after him as well, together with Xerxes and his Successors, have been, on the contrary, morally most culpable, if they had neglected all such considerations? — so letting slip an opportunity to strengthen a position upon which interests of magnitude might yet depend for themselves, and for their adherents.

A great Opportunity in Jewish Patriotism, an Incisive Element.

The fierce Jews, as he had every reason to suppose, would hold their new-built City to the death, with its freshly consecrated Temple, defending it with furious zeal.

Should Cyrus or Darius let this chance for an effective move pass by not utilised?

Their Acumen itself should not be Overrated.

Is it not also, critically speaking, inexact for us to be forever supposing these early Rulers to have been actuated by an acumen keen quite beyond their time? in their still somewhat rudimental affairs of State. The age was not so far advanced, we may be sure, in diplomatic finesse as that we should look for too much intellect and acute sagacity in their close management of affairs just then and there.

XXI, a.

Sentiment of a Certain Type was doubtless Present; and it was Deep.

Subjective Sentiment of a profound and stirring nature no doubt possessed both Cyrus and Darius,

as it did every ruler of their day; and this set on and moved them forward with a vigour all unforeseen because unconscious, and, as it were, against as well as with their wills.

XXI, b.

Was this Sentiment fundamentally Religious in its Whole or in Parts.

And' here we come upon a consideration still more interior, so to speak than those already mentioned, if that indeed be possible: »Had they, Cyrus, Darius and the rest, any serious personal religious character at all, in the sense in which we understand this characteristic? That is to say, had they any deeply ingrained individual principle founded upon thorough convictions as to the objective truth of the substance of their hereditary Faith?, and made alive by a deeply seated devotion of heart and mind to the aims held in view within its doctrines, laws, and promises? And this leads us on to the simple theme of their Personal religious state in particular.

Their Personal Piety as Individuals.

»Hold not God's command to be opposed to the good;« so Darius ordered to be cut, NR, a, § 6 (W.B); »forsake not the right path; sin not.« This shows more than the customary affectation of religious fervour clothing itself, as it so often does, in mere ritual forms.

Darius I, 5 Behistūn. 5. »Through the gracious »will of Auramazda am I King; Auramazda delivered »the Kingdom to me.«

6. »In accordance with the favouring will of »Auramazda was I their King.«

7. »Through the gracious will of Auramazda »these lands became subject to me.«

8. »In accordance with the gracious will of »Auramazda these lands (i. e. these nations) have »regulated themselves under my law.«

9. »Auramazda gave me the sovereignty; Aura- »mazda brought me help; in accordance with the »favouring will of Auramazda I possess the sove- »reignty.«

Note these last three expressions in one verse or subsection.

Subsection 10 and 11 do not admit of the words; nor does subsection 12; but note the contrast; Gaumāta, the supposed or real impersonator, is said to have acted according to *his own* will. It is true that this may have been intended merely to express; »He was successful«¹; but see the antithesis in the form nevertheless. It is marked, and must be considered to be significant. It certainly means more than that he acted »independently.« But in the 13th he begins again: »I prayed to »Auramazda for aid«; »Auramazda brought me help«. »In accordance with the will of Auramazda was I King«; so in the 14th, »According to »the Will of Auramazda I took pains to (restore »the temples, etc.) as when Gaumāta the Magian had »not overthrown our House.«

So in 18: »in accordance with the Gracious

¹ We should naturally understand: »He acted with complete success.«

Will of Auramazda we crossed the Tigris; so in 19; so in 20; so in 25; so in 26; so in 27; so in 28. Everywhère in such sections we have the recurring words: »Auramazda brought me aid,« and »in accordance with the will of Auramazda I«? so in 29; so in 30; so in 31; fortunately not so in the dreadful 32, approaching in atrocity, as it does, one of our own unfortunate conclusions; recall the terribly sad words of that psalm otherwise indeed so beautiful, the 137th. But so also we have the terms in 33, notwithstanding the following horrors. So also in 35; so in 36; so in 38, so in 41; so in 42; so in 44; so in 45; so in 49; so in 51; see 53: »Thereon Auramazda gave them (the Nine Kings) into my hand. »As was my will, so I did.« So in 56; »as Mazda-worshipper (I swear), in 56 . . . »According to Auramazda's will is also much more been done by me . . . (58) »former kings have not done what I did; through »the gracious will of Auramazda in every particular . . .«

So in 59: . . . »Auramazda be thy friend; so in 60« , if . . . , may Auramazda kill thee«; so in 61: »This which I have done I did in all manner after »the Will of Auramazda; Auramazda brought me »aid; and the other gods which exist, whoever they »may be (possibly so meaning).

62. »For this reason Auramazda brought me »aid, because I was never hostile, not lying, nor »despotic, neither I, nor my race, because I ruled »according to the Law.«

So in 65 . . . »Auramazda be thy friend . . . »Auramazda make thy results great«; so in 66, »with threats . . . so in 70: »Auramazda gave the »land into my hand . . .; according to A.'s will I did . . .«

So in 73 . . .; so in 74.

Hardly a possible assertion which could admit of the word »by the will«, or »with help of Auramazda« is without them . . . Neither the smallest victory, nor the severest threat fails to call them forth. Where else in ancient writings do you find a parallel to this? ¹ Even modern literature seldom offers such a case.

XXI, c.

The Sentiment here portrayed can only be described as »Passionate.«

The man was for the moment, in spite of all our effort to contravene the fact, obviously and clearly fully possessed with a deep and almost passionate sense of reverence toward his Deity. And notwithstanding every fault of his age or of his personal character, this fervent iteration should make a strong impression upon every serious reader. So in Persepolis d, 1 (W. & B.): »the Great Auramazda, the »greatest of the Gods . . . has instituted Darius as King . . .; so in 2. »This land of Persia, which »Auramazda has presented to me . . ., according to A.'s will and mine it trembles before no

¹ In all respects. I think we might even say that, taking into consideration their necessarily circumscribed extent, these Inscription contain the most ample expressions of sentimental confidence in the Deity of any writings ancient or modern.

other, and in 3 he prays . . . : »may A. bring me »help . . . and protect this land . . . for this favour pray I . . .« So in Persepolis, e, 2, and so in 3; — even when arrogantly claiming the Persian kingdom as the great bulwark of the interests of his subjects, he does not forget to add »through Aura«. So in Naksh i Rustem »A great God is A. who made this earth and »yon heaven . . .«, so in 3 . . . , so in 4 . . . »as Auramazda saw this great earth in revolt,« etc. . . . , so in 5 . . . , so in 6, as cited above . . . , so in the Elvend (Alvand), Inscription 1, he repeats his expressions of praise. The theme itself is, »the greatness of God«. »A great God is A. . . . who gave man civilisation (so I prefer; others, »fullness of blessings«; so B. & M.). So in the Suez Inscriptions c.1. There is not a solitary place, as it seems, let me repeat it, in all the Inscriptions of Darius from their beginning on, where he could possibly bring in such expressions of adoration, thankfulness, and prayer to his Supreme Auramazda, and where he fails to do so. This does not look like pure hypocrisy; —, though it may indeed have been intended to express the people's fervour, as I have elsewhere argued. A man may be seriously religious while he is also at the same time »officially« religious.

The Sentiment is Genuine.

If these sentences are on the contrary the natural and well-nigh irrepressible expression of one who was keenly actuated by personal emotional

¹ So far as they were personal at all.

susceptibilities as also by a persuasion of the interior and fundamental truth of the Faith which he had always known; — and if Cyrus at all approached his Successor in these particulars; and we may regard this as highly probable from the facts; then we may also infer that the whole dynasty was in a sense religious, at least »presumably« as the representative of the State Religion, and at times „sincerely and personally so; see above; and if this be the fact, then the statements of Ezra at least with regard to Cyrus are fully justified when he hazards the expression that his »spirit was stirred by the Lord.«

Recall once more the words just cited: »All that I have done, I have done through the gracious will of Auramazda . . . in all manner.«

The close inference from the above is to the effect that sincere personal Sentiment influenced and animated much of the Policy of the Persian Reigning Family toward the resident Babylonian Jews whom Cyrus found in the Great City and its environs. And this sentiment, if it is shown to have really existed, certainly carries with it the conclusion that the intellectual association of the Persians with the Jews was all the more a close one.

Section XXII.

The Analogies Pursued.

As to still more pointed allusions in the Israelitish Scriptures, can we criticise Isaiah's so very striking expression, concerning Cyrus as »the called of the Lord« in the sense of providential »establish-

ment?« If Darius's case affords a safe criterion, are not those allusions most fully justified by the texts which have now been cited?

Notice that he, Darius, »calls upon the Lord«: »No one dared utter a word against Gaumāta till I came, then *called I upon Auramazda* for help. 'Auramazda brought me aid.«

See also where he urgently »prays.« Pers. Dar. d. 3 (Sp. H. 21) »for this boon I pray Auramazda...« so at Nakhsh i Rستم, 5. »for this I pray.« And see too what the objects prayed for were: first; »that Auramazda might protect this land against hostile hosts, against deformities, against the (plotting) Lie,« and in the other »May Auramazda protect me against all evil, and my house and this land.«

Auramazda Communicated Commands.

And God spoke in return to him, not only in general commands, but as to the immediate point at the moment in issue before him: »The command of Auramazda is this.« See also above where I recall the passage from Isaiah, there however cited for another purpose. Isaiah wrote: »I have raised him, »Cyrus«, up in righteousness, and I will make straight all his way.« Or was this a half-citation from the Inscriptions, and as if from well known formulas ¹? I have cited this above on page 222 in

¹ Notice the very words »straight« and »way« (cited above) which occur on them, the Inscriptions, as in the biblical allusions, and so also most prominently in the Gāthas of the Avesta where »straight paths, etc.« forms a familiar figure of most deeply interesting significance, also cited above.

regard to the Avesta and the Inscriptions separately; but we can now more freely compare all the three, the Edicts, the Inscriptions, and the Gāthas.

And this recalls to us again the words recorded in Ezra ¹ as already cited where the still later Persian monarch, Artaxerxes, is made to ask »that sacrifices and prayers should be offered up for him in the House of the God of Heaven«; see it alluded to above. Note too that this latter expression »in the House« of the God of Heaven most certainly pointed to Yahweh Elohīm, and not to the national God of Artaxerxes, for the »House« referred to was to be the renovated Temple at Jerusalem. The terms therefore really included a parallel to Darius's appeal to the »other gods« on which I dwelt above. All of which adds increasing force to the considerations which bring the Edicts and the Inscriptions still more closely into intellectual connection.

XXII, a.

As to another conceivable foible, we might be inclined to pause upon the seeming *self-delusion* of Darius; and this, though touched upon under »polytheism«, may be profitably recalled for a moment here.

Darius had indeed a kindly word to say for his neighbours' Gods, as we have seen above. And that he believed too much in them at intervals seems to me to be quite possible.

¹ Cf. Ezra VI already alluded to above. »And that which they have need of give them that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of Heaven, and pray for the life of the King and of his son.« Notice that Cyrus' son was also with him in Babylon when he also uttered an edict asking for prayers.

Certain critics might indeed regard the very theism of Darius as too full a conviction to suit them, and but little restrained in its effusion; but with people such as that, we have here at least very little that is serious to do. Granted however that he, Darius, was indeed superstitious, and most positively so, what possible adverse bearing has such a fact upon my argument as in so far set forth by my statements hitherto? Please to remember that the excellence, inferiority or mediocrity of the characters of these Rulers are matters in themselves considered of quite secondary importance to the general results which I am endeavouring so arduously to maintain, and which have to do with the fact of an intimately *close association between the Persians and the Jews*, and as a consequence upon this, then also with the fact that there existed an appreciably important exchange of ideas between them. Every better characteristic manifested as a habit of mind among the upper classes of the Persians as of the Jews, tends of course to add substance to what I am endeavouring to make out, yet, on the other hand, certain foibles of character are also at times of equal and even of greater efficacy in this direction.

XXII, b.

*Superstition, when Sincere, is not an adverse
Consideration.*

Genuine superstition, unless it be of a wholly sinister cast, carries with it, as a matter of necessity, a certain degree of genuine fervour; and everything which awakens individual religious passion

into fuller play heightens, if it be sincere, the tone of the picture. But vivid personal intellectual action in the two large masses of human beings under review is precisely what is most favourable to the state of things, the existence of which I am endeavouring to demonstrate.

The more vitality there may have been in the daily scenes of religious social intercourse between the two classes among the Babylonian population, the Persian and Israelitish, the more completely the barrier to an exchange of thoughts would be broken down, and the more practically real would be the intercourse between the Persians and their protégés; and this notwithstanding the fact that a certain clash of ideas might at times become perceptible.

If we understand by »Superstitions« an exaggerated veneration for what helps one to be noble and true, and an enthusiastic devotion to its maintenance and propagation, then indeed, we may freely say that the effect of such a superstition would have been to impart an incisive impulse to a type of religion which must have had the effect of bringing the Babylonian Persians and the Babylonian Jews nearer together. That is to say, provided that the pure theologies of the Inscriptions and of the Old Avesta, the Gāthas, were the creed of the Persians on the one side and the better specimens of the Psalms that of Israel on the other. Two differing Peoples, though of distinctly separated race affinities, who were each even to an exaggerated degree altogether inspired by sublime principles basing themselves upon imposing, if possibly only supposed,

occurrences and facts, (in each of these systems although so extremely different in their ultimate origin); — such races would certainly be more readily brought together by any serious circumstances which would tend *a priori* to create a certain sympathy between them. And if this sympathy existed, they might experience, even if it were only for isolated moments, a very flame of ardent mutual appreciation which must of necessity leave some lasting effects upon each; that is to say, upon the mental experiences and character of one, or both, of the convening parties.

Anticipating Alexander and the Greeks of the Areopagus, they would, if only for a brief interval, each strive to make itself as familiar as might be possible with the Religion of its singular though valued chance acquaintance. Even if conflict later supervened, this very perfervour of exaggerated devotion would tend to freer communication of impressions and convictions, which would in their due course all have their effect upon minor details of creed and ceremony; — and this, if shown to be probable, only builds up our argument in still more solid walls.

XXII, c.

Darius's Religious Sentiment, even if of an exaggerated character, is Favourable to our Contentions.

Darius, like Cyrus and the rest, was really so possessed with an innate enthusiasm for the veneration of divine Beings that he would neglect no God anywhere who was recognised by his more substantial subjects, and who, he thought, could help

him; for let us never forget that an inferior God, with him and such-like people, was not much more than an inferior but endeared Person, human or angelic, with ourselves. To trust somewhat to another and inferior God involved no more disloyalty to his Ahura than our own regard for archangelic Personages or even for the Sainted Virgin Mother.* If then Darius, and before him Cyrus, „accepted among those other Gods the Yahweh Elohim of the Israelites whether as the Devá, God of Heaven, or as a colleague; — and if he accorded thus to his new found Deity a position unusually high in his own narrow Pantheon, indeed exceptionally close to his own Auramazda, — and who is not persuaded that this was the fact, — would not that sensibility, even if somewhat distorted and awry, still, in the main, help on his own well adjusted religious principle? Even losing sight for a moment of our Yahweh Elohim as a preferred or indeed even as a particularly remembered Unit among the »other Gods« whom he would occasionally group with his Ahura, could that »Superstition,« even when perhaps partially misdirected as it may have been, fail to carry with it in the end some kind of beneficial spiritual result to himself and to others? Surely in the spiritual apprehensions of a good man there could be nothing so very terrible in the character of a supposed or real supernatural Person to whom his own political or tribal friends were accustomed to accord sincere religious worship, nor anything so very sinister in his veneration toward such a Being. With this much said, we may then return to the

Inscription and the old Avesta, though hardly just here fully to the Veda, and say that they show less superstition of a pernicious tendency, but that they on the other hand show a higher faith as to character and degree than any writings of their age, kind and circumstances; and it would be a poor return to their great Originators if we should refrain from laying our tribute upon their tombs or at their feet. »By their fruits ye shall know them.«

XXII, d.

In our anxious search for further points in criticism with which to fill up our indictment still more completely we might, some of us, hit upon a charge exactly in the reverse direction to the one last named; and see what can be said against Darius upon the side of too little, rather than of too decided a tendency to believe. Is he then on the contrary not impossibly, so we might suggest, open to a charge of »*Scepticism*«, when he expresses himself as he does both with regard to his friends and his enemies upon the Inscriptions, in the matter of rewards and punishments?

The Appeal to Temporal Rewards and Punishments.

And it is certainly a very noticeable fact indeed that so far as his promises of recompense and his threats of chastisement are concerned, his tone is distinctly in contrast to that of the Gāthas and even to that of the later Avesta. »When thou seest this Inscription and dost not destroy it, so be thy family numerous, and thy life long, and what-

soever thou doest may Auramazda make great«, Naksh i Rustem; and so again at Behistūn IV, 65. Everywhere we are reminded of those appeals to temporal rewards which are characteristic of the pre-exilic Semitic Scriptures.

Our Answer.

As to this, I have really not indeed, so very much to say. It is certainly very like the allusions to rewards and punishments in our pre-exile Bibles, which notoriously omit all appeals to felicity in another world as a motive for good conduct in this. And I do not at all conceal from myself nor from my readers that we may have here the appearance of a very deep and far-reaching peculiarity indeed. This might even force some of us to concede a much more pervading and even radical difference between the religion of the Inscriptions and that of the Avesta, Old or New, than many of us have hitherto supposed to have existed. Is it not however possible that an extremely exaggerated, and in fact overbalancing faith in the temporal providence of God may have constrained this excessively practical man to confine his admonitions to the immediate circumstances of those whom he was addressing with such solemnity, losing sight for the moment of more distant, though still more sublime, indemnifications.

Dogmatic Inferences were Necessarily circumscribed.

Or again on the other hand we should not forget that these Sculptured Edicts, posthumous as

they were distinctly, through only in part, intended to be, were written for a vast conglomeration of differing nations spread over an enormous extent of territory; notice the three languages in which they were presented. They therefore needed to be circumscribed as to their dogmatic religious postulates. It was very certain quite *a-priori* and before any questions could be put upon it, that not a few out of those twenty three(?)¹ differing Nationalities would fail to appreciate some element in any appeal to the future world which might be offered in the spirit of the Persian theology; — and from this cause alone he, Darius, may have been the more inclined to dwell upon the present and immediate rewards and punishments which lay, as he so devoutly believed, within the immediate control of the omnipotent Auramazda.

Section XXIII.

A Glance toward the Result.

Cyrus prepared the way and Darius did the work in one of the grandest political structures which the world had, or perhaps, has ever seen, with its age and circumstances considered.

The very roads and mails and viaducts of Iran are said to look back to one of them. While the inclusion of so many nations under one vast Government naturally put a stop to interminable internecine dissensions; and by the very fact left it possible for the otherwise so evil-destined populations to develop the arts of peace.

¹ The names vary at Col. s. I and IV.

And this meant in their case the permission to thousands of honest communities, small and great, to live lives for the greater part exempt from what had so often turned all existence into a scene of horror and dismay.

Well might Darius in the Inscriptions which he composed for his very sepulchre declare: »Auramazda, as he saw this earth in confused warfare, delivered it over to me. And by the gracious will of Auramazda I reduced it to its (proper) condition; (literally »I put it in its place«)«. As christians at least we must acknowledge that the incomparable expressions of Isaiah toward one of these great men were well justified, for the Successor of Cyrus, as well as he himself, was predestined under Almighty God to carry out what proved to be the greatest act of beneficence toward occidental religion¹.

The Rebuilding of Temples Recalled.

As we have already seen above, Cyrus rebuilt the Babylonian Temple at Eššakil (so here); and we should know without much further statement what that act of decent kindness really signified. It meant of course greatly more than the mere reconstruction of an edifice or even the rebuilding of an half-dismantled suburb, for it proclaimed by one act to the population of the greatest City of the World that their religious rights and sentiments would be respected by their manly Conqueror, much as they might be later modified by a superior moral and

¹ The Restoration.

intellectual influence. And on the other hand so of the temples in Iran destroyed by a fanatical pretender, the same undeviating policy of humane generosity was observed. No sooner had the hostile false dynasty struck its colours than, after the execution of its chiefs (which indeed was accompanied with inexcusable horrors a disgrace to any age), conciliation and mercy stepped in at once. The temples in Persia destroyed by Gaumāta were rebuilt like that of Eššakil¹ and that at Jerusalem; see above. And this act again, like both those others (viz. that of Eššakil at Babylon and that in Iran) meant far more indeed than any isolated re-erection of an edifice: Christians at least need hardly to be again reminded of what it did for them as the religious descendants of those worshippers of Yahweh Elohim, who came back in the Return to people Palestine.

XXIII, b.

*The Restoration of Populations to their Homes,
Recalled.*

We have already seen even in the narratives of these necessarily so exceedingly circumscribed Inscriptions, both Iranian and Semitic, that the re-introduction of displaced peoples went on hand-in-hand with the reconstruction of edifices; but to clinch our point I recall them as complete: »Thus »saith Darius the King: the sovereignty taken from »our Kings I brought back. The temples which »Gaumāta the Magian had destroyed I restored, »and the means of livelihood for the people, the »herds and dwellings«; see above.

¹ So here.

Not Isolated Groups alone Were Restored.

At the first glance we may be inclined to suppose that this latter sentence refers to separate groups of people in restricted numbers, whereas the Return of the Jews involved the movements of many thousands. This objection may be indeed quite valid. But even if small parties alone from each of the innumerable hamlets were concerned, the transfer of populations in the case of Babylon must have been very considerable; and this was moreover really, as a matter of form, the nature of the Jewish Return. »Whosoever there is among you, let him go up« clearly indicates selection. In fact there is no disputing it that most of the so-called exiles preferred to live in their adopted home¹; and directly in accordance with this Darius goes on to say: »I restored the people again to their place as »well (to) Persia and Media as also to the other »lands, as it was before; I brought back what was »taken away«. Could the parallels be more distinct, or graphic?

It is now time for us to gather up our results, taking a short but comprehensive survey of our argument as regards the Achaemenian Inscriptions, the Edicts, and the Avesta.

XXIII, c.

The State of Religious Public Opinion in Persia is All-important.

And as one of the very most significant and important of the historical facts which we have been

¹ The later Babylonian Talmud and kindred literature is said to possess the higher authority.

enabled to make out, we must bring once more to bear the principle to which I promised to revert for the purpose of expanding my allusions. It was this; see above. We can no longer suppose that it was Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes in their isolated individualities who instituted that singularly interesting, and to us of the West so momentous policy of conciliating the Jewish residents in Babylonia, the so-called or real Captives of their Babylonian predecessors, but it was, even at that early age, a thoroughly effective *public opinion* which first gave the hint to the Persian Emperors, and then received their own impulse in return.

As I have endeavoured from the beginning of my treatment of this branch of the subject to intimate, my argument in no respect depends fundamentally upon any vindication of the personal character of Cyrus, Darius or his successors; see above. I have tried to make it clearly understood that the better elements in the peculiar disposition of each of those monarchs might, if shown to be really facts, certainly help me on in substantiating what I am labouring to prove, which is the existence of a necessary, if unforced, connection of ideas between the two communities, the Babylonian Jews and the Babylonian Persians. But there are indeed certain particulars, as I have also claimed, in regard to which my argument gains more in plausibility from the supposed existence of a deeply rooted and acutely intelligent sympathetic sentiment widely dispersed among the ruling circles of the Persians as among the same classes of the Jews; see above.

But everything which has survived to us, and which tends to prove that Cyrus or Darius were anything, or did anything, which corresponded in any serious degree with the statements in Chronicles, Ezra or Isaiah proves at the same time, as I assert, the existence of such a sentiment as I have described as widely extended among the population, if not indeed firmly established among their universal convictions. The devout piety, superstition, or religiously affected self-interest, whichever we may choose to term it, which actuated Cyrus, Darius and the rest could have been as little isolated and individual in the character of a single person as the same pointed fervour of any prominent leading person of to-day. What single religious or political leader has ever really originated the particular sphere in which his earnest moral energies have exerted themselves, or the type of personal piety of which he affords an example? Such men are the slow outgrowth of their age and circumstances. Especially gifted indeed they are, or else they could hardly have become the points at which the feelings, convictions and wishes of their fellow men break forth into expressive action, but none the less they are but minute elements in all those intense forces which have been alive among the people of a certain class who have preceded them, as of those same intellectual and moral influences which survive in their contemporaries. Not only do those strong expressions of religious belief and urgent practical religious fervour which we find upon the Inscriptions prove to have been, in their external shape at least, positively set for-

mulas; see above; enduring from generation to generation among the Persians, at least from Cyrus to Artaxerxes Ochus, and so revealing some kind or degree of sentimental sympathy among the leading classes of the people which linked age to age together, but they also presuppose of course the fact that large sections of the middle and even of the under classes of society in the same age harboured such a common feeling; see above.

Darius and his Successors caused these sentences to be chiselled up where they have remained because they expressed the views, convictions and aspirations closely cherished by large numbers of people of more than one class widely scattered throughout their domains, and acceded to by many more who less fully understood their real import and their aims. And we can hardly cherish a doubt that Cyrus also, and his predecessors likewise, found means for publishing similar announcements very nearly in the same political and personal spirit as that which breathes within these columns, whether as engraved upon other rocks now no longer recognisable, or upon walls, vases, or still smaller objects. Even the vast political policy of the great Organizer himself was seldom wholly individual, as I believe, having grown slowly or rapidly out of a mass of convictions and motives amidst the groups who preceded, and among those who surrounded, the central Figure, and who, for all we know, suggested, if they did not actually control, his action.

I am aware that many will suppose me to be

going rather too far in this direction. I do not mean at all to doubt, or to deny the overmastering personality of either Cyrus or Darius; but if they were men of intuitive sagacity as well, they must have quickly felt the ideas of keener wits in their immediate vicinity, as well as the general push of widely extended common opinion among the upper classes who ruled in the twenty-three, or more, great included within their control. Capacity is as Lands quick to perceive as it is eager to originate.

If then we have proved that Cyrus, Darius and their Successors, the Artaxerxes of Ezra IV being included with them, acted in close consultation with various leading persons in their immediate circle, — and that these persons necessarily expressed in their turn the inclinations and opinions of very large classes of Persians throughout the various States of the Empire, — and if again these views were also on the other hand very familiar to leading people among the Jews, (see Ezra and the other Exilic books), then all this as of course, brings that public behind Cyrus and Darius and this public behind the Jewish Leaders still more closely into active communication with each other. For, as regards the Jewish chiefs on their side, they having no King recognised as reigning at the time, would be still more fully qualified to represent the interests of those from whom they immediately arose, and would be really acting as their spokesmen.

The more fully then we can seize upon what was individual in the character, circumstances and ideas of those influential Rulers on both sides as

regards their policy toward the Tribes of Israel on the one side, and toward the Empire of Persia on the other, and, dissecting these elements, expand them again until we see them to be but shreds of a widely extended power, the more obvious it becomes that such a state of public feeling on the part of the Persians must have been to a very effective degree in touch with a corresponding public feeling among the Jews, who were, for the matter of that, from their well-known antecedents, far more democratic and intelligent than the public of the Babylonian Persians.

The Main and Final Issue.

The question then becomes one of 'public' as regards 'public', which is the fundamental basis of this argument¹. For, if it was the fact that the two communities were largely vitalised by religious convictions and aspirations which harmonised in many prominent particulars, how much more easy does it become for us to understand the keen interest taken in Cyrus by the Isaiah of Babylon as also the reported good will of Cyrus toward Israel and the same interest manifested by Darius and Artaxerxes according to Ezra, the Scribe. And when we see that the very language of these Edicts which they put into the mouths of Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes approaches in many important particulars the words in the Inscriptions ordered to be cut by these very same Persian Rulers, we might almost say that the writers who reported these biblical Persian edicts

¹ And this notwithstanding the immensely greater masses who were at all affected by religious considerations within the Persian Empire.

or proclamations were *actually citing those Iranian Inscriptions*, not of course as to the letter of their wording, but in view of their well-known general effect ¹.

Section XXIV.

The age of the Gāthas, and of the Pre-Gāthic Development.

Preliminary.

The above treatise, let us hope, disposes of the doctrine that the Lore of the Avesta did not either in its present form, or in its cognate antecedents exert any influence upon the developments of Jewish and later Babylonian thought.

This Question of the Influence of the Avesta carries with it as of necessity that of its age, the two being properly but parts of one inquiry, for the Avesta could not have exerted influence at any given time unless it existed; nor could it well have existed without having some natural effect upon intellectual developments of a cognate description within the sphere of its doctrines.

Before then we endeavour to drive home the results of our inquiry upon those readers who are practically interested in the current theology of the day, it is desirable to pause for a brief interval, and put in once more and in a somewhat fuller form the effective arguments for the particular date of the documents upon the authority of which all that

¹ See above.

I have said has been advanced. And with this question of the Age of the Avesta we must consider also that of those antecedent intellectual forces out of which the Avesta arose.

The Antecedents of Avesta.

For, although these two elements, the surviving Avesta, and its antecedent intellectual elements, may seem to some of us to be two distinct questions, they are in reality but separated parts of one and the same subject, just as the »influence« and »the age« of the Avesta become practically one and the same particular. Of course what I have here to say in this Section has been already everywhere implied and even applied above, and in fact partly stated. But the inquiry is of such a nature that we must endeavour to recall all the items above alluded to with many others never as yet thoroughly examined by me or by any other writer; and we must endeavour to knead the mass into one manageable whole. Our first investigation is as to the

Surviving Documents.

This too is a question which, as I need hardly say, has been implied at every previous step; and I only allude to it here to explain that, as of course at such a point as this in my argument, I must refer to my own works. For, imperfect as they may be, they are the only writings as yet ever published which make any pretence to a serious examination of all the evidence; see them cited above.

My throng of Cited Opinions.

The remark which necessarily comes in here is made in the hope that the unaccustomed reader may not be confused by the multitude of possibilities presented in the various translations and interpretations, the object of these works being to present nearly every conceivable opinion; and in fact up to this present date, Aug. 1905, and in view of the latest publications, not a single suggestion has yet been made which, with rare exceptions, may not be found more copiously stated in my Commentary, Texts or alternative Translations, and in my Dictionary. But out of this mass there is *always my selected preference*. So that any intelligent reader can easily see a clear and uniform rendering according to my best judgment and with every conceivable source of information exhausted.

XXIV, b.

The Non-Gāthic - Avesta.

Inextricably combined with this discussion of the Gāthas was an examination of the non-Gāthic Avesta. Of this a large and important portion may be found in the remaining parts of my XXXIst volume S.B.E.; see from pages 193 to 400. We may however for every reason regard the Gāthas as forming the central theme of our studies; see above and below.

XXIV, c.

The Age of The Gāthic Documents Definitively Considered.

This question would naturally divide itself into four sections: First; are the Gāthas relatively to the rest of the surviving Avesta »*Old*« at all? Are they not indeed on the contrary relatively the *newest and latest* parts of the assembled different writings recognised as original Avesta.

Secondly.: If not the latest parts of the still surviving Avesta, are they not then, of *contemporaneous* origin with them? This question is of course of a difficult nature; for the at present surviving non-Gāthic Avesta is a collection of documents of very different ages, and the question remains in so far obscure. We may however clear up this difficulty, by taking into our view a general average; and fixing our attention upon what we might regard as the »middle point« of the period covered by the dates of the various documents of the Avesta aside from the Gāthas. Thirdly. Were the Gāthas *anterior* in date to the rest of the surviving Avesta?; and fourthly: »If they were anterior to the rest of the Avesta, by *how long a period* did they fore-date it. In order to solve the above questions we must naturally endeavour to fix approximately the dates of either one, or of both the *elements* involved; that is to say, the date of the non-Gāthic Avesta as well as that of the Gāthic. If we can find one single source of certainty as to the date of any one of the various documents involved, our general

inquiry is in the very fact almost upon the moment solved; the date of Gāthas fixes approximately that of the later Avesta and vice versa.

Dates of All the Documents are Involved.

It is however evidently impossible to discuss the first question as to whether the Gāthas are the latest portion of the surviving Avesta without discussing the second question as to whether they are contemporaneous with it; nor indeed is it possible to discuss the third without examining previously the first two, or without taking them for granted as having been already in a measure settled, and so with the fourth.

The Avesta Homogeneous.

In one very serious but restricted aspect the Avesta cannot be said to be exactly homogeneous; on the contrary, as I have everywhere implied throughout, the Gāthic scene is distinct in its kind from those called up in the non-Gāthic Avesta; see above and below. But in a wider and more general view, and as we take in the whole range of the subject, of course the Avesta becomes homogeneous, perhaps rather more so than Christianity, or Judaism as developed into Christianity.

As then we may have before us what we may fairly regard as an approximately homogeneous whole, we may disregard the order of procedure sketched out above and look at the whole subject as one great matter of fact.

XXIV, d.

*The Gāthic Lore in its Internal as well as in its
External Evidence.*

I have all alone let it be seen that I rely chiefly for the validity of all my conclusions upon *internal evidence*. Yet it is not to be denied that some valuable evidence involving the Yasht and Vendīdād Avesta exists which is at first sight wholly external, and would be so named. And in the course of my discussion later on I will produce such matter. But even what we may have to say as regards external evidence and with reference to the Yasht-Avesta must yet be rigidly estimated as to its internal characteristics.

If then what we may have to say with regard to the so-called external evidence more nearly dealing with the Yasht-Vendīdād and other non-Gāthic Avesta itself depends for its manipulation upon internal considerations, how much more does the supposed older Avesta, the Gātha, depend upon interior views. With this let us proceed. Having decided what the Gāthas actually are in their surviving Manuscripts as rationally edited and translated; see above; our next question is: »Are they genuine«?

Are they Genuine?

By »genuine« I mean »are they what they seem to be, and what they by implication profess to be?« And this is unusually important because they practically imply in almost every line that

they are the compositions of a person or persons actually living amidst the scenes which they recall and sharing in the convictions, fears, hopes and even other sensibilities which they at times so unconsciously and yet so vividly disclose, in the meanwhile also conveying to their hearers the most important doctrines ¹.

*The Secret of their Influence. **

For why do they make any impression upon us at all aside from the momentous principles which they contain? It is because we feel that they sincerely and at times dramatically, if unintentionally, portray those living scenes as historical occurrences and events, and so they open to us an insight into another department of religious and even of political history.

The Essence of the Internal Evidence.

And how are we convinced of all this?. From their emotional spirit. And where do we trace this? In their extraordinary personality (sic), if we might make use of such an expression for their »animated subjectivity«. I mean their allusions to private yearnings, their emphatic iterations of personal feeling, not to say at times, »their passion« ².

It is these indications, given, as it were, in passing and without motive, which prove to me that

¹ See above on page 70, etc.

² For I recognise not only much point in their personal diction, but actual emotional warmth and occasionally unquestionable »fire«. I find in them everywhere at times intense individual feeling. Sometimes we have only a stately emphasis conveyed by the rhetorical use of iteration; compare the repeated »I who« of Yasna XXVIII; see however the fiery Y. XXXI, XXXII, etc. etc., and the extremely personal Y. XLVI and LIII.

they were written by some person, or persons, who actually lived amidst the scenes implied in every line, and that these persons really harboured the sentiments which they express.

The Alternative.

Or else, on the contrary, this sustained »individuality« proves to my mind that they were deliberately concocted in the most subtle possible manner with the intent to deceive; for if they are not genuine, they are not at all in the form of innocent myth handed down from father to son, or from generation to generation, like the complete masses of the later Avesta, which hardly lay a serious claim to genuineness in the sense here indicated.

Are they not Frauds?

If not genuine themselves, are they, the Gāthas, not in fact laboured and conscious imitations of what is genuine; in plain words are they not then artificial impostures. And here I must again call the attention of the reader to this crucial question on the solution of which depends quite completely the validity of my entire argument as much so as that argument depends upon the fact of the strong subjective personality of the Gāthas. Such an indictment of them as quasi-fraudulent compositions I, for one, am not at all prepared to advance, though writers may well be found, present or future, who do not, or who will not, hold with me as to this reluctance; and I will give them all credit for sin-

cerity. It is also not absolutely impossible that they may be right, but to me the point seems to be hardly fit for debating. I must return to this matter further on; but I note here, in the meanwhile, the following items. That they, the Gāthas, were consciously intended falsely to depict unreal scenes, seems to me to be wholly beyond reasonable belief, first of all because *there would be no one who could have composed them under such a supposition*; for the only conceivable authors of such publications could not possess the necessary literary skill to carry out such a curious device as an intentional fabrication; see this question resumed below.

Could they have been later imitations made in good faith, as if romances?

It is indeed conceivable that such pieces might have been constructed as imitations of genuine sentiment in dense scenes of over-wrought and artificial civilisation, blasé, if we might be allowed to make use of such a term, as for instance in some centres of India, though hardly even there at such a date as that of Cyrus the Great, if we are to credit current opinions as to the former state of some of those places. As to the possibility of such imitating reproductions in dense India witness the great masses of closely worked-up Indian literature, much of it also of the most vivid character. But the state of literary and artistic life in Iran could not well possibly have been so over wrought with artificial conditions as to make it at all conceivable that such elements of taste or conviction could have prevailed

there as in the more densely populated India at that early period. Even the Persia of the later Sasanids hardly shows such rich and pointedly varied forms of thought as became manifest in contemporaneous India, or in Persian centuries later on. The ideal Gāthic saint on the contrary was the Husbandman chiefly because upon him depended the food supply of the population. The Priestly Class seems to have been next to these the most recognised, while the word for »soldier« hardly appears; So that no one at all familiar with such a subject would be likely to suppose it possible that pieces like the Gāthas, with their lost companions, could have been artificially produced in comparatively rough Iran at anything like the period at which even upon the most exaggerated late negative estimate, we could feel ourselves at liberty to place them.

Motives Absent.

Then we should not forget to inquire after a motive for such an effort¹. Why should any religious poet desire, even if he had the power, to write Hymns which imitate the spent passions of a by-gone day in such a serious and impoverished situation.

If he had any such motive, it would be sure enough to crop out; but where is there a trace of it? It would be as wonderful a result if they were so constructed as indeed their character remains wonderful upon the other and more original supposition. For their remarkable contents, in themselves con-

¹ See above on page 70 where I notice that they were the central documents of the Parsi religion, the least likely of all compositions to be consciously trifled with.

sidered and apart from their »personality«, fairly stagger us when we try to concede their early age. Bereft of all myth-structure, though alluding in passing to a myth, so pure, so deep, so simple, with no miracle, and with their quite unparalleled rhetorical expressions for their times; see Yasna XLIV, who could indeed without an effort believe that such things could be pre-Christian at all in their undoubted home ¹?

Yet, if a chain of reasoning has any force at all, this is logically, if not quite mathematically, verified from internal evidence as being native to the time and place reported; and the Inscriptions themselves, as to the general date of which there is no dispute, are in some particulars nearly as incredible.

XXIV, e

An Existing Anthology indefinitely proves the existence of Predecessors.

The Gāthas in their Origin and their Main Elements pre-existing in Their Predecessors.

The Gāthas, as they exist to-day, prove not only the extremely probable former existence of companion pieces long since lost, but they also at the same time prove the existence of much kindred individual conviction in the souls of thousands, if not of hundreds of thousands, of human beings, as well as the expression of those convictions in

¹ Aside from the fact that our Achaemenian Inscriptions almost match them in their personal religious fervour, and aside also from all the contentions which we have made above.

personal conferences and formal instructions of every description in days, or ages previous to their later re-appearance.

And in such a discussion as the present it is not sufficient to consider the question of an important Lore in its existing documents alone, but in its fore-runners as well; that is to say, in the intellectual forces out of which it has arisen.

All historial phenomena are recurring Manifestations of ever-abiding Active Forces.

For no such a mental phenomenon as even the main doctrine of the Gāthas could, under any circumstances, and in any community have been of any *sudden origin*¹; and this all philosophical religious history should be thought at once to prove.

Sudden Upheavals Improbable.

It is hard indeed for some of us to give up the idea that the Gāthas, perhaps more than any other ancient compositions, are the result of a quasi-instantaneous supernatural inspiration, but science has long since discarded such puerilities. No psychic development in the history of the human race has ever taken place without its long antecedent causes, which form a part of an ever-continuous chain of being of which the special development is but a link. The lofty tone of the Gāthic pieces gives them, as I concede, the appearance of philosophic-religious inspiration, but even Greek thought grew slowly.

¹ See above in Vol. I.

XXIV, f.

The Practical Nature of Our Inquiry.

We must therefore endeavour to establish the inferred, but none the less, real existence of a vast psychic power extant at a period previous to Darius, of which the surviving Gāthas express the continuance; for all conceivable forms of consecutive intellectual and psychic developments are of this nature, having a beginning, a culmination and a decay¹. These pre-existent general ideas were in all human probability not only identical with the spirit of the Gāthas as being merely separate parts of one and the selfsame thing, but they also doubtless embodied particular convictions closely cognate to those expressed in the Gāthas, if not actual historical delineations as to places and events not much unlike those in the later Avesta.

The Objectivity of the Point.

And this inferred circumstance is as much a solid reality as the re-manifestation of these forces in the Gāthic Hymns themselves, or as the existence of any other conceivable object, and far more effective upon the developments of early historical results than most others, however easily its existence may have been thus reached by inference. For in discussing it, I am seeking to establish the existence

¹ All things indeed whether psychic, intellectual, moral, spiritual, and even physical, are but items in one great Monism, and more or less valuable re-manifestations of the ever recurring results of permanent forces.

of a great intellectual energy which arose, spread and became effective at an important ancient epoch, bearing in the most serious possible manner upon the interests of large and, ultimately, of vast populations in their individual, domestic and even political moral life, and involving almost first of all the very means of honest livelihood and honest commerce; and it is the existence of this necessarily pre-existing practical Power which in the above discussions I have for the most part been obliged by anticipation to assume, but must now more closely investigate and point.

Fuller Statement Desirable.

For obviously certain as such a pre-existing Power must of necessity be, and obvious likewise as its characteristics become to the trained historian, there are many intellectual persons untrained to these especial modes of thought who have never conceived of such a thing.

Time therefore is throughout Indispensable for these Developments.

Even the moral idea, which is the quintessence of all the psychic values under consideration, could not have »found itself«, so to speak, before a seriously prolonged interval of time had transpired, as I have long since suggested, or implied.

The above Inference Homogeneous to our entire Procedure.

So much then, let us hope, is clear; we are seeking to establish the pre-Gāthic existence of a

Gāthic doctrine as well to establish the nature of that doctrine in its existing documents; and for the especial reason that we are seeking also to establish a post-Gāthic continuity of it in the lores of the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, as well as in the later Avesta and in the later Parsism; nothing »isolated« should arrest our attention for a moment at this present juncture. The very point of all our efforts hitherto here is »continuity«, to establish the persistence of one ever self-same existent, but moving, and therefore externally ever-changing mass of psychic or intellectual vitality. To say that the Gāthas in their origin are as important as in their results would be mere tautology; but the facts now noted are in no particular phantastic, visionary, or unpractical; — they are, on the contrary, realistic in the extreme, though not ultimately definable as to their precise details.

The pre-Gāthic Lore is indeed our very first objective in this part of our investigation; and without a due recognition of this we cannot proceed. But of course we can only consider it thoroughly through the study of its results. These are the Gāthas in their Documents, as we have said, which we have now definitively decided to be the genuine product of a person who lived amidst the scenes implied or depicted in them; and these principles must be recalled at every step in the following distinctions and discussions.

Section. XXV.

A first natural Query; was the Language a Living one?

If then the *Gāthas* are genuine as being the earnest and even impassioned expressions of practical personal convictions and feelings, would they, or rather could they, have been written in a *priestly dead language*¹ artificially kept alive in Iran at any early period, even if² other literary compositions referring to the same general religious beliefs but *in another spirit* were indeed later written in the same language after it had ceased to be spoken as a vernacular? See also what I have said above as to the possibility of their being forgeries worked up as historical romances, if I might be allowed to recur to such an idea.

The Yashts not necessarily Sung in a Living Tongue.

The language of the Yashts might indeed be »a dead« dialect, and Zarathushtra, or some other later literary priest, might certainly have written them, the later Yasna and the Vendīdād in a priestly language otherwise also »not living« to the people, for they, these documents, breathe the atmosphere of other days, whether later or earlier³ than the *Gāthas*, days when the ancient myths were fully alive and constantly revived by priestly writers quite possibly in a generally unknown tongue.

There is little room also, so far as I can see,

¹ The question is of vital moment at this point to our endeavours to fix the dates.

² Which was probably the case.

³ See above.

for the Idea of deliberate literary fraud as regards them.

The Circumstances of the Gāthas; as Direct Appeals.

For how could Zarathushtra have written the Gāthas in an unknown tongue when they were specially intended to be recited at assemblies of the tribes? See Y. XXX and Y. XLV. Those addressed in those passages were actually supposed to be spoken to as being present in the concourse; »and they came« from near and from afar.« And these addresses themselves are germane to the entire pieces; see especially XLV; and they could not well have been later prefixed, or infixd.

The Crisis was Acute.

Even a modern Roman priest at Rome conversing fluently at times with colleagues in Latin would never in moments of keen emotion, or when he wrote to overcome an armed heretic in a religious war, continue to express himself in such a way. I do not think it to be at all admissible that these personal strophes, so strenuous as they are, were written in an arm-chair dialect of archaic elegance after the words had lost all meaning for those whom the author professes in these very terms to edify and to arouse; and this I hold not by any means because of any assertion to this effect, for »assertion«, as I never fail to notice, meets my unqualified contempt, but solely from their actual characteristics as spoken pieces.

Further Inference.

But if the Gāthic words were current as the

vernacular of their day, and were meant to be understood by the people, then what is the latest possible date at which we can place them?

XXV, a.

Latest conceivable Date.

The latest conceivable date for them would be that of a Gāthic language as being not inconceivably still alive as a vernacular at the close of the Parthian period, from B. C. 100 till A. D. 225. Did then a Zarathushtra under a Vishtāspa live at such a date and compose in it?; see below. Such a question has never been put forward and deserves no answer.

The Language of such a Date was Pahlavi.

*Coins of the Empire had been Pahlavi for close on three centuries*¹. Haug even supposed some Pahlavi to date back to the 5th century B. C. There was therefore no living Avesta speech at such a date as B. C. 100 to A. D. 226. circa for a Zarathushtra to make use of in his ardent compositions.

If then he did indeed make use of a living language, let us naturally ask *when* was that living speech current as a vernacular in the region where we place the scene of the Gāthic struggle?, for the answer to this question will give us the latest possible date for the authorship of the Gāthic hymns in a living language and for the time of Zarathushtra.

¹ We need not pause to consider the question whether the use of Pahlavi on coins would show that it had been vernacular for some time; yet I should say that such would be the case.

The Search for the Date.

To find out then the date at which he lived and wrote in his living dialect we must go back from the time when the vernacular had become Pahlavi; that is to say, we must go back from the date of B. C. 300—400 about at least, and see what we can find to point out our path for further progress. Such a wayside object, the age^o of which is beyond all dispute, soon meets us in the somewhat formidable shape of Behistūn; and what is its evidence as to this particular? ¹.

XXV, b.

The Dialect of the Inscriptions as a Gage for the Age of the Gāthic.

As we have already abundantly asserted, the Inscription language forms one branch of the original tree of which that of the Old and New Avesta represents another less fully varied, and the question immediately arises as to their relative age; for if we solve this problem, we are not far from the solution of the question as to the age of Zarathushtra and of the Gāthas.

The Deteriorated state of the Inscription language.

This deterioration is of course to be regarded as a phonetic change *from an inferable Mother-speech of the Inscriptional*, the existence and character of which we are obliged to conjecture from

¹ See above for anticipated hints.

the Gāthic and the Vedic, utterly heterogenous as the subject matter contained in each of them may be.

Evidence Prima Facie.

This deterioration of itself offers good *prima facie* evidence that the subject matter contained in it is of a relatively later age than the Gāthas; but it is by no means of itself a final and conclusive evidence; for an older language may be, and often has been, used for later literary purposes. Recall at once the Latin and the Sanskrit and also the later Avesta speech itself which, as I hold, lingered as a priestly language after the Gāthic had ceased to be spoken.

And I think it to be extremely probable (see above) that even much later Avesta, which has now perished, if not indeed much of our at present actually surviving later Avesta was written not only after the Avesta had ceased to be generally spoken, but also, some of it, much later than the time of Darius. For Avesta of some kind was, as I fully believe, written on to an indefinitely later period; see indeed the very imperfect diction of Y. XXIV.

Priestly Language.

The Inscriptional likewise may itself have shared this peculiarity to some degree, with nearly all the modern languages extant¹, for it seems as if the stone-cutters of Behistūn themselves did not under-

¹ Compare at once even some of our present works of fiction which sometimes aim directly at reproducing ancient forms of speech.

stand what they were chiselling; witness their mistakes; yet a living speech was probable.

Ancient Forms even linger in a Living Language.

Not to press such particulars as this last mentioned, we must never forget that a language almost universally preserves some of its archaic forms in one section of a country while it develops novelties in another. And especially in isolated regions, remote from densely populated centres ancient casts of dialect often live on, the inhabitants speaking and composing new matter in them; and so also this occurs not with antique dialects alone, but with complete antique languages; compare the Lettish (the Lithuanian) even yet spoken in the heart of Germany and likewise, I suppose, written to some extent; see also the Welsh and the Irish. So that we shall have to abandon for the moment this point of the relative greater deterioration of the Inscriptural at least when regarded as our main, or as one of our main arguments for the posterity of the Incriptions; that is to say, for their posterity to the spoken Gāthic.

Other considerations intervene.

But while the question of the priority or posterity of the Achaemenian dialect to that of the Gāthas and spoken Vedic has thus no positively decisive force in itself considered as to the priority, or posterity of the documents which were written in either or in both, yet after it has once been positively made out that certain documents were

composed in a spoken Gāthic, and on the other hand that the Achaemenian was sculptured or engraved as a spoken dialect at the dictation of Darius B. C. 500 circa, then the question of the priority or posterity of the dialect of this spoken Achaemenian Daric to that of the spoken Gāthic becomes to the last degree interesting and important to our inquiry as to the date of the Gāthic documents.

The Date of the spoken Gāthic relatively fixed.

For we have a right to assume that the spoken Gāthic was of about the same age as the spoken mother-tongue of the Inscriptional Achaemenian Daric which was a sister-speech to the Gāthic, and we can, other things being equal, draw an inference from the state of the Achaemenian, as at present seen on the monuments to the date at which its mother-speech stood at its still undeteriorated quasi-Gāthic stage as a spoken tongue, that is to say, in such a state as corresponds to that of the Gāthic as it now appears to us in the texts of the original Hymns; and this would of course give us at least the latest possible date at which the Gāthas could have been composed in a spoken vernacular speech; for while later literary matter may appear in an older dialect, older compositions can not be written in a tongue which does not yet exist.

Our Inference.

If then the Achaemenian Daric took from one to three centuries to reach its stage of deterioration from its mother-speech which was a spoken lan-

guage, — and if it be fair for us to suppose that its sister-language stood at about the same general state of preservation or development together with it at any one accepted period, then of course, as said above, we reach the latest possible time at which the Gāthas could have been chanted in an undeteriorated spoken tongue sister to the mother-speech of Daric as being so many scores, or hundreds of years earlier than the Inscriptional; for after such conjectures date no such undeteriorated language existed upon the analogies assumed, as both the Gāthic and the Daric had begun to deteriorate. For if spoken Gāthic survived later than the time of Darius, which, in spite of our *prima facie* supposition, is a thing in itself by no means at all impossible, then this would bring the spoken Gāthic to close upon the time of the vernacular Iranian Pahlavi which succeeded it as a spoken dialect; see above and below; *but this Pahlavi certainly required two centuries at least to deteriorate to its then present state from that of the spoken Gāthic, which was not therefore post-Daric.*

The unproved link in the above chain of argument is of course the assumption that the mother-Daric and the spoken Gāthic must have deteriorated at about the same rate of disintegration during about the same interval of time; *but this assumption has every probability in its favour.*

Probabilities.

Other things being equal, two widely spoken branches of the same original language would undergo about the same degree of change in the same

given interval of time in the same general territory, even though the particular places where each most flourished were in point of fact somewhat far apart.

Gāthic and Vedic.

For, let me say it in passing, and for the benefit of non-experts, no question whatsoever exists among respectable specialists as to the circumstance that the mother-speech of the language of the Achaemenid from which it deteriorated to its condition upon the Tablets, was, save in a few dialectical features, identical with the Gāthic, just as the Gāthic is, with the same exceptions, nearly identical with the Vedic.

We can therefore say at once, without any further obvious reasoning, that it is practically impossible, so far considered, that the Gāthas could have been composed later than the Inscriptions, for not very long after the Inscriptions the Pahlavi language which shows

a very Marked Deterioration from the Gāthic began to appear. This deterioration of the Pahlavi when read as Parsi from the Gāthic furnishes almost an exact parallel to the supposed deterioration of the Achaemenian Daric from its mother-speech; and it is therefore of crucial importance to our argument, except in the mere matters of degree¹. If then

The Deterioration of the Achaemenian

and of the Iranian Pahlavi severally from their orig-

¹ Some few Semitic features linger in the Pahlavi even when viewed as being for the most part Iranian; but we can fairly throw them out when weighing such a question. Nearly all Pahlavi Semitisms may be read as Aryan ideograms; see elsewhere.

inals occupied relatively about the same space of time calculated upon the different degrees of their changes, we can at once pass beyond our preliminary results as to the date of the original Avesta; see above, and say that we have ascertained at what time approximately as the latest possible period the Gāthas could have been composed in a spoken tongue; for we are now in a position to measure with fairly probable accuracy the lapse of such a period of time during which the deteriorations could have taken place from the date of the two mother tongues before the date of Darius in accordance with our present deductions.

XXV, c.

The final question for us now to handle is
How long before Darius were the mother-Achaemenian pre-Daric and the Gāthic spoken as Living Tongues?

Of course none of our details are mechanically exact, especially where I compare the state of the Iranian Pahlavi relatively to the state of the Gāthic with the state of the Achaemenian Daric relatively to its original as sister to the Gāthic; for; see above, I am obliged in justice to repeat that the deterioration of the Pahlavi, while furnishing a striking analogy with that of the Achaemenian has reached a much greater degree of change as to its interior nature, and this must have occupied a longer time. But this only

Tends to Strengthen my Contention

as to the greater age of the spoken Gāthic; for it points out that the change from its condition to that

of its sequent was greater, and that other things being equal, it must have occupied more time. Upon what principles then shall we proceed to measure the time of the duration of these linguistic alterations from the date of Darius back?

Our Procedure.

Unless some irregular influences were at work, we ought to be able to make a fair estimate of the extent of their duration and of their progress as well.

The Influences: Were they exceptional?

What then were the possible irregular influences, aside from time, which may have intervened to retard or accelerate the process of deterioration in either the case of the Gāthic or of the original of the Achaemenian Old Persian, so that either the one or the other outstripped its rival in these processes of change during a corresponding, or during the same period of time?; for while some old dialects ¹ change slowly in remote and secluded sections of a territory, others do not retain their forms so long unmodified, or but little modified.

What Extraneous Influences could have been at work?

Here we have, unfortunately, no effective data whatsoever to go upon in our inquiry as to the possible existence of exceptionally retarding or accelerating influences acting upon this process of

¹ See elsewhere as to the Lettish, the Irish, the Welsh, etc.

change. The two branches of the same language seem at first sight, and even after reflection, to have about equal claims to the character of stability and wide use, the Avesta language toward the North and the mother-Inscriptional toward the South. And if the Avesta language was indeed as wide spread as the Achaemenian at the Daric age, then my argument meets no obstruction; for, given two branches of the same general language spoken over two widely extended adjacent territories, there is no reason at all why one should change much more rapidly than the other, though the degree of the celerity of both development and degeneration would naturally not continue to be exactly the same. See indeed how little even Avesta and Vedic have really changed ¹, notwithstanding extensive time and space. Who can tell then that Avesta was not only spoken at the date of the Gāthas, but widely spread at that time over the entire middle North of the future Persian Empire?

[It would look indeed factitious if we paused to inquire whether the Achaemenian Daric was itself more than a court language, for the stone-cutters make blunders which would otherwise seem difficult to explain; see above, but we will not pause upon this.]

Our way is Clear.

Taking it then for granted as probable that, considering the amount of change experienced, the

² One man might almost ask a question in Avesta and another answer in Vedic even with less difficulty than an unpractised Englishman could converse with a Scotchman intentionally speaking Scotch.

Achaemenian Daric occupied about the same interval of time in its deterioration from its mother-speech as its cousin-tongue, the Iranian Pahlavi, occupied in a similar process (here leaving the extraneous peculiarities of the Pahlavi for a moment out of view ¹), we have reached reasonable data for us to form our opinion as to how late at the latest the Gāthas could have been composed in a spoken tongue in view of such analogies.

To Measure the Process.

For we have now only to make a judicious conjecture as to how long the process of deterioration lasted from the state of the Gāthic to the state of the Iranian Pahlavi.

The Duration.

A half century would generally be considered by most of us who have lived beyond such a period, as a very short interval of time indeed to allow for such linguistic changes; and we can hardly consider anything less than a century or two.

Provisional Conclusion as in so far Reached.

If then *Zarathushtra* was able to express his own passionately held doctrinal views in his Gāthic language, he must have done so at the very latest

¹ Of course there was a degree of change from the Gāthic to its sequent dialect which was exactly like the change of the mother-Achaemenian to its successor, though we have only the more fully changed Pahlavi to shew it. It may have occupied more time or less in its process, but the sister-speech may have on the other hand varied at an exactly similar rate. We must not however indefinitely split up the questions.

a hundred years before Darius, while, aside from exceptional influence, we should naturally think rather of two or three hundred years before the Achaemenian with the dates of the kindred Veda in our eye. So much from the internal evidence of the linguistic facts as they stand, and from the internal evidence of the cognate Achaemenian documents; and this would bring us at once to about 620 B.C. as the very latest possible date for the Gāthas, while it suggests, a much earlier period, say, 960 B.C.; but before we settle finally upon this estimate see our further reasonings below.

XXV, d.

*Further Internal Evidence in External Documents.
Herodotus and His Successors.*

We have also documents not linguistically cognate, nor yet certified as to their age by such a class of data as those by which the age of the Inscriptions is certified to us.

The Father of History.

Nobody however doubts that Herodotus lived about from 484 to 424 B.C.; and he alludes signally to certain Persian religious customs which point at once to the Avesta; see above. But his allusions, one and all, refer to matters known only to the later Avesta, not at all to the Gāthas as such¹. We cannot resist the impression that the oldest part of the Avesta as such had exercised little influence upon

¹ See the extracts in Kleuker; see also p. 6 and p. 11 of this work.

him, Herodotus, and that it was surpassed, in the common current religious sentiment, by the more richly coloured, if more superficial, lore of the later Avesta; and we infer at once that the Gāthas were written before Herodotus; and we are about to proceed immediately to a measure of this priority without any fuller consideration of one certain incisive argument in its favour for which I have however necessarily furnished the materials in my arguments above; but there I have hardly set it at all in adequate point, as the matter requires a special section or sub-section.

The Priority of The Yashts to Herodotus.

Were the Yashts and the Gāthas Contemporaneous?

In order then to have our subject well in hand, and for the measure of the priority of the Gāthas to Herodotus, it would be very useful for us to ask whether the priority of the *Yashts* to Herodotus may not form a necessary prelude to our further progress, with indeed the very interesting question: »were not these *Yashts* in their priority to H. also at the same time *contemporary with the Gāthas?*«

In fact this would be a properly concomitant inquiry; and we can on no account pass it by. Were not the Gāthas then, even supposing that we placed their antiquity at a minimum at two centuries before Herodotus, yet even at that distant date, contemporaneous with the *Yashts*; for their actual date, whether more ancient or less remote, has in itself, and aside from a certain particular line of argument, nothing whatever in it which forbids the

opinion that the Yashts were sung beside the Gāthas, of course I mean, comparing the two styles of compositions aside from decisive arguments to the contrary yet to be made; these reasonings have been somewhat implied above; but for the moment it will be very useful to consider the question here entirely aside from them; for above, where its answer is implied, no space appeared for its indispensable fuller statement.

XXV, e.

*The Gāthas and the Yashts; Were they then
Contemporaneous?*

While then the Gāthas must have been composed in a living language, and while the rest of the Avesta *may* have been composed in a dead one, there is no reason at all of course why the so-called later Avesta might not also itself have been composed in a *living language*. The widely different natures of the compositions do not at all in themselves positively forbid a contemporaneous authorship, even upon the same territory; and the language may have continued on to be a living one in spite of everything. Could not then two of the general divisions of the Avesta have been composed, not only each in a living language, but at the same actual time; see above? The Gāthic represented a distinct reforming work carried on politically and to some extent by force of arms, just as the radical agitation of Martin Luther produced a literature clear of that rich Catholic colouring which was

constantly in course of being reproduced at precisely the same moment, Old and New going on side-by-side. In a case at all similar to this what we now call the »New Avesta« would have claims to Antiquity of date equal to those of the Gāthas.

Actual Yashts in the Gāthic Scene.

A curious item here intervenes. We are accustomed to repudiate even with warmth such a view as the simultaneous prevalence of the Gāthas and the Yashts, but we are familiar enough with Yashts of a certain kind which were indeed actually sung at the Gāthic scene by the D(a)ēva-worshippers mentioned in the Gāthas.

Why could not, *a* Yasht Avesta though not *the* Yasht Avesta, have been sung by parties not so much in sympathy with Zarathushtra, but yet sung all through the Gāthic struggle? No objection can at all hold which is based altogether upon the nature of the Yasht Divinities, for

Mitrá and his set were indeed worshipped at the Gāthic Period; and we should note the fact with especial interest.

We here possess an altogether forgotten argument in favour of the Yasht Gods as present in the Gāthic conflict. Do we not know that Deities exceedingly closely cognate to the Yasht Mithra and his colleagues, in fact almost their other selves, actually must have been sung in the scenes of the Gāthic movement? For to whom did the D(a)ēva worshippers of the Gāthas direct their cult? As

we remember them, they were beyond all doubt cognate to the D(a)ṛeva-worshippers of the Vedic South, being probably the most Northern of the South-Aryan settlers, so to speak. They could not therefore well possibly have avoided singing hymns to Mitrá, who was Mithra, nor to Soma, who was H(a)oma, — a kind of Vedic Yasht was then actually, and beyond all question, chanted in the very presence of the Mazda-worshippers with the living Zarathushtra at their head and in the Gāthic struggle — so that in itself considered and apart from my well-known contentions, our new proposition has nothing whatever that is impossible in it, nor improbable; quite the reverse was evidently the case. But this supposition, while telling for the abstract possibility of a thriving Mithra-Cult side by side with the Gāthic Mazda-Cult, in view of certain circumstances, soon seems to be one of the strongest of all arguments against the probability of the full-thriving presence of a corresponding Mazda-worshipping Mithra-Cult among the hosts of the living Zoroaster; — for that D(a)ṛeva-Cult of Mitrá (Mithra) was, as I need hardly recall, the creed of his deadliest foes and in the Mithra Yasht of his successors the D(a)ṛevas of the Gāthas still appear as Devils, and not as the holy Gods of Veda, but as those of the enemies of Zarathushtra.

And it is from this cause all the less likely that this Zoroastrian Mithra-Cult should have been flourishing at the very crisis of the Gāthic struggle beside the hostile D(a)ṛeva Mitrá-Cult.

But for the sake of full discussion and ample illustration, let us for the moment forget this settling blow to our interesting supposition of a rigorous Mazda-Mithra Cult side by side with the D(a)eva Mitrá-Cult of the Gāthas. Abstractly and aside from my necessarily anticipated solution, let me repeat it, there is no reason at all why the Gods of the Yashts¹ should not have been in favour at the Gāthic scene and date. *But if they were, how could the Gāthic-Cult have shut them so much out?*

Zarathushtra could only upon one remote pre-supposition have been ignorant of the holy names of Mithra and the rest; nor could he have hated them in any sense, for he himself is greatly honoured in their post-Gāthic liturgies.

Could the Passionate Zeal of the Reform Struggle have Banished the thought of Them altogether?

The vehement animus of the Gāthas directed fiercely toward reform might naturally shut out inferior details, and with them here and there some Godlet, but not the very foremost believed in supernatural Beings of the Race; so that we may well ask again; »where is Mithra in the Gāthic.« He should have appeared there beyond all question, if he were still high in his authority, being one of the greatest, oldest and most prominent of all the Avesta-Vedic deities, and even in the later Avesta, where he appears, or re-appears, though still a

¹) See Vayu probably cited in Y. LIII.

creature of Ahura's, he is yet linked with Him at times in an almost supreme position; see above. He is mentioned by Herodotus, and by the later Avesta, and since the latest Avesta (here for the moment recognised as later; see above), is a witness exactly similar to Herodotus in this matter, we may also ask here; »where is H(a)oma in the Gāthas?«; compare his position as Soma in the Vedic; and where are the other late Avesta deities in their throng, as well as Mithra.

No Trivial Reason for Their Absence should be Entertained.

It will then not do at all for us to say that such Gods as these, the first of whom was next after Ahura and His attributes in the non-Gāthic books, could have been kept out of sight altogether in the Gāthas, and *through any mere accident.*

Rejoinder.

The only rejoinder just here conceivable might be that the Yasht-Cult, although not thriving, was still sufficiently in force to represent the Cult of our surviving Yashts, so that we might fully say that, if it were not for other particulars, the Avesta Yashts, were contemporaneous with the Gāthas, notwithstanding the fact that the pre-eminent Mithra does not appear in these celebrated Hymns.

Not Sufficient.

To this I say that a mere mingling-in of the names at the Gāthic period does not suffice to represent the Cultus of the Yashts as it has survived to us.

Mithra and the rest could not indeed have possibly been totally forgotten in the Gāthic scene, if they were ever known before it; and this I have never doubted; and many an obscure poet may well have woven a little ode to them to die still-born; but that was not the Yasht Cult of the non-Gāthic documents. There those Gods are vigorous to the last degree, and their chants a mighty chorus; and if that Cult was on at the Gāthic day, they could in no wise have been kept out of the Gāthic, though the Gāthas are so few; for, few as their weighty remnants are, they are homogeneous, singularly so. From one you may know a hundred; and if a hundred Gāthas kept out Gods not hostile or indifferent, where could their Cult be seen? And that they were hostile like that form of them presented by the Gāthic D(a)ṛva-worshippers I have never for a moment thought.

An Alternative here.

May not a debater then ask, for argument and to exhaust the possibilities: »Could not a *friendly rivalry* between two cognate Cults existing side by side each in a most thriving state have been prevalent in the Gāthic scene, whereby the favoured Gods of the one were *purposely*, though not in an *unfriendly* spirit, kept out of the liturgies of the other with each of these liturgies in the fullest bloom.

Improbable.

The reader will clearly understand that the motive of these queries is as much »illustration« as

serious inquiry; for they really in fact in their very asking solve themselves.

Two Thriving and yet Friendly Cults Could not have prevailed.

Not in such a simple scene. This is my obvious response; there could not be room for two such thriving Cults harmonious with each other yet with one of the two having no trace, even in its finest hymns, of the dearest Gods of the other. Here we have no vast scene of hyper-cultured religious sentiment with its infinitesimally diversified, yet professedly friendly rival sects, raising a quasi-harmonious volume of sacred song. »Hostility« in such a rudimental scene as this little spot in Iran would most certainly intervene, or, on the contrary, furnish a necessary prerequisite to the simultaneous co-existence of two rival sects, each in full life and each carrying with it the necessary complications of conflicting interests; *and we have exactly such a picture in the Gāthic war itself; for the D(a)evas-worshipped there were exactly such Mitrá-dēities in jealous opposition; see just above.*

The Settling Consideration.

Moreover here comes in once more our one ever-unanswerable reason, with its mates. Certain Yashts indeed, like our surviving pieces to Mitrá and the rest must certainly have been sung at the Gāthic period, but not those Yashts themselves, for the Zarathushtra of the Gāthas is a living person in a simple scene, whereas he of the Yashts is quite half-deified. A man cannot be a myth and a non-

myth both at precisely the same interval of time. The Gāthic Zarathushtra is thoroughly human, as much so as Darius upon the Monuments, whereas in the Yashts, Vendīdād and non-Gāthic Yasna he is bereft of all identity, with but the fringe of his former self upon him.

Supposable Mithraic Yashts in the Gāthic Spirit were, by themselves considered, thoroughly possible at the Gāthic struggle. Other Mithra Yashts now long since lost may once have sounded, sung by a personal Zoroaster, so that we could escape the acceptance of a Prophet half godlike as in the surviving Yashts and Vendīdād; but we are not dealing with such supposed pieces here and now, *but with surviving texts*, and we have now here at present nothing whatsoever to do with such hypothetical considerations, deeply interesting as most of them may be. At another point above I enter upon some hypothetical presuppositions and carefully consider the inferred or probable pre-existence of pre-Gāthic hymns, breathing the Gāthic spirit. There, true enough, the Singers would be as human, simply in accordance with the supposition, as we upon our theory hold the actors in the Gāthic movement to have been. But just here hypothesis, however interesting, is out of place, *as we are now handling facts*. Our surviving Yashts, poetical and beautiful beyond measure as they are, and with a half-deified Zarathushtra in the midst of them, and with D(a)ṛvas, Gods of India as their demons, cannot have been contemporaneous with the Gāthas for the reasons above given.

These suppositions are therefore, none of them, in order as valid for our main argument at this place.

My own Theory Restated.

There would therefore also be no use in elaborating a suppositious scene where a really, living Zarathushtra chanted Vedic Yashts with Mitrá as a leading Deity in the midst of them, for »hostility« could hardly, be excluded from such a complication; and »hostility«, whether from incompatibility in doctrine or rivalry in Cults, between Z. and an *Iranian* Mithra I have never accepted; just the contrary. I simply suggest that Mithra, with the rest, though still in a sense revered at the Gāthic period was merely *crowded out*, so to speak, from *the first places* in the enthusiastic Gāthic movement. Our own mediaeval Reformers did not repudiate the Virgin; they merely dethroned her from an exaggerated homage.

If then the above points possess any validity at all, the Mithra-Yasht with its companions, lost or still surviving, represents a different stage in the Zarathushtrian development from the Gāthic, and the two could not possibly have been contemporaneous in the same community, even if both are placed at a date long previous to Herodotus.

The Zarathushtra of the Gāthas as Contemporaneous with the Yashts being Impossible, was he Subsequent to them.

As Herodotus and the so-called later Avesta point thus to a difference in the epochs of the

Gāthas and of the at present surviving Yashts (etc.), so our answer to this second Question; see above, answers also our first, and one can only allude to it in passing and in a quasi-rhetorical, quasi-hortative spirit as a home-driving of the contentions which have just been made. For, if the Yashts, Vendidad and the non-Gāthic Yasna could not, as the lore of the half-deified Zarathushtra, have been contemporaneous with an historical Prophet of the name who appears in the Gāthas, and if, on the contrary, the half-deified Z. must have postdated the real man as the mythical postdates the historical in cases of this particular kind, how much less, on the other hand, is it necessary to show that these same non-Gāthic books could completely antedate the Gāthas which they have just been proved to postdate; and how much still less could they be mentioned with the conclusion that they, the Gāthas, were the latest possible of all the still-surviving books of the original Avesta. For the same reasons which make them impossible as contemporaneous with the Yashts, etc., here make them impossible as their sequents.

A useful Point pressed Home.

And yet we should on no account let slip the opportunity of driving home our point, as this last suggestion, strange as it may be, possesses exceedingly great interest, though, as I believe, it has as yet been advanced by no one; and except for our one ever-abiding consideration; that is to say, except for the living presence of a Zarathushtra in the Gātha, and

the other internal considerations, there is no possible reason at all why the Gāthas should not be post-Yasht productions, and I for one; and let me say it with emphasis once for all, would immediately reverse all my present views upon the subject, and with the least possible hesitation as to such a course.

The First Natural Suggestion.

Any unprejudiced observer would do the same. All the chief Gods of the so-called late Avesta are unquestionably old and quasi-identical with some of the primeval Vedic deities, and any reader fresh to the subject would say at once that they have simply died out from the Gāthic period and its documents, having previously flourished in the period of the non-Gāthic Avesta, so leaving the Gāthas the *latest of all the original surviving Avesta compositions.*

The Advantage in This inconceivable View.

Here then we should have no entangling element of »recrudescence« to deal with, the recrudescence of the Mithra Cult with that of H(a)oma in the later Avesta, and the rest which vanished from the Gāthic period. And this »recrudescence of the once banished Gods, however it may be forced upon us, having also its analogies; see below, yet it does most certainly complicate our case. With this last suggestion however of the lateness of the Gāthas we should have before us a clear and simple proposition being completely freed from the necessity to accept a dying out of the ancient Deities and then their resurrection.

But the facts, already so abundantly made out, are altogether too much for the pleasing theory; it cannot hold for serious discussion. As said above, an historical person, such as Zarathushtra in the Gāthas, might take on later mythical attributes, as was the case with some other great religious agitators in early times; and this was very frequent, even if not always a necessity; but a mythical person, although he may have had an historical origin, seldom or never becomes completely again historical in pre-critic ages. So our attractive myth must vanish. There was no post-Yasht, post-Vendīdād, historical Zarathushtra.

Was he, on the Contrary, then Pre-Vedic.

For the sake of completeness we must recall this question here, though I have often enough made a similar suggestion; see above and in my other Works. Do the Gāthas then on the other hand ignore our Mithra and the rest, because they, these Deities, *did not exist at all at the Gāthic period*; that is to say, because they had never been worshipped in Iran at all before this date. Such a supposition would place the Gāthas at an epoch superior to some of the oldest Vedic Hymns, whole masses of which worship Mitrá with Váruṇa, with one Hymn to him (Mitrá) by himself. In this conceivable case we should evidently have to measure the age of the Gāthas by a fresh standard altogether, from which I, for one recoil; see however the estimate below.

Or again let us ask; »Was Mithra a Post-Gāthic Importation?«

Could the primeval Gods, Mithra (Mitrá), H(a)oma (Soma), while they had been previously known in India, have been as yet at the Gāthic period never known at all in Iran; so that their appearance in the Later Avesta was an *importation* from the Northern Indian outposts.

»Not probable« would be my verdict. Our entire conception of the situation here presents the picture of a large unit. The Avesta, — including Gātha, Yasht, Vendīdād and non-Gāthic Yasna, — is, in a sense, homogeneous with itself¹, notwithstanding its two main departments, or divisions, Gāthic and non-Gāthic. The Mithra of the Yashts by no means came from the Mitrá of the Veda; but both Mithra and Mitrá came from the same primeval parent. A Mithra thrived among the Irano-Vedic tribes in the original Irano-Vedic period and in the self-same original Irano-Aryan Home. No serious experts differ here.

The Decadence and the Recrudescence.

So that we come back once more to the general opinion that the Gāthas, with their once personal Author, antedate the Yashts, notwithstanding the presence of some primeval Gods within these latter and their absence from the Gātha; and that these ancient Deities were simply pushed aside; see above,

¹ See above.

and though not dishonoured, yet totally dethroned in the growing Gāthic reform; but that they found their way back again once more to prominence in the Yasht Avesta.

Reaction, The Pulse of History.

For nearly all religions show a similar pulsation of development; first polytheistic nature-worship; then the same reformed; then polytheistic anthropomorphism creeping back as the masses grow weary of the abstract, and are glad to hear once more the ancient venerated names endeared to song and story. Rigid reforms hold only in an age of reason.

Dates again and finally Considered in the Light of History, as before in the Light of Linguistic Law.

If then the appearance of the Irano-Aryan-Indian Gods was a recrudescence in the Yashts, at what date before this recrudescence must we place the Gāthic-Hymns?; for the recrudescence began, if at all later than the Gāthic date. No sudden recrudescence could have taken place, for we repudiate things sudden; see above. At what date then from this different point of view, shall we place them?

If Herodotus, say at 450 B. C., began to describe the later features, then if those later features, thus described post-date the characteristics of the Gāthic, by what period of time approximately do they thus post-date them? That is to say, how long probably, let us ask again, and now from this changing point of view, how long

before B. C. 450 circa, did Zarathushtra live and compose his Hymns? Our argument is here parallel with that from the linguistic deteriorations; see above, but yet separate from it. If we allowed from one to three hundred years for the Achaemenian Dacic language (500 B. C. flg.) to degenerate to its present stage upon the Inscriptions from its mother-speech where it stood at the Gāthic-Vedic standard; see above, then surely we must allow a corresponding, if indeed a parallel transpiring, period for the recrudescence of old Indo-Iranian divinities from the time of their summary (?), or gradual banishment from their once supreme position, at the Gāthic and pre-Gāthic periods.

We are not Dependent directly upon Statement.

And let it be well remarked once more that we have here again no *statement* of Herodotus at all as to this matter of age. He simply repeats what he has heard and records what he has seen; if he tried to convince us as to this matter of the comparative age of documents, I for one should utterly disregard his assertions. But he is absolutely unaware of such a question, and, like our very Gāthic sentences; see above, he is totally unconscious also of the evidence which he is giving; and this is all that imparts validity to his data in these questions, as I hold ¹. What he says at 450

¹ See his allusion to the treatment of »dead bodies« cited by Kleuker. Where does Haug quote this essential point?; somewhere beyond a doubt. Although the absence of this feature from the Gāthas does not fatally militate against the existence of the custom at that period, we should yet expect to see some allusion to it in the Hymns or in the earlier non-Gāthic Yasna.

B. C. circa depicts without intending it, and without knowing it, a Magian scene from one to four centuries later than its Gāthic predecessor.

Later colouring is Ancient.

Space does not permit me to particularise further here, or I might recall that Hermippos (?), even at 250 B. C. about, affords also some graphic details which meet us in a manner calculated to arrest attention only in the far later Bundahish which does not even represent a post-Gāthic late Avesta, but a post-Avestic and wholly traditional and later Zoroastrianism.

Deductions not Avoidable.

It is hard indeed to credit the considerations which here force themselves upon us, yet we must not blink them. If Hermippos at B. C. 250 could cite a feature now most prominently preserved to us in the late Bundahish, or, as we should rather say, in that extremely late production which we generally place at about the fifth to seventh century of our era, if not much later, this almost throws our well considered estimates into confusion by suggestions of extreme priority. For, if such ideas were traditional at B. C. 250, *where, in times previous to this, must we place the later Avesta itself?*, not to speak of the still earlier Gāthas, supposing that we have proved their relative remoter age; yet see all the colouring of Theopompus, B. C. 300

circa, and of the other Greeks who cite various features of Zoroastrianism which with undeviating iteration *recall the late Avesta*¹ and that alone.

All this cannot be at all conscientiously ignored, and it forces us to report once more again the rather extreme, if provisional, opinion that even the later Avesta itself may indeed have predated Herodotus, 484—424 B. C., by from one to three hundred years, which would of course force us to place our Gāthas at our earlier figure of 1000 B. C., and suggests an epoch still anterior to that; see S. B. E. XXXI, where I even named the excessive 1500 B. C. for this outside earlier limit. And this, because the sister lore of the Veda was once thought, and is, as I suppose, by many still thought to date from an equally remote age, or indeed from one still further back.

Section XXVI.

Can anything be so Old, or Old at all?

Some of us may indeed be seized with a morbid septicism such as Schleiermacher, I believe, reported somewhere. He said, I think, that in early youth he experienced strange doubts as to the reality of many of the well-known figures in Old history. We may fall at times under the like incubus, and doubt our whole question, root and branch.

¹ See them all reproduced in Kleuker, Haug or Jackson; see also J. J. Modi.

Nevertheless Reason remains Unshaken.

If Darius ever lived and dictated his »copy« for Behistūn, then with our deductions Zarathushtra was just as much a person from one to three centuries before him, perhaps still earlier. And, if this be the case, then he lived and taught in Iran at the latest at 650 B.C., and possibly at 900 B. C. or earlier. All conscientious historians are sternly strict with their own suggestions, and we, who labour upon these foundations of history, are the hardest of all searchers to convince; and we incline to take the most moderate of views; but minds fresh to the subject would generally choose B. C. 900; and some might say, »Why not the Vedic age of 1000 or 1200 B. C.?, so, once held by scholars.

Absolute Evidence is not to be Expected.

As to an exceptional certainty such as we have from Behistūn, Persopolis, etc., we must learn to do without it. No other documents like ours possess it. A range of two hundred years, let me say it again in passing, is quite approximate for such an estimate on such a Lore. Some differ three hundred years as to even the Bhagavadgītā, while as to the R. V. itself see how views have varied.

The Non-Gāthic Documents, their Age.

Having reached this approximate estimate, the corresponding opinions as to the Age of the non-Gāthic documents of the Avesta fall in naturally.

Those pieces are of course of various Antiquity; see my views in S. B. E. XXXI, Introduction pp. XLVI — XLVII.

We proceed here entirely in cold blood. We should call the Haptanghāiti the oldest work next after the Gāthas, and put it, say, a century later; then the Srōsh Yasht would come in, say at another fifty years later, then the Hōm Yasht and the others, then parts of the Vendīdād, etc., placing say fifty years between each, though the substrata of each and all the documents, even perhaps without excepting the Gāthas, was in each case older than their texts as they now survive to us.

Extreme Opinions.

There has been some tendency to place even the vigorous Yashts very late; see above, say even in the fifth Century A. D.; and one is always tempted to revise one's estimates; but those who suggest this last, some of them, still hold to an Antiquity for the Gāthas of some six hundred years B. C. at least. This would however leave an unnatural gap intervening between the different documents of a literature accepted as an homogeneous unit; so approximately. There are indeed portions of Avesta possibly as late as A. D. 500; see Yasht XXIV; and it is not always possible for us to decide as to what additions may not have been made by way of interpolation here and there; and this even up to modern times; but to hold the Gāthas to date from B. C. 650 odd, *and then to put the*

still vigorous Yashts a thousand years behind (!) them does not look natural. If the Yashts, even the best of them, were sung so late as in A. D. 500, how is it possible that the Gāthas were composed in 650 B. C.? With these remarks I close my estimate. Logic seems to force us to place the successive documents approximately at the points which I have named.

XXVI, a.

The difficult Alternative.

If however on the contrary it should indeed prove at last to be the fact that the Gāthas and their doubtless voluminous lost companions were composed so late as B. C. 100 to A. D. 226, about the dates suggested by my respected opposition, then we should certainly lose a signal monument in religious history, but we should in place of it gain one sinister curiosity the more and of a character rare to be met in the annals of deceit. We might even place the Gāthas at the head of such existing tricks, and done, *cui bono?* The later Avesta makes no pretence to genuineness in the sense here intended. It is the free voice of the mythic feeling added to indefinitely from poet to poet and from seer to seer; the Gāthas on the contrary, unless they are true, are an abominable sham, one item more to add to the hideous mental deformity of men. But let us hope for better things. Here in these ancient pieces in their grand simplicity we may have indeed the spontaneous utterances of a soul who did not wish

to lie, and who leads all good men on like a lone star amidst terrific by-gone glooms. And may it shine on forever throughout coming history as one pure light the more from God to show the better way:

»Thus that better than the good may he come nearer
Who unto us straight paths of profit shows
Of this life bodily the use, of that the mental
In the Eternal Realms where dwells Ahura,
Like The noble and august, O Mazda Lord.«

¹ Yasna XLIII, 2.

Section XXVII.

Sketch of the Facts Resultant from the Foregoing Discussion.

HAVING proved, or attempted to prove, that Bible, Tablets and Avesta are in so far closely related, and having done my best to present to the reader the solid arguments which make for the Antiquity of the Iranian documents early and late, the way is now fully open for us to proceed toward other elements which stand like ruined temples significant of long past circumstances over the landscape in our path before us. And, as we advance, I will endeavour to point out to those of my readers who may accompany me a few of the more conspicuous objects of personal interest which should awake their attention, and ultimately engage their close and laborious consideration; and this, though an economy of space is fast becoming here an imperative necessity.

A word as to further Restricted Procedure.

But before I advance upon these I must say a single word to those readers who may suppose that I have proved what is self-evident, or at least that I have overproved my points, leaving little space for sequents. These gifted and accomplished inquirers will concede at once that all procedure in such an investigation should be, if possible, exhaustive, and that to the last degree, for otherwise it would be just in so far worthless.

But they may not be aware that the main question which has been hitherto under discussion is, or was, once considered by certain writers to be still unsettled. So that no excuse would be valid, had I refrained from an absolutely ultimate attempted delineation. Criticism under these circumstances becomes simply honesty.

Positive or Provisional Conclusions.*

I have therefore expressed myself in a very decided manner in regard to what points I have considered at my present stage of research to be provable, while I have practised a correspondingly strict reserve with regard to others. And it will be of course understood that except where space and time are given for discussion, I must in this brief Summing-up adhere still more closely to this practice, giving the resultants of the possible facts rather than the facts themselves, except in cases where I am in a position to completely verify; and this upon principle, and again for the reasons given. Readers will recall for themselves how carefully I have repudiated many ultimate conclusions especially upon such matter as the Biblical Edicts which have yet occupied such considerable space above. I have not declared them to be, as they have now survived to us, exactly in the form in which they were first made public; nor have I asserted that »the God of Heaven« was certainly Devá ¹, nor that the Iranian Dualism is at all certainly

¹ To save interrupting the progress of assertion one makes use sometimes of the words »it is« after the fullest notice has been given of incomplete conviction.

present as a positively proven fact in Isaiah XLV; nor even that Cyrus's creed was positively that of Darius and his Successors; nor have I anywhere positively defined as to particulars in how far Persian influence had been felt in Israel, for I do not regard any premature *comittalism to be in good form in such an extended presentation.

What I have strenuously asserted with attempted proofs, and what I now repeat with emphasis, is the existence of both a possibility and probability as to these matters cited, the latter being exceptionally substantial.

With this much further preface I now present my apocopated report, giving indeed a sort of prospectus of future labour.

Section XXVIII.

The Exilic Elements in the Hebrew Scriptures.

Experts have pretty nearly agreed upon what is Exilic in our Hebrew Scriptures, quite sufficiently so at least for such a purpose as I have now in view; for the exact measure of Persian influence is not at all the immediate result which I have proposed to myself; we can therefore proceed provisionally.

What is Exilic, and what is Post-exilic?

When however we speak of what is Exilic, we should at once understand that we are by no means confined to the predominantly Exilic books; that is to say, not to such Books as in their bulk are known and acknowledged to date from the

Period of the Exile and to contain matter derived from Persian Babylon, for there is scarcely a book in the entire Bible, as now surviving to us, which does not contain Exilic elements.

Experts can easily trace the hand of the »Priestly Writer« as he is now quite technically termed; for the complete mass of the documents was over-written and rewritten by him, or »by them,« in the course of the ever-continuous re-copying. Aside from some amusing instances of semi-commercial reluctance, no serious critic supposes that there is, or was, originally any such Eschatology in the Pre-exilic Semitic Scriptures as that now present within the Exilic portion; and, as Exilic matter is also traceable in the predominantly Pre-exilic Books, the remark applies as well to them so far as these differing elements are present within them. There are almost books within books.

XXVIII, a.

The Pre-exilic Eternal Life.

The only Eternal Life, for instance, that was original to the Pre-exilic portions was such as appertained to the existence of the Deity, being quite unlike any of our modern ideas of futurity. No man who had ever died was distinctly believed to have revived to a permanent full consciousness either in this, or in the spiritual world, least of all to a permanently resuscitated body. Enoch and Elijah were merely stated to have escaped death, so partaking of that life of God which Adam and

Eve would have shared, had they not fallen; see Genesis ¹. Miraculous resurrections such as that recorded in the Book of Kings ², etc. were but temporary revivifications to be succeeded by eventual redecense, totally dissimilar to our ideas of the risen body, while the preternatural sagacity incidentally attributed to the shade of Samuel forms the exception which proves the rule.

The Classic Hades may be Compared.

The life of the departed Soul before the Exile was a shadow life, very like the classic Hades, »the land where all things are forgotten«.

Its conditions not resulting from a Judgment.

Very little, if any, distinction seems to have existed as being made between the good and the evil, with scarce a thought looking toward a full personal future bodily state. Those expressions in the Exilic Books which seem to be Pre-exilic had reference to National Resurrection, that is to say, to a moral and religious revival, and were therefore figures of speech, as in the case of Ezekiel's vision of »dry bones«. Separated skeletons became reunited into the former human forms representing the morally reconstituted State, though the imagery was probably derived from Persian passages which described a supposed positive resurrection of human beings ³.

¹ »Lest he put forth his hand and take of the Tree of Life, and eat and live forever.«

² If indeed it was intended to describe more than resuscitation.

³ After the exposure of the dead to the birds as a substitute

The Exile as a Modifying Force.

The Exile had already exerted a powerful psychic influence upon the Jews *entirely aside from any direct intellectual inspiration from without*, and as presenting a mere change in their external condition, and this with the gravest possible spiritual° results. It stirred the first conceptions of a future life within° their minds by recalling them indirectly through their sufferings to the spirit of their Holy Law. The loss of the Temple Service made the closest attention to their »Scriptures« all the more a necessity. From this obvious cause the Ancient Books acquired an influence presumably even beyond what they possessed originally. *The National Existence having been obliterated in the Conquest and Captivity, religious admonition, which had been addressed to the Nation, turned itself perforce toward the individual.* Appeals to personal conscience were made in the terms of Jeremiah and Ezekiel obviously with the most gratifying results. The previous temporal rewards and punishments for righteousness or sin having been proved through experience to be illusory, the ancient Sheol or Hades began to take on the features of the later Heaven and Hell, and even some thoughts must have begun to be experienced looking toward permanent future bodily life continued beyond the grave; and this doubtless entirely aside from any direct Persian¹ in-

for burial, the 'dry bones' were roughly collected, while as the prelude to a formal resurrection 'bone would join to his bone'.

¹ That sporadic ideas of a future life in a revived body must have occurred to some individual Jews before such convictions came in with a flood of other elements from the Persian Lore may be also.

fluence, though Persian colouring must have been borrowed. For Religion, as it developed, notwithstanding the fact that it began to appeal to the awakened conscience, could not all at once shake off the earlier appeal to bodily rewards and punishments and the long implanted hopes and fears with regard to them. When therefore men began to look toward a future life for those requitals which had proved illusory in this world *through the Captivity*, something like the idea of a future corporeal existence, National and even Individual, began to suggest itself *precisely in order that such realistic recompenses as they had so long been taught to expect might at last be fully gained. And a future bodily life* could alone afford either the receptive conditions or the implements for such experiences.

But while such a natural development was ripening the minds of the clear-headed Israelites, these doctrines had long been both familiar and predominant in the Creeds of their new Allies.

regarded as self-evident from the common experience of physicians. The dead have not only been seen in dreams in every land, and at every age, but in fever cases they are seen together with other illusions while the patient is awake. Subacute delirium is especially misleading. Here only the superficial nerves are thrown into morbid activity, generally those of vision and hearing, while the substance of the brain is not affected and the judgment remains still clear. The patient, not aware of these common symptoms, cannot but believe his own senses which he has always trusted; for his reason is cool. This was the case with Martin Luther when he threw his inkstand at the Devil, and frequently heard mutterings as he sank to sleep. Did not John Bunyan have some such similar experiences. A throng of such like cases present themselves in the biographies of enthusiasts. I would call attention to the extraordinary prevailing neglect of these simple but important factors in the discussion.

XXVIII, b.

Resurrection and the Future Bodily Life, with their concomitant doctrines, present in the Original Iranian Lore.

On such a point as this I think it hardly necessary for us, in the present point of our Discussion, to linger, though an excellent Author upon the subject devotes important space to it¹. No forms of religion or indeed of philosophical thought are without their predisposing causes, which in ancient times no doubt operated still more slowly than at present. The Christian Religion was some centuries in developing from the Pre-exilic, Exilic and Post-exilic Judaism, while the Muhammedan occupied a certain period in a similar process. The Mithraic cult was a branch of the Zoroastrian; Gnosticism, if it might be called a religion, had its incipient periods; see also the Neo-platonism, and the later Manichaeism. Should one then assume for a moment for the sake of argument that the earliest Avesta documents, the Gāthas, were several centuries later than they really were, this might be convenient as a stratagetic movement, and would in no way affect our procedure, for they, the Gāthas, must have existed long previously in their forerunners, nor are we left with this obvious inference *a priori*; for as we have already seen, some of their main elements may be found in the Indian Sister Book, at an age long previous to the Exile, and far apart territorially from any possibility of contact².

¹ See Stave.

² As late as Theopompus would answer our purpose, while even Herodotus may be fully accepted as describing later Avestic particulars.

Here then are the facts, — Judaism all moved with formative receptivity on the one side, — and the fully developed System of Iran on the other, and in this last these ideas new to Israel had all been long since focussed in a just perspective, and completely established in accepted dogmas. Here therefore was the overwhelming influence of a mighty State-Religion dominant in the great Empire ¹ of which they, the Israelites, had become in a sense citizens, or at least of course the subjects, dating their public acts from the beginnings and from the annals of the Persian Reigns. What wonder that this Religion of the Great concentration of States helped-on the Jewish Creed. The *Old Seol* already in process of transformation all at once assumed the forms of the full *Persian Eschatology*.

A *Resurrection*, if not absolutely universal,

¹ Surely those who very properly are doing their best to array all the possibilities of Babylonian influence upon the Jews will in moments of reflection accede to the extraordinary difference in the vital forces of the two sources of influence, the Babylonian and the Persian, at least from the date of the Capture of Babylon, or indeed as a matter of psychic power quite apart from the question of the time when it began to operate. Babylonian or Chaldaean influence was, as I freely admit, so powerful at the very earliest periods that it would seem almost to coincide with the thing influenced, if Abram really came from Ur of the Chaldees.

A very different question however presents itself when we examine the Exilic period. Why is it so little mentioned that Babylonian influence became Persian from the Capture of the City; see however Jastrow. And what of the Persian Faith itself regarded as the Creed of populations. The Inscriptions proved to redundancy that the Cult of Auramazda was not only spread over all Iran, but that it possessed enormous practical and political influence. As a mere psychic force it totally overwhelmed at that time all that was Semitic outside of Israel. In fact what Cult was so effective and served by such hordes of Priests for such multitudes of worshippers all over Iranian Asia.

supervened upon the first rudimental ideas of it, and appeared with all the colouring of the Zend Avesta. There was to be a Judgment quite forensic, as we have it in the later Parsism based upon Avesta where the full details have perished. »A New Heaven and a New Earth« were to appear »wherein should dwell righteousness,« according to familiar Avestic terms, extinguishing as with a blaze of light every trace of other ancient endings.

The *Angeliology* of the oldest Scriptures, which was nearly as dim as their Sheol, became occupied with such figures as a Michael and a Gabriel, while the number »Seven«, as attached to them, is as conspicuous as it is significant ¹.

And perhaps even more marked than all became *the Person of the Devil*. »Satan« ceased to remain a general term and became a proper Name. In Job at the Introduction he appears among the Angels of God.

But his sinister attitude does not remain long concealed. He is soon recognised as the »*God of this world*« almost a complete counterpart of Angra Mainyu, bereft alone of independence; see above. The *Demonology* as expressed in Demoniacal possession and dispossession is very striking; cp. the Christian Gospels.

¹ The most prominent particular of the kind in the entire Zoroastrian Creeds carrying with it immense influence probably over all North Persian Asia. A dim sevenfold of planets and of Angels is also reported from the Babylonian Tablets: but what comparison does this bear with the vastly extended Iranian system in days when literature had abandoned clay for a better material.

The world periods are four in Daniel as they are in the later Zoroastrianism, repeating earlier lost documents; and this has struck others as worth mentioning; but in the later Judaism, i. e. in Christianity, *Satan is bound a thousand years*«; and so in the later Parsism, reflecting earlier tenets ¹, he is restrained.

The *Temptation of Eve* seems to me to be hardly coloured at all by the light of Parsism, but that of Zarathushtra bears the very strongest analogy to that of Jesus.

The *Distinction of Clean and Unclean* in Leviticus and Ezekiel seems to be almost a part of the Vendidad ², where it alone receives its explanation ³.

Idol-worship is nowhere so severely reprehended as in each; and the same may be said of *Sorcery*.

Even the doctrines of *Soteriology* seem to have been affected, for, as Apocalyptic hopes led on the soul to bear the evils of existence in view of Restoration, millennial or final, which were Persian thoughts, a *Messiah* became expected. And so in Parsism the Saoshyant is to help bring on the great result; and this concept pressed forward too the Jewish hope; the first was even expected to be Virgin-born as was the last

¹ In the Millennium of Libra he is freed for a thousand years after having been restrained. •See Bundahish XXXI.

² Recall the Naçus and the rules for purification.

³ Some of the animals called »unclean« seem excellent enough, and a reason for their extinction is only clearly given when it was said that the Devil made them.

The »*Fire*« in each became still more a symbol of spiritual purity, and Altars burned with sacrifices in each religious system.

The »*Seven Candlesticks*« recall Zoroastrian imagery¹, while on each side a hierarchy prevailed, some Priests of the Jews possessing princely rank, as did a Persian dynasty². Each Religion was a religion of written books, and who can say *which had here priority*; and each, whether by intention, conquest or migration, carried its tenets far and wide. Greek ideas doubtless mingled with the Hebrew and the Persian views, while Assyriology and Babylon had doubtless their share of influence. But the Persian system came in like a spring-tide and flooded everything. Shall we then say that Christianity in its bare outline was the result of both, with its vast conquests over the habitable globe. Many a cold-blooded witness would at once assert as much.

XXIX.

Regarded as *Literature* indeed, the Jewish went far beyond its rival, though using that rival's principles; except in its great frame-work, the Zoroastrian pales before the other. Job, Isaiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse surpass our utmost efforts at appreciation, while the drama of the Crucifixion with its antecedents, its main action, and its close, seems quite unspeakably magnificent. It should be regarded as a most solemn as well as a most distinguished

¹ See elsewhere for a throng of illustrative analogies.

² The house of Sasan which claimed priestly blood.

privilege of Parsism that it helped on, if it did not give the very keynote to some of the sublimest passages in religious literature which the earth has ever seen.

The One Inapproachable Exception.

As regards its influence upon doctrine, we must however make one altogether isolated claim for Israel, and this concerning the matter now just last mentioned, which became at once the very central circumstance in the Christian system, and one which is not only absolutely apart from Persian ideas, but contrary to them, and arising spontaneously from within the late Semitic cult. *Where is the Religion that ever emerged from obscurity, which offered its very God as a sacrifice partaking of the sorrows of the creatures whom He had brought into being?*

Nothing Persian and nothing Babylonian can approach this »Holy of all Holies« in its remotest precinct. As to the other elements, however, even proceeding to much subordinate detail, grand as they are quite apart from the inapproachable conclusion, they would never have existed at all but for the Jewish, nor would they have been what they are aside from the Persian. Surely Avesta in its sister schemes and in its sources, if our careful reasoning has not been utterly at fault, conferred upon the great Christian Church of all ages the utmost conceivable benefit, since but for its Priestly King, the great »Restorer«, who was animated by Avesta

Lore or by its sources directly or indirectly, our Jesus the Christ would not have been born in Bethlehem, nor would he have agonised in Gethsemane, nor met his end on Golgotha!

The influence of Parsism upon *Speculative Philosophy*, only indirectly concerns us here, — but there are religious elements in those profoundly interesting foci of conjecture which have survived in Avesta documents long lost or present, and which have been already named; see above.

XXX.

The Question of Common Origins.

Among the sources from which both the Iranian and the Jewish Lores were derived, as we must never forget, some were certainly *the same*. When we go far enough back, or far enough down, of course we come upon early universal identities which present a speculative question quite apart from our present theme; and we can never tell what feature anywhere may not be a survival from some such primitive original; perhaps where we least expect to see it this may be at times the case. It is however naturally our business here to study only influences which have operated within the historic period, and we must now devote our attention especially to these.

XXXI.

Semitic Influence upon the Avesta.

A priori we should say at once that the absence of all Semitic influence is inconceivable. Yet

we must not overlook the fact that all the great practical circumstances of the period make a religious influence by the scanty Jewish population upon the vast Iranian Empire a matter of inferior estimation, and an intellectual force most certainly greatly limited in the sphere of its operation. None the less however must we regard the existence of some such influence at some juncture, and to some extent as probable in the extreme.

XXXI, a.

Particularly as Regards the Later Avesta.

As regards the later Avesta especially some of the most valuable pieces are now conjectured by respectable writers to be as late as the time of the invention or adoption of the present Avesta Alphabet, this latter having been a marvellous philological feat. If the Fifth or Sixth Century A. D. is to be thought of, this brings us near upon the time when Khosroes invited Simplicius from Athens ¹, and by that time it is quite certain that much information with regard to the Church of the Roman Empire must have found its way among the Literati of the Sasanian Priesthood ²; and one is strongly inclined to suspect Biblical colouring in many passages in the Bundahesh, so that by inference at

¹ Did not the Persian works upon Aristotle really receive their first impulse from these associations.

² How is it possible that the passages in Isaiah and Ezra* which so distinguished the early Persian Emperors, should not have been pointed out times without number by Jewish doctors to Persian friends.

least Semitic influence ought surely to be also present in some of the features of the original Avesta; but when we come to look for it we are baffled almost at once.

If we commence at the well-known Semitic forms in which the Avesta Alphabet at present appears, we are met by the fact that the most Aryan of all Aryan Books, the Veda, stands likewise at present also in a Semitic character. And if we mention the Semitic elements of Pahlavi aside from the Alphabet as a further sign of Semitic influence, we are told that these forms are only logograms¹. On the other hand, however, we are permitted to say that even the mechanical adoption of Semitic signs shows at least Semitic intercourse at some previous period in the early history of the two races, while we may claim that Semitic influence has left its marks upon the forms of the Pahlavi and even upon those of the New Persian sentence. This much per-contra. Aside from it however, where is our Semitism in the Avesta?

Scarce a word of the Semitic language appears within its texts, not even in the latest of them, whereas a throng of Persian words appear in the Bible; see above and below. Not only is the mythology totally Aryan², with all the proper names, but many of them are also Indian. Avesta is really Veda, or vice versa, and its speech is closer to Indian than Greek is close to Greek³.

¹ like our viz = »namely«.

² See above.

³ See Oldenberg's *Vedic Religion*, p. 27, citing my translation of Y. XXVIII into Sanskrit from Roth's *Festgruss* 1894.

The very metres of the Rk appear with absolutely no influence from India far up in the Iranian North¹, while the central concepts of the Avesta, »The Immortals«, are all prominent, though not collected, in the Veda; see above, as is the Demonology in its leading features. Where then, let us ask again, is the Semitism? Here is our almost Sanskrit Book, with all its elements Aryan, even, as we might almost say, to its latest comments. We are met with difficulties when we inquire for the foreign element.

There is one element in doctrine, however, which should be considered; and it may seem to some readers to be Semitic in its flavour.

XXXIb.

Have we an all-important Case at hand?

We should at once and long since have simply cited those signal and oft repeated words of Vendīdād; »O Ahura Mazda Creator of the worlds, or Settlements, Thou Holy One,« or those in Yasna I. Surely here we have, as some would say, beyond all doubt an echo from Genesis at the Creation narrative. No such direct address in the vocative indeed occurs in Genesis; but neither is there any such in the oldest Avesta. Some also have called attention to the »Six Periods of Creation,« in Yasna XIX, etc. which are still remembered in stated festivals scattered throughout the Parsi year.

¹ See the most beautiful of all of them in the Trishṭup of the Gātha Ushtavaiti* and Spentamainfyu already mentioned. This Trishṭup of India and of Iran came from the same remote original in the common prehistoric home. A possible suggestion of an Indian origin for the Gāthic Trishṭup would be wholly uncritical.

But, if we concede Semitic influence here at the very foundation of all Cosmology, what has become of all the Aryan superstructure; for Aryan it has been fully proved to be; see above. It presupposes an homogeneous base, as we can easily perceive, and a Supreme personal Originator; for we have even a Dhātar, Creator, in the Veda, who, if somewhat late, yet presupposes something homogeneous before him; and in fact even Váruna seems to take on creative functions.

If these features are dim in the Veda, as it might be said, so is the Angelology also »dim« in it, though we know it to be related¹; see above. We are either forced to think of a parallel development², or to turn our fixed scrutiny upon the documents and ask very seriously, has not Genesis itself been helped on from primeval Aryan sources? The »creation« doctrine of the Avesta and of the Inscriptions is quite as extensively and emphatically urged in those documents as it is in the genuinely Pre-exilic portions of the earliest Israelitish Books. Taking into consideration the relative extent of the two sets of surviving writings, some would say that the Iranian works far surpass the Israelitish in these respects, for Avesta and Inscription are far less large in bulk when we excide their many repetitions; see also the endless iteration of the R̥k. How comes it then that in Genesis we have foundations with no homogeneous superstructure³. If Genesis the

¹ An all-important fact.

² See above.

³ till we come to the Exilic elements.

First was absolutely Semitic in its ultimate sources, what has become of its homogeneous personal Angelology, its Demonology, its Eschatology, and its Soteriology, following closely in connection, not to speak here of a beatific Millennium, which last is however cognate only as to its interior significance.

It might almost be called a foundation without a superstructure, a pedestal without a statue, all parts of the phenomena being in order in the Iranian system. We have, the mass of us, and perhaps most fortunately so, got our Semitism upon the brain, grown with our very growth, bred in us from our race; to doubt the absolutely original Semitism of Genesis the First seems at the very thought of it to be profane. Yet Reason must be allowed its course as hitherto.

XXXI, c.

The Immemorial Age of the Aryan Race ¹.

The Aryan race and the Aryan languages are presumably as old as the Semitic. In fact non-semitic Akkad and Sumer with the extremely prominent Aryan terms in their primeval language seem to antedate portions at least of Semitic Babylon, while the ancestry of the Irano-Indians is immemorially remote. The name of Auramazda has been reported on Babylonian tablets. The very name of the Sumerian Sovereign was patesi (?); and what is that but Avesta pa(i)tish. Even at the foundations of the earliest Babylonian Cosmology, at the base of their entire religious system we have an Aryan word.

¹ Japhet?

If »apsu« be not well-nigh the commonest of all the Aryan nouns, then what is it? It looks irresistibly like »water«; compare Genesis. Even *Tiāmat*, looks suspiciously like(?) »Temah darkness«, a conspicuous Iranian torment, while as regards »Ādar« it has actually stepped in its completed form neatly from the Avesta and the calendars, or out of their originals. The pure Iranian word was once doubtless even at an early period of immemorial usage as applied to a »month« in Persian, in Jewish, and in Babylonian¹. Here is a most palpable and significant application of the term in each of the three languages. To which did it originally belong? It is again a common Aryan word applied to a common Month, the Month called »Fire«, most sacred of Avesta symbols, chief in the sacrifice as in the home. See it naturally adopted as a Syrian and Assyrian God. What sense has any other explanation. Fire was a proper Deity with an immense, if not universal cult. It could not well have helped becoming a God in Syrian and Assyrian; but its position was so dominant in Medo-Persia that it gave its name to a great Province; see *Ādarbāgān*(so) and the Zoroastrians have been called Fire-worshippers. If »patesi« is pure Medo-Persian, with »apsu« another universal wide-spread Deity who forced his Persian name on Babylon, how is it possible that the Syrian *Ādar* can mean anything else but Fire? To abandon Fire as the

¹ Surely the claim that this name is originally Semitic seems to be exposed to a *reductio ad absurdum*, but here I write with reserve.

meaning of the Syrian God seems self-stultification; but if Ādar meant fire in Babylonian, it was well nigh the commonest of Persian words. Nothing could be more decisive.

Khisleu may be Khshathra somewhat condensed by expected shrinkage. It is another Parsi and Babylonian month, for an »s« replaces »t« and an »l« an »r«¹; Not only is achash'dar'pān (so) = »khshatrāpāvan« a compositum of pure Medo-Persian in Daniel 3. 2, its first member being reported by Kohut from many other books, but even the Avestic Khshathra-vairya may appear as Ahasuerush. The -uer- = -ver- is the second part of the compositum also represented as -ver- in the later Parsi Khshatraver, the »vairya« being itself a pointed Gāthic word in this connection. These forms are said to occur upon the Babylonian tablets.

See also the Aryan »Tēbeth« Month to Avesta »tap« = »to burn«, cp. Persian Tābistan = »summer«. Āb looks again like Persian for »water«, this also in view of the practically certain Ādar. Is it very likely that »Father«, if such an explanation could be thought of, would have become the name of a month? Even Elūl may conceal Haurva- of Haurvatāt as, »l« is »r« and »u« is »v«; and so we have (H)erver-; and why is not Tishri, Tishtrya, Tishtar, Sirius?

See also the Seven Spirits of Zechariah, Job, and the Apocalypse rivetted to the Avesta in the Book of Tobit by the close occurrence of Asmodai,

¹ Benfey carries this out much further. It is most singular that in an otherwise very full and careful reproduction of the points of exhaustive discussion this notorious article is not even mentioned; and Iranian scholarship seems grossly defective.

a corruption from Av. Aēshmō d(a)ēva, a leading Gāthic demon, where also (in Tobit) the Avesta City Ragha, (Ragā, Rai, 'Paya) appears; compare also Raji; and these, not to speak of Haurvatāt and Ameretatāt, the two last Ameshaspends in the early Talmud together with Khshathravairya (again) where they are unfortunately classed with some Avestic infernals such as the Mūsh and the Ashemogh¹. And further we have the honourable mention of the Jewish Exile-arch*, their political representative in Babylonian, as being fourth in rank in the Babylonian-Persian community under the Arsacids²; and this, with the no less striking proof of Persian influence afforded by the recorded persecution of these same Jews under the early Sasanians³; and though the name of Zarathushtra the prophet had no existence 2000 (?) years B. C. yet the remark of Berosus shows accidental relation. No one will suppose for a moment that I suggest our present Avesta as the *immediate* source of these particulars in Hebrew or Assyrian; for I have even conceded for argument that the Gāthas themselves might be quite late; the »Source of sources« should be our only main objective, and that was Aryan as to these particulars beyond a doubt⁴.

¹ Supposing the name occurring there to be the same.

² The home Jews envied them.

³ See Kohut's Jewish, Angeliology throughout. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. IV. 1866. Both Avesta and Veda should be studied in this connection.

⁴ Persons not altogether at home in these studies might feel disappointment at this; but the source of a thing is an interior part of the thing itself.

It might afford some solace, if we conceded the matter of territory to Babylonists; for the non-Semitic Akkad and Sumer, which seem to antedate some particulars in Semitism, were seated on the Euphrates¹ banks, or in its neighbourhood. But if an Aryan or non-Semitic race had sufficient influence to conquer there, it could well have shed out rays of light to both Babel and Iran; and why not even to India as well. The Iranian scheme hangs well together from base to summit, having its foundations of the widest dimensions and firmest structure, whereas the original Semitic one lacks symmetry. A borrowed idea, even that of »Creation« might indeed conceivably have been built upon in Iran, but »Creation« is the main theological idea of the Achaemenian Religion and so of Avesta. Avesta as to all its greater elements is absolutely one, and accounted for as such, as it has its remotest beginning in common with the Veda. If then the creation scheme of Genesis and that of the Avesta resulted from some common source, this source was primitively Aryan; that is to say, more than possibly, rationally, and probably.

Could influence, if at all at work, after suggesting »Creation« in the scheme of Genesis have stopped at such a point, supposing such a suggestion to have been itself Semitic.

¹ Is not Euphrates itself »the hu-prathu« = a Sansk. »suprat'u« = »the very broad«, so with Oppert, or the hu-fratu = »the well-flowing«, with Spiegel; both pure Aryan.² If this be indeed an Aryan imitation of a Semitic, original; yet see how old it is; and who can tell whether the* parattu so confidently termed Semitic may not be our Aryan prathu after all. Cp. also the Greek *Εὐφράτης*.

Surely the same forces which made Avesta one as a mass of monotheism (apart from sporadic occurrences, and apart also from Satan's speculative independence)¹ must have had something to do with the slow long struggle of the same doctrine in Israel; that is to say, if, as we have postulated, the primeval Aryan Lore suggested a monotheistic creation. This doctrine hung long and often in the balance in Israel and from the very first, as we well know; see the Books, though it was the One doctrine of all doctrines. Elohīm is actually polytheistic at Gen. I, 26, »let us make man«; the very stolen teraphim of a Yahweh-worshipper are simply called »my Gods«; and teraphim are mentioned later. The Golden Calf was adored as soon as Moses turned his back; recall the brazen Serpent, and among the rest Moloch-worship with its infanticide. For half centuries together, all Israel seem downright Baal-worshippers, and so does Judah to a less degree; see the Books.

The battle for a Divine Unity only began seriously with the cry; »Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is One Lord; and on me shall ye concentrate your affections«². What was then the secondary source of this? The Exilic Priestly Re-writer who re-pointed the expressions, in the never ceasing re-copying of the Mss. as they wore out. How little do we picture to ourselves the simplest facts. Being exilic bred, these Re-writers lived in contact with a Lore which before all things forbade

¹ See below.

² »Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart ... etc.«

idolatry as few others did; and all that they wrote expressed a higher mental standard; compare the late Isaiah with the hordes that cried to the golden calves; »these be thy Gods, O Israel, etc.« We must not forget that aside from excessive puerilities in the ceremonial of Vendidad, the main mass of the Avesta concepts are most rational, as the Ameshāspends are God's Attributes, etc., etc.

Here then is Avesta in its chief bulk, the one consistent representative of Monotheism in the Ancient World ¹ with Angelology, Demonology, Purifications, Antimagic, Judgment, Heaven and Hell, Soteriology and Chiliasm, a mass quite compact in itself, and conquering at last, as all now own, its way over Jewish simplicity with Babylonian myth; and here is Israel on the other side idolatrous, as we might almost say of it from its very birth. Baal-worshippers, one half of them, for quite half the time, and lapsing continually into every form of evil.

How is it possible that the Exilic Priestly Writers with their now newly attempted monotheism, more monotheistic even than their original ², should not have *helped on* the »One God« faith of Israel,

¹ ,aside from an independent Satan, which is an original and Gāthic element. Let it be noted well, and kept constantly in memory, that the main argument of this book concerns *the Original Avesta the Gāthas*, while the later is also of great, though secondary importance and is alluded to extensively in connection with side issues. The Religion of the later Avesta is as much modified from that of the Gāthas as the later Christianity is modified from its original. There is no Mithra, even as a created fellow deity in the Gāthas; see above. Where I speak of »polytheistic« tendencies; see above, I mean to refer only to the later Avesta with its modified religion.

² The sources of Avesta, or Avesta itself.

while continually incited by the one distinguished source and centre of all early monotheistic sentiment. Where do we ever hear of Iranian lapses into idolatry and in Mazda-worship? There are wide gaps in Iranian history indeed, and notwithstanding this the usual astounding catalogue of national and individual crimes appears, but where is the *idolatry*? The advanced position allowed to Mithra in places belongs to the later Avesta; and this was also the elevation of a cognate Deity distinctly created by Ahura as if it were His son, less startling to outsiders than our Christian worship of the Trinity.

Dualism Really a Recoil.

The very Dualism which obtrudes itself speculatively upon us favours the settlement of my conclusion.

It was the extreme expression of disgust at sin. The unclean thing was utterly thrust out from Deity. Naturally I do not press these conclusions here and now as if they were fully proven. But I must *suggest* them for future consideration, or I would leave my work half-done. Where would science be; let me ask it once more, if we never made advanced proposals?

Corruption of course forced its hideous presence into the sacred fanes of Zoroaster even immediately after his distinguished birth, but look at the records of the very Temple in the Books of Kings and Chronicles .

Well has it indeed been said, that the public of the Gāthas was indefinitely »purer than the public

¹ Baal-worship, wanton immorality of ultimate description.

of the Psalms«; and enormous is our loss in the destruction of their masses ¹.

In closing I will recall a few of the promised items which I have already here and there foreshadowed, if not indeed anticipated, and which present to us some very striking exterior features. They may assist the wearied reader in carrying away some more distinct impression of the facts. The nuclei of some of them have been already mentioned.

Section XXXII.

A few Coincidences of Reported Expressions in the two related Loves.

»King of Kings.«

No one has forgotten this expression. It occurs at Ez. 7, 12 of Artaxerxes, in Daniel II, 37 in the first Epistle to Timothy VI, 15, and it is repeated in Revelations XVII, 14, XIX, 16, and perhaps elsewhere. A memorable phrase indeed it is; and it came from nowhere else but from the Achaemenian Inscriptions; that is to say, in the Inscriptions we have the first certified occurrence of it ². It appears on all the longer ones and on some of the shorter ones, and it refers to each of the Kings who has left Inscriptions at all of sufficient length to admit of it, some dozen times together. It extends through the Pahlavi literature and it survives, I believe, at present as a title by courtesy of our contemporaneous Persian Rulers.

¹ Of course hundreds(?) of the Psalms have perished likewise.

² See the dates.

Another expression which has very marked significance is the word »Paradise«, having its origin in the Avesta pairid(a)ēza. I have alluded to it above, but hardly cited it; it was entirely a post-exilic word.

Then there are also a throng of other purely Persian words in our Semitic Hebrew Scriptures, largely in Isaiah. I do not here of course allude to the Iranian elements in all the Persian names which would be naturally expected as of course. And if we cannot quite say that many of the best known foreign words in the Exilic Books of the Old Testament are of this language, yet we can assert that at least some sores of important terms are plainly such.

A particular Aside.

The Harps of Israel on the Willows, the Waters of Babylon, and the Lord's Song Unsung.

The associations of the Jewish Tribes with Babylon were naturally at first embittered, however much the feeling may have become modified with time, and the expression of it is vivid.

Psalm CXXXVII speaks nature, if ever any composition did; it is no patched up set of fragments, nor did it speak a sentiment confined to ideas; see its revolting close, which is at least of value as a sign of origin. The expression »they that carried us away captive required of us then a song« possesses especial weight, for it shows that the religion of these gifted people had attracted semi-popular attention as well as official notice

among their Babylonian masters; and if among these, then also among their new found Persian fellow-countrymen. And when they said »Sing us one of the songs of Zion«, the reported wish cannot have been a pure invention. Traces of derision indeed are to be seen in it, yet notice the point of its satire; it is aimed at their devotional fervour quite as much as at their reputation for lyrics. The sting went deep indeed, as we need little doubt; and it aroused a fury which passed the bounds of the better side of human nature, as the close is probably genuine ¹.

And will anyone with mental eyes refuse to see that the subtle Hebrews could *know* as well as *hate*. They *knew* indeed the enemies who *knew* them so well, and with a sagacity acute to the point of fiendishness.

The knowledge was reciprocal, and the vindictiveness itself would sharpen their infuriated wits. And if they knew the mass of the Babylonian tenets in their outline, the Iranian systems must also have come in their mighty force upon them, for reasons which do not need to be here repeated.

A Few Coincidences.

Then as to the signal Daniel passage, here indeed again, as a good ² authority points out, we may have a partial resurrection only in this Rising

¹ Cp. also the embittered tone of Isaiah: »Bel boweth down and Nebo stoopeth.«

² See Stave's very able and very useful »Einfluss des Parasismus« 1898, a scholar so impartial that he cites in approbation a great

from the Dust, the revivification of the martyred dead who had otherwise lost their expected »bodily» reward in this life; but in view of the completely Persian colouring of Daniel throughout, of course the imagery as it stands in its present form is Iranian, the idea which it clothes being possibly of independent origin; see elsewhere.

Forensic Judgment.

The forensic nature of the Judgment in this passage as well as in the Apocalypse surpasses that preserved to us in *Vendidad XIX*, *Yasna XLIII*, etc., but the legitimate expansions of the idea in the later Zoroastrianism afford distinctive detail, nowhere however approaching the magnificent rhetorical presentation in the last Book of the Bible.

(For Further Colour

see the Book of Esther, etc.)

Conclusion.

The name of Cyrus occurs in all the Exilic Books at least some fourteen times, each in a significant connection, often to point a public date. The name of Darius occurs some thirteen times, though doubtless referring to more than one sovereign of the name, as might be indeed possibly, though not probably, the case with Cyrus.

The name of Xerxes as Ahasuerus occurs some seven odd times.

The name of Artaxerxes about the same.

Writer from whom he elsewhere differs on his main question, and this upon what is among critics generally considered to be at his weakest work.

Were the names of the Jewish Kings themselves more often cited, that is to say, outside their immediate personal historical connections? The Jews of the Captivity knew the Persians of Babylonia as well perhaps as their descendants knew the Syrian Greeks, or better. Were they then influenced by them? while at the same time of course exerting influence. Even if the Babylonian Jews were as embittered against the Babylonian Persians as they were at first against the Babylonian natives, a mutual exchange of ideas would have been unavoidable, especially in view of the striking character of the Persian doctrine, so simple and so strong.

But the Jewish tribes were the grateful protégés of the Babylonian Persians¹. Nowhere within the covers of our Bibles, or of any other similar religious book is such language made use of in regard to any non-native Prince as that made use of in regard to Cyrus. The Achaemenid is actually called »the anointed of the Lord«, a very »Christ.« Darius is recognised as an almost equally important benefactor; and the request of Artaxerxes for their mediating prayers reflects the Jews' attitude toward him. The Persian colouring of the Bible is the more to be expected because the only leading Jews who lived later at Jerusalem were descendants to a man, almost, of those who for two generations at least had lived in Persian Babylon.

An enthusiasm for things Persian is distinctly

¹ They actually seem almost to accept (?) the Persian religious leadership in terms, see Isaiah XLIV—V.

presupposed in their enthusiasm for the Restorer; and the very first essentials of the Pharisaic-Christian Creed¹ were probably *helped on* by this emotional devotion. The Jews indeed could scarce endure the name of a foreign God, nor any avowed doctrinal item from a foreign source, being perhaps the most fiercely exclusive religionists whom the world had ever seen²; but in spite of all, they were fairly taken by storm by the Persian policy as by the Persian beliefs, so that the spirit of the Persian Faith at last brought the struggling »Life and Immortality« fully to its light toward the days of the Christian Advent.

If the above deductions be at all correct, it becomes more than ever obvious that such elements of similarity as exist between the Gāthas and any Occidental Philosophy are either due to parallel development, or, if to historical contact, they are then owing to the influence of Persian Babylon upon Judaea rather than of Greece or Jewish-Greece³ upon the Persians.

Parallel development has been however shown to have been strictly partial with an inferior percentage of incisive force. We are then left to the final conclusion that a pre-Gāthic, or an ex-Gāthic form of religious thought, which existed as the source or result of the Gāthas and their lost fellow-compositions »*helped on*« the momentous doctrinal

¹ For the Creed of Cyrus must have been closely cognate to that of his successors.

² ,i. e. of their type and standing.

³ in Egypt.

developments of the Jewish Exile and the Christian era already sufficiently described, if indeed this Gāthic or pre-Gāthic Lore did not actually *save the original tendencies of the Jews from perishing.*

• *What is then our Last Word?*

If our impressions after the above discussions present any definitive shape and point, surely they arise from a profound sense of the doctrinal importance of that singular Lore which is obviously, all things considered, unique in the religious history of the human race. We may indeed not be personally, all of us, in entire sympathy with these tendencies, even taken together with their final results, actually ourselves preferring perhaps the previous simplicity of the Ancient Jewish Sheol and the like.

But such a personal preference in no way touches our view of the very great scientific and literary importance of the existence of these pronounced elements in the original Zoroastrian Creed.

We might indeed, if we were advanced reformers in a particular ¹ direction even make use legitimately of the fact of the Persian character of certain tenets that we may not altogether approve, or of a conceded Persian influence upon their development.

But none the less we revert to the astounding circumstance that our Eschatological system was anticipated in a wonderful manner in early centuries before the Christian era; and this evolution of ideas still kept compact even while it was unfolding, re-

¹ , a negative tendency.

maining also at the same time wonderfully profound, clear and far reaching. It was further beyond all question thoroughly well-meant, and a system necessary and predestined to be some day expressed as inevitable in the course of the history of human religious ideas. And it found its spokesman, whether he were absolutely original or not, in the epoch-making doctrines of one of the greatest and purest ¹ men that have ever been afforded us as a boon upon the earth. Well may Iran be legitimately proud of a name which has been world-wide in its just renown for very many generations, and as revered as it was extended ².

¹ Judging always from his Hymns and by the deep sentiment pervading them.

² Zarathushtra Spitama, the Son of Pourushasp, Prophet of an Ancient Iranian Tribe, is at once akin in a sense to the Vedic world, and at the same time he is its superior, a Soul unique in history.



The Gâthas

of

Zarathushtra (Zoroaster)

in metre and rhythm,

being

second edition

of the

metrical versions in the author's edition of 1892—94

to which is added

a second edition (now in English) of the author's Latin version also of 1892—94, in the Five Zarathushtrian Gâthas, which was subventioned by His Lordship, the Secretary of State for India in Council, and also by the Trustees of the Sir J. Jejeebhoy Translation Fund of Bombay, and is now practically disposed of; (see also the literary translation in the Sacred Books of the East, XXX, pp. 1—393 (1887), itself founded by especial request upon the limited edition of 1883)

by

Lawrence H. Mills, D.D., Hon. M. A.,
Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford.

[All rights reserved].

to be had of

F. A. BROCKHAUS, LEIPZIG.

1900.

The Vision of Haoma to Zarathuštra.

Trl. At the havanī ratu ¹ ** Imperfect proofsheets.
Haoma came to Zarathuštra
while (ritually) cleansing ²
[about] the (sacred) Fire
and intoning the Gāthas ³.

¹ The hāvanī-ratu (prayer-time) was from six to ten A. M.

² He was not merely removing soil, but engaged in initial sacrificial work.

³ For the free critical rendering see SBE. XXXI, pp. 230—235 (1887), which I still regard as the best possible form for the general presentation of this Yasht, preserving, as it does, the rhythm.

Nēr.'s sansk. Text. [(Heading.) Hūmastūmasya [-stomasya] mūlam. Hūmasya muktījananeḥ sanmānakṛtaye kila, ānandakṛtaye, ārād'anāya namaskaraṇāya, mānanāya, prakāśanāya; pūrvoktivat jñātavyam.]

Yašt. *Hāvanāyāḥ gurutāyām ⁵ [kila, hāvanasand'yāyām] hūmaḥ upeyivān jaratūštraṁ [prāptavān] (2) agniṁ paritaḥ pāvayantaṁ, [kila, agni-
tānam parivartulaṁ snāpitum abīpsantaṁ] gāt'āśca samudgiraṅtaṁ [tat a-
sim vohūtrayaṁ bruvāṇaṁ yat p'rauarāṇe ⁵ prāk].**

** The various restorations of Burnouf and Spiegel are mostly good. The Mss. show débris. It would be mere affectation to report the irrational variants here.

[**Nēr.'s Introduction Trl.** The beginning of the Hūma-praise-song (Yašt). To the honouring^{1*}, that is to say, for the rejoicing, for the sacrificing-to, for the homage-making-worship, for the venerating-consideration¹, for the celebrating praise of Hūma the holy (lit. free-*of-birth)², etc. to be understood as aforesaid (i. e. as above)³.]

Nēr.'s Yašt. trl. In the ratu ⁴ of Hāvanā, [that is to say, in the time of the Hāvanā] Hūma came* toward Jaratūš'tra* [came up to him], cleaning around the fire, [that is to say, wishing to wash around the fire-place], and chanting the Gāthas, [and (also) saying that three-fold ašim vohū which is ⁵ before ⁵ the p'rauarāṇe ⁵].

¹ Namaskaraṇa. corresponding to nīyāyeṣṇ, gave us our accepted rendering for *namaskaraṇa* as *'praise'; mānanā should correspond to śnāyēntarī and xšnaoθra. Prakāśana represents a frāz afriganh in the sense of 'celebrating praise' as in frasastayaēśca.

² 'Free' seems peculiar to Nēr.'s kind of Sanskrit. He uses muktātman for aharūv'.

³ Referring to previous occurrences in the Yasna.

⁴ Gurutā is used by Nēr. apparently to imitate a leading definition of ratu; but, as the gloss shows, he means a ritualistic division of time.

⁵ My instinct would be to regard 'p'rauarāṇe (so J.*)' prāk as a quasi-compositum; but see the note upon the Pāhl.

Parsi-pers. text. translit. Pah hāvanī ratih pah hāvan gāh hōm avar rāft (ān) zartušt (2) pah ātās [gāh] pirāmūn ya xšnīpāw-u-pāw-yād-¹ mi-kard [] kiš ān i ašem vehī (sic) i III (si) guft mūn (sic for kih) frarūni (sic for fravarānē) pah pēš

¹ 'Attending to' the cleaning?; yād however may not have been meant; yet what could hād (or—?) mean here?

A study of the
Five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian)
Gâthâs,

with

text, translations, etc.

(being the first attempt as yet ever made to treat the subject with full
exhaustion of materials),

i. e. with the

Pahlavi translation for the first time edited with collation of manuscripts,
and now prepared from all the known codices, also deciphered, and
for the first time translated in its entirety into a European language,

with

Neryosangh's Sanskrit text edited with the collation of five MSS.,
and with a first translation,

also

with the Persian text contained in Codex 12^b of the Munich Collection
edited, transliterated, corrected and collated

together with

a commentary, and dictionary,

being the enlarged literary apparatus and argument to the translation of the
Gâthâs in the XXXIst volume of the Sacred Books of the East,

by

Lawrence H. Mills, D.D., Hon. M. A.,
Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford.

VOL III, DICTIONARY

(PARTS I—III, YASNA XXVIII—XXXIV, XLIII—LI, LIII, COMM.)

Published with a subvention from the Secretary of State for India in Council (of Her
Britannic Majesty's Government), and also with that of the Trustees of the Sir
J. Jejeebhoy Translation Fund of Bombay.

All rights reserved.

F. A. BROCKHAUS, LEIPZIG.

1892—94.

the pure *and* religious *one* [to the disciple, that is, let it be to me no decease]. *This* text is to be repeated twice, etc. (NB. Notice is again given to the student that the translations of the Pahl. and Ner. are throughout rather expositions than translations, as final translations of either in the ordinary sense are wholly misleading and therefore worse than useless; see Introd. pp. XIV-XVII, XXV).

Parsi-persian Ms. frit. Va niyâyishn ân shumâ, Gâsân i ashô! Nêk û kih ân i [] nêki har-kudâm, [kû, har-kudâm âdamî az nêki i û nêki * Hast hih êdûn gûyad; in nêki [] az [] Dîn [] i har kas [] nêki], * (b) [] pah kâmah pâdishâbî dehad Hormuzd^{*1}, [pah lâ'ik (?) i û] * (c) Kûshishn i tuvânihâ. [zûr [] kûvatihâ] ma-râ pah rasad^{*} (?) az Tû kâmah * (d) Ân i Şavâb dâshtan dehad [ân i [ma-râ = *âm*] pah [] Şavâb dâshtan bih dehad], [] ân man dehad Spendarmad * (e) Ân i rûzmand, i bandagî [] [shâgird = *âhâvishî*] [] [ân man] pah Bahman jân [dehad (sic) = *ân ra pavan Vohûmân adâ* (sic pro khayâ) *dâbâna(ê)d** (sic)], kûm [] [bâz^{*1}-(?) = *dûs**-(? *dûr**)] -jân nah bâshad * ^{*1}Ôr^o (?). (NB. *v* is used for *w* in this Gâthâ; see note on page 2, Parsi-p.)

Free tr. And to^{*1} this one that best of all things (^{*1} or 'for')
May that the glorious man bestow^{*2}, the glory; (^{*2} or 'obtain')
Reveal* Thou, Lord, to us with^{*1} Spirit bounteous (^{*1} or 'O spirit bounteous')
What truths by Right* Thou giv'st, and Good Mind's wisdom,
With life's rejoicing* increase and on every day.

Pahl. trl., etc. Thus also that which is of every kind the best, (b) the beatitude (not merely 'the welfare') is to be give to* (?) the beatified man [as a reward]; (c) do Thou therefore make manifest, [i. e. do Thou declare who the glorified (or 'beatified') man is (so in this erroneous gloss), for through Thee is his manifestation], O bountiful Spirit who *art*, (or Spirit of) Aûharmazd, [that is, Thou understandest who the glorious (or beatified) man is]; (d) and do Thou also make manifest what Ye* give (or 'he gives') as just (or 'aright') in accordance with (or 'as') a good mind's regulation, [i. e. the Religion] (e) during every day as the joyful-minded giving-on* of a long life.

Ner.'s sansk. text. Evam cha tasmai viçvebhya^{*1} utkrishâtârâya (b) çubhamate* narâya, çubham pradâtavyam, [prasâdah], (c) Tvam prakâçaya, [kila, Tvam brûhi yat çubhamân narah kah], Tvam mahattarah* adriçya-mûrtir*, Mahâjñânin, [kila, Tvam jânâsi yat çubhamân narah kah], (d) yo dadâti satyam uttamena pramânam manasâ [Dinim] (e) viçveshu vâsareshu dîrghajîvitatayâ** utsavasya dâtâ. ¹ So J.*, P. C.

Ner. transl. (a, b) And so to this man more excellent than all *and* beatified (or 'glorious(?)') happiness (or 'glory(?)') is to be given [the reward]; (c) do Thou therefore manifest, [that is, do Thou declare, who the beatified man is], Thou the greater[-est] Spirit, O Great Wise *One*, [i. e. *it is Thou who knowest who the beatified man is*], (d) who gives the true regulation

I.

The Anthem (beginning) with "Ustâ"

Free tr. Praise to you, the sacred Gâthâs!

Salvation to this one, to this one whomsoever,

Let the absolute Mazda give it, He Ahura; * imperfect proof-sheet.

Long-lasting strength be ours; of Thee I ask it.

For the upholding Right, this, Piety*, vouchsafe us,

Distinctions*, blest rewards, the Good Mind's life.

(Rhythm only is attempted, heavy syllables sometimes counting as two.)

shahîf. 7 DJ. ghal. 8 all tvaskhishnô, or tûkh°. 9 D. i. 10 ins. i. 11 D. om. 12 D. om. zak i; DJ. om. i. 13 corrected; DJ. râyê-h°. 14 D. om. i. 15 see P. 16 Zend. char. =°hya

Pahl. trl. 'Praise to you, O Holy Gâthâs. Happy* is that one for whomsoever (oblique by position) *is* that which *is* that happiness, [that is, for every man *there is* happiness from his happiness. Some say that this benefit is his from this Religion, even from the Religion with is the benefit of every single person (individually)]. (b) Aûharmazd also grants *it* to him according to the°sovereignty of *His* desire (or 'pavan-kâmak-shâltâtâh as compos. = He who exercises authority at will'), [*i. e.* according to his desire]; (c) and *He grants**¹ (P) the energy of the powerful *ones* (or 'energy which *consists** of* powerful characteristics*'), [the strength of (or 'which *is*') powerful *qualities*]; *they are* a desire to (*i. e. desired by*) me in their coming from thee. (d) That which *is* the giving of the possession (or 'maintenance') of Sanctity, [that which they shall give me as* a reward, the possession (or 'maintaining') of Sanctity], that may Spendarmad give me, (e) and that which is the glorious thing which *is* the venerating* (*recognition** (P)) [discipleship (?)], and life in accordance with a good mind, [that is, may no life-extinction be mine].

*¹ Or tûkhshishnô i t°. are governed by the force of kâmak = vas(e)mî; see the Gâthâ.

Ner.'s sansk. text. Namô yushmabhyam, he Gâthâh puṇyâtmanyah!¹ pratyuttaravâk* Hormijdasya; prakriṣṭâ vâk Jarathuṭrasya. 1 Sundarah sa yasya çubham kebhyaçchit*, [kila, kebhyaçchit* manushyebhyaç çubhât* yasya çubham. Asti kaçchit* evam brûte yat çubham Dinitah; Dinitah sarvasya kasyachit² çubham³? (b) Asya svechchayâ (so) râjyam Mahâjñânî dadâti Svamî, [samhitenâ 'sya], (c) adhyavasâyasya* balavatah* prâptau tava kâmât. (d) Yat* puṇyagrahanasya dânam tan mahyam dadâtu pṛithivî, [kila, yah prasâdah puṇyasaṅgraha diyate tam mahyam dadâtu Spindârmadâ] (e) çuddhimate bhaktimate* [çishyâya], uttamaṁ cha jivitaṁ Manaḥ* [Gvahnano* 'marah], [kila, me apajivitaṁ** mâ bhûyât]. Dvivâram vâchyo gujastah, etc.

¹ P. ² so J.³, J.⁴, J.* ³ C. adds to this at length. (Sandhi is only intermittingly applied and Sanskrit of every period is used with unusual application.)

Ner. transl., etc. Praise to you, O sacred Gâthâs. The answer of Hormijda;

A DICTIONARY

of the

GÂTHIC LANGUAGE

of the

Z E N D A V E S T A,

being

Vol. III

of a

Study of the Five Zarathushtrian Gâthas,

the Commentary, vol. II, completed in lexicographical form, with full grammatical details, as the sequel to the XXXIst Vol. of the Sacred Books of the East, pp. I—XLVII, 1—194

by

Lawrence H. Mills D.D., Hon. M.A.

Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford.

First issue " to ϣ (pp. 623—821.)

To be had of **F. A. Brockhaus** in Leipsic.

1902.

Semi-popular Notice.

“The Gīthas, or Hymns, of Zoroaster are by far the most precious relic which we possess of Oriental Religion, the Only sacred literature which in dignity, in profoundness, in purity of thought, and absolute freedom from unworthy conceptions of the divine could for a moment be compared with the Hebrew Scriptures.”

Critical Review Jan '96.

An explanation printed for Circulation among Friends

(This rectification seems to be most urgently called for, certain parties seeming not to have noticed it as printed elsewhere.)

In the *Revue Bleue* of Paris, Feb. 1895, and also in a document of public authority in that City, bearing the date of the year 1895, the following passage occurs in a necrology upon the late lamented Professor Darmesteter, with reference to his request to the Rev. Dr. Mills to take his place upon the Sacred Books of the East: ‘Darmesteter publiâ deux volumes de cette traduction anglaise: quand il fut arrivé au tome III, qui devait contenir le Yaçna, un érudit . . ., M. L. H. Mills, lui fit savoir qu’il s’occupait lui-même depuis longtemps d’une traduction de ce texte. Avec cet oubli de soi qui caractérise le vrai mérite, convaincu d’ailleurs que toute traduction du Yaçna pour laquelle on n’aurait pas de secours nouveaux serait nécessairement défectueuse, il céda à M. Mills l’honneur d’achever la publication.’

The impression naturally received from these remarks is the erroneous one, that the Rev. Dr. Mills in some way originated or suggested the idea that he should take upon himself the task of writing the translation of the Yasna for the Sacred Books of the East, in the place of Professor Darmesteter. As this is in direct contradiction to Dr. Mills’ statement in the Preface to the XXXIst vol. of the Sacred Books of the East, an extract from one of Professor Darmesteter’s business letters of the time is here appended, as it has been considered an “ample refutation of the unfair insinuations” of the *Revue Bleue* and of the other publication.

’5 Nov. (1883).

Cher Monsieur Mills.

. . . M. Max Müller m’a écrit pour me demander si j’avais l’intention de lui donner la suite de ma traduction du Zend-Avesta. Malheureusement cela m’est impossible, des occupations nouvelles me prenant tout mon temps. Je lui ai donc répondu que je ne pouvais, et je lui ai dit que vous étiez la personne la plus compétente pour me remplacer,

ayant fait votre étude personnelle depuis plus de huit ans de la partie essentielle du Yasna. Il me répond aujourd'hui :

“After what you say M. Mills would certainly seem your best successor. Would you kindly write to him -- you could so much better explain what is really wanted. It is very desirable that there should not be much delay.”

“ . . . Je crois que la chose serait bonne et pour la collection elle-même et pour vous ; pour la collection, parce qu'elle aurait la version des Gâthâs la plus au courant possible ; pour vous, parce que cela imposerait l'examen de vos vues à tous les savants et au public en général.’

[Professor Darmesteter here refers to the preliminary edition of proof-sheets of Dr. Mills' larger work, which had been for some time in his hands. It will be seen that he makes the translations which occur in it the basis of his request, and he wishes them to become the translations in the volume of the Sacred Books which he requests Dr. Mills to translate. He proceeds:]

‘Vous n'avez qu'à détacher de votre travail la traduction rythmique avec quelques notes explicatives et le mot à mot quand vous vous en écarterez trop. Cela vous prendrait infiniment peu de temps, puisque le travail est déjà fait. Vous n'aurez qu'à y joindre le reste du Yasna, . . . Réfléchissez bien sur le sujet, puis écrivez-moi votre détermination décisive : je crois que vous surmonterez vos scrupules et que vous direz oui. Je le désire du fond du cœur ; car, à défaut de vous, je ne vois pas qui pourrait faire la chose et la faire bien. . . . Dans l'espoir d'une réponse favorable,

‘Je suis,

‘Votre bien dévoué,

‘James Darmesteter.’

Some spontaneous remarks of distinguished critics.

„ . . . Das Ergebniss einer erstaunlichen Arbeit sehr mannigfaltiger Art . . . unser Verständniss der Gâthâs mächtig gefördert . . . “ — *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Mai 13, 1893. Professor F. Justi.

“Tous ceux qui s'occupent de l'interprétation des Gâthâs rendront hommage à l'immense labeur scientifique de M. Mills . . . son livre reste un instrument indispensable pour l'étude. . . . “ — Professor James Darmesteter, *Revue Critique*, 18 septembre, 1893.

“ . . . insbesondere von Mills,* der diese schwierigen Gedichte mit Beigabe des sämtlichen Interpretationsapparates der Ueberlieferung in gründlichster Weise behandelt hat . . . “

* Lawrence H. Mills, *A Study of the Five Zarathushtrian Gâthâs* 1894 . . . and the *Zend Avesta*, Part. III, the *Yasna*, &c., in the ‘*Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI, Oxford 1887. — Professor F. JUSTI in the 1897, *Preussisches Jahrbuch*, p. 68, *Sonderabdruck*.

Mills, Lawrence H., A Study of the Five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gâthâs with texts and translations, also with the Pahlavi translation . . . with Neryôsangh's Sanskrit Text . . . also with the Persian text . . . together with a commentary . . . 1894, pp. XXX, 622. 4°.

“ . . . Wer heute im Avestâ selbständig und mit Erfolg arbeiten will, muss sich die gesammte Tradition dienstbar machen. Das hat Mills in seinem Werke: ‘*A Study of the Five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gâthâs*’ an dem schwierigsten und dunkelsten Teile des Avestâ gethan. Er gibt erst den Text in Originalschrift, im ersten Teile bis p. 153 und im dritten Teile bei *Yasna* 51 u. 53 auch in lateinischer Umschrift; dann folgt eine wörtliche lateinische Uebersetzung, der Pahlavitext und dessen Uebersetzung, Neryôsanghs Text in Umschrift und Uebersetzung, der Text einer modernen Parsi-Uebersetzung des Pahlavitextes in Umschrift und eine freie englische Uebersetzung des Grundtextes. Der vierte Teil p. 339 bis 622 enthält einen ausführlichen Commentar, der als Erläuterung dienen soll zu der Uebersetzung der Gâthâs, die Mills in den *Sacred Books of the East* Vol. XXXI gegeben hat. Theil 1 und 4 waren schon 1892 ausgegeben worden.

“Mills’ Werk, das Ergebniss langjähriger, mühe- und entsagungsvoller Arbeit, vereinigt bis auf ein Wörterbuch, das in Aussicht gestellt wird, alles, was für die Erklärung der Gâthâs nothwendig ist. Man mag im einzelnen noch so viel abweichen, immer wird es die Grundlage bilden, auf der sich jede weitere Forschung aufbauen muss. Mills hat mit ihm der Avestaforschung einen hervorragenden Dienst geleistet, und es gebührt ihm dafür der wärmste Dank und die vollste Anerkennung.

“Halle (Saale).

R. Fischel.”

(*Zeitschrift der D. M. G. July, 1896.*)

L. Mills, *The Five Zoroastrian Gâthâs with the Zend, Pahlavi, Sanskrit, and Persian Texts and Translations*. Leipzig 1892—94. This work affords to every Avesta-scholar complete materials for the Study of the Gâthâs. *Bombay Iranian Catalogue*. Prof. Wilhelm 1901.

The edition of the book is nearly exhausted. Jan. 1902.

The author is occupied with a (possible) new edition of S.B.E. XXXI.

itâ; pers. nah-khvâstar, and nâ-khvâstar; ep. for form ind. anehâs.

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 28, 9; 32, 15; 53, 8,

instr. pl. m., nt. of 𐭠𐭣𐭥 (which see) through these, illis, adverbially used; (trad. curiously errs; see the texts).

—𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, hostile; or nt., hosti-

lity, displicentia; n. du. masc. (returning for form to Justi), or inst. s. nt. (?)

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 44, 15; ep. ind.

ókas + a priv.; rt. uc; ep. uzor; goth. bi-úhts*, etc. [The pahl.

trlr. is here in error or confused; see comm.].

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, other, alius (atque);

n. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, y. 29, 1;

50, 1; 53, 5 (pahl. zakâi min)

n. s. m. (so rd.) 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 53, 4, DJ(J.²)

acc. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, i. e. *𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥

acc. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, that is 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥,

y. 53, 5 (𐭠𐭣* = pahl. 𐭠𐭣 = (𐭠𐭣)𐭠𐭣

(𐭠𐭣 with inherent vowel))

(acc. s. m. *𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, lat. av.)

acc. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, y. 34, 7;

(one Ms. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥), y. 34, 7.

inst. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, lat. av.

dat. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

gen. s. m. **𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 (sic) ,

gen. s. m. **𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 (as deciphered

(see p. 1) 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, not 'ainyehē?);

n. dual m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥, lat. av.

n. pl. m. (?) 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥(?) " "

n. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥(?) " "

n. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

n. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. m. (?) **1 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 = (**1)𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 44, 11;

45, 11 (pahl. zakâi min)

(acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, later av.)

inst. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, later av.

dat., abl. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

pl. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

gen. pl. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

g. pl. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. s. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

nom. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

nom. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

n. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

n. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

g. pl. f. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 * (sic?) "

" " 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 * (sic?) "

(gen. pl. f. ** (?) 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 (sic) , "

n. acc. s. nt. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 " "

n. s. nt. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 or * 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 (J..)

n., acc. s. nt. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, lat. av.;
 n., acc. pl. nt. (𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠-𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠), lat. av.
 inst. pl. nt. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, later av.;
 ep. *anyá*, old pers. *aniya*. [Is a for-
 mation from 𐭠𐭣𐭠 + 𐭠𐭣𐭠 probable?;
 a connection of 𐭠𐭣𐭠 with *alius* seems
 difficult; ep. armen. *ayl*, etc.; see
 the usual occurrences cited; but ep.(?)
ollus for *on-lus*, *-ólus*(?) from an orig.
 **ono*, which is also set(?) for *ana*,
 𐭠𐭣𐭠(?)] ; the pahl. trlr. led with *zakâi* ;
 Ner. *anya-*; pers. *dîgar*. **1 𐭠𐭣𐭠 as
 orig. pahl.-av. = z. 𐭠𐭣𐭠, lost nasalisation.

𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, 'otherwise', aliter,
 y. 51, 10; pahl. *zakâi-khadûinak* ;
 pers. *dîgar âyin*. (notice the total
 difference of Ner.'s sk. from the
 pahl. here, he having read a pahl.
zak instead of *zakâi*) ; see 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 ;
 cp. ind. *anyáthâ*.

(𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠), among, between, inter
 (as separating; ep. *inter-dico*) ; see
 𐭠𐭣𐭠 and 𐭠𐭣𐭠 ; y. 33, 7 ; 49, 3 (𐭠𐭣𐭠) ;
 51, 1 (𐭠𐭣𐭠), pahl. *andarg* ; Ner. *madhye*,
 y. 33, 7 ; *antarâle*, y. 49, 3 ; 51, 1 ;
 (𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠) is first expl'd at y. 49, 3
 by *min ... javîdâk ; vibkinno bhavâmi*
 (a by no means obvious distinction of
 the highest importance followed by
 all critical writers) ; cp. ind. *antâr*,
 old pers. *antâr*, 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 ; *intró(d)* ; old
 irish *eter*, *etir* (W.), (lost nasalisation
 of *e*), etc.

𐭠𐭣𐭠, read 𐭠𐭣𐭠, gain, attain, at-
 tingere, stem 𐭠𐭣𐭠 for 𐭠𐭣𐭠 ;

3d s. conj. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, l. av.
 1st pl. opt. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "
 1st pl. opt. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

stem 𐭠𐭣𐭠 -

3d pl. indic. med. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, l. av.
 (so already Fick) ; 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 causative
 stem.

1st s. indic. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, l. av.
 (so)

3d s. indic. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "
 3d s. indic. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠³²,
 11.

3d pl. ind. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, l. av.

3d s. pret. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠-𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

2d s. imperv. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

2d s. imperv act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠-𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

2d s. imperv. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠-𐭠𐭣𐭠 " 𐭠𐭣𐭠
 act.

2d s. imperv. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠-𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

1st s. conj. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

(1st s. conj. act. (?) **1 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " ")

3d sg. conj. act. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

(med. forms in variants)

part. perf. med. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 " "

n. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, y. 33, 5

part. causative prest.

-𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠, l. av.

g. s. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠

(= 𐭠𐭣𐭠𐭣𐭠 - irreg.

transfer to an *a* declens.); cp. ind. *âp*, *âpiré*; lat. *apio*, *apiscor*, *adipiscor*.

ପ୍ର, ପ୍ର, f. water, aqua;

- n. s. ପ୍ର, later av.
 - acc. s. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - acc. s. ପ୍ର " "
 - inst. s. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - abl. s. ଅପ୍ର, trsf. to *a* decl.
 - abl. s. ଅପ୍ର, later av.
 - g. s. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - g. s. ପ୍ର " "
 - g. s. ପ୍ର " "
 - loc. s. (?) *ଅପ୍ର " "
 - loc. s. ଅପ୍ର (*a* is a postposition)
 - [loc. s. *(?) ଅପ୍ର, if to ପ୍ର, ପ୍ର then (?) to an *a* decl., ଅପ୍ର-=(?) ଅପ୍ର - (?), or possibly adv. to an ଅପ୍ର, transf., read ଅପ୍ର* (?)]
 - dual in (?) comp. -ଅପ୍ର, later av.
 - (dual (?) var. -ଅପ୍ର " ")
 - n. pl. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - n., voc. pl. ପ୍ର " "
 - acc. pl. ଅପ୍ର, y. 51, 7.
 - acc. pl. ପ୍ର, y. 44, 4.
 - dat., abl. pl. *ଅପ୍ର (mistranslit.)
 - gen. pl. ଅପ୍ର, lat. av.
 - gen. pl. ଅପ୍ର " "
- ; pahl. *mayâ*; Ner. *âpo*; pers. *âv*; cp. ind. (*âp*), *apã*, *apás*, etc., *ὄπός*; lith. *ùpé* (?), etc.

ଅପ୍ର, y. 32, 11; see ପ୍ର (or possibly ଅପ୍ର)? As from ପ୍ର = ଅପ୍ର, 3d s. caus. act. 'takes away', aufert; cp. *âpáyati* [or preferring the root ଅପ୍ର], we must accept a loss of *ya* as in ଅପ୍ର for ଅପ୍ର (?) and cp. ind. *adhyâpayati* (?) and *pratyâyayati* (Wh.), rendering 'causes to go away', i. e. 'takes away', the pahl. seeming to favour this root ଅ with *vazlünd*; as a free rendering however the pahl. may still point to ଅପ୍ର causative of ପ୍ର, ପ୍ର].

- ଅପ୍ର, alien, later, alienus;
 - acc. s. nt. ଅପ୍ର, y. 31, 20 (adverbially).
 - ଅପ୍ର, lat. av.
 - abl. s. nt. ଅପ୍ର (read ଅପ୍ର-)
 - g. s. nt. ଅପ୍ର (=ଅପ୍ର-; ଅ is = ଅ + ଅ; see introd.)
 - n. pl. m. ଅପ୍ର, later av.
 - n. pl. m. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - gen. s. fem. ଅପ୍ର " "
 - acc. pl. f. ଅପ୍ର " "
- The pahl. trlr. led with *min akhar*; Ner. *paçcât*; pers. *az pas*; cp. ind. *âpara*, *aparâm**; formation ଅ + ଅ (ଅ inferior compar. suff.); cp. z. ଅ from ଅ, ind. *âdhara*, *âvara* from *âva*; cp. z. ଅ, ind. *ûpara* from *ûpa*; z. ଅ, ind. *ântara* from *ânta*, etc.; cp. *ἀπώτερον*; cp. goth. *afar*, *aftra*, ohg. *afstarô*; see for further etym. ଅ.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, alien man,
homo alienus; acc. pl. m. ॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 45, 11, homines
alienos; pahl. akhar (?) anshûtâân; Ner.
paçcât (?) manushyânâm; pers. pas (?)
âdamyân; ep. for formation ॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, aparânta (= 'living beyond
the (western) border'); for etym. see
ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, ॐॐॐॐॐॐ.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 51, 7; acc. pl. f.
of ॐॐ (= water), which see.

ॐॐॐॐ (l. av. ॐॐॐॐ), away, from; cp.
ind. *âpa*; *ἄπο**; lat. *ap* in *ap-erio*, *ab*,
abs; goth. *af*; germ. *ab*; engl. off.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 33, 5; see ॐॐ, ॐॐ;
n. s. m. part. perf. med., adeptus; cp.
ind. *âpânâm*, *âpânâsas*; RV. II, 34, 7,
tâm no dâta maruto vâjînam râtha
âpândm brâhma citâyad divé-dive;
pahl. *barâ'm ayâfînâi as = ॐॐ + ॐॐ*
imperv., erron., but so first indicating
the root; Ner. *avâpaya*; pers. (N.B.)
diff. text; *bih am bâyad** = pahl.
shâyad (?); cp. RV. IX, 10, 5, *âpânâso*
vivâsvato jânanta ushâso bhâgam sûrâ
âpvam vî tanvate.

ॐॐॐॐॐ, last, ultimus; superl.
formation from ॐॐॐॐ;

n., a. s. nt. ॐॐॐॐॐ (so), lat. av.

n. s. nt. ॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 53, 7 (per-
haps adverb.).

a.s.nt.(adv.) ॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 30, 4; 45, 3;
48, 4; 51, 14.

loc. s. m. ॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 43, 5; 51, 6.

n. s. fem. ॐॐॐॐॐ, y. 44, 19.

The pahl. trlr. led in recognising the
adv. form, *vad val zak î afdûm*;
Ner. *yâvat nirvânâm*; pers. *ân ân î*
akhar, y. 30, 4; so *vad avô zak î*
afdûm, y. 45, 3; so Ner. in y. 48, 4
nirvâne; so in y. 51, 14, *vad avô*
zak î afdûm; see the texts at the
places; superl. from ॐॐॐॐ; cp. ind.
apamâ, so *adhamâ* from *âdha* (as =
adhâs), *avamâ* from *âva*, *upamâ* from
ûpa, *paramâ* from *pâra*.

ॐॐॐॐ (l. av. ॐॐॐॐ), upon, about,
after; y. 30, 11; 31, 17; 32, 3, 8,
15; 48, 5; cp. old pers. *apiy*; ind.
âpi; *ἔπι*, *ἐπι*.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, thereto, thereafter,
postea, abhinc, y. 29, 4; ॐॐॐॐ +
*ॐॐ + ॐॐ which see; cp. sk. *âpi ca*;
the pahl. trlr. first explained by
akhar, followed by all (except Haug,
who erred just here). * cp. ॐॐ.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ, was known, or
announced, y. 44, 18; 3d s. pass.
aor. of ॐॐॐ (which see).

ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐ, m. offspring (?),
progenies?; acc. s. ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐ
y. 48, 5; posterity, [or (whether a
compos. or not) 'since birth'(?); see
ॐॐॐॐ]; so pahl. *akhar min zerkhû-*
nishnô; Ner. *paçcât yat jâtânâm*;
pers. *pas az zadan*; cp. for form

only *apiprāñī*, 'accompanying every breath'.

٤٤٥ () + ٤٤٤ which see); y. 32, 9 'away from';) is the particle of emphasis; cp. ind. *āpa + ū = āpo*; cp. (to illustrate the infrequent use) RV. II, 28, 6, *āpo sū myaksha varuṇa bhīyāsam māt sāmraṭ r'āvō 'nu mā gṛbhāya*; RV. V, 48, 2, *āpo āpācīr āpārā dpejate prā pūr-vābhīḥ tirate devayūr jānaḥ*; RV. X, 88, 12, *ā yās tatāno 'shāso vibhātīr āpo ūrṇoti tāno arcīshā yān*; so the pahl. *barā*; Ner. *adhikam*; pers. *bih*.

٤٤٥, y. 44, 4, acc. pl. f. of ٤٤٤, 'water', which see.

٤٤٥, without a superior, having no first, nullum-primum-habens; acc. sing. nt. adverbial (or masc. with ٤٤٥) = y. 28, 3; or ٤٤٥ (which see) + ٤٤٤ priv.; cp. ind. *āpūrvyam*; the pahl. has *fratūm*, prob. reading ٤٤٥; Ner. *prathamasya*; pers. *avval*.

٤٤٥, to, against, ad; y. 31, 13; 43, 3, 7; 46, 11, 12; 51, 9, 19; cp. ind. *abhī*; ob; *operio*; goth. *bi* (?), etc.

٤٤٥ (? see ٤٤٥) ٤٤٥-; pp. of ٤٤٥, viewed, seen, nom. pl. nt. (?) ٤٤٥, y. 31, 2; 50, 5; pahl. y. 31, 2 *madam-nikēzishnīh*; Ner. *upari pra-*

pādānam; pers. *avar** *nigarishnī*; y. 50, 5 (*afam*) *madam-nikēzīd*; cp. ind. *dr̥sh̥tā*, pp. of *darç*, *drç*.

[٤٤٥] ٤٤٥, f. (? loc. s. - ٤٤٥) ٤٤٥, y. 31, 2 'in view', in-
conspetu (so altern.). The pahl. trlr. seems at y. 31, 2 at first sight to offer a loc., but it is a compos.; the loc. was therefore first suggested by Roth; cp. ind. *dr̥sh̥tī*.

٤٤٥, most furthering, maxime sustinens; superl. of ٤٤٥ ٤٤٥-; acc. s. nt. ٤٤٥

y. 51, 1, maxime sustinens, prosperans; pahl. *madam barishnīh*; but Ner. *upari varshāmi*. Note the difference and judge of the error committed in holding Ner.'s trl. to be a reproduction of the pahl. pure and simple; some false reading such as *bār-* made him think of *bārīdān*, 'to rain' [in, however, the figurative (?) sense; cp. RV. VIII, 50 (Müller, Auf.

61), 7, (Indra) *ūd vāvṛshasva maghavan gāvishṭaya ūd indrā 'çvamishṭaye*; Sāyana: *he maghavan gavisṭaye gā icchate mahyam ud vāvṛshasva, utsīn* casva gām* (*), *iti çeshah* (?); but Ludwig 'giesz dich ausz, o M.'; so Roth; cp. RV. IV, 20, 7, *ud vāvṛshānās tavishī 'va ugrā 'smābhyam daddhi puruhūta rāyāḥ*; Sāy.: *ud vāvṛshāno 'bhīshṭān kāmān varshakas tvam rāyāḥ paçvādidhanāny asma-*

bhyaṃ stotr̥bhya daddhi, dehi; RV. V, 58, 14, *vr̥sh̥t̥vī çām yōr āpa usri bheshajām syūma marutaḥ sahā*; pers. *avare-barishn* (not misled by Ner.); cp ind. *bhāra*, booty-bringing: see *अशुभ*.

अशुभ, steadfast characteristic, n. pl. nt. *अशुभ*, y. 33, 13, res-, vel indoles-, sine-dubio; the pahl. affording only the general sense, *pavan patākīh* (= 'with', or 'as to', capability); Ner. *çaktyā*; pers. *pah turāndāi**; perhaps *अशुभ* = 'two' + *अशुभ* = 'full'; i. e. dubious, undecided, and this with the *a* priv. would be 'decided', 'not dubious', i. e. 'implanted characteristic'; cp. *ādavyas*; and for form cp. *prā*, as in *jarāṇi-prās, ratha-prā-*; *πλη-*, impleo; goth. *full-s*, etc.

अशुभ (so correcting-*अशुभ**(?)), y. 53, 5, see *अशुभ* and *अशुभ* (?); as from *अशुभ* + *अशुभ*, 2d pl. improp. conj.; cp. form of impf.** *āsta* + *abhi* = 'gain ye', 'nitemini'; or refer the word to *अशुभ*; cp.** *abhiyatta*, 2d pl. of *yat*(?) athem.; cp.* *yākshi* to *yaj** beside *yājati*, or as past p., cp. *yatta* = z. *अशुभ*. Reading *अशुभ**, 'and with these', we have hisque, fem.; 'and with these religious natures (or 'precepts')'; the pahl. seems to have read *अशुभ...अशुभ*;

see *pavan kōlā* II (*dō*); Ner. *ubayor*, -s, (-*h*); pers. *pah har dā*;

[Stating other possibilities, consider the reading *अशुभ* as 2d pl. imperv. from the root of *अशुभ*,

अशुभ, cp. ind. *yas*, but athem.; from *yah* = 'be ye zealous' (hardly a voc. of a past part. 'O honoured ones' (? to *अशुभ*)).]

अशुभ, not seeking wealth in herds, not thrifty, minime incrementum afferens; minime-diligens;

n. pl. m. *अशुभ*, y. 49, 4; from *अशुभ* (which see) + *अशुभ* priv.; cp. for form ind. *gavyānt, pitūy-, stabhūy-, vasūy-*; pahl. *afshuvinishnō**; notice the total difference of Ner. with *avināçanam*; see comm.; the pahl. is made certain as above deciphered by the pers. *nah-afzānī-kunandah*, so also indeed by the gātha-text.

अशुभ, for sacrificial use, metrical, loc. sg. (acc. pl. ?) *अशुभ*, y. 46, 17; Justi comp. *āpsas*; RV. IX, 88, 7 *āpo nā makshū sumatīr bhavā nah sahāsrāpsāḥ pṛtanāshāṇ nā yajñāḥ*; Sāyana has: *apsa iti rūpanāma bahurūpastvaṃ pṛtanāshāt pṛtanānām abhi bhavite 'ndra* iva yajñō yashṭavyo, bhavasi'ti* (so the 2d edit.; Ludw. however does not follow Sāy. with Roth and Grassm.)

'die'; cp. ἀμβροσία* (?); pahl. amerô-dâd; Ner. amirdâde; pers. amerdâd.

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥, not-dying, immortalis;

acc. s. m. 𐭥𐭥𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥, lat. av.

g. s. m., nt. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥

n. pl. m. **𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 introd. to y. 28

(so perhaps 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, as if in comp.)

n. pl. m. 𐭥𐭥𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, lat. av.

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, l. a.

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

acc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 = 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

dat., abl. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥

dat., abl. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥

gen. pl. 𐭥𐭥𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, lat. av.

voc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

voc. pl. m. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 " "

n. acc. sg. nt. 𐭥𐭥𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥; from 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥

plus 𐭠 priv. [𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 = -𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥] often

in an accented syll. bef. 𐭠𐭣, (and 𐭠𐭣

= rt, as in 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, cp. mârtya);

cp. 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 = pîtana, yet see

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥* (?), cp. mârtya-

krta (?), 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 = rtâ, 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 =

prthû, also 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, cp. kîtoan,

*𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, cp. -krti, *𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥(𐭠*)𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥*

cp. ākrti]; cp. ἀμβροσίος (?), etc.; the pahl. trlr. naturally led the way in recognising the connections of this and the preceding word.

-𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥(?-𐭥), going(?), coming, iens(?), veniens; pt. pres. of the stem 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥 of 𐭠 (𐭠𐭣, which see)

acc. s. m. 𐭥𐭥𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 46, 5, venientem (?); pahl. yâtânêdö; Ner. samâ-gamanah; pers. amâd and âyad; cp. âyati of ind. i, aya (+ â (?)).

𐭥𐭥𐭥 (= 𐭥𐭥𐭥, or 𐭥𐭥𐭥) formerly deciphered aêm; but the ê sound is totally absent); y. 29, 8, this, hic. [𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥 g. du. (placed here for convenience), y. 30, 3 emended on account of the metre to 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥, but an ancient form is of course possible. So the pahl. trlr. first explained as to base and case with min valmanshân; Ner. etayos ca; not so the parsi-pers. Ms. which read mûn for min.]

𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 44, 12, n. s. m., hic; see 𐭠, 𐭠.

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥, y. 34, 6; 46, 1; 50, 9;

1st s. imperv. conj. act. of 𐭠, 𐭠𐭣; I will go; ibo; the pahl. trlr. first recognised the root and 1st pers. sg. with sâtûnam; Ner. pracarâmi; pers ravan (y. 46, 1); cp. an ind. âyâni