

# OUR OWN RELIGION IN ANCIENT PERSIA

BEING LECTURES DELIVERED IN OXFORD  
PRESENTING THE ZEND AVESTA AS  
COLLATED WITH THE PRE-CHRISTIAN  
EXILIC PHARISAISM, ADVANCING THE  
PERSIAN QUESTION TO THE FOREMOST  
POSITION IN OUR BIBLICAL RESEARCH

BY

DR. LAWRENCE MILLS

PROFESSOR OF ZEND (AVESTA) PHILOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

TRANSLATOR OF THE XXXI<sup>ST</sup> VOL. OF "THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST"

EDITOR OF THE PAHLAVI TEXTS OF YASNA I, 5-25, 54-71 WITH

COLLATION OF ALL MSS. IN Z.D.M.G. TRANSLATED IN J.R.A.S.

AUTHOR OF "THE FIVE ZARATHUSHTRIAN GĀTHAS"

OF A SECOND EDITION OF THE SAME IN ENGLISH VERBATIM AND FREE METRICAL

AUTHOR OF "ZARATHUSHTRA PHILO THE ACHÆMENIDS AND ISRAEL"

OF "THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE AVESTA COMPARED WITH DANIEL AND REVELATIONS"

- OF "YASNA I. WITH THE AVESTA PAHLAVI PERSIAN AND SANSKRIT TEXTS

AND WITH THE AUTHOR'S SANSKRIT EQUIVALENT"

OF "THE SANSKRIT EQUIVALENT OF YASNA XXVIII XXIX XLIV (Z.D.M.G.)"

OF "A DICTIONARY OF THE GĀTHIC LANGUAGE OF THE ZEND AVESTA"

BEING VOL. III. OF "THE FIVE ZARATHUSHTRIAN GĀTHAS" ETC.

PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES

BY THE

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

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

1913

## PREFACE.

THIS collection of separate University Lectures here brought together under one cover, hardly needs any introductory statements, for I have been obliged to explain in the course of editing them particulars usually reserved to a preface.

I have been especially careful to forestall any criticism on the part of my readers in regard to the unavoidable repetitions. Sometimes years have passed between the occasions upon which the several treatises have been delivered, and I could not eliminate all allusion to previously stated facts without tearing the lectures to pieces. Moreover, some of them have been read aloud to audiences in Bombay, and this mode of extending my teaching may be repeated, in which case the connection of thought between the lectures will not be so apparent, and the disfigurement of repetition will disappear. Yet while apologising for such occasional redundancy, I must add that I endeavour to increase the directness of the pointing, and also to expand the issues at every recurrence.

There are, however, several interior considerations in the treatment of the subject of which large numbers of my readers may have had no opportunity whatever to become aware, nor of what I have endeavoured to do to meet the obligations which rest upon me with regard to them.

Without meaning to be in the smallest degree irresponsible, some scholars may well share in that general apathy upon these subjects which it is the one object of these pieces to dispel,—for I wish above everything to

arouse and fix attention upon these matters as being of paramount and immediate interest. The epoch-making chain of ideas lies clearly before us in the chapters ;—and if they are not astonishing, then I have failed in my effort to express myself, or else the susceptibility of my public is at fault.

My 'opposition' may object that by my own showing we possess these doctrines now ;—and they may ask : 'where is the use of reviving their historical origin' ;—we are, moreover, 'used' to them. I answer that this latter in one sense of it is not the fact ;—our long-standing indifference is not the result of a real familiarity. We need these discussions now to dispel our sinful inattention.\* Take what I regard as the finest product of the entire system, next after, or next before, the beautiful thought of the 'Attributes' as the 'Archangels' ;—I refer to the 'subjective recompense' ;—how many myriads of refined disciples need just such relief as this doctrine offers, namely, the view that both Heaven and Hell lie chiefly within ourselves ? It is nothing less than splendid as an intellectual result, making Avesta far and away the deepest and most refined lore of all equal antiquity ;—for the Avesta is the 'document' of such a necessary thought—that is to say, its first full presentation in the history of religious distinctions. Where has even the early Bible anything to compare with it ?† It is now widespread, of course, among the more enlightened of the clergy, but I very greatly doubt whether the main body of the laity feel it as they should. The threats of a flaming Hell may be

\* What right have we to neglect matters which concern not only the past record of our own spiritual development but its present healthfulness ?

† It was directly in connection with this crucial characteristic that an incident occurred which greatly surprised and charmed me. Having come into contact with a group of young academic Frenchmen, my son lent a copy of my Gāthas to one of them. On returning the book, the reader cited with much interest Yasna 46, where the souls of the evil are their own executioners. Out of all the 650 pages the keen-sighted young Parisian instantly fixed his attention upon this.

more effective toward the embruted masses, but the time has surely come when every human being should be forced to understand that his good or evil thoughts, words, and deeds are actually preparing and moulding his eternal future destiny;—that they constitute the very quintessence of Heaven or Hell;—and they will surely bring their own reward or their own revenge, as being the central element in the ‘great assize’ and the ‘last sentence.’

But we have our ‘opposition,’ some of whom may be honestly alarmed at the distraction of attention from the primary question of ‘conversion’† and the long-established views which tend to bring it on, while others care only for the academical prominence of their personal studies. Their first tactics might be these:—while acceding at once to the undeniable identities between the chief doctrines of the Avesta and the Exilic Bible, they might retort that there has been ‘no historical connection between them.’ But this is exactly the grandest assertion which could possibly be made in the entire connection. If the identities exist without ‘historical connection,’ then they arose spontaneously, irresistibly, and inevitably from the instincts of universal human nature—a proposition which takes its place among the very highest themes in a serious psychology and natural philosophy.‡ The history of the human soul is acutely involved. If this absence of historical connection can be accepted, we have here the one paramount curiosity of all religious literature, so par-eminence—a truly magnificent fact, deeply touching us at every moral fibre. I call upon all labourers in this field to fix their attention closely upon it, and to pursue it exhaustively as a matter of urgent duty.

The second device, whether honestly presented or not,

\* Not only does the Avesta preserve the first effective application of these vital opinions, but we actually need Avesta to-day to enforce them upon us. We are not at all so fully ‘used’ to them as we suppose,—far from it.

† And with this alarm I have full sympathy; see the Second Lecture.

‡ See *Zarathushtra, Philo, the Achæmenids, and Israel*, 1905–6, vol. I.

is to accede again to the identities, but ascribe them to the influence of Judaism upon Persia. Here again we have something as startling in the way of propaganda as the other was important as an element in the original development of man from an inferior condition,—and it is difficult to decide which of the two is the most interesting. If the Jews taught all Persia the illustrious catalogue, this not only shows what the Jews believed during the time that they were Persian citizens, but it presents a result of religious propagation beyond conception for all time, ancient or modern. What ardent missionary will not kindle with enthusiasm over such an opinion? Israel was then in that case not only stated to be, but proved to be, ‘a light to lighten the Gentiles,’ with results incalculable;—how can religious teachers venture to neglect such a thing?\*

While upon a third hypothesis, I do not know what they would like to say. To accede to the identities, and acknowledge that they all come from Persia, would be to avow a debt of religious gratitude which according to one view involves our everlasting salvation;—recall the turmoil of the Pharisees in the riot reported in Acts xxiii when St. Paul appealed to their sentiment in this matter of the resurrection;—see the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he rests our very salvation upon that article of the Creed.

No self-respecting historian could conceal such a theme for a moment if he were really aware of its existence;—while my own theory leaves it almost equally imperative. For if the Persian creed helped on, defended, and encouraged—perhaps saved—the Jewish which was original with the Captives, this was in its turn a momentous and an effective reality. Whichever view we take of it, the system of eschatological ideas, whether studied in connection

\* If the vast Persian Empire was taught futurity by a handful of inspired captives, surely this was a religious result unequalled in ‘missionary’ records.

with Judah or not, is in a good sense of it sensational to the last degree;—to neglect it would be folly, to suppress it would be crime. Scores of seminaries of religious learning are touching upon the subject every year;—let them now dwell upon it and search it well as a prime duty, for by universal verdict it involves the history of all moral life in man. Even literary persons bereft of all immediate interest in theology do not fulfil their scope of enterprise until they examine this most striking of all literary rarities.

What I have to say as to the identities of the Avesta and the Veda is in the same general line, though of course to us at least the interests involved in Avesta are incredibly more acute than any which concern the Veda. Yet as Avesta and Veda are but parts of one and the same original lore, Veda itself has some share in the great propaganda. Though upon the view that it was Israel who taught Persia her eschatology, we can hardly see how Israel could have imparted that same eschatology to the still more distant Indians with whom she had no such connection as she had with Persia.

My policy in view of my 'opposition' has been twofold, or rather it has been one single policy in two branches. I have been compelled to be both comprehensive and then impartial (see my chapter on Avesta's history). I have represented nearly every serious exegetical possibility, ancient or modern, with my own opinions independent of each. Though I have met with some small combinations who will not let me even agree with their own teachers, their falsifying is so irresponsible that it does little harm;—I warn all readers of their petty irregularity (see Chapter XI.), while I express my profound gratitude to the eminent persons who have shown their deep appreciation of my results in this truly dangerous task. As I have treated my subject upon a scale never before attempted, I have been exposed to the inevitable poignant jealousies which utterly dethrone the sanity of

those who harbour them,—yet never has work been received with such an impressive recognition.

With regard to the Appendix, I have only to say that it grew naturally out of my previous labours. I entered upon the entire investigation in 1873(?)–76, while working up a history of the Gnostic philosophy, and it is congruous enough that I should conclude this collection with one further attempt to harmonise philosophy with religion.

L. H. M.

OXFORD, *February*, 1913.

# OUR OWN RELIGION IN ANCIENT PERSIA\*

(ZOROASTER (ZARATHUSHTRA) AND THE BIBLE).

BY PROFESSOR MILLS.

[[THIS essay, which is here for the fourth time edited in English and enlarged, was, in its original form, delivered twice as a public lecture before distinguished audiences in Oxford some years ago. It was soon after, or before, printed in the *Nineteenth Century Review* of January, 1894, also in its shorter form;—and later, with the consent of the editor of that periodical and of the author, it was translated into Gujarati by Mr. D. N. Coorlawala, an accomplished Parsi of Bombay. In the second edition, see the Open Court of July, 1909, I mentioned that, as I then remembered, it was Mr. Palanji Madan who translated it. I am now happy to correct myself, while I repeat what I then wrote in recognition of the important service rendered by Mr. Palanji Madan in translating my XXXIst Volume of the *Sacred Books of the East* into Gujarati so far as the translation of the Gāthas extended in that work.

That translation of this essay into Gujarati was published by the Trustees of the Sir J. Jejeebhoy Translation Fund of Bombay in a large edition. The late very distinguished Editor of the monthly mentioned seemed gratified that the article was to be thus reproduced in that Oriental language, and he would beyond a doubt not object to this enlarged edition of it appearing as a 'University Lecture' here.

\* The third edition appeared in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October, 1911, and in a later number under the title 'The pre-Christian Religion in Ancient Persia.'



(It has also just lately been translated into Italian by a talented author, entirely upon his own suggestion and initiative, and has now been issued in that form,—and also by a gifted French auditor, but not yet published in that language.)

Those who may happen to compare this lecture with its original in the *Nineteenth Century Review* or in its *Gujarati* translation, will notice at once that it has been re-arranged, and somewhat amplified, and also that I seem to have altered my opinions somewhat as to one of the essential points, since I delivered the piece first, and since I gave it to the eminent publication. This, however, is more apparent than real, although I have certainly felt, and somewhat pointedly, the necessity for putting the possible, or probable, *independent origin* of our Jewish immortality in a clearer light. Readers will also easily recognise the later insertions, from the difference in the stylistic flow of the language, as a later and to some extent a more pointed animus imparts greater pungency and vivacity to one's mode of expressing one's self.))

---

## LECTURE.

MANY interested but necessarily hasty readers of the Zend Avesta overlook the fact that in the ancient documents comprised under that name we have works of many different ages; and even scholars eminently endowed with the critical faculty as applied to other specialities sometimes fall into a similar error, and ignore a characteristic which the Avesta possesses in common with nearly all other writings of its description;—for they sometimes turn over its pages without perceiving, or seeming to perceive, that from leaf to leaf matter comes before them made up of fragments nearly or quite dissimilar, and sometimes separated as to the dates of their authorship by many hundreds of years. They are accordingly apt to make themselves merry over absurdities which prevail in the later but still genuine

Avesta, as if they were peculiar to the original Zoroastrian writings.\*

But the author, or authors, of the earlier Avesta had no immediate or certain connection with the superstitions of later centuries;—and as to these quaint myths and trivial ceremonials which are preserved in the less original Avesta, are we not apt to exaggerate the disadvantages which they bring with them? How can their presence affect the value of the nobler elements in these relics of ancient faith?

We are pained to read them, but analogous superfluities survive in many modern systems. And indeed some of the cruder passages in the Zend Avesta which describe the battle with the Demon of Putrefaction, and which might seem to some of us most grotesque, were hardly superfluities, for they showed a sanitation which it would be better for us to follow rather than condemn.† In tracing the following analogies, which I take from the genuine, yet still newer, Avesta‡ as well as from the Gāthas, I shall leave out

\* It is even not uncommon to speak, or write, of the Avesta as if it were identical with the later Zoroastrianism, the revived system of Sasanian times, which is, however, as different from both the earlier and the later Avesta as the 'Lives of the Saints,' for instance, are from the New Testament record.

† Consciously or unconsciously they anticipated much modern theory upon this subject, and led the way in the most practical of all sciences—sanitation,—and their suggestions as to this particular seem to some disinterested critics to have been indirectly reproduced in the Book of Leviticus.

‡ The earlier Avesta consists of the Gāthas, the remnants of the original hymns of *Zarathushtra*, and his immediate associates or followers. They are most dissimilar to the rest of the Avesta and still more so to the apocryphal Zoroastrianism. They were carefully translated by me in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI., so long ago as October 1887, and their Zend, Pahlavi, Sanskrit, and Persian texts were edited, and the first three translated, by me with a Commentary in my *Study of the Gāthas*, some 650 pages, 1902-04. They may be provisionally placed at about 700 to 900 B.C., though they astonishingly ignore the cults of Mithra, Haoma (Soma), and of the sun, moon, etc., etc., which might argue a still earlier date for them. The remaining parts of the Avesta are of different ages, say in their origins at least from 600 to 300 B.C., while, as in the case of every other ancient book, interesting additions of an indefinitely later origin occur here and

these inferior details generally, abandoning them as rare morsels to the collectors of ancient bits. What is here intended is to call attention to the little-known, though long since reported, fact, that it pleased the Divine Power to reveal some of the fundamental articles of our Catholic creed first to Zoroastrians, though these ideas later arose spontaneously and independently among the Jews;—secondly, I wish to emphasise the peculiar circumstances of this separate origin among the Jewish tribes of the Exile;—and thirdly, I wish to show that the Persian system must have exercised a very powerful, though supervening and secondary influence upon the growth of these doctrines among the Exilic and post-Exilic pharisaic Jews, as well as upon the Christians of the New Testament, and so eventually upon ourselves.

After this brief preface let me proceed at once to cite the documental facts as to the whole system, only remarking that they are practically uncontested by any persons whose views are worth considering, for it is by no means necessary just here to go into the closer technical linguistic distinctions\* in such a delineation as this. Let us now first trace the Iranian ideas where their analogy with the Jewish seems most important.

To begin with our excerpts from the Sacred Book of the Iranians, we may consider the connection where it is also most obvious, that is to say, as to the *Nature of the Deity*.

I. First of all He is *Supreme*, and therefore *One*. The usual throng of sub-godlets which appear with Him no more impair His Supreme Unity than our own Archangels impair the Supreme Unity of Jehovah of Hosts or of our own misunderstood Tri-Unity. There can be but

---

there. Some writers, while holding the Gāthas to date from about 700 B.C., put even vigorous parts of the later but still genuine Avesta at a thousand years later. What happened then in that long gap;—did Iranian literature produce nothing?

\* While even the original passages could be learned by any apt scholar with a competent teacher in the course of a very short time.

one\* 'Greatest of the Gods who made the others, with this earth and yon Heaven, who made man, and amenity for him.'† But He is a moral God, His Supremacy is limited by His own character, which is not irrationally dishonest;—for He is not logically responsible either through origination or through permission, for the existence of sinners and their sufferings, the Universe being divided into two immense departments. 'There were two first Spirits, a better (they two), and an evil, as to thought, as to word, and as to deed,—and when these two spirits came together to make life and non-life (they arranged) what at the last the world should be,—the best life of the faithful, but for the faithless the worst mind' . . . ‡,—a doctrine of mighty import indeed and consequence, and we must discuss it fully and at once. For it would be a clumsy history of philosophy which would allow the present noble monotheism of the Parsis to cheat us of the speculatively precious element of dualism as it exists in their genuine writings. (a) [(As regards the later doctrinal development among the Zoroastrians whereby they entirely extinguished the vital elements of Dualism, making the Supreme Good God at last completely victorious, all evil being eliminated in the final restorations see just below;—but this was hardly a part of the original concept.)] To resume. The good and morally Supreme Ahura is exalted as the one only real God in our modern sense of the term;—but He was One in adoration as well as in definition, supreme because His 'goodness' makes Him great, 'His Unity' being that of His Truth, Benevolence, Authority, and sacred Energy; see above and below,—though the equally original evil God, as being

\* See also the very name of the so-called and really one God;—it was Elohim, meaning 'Gods,'—and it once referred to a recognised plurality in Deities;—while Ahura created the highest of the sub-gods, even Mithra, at times otherwise His close companion.

† See Behistūn. Dualism in the Inscription?—Auramazda is signally the creator of what is 'good.'—'He did not make evil' as Yahveh Elohim is said to have done in Isaiah xlv., xlv.

‡ See Y. XXX, 4.

independent, limits Him, completely exculpating Him from all share in crime;—in fact, entirely aside from any personal Devil, He would be sufficiently limited by His own Attributes\*; see above.

(b) *Does analogy fail us here as between the Iranian and Jewish concepts?*—and if so, to what extent?

The Jewish pre-Christian, but post-Exilic thought was doubtless as replete with diabolic demonism as the Christian and the post-Christian, though that of the Christian epoch was obviously under the control of the exorcising Redeemer. Does this last particular, which implies the inferiority of Satan, destroy all analogy here between Iran and Christian Israel as to this essential matter?—Not fully, in the sense in which we should here view the matter. Though *Angra Mainyu* was obviously inferior to *Ahura* in power, neither one of the two could be logically regarded as the possible annihilator of the other; so that the one inferior in power was to a certain point independent;—the Saviour might temporarily frustrate, or seem to frustrate his, Satan's, malign purposes, but He plainly could not annihilate him,—otherwise he would at once have done so.—(What is eternally original could not logically be regarded as coming to an end through the power of any other being, though an eternally Original force might yet of course be inferior within the scope of its legitimate effectivity to another equally independent force,—for there can be but one all-inclusive force which has no inferior;—yet there can be relatively independent and eternal forces which have no immediate connection with one another, and here inferiority and superiority are greatly widespread;—but such a force could have never met any other in the past capable of annihilating it, otherwise throughout a past eternity the meeting must have taken place with the result under consideration);—No theology should, however, be pushed too closely to all its logical results;—and we might indeed even infer such an 'annihilation' of the evil powers from those 'restora-

\* As a God of Honour.

tions' of all men ;—see above ;—and this from some expressions made use of even in the later but still genuine Avēsta as well as in the Gāthas themselves, together with those in the later Zoroastrianism ;—see above and below ;—though, as seen above, this would sacrifice all logic,—for if the Good God could save all men, He should have done this earlier in their career. To allow human, or other spiritual beings to commit revolting crimes for the purpose of letting them see through experience how evil sin is, would be a policy of which a Good and Omnipotent God would hardly be capable. [(—And who of us really believes that he was ?—)]

But if, on the contrary, the Good Iranian God, even He of the Gāthas, is indeed to bring in universal salvation at the end of any period, however restricted or protracted this period might be supposed to be, then, in that case, the difference between such a phase of Zarathushtrianism and some forms of Judaism and of liberal post-Christianity in this respect *fails*, and they, these systems, are here, if only illogically, *one*,—and but for the 'forever and forever' of the Gāthic Iranian Hell, one might yet claim for the analogy between the systems a persistent validity even as to this fundamental particular.

But no similarities, however protrusive, should blind us to the real and apparently radical difference here between the creeds as mainly expressed by their original authoritative exponents ;—and the striking facts of opinion, as they existed among important sections of both parties, remain in all their monumental force.

(c) *Can we not, however, in regard to some large sections of the early Jewish population, modify this apparent difference from an opposite and unexpected quarter, abysmal though the difference referred to may well seem to most of us to be?—It is rather a colossal question never before, so far as I am aware, mooted ;—but we must grapple with it none the less.*

Is, then, Yahveh Elohim Himself (*sic*) always actually so *supreme* as to be independent of all limitation on the part

of the evil Gods of the Gentiles? If not, were not the Jews themselves sometimes in a certain essential sense of it 'dualists'?

I very seriously raise the solemn question whether the Jewish writers of the Old Testament earlier or late at all really believed their *Yahveh Elohim* to be absolutely supreme in so far as to have been the *creator of either Satan, or of Baal, or of any of the Demon-gods*. We know indeed that they, the Jewish prophets, accredited the existence of these Beings as a matter only too emphatically real, and by no means uninterruptedly regarded them as being altogether creatures of the imagination (see the frequent comparison of them with *Yahveh Elohim*). But when, and in so far as, they thus believed them, these gentile gods, to be really existing spiritual beings, in how far did they then suppose their own *Yahveh Elohim* to have been their original creator, either bringing them into existence as being holy in their nature before a fall like 'Lucifer's,' or causing them to arise as being *originally* of evil character?—The question is very serious. The foolish relief offered us by the doctrine that *Yahveh Elohim*, as God the Father, was not responsible for the fall of beings who He foresaw would become evil when He created them, is no longer available, and could not have long continued to satisfy any sober-minded sage;—but if the leading Jews in large numbers thus in due sequence unconsciously, or openly, rejected the view that their good God *Yahveh* originally created the Evil Gods of their enemies—directly or indirectly, in any shape or chain of causality or responsibility whatsoever, then such ancient Israelites were in verity, though they may not have been consciously, *dualists*,\* not far indeed from the type of Zarathushtra;—they held to the existence of a Being, or Beings, who was, or who were, originally evil, and so they held, to an original

\* Recall also the very expression 'God' [applied to Satan as the 'God of this world.' If Satan was a 'God of this world,' and *Yahveh* was the 'God of Heaven,' we have here at once something extremely like the 'Pair' at Y. XXX.

evil principle, which is dualism, and that dualism remains one of the most interesting suggestions which have ever been presented, and one indeed which, in its elements, if not in its detail, is still unconsciously but largely followed.\*

So much for this most fundamental of all discriminations.

Others of the utmost interest offer themselves here at once as being closely connected,—but, in the leading of a more stringent logic, we should postpone them for later expansion, now facing that other most practical of doctrines which often really gives the whole discussion its immediate importance;—and this is the great question of the *Human Immortality*;—although many might indeed well say that the two subjects could be profitably studied quite apart,—and, in fact, that they ought to be so studied separately.

II. I fear that we too little realise how very uncertain the doctrine of a future life was in the minds of pious Jews, even at the time of our Lord. The Sadducees, as we understand, believed in ‘neither angel, nor spirit, nor resurrection,’ and they quite held their own with the Pharisees;—see even the street riot of Acts xxiii.;—several princely high-priests were of their clique, the entire party of the Asmonaeon or Hasmonaeon princes inclined to this opinion. It seems to many of us most curious that the sect among the ancient people of God; which especially claimed the title of ‘purists’† and sticklers for the ancient Pentateuch, should have been well-nigh absolute disbelievers in what are now considered to be the essential elements of religion;—see also the expression ‘who only hath immortality,’ and also ‘who brought life

\* What is the present advancing pessimism (so called) but the recognition of the original necessity of evil co-existing with good? The Avesta here anticipates momentous distinctions;—recall the later schemes of the *Gnostics*;—as to which see also *Jakob Boehme*, *Fichte* and *Hegel*. Some writers have here indeed compared the supposed Babylonian dualism especially in regard to Isaiah xlv., xlv., etc., but such ‘pairings’ of the thrones of Gods should hardly be here mentioned.

† Though the name, being derived from the proper name of some prominent teacher, *Zadok*, did not necessarily imply any especial claims to ‘Righteousness’;—yet the force of the word, as analogously elsewhere in similar cases, was doubtless sometimes felt.



and immortality to 'light' through the gospel, as if the subject had been till lately obscured.

If such a state of things existed at the time of our Lord, when both the doctrine of immortality and that of resurrection had long been familiar as theories, what must have been the condition of opinion upon these subjects while the influence of the Pentateuch, in which these doctrines were not distinctly revealed at all, was as yet not affected by the large addition to canonical Scripture made later?

Few scientific theologians will deny that the full doctrine of a conscious and accountable immortality was scarcely mentioned before the later Isaiah\*; that is to say, not before the Captivity, whereas the Zoroastrian scriptures are one mass of spiritualism, referring all final results to the heavenly or infernal worlds.—We shall return to the details for their necessary amplification further on.

(a) This is, however, also the proper place to emphasise the main essential moral and intellectual elements of this future immortality which we have indeed already inclusively adumbrated. In close accordance with the moral character of God is the deep *subjectivity* of the Religion.

Holiness is prayed for, and Heaven and Hell are chiefly mental states:—‘O Asha (Angel of the Holy Law), shall I see thee, and Vohumanah (the Good Mind), I finding Sraosha (God’s Heeding Ear and man’s), the way to Ahura (or ‘finding His throne’), Y. XXVIII. 5.

The last line in the passage cited above, Y. XXX. 4, seems to imply that the future life of the righteous was the ‘Best Mind’; from this the word ‘Best’ occurs as used by the Persians for ‘Heaven.’

Rewards and punishments are self-induced, Y. XXXI. 20; ‘and this which is your life, O ye vile, with (your) own deeds your own souls have brought you.’ ‘Cursed by their souls and selves (their being’s nature) in the Druj-

\* The future existence of souls after death was as dim in the pre-exilic Bible, as it was in the older Greek classics;—in fact this latter, the Greek immortality, seems to show rather the more of animation.

Lie-Demon's Home at last their bodies lie (or, 'their citizenship (?) is),' Y. XLVI. 12?\*

III. Having endeavoured here at the outset to engage-attention by putting the two most vital elements into point, we can now return to the scarcely less imposing extended detail which presents itself in regard to the chief concepts already touched upon.

(a) Ahura Mazda, the Living Lord, the great Creator (or possibly the 'Wise One'), has a most Bountiful, or most Holy Spirit, who is sometimes identical with Him, and there is precisely the same difficulty in distinguishing between Ahura and His Holy (?) Spirit, which meets us in the Semitic when we endeavour to decide positively in the analogous obscurity. (Often we cannot tell whether Yahveh's attribute or His creature is meant.)

Yasna XXVIII, 1 :

'With hands outstretched, I beseech for the first (blessing) of Thy most Bounteous or (holy) Spirit.\*'

See also Yasna I. 1 :

'I invoke, and I will complete my sacrifice to Ahura Mazda, the Creator, the radiant, the glorious, the greatest and the best, the most firm, (who sends His) joy-creating grace afar, who made us and has fashioned us, who has nourished and protected us, who is the most bountiful (the most holy) Spirit.†'

(b) In the seven Bountiful (or 'holy') Immortals (the Amshaspendas of literature) we have a union which reminds us of the Sabellian Trinity (Yasht XIII. 82):—

'We sacrifice to the redoubted guardian spirits of the Bountiful Immortals who are glorious, whose look itself has power (their look produces what they wish), who are lofty and coming on to help us, who are swiftly strong and divine, everlasting and holy, who are Seven,‡ and all of one thought, of one word, and of one deed, whose thought is the same, whose word is the same, and whose

\* About 700 to 900 B.C., or earlier.

† Somewhat later.

‡ Literary confusion;—they were seven only with Ahura.

deeds are the same, who have one Father and Commander, Ahura Mazda;—each of whom sees the other's soul revolving good thoughts, thinking of good words, contemplating good actions, whose abode is the Home of Sublimity (or 'Song'),—and shining are their paths as they come down to us to offering.\*

While they are thus unified, Ahura Mazda being illogically-included within their number, they are yet separate. Vohumanah is the divine benevolence, the good mind of the Deity, likewise alive within His saints, and later personified as a separate Archangel, while even in the Gāthas it represents the holy or correct citizen. Asha, the Vedic Rīta, is the divine Order, the symmetry and perfection in the Law, the ritual, and in the soul, while at the same time a poetically personified Archangel. Khshathra is His sovereign power realised in a kingdom of righteousness, and yet also poetically personified. Ār(a)maiti is our energetic zeal and piety, the Active mind, inspiring energy of the Deity first thought of as the 'ploughing of agriculture'; to *aratrum*, and from this latter called the 'earth' in both Veda and Avesta, as against the non-toiling and theft-murder schemes of the raiding Turks. She is also in figurative conception God's daughter, and this even in the Gāthas, where 'God' is otherwise only in general the 'Father of the good,' the Fire being 'God's Son,' exclusively in the later Avesta. She is also implanted within the minds of the faithful as a divine inspiration.

Haurvatāt is God's Perfection consummated through His foregoing Truth, Love, Power and Vital Energy, while the name is borrowed, or promoted from the haurvatāt 'wholesomeness'—*i.e.*, 'the health and success' of man. [(It was God's completeness like that of man's as reflected in the body's health, then soon perfected in the weal of soul and mind as well as of body, an idea evidently necessary to the roundness of the scheme, and added

\* Say 300 to 100 B.C., in its origins at least, or greatly earlier?

in most modern theologies)];—while Ameretatāt is their Immortality, God's Eternity and man's Death's absence, a veritable victory over death begun in its long postponement to old age here,—which last was indeed the original point-meaning of the word,—but continued in eternal Deathlessness in a future state.\*

From the second to the seventh they are therefore the personified thoughts sent forth from the mind of God to ennoble and redeem His people. That the general description of such notorious and striking conceptions as these, immensely widespread as they were in the dominant power of Asia, and lying at the logical root of Zoroastrianism, should have become known to the Jews of the Captivity and to their descendants before the date of some, if not all, of the Exilic Prophets, is scarcely less than certain, for they were also signally identified by the distant Greeks with the general theology of Persia far and wide, without distinction of provinces,—and the Greeks also heard of them, in their deepest and purest sense, before the date of Daniel (see the 'invaluable' passage in Plutarch evidently reproducing the ideas of Theopompus, whom he quotes, also cited by me elsewhere). If the priests of Cyrus conferred to the smallest degree with those of Ezra, then not only the Gnostics felt its influence, but the pre-Christian and Christian theology. And in the Book of Tobit, which also contains prominently the name of an Avesta demon, we have an allusion to these Seven† Spirits (chap. xii. 15) at Ragha, the Zarathushtrian centre (let it be noticed), one of whom, those Spirits, is actually mentioned as Raphael, the Jewish Archangel, so positively 'identifying' the two 'sets' of 'Seven Spirits,' though in a somewhat

\* The 'hundred autumns' of the Rik were the hope of all, and this idea of a praternaturally extended life upon earth—that is to say, of a 'temporal immortality'—merged into that of another 'deathlessness' beyond the grave, becoming an universal aspiration with the Irano-indians, as it is, indeed, elsewhere;—for what nation ever existed without some form of it?

† One edition (!) omits the word 'Seven' amply supplied elsewhere.

loose manner. So also in Zechariah (iv. 10) we have the 'Seven which are the eyes of the Lord, and which run to and fro upon the earth';—and this is further expanded in Rev. v. 6: 'And I saw in the midst of the throne a Lamb standing as though it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the "Seven Spirits" of God sent forth into all the earth.' (How sublime it all becomes when we look upon it in the light of parallel development in unassisted growth.)—

[[*(c)* Negative arguments as regards the extent of territory reached by these doctrines, drawn from the absence of the named 'Seven' from the Inscriptions, are the mistakes of non-experts, as well as are the negative arguments with regard to their dates. These names are equally absent from large portions of the Avesta, and no inference can be made from their absence from the Inscriptions. (Certainly not, as we may pause to state, upon the ground that they, the Inscriptions, are in themselves a completed unit, while they yet omit some of these personifications, which should, as an objector might suppose, be included within all complete documents dealing with the Iranian Religion, and that, on the other hand, the portions of the Avesta which omit these personifications are but parts of a whole, and therefore might not be expected to contain allusions even to leading concepts;—this negative point has little force, from the fact that the Achæmenian Inscriptions, while perhaps the most important and extensive of sculptured writings upon rocks are yet, nevertheless, necessarily very circumscribed when regarded as literature. (And how long must it have taken to complete them, by workmen who could neither read nor write in any language, while the composers also should not have been expected to mention all particulars.))

The number 'seven,' together with the very names of the Ameshas, though not visible upon the Inscriptions, found, as we have seen, its way to distant shores, and the report of Plutarch just cited, concerned, as we have also emphasised, the general religion of all Persia, so that it

could not have been intended to exclude that form of the so widely extended Faith which prevailed about Behistūn and Nakhsh i Rustam. And that these same ideas at least, which are expressed in the names of the Amesha Spentas were prominent in Farsistan is illustrated by the fact that two of them are combined in the name of an Emperor, Artakhshatra, which is Asha (A[r]sha) plus Khshathra.

[(—To be complete it may be well to pause here again for a moment, and on the other hand guard my readers against a false identification.

In the case of Arachosia the eastern province (better Harachosia, as the first *s* of the Indian Sarasvati requires a corresponding organic *h*), the name stands only as Harauvati upon Behistūn, so in the Elamatic (Susian) there is no *h*, for the organic second '*s*' of Sarasvati; *h* appears only in the Babylonian;—though in other cases '*h*' is a letter easily dropped; see *India*—(Greek)—instead of *Hindia*; compare *Hindoo* and *Sindhu*. I think we had better restore the '*h*' and read *Harauhvati*. Otherwise Harauvati might be simply the equivalent of Av. Ha(u)rvatāt(i), Indian Sarvatātī, the fifth Amesha. Religious names were not unusual when applied to countries; recall Arminiya (adj.), which seems clearly related to Ar(a)maiti, the fourth Amesha;—see also the name of the great Province of Azarbaijan (Adarbaijan), named from the 'Fire-altars.' But, as said, these remarks are a mere interlude.—)]

*Angra Mainyu* does not indeed occur upon the Inscription, but His Chief Creature, the Female (?) Devil of Deception, the *drauga*=*draogha*—that is, the *Druj(k)*, see above—is present everywhere, though her, or 'his' (?), essential characteristics are more frequently expressed under the verbal than under the nominal form. 'He lied' thunders everywhere from the monumental surfaces;—those reprobations must have been constantly repeated in greatly varied forms; and these ideas in their original, or later, shape may well have helped to mould Jewish and Christian expressions.

Mithra and Anahita too seem to have stepped bodily out of the Avesta: Many turns of speech are strikingly common to the Avesta and the Inscriptions.]]—To resume.

IV. Then as to the attributes of God more definitively considered in their relation to man;—He is *our Creator* (so already necessarily alluded to above upon the Attributes), and perhaps also, in a theological sense, *sovereign*; cf. Yasna XXIX. 4 in S. B. E. XXXI., and in the Gāthas:—

‘The Great Creator is most mindful of the utterances or commands which have been fulfilled beforehand hitherto by demon-worshippers,\* and by faithful men, and of those which shall be fulfilled by them hereafter;—He, Ahura, is the discerning arbiter, so shall it be to us as He shall will (see also Y. XXXI. 14).—He is *omniscient* (see Y. XXXI. 13, 14). He is our *lawgiver* (Y. XXXI. 11) and *teacher* (Y. XXXI. 5; Y. XXXII. 13).—He will establish a *kingdom* (Y. XXVIII. 4). It is for the *poor* (Y. XXXIV. 3): “What is your kingdom, what are your riches, that I may become your own in my actions with the righteous order, and thy good mind, to care for your poor?” (Y. LIII. 9):—“O Mazda, Thine is the Kingdom, and by it Thou bestowest the highest of blessings on the right-living poor.”—It is endangered, and yet in the end *victorious*. It has a propaganda (Y. XXXI. 3): “With tongue of thy mouth do thou speak, that I may make all the living believers.” God is our *friend, protector, strengthener*, and *unchangeable* (Y. XXXI. 7). “These, O Spirit, mayst thou cause to prosper, Thou, who art for every hour the same.”—He is our *Judge* (Y. XLIII. 4).\*—There is a day or period of judgment (Y. XLIII. 5, 6): “Yea, I conceived of Thee as Bounteous, O Ahura Mazda, when I beheld Thee as supreme in the actions of life, when, as rewarding deeds and words, Thou didst establish evil for the evil, and blessings for the good by Thy great virtue or ‘great wisdom’ in the creation’s final change. In which last

\* These Gāthic passages may be placed at about 700 to 900 B.C.

changing Thou shalt come, and with Thy bounteous Spirit, and thy sovereign power (see also Y. XLIV. 19).'

V. Then to return for expansion to the evil element in the dualism, we have again, upon the other hand, the more detailed description of *Satan's* counter-activity toward man. While criticism casts its doubt upon the presence of Satan in the serpent of Genesis, we gather from the Genesis of the Avesta that the Scriptural reptile may well be recognised as that 'old Serpent, the Devil.' A serpent tempts in Genesis, and the consequence is sin and the expulsion from Eden. In the Vendidad, the Evil Spirit\* opposes every good object of creation, and the implied consequence is an expulsion;—the point is closer here.

Vendidad I. Ahura Mazda said unto Zarathushtra Spitama :

'I, O Zarathushtra Spitama, made the first best place, which is Airyana Vaêjah,—thereupon Añgra Mainyu (the Evil Spirit) created a counter-creation, a serpent in the river, and frost made by the demons. . . . The third place which I, Ahura Mazda, made the best was Moûru ; thereupon Añgra Mainyu (the Evil Spirit) created a counter creation, which was backbiting and lust. . . . The fifth place which I, Ahura Mazda, made the best was Nisaya ; thereupon, in opposition to it, Añgra Mainyu (the Evil Spirit), full of death, created a counter creation, which was the curse of unbelief. . . . As the seventh best place I, who am Ahura Mazda, created Vaekereta . . . thereupon, in opposition to it, Añgra Mainyu (the Evil Spirit), full of death, created the evil fairy who clave to Keresaspa. . . . As the ninth place, I, who am Ahura Mazda, created Khneñta as the best . . . thereupon Añgra Mainyu (the Evil Spirit) created a counter creation, the inexpressible deed of Sodomy † . . . etc.'

\* Though hardly Azhi Dahāka, who was nevertheless a serpent.

† About 500 to 300 B.C. ; in its main prior elements greatly earlier ; but, except where guarded by the metre, extraneous matter universally finds its way in places into ancient texts ;—many portions of the later Avesta must have been repeatedly, seldom fatally, written over.



These memorable fragments must have struck the attention of every learned Jewish scribe who studied the Lore of his great Persian Protectors ;—and what Zarathushtrian who was at all religiously instructed had not at least known of these items in their earlier form ?—See the allusions to them swarming everywhere.

(a) Then the Asmodeus (Asmodai) of the Book of Tobit (see above) is positively the Aeshma-daēva of the Avesta and Aeshma was the Wrath-demon of Invasion contending with the Seven Spirits in the Gāthas, as he did with other fell aims against the same Seven Spirits in Tobit (see Y. XXVIII. 7, etc. ;—see above and below).

(b) A 'fall of man' is included in the successive expulsions just above related, but we have also in the original Avesta, which was written still earlier than the Vendīdād, a fall of man, as of spiritual beings, distinctly stated (Y. XXX. 3) :—

'Thus are the primæval Spirits (see above) which, as a pair, each independent in his actions, have been famed of old (as regards) a better and a worse, as to thought, as to word, and as to deed ; and between these Two, the demons (or 'their worshippers') could make no righteous choice, since theirs (was) deception ;—as they were questioning (in their hesitation) the Worst Mind approached them that he might be chosen.—Thereupon they rushed together unto Aēshma, the Demon of Rapine, that they might pollute the lives of mortals.'

(c) So much for the more definitive, and, so to speak, 'applied,' attributes of the Evil Deity, the '*God of This World.*' The fell characteristics here manifested are not indeed so categorically arranged in a recognised order in the Gāthas, nor in the later, but still genuine, Avesta.

The '*Good Immortal Seven*' are so constantly presented together in those productions that a formal correspondence in antithesis is more nearly approximated in the later Zoroastrianism, yet we may easily trace out a marked and most important informal grouping of the opposed intellectual forces even in the Gāthas. As Añgra Mainyu

there is opposed to Ahura Mazda, the One, the first, being the God of Heaven, and the second the God of Hell, so the *Druj* Lie-demon of the Infidels is opposed to Asha (Arsha) the Truth-Law everywhere ;—the Akem, evil, (sometimes called Achishta = 'the worst') Mind is opposed to Vohu Manah, the Good Mind, at times Vahishta, 'the best.' The Dush-Khshathra = evil Kings, are opposed to Khshathra, Archangel of the Sovereign Authority ; Tarōmaiti, surpassing insolence, is opposed to Ār(a)maiti, the zealous Piety ; while Av(a)ētat = 'dejection,' etc., opposes Hauravatāt the Universal Weal of Health and of Salvation, and Ameretatāt, the deathless-long-life, here and hereafter, is opposed everywhere by Merethyu, 'death,' etc.

VI. As to *Soteriology*, a virgin conceives. It is not how<sup>1</sup> ever, to produce Zarathushtra, but the restoring Saviour of the latter age ;—nor does she conceive without seed although she is still a virgin. She conceives from the seed of Zarathushtra, which has been miraculously preserved.

The details, which show a gross deterioration from Gāthic times, are presented in their rounded form only in the Bundahish, which is perhaps as much as a thousand years later than the date of the original passages in the genuine but still later Avesta. 'Zarathushtra approached his wife Hvōv . . . the angel Neryosangh received the brilliance and strength of that seed, and delivered it with care to the angel Anāhīd, and in time it will blend with a mother. Ninety-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine myriads of the guardian spirits of the saints are intrusted with its protection' (see the Bundahish. *S. B. E.*, vol. v., p. 144). It is preserved in the Lake Kāsava till, at the end of the earthly cycle, a maid Eretāt-fedhri, bathing in the lake, will conceive from it, and bring forth the last Saoshyant, or future benefactor, while two of his predecessors are similarly engendered. These several items are likewise visible in a scattered state in the ancient but still comparatively later Avesta. In Yasht XIII. 142, we read :

'We worship the guardian spirit of the holy maid Eretāt-fedhri, who is called the all-conquering, for she will bring him forth who will destroy the malice of the demons and of men.'\*

While in Yasht XIX. 92, we read that—

'Astvat-ereta (the Saviour of the Restoration) will arise from the waters of Kāsava, a friend of Ahura Mazda, a son of Vispataurvairi, the all-conquering, knowing the victorious knowledge which will make the world progress unto perfection.'†

And in Yasht XIII. 62, we learn that many myriads of the spirits of the faithful watch over the seed of Zoroaster.‡ [(That we have here the hope of a *virgin-born Redeemer* admits no doubt. Whether such intimations, repeated under various forms, came from the hint of the Israelitish prophets or *vice versa* is of course a question, but that Zoroastrian or Mazda-worshipping Magi, if they came from the East to do honour to the virgin-born babe of Bethlehem, were familiar with them is certain. And as they expected a virgin-born Saviour themselves, it is but reasonable to suppose that this pious hope may well have lain at the foundation of their divine call to discover him who was born 'King of the Jews.')]

VII. According to the record, evil Powers aroused themselves at the birth of the Semitic Deliverer, and so at Vendidad XIX., 43 we have:

'He shouted, and shouted forth again, he Añgra Mainyu, the evil Spirit who is full of death. He pondered, and he pondered deeply, the demon of the demons, and he thus said, he who was the evil-minded Añgra Mainyu, "What! will the demons be assembled in an assembly on the top of Arezura,\*§ they the wicked, evil-minded?" . . .

\* In its origin, say 300-500 B.C. (?), or greatly earlier.

† In its origins, at about 300-500 B.C.; the much later repetition of this myth argues its long previous growth through centuries.

‡ Compare this drivel with the grandeur and simplicity of the Gāthā, S.B.E. XXXI., pp. 1-194.

§ Recall the 'exceeding high mountain.'

They rushed and they shouted,<sup>b</sup> they, the demons, wicked, evil-minded, and with the evil eye:—‘Let us assemble in an assembly on the top of Arezura, for born indeed is He who is the holy Zarathushtra of the house of Pourushaspa. Where shall we find destruction for Him?—He is the demon’s wounder,—He is the demon’s foe.<sup>c</sup> He is Druj of the Druj (a destroyer of the destroyer). Face downward are the demon-worshippers, prostrate is the death-demon,<sup>d</sup> and down is the Draogha of the lie.’\*

(a) Then as to the *Temptation*.—If our Lord approached that great event in the spirit of a wide humanity, one would surmise that he felt some sympathy with sages who had gone before Him in similar signal encounters,—and there exists a temptation of Zoroaster of which He may have known through supernatural cognition, and to which for colour that of Hercules, for instance, bears no comparison. The myth containing it doubtless expresses in its fragments what was once a real struggle, which, if it in any sense saved Zoroastrianism, was one of the world’s crises. Zoroaster is besought by the Evil One to abjure the holy Mazdayasnian religion, and to obtain a reward such as an evil ruler got (Vend. XIX. 1). A rally from a first defeat having been made, Añgra Mainyu, the evil Spirit coming from the ‘north region of the North,’† orders the Lie-demon to assault and slay the holy Zarathushtra, now no longer just born, but in the vigour of his age. The demon, again discouraged, returns to Añgra Mainyu. She says:

‘O baneful Evil Spirit, I see no death for him, for glorious is the holy Zarathushtra.’‡

Zarathushtra (seeing through their thoughts, says within himself):

‘The Demons plot my death, they, evil-doing as they are.’

\* In its origin, say about 300 or greatly earlier (?). The foot-note signs expressed in letters refer in each case to the corresponding analogy; see the note below, p. 23; (recall, ‘cried with a loud voice’).

† An accursed quarter.

‡ Recall: ‘I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God.’

Then Añgra Mainyu again heads the throng:

'He (Z.) arose, he went forth uninjured<sup>†</sup> by their plan and the hardness of their words. And Zarathushtra let the Evil Spirit know:—

'O evil-minded Añgra Mainyu, I will smite the creation made by demons; I will smite the Nasu (putrid demon); I will smite the evil fairy (that seduced the early sages), till the Saviour is born victorious from the waters of Kāsava, from the utmost region of the East.\*—

And Añgra Mainyu answered, shouting as he spoke:—

'Slay not my creatures,<sup>§</sup> holy Zarathushtra. Thou art Pourushaspa's son, for from thy birth have I invoked (thee).<sup>‡†</sup> Renounce the good religion of those who worship Mazda.<sup>‡</sup> Obtain the reward<sup>‡</sup> which Vadhaghan, the murderous (ruler), gained.'—

And Zarathushtra answered:

'Never shall I abjure the good faith<sup>k</sup> of those who worship Mazda: (no), let not my body, nor my life,<sup>‡</sup> nor my senses fly apart.'—

And to him then shouted the Evil Spirit of the evil world:

With whose word wilt thou thus conquer?—With whose word will thou abjure? With what weapon as the best formed wilt thou conquer these my creatures?—

And Zarathushtra answered:—

'With the sacred Haoma plant, with the mortar, and the cup, with the word which God pronounced.<sup>‡</sup> With these my weapons (will I slay thee), they are best. With that word shall I be victor, with that word shall I expel thee,<sup>m</sup> with this weapon <sup>§</sup> as the best made, O evil Añgra Mainyu. The most bounteous Spirit forged it<sup>n</sup>; in boundless time He made it;—and the Bountiful Immortals gave it, they who rule aright, who dispose (of all) aright.'

\* A blessed quarter.

† First aorist mid. 'All these things will I give thee.'

‡ Other translators introduce an 'if' to gain a better meaning 'Not if my body, nor my life, nor my senses fly apart.'

§ Recall 'the sword of the Spirit.'

And Zarathushtra chanted :—

‘As the higher priest is to (be revered and) chosen, so let the lower chief (be one who serves) from the righteous order, a creator of mental goodness, and of life’s actions done for Mazda, and the kingdom° is to Ahura, which to the poor may give their nurture.’\*—

Here we may well introduce the closing verse of the chapter (XIX. 147): †—

‘The demons shouted, the demons rushed, the evil-doing and the wicked; they rushed and they fled to the bottom of the place of darkness; that is, of frightful Hell.’<sup>p</sup>

Few Medo-Persian subjects in the streets of Jerusalem being presumably Mazda-worshippers, like their Emperors, here lingering in the Persian subject city soon after, or long after the Return, could have failed to know this striking myth probably in a much fuller form;—and none who knew it could have failed to tell it, if creeds were at all discussed.

VIII. We can now trace the records of the *soul’s individual* experiences in its salvation, and here the astonishing subjectivity of the system comes once more fully out. In Vend. XIX. 30, the soul is met on its arrival after death at the Chinvat, or Judge’s, Bridge by a female form accompanied with dogs,† and in Yasht XXII. we learn who this female was. It was none other than the believer’s *conscience*.

\* The texts cited are all of them metrical, from this the rhythm of the renderings.

† For detailed analogies in the above citations, which are not very close, recall perhaps <sup>(a)</sup> ‘the exceeding high mountain’; <sup>(b)</sup> ‘cried with a loud voice, My name is Legion, for we are many’; <sup>(c)</sup> ‘Art thou come hither to destroy us before the time?’ <sup>(d)</sup> ‘Death and Hell shall be cast into the lake that burneth’; <sup>(e)</sup> ‘The Holy One’; <sup>(f)</sup> ‘was led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil’; <sup>(g)</sup> ‘And the devils besought Him,’ etc.; <sup>(h)</sup> ‘I know Thee who Thou art’; <sup>(i)</sup> ‘All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me’; <sup>(j)</sup> ‘I will give Thee this authority’; <sup>(k)</sup> ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God’; <sup>(l)</sup> ‘It is written’; <sup>(m)</sup> ‘Get thee hence’; <sup>(n)</sup> ‘The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God’; <sup>(o)</sup> ‘him only shalt thou serve’; <sup>(p)</sup> ‘Then the devil leaveth Him’; ‘into the abyss.’

† Related to Cerberus (?).

The figure presents the typical features of female attractiveness;—she is beautiful, she is noble, and in the flower of her youth.—‘What maiden art thou,’ he asks her, ‘who art the most beautiful of maidens that ever I have seen?—And she, who is his conscience,\* answers: ‘I am verily, O youth, thy conscience, thy good thoughts, and words, and deeds, thy very own.’ But he asks her:—‘Who hath desired thee hither with his love, coming with thy majesty, thy goodness, and thy beauty, triumphant and an enemy of grief?’ And she answers:—‘Thou hast loved me and desired me † hither, O youth, even thy good thoughts, and words, and deeds. For when thou sawest idol-worship . . . thou didst desist, chanting the Gāthas, and sacrificing to the good waters and to Ahura-Mazda’s fire, contenting ‡ the righteous saint who came to thee from near and from afar.—It is thus that thou hast made me, who am lovely, still more lovely, and me who am beautiful hast thou made still more beautiful, and thou hast made me who am beatified still more beatified . . . through thy good thoughts, and words, and deeds.’ (Here we may observe, in passing, the same element of pleased surprise which we have in the sublimer Matthew XXV. 37; the soul is incredulous: ‘When saw we Thee a hungered and fed Thee?’,—and the answer is, ‘Thou hast fed and lodged Me;’ so here there is surprise: ‘Who hath desired thee hither with his love?’ And the answer is: ‘Thou hast;—for thou didst content the righteous man coming from near and from afar.’) As the soul proceeds further, it passes the Judge’s Bridge and comes before the golden throne, where the Good Mind is seated§ (Vend. XIX. 31). He rises to meet it, and welcomes it: ‘When didst thou come hither from that perishable world to this imperishable world?’;—and the saints who

\* Some writers render, the believer’s ‘soul’; others, the believer’s self, so varying the identical idea.

† ‘Invited me.’

‡ The later Zoroastrianism explains ‘lodged and entertained.’

§ Recall the ‘Son of Man’;—V.M. also equalled ‘the good man.’

have passed away before him ask him the same:—‘How long was thy salvation?’ Then said Ahura Mazda: ‘Ask him not what thou asketh of that cruel way which is the dividing of the soul and body’ (Yasht XXII.).—And the first step, as he advances, places him in the entrance of the three-fold Heaven, which is again the Good Thought, and the second step places him in the Good Word, and the third in the Good Deed.—Then the soul passes on contented to the souls of the saints, to the golden throne of Ahura Mazda, and to the golden thrones of the Bountiful Immortals, and to the abode of Sublimity (or ‘Song’), even to the home of Ahura Mazda and His blest\* (Vend. XIX. 33). A corresponding evil spirit awaits the wicked; a hideous female is his conscience,—the wicked and Añgra Mainyu mock him, and he rushes at last into the Hell of evil thoughts, and words, and deeds.†

IX. *Corporeal resurrection* seems to be placed after the reception of souls into Heaven as if they returned later to a purified earth.‡

As to this doctrine,—which is, properly speaking, not identical with that of ‘immortality,’ but which may be said to be closely associated with it,—aside from the constant implication of it throughout, we have in Fragment IV., ‘Let Añgra Mainyu, the evil spirit, be hid beneath the earth,—let the Daēvas disappear, let the dead arise, and let bodily life be sustained in these now lifeless bodies.’ And, in Yasht XIX. 83, we have resurrection together with millennial perfections:—‘We sacrifice unto the Kingly Glory which shall cleave unto the victorious Saoshyant and His companions, when He shall make the world progress unto perfection, and when it shall be never dying, not decaying, never rotting, ever living, ever useful,

\* About 300 B.C., in its origins at least, probably greatly earlier.

† A perhaps misunderstood echo of this would be Rev. xxii. 11: ‘He that is unrighteous, let him be unrighteous still:—and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still.’

‡ Recall the same uncertainty among Christians as to the detail of their future beatification.



having power to fulfil all wishes, when the dead shall arise, and immortal life shall come, when the settlements shall all be deathless.' Contrast this with the earlier Scriptural passages, void as they are of any genuine statement of this important dogma ;—compare these, then, with statements which appear after the return from the Captivity, a captivity during which the tribes had come into intimate contact with a great religion\* in which the passages cited express predominant convictions ;—what do we find in them? First, we have the jubilant hope expressed by the later Isaiah: 'Let thy dead live, let my dead body arise ;—Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust ; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the shades.' And then the full statement in Daniel: 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'—And yet God's people, as we have seen above, had by no means universally accepted the meaning of this language even at the time of Christ. We draw the inference—*the religion of the Jews was originally Sadducaic.*†

X. Such then are the historical literary facts,—uncontested for the most part, the great mass of them (see above), and also incontestable ;—and this, whatsoever may be their possible or impossible, exterior historical connection or disconnection with the Hebrew theology, or with our own. The points deduced from them clearly show that they contain the very most essential elements of '*our own religion*' in its advanced, if still formative, condition, from the date of the Captivity, or before the time of Christ, and after the Restoration from the Exile. [(—Let us now for convenience compactly collect the points made in the above copious citations. First of all there was God's unity as the greatest of the deities and with a name far more appropriate than our own for Him.—He has the Attributes

\* Within a vast Empire in which they had become citizens.

† Sadducees before Zadok.

of Justice, Benevolence, Authority, Inspiring Energy (compare the Holy Spirit), Universal Weal and Eternity. There were these latter at times personified as Archangels so, rhetorically or otherwise;—there was His ‘creationism’ of ‘this world and yon Heaven,’ as of man, with optimistic aims and results, no evil appearing as His product, and of the other Gods and Archangels, these last having been at first His Attributes;—there was a human Immortality also certified as to the eternity of its duration by the application of the word ‘Amesha’ in the next oldest portion of the Avesta to the ‘Immortal’ Archangels, ‘amesha’ being an adjective to Ameretatāt.—There was a dominant subjective susceptibility in all the three personified better elements, God, the Archangels, and sanctified man, extending to thought, word, and deed.—

There was a Demonology with the most pronounced Satan of all literature, a very ‘God of this world’ as against the ‘God of Heaven.’ He has his evil Attributes in antithesis to the beneficial ones of Ahura Mazda. One of them is positively personified in the Gāthas, and perhaps two of them;—there is a fall of man as of other spiritual beings from successive Edens through his, Añgra Mainyu’s, malign influence.—

There was to be a judgment personal and universal, discriminating thoughts, words, and deeds, with an approval experienced in the saved man’s soul, and continued as a recompense,—and also a future Heaven itself partly consisting in the person’s own good thoughts, and words, and deeds, but with various additional particulars of beatification. Millennial periods of intermitting righteous felicity here intervene, with a final restoration upon a renewed and supernaturally beatified earth. This latter seems to take place as a sequel to the first beatific reception of the soul in Heaven, a resurrection being an essential element in this restoration, while the entire redemption is brought about by a Virgin-born Beatifier. (—There may be some possibility of a ‘sevenfold’ gradation of

felicity, in connection with the Seven Karshvars of the Earth, or with the Seven Spirits) ;—For the evil, a corresponding Hell exists in equal grade.—These are, as I need hardly repeat, the vital essentials of ‘our own religion’ as it existed in its earlier stages in the Exilic period during and after the Captivity and before Christ, being conspicuously manifested in the orthodox Pharisaism, while these elements existed in the Persian documents for unknown previous ages ;—see also the Veda at places.\*—)] (a) It can now be fully seen why I used the expressions in the title to these lectures. Contrary, however, to many acute and sincere searchers, I hold that the two forms of this same religion were originally each of separate origin—see again above and below,—each being a regularly spontaneous and parallel development from unchanging universal laws, proving the original man-unity, and strongly supporting the view that it was impossible to prevent the origin and development of similar ideas, entirely aside from all borrowing of them from one nation to another. (b) But while I hold that these views arose from ‘parallel development’ having been caused by the disastrous afflictions of the Captivity, I lay no illogical straw in the way of those who hold to the view that the doctrines were, under God, taught directly to the Jews by their protectors. In fact, I would strenuously repeat, and with emphasis, what I wrote in 1894—viz., the principle, that any, or all of the historical, doctrinal, or hortative statements recorded in the Old or the New Testament might, while fervently believed to be inspired by the Divine Power, be yet freely traced, if the facts would allow of it, to other religious systems for their mere mental initiative,—that the historical origin of particular doctrines or ideas which are expressed in the Old or the New Testament does not touch the question of their inspiration, plenary or otherwise—(c) [(That, for instance and to illustrate, as St. Paul freely discloses his mental peculiarities, and (as to

\* Further citations on the contents of the Vedas are given later in the lecture by the author upon ‘The Avesta and the Veda.’

citations) quotes a poet of his youth, so our Lord Himself also reveals a mental constitution, and to a certain degree expressed, as all others express them, the convictions and enthusiasms which he has absorbed from earlier associations. . And still more than this, unless we are prepared to accede to a docetic heresy doubting the very reality of our Saviour's human nature, every sentiment of veneration ought to induce us to trace, if it be possible to trace them, not only the fountain-heads of His human convictions, but the supplying rills of His expression. (—If we carefully study the genealogy of His body, with how much greater earnestness should we examine that of His mind.—) For it was His thoughts, humanly speaking, and sometimes His earlier ones, which not only constituted a part of His momentous history, but actually determined His career. In the source of His thoughts, therefore, the great motives of His subsequent history are to be sought. (d) Recall, for instance, what I also have just alluded to above\* in the citations as to the recorded temptation of the Persian Saint:—as He was gathering up his resolves for such a mental scene as that described in the fourth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel; see above,\* in which He purposed to meet in one decisive encounter a spiritual power which, as He believed, was threatening His creation, as there had been something memorable of a similar kind in the experiences of prophets of kindred religions, and if these were known to Him, as I have suggested, through His omniscience,† it does not seem to me to be at all deniable that such preceding '*temptations*' (as He revolved them, with all that they signified) *influenced* Him,—if He possessed that larger intellect which could see over the trivial paraphernalia of superstition, and look at the soul struggling in its sincerity for spiritual life, and for the spiritual lives of many who revered it, then the humblest of His forerunners *must have led him on*. It would seem, therefore, to be a very pious act to search

\* Page 21.

† See the Talmud article by Dr. Deutsch (*Remains*, 1874).

diligently for everything which Christ hallowed by His reverence, and it would seem a very mistaken religious sentiment which would arrest one in such a course.))]

### *Reflections.*

The most obvious place to search for the doctrines and opinions amid which our Lord grew up, has been, as of course, the Jewish literature of His period, and of that which preceded His appearance;—this has been examined to a considerable extent, and much of the greatest interest has been brought to light;—the theologies of Babylon and Egypt should be also searched as well as those of Greece and Rome. From India we have what seem a throng of rich analogies from the Buddhist Scriptures, but our highest authorities upon the subject are, or were, inclined to doubt the possibility of the historical connection; there remains then this ancient Persian theology, where, as we have seen, an effective historical connection amounts, at one stage of it at least, to historical identity,—and it is as such, I believe, universally recognised. Cyrus took Babylon, say, about the year 539 B.C., and with it the Jewish slave colony, whose tribes continued to be Persian subjects till the Achæmenian power broke. Jeremiah, foreseeing this future invasion of the dominant and restless Aryan, voiced his anathemas against his Semitic Babylonian oppressors in view of it;—the ‘Kings of the Medes’ were to avenge him, and in due course they did so, and later sent the Jewish people back from their Captivity, rebuilding the Holy City when it had become an ‘heap,’ decreeing also the restoration of the Temple. The later Isaiah speaks in most astonishing terms of this Restorer;—the Book of Nehemiah discloses further scenes with Persian monarchs;—section after section of the Bible dates from their reigns, while Magian\* priests, who were of the

\* The word ‘Magian’ is with little doubt Avestic; the *Maga* was ‘the Holy Cause,’ occurring repeatedly in the Gāthas; the changed suffix *u* in *Magu* is of no importance, and the *o* of the Avestic *moghu*

religion of Cyrus, came later to do honour to the Son of Mary, and one of the last words uttered by Christ upon the Cross was in the Persian tongue.\* [(—The fact that Cyrus may have coquetted politically with the Babylonian priesthood, if it be a fact, is one which redounds somewhat to his credit and corroborates our argument. How much better that he should show some respect to the religion of his fallen enemies, who now became fully acquiescent in their submission, than to crush them all wholesale with the usual slaughter. Were it even true that he was accurately depicted upon a stele as present at the worship of one of their chief deities, this would be but one proof the more of his considerate courtesy. He did not conquer to annihilate.

Whether the precise form of Mazda-worship now upon the Inscriptions was that of Zoroaster exactly or not is just at this point of our inquiries again a question which we need only glance at, as it is of little moment.† It seems likely, indeed, that it was an especially original form of Mazda-worship remaining undeveloped in an original simplicity, while elsewhere throughout Media and South Persia the particulars of the general creed advanced till they became identified with those of the Zoroaster of Plutarch. But whether this were the fact or not, it must have possessed the main features which have been more or less exactly preserved to us in the Zend Avesta.—)] Further.

The word *Mazdā* (perhaps *-dāh*), meaning 'the Great Creator,' or 'the Wise One,' is, as said above, with Ahura, the Life-spirit-lord, an especially well-adapted name for God, much more so than a name derived

---

results from epenthesis; cf. *vohu* for *vahu*, Sk. *vasu*; *gh* also = Gāthic *g*. *Maga*, as being pre-Gāthic by centuries, may have been carried down to Akkad by Turanians; cf. Y. 46, 12. Some writers have, I believe, assumed that the expression *rab mag* in Jeremiah could not have originated from across the border; that it was purely Semitic;—but no one doubts that the Magi of the Gospels were Aryan and Persian. And they naturally came into once-Persian Judæa. Here is the same word as *mag* beyond all doubt non-Semitic: the *mag* of *rab mag* may well be one of the hundred odd Persian words in our Semitic Bible.

\* Luke xxiii. 43. Paradise = Av. *pairi-d(a)eza*.

† See my remark in Vol. XXXI., *S.B.E.*, Introduction, p. 30.

from a Heathen Deity, it being the name used for Him by that great Mazda-worshipper, who, under the providence of God, determined the entire later history of the Jewish people. For had Cyrus, the Mazda-worshipper, not brought the people back, the later prophets might not have spoken at Jerusalem, nor might Jesus have been born at Bethlehem, nor taught in the region. Indeed, the influence of the Great Restorer and his successors over the city was so positive that in the opinion of some writers Jerusalem was for a considerable period after the Return in many respects almost 'a Persian city.'\*

\* THE AGE OF THE GĀTHAS.—I have omitted to place the present note under the text, not wishing to accumulate too much of such matter at the foot of the pages.

My argument for the age of the Gāthas has been very carefully thought out. *First*, any verbal statement within the Hymns themselves directly mentioning their age would be regarded by me as a mere curiosity aside from *internal evidence*;—it is what the documents reveal of themselves, as it were, in passing and without intention, which alone possesses validity in my eyes.

*Secondly*,—as to this internal evidence.—Are the Gāthas the productions of a person or persons living amid the actual scenes to which they unconsciously allude? If they did so allude to interests which were real, immediate, and vital, the Hymns must have been composed in a *language generally spoken as vernacular at the time*. Reasons:—first (a), they are *twice formally addressed* to assemblies 'coming from near and from far' (see Y. XXX., 1, and Y. XLV., 1); secondly (b), they allude *pointedly* in the first, second, and third personals to *persons immediately and vitally involved in the religious-political situation* of which the Hymns are the expression (see Y. XXVIII., 8, 'to Vishtāspa and to me,' 'to Frashashtra and to me';—see even a vocative in Y. XLVI., 15, 16); while their whole tone, so personal and at times impassioned, clearly precludes the hypothesis of a 'dead language' in a scene so rudimental and in a climate so severe as Iran, where energies would be directed rather to the necessities of life than to a hyper-artificial literature of such a character as would use a dead language for a careful imitation. Even in swarming India a fabricated structure exactly of such a type as the Gāthas would be if artificially composed, is really unheard of. There was nothing there like such a supposed worked-up romance. Sanskrit when a dead language was, indeed, widely used; but never in close fraudulent imitation of a personal crisis. It would have demanded inimitable art to imagine and fabricate such a forgery. If, then, the Author or Authors of the Gāthas used a language familiarly spoken at the time, we know at once *when* they used it. For, *thirdly*, no one

doubts the date of the Achæmenian Inscriptions, nor that the language in which they were sculptured was that spoken by Darius and the Persians of his day and neighbourhood;—and this language is well preserved on the mountain rocks;—but upon comparing it with the Gāthic we see that it appears in a form much degenerated from it. Two hundred years, say, more or less, are needed as time to account for the change; for that change was almost as great as that from Anglo-Saxon to Elizabethan English. If, then, the Gāthic language was in vernacular use at the time at which the Gāthas were written, and that vernacular could not have prevailed at Behistūn later than 200 years (about) before Darius had his Inscriptions chiselled, we have at once the latest date at which the Gāthas could have been produced, say 700 B.C.

To suppose them written in a vernacular near the time of Christ is therefore wholly absurd, for the Gāthic language had been dead for centuries, Pahlavi having taken its place;—and to regard them as having been written in a dead language preserved among the priests is likewise excluded by the nature of the compositions;—see above. The language must, indeed, have lingered amid the priestly schools as Sanskrit and Latin did, and much later Avesta must have been written or rewritten in it. For such matter as we have throughout the later Avesta would be naturally reproduced from time to time amid the priestly schools written over in the then 'dead language'; cp. again the Sanskrit literature. Yet the intense 'personality,' so to express it, of the Gāthas could hardly have been so radically reconstructed, much less fraudulently originated, with the metres, had he even so much desired it, by anyone living at the time of Christ;—[(such an hypocrisy would imply an advanced cynicism incredible in the circumstances)].

Pious fraud of the type indicated would have also no visible motive;—and without such an artificial misrepresentation intentionally practised, the authorship of the Gāthas at about the time of Christ is unthinkable. Even if the allusions to the Gāthas which occur in the other books may have been, some of them, later inserted and incorporated with them, yet it cannot be denied that they pointedly suggest a very early date for them;—while the full view that the Gāthas were *genuinely* composed at the time of Christ by a then living Zarathushtra of a then living Frashaoshtra and Jāmāspa, etc., needs hardly to be considered; see above;—no living poem composed in a contemporaneous national crisis could have been popularly *spoken* in an unknown tongue. And as to the *personality* of Zarathushtra,—not only is it irresistibly implied in every allusion to the Persian religion from Herodotus down, but we have Zarathushtra mentioned by Plutarch as if his name were positively familiar to Theopompus, *circa* 350 B.C.

To sum up: the Gāthas could not have been written in a vernacular tongue later than 700 B.C., and they may have been written much earlier;—and they could not have been written in the 'dead language' at all.



## SUPPLEMENTARY LECTURE TO THE FIRST

[(Fearing to include too many points in summing up, I have separated some remarks which originally appeared in the main body of the First Lecture, but which may yet be useful. Should this Lecture be read publicly in Bombay, where that much-appreciated honour has already been conferred upon some of my well-meant productions,\* the main points of the previous Lecture should be here recapitulated.)]

. . . Many indeed have been the erroneous statements made by well-meaning tyros in Christian pulpits, as by myself too, once among them, with regard to the 'impossibility' of all later connections between our great doctrines and analogous truths once held by nations foreign to the Jews who may yet have been brought into connection with them; and the fervent novice may well be pardoned if, in his first sincere efforts, he is too decided in a negative sense; but in men of maturer years let us hope for better things. For surely—to be sentimental, if only for a moment,—the first object of religion next after the suppression of unlawful violence or appropriation should be the suppression of inaccurate statement, and to deny without any effort to become an expert what every expert knows to be the truth is, so it seems to me, to commit a crime in the name of Christianity for which Christianity will be one day called upon to account. It is therefore to help the Church against well-furnished gain-sayers, and to re-establish her character for conscientious investigation, that Christian specialists in Orientalism have

\* Indeed, without any previous knowledge of it on my part.

given the best years of their lives,—to save the endeared religion which once inculcated every honourable principle from continuing herself to be a victim if not the agent of that most sinister of equivocations known as ‘pious fraud.’\*

My procedure is thus, I hope, now clear to all. The *connection* between Persia and Israel has been found to approach identity, as was only to be expected from the fact that the two nationalities,—if indeed the Jewish could really be called a ‘nationality,’—were parts of the same Empire for close on, or more than two hundred years. As this is a point unquestioned *a posteriori*, so the doctrinal analogies were as probable *a priori* as presuppositions, as they have been proved to be historically actual through our Oriental research. And with this, note the unparalleled expressions of theological sympathy. If we have found a pictorial sculpture representing Cyrus as worshipping in a Babylonian temple, a sort of political manifesto,†—and, if we regard this as showing clearly a strong leaning toward the Babylonian Baal-worship, what shall we say as to the astonishing language of this same Cyrus, with that of Darius, and Artaxêrxes recorded in our Bibles, re-reading also what the Jewish prophets and historians have left written in response to it.

I hardly think that anything of their kind approaches these extended statements *in the history of literature* as an expression of religious identity of feeling between two peoples similarly situated, or even more closely connected, certainly not at their date;—that is, not, when all the other circumstances are held in view. Recollect that the Bible is beyond all other documents regarded as hyper-sacrosanct, and by nearly, or quite one-third the human race;—even sceptics as to its detail acknowledge harmoniously

\* To emphasise such a point should be hardly our secondary object throughout such discussions as the present.

† See above.

its unspeakable influence—then let us re-read attentively what the Bible records of its own great Jewish-Persian Emperors.

The *psychology* of the development was, more distinctly, this :—During the shock and sorrows of the Captivity God's people turned their thoughts from earth to Heaven,—just as we so often do,—for the eventualities had proved that the emporal rewards so persistently promised to the 'righteous,' had in some way, and for the time being, proved illusory. Then came their Deliverer with His thronging forces, and with a change in their immediate circumstances which might well have re-assured them that the Psalmist had indeed 'never seen the righteous forsaken'; see above. And also that very same enormous event, which might well have convinced them that this world should at last show them better times as a reward for their fidelity, actually itself brought with it the same settled and worked-out doctrine of *another life* which the Jews had just acquired, but which had been believed in from their birth by those same large masses recruited from all parts of the Iranian Empire, while priests of this Immortality accompanied every battalion, or made many groups for each corps, with an illustrious *King of Kings* at the head of all of them, who never dictated a word for an Inscription without attributing every victory to the 'Life-Spirit-Lord, the Great Creator, Auramazda'; see Behistūn and elsewhere. What wonder then, as I have so often implied, that the Jews listened to the unconscious expressions of their new-found friends, whose fire-altars at times glowed at evening widely, and that, listening, they began the more to vie with these Persian fellow-believers in the hopes and fears of what was now the common Faith,—and so the doctrine grew. While the historically more conservative party amidst the Jews, that of the Zadokians, (the Sadducees) clung with aristocratic tenacity to the old simplicity, and opposed this growing Zoroastrianism of the masses. Yet the new views, adapted as they were to

appeal to the feelings of an afflicted humanity, *prevailed*, having first concentrated themselves in a sect which termed itself, or which was termed by its indignant predecessors *Pharisees, Farsees, Persians*,\* hardly 'separatists,' 'dividers.'† So that, at the time of Christ, it could be said, and upon His own authority, that 'the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' seat,' and it was from him 'who lived a Pharisee' that our own future hopes were chiefly handed down to us.‡

For additional literary focus to our results, I would say, as if speaking from the orthodox point of view, that while the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are unrivalled in their majesty and fervour, constituting perhaps the most impressive objects of their kind known to the human mind, and fully entitled to be described as 'inspired,' yet the greatly more widely-extended, and as to certain particulars, long prior religion of the Mazda-worshippers was supremely useful in giving point and body to many loose conceptions among the Jewish religious teachers, and doubtless also in introducing many good ideas which were entirely new, while as to the doctrines of immortality and resurrection within a restricted sphere the most important of all, it certainly assisted and confirmed, though it did not positively originate belief.

But the greatest and by far the noblest service which it rendered was the quasi-origination and propagation of the doctrine that 'virtue is chiefly its own reward,' even in the great religious reckoning, and 'vice its own punishment.'

The time is now past, let us hope for ever, when the Christian apologist recoiled from recognising the very im-

\* The modern name of the original province of Persia is *Farsistan*.

† It is bad etymology to trace words to an abstract.

‡ Of course our Lord Himself as an eschatologist adhered to the tenets of the Pharisees;—this while He denounced the practices of some of their chiefs who were contemporaneous with Him.

portant services which have been rendered to the holy faith by peoples foreign to the Jews. And surely no one will look askance at the happy fact that not only a small nation to the west of the Jordan held to those great truths on which rest our hopes beyond the grave, but that the teeming millions of Persia also held to them in successive generations *long earlier than the prophets*. These considerations entitle their ancient lore to our veneration and investigation. It now lies open not merely to the laborious specialist but to the intelligent student,—and it is to be hoped that from the mass of human energy devoted to so much that is trivial, some fraction may yet be spared for the study of this rich and influential monument of the past which holds such a conspicuous place among the records of our own religious history.

---

## SECOND LECTURE.

### CONTINUED RECAPITULATION WITH EXPANSION, AND FRESH POINTING.

ANYONE who has been disposed to treat this great subject with respect has already seen what my plain issue is. I do not in any way object to my readers or hearers denying any possible or probable original influence of the Persian theology upon the Jewish-Exilic. I wish simply to place in clearest light the undeniable fact that two such systems existed, one in North Persia,\*—and the other in Perso-Babylonia and in Jerusalem, and that they contained certain crucial and fundamental elements which were approximately identical. There can be no doctrine more angularly practical than that of the one-God-ism† with creationism, and this was expressed by the Persian in a manner which left no room for a plurality;—Ahura was supreme as the ‘greatest of the gods,’ having created the others as Yahveh created our own Archangels‡: ‘He made this earth and yon heaven’; ‘He made man and amenity for him’; Genesis is not stronger;§ while the elohist in Genesis uses the plural§ word for the Deity.

As regards an outcropping dualism in the one and the fundamental dualism of the other, see the first Lecture. So also for the animated personal immortality|| with judgment,

\* Or focussed there while universally diffused throughout Persia.

† There can be but one ‘greatest’; see the First Lecture.

‡ Both from the same source (?).

§ In some occurrences actually meaning a literal ‘plurality.’

|| Some critics may, indeed, be surprised that I make so much of ‘Immortality’ when placing it among such supreme principles as Truth, Love, Order, and Energy; but manifestly ‘Immortality’ gains

etc. These vital constituent elements, then, exist in the two systems as a matter of fact, and their identity is unquestioned totally aside from all external historical influence, mutual or other, between the two.

[(But a very urgent moral side-question may here arise among circles acutely interested in the immediate application of these supposed or real facts to individual believers, especially to the young. 'May it not be dangerous'—so they might say—'to our practical results to occupy the attention of the young or simple with religious matter even when it is only externally foreign to their desired personal experience, if it be outside of the point of immediate conversion or edification?' My more advanced readers may, indeed, not understand why I pause to notice such a suggestion, but I do so, nevertheless,—and I would answer the query first of all with an emphatic *acquiescence*.

Scientific religionists will not deny that the most solemn and beneficial effects result from our manifold forms of Christianity far outweighing their defects ;—and God, if He is anywhere as a spiritual force, is in the immediate application of the good elements here. To block the application of holy ideas is to negative their value. All the greatest historical doctrinal truths of the most sacred systems are in themselves of infinitesimal value aside from what they effect in the moral redemption and edification of man. The salvation of one human soul from sin, so to speak of it, is of more importance than all the doctrines of all the religions without it. Better by a heavy multiple that the young romanist should never hear a word of 'reformation,' nor the young liberal a word of 'Church' than that the new-born hunger for holiness in either of them

---

all its dignity as an effort to justify our creation. How else, says the religionist, can we possibly acquit the Author of our being? All men born into the world should each certainly be willing to bear his share of fraud, bereavement, illness, and poverty ;—but none the less the doctrine of a judgment on high, with rewards and punishments in a future state has its chief value to us in rectifying the universal sense of wrong. Immortality with a judgment well expressed a keen moral idea

should be baffled by conflicting claims. Let me not be misunderstood. Settled interior tendencies to sin are the cause of the worst of human sorrows. With universal goodness spurring on activity, almost the entire mass of calamities would be forestalled;—and while completeness could never be reached owing to unavoidable pain and bereavement,—yet a state of great happiness could always be indefinitely evermore approached.

So much for the *immediate* as the focus of benefits. Yet closely linked with it is that past which the present becomes at every moment. And this for every reason demands our earnest attention, for it not only helps on the present, but is pregnant with the future. As the perfection of human character is the most wonderful work of God, it manifestly both encourages and guides us in the present to study its history, and this wherever it may be found, though, again, we should first arduously examine that past which lies nearest to us—once more the *immediate*.)] After this, to shut out the great events which have transpired of this nature in places even far distant, and in times long gone by, is not to be permitted, for the broadening of our minds demands it. Of all the ancient religions of the earth the Persian should be the dearest to Jews and Christians on account of its close intimacy with their own, and also because of its depth, *i.e.*, its 'interior' spirit. For we can freely claim that the Zend Avesta is the 'earliest document' of interior religion searching the 'thoughts, words, and deeds.' See also the emphatic iteration of personal religious hopes in the Inscriptions.—Egoistic they may be, but there is no mistaking their sincerity. And there is also no vulgarity in numbers here, for who of us has not felt aglow at the 'multitude whom no man can number,' presumably, among the 'saved'; and coarseness is especially excluded from religious statistics when the widening of numbers carries with it the narrowing of 'perdition.'

Here, again, Persia fills out our sphere of vision. Nowhere else on the face of the earth had such numbers been



affected by such views. They were in general characteristic of all Persia (see Plutarch\*). If God was anywhere present in any human event He was active at the taking of Babylon, even when regarded as an external circumstance. How much more if the Persian army was animated, if only dimly, with an interior faith. Had Cyrus failed there, where would our post-Exilic Judaism and our pre-Christianity have been now as historical facts?† Somewhere, doubtless, and in some form,—but where? Cyrus and his successors not only saved the Jewish national existence, but restored the Jewish worship with its very Temple.

*Time* likewise works with these considerations of vast populations. If but one in a thousand‡ among the Persian public had ever really felt the effective influence of these interior ideas, yet that alone must have accumulated to a vast psychic force within successive generations.

Political motives doubtless played the larger part with the Emperors in determining upon the Restoration of the Jews, yet it is wholly unreasonable for us to suppose that religious sentiment had nothing to do with it. Recall the altogether remarkable statements in the Book of Ezra—the announcement by Cyrus himself, the requests for Jewish prayers by his successors. See also the marked friendship between the Persian and the Jew as opposed to the bitterness of the as yet unconquered Babylon.

To ignore what Persia did under the hand of God for the Jews as for ourselves would be more than ingratitude;—to deny it would be sacrilege, impugning either the Divine omnipotence or benevolence in one of their most glorious manifestations.

\* As noticed above at the head of the supplementary Lecture; I have been much gratified to know that some of these Lectures have been read aloud to sympathetic audiences in Bombay;—and I am pleased to hope that others of them may be so honoured. It is this which explains the recalling of ideas already once before expressed. I am reminded of the continual repetitions inevitable in a volume of sermons.

† See the first Lecture.

‡ Are more than this average affected by Christianity?

If it was at all effective in the sense which I have urged, it cannot be described as less than the most wonderful pre-Christian religious work of the Divine Power outside of Israel.\* Arithmetic itself becomes sacrosanct.†

As to both of these elements—‘numbers’ and ‘time’—Israel stood far in the second place, owing her supremacy alone to the intensity of her religious feeling. Being insignificant in numbers, she also reached these results much later. Her immortality was for the most part a dim, shadowy, half-conscious state very like the classic Hades—with little judgment and heaven or fiery hell, and with but transient gleams of vivacity.‡

[ (—This is notorious.§ Let the reader take up his pre-Exilic Bible and read Kings and Chronicles—ten chapters at a time—he will be profoundly struck with this marked negative peculiarity :—the evil kings did their ‘evil’ in the sight of the Lord, died, were buried in their appropriate sepulchres, ‘slept with their fathers,’ and their varying sons reigned in their stead ;—so the good kings did ‘good’ in the sight of the Lord, died, and were buried in their several tombs, and where is there any judgment for the evil or for the good, and where any Hell for the one or Heaven for the other—the ‘Semitic future state’ before the exile ignored or scarcely hinted at these last, as every scholar knows.|| Look at the very Ten Commandments—the place, of all others, where we should most expect to find it—where is there

\* Can even this exception hold as valid?

† If this interior system operated upon a vast population tenfold, if not a hundredfold more numerous than any other analogously affected, then every century through which that influence has persisted multiplies the bulk of this effect ;—but this system had been at work in Persia for prehistoric periods ;—the numbers seriously influenced must therefore have been very great. To the element of numbers must therefore be added that of time, which, indeed, combines with it.

‡ Expansions to the first Lecture.

§ And it was preached in my pulpit close on forty years ago, the speaker not having been then thought particularly ‘broad.’

|| And as has been long since popularly ceded.

any Last Judgment, even there?—where is there any just reward or punishment?—The future state is not even mentioned. Who has not been shocked by this? It was during the horrors of the Exile that God's people began to doubt whether, indeed, the righteous 'never was forsaken' in this life;—like ourselves, when similarly situated amidst financial ruin,\* they turned bitterly to God, and sang the finest, if, at the same time, the most terrific, of their hymns (see Ps. cxxxvii., with its close, if, indeed, that close be genuine†). [Then, soon after, we begin to hear of 'awaking from the dust,' of a judgment, rhetorically majestic beyond description (see Daniel;—'Revelation,' is its echo); then we first hear of a 'golden age,' culminating in the thousand years of Chiliasm (N.T.);—then, first, the angels assume their names and forms, 'becoming 'princes';—then a conscious 'immortality' becomes defined;—then the Saviour was 'promised long'—and 'the Gentiles were to rejoice in His light,' and 'the earth'—not alone Judæa—'was to be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.' It soon became a complete pre-Christianity, with the known results.)]‡

But may not the Persian system, in spite of all just said above, have likewise acquired these views suddenly?—By no means; for such beliefs as these—a God-Unity, a developed Angelology, an Immortality, Resurrection, Judgment, a Heaven (of recompense) with a definitive Hell, a millennial Restoration with a virgin-born Restorer—*inexorably* presuppose far-distant *antecedents* foreshadowing their coming-on in the same literature in which they became at last embodied, *unless that literature conspicuously lacks such antecedents. In Persia this foreshadowing stares us in the*

\* Reprinted from the First Lecture.

† [(Hell itself was not quite quick enough for their fierce vengeance.)]

‡ Extract from a speech delivered in London at a reception kindly given by the late Mr. N. M. Cooper (a leading Parsi), at which Sir George Birdwood and Professor Moulton were also guests, in June, 1910,—and from articles elsewhere communicated.

face (—see also the *Rig Veda*), but in pre-Exilic Israel there is no trace of it.\*

[(—*Interlude and Excursus, with continuous recapitulation, upon the separate and parallel movement.*

*The Religions were the same*—that is to say, as to their main higher elements, and this without external historical connection within historic or even otherwise ‘memorial’ times, for it was seventy odd years before Babylon became Persian, after the Jews arrived there. Do we think that we have any right to ignore this or to belittle it, involving, as it does, a most signal work of God, and dealing, as no other question does, with the human psychic unity, new to Israel, immemorial in Iran?;—and do we regard these facts as only fitted to arouse our orthodox suspicions? I think, on the contrary, that we shall be called to account for it if we neglect them.—

If these vast multitudes of persons—on one side vast—in those regions throughout such long periods of time were so marvellously reached by them, elaborating them further to quasi-identical conclusions—recall the list above—in places and times so far separated from each other that neither one of the two races had, up to a certain date, ever yet heard popularly of the other, speaking reciprocally unknown tongues, and yet evolving views so essential to spiritual growth,—surely this proves that this development was inevitable and beneficial. Please to remember that I am not here rapidly considering loose items in credulity upon the other life which are well-nigh universal to mankind, no nations having ever appeared without them vaguely founded upon dreams and diseased visions,—I am dealing with two closely compacted systems symmetrically filled out as if carefully pre-arranged; also established, and only with these.

That God-Unity has *with* it a definitive Angelology, its personalities approaching identity with the Godhead as At-

\* One would say, indeed, that these tendencies must have long been latent among the keen-witted Jews awaiting only the first stir to burst them into bloom.

tributes, or included with Ahura as if in an Heptade,—for He is, later, if only through confusion of ideas, ‘one of a Seven’,—an Immortality *with* a Resurrection,—a forensic Judgment *with* a plain heaven, and a condemnation *with* a positive Hell,\*—a restoring benefactor, who was to be born out of the common course, a renewed earth in a paradise, which, with all the inevitable accretions of grotesque puerility, yet became marvellously effective none the less in a superior spiritual sense,—and all this in parallel development absolutely without any (?) previous immediate external communication between the two. I call this a ‘marvellous phenomenon’ indeed, and as solemn as it is wonderful, dealing also with the psychic unity in a manner otherwise unknown;—*and yet all of it is marred or lost the moment we trace all these identities to one and the self-same recent external, historical, tactual connection*, the one set of ideas having merely migrated in the mass, so to speak of it, with some suddenness from Persian Babylonia to Babylonian, and later ‘Persian,’ Israel,—mechanically borrowed.

The migration of good ideas is indeed to be desired, and we have long endeavoured to further it even with missionary zeal,† but certainly it is a different thing from the spontaneous origin of these views out of the primaeval psychic human forces. As the ‘wonderful phenomenon’ first of all proves that these views were inevitable in the unending cycles of creation, so they contain elements of supreme utility, as no one wishes to deny, they being, in fact, the secondary utterances of the Beneficent Deity, and this notwithstanding the encrustations of erroneous acceptations, all centring in the unsurpassable doctrine of subjective recompense which no religion had ever expressed so fully as the Iranian. Such, then, is the ‘phenomenon,’ the original self-growth of these compacted thoughts from forces con-

\* With a subjectivity almost organic in the Iranian coming less obviously to light in Israel;—recall ‘he went to *his own place*,’ one of the very few Semitic occurrences.

† Recall the great work of S. J. Mills.

stitutionally present in the human personality, dormant even in the animal,—and coming inevitably into apex and activity in the course of ages in parallel developments more rapidly indeed, where the first ‘spring’ of them was strongest.—)]

*But the other enormous, if secondary, question now comes back upon us with accumulating force:—did or did not the so widely extended, and yet compactly moulded Aryan creed in which the Israelites were engulfed, so to speak of it, during their first Exilic centuries in Persian Babylon exercise any later and supervening beneficial influence upon these already accepted but new-found similar convictions among the Jews? Every conceivable circumstance affirms the reciprocal influence of the two systems, the one upon the other,—and in view of the very great superiority in the position of the recently successful Persians to that occupied by the handful of mourning captives, that influence upon the side of Persia must have been preponderating.*

Here was Israel upon the one side, for long pre-Exilic centuries without a pointed hope of any such an Immortality as most of us hold dear, without a definitive Judgment, without a Resurrection, without a clear Heaven, a Millennium (or a Hell), yet suddenly at once awakened to these expectations by a calamity which had brought swift ruin upon their remnant, while their status was, at times, much like that of slaves, or worse\* ;—and *vis-à-vis* to them were Median multitudes—military, civil, priestly, princely, with their illustrious Imperial figure at their head—and these, only a few brief decades later on, swarming in the streets and roads of Persian Babylon, the city with its province now from that time on the Persian capital.

Aryans to a man, these Medo-Persians—as we might almost say of them—they had long since been possessed with that same hope of full future conscious life beyond the grave which the Jews had just acquired—with much

\* Expansions and repointings of particulars already hinted at above, and here supposed to have been earlier orally delivered.

emotion, let us believe.\* With what surprise, then, growing to astonishment, must the excited Semites of the early Captivity have first discovered this grateful fact! Here they were themselves just new-born novices, as it were—a grouplet of beginners in a full system of Immortality—doubtless also much affected by the impression that their views were a new discovery, and stirred to their utmost depths with all the emotional effects of regeneration in its train. But when the Persian army appeared, whose victory and continued presence were hailed as their temporal salvation, they discovered, to their amazement, that their own fresh ideas upon futurity were an ancient creed with their new-found friends, and that they were held almost universally—not always, of course, with that personal fervour which the Jews then felt as neophytes,—but that they were most certainly held with ponderous conviction by the very chief representatives of the new Babylonian life, who would be, of course, the so-called Magian priesthood.

Everything, as regarded also from every reasonable point of view, looks rather toward this later influence of the great religious patron nation upon their once suffering, but now grateful, protégés, while but few have suggested the other direction to the current. ‘Affection,’ alone of itself, must have had something to do with the intricate psychic motions inevitably stirred within the one party in the vivid situation. The signal Conqueror of their oppressors would be naturally the object of their enthusiasm, as would be, indeed, the leading personages in his garrisons. Think of the change which Cyrus occasioned in their cir-

\* These are the obvious ineffaceable facts which the most ultra-conservative of all historical theologians will not, because he cannot, attempt to dispute, they being the A B C of all historical religious knowledge upon the points. No Bible-class, nor indeed should any Sunday-school instructor, be without this knowledge as to this most solemn circumstance. *It was Our Own religion in a friendly race*;—and this should be rather more than less pressing upon the attention of every student of our Holy Faith, teacher or taught,—that is to say, so long as we hold to this spontaneous growth of Immortality among the Jews.

cumstances at his advent, and see how they recalled it in Isaiah xliv.-xlv. My claim in argument is, therefore, for a very strong and completely surrounding and enveloping *later* and *supervening* influence of the North Persian One-Godism, Angelology, Immortality, Soteriology, Judgment, Resurrection, Millennium, Heaven, and Recompense, upon the same slightly earlier developments in Israel during the Captivity.

[(-But let me also not be misunderstood here once again while repeating a principle which I hold to be crucial in all these discussions. Many have, indeed, held, and still hold, to the striking opinion, so often here noticed to refute it, that this entire scheme of Persian theology and eschatology, not only subsequently confirmed, defended, and encouraged—in a word, ‘*saved*’ these views within the Jewish Pharisaism—a proposition which we may accept—but that the Persians *originally* and *first of all* taught the Jews these things in their full, definite, out-formed shape, as a whole, through dominant influence or through charm.

I do not regard it as being at all a just or honourable thing to lay one illogical straw in the path of those many who have held, or still hold, to such a view, if they hold to it with honesty. *Any so-called, or real, divine authority, through inspiration or the like, has, as I firmly hold with the most advanced of opponents, little, if anything, to do with the fact that portions of the mere mental ideas involved have been imparted through various sources wholly unconnected with any previous especial development of the faith concerned.* Inspiration has, as I contend, nothing whatsoever to do with the question of the mental channels through which the bare ideas of any good creed may have been imparted to a favoured race or people;—and \*much do I deplore the prevalence of a contrary impression.\*-)]

\* See these remarks in other words at the close of the first Lecture. Repetitions of an admonitory nature and the recalling of ideas are here unavoidable, for the reasons already stated.



### THIRD LECTURE.

#### THE PHILOSOPHIC INITIATIVE OF AVESTA IN THE LIGHT OF APPLICATION, WITH CONCURRENT RECAPITULATION, ESPECIALLY ADDRESSED TO PARSIS.\*

I. What—so some of us may inquire—is practically after all this value of Avesta upon which such emphasis is laid? Professors of philosophy in the central home of learning would not ask of us such a question;—but it is still well worth our while to suppose it put and to answer it,—for those who wish to name it may be reassured at once.

The intellectual initiative of Avesta was, like its fellows, a condensed psychic force, evolving almost untold results even in economics.

The immeasurable financial, political, and educational force in Christianity surpasses that of Avesta, but yet it affords us a lead in our discussion here. Thousands of millions could hardly stand as a proper expression for the hard results of the Christian system;†—and Zarathushtrianism once scored as heavily, for in remoter influence‡ it once helped the other on.—Avesta has been this eminent initial force in history;—and history, let us remember, is the compact summary of crucial facts. Christianity, let us claim it, has been the most potent of all forces to restrain murder, rapine, theft, and arson;—but Zarathushtrianism

\* As an appeal for a higher appreciation of their impressive lore.

† What was Church property once worth,—and what is it not worth yet?—in buildings, lands, hospitals, organisations for collecting funds, etc.

‡ Beyond all question.

was before it in the same line of preventive causality without immediate early historical connection,\* and by assisting gained an after-share in the results.

*The Nature of the Psychic Forces here.*

(a) We open the Avesta, and first of all we meet, immediately upon its folios, what I have already described in much detail above.†—It was a God, who is supreme indeed over the good creation, but saved through limitation from all responsibility for the evils which so unjustly hamper us, with regard to which He was neither implicated through origination nor permission, these evils being, as we have later discovered, inherently necessary to existence. And surely this was the first clue ever given to this now inevitable opinion?—No one before our sage had so traced all our woes to the counter-creative activity of an independent Evil Spirit, who was also necessarily original and eternal,‡—and who upon his part was within his limits verily an evil ‘God of this world,’—a scheme which was beyond all question first motived by a school of which Zarathushtra became the leading mind. No one has ever doubted that the Evil God was thought of because the evils of experience seemed utterly incompatible with the absolute omnipotence of any good Supreme Being§;—therefore that scheme initiated within all known history the entire clearness of modern conclusions on this subject. The idea may have been mooted earlier, but we have no record of it.

(b) The Archangels also of this Supreme Being who in

\* Zarathushtrianism was identical with Christianity only in the immemorial fundamental elements in prehistoric ages from which each developed; see above and throughout.

† But which we cannot name too often,—so, necessarily also when we wish to link it in with companion issues.

‡ See the first and second Lectures.

§ Some idea of ‘mere indignity’ had effect among other considerations;—other evil elements aside from right and wrong, doubtless had something to do with it:—at times much.

the highest conceivable sense also 'limit' Him, were no mere winged creatures of the poetic imagination, but, most sublimely, His own attributes, those few mighty, if simple, essential principles which alone save life from being chaos, and the Universe from being 'Hell';—they govern the Supreme God Himself;—He could not violate them if He would. Could anything be more impressive? He is—as said—otherwise One only and supreme;—for the few subordinate things, called 'deities,' were His creation;—recall our own Archangels;—and this in no way impairs His sovereignty;—compare likewise our Tri-unity;—there can be but one 'supreme' good object, but one 'Greatest Creator.'\*

This, as said and as understood above—this idea of a Supreme God still fettered by His character—led the ancient world at its date as a scheme of conservative theism, with all its vast economic consequences;—and this initiative is what gives it its 'scientific' importance. [(—Can anything modern of the kind be compared with it? Instead of presenting such a contradiction as a good God, who could create immortal beings predestined by Himself to everlasting flames, He was actually in essence rather more limited by His own attributes than even by His supposed terrific personal Opponent.† He could not possibly have been personally concerned in such an origination.)] Here we have first of all in obvious light, the chief elements in all theological representation personified, saving the nature of the Most High God from the crime of permitting the origin, and continuing the existence of the greatest, saddest, and most familiar of all the sorrows which force themselves upon us.

The horrors of evil existence—so it is unavoidably implied—were, as said, inevitably fixed as constitutive links in the chain of causality, and this in the very vital elements of that existence itself, with its supposed 'will-freedom'; recall Héraclitus;—the Good God was therefore morally,

\* In the Veda Mitra was the full mate of Varuṇa, but in the Avesta this independence was absorbed in the supreme 'creationism' of Ahura.

† So, in the interior elements of the subject.

but, praise to His Holy Name, only 'morally' supreme, never mechanically omnipotent ;—He could not disintegrate the very laws of His own being\* ;—'it must needs be that the offence come.' This alone was an immense idea, if, indeed, but one in ten thousand ever understood it ;—there have been many thousands since. The contrary to it would be mental mania, which only fails to make men 'demons' because we dare not think ;—recall the third creed, 'incomprehensible,' 'incomprehensible,' 'incomprehensible.' A wonderful thought, indeed, it was for the time, 700 to 900 B.C., and for the place, North-east or North-west Iran ;—† and a wonderful thought it is for all time, if we could but afford to permit ourselves to see it.

No—the Good God, according to this implied principle, never made a 'Hell' beneath or here ;—that 'Hell' has been as eternal in the past as it shall be in the future.

*(c) The Constituent Elements of the Gāthic Character.*

And where at such a date was there also such a discrimination of men 'as to thought, word, and deed.' A few little words‡ these are doubtless, and common enough at present, as we may say, but if acted on, still how deep ;—as all well know, they, little and few though they be, would, if followed, then raise the world from the 'death of sin to the life of righteousness' ;—and they find their first original here ;—for where was there at such a date, and in such a place, their duplicate ? They were, therefore, epoch-making in the redemption of man from brutality. See also 'that bodily life and the mental'—again but a few little words, and often falsified by hypocrites ;—but, while they express a refined view which soon became familiar,

\* There was one thing which, thanks to His supreme limitation, He could not be, —a felon.

† This is the place most clearly indicated to us ;—but it pervaded Iran ;—see the first Lectures.

‡ 'A few little words' indeed now left to us, but those few imply hundreds whose memory has perished.

they were once more again epoch-making in the unfolding of our civilisation. It was a 'few little words' which revealed the Copernican theory;—Isaac Newton's law expressed itself in nine words;—see the memorable fragments of Heraclitus, how short they are!—It is 'a few little words' always which awake the world.

(d) *Subjective Recompense.*

And where elsewhere, at such a date, does the wicked's 'own soul' shriek at him on a Judgment Bridge;—and where does 'his own beatified conscience' meet and reward the blest man on the path to a Heaven again of 'good thoughts, and words and deeds'? 'Virtue' is here first in history 'its own reward,' so definitely, and 'vice is its own punishment.'\*—If this had not been said then, much immediate amelioration might have been postponed;—recall our Lord's own later searching words as to 'the thought the essence of the crime.'

Were these things mere historic relics of the past—gems, so to speak, and nothing else?

I have elsewhere, just above, implied the vast results of every kind which flowed from these psychic forces; but it will be well to return to them for a moment and to expend a few further comments upon them;—and first, their acute spiritual result. Zarathushtra was no hypocrite;—hypocrisy was not then the fashion;—nor had people learned that it might pay,—and if but one man even in a hundred thousand throughout those coming ages really sought God in the manner said (with thought, word, and deed), with the 'care of the poor' as his charge, and a 'Heaven of good principles' in his eye, what more than this could we desire or expect? This was what we used to call 'conversion.' What Christian or pre-Christian could think of purer character? Even such an average as that just named—one in a hundred thousand—would soon mount up, a

\* So, epoch-making as a distinctive delineation;—see the first Lecture.

'gem' which lived on with vital effect is a 'gem' which we should study and revere. Tens of thousands up to millions must have been made penitent throughout those pre-Christian centuries by Faiths like this,—so from statistics. Was this 'nothing,'—a 'trivial result'? If we have souls ourselves we must value good in souls from that one fact only.

It is our duty to God, to ourselves, and to our fellow-men, to study this and to pray over it.

*(e) Then the Quasi-external Realistic Reward in Heaven.*

The present Spiritual World likewise must be taken into consideration. We—the most of us—believe that souls live on, that they are, as it is said, 'immortal.' If so, the soul of Zarathushtra, at the head of his innumerable spiritual descendants, Iranian or others, multitudes as they were and are, exists to-day as saved on high;—is that nothing? I do not at all apologise for having mentioned it. No true prophet, of course, whether Jewish or, indeed, Christian, could despise saved men of their own Cyrus's race, the race of their Deliverer, their God's 'anointed,' who likewise served the 'God of Heaven' presumably 'in thought, in word, and deed.' What Christian, or pre-Christian pious Jew, could have asked more than that souls should strive for a Heaven of holiness in such a spirit, and with a record of corresponding deeds? Souls uncounted are in Heaven now this moment, if there be indeed any Heaven anywhere at all, solely in consequence of things like this, this strongly formulated, established, but simplest,\* Law. Is this then, again, 'nothing'? One might challenge opposition. No sane human being who has a heart can doubt that this is something.

*(f)* And there are external rewards upon earth;—these

\* The entire mass of evangelical Christendom, with its enormous effects, claims only the very slightest number of points;—they rejoice in reducing all to 'conversion.'

forces live on here. All human life is physically one,—so science shows us, the father surviving within the son, so, actually, as also the mother ;—and a soul's sentiments pass on through example, teaching, warning, discipline, and promising—that is, by entailed mental tradition as even by intellectual inheritance. If there be any good in us to-day, we are now what we are of that good, because Zarathushtra and his like were what they were three thousand years ago ;—they sowed the seed ; they focussed the scattered holier forces. This is even medical ; see above. Ideas themselves are hereditary, not only traditional,—so that we need not ask 'what good is it at all' ? Our own living status at this hour is here involved ;—if we can earn our livings now, and keep our property, we owe it to the Saints of Iran and their like in India, Egypt, Babylon, and Israel ;—they first planted these principles here and when they did. Who does not see it ?—and this—let me repeat it,—if but one among a hundred thousand of our forebears were 'heart-devoted' to a God of honour. All the good on earth to-day is a continuation in an unbroken line, largely psychical if not physical ;—Asha is 'incarnate' now, as when Yasna XLIII was written ;—this guides our 'living' present, which is ever becoming future. History is here no mere amusement, and the Gāthas, with their large lost portions, are the foundations of this history. (*g*) By studying the past we can, first of all, now and here, awake our thankfulness to God for what is good in it ;—and this helps us now and here ; and the evil in it warns us ;—is this again nothing ? If we have any feeling, it is beyond all question, 'something.' So only can we understand the present, take courage for the future, with foresight. By recalling the virtues of the past—if there were any virtues in that past, and some there were beyond all question—we respect our race ;—and this gives us still further hope and energy,—for so we respect ourselves. And (*h*), as to antiquity, again, the further back we can trace such Hymns as Zarathushtra's—and

scores of the like once lived and told their tale—the wider the circles of their influence, for the further back they began their work, the longer has been the time for them to produce effect;—we fatuate ourselves when we ask, ‘What good is there in what is old,’ even ‘old goodness’? The further back the holy effort, the more were the people who have felt it, some ameliorated beyond all question—so ‘saved.’ Hearts by the myriad would have broken but for this lore, homes by the thousand would have been destroyed;—I challenge the direst infidel to doubt it. Virtuous energy has been, and is, incited by such laws, and virtuous energy fills our barns with plenty and our chests with gold. This is physiology, as I intend it, the hardest of all hard-headed fact;—these doctrines of 3,000 years ago are among the things which save us now;—it is ingratitude to slur them or to conceal them.

II. We can now return, with all just said, to emphasise once more the ‘most stupendous’ event\* which ever happened in that secular history of Israel;—for it has been neglected,—one of the most ‘stupendous’ also in all history in view of what we deem its consequences.

I have endeavoured above with little expansion to point out bluntly the immense effects of Christianity upon every conceivable interest;—it is not further necessary to dwell upon that matter.—[(Any person capable of an economic estimate will see at once that our Religion underlies our material civilisation, having become to a large extent the land’s common law, its great vitalities of truth carrying away all the defects of mere historical or dogmatic error.)] The influence of Judaistic Christianity, with its ten Commandments and its crucified Redeemer, has made the world a hundredfold more possible;—the Coliseum would not be conceivable to-day, nor would be—parts of—Pompeii. But Zoroastrianism was a twin-sister to that faith which made this change, though an independent one, pre-dating Exilic

\* See p. 42, second Lecture.



Judaism;—and but for that political power which represented Zarathushtra the voice of Ezra would never have been heard;—the Divine Being might have selected some other means to accomplish similar universal results, but they would not have been these means,—nor these results. As scientific historians we are forced to say that an intensely effective element in the combined forces would have been totally wanting, whether replaced by some other influences or not, we need not ask. Judaism with Christianity then was, and is, an incalculable power in the world predominating for good, Muhammadism being their offspring, and no one of the three would have been what it was save for Persia—secularly, certainly not;—nor would Buddha have come to light but for Persia's twin-sister Lore, the Veda. Had Cyrus not arrived when he did with his permanent conquest, then, for all that we can see, the re-settlement of Judah at Jerusalem by Persia would have been indefinitely postponed\*; possibly it would never have taken place,—and Judah would have been left to sing other sad psalms in her vast captive home.

The nascent hopes of a definitive spiritual world on high, with its grand items of the creed, might have been a mere flash, smothered by the rich forms of Babylonian superstition;—the animated history of the re-founded Jewish polity would never have transpired; nor would the prophets of the Return, with the second Isaiah at their head, have ever penned their fervid chapters;—nor would the Asmonean Princes have made Judah's name for the first time glorious in war;—nor would, indeed, the Son of Mary have been born where He was, to rule futurity.†

But Cyrus *did* arrive at last, and the vast chain of causalities began to move.

What other event of a similar kind can be compared with it!—this, almost aside from the Persian religious element. That course was taken which alone made our

\* Repointing and expansions of things said above; see the preceding Lectures.

† Not in a nation rebuilt by Cyrus.

Judaistic-Christianity and Muhammadism possible,—while the philosophy of the ‘great renunciation’ was likewise spreading.

(a) Then this action was neither insignificant nor accidental.

Sometimes very insignificant events have produced immeasurable effects—the Crucifixion (!) of itself would have been deemed ‘trivial’ by many;—see Tacitus. But here was a move only to be looked upon as petty on account of the pettiness of a ‘nation,’ saved by it in a small side-place within the largest and most energetic Empire of its day or of its past\*—ruling from Egypt to India and from the Ocean to the Caspian. It was altogether a big move on the part of a big power. The conquest of Judæa was but a mite in the main conquest of Babylonia, though her estimate would not be ours;—and the re-creation of Judæa was but a fraction of one of the world’s greatest consummations,—if to us a colossal fraction. To neglect this in our political studies would be as fatal as it would be in our religious searches;—regarded as a grasp upon genius alone, it preserved to us the world’s greatest book;†—the Iliad was different;—and then, last of all, because not externally so obvious to us, it brought into Babylon a great conservative Religion which soon showed identities with Zion.

III. Here I must make one confirmatory point not yet elsewhere sufficiently pushed home, but, in fact, it is the chief ‘motive’ to this present Lecture of ‘application.’ None deny the copious abundance of Persian allusions in the Scriptures, centring in the, somewhat touching crisis of the Return;—here the great restorative decrees occur with requests by the Restorers for divine assistance;—Judah becomes again a nation‡—a mere item among the more than score incorporated in the mighty Empire, but still a nation, if we could call her that. In her scriptures capable philologists discover over a hundred Persian words, and the

\* Persia ruled mid-Asia where she liked, and ruled it rigorously.

† The Bible.

‡ See Ezra, Nehemiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc.

most superficial of readers cannot fail to be struck with one dire but most overshadowing significant particular,—that is, the close approach of the new Jewish Satan in those exilic pre-Christian and Christian times,—a Satan so exactly like the Persian Aŋgra Mainyu\* ;—see him especially in the New Testament, where he is actually termed ‘a God,’ ‘the God.’ Where did Satan ever come to such excessively close quarters before in early Jewish times? Some even doubt altogether whether it was ‘Satan’ who tempted Eve, the serpent being one of the ‘beasts of the field.’ And where else was ‘he’ at all so prominent as in Iran’s faith? At the first we only infer later actual historical literary influence, but scientific history has here also something quite additional to say.

(b) Just as we know from the scant fragments left us of Avesta that its literature was originally manifold as great—so we may be sure that the religious political communications from Persia and to Persia still left us in the Bible, were but a tithe of what were really exchanged ;—nay, scarce a hundredth part ;—so we must always measure things in ‘scientific’ history ;—a tithe, or a hundredth part, only of such evidence, survives ;—this has been forgotten by most of us.† But the intercourse between Great Babylon and her tiny province must have become continuous, the political machinery in that Empire being kept taut ;—and Babylon, let us never forget, was Persia’s Capital.‡

Insignificant as the Jews must have been politically,

\* See above.

† Readers used to imagine that all which Persia had to do with Judah is contained in what is left to us of all the greatly numerous documents and fragments which once made up the Bible. ‘Yes,’ we used to say, ‘Cyrus is mentioned in an interesting manner’—‘he decreed the Restoration ;’—‘Darius is mentioned,’ ‘Xerxes is mentioned and Artaxerxes’ ;—and ‘Babylon was Persian.’ Did we even know this last? First of all, we never dreamt that half our Bible perhaps has been lost to us, nor that but a hundredth part of the Persian decrees have been preserved ;—it is indeed well-nigh a miracle that so much has escaped annihilation.

‡ Practically, if not actually, so for two centuries more or less.

though their city flanked the road to Egypt, no thorough historian doubts that they attracted more than their natural share of imperial attention, for beyond all question their incisive religious animus gained the notice of the Government as of the Emperors, unless we ignore Ezra as pure forgery. See how their religious lyrics became an object of envious derision to the pre-Persian Babylonians.\* Persian notice of Judah would argue reciprocal 'notice' of Persia on the part of Judah, even if we had no positive record of it, as *vice versa*; this I have said before†—and what a record have we got of it deemed, too, inspired.

(c) Some writers used to deny 'all connection' of Jews with Persia—especially religious connection and mutual influence—and these persons‡ would recoil when we show how tremendous this influence was;—but we can follow up our advantage and show from Scripture a tense activity on the part of Persia, whether in flank, or originally direct;—it might well stagger all contenders.

So,—the *Jews got nothing religious* from their deliverers,—did they not!—This (!) is what we were called upon to consider, though it would astonish any sane outside critic;—but I gather that the *Decrees* had some little of 'religion' about them. Read their astonishing sentences—astonishing still, if yet but half of them be genuine. He, Cyrus, was the representative of the dominant Asiatic power—mid-Asiatic,—also its unique religious representative;—see the Inscriptions;—(they break all records in such writings, focussing piety if they did not really impassion it).—He, Cyrus, forerunner of Darius, adopts the God of Israel as the 'God of Heaven' (Deva),§—avows himself to have received a revealed command, and is so stated to have received it by the Jewish writer: 'All the kingdoms of the

\* See above, Ps. cxxxvii.

† See my *Zarathushtra, Philo, the Achaemenids and Israel*, 1905-06, Vol. II.

‡ Presumably they exist no more.

§ A curious Iranian exception, indeed, if my conjecture be correct, for 'deva' otherwise too sadly represented 'Demon' there in Iran.

earth,' so he begins, 'hath the Lord, the God of Heaven, given me,' thus repeating his own now lost domestic edicts, anticipating Behistūn;—this alone is some guarantee of genuineness;—'and he hath charged me to build Him an house in Jerusalem'—just as he had rebuilt temples in Persia and in Babylonia. There was some little *religion* and even 'theology' there, I think. [(We have strenuously worked in foreign missions—here we have meanwhile a 'supreme record' with non-supported itineration.)],—Cyrus, like Darius, the Supreme Head of Auramazda's Faith, accepts Jahveh Elohim apparently as His equal with another name;—or did he literally mean by 'God of Heaven' his own Auramazda?—here named as 'Asura, Ahura,\* God of the shining sky.'

He acknowledges Jahveh Elohim as the 'God of Heaven,' who had charged him to build a House—and the inspired writer corroborates his claim to inspiration, even to a most incisive form of it;—he actually wrote: 'The Lord stirred up the Spirit of Cyrus,' and adds, 'in order that the word of the Lord by Jeremiah might be fulfilled,' see Jer. li.;—and this proclamation, adopting and acknowledging the 'God of Israel,' became politically universal according to the passages;—he, Cyrus, so it reads, 'made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, his Empire, and also put it in writing.†'

I fear that very few of us, indeed—even of our Bible-teachers—have ever at all taken in what this means,—if, indeed, but the half of it be true.

Those were no days of electric intercommunication, but

\* Perhaps he only meant that Jahveh Elohim was a great Secondary God, in full forceful harmony with his Supreme Ahura, much perhaps like Mithra, or like Gabriel, or like the 'Spirit,' as some would understand it;—and was that nothing for the Persian Emperor to say. (Vedic 'Asura of Heaven.')

† In some now lost inscription or document. Portions of such edicts amplifying the Behistūn inscriptions have actually been found in Babylon; see 'Babylonische Miscellen,' Weissbach; and also papyri fragments; see 'Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka,' Sachau, 1911.

that edict, if it was ever really so issued, must have held up the Holy Faith for the first time to a vast public in the first of the then existing civilised powers in all its religious centres.\*

(d) And we see from the Avesta with the Inscriptions what kind of a 'God' Cyrus, with his successors, must have thought of when he so wrote. He and they would gladly have received support from any serious Deity wherever he had obtained credit;—and small blame to the lot of them for this;—but if Cyrus, with Darius, really thought chiefly of the 'greatest of the Gods who made this earth and yon heaven,' 'who made man,' with all the lesser Gods,—if he really accepted Yahveh Elohim as but another name for his Aura-mazda—was there, then, no *religion* there;—or even supposing, as I have suggested, that he merely thought Jahveh to be a high secondary good God;—was that nothing? Little wonder that Christians name 'St. Cyrus.' Here was even religious tenderness beyond all doubt made practical by deeds, with political benevolence and political church-building. The Faith of God was authoritatively proclaimed by her great master to Israel as to the world. Nobody who is sincere and sane would call that a 'trivial' circumstance.

So much for a pointed propaganda followed up with action. Even if Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes were politically but half sincere, they made good their assertions, and with great ultimate effect,—not that they fully understood them.

(e) And was the later influence of Persia also of little account religiously as a factor in development? I have firmly asserted that the dominant system of the Persians only later assisted the Jewish orthodoxy,—but was that 'assistance' trivial, especially in view of the large negations of one influential party?† What competent historian can

\* I am proud to recall again the epoch-making work of my forekinsman, but what 'mission' has approached that act of Cyrus in spreading evangelistic light?

† The non-eschatologists (Sadducees).

doubt that this influence was great—perhaps crucial—till ‘life and immortality were brought to light’? Unless we totally deny all ordinary intercourse between immense Persia and its pet-favoured subject nationality, the inferences become overwhelming. If Persia produced any effect at all—and who but a fatuate can doubt this—after restoring the Jewish nationality, with its religion, then this influence must have been pronounced indeed. And as the acknowledged religious influence was so massive, so an animated intellectual result was unavoidable. From what source did our Lord receive that word ‘paradise,’ now with us also a name for Heaven, used in the most awful moment of our religious history? One word like that implies an hundred once used in Israel, now lost to us;—this is the *main point* I am now endeavouring to drive home as our focus in procedure—: whence came the hundred odd other Persian words of our surviving Hebrew Bible? \* That hundred imply a thousand;—so, in scientific history. † Whence came the military roads, and whence the aqueducts? ‘Every depression was to be exalted’—levelled up—‘and every elevation was to be brought low’—made passable. ‡

This point, which, as I assert, is crucial, has been fatally neglected, this ‘estimate by the multiple.’ To read even the overwhelming ‘persianism’ of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, with Jeremiah, the new Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the rest, as if they were all that Persia did and said in those connections, is to lose ourselves to all sound reason. What other science ever so limited its evidence? Who but an incompetent would take a few stray nuggets as all of a precious metal to be found in any given place suspected to be gold-bearing?

I assert, with every careful attention to what I say, that the capture and occupation of Babylon with its Provinces by Cyrus was not only a mighty event in the history of

\* See above.

† This is the only way to get a straight view in serious investigation.

‡ For the Persian ‘posts,’ the earliest known in history.

politics and war, which no one disputes, but that its results, both immediate, in restoring the Jewish nation, and later, in protecting and influencing its worship, were well-nigh *incalculable*;—see above. Without it, where—as I have so often asked—would the post-exilic, pre-Christian creed have been?—Where the Christian?—Where the Muhammadan?

IV. It is therefore our close Christian duty to study this event in all its bearings. The foundations for this study I have been here endeavouring to lay anew, as in all my well-meant works. How can we study the Bible without studying the Inscriptions\* and the Bible of that Restorer who alone made our exilic Bible possible?

(a) In studying the Zend Avesta let us first winnow out the chaff (with no offence to Parsis), for every like religious document must have its puerilities. To fling aside the Zend Avesta on account of some of these shreds of quaint ancient fable would be only to prove ourselves as silly.\* Out of the mass of them the grand forms of a noble faith soon rear themselves, and we should yield them our attentive veneration.

\* See the first Lecture.



## FOURTH LECTURE.

### THE AVESTA AND THE VEDA.\*

[(*Was Philo's Logos the source of Vohumanah?*—a light question in Avesta and its connections which may introduce our theme.—

One of the most ill-timed devices with which a group of parasites ever endeavoured to wreck a subject was a suggestion of two decades past (for a moment also repeated by a man of reputation,—eating his own recent words);—it was this,—that the Avesta, even in its oldest parts, was no earlier than the Advent, and that one of its Amshaspends was Philo's Logos. This is not the place to waste words on those who do not know that the purpose and 'motive' of the Philonian Greek logos was radically the opposite to the 'motive' of the origin of Vohumanah†, nor that the seven (literally six) cities of refuge mentioned in Philo Judæus did not originally suggest the Seven Spirits of Tobit, Ezekiel, and the Avesta, the *dynamis basilike* of Philo having been taken from the *Kurios* of the Septuagint, which the gifted Alexandrian in his (accidental) ignorance of Hebrew, applied independently.‡ But it happens that the clear facts which these hasty

\* This Lecture was publicly delivered at the Indian Institute in Oxford some years ago;—it has been since made use of in Instructional Lectures. It also appeared as two articles in *East and West* of Bombay in 1902, and was re-edited as enlarged in *The Open Court* of June and December 1910, translated into Italian lately, here appearing in a fourth edition.

† For the Greek *logos* was invented as an intermediary between God and all matter, an idea which presupposes an *original antagonism* between the two utterly repugnant to Zoroastrianism.

‡ See Siegfried, *Philo v. A. als Ausleger der A.T.* p. 214.

observers have so singularly overlooked in claiming Greek origin to *Vohumanah*, possess in themselves exceeding interest (quite apart). And this comes out most fully in the obvious answer which we have to give to a view now held, as I believe, by no expert of authority ;—for the one simple, but at the same time impressive, circumstance which proves, once for all,—and as one would say, without a returning question—that Philo could not have inspired the Gāthas, is the forgotten point (or, perhaps, the as yet too little known one) that the Avesta, as all experts must acknowledge, is almost Veda. If the gifted Jew inspired the one, he could not well have missed the honour of being father to the other also.

Let this then stand as the objective to our entire discussion here,—its ‘text,’ so to speak of it, namely, ‘the almost close identity of Avesta with Veda.'])\*

#### *The Veda and the Post-Vedic Indian.*

The incalculably rich and varied Indian literature opened to us, indeed, an exceptionally interesting world of early civilisation,—and that so closely subtle and compacted as to be at times almost *blasé*. We have delighted in the grandly simple and highly coloured Rik, where gods, heroes, and demons struggle in a maze of close particulars so dim as to specific points, in fact, as to be in places almost a tangle, but all combined in a moving mesh-work out of which life’s passions glint at every turn.—We have enjoyed the calm Brahmanas with their placid puerilities, set here and there with the invaluable lines of early myth and deeper thought; we have been charmed with the melodious epic, till at last the ‘Friendly Counsel’ with its inimitable fables has fairly won our hearts ;—and we have stood throughout in respect at what may well have been

\* As this Lecture may appear within a different cover, and upon another date from the others upon the general subject of ‘Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia,’ matter unavoidably comes before us here which has been already touched upon in those previous pages.

the earliest sources of speculative conjecture,—but who ever dreamt that there was a Veda, in some respects equal to it all and superior to much, far up in the misty north, a thousand miles from Ganga, and as old perhaps as the oldest Rik? \*

Yet so it was, and it began to be suspected not so very long ago, for the tracing of the particulars still goes freely on. And it is this which, strange to say, brings in the full evidence even of the Indian documents upon some of our own (Occidental) religious dogmas,—of which let the 'Philonians' here take notice;—not that there existed any closer historical connection between them and our religious views than that through the Avesta. No one who can read, as we may say, can well deny the identity of many thoughts in Avesta and in our Exilic or post-Exilic sacred Semitic books, even if we did not have the Gāthic demon Asmodeus in the Book of Tobit, where he was opposed, as in the Avesta, by the 'Seven Spirits,' not forgetting also the mention of the Persian Avesta city† *Ragha, Rayes, Rai*, all in a single piece, though not in a single chapter;—but how much are we startled when we recollect that the R̥ig Veda itself is here related? It is indeed a 'far cry' from the Ganges to Jerusalem, or even from the Indus by way of a Persian Babylon,—but longer stages have been 'laid behind.' Of course we have the additional item of attraction that the stories of these lores are the tales of our kinsmen,—and why not of our very ancestors?—May they not positively preserve the myths of the ancient tree from which we actually descended?—they certainly concern a bough of it.

Was Avesta then concocted in our A.D. One (*sic*), when the Persian language had been Pahlāvi for centuries?—Did some ancient Chatterton of Teherān at the time of Christ, or just before it, weave such a cunning tale as even

\* At least as old as the Brahmanas, possibly much older.

† Recall also the statement that it was 'also in the cities of the Medes' where some Jewish tribes were deported.

the Gāthas tell us all unconsciously indeed, as if in passing\* and wholly without effort to convince us, nay, even without a single attempt to state any one so-called historic fact in the historical manner?;—if he did, he must have been at work for India as well. But the age for such miracles in letters had ceased, or never was, in Old Iran with all like hidden influences long before it ceased in late Jerusalem.

From this let us proceed a little further.

*The First Home of the Aryans in their Migration, as the Tribes divide,—Identities persist.*

To trace out, then, our analogies more fully, let us take first of all the familiar name of 'Aryan,' which, while used as an adjective completing the especial name of the Great Indo-germanic race, is also much applied to the present Indians and Iranians. The term occurs frequently enough in the Rik, but strange (or, yet again, not so, strange) to say, it is only marked as the 'generic' in Avesta, though it appears, as might be expected, enormously widespread over all Europe as well as in south and mid-Asia; see it even in the Celtic *Iran* and in the Irish *Erin*.† So that I need not have paused to allude, if only with a few syllables, to 'distances.' For no one anywhere, as we may now well presume, supposes that the Indians, as we have long since named them, were indigenous to India, or that what influence they may have exerted issued originally and altogether from the land of the Seven Rivers.‡ The present so-called Indians were invaders, of course, coming down as a ruling mass into the lands now known to us as India from the north and the north-west, and by that same Khyber Pass which has seen the ingress of so many differing peoples at memorable epochs. We can easily trace their very movements southward and south-east. The old Rik of the Veda mentions the rivers on whose shores

\* See my remarks above, in the previous Lectures.

† So it is supposed; cp. *Airyena V(a)ejah*.

‡ Or 'of the five'; *panj-āb* is the 'five waters.'

they dwelt at successive intervals as they slowly spread. The first Rishis sang of Indus with its tributaries, then the later ones at last of the Ganges. The men of the Brahmanas and commentaries had reached still more distant points in the same ever-persisting direction. But, what is still more decisive, we can also trace the sources of their movements, so to say, backwards to the north, till we find them as far up as mid-Afghanistan;—then, leaving Vedic lore entirely, we actually discover their presence in feeble remnants among the Iranian tribes,—that is to say, we have in Avesta, old and late, the presence of people who oppose the new Iranian party, and who correspond, at least as to the chief name of their deity, to the Indians rather than to the Iranians, for they were termed D(a)eva-worshippers in reprobation. First they are seen in the Gāthic Avesta as deadly foes of the Zoroastrians,\* then later as a beaten fragment left behind by their disappearing fellow-countrymen, as a servile class. So, backward and northward we trace the scattered throngs of tribes named Aryan, till we come upon what may have been a quasi-description of the primæval home itself (for all of them, as of all the other Aryans).

It would be, indeed, a point of peculiar, if not of solemn, interest if we could fix the very spot which was once the early scene where the Indo-germanics acquired those dominant characteristics which distinguish them from the hardy Mongol and the brilliant Semite. But beyond all doubt we have really an attempt at least to allude to the 'starting-point' of all Aryan Indo-iranian migration. The account, as it reached us, is contained only in a few sentences amidst much of a later type which could not fail to encrust itself upon it, helping, however, by its very presence to preserve the ancient hints.

We find it, this depiction, in the celebrated first and second *fargards*, or chapters, of the Vendidad, 'first' in the

\* Zarathushtrians.

order of printed texts in some editions (but by no means first in the order of genuine priority—this of course). Here we have a sort of rough Genesis with a series of Edens, and with successive expulsions. It is one of the most striking fragments of early fable (enclosing history) which has been left to either Aryans or to Semites.

*The exact determining of Localities is, of course, not feasible.*

Where the old place precisely was we can, indeed, never know, but the Iranians of the two (the future Indians and Iranians) alone report it, curiously enough.\* No place called '*Arya*' is prominent in the Veda, though the word is frequent, but at the very outset of the Avesta document we have the 'fatherland.' It was *Airya* *V(a)ejah*, the race's 'start.' The *Aryan*† seems to have been the 'tiller' first rallied to his work, and we have in the scant narratives one of the first records of an attempt to rise above the level of the otherwise universal savage life.

### *The March of the Aryans.*

Wherever the land in fact really was, it cannot fail to impress us, even without the fuller information, as the momentous scene of the first movement of the present dominant races of the world, to subdue predestined subjects.

### *The stirring Cause.*

It would seem to have been somewhere up in the frozen North, for the first resolution to move on came from the constraining force of weather; that is to say, from cold: 'Ten months winter, two months summer, cold on the land, cold on the water, cold on the plants, cold on all, winter demon-made.' From this began that mighty march of the Aryans, if not of all the Indo-germans, whose subjugating footstep presses everywhere as beneficent, let us hope, as it is

\* So far as I know.

† I trace the word to the root *ar*, 'to plough,' as in *aratrum*; see the previous Lectures.

irresistible. It received its first impulse from the unvaried and imperative cause of many similar advances—I need hardly further name it—‘discontent.’ It was, however, no unreasonable nor sudden restlessness, nor was it brought on by a change which was rapid in its effects. Its cause was one of the most unbearable of those powers which afflict us, and also one of the most prohibitive, if not destructive, to the prospects of an early civilisation. Climate, that sovereign power under which the ‘mode of motion’\* appears to be modified or diverted (for it cannot be destroyed), was—as so often—the impelling force. Not perhaps for the first time;—that can be hardly possible, but for a first time, in an energetic primæval line, it gave the *push of fate*, and stirred in the virile breasts of our forefathers or fore-kinsmen† their first fixed thought of tribal, not to say of national, prospective pioneer adventure as a unit. It was, indeed, no foolish curiosity which led them on, for these Aryans were as little fanciful, if we may judge from their practical points in literature and in polity, as any of the other main divisions of mankind. Their reasons were indeed less trivial than those which induce most similar decisions. They moved out, as we gather from the venerable tale, before the temperature as it chilled, one of the most convincing of all motives for a migration—receding step by step.

*Whence came this Climate's change?*

What sort of a fall in temperature was this particular one recorded? We know that, in lands now ice-bound throughout the year, the bamboo once grew in torrid heat quite half a foot in thickness and rising to a dozen yards;—so the elephant, as we see from fossil ivory, once stalked in the dense fens of *hot* Siberia. Can it be possible that these strange words of the book *Vendidād* actually report a similar change from a similar cause? And was that cause conceivably the original decline of caloric upon the

\* Heat.

† *Sic*.

earth's crust,—or was it induced by a sun's periodicity,—colossal inference,—or by what? If it were the former, what an obtrusive item, or rather what a dominant occurrence, do we possess in this remote event of which we have so clear a trace!—a change from the cooling of a region upon the surface of the globe in the course of the original refrigeration, and within human times,—not in human history, of course, but in human myth, reflecting earlier tales that grew from fact.

And why should this be so stoutly doubted,\* as, doubt it, of course, we must? That its essential idea was mere guess-work of the story-tellers lighting upon frost as a chance theme, does not seem to be so likely. The simple seers of the villages would not so naturally have hit upon such a fancy as 'cold' for the conceived-of motive, or moment, in 'driving a whole people out.' Some actual past event of the kind of an enduring magnitude, in immemorial times, had evidently sunk deep in the hereditary traditions and memories of the infantile but sturdy generations.

And why, indeed, should a climatic crisis be regarded as so incredible; for, as a civic mass, they would have left no home for merely a few, if even somewhat persistent, bad seasons. Generation after generation in prehistoric years must have felt the gradual closing in of a polar world, and the forebears of these myth-weavers of Avesta may have been among their number. Crop after crop must have become impossible,—as we see them indeed now failing in our Middle Europe. The herbs, the fruits, the cereals, shrank and grew tasteless under the freezing grip†; and the 'tiller,' *Aryan*, was obliged to turn southward seeking the summer zephyrs, coming down and ever farther down, from his more northern home. That region, which from its moderation was once the only

\* Not that any one has suggested such doubts;—the idea is now, I believe, first mooted.

† See Dr. Warren's most interesting work upon *Paradise Found* (at the Pole).



habitable territory for a man, actually once around the poles, became no longer possible, and the moving tribes marched ever southward as the seasons fell, led on, and it may be 'lured' on, by 'vegetation.' At last they reached the land soon called as they were, Iran,\* in memory, perhaps, of their more ancient birth-place—a name which they have retained, and which has survived among us until now (see above);—its vales and plains stretched far and wide before their view amidst the peaks, south-east of the Caspian, south-west of it, and south of it. A part of them found support enough, as we observe, in the nearly middle Aryan territories; and a part broke off in huge banks, or strolled away in dribblets still farther south, down through the Afghan passes ever south and south-east, till they reached the Five Waters, the Punjāb, and became the Sindhus† or Hindus, the river-men, and with a singular destiny before them. But the old name still held;—the Aryans were *aryans* yet.

*Some South-going Aryans lingered in the Far North,  
almost as if they were Iranians.*

For a long time the territories of the two kinsfolk touched, or almost touched.

The Gandharvas of the Veda, who recall the Avesta name *Gandar(e)va*, were with *Apsaras*, as far north as the vales of Kubha, or Kabul. Not far distant was the *Krumu* which was the *Kurum*, and the *Gomati* which was *Gumti* (*Gomal*), and the *Çutudri* which was the *Suilej*, and even the half-mystic *Rasā* which was the *Ranghā*. As the common native home is named in the

\* Eran (Spiegel).

† The Greek form of their present name, the *Indians*, rather than the *Sindians* (*sic*) came through the Avesta, or at least the *Persian*: *Hindu* is *Iranian* as against the Indian *Sindhu* (the same word with phonetic change; but how about the Prakrit, etc.?; there I am not at home). This is hardly my own original view; yet see the *Century Dictionary of Names*, as if there were some hesitation here.

Avesta, so their primæval history is disclosed, not told, in both the ancient documents. It is a history repeating its predecessors, as history seems ever destined so to do, working forward with pathetic effort in its spiral, returning but not always, to the selfsame centre in a devious circuit on a beaten track. When they had reached the rocks of Iran where we left them still undivided, the same deserts again stretched before them, ever south, arid and hopeless as they are to-day;—but not arid, as we may believe, from the salts of evaporated seas alone;—parts of them were waste as well, no doubt, from other causes, and from the reverse of that which first impelled the Aryans to break up their early borders;—the summer's drought became, at one point, desolating, for it was not sufficiently relieved;—their chief struggle was for water.

#### *The Azhi.*

Why did the rivers fall, and the rain hold off?—Some power was at work against them in the distant upland from which the rivers rolled, or in the distant heavens from which the rain-streams poured. They thought this influence was personal and præternatural,—what else could they think?;—some accursed being in the sky was busy and active, toiling to accomplish their defeat. Sometimes they thought the clouds themselves were outside walls,\* sometimes the limbs of some huge animal they feared, shut in the clouds as nutriment;—the dread dragon-monster of their early tales and terrors gave the first outline to the eye of their imagination, as the *boa constrictor* of the South helped on the image there.

Some snake-devil up above, both near and far, was winding his fell coils about the cloud-cows dripping to be milked. In the Veda he was called the *Vṛitra*, the 'imprisoner,' and so *Verethra* in Avesta. His other name was *Ahi* in the one lore book, and still more

\* See Bergaigne (?).

originally *Azhi* in the other. He is *six-eyed* and *triple-headed* in the one, *six-eyed* and *triple-headed* in the other. He might have the title *Dāsa*, 'fiend,' in Veda, and he is positively *Dahā(ka)* (the same), in Avesta.

His bellowing strikes terror in the one, we only hear his fell petitions in the other. His object in the one is destruction simply, and in the other he would 'empty the seven Karshvars of the earth of men.' *Apaosha*,\* withering drought fiend, becomes his servant. The cloud-war becomes a god-war.

The same thing is taking place to-day. Drought is the murderer in large tracts of India, and in Iran it has, with other influences, in places literally swept the signs of human life away. So of old;—blighted harvests brought on famine;—dried-up rivers exhaled their poison, the virus of the reptile;—the cattle drooped, the flocks grew small;—the hardy camel pined;—and Indian and Iranian called on the same gods, and in hymns which have long been silent, for their help. As we are led to believe, they used the very metres in those vanished chants which are still sacred now;† and the same great deities took up the contest. The Creator of all was *Ahura* in the Avesta, and *Asura* (the same) in Veda.‡ There was *Mithra* among the one set of tribes, and *Mitra* among the others.—The old god *Athar*, whose form half perished from the *Rik* (though reappearing later) was strong and resistless in the sister creed, while *Agni* took his place in Indian chants.§—But the very name of the chief combatant of *Azhi* is *Verethraghna*, the fiend-smiter in the Avesta, and *Vritrahan* (the

\* Cp. *Çushna*.

† We judge so from the metres of the *Gāthas* and of the *Rik*, and from those in other and later songs which have been left to us.

‡ Or 'an' *Asura*; *Varuṇa* is also at times both literally and constructively *Asura*. The *Rishis* themselves hardly know when to speak of an *Asura* as a separate person, or as designating the god-class. Here also it was and is impossible to be certain.

§ He has been in his turn half-forgotten in *Avesta*, though the word occurs.

same) in Veda.—There was *Gau*, the kine, the prize of warfare in both;—there was *Vayu* and *Vāyu*;—there was *Soma* who set on valour on the one side, and *H(a)oma* (the same) on the other,—till we come upon the glorious abstracts which were later the Archangels of Avesta (the *Amesha-spentas*). We have *Rita* (the law) on the one side, and *Asha* (was it *arsha*?), the same (see also *ereta*), the law on the other;—there was *Manyu* (earlier ‘spirit’) on the one side, who was *Mainyu* (spirit) on the other; \*—there was *Vasumanah*, ‘who had the good mind’ † (in the *Rik*), and *Vohumanah*, ‘good mind,’ in Avesta;—there was *Kshatra*, the kingly power, who was *Khshathra*, kingly power;—there was *Aramati*, the ‘energetic zeal,’ who was *Ār(a)maiti*, the ‘devoted mind’;—there was *Sarvatātī*, healthful weal, who was *Haurvatāt(i)* (the same);—and there was *Amṛitatva*, who was immortality, and *ameretatāt*, the deathless long life, here and hereafter. By the side of these there was *Çraushṭi*, ‘willing hearing,’ and *Sraosha*, ‘heedful listening.’

### The Demons.

And the same demons too often fought against the saints on either side (indifferently). There was *Manyu*, later ‘demon fury,’ on the one side, and *Angra Mainyu* on the other;—there was the *Druh*, a harmful-lie-god, and the *Druj*, she-devil, on the other;—there was *Drogha* and *Draogha*;—there were the *Yatus*, who were *Yatus*;—there was *Rakshas*, demons on the one side, and *raksha-doers* ‡ on the other;—there was the *Dānu* and the *Dānu*. The same human, or half-human, helpers took up the cause. *Yima* in his heroic character is *Yama*, later. §—*Trita*, the mysterious ‘third one’ in the

\* Not, however, an *Amesha*, more another name for *Ahura*, or for his chief servant above the *Ameshas*.

† As the name of a *Rishi*.

‡ *Rakhshaiti*, my suggestion in *S.B.E.*, XXXI.

§ See above (was not the Avesta vowel ‘i’ a later false transmission?).

Veda, is *Thrita* in Avesta.—In the Veda he is primæval before all as the first preparer of the Soma, in Avesta he is only the third, if still pre-eminent arranger; *Trailana* is *Thraetaona*; *Kavya Uçanā* was *Kavi Usan*. The features of the encounters are alike;—the god-war became a 'faith-war.' *Trailana* battles with the *Dasa* as others with the *Ahi*;—his tribe name was *Aptya*, and so in the Avesta it was *Thraetaona Athwya*\* 'who smote the same dragon, three-jawed and with thousand jointings† and of mighty strength, which *Angra Mainyu*, the torture-god-wrath, made against the corporeal world.' In India both old forms faded, and the Hercules of the Veda appeared;—*Indra* took up his bolts;—so in Avesta we have *Indra*, misspelt *Andra*, but in this case turned to demon like the *Devas* and some others.‡

In Veda he drinks the soma to stir his courage; it is of *Trita's* brew;—sometimes he takes that old kindred name. He smites the *Ahi* as *Thraetaona* did his monster.—His mace has a thousand points, *Kavya Uçanā* forged it, and is there at hand with it—and so in Avesta *Kavi Usan* is on the side of *Thrita*.§

*Men side by side with Gods almost as Peers.*

Man not only took part, but helped on the gods with equal energy. *Keresaspa* (in Avesta) is almost an *Indra*, and so men help on, half-god(-d)ed throughout, in Veda. *Sacrifice* itself, as if half-deified, did much in

\* I would now suggest *Awthya* as of course, and a corresponding change in the analogous Vedic form, as in the texts.

† So I suggest an alternative. Avesta's *Thrita* is rationally 'third.'

‡ See below, upon the further divergencies. We must not forget the *Rishis*, who assumed these god-names wholesale.

§ The influence of Avesta upon Veda is a great deal more probable than that of Veda upon Avesta for the simple reason that the Vedic people came down into India from the north-west, as no one doubts;—there the Vedic Indians were once pre-Avestic Iranians beyond all question; yet far as India was and meagre as were the intercommunications, a stray idea may well have reached Iran from early Vedic Afghanistan.

the matter too. So also in Avesta: '*O Ardivi Surā Anahita*,\* with what offering shall I serve thee, that thou mayst run down, that the Serpent slay thee not, damming up thy streams?'—The Yasna answers, 'with offering and libations';—these are the powers and the weapons which arm both defence and attack throughout.

The almighty force was fire, and in both communities it never faltered,† as the battle raged. The grass was spread,—the seat was made (*barhis* in the Veda, *bareś(man)*‡ in Avesta),—the hymn was raised,—the ear was gained,—the sticks twirled furiously and the sparks appeared,—the fire came,—the god lit on his throne;—his word went forth,—the cloud-flame fell, the lightning struck,—and the monster quailed;—his folds were burst, and the showers loosed, with all the blessings which they brought or symbolised.

### *The Same Heroic Deeds.*

Different heroes, both Indian and Iranian, bring on the same salvation by the same deeds,—and sometimes they even take the selfsame names.

The half-god *Keresaspa*, as above, does the same work as *Trita*, and for the matter of that, as implied, he does Indra's too. This was to be expected in the successive developments of myth, and it has analogies in every ancient record of the kind;—gods and devils, demons and angels, borrow everywhere each other's deeds, as do heroes and their opposites;—and this as if by merest chance (in all such lores).

### *The Reason Why.*

Yet there remains always the reason why successive champions should meet successively the selfsame foe;—the *Demon's work was nature's course*, and so ever fresh as it

\* 'Heroic one of spotless (waters).'

† Though its name shifted back and forth; see above.

‡ But if this form be original the etymology must be irregular. In all such cases the word should be rationally restored; no ancient document has been handed down intact. *-man* is mere suffix.

recurred;—decade after decade,—if not year after year,—the same serpentine power wrapt his encircling length about the rain-clouds, and brought the famine on.—How could it be possible that similar deeds done by successive heroes could remain unsung?;—the identity of the results would stereotype ideas.

*The Gods of Peace.*

And when the war ceased for an interval, the same *gods of peace* ruled in the happier time. There was *Airyaman* of Avesta, 'friend true to *Airya*,' who was *Aryaman* of Veda, and *Nairyosāṅgha*, 'blest of man,' who was *Narāṇsa*;—there was *Bagha*, god of good luck, who was *Bhaga* in the sister book;—there was *Parendhi*, god of riches, who was *Puramdhi* in the Rik (though not personified), until we come upon a summing-up of favourites (favoured for good reasons, if only for the moment);—and they are curiously enough counted up to the same figures (thirty-three) in both Veda and Avesta, in each division of the tribes.\*

*And the same Human Princes of the Peace are in part common to both sides.*

*Vivasvant* is *Yama's* father, and *Vivaṅhvant* (the same) is *Yima's*.† *Yama* is a king of the blest, and so is *Yima Khsh(a)eta* (in Avesta). Some of those who were erstwhile warriors were later renowned in calmer days. So our *Thrita*, no longer spreading slaughter (see above), is now occupied in precisely the opposed direction;—he is the first physician;‡—and so in the Atharvaveda (he wipes off sin or disease);—he even gives elsewhere to the gods the boon of slumber;—in yet another place

\* In both Veda and Atharvaveda we have it on Sanskrit side; and so, sure enough, in Yasna (I, 33); not perhaps that the same gods were actually meant at all times when the figures were used, but the number was once emphatically solemn, and the old impression lingered with the relic of a forgotten reckoning. Burnouf first noticed this, not Haug, who repeats it.

† See my notes above.

‡ Vend., XX. See also XXII for other healing.

he gives long life to men;—in yet another any evil thing is to be brought to him to be appeased.\* In another he appears as poet. *Kavi Usan* backed up the *Thrīta* in his duel, as we saw,—but he is also engaged in kindlier work, and reinstitutes great *Agni* as high-priest, leading the heavenly cows themselves to pasture.† It is another person, if *Vafra Navaza* be a person, who in Avesta takes up the task of *Kavi Usan* (in the later books) and anticipates air-navigation,‡ for he tries to fly to heaven, though where does *Kavya Uṣanā* do the like?—there are plenty of mountings to heaven.

Such are some few of the parallels. Well indeed are these Iranian texts called three parts Veda, so far at least as the tales they tell may tally. The word itself too, *Veda*, is near *Avesta*, which, however, may be *āVista*§ with a prefixed *ā*, *-ā-Veda* and *ā-v(a)edha* || touch everywhere. While of the metres which I mentioned,¶ one of the oldest and not least beautiful, Vedic Trishtup, survives in some of the choicest of Avesta hymns. And these analogies tell irresistibly toward the argument for the earlier age of even the later Avesta, where, for the Iranian side, the analogies for the most part fall.

\* See R V., VIII, 47, 13.

† R V., VIII, 23, 17.

‡ I can, however, find no exact parallel in the Veda. In a later book (Bhagavita-gita, X, 37), he is the first of poets. He has four sons in the Mahabharata (?), etc., etc.

§ The same as *A-vitta*, *t* before *t* goes over to *s* (*st*).

|| *V(a)edha* occurs in the Avesta, but more in the kindred sense of 'possession.' According to all analogies an Iranian *V(a)edha* might, however, precisely equal *Veda*.

¶ See above. The 'fringes,' so to speak, of these analogies must vary, considering the immense distances involved and periods of time, with sparse intercommunications. In the case of *Asura* we must also remember that the shiftings of the applications of the word must be more than usually kaleidoscopic, because the word of itself had originally so clear a meaning as 'God,' aside from all application to a person;—yet I hold that its earlier occasional use as of a supreme person affected to some extent its application ever after. Its inverted use for 'devil' or 'devils' seems almost exclusively personal;—it is applied to it, or to them as to a personal Satan, or to a gang of Satons, so named.



THE ESTRANGEMENT AND THE BREAK.\*

But amidst this mass of evidence, full as it so evidently is, and decisive for the unity, we come upon a phenomenon which at the first sight of it undoes it all.

[(Internal differences, as we are all too well aware, have everywhere lowered religious names, and holy offices once held most sacred fall to less repute;—‘unpreaching prelates,’ let us recall, for instance, were once not approved by Puritans, and the chief titular Christian Bishop is openly called ‘Antichrist’ by a large fraction of those who profess to worship the same great Lord;—many also who exalt the ‘saints’ with conscientious devotion are termed ‘idolaters’ by their co-religionists; while these in their turn hurl back the retort of ‘heretic,’ each party to the conflict being doubtless both serious and fervent, while each also consigns the other without hesitation to the flames of an eternal future.

It was still more natural in the first struggles of the Faith with the classic heathenism for the early Christians to find ‘Jupiter’ a possessing devil, or to withdraw ‘Apollo’ through the nostril of the neophyte.

No facts, indeed, would seem to be more cruel than such as show the dearest gods of one race made the very demons of the next)].

*The Great Dethronement.*

Yet where—to resume—in the wide history of religions or religious peoples, will you find the gods whom the very men involved themselves once worshipped,—nay, the supreme chief one of them all, long regarded as Creator,—at last dethroned,—a god still adored by their own close kindred †—those of His present defamers;—nay, not alone

\* See *East and West* of Bombay for March 1902, and *The Open Court* of December 1910.

† The kindred of the men who now condemn them.

dethroned,—*transformed* like any foreign god to *fiend*, and this not only in spite of their kinsmen's unchanging belief, but in fact possibly, if not probably, *because* of it. Yet this is what stares at us from every folio of Avesta, as from many a section of the Veda. Not only have some of the subordinate divinities turned upon their *alter-ego's*, but the very name of Heaven itself is violated;—and this, as I regret to say, upon the side of Iran. No name more fitted to beneficial spiritual powers could ever, as one would think, have fastened itself upon the receptive sensibilities of happy worshippers, than that name of the 'shining sky'; and *Deva* (*to dyu, dyut*) is, indeed, still used by several branches of the great Indo-germanic family as *deus, deity*, and the like, a household word in Western and South Europe (more book-word with the Teutons).

And so in classic times as well, *Zeus pater* was *Ju-piter*, as *divas pitar* was Heaven's father, and yet it was this 'Heaven' itself, *Zeus-divas*, which Iran used for the gods of Hell!—a great pity, as we may well concede;—it might indeed even shock us,—but so it remains the fact. From the very Gāthas on, throughout the old, the intermediate, and the new Avesta, throughout the period of *Pahlavi*, through that of the exquisite Persian literature (early, middle, and late), down to this very day, hardly the smallest trace of a deviation has been discovered or reported. *D(a)eva* and *Dev* have never been made use of prominently, if at all,—so far as I have observed, or can remember—in all our surviving Iranian to designate those Holy Beings whom the ancestors of both Indian and Iranian once worshipped with the word (so signal in this use)!

#### *Its Cause.*

And how did this sad change occur, as we must in due course inquire?—It might assist our answer if we first look for a moment at a still greater profanity, if not, indeed, still greater blasphemy,—as we might so term it,—and this time still quite as unhappily, if, as was the fact, upon the other

side. *Asura* became displaced. The Indian Aryans, and some of them at an excessively early period, themselves dragged down this once honoured name for the Supreme Spirit whom their own still earlier seers adored. '*Asura*' itself was changed by the ancestors of Indians, as by Indians themselves, and not only changed but inverted in its turn,—as in the other case of *Deva*. There a sacred generic name was degraded;—but this was worse than degrading a mere generic name. '*Devá*,' however glorious, seldom meant an individual deity till later days,\* while *Asura* was seemingly at times beyond all doubt a distinct person, or at least rhetorically so used, and as such his name was taken most horribly in vain,—at all events as the great *god-class*. He was once the believer's father,† not only 'Heaven's *Deva*'‡ as in the older Veda, but father of the heroes that bear the earth,§ and even of the infinite 'eternals';—not man alone, but 'gods' bore hymns to him,||—'the offerers of the great race of *Angirases* are his servants, sons of Heaven,'¶ so three of the First *Adityas* are his champions.\*\* Even Agni, dearest of the gods, is born of him.††

'Seven-priested from of old, forth, forth he beameth  
As in the mother's womb apart he shines,—  
Eye hath he never closed, the watchful, joyful,  
Since from *Asura*'s loins he issued child.'

One would think that *Asura*'s place as a god—so far as he was so signally a person—was safe, if ever a deity's possessions were;—but he begins to lose it, and before a redoubted rival, who is found indeed uniting with Heaven itself and the wide Earth against him, *Asura*,—for all bow

\* Cicero's *deus* was often merely 'the divine,' as was also *theos*.

† Not understanding '*Váruṇa*' just here. R V., X, 124, 3.

‡ R V., V, 41, 3. *Asura* of heaven.

§ R V., X, 10, 2.

|| R V., V, 41, 3.

¶ R V., X, 67, 2, etc.

\*\* R V., III, 56, 8.

†† R V. III 22 7.

down before the rising Indra (R̥ V., I, 131, 1). The full celestial civil conflict at length breaks out:—

‘O Lord of prayer, Brihaspati, O Indra,  
With thy hot bolt split through Asura’s men  
As thou of old didst smite with daring fury—  
So smite to-day, O Indra, that fell fiend!’

And this of Asura, erstwhile the father of both gods and men!

‘O Indra, Vishnu, all Çambara’s strongholds  
Ninety-and-nine, ye smote, though fastened tight  
A *varchin*’s hundred, yea a thousand foemen  
Ye slew them all, Asura’s thousand might.’

At last he is totally ‘ungod-ed’ (called ‘no-god,’ *adeva*) with his once peerless hosts:—

‘Bladeless the non-gods Asuras oppose thee,—  
With hurling spear,\* O headlong, drive them hence!’

And this goes back how early? The *Rishis* foil their tricks,—Atri defeats them. Several of the gods claim to overshadow them. No fall could be more signal. Even the *Dāsa*, the ‘fiend’ (see above), is coupled with the name (R̥ V., X, 138, 3).

It is a very remarkable phenomenon, look at it in whatever light we may. (It is not at all possible that the word ‘*Asura*’ was used of evil beings arbitrarily and with no gradual departure from the earlier sacred use;—recall the same change with *manyu*, etc.) And this occurred in hymns sung by *Rishis* of the same people, in the same metres, and in the selfsame line of priests (apparently). Here then is a god-name, spiritually supreme in one century, or perhaps even in one decade, and yet not only degraded but reviled in another closely succeeding period,—and in the same country, among the same people.

And so again we have the question, as of the *D(a)eva*

\* R̥ V., VIII, 85 (96), 9; literally ‘with thy wheel.’

name, though *Asura* is somewhat less familiar. Let us now ask more closely,—how did this happen? The great name *Ahura*, i.e. *Asura*, held itself unrivalled in the other land from one end of the Iranian territory and history to the other;—it never lost its supremacy. Why did it not likewise continue to be supreme in India as well? And why did the like—only approximately—parallel reverse take place with the name of *D(a)eva*\* as we have seen—*adored* in one accidentally far-separated lore—territorially separated—and *execrated* with dynamitic fury in the other. Was *theology* alone the evil cause in both cases of this lost sovereignty?

That the once twin peoples later quarrelled theologically on the matters of ritual and creed none can doubt;—and that their religious disagreements had something, as of course, to do with their mere geographical division seems certain. In the case of *Asura* this took place not with the division between Indian and Iranian alone, but with the jarrings between school and school among the Indians;—there were such bickerings beyond a doubt, and as usual, and this even between *shrine* and *shrine*. To explain this deplorable, but too frequently recurring, mishap, we must, as so often, now go back to the pettiest of all small causes. Some poet in a favoured centre had made too brilliant illustrations—this was the difficulty;—or some woes predicted by one priesthood there had turned out too strikingly, though perhaps accidentally, correct;—or again, more simply and as a familiar case, one community had become too prosperous, so that their especial patron deity must be a little taken down. Such was beyond all doubt the far-back secret of the thing.

So, low and deep, the mutterings began against the prestige of the now, alas! too loudly praised *Asura*: 'Those vaunted deeds of that especial deity, or class, *give flocks and herds* across yon river, or yon border'; 'This is the very cause, perhaps, why flocks and herds *are dwindling here*';—'*Asura*, once supreme for all of us, is turning out

\* *I.e.*, Devá.

to be a party-god to the great profit of *those* rivals.' And as the negro first neglects and later pounds his fetish, so the Indians began to drop Asura hymns, then to murmur in undertone some fragments in a hostile strain,—till at last after some savage struggle they cast off all reserve, and openly reviled the god who could so help-on the hated neighbour, and soon forgot the days when they too raised his name (in song as sweet as any).

This was the true, main motive of the change, we may depend upon it, as between Indian and Indian; and—take my word for it—it is the secret of half the changes in opinions since. Could things like this have failed to help-on, if not actually to cause as well, the differences also between the men of Veda and men of Avesta (and this while they, the future Indians and the original Iranians, still touched each other in their homes), as such like things most certainly brought on the same sort of differences between Indians and Indians in their southern settlements, also *still later on*? The contrary seems hardly possible; things like these must have been the causes here at work. That these grave, and ultimately fatal, differences with all their mournful but inevitable consequences had their actual origin from anything like simple and clearly differing radical *intellectual* convictions stirring the very soul and conscience, is unlikely to the last degree. Even the precipitation in some of our own great modern reformation had its impetus from the smallest of all trivial hopes or fears. No,—it is extremely foolish to suppose that a purely rational theological antagonism in opinion was really, at that early period, the moving cause of the harsh events which followed upon these subdivisions in either case. Theological rancour—indeed, to some degree of old, as I have conceded—deepened, and become embittered by every selfish instinct fermenting in the minds of the great leaders,—and this to some degree, and as a thing of course, kept them, as they felt it, active both in the stream and at the helm, and more sincere fanatical con-

victions must have helped on the conflict everywhere and throughout,—but the mainspring of the conflict lay, as ever, in *brute jealousies*.

As the Indo-iranian tribes extended, the advanced settlements stood somewhat too far off from the chief centres, and the bands of inter-racial connection became at times attenuated. Differing interests—if only in the great markets in the wider meaning of the term—could not fail to stir up discord;—unequal fortunes nourished hatred,—greed grew furious as wealth grew insolent,—border friction became more constant as the country's sections grew personally more and more estranged,—bloody brawls led on to still more bloody raids, and these to remorseless inextinguishable feud,—until the long fratricidal wars began, and the battle-shouts were deities. As Moslim cried 'Allah, Allah!' with terrible effect, so each side in murderous affrays called on its favoured name. 'Deva, Deva!' was shouted along the one line, and 'Ahura, Ahura!' rose fiercely from the other. And in the roar of the chorus the keener wit and the nimbler tongues\* of the future Rishis too often wove the better words, and silence sank upon the ranks of Iran. And when victory came, with its known atrocities, we can well perceive how 'Deva, Deva!' became more feared, and if possible more hated (though it was once to both a name endeared), while Ahura as Asura was correspondingly despised by the southern throngs.

The one side in desperate fury cried—

'Your kindred, O ye D(a)evas, are a seed from the mind polluted;

Who praise unto you most offers, with the deed of the lie deceiveth;

Advanced your stratagems are, renowned in the sevenfold earth.' †

\* The short shouts went back on battle hymns;—recall the soul-stirring hymns of modern civil war.

† Yasna, XXXII, 3. Something such-like, or parts of it in short cries.

while the other side thundered back with hymns such as I have quoted.\*

I am convinced that this was the explanation of the strange changes as regards the gods of each.

*The Results, or some of them.*

Victory was not always on the Deva's side, and with victory captives were divided ;—many a North-Western was carried off towards India beyond a doubt, and some from amongst future Indians were dragged back to Iran. There, after the sullen peace, in the New Avesta, these D(a)eva-worshippers became a servile caste amid the subjects of Ahura, though in the Gāthas we find them still unbeaten and in arms. There, in the New Avesta, they are at home, domesticated, and to a degree assimilated, but with such scanty civil rights that their very lives were lightly risked. A grim smile forces itself upon us as our eye runs down the pages ;—the form of cruelty is as quaint as it is merciless ;—the tyro-surgeon might try his virgin knife on them, these D(a)eva worshippers, but on no account could he begin his practice on a believer in full credit. If he 'cuts' three times, and all three times his patient dies, his knife must rest for ever ;—only if he cuts three times, and all three times his D(a)eva-worshipper survives,—then only may he proceed and 'cut' the orthodox.†

*These Differences and Inversions only the more acutely point the Facts of Unity first noticed.*

Such murderous estrangements—as is often elsewhere seen—only heighten still more the singular effect of the phenomenon of the past agreements on which we lay such stress, and they set the last seal to our convictions. The ancient, but alas ! now too often spiteful, sisters, were once almost as one, quite members of a family. If the chief

\* The hymns behind the battle-shouts.

† Vend., VIII, 36 (94) ff.



gods (see above) lost their hold among the Indian-aryans, how much more was it to be expected that brother deities of lesser magnitude in the two great race divisions should lose their caste, and that among them even some leading—if still somewhat *sub*-chieftain—gods should suffer similarly after they have become the pet saviours of one or of the other of the angry sides? \* *Mainyu*, 'spirit,' is indifferent—as a word—in Avesta, needing an adjective to define it more closely as the 'evil,' while it sometimes occurs alone, and often to designate a 'good' deity. And so, at first, as said, in Veda; it was 'good' enough—though standing quite alone—as 'zeal' or 'forceful passion' not yet personified, but, like the other names, as seen above, it became at last, not mere 'spirit' as in the other lore, but 'spirit anger'; and so at times personified, while in Avesta it is never the Supreme Devil without its adjunct *angra*; see above.

Then there were the *Nāsatyas*, who were, under a still higher name, the *Asvins* of the Veda; but *Nanhathya* (the same) is a demon in Avesta. Whether the *Angirases* of Veda are the *Angra* of Avesta is much more doubtful.†

Then the *Gandharvas*, gods of sheen-mist, are so high in the Veda that they even put the stimulating power into *soma* (sacred drink)‡ beside very many other mighty functions,—but in Avesta *Gandarva*, once named aside from this, attacks the *h(a)oma* (which is *soma*), as a *D(a)eva*-demon attacks a sacred object in an opposing book.

*Kalpa* is the holy rite, among many other momentous items in Veda, but the *Karpans* are a hated band in the Avesta. Even great Indra, as said, was a devil in the

\* If '*D(a)evas*' carried havoc among the Iranians in conflict with Indians, no better reason could be furnished for their neglect and final detestation, and so of *Asura* among the future Indians, not only in civil war between the neighbouring Indian tribes, but in some frontier battles with Iranians. Of course, as I have said, the matter by no means stopped at this.

† For the *Angirases*, some think, are mentioned in a good sense in early Persian; but see below as to changes in the same old usage.

‡ Apparently the first there discovered intoxicating liquid, and from that quality deemed to be supernatural.

Iranian lore, and little wonder, though he fights the Dragon just as the Avesta champions did.

*Ithyejah* is a demon in Avesta, but *tyajah* (-s) (the same) is often not an evil in the Veda. *Būiti* is a demon in the one lore, but *bhūti* means 'plenty' in the other; so *Bujin* is a demon in the one, and *bhuji* means 'enjoyment' in the other. Other sub-gods and sub-devils fall, or rise, on one side or the other,—but the list would tire us. Among the heroes, too, are many changes. *Kriçanu* shoots to save the *soma*, bringing down its keen foe, the hawk; but in Avesta *Keresani* is an enemy of *H(a)oma*, which is *Soma*. *Gotema*, and his progeny, are singers and heroes in the Veda, but *G(a)otema* is cursed in the Fravardin Yasht, etc.

One item aside from personalities should be noticed. Curiously enough *Dahyu*, the marked name for the provinces in the Avesta, is *Dasyu*, which is used for hostile tribes in the Rik, and here, indeed, we are so startled by the coincidence that we are almost forced to see in the one a pointed reference to the other. These *Dasyus* mentioned in the Veda were tribes that did not worship *Devas*, and they are supposed to have been the savage aborigines whom the Aryan Indians forced farther back, as the advancing white man drove the red man elsewhere.

But were those who formed this opinion aware of the familiar Iranian name? Those *Dasyus* were not only unbelievers, and non-sacrificers, but 'people with other rites.' What rites had savages which could raise them to the rank of rival worshippers? \*

To finish with analogies. As *Asura* turned demon among the Indians (or future Indians), and *Manyu* with him;—as *D(a)evas* were once gods in Iran, in times before the *Gāthas*, so in the same lore we have from the same

\* Some doubt that the etymology here is identical with that of *Dasyu*. If the Indian's *dasyu* had an evil origin in India itself, this may have been overlooked by the Iranians. If Indian enemies called Iranian regions *Dasyu* like their own evil *dasyu*, this may have been sufficient cause for Iran to accept the name in a better sense.

cause a good and evil *Vayu*, and among heroes with their families a good and evil *Kavi*, and the like.

These crossings and recrossing of gods and sub-gods, heroes and head-knaves, from one side to the other in the celestial or infernal minuet, do not affect the argument. Let me again assert it;—Veda and Avesta are really one; and I add the chief item here.

*Not only are the mythologies, the echoes of past history, and the proper names of gods and heroes the same, with the names of countries, the languages being recognisably allied,—but the entire essence of the two dialects are closely identical with only such phonetic variations as might be expected;—even these largely vanish as we learn more and more how to decipher the Avesta alphabet. Their very irregularities correspond most strikingly, like their laws. This clinches all the other illustrations.*

Said the greatly distinguished Professor Oldenberg,\* then of Kiel: 'The languages, Avestic and Vedic-Sanskrit, are nearer to each other than were the dialects of Greece near to each other, and even nearer to each other than the Veda is to its own Sanskrit "Epic." †

This seems to us, at the first sight of it and hearing of it, to be hardly credible, but what is really more wonderful is that it is so little known. It is actually the fact that we have a mass of documents from the remote north-west which are verily twin-sister to the south and south-east Sanskrit,—and not to the later type of it, but to the earlier; to the Vedic rather than to the post-Vedic;—and this is true also even of the later parts of the late Avesta. There is one main feature of identity to which we should never allow ourselves to grow accustomed;—the *metres are the same*, and the most beautiful of all, as said above, predominated in the hymns of the original united home.

\* One of the translators of *S.B.E.*

† See my communication to the *Times of India* under date of July 28, 1909. This gentleman, Professor Oldenberg, was quoting a chapter of my own in Roth's *Festgruss*, in which I had endeavoured to

*Which holds the Claim to be the more Original?*

As to which side of the two bears the fullest traces of their common origin is not so easy to decide. Now the older forms fore-gather in the Avesta, now in the Indian, —but that all are remotely ancient as terms in Indo-germanic speech no expert anywhere has doubted.

I refrain from further items;—it seems clear, indeed, without more said, that Avesta is nearly Veda in history, features, language, and metres.

*The Impossibility of Later Fabrication.*

If so,—to return to our first question,\*—how can its greatest and oldest part be the cunning product of the Augustan age?—and on Persian soil where the Avesta language had been dead for centuries? A dead speech can live in literature, and Kalidasa could speak no Sanskrit,† writing in a left-off lingo, but it would be hazardous to postulate too suddenly the same conditions of things for ancient Iran as for less ancient India. The scenes presented in the old Avesta, the Gāthic, teem with intellectual life indeed, rough and severe, and they do not show a hyper-cultivated finesse. The Gāthas almost surpass the credible in sublimity of tone, their age and place considered,—but in view of the later over-elaborated ideas of India they betray a too unsuspicious view of life, and we doubt whether the men that wrote them knew the world too well. Not even in the latest Avesta, or post-Avesta, fragments down to the time when Avesta could have been no longer spoken,‡ do we see the smallest trace of any such malign capacity as could forge the old

---

turn the forms of Zend into those of Sanskrit; see his *Religion des Weda*, p. 27. No Scotsman, justly proud of his rich native speech, will take offence when I use it as an apt illustration,—Avesta is nearer Veda than Scotch, with all *its* genius, is near to English.

\* Let the reader not forget that these Lectures were separately delivered.

† So some think.

‡ As a vernacular.

hymns, working up a mass of broken allusions which depict in passing scenes too often far from pleasing, scowling with party passions, and all directed to one single aim.\*

*If Genuine, a Later Date for Them is Unthinkable.*

The fabrication of such productions as the Gāthas would betray its origin in every line, while as to the seemingly still open possibility that they were late and yet *genuine*, it hardly deserves to be discussed. If there was a *Vishtāspa* at the time of Christ, a *Frash(a)oshtra* and a *Zarathushtra*, they could not possibly have then written pure old Aryan with the very names still perfect, and with the whole cast and colouring such as it lies before us.

Either—entirely unlike the rest of the Avesta—they describe in their vehemence scenes which were actually transpiring, and sentiments that were personally felt, or else somebody made them up to imitate the half-baffled fury of a group of leaders struggling in a religious-political crisis. This last would call for a letter-miracle;—as said above, and the age for that was past (or never had been).† Nobody living high up in the hills of sparse Iran could well have worked up a fiction such as that. It would have been a masterpiece immense. Such is the state of the case. There is, however, always the one main result indeed which nothing here affects.

We can offer to inquiring applicants in the Avesta some of the most delicate, as well as momentous, suggestions in ancient literature. With the exception of a frequent solecism, the passages are all, one after the other, but little disputed as to literal terms in their primal sense. It is here the 'last step' which costs as to the exact point, and not the first. Our doubts are great indeed as to the precise turn of the detailed ideas intended by the

\* The victory of a bold political-religious party in the struggle for a throne; so we must fully reconstruct from the plain, if isolated, texts.

† See above in the previous sections.

composer to be expressed ; and it is here that we specialists consume each other ;—but they are next to nil as to preliminary elucidations, and the cruces often fall in dependent parts of sentences, *which might actually often be left unrendered* with little loss to the main theme.

No one, as I suppose, has ever denied in any tongue this extraordinary elevation of sentiment in those most ancient pieces of the Avesta, silly as some of its later excrescences may be, nor does any one question the marvellous subtlety of those distinctions as 'to thought and word and deed.' The grouping of the Ameshaspentas alone is wonderful, for they mean God's attributes now personified as the archangels, and again still denoting characteristics implanted in His people, with the result of healthful weal and deathless long-life\* (also much personified), but resulting in an especially subjective future state. And all these elements, instinct as they are with religious vitality, have again strange,—and yet not so strange to say,—their traces in the Veda.

We may remember the man in the fiction† who objected to Semitism as 'too much immortality,' etc. Little did he know that it was far more Aryan than Semitic. While the Hebrew exile had a Saddusaic faith with few glimpses towards the 'other side,' he came back from his Persian East with a soul all moved with futurity. His God took closer notice,‡ and his Devil had more form. His Judgment was to be forensic, and he came prepared to write the Daniel piece, with many more. His spirit, the Iranian's, was to be lashed indeed (if bad) hereafter, but it was by his own evil personal emotions, and his pangs were to be 'bad thoughts and words and deeds' ; while zephyrs of aromatic fragrance were to meet his soul if blest, as it left the lifeless clay for the Bridge of the Discriminator and

\* See the first Lecture.

† Was this in Mr. Disraeli's *Lothair*?—see my letter to the *Times of India* of September 24, 1909.

‡ Spiritual notice.

the Last Assize. In the approach to these a beautiful form was to appear which was declared to be 'his own religious nature,' or, as some would read, 'himself'; and she would answer to his bewildered question: 'I am thy conscience, thy good thoughts and words and deeds, thy very own.' Still dazed, though not alarmed, the soul would proceed under her benediction till it came before the 'Throne all golden,' where Vohumanah, like the Son of God, arises to hail and reassure it;—souls of the holy dead throng to meet it;—the Almighty intervenes to spare it painful reminiscences;—and it enters a heaven of 'good thoughts and words and deeds.' But this is Avesta, and by no means Veda.\*

\* See these points more copiously presented in the first Lecture. Such particulars require frequent re-introduction, as their importance is

## FIFTH LECTURE.

(*An Interlude.*)

'GOD HAS NO OPPOSITE.'\*

### *A Sermonette from the Persian.*

WE have all of us noticed that ideas develop not so much in circles as in spirals. We find the old thoughts coming again, as history unfolds itself, but they always reappear increased. This is perhaps as apparent as anywhere in the familiar argument by which we try to harmonise for ourselves the blemishes which we observe everywhere in our personal destiny and in that of others—that is to say, in the argument by which we accept these miseries on the score of antithesis.

Hegel, and Fichte before him, used this procedure more fully than others among moderns; but devout clergy, whose religion no longer includes a cold acquiescence in human sufferings, have often urged upon their hearers as a consolation the necessity of evil to the development of the good, of sorrow to the possibility of happiness.

Obvious as such thoughts may be, and vital as they certainly seem to all men in their attempts to smooth out the wrinkles on the face of things, we little expected to find them expressed to a nicety at such a time as the thirteenth century, and in such a place as Persia;—and it is equally

\* This little piece, now here re-edited or re-printed for the fifth time, was suggested to me some years ago by a fresh consideration of the doctrines of rational dualism as set forth in the Pahlavi literature. See the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July 1897, pp. 103-110. See also *The Open Court* of 1910; *East and West*, Bombay, January 1911; *The Parsi* of 1911.



startling to see their very detail worked out in a style which reminds us of the much-praised, if sometimes belittled, philosopher of Stuttgart.\* The *Masnavi* is the Bible of the Persians, and *Jelalu'-d-din Rumi* is their apostle of the Prophet. No book of antiquity or modern days is, all things considered, more remarkable than his production. Wit, humour, poetry, and rhyme express its sometimes postprandial pantheism, and these are offset with conceptions which are often sublime and a piety which was doubtless sincere. When he comes to philosophical hair-splittings in the style of the mystics he is very acute, although, as he himself confesses, he often sews himself up. On this matter of antithesis he is especially rich, and he gives us in many a place 'Hegelianism before Hegel.' Here is a bit of his doctrine of limit :—

'Errors occur not without some truth. If there were no truth, how could error exist? Truth is the Night of Power, hidden among other nights in order to try the spirit of every night. Not every night is that Night of Power, nor yet is every one devoid of power. If there were no bad goods in the world, every fool might be a buyer, for the hard act of judging would be easy;—and if there were no faults one man could judge as well as another. If all were faulty, where would be the skill?—If all wood were common, where would be the aloes?—He who accepts everything is silly, and he who says that all is false is a knave. . . .'

'Discern form from substance, O son, as lion from desert. When thou seest the waves of speech, know that there is an ocean beneath them. Every moment the world and we are renewed. Life is like a stream, renewed and ever renewed' (compare Hegel's 'All is flow,' as borrowed from Heraclitus). 'It wears the appearance of continuity or form;—the seeming continuity arises from the very

\* Hegel was born in Stuttgart, where a marble slab bearing his name is set in the facing of the house which claims to be his birth-place.

swiftness of the motion (p. 3); a spark whirled round has the appearance of a circle.\*

He expresses the principle of this on page 31, book i. Here he begins and slowly works his way up to a statement so great as nearly to silence us with respect for him. Commencing with the usual instance of light and colour, he goes on: 'And so with mental colours. At night there is no light, and so no colour,—but by this we know what light is,—by darkness. Opposite shows up opposite, as the white man the negro;—the opposite of light shows us what is light;—hence colours are known by their opposites. *God created pain and grief to show happiness through its opposite.*†—Hidden things are manifested thus.' And then come the (to a scholastic) magnificent words, '*God has no opposite; He remains hidden.*' God has no opposite; He is all-inclusive. We are all of us a little pantheistic nowadays,—although on Hegel's law we may still claim to be 'orthodox';—and who that thinks has not been, or will not be, mentally moved by the conception of that inclusiveness. 'He has no opposite.'

All that exists, exists through His will, and has ever so existed.‡ The discoveries of physical science, the still more far-reaching ones of the purely mental, only define His indefinableness, and make Him greater.

He has no opposite,—not in the realms of the moral idea,—not in the close distinctions of the exact or the quasi-exact sciences,—not in the physical astrologies of the skies,—not in the range of mathematics surpassing imagination,—nor in the scope of æsthetics, which are as minute as they are expanded. The telescope and the microscope are as powerless as is that world of sensibility which is called into life by music or colour.—Nowhere is He arrested or described. Sorrow cannot say to Him, 'Here is your

\* Compare book ii. page 165. I have not followed Mr. Wynfield's most impressive and effective translation literally, but I have preferred it to others.

† The italics are mine.

‡ Save moral evil.

limit,' nor Pain declare, 'Me you never made.'\* Even the old conceptions of future torment which exist clear and distinct as ideas at least, almost as dreadful as the supposed realities ;—nothing,—nothing is without Him, or so opposed as to define Him ;—He has no opposite. But He has detail, if we might so express ourselves. He has no opposite, but His actual deeds and attributes are made up of them. He can never be defined,—but we can approach a definition. All the thronging results of science may be said to be the discoveries of 'opposites.' Every opposite found out by brain, or eye, or glass, or measure,—every tool with its adapted edge, every structure in the subdivision of mechanics, is an added item in the rearing of that great edifice made up of differences out of which we approach Him. Without the recognition of difference no consciousness can exist, and the pang of misery is the actual condition to the thrill of rapture and the calm of peace.

Surely it is a consoling as well as an impressive thought to the thinker, that notwithstanding the conflicts in his mental processes he does not think in vain,—that to the universe of opposites on which he works there is a unity towards which he may indefinitely progress.† 'God has no opposite' ;—it gives consolation to the *doer*, for he knows that every result which he brings forth, sharply facing either menace or defect, brings him nearer to the Harmonised. Well may we accept the 'pulse of thought,' 'the grasp,' 'the split,' 'the combination.'‡ What consolation, above all, it gives the obstructed!—How oppositions tend to make us doubt!—How can there be a purpose in so much treason, such equivocation, and such oppression as we see?—How is it possible that there can be anything so mean? Surely here, if anywhere, is God's Opposite. Yet even here the old Persian's word holds good. God means

\* Except the moral evil.

† Compare Kant's 'Ad Indefinitum.' (Or was this an unconscious joke?)

‡ Compare Hegel's 'Begriff, Urtheil, Schluss.'

the caitiff as the only being that can define the good,—though He may neither have created nor permitted \* him ;—He uses his results, as He does all things,—the evil for a supreme purpose. That good is somewhere, and all of us will be sure some day to find it out. God has no opposite, and He perhaps never makes us more acutely sensitive to His goodness than when He permits us to recoil and with disgust from what seems the contradictory opposite of all that He can be.

\* Here is the great crux, with its seemingly inscrutable contradictions, which I make no attempt to solve. See Lectures XII and XIII.

## SIXTH LECTURE.

THE SUPPOSED AND THE REAL 'UNCERTAINTIES' OF THE  
GĀTHAS;—THEY ARE CIRCUMSCRIBED BY INCONTRO-  
VERTIBLE CLEARNESS.\*

[(To state our case here more plainly at the outset :—there are two well-defined leading issues in Gāthic studies, as in some other leading branches of research, each of great, if differing, importance : one is the moral-theological, and the other is the merely literary-æsthetic. The first interest is obviously paramount, because it lies at the foundation of the history of ethics ;—if even all the doubtful terms in the Gāthas which express literary or æsthetic point were stricken out, this moral element would still remain untouched.—The other points possess that same artistic value which attaches to the complete æsthetic treatment of all important subjects, ancient or modern. To put these crucial factors into focus is here our purpose.)]

On the many branches of Oriental research all serious authorities are sure to differ,—as indeed upon all specialities of whatsoever scope,—but it is always a little difficult to understand just why Avesta studies should be so often especially branded as bristling with the 'inscrutable.' And there was indeed at one time a most extraordinary element of hindrance, which to one unaccustomed to the facts seems fatal to all serious investigation of the matter. I

\* Thus, as ever, recalling, expanding, and repointing what has been necessarily already, but less prominently, mentioned, or implied above in the other Lectures once separately delivered.

state it fully as follows for an obvious reason. As is universally understood, all important texts should be approached only after and with the mastery of the obviously essential materials for exegesis;—but the Pahlavi Commentaries upon the Yasna which actually grew out of the Yasna itself, and therefore possess the most imperative of all claims to a hearing, have been handed down to us in an alphabet in comparison with which that of Assyriology is lucid. Owing to this initial disadvantage, some justly impatient adventurers two or three decades ago felt forced to advance with many an interesting and valuable suggestion, and interpreted the Avesta without its daughter. We might clearly and at once cross off these parties from our score,—did they really any longer exist,—but at this present time there is scarcely any longer a single writer of this description to be found. No serious person now disputes the fact that the Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit Commentaries teem with valuable indications at every line, having given us all our first knowledge of Avesta grammar, anticipating our finest re-discoveries, while they unfortunately also launch out into the impossible as to both terms and syntax everywhere throughout. Such is the character of all such ancient ‘targums’ themselves written over or rewritten by every later generation. We have, however, at last in so far deciphered the Avesta-pahlavi alphabet as to find incisive elements of the Pahlavi alphabet in our later-formed beautiful Avesta alphabet itself;—and so we have finally at least become more seriously aware as to what both our cherished certainties and our dreaded ‘uncertainties’ in Pahlavi and Avesta really are. As to those of the Gāthas, these difficulties arise from one of the strangest particulars in literature, when we take into consideration the vast historical importance of the interests here involved. Everybody has heard of the Ameshaspends of Persia, with the resonant name of their enouncer, and many know that they were worshipped throughout that vast Empire, signalling the deepest personal religious principles for centuries. Having

even become familiar to the distant literary Greeks, also in their interior sense, so early as the fourth century B.C.,\* they were rehabilitated, if with much loss of dignity, by the Gnostics, B.C. 60 to A.D. 100.† They must have had great influence with the noble Mithra cult, and they told indirectly but most positively upon posterity through the known channels, animating our own faiths even till to-day. But in the original Hymns the names which distinguish them,—these Amesha-Spentas,—are used in many differing applications (rhetorical and literal) as words; and here opens the entrance to our labyrinth.

The leading term, *Asha*—to wit—the most closely associated with the name *Mazdā(h)*, occurs first of all in its natural sense of 'correct truth,' having originally grown out of the observation of the undeviating regularity of natural phenomena, chiefly in the movements of the heavenly bodies; e.g. God speaks *ashā*—i.e. 'with His truth';—this idea then becomes personified, first rhetorically and then literally, as the *Archangel* of 'rhythmic regularity,' 'O *Asha*, shall I see thee,' etc.;—it is then, again naturally, used of the land's 'statute-law,' including religious as well as civil regulations—which point, however, might properly come under the first;—it was then also not strangely applied to *Asha* as embodied in the 'Holy Congregation' [(and in the later Zoroastrianism *Asha* without much incongruity ruled the Fire, as the first sacramental object;—see the altars)]. *Vohumanah*, traditionally regarded as the 'first (?) of God's creatures,' is really His 'Good Mind';—then this personified rhetorically or actually as His *Archangel*,—then as embodied in the individual correct-citizen—the saint; [(after that also as alive within all the good-living creatures 'made by Mazda')]. *Khshathra* is the needed Sovereignty; first that of God Himself, without which the horrors of chaos would be ours,—then this personified rhetorically and literally as His *Archangel*;—then most practically meant as the actual Government of the particular State, the Holy Realm

\* See previous Lectures.

† Recall also Manes.

[[and in the later Zoroastrianism in a most interesting, if curious, sense as guarding the metals]]. *Aramaiti* is the Energetic 'Zeal of the Lord' and of His Saints;—this pleasingly personified rhetorically as His 'daughter';—see the feminine form, and then literally as the *Archangel* [(later also as the genius of the Holy Earth our mother; (see also this in Veda))]. *Haurvatāt* is God's 'completeness,' a conclusive concept needful in the extreme;—then man's Health, Well-being, and Success;—then these as ever personified rhetorically and literally as Archangel [(later chiefly as the Guardian of the (healthful) Waters, purging all disease)]. *Ameretatāt* is Death-absence,—God's eternity, and man's long-life, with immortality,—then this personified rhetorically and literally [(then once more, and later only, as Guardian of plants giving food-life to all)].

Here is a bit of variation, if variation be anywhere. And it is often *well-nigh absolutely impossible* for us to tell in which one of these three, or four, differing applications the words are first and immediately intended to be understood. Here is then 'uncertainty'—and, indeed, with an emphasis to the ultimate. Yet, although we cannot always be at all sure as to which one of these applications is the one intended by the author to be expressed in any particular passage, not one of the three or four applications can escape the possibility of having been one of the first held in mind by the author, while *all are intimately related in their interior significance*,\* and each must have had its place among the impulses and convictions which impelled the expressions. Here is 'included certainty' also of a character beyond all comparison. Other uncertainties occur from the defective nature of the grammatical terminations, which are archaic, unrelieved by the use of auxiliaries. This defect continued, doubtless, to be tolerated to some extent because these obscurities were explained to the first hearers by rhapsodists circulating perennially from hamlet to hamlet under the direct instructions of the

\* Almost variations of one and the same all-inclusive idea.



Prophet and his successors, and at the periodical gatherings of the tribes 'from near and from far,' intoning also doubtless hundreds of companion Hymns now lost to us for ever. Yet, as we have freely acknowledged, to us who lack these original explanations the exact literary point of many passages may be again one of three or four, as well as the application of the names, if there be any difference between them;—see above, a closer decision being often impossible. I doubt whether the author, or authors, of the passages themselves could have later decided what they themselves had in their own sentences exactly meant to say in many a place;—that is to say, not without a strenuous personal exercise of the faculty of memory, recalling approximately what they had long since once intended to declare.

So much for the 'riddles,' as they have been called,\* the 'enigmas' of the Gāthas. But the 'cause' of it?—or 'of them all'—of this extraordinary condition of things in these now so crucially important documents?—my baffled while inexperienced reader will long since have asked this question: What could be the possible *reason* for such perplexing vagaries? Was it—the cause of this—the mere dulness of an affected throng—a stupid idiosyncrasy and nothing more? [(As I wrote in 1900 (see the *Critical Review* of 1900, p. 256): 'If they—the Gāthas—were cold and dry, like metaphysics or mathematics, little else could be expected;—simplicity, poverty, and (forceless) repetition in the choice of terms would be *de jure* the order of the day in them. But they are not cold in these senses;—they burn with life in the excited passages, and glow with it in the calmer ones;—notice the vocatives everywhere, the first and the second personals;—see also the iterations;—the composer was fervent rather than fligid;—and this was well for us—but what was the exact reason for this apparent deficiency?—or, if you please, what was the excuse for it?')]

\* See the Appended Note for details.

Did, then, some bewildered enthusiasts, pressing on a propaganda amid the scattered villages of old Iran, adopt it,—this indefiniteness,—or fall into it, hap-hazard?—Far from it. These concepts thus astonishingly grouped were the signal expression—almost the very battle-cry—of an acutely pointed political-religious revival on which a throne depended.\* With an ardent impulse rarely equalled—never surpassed—they totally threw off their ancient ways,—reversing at times the very titles of their own once-honoured gods, whose culture had now become badly congested with minor secular interests struggling with the higher elements, excessive image-worship having acquired influence, while all was overgrown with exaggerated dependence upon rites. It—this antiquated system—was no longer able to stir the degenerate populations to that one supreme test of ‘good intention,’ the sacred tillage of the soil on which existence then hung as now;—their life’s only salvation, in fact, that tillage was, from murder, arson, and the raiding theft, pestilence, and starvation intervening. In the mighty struggle of revived virtuous energy all must indeed have begun upon the smallest of all small scales;—but its spread—that of this doctrine of honest work—was obviously immense in mid-Asia, and as wonderful as it was great (see above);—the six pure concepts—with Ahura, seven—were identified with all Persian Faith.† All literary Greece, as said, heard of them in their most vitally essential sense by B.C. 350 *circa*, again almost incredible;—even the attention of the still ‘farther’ West was early earnestly engaged. The signal outbreak, from its longing after purity, certainly then unique in history, reminds one of the great Church Reform (upon a lesser scale), recalling also, somewhat, the English ‘Commonwealth,’ with the Puritan emigration. For the first time, so far as we know in recorded history, an earnest political movement appealed in such a degree to the moral sense

\* See Yasna, XXXI, 5: ‘Who prepares the throne for the faithless.’

† See again Plutarch, so often alluded to above.

of the individual,\* pointedly, radically, continuously. They formulated the supreme, if simple, concepts like a creed,—short, indeed, and so more pointed,—defining closely the character of God in a manner not yet surpassed and seldom equalled,†—exalting and impressing also His personality at every line, for they ever called on Him for help. They even personified His Attributes for a like reason that the Christian *Logos* became incarnate ;—bringing God's just love, authority, and power to the very souls of His struggling people—in the crisis of a mortal strife. This saved the life-enthusiasm of the moment—and this alone ;—had they let up here, if even for an instant, their established polity would have crumbled to its atoms.

These names of the personified Attributes of themselves made up a short vocabulary as well as 'creed,'—certainly indeed it was—this list—but being sacrosanct as well as fresh, they—these terms—conveyed volumes at every sound ;—occurring everywhere, they controlled the sense of all that followed, and felt the life of all that went before ;—recall our own Bible, 'God is Love,' has 'Justice,' and 'Authority,' 'Zeal,' and 'Immortal Weal.' And all this shows why there is *so little explanation* ;—that is, of these differing applications,—with a style so rough. 'Glorification of the Ameshas' they have been called—these Gāthas ;—they were rather their 'delivery.' Intense and world-wide literary interest should centre here, because in our Gāthas enormously influential and emphatic groupings of first principles were evidently for the *first time* made ‡—so, pointedly. Who does not value such a 'driving home' of the supreme laws, even if literary detail beside it be more than a little dim ? It is these striking elements which dominate the theme, belittling 'uncertainties,' real or due to ignorance.

\* See 'man for man' in Yasna XXX, 2.

† See previous Lectures. Is it not somewhat of a defect in our own later creeds that we do not follow this precedent ?

‡ Recall once more the vast historic and still surviving systems which found and find their beginnings here.

Later, indeed, as just said, these six became associated with lower, if still vital, interests—more pagan(?)—like;—but the keener people never lost the first ideas. This is proved most signally by the late Commentaries on the Yasna. Even in revived Sasanian times far later\* than the Gāthas, these writings err on the other side—the side of excessive depth, of paucity; so, strange to say, on the side of meagreness in the lower scope. In the view just here—they actually fail to express fully that plain objectivity just mentioned, which the simple folk most like; even the first and wholly legitimate personifications in the Gāthas, undoubted as they are,—these valid, if inferior, elements—were in fact defectively rather than redundantly expressed;—*Asha* is almost always *Aharāyih*, 'Righteousness,' so, alone with little depiction of the 'Angel,' Gāthic as he was beyond all question; *Vohumanah* is *Vohuman*, 'Good Mind'; *Khshathra* is *Khshathraver*, from *Khshathra-vairya* of Yasna, LI, 1, 'the Realm desirable'—where, indeed, is he in the text itself so certainly an Angel?—at times, but not so often as the others;—*Ār(a)maiti* is actually taken apart and etymologically reproduced as *bondag' minishnīh*, 'perfect thinking';—no hint of Angel or of 'earth.'† The ideas were so adored and pointed that they then controlled the diction—as in fact they should to us;—this as inevitable;—'space' alone—that is, to save it—space in the sentence—was not at all the cause of the succinctness, as if the chief ideas crowded all others out—though 'space' was precious;—the great 'uncertainties' are then, as said at

\* The religion of the Pahlavi Commentaries is a thing apart. It should be *separately* and carefully studied. To underrate either this religion or that of the Vedic Commentaries, because either was not actually critical in the discriminations which as exegesis they attempted to carry out, would be wholly beside the mark. By whatever minor or greater misconceptions of the original form of the religion they may be hampered, as discussions they often expressed an increased spirituality. See my emphatic distinctions as to this, in my *Introduction to Yasna I.*, Leipzig, 1911.

† Neryosang's Sanskrit more fully supplies these defects, but in places only.

first,\* hemmed in with a greater wall, unbreakable,—of 'certainties.'

To sum up, pressing the matter home. We cannot, indeed, be quite so sure whether *Asha* means God's Truth, in certain sentences, its Archangel, the code of law, moral, civil, ritual,—or the Holy Tribes in which it was 'incarnate,' [(or indeed, later, in the very sacramental Fire upon the Altars—fine symbol of God's purity)];—but we do know beyond all question that God was there, in each one or the other of these thoughts—all inextricably connected as they were and are—interior identities riveting their substrata, each one needful to each, and somewhere very near. *Asha* as the Eternal Truth of 'Balance' was the sublimest, comprehending all;—but where could there be any 'balance' without things balanceable?—living fibre must be also there to thrill at the moral concept,—tissue of undiscoverable subtlety to harbour thought.—Sentient being alone made *Asha* 'flesh' in a 'Church' redeemed. Even the abstract dream of justice is still undreamable without a dreamer. *Asha* as the holy race was imperatively needed to harbour and reveal *Asha* in any sense at all. Was a Supreme God thinkable in solitude?—Having power to create, He would create;—begetting, He would beget. Not least of all is God in Fire—which is not the mere fine 'sign,' but life itself;—the 'mode of motion,' heat perpetual as it is, the 'force' in all—'God's Son' in actuality. Well has the Christian Church her seven lamps.† Without it—this heat-life-motion-fire—no brain could stir, nor heart be moved, nor universe revolve. We can never indeed be quite so sure whether *Vohumanah* voices God's Love, its Archangel, the living Saint, or indeed, later, other forms of genial life; but we are by all means sure that God's love is universal, and that it exists in each such thing;—

\* See above.

† So, often, this from Revelations, so close akin to the great 'Seven'; see previous Lectures.

but where could it be real without some spiritual person well called 'angelic,' or the happy human heart with its mother-love and better passions?;—see also the same in almost every living object—each of the four ideas glides quick into the other. Nor can we, indeed, be always quite so sure whether *Khshathra* is God's Sovereignty, its Personification, or the Realm itself so sacred;—but where would be the rule without a subject—the king without his throne?—God did not need to rule Himself. He is rule itself essential.

So, later also, what was there so belittling in thinking of the 'metals' making mechanics possible—with all they rear?;—see the ideas again so closely linked—and the depth is deepest often, strange again to say it, where the touch is light. Nor can we always be so sure whether *Aramaiti* points to Zeal,\* to her who alone makes 'zeal' reality,—or indeed, later, to the 'Holy Earth' ('our mother'), with its 'ploughshare' thought—an *Ara*—mind—first instinct of life civilised,—turning desert to verdure, verdure to food,—but God is there in each. Nor can we be always sure whether *Haurvatāt* immediately means God's 'All-ness,' that is, as Person in speech-figure or reality, or that in Man's Weal of soul and body,—or indeed later, in Health waters;—but one of the first three thoughts is ever there;—and each is eminent. Nor can we be always quite so sure where *Ameretatāt* is His Eternity, its Angel by word-picture or reality, or man's deathlessness here and 'there,' or later even the bread-plants turning all to life. Surely if God be any where, He is here again in things like these. Where is the fatal fault?

I even dare to say what, indeed, may seem to some quite singular:—Not only does the Gāthic thought-life survive these doubts, but, in one high light of it, they actually help on our grip. For they, these hesitations, call into play constructive instinct at every word, as the mind sweeps over all the varying points, and the grand certainties

\* The 'Zeal of the Lord of Hosts.'

stand out plainer, like boughs of a winter tree ;—suggested strength looms over us. Uncertainty here is many-sidedness,—many-sidedness is amplification,—and amplification here concerns what most of us well recognise to be the first consistent statements of interior faith. Elsewhere for literary point obscurity is, indeed, harassing, if not fatal ;—with Homer and the Veda we pursue each scintillating glint to its ultimate, ever ready to spring upon our reader the remotest fraction of an idea, if new, in issues, too, bereft of deep significance ;—but here we are engaged upon the very foundations of human moral religious thought, the quintessence of all just life—without which we should still be worse than animals ;—paramount values stare at us, from every line.

With what emotion, then, must even a beginner here, in this deep 'search,' become aware that these, his formidable Gāthic texts, are, when looked at discerningly, with rare exceptions, one long, unbroken stretch of clearest words, out of which, too, a pointed sense shines *prima facie*, not only one of utmost value as a stepping-stone, but one which often survives our closest scrutiny. To make this evident, I restore the Avesta words to the actual now current Vedic Sanskrit forms—for *Avesta* is *almost Veda*.\* And while Avestic literary search has been kept back by these many applications of the chief terms recurring, Vedic has been here clear for centuries—that is to say, its syntax has been clear,—not so fully the detailed 'interpretation,'†

A Gāthic sentence when restored with science almost at once stands out as Gāthic-vedic in its plainest forms;‡ this from the concentrated Gāthic thought with its purpose straight.§ Is it not, then, after all, once more and for this

\* See the Fourth Lecture.

† Far from it ;—no two expositors continuously agree.

‡ The rare *hapaxlegomena* and odd difficulties do not count, with a sense, too, pointed everywhere, *prima facie*.

§ For this reason, when invited to contribute to Roth's *Festgruss*, I gave a translation of Yasna XXVIII. into Sanskrit, for which I also received the thanks of the great Vedic-avestic Guru. See also the *Transactions* of

further reason somewhat of a distinguished thing, as said, that we cannot be always exactly quite so sure which great intensity is first in mind;—the uncertainties *here too*, catch on our thought, as said above, keeping it ever more in touch with the splendour of the whole—this too keeps off satiety, as we read them and re-read. And the pure thoughts shine sometimes strongest in solar beam—let us once more take note—where all else is dim (*NB.*);—one might strike the obscurities away—to return to our first proposition (see above, page 103).—resulting voids gape harmless.\*

I think that I have now considered every probable point made *re* uncertainties—and was there not a cause! If the Gāthas contain the earliest pointed effort of their kind to reform the human heart, being also alive to-day in all our faiths, on which, too, futurity may hang, they are, indeed, unique in morals, and morals are never old;—it is the world's hard task to drive them home—as it was their Prophet's. Life's safety, food, clothing, shelter, education, were all impossible, had Justice never been proclaimed, with Power. I close as I began—the Gāthic fragments *occupy a totally exceptional position* for the reasons stated—as against esteemed high-colour and better sentence-pointing—elsewhere.† As I wrote in 1900 (see again the *Critical Review*, p. 258), so we may once more say: 'While the Rik scintillates with a hundred human passions, rich in colour beyond a common measure, the Gāthas burn with sterner fire, narrowed and severe, a Puritan fanaticism;—the one is

---

the Eleventh Congress of Orientalists held in Paris in 1897, where I gave Yasna XLIV. in Sanskrit, re-edited in the *Zeitschrift* of the German *Zeitschrift* for July 1911, followed in October 1912. In my just-issued *Yasna I.* this lengthy chapter is rendered fully into Sanskrit. Yasna XXIX. has just appeared in that form in the *Muskon*, and the rest of the Gāthas, long since so treated in manuscript, will follow in *Z.D.M.G.*, etc., if time be spared.

\* The forceful elements would not only still be there—but positively still more clear.

† My great Vedic-avesta friend, Professor R. von Roth, used to say: 'The Veda is the most poetic book, but the Avesta has far more theology' (doubtless referring to the expression of the 'moral idea').



nature eager for acquisition just or selfish, and spread out in its depicments like the red of the Auroras, the other was a reformed enthusiasm, centred and intense \* (and once alive in fervid generations).

'The meditative parts are as much pre-occupied with deep-felt sentiment as the more vehement ones are engaged with earnest utterance;—read Yasna XXXII., XXXIII., parts of XXXI. and XXXIV., and the *polemik* throughout;—even in the wedding fragment ferocity appears;—everywhere the thrice-holy Law, the Love, the Rule, the Busy Will of Ahura pervade the subject-matter, and show the urgent fresh convictions ever ready to break out;—it is this which makes the Gāthas "easier," if only in a preliminary sense. Any reader with a good guide can get the cream of them in a comparatively very short period of time,—though, to absorb their full significance, originally and as a teacher, should consume the toil of patient years—a duty seldom met;—but for the greatest of all interests *obscurities can wait.* †

\* And let us never forget that we have left to us but three-sevenths of the full volume of such righteous song, with all that this implies;—to miss this point is to miss everything;—the survivals not only prove lost messages, but they prove a once *vast public* so animated. See the Third Lecture.

† I append the testimony of another writer, re-cited from the same number of the *Critical Review*, p. 255: 'The Gāthas, or Hymns, of Zoroaster are by far the most precious relic that 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 ever for a moment be compared with the Hebrew Scriptures. [(Do people who read that think, then, that these Gāthas can be shunted off as things of little moment? Really, if we have any sane sagacity at all, they are matters of supreme historical and present importance. Human character in millions of struggling persons has been redeemed by them, with their fellow-writings;—and is this a trivial matter? Look, again, over the other Lectures. All the possible crimes have been greatly reduced by these things, with our poor human sorrows much relieved;—and is that of no importance?—We must not all be 'fatuous.')]'

## APPENDED NOTE.\*

*Some Leading 'Uncertainties.'*

I give two examples here of those uncertainties which more closely touch us, and would apologise to my general reader, as such details are necessarily more technical and therefore naturally less pleasing. In Y. 28, 1,† we have a thought so subtle in its refinement that we can hardly credit it as possible for the time and place: 'With hands uplift'—we have—'I ask for the first-boon' (so supplying from verse 9?)—'of the most bounteous spirit . . .';—see also the far later Introduction to Y. 28, which has a reference to the same idea 'boon,' reading another form of the word. So far all seems moderate enough;—but when we find out that this boon is *prima facie* 'all actions done in the Right,' we begin to hesitate;—for this rendering is incredibly 'interior' for the time and place;—only the fact that there are like subtle occurrences elsewhere in the Gāthas relieves our scepticism. How, then, can we escape this 'sublimity'?, for—as the unaccustomed reader may well be astonished to learn—one-half of our business is to challenge the 'sublimities' at every step, reducing them so far as may be possible to commonplace;—see our similar procedure with the Bible.‡ We must then, as said, challenge this 'sublimity,' though we meet the like elsewhere on every side;—so only it is set in its just light. But we must also *mention its possibility*, that of the 'sublimity,' everywhere, even when we ourselves would modify it; otherwise we may miss some of the finest thoughts

\* Addressed only to closer students. † In the *Critical Review* of 1900 I gave a number of examples of the less important indefiniteness.

‡ Many a 'sublime' concept must be modified. Recall the 'beauty of holiness,'—it means, at least to us, indeed all that it seems to mean;—but the first thought of the composer may well have been the sacred 'beauties of the service,' or 'holy raiment' used at the altar. If we accept 'sublimities' wholesale, and are obliged to modify them later, we place ourselves at a disadvantage.

of Avesta. We must do this especially when writing for scholars of great authority upon other subjects but non-experts here, for serious specialists are few. [(Here, as I need not say, is where I chiefly differ from my exceedingly few colleagues, who print only their own conclusions, leaving the great Vedists who are not also Avesta scholars in a maze of confusion. This practice in treating the Veda, while stating only our own views, is more rational, as the Veda is closely studied by a large public; but Gāthic Avesta has its very peculiar claims as the first document of interior religion. To disaffect intending students here through an inadequate procedure involves serious loss to the cause of the higher morality.)] Mention and describe the 'sublimity,'—thus I repeat,—or you may miss some of the grandest ideas of antiquity,—this *de rigueur*;—but then assault and challenge them, these sublimities, in *your notes*, even if you positively accept them;—test your steel girders, I insist, or your houses may come down;—let the beginner note this well.\* As to this passage, Y. 28, 1, other writers often resort to what seems to me to be the utter destruction of all syntax in the sentence. Space fails me here to cite their well-meant efforts,—I reproduce them elsewhere.† We cannot here, at Y. 28, 1, emasculate the force of *Asha* as the Law, suggesting mere ritual observance; nor say '*punyavān\*asmi*'—'Meritorious I am' with gifts to priest, and prayers for mere good luck, well paid for,—*punyavān* would mean more than 'quite fortunate' here;—these 'deeds' here referred to apply in the next words to the cattle culture on which all civilisation then depended. See also the sentences just following: 'the attained prizes, rewards of this bodily life and the mental';—see also in 28, 4, 'I, knowing the rewards of Ahura Mazda,' and so on throughout; see also the expression in Y. 30

\* Apply this to all exegesis—Biblical—classical—literary. We challenge in our detailed discussion all these beautiful concepts, and the more fiercely the more we value them.

† See the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July 1911.

'as to thought, word, and deed'; \*—this constantly recurring 'sublimity' elevates the tone of the entire piece, as well as that of the particular expressions just adjacent. 'Ritual observance' was, indeed, included—as well it might be, for it was then, as now, vital to stability—but it is not conceivable that the composer should have so limited this prayer here to 'ritual' in view of all the others. My last device to diminish the fine effect just here might be to omit the word 'my,' which brings in the suspicious subtlety to the expressions, so rendering, 'I pray for impelling grace toward all actions of the holy community done with Asha,' not merely 'my own actions,'—'all actions in public administration and polity, regulating the one essential national industry;—may these be carried out with universal justice, regularity, and efficiency, *i.e.* according to the Law, Asha.' This is not quite so subtle as 'the gift, the righteous actions of the individual soul,' 'all actions done in the Right,' as if the actions were themselves indeed immediately their own reward; see elsewhere, being actually referred to as the immediate benevolent agency of Mazda, the 'Bounteous Spirit,' taking possession of the soul, and making all its actions positively holy. There is some difference here;—perhaps not so much;† but *NB.*, the Avesta words are actually the same whichever way we render. A closer case to show our point is again in Y. 28, verse, or strophe, 5. At first sight we seem to have:—'O Asha (Angel of the Holy Law), when shall I see thee,—I finding the Good Mind, and Obedience, *Sraosha*, the way to the Lord . . . '—or 'I finding Obedience and the throne of Mazda . . .';—and it is imperative to report at once such a view, or we may miss a beautiful idea;—but we must by no means submit to such a fine bit without an effort;—we must lower its beauty, if possible. *Sraosha* = 'Obedience' might be taken in the sense of the 'Obedient One,' which seems

\* Language like this before and after a passage makes an immediate lowering of ideas in Y. 28, 1, impossible.

† The same words.

to occur elsewhere in the Gāthas;—this would take off the edge of the subtlety. *Sraosha* does indeed occur as equalling precisely 'Obedience itself,' and so as absolutely inevitable in its finest and closest sense at Y. 45, 2—'they who render me Obedience';—there neither the Angel 'Obedience,' nor the 'Loyal Saint' is at all possible,—but in endeavouring to escape from the 'incredibly lofty' here, as in Y. 28, 1, we might diminish the 'sublimity' by the device just mentioned with regard to 'Obedience the way to the Lord,' and render 'O Asha, when shall I see thee' (or 'shall I indeed see thee'); 'I finding Vohu Manah and the throne of (?) Ahura'—[(yet the word for 'of' is in a dative for genitive, and not in a genitive)]—'the throne of Mazda the most beneficent toward the Obedient,'—but the syntax in such a rendering would be very difficult;—the dative for genitive or *vice versa* occurs mostly only later as in Sanskrit, —and it looks here extremely awkward—in view of all. We might, however, possibly depress the effect by rendering 'I finding Vohuman and the throne of Ahura and *Sraosha* (the Angel of the Heeding Ear), the (One) Obedient to Mazda the most beneficent';—or 'I finding *Sraosha*, the Angel of the Heeding Ear, leading the way (?) \* to Mazda the most beneficent'—this also might lower the 'sublimity' a little [the sublimity of 'Obedience the way (?) to the Lord,' but not so very much.]] The point is, as I repeat, that, finding Obedience, as the way to God, though commonplace enough to-day, is too subtle in its purity for the time and place. The sum and substance, however, remains, as we see, unshaken with either alternative sense, while the literal words are absolutely the same with any interpretation.

No one anywhere doubts—so let me pause still longer to press home—that the prophet wished to 'see *Asha*' solely because he was 'the Angel of the Holy Law' 'as to thought, word, and deed'; nor that he wished to 'find *Vohu Manah*' solely because He was the 'Archangel of God's Benevolence and Good Will,' 'in the bodily life and the

\* *Sraosha* 'leads the way' in the later Zoroastrianism.

mental';—nor that he wished to 'find the throne,' or 'way,' for the holiest of reasons; nor to see 'the One obedient,' or 'the throng obedient,' to the 'most bountiful Ahura-Mazda' solely for the reason that he (?) was, or 'they were,' thus obedient—so expressing the deepest of sympathetic loyalty;—just as the Christian longs to see the 'multitude whom no man can number,' as mentioned once before. This last is certainly, indeed, not quite so fine as our *prima facie*;—see above,—but it does not fall so far short of it.

The manifold 'certainty' of one or the other of these thoughts, too sadly commonplace, as said, to-day, but great and epoch-making then at that time and place—again includes and circumscribes the 'uncertainties' of the other particular pointings of the literary sense;—but then as mere literature how great they—these uncertainties—here are! And so throughout, though here at Y. 28, 5, we have what is to me the severest puzzle of the throng, with words, mark you, absolutely the same.\*

\* The remaining line of the strophe gives us another tangle, preserving, however, the inevitable depth. See it elaborately treated in the Gāthas, *S.B.E.* XXXI., and in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July 1911; for the literal Sanskrit of it, see Roth's *Festgruss*, 1893.

## SEVENTH LECTURE.

### THE MORAL IDEA IN THE GĀTHAS AS APPLIED TO CONTEMPORANEOUS PERSONS AND EVENTS.

As I have dwelt so copiously and so incisively upon the moral idea as being pointedly effective in the Gāthas in its finest and keenest sense, with the immense inferences upon the history of interior religion and its philosophy which such a fact implies, it is high time that I should, on the other hand, do my best to guard my readers against the exaggerated impression that these ideas were worked up in any exclusive spirit, as if being entirely academic and of the cloister, having for their sole object the purifying of individual character here and there hap-hazard, if one could so express oneself, and in sporadic instances with little thought of any immediate practical issues. Such an opinion would be like bared poles to a ship. The Gāthic moral idea, like applied mathematics, butts full upon real life at every turn. And yet this—strange, and again not so strange, to say—is a view which is much needed to be put plainly for the benefit of some semi-experts. Writers of this description have actually supposed that the academic intensity of the authors of the Gāthas was the sole reason why they did not mention the important secondary Deities whose names appear only in the later Avesta, and that this was also the reason why other particulars were shut out from the scope of their attention. Such an opinion, as one need hardly remark, is the result of untaught and jejune misdirection;—and to refute it is chiefly my purpose in re-editing this fragment.

To suppose that Zarathushtra had either the leisure or the inclination, in the midst of the civil (or border) warfare in which he was so unhappily involved, to vapour about 'holiness' by itself alone considered, and solely in the abstract in an exclusive sense pure and simple, without any necessary connection at all with his immediate circumstances, would be to hold a very uncritical opinion indeed. We could not reasonably expect this of him during the harassments of his campaigns, military or political, or military, religious, and political together,—nor wish him to dwell upon the abstract concept of 'holiness' in general and for all ages and for all people, and apart from the matters immediately before him. The circumstances called most imperatively for the application of the Holy Law, the 'Righteous Order,' to save the existing fabric of the national life. And if we would not press on that point to demand of him an abstractness of Justice bereft of all application to an actual situation, how much less could we expect of him to dwell on a totally abstract 'Love' (for, if it were to a so very refined degree 'an abstract,' it might even exist in the hearts of the 'accursed foes' themselves); nor had he time to trouble with any 'Sovereign Power' so comprehensive as to belong also to the other side,\* nor with 'abstract' zeal, the Alert, but in their evil sense, the Ready Mind, and as little did he concern himself with Immortal Happiness in the same vague general sense for every existing being (including the clamouring throngs in arms before his face). When his campaigns *were over*, then, or in the brief intervals between them in his calmest years of rest,—yes,—then indeed these thoughts might be or they might become totally 'abstract' and nobly so, as indeed we see them at times during the very conflicts in the Gāthas;—and he may even have longed for their realisation without limit and in every living thing, perhaps even in the non-Iranians so long as they did not take the field, but in the midst of '*business*,' and of such business as

\* With its fell deity.



he had before him, he needed all his wits for the movements on which the nation's all depended. Asha was the Holy Order, in God's law fast enough;—it was eternal, sublime, infinite, etc. etc., as much as one could wish it, and as strongly as one could express it, but it was *appropriated*, seized by privilege, *embodied* in an established system. He was engaged in a struggle in which absolutely supreme interests hung often in suspense, amidst scenes at times terrific.—He wished to know, and very quickly too, whether every thing were *taut*; whether every priest, judge, soldier, or ploughman was awake and alive. Had he caught an Atharvan fumbling (with his rites), a judge hesitating, a soldier 'dubious,' or a farmer lazy, we might almost hear (in imagination) his short sentence,—and it would be one to startle us. Asha was God's Holiness, Eternal Right, Law, and Order, in full honour and truth, but as he for the moment saw Asha, 'he' (or it) was Asha in the ranks before his eyes, in the priests beside his altars, and in the tillers in his fields. Work was everywhere to be done, skilled, rapid, and thorough; and Asha (God's Order) was the only force which could get his men to do it. He (Asha) was therefore seen chiefly, if not only in the loyal corps of his armies, in the digested laws of his codes, in the 'peculiar' people of his tribes; wherever else Asha might be, or might not be, was a dream for calmer days. [(Zarathushtra had then no time whatever for a Holiness which might smoulder in the infidel; his great, but at the same time his only, 'call' was with Asha in the Church.)] The 'abstractness' of Asha was thus in so far limited at moments or absorbed for long intervals in the machinery which Zarathushtra had set up, and in the work which it, or he, was intended and destined to complete. [(I take nothing back; let it be noted well—not one syllable that I have ever said or written. Asha was a holiness deep and living indeed, none more so, far-reaching beyond comparison in its judicial and benevolent purposes, for it even aimed at the conversion of contemporane-

ous opponents,\* nor could there have been a holiness more fervent in the enthusiasm with which it aimed to inspire every universal virtue, or in the tenacity with which it endeavoured to maintain every form of noble action, and to carry such principles out to their most pointed effect in action; but it was sometimes, though perhaps necessarily, fixed in a *holy race*.)]

As to how far—in fact, Asha ruled beyond the nation's border, amongst the best of living Gentiles who were utterly foreign to him, and had been in no possible sense at all in arms against him or his enterprise, Zarathushtra had not more and perhaps even less to say than the supreme Christian Pontiff has to say to-day about the potential 'holiness' of the millions who never heard his claims. That principle and the enthusiasm of Asha was not in any sense confined to a 'mechanical' sanctity, we may be sure, though it pervaded an orderly working structure;—no verbal mummeries alone could for a moment have satisfied its ideal of devotion; nor could even a practical honesty in word and barter have been all it sought for,—the heart and the soul, according to its principle, must be as absolutely pious as the ritual must be pure and the civil statutes flawless. As the two spirits themselves were good or evil 'in thought and in word and in deed,' so the worshipper 'must content Ahura with actions essentially true.' Zarathushtra's holiness must be practical, and it must be spiritual likewise for the 'bodily life and the mental.' Here I am absolutely positive, after years of searching thought,—he could indeed only think of it at moments when he could see it in the castes of his warrior State, and he had no time for Asha either in the distance or in the 'atmosphere,' yet even in the most privileged of his interested oligarchy, the holiness which he recognised must not be of a technically limited character, for it must be, before all things, sincere. And so of the other enthroned characteristics; they were the Good Mind, the Kingdom,

\* Cf. Yasna, XXXI, 1.

the Ready Zeal of Ahura in *His immediate people* as such, but they were none the less in reality and in actuality as well a 'Good Mind,' a 'Power,' and a 'Zeal,' sovereign and energetic in the individual believer's own soul, with at times a lofty thought for all men everywhere.

The entire scheme of his system was closely harmonised with his active administration, political and civil. Such was the moral idea in the Gāthas, as I discover it. It was often closely localised, for the most part losing sight of the non-Zoroastrian, hampered at every step of its progress, as well as marred in every impulse of its sentiment by a furious fanaticism (for the life of Zoroastrianism was at stake), yet also everywhere preserving fine elements of conscientiousness. No soldier, priest, nor tiller amongst the foreign hordes could have 'any share' even for a moment in the inspired Attributes and in the protection which they offered, but neither was a Gāthic man *ashavan* from his mere membership *per se*; the 'official holiness' which he bore was no more indelible than the sanctity which cleaves to the modern Catholic disciple. It was a stamp, a *χαρακτήρ* which meant everything in the way of privilege and covenant, but it was a mark which might wear off through abrasions if not guarded with close vigilance, or it might become a brand of infamy if defiled by treason, rather than remain a scar or sign of honour won through a lifetime of virtue, of valour, and of thrift.

But the point of the above cannot be put into its proper focus and kept there, unless we fully recognise that one dominating circumstance which I have implied throughout—that the Gāthas were the hymns of war, and the moral distinctions drawn in them are necessarily those which were supposed to exist between opposed and rival communities to be settled by force, rather than those which might arise between estranged and intercriminating individuals in the same community to be settled by law. Men are judged of in the bulk in the Gāthas, as they

so often are in the Bible, and as is usual at similar junctures, or throughout similar long periods of time. As Puritans could see no good in Cavaliers, and as loyalists could only detest the principles of rebels, so Zoroastrianism knew no term too hard for the hated throngs who opposed at once their interests and their faith. We have, therefore, strange to say, no abundant or even adequate opportunity to judge of the personal aspects under which the moral idea applied itself immediately in that part of Iran at the date of the Gāthas ;—and this, notwithstanding the fact that they are themselves made up of fervent expressions implying an earnest reverence for the moral sentiment in all its forms, and a devotion to it under every conceivable combination of circumstances. Curious as it may seem, the far less lofty Vendidad and even the Yashts give ampler items for such applications and analyses, for there under the jurisdiction of the penal law, as under that of the ritual statutes of the Vendidad, the Zoroastrian is comparatively at peace, immersed in the busy toil of civic life which discloses the individual nature and occupations of the average citizen at every turn; and so of the less warlike Yashts—see especially the beautiful fragment in Yasht XXII. Asha, the inspired spirit of the law, is no longer called on to arouse the patriotic ardour of the Zoroastrian to the point of heroic action, fanning its fury to white heat, and painting in still darker colours the malignant motives of the ‘enemy’; he, or it, is needed to measure all possible deeds—domestic, commercial, social—of the best known Iranian citizen as well as the deeds of the most doubtful, and so to divide good men from the evil, not in vast multitudes or in nations, but individually, and as man is separate from man. Yet the Gāthic type of the moral idea preceded the legal and gave it birth, and therefore, as of course, includes it ;—and while the hymns themselves do not so fully express its incidence and force, yet at times even there in the Gāthas it searches the individual, and closely, Zoroastrian though he be—see especially Yasna XXX. 2, 3. With this remark I

will close my plea for the general clearness of these most ancient fragments, so far as they express the few salient points in theoretical and moral theology, comparatively judged. [(From those weighty sentences in the Gāthas I have here endeavoured lightly to sketch a few animated scenes in this long past civilisation. I do this from ideas which in the eyes of some readers may seem to be merely mechanically expressed, and with a futile redundancy in those spare \* lines;—but to any person gifted with interior insight,—each of these formulated ideas contains volumes;—and from them, if time and space allowed, I should boldly reconstruct a filled-out picture. One scholar could actually see no meaning in the constant repetition of 'Asha' itself, and seemed rather to look upon this priceless feature as a superfluity and a blemish, whereas in this pointed recurrence of Asha everywhere, we see the most startling evidence of a religious revival.)]†

\* To show the absolute essential necessity of reporting all the meaning in these meagre expressions, we must remember that perhaps all but some three out of an original twenty-one (?) books of the Avesta have been lost.

† The above is a fragment re-written from a Lecture delivered at the Indian Institute before 1898, and published in the *Critical Review*.

## EIGHTH LECTURE.

### IMMORTALITY IN THE GĀTHA AS UNBROKEN HOLY LIFE BEGUN ON EARTH.\*

SURELY among the doctrines taught in connection with Religion none save those of a moral nature can equal 'immortality.' And it was precisely this great expectation which the pre-Exilic canon,—if canon the pre-Exilic Scriptures can be said to have had—failed distinctly to express. So much the more, then, do we value it as it appears in the vast sister-lore which surrounded, cherished, and saved Judah in the Exilic times, while it was prominent in the general faith of all mid-Asia—that is to say, in so far as mid-Asia was represented by its central Empire. If, then, this main idea in the faith of Iran helped on the kindred thought in Exilic Judah, a service incalculably great † was done,—that is to say, 'great' in the view of those who at all value such a doctrine as that of another life in an unending future. And there is, in fact, one phase of such a thought which should make it dear to every human heart even where unbelief and doubt arrest us in regard to the never-ending continuance. Few can have failed to see that Heaven's light, where it is at all believed in, reflects redeeming beams on us and ours,—for who that has ever experienced religious conviction can have failed to feel that Heaven, if it be ever attained, must be

\* This fragment of a Lecture was delivered before an exceptionally distinguished audience at the Indian Institute in 1892—it is here, however, much reduced, also re-arranged. It has been also, with the others, frequently re-applied in Instructional Lectures since its first delivery.

† See above throughout, and see below.

begun here,—and it should be only to the vulgar a gaudy scene of detached repletion totally unlike all holier joys of earth. Does Avesta give us here any help in this last particular as well?—If so, its services were still more incalculably great.

(1) And first of all, let us pause for a moment at the word which most expresses it. *Amereša-* is Avesta for Vedic *Amṛita-*, and our 'immortal'—these are the same words identically, with mere phonetic change. The 'im-' privative in 'immortal' is the nasalised 'a' privative of *amereta-*, *amṛita-*. Avesta *-ere* spells Vedic *-ṛi*;—our *-or-* is variant to the two. The 'l' of 'immortal' is close akin to the 'r,' so cropping out again;—the *-tāt*, *-tvā*, and *-ty* express the same. '*Ameretatāt*,' '*amṛitatvā*,' and '*Immortality*' are then identically one, slowly modified through ages. *Amṛita* in Vedic was more often said of Gods.

(2) In Gātha the idea was elevated in mere culmination among the six after the five. Where would the 'Justice' be, with the 'Love,' 'Authority,' 'Zeal,' and 'Weal,' were they so soon to perish?—The very 'idea' of Truth is 'unalterable'; Ahura was for 'every now the same.'

*Ameretatāt*, death-absence, included the fuller consummation of the five sublime abstracts so marvellously shifting at every breath to personalities—as if by automatic action, in reciprocating force.\*\* We often positively cannot tell whether the great 'thought' or the 'Archangel' is before us;—so of the 'two lives' as parts of one, we often ask 'which is uppermost'? As in life physical present, past, and future in the racial longevity are unbroken through myriad *aeons*, so is God's life one in us. In Vedic the 'hundred autumns' of the R̥ik were the prize first prayed for, yet even there futurity was not forgotten.

'Pass on, pass on, by paths of old long trodden,  
Whereon primæval fathers passed from hence;  
Váruna, Yama, kings in bliss rejoicing,  
Thou'lt see alike both God and Man at once.

Unite thee with thy forebears then with Yama,  
So with thy Virtue's prize in highest Heaven,  
From blame all free again toward home be turning,  
Join with thy body now, all-glorious blest.'

R. V., X, 14. 7, 8.

And that the life of the departed was not to be unconscious, see R. V., X, 16. 2 :—

'And when he gains that spirit life among them,  
'Will of the Gods shall he (most just) fulfil.'

Another deep corroboration from Veda of our 'two lives' as the 'one' meets us also in Indra. He was Himself 'long-lived,' so for 'eternal'—thus from this life here. Ahura, too, so thought our great Avesta-vedist, may be 'long-lived' for 'eternal' in Yasna 28. If 'long life' be 'Eternity' for the very Gods expressing life as one, how much more is a holy human life but Heaven forefelt?

(3) Another chief Avestic thought closely kindred here joins on ;—'prosperity is life.' In the mighty dual conflict (Y. 30) God's side is 'All-life-happiness'—'success' in its higher sense. Ahura made 'happiness' for man,—so the Inscription—'Non-life' would be its opposite. Goodness is 'happy welfare' of its essence ;—beatitude, not its mere outside product, half-mechanical. '*Haurvatāt*,' '*Sarvatāt(ī)*,' '*Salubrity*' (the same words for one), here culminates the foregoing four,—for what would they be all and each without 'completeness,' *i.e.* success, and what would that be without 'continuance'? 'Eternity' seals the preceding five ;—the 'ephemeral' is nothing. The soul treading toward Heaven over Chinvat\* is *young*. Goodness has nought to do with long or short, it is embryonic peace unbroken ; death-absence but guards it whole ;—it is infinitude. The very sense of Frashakart is 'progress' ; †—millennial depicments are by negatives—as with this

\* Yasht XXII.

† 'Making all things fresh, advancing.'



our great Ameretatāt;—we have ‘*never rotting*,’ ‘*never ageing*,’\* etc.,—a sort of ‘*excelsior*’ is the keynote. It, the death-absence, could as little divide Frashakart from Garodman itself as we Christians can divide our Paradise from Heaven.†

(4) Next,—to our texts. In Y. 28. 2 we have, in free translation:—

‘I, who you two encircle, Great Giver, the Lord with  
the Good Mind,  
Gifts for the two lives grant me, this bodily life and  
the mental,  
The prizes through Right deserved;—thus to glory He  
brings His blest.’

Why such a piquant phrase as the ‘two lives or two worlds’ in Old Iran, amidst its barren hills?—Was it a literal distinction between soul and brain? To some extent so, beyond all doubt; and that of itself was most refined,—commonplace enough to-day. Where does the Iliad speak like that? Somewhere doubtless, but where? And that the ‘lives’ were ‘here and hereafter’ we hardly need to prove; ‘getting gifts’ for the ‘two lives’ was an expression which could only take its shape from this world! While the ‘beatific welfare’ is obviously that beyond, the word itself suggesting ‘glory,’ rather than mere ‘comfort’ here, and one of the lives of course was therefore ‘Heaven,’ in view of this Y. 28. 2: ‘Give me, O Mazda Ahura, the prizes of the two worlds, that of the body and that of the mind, by which through sanctity (he?) may place their recipients in shining-weal.’ Here, while ‘Heaven’ is introduced beyond a doubt, we have ‘the prizes of the bodily world,’ distinctly referred to in close connection with it.

\* See Yasht XIX., and elsewhere.

† *Pairi-d(a)eza*,—see elsewhere. We are all notoriously a little confused as to the exact difference between millennium, Paradise, and Heaven.

At Y. 30. 4, we may render freely :—

‘Then those Spirits created, as first they two came together,  
Life and our Death decreeing how at last the World  
shall be ordered,  
For evil men (Hell) the worst life, for the faithful the  
best mind (Heaven).’

The word ‘best,’ *Vahisht*, in this verse is the *Bahisht* of the Persians, a name for ‘Heaven’ so continued on from this and similar places. So, by the way, we have in Y. 28. 8 :—

‘That best I ask, Thou Best One, one in mind with  
Holiness best (*Asha Vahishta*),  
Of Thee, Ahura, I ask it, for Frashaoshtra and for me  
beseeching,  
And freely to us may’st Thou grant it for the Good  
Mind’s lasting age.’

Yet the expression for ‘all duration’ of ‘the Good Mind’s lasting age’ (notice how fine it is), refers here far more impressively to future temporal ages, or indeed the next immediately coming years, through which the Good Mind, Archangel of the Holy Reason, was to inspire God’s people and through them mankind.

In Y. 28. 11 we have :—

‘I who to guard Thine Order (Thy Holy Law) and the  
Good Mind am set for ever,  
Teach Thou me forth from Thyself to proclaim from  
Thy mouth of spirit  
The laws by which at the first this world into being  
entered.’

He actually uses ‘for ever’ of his own teaching. Notice the width and force of the idea—the ‘for ever’ was indeed that same ‘beyond’; yet it would be ridiculous to lose sight of its identity with his life of apostleship begun here; and see how it roots itself to earth—he was ‘set’ for ever,—and

he asks for God's tongue itself to help him proclaim the truth—surely not alone in 'Heaven.'

So in Y. 32. 5, where the word 'Immortality' is used :—

'Man therefore will ye beguile (ye faithless sinners) of  
Weal and the Life Immortal,  
Since you with his Evil Mind the foul Spirit rules as  
his servants,  
By speech unto deeds thus false as his ruler rallies the  
faithless.'

Here plain reference is made to the bad language used by the Evil Spirit in Hell, but this need not be an exclusive reference; the Evil Spirit was active upon earth, or in some spiritual scene prior to the earthly, and corresponding to that in which Satan is supposed by some to have fallen. The evil rulers of the moment are clearly apostrophised for this life as for the other.

And see also where the composer immediately joins on to this 32. 5, with its 'Weal and Immortality,' his 32. 6, where all the busy scene of an ecclesiastical polity suddenly flashes before us :—

'These in Thy kingdom I place, for *Asha* Thy truths I  
establish.'

Surely the 'Kingdom' here was the field of his immediate exertions.

At 33. 5 we have a beautifully typical piece where the two ideas are again blended as this life prolonged with that on high :—

'I who invoke Thy *Sraosha* all-greatest, heedful to help us,  
Gaining long life for myself in the Realm where the  
Good Meaning ruleth,  
And paths that are straight from their truth where Mazda  
Ahura is dwelling.'

This smacks of Heaven, if any language can. Here the 'straight paths' are 'the very roads' where Ahura

dwells—hardly the literal streets of the Zoroastrian Zion; and yet it is the saint who plants them. At 43. 5 they are there the 'straight roads' to the Kingdom pointed out by the prophet, rather than roads on High themselves; while at 53. 2 they are again clearly the '*D(a)ena*,' the Holy Lore, which showed the way. Here, also, we have the double reference, as in so many other places. Yet at the next verse we have 'earth' so realistically before us that some might regard the contrast as a bathos as deep as it is sudden—distressingly so. He actually calls on God *re* the crops—

'An invoker unerring through Truth from the Best Spirit will I implore it,  
From Him with that mind will I ask how our fields  
are best to be cultured,  
These are the things that I seek from Thy sight and a  
share in Thy counsel' (32, 5).

On second thoughts, however, we may say, 'well suited too,' like our own prayer 'this day for daily bread,'—their prayer for food supply, like ours, recalls the one gigantic interest saving all 'so as by fire' from crime as from starvation,—but far more compactly so in those days when crop-failure meant instant bloody murder (of those more fortunate). Good food-raising was the first good act of the typical saint, and justly so. I regard this 33, 6 as especially precious;—we too ask for rain, and thank for harvests. God might indeed here intervene, if anywhere; yet see 33, 8, 9, soon following, where Heaven is the most in sight, the ideas pass beyond the earthly horizon, and in verse 9 they settle distinctly in Heaven.

'Obtain for me then the true rites that with good  
Mind I may fulfil them,  
Your praiser's Yasna, Lord, and your words, O Asha,  
for chanting;  
Your gift is Immortality and continuous (eternal?)  
Weal your possession.

Then let them bear the spirit of Thy two Law-  
promoting rulers  
To Thy brilliant home, O Mazda, with wisdom, and  
Thy Best Mind  
For perfection's help unto those whose souls are  
together bounden.'

So everywhere the acts of faith are progress ;—the advance  
is ever upward—' progress ' always as on every day of earth ;  
see above on Frashakart.

The most incisive Gāthic expressions occur at Y. 31.  
20, 21, which are also doubly historical, as they chiefly  
represent the original of the incomparable Yasht 22 ; see  
also Y. 49. 11 :—

' But he who deceives the saint, for him *shall* at last *be*  
destruction,  
Long life in the darkness his lot—foul his food with  
revilings loathsome ;—  
This be your world (or ' your life '), faithless *men*, by  
your deeds your own souls will bring it !

But Mazda Ahura will give both Weal and a Life  
Immortal  
With the fulness of His grace from Himself as the head  
of Dominion,  
And the Good Mind's power He'll send to His friend  
in deed and in spirit.'

Here heavenly ' Immortality ' is closely defined in its  
contrast with Hell.\* Notice ' long life ' ever again as  
' eternal life,' linking up the two parts of the ' One.'

\* In Yt. 22, in its once extant complete form, the souls of the evil meet  
in detail the exact contradictory opposite to what the soul of the saint  
experiences, but the passage has disappeared. We have, however, what must  
be a faithful translation of it in the Mainyō-i-khard, editor West, page 9.  
Here, again, as in the Avesta, the sole activity which forms the continuous  
oneness of the two lives is of the mind itself. The evil man's own soul  
meets him on his way to judgment, as the soul of the righteous met him.

In Y. 43. 3 we have: 'Then may Thy saint approach toward that which is the better than the good (the *summun bonum*), he who will show us the straight paths of spiritual profit of this life, the bodily and of the mental in those veritably real ('eternal'?) worlds where dwells Ahura, like Thee, noble and august, O Mazda Lord.' So also as to Y. 28. 2 (see above). Y. 43. 4. 5 goes on: 'Yea, I will regard Thee as mighty and likewise bountiful (others, less critically, 'holy'), O Ahura Mazda, . . . when Thy rewards to the faithless as to the righteous . . . come, when as rewarding deeds and words Thou didst (? 'shalt') establish evil for the evil and happy blessings for the good by Thy just discernment (or 'virtue') in the creation's final change (so, literally, in the 'last turning, change,' or better 'end'). In which *last* changing Thou shalt come and with Thy bounteous (others, 'holy') spirit and Thy sovereign-power, O Ahura Mazda, by deeds of which the settlements are prospered through Holiness (Asha), *for* Devotion (our Piety inspired by Ahura) is declaring the laws of Thy wisdom to these Thy settlements, *the laws* of that wisdom which no man deceives.'\*

To proceed:—in Y. 45. 5 the composer says: 'Yea, I will declare that which the most bountiful one told me, that word which is the best to be heeded by mortals, and they who therein grant me obedient attention, on them come,' or 'they come to,' 'Weal and Immortality';—and that this immortality could not be the finite only we see from verse 5, where the souls (so literally) of the righteous are spoken of as 'desiring these blessings, in (locative) the continuous (or more boldly, 'in the eternal') Immortality, which blessings are woes to the faithless'; and accordingly the Home of Song (or 'sublimity'), which is distinctly Heaven, is next mentioned (in verse 8).

While in Y. 46. 10 we see the souls actually proceed.

\* See *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxi. pp. 99–101. The wording is somewhat changed here; see the passage also necessarily cited elsewhere.

ing over the Judge's Bridge which reached from the Sacred Alborj (Mount Haraiti) toward Heaven—'Whoever, man or woman shall give to me those gifts of life, which Thou has known as best, O Mazda, and as a blessing through Thy Righteous Order a Throne established with Thy Good Mind, *with these I shall go forth*.—Yea, with all those whom I shall (by example) incite (lit., 'accompany') forth to the Judge's Bridge shall I lead on, *while* (v. 11) the Karpan and the Kavi will join with *their* evil Kings to slay the lives of *holy* men by evil actions, *they* whom their own soul (so literally) and their own conscience (so) shall bewray when they approach there where the Judge's Bridge *extends, and they shall fall*, and in the Lie's abode (that is 'in Hell') for ever (*yavōi vīspāi*) *shall* their habitations (or 'their bodies') be'; and he closes: 'He who from Holiness shall verily perform for me, for Zarathushtra, that which is most helpful according to my wish, on him shall they bestow reward beyond this world (*mīzhdem parāhūm*).'

Yes;—this Immortality with all its cognate elements pervades Avesta, bone and fibre. Yet,—as I have so often said, and as I cannot too urgently repeat,—it is not an Immortality of mere physical continuance which is our theme. Such 'Immortality' as that is well-nigh universal from Egypt down. It is the deathless One-ness of the interior mental identities of which Avesta speaks, and which is alone now worth our thought;—it is *here* that Avesta holds the record;—the very tissue of the sentences is interwoven with it in Gāthic lore.

And so we return to our first proposal; see above. The converted soul breathes no contempt for this immediate life, lost in long-distance dreams, however glorious;—this life was sacred, every hour of it, even with all its evil contacts. The saint of Gātha loved it well, if purified. As base is to statue, as fundament to pinnacle, so was this holy life in view of its other portion—a thought still finer if not so grandiose as that of the great 'Permanence' itself,

and far more touching. The very rewards of Heaven, as we have seen—in their close shape were to be constructed here at once in our now passing moments, for those rewards were to be 'good thoughts, and words, and deeds' of souls all rational—results immediately from them. Here once more as I have so often had to say—this system 'led the world.' Then think again of such a Future with its reflected light on this. Incisive Energy, Justice, Love, Authority, Zeal, are at once its present and its goal on high. How pervadingly this solemnises every minutest fraction of our time;—what we do here, whether it be good or ill, we shall do there. We are builders, not *for* eternity but *of* eternity. Such views hold all the motives in the Gātha, though later often covered up with puerilities;—they impelled the Gāthic saint.



## NINTH LECTURE.

THE SCULPTURED TEXTS OF BEHISTŪN, PERSEPOLIS, AND  
NAKSH I RUSTEM, COMPARED WITH THE MSS. OF AVESTA.\*

ON the old Median boundary not far from the modern city of Kermanshah, a mountain called Behistūn, or Behistān, rises steep from the surrounding plain to the height of some seventeen hundred feet. In an inward division of it, and some three hundred feet from its base, in a wide cleft stand perhaps the most impressive inscriptions which have survived the ravages of time. The surface of the rock was polished for their reception, and where irregularities occur the defect has been replaced by slabs so deftly joined that the edges are scarcely visible. On a wide surface and in the ancient cuneiform character are cut with chisel the splendid records of Darius the Great, and of his successors.

Similar inscriptions of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes the Third are to be found on the ruins of Persepolis, Naksh i Rustem, Murghâb, Khorkor, and Susa, as also on Mount Alvand, near Hamadan, while the most important inscription which we have of Cyrus, and one of the most important of all, is written in Assyrian upon an open vase. Those upon the mountain rocks are written in a later dialect of the Zend-Avesta language, and, aside from a few difficulties here and there, they are very clear, and yield at

\* Fragments of a Lecture delivered at the Indian Institute in the nineties, before an audience unusually distinguished. Also published in the *New World* of Boston, U.S.A., and, later, in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* of October 1909, and having been also frequently later used as parts of Instructional Lectures.

once to study. In them we find expressions of religious fervour quite as marked as in the writings of any other nation. Every advantage is traced to the 'grace' or 'will' of Auramazda. Certain clan-gods are also mentioned, doubtless out of just respect to the religious susceptibilities of the various nationalities then included within the Empire under the sceptre of the authors. That this considerate recognition was not intended to impair the supremacy of Ahura Mazda is clear from the Avesta—where Ahura is copiously apostrophised as the 'Maker' of the very highest of all the non-Gāthic gods as of His own Bountiful Immortals. Monotheism in this sense is dominant,—[(though it is here in the inscription most expressed in the constantly repeated words: 'Who made this earth and yon Heaven, who made man . . . ' which imply it.—Where is any sub-God thus spoken of?)].

Darius commanded his sculptors to chisel upon Persepolis as follows (see for this inscription Spiegel, p. 47, and Weissbach and Bang, p. 34, from whom, however, my versions differ somewhat):—

'The great *Auramazda*, who is the greatest\* of the gods†, has made Darius King.—He has delivered the kingdom over to him—through the gracious will of *Auramazda* is Darius King. (Thus) saith Darius the King: this land of Persia—which *Auramazda* delivered to me, which is prosperous‡, rich in horses, well-populated§, through the grace of *Auramazda* and through mine||, Darius

\* There can be but one "greatest," and but One who created all the others; see Avesta.

† These gods were inferior, like our archangels.

‡ Hardly merely 'good' or 'beautiful.'

§ Very Vedic and very Avestic expressions.

|| This naïve expression sheds much light on the shade of meaning to be attached to the important word '*vashnā*.' *Vashnā* cannot mean here 'through the will of me, King Darius.' Darius had no intention of implying that he had exercised anything like a Sovereign decreeing 'will' in this instance. He means 'active beneficent will.' Perhaps 'gracious will' is better than 'grace.' The bare word 'will,' which some writers consider to be a marked improvement, is not here adequate.

the King's—fears no other (or 'no foe')—may *Auramazda* grant me aid together with the clan-gods;—may *Auramazda* protect this region from hostile hosts—from disastrous years,\* from the (plotting) lie (political intrigue). May no (hostile) host approach this region—no disastrous years (of drought, famine, or pestilential blight)—no lie (that is to say, 'no sinister political agitation');—and this favour† I beseech of *Auramazda*—with the clan-gods.‡ (Thus) saith Darius the King: I am Darius, the great King, the King of kings, the King of these numerous provinces§, the son of Vishtāspa|| the Achæmenid.

'(Thus) saith Darius the King: Through the gracious will of *Auramazda* these lands, which I with intimidation dominated ¶ with this Persian host, feared before me (that is, they were politically 'intimidated');—and they paid me tribute (as showing my success in their submission).'

Darius wrote for *Behistūn* (cp. for texts, King and Thompson, pp. 70, 71, and W. and B., p. 28): 'What I have done, I have done in every particular through the gracious will of *Auramazda* and (all) other gods who exist.¶

'Therefore *Auramazda* brought me aid, with (all) the other gods who exist, because I was not hostile to Him, nor to the lands—because I was no false political intriguer (lit., 'no liar')—no despot—neither I nor my family; I ruled

\* Bad seasons as to drought, pestilence, etc.

† *Yānam* in this sense is also a purely Avestic expression as well as Inscriptional; the Vedic *yāna* has an entirely different application.

‡ He would neither insult the various dissenting religions of his Empire, nor would he neglect the minor subdeities of his own. Again let us recall there can be *but one* "greatest."

§ Notice that the word *dahyāum* and *dahyunām* are used in a 'good' sense here in the inscription as in Avesta, whereas in Vedic *dāsyu* has an 'evil' sense,—border bitterness.

|| Hardly the *Vishtāspa* of the Gāthas, as some think. This person was, however, one of the *Satrapas* (*Khshatrapāvan*) of his son's Empire, and indeed in Parthia, eastward and northerly toward Bactria.

¶ A very Avestic and Vedic expression.

according to the rectitude \* (of the law)—I favoured those who assisted my clans—(in just return),—and those who were hostile I without any fail visited with meet punishment. (Thus) saith Darius the King: Thou who hereafter shalt be King—with a man who is a (political) intriguer—(a revolutioniser, lit., 'a liar')—or a positive rebel (?)—make no political compact (lit., 'be no friend of his')—punish him with good punishment† (if thou thus thinkest 'my land shall go unscathed').‡

'(Thus) saith Darius the King: thou who hereafter shalt view this writing§ which I have written—and these sculptured reliefs; destroy them not—so long as thou livest|| (?) . . . preserve them. (Thus) saith Darius the King: if thou viewest this writing and these sculptures, and dost not destroy them,—but preservest them for me,—so long as thy family shalt last,—then may *Auramazda* be thy friend,—and may thy family be numerous. Live long; and what thou doest may *Auramazda* prosper.'¶

And for his own future tomb at *Naksh i Rستم*, near *Persepolis*, he wrote: 'A great God is *Auramazda*, who

\* *Arshām*; so K. and T. for the formerly supposed *ābishtām*. Notice the *r* of *arsh*, confirming my suggestion as to an *arsha* rather than *asha*.

† *Ahifrashtādiy* is no longer read. *Ufrashtādiy* is the word.

‡ From another place.

§ The word *dipi* may go back to a root='to besmear.' Notice that the writing of the original draft for the inscription upon the skins, or other material, was rather in the composer's mind. He smeared, or 'painted' it, to be later cut. One would have rather thought that he would have used some word more in consonance with 'stone-cutting.'

|| See *dargam jivā* at XVI. 75, p. 38, Sp.

¶ Notice the 'proclaimed rewards'—unlike those in Avesta—'all for this life'; so also in the pre-Exilic *Semitic* Scriptures. Notice what appears to be the very marked contrast between the tone of this appeal to temporal rewards and punishments, and those appeals to futurity to which we are so much accustomed in Avesta.—Was this accidental?—As Veda was also eschatological, with Avesta, we cannot suppose that Darius's creed was undeveloped Vedism. We seem forced to the opinion that we have here a case of peculiar and particular religious opinion, either of an individual, or of a party, in the very centre of the Empire.

made this earth and yon heaven,\*—who made man—and amenity (civilisation) for men,—who made Darius King—the alone King of many,—the alone Commander of many.† I am Darius, the great King, the King of kings,‡ the King of the lands of all tribes, and the King of this great earth for afar,§ the son of Vitštāspa, the Achæmenid,—a Persian,—son of a Persian, Aryan, of Aryan race. Through the grace of *Auramazda* these are the lands which I captured beyond Persia . . . I conquered them . . . beyond Persia.—I brought them under my authority.—They brought me tribute.¶—What I said to them, that they did.—The law (which was promulgated by me) which was mine was maintained.—(Here follows a list of the provinces or sub-kingdoms.) . . . (Thus) saith Darius: As *Auramazda* viewed this earth . . . in war . . . (?) he delivered it over to me ¶—he made me (its) king—I am King. Through the gracious will of *Auramazda* I have settled this earth through my throne (or 'through my government,' or 'under my throne'; others render 'in place,' 'to rights,'—but see the same word 'throne' just under).

\* 'Yon heaven' is precisely Avestic; *ava* is only obscurely Vedic.

† His authority was actually realised as a dominant fact; recall Avestic *aīva*, not Vedic.

‡ 'King of kings' must have been originally Aryan, and adopted from Persia by the Prophets. If Darius used it about 520 B.C., it must have been in vogue for some generations previously, and doubtless predated the Scriptural usages. In the Semitic Scriptures it rarely refers to a human potentate. The emphatic expressions are more Avestic than Vedic.

§ This 'for afar' (*duariapi*) seems thrown in to modify the asserted claims to 'universal' sovereignty.

¶ Practical evidence of subjection.

¶ Recall the expressions attributed to Cyrus in Ezra i.: 'All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord the God of Heaven (*Deva*) given me.' The terms in Ezra seem to be stereotyped (see them also repeated from Chronicles), and they may have arisen from the same source as the expressions upon the Inscriptions. Indeed, as I have suggested elsewhere, the frequent resemblance of some of these expressions in the Inscriptions to some of those in the Scriptural Edicts goes not a little way towards establishing the genuineness of the latter.

What I said that was fulfilled, as was my wish.\* If thus thou thinkest: "How many (?) are the lands which Darius the King governed,"—then look upon this sculpture which bears my throne,—that thou mayest know.—Then shall it be known to thee that the lance of the Persian hero has reached afar; then shalt thou know that the Persian hero has fought battles far from Persia. (Thus) saith Darius the King: What I have done, I have done all through the gracious will of *Auramazda*.—*Auramazda* gave me aid till I had completed this work.—May *Auramazda* protect me, and my clan, and this province against . . . hosts (?). For this I pray *Auramazda*,—this may *Auramazda* afford me:—O man, may what is the command of *Auramazda* be to thee acceptable,—let that not be obsolete (or repulsive) to thee.—Leave not the right way:†—Sin not.'

Such are the voices from the stone,—if I might be allowed so to express myself,—but besides these we have the book, preserved in its mysterious book-life from manuscript to manuscript, and from oral recital to recital;—generations of the priests who were its guardians followed one upon another and closely,—there was no break, nor was there need for dying men to recite these compositions to listening novices;—the venerated words, for the most part fixed in metre, were imbedded in the race-life of the tribes. Long before the old could die,—and while the young matured,—the middle-aged were there, the race-life of the priests was one abiding generation,—and in it the *Avesta* lived, lasting as the rock which itself yields slowly to the weather, immovable as the glaciers which stand while they advance. As time has worn the race, as the mountain streamlet has eaten off some letters, and as, alas! the hammer of the vandal has in places also added to the injury, so time has worn the book;—but it lives on in

\* Notice the repeated assertions as to the practical result of his administration—that is to say, as to its 'success.' They are by no means wasted words. *Gâthum* = 'throne.'

† Notice the very *Gâthic* expression, 'the right path.'

noble fragments, the Bible of a remnant, small indeed in numbers, but, in some respects, perhaps the first of Asia.—We know its contents, and the Inscriptions seem to cite them: ‘A great God is *Auramazda*, who made this Earth and yon Heaven—who made man and provided civilisation (or ‘the amenities of life’) for him’;—so, as we have seen, reads Behistūn,—with constant iteration, like the rest;—and in Yasna I we have: ‘Inviting I announce, and I will complete my Yasna to Ahura Mazda, the radiant and the glorious, the greatest and the best,—who sends his joy-creating grace afar, who hath made us, and hath fashioned us,—who hath nourished and protected us;—who is the most bounteous \* Spirit’ . . . The Inscriptions have the words ‘*Vashna Auramazdāhā*’ cut again and again upon their surface;—they mean ‘through the gracious will of *Auramazda*’ (see above);—and in Yasna XXXI, 15 we read of victories even more momentous than those of the great Organiser: ‘By Thy Sovereign power and grace may’st thou make life really progressive’ (till perfection shall have been gained);—and again: ‘Make every deed through grace progressive still,’ etc. through many a similar analogy. Notwithstanding a difference in tone between the hewn-out sentences and the paper codex, we have in both the same *gracious* God and the same fervent faith in Him.

\* Or, with others, ‘the most holy.’

## TENTH CHAPTER.

### A GENIAL EPISODE.

*(From the Parsi of Bombay [Weekly Edition], 24th December 1911.)*

### THE DEBT OF PARSIS TO PROFESSOR MILLS.

#### PRESENTATION AT OXFORD.

*(From their own Correspondent.)*

ON Saturday morning a small but representative number of Parsis journeyed from Paddington to Oxford to pay tribute to the venerable Professor Mills for his inestimable services to the Zoroastrian faith, on behalf of the Parsis of Great Britain, and through them of the Indian Parsis generally. The movement originated with the late Mr. Nasarwanjee Cooper, to whose services in the publication and distribution of gems of the sacred writings of the Parsis hearty reference was made in the course of the proceedings. The deputation was headed by Mr. E. J. Khory, who, after a successful legal career in the Far East, now resides at Sidcup, Kent. He was accompanied by Mr. Homi D. Cama, Mr. J. Cursetji, Dr. D. R. Wadia, and Mr. B. B. Erancee, who as secretary of the movement arranged all the details. The visitors also included an English sympathiser.

The day had begun dull and cold, but by the time Oxford was reached the sun was breaking through the clouds and it had become a delightful day of late autumn. Mr. Khory made timely reference to this happy omen when he pointed out to Dr. Mills that Mithra had burst through the clouds as if to honour one who had helped Europe to understand the spiritual significance of the



Zoroastrian reverence for the sun. Dr. Mills received his guests with scholarly charm, and many apologies that the state of his health would compel him to remain seated when he replied to the address.

#### THE PRESENTATION.

Mr. Khory said they had come there to convey to him on behalf of the subscribers their affectionate regard and esteem, and to express their gratitude for the invaluable services he had rendered to Zoroastrianism. By his translation of the Gāthas, which were written by Zoroaster himself, and by his other services, he had made his name a household word amongst all enlightened families of the faith, whether in Persia, their ancient home, or in India, and at the same time had brought their sacred writings to the knowledge of scholars and others in all quarters of the globe. The movement to do him honour was started by the late Mr. Nasarwanjee Cooper, and would have been carried further but for his untimely and sad death. Owing to this event the appeal for subscriptions had not been widely distributed; and the promoters of the project, in consultation with his sister, Dr. Miss Cooper, had decided that the testimonial should take a simple form and be confined to a comparatively few. But it could at least be said that that deputation was thoroughly representative of the Parsis. They had with them a scion of the great house of Cama, one of whose relatives, Mr. Muncherjee Hormusjee Cama, had been instrumental in securing a translation of the Vendidad. There was Dr. Wadia, a descendant of the great Wadia family, which was first in Bombay after the English took possession of that island, and some of whose ancestors were ship-builders for the East India Company. In Mr. Eranee, their secretary, they had one closely allied to the ancient fatherland. His grandfather went to Bombay from Persia only about fifty years ago, and he might be called a Persian Zoroastrian.

At this stage Mr. Eranee took off the wrappings from the massive silver casket containing the address, and handed that document, beautifully illuminated on vellum, to the Rev. Professor. Both the address and the casket were ornamented by drawings of Zoroaster and by well-known Parsi symbols. The inscription on the casket was as follows: 'Presented to the Rev. Lawrence Heyworth Mills, D.D., M.A., Professor of Zend Philology to the University of Oxford, by Parsi friends and admirers residing in Great Britain, as a mark of their profound appreciation of the invaluable services he has rendered by his ripe scholarship to Zend-Avestic research and to the fuller understanding of their sacred writings by the Zoroastrians themselves.—OXFORD, *November 1911.*'

#### THE ADDRESS.

Mr. Eranee read the address, which was signed by each member of the deputation. It was as follows:—

TO THE

REV. LAWRENCE HEYWORTH MILLS, D.D.,  
HON. M.A.,

*Professor of Zend Philology, Oxford University, Oxford.*

REVEREND SIR,—In common with our Zoroastrian brethren in the Indian Empire and Persia, as well as those scattered in other countries both of the East and the West, we, as Parsis, are deeply conscious of the profound debt of the whole Zoroastrian community to you for the long years of ripe and fruitful scholarship you have devoted to the study, translation, and exposition of our ancient sacred writings. You took up the subject a generation ago, and more than a quarter of a century has elapsed since you came to Oxford from Germany on the invitation of the eminent editor of the Sacred Books of

the East Series, Professor Max Müller. In Germany you had been completing your translation of the XXXI\* volume of the Sacred Books at the pressing united request of Professors Max Müller and James Darmesteter. From that time forward you have devoted yourself with an untiring zeal, which age does not quench, to this important branch of Oriental study, and for many years you have been the greatest living authority thereon.

This is not the occasion to set forth in detail your contributions to the subject, such as your great Dictionary of the Gāthic language of the Zend-Avesta; the continuation and completion of your work upon the Gāthas; your comprehensive Yasna of the Avesta; your work on Zoroaster; Philo the Achaememids and Israel; your comparisons of ancient Israelitic literature with the Avesta; your editorship and translation of the Pahlavi Commentaries, together with your translations of Avesta into Sanskrit. Not only have your labours been of the highest value in opening out to European scholarship the rich mines of Zoroastrian literature, they have done much to stimulate a more enlightened understanding of the teachings of our ancient faith by its followers. Although the great majority of Parsis in India are familiar with the English language, the need for bringing your researches within the knowledge of the less-educated members of the community has been recognised by the translation of several of your works into Gujerati.

Your interest in our literature has been accompanied by a kindly and hospitable solicitude for the welfare of members of the community, particularly young students sojourning here.

The debt of the Parsi race to you is beyond estimate, and it is by way of indicating our recognition thereof that we ask leave to present this address. It is accompanied by the prayer that you may long be spared for the great service you are still rendering, at the age of seventy-five, and by feelings of affectionate gratitude that you have done

so much to make possible the realisation of your own words, that 'the Zend Avesta should be revered and studied by all who value the records of the human race,' since 'Zarathustrianism has had an influence of very positive power in determining the gravest results.'

We are, dear Professor Mills, on behalf of the subscribers,

H. D. CAMA,  
E. J. KHORY,  
D. R. WADIA,  
B. B. ERANEE,  
J. CURSETJI.

LONDON, 1911.

Professor Mills, in reply, said—

'GENTLEMEN,—I am deeply touched at this token of affection in its beautiful casket. Though I feel that the expressions made use of go far beyond my deserts, they do not surpass my good intentions. I have done my best since 1883, and I may say since 1881, to exhaustively expound the lore of your forefathers. I will greatly treasure your gift, and my children will value it after me. Should a little more time be spared me I will have finished the Dictionary of the Gāthic Language, which will at least complete the first stage of my endeavours—(when I think how much there is remaining to be done I could wish that I was sixty instead of seventy-five). On greeting you I sadly miss our late endeared friend, Mr. N. M. Cooper, who did so much to encourage the cultivation of your holy faith. Never have I met a Zoroastrian so practically devoted. I cannot at this time forget your late revered Dastur Jamaspji Jamasp Asa, nor the gift of his precious manuscripts of the Yasna to the University, which enabled me to do work which I could not otherwise have accomplished, and which afforded the University the opportunity to reproduce one of them in an unsurpassed manner,

I would also express my gratitude to the son of that endeared High Priest, Kai Khoshru Dastur Jamasp Asa, for sending another valuable manuscript of the Yasna for my use, to be presented to the Bodleian Library when I shall have finished with it. The late Dastur also presented me with a valuable manuscript of the Vendīdād, which I hope ultimately to have deposited in the Bodleian. I cannot also forget the great kindness of the father of Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, who loaned his most valuable manuscript of the Yasna to me, with permission to have it photographed at the University Press. So long as strength remains to me I will continue my work, being especially interested at the present time in translating the Gāthas into their twin-sister speech, the Vedic-Sanskrit. Once more expressing my gratitude.

After the formal presentation had closed, some time was spent in conversation with the venerable Professor, and then the deputation took leave of him to return to London.

## ELEVENTH CHAPTER.

### A CHAPTER IN AVESTA'S HISTORY.

*(To the Editor of the Parsi of Bombay.)*

SIR,—Thanking you for your kind remarks in your late issues of 4th December and of 24th December 1911,\* it is time that I should let Parsis know something of the other chief serious items of good fortune through which by the Divine Power I have been somewhat astonishingly led. They group themselves about some rather extraordinary particulars in the line of co-operative appreciation from some of the leading men of the period,—they, these sympathetic fellow-efforts, being such as have rarely crowned the labours of any Oriental scholar. And here I am not merely moved by egoistic susceptibilities;—Science itself has been seriously at stake. And this indeed from some reasons which it would be well, if possible, to ignore did they not persistently reappear republished in a stereotyped edition,—and that, too, in a work otherwise of great merit,—and saddest of all to say by an author who has elsewhere done much service in the field of Oriental studies. The facts centre about the following notorious, if painful, circumstance:—the miscalled critique upon Zend Philology has long been a chamber of mean horrors which have excited the *disgust and ridicule of Germany*. This originated in one of the most regrettable episodes in literary history, the effective evil cause at work being as usual the universal ‘brute jealousies.’ The prize in sight was great indeed:—Dominant influence upon Avesta is, or should be,

\* See also the issues of March 31<sup>st</sup> and of April 7<sup>th</sup>, 1912.

the very acropolis of Aryan scholarship including Veda upon the one side and Persian upon the other, with a vital bearing upon our Semitic religions unapproached by any other non-Semitic subject;—and such authority is, if possible, wrested from its possessor by every low device conceivable.

To explain a little further:—There are apparently two distinct modes of procedure in all such exegesis;—one of them is to guess shrewdly after a hurried glance, trusting to hit upon valuable suggestions whether they may be fully correct or not,—a fashion by no means so lightly to be esteemed as one might think—and as a provisional part of our progress by all means to be recommended;—but it is too apt to be applied not ‘on the way’ or provisionally, but as a final result to startle attention. The other mode is to exhaustively exploit the entire subject before hazarding conclusive conjectures. The snap-shot guesser has naturally more time than the toiling reconstructor, and a talented bold writer often brings out many brilliant points of permanent value, but his translations as a whole are apt to bristle with the absurd. This last, however, Germany used not so much to mind, ‘*macht nichts,—es hilft.*’\* The true method lies of course between the two. One of the dashing sort had done some interesting work—incisive here and there in new points—but choked with chaotic views in its general results. These later drew on him the sober critique of another, as was only natural. He, the first mentioned, answered with a smothered fury which opened the disgraceful strife, or onslaught rather, for the victims seldom answered. He ‘was compelled,’ so he, this first-mentioned writer, feared, ‘to take an unfavourable view of the other’s scholarship’ (in general), and attacked with persistent ferocity his every view. Spiegel’s scholarship!—for he was the person meant,—scholarship!—the one

\* On such more familiar subjects as the Veda it was understood that positive assertion was used for shortness merely, whereas Avesta had been till then too much unbroken ground and too incisively important for us to put shrewd guessing in our final reports bereft of all sense of probability.

immense distinction conceded him by the most bitterly formidable critic that ever drew a pen. 'He surpasses us all in learning,' said the Titanic Roth, first vedist of all Germany, creator of the other;—one of the most important vindications ever made.\* 'Learning'!—he stood at the very head of Avesta, and I believe also of Persian scholarship, before this infamy. A few younglings, gloating over an insult to a leading master, with sycophantic adulation re-echoed the mean slur in varied words.† Then Justi, Spiegel's co-worker, a little too assiduously close perhaps,‡ but all from generous feeling,—he, for that sole reason, was to be the next,—Justi, who has done more practically for Avesta than all of us together,—who first laid out in detail all Avesta grammar followed almost to the letter by later writers with antiquations emended,—Justi, whose comparative philology is still a mine for all who read it,—he was,—so the aggressor feared,—a 'young and ambitious' scholar who had entered upon his high task '*with too little study*' §! (this from a man whose chief work seems bereft of all knowledge of the Pahlavi ||). The same or like futile underlings took up the cry raised in the case of Spiegel—all 'praise God' now dead, gone, or

\* Spiegel's supposed deficiency lay solely in a lack of what we might 'dialectically' call 'snap'—this largely owing to his too genial disposition.

† Those are all now long since dead and gone to 'their own place,' I believe.

‡ Justi, most properly regarding Spiegel's translation as a good first attempt by an author thoroughly prepared, fixed his attention effectively upon the grammar, etymology, and word-structure. His work has been the source of all such subsequent attempts. Mere time itself failed Justi for much independent suggestion upon the translation—though his works abound with the keenest new discriminations.

§ His own partner told me personally that this was all from 'jealously,' that he, the aggressor, had 'intended to write a Dictionary himself.' Here he had not even received such provocation as Spiegel had innocently offered.

|| He actually seems at times at least not to be aware that Neryosang was translating from the Pahlavi;—the tone of his censure rings that way, while he seldom even *alludes* to the Pahlavi;—later he became a high and epoch-making authority upon its structure.



converted. I am speaking here strictly of the past, let it be understood;—yet these all, too sad to say, ‘being dead still speak’ in the persistent stereotyped Edition, as said;—though, Parsis should understand, there were and are but a merest handful of these people, not three persons on all ‘the continent’ being conceded anything which approaches leading ‘authority,’ while their satellites were and are hardly half-a-dozen. The great dictator, Roth, came once more to the rescue, ‘*musterhaft zweckmässig eingerichtetes Handbuch*’—‘a model of arrangement, a most well-adapted handbook,’—but so far as suffering was concerned, in vain;—the pack took up the hideous lying as before;—two valued lives were embittered. This was the effect, with many outside readers utterly misled. Do Parsis naturally think these matters mere personal items of little moment?—They affect a mighty theme;—human hope beats low for human nature.\* Science in general was involved—and this at every step. Personalities are entities after all, and those who have done indispensable work are forces par-eminence in our keeping;—to see these consumed would be as false as to see their very codices burnt up. Spiegel and Justi were fundamental. They survived in spite of all, in the literary sense: Spiegel was knighted and held the chair at meetings;—Darmesteter used him copiously, followed him often, respected him always; and he died honoured everywhere. Justi was made professor;—but neither one, nor the other ever personally recovered from the effects;—melancholia seized them, and the stain on human honour rests. And *this* was the field upon which I was about to enter—in 1881–83. Do Parsis think I lower dignity by these remarks? Perhaps I do.—‘Position’ I am supposed to have—not a bad thing it is in its way, but for the strut and pomp of it I have no time. Moreover, let it not be forgotten, I am writing of the date before I had even circulated my first tentative edition—and this is history

\* Surely a Good God never permitted this;—it was the work of the Evil Being.

which bears upon the present. 'What have you to fear?' said a noble friend, 'with your new edition of Avesta, Pahlavi. Sanskrit;—It is what is new alone which advances science';—These things are epoch-making;—so he implied. Little did he know—held back by kindly feeling;—It is what is good and 'brilliant' which alone brings on the little pack. Discoveries!—the very hint of them strikes rivals cataleptic;—unless you can control the papers with a foul clique behind you, discoveries are *fatal*. The more striking they are, the worse. 'Printed in scarlet ink'—they would hardly say that of me, but things next to it. Darmesteter himself first warned me:—'criticism' he implied, 'there is no criticism.' 'Success will be your ruin.' 'You will sacrifice yourself.' 'Criticism,' implied a leading German in the very '*hot*' of it—'there is no criticism';—'between —' naming a great German University 'and —' naming another, there is a *furchtbare eifersucht*—'fearful jealousy';—a book written in one is murderously condemned by some writer in the other, *bloss weil, merely because* the Author is in that other. 'Criticism!' said another;—'there is no criticism.' A book is highly praised in B. and fiercely condemned in L. 'One page is often not so neatly done,' so he continued;—the 'critic' (!) seizes upon that and condemns the whole. [(This actually occurred in the case of the great Petersburg Dictionary, and from the very person above alluded to. He found one word mistaken—so I heard from good authority—and wanted to condemn the whole—but he seems to have retracted.)] 'Criticism—there is no criticism'—implied a well-known writer for the Parsi. 'It is all egoism.' This is all of the past—again let me say—I allude to no man now living—but they may have had successors, though all told there are not five of them.

[(What Darmesteter really meant; see above,—was the filching of new matter under the instigation of a rival. The thieving 'tool' seizes a new 'edition,' makes a few supposed improvements and then with turgid pomp reviles

the source of his existence.\*)] And this was the field which I was about to enter,—What could I not expect!

‘Provocation’! I was about to give,—enough of it;—Not only were my Pahlavi, Sanskrit, and Persian new, fresh, and indispensable; see above,—I had, beside this, dared to use three faculties, judgment, conscience, and humanity, each little suited to the issues. Above all I faced the Gāthic *prima facie*—where it still lingered sane,—this is yet my chief crime. [(‘He has not accepted our improvements’†—so they would surely say;—yet I was often doing just that very same. All the chief ones I was actually accepting as alternatives;—so a great Sanskritist advised me—this in ’81, though they, those views, had been made openly without the alphabet of Pahlavi‡; yet this was not the only reason why I was putting them in my alternative.)]—I had dared to mark the abysmal faults of Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit upon the one side and their splendid hits upon the other;—I had dared in fact the *via media*—now followed close by all—as well as *prima facie*. I was even citing all my opposition modern as well as ancient. In fact I was not only preparing a first translation ever made with exhaustive treatment of three commentaries but also a translation with which I felt all sane writers would in the main agree, as near as one translator should reasonably agree with another—this was, as I fully felt, the acme of audacity. Not even that sufficed me! I was working upon the fullest and the closest commentary yet attempted,

\* Awful perfidy.

† As they were all the work of a great master, filched for the most part from him and made without the Pahlavi.

‡ I regarded, and still regard, all translations made without mastery of materials as being merely provisional and so as of subordinate scientific value when regarded as work completed, this, as of course;—and so the authors must desire to be understood, but they did not hold that tone in their immediate productions. From this reason I was giving all the renderings, ancient and modern—with my own differing or agreeing, yet very near indeed those now prevailing.

with Dictionary promised! [(That I had used a close Latin was not so much my offence;—Haug had used Latin, Rawlinson had used Latin,—Latin is verbatim's only vehicle,—but I had used it copiously, and copious Latin would alone bring on the petifogging group.)]—Infatuation still held me;—I was preparing my free metrical. —Haug had used free German;—Roth had used free metrical upon Vedic; Grassmann had used free metrical—to illustrate the metrical was essential;—but mine was a first attempt—and I was putting all together, verbatims, free metricals,—the three, expository texts, Commentary, Dictionary! What had I to expect? \*—The very sight and bulk of such a book with its twelve hundred pages would bring the frenzy on—the cliques would stagger to their pens. '*Es imponirt*,' said a great friend. Well did I know what that meant—'imposing' to sane honour, a blazing torch to thieving combinations. The splendid theme itself somewhat sustained me †;—tough sinews wrapped me firm. I fear I love a battle,—contempt my only weapon. What could I expect? Herder even wrote against Kant.

What happened?—always 'the unexpected.' Suddenly interrupted by Roth's desire to have the book as in so far tentatively printed, I could not refuse;—[he later wrote for the fuller edition as *sehr erwünscht* (very gratefully desired. He had given me gratuitously double and private lectures.)]—Having put the tentative book into the hands of this endeared if somewhat formidable critic (he promised me a 'kind word,' and a 'kind word' from him would ward off sneak butchery), I denied it to none.‡ Among others

\* One acquaintance personally touched upon this point. 'Ah! you have done too much.' He wished to let me down gently. I did not fully know what he meant, nor do I now.

† Where in human thought were there such sublimities? See my depicments elsewhere.

‡ I am not at all ashamed to mention these particulars;—recall what my predecessors had suffered in actual loss of health:—recollect that I was to face a combination utterly bereft of sanity in honour who had all power to retard me.

Darmesteter received it. I turned to my never-ending toil. In Hanover, where I was residing, giving my children the very great advantages of German education, in November 1883, I heard from him, Darmesteter:—he urgently requested me to take his place on the *Sacred Books of the East*! \* It was certainly one of the most remarkable letters ever written, and at that time was crucial in its importance to me. He, Darmesteter, the most distinguished literary man in France after, with, or before Oppert, urged me, a person who had only tentatively printed,—in Max Müller's name and immediately writing at his request,—the last, by all means also the most distinguished non-resident literary German,—the two inviting me on behalf of the University Press of Oxford to take Professor Darmesteter's place on the *Sacred Books of the East*, the most prominent series which has ever appeared, with Georg Bühler at its head,—and upon one of the most 'important' volumes of it,—and this 'in the hope of a favourable answer.'—I was to take the *Yasna* on account of the *Gāthas*, perhaps the very most vitally essential religious subject in the whole XLIX volumes and certainly the most difficult. Max Müller was kind enough to explain that I 'was (then) considered the best authority on the true interpretation of the ancient 'Gāthas'; see the *Athenæum*, April 12, 1884.' † I was to use my 'free metrical as modified by my verbatim.'—Here was something a little different from what my martyred predecessors had met. Touched and encouraged I turned to that new work, and published in 1887. Again I waited somewhat anxiously; see above.—Some would be surely nettled, as I had felt forced to apologise for knowing the Pahlavi alphabet and using a free metrical for *Yasna IX*.

\* See at the end some pleasing expressions with reference to it.

† His, Darmesteter's, studies had been mostly upon the *Vendidād*, and he 'shrank' for the moment, as he later printed, from the 'enigma' of the *Gāthas*, afterwards writing fully and in a most valuable manner upon them.

I waited. Darmesteter soon wrote that it was 'already cited and appreciated by all the specialists'; Max Müller added that it had been 'favourably' received;—Spiegel reviewed it respectfully in the Berlin *Literatur Zeitung*, 'Ansichten wol erwagen';—it had been subventioned by Government with the rest of the *S.B.E.*—was translated into Gujarati so far as the completed Gāthas—mentioned in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—'The best translations are those of Darmesteter and Mills,' so Dr. Geldner. Here was again something a little different from the 'expected';—see at the end a most touching letter from Mr. Gladstone.

But my more mighty grip was yet to come. Mendacity would gather for its spring, and mendacity alone was what I feared\* (the hard lying shown above). I finished the Gāthas and published Parts I. and III., and again I trimmed all taut for the encounter. One morning I got a Review by post;—it was the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* of May 13, 1893, from Justi.—Would he take vengeance for his own great suffering—excuse the base thought—I never had it.—I opened and I read: 'das ergebniss einer erstaunlicher Arbeit sehr mannigfaltiger Art. 'Unser verständniss der Gāthas mächtig gefordert,' and later in the *Preussisches Jahrbuch*—'insbesondere von Mills der diese schwierigen Gedichte in gründlichster Weise behandelt hat.' 'The result of an astonishing labour; our understanding of the Gāthas greatly furthered'—'Especially of Mills, who has treated these difficult poems in the most exhaustive manner.' Noble words of vast influence against the forefelt flood of lying. And then Darmesteter—would he be piqued at the sight of the pages?—The *Revue Critique* arrived—Septembre 1893,—'tous ceux qui s'occupent des Gāthas

\* Bergaigne had refused authority even to Roth himself, but Bergaigne was a gentleman;—he would not have denied the herculean suggestiveness of the great German: 'thought-stirring effort,' even when not accepted, is highly prized.

rendront hommage à l'immense labeur scientifique de M. Mills . . . son livre reste un instrument indispensable pour l'étude,' etc., etc. I was invited to contribute to Roth's *Festgruss*, and my exceptional piece in the Sanskrit language was accepted (with Roth's later thanks). In '94 I issued the completed Gāthas, pages 622 + xxx. Pischel, first Sanskritist of Germany (after Böthlingk)—once more declared, *Zeitschrift D.M.G.*, 1896: 'alles was für die Erklärung der Gāthas nothwendig ist . . . immer wird es die Grundlage bilden auf der sich jede weitere Forschung aufbauen muss . . . einen hervorragenden Dienst.'—'Everything which is necessary to the explanation of the Gāthas'; 'ever will it remain the basis upon which every future work will be built'; 'an eminent service.' So Dr. E. W. West followed in *J.R.A.S.*, 1896. So Professor Wilhelm: 'This work affords to every Avesta scholar complete materials for the study of the Gāthas'—*Bombay Iranian Catalogue*, 1901. So several eminent scholars in private correspondence.\* His Lordship the Secretary of State for India in Council had subventioned me again under Rawlinson's influence,—The Trustees of the Sir J. Jejeebhoy Translation Fund followed his Lordship's lead. Never before had such a book of such dimensions met such success—which happily continues. Dr. L. H. Gray, one of the most gifted men living, wrote of it so late as 1906: 'beyond question our leading authority now living on the Gāthas.'

After such a full reception the storm of concentrated venom must certainly have had its vent at least in small ejections. How do I know this,—for I have never read a word. So long ago as 1897 at the Reception in Paris where the Congress of Orientalists was sitting, an eminent German, whose personal acquaintance I had not yet made, said as he passed me, 'All the world knows of your great productions.' From that I understood that the units had begun under instigation—while Gray has later expressed

\* 'A deepening of method,' etc.

his indignation. [(Probably my incisive discoveries had touched them rather closely;—for I have advanced further reconstructions of the Avesta alphabet from its original the Avesta-pahlavi, no one anywhere having as yet suspected the almost necessary survival of original Pahlavi signs in the full Avesta forms.\*)] And it is *such things* to which some parties wish to call my attention. Suppose I should catch one of these gentlemen before a court academical.—‘So you have looked askance at my work—have you—a book which has been pronounced epoch-making by the first men of the day;—have you ever read it?’—‘I have glanced over your free metrical and your free Y. IX. in *S.B.E.*’—‘Have you ever read my verbatims in their Latin form (which has been liked)?’ see above.—‘I have glanced over them.’—‘Do you think hasty ‘glancing’ is enough in the case of a work so valued?’; see above.—No answer. ‘Did you ever even open the covers of my English verbatims and free metricals of 1900?’—‘No.’—‘Did you ever study my commentary, the fullest of the kind yet published?’—‘I have read parts of it.’—‘Do you deny that my verbatims are nearly identical with those which you mostly follow—as nearly so as could be at all expected, and more closely far than any two writers upon Veda approach each other?’†—No answer;—‘and that I give in alternative, to a large extent, the very especial views you personally adopt, so half accepting them.’—No answer.—‘Did you not know that the authors who suggested these so-called improvements openly stated at times that they had no knowledge of Pahlavi?’—‘No, I did not know.’—‘As to my ‘system’—the *via media*—are you not aware that no writer anywhere

\* I have, for instance, recently shown that the senseless *-ēu(sh)* of a gen. sg. is really (*ē + u = o*, an old way of spelling ‘o’) *-ōsh* = Skt. *-os*; *a + u = o*;—so *-ōish* (*a + i = e*) is really *-esh* = Skt. *-es*, etc.;—*ahē* is of course non-existent; the word or termination is *-ahyā*. This all would be first denied, then later filched under instigation, as so usual.

† Hubschmann, judging from his sane translations, would have rendered much of the Gāthas in harmony with my views.



any longer ventures to proceed upon any other,—all now studying the Pahlavi, Pers., and Skt., yet seeing their imperfections on the one side, with their wonderful hints upon the other?—‘That is so.’—‘Have you ever fully mastered my Pahlavi texts and translations?’—‘I have read the translations, and to some extent the texts.’—‘Are you not aware at least that my Avesta translations are, or were, the first yet made after exhaustive treatment of the Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit?—and that I profess, so far as possible, to give the main antagonistic views of my opposers ancient and modern?’—Vague answer.—And yet, though you have never read my book, you venture to look askance upon its very extensive and full work!—No answer.—Then WHAT\* do you suppose yourself to be?—How do I know that such would be the answers?—know it!—One of them came to me—of the most venomous. Inquiring what he knew of the Pahlavi?—He admitted ‘nothing of it.’—He said it *would* ‘*Extend the Study too Far*’! Needless to examine such a man as to his opinions. His master, so he said, an instigator, declared himself ‘unable to teach the Pahlavi’;—so another of the pupils—both in my presence.

Never, in a word, has a book of such extended scope been at all attempted†, and never, as I add with still astonished sensibility, has such a book been at all so well received, *i.e.* never without a clique controlling periodicals. That its edition is all sold, some copies at three times the first stated value, is not so serious. Subvention to a new edition has been offered by Government, though this third subvention has not been as yet claimed;—if time be spared it will be.

\* This is the kind of creature that sometimes ventures to talk about a ‘scientific’ procedure.

† I may mention just here as it occurs, that the eminent gentleman who freely asserted that he had worked ‘without any experience’ at all with the Pahlavi—seemed on that account with some of his pupils to be justly proud of his grandiose suggestions as being especially ‘original,’ but at last he verged upon being convinced. The ‘pointed hint’ he said approvingly—‘the pointed hint,’ alluding to the Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit is effective—as giving the ‘general indications.’

Annoyances!—yes—I have had some of them, if Parsis wish to hear them. To receive a valuable book with thanks alone implies fair favourable treatment;—but what do my readers think of a man who will ask for a still unpublished work, full of well-weighed fresh materials ‘indispensable to the study,’ gain ‘great service’ from it, write flatteringly in return,—and then surreptitiously oppose it.\* Some got copies from the British Government and tried to sell them, knowing that each copy of such a book is important for expenses. Another, 18th November 1892, thought my book which he received *gratis*, ‘*umfasst in der that das gesamte Rüstzeug zum studium dieser so unendlich schwierigen Texte*’ . . . ‘embraces in fact the complete outfit for the study of these so infinitely difficult texts’;—yet he edited a defective description from the first-mentioned person. Another actually asked me with emphasis to recommend him to a professorship, the most intimate conceivable of all possible requests, though I have such now and again,—‘it would have great weight,’ so he thought;—and later cast an imbecility! etc., etc.†

So I return to my first point—devout gratitude to ‘the God of Heaven.’

Escaping the worse than murderous fate of abler men, I have been spared to expound the most important lore of all Aryan antiquity,—one not only vitally identical with Vedic interests, but which has told immensely upon the history of Our Own Religion with its boundless connections;—and one which must shortly form an integral part in all serious exegetical Biblical studies.

\* One of these gentlemen wrote me to decipher a passage in Pahlavi of some eighty words, not, let us hope, that he was totally ignorant of the meaning of every individual one of all the Pahlavi characters. This would have been a penal offence, as he was receiving a stipend from a respectable university.

† How—so one of my distinguished correspondents implies—can such culprits be brought to justice?—‘Through their own insignificance’—is my only answer;—fraud, as is well known, universally combines against exhaustive, successful labour.

VARIOUS NOTICES, REMARKS, AND LETTERS.

From the *London Athenæum* of 12th April 1884.—  
‘Mr. Mills is considered at present the best authority on the true interpretation of the ancient Gāthas’ (so Professor Max Müller, *re* the first distributed edition, full publication having been interrupted by the engagement to translate the thirty-first volume of the *Sacred Books of the East* for the University Press, Nov. 1883).

From an eminent person, the instructor of all German sanskritists, *re* the first distributed edition of the Gāthas, 1881.—‘L. H. M: Ich habe ihr werk bis Seite 312, alles inzwischen gedruckte, also Bogen 40 und folgende wird mir sehr erwünscht sein.—Thr. R.—R—. 17th Feb. 1884.’

From a much-known writer, 1st February 1884, *re* the distributed edition of the Gāthas.—‘Ich habe mit vergnügen gehört dass der Erste Band ihres Grossen Werkes fertig ist, und bin sehr gespannt darauf: Wie kann man sich dasselbe verschaffen . . .’ 5th March 1884.—  
‘Besten Dank für Ihr werthvolles Buch, von dem ich mir, wie allen die sich mit den Gāthās beschäftigen, sehr viel Nützen. verspreche . . .’ Yet see p. 164.

*Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*, 24th September 1887, of S.B.E. xxxi.—‘. . . Ansichten wol erwogen.’ (Professor Spiegel.)

From PROFESSOR DR. EUGEN WILHELM of Jena, April 1888 (sent for publication).—‘It is no longer doubted that we have in the Avesta essentially the religion which prevailed in Persia when Cyrus came into contact with the Jews. The Gāthas form the most difficult part of the Avesta, as well as the oldest and most important. And this circumstance induced Dr. Mills, during a period of ten (then nearer sixteen) years, to devote unusual attention to them . . . The undersigned, who has become acquainted with particular sections of this work, and has examined

them from every point of view, knows from personal observation with what extraordinary thoroughness and conscientiousness (*mit welcher ausserordentlichen Gründlichkeit und Gewissenhaftigkeit*) Dr. Mills has proceeded in its composition.'

Copy of an autograph letter from the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to the Rev. Dr. L. H. Mills, first printed by advice, and for circulation among friends:—

'HAWARDEN, 6th October 1891.'

'MY DEAR SIR,—You have done me very great honour by sending me your translation from the Zend Avesta, and I have profited greatly this morning by reading in your Preface and Introduction. Though I am only in the outer court of the temple of Philology, I am sensible of the extraordinary interest attaching to the Zoroastrian religion, and grateful to those who, like you, give us such aid in understanding it.

'I was led to mention it, and refer to some authorities for the purpose of throwing light upon the question whether the belief in a future life gained or lost ground with the lapse of time. Only in the case of Greece have I any knowledge of the *quellen*, and there I think that both this doctrine, and religion generally as an influence, lost greatly between the Homeric and the Classical ages. Some small presumptions appeared to exist on behalf of the belief that in Persia also [in regard to] the future life, and the retribution with which it was there combined, there was a similar downward process.

'I hope I have not stated this too boldly, or used any arts to disguise my ignorance.

'Accept my best thanks for your kindness. Perhaps if I am able again to visit Oxford you will allow me to profit by your conversation, and meantime let me remain, faithfully yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.'

L. H. MILLS, Esq. [*sic*].

[First reprinted for Distribution among Friends.]

SIR EDWIN ARNOLD, the author of *The Light of Asia*, authorised his name to appear as a writer of the following notice in the London *Daily Telegraph*. It appeared in the issue of 10th August 1894. Sir Edwin was well acquainted with the history of Zoroastrian science, and has exerted no little influence upon it.

'A book of vast learning and high archæological value, lately issued, has been much too silently passed over by scholars and critics.\* It is that monumental work by Dr. Lawrence Mills of Oxford, entitled *A Study of the Five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gāthas, with Texts and Translations*. Brought out with the assistance of the Indian Secretary of State, the volume is indispensable to students of Zend literature and theology. In 1876 Dr. Mills turned his attention to the great subject of his tome. He first translates the Gāthic texts into Sanskrit †, word for word; and next, in order to be sure of significations, the erudite doctor sets himself to examine the Pahlavi Commentaries, collating all the known manuscripts and deciphering their at times almost inscrutable characters. Side by side with these he also translates and edits the Parsi-persian manuscripts. He next re-edits the

\* The London *Athenæum*, as cited above.

The *New York Nation* of 12th July 1888 says (of the old edition): 'A boon to all scholars.'

The *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, as cited above.

The *Revue Critique* of Paris, as cited above.

The *New York Nation* of 21st June 1894 says: 'Scholars will no longer have an excuse for neglecting the Pahlavi Commentaries.'

The *Times of India* of 22nd September 1894 says: 'The great work now before us, which may be truly called monumental.'

† Translations into Sanskrit are (as Dr. M. thinks) a *sine qua non* to a complete treatment. Dr. Mills' translation of Yasna XXVIII. into Sanskrit has the highest possible sanction, as it appears in the *Festgruss*, or volume of short pieces, dedicated by a select number of German Sanskritists to the eminent Professor R. von Roth, first Vēdist of Germany, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his doctorate.

Sanskrit Commentary of Neryosangh, and after accumulating all that wealth of material, he finally produces what may be called the finished flower of this massive version. . . . Dr. Mills has given to the world of learning the superb and scholarly volume, which is an honour to the University of Oxford, while it establishes the author as standing as the head of Zoroastrian expositors. This is not the place in which to examine minutely the difficult pages of such a work; but it would not be decorous to allow it to appear without the salutation due from all Orientalists to the completion of so noble a toil in the fields of Eastern classics.'

# APPENDIX.

## TWELFTH LECTURE.

GOD HYPOTHETICALLY CONTEMPLATED AS MORE THAN PERSONAL—THAT IS TO SAY, AS ALMIGHTY, UNLIMITED; OUR IDEAS OF HIM DEFINED BY DIFFERENTIATION.\*

### UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES.

'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'

My object in reproducing these Lectures, now some five years old, is to heighten, purify, and increase our adoring love of the One merciful, superpersonal, unlimited God,—and to do so we must disentangle some dangerous misconceptions with regard to Him. We do this by differentiation—that is to say, we must make clear what our idea of Him is by fixing firmly in our convictions what 'our idea' of Him is not. And first of all we must dispel an illusion into which we have been most naturally led, and which indeed seems to be a tendency which we can sometimes hardly resist when we allow ourselves to express our passionate devotion,—it is the impression that our God is merely a person in the lower, genial acceptation of the term, so misinterpreting the language of our leading prayer, which has become so sacrosanct in every syllable. But the time has surely come when we can with safety make known some vital distinctions just here.

(1) To be a person in the words of ordinary precision is to be a 'subject' which can be an object to

\* This Lecture, as it here appears from page 176, was printed in *The Open Court* of March 1908.

itself. Nothing can be an object to any sane intelligence,—not even one's self—which cannot be defined,—definition by its very form meaning the fixing of a *finis* beyond which an object does not and cannot extend. So that to be 'a person' in our stricter sense of the matter is to be 'limited';—the expression 'infinite Person,' though it has been at times made use of with good enough intention, would be pure nonsense. To worship a limited person, however otherwise exalted, would be to commit idolatry in the form of nature-worship,—for such a person would be an object in nature. We could never truthfully make use of such words as 'almighty,' 'omniscient,' 'omnipresent,' with reference to him;—we could only use the prefix 'all' with reference to his *character*, saying the 'all-holy,' 'all-merciful,' but we could not apply the particle before any term implying *power*, for 'omnipotence' includes 'omniscience' and 'omnipresence.' Such a definable and therefore limited being might conceivably be *supreme* among the objects of nature, and so everlasting—under the Unlimited Superpersonal; but he would be without unlimited *power*, and to make our prayers to him as if to an Unlimited Being would be not only meaningless but perhaps also profane,—it would contravene the First Commandment. Our Adorable and Adored One, Almighty, Omnipresent, Omniscient, and Unlimited is therefore superpersonal,—that is to say, our idea of Him goes out beyond our idea of human or angelic personality. A person, as we have seen, can be defined and so understood,—but our adored-superpersonal-Unlimited One passeth understanding.

(2) Is He—our Deity—the Universe itself?—forbid the sacrilege,—yet there have been parties known to hold that the two ideas—the 'Universe of Nature' and 'Deity'—coincide, and we must ask the question further to define Him by showing what He is not. What, then, is the material, intellectual Universe?—for 'intellect' inheres in nature.—The natural, physical, material, and intellectual



Universe seems, as we generally understand it, to be an inconceivably extended but not unlimited mass of vivified electron-atoms endowed—under the Unlimited—with interior motive-force, and having within it all we know of majesty, design, beauty, and—of grief. Is it stationary within itself?—an inquirer may ask.—On the contrary, motion is its life,—the place-changing of its elemental electrons builds up all that we see of magnificence or charm. Has it ever *begun*?—Never of itself except under the all-causing, all-permitting will of the Unlimited Super-personal. Did it ever *need to be begun*?—Not of its own nature or self—under the Unlimited. Does it ever *increase*?—Not by one measurable fraction of an atom—save for Him. *Can* it ever increase?—Not of its own nature. Does it ever decrease?—In no particular. *Can* it ever decrease?—Not by any infinitesimal particle—except under Him. Do its elemental electron-atoms ever change in their essence?—Not to the slightest conceivable degree of measure. Has the *course* of its incessant interior place-changing of atoms ever been deflected or diverted?—Never—save under His will. *Can* it and *will* it be ever so deflected or diverted?—Never—save as He so wills. Will it ever end?—Never of itself. *Can* it ever end?—Never—save as He puts forth His annihilating power.

Nature, then,—that is to say, the Universe of Nature,—is under His almighty will an unbroken and unbreakable chain of causality unbeginning—save for Him, unbegin—save for Him, indivertible—save for Him, unending in its ever-moving but within themselves never-changing elements. Beyond that self-moving circle science does not penetrate;—He Himself—forbid the thought—is, as so often said, not within this nature-Universe, nor is He the object of its ken;—He is the *object only of its faith*.

(3) *What is His 'permission'?* If the Universe of Nature is in itself complete, of its own nature unbegin and

unending, 'saye under Him'—what is the meaning of such a qualification?

This qualification necessarily results from our religious hypothesis.

We believe in an omnipotent and therefore superpersonal God, who dominates all existing and so all imaginable possibilities.—But if an object great or small is unbegun and unending, how can it be and how has it been under His supernatural power? The answer is that the sub-eternity—so to speak—of the physical-intellectual Universe cannot interfere with the absolute supreme eternity of an unlimited, illimitable, superpersonal God—so believed in upon our 'scheme of faith.' If one eternity can exist, as science so well asserts, why may we not accept another, if, as we so religiously believe, the two would be conceivable? [(For our whole concept, from root to blossom, from corner-stone to pinnacle, is reared upon the illimitable supernatural power in the super-scientific masonry of devotion;—and Nature's course seems sometimes interrupted.)) Even as recognised by science there might be two or indefinitely more objects, unbegun but for Him,—unending but for Him,—and yet each such an one might be wholly independent of the others, save from similar particular interior elements and conditions. If, therefore, two or more objects can be thus even in the eye of science unbegun, and yet mutually independent, then by presumption at least there should be no insanity nor difficulty in our religiously accepting as an article of faith the existence of two vast things so different as God and His Universe, both unbegun, the latter so only under Him—for we are not at this point, let me repeatedly emphasise, proceeding upon the lines of finite science.

We do not proclaim a God *ex machina* (*sic*, with Voltaire(?)). We simply mean that we intend and are determined to maintain our devoted belief in the superpersonal indefinable super-existence of our God. This is the point where the question again naturally arises:—since you think

with science that the Universe of Nature may be, ought to be, and is naturally and in itself—but under Him—unbegun, what particularly is then the meaning and bearing of His believed-in, eternal, all-encompassing omnipotence, and of the constantly recurring expression, ‘under Him’?—the question has been already put; I enlarge upon it merely. The pre-supposed answer obviously is, that as the eternity of one object does not interfere with the eternity of another, even in scientific distinctions (see above), so the supersensual illimitable omnipotence of a Supreme religiously-believed-in God may—in religious belief and in our well-meaning scheme—very well envelop, surround, interpenetrate, and maintain the otherwise self-sufficient unbegun and unbeginning existence of a lesser object recognised by science—that is to say, it may be rationally so believed and held in the sense of a quasi-unreasoning, all-giving, illimitable faith. Nothing could be clearer;—the believed-in God, supersensual, Himself beyond all our knowledge, beyond all our measure and calculation, known to us by faith alone with a spiritual knowledge, conceived of as omnipotent by belief alone—could, did, and shall for ever hold all things outside Himself in His almighty power of permission, for sustenance and defence, if aught were able to attack them. Surely if it be not insane for us to accept the existence (or ‘being’) of a God illimitable, beyond our ken, it is likewise not religiously irrational for us to hold to *His Supreme Permission*, as being under all, about all, and over all existing and even everlasting things, even under, about, and over such as have been otherwise of their own nature unbegun.

[(It will be seen that the idea which pervades my whole discussion of the scheme is to decide just where to place the Miracle.—Too hastily has science cast off all belief in Miracle, inattentive to the long reports of closest observations. Things which cannot be accounted for have no doubt occurred;—*i.e.* not yet accounted for;—until science has explained such-like as the product of hitherto undis-

covered forces we feel bound to acquiesce in the statements referred to;—the apparently supernatural has indeed taken place. If such quasi-supernatural effects can be manifested, who can tell what their limits may be?—I find my 'supernatural' in the thought of the Omnipotent God hyperpersonal—all-holy. If either the Universe or one microbe existed to all eternity as unbegun, then He existed with it still potentially omnipotent;—in such a case He has continuously willed its continuous existence—He has continuously encompassed and continuously permitted all that it is as begun or unbegun. Such is His 'Permission';—and the thought leads us at once and again on to its quasi-identical fellow-concept 'Creation.'))

(4) What is Creation?, an idea so closely interwoven here. The creation of any object whatsoever means an originating and promotive act (?), breaking in upon the otherwise unbreakable chain of causality—under the Unlimited Superpersonal;—that is to say, it is a 'miracle,' like accident and other manifestations of 'providence';—it is outside the chain of the otherwise—save for Him—invariable course of nature. To say that a Universe which was never begun was created even by the Unlimited Superpersonal would be a foolish contradiction in terms;—but it is not a contradiction in terms to say that an Unlimited Being, superpersonal, almighty, could create a physical-intellectual Universe whose forces were balanced and which was, under Him, self-contained and also self-moved,—and which by its own nature did not therefore need ever to have been begun, or to end?;—and this is all that I have now asserted, though it seems to introduce a new distinction. Surely the Unlimited Power, almighty, superpersonal, if it—or He—exists at all, could and might create anything except a contradiction;—and therefore He could and might create such a self-moved system, as such a system is not only thinkable but has been almost verified by science. And it is my opinion that our so familiar material-intellectual-universal nature may well be of such a character,

—under Him,—and that He may well have miraculously created a substance-matter of the Universe which otherwise—under Him—needed not of itself to begin, nor to change, nor end;—and this by no means involves an actual non-beginning, though—as seen above—by the exercise of an unlimited all-wise permissive power—a state of non-origin and unlimited permanence past and future might be conceivable and might exist;—and I have the right religiously to believe either the one or the other of these hypotheses.

So also with reference to the incessant place-changing of the otherwise unchanging and unchangeable electron-atoms of the universe which alone builds up the world's phenomena,—to interfere beneficently and promotively in this otherwise unchangeable course would be of the nature of sub-creation and of miracle—though naturally not upon such an immense scale as the almost inconceivable universal miraculous creation of the self-moved elements of the nature-Universe itself;—as the greater creative miracle may have taken place, so may the lesser. And may not this indeed have been—as one may well alternatively suppose—the nature of that 'creation' so wonderfully depicted in Genesis the first. That exquisite piece may well indeed have been intended to portray in poetic lines an original and miraculous creation of the eternal elemental-substance of the nature-Universe itself,—but there is nothing irreverent and much that may be useful in the alternative view that it depicts with unspeakable beauty the lesser form of the creation-miracle,—that is to say, that it represents only a promotive and so creative interference with the otherwise unchangeable course of the developments of nature, unless indeed it be intended as a panoramic poetical representation of the developments of Nature entirely aside from miracle and creation—and all this, let me repeat, seems ever the more seriously practical because greater or less impressive manifestations of a seemingly miraculous creative element have been afforded in events

which have been credibly attested by unquestionably veracious witnesses as inexplicable,—and also in what may be sometimes called ‘accident’ or ‘providence.’

Such are the principles which underlie the following Lectures.

But let me again once more most emphatically repeat that the above remarks and those which follow concern only *our own ideas* as to these things, not presuming to discuss the things themselves—least of all the Superpersonal Unlimited. And yet still further let me guard myself by saying that I here make only positive assertions as to what *seems* to science to be the truth in regard to the balance of universal Nature, its self-contained self-motion.

I do not attempt to dogmatise. I endeavour to define the ideas of these things approximately only by defining more and more closely the things which they are not;—and from this I proceed by negatives to bring out ever clearer His adorable Godhead and His Truth.

First, and in due course next after the above, in order to bring into clearer light my ideal view of Him, I strive to depict as best I can that most godlike of all Nature's forces which some seem indeed at times to have confused with Him,—I mean that wonderful thing called ‘Nature's Mind.’ The clearer we can bring this out as super-ideal in its attractiveness while separate from Him, the clearer again we can extend and enliven our feeble concept of Himself;—sublime as we can show an exalted thing to be, He is ever still more glorious, yet beyond.

#### THE VAST MIND-FORCE IN NATURE AS A THING UNSPEAKABLE IN MAJESTY AND JOY.\*

—Yes, there is in Nature this one incomparable Power, passing imagination, baffling calculation. It hardly

\* This portion of the Lecture was printed in *The Open Court* of September 1907.

approaches in its mystery and grandeur our ideas of the Unlimited Superpersonal Himself, but, if personal, it would indeed almost seem to identify itself with our old Nature-God, the merely personal, not-almighty, if all-loving. And just in so far as we can make this unspeakable object clear and vivid to ourselves, and show it to be separate from Him while it is yet included within His omnipresence and omnipotence—just in so far, as said above, do we add to our adoring concept of Himself. \*

This Reason-Mind-Force in all Nature, pervading as it is under the unlimited, all-energising, all-guiding, comes ever clearest to its repeated focus in the marvellous Intent,†—the plan, the design. Of all things under Him it also seems the very one toward which we evermore feel naturally constrained to draw near and ever nearer. So vast it is and yet so closely intricate that neither our measuring reach nor our counting iterations, neither our analyses nor yet our syntheses, seem ever able even to approach its nearest bounds;—we seem to merely feel it, though with rapture;—ever beginning as it is with all other Nature, and also, save for Him, a something unbegun—self-moving like the rest. We can hardly even say that it comes most to consciousness in man;—for how many grades of intellect may there not be beyond us and above us, as there are so many—as we think—beneath us? It moves about us everywhere, steadily, impressively, in the pencillings of leaves, in the growths of embryos as in the sidereal mathematics,—for each ‘half-vivified’ orb of whatsoever grade seems actuated by this Universal thing. Half-vivified, indeed!—We might once well have reserved our qualifying fraction—for the greater Greeks—some of them—thought them to be literally alive. Soft splendours with their mighty centres,—each seems to know and keep so exactly its reasoned course—with waste shed slowly off, at last regathered. So in their last so-called originating fusion—all followed the inspiring all-

\* By one more beatific thing beneath Him.

† Aristotle.

Thought, finding each his place;—one must be a sun, others planets in its system;—the elements in each must be of exactest measure, weight, and even climate. So the plutonic rocks in each as truly as the atmospheres follow the same great Idea, hardening duly from their molten semi-fluid state—diamonds centring as the bubbles ball and dance;—every object, from the most enormous to the most minute, seems interadjusted to all others. Reason, as the mind-soul, inspires most of all—we think—the physically living,—even the lower forms of them;—they know from instinctive miracle things hid from man, though he too has his innings. Wild herds forestall the floods;—the albatross knows just where to strike her path for remotest home when man does not even know his own interests;—how does the butterfly find his mate, or the calf his mother's teats? The crocodile—do they tell us?—knows just where to lay her eggs beyond the reach of Nilus;—the young elephant shelters himself in his mother's lee—how does he know that he is safe there?,—the very chick from the shell flies to a leaf when the cock-bird sounds for the hawk. All being seems to throb with the thought-force intercommunicated,—while man, seemingly least instinctive of them all, can measure the heavens and the seas—even soul. All is stored experience, centring and then pushing on throughout ages;—but how did it all originate,—if ever? Not only Mind but Moral Mind is everywhere;—recall that miracle of sweetness the mother-love;—see too the hate and the revenge—incomprehensible—all of it. Attractions of gravitation have Reason in them—within all, above all, through all—through them and under Him our nature-Universe is one vast breathing mass of sympathy and power, a very Cosmos unfolding itself in myriad forms, infolding itself again;—the microscope reveals systems as intricate as the telescope. Such is the Mind-Force—under Him—throughout all nature. We cannot very well adore it in the lesser sense, for it is *not a person*, nor a sub-person, nor yet a super-person. We



cannot supplicate it, for it is *part of our very selves*—supplication here would be mere fixed self-resolve—nor can we hope much from it, for it is *immovable*. Never has it varied, not even to entreaty, from all a past eternity save through Him—so with the rest,—nor shall it ever vary to the endless coming ages. I call it freely with some speech-figure, ‘great Nature’s Soul,’—so with the Greeks,—the great soul of all reasoned life and all life’s reasoning, involving all it has of strength, joy, sorrows, with Justice; \*—Sovereign Rule† is there in it,—and above all there is *æsthetik*—for we are parts of a world all calm with beauty, throbbing with bright wishes based on truth and love.‡ What else in all Nature can approach it;—it seems all Nature’s better self in one. Do we then think it well to turn our backs upon it, this so ill-called ‘poor’ human and ‘poor’ angelic ‘reason,’ so limited?—Do we think it decent so to do? Does He—the Unlimited—turn His back upon it?—Our faith-God Ideal turn His back on Reason!—the Holy One of all-Holies turn His back on all that holds the world non-maniac, indifferent to all that love is nourishing, to all that truth is defending, to all that mercy is redeeming!—Ah no! our faith-God Ideal, our One ever supremely to be adored, is not indifferent to this;—much less is He adverse to it—atrocious thought. He in fact stands ideally related to it;—in shutting out all Nature’s realm from His, I only mean to shut out profanely pushed identities.

His whole supreme Heart, although ideally beyond our ken or intellect, still yearns to it (as, with devout speech-figure, we may say),—still yearns in a sub-sense over it. He adores it too, if so we can imagine, just as Ahura burned sacrifice to Mithra—as kings call nobles ‘Lords.’ It is the all-in-all in our rich world of power and truth,—and as our Supreme Ideal One reveres it, so should we!

\* Asha.

† Khshathra.

‡ Vohumanah.

## THE WORD IS NIGH THEE.

It does not hold itself aloof in awful distance far beyond, away from us, aloft;—it is close around us as a sweeping sea, yet touching each of us with lightest finger, while it stares us in the very face. Why should we not in one fond blind sense pour out our loving wonder toward it, though it be not 'personal' in any sense? He, our Supreme Ideal One delights in it, as we may devoutly say again,—and so may we;—but to do so we must define it from other Nature, and most of all from HIM.

## THIRTEENTH LECTURE.

GOD AS ALMIGHTY, SUPERPERSONAL, ALL-HOLY, FURTHER  
DEFINED FROM UNIVERSAL NATURE.

I HAVE endeavoured in the Twelfth Lecture to gather up my revering thoughts toward some great things, godlike, yet not of God's essence, and especially as regards that most majestic and most tender of things thinkable—the once-called 'World's Soul.' Let us now consider for a moment more closely than we have above, and yet still in general, the other phases of that nature-Universe of which the world-soul is in one sense of it the life;—for we can make a distinction between a force, however widely active, and the object, however immense, which it inspires, though the endeared concept just named above comes back to us with welcome persistence and at every step.

What is then again and still more definitely the physical-intellectual Universe of Nature?

Here at once—as I regret to say—a petty, if amazing, question meets us—'amazing only' of the questioner. Is not—so it has been astonishingly asked—is not the physical Universe infinite—that is to say, as extended in space? Such an inquiry would be like that *re* the 'infinite person'; see above. It reminds one of that other sage question sometimes put into the mouths of pupils as to what 'state' an object is in?—meaning by this whether an object is in a 'state of motion' or a 'state of rest.'—Of course such 'states' as 'motion' or 'rest' are entirely relative to other bodies within the same sphere in Nature;—the 'rest' or

\* This Lecture, from page 182, was published in *The Open Court* of April 1908, and has been used in Instructional Lectures since.

'motion' of the Universe itself in the empty 'nothing' outside itself has no meaning. Even in the matter of relative rest or motion, it may be seriously doubted whether there is any such thing as absolute rest, or anything more than approximate rest, even within the electron-atoms of adamant. It reminds me of one of my own early blunders, when I used to wonder how Nature of itself—and without miracle—could regather the heat-power given off by radiation as the planets of solar systems solidified;—of course this heat-force which is motion-force inheres in Nature and is regathered;—but *how*, indeed, remains a question.

The physical Universe is not more unlimited as extended in space than a pebble; nor is it in itself any more mysterious. If we possessed the means of locomotion and the powers of endurance with the skill which might be required, we could travel to the utmost limits of the physical Universe with no expenditure of supernatural effort. Space itself is, as said, mere 'empty nothing' in which objects extend themselves. Mentally indeed, as Kant first emphasised, our thought of space goes out indefinitely,—we cannot conceive of a point in space at which our thought is arrested,—so in numbering. In this sense of it, as our mental concept, space is indeed 'infinite' in its range,—but this is 'dialectics' and has little meaning here.

The material All-world, however, while neat-cut as a prism as regards 'space,' must yet be, as a whole, entirely unmeasured and immeasurable as regards 'time'; for its teeming life in its everlasting change-motion is of course all that actually makes up 'time' itself. Causal thought demands seemingly fresh origination at every instant for each such myriad-phase of passing matter-form, but common sight soon shows us that the substance itself of the particles, of which the almost immeasurably minute and multitudinous appearances are the fleeting shapes,

cannot itself be destroyed ;—the atomic electron-particles simply change position ;—see above and below. Not fire, flood, nor earthquake diminish their weight by one fraction of a grain ;—do ashes, smoke, and gas weigh less than the not-yet-ignited wood, coal, or spirit ?—see the oxygen and hydrogen separated by electricity in our experimenting machines,—they combine again to equal weight. Let me never be misunderstood :—I block no causes nor beginnings ;—beginnings there are, as said and said again, by the myriad at every instant. 'All is flow' with Hegel's originals, as with himself ;—and precious are all things just in proportion as that flow is strong and rapid.

Life is all the firmer for it,—for it is the flow alone that makes it ;—see the pulse, or rather feel it.—Yes, there are changes as beginnings rushing on at every infinitesimal fraction of a second—but the everlasting elemental substance in which the change takes place is itself unalterable. (How can a-change take place without something which changes, but which only changes in its outward form ? If there were no solid basis, motion could not exist, nor be maintained ; a thing cannot move before it exists.) The physically everlasting elemental substratum of all nature is—inadequately—like the deep sea,—'motionless' ;—the form-change which is its manifestation is the splendid surge. The water particles rest still, or move but vertically ;—it is the wave-form that rushes on over sea or wheat-field. So also the thought-forms themselves, the life-sparks of sentient nature ;—they cannot stop. Mind-organism on organism reaches mature status and cerebral action at once inevitably sets in ;—it is the mere motion of thought-faculties, thought-particles \* ;—the thought-muscles alone rest in sleep, if then. The brain cerebrates, whether normally or not, at advancing stages. Take our common human puberty as a sample,—a seed-thought time it was for most of us ;—see it at the soul's awaking,—'conversion' we used to call it,—blessed crisis ;

—we then broke forth to reason's consciousness,—we were veritably 'born again.' 'Right' was our deity;—the strident will seemed fiercely free, to have it out with all our highest yearnings,—this, passionately. Negation seemed cowardice to us; to do some noble thing, or many, was our point;—we took our lives lightly in our hands;—we gripped to do or die;—we would even violently force idlers to take part. But what were we here again but the fine poise of Nature's sentient forces, her better ones? Injustice seemed the kernel of all woe (all hell) to us, its centre,—focus;—but behold, truth was everywhere, half-consciously consoling us.

If the bird be fragile, she can yet rise on wing and be in a moment safe;—if the farm labourer bends to toil, he still smells the sweet earth and breathes the life-giving air;—if the tigress is long starving, she yet enjoys her fierce spring the more, and a fuller meal;—if the inventor wrestles with hell's stabbings in the frightful fights of jealousy, he has yet at times the thrill of victory;—if Dives is his life-long assailed by a million demons tugging for his coin, he has still at moments the glut of his desires. There is (imperfect) balance everywhere,—the essence of what we so fondly try to call 'fair truth.' Equity means evenness (see gravitation, which is analogous to stability, compactness);—it is, however, never perfect, but attempted everywhere—sometimes in terrific forms. Two monsters meet in duel—one horn snaps like a pipe-stem—each battles, so he thinks, and thinks rightly, for some vital interest;—two stags struggle on a precipice—antlers are interlocked—the does look on. The youth knows that he feels conscience as much as this—nay more. And so of that active right-form, the affections, with their obedience;—he, our youth, longs on principle, as on passion, to follow them,—and the very doves do too, dying if parted, of their sorrow. See the wild-fowl's motherhood;—she will draw the gunner off, feigning herself wounded, drooping her bedraggled wings, on ever

farther from her nest, saving her half-hatched brood;—look at the common poultry of the barn-door—they even attracted the attention of our Lord;—see too a keen bitch with her litter; she shows her sharp teeth at once;—devotion is a part of nature;—‘attraction everywhere as the square of the distance’; see above.

And what is the controlling order within and throughout it all but a something akin to chemical concentration and distribution?—like crystallisation; see above;—the chief bull leads the herd;—look at the ants again;—order is everywhere (attempted), and so is genius. The very mould of the world seems to unfold itself of itself;—see the chrysalis; the butterfly’s cast is there;—look at the physical perfection of a new-born human being;—every little nail is in its place;—in fact, all sentient and all non-sentient being is there in motion toward an ideal, infernal or sublime. Even in the fused condition this was so;—change-phenomenon lived on in the electron in spite of flames;—forms predestined and pre-existing appeared everywhere, as globe on globe grew cool;—all the poles at first chilled slowly;—then half-way down they grew more temperate, till at last the equators became possible, just as the globes themselves contracted from their still prior fire-mists,—and everywhere, as of dire necessity, as the heat went off, ‘life swarmed,’ and with it consciousness, satanic or benign. So our own self-life;—all was struggling right, love, order, and motion, with intermittent defeat or victory through murder, sneak, etc.;—but where did it all come from?—this all-creative force—for none of us who have left our cradles interpose a præternatural creative interference at the very last, or first strange occurrence which we notice going back. We, all of us, insert that miracle at a long distance, indefinitely farther off—all is as yet the eternal ‘sequence’ with us, in the common causal-chain;—it is ever-changing shape-form from the place-changings of the electron-atoms of the everlasting unchanging substance—substratum.

[(To focus our thoughts upon the one question which is here paramount and closely exacts our utmost attention, let me return for a moment to what I have just said; 'life swarmed,' I have asserted, including perhaps too lightly the most crucial of all physical inquiries within the other formative processes and their discussion. What, then, as regards the origin of life itself have we further here to say;—and what as regards its re-origins reiterated in a past eternity?—Has it, life's origin, indeed been no exceptional occurrence with all the others, or have we here the re-originating creation-miracle in its most central effect before us? Well might the unequalled question again possess us, breaking in upon every other consideration.

I hold indeed—so I repeat—to Miracle everywhere as a supreme factor here throughout in this religious scheme of system which I am just building up;—see everywhere above;—but immense as are the issues, and enormously difficult as is the problem, I do not think that we need to introduce the Miracle just at this point. Caloric itself, the all-energising, vivified and vivifying life-motion-force throughout us *does not—and did not—as I believe—destroy those forces in the elements which ever evolve the vital principle.*

All existing things once flamed, as said before;—so once at least, upon this sidereal ball, with its planet-mates, and probably not once alone,—at indefinitely repeated intervals throughout a past eternity;—all surely passed through fire. Every principle discovered and discoverable was there, with every element, within that blazing mass of burnt nature. Out of these seething substances, once vapour, then fluid, then fiery sands and stones and metals, came all things here terrestrial,—as few now doubt,—for all were already there in germ without exception. The evolving and revolving masses grew slowly dense;—vapour thickened to liquid, liquid to solid, till the well-formed continents appeared between the oceans, with hot rivers rushing in their own midst as well;—and out of this



all came the great souls of earth as well as the villains, counterfeits, and knaves,—and with them the now for ever forgotten millions upon millions of other sentient beings who have emerged from the same elements, come also to their apex, some of them, and perished, having vibrated to some partial measure at least, all of them, with the same yearnings, emotions, fears, and hopes in the long æons of a past formative eternity;—and this in endless iterations, catenations. No, verily! we raise no voice to deny that thing ‘beginning’—far from it; God forbid;—see everywhere before. Beginnings rushed on, are rushing now, and will for ever fly at more than electric speed;—it is only the affixed particle to the great word with which we quarrel. ‘Beginnings’ there are, as we cannot too frequently accede, and by the million,—myriads at every fraction of a second,—so ever throughout all,—but they are but the rushings-on of *eternal form-change*,—not one single one of the vast finitude was ever for a moment *absolute as an ultimate*, or primal, original in any sense at all,—not for an instant. Like the chants to God in the Gāthic faith, they ‘had no first’;—all was fleeting ‘form-change’ of an abiding substratum, eternal in its sequence, forth and back;—for so He willed. So only, or rather, so really,—for there is nothing greater than a form-change,—we must not snub it,—substance’s eternally proceeding external it is—mighty indeed,—advancing ever,—so they are, these form-changes with crashing cataclysms in smiles of beauty or frowns of horror. Differences there are in them, somewhat great;—slime and a solar system are not so close alike;—nor are a fetish and a Phidias. The ever-furious fresh form-changes glide, or crash on with standing speed (*sic*), and in that motion under Him all sentient life-forces have their being,—but from the first ever imagined slightest jar,—not to say ‘recorded,’—to those awful motions now passing at this present instant, not one single one of them, not even LIFE ITSELF, has been without its causing conditions, save for HIM.]]

## A SUMMARY WITH AN APPLICATION.

SUCH, then, was and is my attempt to redeem our holy faith from nature-worship,—if still from one half-unconscious and most seductive,—while I would ever at the same time exalt our supreme adoration of the All-merciful, Almighty, Illimitable God, superpersonal and omnipresent. And in doing this I have endeavoured to point out,—not what He is—*forbid!*—but what our *ideas* of Him are;—and I have done this by showing what our ideas of Him are not;—for to endeavour to show what He is aside from this negative method would be profane.\* I have shown that we may declare Him to be superpersonal beyond all limits,—not a phase of nature merely, nor an object in nature personal like ourselves and limited, perhaps mighty, but not almighty. And in the course of doing this I have tried to build up both arguments and their illustrations out of the deductions and discoveries of that very science which sometimes would resist our worship;—for I wish to accept with gratitude and still more diligent examination all that active sanity has shown to be most probable as the truth—and what is discussion without truth?—above all, what is religion (!) without it? First of all I have endeavoured to make plain that our Universe, moral, material, intellectual, is—always under His will—complete as in itself for good or ill,—the best, the worst, the only possible.†

\* Who by searching can find Him out? 'Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel!' Even 'nature loves to conceal itself.'

† How exceedingly ill-judged it was of Schopenhauer to emphasise so constantly 'the worst world,' as of Leibnitz to talk so much about the 'best'; it is of course the 'only possible' world;—otherwise we have 'chaotic intoxication.'

This I believe to be the first of intellectual truths; and I think it to be one of the most sacred of all our duties to hold it firm, saving it from profanation. Our Universe could not exist for one instant, save as He has willed it and as He wills it,\*—all its wonder, all its power, all its beauty, all its terror rests and moves and lives incomprehensibly only in Him;—but I urgently maintain that even while it may so exist under Him it is as a mechanism self-moved and self-sufficient. Even if it once began in time, it so began under Him and at His will; and if it never needed to begin, it was as existing under His permissive will. I have also asserted my right to believe that it may in fact be true that it did so never need to begin—under Him,—and that it is also so constituted under Him that it will never of itself end. Surely there is a higher adoration† lurking here rather than a suspicion of impiety. Though a thing be self-contained, if it be still within and under His almighty power, it is then as evermore His property none the less, and His glory is to us obviously the more exalted when we recognise this strange completeness in His possession, while with one touch He could annihilate the whole of it, if so He would—with another re-originate it;—so that while it is indeed a contradiction in reasonable terms to say that He created a Universe which was never begun—it is actually no contradiction—see above—to say that He created that which would aside from His creative word need no creation, nor yet is it a contradiction to say that He may have actually from all eternity *permitted* and *upheld* the existence of a mechanism the forces of which are balanced and contained within itself, and which has of itself never begun, and which of itself shall never end‡. Confusion of thought here baffles us, as of course,—but why should it so arise? Could not Omnipotence

\* See above, upon the 'Underlying Principles,' page 169 ff.

† See above and below.

‡ Recapitulated from the 'Underlying Principles.'

create or permit the existence of an object which would otherwise have been in itself unbegun as well as unending, if so He willed,—and is not the contrary irrational? For surely no unbegun and unending existence has of itself any *supreme divinity*,—it is ‘under Him’; and even aside from Him it has not even then any independent power, unless it be the Universe itself—for all the force in every separated object is but one pulsation of the universal moving energy. *Permanence* is not in itself a thing adorable;—time itself is something existing only in our minds (so again with Kant);—it is our own observation and our own measure of the course of nature;—there is no ‘time’ with Him, as one day even with ourselves ‘time shall be no more.’ Past and future are with Him but one absolute present, a present not like ours an ever-fleeting point. If He from His eternity wills the existence of a self-contained, self-moving object, where is the impossibility and where the mystery—for active sanity has long since shown that every pebble in its elements exists—under Him—as of itself? What business have we to talk of ‘*confusion*’ here? We are dealing with matters *in themselves* utterly beyond all conclusive inference. Standing in awful adoration as we do, upon the very field of faith before the all-presence of our Almighty Illimitable God—no mere Olympic person—what right have we to fumble here with *mysteries*?—*all is mystery as of course*. And what, after all, is there so wonderful in this—under Him—this *unbegun* existence?—surely what exists in this flying moment is as wonderful as the unbegun, if not more so?—and here we cannot well be too particular.

What could be so wonderful as that miracle, the supposed arrest or diversion of the ever-moving form-change,\* even for one moment—not to speak of the elemental substance;—*the Permanence* is not the exception, the wonder;—Permanence in the regulated form-change, in the phenomenon of the substance, is *the rule*;—it.

\* See the ‘Underlying Principles.’

the *Permanence*, is in reality the reverse of wonderful ;—it is merely the punctual and fully expected reappearance on every day of an object in form-change which always occurs in the causal chain, and could not but recur. Is not the fact that a pebble exists to-day really more wonderful than that the pebble's elements existed yesterday? Of course it is ;—I say 'the pebble's elements,'—for the pebble's form has changed since yesterday, if but infinitesimally through waste. That it exists in this present vanishing moment proves that the forces which were in it yesterday *still hold out*, a matter not at all so lightly to be taken as self-evident—not at least in the light of higher science. We could vow from habit that a pebble which we see to-day—barring slight waste—existed yesterday ;—but we could only do so because it seems to be before us now this instant *in the causal chain*. The fact that it existed yesterday is the needed basis of its to-day's existence ;—that yesterday's existence is the farthest removed of all things from a mystery, and so of before-yesterday and before-yesterdays before that by the million—back to the very infinite. The fact of these fore-yesterdays, with the ever same form-changes in the ultimate particles of the elemental substance, is the most *commonplace of all commonplaces*, never the exception.

The continuous process of the form-changing, even if it continues unbroken back to a past eternity, is not the miracle which, when recognised, should startle us,—it is, on the contrary, the slightest *break* in that causality which would seem to us the maniac's idea ;—that is, save for Him ;—it is this which should be the astounding thing,—the sub-eternity of timelessness in this substance is the *natural state of all physical existence* ;—and we should school ourselves ceaselessly to get used to it.

For if these elements which now exist before our eyes in their ever swiftly passing form-change have existed in a causal chain throughout a past eternity as a necessity

to their existence this instant, aside from fantastic error, how could they have ever got out of existence at any conceivable past period of time?;—and if they had ever existed before a supposed annihilating break, where could they have gone to?—and how was the space filled up which they once occupied?—and if they had never existed before, where did they then come from?—aside from His creative fiat. Our imaginations are diseased upon this subject—diverted, perverted, subverted. The *Unbegun*—aside from Him—should be to us the simplest of all simple things, the most familiar of all familiar, the one idea non-ideotic. So—of course—as we slowly recover from our fond fatuities, infantile as they were,\*—so while taking fully in what this simplest of all simple things must mean,—what else,—let me repeat once more, to drive this most critical of all suggestions home—what else can such a recognition do but exalt the more, and ever yet the more, our adoration of Him who created such a self-moved mechanism or—what is the same—permitted it? Nothing can increase *His* glory which is illimitable—but surely this can and must increase *our* measure of it—as I repeat.† If a self-moved Universe, unbeginning in itself, unbegun in itself, unending, save for Him, is the grandest of all conceivable objects, filling up—to over-repletion—our receptive image-making power, surely this exalts our adoration of Him who is its Owner—its Permitting Lord—its illimitable, all-powerful Creator; and this was meant to be the proposition with which I first set out.

Why then—it may be asked—do you say ‘Our Father’ in your prayer? All the more, I answer,—I do so all the more from these my principles, for ‘I walk by faith,’ speaking with illimitable freedom when I speak in worship of Him who ‘dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto’—and of what He represents. Do you understand,

\* Recovering from our congenital imperfection.

† See above.

then—so one may inquire further—what you say of the Illimitable? How futile is the question;—see everywhere above. I build up negations indeed with intellection, that is to say, with ‘understanding’; but as to *Him*—I throw my soul in adoring worship before His footstool—‘Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name.’ But are not those words ‘speech-figure’?—so some might interpose once more.—All language of the kind is but speech-figure—to help express things not otherwise expressible?—I take with others the sweetest word in all the universe of sound, and I apply it to the Great Spirit illimitable who is over all, within all, throughout us all,—He who in the beginning by awful creative miracle made, or still more wonderfully permitted and upheld, the heavens and the earth:—and with that same creative and permissive miracle may He save us as we need!

*Printed by*  
**MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED**  
*Edinburgh*



# WORKS by PROFESSOR MILLS

LATEST—1913

## A DICTIONARY OF THE GĀTHIC LANGUAGE OF THE ZEND AVESTA,

being pp. 623-1138+xxx of the FIVE ZARATHUSH-  
TRIAN GATHAS, completing that work. Vols. i. and  
ii. were subventioned by his Lordship the Secretary of  
State for India in Council, and by the Trustees of the Sir  
J. Jejeebhoy Translation Fund of Bombay.

This work, together with vol. xxxi. of the *Sacred Books  
of the East*, and with the editions of the Pahlavi Yasna  
II, IX-XXVI, LIV-LXXI, published in *Z.D.M.G.*, trans-  
lated in *J.R.A.S.* (several dates), exploits the MSS. of the  
Yasna now in the Bodleian Library, especially the leading  
one, which is also reproduced, 770 photographs, with an  
introductory note by L. H. Mills (Ten Guineas).

The author here endeavours to reproduce all the more  
serious opinions of other writers, ancient and modern, and  
especially those in the Asiatic Commentaries, Pahlavi,  
Persian, and Sanskrit, which are deciphered, edited, and  
translated, and commented upon in the first two volumes.  
He is happy to say that his views coincide with those latest  
issued as closely as could be expected in the case of writers  
pursuing mutually independent studies, more closely than  
those of any two mutually independent writers upon the  
Rig Veda, while he reports the views of others largely as  
alternatives. His sole point of criticism concerns the  
incomplete mastery of the materials on the part of esteemed  
writers who follow opinions made without the exhaustive  
study of the Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit commentaries,  
which circumstance alone mars the otherwise great value of  
their suggestions.

The Avesta text in this Dictionary is in the original  
character, and contains the entire text of the Gāthas, also  
a complete Grammar of all the forms in the Gāthas, includ-  
ing lengthy excursions upon both the danger and the value  
of the Pahlavi, Persian, and Sanskrit translations. Price  
£1; pp. 200-516 (?) sold separately to those who have  
purchased pp. 1-199. 10s.

---

YASNA I in its Sanskrit equivalents separately  
printed, 1912, pp. 22. 2s.

YASNA XXVIII in its Sanskrit equivalents (Roth's  
*Festgruss*, 1893).

YASNA XXIX in its Sanskrit and English equivalents, pp. 25, just issued. Louvain (*Muséon*), 1912.

YASNA XLIV in its Sanskrit forms, 1897, re-issued in the *Z.D.M.G.*, 1911-12. (The rest of the Gāthas are in manuscript in similar form, and will be issued as time permits.)

Just issued. OUR OWN RELIGION IN ANCIENT PERSIA, being a collection of Lectures delivered in Oxford, collating the pre-Christian Exilic Pharisaism with the *dogmatik* of the Avesta, so advancing the Persian Question to the foremost position in our Biblical Criticism, pp. 193 + xii, 1913. 6s.

### THE YASNA OF THE AVESTA

in continuous treatment, upon the plan initiated in the FIVE ZARATHUSHTRIAN GĀTHAS, by L. H. MILLS, Professor of Zend (Avesta) Philology in the University of Oxford. A STUDY OF YASNA I, with the Avesta, Pahlavi, Sanskrit, and Persian Texts. The Pahlavi is given in the original character and in transliteration, the Pahlavi and Sanskrit being translated into English here, the Avesta in *S.B.E.*, xxxi., 1887, with Sanskrit Equivalents here, 1910; the Persian is itself an interlinear translation of the Pahlavi. The Avesta Text is reconstructional with copious notes. The Pahlavi is re-edited from the Journal of the *German Oriental Society*, with all the MSS. collated, Bd. lvii. Heft iv., 1903; the English translation is re-edited from the Journal of the *Royal Asiatic Society* for October 1904; Nēryosangh's Sanskrit is re-edited from Spiegel, with the additional collation of five MSS., and for the first time translated. The Persian is from the Munich MS. already partly edited in the Gāthas. An Appendix contains the accented Sanskrit Equivalents of the Avesta Text by the Author, issued upon the plan adopted by him with Yasna XXVIII in Roth's *Festgruss*, 1893 (see Oldenburg's remarks *re* the Vedic poetry, in *Vedic Religion*, p. 27), and with Yasna XLIV in the Acts of the Eleventh Congress of Orientalists held in Paris, 1897, 2nd ed., *Z.D.M.G.*, 1911-12. Four photographic plates of MSS., with other illustrative matter, are added, pp. 163, to be had of F. A. BROCKHAUS, in Leipzig, 7s. 6d. Yasna I is especially valuable, as it deals with the chief important questions of all the non-Gāthic Yasna.

YASNA XXVIII re-translated into English in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1911.

YASNA XXIX, commented upon re-translated into English and Sanskrit, *Muséon*, 1912. (See above.)

YASNA XXX re-translated into English in *J.R.A.S.*, 1912.

YASNA XLIV, 1-10, re-translated in *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1911.

YASNA XLIV, commented upon, with Sanskrit translation by the author in *Z.D.M.G.*, 1912. (See above.)

A few copies of ZARATHUSHTRA, PHILO, THE ACHÆMENIDS AND ISRAEL, pp. 466 + xxx (1905-06) are still to be had of Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., and of the leading booksellers in Oxford, at 12s. 6d. "He treats his subject thoroughly and exhaustively . . . deep and patient studies." J. J. MODI, Head Priest of the Parsis, Colaba, Bombay, in the *Parsi* of Bombay, 1906.—"A wealth of learning and thought." *Nation*, N.Y., August 30, 1906 (Dr. GRAY).—This work, almost in its entirety, first appeared in articles in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*.

AVESTA ESCHATOLOGY COMPARED WITH DANIEL AND REVELATIONS, by L. H. MILLS (1908), to be had of Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co. SAGGI DI LETTURE, TENUTE ALL' UNIVERSITA' DI OXFORD, SULLA RELIGIONE DELL' AVESTA, dal Prof. LORENZO MILLS, being sections of lectures, delivered in the University of Oxford, with ZOROASTER AND THE BIBLE, by L. H. MILLS (*Nineteenth Century Review*, 1894, first translated into Gujarati by N. D. COORLĀWALĀ, of Bombay, 1896), now translated into Italian by an accomplished Italian man of letters upon his own initiative, 1910. G. Sacerdote, Turin, Italy. Pp. 75. Price 2s.

The Ahuna Vairya formula, *J.R.A.S.*, 1910.

THE GĀTHAS IN ENGLISH VERBATIM AND FREE METRICAL, with Headings from *S.B.E.*, xxxi. (Leipzig, 1900; 7s.), has been re-issued, bound with the Sanskrit Equivalents of Yasna I, the Pahl. in oriental and transliterated characters, the Persian, Sanskrit, and the Italian, or with the Dictionary. As bound up with the DICTIONARY, this English edition of 1900 gives both the complete Gātha text, with Grammar and Dictionary, and also a verbatim and free metrical version. The antiquations of the English edition of 1900 are corrected in the Dictionary, and to some extent in *Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia*; see also the

new Editions of Y. XXVIII, *Asiatic Quart. Rev.*, 1911; Y. XXIX in the *Muséon*, 1912; Y. XXX in *J.R.A.S.*, 1911; Y. XLIV, 1-10, in the *Asiatic Quart. Rev.*, 1911, and in *Z.D.M.G.*, 1912.

The thirty-first volume of the *Sacred Books of the East*, the YASNA, VISPARAD, AFRINAGAN, AND GĀH, pp. 400+xlvi, 1887 (same Author), is still to be had at 12s. 6d. ("the best Translations are those by Darmesteter and Mills": thus Dr. GELDNER, *Ency. Brit.*, vol. xxiv. p. 778); as is the ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT OF THE YASNA, collotyped in an unsurpassed manner in the actual size and colour of the original, 770 photographs, with Introductory Note by L. H. MILLS (Ten Guineas). This is the main document of the above-mentioned works, and for the presence of the original of it in the Bodleian Library Mr. Mills is responsible, 1889.

---

"Prof. Mills's name stands foremost in the ranks of those who have explored the field of Avestic literature." The *Rast Gofar*, Bombay, April 18, 1909.—"Beyond question our leading authority now living on the Gāthas." The *Nation*, N.Y., August 30, 1906.—[Earlier] (of Mills' Gāthas) "Das Ergebniss einer erstaunlichen Arbeit sehr mannigfaltiger Art—unser Verständniss der Gāthas mächtig gefördert." *Gött. Gelehr. Anz.*, May 13, 1893.—"Insbesondere von Mills, der diese schwierigen Gedichte in gründlichster Weise behandelt hat." *Preussisches Jahrbuch*, 1897, Prof. JUSTI (Lexicographer).—"Tous ceux qui s'occupent de l'interprétation des Gāthas rendront hommage à l'immense labeur scientifique de M. Mills . . . son livre reste un instrument indispensable pour l'étude." Prof. JAMES DARMESTER, *Revue Critique*, September 18, 1893.

"Alles was für die Erklärung der Gāthas nothwendig ist." (So also Dr. WEST in *J.R.A.S.*, 1906.)—"Immer wird es die Grundlage bilden, auf der sich jede weitere Forschung aufbauen muss . . . einen hervorragenden Dienst." *Zeitschrift der deutschen M. G.*, 1896, (the late) R. PISCHEL (first Sanskritist of Germany).—A new edition has been inquired for, and a renewed Government subvention is expected from an antiquated engagement.

A very few copies of the Gāthas (Av., Pahl., Skt., Pers. texts, and Comm., pp. 622+xxx, 1892-94) are still to be had for libraries, at £3. of F. A. BROCKHAUS in Leipzig.