

is a total blindness. If we vividly represent to ourselves the whole frightfulness of that thought, and are compelled to regard it as the inevitable consequence of hatred of one's brother, we must be greatly deterred from everything that is hated. It is, however, unfortunately a daily experience that hatred has a blinding effect upon the human mind. It makes a man guilty of deeds of which he would have held himself to be altogether incapable. Nothing entangles one more completely in the power of

the passions than hatred; and wherever only scope is given it, it ultimately leads inevitably to an abyss. Love, on the other hand, knows whither it goes; it seeks not its own, and can therefore easily abide upon the straight, divine way. Surrendering what is its own, it knows that it therewith gains the love of the brethren, and the love of the heavenly Father Himself. Perfect self-satisfaction in love of the brethren and of God is the goal towards which love surely tends.

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel.

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

PART III.

(c) The preceding argument is of course only valid if, on independent grounds, chaps. lxv. and lxvi. be denied to the Second Isaiah. My view of the next passage, Dan. xii. 2, will hardly be disputed, the Maccabean date of the Book of Daniel being an accepted critical result. It runs thus: "And many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth (*i.e.* in Sheól) shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to disgrace and everlasting abhorrence." The "awaking" means the revival of the soul to earthly consciousness in a body. The "everlasting life" and "everlasting abhorrence" are the recompenses of the good and the bad respectively among the dead. It is not, however, a general resurrection which is meant; the writer is probably thinking, on the one hand, of faithful Israelites of the better time, especially those who have suffered martyrdom (*cf.* Rev. xx. 4), and, on the other, of base renegades who are raised from the dead that they may be put to open shame. To a great extent, then, this passage agrees with Isa. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19, taken together. It goes beyond them in its coinage of the new phrase "everlasting life"¹ ("everlasting death" is evidently avoided), and in its extension of the resurrection to the wicked. Is this latter feature merely derived by inference from Isa. lxvi. 24 (from which the rare word *דְּרֵאָה* is borrowed)? Scarcely, for the objects of perpetual abhorrence in that passage are (see ver. 16) partly Jews, partly Gentiles, but here (to judge from the context) exclusively Jews. Nor is it a fresh product of the Maccabean struggle, for (unless we are prepared to follow Olshausen in his view of the date of the psalms) open or virtual apostasy was not unknown before the Greek period. A form of

the resurrection belief resembling that in Daniel may have existed long before, and why should we hesitate to suppose that the feature in question was suggested, not only by a natural craving for justice, but by its existence in Zoroastrianism? Surely the psychological and the historical explanation must be combined.

(d) Ps. xlix. 15, 16. The forty-ninth psalm is, one can hardly doubt, post-Exilic; it may be plausibly assigned to some part of the long reign of the second Artaxerxes (405-359 B.C.). Verses 15 and 16 are the central part of the *khida*, the "dark speech," or, better, the "enigma," which the poet opens to the accompaniment of the harp (ver. 5). Can we re-read it in a Zoroastrian light? First of all, something must be said as to the form and contents of the verses. The text has been suspected of corruptness. One of the difficulties complained of is the abruptness of the transitions; this, however, is mitigated by transposing the words, "And the upright shall trample upon them at the dawn," to the end of the verse. Other difficulties spring from the peculiarity of the phraseology; but this hardly justifies us in altering the text; the poet has warned us that there is an "enigma" to be solved. Prof. Abbott, indeed, after Kamphausen, proposes to read in ver. 16, *וַיִּרְדּוּ בְּמִשְׁרָיִם לְקִבְרָם*, but it seems to me that this can only mean, "and they shall go down gently to the grave," which is a description of a euthanasia (*cf.* Job xxi. 23), and unsuitable here. For my part, I adhere to the rendering, "And the upright shall trample upon them at the dawn," and I put this line at the end of ver. 15 (transposition is of course an allowable critical process), as the greatest and hardest utterance which the poet has to make. The other statements in these verses are simpler. They are (1) that the wicked remain in Sheól for ever, and never see (or for ever see not) the light, and (2) that the soul

¹ It is possible of course to explain *חַיֵּי עוֹלָם* "life of long duration" (*cf.* Enoch x. 9), where the phrase seems to mean "(at least) 500 years." This would agree with Isa. lxv. 20, but is in our present context most improbable.

of the righteous man shall be "set free," and be "taken from the hand of Sheól." The old Hebrew notion of the arrangement of the underworld was, like the old Greek, an aristocratic one. There was a secluded department of Sheól, where sceptred kings enjoyed a majestic repose (Isa. xiv. 9, Job iii. 14), and to this dignified resting-place selfish and tyrannical rich men in the age of the psalmist considered that, in a certain sense, their "glory" would "descend after them." For neither in the upper nor in the lower world could they brook the thought of judgment. "How should God know? is there knowledge in the Most High?" are the words assigned to them in one of those psalms which resemble most nearly the forty-ninth (Ps. lxxiii. 11).

Against this false theory the Psalmist, like two later writers in the Book of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon (which are not so absolutely different from all the canonical psalms as Professor Kirkpatrick supposes),¹ utters a protest. "Far be it from thee," he would have said with the Yahvist of old (Gen. xviii. 25), "to do thus, to slay the righteous with the wicked, that so the righteous should be as the wicked; that be far from thee: shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The Yahvist looked for a retribution in this life; this far more spiritually-minded post-Exilic writer (who speaks, not for the nation personified, but for each pious Israelite) in a higher life, which may conventionally be said to begin with death. But of what nature was this retribution? was it moral or material? Now, if we might, with Prof. Abbott, emend instead of transposing the second line of ver. 15 ("and the upright," etc.), it would be permissible to assume that the retribution was a purely moral one. For ver. 16 *b* ("from the hand of Sheól shall he take me") is certainly to be explained on the analogy of Ps. lxxiii. 24 *b*² ("and afterward thou wilt take me into glory"), the sense of which is clear from vers. 25 and 26—

Whom have I (to care for) in heaven?
And possessing thee I have pleasure in nothing upon earth.
Though my flesh and my heart should have wasted away,
God would be the rock of my heart and my portion for ever.

¹ See my *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, pp. 412, 413; Kirkpatrick, *Book of Psalms*, p. 37. Exegesis, I think, reveals the germs of the better Pharisaism in some of the canonical psalms, and so softens the transition from the pre-Maccabæan to the later Maccabæan type of piety. That there is a wide difference between the two Psalters, I do not of course deny; but this has not the critical bearing which Professor Kirkpatrick supposes. It is not chronological nearness which produces an affinity of tone and thought (contrast Jeremiah and Ezekiel), but belonging to the same intellectual stage or period. The difference between the two Psalters is wide, but not absolute, and can be fully explained. For the Maccabæan rising was a turning-point in the religious history of Israel. What a century that was between 142 and 50 B.C.!

² Wellhausen, I know, would not grant this. He alters the text of ver. 24 *b* (see my *Lectures*, p. 430).

But if we are right in retaining that difficult line we must admit that, though a moral recompense (if at least, the word may be used) ranked first in the Psalmist's mind, yet there were times when he aspired, not from selfish considerations, after a lower, but not less necessary, compensation. Thinking of the sweetness of unimpeded communion with God, he was indifferent to the outward conditions of heaven itself. But when he looked earthwards, and realised the havoc wrought by sin in God's fair creation, he could not help longing for the removal, or even the destruction, of sinners (Ps. lxxiii. 27, 28; cf. civ. 31, 35). Of this general readjustment of circumstances the already current symbols were the resurrection and the renovation of the heavens and the earth. To the latter there is no allusion in this psalm, unless we can imagine one in ver. 20 *b*, "who shall never see the light." But a resurrection of the righteous is very possibly indeed referred to in those difficult words, which so evidently require something to be supplied mentally, "and the righteous shall trample upon them at dawn." The "dawn" is that of the resurrection-day when, as was already believed, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," and the "trampling upon" the rich oppressors (*i.e.* upon their graves), who remain in their everlasting prison-house, is a sign of satisfied vengeance. At a later time, when the Scribes had developed all possible eschatological germs into an elaborate system, "dawn" became a figure for the opening of the new order of things called the "coming age."³ Hence the Targum of Jerusalem on Ex. xii. 42 says that the fourth of the extraordinary nights is "when the end of the age shall be accomplished," and the Septuagint translator probably attached the same idea to the ἀντίλημψις ἐωθινή of the Greek title of Ps. xxii. But, long before this, the dawn was doubtless a Zoroastrian image. "Till the powerful dawn," says the faithful Mazda-worshipper, when waiting for each fresh day; "till the powerful *frashôkereti*" when longing for the everlasting light of the renewed earth and for the resurrection.⁴

I know that there are other possible explanations both of Ps. xlix. 15, 16, and of the other Psalm-passages referred to. It is probable there always were divine interpretations of them, and

³ R. Meir (second cent. A.D.) gave this interpretation of Ruth iii. 13: "Tarry this night here," *i.e.* in this world which is only night, "and in the morning," *i.e.* in the other world, which is only good, "if He will redeem thee; well, let Him redeem thee," *i.e.* God (*Midrash Ruth Rabba*, Par. iii.). Another statement is this: "R. Hiya Rabba and R. Simon ben Halaftâ were one morning walking in the valley of Arbel, and they noticed the dawn darting its rays of light. R. Hiya said to his companion, Master, this represents to me the salvation of Israel; at first it is slightly perceptible, but it increases as it advances (Talm. Jer., *Berachoth*, c. 1).

⁴ Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 239.

that the liturgical poets anticipated and sanctioned this diversity. But the highest interpretation may, I think, considering the period to which the writers belonged, and the influences to which they were subject, reasonably be regarded as that which they themselves preferred. And, both for the idea of spiritual communion of God, begun in this life, but intensified after death, and for that of the resurrection (the two ideas need not always have been united), the Psalmists, and those who sympathised with them may, not to say must, have been indebted, to some extent at least, to the noble, though far from perfect, Zoroastrian Church.

(e) Ps. xvii. 15 :

As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness ;
May I be satisfied, when I awake, with thy form.

Ps. xvii. is one of the most striking persecution-psalms of the late Persian age.¹ We cannot on that account say that it is bound to contain a reference to the new great hopes current in that period ; but we may, when two interpretations are equally possible, prefer the one which involves such a reference. The "awaking," then, spoken of in ver. 15, is not that from nightly sleep, but is of a transcendental order. *וּפְתֹחַ עֵינַי*, literally "at the awaking," may mean "when life's short *night* is past," or when the relative sleep of the intermediate state gives place to the intense vitality of a new phase of being. In the one case the higher immortality is the hope of those whom the Psalmist represents ; in the other, this combined with the resurrection. And if both the idea of the resurrection and that of immortality are equally characteristic of the Persian age, what object is there in resting satisfied with what is in one sense the lesser meaning? If, in Isa. xxvi. 19, Dan. xii. 2, "awaking" has the definite sense of rising again, what reason is there for giving it any vaguer meaning here? Notice, however, that there is no separating veil between heaven and earth. The risen man will, according to the Psalmist, see God as truly as if he were in heaven. "Face" and "form" are, of course, but symbols for the Divine glory. Need I add that this verse, especially if taken with the preceding one, is thoroughly Zoroastrian in spirit? (See *Yasna* xliii. 3, quoted in my first lecture.)

But here I come into conflict, to some extent, with the latest commentator on the Psalms, Professor Kirkpatrick of Cambridge. This conscientious scholar comments as follows on ver. 15 : "The words are commonly explained of awaking from the sleep of death to behold the face of God in the world beyond, and to be transfigured into His likeness. Death is no doubt spoken of as sleep (xiii. 3), and resurrection as awakening (Isa.

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 229.

xxvi. 19 ; Dan. xii. 2). But elsewhere the context makes the meaning unambiguous. Here, however, this meaning is excluded by the context. The Psalmist does not anticipate death, but prays to be delivered from it (vers. 8 ff)."² Professor Kirkpatrick's criticism upon the incomplete interpretation which he adduces, is partly justified. The Psalmist's words do not refer exclusively to the state of the soul after death. But he errs, I venture to think, in supposing that either here or in xvi. 9-11 "death fades from the Psalmist's view" altogether. Reading Psalms xvi. and xvii. as products of the late Persian period, when the higher Jewish religion had become conscious of its tendency, and been stimulated by the example of Zoroastrianism, and holding the opinion which I do on the data and the work of exegesis (see note 2, p. 227), I find it very difficult to assert that there is no reference at all to the bliss into which, according to the higher religion, the soul is introduced after death. Let us pass to Ps. xvi. The Psalmist prays thus : "Preserve me, thou God in whom I trust, to whom I am entirely devoted, and who art my sole happiness." The Divine answer is : "I will not abandon thee to thy murderous assailants, but will both prolong thy life, and sweeten it with proofs of my loving-kindness, and with the assurance of my nearness." Does the prayer seem to you sufficiently covered by the answer, from the point of view which we have adopted? For, after all, the peril of death must return, and, according to the traditional orthodoxy, "Who remembereth [God] in death, or can give [Him] thanks in the pit?" The deliverance, then, for which the Psalmist prays must be twofold : first, from the immediate peril of death, and, secondly, that from death itself absolutely and entirely. And, to judge from the lofty tone of vers. 5-8, he cares most for the second. The life for which he craves is that communion with God which, though begun in this life, can only be perfected in another. Death, to the nobler Psalmists, is not departure to dark Sheól, but an "assumption" to be with God (Ps. xlix. 16, lxxiii. 24). Such death cannot "fade from the Psalmist's view."

I know the objections that may be raised to this interpretation, and have already endeavoured to answer them in my *Bampton Lectures*. It may be said, for instance, that it presupposes a mysticism in the Psalmist, which is alien to the Jewish character. "For opposite reasons," says Professor Seth, "neither the Greek nor the Jewish mind lent itself to mysticism."³ The answer is, first, to define mysticism rightly, and next to enlarge our view of the facts of Jewish literature. Another objection is that I have antedated the distinction between this life and the next—this and the coming age.

² *The Book of Psalms*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1891), p. 83.

³ Kingsley.

There is some reason, however, to think that in this, as in many other respects, the evolution of Jewish thought has been continuous, and that, while elaborate logical theories were late, the germs, or rather some of the germs, of later theories can be traced, if not with clearness to the first, yet to the second, century of the Persian rule in Palestine. On this subject I cannot now dwell at length, but will ask you to remember the constant presence of Zoroastrian ideas in the neighbourhood of the Jews. The distinction in question was already familiar to Mazda-worshippers, and its adoption would be helped forward by the nascent consciousness of the Jews that "communities are for the divine sake of individual life, for the sake of the love and truth that is in each heart."¹ Could this love and truth be "as water spilt on the ground?" Must there not be a second stage of life? There was, however, no sharpness in the antithesis, because, according to a fundamental principle alike of the higher Zoroastrian and the higher Jewish religion, heaven is primarily not a place but a spiritual state. One point more and I will pass on. The reader will not be surprised that here, too, I suppose a diversity of interpretation to have existed from the first, and to have been anticipated and sanctioned by the writers of Ps. xvi. and xvii. I have stated which interpretation was, in my opinion, preferred by the psalmists, and mentioned a second less adequate, but still possible, one. There is also a third which I have indicated in my commentary. It was adopted by Theodore of Mopsuestia of old, and has found its ablest modern advocate in Rudolf Smend.² The view is that the speaker is the Church-nation personified. Modern minds find it difficult to take in the nationalistic interpretation of the Psalms; I have endeavoured in my *Bampton Lectures* to meet their difficulties. There is much in the Psalter which is primarily said of the true Israel. But since whatever is said of the Church-nation is applicable to each faithful Israelite, we must, I think, reject Smend's assertion of the exclusive reference of Ps. xvi. and xvii. to the nation. "A study of the spiritual atmosphere of the Psalmist's age leaves no doubt in my mind that Ps. xvi. 10, 11 [and still more Ps. xvii. 15] must have been appropriated without deduction by faithful Jews."³

(f), (g) Ps. xvi. 10, 11, lxxiii. 24-28 a. I have spoken almost enough already of these passages in explaining the two preceding ones.

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xvii. 130.

² *Zeitschrift f. d. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, P. 93-96. בְּרִיקָיִן, "at the awaking," is very difficult on Smend's theory. He proposes to correct בְּרִיקָיִן, "when thou awakest." God is said to "awake" to judgment in xxxv. 23, lxxiii. 20. But a reference to the judgment introduces a jarring note.

³ *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, p. 407.

The Psalms in which they occur⁴ are possibly as late as the beginning of the Greek period, when religious differences began to be more marked among the Jews. There is no reference in either to the resurrection. It would appear that, to most writers of this strong mystical bent, the hope of the higher immortality seemed more important (as it also certainly did to the early Zoroastrians) than that of the resurrection. Neither hope was as yet expressed in dogmatic form (the מְחִיית הַמֵּתִים of the second Jewish Benediction is hardly pre-Maccabean), and, therefore, either might be selected by a religious writer in preference to the other. Without, therefore, denying the bare possibility that the writers of Ps. xvi. and lxxiii. presupposes the "sleep" and the "awaking," but leap over both in their eagerness for that which was to follow, I think it more probable that the soul, as they believed, passes directly from this world to the "Beatific Vision." It is a well-known fact that many of the later Jewish theologians did not postpone the sight of the face of God by the righteous till after the resurrection. We read, for instance, that "when the righteous depart out of the world, they mount upwards at once and stand on high."⁵ And, what is more important for our present inquiry, the faithful worshipper of Mazda looked forward to direct communion with God before the great change of the world. Thus a famous passage of the Avesta says:—

"Gladly pass the souls of the righteous to the golden seat of Ahura Mazda, to the golden seat of the Amesha-Spentas, to Garô-nmānem (= the house of songs), the abode of Ahura Mazda, the abode of the Amesha-Spentas, the abode of all the other holy beings."⁶

This leads, of course, to the view that there are two judgments, a private and a general one, the first of which alone is really significant—a view which is clearly implied in the following sentence from Dr. John Wilson's sketch of the present Parsi religion (p. 339):—

"The resurrection, according to the notion of most of their community, is a resurrection not to judgment, which has long preceded it, and takes place at death, but to a deliverance from all suffering."⁷

⁴ See my exegetical study of Ps. xvi. in *Expositor*, 1889 (2), pp. 210-224.

⁵ *Tanchuma, Wayyikra*, 8, quoted by Weber, *System der Pal. Theologie*, p. 323. This reminds us of the Essenian belief, if we may follow Josephus (*War*, ii. 8. 11), that the souls of the righteous after death "rejoice and are borne upwards."

⁶ *Vend.* xix. 32, cf. *Yasna* xxxii. 15 (*Oxford Zendavesta*, i. 214, iii. 65, 66).

⁷ This is a purely controversial work, published at Bombay in 1843, but gives a good idea of that unreformed Parsi religion, which the modern reform-party are doing their best to transform (see Mr. Dadhabai Naoroji in the *The Religions*

Upon the expressions of the remaining passages of the Psalms I can afford to speak more briefly. They are so vague and poetical, and so little defined by the context, that it is only in the light of the preceding passages, and of the contemporary Zoroastrian belief, that they acquire a subsidiary importance. Those of (*k*) Ps. xxi. 5, (*i*) Ps. xlv. 3, (*z*) Ps. lxi. 7, (*l*) Ps. lxxii. 5, for instance, may easily be explained away as mere hyperboles. In my commentary I have ventured to plead for a deeper meaning, not, however, on the very dubious ground that the Psalms to which these verses belong are prophetic of "king Messiah" (see the Targum), but because they most probably represent an idealised form of the Semitic belief that kings, as semi-divine beings, have places assigned to them in heaven, which we find in Assyria and Babylonia.¹ That belief, in its unidealised form, may possibly have existed among the Jews before the Exile, for a pre-Exilic writer makes Bathsheba say to David, "Let my lord king David live for ever" (1 Kings i. 31). You may tell me that David, the "man after God's own heart," was precisely one of those kings for whom an exceptional escape from Sheól might naturally be assumed. But it should be observed that the author of the "family history" (2 Sam. ix.-xx.; 1 Kings i., ii.), from which Bathsheba's words are quoted, by no means represents David as a model of the virtues insisted upon in the Psalms. The idealising of this belief in the immortality of kings is, in fact, scarcely intelligible, except after the Return. Then it was that Israel as a nation awoke to the consciousness of the rights—the equal rights—of individuals, so that, in fact, to pray for the immortality of the king was tantamount to praying for the immortality of all worthy Israelites. Now, according to the view advocated in my *Bampton Lectures*, Ps. xxi., xlv., lxi., and lxxii., all refer to post-Exilic princes (viz. the first and the third probably to Simon the Maccabee, the second and the fourth to Ptolemy Philadelphus). May I not reasonably hold that the conditionalness of the immortality desired for the king in Ps. xlv. and lxxii. (where the evidence is very clear) is not wholly unconnected with the conditionalness of the immortality of Persian princes?²

of the World, London, 1890). The sentence quoted above shows that on the point referred to the modern Parsis adhere to the belief of their ancestors; *comp.* the passage from *Vend.* xix. 27, 28, quoted in my *Bampton Lectures*, p. 399.

¹ I am aware that the interpretation of the Assyrian phrase, "land of the silver sky" (quoted in my book), has lately been questioned. But the belief in a heavenly mansion for royal personages cannot be argued away (see Tiglath-Pileser's Prison Inscription).

² In Ps. xxi. 6, xlv. 4 (*cf.* civ. 1, 31) the king is represented as endowed with divine glory. This regal reflection of divinity, of course, includes immortality. It is, in all respects, parallel to the *garenô* of the Avesta, which de Harlez translates "la majesté royale," and explains as

(*m*) Ps. lxiii. 9, 10. Many of the earliest readers must have understood this in the same sense as Ps. lxxiii. 26, 27; and the Psalmist must have anticipated and very probably sanctioned this. (*n*) Ps. xi. 7 (*cf.* cxl. 14). (*o*) xli. 13 *b*. If two interpretations of the phraseology are equally possible, why should the Psalmist have preferred the weaker? (*p*) Ps. xxxvi. 10. Unless mythic phraseology had ceased to be intelligible to the later Jews, the Psalmist virtually says that the true function of life is not to be localised by mythic geography, but is with the righteous Jehovah (*comp.* 2 Macc. vii. 36). And why should not the deeply spiritual writer of Ps. xxxvi. 10 have referred, in the second line of this verse, to the crown of all joys—the nearer vision of God? Whether he looked for this boon immediately after death, or postponed it till after the resurrection, it is, of course, not for us to determine.

I trust that I have been able to show that the ideas of resurrection and the higher immortality may reasonably be traced in certain psalms and prophecies, on condition of our assigning these documents to the late³ Persian period, when the direct and indirect influence of Zoroastrian ideas upon the Jews must have been so considerable. If I have succeeded in doing this, I have also proved that "advanced" biblical criticism has no inherent rationalistic bias. Certainly I am conscious of no such bias myself. My sole aim as a critic is to help in recovering the secrets of Jewish antiquity, which are often of so much importance for the right understanding of Christianity. These secrets may sometimes, it would seem, have been secrets only to the critics, having been preserved in the older exegetical tradition, though distorted by elements belonging properly to a different historical situation. I claim the goodwill, therefore, of church students of theology for the critical theories which I have on several recent occasions brought to their notice. At present they may seem to be, as this year's Bampton Lecturer has said in a well-known volume, speaking of the Psalter,

"une noblesse de nature jointe à un éclat de splendeur extérieure, qui appartient dans le ciel aux Yazatas et même aux justes. Sur la terre, elle a été conférée principalement à la race Aryaque, la race noble par excellence, et à ses rois. Mais à ces derniers, Ahura Mazda l'enlève lorsqu'ils abandonnent la voie de la justice" (*Avesta, traduit du texte Zend*, p. 200). Note here especially that the king only has this "majesty created by Mazda" as the representative of his race, and that even he may lose it. So Darmesteter remarks that this attribute is "the glory from above which makes the king an earthly god. He who possesses it, reigns; he who loses it, falls down" (*Oxford Zendavesta*, i., Introd. p. lxiii). Of course, the conception of the divine glory, reflected on human bearers, passed, both in Persia and in Palestine, through two phases, a physical and a moral.

³ As far as I can see, it is not in the first but in the second Persian century that Zoroastrian influence made itself deeply felt among the Jews.

“very improbable and far-fetched ;”¹ they are not, indeed, to be found in any of the German works which this helpful and considerate teacher has there mentioned. But the problems of the Hexateuch will not always monopolise the attention of critics, nor could I hold any of my esteemed opponents bound by their own words. For I have strong confidence, not indeed in my own or in any man’s infallibility, but in the power of truth and in the effects of time.

It was this high doctrine of faith, which with quite youthful brightness the veteran critic Eduard Reuss² preached to me last summer in his country home in Elsass. He had himself experienced its truth, and learned to look forward rejoicingly to the constant expansion of our historical knowledge. He did not for his own part admit that the great ideas which I have mentioned were expressed or implied in the Psalter, but he has frankly told us in print that the psalms being nearly all of post-Exilic origin, he would not feel embarrassed (“ne nous gênerait pas”) if they contained references to a future life.³ Where there is such candour and such a genuinely historical spirit, it is impossible to be discouraged by an opposition which may prove to be merely temporary. Reuss was perfectly well aware that he was too old to change, but a deeper study of the criticism of the psalms and of Zoroastrianism may yet bring over such scholars as Hermann Schultz to my side ; while from the numerous younger English scholars, who are either uncommitted or but half-committed to definite critical views, much may in course of time be hoped.

Such opposition as Schultz, and shall I add ? Dr. Davidson, may give, will therefore not discourage me. It is much more trying to one’s faith to read such an essay as appeared on this subject in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October 1890. The author, M. Montet, of Geneva, was known to me by his writings in the *Revue de l’histoire des religions* as a bright and keenly interested student of the history of religions. Disputable as some of his statements in an earlier study⁴ upon the same subject might be, my general impression was that he was a truly progressive scholar who would neither rest satisfied with the antiquated theories of the past, nor with a scepticism which would make any really valuable result impossible. In his later essay, however, M. Montet does not appear to have gone forward but backward, and I cannot help attribut-

ing this to a one-sided study of the works of M. de Harlez. If I am wrong, I trust that I shall be corrected. But the sentences in which M. Montet speaks of the Zoroastrian books and of the determination of the dates of their contents, and also of the age of the Mazdean belief in the resurrection, are in harmony with those of the learned canon of Louvain, but not with those of the leading workers, German, French, and English, in the field of Zoroastrian literature.⁵ In his general results, M. Montet, if I do not misapprehend his meaning, has gone backward. In 1884 he, at any rate, held that the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the body was closely connected with, was in fact practically derived from, the Zoroastrian ; in 1890 he maintains that it is “merely a different reading of the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul.” Professor Grätz’s treatment of the subject in a long note to the second part of the second volume of his history seems to me much more critical and satisfactory,⁶ and I feel entitled to ask M. Montet for a revision of the judgments expressed in his second essay, which, able as it is, does not come up to the high standard which he has himself taught us to apply to his work.

There is much more that I should like to add ; many more Zoroastrian parallels and contrasts to Jewish beliefs to which I would gladly refer. I have in fact but completed one section of the inquiry promised by my title. This is all, however, that my present opportunity permits. I will conclude with a wish that does not, I am sure, exceed the limits of Christian generosity. May these two great religions, committed to highly-gifted peoples which have survived equal misfortunes simply and entirely through their strong attachment to their Scriptures, find in my own time a more unreservedly historical, and therefore also at once a more just and a more sympathetic, appreciation from English students !

⁵ See Darmesteter (*Oxford Zendavesta*, vol. i., Introd. p. xliii), with whom Spiegel, Goldner, and Mills agree.

⁶ Prof. Grätz makes the Zoroastrian influence begin somewhat later than I have supposed. He makes, however, this important remark, which helps much to justify my own line of argument. “Iranian influence upon the Jews of Palestine can only (?) have been exercised through the medium of the Jews of Persia. These no doubt were surrounded by an Iranian atmosphere, and exposed to invasion by it. By the frequent intercourse of foreign and Palestinian Jews, Iranian elements can have found an entrance into Jerusalem, and been received with favour by those who gave the tone to society” (*Geschichte*, ii. 2, p. 418). He traces the doctrine of the resurrection to Zoroastrianism, and that of immortality to neo-Platonism. That neo-Platonism contributed greatly to strengthen the latter belief among those who came within the sphere of its influence, I do not of course wish to deny.

¹ *Lux Mundi* (latest preface).

² This honoured theologian was called to his rest April 15, 1891.

³ *Le Psautier* (1875), p. 101.

⁴ *Revue de l’hist. des religions*, 1884.