

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel.¹

BY THE REV. CANON T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., OXFORD.

PART I.

TIMES have changed since the only use that could be made of a Zoroastrian Scripture was to hang it up by an iron chain among the foreign curiosities of the Bodleian Library. Had I the pen of Dean Swift I might amuse the reader by some sarcastic sentences on the indifference of old Oxford to the treasure which it possessed. This, however, would be unfair, as a moment's consideration will show. We need not disparage the achievements of the chivalrous Anquetil-Duperron, whose claims on the respect of the present rulers of India seem hardly inferior to those of another great Frenchman, the gifted, but unfortunate, Dupleix. But we must not forget that it was an Oxford professor, Hyde, who first urged the importance of searching for the sacred books of Zoroastrianism, and a Scotchman named Fraser who made the first unsuccessful attempt to obtain instruction from the Parsees in the contents of those Scriptures. And if it was the enterprising young Frenchman who published the first version, necessarily altogether inadequate, of the Avesta, our own University has from the year 1880 onwards been publishing accurate, though doubtless improvable, translations of the Zend and Pahlavi records of the Zoroastrian religion. The door of the treasure-house has now been fully opened, and opened by Oxford herself. A French, an English, and an American scholar have divided the work of translation; but the plan is an Oxford plan, and the publication is through the Oxford press.

To Dr. Mills in particular our thanks are due for reminding us, both by the spoken and the written word, of the importance of the Avesta to critical students of the Bible. Nor must we forget his two eminent predecessors. It was Archdeacon

¹ This article forms the chief part of a public lecture delivered in the University of Oxford in March 1891. Like its sequel, it supports the historical and exegetical views advocated in the author's *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co.).

Hardwick who first called attention to this subject in his *Christ and other Masters*, a good early specimen of the Cambridge school of theology. Professor Max Müller renewed this appeal in his well-known *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, and it is no slight sign of progress that those ancient Zoroastrian hymns, called collectively the Gâthâs, of the interpretation of which this careful teacher eighteen years ago spoke so doubtfully, is now sufficiently well understood to be used for historical purposes. Such uncertainty as there is relates only to the details of translation, not to the general purport of most of the hymns. I make this statement, not only on the authority of the Oxford editor of the Gâthic hymns, but of eminent younger German Zend scholars, such as Geldner and Hübschmann. But let the reader examine the different versions himself, having first gained some general knowledge of the subject, and judge. And after reading the Gâthâs, let him pass on to the "later Avesta," and in due time to the texts which in their present form are the latest of all, translated by Dr. West from the Pahlavi. My readers are probably not themselves Pahlavi or Zend scholars; neither am I. Neither is Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye, whose sketch of the religion of Ahura Mazda, in a work which is now being translated, is the best which we at present possess.² It is not Zend studies which we aspire to promote, but the better comprehension of Jewish antiquity by the help of the results of Zend scholarship. There is doubtless much work to be done both in the criticism of the Zoroastrian and in that of the biblical and the allied literature before the last word can be said on the subject of these lectures. But we have at any rate, even in Zend studies, got sufficiently beyond the pioneering stage to begin the historical inquiries to which I invite you.

² See his *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Band I., 1888; Band II., 1889.

In which direction, then, shall we bend our steps? Shall it be to that battle-ground of historical critics—the early chapters of Genesis, or the less dangerous, though perhaps less interesting, field of Jewish angelology? In both these departments satisfactory results may be obtained, and in the latter sufficiently positive ones to serve in part as the basis of a historical construction. The subject of angelology, however, does not attract me to-day. Partly because it has been treated with great thoroughness by a distinguished Rabbi, Dr. Alexander Kohut, and I should not like to incur the imputation of captiousness by criticising some of his results in a public lecture. Partly, too, because the subject does not appear to me to have pressing importance. It is not the religion of the Bible but that of the Korán which makes the doctrine of angels a fundamental one, and though “He shall give His angels charge over thee” may be no mere form of words to a modern Christian, yet such a one may feel but a languid interest in the details of Jewish angelology. The later Avesta ventured on a dangerous path when it consecrated for worshippers of Mazda an elaborate and even superstitious doctrine of spirits, and I would not occupy your precious minutes with tracing its injurious influence upon Israel’s religion. No; it is a harder because a less familiar subject by which at present I feel myself attracted, viz. the growth among the Jews of a spiritual doctrine of the future life, which may, as I hope, be elucidated by the help of Zoroastrianism. Such a doctrine appears full-blown in the Christian and in some of the later Jewish teaching, but it is evident that it must have passed through more than one earlier stage. It is these earlier stages of which I am in search in the present lectures.

Let no one presume to say that inquiries of this kind are irreverent. To quote from a learned Israelite, “It is anything but the right sort of reverence, when we would rather have unknown or misunderstood a region of literature which we all love and venerate, and to which we owe most of our moral and religious ideals, than trace its elements and analyse their psychological and literary history, so as to understand the object of our love.”¹ It would not be irreverent to maintain that even such important conceptions as the resurrection and the spiritual vision of God were alto-

¹ Goldziher, *Hebrew Mythology*.

gether borrowed by the Jews, the one from Iranian religion, the other from a Hellenistic religious philosophy, but it would certainly be fraught with serious consequences for Christian theology. Let us boldly face these consequences if we must, but, so far as I can see, the critical study of ancient religions by no means enforces a complete revolution in the received Christian view of revelation. To me the religion of Israel appears not a thing of shreds and patches, but a tree which has grown in proportion to the wants of the Church-nation. Those two sublime conceptions of which I spoke were not borrowed from without, in the manner of an eclectic and syncretistic philosophy. Both Babylon and Persia may, under God, have helped forward their growth, but they existed potentially among the Israelites in germs which had, to a certain extent, an inherent power of development. The hypothesis of borrowed beliefs is an easy but not always a very critical one, and it appears to me in cases like the present to be inconsistent with the policy of Israel’s church-leaders, who felt that the originality of their own religion would be endangered by too large an admixture of elements of foreign origin. They may, I admit, have given way on matters of secondary importance (such as the number, character, and work of the denizens of the spirit-world), and I grant further that in the long-run even these concessions may have proved injurious, but on matters of vital concern they stood firm, and refused foreign innovations. And if even in these they allowed themselves to be influenced from without, it was only because, reflecting on their moral experience and on the bearings of their fundamental beliefs, they felt a natural attraction towards those who had outrun them on the same line of thought. The influence exerted upon them was not that of a master upon a slave, but that of one disciple of the true God upon another. Israel, though the destined leader of religious progress, was comparatively slow in his development; was there any reason why he should not receive, not indeed entirely fresh intuitions, but stimulus to thought, and, it may be, sometimes even forms of theological expression, from without?

I most willingly admit that this determination of Israel’s church-leaders not to follow foreign teachers into wholly unfamiliar paths, nor to adopt

anything which they had not already begun consciously to feel after, and which was not the natural complement of their own inherited beliefs, makes it peculiarly difficult to prove that discipleship which I have ascribed to them. It was for this reason that I selected, as the title of this lecture, "*possible* Zoroastrian influence upon Israel's religion;" I wished, that is, rather to claim too little than too much, for you will imagine that I think my own results to be something more than possible though less than certain. Three things only are certain, and these I make my starting-points:— (1) That from 536 B.C. onwards, the Jews were in constant intercourse with the Persians; (2) that Persian influence upon the Eastern, and finally upon the Western world was, for good or for evil, both wide and lasting; and (3) that there is a strong natural affinity between the higher Jewish and the higher Persian religion. At the two former points I can but glance. Of course, the Jews who lived nearest to the centre of the Persian monarchy would be more exposed than others to Persian influences; but when once Persian ideas were in circulation, they could not but penetrate gradually to the furthest limits of the empire. If even in the Christian period we still find the less noble Persian beliefs powerfully affecting the Jews, how much more at an earlier time must kindred spirits have owned the attraction of a comparatively pure Mazdeism! I could say much to explain and qualify these statements, but time forbids. It is the third point, viz. the strong affinity between the religion of Ahura Mazda and that of Jehovah, to which I must now restrict myself, urging you once more to derive your ideas of it, not merely from compilations, however excellent, but from the Zoroastrian records themselves. Even through the veil of an English, French, or German version the thoughts reveal themselves in a fascinating though sometimes enigmatical originality. Commentators and compilers may give priceless help, but the basis of your knowledge must be supplied by the Zoroastrian writings.¹

How close and even tender a relation could exist between a faithful Mazdayasnian and his Lord can only be adequately realised from the Gâthâs,

¹ On Zarathustra, his age and character, also on the Avesta, and our right to use it for historical purposes, see my *Bampton Lectures* (1891), pp. 433-437.

those five books of metrical chants which criticism permits us to regard as an authentic record of the great prophet and reformer, Zarathustra. They are, in fact, a repertory of these spiritual elements in Mazdeism by which this religion must have powerfully attracted the nobler Israelites. I do not, of course, assert that any of the Jews actually read the Gâthic hymns, but only that the truths enunciated or implied there would be those which by a spiritual tact they would instinctively welcome. The inconsistencies which grieve the sympathetic and yet critical student of Mazdeism, they would feel to be excrescences in the same sense and degree as the analogous inconsistencies in their own popular religion. They would not be hindered by these notes in the sunshine from using with reference to the Persians those words of the prophet Malachi, "The name of Jehovah is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered unto His name and a pure offering."² I should like nothing better than to draw out at length the remarkable affinities between the religions of Jehovah and Mazda, to which even Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye has not, in my opinion, done full justice. My time, however, forbids me to do so. I must confine myself to those two profound conceptions of the kingdom of God and of the rewards of righteousness in which Zoroastrianism may fairly be held to have anticipated the best Jewish religion. The two conceptions are allied; the first naturally leads on to the second. The true great king is Ahura Mazda; he is, as his name imports, the wise or omniscient Lord; but omnipotent he cannot be, so long as evil hinders the establishment of the Righteous Order (Asha) in the creation. It is the great object alike of Zarathustra and of his followers to co-operate with Ahura Mazda in the setting up of the Righteous Order and the defeat of the Lie-demon and his servants, and the beauty of the prophet's teaching on the rewards of righteousness is that it makes them begin in this life, but gives the supremacy to those rewards which are (to use Western language) spiritual. The school of Zarathustra had, in fact, reached a distinction, which to the Jews came much later, between the material or bodily life and the spiritual or (to adopt Dr. Mills' word) mental, the latter of which brings us into connection with "those

² Mal. i. 11.

veritably real (eternal) worlds where dwells Ahura." ¹ The distinction is no imaginary one, based upon one or two doubtful passages. Here is another passage :—

"And now in these thy dispensations, O Ahura Mazda! do thou act wisely for us, and with abundance with thy bounty and thy tenderness as touching us; and grant that reward which thou hast appointed to our souls, O Ahura Mazda! Of this do thou thyself bestow upon us for this world and the spiritual; and now as part thereof (do thou grant) that we may attain to fellowship with thee and thy righteousness for all duration." ² In short, heaven and hell are not primarily localities, but states; the one is called "life" or "best mental state," the other is "life's absence" or "the worst life"—a truly noble doctrine, as much above the multitude, no doubt, in Zarathustra's day as in mediæval and modern Christendom.

But can a faith like Zoroastrianism, which is not merely for the philosophic few but for the multitude, have nothing to say on recompenses of good and evil deeds after death? Surely not. Zarathustra himself indeed had no elaborate theory of "the last things." He was content with the assurance of the triumph of Ahura over Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman) which no temporary success of the evil one could render doubtful. It was his privilege to open the "gates of heaven" to the poor as well as to the rich, on condition of their "fighting the good fight" against all that was contrary to Ahura's holy will. "Immortality" meant to this great teacher and his followers not merely the prolongation of being (*Ameretât* = "deathlessness"), but the perfection of another blessing which was associated with it, viz. happiness of body and soul, begun in this life and raised to its highest degree in the next (*Haurvatât* = "welfare"). "To his kingdom," says Zarathustra, "belong *Haurvatât* and *Ameretât*." ³ From the very beginning of the world, evil was ordained for the evil and "happy blessings" for the good, to be

¹ *Yasna*, xliii. 3. I quote Dr. Mills' translation. M. de Harlez, with his usual preference for elegant, modern expressions, renders "ces mondes parfaits qu'habite Ahura."

² *Ib.* xl. 1. De Harlez renders the close of the above passage thus, "Donne-la telle qu'elle nous compète pour ce monde et pour le monde céleste; que nous l'obtenions telle (que je l'indique); que nous nous attachions à toi et à la sainteté, pour tous les siècles."

³ *Ib.* xlv. 10. De Harlez, "À son royaume appartiennent l'intégrité et l'immortalité."

adjudged "in the creation's final change." ⁴ The "final consummation and bliss" (to quote from the English Prayer-Book) takes place at that general judgment which is to follow the decisive defeat of Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman). It is then that, evil having been cast out, the earth shall be renewed, and the bodies of both good and bad shall be raised. The righteous shall be set apart for heaven (*garô-dmâna* = "the song-house"), the wicked shall be cast back to hell (*drujo-demânem*, "the abode of the Lie-demon"). But this is not the only judgment according to Zoroastrianism. Even in the Gâthâs (the oldest part of the Avesta), we twice find a reference to the so-called Judge's Bridge (the bridge, spoken of in various mythologies, which joins the two worlds), to pass which is the privilege of the good, but to fall from the it the doom of the bad; and this terrible and decisive test of character is applied before the final judgment. In other words, there is a first or private judgment, in which the judge is a man's own conscience (personified as a beautiful maiden in a fine allegory, *Vend.* xix.), and a second or public one, the agent in which is Saoshyant, the great hero-prophet and his "helpers." And, if we ask, of what sort were the risen bodies of the saints? A remarkable passage of the Avesta throws some light upon this. It contains a prayer that not only the soul of the believer but his glorified body might "go openly" to "the best world of the saints," and that there he might "come round about God, and attain to entire companionship with Him." ⁵ Yet even before the resurrection there seems to have been, in a true sense, the "vision of God" according to a famous passage in the "later Avesta." For the righteous soul passes from the "Judge's Bridge" by four steps, the last of which brings him to the "Endless Lights," where is the "house of songs" (*see above*). ⁶

And now let me ask, Can Israel have been uninfluenced by this profound doctrine which came to it from a religion so congenial in some respects to its own? Surely not. Angelology and dualism cannot have been the only Persian doctrines which attracted the Jews. In my second article I hope

⁴ *Yasna*, xliii. 5. De Harlez, "J'ai vu que, rétribuant les actions et les paroles, tu donnes le mal au méchant et la bénédiction sainte au bon, par ta vertu, au dernier terme de la création."

⁵ *Yast*, xxii. 15.

⁶ *Ib.* xxii. 33.

to justify the assumption that the resurrection was another.¹ To-day my contention is that, at any rate outside the Egyptian-Jewish literature, not only allusions to resurrection, but expressions which suggest the hope of the higher immortality, should be accounted for in the first instance by Persian influence. Nor is religious literature the only department to be examined. The historical notices of Jewish society must be carefully searched for indications of possible Zoroastrian tendencies. Our course is no doubt beset with difficulties. Not only are these notices very incomplete, but our chief authority, Josephus, has incurred the grave suspicion of having tampered with facts to please his Græco-Roman patrons. But we must not, like the slothful man in Proverbs (xxii. 13), be frightened by a report of lions. Josephus' Græcising account of the three Jewish schools speaks veraciously to those who can pierce through to the underlying ideas. Let us devote a few minutes to his sketch of the Essenes, it will help us when we come to the Book of Enoch, which has been thought to contain passages more or less distinctly Essenian. I will quote a part of the principal passage in English: "For the opinion is prevalent among them that bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent, but that souls are immortal and continue for ever, and that they come out of the most thin air, and are united to bodies as to prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement; and when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then rejoice and mount upwards, as if released from a long bondage. They think also, like the sons of the Greeks, that good souls have their habitation beyond the ocean . . . while they allot to bad souls a murky and cold den, full of never-ceasing punishments. And indeed the Greeks seem to me to have the same notion, when they allot the islands of the blest to their brave men, whom they call heroes and demi-gods; but to the souls of the wicked the region of the ungodly in Hades," etc.²

Now it is impossible to speak on these passages without taking up a position with regard to the radical criticism of Ohle, who, accepting Zeller's view of the essentially neo-Pythagorean character of

the Essenes of Josephus and of the supposed Philo, undertakes to show that the accounts of Essenes in the former are spurious. Nothing, in fact, is left of Essenism by this critic but a very simple form of religion which may be naturally viewed as a development of Pharisaism. I cannot bring myself at present to accept this radical criticism. There is much in Josephus' account of the Essenes, which altogether tallies with our previous expectations, and can be explained either from native Jewish or from Zoroastrian beliefs. Yes; from Zoroastrian beliefs. On this point I agree fully with Bishop Lightfoot, though I cannot help doubting whether all that he ascribes to Zoroastrianism is genuinely Essenian. For instance, was there ever such a thing as "Essene worship of the sun"? I admit that the Greek of Josephus³ (*War*, ii. 8, 9) refers to the sun-god; indeed, my own sense of the mythological character of the phraseology is even stronger than Bishop Lightfoot's. But I cannot make Josephus responsible for every detail of Greek phraseology in the translation of the treatise on the Roman war. I cannot believe that any recognised Jewish sect offered worship to the sun, without there being an indignant reference to this in the Gospels and the Talmud. But I do not deny that the Essenes adopted with special zest the custom of saying the first prayer at daybreak, which was, almost demonstrably, suggested by Zoroastrianism, and it is possible that Josephus' literary assistant turned this innocent practice, which may have been accompanied by an uplifting of the hands, into an act of worship to the sun, such as is still common in India. The biographer of the Emperor Akbar (Col. Malleon) tells us how his hero "has been called a Zoroastrian, because he recognised in the sun the sign of the presence of the Almighty,"⁴ and we all know how in Tertullian's time a familiar Christian custom received an equally gross misinterpretation.

I do not, of course, seek to relieve Josephus altogether from the charge of misinterpretation. It is certain that he passes very lightly over one of the most essential doctrines of Pharisaism, that which relates to the resurrection and the judgment. Is it not probable that he deals similarly with the Essenes? The belief in the immediate reception

¹ That this is not wholly superfluous is shown by a recent very able article in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* (October 1890), by M. Montet, of Geneva.

² *Jos.*, *War*, ii. 8, 11 (Shilleto's revision of Whiston).

³ *ὡς μὴ τὰς ἀγὰς ὑβρίζουσιν τοῦ θεοῦ.*

⁴ *Akbar*, p. 163.

of the recompense of a soul after death is by no means inconsistent with the belief in a great final judgment, when (as the Zoroastrians at any rate held) the happiness or misery of the soul would be greatly intensified, and the fact that John the Essene was one of the Jewish generals in the war with Titus proves that the Essenes in his time, at least, shared the popular belief in a final judgment. And if this be so, may we not presume that the Essenes also held the belief in a glorified body? This certainly agrees as well as possible with the theory of pre-existent souls entering at last into bodies which is ascribed to this sect. What I mean is this. The Essenian doctrine of the soul in Josephus, divested of its false Greek dress, combines two elements—a Babylonian and a Persian, both, of course, adapted to Hebrew modes of thought. The happy islands remind us rather of Babylonia than of Persia. But the Essenes described by Josephus, being fully abreast with the later religion of Israel, could not restrict this Paradise to “have men called heroes and demi-gods” (say, to Abraham, Enoch, Elijah, as friends of God); they, of course, considered it to be open to all the faithful. Nor could they, at that advanced period, have failed to identify it with that “better world of the just” (a phrase of the Avesta), which our Lord describes as the “Kingdom of Heaven.” On the other hand, the description of Hades is distinctively Zoroastrian, *i.e.* Persian, and not less so is the alternative account which Josephus gives of the Essenian view of the future of righteous souls. In fact, the opening words of the famous passage of Josephus (*War*, ii. 8, 11) give a reflection of the Zoroastrian view of those ideal and yet real existences called the *fravashis*, those “guardian angels” which were so linked to human nature as to be practically indistinguishable from souls. Without implying the theory expressed in a late Zoroastrian book (the *Minôkhired*), that the constellations are for the most part “guardian spirits,” one might venture to say, applying Josephus’ words, that the *fravashis* “keep coming (to earth) from the most subtle ether,” to which when this life is over they will return. There is no doubt one discrepancy between the Zoroastrian theory and the Essenian, but a satisfactory explanation of this can, I think, be given. In fact, it is only by reading Josephus’

account of the Essenes in a Zoroastrian light that it becomes in all respects clear.

You may tell me that this is at most a probable result. Perhaps it is; but no one who is interested in the history of Judaism and Christianity will despise it on that account. Josephus, it is true, is a writer of the first Christian century; but the spiritual forces which acted upon the Jews of his time must have been long since in operation. Zoroastrian influences, at any rate, if they can be admitted in the time of Josephus, can still more readily be understood in the earlier period. We have a right, therefore, to compare the views of any part of the Book of Enoch with those which we have found reason to assign to the Essenes, and to ascribe in some measure to Zoroastrian influences. That the religious views of the different parts of Enoch are not by any means the same, is well known. The picture of the divine judgment and of its consequences given in the *Similitudes*, is much more distinctly spiritualistic and, if I may say so, Essenian than that in the *Grundschrift* (or earlier part of the book). It must not, however, be overlooked that even the *Grundschrift* presents points of contact with Essenian views. It would be a mistake to say that its view of the state of the righteous dead is lower than that in the *Similitudes*. It is true that in C. 5 it speaks of them as possibly sleeping a long sleep; but the phrase “the sleep of death” has different shades of meaning with different writers, and it can be shown that this sleep, even in the oldest part of Enoch, was not supposed to exclude great, though imperfect, joy or pain. In the temporary abode of the righteous (which is not in the underworld, but, as also with the Essenes, far away in the west of the earth) we are told that there is a fountain of water and light (xxii. 9). Now, what can this mean but that the departed righteous soul has even before the judgment a foretaste of the vision of God which later writers delight to express by such images? It is also true that in V. 9, a long life is all that is promised; but it can, I think, be shown that a spiritual and eternal state of being is only postponed, not denied. The Zoroastrian conception of a glorified spiritual body seems common to both the main divisions of the Book of Enoch.

But I must not linger on this interesting and

important book. I must not, for instance, refer to the account of Jehovah's fiery palace, in chap. xiv., nor to its developed angelology, nor to its doctrine of the renovation of the world, which, though not without Jewish germs, has been largely influenced by Zoroastrianism. Suffice it to say that, had I space to discuss this, the result would confirm the view that both the universally admitted leading divisions of Enoch are tinged with Zoroastrianism. But I venture with some hesitation to go further. The title of this paper speaks only of the religion of Israel. But to me, as a Christian scholar, the New Testament is the crown of the religion of Israel, and upon the whole, as even Havet admits, it preserves the character of a Hebraic work. Let me say out, then, in conclusion, that the Pauline and Johannine forms of thought appear to me to contain some strikingly Zoroastrian elements. I have no antecedent prejudice against the view that Hellenic ideas and sentiments have filtered to some, as yet uncertain, extent into the New Testament; but I think with Harnack,¹ that specifically Hellenic ideas are not the presuppositions either of the Fourth Gospel or of the other important New Testament writings. I think, too, that so far as an infiltration of Hellenism took place, it was only possible because more or less similar Oriental influences had gone before. Zoroastrian ideas had been in the air long before the battle of Issus, and had too tenacious a life to be destroyed. Alexander, like the mad Antiochus after him, might burn the Scriptures of a hostile religion; he forgot that it is ideas which give permanence to books, and not books to ideas. Had I space I could refer to many New Testament passages which, perhaps, betray the direct or indirect influence of Zoroastrianism. I must confine myself, however, to one of the most famous, viz. 2 Cor. v. 1-10. In spite of what Pfeiderer has so ably urged.² I am not convinced that the Apostle is altogether Hellenising. Even if he borrowed a Greek expression directly from the Book of Wisdom and indirectly from Plato, he did not borrow his idea. The strictest Palestinian Jew might have called the body a "vessel" or a "tabernacle," and the notion of the future state which this passage contains reminds us not so much of Wisdom as of the Book of Enoch, the writers of which are, as we have seen, unconsciously affected by Zoroastrian influences. May I not go further and suggest that

the invasion of Egyptian Judaism by Greek philosophical ideas is more easily accounted for, if the Jews who entered Egypt under the early Ptolemies had been already in some degree Zoroastrianised; in fact, that the Alexandrine-Jewish philosophy is a synthesis of Judæo-Zoroastrian and Greek elements, different enough upon the whole, and yet not without striking points of contact? To take but one example. How attractive the Platonic upper world of ideas and spirits would be to those who had already an analogous though less philosophical belief of Judæo-Zoroastrian origin! It may be urged indeed, on the other hand, that both by Philo and by the author of Wisdom the Judæo-Zoroastrian idea of the resurrection is ignored. That is true; but it is undoubtedly referred to in the Septuagint.³ Philo may perfectly well have rejected some Zoroastrian ideas, and accepted others which were supported by Greek philosophy. Even Freudenthal, the author of *Hellenistische Studien*, admits the possibility of a connection between Alexandrinism and Zoroastrianism;⁴ and Siegfried, in his classical work on Philo, produces modestly enough some evidence of its reality.⁵ But I must not now develop this theory; it would lead me into a department of research which I have reserved for another lecture. Let me only add that no one is more conscious than I am of the difficulty of absolutely proving any particular example of Zoroastrian influence, owing to the strength of the Jewish capacity of assimilation. The linguistic proof of the original connection of Asmodeus (the demon who takes the place of Satan in the Book of Tobit) and the Aeshma-deva is indeed too clear to be denied; but almost everything else can be doubted. The general truth of Zoroastrian influence upon Judaism cannot, however, be questioned, and historical theologians will not be displeased with an attempt to show how this influence may have worked. I do not pledge myself not to enter on the fields which I set aside at the opening of this paper; but in these two lectures I must limit myself to the chosen subject of the doctrine or doctrines of a future state. If I can help some students to the right historical point of view, I indicate some possible results which give body and substance to a truth which without these would be lifeless, my chief objects will be gained.

³ See Sept. Isa. xxvi. 19; Job. xix. 26; Ps. i. 5, xliiii. 14, 15, lxx. (title).

⁴ Review of Siegfried's *Philo*, in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1875, p. 234.

⁵ *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 141.

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 68. ² *Urchristenthum*, p. 299.