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This dissertation presents the need for a reconsideration of Iranian influence upon Jewish apocalyptic, and offers grounds upon which such study may proceed. The Prolegomena describes the history of scholarship on the question of Iranian influence and on Jewish apocalyptic and offers grounds upon which comparative research ought to be conducted. Chapter I describes the sources for Iranian religion, the issues involved in attempting a historical reconstruction, and the methodology by which one can date the various texts and ideas. Chapter II argues for the historical and sociological likelihood of Iranian-Judaean interaction by discussing the various places in which the two communities could have interacted. In addition, several broad affinities are mentioned by way of suggesting potential concepts for rapprochement. Chapter III discusses Oral Theory, describing the kinds of processes and worldview in which Persian-Judaean interaction occurred, critiquing the standard text-centric method of current Biblical Scholarship. It also analyzes various apocalyptic texts for views on orality and textuality. Chapter IV analyzes some of the major texts which have been considered either 'proto-apocalyptic' or apocalyptic, both within the Hebrew Bible and in 1 Enoch, for details which can best be understood in an Iranian milieu. This is divided into Parts A (Biblical Literature) and B (Enochic Literature). Chapter V brings together the various themes and theologies which were analyzed in Chapter IV to argue for an 'Apocalyptic Hermeneutic' which is responsible for both the differences and similarities which scholars have seen in the prophetic and apocalyptic literatures. It relates the phenomena of apocalypticism (ideas), apocalypse (literary genre), and millenarianism (social movements), seeing the hermeneutic as a dialectical thread holding them all together as well as apart. This is intimately intertwined with the growth of a highly literate scribal elite (as discussed in Chapter III), and is argued as the best way to conceptualize Iranian influence. The Metalegomena brings together all of the analyses of the previous chapters, pointing towards the importance of the subject as well as to possible implications for further areas, such as the relationship between various Jewish 'sects,' the historical Jesus, early Christianity, and the sociology of millenarianism. Appendix I gives a brief explanation of the sources utilized and available in the reconstruction of Achaemenid Iranian religion, including critical editions of texts. Appendix II explains the orthography adopted here. Appendix III: Glossary of Terms provides explanation of the many Iranian terms which are used in the dissertation. Appendix IV: Annotated Definitions glosses the definitions adopted for controversial English terms.
Some say the world will end in fire,
    Some say in ice.
From what I've tasted of desire
I hold with those who favor fire.
    But if it had to perish twice,
I think I know enough of hate
To know that for destruction ice
    Is also great
And would suffice. —Robert Frost

VIII
Whether at Nishapur or Babylon,
    Whether the Cup with sweet or bitter run,
The Wine of Life keeps oozing drop by drop,
The Leaves of Life keep falling one by one.

XVIII
They say the Lion and the Lizard keep
The courts where Jamshyd gloried and drank deep:
    And Bahram, that great Hunter—the Wild Ass
Stamps o'er his Head, but cannot break his Sleep.

XXXI
Up from Earth's Center through the Seventh Gate
    I rose, and on the Throne of Saturn sate,
And many a Knot unravel'd by the Road;
    But not the Master-knot of Human Fate.

—Omar Khayam
(From Rubaiyat, trans. and adapted Fitzgerald)
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The writings known as apocalypses sit at the vortex of east and west, constituting a significant source of scholarly controversies in the study of emerging Judaism and Christianity. These works—which largely fall in the period between the books which would eventually make up the collections of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament—are powerful and often obscure, dealing with many of the perennial issues which occupy the religious mind: the problems of suffering and of evil, the afterlife, and the appropriate source of religious authority. As such, they are extremely important not only in the history of Second Temple Judaism (ca. 597 B.C.E.—70 C.E.) but for the history of religions as well. The issues which come into play in the study of the apocalypses are questions which underlie many areas in the humanities: how do humans receive, understand, reformulate, and transmit traditions?

A major desideratum in the study of the Jewish apocalypses is whether or not they evidence Iranian influence, from either of the two relevant Iranian Empires with which the Judaeans came into contact, the Achaemenid Empire (ca. 550 B.C.E.—330 B.C.E.) or the Parthian Empire (ca. 250 B.C.E.—224 C.E.). Although some scholars considered the potential of Iranian influence as early as the eighteenth century, an adequate, comprehensive study of the question remains unwritten. A plethora of studies on the problem were conducted around the turn of the twentieth century, yet their excesses and racial biases discredited the topic among Biblical Scholars. Recent advances in the fields of Biblical Studies and Iranian Studies, however, mean the time is ripe for in-depth research of the question.

The exploration of the question ‘what has Persepolis to do with Jerusalem’ is one which should interest all students of the Bible, formative Judaism, the Ancient Near East, and ancient Iran. This dissertation seeks to renew that study on a firmer foundation.
Acknowledgments

No dissertation is written alone, and this dissertation has benefited from the insight and encouragement of many scholars.

The early efforts at grappling with the new field of Iranian studies were aided by the generous assistance, bibliographic information, and comments of Dr. Almut Hintze (SOAS) and Dr. Bryan Rennie (Westminster College). Of course, this study could not have even begun or continued very long without the tireless efforts to procure obscure materials by the Interlibrary Loan Officer at Trinity, Ms. Jane Moriarty.

I am grateful to several scholars who critiqued drafts of various sections of the dissertation. Professor Brian Espey (TCD) helped me understand the science behind the astronomy in *1 Enoch*. The textual analyses benefited from the insightful observations of Professor A. D. H. Mayes, Professor John J. Collins, and Dr. Benjamin Wold. Professor Susan Niditch cast her careful eye over the Orality chapter. Ms. Helen Jacobus (Manchester) helped me wade through unfamiliar Babylonian astronomical materials. I am also grateful for the improvements to my reading of *1 Enoch* 77 from Dr. Mark Geller; two anonymous reviewers also very helpfully critiqued this section. Several sections of the dissertation have also been improved through the suggestions and critiques of conference audiences.

Special thanks belong to my long-suffering advisor, Dr. Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, who persevered as my research took an unexpected Iranian turn. She constantly reminded me to rein my wanderings back towards Biblical Studies and to clarify my writing.

Far more than can be quantified, this research owes a debt to the constant discussions, companionship, and encouragement offered by my biblical compatriots in Dublin, Father Murray Watson, Lidia D. Matassa, Amy Daughton, Audrey Barnett, Jason Michael Reid McCann, Claire Carroll, Máire Byrne, and Killian McAleese. They endured patiently more rantings on Persia and things apocalyptic than they probably ever cared to hear during our periodic coffees in 'Paris' and helped organize the conferences where material from this dissertation was first publicly aired. I am particularly in the debt of Murray, Máire, and Killian, who acquired sources unavailable at Trinity and proof-read various drafts for me.

Beyond academic debts, I am grateful for the continual encouragement received by my friends and family over the course of my studies.

Finally, two years of my research were made possible by a scholarship from the Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies Seminar, TCD. Most helpfully, I was able to attend several Annual and International Society of Biblical Literature conferences due to the support offered through the conference travel grants of the Trinity Trust.
Earlier versions of two sections included in this dissertation have previously appeared in print. A modified form of the section entitled ‘Types of Influence and Transmission’ in the Prolegomena is published as ‘On Cultural and Religious Influence.’ The first section of Chapter II: The Achaemenid Context appears as ‘Iranian-Judaean Interaction in the Achaemenid Period.’

The style, grammar, and orthography of this text follows the Chicago Manual Style and the SBL style guides; choices for where they differ are eclectic. The exception to this rule is the inclusion, for ease of reference, of the publications consulted for primary texts.

1 In Jason M. Silverman, ed., A Land Like Your Own: Traditions of Israel and Their Reception (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010).
2 In Lidia D. Matassa and Jason M. Silverman, eds., Text, Theology, and Trowel: Recent Research into the Hebrew Bible (Scranton, PA: Scranton Univ Press, 2010).
- List of Abbreviations -

Boyce, HZ I

Boyce, HZ II

Boyce and Grenet, HZ III

Zend-Avesta I

Zend-Avesta II

Zend-Avesta III

Pahlavi Texts I

Pahlavi Texts II

Pahlavi Texts III

Pahlavi Texts IV

Pahlavi Texts V

For all other citations, short titles are used for non-debut appearances.
Prolegomena
INTRODUCTION

Since the first appearance of the Avesta in the West, the influence of Iranian ideas on Judaism has been periodically mooted by scholars. Yet, despite this seemingly rich heritage, a thorough and adequate study has yet to appear. This study redresses this by beginning a re-evaluation of the potential import of Iranian ideas on the formation of the apocalypses and related phenomena in Second Temple Judaism. Towards this end it is necessary to situate the discussion within the scholarly contexts of two broad fields: the history of the question of Persian influence on Judaism and Christianity and of the study of apocalyptic in Biblical Studies. After this is done, it will be possible to describe the contexts and methodologies upon which a re-evaluation of the question may proceed. As this discussion makes apparent, there is ample scope and need for further research into this question.

Before proceeding, however, a brief explanation for the focus of this study largely upon apocalyptic rather than on Second Temple Judaism more broadly is merited. The first reason is disciplinary: the focus of research on Iranian influence has fallen on the apocalypses, therefore they represent a convenient place to begin engagement with the questions current in scholarship. The working hypothesis of this study provides the second: that the predominance of Iranian influence is to be found within apocalyptic. That a focus on apocalyptic does not exclude or minimize potential influence on other forms of Judaism is due to how this study understands the apocalypses to be related to Second Temple Judaism as a whole: they are related via a dialectical, hermeneutical relationship. This relationship is sketched out further below and argued at length in Chapter V.

Towards these ends proceeds the following. First, a brief discussion of the history of scholarship on Iranian influences demonstrates the need for a re-evaluation. Second, the background of apocalyptic studies prepares the view of apocalyptic here advocated as a locus for potential Iranian influences. This is followed by a statement of the methods needed to investigate influence. Finally, the plan of the study proper is presented.

HISTORY OF IRANIAN INFLUENCE ON JUDAISM

1 While the plurality of traditions and forms which may be subsumed under the rubric 'Judaism' is acknowledged, it is here maintained that there remains enough identifiable continuity to meaningfully speak of a tradition without recourse to the word 'Judaism.' This usage is not meant to deny the diachronic and synchronic differences which by necessity must be subsumed under a comprehensive term such as 'Second Temple Judaism.' In this study 'Judaems,' 'Jews,' and 'Yahwists' are used as convenient synonyms, without making any claims towards the vexed issue of the validity of speaking of 'Judaism' versus 'Yahwism' at this early period. The possibility of 'Yahwists' descended from Israelites or converts is not excluded from this usage. For related issues, see Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38.4—5 (2007): pp. 247–512.

2 For the definition of 'apocalyptic' and related nouns, see below.
Scholars have long contemplated the question of Zoroastrian influence on Judaism and Christianity. Although there was a period of intense interest in the subject during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, comparatively little research into the details of the issue has taken place in the past century. While many scholars were quite enamoured of the idea of Persian influences on Judaism, "parallelomania" took the idea to extremes and helped to discredit the idea with biblical scholars. Additionally, the rejection of oral theories associated with biblical literature as advocated by Gunkel and others prejudiced biblical scholars against the Iranian material, some of which comes from certain late Zoroastrian texts. Beyond the textual question, however, a focus on Hellenistic history has disguised the relevance of the Achaemenid and Parthian eras to the question.

The heyday of studies into Persian influence was the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Two scholars, Moulton and Mills, illustrate the unfruitful methods which dominated the studies in this period. The biblical scholar Moulton devoted a series of articles and later a book to the issue of Zoroastrian influence on Judaism. He already suggested that where influence on Judaism can be found, it can be found in the apocalypses, but he primarily based this claim on ideas of the inferiority of apocalyptic religion and the superiority of the biblical tradition. Far from an acceptable reason for positing or rejecting influence, this type of reasoning has played a significant role in discussions of the issue in the past. Another contemporary scholar to apply himself to the question of influence was Mills, the translator of part of the Iranian texts in the Sacred Books.

---


6 For more discussion of this topic, see Chapter III.

7 E.g., The Arda Virâf Nâmé, the Zand-i Vahman Yâsin.


10 E.g. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, p. 326.
of the East series. The opponent of Moulton, Mills saw sweeping parallels between Zoroastrianism and both Judaism and Christianity, to the point of identifying the Platonic and Philonic Logos with the Avesta Spontus of the Avesta. His studies are tendentious and totalizing, and therefore of little contemporary use other than as examples of how not to proceed. While individual details on occasion are useful as starting points, a thorough re-investigation of all of his ideas is needed to accept them. Together Moulton and Mills illustrate two common faults in this early discussion: the ideologically charged nature of influence and a sweeping 'parallelomania.'

Most investigations into Persian influence can be labelled along three lines: ideological, enumeration of parallels, or discrete, brief studies. A concise discussion of these types will demonstrate the need for a new study.

Ideological

One of the more extensive investigations into the potential of Iranian influence is Sheftelowitz's 1920 study. Scheftelowitz concludes that the similarities between the two traditions are mostly parallel developments, with only relatively 'cosmetic' borrowings such as eschatology. The strength of the Judaic religion was so strong that it inoculated Judaism from the Achaemenid's influence until the Greco-Roman period. Despite Judaism's apparent resilience towards influence, however, Sheftelowitz is willing to see Babylon wield its power upon both traditions. This is a peculiarly selective 'resilience' on the part of Judaism. His conclusions, however, deserve to be reappraised; much of his study is based on the Rabbinic literature rather than the Hebrew Bible or Pseudepigrapha, and both the Iranian and Biblical Studies disciplines have developed for nearly a century since. Even if it would conclude along similar lines, a study of similar extent is certainly due.

Shortly after Scheftelowitz's study, Maynard proceeded along contrary lines, arguing that religions can only be influenced through 'externals' and not ideas. On this basis he proceeds to list practices which Judaism and Zoroastrianism do not hold in common. He then further claims that since only (superficial) similarities are to be found in apocalyptic

---

11 Lawrence H. Mills, "Mr. Moulton's Zoroaster and Israel," The Thinker 1.6 (1892): pp. 508–514.
12 Lawrence H. Mills, Zarathustra, Philo, the Achaemenids, and Israel (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1905-6), pp. 12–17.
13 Mills, Zarathustra, Philo, the Achaemenids, and Israel; Lawrence H. Mills, Avesta Eschatology Compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation (Chicago: Open Court, 1908); Lawrence H. Mills, Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia (Chicago: 1913).
16 Scheftelowitz, Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum, p. 4, 6.
literature, which "remained very much on the margin of the main current of Jewish thought," the parallels are thus unimportant.\(^9\) Despite the logical and methodological problems inherent in Maynard’s approach, it appears that his main reservation is due to the assumption that the Israelites held religious genius, and therefore had no need to borrow ideas.\(^20\) This kind of argument fails to advance research in any meaningful direction.

It is apparent that a non-value-laden understanding of influence is necessary to better undergird the investigation of intercultural, interreligious influence.

**Enumeration of Parallels**

The work of a number of scholars consists in essence of listing parallels and pontificating on their (non)-importance. In the last chapter of his *Western Response to Zoroaster*, Duchesne-Guillemin appraises the thesis of Persian influence in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Zurvanism.\(^21\) His treatment here is contented with dismissing a few general parallels (Philo’s *Logos*, the messiah) and listing a few he favors (two spirits in the *Manual of Discipline*). Similarly, in his respective study,\(^22\) Carter attributes the appearance in Judaism of strict monotheism, a developed angelology, personal eschatology, and resurrection to a catalyzing effect of Zoroastrianism, even positing an absorption of Persian proselytes.\(^23\) While Carter’s investigation laudably distinguishes between the wholesale importation of new ideas and the catalyzing potential of ideas, his short book is unfortunately terse and uncritical in its use and appraisal of both the Jewish and Zoroastrian literatures. With the exception of the appearance of the demon Asmodeus in Tobit,\(^24\) he prefers to discuss general similarities or parallels than investigating problematic details in the Jewish texts which find better explanation in Iranian sources. In 1966 Winston attempted to establish the importance of Iranian ideas for Qumran.\(^25\) In the course of his argumentation, he discusses Second Isaiah, 1 and 2 *Enoch*, *The Assumption of Moses*, and *The Testament of Abraham*. Winston merely offers a variety of interesting and useful parallels, since, due to the limited length of the article, he is unable to tease out further evidence or structural considerations beyond the parallels. This leaves the reader unsatisfied and unconvinced. While offering a useful starting point for investigation, a more thorough study investigating influence is still needed to evaluate the significance of the particular parallels which he notes.

\(^{23}\) Carter, *Zoroastrianism and Judaism*, p. 106.
\(^{24}\) Carter, *Zoroastrianism and Judaism*, p. 65.
The more modern study of Cohn fares little better in detail. Cohn, the author of a remarkable study of Medieval Christian millenarianism, forcibly argues for the influence of Zoroastrianism on Jewish and Christian apocalypticism. After investigating the cosmological and historical beliefs of the Ancient Near Eastern peoples and the Vedic Indians, Cohn finds no eschatological beliefs which parallel those in the Jewish apocalypses. However, he notes analogous eschatological beliefs developing in Iran under the name of Zoroaster. He gives an admirable summary of Zoroastrian beliefs (chapter 4), and identifies it with the royal religion. Without denying the role of Canaanite myths or Mesopotamian influences, Cohn sees the development of eschatology as due to influence during the Hellenistic period, perhaps partly due to the descendants of Iranian colonists in Mesopotamia and Anatolia. However, only the last chapter of his book is devoted to exploring the parallels and details which the Jewish and Zoroastrians texts share. While his overall thesis is important for this study—that much of the ideas which are new in the apocalypses are borrowed from Iran, as the relevant ideas can only be found there—he leaves much room for a more detailed study, to shore up his argument with specifics.

Boyce is also a strong advocate of the relevance of Iranian studies to the history of Judaism. Primarily in her monumental history of Zoroastrianism, Boyce suggests areas in which Judaism was influenced by Iranian ideas. She traces influence well before the advent of the apocalyptic in Second and Third Isaiah and the careers of Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as in the Priestly Code. Her individual suggestions are provoking and deserve deeper investigation; her presentation of the material, however, is more of a general rather than analytical kind and unlikely to carry much persuasive force in the eyes of scholars. Additionally, since she frequently presents general parallel situations, her account could easily be accused of ‘parallelomania.’ She does, however, attend to the possible historical contexts

28 Cohn, *Cosmos, Chaos*, Part I.
29 Cohn, *Cosmos, Chaos*, p. 145.
for interaction, primarily in the Parthian-Hellenistic struggles in Anatolia. With attention to the difficulties of dating, her comments highlight very valuable points for investigation. Her work is an exceedingly important work of synthesis in the Iranian field, and this study has much recourse to her works and individual suggestions of parallels.

A well known study which accepts Persian influence is that of D. S. Russell. While open to and positive about Zoroastrian influences on the apocalyptic literature, Russell never investigates them in any depth. For him, Persian angelology 'facilitated' the monotheistic tendency to demote old gods to angels and influenced the development of demonology, and he parallels chronological schemata to ones in both Babylon and the Bundahis. He briefly investigates Moulton's discussion of fraumāis, but comes to no real conclusions. Russell's work clearly points to the role of native Jewish traditions in apocalypticism, while allowing for foreign elements. However, since his discussion never deals with the problems inherent in the Iranian sources nor with the possible loci of transmission it is thus susceptible to a charge of overly abstract parallelism. His views still leave room for a more thorough investigation into how and where, if any, Iranian influence may be found.

Yamauchi's massive volume, Persia and the Bible, purports to offer an overview of the relevant materials for study. As a source book, the volume is extremely helpful: the bibliography—both primary and secondary—is immense. A scholar seeking to broach the subject would do well to start with this tome for access to many of the issues of relevance to the subject. However, the book suffers from errors in relating to the relevant Iranian scholarship and can therefore be misleading. Further, despite the promising title for the present purposes, he undertakes very little detailed discussion on questions of influence. His inclusion of wide-ranging Iranian topics in the volume, however, represents a better historical grounding to inquiry.

Studies Pointing in a Better Direction
A number of useful and careful studies of discrete issues and passages, or short forays into the topic, also exist. Most of these will be discussed in more depth in the appropriate places; comments here merely point towards a more fruitful approach to the topic.

The Scandinavian scholar Widengren is generally affirmative of Iranian influence on Jewish thought, and has tried to show a variety of parallels. His most drawn-out analysis of a Jewish text is on 1 Enoch, in which he sees quite a variety of parallels with four major points: dualism, 'apocalyptic pattern,' eschatology and judgment, and visions. In addition to 1 Enoch, he has suggested Parthian influence on Early Christianity as well. Widengren presents a number of interesting and useful parallels on this text, out of an understanding of a 'Zurvanite' and Parthian milieu. His discussion falls largely within the context of his earlier work on the Parthians, and so his comments largely consist of contextualizing the role of the Parthians in the West by pointing out various instances of parallels. Yet, since the parallels noted are rarely discussed in depth or with regards to their significance in the Jewish context, they have not received much acceptance among biblical scholars. Widengren's attention to a specific historical context for influence represents a solid beginning for a renewed appraisal.

Shaked directly addresses the issue of Iranian influence, as well as editing several volumes on the question in Judaism at large. Shaked believes that the dilemma at hand is not whether there was Iranian influence on Judaism but its extent and importance. In his Cambridge History of Judaism article he approaches the issue from the perspective of a few


'cognate parallels': dualistic tendencies; elaborate and counter angel- and demonologies; cosmic and individual predestination; periodicism; eschatology with judgment, ordeals, resurrection, and salvation. According to Shaked, these concepts are more 'organically' woven into the warp and woof of the Iranian system than in Israel, indicating a likelihood that they were adopted piecemeal from Iran as they aided the Judaic system, rather than originating in the Jewish context. He is not content with just a general approach and offers closer examinations of Esther and the relationship of Aramaic to Old Persian. Shaked's in-depth knowledge of the Iranian material and sensitivity to the contexts of both traditions points forward to a better, more critical appraisal of the role and importance of Iranian ideas upon Jewish traditions. A scholar would do well to apply similar approaches and concerns to a larger body of Judaean texts in greater detail, enabling a more nuanced answer to the common observation of 'cognate parallels.'

Call to Re-evaluation: Towards a Methodology

In a well-known article, Barr is highly skeptical of attempts to appeal to Zoroastrian influence on Judaism. He rejects many of the typical parallels between the two traditions (such as in angelology), but allows for either an influence on conceptions of ritual purity, or late, Hellenistic-mediated influence. Barr critiques what he sees as an overly tendentious approach to the problem which sees influence as necessary to explain the development of Judaism, and therefore seeks evidence of it. However, as Hinnells notes, the real question is not whether it is necessary but whether it did in fact occur. Barr proceeds to investigate a few details, most notably the writings' opinions of the Persian rulers and the occurrence of Persian loanwords. He concludes that the Jews were uninterested in Persian religion since the majority of loanwords pertain to administration rather than religion. However, the force of this argument is undercut by two points: 1) his own observation that Nehemiah, who was most likely extremely familiar with Achaemenid religion, only uses the likely loanword "Dīdē," negating the evidential import of loanwords for potential contact; 2) the limitation of the concept of influence to 'religious' concerns per se. Be that as it may, Barr

46 Shaul Shaked, "Between Iranian and Aramaic: Iranian Words Concerning Food in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, with Some Notes on the Aramaic Heterograms in Iranian," Irano-Judaica V, eds. Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 2003), pp. 120–137.
49 Barr, "Question of Religious Influence," p. 204.
admiringly demonstrates the methodological care which needs to be used when evaluating the probability of Judaean interaction with Iranian traditions, and avoids the temptation to equate general parallels with influence per se. Barr's concerns highlight the need for an examination of the bases posited for proposed parallels.

Hinnells argues forcibly for the relevance of Zoroastrian texts to Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity. In a series of articles, he calls for a more nuanced understanding of the concept of influence than sometimes assumed in the scholarly literature, posits a historical setting in the Parthian era, and points to various details which he finds illustrative of the influence of Iranian ideas. Among the details, he notes that the development of demonology in Judaism and Christianity—often conceded to be a result of influence—has further implications in other theological areas, notably in the role of a saviour figure. Structural similarities and various parallels between Zoroastrian ideas of eschatology, demonology, and a saviour make influence appear likely. He briefly notes details in various apocryphal and New Testament texts which he feels demonstrates knowledge of Iranian ideas, in particular positing influence in the Books of Matthew and Revelation. These articles have received little attention from biblical scholars, but the methodological arguments and the parallels he briefly mentions deserve a more thorough investigation. Hinnell's discussions on the nature of inter-religious influence is taken up in a following section as an essential part of any methodology dealing with issues of religious influence.

Grabbe gives an excellent, albeit short, overview of the issues which beset the scholar interested in the question of Persian influence. He identifies five main methodological issues which must be addressed in such discussion: 1) The dating of Zoroaster and thus of the tradition bearing his name; 2) philological and textual problems; 3) dating of the ideas and literature itself; 4) the sociological manner of the transmission of influence; 5) the problem of determining 'influence' in the first issue. All of these points are very apt and are critically addressed in this study.

The question of Iranian influence on Judaism and Early Christianity in general and apocalyptic literature in particular deserves a thorough analysis which takes into account the

54 In particular, Hinnells, “Zoroastrian Saviour Imagery” (in Hinnells, Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies, p. 46, 61).
55 Hinnells, Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies, pp. 81–84.
historical context as well as all the evidence available from the various sources. Indeed, several scholars call for this. Re-opening the question of Iranian influences neither implies an uncritical acceptance of late texts nor a rejection of the advances in sociological and literary understandings of the apocalypses and millenarian movements; rather, it adds a new piece into the overall puzzle of the emergence of the new phenomenon in the Ancient Near East.

**Iranian Influence**

This dissertation deliberately discusses ‘Iranian’ influence rather than the more typical discussion of ‘Zoroastrianism.’ There is an undue fixation on ‘Zoroastrianism’ *per se* in Biblical Scholarship, which is misleading and less than useful. ‘Zoroastrianism’ in its classic and most well-known form was formulated in the Sassanian Empire and consists of a more or less homogeneous tradition which was the basis of the official Empire-sponsored religion. This is primarily the religion that is found in the ninth century texts. This tradition is the culmination of nearly 2000 years of religious tradition and does not exhaust the forms and ideas in Iran up to and including the Sassanian period. Just as it is misleading to speak of Rabbinic Judaism as the sole form of Judaism or to use it as a definitive model for Second Temple Judaism, it is misleading to attempt to focus only on Sassanian Zoroastrianism. For this reason, this dissertation expands the discourse to ‘Iranian religion.’ ‘Iranian religion’ includes a matrix of more or less organically related religious ideas traditionally transmitted by Iranian peoples. The words ‘Iran’ and ‘Iranian’ derive from the Old Persian word ‘Arya’ or ‘Aryan,’ which appears in the inscriptions of Darius I, and are used to refer, in the first instance, to a group of linguistically related languages and, by extension, to the peoples who have spoken those languages. Old Persian is the Iranian language of the Achaemenids. The Iranian linguistic family includes the modern languages of Farsi, Pashto, and Ossetic, and the linguistic area covers much more space than the modern Islamic Republic of Iran. The use of ‘Iranian religion’ rather than ‘Persian religion’ broadens the discussion to all the varieties of Iranian religion, rather than to focus merely on the forms which were (or were not) consonant with the Sassanian forms. This is not to discount the importance or relevance of Zoroastrianism, but to shift the focus away from discussion of the (non-)relationship of ‘Orthodox Zoroastrianism’ to the Achaemenids’ ‘Mazdaism’ and towards an evaluation of the traditions in the sources as a whole.

---

A proposed method for understanding ‘influence’ and for pursuing the question appears below. First, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by ‘apocalyptic.’

APOCALYPTIC STUDIES

The origins and development of Jewish apocalyptic literature and its relationships with other Judaean literature have long been dilemmas for which many solutions have been offered. Beyond the complexity of the primary sources, the question is complicated by several problems. First, scholars differ on the use and referents of several key terms, causing confusion and circular arguments between scholars on the various subjects. Secondly, the focus and methodological assumptions of scholars vary nearly to the point of positing competing, mutually exclusive models for the history of religions. Despite the plethora of studies on the prophetic and apocalyptic literatures in the past decades, many major issues still appear to elude scholarly consensus. A brief overview of the issues in the literature on the subject will highlight some of the problematics and point to the perspectives adopted for the following study.

Definition of Apocalyptic

The term ‘apocalyptic’ has generated fierce debate as to its appropriate referent and suitability. The major problem with the term is its tendency to simultaneously denote a genre, a worldview, and a sociological phenomenon. Hanson proposes to replace the term ‘apocalyptic’ with the terms ‘apocalypse,’ ‘apocalyptic eschatology,’ and ‘apocalypticism’ for the three respective referents—and many scholars utilize his or a similar division—but the term apocalyptic as a noun still periodically makes a re-emergence in discussions. The reason for this is the apparent—but difficult to define—relation between the three. Few scholars would argue for a one-to-one correspondence between apocalypses and apocalyptic movements, yet a relationship of some sort does exist. However, a difficulty with Hanson’s

---


definitions is his heavy reliance on eschatology, a term which itself has serious problems (see below). While there is at least a basic consensus on what constitutes the genre of apocalypse, there is little agreement on either the nature of related movements or worldviews or their relations to apocalypses.

This study uses the terms ‘apocalypse’ for the genre, ‘apocalyptic movements’ or ‘millenarianism’ for related movements, and ‘apocalypticism’ for the worldview. The term ‘apocalyptic literature’ is used for texts which may contain apocalypses within them or otherwise closely associated with apocalypses, but may not strictly be apocalypses themselves. The study understands, and will attempt to partially demonstrate, that a prior stream which is here termed an ‘apocalyptic hermeneutic’ is what links the ‘apocalyptic’ phenomena and accounts for their resemblances, rather than the link being the texts themselves. Such an understanding explains why some of the ideas which are evidenced in apocalypses can reappear in non-apocalypse genres. When the term ‘apocalyptic’ appears in this study as a noun, it refers to all of the above concepts as a concise collective noun.

The modern period of scholarship in apocalyptic is often traced to the work of Koch. In the context of disputes over the historical Jesus, Koch anticipates much modern discussion of apocalyptic by calling for an increased investigation into form-critical considerations of the apocalypses. He also anticipates further discussion on the worldview of the apocalypses by discussing what he considers to be the importance of ‘moods and ideas’ in addition to formal characteristics. The work of Koch spurred scholarship to devote attention to individual apocalypses, ultimately resulting in the formation of a group to define the genre apocalypse, the results of which are published in *Semeia* 14 and revisited in *Semeia* 36.

For the purposes of this discussion, the definition of ‘apocalypse’ as proposed in *Semeia* 14 and amended in *Semeia* 36 is considered to be sufficient:

“Apocalypse” is a literary genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spacial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world, intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behaviour of the audience by means of divine authority.

---


64 Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, pp. 28–33.

While several scholars have critiqued this definition on a number of grounds, no superior definition has yet emerged to replace it. As long as the genre definition is recognized to be a modern scholarly construct, the term is useful for clarifying discussion. Collins and Yarbro Collins are right to retain eschatology as one of the distinctive features of the genre, even though this term itself creates much controversy.

Rowland argues that undue emphasis is placed on eschatology, something which he sees as too variable and sporadic to be useful as a criterion; as such, he prefers a definition in terms of direct heavenly revelation. He emphasizes the diversity of material which can be found in apocalypses and sees the unifying factor to be a worldview whereby direct access to the divine was available, at least to the worthy; behind the mask of some passages may lie actual visionary experiences. Rowland's observations on the diversity of interests extant in the corpora and the importance of the concept of revelation are certainly correct as far as they go. However, in his discussion of these topics one is left to one wonder, if 'apocalyptic' is merely a belief in revelation, what separates the apocalyptic literature from prophetic literature or indeed any other revelatory genre? Unless one wishes to discard all distinction between the two, Rowland's observations are insufficient criteria to define 'apocalypse.'

While he claims not to discount the importance of eschatology for the apocalyptic literature, he seems to ignore how deeply the eschatology shapes various characteristics of the genre; his emphasis on revelation occasionally leads him to miss how central eschatological concepts are to the very revelations he discusses. Additionally, while it is certainly possible that real experiences lay behind some of the visions in the literature, this fails to explain how this differs from prophecy: the source of prophetic inspiration is no more resolved.
an investigation into ecstatic techniques should prove fruitful, the appearance of the apocalypse as a literary genre and its scribal, exegetical locus helps to explain more features than just the revelatory claims of the authors.\(^{72}\) Collins and Yarbro Collins are right to insist on the generic import of eschatology.\(^{73}\)

Aune argues that, while important, Collins’s definition of the genre apocalypse is too 'inductive and descriptive' as well as lacking in a description of function.\(^{74}\) He therefore offers a new definition in terms of form, content, and function, largely with Revelation in mind.\(^{75}\) In form, he proposes to consider an autobiographical form as essential, as well as a structure which places the central message a literary climax; in content, “the communication of a transcendent, often eschatological, perspective on human existence”; in function, a threefold function which purposes to recreate a revelatory experience which will be both considered legitimate as well as behaviorally modifying.\(^{76}\) However, as Yarbro Collins notes, this proposed definition is problematic for a number of reasons: 1) the autobiographical form is not universal; 2) the participatory aspect of the genre which Aune himself notes seems to preclude a central message;\(^{77}\) 3) eschatology seems to be the “primary distinguishing mark” of apocalypses against other revelatory genres; 4) Aune’s idea of ‘reactualization’ depends too much on the assumption of an original revelatory experience.\(^{78}\) However, his insistence on the need for a supplement of function to the definition is well-taken and reflected in the definition above.\(^{79}\)

On the basis of her studies in the Christian apocalypses, particularly the phenomenon of ‘tours of hell,’\(^{80}\) Himmelfarb objects to Collin’s categories of the apocalypses\(^{81}\) as they place two Christian apocalypses with different visionary experiences (Ascension of Isaiah and Apocalypse of Paul) in the same category. More importantly, she also sees an over-emphasis on the importance of eschatology in his definition to flaw its usefulness.\(^{82}\) From her perspective, the similarities between visionary experience (i.e., tours) is more important than

\(^{72}\) Rowland, *Open Heaven*, p. 212, 445–6, seems to discount the role of literacy or scribal origins.


\(^{74}\) Aune, *Apocalypticism*, p. 43.


\(^{76}\) Aune, *Apocalypticism*, p. 60.


the presence or lack of universal eschatology. However, she refrains from offering an alternative paradigm. She highlights some important variants in message and supposed experience among the apocalypses, but, as Yarbro Collins notes, this does not in itself question Collin's basic definition or framework.\footnote{Yarbro Collins, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism," p. 6.}

As the objections above show, perhaps no term in Biblical Studies has generated more confusion than the term 'eschatology.' As Collins points out, there is a 'minimum' consensus that eschatology refers to 'future expectation,'\footnote{John J. Collins, "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 36 (1974): pp. 21-22.} but such a definition is too nebulous to be useful, requiring additional epithets to become so (as, indeed, Hanson is compelled to distinguish between 'prophetic eschatology' and 'apocalyptic eschatology.')\footnote{Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 11-12.} Despite attempts to the contrary,\footnote{E.g. Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," pp. 22-25.} the variety of futures envisioned by texts such as Amos or Daniel questions the validity of calling both merely 'future expectation.' Since the term eschatology itself is based on ἔσχατος, 'farthest,' 'uttermost,' or 'end,'\footnote{Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, eds. Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), pp. 699-700.} it seems best to reserve the term to meaning the 'terminus,' both of human history and of human life, often called 'universal' and 'personal' eschatology respectively.\footnote{E.g. Collins, "Transcendence of Death," pp. 21-43; Collins would object to this restriction, however.} To use the term 'eschatology' to merely refer to a mundane future expectation which does not involve an absolute end of something simply creates unnecessary confusion.\footnote{Contra the definition given by George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Early Jewish Eschatology," Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. II (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 579-594.} This study understands the term 'eschatology' to only apply to a variety of beliefs concerning a decisive ending or transformation of either the cosmos or the individual, agreeing with Mowinkel who also strictly defines the term 'eschatology.'\footnote{Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G.W. Anderson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 125, 261-266.} In this view, it is redundant to speak of an 'apocalyptic eschatology' and 'prophetic eschatology' is non-existent. Similarly, the attempt to bundle other issues into the definition of eschatology\footnote{As does Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 11-12.} also further obscures the issue. Eschatology here merely refers to the belief in some form of ultimate termination. This end can (and does) come in a large variety of types and schemata and may be conceived of as imminent or remote. Indeed, much of the differences between various eschatological programs and the texts in which they appear can be understood as relative to the question of

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{Yarbro Collins, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism," p. 6.}
  \item \footnote{Paul D. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 11-12.}
  \item \footnote{E.g. Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," pp. 22-25.}
  \item \footnote{E.g. Collins, "Transcendence of Death," pp. 21-43; Collins would object to this restriction, however.}
  \item \footnote{Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G.W. Anderson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 125, 261-266.}
\end{itemize}
One would expect significant differences between an end expected tomorrow and one expected thousands of years hence.

Typically wrapped up with eschatology is some sort of teleology. This is strictly speaking a separate idea from the logical positing of terminations, but in the Jewish apocalypses it is firmly wrapped up into their understandings of the *eschaton*. In the prophetic literature, however, teleology appears without being joined to an eschatology: YHWH has a purpose (telos) behind his dealings in history, but these dealings are not related to an ultimate *eschaton*. The prophets often speak of YHWH's goals and plans, however these do not coincide with cessation. Indeed, they are open to reversal based on the people's response.

In the apocalypses, on the other hand, telos and *eschaton* are bound together, as they are in Iranian traditions (see Chapter I). One crux of theodical debate (an important, albeit not only component, of apocalypses) is the resolution of telos: one answer is eschatological, and this is an answer which is not found in the extant prophetic literature as it is in apocalyptic.

In contrast to the majority of scholarship, Sacchi finds the quest for an apocalyptic paradigm either fruitless or at best misleading, even wishing to eschew the term altogether. To him, even the distinction between 'apocalypse,' 'apocalyptic eschatology,' and 'apocalyptic current' is misleading, as they do not appear in the historical literature. Instead, he wishes to approach the subject from an evolutionary standpoint, departing from *The Book of Watchers* and tracing 'currents of thought' therein. The importance of *The Book of Watchers* for Sacchi is due to subsequent authors taking up issues related to its theodicy. Sacchi's emphasis on the modern heuristic nature of the term 'apocalyptic' and the need to understand the texts as historically situated is well-taken, but that observation on its own does not add any clarity to scholarly discussions on the meaning of the term, nor help to highlight the 'currents of thought' on which he wishes to focus. The recognition of the heuristic nature of terminology should lead to a refinement of their use rather than an abandonment of them. The assertion that the texts and traditions evolved over time is apt; however, this does not

---


95 E.g., Amos 5:15; Jer 4:1–4.

96 It may be pertinent to note that most of the parallel millenarian movements mentioned by Worsley had previously encountered either Christianity or Islam, both traditions with an eschatology. See Peter Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "Cargo" Cults in Melanesia*, Second ed. (London: Paladin, 1970), pp. 230–233.

97 See Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, in particular the introduction (pp. 13–26).

justify the restriction of the phenomena to a development of theodicy out of *The Book of Watchers* tradition alone. *The Book of Watchers* is indeed important, as is the issue of theodicy, but neither exhausts the issues.

For the purposes of clarity, this study attempts to be precise in the use of terminology related to the issue of apocalyptic. Towards this end, it is necessary to describe the terms and their relationships as understood and used in this study, as they may differ from some scholarly use of similar terms (also illustrated in Figure 1). The use of the term 'apocalyptic' will here be used either as an adjectival part of a larger term, or as a convenient collective noun to denote all related concepts. The term 'apocalypse' refers strictly to a genre of revelatory literature as defined above. Apocalypses are the products of 'apocalyptic traditions,' or schools of thought (e.g., Enochic, Qumranic), which are more specific than the 'apocalyptic worldview'/ 'apocalypticism,' but less coherent or organized than an 'apocalyptic movement.' Such traditions emphasize different parts of the common apocalypticism and can naturally interact with other traditions, apocalyptic or not. An apocalyptic tradition may or may not result in the writing of apocalypses or the formation of a distinct movement; it may also be absorbed into the overall framework of a larger religious tradition. If a 'school of thought' coalesces with 'members,' it may be called a movement. If an apocalyptic movement expects the imminent end of the world and assumes a more radical disposition towards society, it may be called 'millenarianism'/ 'millenarism.'

'Apocalypticism/Apocalyptic worldview' is a worldview which manifests itself in the apocalypses and apocalyptic traditions, but also influences the general religious tradition. This worldview and its antecedents and sources is still fraught with uncertainty. One of its sources, however, is an attitude which may be termed an 'apocalyptic hermeneutic.' This apocalyptic hermeneutic is the approach and method whereby a tradent approaches his or her experiences and religious traditions, influencing how he or she reads, evaluates, and applies them to his or her overall worldview. This, as a hermeneutic, both comes out of and creates its worldview by interpreting and placing data. In the context of apocalyptic, the sources will largely be Jewish traditions and the Hebrew Bible. It is largely this last category ('apocalyptic hermeneutic') with which this dissertation is concerned (see Chapter V).

Apocalyptic can be approached via a variety of perspectives and methodologies, leading to an equal variety of conclusions. A brief discussion of these will serve to


contextualize the approach adopted here. Some of the approaches chosen can be classed broadly as sociological-historical or in relation to their perceived sources.

Sociological-Historical

Some modern discussion of apocalyptic concerns its relationship to modern systematic theology and the theology of Jesus and the Jesus movement. Since apocalypses are religious literature which deal with religious issues, a concern for theological issues is certainly relevant to their understanding. However, a certain lack of historical contextualization and over-reliance on systematic schemes has led scholars to seek a paradigm based on social-scientific or text-critical categories rather than theological-philosophical ones. Understanding the social and historical context is vital; towards these ends, various avenues are available.

Seeking to understand the apocalyptic worldview as an outgrowth of pre-Maccabaean developments, Ploeger discusses apocalyptic against the background of Israel’s transition from
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a nation-state to a religion.\textsuperscript{103} For Plöger, two concepts are key: the usage of prophetic eschatology and the development of a 'theocracy' or ruling priesthood. The seeds for later sectarianism were sown in the early Persian period; the restoration program assimilated prophetic eschatology as self-legitimation, while various dissenting 'conventicles' maintained a more 'dualistic' eschatology.\textsuperscript{104} The essential difference between the two camps was the interpretation and use of the prophets: for the theocrats, the prophets were interpreters of the law, while for the conventicles, the eschatology still held living potential. The crises occasioned by the Seleucids catalyzed the latent schisms, more bringing to the forefront the pre-existing tensions in Jewish society than creating them.

Plöger's thesis has the benefit of emphasizing the importance of the interpretation of traditions to post-exilic Judaeans; indeed, he understands the difference between his two camps as largely one of the interpretation (and collation) of the prophets. However, his treatment too easily and without evidence creates defined parties and movements which may or may not have existed within Judaea and the diaspora. Additionally, a dichotomy between priests and prophets oversimplifies the overlap in interests which either role could have;\textsuperscript{105} indeed, many of the apocalypses evince sincere interest in the workings of the cult, and the Pharisees were known for many 'apocalyptic' beliefs. Further, the considerably pre-Maccabean dating of the earliest Enochic works questions the role of that crisis, even in terms of mere catalyst. Internecine struggles certainly played a role in the development of the period and its texts, but a dichotomy as Ploger describes it is too simplistic and has little evidence in the texts.

Hanson, in his \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic},\textsuperscript{106} follows the lead of Plöger and argues for the emergence of apocalyptic in the context of a battle between 'hierocratic' and 'prophetic' camps in Second Temple Judaism. He traces the development of 'apocalyptic eschatology' from 'prophetic eschatology' in the later portions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, seeing the 'apocalyptic visionary' as merely an embattled prophet deprived of a king. From his analysis of late prophetic and 'proto-apocalyptic' texts, Hanson claims that: 1) the sources of apocalyptic literature are prophecy; 2) the origins are set in sixth-fifth centuries rather than the Hellenistic period; 3) the texts evidence an increased 'abandonment of history' for myth;

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
4) this process takes place in the context of inner community struggle (i.e., deprivation). While Hanson has deservedly come under criticism for his dichotomization of myth and history, his emphasis on party politics and deprivation theory as well as his emphasis on the prophetic origins of apocalyptic continues to be influential. However, the majority of Hanson’s analyses in his book are dependent on the myth-history dichotomy—including his assignment of texts to various religious-political parties or their polemic—throwing doubt on his other results as well. While deprivation theory certainly has a role to play, particularly in relation to millenarianism, it cannot be used to posit such definite parties without other evidence for them. People can have fundamental disagreements without being aligned with an organized party. Still, in light of the subsequent re-dating of the Book of Watchers, Hanson’s appeal for a pre-Hellenistic dating for some of the origins of apocalyptic seems a wise choice.

A better method is Cook’s, who seeks to understand the Jewish and Christian texts through comparison with the apocalypticism or millenarianism of other cultures and within the context of the biblical traditions. For Cook, the selection and emphasis upon certain traditional motifs in a new eschatological setting adequately describes the situation in Second Temple Judaism, as it does among the Native American Ghost Dancers. Cook’s method of anthropological comparison is useful and offers many insights and valuable correctives to overly theoretical approaches to the texts. His work offers glimpses into the actual functions of apocalyptic texts in real communities, beyond a simplistic reading of deprivation. However, as Grabbe rightly critiques, it is dangerous to automatically read a group or movement behind any given apocalypse a priori. While there certainly are millenarian groups which created and nurtured texts, it is also possible some texts preceded the formation of ‘apocalyptic’ communities (as appears to be the case at Qumran). Beyond the possibility of an individualistic origin to a given text, millenarian groups are not guaranteed to write in the genre of apocalypse: the correlation between the two phenomena is not one-to-one. Assuming coherent, sect-like groups behind every Second Temple text is surely dangerous and misleading. One must be careful, then, to distinguish between texts and groups which may carry the ‘apocalyptic’ adjective.

107 Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, p. 29.
As in Plöger and Hanson, the sociology of deprivation is often applied to apocalyptic groups.\(^\text{112}\) One of Nickelsburg’s more well known hypotheses connects the genesis of the Book of Watchers with the Wars of the Diadochi.\(^\text{113}\) The critique of violence in the Semihazah layer is, in his mind, reflective of the violence of these times.\(^\text{114}\) While there certainly is some merit to the observation that many millenarian groups are marginal and appear in times of crises, the appeal to deprivation is susceptible to four serious objections: many people experience hardship and deprivation without becoming apocalyptic;\(^\text{115}\) the prophets can be analyzed as responding to deprivation;\(^\text{116}\) groups in power may hold apocalyptic ideologies;\(^\text{117}\) and the notion of relative deprivation is so nebulous as to be almost meaningless.\(^\text{118}\) It is worth noting that apocalyptic-millenarian hopes are often fostered by those seeking a coherent worldview rather than merely in a socio-economic crisis.\(^\text{119}\) One wonders, then, if instead of serving as a cause, crises serve as intensifiers of pre-existing tensions.\(^\text{120}\)

**Relations to Previous Traditions**

Beyond the historical setting and the sociological perspectives, the question of the sources of apocalyptic is a contentious issue. Three of the most oft mooted are prophecy, wisdom, and foreign sources.

**Prophecy**

Both the apocalypses and their modern day commentators commonly reference biblical prophecy, and the understanding one has of the prophets undeniably influences one’s understanding of apocalyptic. In the context of Biblical Studies the term ‘prophecy’ can refer to either the books which are labelled prophetic in Hebrew Bible, most notably the ‘writing prophets,’ or it can refer to the socio-religious phenomenon of prophecy in the context of


\(^{120}\) Note also the critiques of Kathleen J. Tierney and Joan Neff Gurney, “Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: a Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research,” *Sociological Quarterly* 23.1 (1982): pp. 33–47, from a completely different viewpoint.
ancient Israel as whole, whether or not linked to the books which later bore their label. The meanings of 'prophet' and 'prophecy' and the relationship between these two has been assessed variously, impacting heavily on the understanding of the prophetic corpus of the Hebrew Bible, and the literature is vast. Only the aspects deemed most relevant to the current issue can be discussed here.

Wellhausen understood the prophets as religious reformers who challenged the monarchy and the books which bore their names as belonging either to the prophets themselves or their followers. While the uniqueness of some prophets' messages may indeed account for their remembrance, Wellhausen's view has long been noted to recreate the prophets in the mold of the Protestant Reformers. Instead, for the purposes of this study, a 'prophet' is understood as a person who fulfills the role of speaking a message from YHWH to his or her contemporaries. Whatever the origin and semantic development of נל"ק, it was the primary descriptive term by the emergence of apocalyptic. This is a fundamentally oral phenomenon, although reports could be written. Since a prophet could function as part of a prophetic group, alone, or part of the cultic structure, 'prophet' should be understood as a role which one could perform anywhere from once to a lifetime vocation. By the time of the appearance of apocalyptic, however, the importance of this live intermediary was eclipsed; it seems likely that the rising importance of collections of prophetic literature played a part in this. 'Prophetic literature' refers to the texts traditionally so-called in the Hebrew Bible, which were believed to be the records of the previously oral prophets, through whom YHWH spoke new message(s) to his people. The difference between the two is largely of medium and skill: the prophets required the skills of...

communication with G-d and with their audience; the prophetic literature required the skills of a scholar skilled in interpretation and teaching.

In a recent study Doan and Giles apply performance criticism to the understanding of the Hebrew prophets. Starting from the recognition that prophets were originally oral communicators, Doan and Giles attempt to understand the implications of the characteristics of presentation for the original prophetic event, the scribal record of it, and the presumed scribal re-enactment of it. In this respect, they make two important claims: 1) that the prophet himself had authority through his performance while the scribe had to 'impersonate' the prophet to actualize the same authority; and 2) that a performance (e.g., a prophetic oracle) is judged by its impact. These two claims have several implications on the rise of apocalyptic. First, that while texts receive their power from the power of the performer, subsequent performers' power is sub-ordinated to the text. In other words, the writing of prophecy simultaneously glorifies the recorded prophet while denying the possibility of encore performances. The scribe, therefore, cannot reclaim the same level of authority in his person, dependent as it is on a text. This not only confirms the implications of Oral Theory, it perhaps helps explain the high incidence of pseudepigraphy in the apocalypses: a prophetically-authored text carries more authority than a scribal re-performer. Second, it reduces the importance of 'prediction' for prophecy through a focus on the impact on the audience. A prophet's performance would be preserved and remembered if deemed 'effective'—as the audience subjectively perceived it—whereas the scribal performance implies a 'communal audience' which already accepted the prophet's performance as true, and thus more inclined to a predictive element.

Perhaps the prophetic issue most relevant to the investigation of apocalyptic is the 'end of prophecy.' Although the concept of the end of prophecy is probably a misnomer, it is an impression which is given by the extant literature. This is partly a reflex of the disappearance of the prophetic literature genre, despite evidence of sporadically appearing self-proclaimed prophets. The apparent occultation of prophecy is here understood as the upshot of three interrelated developments: the change in authority structure, the rise of

---

128 Doan and Giles, *Prophets, Performance, and Power*, p. 27.
Pre-exilic Judaean (and Israelite) society had a triad of authority sources: the king, the priests, and the prophets. The prophets largely functioned as a 'barometer of the status quo,' both upholding and critiquing the institutions of cult and monarchy. Scribes would have had a mostly administrative and relatively minor role. Following the restoration, Yehud's authority structure was altered from this paradigm. While executive power first devolved upon a local Persian governor, probably even the Davidic scion, the ultimate authority was 850 miles away. This had the effect of increasing the authority of the Persian-supported priests (to the extent that the role of governor appears to have disappeared completely in a process still poorly understood) as well as those with expertise in handling the imperial administration, e.g., scribes. The loss of the Davidide both robbed prophets of their former patrons as well as problematizing the critique of executive authority. A threat to Persian authority would have been a threat to the positions of both the priests and the scribes in a way which a critique of the Davidic monarchy does not appear to have been.

---


133 E.g., the overview in Rainer Albertz, A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, 2 vols. (London: SCM, 1994), Vol. 1, pp. 105—242, albeit without endorsing all the particulars. Cf. Carroll, When Prophecy Failed, p. 17. It is interesting to see how this contrasts with other preserved oracles from the Ancient Near East, where only oracles favorable to the king are preserved, even if this is only a function of the limited number surviving. See the collected oracles in Martti Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, Writings from the Ancient World (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003).

134 In Chapter III; see also William M. Schniedewind, How the Bible Became a Book: the Textualization of Ancient Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2004), chapters 3 and 4.


139 Persian administration is also highly contended; for the moment, see the description of the Achaemenid system of personal loyalty to the crown in Pierre Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire, trans. Peter T. Daniels (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002), pp. 324—326.
Simultaneously, the importance of writing—both generally and as a repository of authoritative traditions—was gradually increasing in Judaean circles. The codification and canonization of prophetic oracles—whatever the details of that process—would have reduced the authority of contemporary prophets: since the texts were already considered ‘validated’ prophecies from true prophets, the insolvable question of validation was not an issue for them as it would have remained for the living prophets.\(^{140}\) The dynamics of textuality are discussed further elsewhere,\(^{141}\) but this phenomenon parallels a sociological pattern. The pattern of revelation—codification—closing of canon/turn to exegesis can be seen repeatedly in the history of religions. Since the epistemology of new revelations is an intractable problem, communities will tend to curtail their recurrence after an initial period.\(^{142}\) A similar situation in Second Temple Judaism is therefore not unusual.

Thus, it is apparent that prophecy in Judaean traditions was likely squeezed between the forces of a new political, sociological, and communicative setting. The continuing relevance of living prophets was probably confined to a more popular level.\(^{143}\) In textual terms, the scribes appropriated the role of ‘barometer of the status quo.’ Indeed, it appears that they assimilated not only a prophetic self-understanding but a royal one as well.\(^{144}\)

This understanding of prophecy is at odds with much previous scholarship. Charles—who provides a vast amount of scholarship on apocalyptic traditions which continues to be a starting point for scholarship, even though the Qumran discoveries have necessitated updating—understands apocalyptists as ‘essentially’ the same as prophets with only ‘accidental’ differences.\(^{145}\) The major difference between the two in his view has more to do with spatial and temporal scope and the assimilation of monotheism than any fundamental difference in thought.\(^{146}\) He acknowledges that eschatology strictly means ‘end


\(^{141}\) See Chapter III.


things' but affirms that it is essentially the same in both the prophetic literature and apocalyptic literature, despite differences in content. In his view, the reason that prophecy disappears and apocalyptic appears is due to the growth of legalism and the attendant closing of the canon; legal exegesis replaces the need for prophetic pronouncement. While justifiably noting the literary and exegetical character of much of the apocalyptic literature, Charles bases too much of his theory on views of Jewish legalism and assumptions on the development of canonical thought to justify his assertions that these explain the emergence of apocalyptic. His discussion limits the scope of apocalyptic to a tiny school of religious elites, and fails to explain its widespread appearance in Judaism and Early Christianity.

Grabbe problematizes the entire program of differentiating between prophecy and apocalyptic tradition, wishing to understand apocalypses as a subset of prophecy, and prophecy as a subset of divination. The questions which Grabbe raises are important questions to keep in mind, and they help the scholar to avoid oversimplification of the issues involved. The role of myth and history, of scribality, of eschatology, and their relationship to the understanding of the literature and social situation are serious questions which have not yet found a satisfactory formulation. However, as Collins rightly critiques, the denial of distinctions between prophetic literature and apocalypses hardly brings any clarity to the relevant issues, nor does it clarify the problems Grabbe identifies. A preferable method would be to understand how each category appears/is used in the respective genres, rather than assimilating the two into a greater, vaguer genre (such as divinatory or revelatory literature). While Grabbe's comments ought to give pause for thought, he does not offer a useful replacement paradigm for understanding the relationship between apocalypses and their prophetic antecedents.

Russell's understanding offers a better way forward: he understands apocalyptic to be a growth from the prophetic tradition, differentiated by a 'new eschatology' through scribal exegesis of the prophetic literature, and he recognizes the role of foreign influences from Babylon, Greece, and Persia. Russell laudably emphasizes the role of literacy in the formation of both the form and thought of the texts. While he has been criticized for his

151 Russell, Method and Message, p. 104.
recurrence to foreign influences, his study attempts to carefully weigh biblical precedents against foreign elements.

Wisdom

In contrast to the prevailing scholarly consensus, von Rad argues that much of apocalyptic can better be seen as an outgrowth from sapiential rather than prophetic traditions. For him, the concept of history in the apocalyptic literature is too radically different from that in prophetic—in its scope, lack of reference to Israel’s salvation history, and its determinism—to be connected with the prophets. Instead, the emphasis on the cultivation of knowledge fits better within a sapiential paradigm. In addition, he connects the two through prognostication and the development of deterministic ideas. While his discussion of the idea is fairly short, it has provoked widespread discussion, if not acceptance. Though von Rad’s analysis is overly dismissive of the role which the prophetic tradition plays in apocalyptic, he draws needed attention to the variety of materials found therein, and the important relation the sapiential writings have to them. Ultimately, however, it seems likely that the parallels to be found between the apocalypses and the sapiential literature are in a common originating milieu—i.e., scribes and their scribal training in schools which would have utilized and contributed to sapiential writings—rather than in a textual dependence. A strict delineation between prophetic and sapiential traditions is both misleading and unnecessary—it was most likely the same scribal circles ultimately responsible for preserving both corpora and thus heirs to both traditions. Von Rad’s comments, however, have led to an admirable broadening of the search for relevant sources and inspirations for the apocalypses.

After von Rad’s attempt to locate the origin of apocalypticism in sapiential literature, Müller qualifies that position by linking it to ‘mantic wisdom,’ and in this he has been followed by most scholars, most notably VanderKam and Collins. Müller argues that the

E.g. Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, pp. 31—34.
155 E.g., Benjamin G. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills, eds., Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism, Symposium (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2005).
general context of נֵסָיָה in the Hebrew Bible, *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*, and Dan’el at Ugarit demonstrates the ‘magisch-mantische’ associations of the word.¹⁵⁸ He understands the resurgence of manticism in post-exilic texts as related to the resurgence of ancient myth in said texts.¹⁵⁹ Thus, for VanderKam, Enoch can best be understood as the Jewish version of Enmenduranki, seventh in the antediluvian sage lists.¹⁶⁰ Similarly, Mesopotamian traditions represented by the Akkadian predictive texts are very similar to some types of apocalypses (the historical-review type).¹⁶¹ While in Müller’s view this thesis offers answers to some of the long standing questions in apocalyptic (pseudonymity, determinism, future-orientation),¹⁶² the comparison between the apocalyptic sages and Mesopotamian mantic sages is too superficial for the weight placed upon it. The relations between sapiential traditions and the apocalypses must find a better explanation.

Recently, Bedenbender has rejected the consensus on mantic wisdom, based on a re-evaluation of the Mesopotamian evidence for manticism.¹⁶³ Preferring the term ‘revealed wisdom’ to ‘mantic wisdom,’ he notes that the very concept of the mantic sage—expert in knowledge of rituals and special ‘scientific’ training—obviates the need for revelation.¹⁶⁴ Thus, Joseph and Daniel—the bases for Müller’s thesis—do not act at all like mantic sages: they receive revelations rather than use mantic skills.¹⁶⁵ The authors of the Daniel and Joseph cycles are quite aware of this difference between their protagonists and the religious specialists of Egypt and Babylon, taking pains to draw attention to the *revealing G-d* in place of the messengers’ skill (Cf. Gen 41:16; Dan 2:22, 27).

Bedenbender specifically notes a difficulty with the parallel of the *baru*: the *baru’s* skill was based on the technical inspection of sacrificial offal (extispicy) and lecanomancy (the interpretation of oil-patterns on water), not on oneiromancy (dream interpretation), let alone the writing of revelatory literature.¹⁶⁶ This is an important qualification which VanderKam

---

¹⁵⁸ Müller, “Magisch-Mantische Weisheit,” pp. 79–85 (in the Hebrew Bible); p. 87 (on the Qumran text); pp. 90–94 (on Ugaritic Daniel).
himself admits.\textsuperscript{167} The apocalyptic preoccupation with revelation contrasts highly with the technical interpretation of phenomena as appears in the Mesopotamian literature.\textsuperscript{168} Indeed, at least at Mari, the mantic arts often functioned to verify messages received via prophetic means (i.e., ‘revelation’).\textsuperscript{169} When dreams are mentioned in Mesopotamian texts, their meaning is straightforward and clear, requiring only verification rather than explanation.\textsuperscript{170} It is therefore hard to understand the role of dream-interpretation-through-revealed-exegesis as ‘mantic,’ and thus, the character of Daniel is no mantic.\textsuperscript{171} There is little if any evidence of apocalyptic authors’ interest in the interpretation of entrails; there is, however, much interest in the eschatological interpretation of the Torah and prophets. This points to another difficulty with Müller’s thesis which Bedenbender’s critique notices: the prediction of the near future and of the eschaton are two very different concepts that need not lead from one to the other.\textsuperscript{172} While omen literature and the apocalypses do often deal with the future, the future with which they deal are of qualitatively different kinds: it is the difference between predicting the outcome of the next presidential election and predicting the fall of the current world order. One does not lead to the other without some serious impetus and change of assumptions.

Mesopotamian traditions certainly did influence the Jewish apocalypses, but mantic traditions are not the most prevalent of those traditions. Other considerations should be sought to explain both the relevance of sapiential literature and of scribal traditions. More to the fore is the appearance of revealed interpretations rather than mantic interpretations.

The relationship between sapiential and apocalyptic literature has again occupied scholars of late, and Wright and Wills offer a sample of some results from recent scholarly discussion.\textsuperscript{173} While pointing to the variety of ways in which apocalyptic and sapiential forms and preoccupations mutually influenced each other as the Second Temple period progressed, a number of authors also broach the issue of the social loci of the literature. What emerges from a number of scholars’ suggestions and observations—more implicitly than explicitly—

\textsuperscript{167} VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition, pp. 57–59.


\textsuperscript{169} Cf. the documents in Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, nn. 8, 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 25, 27, 29, 36, 38, 39, 44. For a discussion, see Daniel E. Fleming, “Prophets and Temple Personnel in the Mari Archives,” The Priests in the Prophets: The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Later Prophets, eds. Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis (London: T & T Clark, 2004), pp. 55–56.

\textsuperscript{170} Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, nn. 36 and 38.

\textsuperscript{171} Cf. the similar comment Bedenbender, “Jewish Apocalypticism,” p. 191.

\textsuperscript{172} Bedenbender, “Jewish Apocalypticism,” p. 194.

\textsuperscript{173} Wright and Wills, eds., Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism.
is the importance of a common denominator for every book: scribal origins.174 While Nickelsburg's early, tentative term 'wisdom circles' may leave a desire for increased precision,175 it is clear that both genres and styles are related by a shared social situation, if not necessarily shared ideologies or groups. Recognizing the scribal origin of all genres then also points to several issues which the student of apocalypticism must consider: the role and nature of education and the development of scribal hermeneutics.176

If one understands sapiential literature as related to the training of scribes, then one of the keys for understanding the relationship between the genres is epistemology, or more specifically, the issue of revelation. While all scribes would have been trained through the cultivation of traditional and Torah-based knowledge, they clearly did not hold uniform views on the role or importance of revelation, and thus on the interpretation and relative role of the traditional wisdom. A scribe who accepted a revelatory epistemology would be willing to write, read, and study apocalypses, while a scribe who rejected it would not. However, even if a scribe who accepted a revelatory epistemology did not write an apocalypse, that scribe's hermeneutic and literary production would still bear the hallmarks of such an approach to tradition. Goff's study of 4QInstruction is in this regard illuminating.177 He notes that 4QInstruction, while sharing a pedagogical function with the sapiential literature, presumes an already known revelation. Whereas an apocalypse imparts or shares the experience of a new revelation and gives it authority, 4QInstruction admonishes scribes to study a revelation which is already accepted as authoritative. To put this in more concrete terms, Sirach represents a scribe who rejects a revelatory epistemology, 1 Enoch represents scribe(s) who wish to impart a new revelation, and 4QInstruction represents scribes who have accepted a new revelation and continue in the scribal tradition of study and interpretation (including that revelation). One of the decisive factors in characterizing these works is their hermeneutical presuppositions,


175 As Tanzer herself comments in the note cited above.


as well as their chronological relation towards the material from which they derive their wisdom.

From Prophecy-Wisdom Dichotomy to Interpretation

The above discussion of prophecy and wisdom highlights the importance of interpretation for apocalyptic. An interesting contribution to this debate can be found in Smith's studies comparing a variety of genres and cults from the Ancient Near East.\(^{178}\) He understands apocalyptic movements and apocalypses to stem from what he calls an 'apocalyptic situation'—in the context of the Ancient Near East, the scribes' loss of royal patronage—but more generally, in a situation in which traditions require 'rectification.'\(^{179}\) This 'rectification' is not a result of failed prophecy, but the need to fit a new situation into an older paradigm, to fit a previously unimaginable situation into a traditional framework. Smith's comments highlight the importance of reinterpretation and (at least in the Ancient Near Eastern context) the important role of scribes in the appearance of apocalypticism. This perspective is a helpful corrective to appeals to cognitive dissonance or relative deprivation for several reasons. First, cognitive dissonance depends too much on an idea of unfulfilled predictions: the sources and preoccupations of the apocalypses are much broader than the 'correction' of failed prophecies.\(^{180}\) Secondly, the concept of relative deprivation—encompassing any perceived deprivation—is too nebulous to count as a meaningful analytical tool.\(^{181}\) The intellectual aspect which these two ideas do invoke and have in common, however, is the reinterpretation of older traditions in the light of a new situation. This is, of course, a matter of hermeneutics.

Aune investigates the role of biblical interpretation which claimed revelatory status as Jewish or Christian 'prophecy' (including the apocalypses), also known as 'charismatic exegesis.' He understands this phenomenon as a 'hermeneutical ideology' in a context of interpretive disputes.\(^{182}\) This ideology presupposes a common sacred text as well as difficulty in its interpretation. While this phenomenon is not restricted to apocalypses, it is an


\(^{181}\) Cf. the similar reservations of Newman, *Proximity to Power*, pp. 7–11.

\(^{182}\) Aune, *Apocalypticism*, p. 298.
important factor in them and their general setting. This idea places the apocalypses in a context which requires other previous and contemporary genres: based on generally accepted revelatory texts, they claim either an additional or an interpretive revelation in reference to a pre-existing text or tradition which is counter other contemporary interpretations of the same texts or traditions. Since claims to revelation are not unique to apocalypses, this begs the question of why the authors chose this form to express their ideas rather than other contemporary forms (such as pēter). While this is an intriguing question which cannot be answered here, it points to a few important contexts for the apocalypses: the role of interpretation, the situation of interpretational conflict, and the presence of ‘authoritative’ texts.

Tigchelaar, in his careful study and comparison of Zechariah and the Book of Watchers,\(^{183}\) emphasizes the importance of the interpretation and the systematization of prior traditions in both books,\(^{184}\) although he sees this as less true for the Book of Watchers.\(^{185}\) He also briefly notes an apparent shift from prophets to scribes, probably in the context of the “accumulation of a corpus of religious texts.”\(^{186}\) While all living traditions receive continual (re)-interpretation, Tigchelaar’s observations lead to further questions on the cause and effects of this process in Second Temple Judaism, in particular the methods of interpretation (the hermeneutics) used and their sources. The importance of these questions is borne out further by his observation that the disparate and encyclopaedic interests of the texts still serve to further a “comprehensive interpretation.”\(^{187}\)

For these reasons, this study understands the relationships between prophecy, wisdom, and apocalyptic through the lens of an Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. The apocalyptic hermeneutic is primarily to be regarded as a shared interpretive framework which interrelates apocalypticism, the apocalypses, and millenarianism. It is not a shared theology, nor is it a coherent, systematic philosophy. It is a method of receiving and reshaping traditions which shares identifiable aspects while producing noticeably divergent results. It is an intellectual paradigm through which many Judeans of the Second Temple period channelled their concerns, queries, and teachings. By correlating apocalyptic to the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic and placing the primary locus of Iranian influence there, this study maintains that Persia’s

---


\(^{184}\) Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, pp. 243–244, 253, 265.


\(^{186}\) Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, p. 254, 263.

\(^{187}\) Tigchelaar, Prophets of Old, p. 247.
relevance to apocalyptic as a whole and not just individual apocalypses can be better understood and formulated. This is further explored in Chapter V.

Foreign Sources

In addition to native Judaean precursors, the material in apocalyptic can be understood in relation to a variety of foreign sources. One of the more common referents for Jewish apocalyptic is the matrix of Jewish nationalism in the face of an encroaching Hellenism. There is no denying the importance of the Hellenistic context of many of the apocalypses nor that nationalistic sentiment certainly factors heavily into the context of many of the analogous texts from around the Ancient Near East. The term 'Hellenism,' however, is problematic and should not be understood as the dichotomized opposite of Judaism, as sometimes understood. A group’s interaction with the zeitgeist may be better understood as a complex dialectic than a confrontation. There is no denying the importance of renewed nationalistic interests in the Hellenistic world, from traditional cultural motifs to desires for political independence, yet this resurgence also happened in the context of a remarkable, pan-Ancient Near Eastern admixing and borrowing of myths, religions, and laws. However strong a nationalistic urge in any given movement is, this is rarely an effective barrier to the influence of foreign elements, even among so-called nativist/revivalist movements. Further, the various regions which produced apocalypse-like literature shared not only the experience of Hellenistic rule but also shared the experience of Achaemenid rule and its end. One may wonder, then, whether the Persian past or Hellenistic present was the more important aspect of the era’s common zeitgeist. Although any discussion of the apocalypses by needs must deal with their Hellenistic context, the significantly pre-

---


190 E.g., Prophecy of a Potter, Demotic Chronicle, Oracle of Hystaspes, Sibylline Oracles; Cf. Smith, Palestinian Parties, pp. 60-61; Levine, Judaism and Hellenism, pp. 18-19.

Maccabaean appearance of the oldest known Jewish apocalypse (The Book of Watchers) begs the question whether Hellenism’s role was in the origins or the evolution of the phenomena.

In Collins’s study of the overall phenomena of apocalyptic literature in the Ancient Near East, he argues that it appears in the wake of Alexander, at least partially linked with a resurgence of nationalism caused thereby, as well as fits into an overall Hellenistic zeitgeist. It is worth noting, however, that Alexander’s empire was largely contiguous with the Achaemenid Empire. The relative roles of Hellenism and the previous ‘Achaemenid Koine’ have yet to be assessed. Collins argues that apocalypticism has eclectic sources but combines them uniquely into a novel entity; he is certainly right to emphasize the role of a new synthesis in apocalyptic. However, significant work still remains to be done on identifying and understanding the various elements which contributed to the apocalyptic syntheses. A number of contexts for these elements can be considered.

Mowinkel claims an ‘Irano-Chaldean’ syncretism is the source for certain apocalyptic motifs, in particular the contentious ‘Son of Man.’ Mowinkel’s overall analysis of the appearance of apocalyptic appears to be a useful model: the reinterpretation of scripture along the lines of non-scriptural ideas, in the context of Persian ideas as catalyst. His model, however, leaves a need for a more detailed investigation of this catalyst beyond an unfortunately nebulous ‘Irano-Chaldean syncretism.’

Kvanvig argues for the importance of Babylonian materials on the traditions, most notably of Enoch and Daniel. He claims that in the Enochic traditions the characters of Enoch and Uriel share the roles played by Uanadapa in Babylonian myths. He also finds a parallel between the Babylonian ‘first man’ and the Son of Man figure. He ultimately understands the Enochic tradition and Daniel 7 as stemming from The Poem of Erra and The Vision of the Netherworld, respectively. These were gradually transformed in a Jewish context into a visionary form. For Kvanvig, the Mesopotamian influence is decisive and distinctive for this literature.

There is no doubt that Babylonian materials are significant for Judaism,
although some of Kvanvig’s particular parallels have confronted resistance.\(^{203}\) While he is
certainly right to emphasize the lack of direct correspondence between myth and history (i.e.,
a mythic story does not by definition correspond one-to-one with any contemporary event)\(^{202}\)
and a pre-Hellenistic origin to many elements,\(^{203}\) his discussion of the Persian context of the
proposed Babylonian backgrounds leaves significant room for at least another layer of
transformation before the apocalypses.\(^{204}\) Indeed, the present author is left wondering
whether the Babylonian substratum or the Persian adaptation of it is the more decisive
matter.

Few would dispute the influence of Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Greek
contexts. While the possible relevance of Persia is often alluded to, it has long gone without
a serious evaluation. If one accepts that the traditions of the Judaeans were affected by the
other imperial powers with which they came into contact, one would prima facie assume the
same must be true for the Persian Empire. Certainly, if Persia did not, there ought to be a
significant reason for such an exceptional status. This study attempts to begin a test of the
hypothesis that Persia was not an exception.

Apocalyptic and the Nature of Religious Discourse

Types of Language

An important consideration in apocalyptic studies is the type of language used and
form of discourse it represents. Sandy draws attention to the importance of understanding
the types of language used in the prophetic and apocalyptic literature; he is more concerned
with the understanding of the genres than with a strict delineation of them.\(^{205}\) He takes
considerable time trying to understand the types of language used, focusing more on the
overall message and impact of a text than with a detailed exegesis, noting that with both
types of literature an emotional as well as an intellectual response appears to be what the
authors desired.\(^{206}\) He even suggests that the apocalypses depend on a sense of mystery for
their effectiveness.\(^{207}\) The poetic and artistic aspects of the literatures certainly should be kept
in mind when attempting to understand them: the people responsible were poets and artists

\(^{201}\) Cf. D. Brent Sandy, *Plowshares and Pruning Hooks* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), p. 109,
where he seems to take a family resemblance approach.


\(^{203}\) Sandy, *Plowshares and Pruning Hooks*, p. 127.
as well as communicators, not necessarily systematic theologians or astute politicians. While they had urgent and deeply-felt opinions on various matters, their ideology need not necessarily reduce to simple or propositional ideas. The nature and type of languages, as well as the forms employed, could hold meaning for the authors in these less cerebral ways. When attempting to understand the texts it is important to consider categories of hyperbole, symbol, and metaphor as well as myth and theology.

A useful notice in this regard is offered by Bryan in his proposal to situate at least aspects of the apocalypses within the framework of 'the Kosher mentality. His point of departure is that the use of symbolism often cannot be reduced to merely the supposed referent: other connotations and shades of meaning are carried by the use as well. While one may quibble over his understanding of Kosher regulation, his careful attention to the way in which forms of speech, intellectual backgrounds, and types of language function to create meaning in texts is a valuable contribution. People’s contexts—be they Kosher-legal or imperial—play subtle roles in the creation and interpretation of meaning, and symbols cannot be merely reduced to philosophical categories or singular referents.

From his in-depth study of 4 Ezra, Stone distills insights into the nature of the apocalypses which previous scholarship had ignored. His approach highlights the need to understand the texts as religious texts, not necessarily theological treatises, and this opens up analyses in a few new directions and methodologies. In particular, this means an openness to the potential of the texts to transmit authentic religious experiences, and that traditional text-critical categories are therefore misleading in this respect. Stone’s approach underscores the importance of understanding the texts not merely in the context of ideological struggle, which is of course important, but in the context of real religious communities, with needs and experiences beyond analytical, disputational, or materialistic categories. While culture forms the language and style of any textual creation, traditional
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208 David Bryan, Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality, JSPS 12 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
209 Bryan, Kosher Mentality, pp. 27—31.
language, tropes, or subjects need not eliminate either the genuineness of experience or the variety in potential interests.²¹⁴

Nature of Traditions

An extremely important aspect to apocalyptic studies is the nature of human traditions; ‘tradition’ functions as a middle-level referent in the terminology posited above. A pioneer in this regard, Boccaccini attempts to understand what he terms as ‘Middle Judaism’ (Judaism between ca. 300 B.C.E.—200 C.E.) by way of intellectual ‘traditions.’²¹⁵ Noting that genres and even identical ideas can service very separate agendas or ideologies, Boccaccini seeks to trace ‘ideological traditions’—traditions which transcend genre and even party boundaries—behind the various extant literatures of Second Temple Judaism. He identifies three main traditions: a Zadokite tradition, a Sapiential tradition, and an Enochic tradition. It is the Enochic tradition which must be connected with an apocalyptic tradition, if one exists.²¹⁶ The Zadokite tradition belongs to the new post-exilic priesthood, the Sapiential tradition stems from the educated laity and administrative scribal class, and the Enochic tradition supported disenfranchised priests.²¹⁷ In some ways, Boccaccini’s discussion recalls Smith’s discussion of parties and politics,²¹⁸ replacing the terminology of politics with ‘tradition.’ While it is nebulous and perhaps requires further elucidation, ‘tradition’ appears to be a better way to acknowledge both the continuity and changes visible in the texts as well as their independence from particular ‘parties.’ An individual is certainly capable of being influenced by several intellectual ‘traditions’ regardless of social-economic status or ‘party’ affiliation. However, his temptation to limit apocalyptic to only the Enochic tradition like his mentor Sacchi is surely misleading and unfortunate.²¹⁹

Boccaccini’s emphasis on the antagonistic stances possible within the genre and worldview of the apocalypses, as he illustrates between the Book of Dreams and Daniel, is apt and needs to be kept in mind when discussing the apocalyptic phenomenon. A cursory overview of sectarian and political strife will confirm that the bitterest debates can flourish between the closest of ideological allies. His reminder that similar positions can reappear in a variety of genres and among different parties must also be remembered in the discussion.

²¹⁵ Gabriele Boccaccini, Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 BCE to 200 CE (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), p. 25, 129.
²¹⁶ Boccaccini, Middle Judaism, pp. 129—130.
²¹⁷ See the book Boccaccini, Rabbinic Judaism, particularly the summarizing diagram at the beginning.
²¹⁸ Smith, Palestinian Parties.
²¹⁹ Boccaccini, Middle Judaism, pp. 129—130, 160. Cf. the critique in Collins, Seers, Sybils (sic) and Sages, p. 295.
These insights, however, do not invalidate investigations into individual texts, the overall worldview inherent in them, nor of their sources. They should, however, qualify their significance, and cause pause before hypothesizing conventicles, movements, or sects based simply on shared traditions.

Martínez uses the term ‘apocalyptic’ to refer to a tradition, much as Sacchi or Boccaccini do, something which is evident in, but not restricted to, the apocalypses. He defines this tradition as

A current of thought that is born in the religious context and specific culture of post-exilic Judaism, that develops over a long period, reacting interactively with other currents of thought of the Jewish environment, such a prophetic tradition to the wisdom tradition [sic], and is shaped in the various works that we call ‘apocalypses.’

He notes that Collins objects to a single apocalyptic tradition, preferring to speak of multiple apocalyptic traditions (such as Enochic and Qumranic apocalyptic traditions), which are more cohesive and fall under an umbrella worldview of apocalypticism. To Martínez, however, a tradition is able to contain contradictory positions within itself, as a tradition consists of both inheritance and development. While he is certainly right to note that traditions can contain both continuity and potentially divergent development, it also seems possible that there can be distinct heirs with significant enough discrete traits to speak of separate traditions (or sub-traditions). As he demonstrates, Qumran certainly inherited much from the Enochic tradition, but it is also characteristically different. Because of this distinctiveness, it would be more clear to continue to speak, with Collins, of apocalypticism as an umbrella worldview within which a variety of apocalyptic traditions can be situated. The interactions between various traditions are not thereby negated, but it helps to maintain a distinction between the preoccupations of the common (apocalypticism) and the unique (a specific apocalyptic tradition).

A recognition of the role of traditions refocuses attention to the importance of the history of ideas for the study of apocalyptic. While the sociological and comparative approaches serve as a necessary corrective to previous studies, they too often ignore the importance of ideas—specifically religious ideas—in the respective texts, and thus misunderstand one of the central purposes of the texts. A recognition of the social,
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economic, and political contexts of texts and people is vital, yet these contexts cannot exhaust the significance nor meanings in religious texts. A look at ideas and theology is necessary to both understand the texts in question fully, and to correlate the otherwise disjointed concepts of apocalypse, millenarianism, apocalypticism, and apocalyptic hermeneutics.

This dissertation is more concerned with the role and dissemination of ideas—theological, cultural, philosophical, political—than it is with history or sociology per se. However, the historical and sociological contexts are vital to understanding the import and development of ideas and cannot be ignored; furthermore, the appearance of apocalyptic literature occurred in a historic era, and this study attempts to understand it in the context of its contemporary and antecedent events and traditions, not merely in a timeless comparative manner, drawing parallels which cannot be justified in a plausible historical setting. The appearance of apocalyptic groups and apocalypses is often understood in matrices of materialistic concerns, of class rivalry and oppression, of political-economic machinations. These, of course, are present and important. The texts themselves highlight issues of justice. Yet material concerns and political ambition do not exhaust the realms of human interest and motivation. In texts which purport to be ‘religious’ in nature, it is also appropriate to seek more ‘religious’ motivations as well.

An exploration of historical theology begs the question of the source of new theologies: were they organic developments, products of schools or individuals, or were they borrowed from or inspired by other religious systems? It is apparent that in a topic as complex as apocalyptic literature the solution to such problems will often also be equally complex. It is likely that the development of ideas in Second Temple Judaism was a combination of individuals and schools studying and developing received traditions as well as exploring the ideas and systems of the people in which they came into contact. A variety of foreign influences are claimed for Jewish literature of various ages, as is briefly noted above. While elements of Hellenistic, Babylonian, Roman, and Egyptian cultures are often entertained by biblical scholars, the possibility of Iranian influence has largely fallen out of
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225 Cf. a recent study on the causes of contemporary conflicts, where the category ‘resources’ only came in fourth as cause; the first was ‘ideological change’. Anonymous, “Why Wars Happen,” The Economist 16 Dec 2008: np., http://www.economist.com/daily/chartgallery/displayStory.cfm?story_id=12758508&source=features_box4.
fashion. Since Palestine was under Persian rule for over two hundred years and areas of the Diaspora lived under or in contact with the Parthians (and later, the Sassanians) for many centuries, this lacuna in scholarship deserves a reappraisal.

To understand some of the streams which fed into the apocalypses, it is necessary to understand the period which preceded them as well as their contemporary contexts. This preceding era includes both the Hellenistic period—which is often the focus of apocalyptic studies—as well as the Achaemenid period. This long 'post-exilic' period was extremely important, even if it is shrouded in mystery. Out of it emerged a community which was ruled by a high priest, had a collective identity both 'religious' and 'ethnic,' which held texts as authoritative, and which had numerous variations and tensions. It had a homeland which was, for most of the period, subject to imperial powers as well as a large diaspora. Judaeans in this period did not all inhabit the same social location, and thus probably held divergent interests and tendencies. Which factors played the most decisive roles in the formation of this new polity—whether political, socio-economic, geographic, or theological—is difficult to ascertain from the sources. In any case, it is likely that all of them played respective roles in one way or another. However, one ingredient in the appearance of apocalyptic must surely be 'foreign influence.'

**TYPES OF INFLUENCE AND TRANSMISSION**

The positing of foreign influence has a long scholarly pedigree. Yet, as highly literate scholars working primarily with textual evidence, researchers have often understood the ancient processes of tradition-creation and -dissemination as if carried out through a cut-and-paste method appropriate to their modern world. The proper understanding of the ancient texts themselves and the methods of cultural influence in general require the recognition of several communicative contexts. First, it is important to note that the vast majority of the population was either completely or functionally illiterate. Except for the educated elites, all knowledge of traditions by definition was acquired aurally. Secondly, the creators of our texts were scribes, and thus literate. They, however, did not have the luxury of vast and accessible deposits of texts; even their textual activities were in a more
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thoroughly oral environment than today. Because of this, it is necessary to investigate the role and effects of the introduction of new media upon a society in terms of not only the preservation, creation, and dissemination of tradition, but in the interaction of traditions (i.e., influence). This topic is highly contentious and complicated but cannot be ignored without significant peril. Chapter III will more thoroughly investigate the issue in relation to modes of transmission. For the present purposes, all that needs to be noted is that influence and parallels cannot be restricted to direct textual quotations or borrowings.

To discuss questions of influence, it is first necessary to clarify what is meant by the term and to specify a working methodology for assessing its presence and effects. The term ‘influence’ is here understood as one type of ‘interaction.’ ‘Interaction’ denotes a variety of types of intercourse, from superficial to significant, including the social-situational phenomenon of the meetings of cultures as well as the ‘intellectual’ side. Political and social structures as well as cultural and religious elements are included in the concept. This is generally recognized as being nigh universal. The scholarly use of the term for the intellectual side of interaction—‘influence’ or ‘dialogue’—is inconsistently used, however, with a variety of connotations attached. It is therefore important to note what is not meant by the word ‘influence’ here: it does not mean a wholesale ‘cut and paste’ of literate materials from one canon to another (say, from the Bundahisn to 1 Enoch). Neither does it denote a religious conversion under another name, nor does it indicate the ‘syncretism’ or ‘assimilation’ of anthropologists. Of concern here is not the development of entirely new


systems or traditions, but of change within a system due to external interaction; the question
of how much change a system or tradition can undertake before being a new system is an
interesting problem, but it cannot be broached here. Interaction and influence are
understood as unavoidable aspects of the human condition, one which has impacted and
continues to impact all traditions and religions. In all cultures, and particularly in largely oral
cultures, influence is a subtle affair, and requires much thought to tease out.

Hinnells offers a suggestive discussion of the types of influence possible between
communities, and his ideas are worth keeping in mind when assessing questions of
influence. He notes two basic types of influence, each with their own variations: 1) the
conscious imitation or borrowing of elements from another tradition. This can be either
positive (i.e., accepting ideas accepted in another tradition) or negative (i.e., rejecting ideas
which are rejected in another tradition); 2) conscious rejection of another tradition. The
rejection of a tradition, however, can still affect the rejector's own tradition in two ways: a)
by rejecting aspects of own traditions seen to conform too closely to the rejected one; b) by
utilizing the modes of discourse of the rejected tradition to combat or argue with it. Hinnells
notes that type 1 will often occur consciously while type 2 will often occur unconsciously,
although either can simultaneously function consciously and unconsciously. In addition to
these forms of influence, a tradition can be influenced by using new ideas to re-interpret
native ideas. This last type of influence is the most difficult to detect, because it will for the
most part utilize native ideas and motifs and will claim to be an organic growth of the
tradition. All of these types of influence are possible—even likely—even in situations without
external coercion (such as a state-mandated reform program). In other words, an officially
supported 'missionary' program is not necessary for influence to occur; it can quite simply
happen when two cultures interact on a personal level. This personal level includes
administrative scenarios as well as scenarios from the course of everyday life. The potential

Some of the differences in terminology seem to relate to focus: 'syncretism' often seems to imply either the
wholesale merging of two (or more) independent traditions or the highly deliberate, conscious 'cherry-picking'
of foreign elements by an individual or community (e.g., Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo, "Syncretic Sociology:
the intention here; the second would only be one kind of influence.

'Assimilation' is sometimes used in ways amenable to the present study, cf. Kamyar Abdi, "Notes on the
257 is satisfactory, but he provides no elaboration. Similarly, Raymond H.C. Jr. Teske and Bardin H. Nelson,
delineate 'assimilation' and 'acclutation' but offers no criteria for texts.

For the purposes of discussion, 'tradition' and 'system' are deliberately broad: they include both overarching
religions (e.g., Judaism) and more specific groups (e.g., Qumranic Judaism). For an interesting attempt at such a
discussion, see Dronen, "Scientific Revolution," pp. 232–253; in the context of globalization, see Simon


role of home life and women in particular, in terms of intermarriage, should also be kept in mind, although it is not addressed in any detail here.231 Two studies from a slightly different scholarly debate232 highlight two important aspects of any religious tradition: within each system there is a continual presence of hermeneutics as well as a hierarchy of importance for each element within the tradition.233 No human is static, and tradents will continually (re-)interpret their traditions. However, in this process, elements which are considered to be more peripheral are prone to more extensive reinterpretation than those which are central. Vroom, emphasizing the incorporation of ‘foreign’ and ‘incompatible’ elements within a tradition, argues that such incorporation involves the reinterpretation of old beliefs as well as a reconfiguration of the relative structural importance of elements within the receiving system.234 Without limiting the discussion to traditions which are ‘incompatible’ as Vroom does, his observations on the results of influence or borrowing on the receiving tradition are still useful for evaluating less radical influences. The reinterpretation of elements within a system and the importation and adaption of elements into a system will necessitate the altering of the ‘ratios’ and relations in that system. When analyzing potential instances of influence, then, it is necessary to consider 1) areas in the receiving tradition which are most susceptible to reinterpretation (i.e., how central or peripheral it is); 2) the re-interpretation which would be needed or effected by the influence or borrowing; 3) the relative structural impact on the receiving system.

Light understands religions to consist of three ‘cognitive entities’: symbols, categories into which symbols are arranged, and the organizational rules which govern the importance and interactions of symbols and categories.235 The rules which govern the relative importance or types of acceptable change will vary drastically from tradition to tradition, so that rules which are valid for one tradition will not likely be the same for another. This means that a change (or influence) which one tradition may be able to accept as normal and unproblematic could very well be “a drastic and traumatic alteration in foundational understanding from the viewpoint of the other tradition.”236 This relates to Vroom’s understanding of the structural importance of a given element within a tradition, and Light’s illustrations make the
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232 The History of Religions and Anthropological debate over ‘Syncretism,’ which appears to focus on slightly different questions than the ones of interest to this study.


point amply clear: while the Chinese religions are easily able to assimilate a new deity, the same is not true of the monotheistic religions. Even though two religions may share an analogous category of 'divinity,' they need not have the same structural importance, thus qualifying any superficial parallel between them. Thus, to a Christian scholar, the adoption of a new deity looks like a drastic change, while to a devotee of Chinese religion, it would not. As a result, Light posits 'two principles of religious syncretism': the principle of religious change and the principle of cognitive integrity, which could interact suggestively with a metaphor of 'recipe.' These are similar to the views of Vroom noted above. Light posits that change will most likely produce a re-arranging of the structure and a redefinition of symbols within that structure, although the tradents will understand the process as simply a normal part of the hermeneutical process. Further, it is to be expected that the elements most likely to be influenced or borrowed are of less structural importance to or fit within currently existing categories of the receiving tradition. In other words, interaction will appear completely natural and organic within the adapting system, even if, from another (outside) perspective, it appears to be quite radical.

For the purposes of this study, the terms 'interaction,' 'influence,' and 'borrowing' are distinguished and defined as follows. 'Interaction' denotes the participation in social and intellectual intercourse with those of other religions and cultures which occurs in normal human society. This interaction can have three types of result on a culture as is visible in texts. 'Borrowing' refers to the usage of a term, story, or other discrete element which is taken from another culture or religion. This is similar to, but here distinguished from, 'quotation,' which is reserved solely for the direct and intended reference to a text or saying. 'Influence' designates the reshaping, selection, and/or interpretation of ideas, stories, characters, or doctrines from the native traditions due to interaction with another culture.

As noted by Hinnells, this can be conscious or unconscious, positive or negative. These three forms of interaction are not, in practice, so easily delimited; however, it is useful to make the distinction for purposes of clarity (see Figure 2). Immediately apparent from these definitions is the fact that two types of interaction—incidences of quotation and borrowing—are the easiest to identify. All four forms of influence delineated are difficult
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239 Similar to the objections put forward by Sandmel, "Parallelomania," p. 5, 7.
242 Thus, similar to 'assimilation' in Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, p. 92.
243 Similar to 'accommodation' in Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, p. 96.
244 For a discussion of the problematics of identifying allusions, see Benjamin G. Wold, Women, Men, and Angels: the Qumran wisdom document Musar levuren and its allusions to Genesis creation traditions, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe, 201 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pp. 49–78; for quotations, see Richard L. Schultz, The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets, JSOTSS 180 (Sheffield:
to spot, with the negative forms perhaps impossible without the aid of additional, non-
textual evidence. A rather intimidating amount of data would probably be needed to
demonstrate the unconscious rejection of internal traditions due to similarities with another
tradition, and as such it is probably not often possible for Second Temple Judaism;
nevertheless, the possibility ought to be kept in mind.

Religio-Cultural Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscious</td>
<td>Unconscious</td>
<td>Direct textual or proverbial citations or allusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Conscious rejection of foreign ideas and native ideas deemed too similar</td>
<td>A: Ritual, Cubic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Unconscious downplaying of aspects of native traditions too similar to foreign</td>
<td>B: Customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscious acceptance of ideas in understanding of tradition; can include borrowing</td>
<td>C: 'Characters': gods or heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconscious reinterpretation of native ideas in similar manner to foreign tradition</td>
<td>D: Linguistic: Loanwords, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E: Ideas, concepts, 'doctrines'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted from Hinnells (1976)</td>
<td>Adapted from Wood (1927)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Terms for Religio-Cultural Interactions
Author's Own

Given the subtleties involved in interaction, how can the presence and effects be
detected in texts, the primary remaining source of evidence for ancient civilizations and
religions?

Barr delineates two basic approaches to comparative studies: general and specific. He notes that general comparisons or lists of parallels do not constitute evidence of
interactions; detailed, specific argument is needed to demonstrate that the general parallel is
indeed not just happenstance. Specifically, he emphasizes the need for explanatory
circumstances and motivations which occasioned borrowing. This also needs to be

Recollection of Previous Texts in Isaiah 40–55 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1997), pp. 82–83 presents Hayes’s seven criteria
for an allusion, some of which are of dubious validity. For a better context for such considerations, see Chapter
III (which replaces Willey’s intertextuality with orality).

246 For a discussion of these question in the context of archaeology see the thought-provoking collection in
Joanne Clarke, ed., Archaeological Perspectives on the Transmission and Transformation of Culture in the Eastern
Mediterranean. Levant Supplementary Series 2 (Oxford: Oxbow, 2005). Although the terminology utilized here
is quite different, the overall conceptualization is quite amenable to that proposed by Abdi, "Notes on the
Iranization of Bes in the Achaemenid Empire," p. 135.


undertaken with an understanding of the structural import of the proposed influence or borrowing in both source and new context. Although Barr only briefly alludes to the possibility of negative or unconscious influence, his insistence that proposed parallels must be understood within the greater structural contexts is important. Rarely do people or groups adopt wholly different ideas to their own, nor do they adopt them without adaptation to their own worldview. The student must be careful to understand how a detail or concept could both be transformed by and transform the receiving tradition.

In broaching the question, Wood suggests five criteria which a proposed parallel must satisfy to be considered an instance of borrowing: 1) Did the receiving tradition have a need which the borrowed idea fulfilled? 2) Are there similar sources in the receiving tradition which could evolve in a similar manner? 3) Did similar ideas pre-exist in the receiving tradition? 4) Could the element come from elsewhere as well? 5) Can the source tradition be reliably dated earlier? Wood’s last criterion is certainly the most important; the source must predate the reception. The fourth question is also a valid concern; if similar ideas do appear in multiple contexts, one must decide whether there are enough details to justify the identification of a single source, or whether the idea is more the result of a general zeitgeist. However, the first criterion is historically dubious, depending on the intent of the question: the proper historical question is not the necessity but the probability of what did happen in the past. If Wood means that there must be a ‘space’ or way in which element can be utilized, then that is the same as the next two criteria. The second and third criteria appear to be the same criterion. For interaction to exist, there must be a ‘hanger’ upon which the borrowed ‘coat’ can hang in the receiving ‘wardrobe.’ People rarely adopt ideas which appear to them wholly alien. Thus, Barr’s concerns about the structural import in both traditions is necessary to understand the nature and likelihood of interaction. Kraehling’s proposals, besides offering similar concerns to Barr and Wood, merely add a concern for the historical particulars and scholarly consensus.

‘Alien’ is not the same as ‘novel’; the criteria for an element being ‘alien’ rather than simply novel vary greatly between individuals and systems.
Further—despite the impact of systemic and unconscious forces—individual/discrete communal choice must also play a role in this interplay. A quote by Dostoevsky is pertinent in this regard: “One’s own free and unfettered choice ... overwrought though it sometimes may be to the point of madness—that is that same most desirable good which we overlooked and which does not fit into any classification, and against which all theories and systems are continually wrecked.” (Fyodor Dostoevsky, “Notes from the Underground,” trans. David Magershack, The Best Short Stories of Fyodor Dostoevsky [New York: Modern Library, 2001], p. 116). This aspect remains pertinent, even if other communal factors are in play (e.g., Kevin W. Welch, “An Interpersonal Influence Model of Traditional Religious Commitment,” Sociological Quarterly 22.1 [1981]: pp. 81–92).
In light of the above considerations, five general criteria and one additional criterion for 'influence' are here proposed. The first two criteria are really preconditions: 1) the proposed source must predate the proposed incidence of interaction, and 2) there must be a plausible historical context for the interaction. The remaining criteria are more difficult to establish or demonstrate. 3) The foreign element must make more structural 'sense' in the original context than in the new one; 4) there must be a 'hook' or way in which the foreign element could be included in the receiving tradition; 5) there must be discrete, distinctive elements which betray the origin of the element. These must be more distinctive or specific than potential parallels from other sources. Any form of borrowing in a text is certainly evidence that interaction on some level has occurred, but on its own is insufficient to demonstrate the presence of influence. The accumulation of multiple, detailed borrowings certainly tilts the scales towards the possibility of influence, yet a sixth criterion is needed to demonstrate influence as defined above: 6) there must be an interpretive or structural change in the receiving tradition on account of the influence. This is perhaps the most important (albeit evanescent) of the six criteria.

The first two criteria are straightforward and require no further justification. The others require more elucidation. The third criterion—the foreign element must make more structural sense in its original context—means that there should be indications that the element more 'organically' fits within the source tradition than in the receiving one, therefore making it more probable that its appearance in the receiving tradition is due to interaction rather than parallel internal developments. For example, the belief in the Davidic covenant in Jerusalem leads logically to the concept of the inviolability of Zion. If the same Zion doctrine were discovered in a text from a neighboring country without an analogous royal tradition, it could indicate borrowing or influence. The fourth criterion is the requirement for a 'hook' or space for the new element in the receiving tradition. This is similar to Wood's insistence on the fulfilling of a need and Barr's insistence on a plausible motivation. There must be a way in which the receiving tradition could have incorporated the element and still have perceived it as being consonant with said tradition (in line with Light's principle of cognitive integrity). A potential example would be the adaptation of a dualism as a response to monotheistic theodicy. The fifth criterion—the need for discrete details—is the most commonly utilized. One must demonstrate why the proposed source tradition is more probable than another. Many societies have analogous stories and traditions; for the parallel to be more than merely illustrative there must be discrete, distinct
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254 Provided the borrowings are of an useful nature; cf. Sandmel, “Paralleloomania,” p. 10.
255 To use the term utilized by Shaked, “Iranian Influence on Judaism,” p. 323.
details betraying the original source. These could be linguistic terms or names, but could theoretically be anything. The last criterion, six, relates to the overall structure of the receiving tradition as it can be reconstructed. This is perhaps the vaguest and most difficult of the criteria to be demonstrated adequately, but it is necessary for the attempt to be made. As both Vroom and Light note, the introduction of new elements into a system often necessitates either a reinterpretation or a reorganization of other elements in the receiving tradition (as well as the reinterpretation of the element itself). Thus, a polytheistic religion which adopts a new god will most likely correspondingly modify the functions of other, similar gods in the pantheon, perhaps even replacing some of them. It is within this criterion that Light’s discussion of symbols, categories, and organizational rules becomes most helpful. Each tradition has symbols and categories which are more central and others which are more peripheral. Central elements will be more resistant to influence, while more peripheral ones will be less so. When analyzing the structure of a proposed receiving tradition, it is necessary to determine the radicalness of the proposed element within the perspective of that tradition: the ‘organizational rules’ of the receiving tradition must be taken into account. For example, the structural importance of monotheism in Christianity would lead one to expect that either no foreign deities would be adopted or would be adopted in a drastically different understanding to their original function. This, of course, fits the assimilation of deities as saints and angels: open categories in the Christian tradition in a way the category ‘divinity’ is not. This is not the case in traditions such as Buddhism.

When seeking to understand the potential relevance of Iranian (or any other) traditions on the development of Second Temple Judaism, then, it is important to remember the types of interaction which could occur (not only quotations or direct, discrete borrowings, but influence, conscious and unconscious, positive and negative), as well as to consider the six different aspects related to the criteria noted above. Prior to analysis of particular texts or elements, however, must come at least a preliminary investigation of the structure of the two traditions in focus. The scholar must consider how the proposed interaction would have been perceived by contemporary tradents, who most likely had different priorities and perspectives than the contemporary scholar. Finally, the overall interpretative import must be considered.

The discussion in this study, therefore, proceeds to first establish the historical priority of the Iranian traditions as well as discussing their relative structures, then considers the historical and social contexts in which interaction could have occurred, before attempting to directly investigate individual apocalyptic texts. The final step is to analyze the

hermeneutical changes which a potential Iranian influence would entail upon a receiving Judaism. Ultimately, analysis of 'sectarian' factors (as against merely 'tradition') would potentially be important, but that cannot be pursued here.

**THESIS**

The thesis which this dissertation presents is that one of the catalysts towards the development of the apocalypse and its related worldview in Second Temple Judaism was the adoption of a new 'apocalyptic hermeneutic' by some Judaeans. This new 'apocalyptic hermeneutic' was one which incorporated ideas and methods which find their best explanation in having been inspired by an Iranian milieu. The development of this new hermeneutic was undertaken by scribes and thus heavily influenced by the increasing importance of written over oral modes of discourse. One of the reasons this hermeneutic has eluded scholarship is due to its 'evanescent' nature as a new, literate interpretation of recently written texts, as opposed to an entirely new theological or philosophical system, or indeed, rather than merely a question of the identification of textual allusions in the manner of traditional text-critical methods. It is this kind of hermeneutic and the ideas it usually implies that links the phenomena of the apocalypse and the millenarian movements.

**Overview of Dissertation**

The dissertation contains five chapters with prolegomena and metalegomena, plus appendices. **Chapter I** describes the sources on Iranian religion, the issues involved in attempting a historical reconstruction, and the methodology by which one can date the various texts and ideas. **Chapter II** argues for the historical and sociological likelihood of Iranian-Judaean interaction by discussing the various Achaemenid sources available. The thesis of a 'Persian authorization of the Torah' is briefly mentioned in this context. **Chapter III** discusses Oral Theory, describing the kinds of processes and worldview in which Iranian-Judaean interaction occurred, critiquing the standard text-centric method of current Biblical Scholarship. It also analyzes various apocalyptic texts for views on orality and textuality. **Chapter IV** analyzes some of the major texts which have been considered either 'proto-apocalyptic' or apocalyptic, both within the Hebrew Bible and in other sources, for details which can best be understood in an Iranian milieu. This is divided into Parts A (Biblical Literature) and B (Enochic Literature). **Chapter V** brings together the various themes and theologies which were analyzed in Chapter IV to argue for an 'Apocalyptic Hermeneutic' which is responsible for both the differences and similarities which scholars have seen in the
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prophetic and apocalyptic literatures. It relates the phenomena of apocalypticism (ideas), apocalypse (literary genre), and millenarianism (social movements), seeing the hermeneutic as a dialectical thread holding them all together as well as apart. This is intimately intertwined with the growth of a highly literate scribal elite (as discussed in Chapter III). The Metalegomena brings together all of the analyses of the previous chapters, and points towards the importance of the subject, as well as to possible implications for further areas such as the relationship between various Jewish 'sects,' the historical Jesus, early Christianity, and the sociology of millenarism. Appendix I gives a brief explanation of the sources utilized in the reconstruction of Achaemenid Iranian religion. Appendix II explains the orthography adopted here. Appendix III: Glossary of Terms provides explanation of the many Iranian terms which are used in the dissertation. Appendix IV annotates the definitions adopted in this study for controversial English terms.

Explanation of the Textual Sources and Translations

Jewish Sources

For the biblical materials the standard texts used are the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia for the Hebrew and Septuaginta for the Greek. The default English text used is the NRSV unless otherwise stated. The biblical texts discussed here are texts which are often labelled either 'apocalyptic' or 'proto-apocalyptic' by biblical scholars. They are Ezek 37:1–14; 38–39; and Dan 2.

Ezekiel 37:1–14

The famous vision of the Valley of Dead Bones has long been an important crux for the development of belief in bodily resurrection. This pericope offers an early example of how attention to the re-interpretive aspects of tradition affects understandings of apocalyptic.

Ezekiel 38–39

Often considered apocalyptic or proto-apocalyptic, the prophecy to Gog still plays a role in modern apocalyptic speculations and sits on the border between prophecy and apocalyptic. Like the previous passage, it offers a glimpse at ways interpretation can be suggestive well before the Hellenistic period.

Daniel 2

The four empire schema of world history, with its implicit eschatology, has long been considered in conjunction with Iran. It offers a classic opportunity to reassess Iranian influence.

Enochic Literature
Of course, much of the literature relevant to apocalyptic studies is extra-canonical. The texts studied in depth here are the books of *Enoch*. Only the first corpus under his name, *Ethiopic* or *1 Enoch* is discussed in any depth. Most attention is paid to the earliest works of the compilation, *the Astronomical Book* and *the Book of Watchers*. The standard English text utilized for *1 Enoch* is Nickelsburg and VanderKam's edition. For the Dead Sea Scrolls, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* is used for both the original and the English translation, unless otherwise stated. The basic English translation for other extra-canonical literature referenced here is Charlesworth's.

**Iranian Sources**

The Iranian sources are multiple and often fairly inaccessible. The texts are briefly defined below; critical editions and translations are available in Appendix I.

The *Gathas* are a collection of five esoteric hymns in the language called 'Old Avestan.' They are situated at the heart of the Zoroastrian liturgy, known as the *Yasna*. They surround another group of texts known as the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* which are also in Old Avestan. These are 'rhythmic prose' sections of the liturgy. The remainder of the liturgy is in 'Young Avestan.' In addition to the liturgical texts, a collection of hymns (*Yaśits*) and a collection of purity laws (*Videvdait*) also exist in Young Avestan. These texts together are known collectively as the Avesta.

In addition to the Avestan texts, a large number of texts in Middle Persian, or Pahlavi, also exist. Perhaps the most famous of these is the *Bundahišn*, an epitome of cosmological, eschatological, and mythical lore. The apocalypse known as the *Zand-i Vahman Yašt* (also known as *Vohuman Yaśn*, *Zand-i Balman Yašt*, or *Zand-i Vahman Yašt*) also exists in Pahlavi. Finally, a lost work which survives only in various quotations in Classical sources is called the *Oracle of Hystaspes*. A variety of theological treatises and related works are also extant in Pahlavi.

Beside the religious texts, a number of inscriptions have survived in Old Persian from the reign of Darius I onwards. Additionally, archaeological discoveries have provided administrative tablets in Neo-Elamite from the area of Persepolis, tablets from Babylonia, and Aramaic papyri from Egypt.

---

I

The Iranian Sources:
Religion and Royal Ideology
INTRODUCTION TO IRANIAN RELIGION IN THE ACHAEMENID PERIOD

As Grabbe argues, the question of Iranian influence on Judaism faces several methodological issues which must be addressed before discussing any suspected instances of influence.\(^1\) Grabbe identifies five broad areas of consideration: the dating of Zarathustra (Latinized Greek, Zoroaster) and his subsequent tradition; philological and textual problems; the dating of the literature; the mechanisms for influence; and the difficulty of demonstrating or disproving influence in general. This chapter addresses the issues of the dating, nature, and content of Iranian traditions and texts; the subsequent chapter investigates the historical setting in view of establishing possible mechanisms and settings for influence. While all of the issues Grabbe identifies must be dealt with, the list itself unnecessarily limits the discussion to Zoroastrianism \textit{per se}. Because the religious and ideological traditions in Iran most likely encompassed much more than what became known as orthodox Zoroastrianism, this chapter explores the question of Iranian religion as it can be reconstructed by the sources rather than getting caught up in the evaluation of Zoroastrianism(s).

For the purposes of influence, the date of Zarathustra (or even his existence) is really a non-question; Zarathustra’s date, whether 1500 B.C.E. or 569 B.C.E., is still before the rise of Jewish apocalyptic literature—indeed, before the rise of the Achaemenid state. The important question is the date of Zoroastrian ideas reaching the west from the east, as well as the level of dissemination of Iranian ideas generally in the west. Knowledge of and influence by Zoroastrian and Iranian ideas can be demonstrated in various Greek writers; the information available from these sources allows one not only to confirm the approximate arrival of Iranian religious ideas to the west, but also to verify something of the nature and content of those ideas and their accessibility to non-Iranians. Thus, even if the linguistic evidence is misleading and Zoroastrianism is not much older than the Achaemenid Empire, the influence of ideas traditionally associated with Zarathustra existed within the empire well before the emergence of Jewish apocalyptic.\(^2\) Additionally, the important focus of investigation is the ideas which were current during the Achaemenid and Parthian empires, not necessarily those which dominated during the Sassanian Empire. Hence, ideas and
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\(^2\) This could be archaeologically corroborated if a seal republished in Briant, \textit{From Cyrus to Alexander}, p. 249, fig. 28b, is reliable. This seal supposedly depicts a typical altar scene with an Aramaic inscription reading, “\textit{Zaradustris}.” However, Briant merely prints a drawing of the seal, citing P. R. S. Moorey, “The Persian Empire,” \textit{Cambridge Ancient History}, ed. John Boardman, vol. Plates to Volume IV (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1988), p. 44, seal c. Moorey, however, also only shows a drawing, and cites André Parrot, Stuart Gilbert, and James Emmons, \textit{Nineveh and Babylon} (London: Thames & Hudson, 1961), figure 160. The author has been unable to source this book, but a personal email from the publisher (16 Feb. 2009) indicated that the illustration was p. 260 and cited as in an unnamed private collection. The author still awaits response from the French publisher to whom he was directed.
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symbols which may from a later perspective be considered 'heterodox' or 'non-Zoroastrian' are still relevant for exploration.

Therefore, the question of Persian religion need not be limited to the Zoroastrian texts or even to the Zoroastrian tradition. Besides this tradition one must be open to the possibility of influence by other Iranian religious traditions (perhaps 'unorthodox' traditions), Imperial ideology and propaganda, and cultural influences of a more general nature, indeed even of general Zeitgeist. It is worth recalling on this point that the modern segregation of life into 'religious' and 'secular,' 'political' and 'cultural' realms is misleading for the ancient world. While much academic interest in Judaean traditions centers on 'Judaism,' potential influences need not be limited to modern conceptual categories.

Having expanded the discussion beyond so-called orthodox Zoroastrianism, the question remains as to the form of the religious beliefs which were present in the Achaemenid and Parthian Empires. The basic premise of the methodology used here is that at least some aspects of the contemporary religious beliefs and practices may be reconstructed by the careful and critical comparison of several sources: 1) The Old Persian inscriptions and other contemporary written documents and archaeological remains, such as those found at Persepolis; 2) The reports of the classical authors as they pertain to the politics and religion of the Persians; 3) and the Zoroastrian writings.

Each of these three main sources has benefits and difficulties. The Old Persian inscriptions have the advantage of being securely dated and contextualized, and thus offer very valuable checks for chronology. They are, however, unfortunately terse and focus on a rather narrow range of topics, largely dedicatory. While they do reveal some important information, the amount of detailed information to be gleaned from them is infuriatingly small and/or ambiguous. In addition to the inscriptions, a variety of archaeological remains and administrative records (in Neo-Elamite and Aramaic) provide valuable sources. Like the Old Persian inscriptions, the classical sources have the benefit of being more or less securely dated. They also tend to be much longer than the Old Persian materials and offer a vast variety of reports, anecdotes, and opinions on the Persians and their traditions. However, the various classical writers vary in reliability and must be used with much caution. Some of the authors (such as Herodotus) may indeed offer some of their material from personal observation; often, however, they (mis)understand the Persians to fit their narratological or philosophical purposes (such as Xenophon's depiction of Cyrus as the ideal philosopher-king). The classical writers certainly provide valuable perspectives on the nature of Persian

---

3 One could argue they are not always easily delineated in modern society, either.
ideas available to other groups, even those outside of Iranian empires, but one has to be careful to separate the Iranian material from the Greek interpretation.

The final primary sources of material are the Zoroastrian writings, mainly extant only in their ninth century C.E. redaction. These writings are an extremely varied and complex conglomeration of writings from a vast variety of eras and locations—the late dating of the extant manuscripts is no more decisive for antiquity than the Qumran finds for the writing of the Hebrew Bible. The most important of these texts is the Avesta, the sacred scripture of the Zoroastrians. The remainder are largely late compilations in Pahlavi (Middle Persian) which purport to translate, comment on, and/or systematize the teachings of the Avesta. The more famous of these compilations include the Bundahisn, which is a collection of cosmological and eschatological lore, the Zand-i Vahman Yasn, which is an apocalypse supposedly written as a commentary to a lost Avestan Yast, and the Minog-i Xrad, which is a collection of a ninth century Zoroastrian priest’s summary of Zoroastrian theology. The final compilations of all of these Pahlavi works can be dated due to references to events of (or the fall of) the Sassanian Empire. It is primarily these Pahlavi works which are vulnerable to the charge of anachronistic usage for comparative purposes, as they are manifestly late. However, even here the picture is not as simple as it may first appear. Much in these writings is classified as zand, or ‘interpretation’: they often quote an Avestan text and then proceed to comment and expand on it. This form is analogous to the pseudepigraphic literature found at Qumran. Sometimes the zand even quotes the verse in Avestan before translating it into Pahlavi; when these quotations are compared with known Avestan passages, they are usually
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4 The Avesta is the ‘Bible’ of the Zoroastrians; the surviving portions consist mostly of hymns (Yâsts) and liturgy (Yân), including the Gathas, the hymns attributed to Zoroaster. The most convenient edition of the entire extant Avesta is still in the Sacred Books of the East series; the Gathas alone are much more readily available. For critical editions, see Appendix I. The standard critical analysis of the extant Sassanian collection and its textual history is Karl Hoffmann and Johanna Narten, Der Sassänische Archetypus: Untersuchungen zu Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1989).


7 Yâsts are hymns devoted to a deity.

Zoroastrian tradition claims that there were originally 21 \textit{Nasks} ('books') of the Avesta, although only one of those \textit{Nasks} survives as fully extant. While the number 21 may be a later, theologically based number, it is clear that much lore and theology has been lost (it is traditionally claimed that only one third of the original Avesta has survived). Because of this, the Pahlavi \textit{zand} offers an invaluable source of Avestan material which has otherwise been lost. The most famous example of this type of material is the \textit{Zand-i Vahman Yasn:} while there is no known extant \textit{Yait to Vohu Manah} (the Avestan name for \textit{Vahman}), it seems most likely that there was one which has been lost, and at least the quoted sections belonged to it.\footnote{Hultgård, "Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse," pp. 127–128.} This means that the late material cannot simply be ignored. Thus, even though the majority of written Iranian material is extant only in late sources, it can be useful with careful critical analysis.

As part of the effort to define the genre of apocalypse, Collins investigated the phenomenon in Iranian literature.\footnote{John J. Collins, "The Persian Apocalypses," \textit{Semeia} 14 (1979): pp. 207–217.} As is appropriate in a volume dedicated to the genre of apocalypse, Collins's discussion deals primarily with the Persian texts which may shed some light on the existence of the genre in the Persian tradition. He finds two (\textit{Zand-i Vahman Yasn} and the \textit{Arda Viraz Namag}) which conform to his paradigm (Ia, IIc).\footnote{Collins, "The Persian Apocalypses," p. 208.} His use of the material is rightfully cautious in light of the text-critical problems involved with the Iranian texts. His analysis is admirable for dealing with the genre as extant in Iranian tradition, but it bypasses the question of the relevance of Iran in questions of influence. Although he dates the generic apocalypses late, the influence of Iranian ideas need not be restricted by the limits of genre. Other texts which are not formally classed as apocalypses may nevertheless hold relevance.

With these caveats in mind, a brief introduction and overview of Iranian religion during the Achaemenid period and its sources, as well as considerations on historical methodology, follows.

Much debate over the possibility of Persian influence on Judaism in the Achaemenid and Hellenistic Periods gets caught up on the date of Zarathushtra (commonly 'Zoroaster' in
English, from the Greek Ζοροαστρίς), and thus on the antiquity of the religious ideas evidenced in the late writings of the Zoroastrians. Experts in Iranian Studies have no real consensus on a date for his life; two schools give widely divergent dates—one based on a native tradition of 258 years before Alexander, and the other based largely on linguistic grounds (usually placed ca. 1500–1000 B.C.E.).\(^9\) The unreliability of the ‘traditional date’ for Zarathuštra (ca. 569 B.C.E.) is argued by Shahbazi and Boyce; Zarathuštra had to pre-date Cyrus’s invasion of the north-eastern Iranian lands, and there was no tradition of fixed dating until the Seleucids.\(^10\) More recently, Skjærvø suggests that the so-called ‘traditional date’ itself rests on ‘mythical’ chronology, hardly a promising starting point for historical dating.\(^11\) It is worth noting, however, that both chronologies place Zarathuštra prior to the Achaemenid Empire. Thus, the correctness of either school of thought little affects the antiquity relative to Jewish apocalyptic literature.

The Iranian texts of relevance are extant in a number of languages, which are all classed as members of the Iranian half of the Indo-Iranian group of Indo-European languages, and which come from different time periods and locales. The most relevant languages are conventionally known as ‘Avestan’ (divided into ‘Old Avestan’ or ‘Gathic’ and ‘Young Avestan’), Old Persian, and Middle Persian or Pahlavi. Avestan is the language which is used by the Avesta; it is classed as a North-eastern Iranian Language. Old Persian is the language of the Achaemenid inscriptions, and is classed as a South-eastern Iranian


language. Pahlavi or Middle Persian is the language of the Sassanians, and developed out of Old Persian, beginning prior to Alexander's campaign. Other Iranian languages and dialects also existed—such as Median, Parthian, and Sogdian—but are more scantily attested. It is clear for linguistic reasons that much of the Avesta (the scriptures of the Zoroastrians) is extremely ancient. The language of the Avesta (so-called ‘Avestan’) has long been recognized as related to and linguistically archaic like the language of the Rig Veda (Sanskrit). On this basis Indo-Iranicists usually date the Old Avestan language to the mid-second millennium B.C.E. The oldest sections of the Avesta—the so-called ‘Old Avestan’ sections of the Yasna—the Gāthās (the poems supposedly by Zarathushtra himself) and the ‘Yasna of the Seven Chapters’ (the Yasna Haptahāiti) are usually dated by linguists around 1000 B.C.E. through comparison with Rig Vedic Sanskrit, and are possibly much older. Skjærvø avers this from the various archaic features of Old Avestan compared with Young Avestan: the non-contraction of vowel sequences, the retention of ii and uu vowels, the regular use of aorist forms, and the unity of ablative and genitive endings. These features of the Old Avestan sections require it to predate the Younger Avesta by at least 200 years. The other parts of the Avesta are more recent—the ‘Young Avesta’ dates from the pre-Achaemenid to the early Parthian Periods, and the Videvdāt ('Laws against the demons') to the late Achaemenid period.

The evidence for this is linguistic. The end of the Old Persian language is securely dated by the Old Persian inscriptions and the appearance of the transition into Middle Persian (Pahlavi) in the fifth century B.C.E. evidenced therein (by loss of case endings, vowel shifts, etc.). The appearance of four similar changes in both Old Persian and Young Avestan indicate a common origin which must predate the historical emergence of Old Persian (ca. ninth century B.C.E.). The Persians appear to history in Western Iran in the ninth century, therefore the split between Young Avestan and Old Persian must predate that
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time, as they appear speaking Old Persian." Since Old Persian itself was turning into Pahlavi by the end of the Achaemenid Empire, its parallel dialect is unlikely to have lasted drastically longer as a spoken language. Therefore, language of the Younger Avesta is more or less contemporaneous with the Old Persian inscriptions, and on this basis alone the Gāthās and the Haptayhaiti must date at least to 700 B.C.E. Thus, the entirety of the extant Avesta—by linguistic evidence alone—must pre-date or be contemporaneous with the Achaemenid Empire. The lack of Iron Age references, references to the Western Iranian lands, or of an urban civilization or empire in the Avestan texts is consonant with the linguistic dating.

The linguistic development of the name of Ahura Mazda from a separable pair of epithets in the Gāthās, to a fixed name in the Young Avesta, to a single word (Auramazda) in the inscriptions is also consistent with a dating which is prior to and contemporaneous with Old Persian's use. Widengren further avers that the Sassanian Zoroastrian scholar-priests' use of Pahlavi translations of the Avesta for their commentaries and epitomes demonstrates that the Avestan language was long dead, and that the texts preserved in that text are more likely to be preservations than late compositions.

Beyond linguistic relationships, the close parallels between the Avesta and the Rig Veda, and between Zoroastrian practice and Brahmanic practice demonstrate that some of the ideas, religion and rituals evidenced in the writings go well back into Indo-Iranian prehistory. It is agreed by most scholars, however, that these scriptures were oral and not

29 The field of Indo-European Studies is based on the linguistic comparison of many modern and ancient languages, and posits a single common antecedent group for all of them. This group includes Old Irish, Norse, Latin, Hittite, Sanskrit, and the Iranian languages. "Indo-Iranian' is used of a branch of that family which is understood to have remained together after the initial migrations, due to close similarities. For an overview, see Fortson, Indo-European Language, Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paolo Ramat, The Indo-European languages (London: Routledge, 1998); James Mallory, "A Short History of the Indo-European Problem," Journal of Indo-European Studies 1 (1973): pp. 21-65.
written down until very late, perhaps not until the Sassanian period. Thus the discrepancy between the linguistic evidence for the 'composition' and the date of the earliest manuscripts (at least 2000 years) requires a very long period of oral transmission, of which some biblical scholars are understandably skeptical. The antiquity of the traditions, however, can be investigated through several avenues: the linguistic evidence, parallels with the Rig Veda, parallels with Achaemenid texts and archaeology, and the evidence of Greek authors. Beside the close linguistic and terminological affinities, the religion of the Rig Veda offers other parallels to the understanding of the Avesta, as well as corroborating the antiquity of some of the details. A full exploration is not necessary here, but a few illustrative parallels can be noted. Characteristic of the Indo-Iranian religions is the ritual use of Haoma (Avestan)/Soma (Sanskrit). This was the liquid, procured by pounding a now unknown plant, which was ritually drunk or poured out; the large find of mortars and pestles at Persepolis is usually linked to this activity (See Figure 4). It was deified in both traditions, although Zarathustra's attitude towards it is debated—its appearance in the Gathas is minimal and ambiguous—it is characteristic of rites from very early on through to modern Zoroastrianism. Scholars also debate whether the liquid was stimulating, intoxicating, hallucinatory, or all three, with multiple suggestions for identification of the original plant (modern Zoroastrians use Ephedra). The ritual respect of the hearth fire and the use of grass or twigs (barxman) are also common to both. Bundles of twigs usually interpreted as the barxman can frequently be seen on Achaemenid seals and engravings (See Figure 3).
These details show that both Achaemenid archaeology and the Indian parallels conform to the general ritual pattern visible in the Avesta.

Prior to their split, the Indo-Iranians had two classes of dignities, the *Ahuras/Asuras* and the *Daेंnas/Devas*, which Boyce characterizes as ‘ethical’ and ‘amoral,’ respectively. In India the *Asuras* became demons, and the *Devas* the gods, and the reverse in Iran. That these terms are Indo-Iranian can be seen by the correspondence of some of the names of the *Daेंnas* in the Young Avesta with the *Devas* of the *Rig Veda*—notably Indra and the Nasatyas (both of which also occur in the famous Mitanni treaties). The Gothic innovation seems not to have been the ‘demonization’ of the *Daेंnas* as such, but rather the rejection of their propitiation; the *Asuras* continue to receive sacrifice in the *Rig Veda*, even after their loss of status.

Central to the religious systems of both the *Rig Veda* and the Avesta is the concept of *asa* or *rta*—‘cosmic right order,’ ‘truth’—although they developed in different ways. Whereas in India *rta* was usually contrasted with *anrta*, ‘disorder,’ in Iran *asa* came to be contrasted with *druj*, ‘falsehood,’ ‘deceit.’ Whether or not Zarathustra is the initiator of this alteration

---


it is clearly integral to the thought of the Gāthās and can be seen in the inscriptions of Darius I, and to a lesser extent, Xerxes I (see discussion of Herodotus below).

Both traditions have hereditary priests who are considered mātrān-/-mantrin-‘expert in mātras (the divine word).’ Boyce considers it likely that Zarathuṣtra himself was trained up as a priest from the age of seven, as is evidenced among the Brahmans and the modern Zoroastrians; however, the antiquity of the tradition is unaffected by Zarathuṣtra’s historicity. The memorization and recitation of the sacred word was one of the chief duties of the Indo-Iranian priests and appears to be characteristic of the profession in both traditions. Even in modern times, the verbatim recitation of hymns by Hindus by memory is reported. The parallels noted above serve to demonstrate the antiquity of the religious milieu visible in the Avesta and in the Zoroastrian tradition generally.

The Zoroastrian tradition contains much more material, however, than just the extant Avestan texts; indeed, the tradition claims that the extant Avesta is itself only one third of the original Avesta. A variety of epitomes, commentaries, and translations of Zoroastrian scriptures also survive in Pahlavi works of the ninth century C.E. Much of the mythology and theology for which the Zoroastrians are known comes largely from these very late works. Works such as the Bundahišn, the Zand-i Vahman Yašn, and the Denkart contain much material that appears archaic but is available only in these late, post-Islamic redactions. Yet, with careful methodology, even these works provide a valuable source of information on much earlier traditions. It is worth noting that Widengren offers a number of criteria for determining quotations, translations, and paraphrases of Avestan material in Pahlavi works. While these late text can prove valuable, then, they are used here merely as supplementary material to the more surely archaic material of the Old Persian sources, Greek authors, and the Avesta.

The usage of the Zoroastrian literature does not require an uncritical assumption of the antiquity of late texts. There are several methods to establish earlier dates and contexts for some of the texts and ideas in the late books. Firstly, a variety of classical writers
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41 Boyce, HZ I, p. 7, 183.
mention or describe aspects of Persian religious thought and practice, offering valuable accounts datable to, during, or shortly after the Achaemenid Empire. Secondly, the Old Persian inscriptions and other Achaemenid archaeological sources provide hints and parallels to the internal and official understandings of religious concepts in the empire. Thirdly, the Avestan texts can be dated for linguistic reasons to the beginning of the Parthian period at the absolute latest. The basic methodology assumed here compares the evidence of the Greek and Latin authors, the archaeology, and the Avesta for Persian religion. Each will be allowed to speak on its own terms but in the context of the evidence available from the others, and keeping in mind a probable continuum of variation. Additionally, the Pahlavi texts will be carefully explored for supplementary sources to those available in the Avesta. If a classical or Achaemenid text can be demonstrated to parallel a Pahlavi text, it is considered likely that at least a nucleus of that idea existed in the Achaemenid period, even if the final form as evidenced in the Pahlavi did not. Each text and passage will have to be assessed on its own. Despite their lateness, comparisons with the Pahlavi texts can help make better sense of the ideas in the earlier texts; the Avestan texts consist largely of allusive poetry and liturgy, while the Pahlavi works contain epitomes and systematic treatises.

On purely linguistic grounds, this study accepts that the extant Iranian texts can be roughly dated as follows (following Skjærvø): the Old Avestan texts: pre-Achaemenid; Old Persian texts: Achaemenid; the Young Avestan texts: roughly late Achaemenid (This includes the Vīdevādā and the Avestan sections of the Aogāmadācāa;47 the Zand-i Vahman Yāsīn: Early Hellenistic core with later accretions; the remainder of the Pahlavi Texts: considered late, unless comparisons with Rig Vedic, Classical, and Old Persian texts demonstrate a likely antiquity, or can be demonstrably shown to be quotations.48 The question of Iranian religion thus offers several layers of evidence, which can be critically compared to establish reasonably certain antiquity for practices and beliefs. It is historically valid, therefore to begin with a comparison of the Greek material, Achaemenid archaeology, and the Avesta, and from there to carefully sift later works where potentially illuminating. The analyses here, then, are based on the comparison of the Old Persian inscriptions and the various related textual sources, the evidence of the Greek authors, and the Avesta, as these all may be comfortably used as witnesses at the latest to the end of the Achaemenid Iran. When

46 The Vīdevādā is a collection of purity laws and some mythology, named from a corruption of a phrase meaning ‘Laws against the demons.’
47 The Aogāmadācāa is a funeral liturgy which compiles Avestan verses, and overlays them with a Pahlavi translation and commentary.
necessary and useful, later Pahlavi texts are consulted for clarification, but only where either comparison with the Greek material or linguistic criteria reasonably predate the material. Thus, despite the heavy emphasis on the Zand-i Vahman Yain and the Oracle of Hystaspes in the literature, the method here focuses more the Avestan liturgies and hymns and the Greek reports of Iranian religion. While these two texts may indeed be valuable witnesses, the Avesta is be considered a safer and more reliable guide to the antiquity of ideas.

Evidence from Classical Authors

A useful place to begin investigating the religions of the Iranians is the more concretely datable classical authors. The following only selects a few significant points from several authors to illustrate the basic method and background utilized in this study. A convenient collection of the relevant classical sources is collected by Clemen; a useful discussion of this evidence is available by de Jong.

Plato

The first datable appearance of the name of Zarathustra/ Zoroaster in Greek is in Plato’s Alcibiades I.121–122. In this passage Plato discusses the training of the Persian royal heir. The ‘wisest’ of the child’s four teachers teaches him ‘the Magian lore of Zoroaster, son of Horomazes; that is the worship of the gods’ (ὁ μεν μαγείαν τε διδάσκει τὴν Ζωραοατρον τοῦ Ὄρομαξου ἐστι δὲ τούτῳ θεων θεραπεία). This passage is important as it reveals knowledge of the name of Zoroaster as well as his adoption by/ association with the Magi circa 390–374 B.C.E. It also shows the Greeks, however muddled their understanding, considered the royal religion to also be associated with Zoroaster. According to Diogenes Laertius Lives of the Philosophers III.6–7, Plato even planned a trip to visit the Magi. If true, this would imply that the Magi were well known and had a reputation for learning. Seneca even claims that Magi were in Athens when Plato died and offered sacrifice to him at his death. Plato also demonstrates the success of Darius’s Behistun propaganda (Laws III.695B): he repeats the story of Bardiya’s usurpation as given by Darius. These brief

50 Jong, Traditions of the Magi.
passages seem to link—at least in nominal form—the Zoroastrian tradition and the royal cult, as well as imply that a combination of official propaganda and a modicum of non-official information on the Achaemenid Empire was available to the Greek world.

**Aristotle**

Two fragments from Aristotle’s *On Philosophy* give relevant information. According to Pliny, Aristotle states that Zoroaster lived six thousand years before the death of Plato. Shahbazi considers the number 6000 to be an interpolation for 600, and he uses this revised number as support for his dating of Zoroaster (ca. 1080 B.C.E.). Although ingenious, this explanation implies that the Iranians had kept a more or less reliable chronology of the prophet’s life, which seems unlikely. Kingsley notes that, according to Diogenes Laertius, Xanthus the Lydian—one of Aristotle’s sources—recorded that Zoroaster had lived 6000 years before Xerxes’s crossing of the Hellespont. Since the number 6000 is prominent in a variety of Iranian and Armenian eschatological schemata, Kingsley suggests this piece of information was royal propaganda portraying Xerxes as ushering in the eschatological renovation of the world, *Fratel karati* (‘making fruitful, renovation’). He further argues that after the failed invasion, the prophecy was altered by Magi visiting Athens to portray Plato in a similar light. If this is true, then here is evidence of deliberate religio-political propaganda from the Achaemenids reaching Greek ears. This propaganda also presupposes much of the eschatology found in the late *Bundahish* and the *Denkart*. Besides this ‘official’ propaganda, Diogenes Laertius credits Aristotle with describing the teaching of the Magi as an ontological dualism, with a good spirit named ‘Zeus and Oromasdes’ and an evil god named ‘Hades and Areimanius.’ These names are very clearly those of Ahura Mazda/Ohrmazd and Angra Mainyu/Ahriman with their logical Greek counterparts. It is quite apparent in the Greek writings and inscriptions that Ahura Mazda is frequently identified with Zeus. The depth

---

56 Shahbazi, “The Traditional Date of Zoroaster Explained,” p. 34–35; Humbach, et al., *Gathds of Zarathushtra*, p. 26 also accepts the 600 revision and uses it to place Zoroaster ca. 1080 B.C.E.
57 Kingsley, “Meetings with Magi,” p. 190.
of Aristotle's engagement with or investigation of the philosophical implications of this
dualism cannot be determined from the length of the fragment, but it is possible other
(earlier) Greek philosophers did (see discussion of the influence on Greek thought below).
These two fragments, then, seem to confirm a pre-Hellenistic antiquity for both eschatology
and ontological dualism in the Iranian religious tradition, as well as at least nominal
dissemination of the ideas outside 'theological' Magian circles.

Figure 4: Mortar and Pestle from Persepolis
Chicago Oriental Institute P-57934
Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago
© University of Chicago

Herodotus

Herodotus, the most extensive written source for first half of the Achaemenid
Period, records valuable information on Persian religious practice. In his Persian Wars (or
Histories) I.131–132, Herodotus presents his well-known observation that the Persians do not
'set up statues and temples and altars,' considering such behaviour incongruous with the
non-anthropomorphic nature of the gods. He claims they sacrifice on mountain tops,
worshipping a list of naturalistic gods (sun, moon, earth, fire, water, winds) as well as the
'whole circle of heaven' which he calls Zeus. Calling Ahura Mazda the 'whole circle of
heaven' is a reasonable understanding of an Avestan idea; the Avesta describes him as
clothed in the sky (Yāsna 30:5). Boyce considers the list a 'fair attempt' at rendering the
Amūz Spāntas (a doctrine discussed below), but this is an unnecessary identification: the list
is congruent with the nature-worship and the worship of Mitra (with his frequent

62 Boyce, HZ I, p. 193; Boyce, HZ II, pp. 179–180; the phrase in question seems to strictly speaking refer to
Spenta Mainyu. Cf. William W. Malandra, An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion, Minnesota Publications in the
Prods Oktor Skjærvø, “Ahura Mazda and Armaiti, Heaven and Earth, in the Old Avesta,” Journal of the American
63 Boyce, HZ II, p. 179. However, Jong, Traditions of the Magi, p. 102, rejects this, seeing a naturalistic
explanation.
identification with the sun) attested in the Avesta and the Persepolis finds. The issue of (fire-)temples in Achaemenid Persia is much more fraught. Herodotus also claims they have a rather simple worship ceremony at which a Magus is required to sing ‘of the birth of the gods’ (θεογονία). Boyce considers this description as consonant with ‘orthodox Zoroastrian lay observance,’ although Benveniste and Zaehner dissent. The issue of ‘orthodoxy’ aside, it fits well with the evidence for Achaemenid practice in particular and Indo-Iranian practice generally. It is tempting to identify the Magi’s song with the Gāthās or the Yāṣts, but his lack of specificity only leaves it as a tantalizing possibility. Even though the Gāthās cannot strictly be described as about the birth of the gods, it is unlikely that Herodotus knew the Avestan language, and if he heard the hymns chanted or described, he quite possibly would have considered the hymns as equivalent to Hesiod. It is also possible Herodotus refers to now lost cosmogonic hymns.

Also well known is Herodotus’s claim that Persian boys are taught ‘riding, archery and truth-telling,’ (I.136) and that the Persians consider lying to be one of the greatest offences (I.138). The importance of the idea of truth (Avestan Aša, Old Persian Ahrta) can be seen positively in the Gāthās as well as negatively in the Bisitun (Behistun) inscription of Darius I (see figure 5). Aša is an extremely important concept in the Gāthās: one of the Amūdā Sputas (see below), it appears both personified and as a common noun. Those who choose aša are commonly contrasted with those who choose druj (‘falsehood’). Aša occurs in the Gāthās over 80 times, quite remarkable given the length of the text. In the Bisitun

69 Inslser, The Gathas of Zarathustra, does not distinguish between the proper and common meanings in his translation, but see Yasná XXVIII.3; XXXIII.7, 12; XXXIV.6; XLIV.9 for examples of where personification seems likely. Cf. the comments on the alternation between Divinity and concept in Boyce, HZ I, pp. 212–213; Johanna Narten, “Bahman I: In the Avesta,” Encyclopedia Iranica III (1989): p. 487.
70 I.e. Yasná XXX.10; XXXI.1; XLVI.11, 16; XLIX.11; LI.10, 14; LIII.6.
inscription, Darius attributes the uprisings surrounding his accession and the authority of the 'Pseudo-Bardiya' to *Dranga* ('Falsehood'), the Old Persian equivalent of *Druj*. *Dranga* as an active force is mentioned four places, while the act of insurrection is several times referred to as 'he lied' (*adunijiyd*). In fact, Darius repeatedly declares that 'Ahuramazda brought me aid' (*Auramazdāmaī upastām abara* and that this was so because he was 'no follower of Falsehood' (*nai drujianna ahām*). While the Behistun text clearly served a political purpose, the rhetoric of the text frequently utilizes religious language consonant with the religious tradition and the importance of the *Asia-Druj* dichotomy. Indeed, Skiærbo is impressed by the 'lexical correspondences' between DBb 6–13 and *Yasna* LX.5 and suggests that Darius saw himself as the ideal worshipper of Ahura Mazda, perhaps even portraying himself as a *Saosīant* in the Susa inscription (DSf 15–18). Since in the *Rig Veda*, *Rta (= Asia)* is contrasted with *anṛta (= 'anasa, 'disorder') rather then the Sanskrit equivalent of *druj, druh,* it seems that the opposition of Truth/Order (*Asia*) to Falsehood/the Lie (*druj*) is characteristic of at least Iranian religious thought, if not Zoroastrianism *per se*. It seems highly likely that Herodotus was accurate in pinpointing this area of royal ideology, which was also consonant with the thought of the Avesta.

---

75 Skiærbo, "Avestan Quotations," pp. 50–51.
76 *Saosīant* is a Gathic epithet meaning 'victorious one, over-comer, savior' which becomes a technical term for the final eschatological savior.
77 Skiærbo, "Avestan Quotations," p. 57, 58.
Herodotus also declares that the Persians consider the sun to afflict leprosy in recompense for sin (1.138). This clearly must refer to Mithra, who was frequently identified with the sun and responsible for protecting the contract. In the Bahram Yast (XIV.48) one of Mithra’s associated deities, Vəxəθraga, protects the faithful who do not lie to Mithra from leprosy. In Zoroastrianism Mithra was one of the deities who weighed the actions of the dead. This information fits well with the Avestan evidence. He also notes that the Magi practice exposure, while the Persians embalm their dead in wax before burial (1.140). Both of these burial practices are attested in the archaeological record of Asia Minor. In the midst of a somewhat legendary tale, Herodotus notes that King Darius (I) refused to pass under the remains of a dead body (1.187). If this story has any historical reality, it seems to
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82 Zend-Avesta II, p. 244. The previous verse (47) explicitly links the protection to not-lying.
83 Mithra is described as being ‘debt-paying’ and having 10,000 eyes in the Mith Yalt (X):7, 18–19, 69, 82; (Gershevitch, Hymn to Mithra, p. 77, 83, 107, 113; Zend-Avesta II, p. 121, 124, 139–140); Boyce, Textual Sources, pp. 28–29; Cf. Boyce, HZ I, p. 31.
indicate some form of concern for ritual purity in regards to death. Some have thought the rock tombs of the Achaemenids, as well as the reference to embalming in wax, indicate a concern for the avoidance of contamination, but there is evidence that regular Persians were interred with no ritual barriers, only clay coffins, between the corpse and the earth. It is certain that later Sassanian scruples over burial were not yet universally current in the Achaemenid period, but the Magi may have been beginning to think in that direction. Evolution in Iranian funeral practices is likely illustrated by the change in meaning of the word *daxma* from ‘grave’ to ‘exposure area.’ At least one clear concern for purity exists, however—the protection of fire from the contamination of bodies. Herodotus reports that fire was venerated as a god (III.16). *Atar,* ‘fire,’ appears often in the Avesta, and the image of ‘fire altars’ are common on Achaemenid seals.

In the course of the Greek campaign, Herodotus claims Xerxes buried alive nine boys and maidens at ‘Nine Ways,’ and that Xerxes’s wife buried fourteen nobles’ sons to the god of the netherworld (VII.114). Such apotropaic rites are strictly forbidden in Zoroastrianism, but they are evidence of a divide between the good gods (*Ahuras*) and the evil gods (*Daevas*). This behavior contradicts the earlier information given by Herodotus that the Magi were concerned with the defiling aspects of the corpse, if indeed they practiced exposure for that reason, and if Darius’s above scruple is historical. If the accounts of burial alive are historical, there seem to be two possible explanations; either the Magi had yet to develop a concern for the purity of the earth and the practice was some form of ‘black’ Iranian practice, or the events were more political or judicial rather than religious.

Considering the so-called ‘*Dainas* (Old Persian for *Daevas*) Inscription’ of Xerxes (XPh

---


§4b.35—41), where Xerxes boasts of ending the worship of the *Dammas* in an unmentioned location (*daivadāna*)—he even contrasts the worship of the *Daivās* with the worship of Ahura Mazda and *Artā*—it is difficult to accept Xerxes assenting to a 'black’ ritual. If these events are compared with the stories Herodotus tells of Cambyses’s treatment of a royal judge who accepted a bribe (V.25) and Astyages’s treatment of Harpagus (I.119), it seems a political or judicial setting might be more probable. While the Harpagus incident is suspect due to Herodotus’s largely legendary treatment of Median history and the Cambyses incident could fit into his portrait of the emperor as a madman, the Great King still was the final arbiter of justice and not beyond drastic punitive measures. Many of the Greek authors are intent on portraying moral lessons in their writings, with the decadence of the Persian kings a favourite topic. Attributing these burials alive to apotropaic rites or a queen’s selfishness may be a ‘misunderstanding’ that fits Herodotus’s theory of Xerxes’s *a priori* inferiority to his father and to Cyrus.

Herodotus (I.140) also notes that the Magi kill every creature except dogs, something consonant at least with the later Zoroastrian practice of killing ‘*xrafsträs,*’ obnoxious creatures considered the creation of Angra Mainyu. Instruments for the destruction of such creatures can be found in the Avestan text, the *Videvdat.* This is quite a peculiar practice to Herodotus, and he remarks that the Magi consider it virtuous; something of the later theological justification for the practice must have existed in at least some form by this time. Indeed, it is perhaps related to Xerxes’s habit for sponsoring the killing of scorpions north of Susa. Despite some scholars’ opinions that this habit was a Magian or Median innovation, the killing of *xrafsträs* appears to be an Iranian practice, as it appears in such a role in Indian texts. Further, Herodotus records Xerxes honouring a particularly beautiful tree

---

94 Cambyses is said to skin a judge who took a bribe, cover the judicial chair with his skin, and force his son to sit on and judge from that seat. Herodotus, *Wars* I—II, p. 27.
98 *Videvdat* XIV.8 and XVIII.2 (Zand-Awosta I, p. 168, 189).
Boyce finds this to be typical of Iranian religious practice and possibly related to one of the Anahita Spontas. Whether or not there is any relation to an Anahita Spontas, this act fits with the nature-worship recorded earlier by Herodotus, as well as with the noted Persian predilection for paradises.

Greeks quite commonly remarked on the Persians’ veneration of rivers or water, but Herodotus records that Xerxes scourged the Hellespont with a hundred lashes, calling it a ‘bitter water’ (πικπον ὕδωρ) (VII.35). Later Zoroastrian doctrine considered salt water to be fresh water corrupted by Angra Mainyu, which Boyce thinks explains this behavior. While the source she quotes is quite late (The Greater Bundahish is Sassanian), the account in Herodotus could be considered evidence for the antiquity of the belief. The first chapter of the Vohdvdt contains an analogous system of Angra Mainyu’s counter-creations, although salt water is not included in the pericope. The earlier noted occurrence of xrafxstras in Herodotus, however, may indicate that theological speculation on such issues was already underway in Xerxes’s time. In VII.191, the Magi sacrificed to Thetis and the Nereids to make a storm cease. Shahbazi considers the Nereids to be an Hellenized form of the Ahuranis, consorts of Ahura Mazda. It is possible that Thetis is an attempt to translate Arzdei Sura Anahitá, a water-goddess of Indo-Iranian origin who was later assimilated to Anahtis, and whose cult is well-attested in Achaemenid times. Whatever the exact Iranian deities involved, this detail is unsurprising, and it highlights the problems involved in divine equations.

101 Herodotus, Wars I—V, p. 245.
102 Boyce, HZ II, p. 165.
103 Although their exact purpose and import is debated; See a lengthy discussion of the evidence in Christopher Tuplin, Achaemenid Studies, Historia 99 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996), pp. 80—131; cf. Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, pp. 442—443. It is worth noting that trees do appear to have been deliberately cultivated by the administration. PFA 33 links ten types of trees with the location of several partetals (Hallock translates these as including olive, apple, quince, mulberry, pear, and date). This must be relevant, even if partetals itself cannot be directly related to paradise. See Richard T. Hallock, “Selected Fortification Texts,” Cahiers de la D. A. F. I. 8 (1978): p. 116, 135—136; cf. David Stronach, “Caharbag,” Encyclopaedia Iranica IV (1990): p. 624.
104 Herodotus, Wars I—II, p. 246.
107 Herodotus, Wars I—II, p. 250.
Another indistinct element in his work is his mention of the Magi. Herodotus periodically associates the Magi with the interpretation of dreams (I.107, 120; VII.19). This could be considered a Greek confusion with the Babylonians, long noted for astrology and oneiromancy, but Duchesne-Guillemin considers it characteristic of their practice (albeit without much discussion). While the first mention of dream-interpretation is in a clearly legendary tale of Astyages, it is probable that the professional religious caste of the Achaemenids served their royal patrons in this manner, since it was a traditional priestly duty in many (if not all) of the conquered lands. On their own, these reports of oneiromancy are insufficient to ascertain the level and importance of such activity among the Magi. Despite their fame and obvious importance to Iranian religious life, the Magi remain unfortunately little known. Herodotus’s general picture of the Magi as important priests in the empire is—at least on that point—consistent with the evidence from Persepolis, if not particularly illuminating.

Herodotus offers a great variety of information of the Achaemenid Empire, much of it confirmed by Iranian sources. While his claims often need to be carefully considered, they offer a valuable insight into what an interested Greek could discover about the Persians and their religious ideas. It should be kept in mind that Herodotus’s interests were ultimately in understanding the sources of the Greco-Persian wars and not in illuminating theology.

Xenophon

Xenophon offers extensive materials from the Achaemenid period but is problematic for historical investigation. It is clear much of his historiography is dependent on previous writers, particularly Herodotus, and that he has Hellenized, philosophized, or novelized much of his material. Still, a brief investigation of the evidence may prove useful. Xenophon follows Herodotus in crediting the Persian education with truth-telling (Cyropædia I.vi.33). He has Cyrus offer libations after dinner (Cyr. II.iii.1), a note in the Loeb edition
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115 Xenophon, Cyr. I–IV, p. 177.
claims that this is a Greek interpolation, but libations are attested both in later Zoroastrian use and in the Persepolis tablets, both for the Haoma-ceremony and additional to it. His descriptions of Cyrus’s sacrifices are reminiscent of the phrases which appear in the Old Persian inscriptions (such as ‘Ahuramazda and the other gods who are’)—in Cyr. III.iii.21–22 Cyrus sacrifices to Zeus and every god brought to his attention; in VII.i.1 he has Cyrus offer sacrifice and libation to ‘ancestral Zeus;’ in VIII.v.57 Cyrus sacrifices to Hestia, ancestral Zeus, and ‘any other god the Magi suggested.’ Again, they offer holocausts (ὡλοκαυτήσεων) in VIII.iii.24, and, in VIII.vii.3, he offers to ancestral Zeus, Helius, and all the gods. Zeus and Helius could easily be understood as Ahura Mazda and Mihr or Hūa XšaHa (yazata of the sun) and Hestia is quite possibly linked to the cult of the hearth fire. Xenophon claims Cyrus was devout, singing and sacrificing daily, and that he instituted a college of Magi (VIII.i.23–24). The Magi do appear frequently in the Persepolis tablets, and it is likely that they were the official priests to the Achaemenid dynasty from the beginning, perhaps holding pre-eminence in the Median Empire as well. It is possible that Cyrus organized an official cult training apparatus, even though no Iranian ‘church’ is known until the Sassanian period, but Xenophon could also be simply projecting his image of the ideal ruler onto Cyrus.

Xenophon describes a procession of Cyrus as headed by four bulls for ‘Zeus and the other gods as the Magi directed,’ commenting that the Persians think they must consider the religious professionals’ opinion. The procession also had horses to be sacrificed to the Sun and three chariots—a chariot for Zeus (with white horses), one for the Sun, and a third chariot (unassigned) with purple trappings, followed by a fire altar (VIII.iii.11–12). Since by Artaxerxes II’s reign (404–359), the court acknowledged Ahura Mazda, Mihr, and Anāhītā in its inscriptions, and Xenophon’s expedition was during Artaxerxes II’s reign, it is reasonable to assign the three chariots to this triad; in any case, the chariot for Zeus is certainly for Ahura Mazda and that of the sun for Mihr. Perhaps one may wish to see the


118 Boyce, HZ I, pp. 154–155.
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121 For a concise overview, see Duchesne-Guillemin, “The Religion of Ancient Iran,” pp. 323–76.
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other member of the old Indo-Iranian triad, *Vouruna, as here venerated, but is unlikely considering the lack of attestation for his worship. If Ahura Mazda is *Vouruna, as Zaehner suggests, then the third chariot cannot be his in any case. The one piece of evidence given of this god is the purple trappings. Shahbazi suggests that the chariot was in honour of Kavi Vištāspa, the patron warrior-king of Zarathuštra (or more properly, his fraunasi). If Arrian is to be believed, deceased kings were given sacrificial honors, and some scholars argue that the kings' daimon in Plutarch's Artaxerxes is the royal fraunasi. Additionally, Boyce claims that in Iran purple was the color of warriors and Strabo mentions purple as one of the summer wardrobe choices of Persian warriors, but it is unclear why. If this warrior association is correct, then Shahbazi's suggestion is possible, although the martial aspects of Anāhita in her assimilation to Ishtar may also explain the purple trappings. Since it is known that Artaxerxes II set up temples to Anāhita but references to Vištāspa's fraunasi are lacking, Anāhita seems a more likely candidate for the chariot.

The information derivable from Xenophon is largely consonant with the other sources, albeit in a Greek veneer. While useful as a check, it offers little that is completely novel, of major consequence, or not massively problematic for use.

Plutarch

In his Moralia, Isis and Osiris (46–47), Plutarch gives a fairly lengthy description of Persian religion. Although Plutarch wrote around 120 C.E., he claims his information comes from Theopompus, who wrote in the fourth century B.C.E. This passage is very significant for the dating of several concepts, and has been much discussed by scholars. He

124 Boyce, E/I, p. 37; Boyce even argues that the formula 'Ahraramzād/nā Mi/fta hagd' in A-Pa 24–25 (Kent, Old Persian, p. 156) is the triad Mazda, Mithra, and *Vouruna. See Mary Boyce, "Apa-napā, Encyclopaedia Iranica II.2 (1986): p. 149. It should be noted, however, the numerous interpretations proposed for 'baga.' Cf. N. Sims-Williams, "Faga II: in Old and Middle Iranian," Encyclopaedia Iranica III (1989): p. 405.
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130 XV.3.19 (Strabo, Geography VII, p. 183).


ascribes to Zoroaster (as well as 'the great majority of the wisest of men') an ontological dualism. He also describes a good god 'Oromazes' and an evil god 'Areimanius,' with Mithras in the middle, an apotropaic rite involving 'omomi' (ὄμομι), the killing of noxious animals, an eschatological battle between the two gods, the creation of six supportive- and counter-gods, and a cosmology. This passage presents a number of interesting and problematic claims. Putting aside the question of the orthodoxy of the Zoroastrianism described here for the moment, a few important ideas are unambiguously evidenced here. A radical ontological dualism is linked with an eschatology which contains a period of war and a final victory for the forces of the good god, and these two antagonists are clearly identified as Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu. This is also accompanied by what could be called a proto-angel- and demonology, creatures which are clearly created by the respective gods to aid them in their battles against each other. Sundermann would even argue that Plutarch's description of Angra Mainyu's demise as due to hunger parallels the myth of his swallowing by Ahriman, the demon of hunger. The eschatological scenario described by Plutarch nearly exactly parallels many details in the Bundahisn (e.g., I.17–18, 26–27; II.5–7; XXX.7–32). These passages in the Bundahisn have a much more systematic and extensive eschatology than any other extant Iranian text; the appearance of the same themes in Plutarch, however, prove that the ideas long predate the Bundahisn's ninth century redaction. The killing of noxious creatures and other issues were already seen in Herodotus.

It is frequently pointed out that the rites described in Plutarch's passage are not consonant with Zoroastrian teachings. Indeed, the practice of apotropaic rites is generally considered to be one of the integral prohibitions of Zarathustra. However, (see discussion below) attempting to limit the discussion of Persian religious ideas to the 'orthodox' Zoroastrian position is to ignore both the historical data as well as historical likelihood.

The information Plutarch gives here reveals an interesting blend of religious ideas that may
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138 However, Jorg, Traditions of the Magi, pp. 179–180, sees the description as based on Zoroastrian polemic, and thus not reflective of any real sect at all.
hint towards the origins of the religious movement known as Mithraism; however, contra Boyce and others, the role of Mithra as mediator is not necessarily so foreign to Iranian doctrine—the role of Mithra as judge could easily be interpreted or extended to mediation, as could his role as protector of the contract. The role of Mithra as mediator or judge does appear in the Zand-i Vahman Yain, and Shaked understands Plutarch as reflecting an older understanding which was lost by the Pahlavi redactions. It is also worth noting that the system of six good gods and six counter-gods seems to be identical to the doctrine of the Ama Spantas and their evil counterparts. His subsequent mention of twenty-four deities can also be related to the Zoroastrian calendar dedications. It is remarkable, then, how much of Plutarch's information is constant with the late Pahlavi writings. It is certain, anyway, that similar cosmological and systematic treatments of Iranian traditions were underway centuries before the Sassanians.

Strabo

Strabo, writing in the first century C.E., seems to have combined personal observation with the works of previous Greek authors. His Geography provides a few details on Persian religious customs which are congruent with the Zoroastrian tradition and the Old Persian inscriptions. In XV.3.13, he essentially restates Herodotus (I.131), including the information that the Persians use neither statues nor altars. However, two sections later he notes not only a large number of ‘temples to the Persian gods’ in Cappadocia, but claims to have seen a procession of a statue of ‘Omanus’ himself (XV.3.15); he had previously noted Armenian temples to Anaitis (XI.14.16). This can be understood two ways: that there was a historical development in Persian religion from the time of Herodotus to Strabo in which ‘fire temples’ (Taratapta) became normative; or, that temples were used ‘selectively,’ either only for certain gods or rituals or by certain groups who existed simultaneously with ‘traditional,’ ‘exterior’ worship. Boyce and Grenet suggest that ‘Omanus’ is Vohu Manah, one of the Ama Spantas; perhaps this points to either a prominence of the Ama Spantas by

141 Hambach, et al., Gaithas of Zoroaster, p. 13, n. 17 understands a reference to the Ama Spantas in this passage.
142 Jong, Traditions of the Magi, p. 195.
143 Strabo, Geography VII, p. 175.
144 Strabo, Geography VII, p. 177.
146 Boyce and Grenet, HZ III, p. 250, 270.
the first century, or to a link between adherence to the doctrine and temple-use. Wikander understands this appearance of Vohu Manah as evidence for an older Vayu-cult, but his interpretation is tenuous and tendentious.147

Strabo’s depiction of the education of Persian boys (noble, presumably) is quite suggestive, particularly if it is more than an elaboration of the account in Plato. Beyond paralleling the particular disciplines of study, Strabo describes a course of oral training which sounds distinctly like an heroic-poetic tradition.148 In a largely oral culture, the deliberate inculcation of cultural and religious traditions is to be expected, especially among the nobility.149 An anecdote attributed to Dinon also places minstrels, at least, as early as the Median court.150 Strabo’s description, then, confirms the existence of at least one potential medium for the transmission of the traditions which are extant only in later manuscripts.

Strabo also offers descriptions of the general Persian sacrificial rituals, all of which are similar to the pictures drawn from the Avesta and Old Persian.151 He describes sacred fires, prayers, blood sacrifice, libations, bundles of sacred twigs, and the presence of Magi. These descriptions require all of these elements—if based on personal observation—to date to the early Roman period at the latest, and—if based on previous Greek writers—to a much earlier period. The Persian archaeological record, however, confirms Strabo’s description as accurate for the Achaemenid period as well: seals discovered at Persepolis depict a ritual with a man/two men with mouth(s) covered holding twigs before a table with mortar and pestle and a fire altar.152

**Persian Influence on Greek Thought**

As a parallel consideration to Irano-Judaean interaction, it is relevant to note that, beyond awareness of Persian ideas, some scholars argue that Greek philosophy and culture were influenced by Iran. The question of Persian-Greek interaction is perhaps even more

147 Stig Wikander, *Vohu: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Indo-Iranischen Religionsgeschichte*, vol. I: Texte, Quassiones Indo-Iranicae 1 (Uppsala: Lundsquestiska Bokhandeln, 1941), pp. 36–37. Wikander’s views on Vayu have not received much acceptance among Iranicists (Private communication. Dr. Almut Hintze).


151 See XV.3.14, 15, 16 (Strabo, *Geography VII*, pp. 175–6, 177, 179).

fraught than Iranian-Jewish since both share a common Indo-European inheritance. A few scholars' suggestions are here mentioned by way of contextualizing the study of Second Temple Judaism. Duchesne-Guillemin notes that Heroditus's doctrines of the logos and of the nature of fire are quite similar to the Iranian concepts of atis and fire, respectively, and can be interpreted as borrowed. He also notes the astronomical list of Anaximander parallels Pahlavi texts, but considers these to be parallel developments; West, however, considers Anaximander's system to be a combination of Babylonian and Persian systems. Afnan argues that the early Greek Philosophers knew of the Persian ideas but rejected them due to dislike of 'revelatory' religion, but goes on to claim that Plato's concept of the ideals was inspired by the Amoisa Spontas. West argues for Persian influence on Anaximander, Anaximenes and Heraclitus. According to him, Xerxes's attack on Athens ended a period of 'active Iranian influence' (550–480). Kingsley, however, rejects an end to an era of Persian influence, claiming that Magi were present in Athens at least until the death of Plato. Boyce also positively discusses the possibility of Zoroastrian influence on Greek Philosophy. These possibilities cannot be explored in depth here, yet even these brief comments highlight the availability of Persian ideas during the Achaemenid Empire. If a people outside the confines of the Persian Empire had opportunity to hear about Persian ideas, how much more so a people which had lived entirely within its confines for two centuries?

**Religious Situation in Iran**

A common hindrance in the evaluation of Persian influence is to limit the discussion to Zoroastrianism per se, much of the content and worldview of the Iranians in general and the Zoroastrians in particular pre-dates the 'reforms of Zarathustra.' While many of the ideas most likely to have been borrowed became standard doctrine in Sassanian Zoroastrianism, various other ideas were available during the same periods and may have also played their own roles. The details of the antiquity and relation of various religious strands are heavily
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debated, but aspects relevant to the question of influence on Jewish apocalyptic can be
picked out from amid the mêlée without having to decide on all of the tricky questions in the
history of Iranian religion.

In the above discussion of the evidence of the Greek writers, it was briefly noted that
much debate on the question of religious influence gets unduly caught up on the question of
orthodox Zoroastrianism. Before approaching the issue of Judaean-Iranian contacts, it is
necessary to investigate the religious situation in Iran and the matrix of religious ideas likely
to have been encountered in the Achaemenid Empire (and the later Parthian Empire).

It is common to distinguish between three forms or stages in the development of
Iranian religion: the early Indo-Iranian religion, the religion of the reformer (the so-called
‘Zarathushtrianism’), and later Zoroastrianism;” Boyce, however, dissents from many in the
evaluation of the difference between ‘Zarathushtrianism’ and Zoroastrianism, seeing a greater
continuity of thought between the Gāthās and the Avesta.” Many scholars also add a fourth
‘Zoroastrian heresy’ commonly called Zurvanism.” Jong characterizes three basic
approaches to the history of Zoroastrianism, which he calls the ‘fragmenting, harmonizing,
and diversifying’ approaches, and he criticizes what he sees as an overly Hegelian view of
history in each.” Rather than trying to impose evolutionary or dialectical models on the
evidence, it is important to allow a realistic picture—one which will often be messy and
contradictory. Also important for evaluating the influence of Persian ideas is the nature of
the religious ideas which pre-dated Zarathustra, and which were never completely
‘suppressed,’ regardless of how much one thinks was eliminated or anathematized (or not) by
the prophet. This section will attempt to put the religious situation into a perspective
suitable for investigating influence; detailed analysis of texts and theological trends will be
dealt with elsewhere.

Shaked has rightly criticized the prevailing understanding of Zurvanism as a
Zoroastrian heresy or independent religion,” such as dominates much discussion of

162 A fairly standard description of the situation is available in Malandra, An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion,
p. 4; Cf. Schwartz, “The Religion of Achaemenian Iran,” pp. 664–697; Gershevitich added an additional term
‘Zarathushtricism,’ but it apparently was not taken up subsequently. See Ilya Gershevitich, “Zoroaster’s Own
163 See, for example, her comments in Boyce, HZ II, pp. 241–242.
164 E.g., the overview in Mary Boyce, “Some Reflections on Zurvanism,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and
Zervanite Apocalypse II,” Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 10.3 (1940): pp. 606–63; Zaehner,
Zurvan. Although these studies are dated, Zurvan still makes periodic forays into the discussion.
165 Jong, Traditions of the Magi, pp. 43–45.
166 Shaul Shaked, From Zoroastrian Iran to Islam, Collected Studies (Aldershot: Variorium, 1995), Section V (pp.
zum
Achaemenid period religion. \(^{167}\) 'Zurvanism' refers to the myth that both Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu were twins born of the god Zurvan ('Time') that some scholars take to be the defining belief of a separate 'heresy' or faith. The question of the relationship between Zoroastrianism and Zurvanism is essentially the perennial question of whether the religion as taught by Zarathuṣtra was monotheistic or dualistic: was the dualistic understanding a corruption or faithful continuation of the religion of the \(\text{Gāthās}\)\(^{2}\)? And, was the dualism 'primary' or 'secondary'? The debate essentially hinges on the interpretation of a single \(\text{Gāthā}\) passage, \(\text{Yasna XXX.3–5}\). Insler translates this passage as the following:

Yes, there are two fundamental spirits, twins \(\text{yomā}\) which are renowned to be in conflict. In thought and in word, in action, they are two: the good and the bad. And between these, the beneficent have correctly chosen, and not the maleficent. \(^{168}\) Furthermore, when these two spirits first came together, they created life and death, and how, at the end, the worst existence shall be for the deceitful but the best thinking for the truthful person. \(^{2}\) Of these two Spirits, the deceitful chose to bring to realization the worst things. (But) the very virtuous spirit, who is clothed in the hardest stones, chose the truth, and (so shall those) who shall satisfy the Wise Lord continuously with true actions.

Particularly vital to the interpretation of this passage is the understanding of the term 'twins' \(\text{yomā}\). Some interpret it literally, and thus posit an original but derivative dualism; others metaphorically. Of these latter, depending on whether or not Spenta Mainyu is equated with Ahura Mazda, some conclude a dualism,\(^{170}\) or a monotheism\(^{171}\) (See Figure 6). In the midst of this hermeneutical melée, however, two things are certain: the interpretation of the verse is exceedingly difficult and ambiguous, and that the force of Zarathuṣtra's

---


teaching was primarily an *ethical* dualism. The implications of these two points are very significant, and often overlooked in the discussion.

That the interpretation of this passage is ambiguous can be clearly seen in the continual divide between scholars, and can be touched upon in the references given in the footnotes above.\(^\text{172}\) What is not appreciated is that this ambiguity most likely, if not definitely, *existed already in the adherents of the tradition* in the Achaemenid, Parthian, and Sassanian periods, just as it does today. It is in this light that the 'Zurvanite' myth must be viewed: this teaching took the word 'twin' literally and posited that Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu were twins born of the god Zurvan, 'eternal time,' an interpretation also followed by many modern commentators. Thus, a dualism grounded in a (remote) monotheism. Simultaneously, the Magi may have interpreted the word 'twins' simply as an ontological co-eternity of the two deities. Some modern commentators attempt to describe Zarathuštra's teaching as monotheistic in tendency or actuality, and see this tendency also in the inscriptions of Darius I and Xerxes.\(^\text{175}\) While a plethora of gods or entities are evident in the Gāthas and the Yasna Hāstpasteiti, there is no doubt that Ahura Mazda always takes a place of prime importance, as he does in the Old Persian inscriptions. Much scholarship considers the renewed presence of Indo-Iranian deities in the Younger Avesta and Vīdēvdāt as a 'backslide' or capitulation to the old Iranian polytheism, but this is far from clear.\(^\text{174}\) The resolution of this issue brings up the second point above: the focus of Zarathuštra's message.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monotheistic/ Monistic</th>
<th>Ahura Mazda and Spenta Mainyu</th>
<th>Ahura Mazda and Spenta Mainyu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Not Identified</em></td>
<td><em>Identified</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahura Mazda</td>
<td>Angra Mainyu (\rightarrow) Spenta Mainyu</td>
<td>(\rightarrow) Ahura Mazda = Spenta Mainyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angra Mainyu (\rightarrow) Spenta Mainyu</td>
<td>Angra Mainyu (\rightarrow) Ahura Mazda = Spenta Mainyu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6: Mazdaean Monotheism or Dualism in Yasna 30**

Author's Own.

\(^{172}\) Cf. the overview of Philippe Gignoux, “Monotheism or Polytheism in the Gathic Revelation?,” *Irano-Judaica IV*, eds. Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 1999), pp. 65–71, who refuses to make a decision on the matter.


That the Gāthās teach an ethical dualism focused upon the person of Ahura Mazda is unquestionable, even if expressed with ritual terms. All of the Gāthās can easily be seen to be drawn from this premise: that humanity is presented the choice between aša and druji, and that Ahura Mazda is the god exclusively of aša. This teaching had ontological implications; what is unclear is whether or not Zarathushtra himself drew these implications. The force of his teaching is, to borrow a term coined in the discussion of the monotheism of Israelite religion, monolatrous; whether or not other deities existed, Ahura Mazda alone was source of all which was worthy of worship. In this light, his teaching had a monotheistic-appearing tendency situated in an ethical dualism. However, in light of the subtlety of his verses, these two tendencies—monistic and dualistic—appear in constant flux, and have led modern commentators to conflate the ethical with the ontological dualism. The tradition is thus susceptible to simultaneous interpretations of dualism and monotheism, in a tension which refuses to be removed.

In an interesting article, Boyd and Crosby discuss the history of this problem and attempt a solution which is highly illuminating. They place the question of dualism versus monotheism in the perspective of eschatology: while current reality is dualistic, the end of history will also be the end of Angra Mainyu, and thus of dualism, or, as they phrase it, "Zoroastrianism combines in a manner unique to itself among the major religions of the world a cosmogonic dualism and an eschatological monotheism." Two of the arguments which Boyd and Crosby utilize are of much interest to this study: they reveal the integral nature of time and the eschaton to the theological system, and the link of Ahura Mazda with wisdom. "Time plays an absolutely decisive role in the Zoroastrian religion, even to the point of altering in a fundamental manner the ontological status of Ahura Mazda." It is this concept which unifies Zoroaster's monolatry and his ethical dualism, as well as explaining the myth of the subordination of Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu to Zurvan (the personification of the concept zurvan akanārag, 'eternal time')—the fates of both are indeed dependent on time.


176 In fact, the use of 'dualism' in scholarship is too often imprecise, conflating all kinds of binary oppositions which may or may not be related. For a pertinent study to this effect (albeit with terminology which this author would not endorse) see John G. Gammie, "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature 93.3 (1974): pp. 356—385.


178 Boyd and Crosby, "Is Zoroastrianism Dualistic or Monotheistic?," p. 575.

179 Boyd and Crosby, "Is Zoroastrianism Dualistic or Monotheistic?," p. 576.
The basic translation of the name ‘Ahura Mazda’ as either the ‘The Wise Lord’ or ‘Lord Wisdom’ is well-known; the importance of this role as the god of wisdom is pointed out by Boyd and Crosby. It is this role, they argue, which enables Ahura Mazda to guarantee his ultimate victory over Angra Mainyu despite his ontological limitations and without compromising the role of the ethical human will. This doctrine is highly sophisticated and balanced—indeed it seems to consistently elude highly educated minds—and it is to be expected that a multiplicity of understandings and simplifications of it would quickly circulate. That neither the monotheistic or dualistic interpretations are wholly correct helps explain some of the confusion over the matter, both in modern research and in ancient observers.

The second clear point is the ethical thrust of the above quoted passage, as of the Gaithas as a whole. While unavoidably containing cosmological, ontological, and ritual referents, the Gaithas are prayers which emphasize the righteous choice made by the speaker (the original composer as well as the present reciter) before the god, and as an ‘added benefit’ encourage the listener to make the same choice. The term ‘twins’ emphasizes the duality of the choice more than making an ontological statement. As Boyce noted, Zarathushtra was not a modern systematic theologian nor philosopher—indeed, Choksy doubts that Zarathushtra can even properly be considered a priest or prophet, preferring to call him a devotional poet. This choice is available to every man, just as it was to the divine beings—both or all hundreds of them. On its own the teaching is able to adapt to a form of polytheism by subordinating all to the choice, and thus either to the realm of Ahura Mazda or Angra Mainyu. Whether this ‘adaptation’ involved a fall from monotheism to polytheism or a reform from polytheism to monotheism is immaterial to present concerns.

Ethical dualism and ontological dualism are not the only important dualisms in the Zoroastrian texts; a dualism between material or tangible and immaterial or intangible (Avestan *mainyavaka- and *gaityyaka-, Pahlavi menog and getig) also plays an important role. This concept is both similar to and very different from the dualism between spirit and matter found in Greek philosophy, but the importance of this has generally been overlooked in the

184 On the issue of menog and getig in general see Lommel, Die Religion Zarathustras, pp. 93–129; Boyce, HZ I, pp. 229–256. 
debates over potential Iranian or Hellenistic influences on Jewish thought. The material and immaterial dualism cuts across both of the other dualisms in Iran; neither is valued nor disvalued compared to the other, unlike in Platonic or Gnostic systems. In fact, the physical world is of immense value as it was created with the express purpose of defeating Angra Mainyu. While the implications of the \textit{menog} and \textit{gêtig} dichotomy certainly underwent significant elaboration, possibly even absorbing some Neo-Platonic influences in the Sassanian period, the dualism appears already in the \textit{Gāthās}. As Shaked shows, this dualism is intimately entwined with the eschatological perspective of Zoroastrianism, and it makes sense of the apparent duplication of eschatological events: justice is served both in the spiritual (\textit{menog}) and physical (\textit{gêtig}) planes.

A Zoroastrian idea which has been alluded to several times is the doctrine of the \textit{Amaša Spōntas}, or 'Holy/Bountiful/Beneficent Immortals'. These are abstract entities which appear in the \textit{Gāthās} and are standardized into a list of six or seven in the Young Avesta. They are difficult to classify, as they are personifications of abstract ideas and alternate in use between the abstract concept and personification. Some scholars consider them little more than 'emanations' of Ahura Mazda, while others classify them as independent deities. The most important seem to be \textit{Vohu Manah} ('Good Thought') and \textit{Aša Vahišta} ('Best Truth/Order') in the \textit{Gāthās}, and while the \textit{Amaša Spōntas} were not systematized into a fixed list (or indeed even given that name) in the \textit{Gāthās}, they clearly are important to its thought. At some point, the \textit{Amaša Spōntas} were associated with the seven

\begin{enumerate}
\item E.g., Gr. \textit{Bundahisn} III (esp. vv. 23–24)/Sh. \textit{Bundahisn} II.9–11 (Anklesaria, \textit{Zand-Ākāsit}, pp. 20–45; Pahlavi Texts I, p. 14); Cf. Shaked, "The Notions \textit{menog} and \textit{gêtig}," pp. 70–73.
\item Shaul Shaked, "The Notions \textit{menog} and \textit{gêtig}," p. 60.
\item E.g., \textit{Yavan XXVIII.2, XXXI.11, XLIII.3} (Humbach, et al., \textit{Gāthās of Zarathushtra}, Vol. 1, p. 117, 129, 152).
\item Shaked, "The Notions \textit{menog} and \textit{gêtig}," p. 75, 83–84.
\item They are standardized as \textit{Vohu Manah} (Good Purpose or Thought), \textit{Aša} (Truth, Order), \textit{Amaratat} (Immortal), \textit{Avaro} (Devotion or Piety), \textit{Haurvatat} (Health or Wholeness), \textit{Xlastra} (Dominion or Kingdom), and sometimes \textit{Spōnta Mainiu} (the Holy Spirit). See Boyce, \textit{HZ} I, p. 203; Kellens, \textit{Essays on Zarathustra and Zoroastrianism}, p. 48.
\item Kellens, \textit{Essays on Zarathustra and Zoroastrianism}, pp. 50–54.
\end{enumerate}
elements of the creation, possibly under Greek influence. The subtleties of the debates over the nature of these beings reminds one of the Trinitarian debates in Christianity, and it is likely that, like those, the theological finesse of this doctrine was lost on the majority of believers. It is impossible to know exactly how Zarathustra envisioned these entities, but Boyce may be right to consider them as an attempt to ‘ethicize’ the Indo-Iranian nature religion. In the Bisitun Inscription of Darius and on his tomb, Darius is surrounded by six co-conspirators, and some have seen a conscious imitation of Ahura Mazda and the Amada Spantas here, but beyond this, they only appear sporadically in more or less probable allusions during the Achaemenid period, including the passages noted above in Plutarch and Strabo. Given their highly ritual allusions, however, it is also possible their significance was confined to the priestly class.

The exact extent of the reform of Zarathustra (assuming he was both historical and a reformer) is a matter of much debate, but comparison with the Rig Veda enables the identification of some trends in Indo-Iranian religion which can be confidently identified as Iranian, regardless of their connection to Zoroaster. It is clear that there were two classes of divinities, the Ahuras (Sanskrit Asuras) and the Daevas (Sanskrit Devas). Over time, in India the Devas became the good gods while the Asuras sank to the position of demonic gods, and the reverse occurred in Iran: the Ahuras became the good gods and the Daevas the evil ones. This change likely was occurring before Zoroaster. As is amply paralleled in cultures around the world, the Indo-Iranian religious rites sacrificed to benevolent gods to secure favours and to maleficent gods to ward off evils. The radical ethical dualism as associated with Zoroaster, however, seems to have declared that apotropaic rites—by strengthening the forces of evil—were in themselves against aša and therefore illegitimate. With this doctrine, the Daevas changed from being legitimate gods (albeit malevolent ones)

---

194 The seven elements are fire, water, earth, sky/metal, plants, animals/cattle, humanity. See Boyce, HZ I, pp. 203–205.
196 Boyce, HZ I, pp. 91–94; Shahbazi, “An Achaemenid Symbol II,” p. 125; however, Jong, Traditions of the Magi, p. 56, n. 50, rejects this theory. See further on this topic in Chapter IVb, ‘Mythic Geography.’
198 Kellens, echoing some earlier scholarship, throws doubt on the historicity of Zarathustra, allowing for the Gathas to be the work of a sect of some sort. Such a debate is familiar to biblical scholars; whether or not the man is historical, either position is irrelevant for the existence of the ideas in the writings. See Kellens, Essays on Zarathustra and Zoroastranism, pp. 83–94. Cf. Skjærvø, “The Antiquity of Old Avestan,” p. 38.
to being false gods, and then to being demons (in the modern sense of the word). The denial of the legitimacy of apotropaic rites, which are so amply attested in the Brahmanic literature and so central to the religious mindset of his time, easily explains at least some of the resistance experienced by the early Zoroastrian communities as evidenced in the Gāthās, and perhaps also the persistence of some such rites, even after the adoption of some of Zoroaster's ideas. Further, the similarity of rites as practiced by Zoroastrians and the older Indo-Iranian traditions is considerable. Both had similar sacrificial rituals using haoma/soma and the barsman/barsum, honored the hearth fire, and utilized the traditional priests; the most important differences in ritual were the acceptance and use of the Gāthās as ritual poems and the (non-)propitiation of the Daevas.

The Magi

The evidence of the Greek authors and the Persepolis tablets make the importance of the Magi undeniable; if they did not hold a monopoly on religious specialization in the Achaemenid Empire, they certainly were the most important priests of the Iranian religion, at least in the western areas of the empire. What is decidedly uncertain is exactly what they were; Herodotus (I.101) claims the Magi were one of the six tribes of the Medes, but they also consistently appear in his history as priests; they also receive rations for offerings in the Persepolis tablets, where they are linked to the mysterious Lan ceremony. Strabo describes them as one of the three tribes of Persis, but he also labels the ‘Chaldaean’ wisemen both ‘tribes’ and ‘sects.’ Scholars variously understand them to be an ethnic tribe, a sociological caste, or professional class, portraying them as converts to Zoroastrianism, opponents to Zoroastrianism, and mercenary ritualists willing to sacrifice regardless of the convictions of the client. Several scholars make the Magi central to their understanding of the

---

201 See in particular Yasna XLV1.1–4, 8 and XLIX.1–12. Cf. Yasna XXVIII.6; XXXI.18; XXXII.13; XLIII.15; L.I.12, 14 (Insler, The Gathas of Zarathustra, p. 81, 83, 95, 25, 41, 49, 65, 105, and 107, respectively).
204 As a Persian tribe: XV.3.1 (Strabo, Geography I II, p. 157); on the Chaldaean sect-tribes, XVI.1.6 (p. 203).
As ‘mercenaries,’ Gershetsivitch, Avestan Hymn to Mithra, pp. 16–17.
transformation of ‘Zarathuštrianism’ into ‘Zoroastrianism’ and/or Zurvanism. Much of
the Greek and Latin evidence for the Magi is unusable, as the figure of the Magus gradually
became assimilated with the image of the sorcerer (and thus the origin of the word magic). The Greeks frequently credit the Magi with astrology, divination, and magic, traits scholars
sometimes attribute to Babylonian influence. While Babylonian influence on the Persians
is undeniable, scholarly discussion of the influence upon the Magi is frequently in
conjunction with the Magian ‘corruption’ or misunderstanding of the Zoroastrian tradition.
Indeed Zurvanism’s supposed tendency towards fatalism is sometimes attributed to this
influence. As discussed above, however, this strict limitation of the interpretation of
Iranian religion is problematic. Even though speculations on the ‘gift of the Magi’ may be
interesting, the sources allow no conclusions on their influence as differentiated from Iranian
religion in general. All that is certain is that they were important, commonly associated
with the name of Zoroaster, supported by the Great Kings, and hereditary.

Although relatively unnoticed, the ambiguity of the Magi seems to parallel the status
of another priestly tribe, the Levites. The Torah’s description of the role and position of
the Levites is ambiguous, just like the descriptions of the Magi: sometimes the Levites are
distinguished from priests, and sometimes they are not. Judges 17–18 seems to imply
either the necessity or prerogative of the Levites to serve as priests. While their cultic duties,
in whatever form, are essential, their status as a tribe is more ambiguous. While the normal
tribal list consisted of twelve tribes including Levi, sometimes the list of twelve excluded

208 P.F. M. Fontaine, The Light and the Dark: The Cultural History of Dualism, vol. V: Dualism in Ancient Iran, India
and China (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1990), p. 27, 29, claims the Magi were Medians who corrupted Zoroastrianism
into Zurvanism, echoing Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, p. 198, 197, where the Magi are described as responsible
for the Avesta’s divergence from the Gaithas; Zaehner, Dawn and Twilight, describes a ping-pong-like alternation
between the ‘Zurvanites’ and the ‘Mazdeans,’ utilizing the terms ‘primitive,’ ‘catholic’ and ‘reformed

3(2) The Seleucid, Parthian and Sassanian Periods (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1983), pp. 826–828; Jong,
Traditions of the Magi, p. 387, 393.

210 Cf. Boyce and Grenet, HZ III, p. 278, 368, 386–389; In the context of the Hellenization of the Parthians, see

211 For Babylonian influence on Persia and Magian delinquency, see Schwartz, “The Religion of Achaemenian
Iran,” p. 690, 696–697; See also Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 182–253 (Lectures VI and VII), where he
finds the Magi responsible for the Avesta and its ‘Semitic overtones.’ Jong, “The Contribution of the Magi,”
pp. 90–91 notes the unhelpfulness of this approach.

212 Zaehner, Dawn and Twilight, pp. 236–244; Boyce, HZ II, pp. 234–235.


Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 81, would rather compare the Magi to the Rabbis.

215 For example, see the overview in Lester L. Grabbe, Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of
Levi.\textsuperscript{216} Of course, the tribal number itself varies. Deuteronomy 33 only counts ten (including Levi); 2 Sam 19:43 has eleven (unspecified 10 plus Judah); 1 Kgs 11:31–32 counts eleven (unlisted); Gen 29:31–30:24 has eleven (excluding Benjamin); and 1 Chr 4–8 lists eleven tribes (including Levi, but excluding Zebulun). One of the oldest extant Hebrew poems, \textit{The Song of Deborah} (Jdg 5), lists eleven tribes, but includes two unique tribes (Machir and Gilead) and excludes four others (Levi, Judah, Gad, Mannasseh). The much later Revelation counts twelve, but still excludes Dan (Rev 7:5–8). While these tribal lists allotted Levites no lands among the tribes, they are given cities (including 'cities of refuge') and religious duties.\textsuperscript{217} Despite the tradition in the Torah of Levi's landlessness, Ezek 48 allots land to the Levites (and to the Zadokites) among the tribes (making a \textit{de facto} fourteen tribes). The Levites were hereditary, just like the Magi (and indeed, the priests of many peoples, including the Indo-Iranian). If priests in these groups generally became priests because they were born into a priestly family, the image or analogy of a tribe is fairly apt, regardless of the origin of the group. Perhaps a better word to use than 'tribe' is 'caste.' It is worth noting that just as Second Temple Judaism had several parties within the priestly group, there is no reason to assume that the Magi were an unified group.

\textbf{Figures 7–8: Apadana Reliefs; detail}
Chicago Oriental Institute P-866 and P-73. Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago © University of Chicago

\textsuperscript{216} With Levi: Gen 35:23; 46:8–25; Num 26; Deut 27:12–14; 1 Chr 2:1–2.
Without Levi: Num 1; 2–3; Cf: Gen 48:5.
\textsuperscript{217} Num 18:23–24; 35:2–8; Deut 10:9; Josh 13:14; 14:4; 21.
While less specific than a particular cultus, the remains of Achaemenid imperial art reveal a consistent religio-political ideology of the Great King which differed from those of previous empires, some of which is consonant with Avestan ideas.\(^\text{218}\) The art and archaeology of Iran deserves a much more thorough investigation in this regard.\(^\text{219}\) Nylander points out subtle but significant alterations to Mesopotamian monumental traditions in the imperial reliefs that betray a specific and intentional royal ideology. This ideology glories in the extent and multiplicity of the empire and in its subjects' voluntary submission and subservience to the Great King.\(^\text{220}\) The procession of peoples bearing gifts on the Apadana and at the ‘Gate of All Nations’ at Persepolis, as well as Darius I’s foundation tablet at Susa, reveal this (See Figures 7–8). In contrast to Egyptian and Assyrian iconography, where the king is depicted crushing the opponents of world order, the Achaemenid art portrays the king as welcoming the collaboration of peoples in the maintenance of the world.\(^\text{221}\) Whereas the Assyrians graphically used violence in their aesthetic, the only visible violence in the Achaemenid repertoire is the hero slaying a monster and the lion killing a bull (See Figure 9). Yet, even in these scenes there is still an odd sense of serenity, of the proper order remaining upheld.\(^\text{222}\) Both the lion and the bull are common symbols in the Near East, but their ubiquity in Achaemenid art is one of its most conspicuous aspects. Bull and lions, either singly or together, appear in carvings, on seal impressions, coins, plates, and as the capitals of


\(^{219}\) For studies in these areas—which are not discussed here for want of space—see Appendix I.


\(^{221}\) Nylander, “Achaemenid Imperial Art,” pp. 54–55.

magnificent pillars. The prevalence and stylization of the bulls and lions indicates a deliberate and particularly Persian ideology in their use.

**Figure 9: Lion and Bull Motif**
Chicago Oriental Institute P-468. Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago © University of Chicago

Far from implying a postmodern hero in the Great King, this ideology of diversity instead urges a recognition of the yet poorly understood ideological and theological underpinnings of the Persian Empire. That this world order is explicitly or implicitly in the name of Ahura Mazda is visible in all of the kings’ inscriptions from Darius I. Skjaervo even suggests that Darius not only quotes the Avesta in Old Persian translation, but saw himself as partially fulfilling the role of a *saoshyant* by making the world *frasa*}, an important eschatological term. It seems then that at least aspects of the Avestan tradition were important to royal ideology, at least from Darius I onwards. These are ideologies which could not have gone unnoticed by the Judeans. These more overtly political sources, however, need not be ignored in the investigation of influence: political and religious ideas can interact in numerous ways, or have mutual influences on the expression of the other. An example of iconography which may carry both religious and political overtones is the so-called winged disk.

---


Winged Disk

One of the most ubiquitous symbols of the Achaemenids is the winged disk. It is perhaps the only symbol which is used more often than the bull and/or lion. The symbol is generally considered to be borrowed via Assyria from the Egyptian solar disk. It appears on reliefs, coins, and seals. Sometimes it is merely a winged disk; sometimes the disk contains the upper half of a bust of a crowned male figure, holding a ring of power. Sometimes the lower part of the ring has an eagle tail.

As the winged disk borrowed the ninth century Assyrian representation for either Aššur or Šamaš, many scholars have assumed that in Persian inscriptions the symbol stands for Ahura Mazda, the god mentioned in many royal inscriptions. Shahbazi, however, demonstrates that the identity of the winged disk with Aššur was based upon an assumption of the identity of it in Persia with Ahura Mazda, and the identity with Ahura Mazda later supported by the identity with Aššur. He further argues that beyond the circular logic, the identification in fact is questioned by four considerations: 1) it contradicts the evidence of Greek authors; 2) it is questioned by the variety of forms in which the symbol appears; 3) it ignores that the symbol is sometimes subordinate to other divine symbols; 4) it ignores the dissimilarity to known depictions of Ahura Mazda in post-

\[\text{Figure 10: Winged Disk with Figure}\]

---

Achaemenid Iranian art. He instead proposes that the winged disk symbol was intended as a representation of *Xvarsnah*—both the Royal/Kingly and Iranian Glory (Persian *Farnab*; Avestan *Xarunab*). Both Boyce and de Jong concur. *Xarunab* in the Zoroastrian writings is a complex concept; closely linked with one of the later systematized *Amastia Spanta*; (Xishta, ‘kingdom’), *Xarunah* was a political and religious concept, and its precise translation is debated. The entire *Aitād Yāst* (XVIII) is devoted to the praise of the *Xarunah* of the Aryans, although Hintze considers the *Zamyad Yāst* (XIX) to be the most important text for understanding the concept. It has been translated as ‘glory,’ ‘fortune,’ ‘dignity,’ ‘luck,’ and by Hintze as ‘Glücksglanz.’ It was possessed by the Mazdayasian religion (what the Zoroastrians call their religion), the Aryans and Arya (Indo-Iranians’ designation of their own lands—the origin of ‘Iran’), heroes, and the king. According to the *Zamyad Yāst* (XIX.34–36) and the *Shahnameh*, the *Xarunah* departed from the mythical primal king Yima when he ‘found delight in words of falsehood and untruth’ in the form of an eagle. And, according to the same *Yāst*, §§ 11–12, 19–20, 23–24, 89–90, it is the *Amastia Spantas* and their *Xarunah* which will renew the world by ending decay and death. Indeed, the *Zamyad Yāst* strongly links *Xarunah* to the *Saoshyant*, the eschatological savior or ‘overcomer,’ who will inaugurate the final age when evil is no more. It is tempting to speculate that Darius chose this symbol to allude to this victory of Ahura Mazda’s *frata* world—as he describes his reign in his inscriptions—but, Hintze denies that *frata* has the eschatological connotation in Old Persian that it has in Avestan. The rule of Iran cannot be held without the Iranian *Xarunah*, and it can only be given, not seized, certainly a convenient idea for a monarch. It

231 Jong, *Traditions of the Magi*, pp. 299–301, prefers to understand the symbol as the king’s *Xarunah* as does Boyce (Boyce, *HZ II*, pp. 102–105).
234 Jong, *Traditions of the Magi*, pp. 299–301, prefers to understand the symbol as the king’s *Xarunah* as does Boyce (Boyce, *HZ II*, pp. 102–105).
236 It was possessed by the Mazdayasian religion (what the Zoroastrians call their religion), the Aryans and Arya (Indo-Iranians’ designation of their own lands—the origin of ‘Iran’), heroes, and the king. According to the *Zamyad Yāst* (XIX.34–36) and the *Shahnameh*, the *Xarunah* departed from the mythical primal king Yima when he ‘found delight in words of falsehood and untruth’ in the form of an eagle. And, according to the same *Yāst*, §§ 11–12, 19–20, 23–24, 89–90, it is the *Amastia Spantas* and their *Xarunah* which will renew the world by ending decay and death. Indeed, the *Zamyad Yāst* strongly links *Xarunah* to the *Saoshyant*, the eschatological savior or ‘overcomer,’ who will inaugurate the final age when evil is no more. It is tempting to speculate that Darius chose this symbol to allude to this victory of Ahura Mazda’s *frata* world—as he describes his reign in his inscriptions—but, Hintze denies that *frata* has the eschatological connotation in Old Persian that it has in Avestan. The rule of Iran cannot be held without the Iranian *Xarunah*, and it can only be given, not seized, certainly a convenient idea for a monarch. It
also echoes Darius’s frequent pronouncements of Ahura Mazda’s aid (e.g. the remarkably religious and political Bisitun inscription). If the winged disk was intended to depict the royal Xarašna, it is difficult to know how much of its resonances would have been known to the average Persian subject, whether devotees of Ahura Mazda or not. Yet, that the idea was certainly known in the empire is demonstrated by its appearance as a theophoric element in names. It certainly would have been easily recognizable as a royal symbol, but the array of ideas associated with Xarašna would only be suggested to those who knew the intended referent. Shahbazi suggests that veneration of Xarašna can be seen in Isa 65:11, but this is unlikely: even if the Achaemenid cult of Xarašna was assimilated with the Greek ΤΟΥ and the Aramaean ܡܘ in places, it seems more likely that Third Isaiah simply intended the old Aramaean cult. Still, if the connection is correct, it is evidence of both the dating of the eschatological ideas and of their importance at least in the royal cult.

The case of the winged disk, then, illustrates both the remaining work to be done on the ideological matrices of the Achaemenid period, as well as the necessity to expand the discussion beyond ‘Zoroastrian’ texts per se without excluding them. Political ideology—with its inherently religious coloring—is not to be excluded from the remit of potential Iranian influences. Much more work towards these ends remains to be explored, with the traditions surrounding (and promoted by?) Cyrus perhaps the most outstanding.

**Summary**

The scholar looking for sources on Iranian religion during the Achaemenid period has plenty to investigate, even if the evidence requires significant reconstruction and complex case-building. Achaemenid texts and artifacts, Greek authors, and the Avesta provide reliable sources of information on the period before Alexander and can be used together to reconstruct some of the ideas which were current at that time. Even though the extant Iranian manuscripts are very late, they can provide invaluable perspectives on ideas which


40 For a convenient list, see Shahbazi, “An Achaemenid Symbol II,” p. 146. One (پرسته) is also listed by Bezalel Porten, “Persian Names in Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt,” *Iran-Judaica I*, eds. Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 2003), p. 186.


most likely circulated in the Achaemenid Empire when investigated in conjunction with the other sources. Linguistic considerations show that the Avesta can be securely dated to the Achaemenid period at the latest; various Classical texts and Old Persian and Elamite texts attest to contemporary practice. The late, Pahlavi sources can be useful when attesting lost Avestan texts, or when explaining otherwise enigmatic classical sources. The investigation is greatly aided if not confined to a search for a monolithic, 'orthodox' tradition, but is willing to see the variety which inevitably presents itself. This brief overview noted that the Iranian religion had multiple traditions, much of which is related in some form to the tradition known as 'Zoroastrian.' The cult of Ahura Mazda had related traditions of dualism and eschatology. The Magi appeared as important but elusive agents, and tantalizing hints of royal ideology appeared. Not all of the relevant issues were examined here; rather, an overview of the situation as it pertains to the question of potential interaction and influence between Iran and emerging Judaism was given. It remains to see how much of the Iranian cultural matrix Persian subjects could be reasonably expected to discover, and the situations in which this could be expected or posited. The following chapter deals with the issues of the potential settings for interaction.
II

The Achaemenid Context
There were many opportunities for Judaeans and other Yahwists to come in contact with Persians and other Iranian peoples,1 within Israel and in the diaspora. The exact location where Jews were influenced by Persian ideas cannot be proved—indeed they were probably absorbed over time and in a variety of locations—but the opportunity for such absorption can be amply demonstrated. As the entirety of the Yahwistic world lived under Achaemenid rule for roughly 200 years, there are too many scenarios to discuss each in detail;2 the following chooses five broad geographical areas (Babylonia, Media and Iranian lands, Asia Minor, Egypt and Palestine) to mention situations where likely Iranian presence and Judaean/Israelite presence can be surmised. Historians and biblical scholars have sometimes contented themselves with exploiting the relatively sparse archaeological record of the Persian period as evidence of Persian laissez-faire and/or non-presence;3 however, the vagaries of retrieval well-known to archaeology warn of this ‘arguing from silence.’ Below will attempt to point to some of the positive evidence available, suggesting the likelihood of multiple Iranian-Jewish contacts throughout the Achaemenid period and even into the Hellenistic and Roman (aka Parthian) periods. Given the number of potential historical contexts in which Judaean-Iranian interaction was possible, complete segregation of the two peoples would require remarkable proof.4 For concision and clarity, this study focuses on and emphasizes the Achaemenid Empire, although other empires and periods (Median, Parthian) are also potentially relevant.5

1 There were a variety of Iranian peoples in the Achaemenid Empire, the Persians being only one of them. The term *Iran* derives from the word *Aiya,* and was already recognized in antiquity to include the Persians, the Medes, the Caspians, the Bactrians, Scythians and others speaking Iranian languages. For an overview see Fortson, *Indo-European Language,* chapter 11.

2 This fact is put well in Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire,* p. 465: “In the case of the Jews, the whole oriental world, throughout which they were even now so widely scattered, recognized a common master. The importance of this factor in the religious evolution of the Jews cannot be overestimated.”


4 Historical decisions on the likelihood of any of the discrete hints discussed here are not necessary for the overall purpose of this study; the goal is merely to demonstrate that historical interactions between the two populations is highly likely within the Achaemenid Empire, fulfilling the historical criterion for influence set forth above.


For Parthia, see Boyce, “The Parthian gāšān and Iranian Minstrel Tradition,” pp. 10—45; Geo Widengren, *Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit, Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordhein-
Nebuchadnezzar deported Judaean exiles to the region of Nippur, on the Chebar River/Canal (Tel Abib; Ezek 1:1, 3; 3:15; 10:15, 20, 22). From the conquest of Cyrus, or at the latest, Darius I, Nippur also housed estates of Persian nobles and Iranian colonies. These estates included the lands of Prince Achaemenes, his son Phradates, and the Egyptian satrap Aršam, who held a manor near Nippur. Indeed, Dandamaev suggests that entire districts around Nippur were held by Persian nobles. Beyond official colonies, the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods saw increasing immigration into Babylonia from the Iranian Plateau. This could partially be explained by Dandamaev's suggestion that Nippur's importance increased under the Achaemenids, particularly following Xerxes's supposed suppression of the city of Babylon. Further studies on Achaemenid Babylonia are likely to illuminate more adequately the details of Iranian presence within the region.
The Jewish community at Nippur is partially illuminated by the Murašu Archive. While making ethnic or religious identifications based solely on names is problematic, onomastics can be used as a source for some general probabilities. Zadok opines that the scribes of the Murašu Archive were more familiar with YHWH as a deity than other Babylonian scribes, obliquely indicating the important presence of YHWH-ists in the region. According to Daiches, at least 70 Jews can be identified in the records, two of whom had Persian names; Zadok counts 64 with YHWH-istic names, but allows for up to 100 persons represented in the archive in total. Some of these Yahwists served as servants to Persians, some as royal officials, including one who was "over the birds of the king." One Judaean, with the Persian name Gu-uk-ka-, was a servant of a Persian and son of an interpreter-scribe. There is also evidence that Jews owned horse- and bow-fiefs. The Jewish community quite naturally represented all social strata, many of which required interaction with the local Persian officials.

---


Several names in the archive indicate at least the beginnings of Persian borrowing: Judeans borrowed the Persian word *tiri* for the formation of several non-Iranian names. This is evidence of some co-mingling. Indeed, the occupation of interpreter-scribe for the Persian authorities was held by at least three or four Judeans in the Nippur region. The position of interpreter-scribe is ideally positioned for exposure to Persian ideas and ideologies; they were essential for the functioning of the Persian administration and present at all official communications. Old Persian was primarily a spoken language, Aramaic (and Elamite) the languages of the administration, and local languages still used locally; interpreter-scribes received oral commands in Persian and wrote them in Aramaic, or received written communications and read them out in Persian or the local language. Hence one can expect familiarity with the system of administration, at least, among the interpreter-scribes, perhaps even knowledge of Old Persian and the traditions shared thereby.

New tablets (so-called 'TAYN' tablets) have recently been discovered which reveal the presence of other Judean communities in Babylon—at alu ša Našar and al-Yahudu, both probably near Borsippa. Pearce considers that these new tablets provide evidence of what she refers to as an ‘administrative fiscal district’ composed largely of Jews. If this is true, such a community would likely have had at least periodic contact with Persian officials, even if the tablets so far only evidence two Persian names. At the very least, it would be reasonable to expect a familiarity with the mechanisms and ideologies of the administration which they served.

Smith argues that familiarity with Persian ideology is particularly evident in Second Isaiah. Indeed, he posits the presence of pro-Cyrus propagandists in Babylonia prior to its fall. Regardless of the presence of Persian agents or the ideology of Second Isaiah, it is clear

---

18 Daiches, *The Jews in Babylonia*, pp. 16–17; cf. a different name using *tiri* in 1 Chron. 4:16 (NIV); Coogan, *West Semitic*, p. 86. Daiches cites *tiri* as meaning ‘power,’ but that does not appear to be correct—rather it is a name of a deity. The word does not seem to appear in either Avestan or Old Persian (Cf. Kent, *Old Persian*, and Bartholomae, *Altiraniranisches Wörterbuch*, neither of which list *tiri*), except as the name of an obscure deity who received a day name in the Zoroastrian Calendar.
19 Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, p. 77.
that Cyrus (II) was known before his advance in 539 B.C.E. Much has been written on the (un-)historicity of the Nabonidus Chronicle and the Cyrus Cylinder, but it is reasonably clear that Cyrus was known (and perhaps anticipated) in Babylon from his battles with Astyages, king of Media (550 B.C.E.). The prophecy in Jer 51 seems to confirm some form of this expectation.

Perhaps the enigma of 'Darius the Mede' in Dan 5:31 also reflects this situation in an oblique manner. While the use of any Daniel passage for Neo-Babylonian or Achaemenid period history is problematic, the use of Iranian terms within it evidences some form of interaction by the time Daniel was written. To the non-Iranian world, Cyrus's defeat of Astyages was viewed more as an internal coup than the rise of a new empire—Greeks continued long afterwards to confuse the distinction between 'Mede' and 'Persian'.

Darius I appears to be the first to declare himself specially Persian rather than Median, making Daniel's epithet ironic. While the final redactional reason for the designation 'Mede' in the book of Daniel was likely to fit the four empire scheme, the historical confusion between Media and Persia certainly did not hinder such use, and it may be part of the reason it was later found unproblematic by commentators. Further, Zadok has argued that the new names given to Daniel's friends Hananiah and Mishael—Shadrach and Meshach—are also Iranian names, placing the Danielic traditions into some form of relationship with Iran. In any case, the possibility for knowledge of Persian ideas among the Babylonian exiles exists from at least the fall of Babylon, if not before.


29 Cf. the discussion in Chapter 13a.


Ezra 8:15—20 records that Ezra was able to identify distinct communities of Levites and temple servants still intact at Casiphia, an unknown location presumably different from the communities around Nippur. Even without further information, it, along with the new ‘TAYN’ tablets, indicate that the Yahwistic exiles were not exclusive to Nippur. They could have come into contact with Persians throughout the Satrapy of Babylonia, where there were many Persian confiscated lands.

MEDIA AND IRANIAN LANDS

There is also evidence of Judaeans and Israelites living in Iranian lands during the Achaemenid period. According to 2 Kings 17:6, Assyria exiled Israelites to unnamed cities in Media (721 B.C.E.); these cities may have been Harhar and Kišessu, in the former Kingdom of Ellipi. The Book of Tobit, if it reflects its setting at all historically, seems to indicate that some of the Northern exiles kept their identity and religion, implying an Israelite community around the Median cities of Ecbatana and Rages, both of which feature in the narrative (Ecbatana is about 50 miles from Harhar). As Bauckham notes, more Northern Israelites were exiled than Judaeans, so their continuance as a community is not impossible. Indeed, he would argue that Tobit was written to convert the deportees’ descendants to a Jerusalem-centered faith. It is not out of bounds to suggest, therefore, the possibility that these former exiles were in contact with their Judaean counterparts. Zadok even suggests that several of the clans which are recorded in Ezra-Nehemiah are descendants of the deportees to Media. Judaeans from Lachish were settled in the region of Nineveh (701 B.C.E.), which was conquered by the Medes (612 B.C.E.), and these also could have been in

---


38 Bauckham, “Tobit as Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel,” p. 159.

contact with other exiles either in Media or Babylonia. The relationship between Judaeans, Israelites and emerging Judaism is difficult to elucidate, but these hints suggest that the groups related to the biblical traditions were broadly dispersed and in contact with each other, even in the sixth century. The mention of Rages (Raga) may be significant: Raga played an important role for Zoroastrianism in the west. Indeed, the appearance of ‘Asmodeus’ in Tobit as a demon (from Aēšma-Daeima, the only demon in the Gāthās) is one of the few generally agreed Iranian borrowings.

The book of Nehemiah (1:11) preserves the tradition of Nehemiah serving as a cup-bearer to the king in Susa. The position of cup-bearer was extremely high and important, as it represented the king at his most vulnerable. Even if the accuracy of this title is doubted, Nehemiah’s position must have been sufficiently high to merit two appointments to govern Yehud. Such a high position of a Judaean in Susa, one of the imperial capitals, could indicate the presence at least of a small community in the area; indeed, Nehemiah’s memoir (1:2) records the presence of his brother, Hanani (חָנָנִי), and ‘certain men from Judah.’ Briant suggests that Hanani may even be the same official as the Hanni (סַנִי) mentioned in correspondence of the Elephantine community. If this connection can be made, it suggests a tradition of at least one family serving in the Persian civil service, but this is uncertain. The Book of Esther also implies a Jewish community around Susa, possibly the clan known as ‘Elam;’ Dandamaev seems to think there was a large Jewish community in Susa, and

---


42. Zaddok, *Jews in Babylonia*, p. 43.

43. Even if the accuracy of this title is doubted, Nehemiah’s position must have been sufficiently high to merit two appointments to govern Yehud. Such a high position of a Judaean in Susa, one of the imperial capitals, could indicate the presence at least of a small community in the area; indeed, Nehemiah’s memoir (1:2) records the presence of his brother, Hanani (חָנָנִי), and ‘certain men from Judah.’ Briant suggests that Hanani may even be the same official as the Hanni (סַנִי) mentioned in correspondence of the Elephantine community. If this connection can be made, it suggests a tradition of at least one family serving in the Persian civil service, but this is uncertain. The Book of Esther also implies a Jewish community around Susa, possibly the clan known as ‘Elam;’ Dandamaev seems to think there was a large Jewish community in Susa, and
Kessler also intimates Elam to be a ‘major center’ of a Yahwistic population. While neither Dandamaev nor Kessler mention any evidence, Neo-Babylonian inscriptions on alabastra and an oblique reference in the Talmud imply that Susa long held a Yahwistic community. In any case, if no one else, Nehemiah himself had frequent and intimate contact with his Persian lords. Boyce argues that this contact would have not only familiarized Nehemiah with Zoroastrian purity laws, but have required his observance of them; she points out in this connection that one of the major themes in his memoirs is the observation of religious purity. Whether or not it is wise to go that far, one would expect that Nehemiah’s position would expose him to Persian ideas at some level.

Lipinski argues that there is some evidence from the Persepolis tablets of Judaeans working in the Persian heartland itself, although this is limited to a few potentially Yahwistic names. As the Persians utilized a wide variety of ethnicities to work on the extensive building projects of the kings, it is hardly surprising to find evidence of at least a few Jewish workers among them. The existence or non-existence of a full community is impossible to ascertain from the evidence available here, however.

The sources presented so far evidence at least a minimal presence of Judaeans in three major centres of Achaemenid Iran: Ecbatana, Susa, and Persepolis. This is significant for the question of Judean-Persian interaction, even if the size of these groups was relatively small. It should be remembered in this context that the authors of the received text of the traditions were also probably a relatively small group. But whatever the size of the groups in this period, some Jews did remain in Iranian lands into the Roman period and beyond (Cf. Acts 2:9)—perhaps partly descended from the communities hinted at here.

---

50 See Boyce, HZ II, p. 189.
Asia Minor/ Anatolia

The large area of Asia Minor, with its many imperial and cultural traditions, is too large to deal with in detail here. Rather, it will suffice to point to the Persian presence in the various areas and their relative proximity to known Jewish communities. In general, the Persian presence in Asia Minor, both in terms of ethnic Iranians and cultural influences, was significant well into the Hellenistic era and even into the Roman. The evidence available indicates significant Iranian populations in various regions, although the exact details are difficult to reconstruct. Perhaps most significant from the perspective of this study is the continued presence of an Iranian ‘diaspora’ in Asia Minor long after the fall of the Achaemenid Empire. As late as 562 C.E. the Sassanian emperor felt it necessary to negotiate with the Byzantine emperor to prevent the persecution of Zoroastrians in Asia Minor.

These must be largely descendants of Iranian colonists who moved to Asia Minor as early as Cyrus’s campaign—Persian landholders were part of the defense structure of the empire. Xenophon even regarded colonists to be essential to Cyrus’s organization of the empire. Thus any Jews in Anatolia had many centuries to come into contact with Persians and their ideas. Jones even thinks that Iranian influence was most likely in the Hellenistic Period, when both diasporas spoke Greek.

Josephus claims that Antiochus the Great moved 2000 Jewish families from Babylon to Lydia and Phrygia (Ant. XII.147–153), and later he records that some participated in the Senate of Sardis (Ant. XIV.259–261). While it is not known if this was the first arrival of the Jews in Asia Minor, they seem to have been a fairly populous and prosperous minority, particularly in Sardis, where a large synagogue with at least 30 donors has been discovered. This building is quite late, but some suggest that Obad 20 indicates Jews in Sardis in the

55 The evidence for the extent of Persian influence has sometimes been obscured by Western pro-Greek bias. This bias can be noted perusing the public explanations of the Lycian displays at the British Museum—nowhere is it indicated that these monuments were produced in the Persian Empire or that any of the motifs could have any relation at all to the Persians. Cf the comment in Root, “From the Heart,” p. 14 and the article in general. This effect is apparently not limited to Anatolia, however. A similar downplaying of Iranian connections was observed by Farmanfarmaian in several exhibitions of Georgian artifacts. See Fatema S. Farmanfarmaian, “Georgia and Iran: Three Millennia of Cultural Relations, an Overview,” Journal of Persianate Studies 2.1 (2009): p. 5, n. 5.

54 Apparently Sassanian emperors twice interceded on the behalf of co-religionists, in 464 and 562. See Boyce and Grenet, HZ III, p. 239 and 257.

55 See Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, p. 66, 704.

56 Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, p. 501.


Persian period. Trebilco thinks that the Jewish community dates to at least 200 B.C.E., even though the synagogue itself is much newer.

Lydia generally and Sardis in particular was likely home to large numbers of Iranians. Sardis was the seat of the Satrap Tissaphernes and his successors, Persian influence can be seen in Sardis's pottery from shortly after Cyrus's conquest. According to Strabo (XIII.4.13), the Hyrcanian Plain to the west of Sardis was named after Iranian colonists from Hyrcania. He also mentions a 'Plain of Cyrus,' but does not indicate where this location is. An inscription to 'Zeus Baradates' or 'law-giving Zeus' found in Sardis has been interpreted as referring to Ahura Mazda, and has been compared to an inscription to 'Zeus of the Persians.' Pausanias, Description of Greece V.27, lists Persians and Persian cults in the Lydian cities of Hierocaesarea and Hypaipa, and the cult of Anaitis existed until at least the reign of Augustus in Sardis. Tralles seems to have been the site of the oikos of Tissaphernes as well as a garrison. Josephus mentions Jews in Halicarnassus (Ant XIV.258), also a place of Persian settlement. Pausanias, Description of Greece V.27, lists Persians and Persian cults in the Lydian cities of Hierocaesarea and Hypaipa, and the cult of Anaitis existed until at least the reign of Augustus in Sardis. Tralles seems to have been the site of the oikos of Tissaphernes as well as a garrison. Josephus mentions Jews in Halicarnassus (Ant XIV.258), also a place of Persian settlement. If the early Christian communities in Asia Minor reflect Jewish communities as Feldman suggests, then a large percentage of these (Ephesus, Tralles, Laodicea, Colossae, Miletus) had Persian colonists during and following

---


the Achaemenid period; Ephesus, and Lydia in general, were accused by Greeks of being too heavily Persianized.\textsuperscript{72}

As an example of the potential for Persian presence and influence within Asia Minor during the Achaemenid Period, it is worth noting Lycia. Lycia, and its capital Xanthos, exhibit the presence of significant ‘Persianizing’ and Persian presence. Shahbazi refers to Lycia as a “hardcore Achaemenid colony,”\textsuperscript{73} although Sekunda thinks it is more likely the local dynasts remained in power underneath the satrap until Artaxerxes III.\textsuperscript{74} Shahbazi identifies clear signs of Persian influence on the famous ‘Harpy Tomb,’ ‘Xanthos Stele,’ and ‘Nereid Monument,’ even suggesting that the Nereids are actually representing the Ahurani, consorts of Ahuramazda.\textsuperscript{75} In 545 Xanthos was apparently rebuilt with colonists, including Iranians.\textsuperscript{76} Burials in the region attest both embalming and exposure, being examples of Persian noble and Magian practice respectively.\textsuperscript{77} Even if much acculturation in the region is due to intermarriage, as Sekunda suggests, this implies the presence of individual Persians for the locals to intermarry with.\textsuperscript{78} In any case, heavy Iranian influence existed in this region at least throughout the Achaemenid Period.\textsuperscript{79} How long this influence remained is uncertain, however, and it may have faded by the time a Jewish community arrived in the area.\textsuperscript{80}

Perhaps the strongest presence of Persians outside of Iran is attested in Cappadocia, which was under Median control from the time of Cyaxares.\textsuperscript{81} Darius III’s ability to use troops raised from Phrygia and Cappadocia at the Battle of Gaugamela implies that those troops were from Iranian colonies there.\textsuperscript{82} Further, former Persian satraps and their descendants managed to establish independent kingdoms in Pontus and Cappadocia, quite often successfully resisting Macedonian and Roman rule, and this implies significantly sized


\textsuperscript{73} Shahbazi, “Monuments,” p. 2.

\textsuperscript{74} Sekunda, “Settlement,” p. 87.

\textsuperscript{75} Shahbazi, “Monuments,” p. 156. On the Harpy Tomb see pp. 21–71; on the Xanthos Stele, pp. 72–103; on the Nereid Monument, pp. 104–132.

\textsuperscript{76} Shahbazi, “Monuments,” p. 60.


\textsuperscript{78} Sekunda, “Settlement,” p. 105; cf. p. 100.


\textsuperscript{81} Diakonoff, “Media,” pp. 125–126; It has even been suggested that there was a Median imperial capital in Cappadocia: see Summers, “The Median Empire Reconsidered,” pp. 55–73. Cf. Herodotus 1.72 (Herodotus, \textit{ Wars I-II}, pp. 86–89.)

colonies to support these polities. And unlike the evidence of Persian presence in other areas, direct evidence of their worship is available: a sanctuary with an altar to 'Omanus' (Ωμανος Μανα) has been found in Zela, and an altar with a man in 'Median' dress with a harasman was found near Bünyan. Strabo (XI.8.4; XII.3.37) also describes a temple to Anaitis, Omanus and Anadatus in Zela, which was 'governed as a sacred precinct of the Persian gods' (ὑπὸ σημαντικοῦ τῶν Περσικῶν θεῶν). In XV.3.15 he claims that Magi known as 'fire-kindlers' (Πύρατοι) have several fire temples (Πυρατεία) in this region.

Inscriptions found at Arebsun, which could be as early as the fifth century B.C.E., refer to the 'Mazda-worshipping religion' (祆護), which Boyce considers to be a name for Zoroastrianism. If this reading is correct, this would be highly significant; however, Lidzbarski has retracted this interpretation. Bishop Basil of Cappadocia, in a letter dated to 377 C.E., claims that 'Magusaeans' (Μαγοσαίοι εἶνος) are found throughout the region, whom Boyce interprets as Zoroastrians. When the Magus Kirder passed through Cappadocia he claimed to find many Zoroastrians living there. Indeed, it is claimed that the cult of St. George is partially derivative of worship to Mithra. These latter, later references again point to descendants of Achaemenid colonists, as Asia Minor lay outside Parthian and Sassanian control. As mentioned above, Trebilco believes that 1 Macc 15:16–23 and Acts 2 imply that Jews lived in Cappadocia (as well as Caria and Lycia) by 139–8 B.C.E.

Interestingly, Trebilco posits the possibility of a Jewish-Persian syncretistic cult in

---


86 Strabo, *Geography* I, p. 177.


88 For this inscription Boyce cites Mark Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik*, vol. 1 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1902), pp. 59–74. She does not notice, however, that on pp. 319–326 he presents a revised edition, in which he retracts his reading of mazdayasna (p. 324).


93 Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, pp. 6–7, p. 25.
Cappadocia in the fourth century C.E. If this is correct, it certainly points to interaction between Jews and Persians in this area, even if it occurred well after the Achaemenid period.

Further possibilities for interactions include the other Anatolian regions of Phrygia, Caria, and Ionia, which were mentioned in passing above. Levine notes an inscription from Acmonia in Phrygia, which indicates a significant synagogue near the Persian Royal Road. Trebilco thinks the Jews were there from 205 B.C.E.

It can be seen from the diverse, albeit fragmentary, evidence mentioned above, the presence of Persians outside of Iran proper was certainly not an insignificant phenomenon. Any community in these regions had ample opportunity for contact with Iranians and their culture and ideas. As Boyce notes, the Magi went where Persians went, so evidence of Persian religion in Asia Minor is hardly surprising. It seems several areas for which Jewish presence is probable, at the least in the Hellenistic Period, also show evidence of some Iranian colonization. While the evidence is thin for the Persian period proper, the information is interesting in the overall context of interaction and suggests a longer incubation period than the 200 years of direct Persian rule; it also broadens the options for potential loci for interaction.

EGYPT

The Jewish military colony at Elephantine has drawn considerable attention due to the archives found there. The colonists served the Persians, but claimed to pre-date Cambyses’s invasion. The papyri show a remarkable level of governmental intervention in the affairs of the garrison, including religious affairs. It is likely that direct contact between the two was common. As Porten notes, Bagavahya’s endorsement of the reconstruction of the Elephantine temple only addresses Persian officials; Porten even claims that all the leading positions around Elephantine were held by Persians. The Jews of Elephantine wrote to the Governors of Judah and Samaria, assuming they had jurisdiction or influence regarding their affairs, thus, not only does it seem that the various groups were in contact with the Persian administration, but that they were in contact with each other. Indeed, an
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94 Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, p. 164.
97 Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, p. 83.
98 For a fuller discussion of the evidence in Asia Minor, see Boyce and Grenet, *HZ III*, pp. 197–308.
100 See in particular the history of the colony in Porten, *Archives from Elephantine*, pp. 278–298.
apparent Jew was sent by the government to regulate Passover. Thus, while the Persians were intimately involved with the religious affairs, they recognized the importance of the religious establishment for the particular community, in this case Yehud and/or Samaria. The political complexities of the empire are nicely demonstrated by the correspondence over the destruction of the colonist's temple in 410 B.C.E.; several levels of local, Persian, and kinsmen authorities (Judaean, Samaritan) are involved in the decisions and petitions. It is worth noting as well that the island of Elephantine is across the Nile from Syene, a town which housed the fratarak of Upper Egypt. Persian officials are frequently referred to in many capacities in the papyri, which is consonant with being near an administrative center. One of the papyri confirms that the Persians brought their religion with them by mentioning the presence of a ‘Mazdayasna’ whatever that term implies. The satrapy, particularly around Elephantine, seems to have hosted a large mix of Iranians of various descriptions besides Persians proper as well. It is clear from these papyri that this particular community had ample contact with various Iranians as well as other Yahwistic communities.

Besides the Jewish colony at Elephantine, the Hebrew Bible indicates the presence of Judeans in Egypt in a variety of places, from several times and for varying reasons. Isaiah 11:11 expects a recall of Jews from Egypt, Pathros, and Nubia (מויסダウン. שטוח. נוע), and Jeremiah prophesies to the Jews in Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph and Pathros (MERCHANTABILITY). These passages imply at least nominal Jewish groups throughout Egypt. Jeremiah curses the Jews of Egypt (24:8; 44), but was himself taken to Egypt with fleeing Judeans (43). At least one of these locations definitely had a Persian presence—Memphis, the seat of the Egyptian satrapy.

Even during rebellions, the Persian presence in Egypt was not entirely eliminated. In one of the extant papyri, Arsam commands his servants to protect his holdings from the insurgents. The presence of ethnic Iranians therefore cannot be excluded during the
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105 See discussion above on Hananiah.
interruptions of Persian rule. It is also possible that Persians remained behind in Egypt after Alexander, just as they did in Asia Minor; the term Mede or Persian), at any rate, remained in use in Egypt into the third century B.C.E. The fate of the Jews at Elephantine is unknown, although the community probably did not survive the Persian Empire given the local hostility towards it in the papyri. However, Jewish communities remained in Egypt in other locations up through at least the Roman Period, notably at Alexandria. Thus Egypt offered another location for Yahwists to interact with Persians on various levels in the Achaemenid Period, and possibly into the Ptolemaic.

PALESTINE

Within the land of Palestine there were several opportunities for contact with Iranians. The coast was heavily fortified and provisioned. Gaza had a garrison large and loyal enough to thoroughly resist Alexander (although Arrian attributes the resistance to Arab mercenaries: Anabasis II.25.4—26.7). Even in the technically unadministered areas of Sinai and the Negev, permanent Persian garrisons are attested. Briant notes that remains in Idumea attest a “very thorough mingling” of populations, including Persians and Judaeans, and Amiran posits the “significant role” of Achaemenid elements in the culture of Palestine and the empire as a whole. If Nehemiah turned Jerusalem into a fortified garrison town (הדרי), this implies a direct Persian presence. In this respect, it may be significant that the governor of Judah to whom the Elephantine colonists wrote had the Persian name Bagavahya (בגאיבעה), perhaps a Persian or Jewish official with a Persian name. Even during the periods of Egyptian independence, Persian control reached into the Negev. Indeed,
Lipschits considers the Egyptian revolt to be the impetus for increased Persian interest in Yehud in Nehemiah’s time.\textsuperscript{121} (For present purposes, questions regarding the details of Persian administration of Yehud are irrelevant.)\textsuperscript{122} In addition to military installations, the Persian king likely held crown lands in Yehud (as in other provinces), perhaps what was previously held by the Davidic monarchy. Ackroyd thinks the ‘king’s forest’ (literally ‘paradise’—מדשא אלט) in Neh 2:8 refers to these lands.\textsuperscript{123}

Excavations at Ashkelon have revealed an extraordinary number of dog burials, the vast majority from the Persian period; of the sites at Ashkelon which attest Persian presence, all also attest dog burials.\textsuperscript{124} Dog burials have also been found in several other sites in Persian-period Palestine, albeit not in such spectacular numbers.\textsuperscript{125} These finds are provocative, especially as regional attitudes towards the dog were generally negative or, at best, ambivalent; the biblical text generally supports a culturally negative view (Deut 23:19; Prov 26:11, 17; Qoh 9:4; Matt 7:6). The exceptions were Egypt and Persia, where dogs were esteemed.\textsuperscript{126} Due to Egypt’s long history in the coastal region, one would suppose the likelihood of Egyptian influence, especially as dog burials and mummification are found there. However, no such burials are attested in Ashkelon for any of the periods of Egyptian control.\textsuperscript{127} It seems significant that of all the parallel Palestinian dog burials listed by Wapnish and Hesse, all are in the Persian period. While they acknowledge a solitary dog burial in Achaemenid Iran in what may be a fire temple, they dismiss the relevance of Zoroastrian veneration for dogs due to Sassanian period scruples over the burial of bodies.\textsuperscript{128} However, according to Boyce, the Zoroastrian veneration of dogs did sometimes include burials.\textsuperscript{129} As

\textsuperscript{121} Lipschits, “Achaemenid Imperial Policy,” p. 38; Cf. Hoglund, Achaemenid Imperial Administration, p. 210, 243–244.


\textsuperscript{125} Wapnish and Hesse, “Ashkelon Dogs,” pp. 67–69. One of the other sites includes Arad, a location known to have been a site of a station of the Royal Road (on the Royal Road, see below.) See Israel Eph’al, “Changes in Palestine During the Persian Period in Light of Epigraphic Sources,” Israel Exploration Journal 48.1–2 (1998): p. 177.


\textsuperscript{127} Wapnish and Hesse, “Ashkelon Dogs,” p. 71.

\textsuperscript{128} Wapnish and Hesse, “Ashkelon Dogs,” for the Iranian burial, p. 70; for Zoroastrian custom, p. 72.

\textsuperscript{129} Boyce, HZ I, pp. 302–303.
Ashkelon possibly housed the Persian governor of the Ashdod province; it is possible that the dog burials evidence either significant Persian residency or high acculturation during the Persian period. However, dog burials are also attested in earlier Crete, Greece, and Sardis, which may be significant for the Levantine coast.

In the province of Samaria there is some evidence of Iranian presence. According to Stern, the Persian period strata of the city of Samaria was nearly obliterated, so not much evidence has been found in the city itself. However, the finds at Wádi ed-Dáliyeh have produced some Persian seals similar to those in other areas of the empire. The papyri also revealed an interesting name—Tllinn’. This is another example of the use of a Persian word to create a new, Yahwistic name (Using Old Persian baga, ‘god’). Although the cultural significance of material culture is difficult to assess, Samaria evidences some finds typical of Achaemenid style. An imported Achaemenid vase and a bronze throne leg in clear Achaemenid style have been found in the area. Although he denies evidence of colonization, Stern mentions the presence of “Irano-Scythian” arrowheads which appear in the Persian period, but without mentioning the find-sites. Three clearly Achaemenid objects have also been found north of Samaria; Amiran even claims to see echoes of the winged disk motif on one. Although meagre, this confirms that the Province of Samaria was not isolated from the rest of the empire. Stern claims that the mountainous region of Palestine shows higher ‘eastern’ affinities than others in the Persian period, even suggesting that tombs near Shechem indicate the possibility of Iranian colonists (despite his contrary
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132 Stern, Material Culture, p. 29.
claim noted above). Uehlinger also suggests the possible presence of Persian colonists in Samaria, based on ‘powerful Persianisms’ on Samarian coins.

If there were Iranians or Iranian influences in Samaria, it is likely they reached Yehud as well. Whatever the details of the ethnicities of the Shechem tomb-builders, Knoppers argues convincingly that the break between Samaritans and Jews was not decisive until well after the Persian period, despite the attitude of Nehemiah, and that their mutual contacts may have been significant. He considers the separation between them a matter more of administration/politics than religion or culture. In fact, Ezra-Nehemiah seems to confirm close relations between the two communities, despite attempts to prevent them (particularly Neh 6:17–19; 13:1–9. See Also Neh 2:19; 3:33–35; 4; 10:31 and Ezra 4:1–5; 9:1–10:44). Yehud clearly was not exempt from interactions with its northern medinah and that medinah’s influences.

It is often noted that Palestine lies in a strategic location between Mesopotamia and Egypt. Any group traveling between the two of necessity would pass through the land. The history of the Achaemenid Empire contains several large-scale operations which brought armies and baggage trains through Palestine. Cambyses conquered Egypt in 525, and it is likely preparations for the invasion began in the reign of Cyrus. Revolts and reconquests required repeated military incursions into Egypt (486–484, 460–454; revolt in 405 which was followed by unsuccessful attacks in 373, 350, and reconquest in 342). Prior, during, and after these campaigns, the various medinahs along the route to Egypt must have often hosted Persian officials and troops. Indeed, the Great King himself sometimes participated in the campaigns (Cambyses, ca. 525; Xerxes I, ca. 484; Artaxerxes III, ca. 345–342). Wherever the king went, including into battle, the entirety of his court—with the associated pomp,
courtiers, and Magi—followed. 145 This appears to be a significant point which is often overlooked in the discussion. At the very least, such royal caravans would have been ideal situations for the dissemination of royal ideology and for the locals to demonstrate their loyalty. Even if there were no permanent Iranian residents within Palestine (and there clearly were), traveling Iranians were no novelty in the region. Jews had ample opportunity to come into contact with Persians and their ideas within Israel.

The Royal Road and Royal Mail

One final point remains for discussion of potential locations for Persian contact, one which properly involves all the regions so far discussed. Herodotus describes a complex network known as the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa (V.52–3; V.35; VIII.98). 146 He describes this massive distance as stationed with fortresses, hosteries, and riding-posts (ἀγγαρίου) at a day’s journey distance. This system included rapid royal couriers (ἀγγέλοι or πιραδαζῖ), escorts for travels on official business, 147 paved sections, 148 and even fire-signals. 149 Yet the royal road and mail were not limited to the route between the central capital and the Greek-inhabited lands of primary interest to Herodotus; the entire empire was connected by it. Indeed, one part of it ran through Palestine to Memphis. Use of this road required a ‘passport’ or miyautukka/, just as in Neh 2:7. 150 A papyrus from ‘Arsam, Satrap of Egypt, records an order for the precise provisioning of one on official business, indicating the duty of the local provincial leaders for the upkeep of the stations within their jurisdiction. 151 The local administrators, be they local dynasts or Persian appointees, would thus be required to maintain regular contact with the couriers, escorts, and officials passing through on official

151 Driver, Aramaic Documents, Document 6 (pp. 20–23).
business. Such a complex system, able to provision various qualities of grain, wine, beer, and sheep, as well as provisions for the horses (presumably including blacksmiths), implies a substantial local involvement in the provisioning of these hostels and ἄγγελοι. It is likely that many of the officials using this system were Iranians, and that both Ezra and Nehemiah also used it while traveling. Thus this network provides one more locus where populations and groups could interact, including Judeans, Israelites, and Iranians. A similar sort of scenario is (broadly) sketched for the later Silk Road.

SUMMARY

The above evidence shows nothing conclusive; it does, however, show how possible it was for Judeans/Yahwists and Persians/Iranians to come physically into contact with each other throughout the Achaemenid Empire during the reign of the Achaemenids and even well into the Hellenistic period. This chapter focused on instances and situations where actual, physical interactions were likely or possible. In addition to these practical factors, the scholar must also consider the less-physical dynamics of zeitgeist and word-of-mouth transmission of ideas. Since religious and cultural influences are more often a matter of prolonged contact and of unconscious absorption and/or reaction, it is highly probable that any instances of influence happened gradually and differently in various Judaean and Israelite communities. As debate grew and continued on what it meant to be Jewish, with various communities holding their own interpretations of their traditions, it behooves the scholar to ask which is more likely—that this process was in dialogue with the Persian elements in the cultural and religious context, or that it was completely segregated from them?

In the context of cultural-religious interaction and influences, it is not necessary to find a single, definitive location. When one considers the complexities of the diaspora and the ‘Yahwism to Judaism’ question, such an answer is unlikely and unconvincing, except for isolated textual cases. The evidence put forward above indicates that any interactions would have necessarily been gradual, widespread, and sporadic. This context implies multiple locations for a variety of levels of interaction, from superficial to extensive. This needs to be taken into account when discussing textual questions in Biblical Studies and the overall import of discrete analyses.

152 Cf. Graf, “The Persian Royal Road System,” p. 188. Aperghis, “Storehouses and Systems at Persepolis,” argues that there were two overlapping systems, a ‘regional’ one and one for work groups.
EXCURSUS: ELAMITES AND IRANIANS IN ANŠAN AND DARIUS'S COUP

Although not directly related to the juxtaposition of Yahwists and Iranians, the ethnic situation of the region today called Fars (Greek Περσίς, Elamite Anšan, Old Persian Parsa) may be relevant when considering the import of Eastern Iran and its traditions for the Achaemenids generally, and for Second Temple Judaism specifically. If one analyzes the implications of Darius I’s rise, one can posit a context for understanding both the ambiguity and plurality of the evidence for religious practice in Fars. Following several recent studies,\(^\text{154}\) it can be argued that Darius represents a Persian Coup over the indigenous Elamite elements in the region.

The question of the arrival of the Persians into Southwest Iran is long-debated and uncertain.\(^\text{155}\) Without digressing into all the complications, several pieces of evidence combine to suggest the dynamics which were operating in the region at the dawn of the empire. First, Cyrus (II) the Great always referred to himself as ‘King of Anšan,’ and the Babylonians typically followed suit.\(^\text{156}\) ‘Anšan’ is the old Elamite name for the region, which once functioned as part of the typical Elamite titulature, ‘King of Anšan and Susa’; no other Persian king uses this title.\(^\text{157}\) Cyrus appears to have descended from a line which had ruled Anšan from at least 646 BCE, in the context of a fragmented Elamite polity.\(^\text{158}\) Second, Cyrus and his father, Cambyses, seem to have deliberately made ties with leaders of the Iranian elements within and around their kingdom. According to Herodotus, Cyrus was the both the son of the Median King Astyages’s daughter and also had married the daughter of a noble from the Achaemenids, whom Herodotus calls a clan.\(^\text{159}\) Third, Cyrus’s name (Kuršt), is not


\(^{157}\) Waters, “Cyrus and the Achaemenids,” p. 94.


On Cyrus’s wife (and Cambyses’s mother), Cassandane, as an Achaemenid, III.2 (Herodotus, *Wars III–IV*), pp. 4–5.

an Iranian name. Thus, it would seem best to understand Cyrus as the scion of an Elamite dynasty which had nevertheless ‘persianized.’

In contrast to Cyrus, Darius I emphasized his Iranian ethnicity in his inscriptions. It is telling that Darius claims Cambyses—but not Cyrus—as his ‘family’ (tauma), as Cambyses was the son of an Achaemenid noble. From these indications one may posit that the Achaemenids were a traditionally noble clan of the Persians, that Cyrus had politically benefited from intermarrying with them, and that when Bardiya (Cyrus’s, but presumably not Cassandane’s, son) rebelled, the Achaemenid clan took steps to ensure their continued centrality. Once in power, Darius proceeded to write Cyrus into the Achaemenid clan (and to promote his ancestors to kings). Cyrus and Darius therefore represent the two main groupings within first millennium Southwest Iran, the Elamites and the Persians.

When one recalls that the names of Darius, his father, his son, and Cyrus’s daughter, Atossa, have names which are Iranian and have potentially Avestan resonances, an eastern origin for his ‘family’ is not impossible. If one posits an Elamite derivation for Cyrus’s family and an Eastern one for Darius and his clan, this could help explain the mixture and ambivalence between the two in the Persepolis tablets. Vogelsang has argued that familial ties between the Medians and Scythians enabled Median control over the vast areas of the east; if this is accurate, an eastern origin (with remaining familial ties) for the Achaemenids would help explain the strong support Darius I received from the eastern satrapies during his coup. If the story behind the Behistun inscription is thus understood as a ‘Persian coup,’ some of the complexity in Parsa evidenced on the ground can be contextualized. More significant for this study, however, such an understanding brings the so geographically distant eastern satrapies (and their traditions) much closer to the imperial center, both geographically and for imperial ideology.
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160 Kuhrt, *The Persian Empire*, p. 48, 55, thinks the name Elamite; however, Rüdiger Schmitt, “Cyrus i. The Name,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 6 (1993): online, thinks that it is Old Persian.


164 For Hystaspes, see Kent, “The Name of Hystaspes,” pp. 55–58.


168 Potts, “Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan,” p. 23.

169 From the preceding discussion, it is apparent that—in the opinion of the author—Darius’s Behistun inscription’s description of the downfall of Bardiya is dubious at best, most likely being a complete fabrication to cover the coup. This has been a much debated matter. For various studies, see Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 108–118; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, pp. 107–127; Christopher Tuplin, “Darius’ Accession in (the) Media,” *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society*, eds. Piotr Bienkowski, et al. (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 119
The dynamic argued above implies a strong Eastern affinity for the dynasty post-Darius, but still leaves the Anšanite dynasty in a murky, 'persianizing' status. Two of the points argued in Chapter I are, however, strengthened by it: first, the relevance of the Eastern traditions (i.e., the Avesta and heroic sagas) and, second, the diversity of traditions which one ought to expect within the empire.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFINITIES BETWEEN JEWS AND PERSIANS

So far this chapter has discussed some basic historical considerations for Persian influence on Judaism. Yet, even with centuries of potential contact, there is no guarantee or requirement for the Jews to be receptive to foreign ideas. If there were no similarities or potentials for rapprochement, interaction could have remained solely superficial or only have occurred in negative ways. What is more important, there are several categories of theological and sociological affinities between the Judaeans and the Persians which increase the likelihood that Persian ideas could be seen in a favorable light or viewed as latent within Judaism itself. While such parallels do not require influence to occur, they ought to serve as points of orientation, helping to dissolve an overly dichotomistic view of interaction and to identify potential 'hooks' for borrowings. A brief discussion of these will help highlight trends in preparation for textual analyses.

Post-exilic Judaism was partially characterized by a struggle between strict monotheism and varying forms of 'syncretism.' This is well-illustrated by the colony at Elephantine and the supposed Jewish inscription which swears by Bel and Nabu in Asia Minor. It is impossible to know the details of the struggle, but it is beyond doubt that strict monotheistic and other less-monistic forms of YHWH-ism co-existed and competed, perhaps for many centuries. The religious situation in Iran apparently was not so different; followers of the teachings of Zarathustra had so many competing interpretations of his vision that scholars still cannot decide whether the teaching was monotheistic, dualistic, or polytheistic. If Xerxes's Darevna Inscription (XPh) is any indication, the controversy ran well into the Achaemenid period, and certainly could not have gone unnoticed to interested observers. Partisans on either side of the divide could thus have found within the Persian traditions useful arguments to use in their own polemics. Commentators frequently suggest


that Second Isaiah utilized Persian traditions to argue for his Creation-theology;\textsuperscript{170} unrecorded debates lost to history quite probably did the same. Forms of rhetoric as much as ideas can be borrowed. For a Judaism still struggling with this question, a tradition with unknown centuries of debating a similar question was available for comparison and perhaps emulation. The potential for analogous rhetoric to be used within internecine debate should therefore be considered.

In a similar vein, the religious tradition in Iran was undergoing a prolonged and difficult process of demoting a category of gods into false gods and then into demons, a process which is broadly attested regardless of the role of Zarathuṣtra. Jeremiah and Second Isaiah's mockeries of the foreign idols\textsuperscript{171} share in purpose and tone what the opponents of the \textit{Daenaus} must have used in their polemics. For those advocating a stricter monotheism and separation from foreign cults, the polemics against the \textit{Daenaus}—the ideology of denying them the very category of divinity—must have been very useful and appealing. Many Yahwists were surrounded by the Babylonian and Assyrian beliefs in gods and maleficent demons, whose cults threatened to subsume the Judeans' and to deny the uniqueness of YHWH. An ideology which neutralized the threat of these cults by denying them the status of divinity while admitting their existence, albeit as mere demons, seems perfectly well-suited to their situation.

The purposefulness of history in the Hebrew prophets is oft noted.\textsuperscript{172} History is the field in which YHWH exercises his will and power, and ensures that not only can he punish his people with exile, but can effect their return. The essential purposefulness of history is also central to the traditions of Iran, although in a much more radical way than in pre-exilic Judaism. Physical creation itself is described as being for the purpose of defeating Angra Mainyu;\textsuperscript{173} history is the field where the cumulative ethics of man will overcome the evil one, and where Ahura Mazda will be proven to be the only god. History, or 'limited time,' is the method whereby 'unlimited time' is perfected. The similarities and differences between these two views, different as they are from the other conceptions current in the Ancient Near East, are subtle yet profoundly important.\textsuperscript{174} Inherent in the Iranian view of history is the \textit{eschaton}


\textsuperscript{171} For example, Isa 40:18–20; 41:6–7; 44:9–20; Jer 10:1–16; 51:15–19.


of history—history's very telos is to destroy evil and thus expire its use. History is known as ziyvan dorxeg xdata, 'limited time', a term implying its end. Nowhere in the pre-exilic prophets can this end to history be intimated; it certainly is not latent or inherent. Yet, the importance of history, the divine purpose in history, is the same in both traditions, and this is so similar in the two traditions that the logic of the end in Iranian traditions could over time have appeared to various Jews as also inherent in their own tradition.

Beyond these more purely theological affinities lay some more purely sociological factors to consider, in particular, the implications of Persian administration (both in Yehud and more broadly). A more complete study of this aspect is reserved for the future; for present purposes only a few minor comments must suffice. An important yet elusive occurrence in Persian Period Palestine is the rise of the High Priest as ruler—by the arrival of Alexander, Jerusalem was firmly in the control of the High Priest. The book of Ezra-Nehemiah claims that the re-installation of the priesthood and rebuilt temple was due to royal decree and favor; as historical study of the Achaemenid administration shows, this could have happened no other way. While Persian 'toleration' was certainly not the modern enlightened toleration of earlier scholarship, diversity within the empire was not only merely tolerated, it was encouraged as long as the beneficiaries were loyal to the person of the king. An example of the relationship between the Great King and religious specialists in the empire can be illustrated by the well-known letter of Darius I to Gadatas, although the authenticity of this is questioned. If this is paralleled to the famous story of the pro-Cyrus Delphic oracle, it may indicate the kinds of relations religious foundations could expect to enjoy vis-à-vis the Persians, provided they offered services to the Great King.

It is clear that no priesthood within the empire could be or remain established without royal support, and more importantly, loyalty to the person of the king. While in

175 On the question of a/the 'Day of YHWH,' see Chapter V.
176 This is, of course, the main thrust of Cohn's argument, Cohn, Cosmos, Chaos.
178 Root, "From the Heart," pp. 5–6.
179 Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, pp. 491, 583–587, accepts it, however, in the introduction he retracts this view; the text of the inscription can be found in Michael H. Crawford and David Whitehead, Archaisch and Classical Griechisch: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1983), pp. 197–8 (No. 95b); and in Russell Meiggs and David Lewis, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C, Revised ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), pp. 20–22.
180 Although the story in Herodotus I.53, 90–91 is legendary, it is likely Cyrus would have rewarded an oracle which had been favourable to him.
181 The view that the Persians are normally remembered favorably may relate to this. However, for alternate views see Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Biblical Portrayal of Achaemenid Rulers," Achaemenid History V: The Roots of the European Tradition, eds. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J. W. Drifters, Proceedings of the 1987 Groningen Achaemenid History Workshop (Leiden: Nederlands Institute voor het Nabije Oosten, 1990), pp. 1–16 and Enric S. Gruen, "Persia through the Jewish Looking-Glass," Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in
some other areas of the Persian Empire peoples were ruled by local dynasts underneath a satrap (at least for a while—i.e. Lycia, the Phoenician city-states, Samaria), Yehud eventually came to be ruled solely by a ‘theocracy’.\(^{182}\) When the governorship ended is unknown, but it is certain the priesthood owed its position solely to the Persian overlord, and held this position on condition of loyalty. Beyond the hierarchic benefit the priestly classes received, one should consider the patronization and authorization of their law. Much has been written on the supposed Persian authorization of the Torah, and no real scholarly consensus on this point exists.\(^{183}\) Without going into a detailed analysis on this point, it is pertinent to note that the government implemented local law as well as imperial law (cf Egypt),\(^{184}\) and that Darius I seems to have had an interest in its codification (if not to the extent advocated by Olmstead).\(^{185}\) No law could operate in Yehud without (implicit) royal permission. Dozeman even argues that in Ezra-Nehemiah the former role of the monarch in YHWH-ism is replaced by Persian law.\(^{186}\)

As noted by Boyce, purity laws play a significant role in Zoroastrianism.\(^{187}\) Overtime, what probably originally related only to the ritual precinct and priesthood became applied to the believers as a whole. A similar development can be seen in Second Temple Judaism. The gradual extension of purity laws from the priesthood to the people possibly underlies some of the conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah\(^{188}\) and between the so-called ‘Hellenizers’ and ‘Hasids’ in the Maccabean period.\(^{189}\) While these are most likely parallel developments, they create situational affinities which could be useful for polemical use on either side. Priests or scribes attempting to impose stricter purity laws on the populace (‘people of the land’?) had a source to plunder for inspiration.

Earlier the importance and role of Ahura Mazda as ‘the Wise Lord’ was mentioned. Ever since von Rad suggested the roots of apocalyptic lay in the sapiential tradition,
scholarship has debated how much the influence of prophetic or sapiential literature can be seen in apocalyptic literature. For those interested in wisdom literature, the idea of god as primarily a god due to his wisdom could be quite compelling. Perhaps the personification of wisdom would even be less threatening than a more overtly naturalistic or anthropomorphic god. One may wonder about the extent of Persian scribal activities (at least among non-noble Iranians), but surely aspects of a god of wisdom would appeal to scribal schools.

There are two more possible but extremely speculative similarities between Second Temple Judaism and Iranian religion. Both were supposedly aniconic, but experienced tension between the rule and the reality. While various stories and myths are clearly depicted in Jewish structures (such as the later synagogue at Dura Europas), YHWH was not; similarly, while Artaxerxes II instituted a cult statue for Anāhītā, Ahura Mazda was not represented, and the aniconism of Persian religion was a feature noteworthy to Greek observers.

Recent scholarship has posited that the impetus behind some of the visions in prophetic, apocalyptic, and merkabah literature were real visionary experiences. Artificially induced (or encouraged) mystical experiences are common throughout the world, and the possibility of this type of mysticism lying behind at least some of these visions cannot be excluded out of hand. Iranian tradition knows of a stimulant used by poet-priests, haoma. The use of this in the Achaemenid Empire is indicated by the mortar and pestles found at Persepolis and is characteristic of the Iranian religion both before and after Zarathustra. Could the Jews have learned of its use from the Persians, or perhaps could they have emulated the idea of a mystical journey from it? Even without such a connection, a mutually similar approach in both could have increased a sense of affinity between adepts of each.

In all these examples, the nature of religious influence must be kept in mind. Influence is not a matter of wholesale adoption of strange ideas, but of how the continual process of reinterpretation occurred in dialogue with foreign ideas which became to be perceived as latent within the Jewish tradition itself, whether consciously or subconsciously.


Cf the discussion of influence in the Prolegomena, which is indebted to the excellent comments on this issue by Hinnells, "Zoroastrian Influence on the Judeo-Christian Tradition," pp. 9–12 and Shaul Shaked, "Iranian Influence on Judaism: first century B.C.E to second century C.E.," The Cambridge History of Judaism, eds. W. D.
When evaluating this issue, care must be taken not to force everything into an Iranian mold, but rather examine carefully the nature and extent of Persian borrowings, and how they were used on their own terms within their new Jewish context. Before moving on to textual evidence, the communicative contexts of the emergence of apocalyptic and of the Achaemenid Empire much be considered.

The Media of Influence: Orality, Literacy, and Cultural Interaction
The issue of orality and literacy in the Ancient Near East during the periods of prophetic and apocalyptic literature is a vexed one. Scholars have varied widely in their opinions and appropriations of the understanding of orality, to the point that one may wish to eschew the quagmire altogether. A full exploration of the issues involved would demand a monograph; this chapter merely argues that understanding the roles of orality and literacy is essential not only to understanding the context of the emergence of the apocalypse, but to the very nature of cultural interaction, and thus to the methodology needed for investigating Iranian influence. The issues of the interplay and natures of orality and literacy are issues of basic and largely subconscious Weltanschauung, and thus must be understood prior to tackling questions of more explicit dynamics such as socio-economics, colonialism, or theology. Orality and literacy affect how one understands the social situation, the formation of texts, the transmission and alteration of traditions, and the nature of religious authority. Ultimately, it is an issue of hermeneutics, of how ‘religious specialists’ interpret received tradition in light of contemporary circumstances. While at first glance such a topic may appear to be a diversion from the issue of Iranian influence, it is an essential component of the methodology needed to investigate tradition histories at all. If the way in which people communicated in the relevant historical period is not understood properly, then the way in which they communicated ideas cannot be either.

Past attempts at delimiting the oral layers and traditions from the various sections of the Hebrew Bible have been criticized significantly and are characteristic of an older scholarly paradigm. The work on the so-called oral Überlieferungsgeschichte, by such scholars as Herman Gunkel and Martin Noth was largely based on extensions of Julius Wellhausen’s ‘Documentary Hypothesis’, similar work has been done on ‘Q’ in the New Testament as well. However, the incessant search for ‘source documents,’ whether it be J, E, D and P, Q,
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1 As Walter J. Ong has pointed out (Walter J. Ong, Orality and Literacy [London: Routledge, 2004], pp. 10–15), the term ‘(oral) literature’ is inappropriate for works originating in an oral medium. Barry B. Powell, Writing and the Origins of Greek Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2002), p. 16, also wants to abandon the term, albeit without reference to Ong.


3 To borrow the catch-all phrase used by Grabbe, Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages.


or itself betrays a modern, post-print literate misunderstanding of the dynamics of orality. At issue is not the detailed microanalysis of hypothetical documents, but of traditional oral milieu. Now, after an apparent decline, issues of orality and literacy are again on the scholarly agenda. This chapter does not call for a return to the efforts of scholars like Gunkel, but it argues three main points: 1) The cultural and cognitonal difference between the modern, scholarly milieu and the world dominated by orality and emerging literacy; 2) the importance of the increasing 'interiorization' of writing on the scribal elite and culture in general and for the rise of the apocalypse in particular; and 3) the importance of these considerations for understanding prophecy, apocalyptic, and Persian interactions. This Oral Theory will be applied to the phenomena of the apocalypses and the various forces which influenced relevant trajectories in Second Temple Judaism. Given the limited resources extant for Ancient Judaism (and, indeed, for all ancient societies), it is not possible to reconstruct a history of oral traditions, as some scholars have previously attempted; such an endeavor could only be possible through an extended anthropological study of the given oral tradition of a kind which is rarely, if ever, produced (and, in any case, impossible with an extinct society). Scholars must be content with working with the textual indices extant, while understanding the dynamics which make it different from later, more thoroughly literate (interiorized—see below), contexts. First, an overview of relevant Oral Theory and its relation to influence is discussed. Afterwards, one aspect of Oral Theory (interiorization) is applied to the emergence of the apocalypses. Finally, the last section problematizes the traditional literary methodology utilized in Biblical Studies for questioning influence by raising questions begged by Oral Theory. These problems in themselves deserve a full study and can only be mentioned here by way of better contextualizing the discussion of Iranian influence.


The Importance of Orality and Its Role in Influence

Oral Theory

The modern birth of Oral Theory belongs to Classics and Comparative Literature, particularly the studies of Parry and Lord in Homeric Studies. However, the following overview takes its departure from the field of Communication and Media Studies. The focus is on the effects of the media themselves, rather than poetry or formulicity per se, as has so occupied some earlier biblical scholarship. Before proceeding, the terms which appear in this overview are defined; they will be further discussed subsequently. A medium is the format in which communication proceeds (e.g., speech, writing, television, etc.). Orality is the technology of speech-listening. This has three main forms: Primary Orality, the condition of peoples in which verbal communication only occurs oral-aurally, which prevails before the invention of writing and in various isolated communities today; Residual Orality, the form of orality that persists subsequent to writing; and Secondary Orality, the resurgence of aspects of primary orality post-electronics. Literacy is the technology of writing-reading. There are various levels of literacy, and it consists of several independent but related skills: reading, writing, and composition. Interiorization is the process whereby a technology becomes integrated into individual and societal psychological processes and becomes part of the cognitional and functional norm. Finally, Amplification is the phenomenon whereby aspects of a previous technology are at first increased by the advent of a new technology.

Marshall McLuhan demonstrates the life- and consciousness-shaping aspects of communicative technology. His famous dictum "the medium is the message" declares the fundamental shifts created by media technologies in society and psychology. He shows that it


9 The extended treatment of the theory here given is due to its unfamiliarity in Biblical Studies. The present author is only aware of one biblical scholar noting McLuhan’s work (Schneiderwind, How the Bible Became a Book, p. 2).


is not just the context or content of a message which gives meaning, but that the very medium in which it is given carries an implicit message, regardless of the intentions of the user. This message is one of change in social organization and patterns of thought—after all, communication is in many senses synonymous with society and thought. Because of the structural ramifications in both society and thought of communicative technology, “the message of any medium or technology is the change of scale or pace or pattern that it introduces into human affairs.” It is this effect—of the medium independent of its content—which is too often ignored by biblical scholarship, intent on the ideology or historicity of the content as it is. The very fact that texts are gaining religious authority in the period in which the investigation of Iranian influence is concerned must be as significant as the texts themselves. McLuhan puts this point forcibly:

It is the medium that shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action. The content or uses of such media are as diverse as they are ineffectual in shaping the form of human association. Indeed, it is only too typical that the ‘content’ of any medium blinds us to the character of the medium. McLuhan uses the light bulb to illustrate his point, as it contains no verbal message to cloud the issue, unlike other media. The light bulb transforms society and the manner of human associations by eliminating the difference between day and night—no longer must practical limitations of daylight or candle wax determine lifestyles. This effect is independent of whether the light bulb is used for Midnight Mass or a sporting event—the patterns of daily life are just as altered. It is important to note that, while the light bulb appears to be a frivolous example, this “technological change alters not only habits of life, but patterns of thought and valuation.” To stay with the example of the light bulb, this little device increases the hours available for work and recreation, reduces the need for candles, and increases the demand for ophthalmology. Even peoples who reject the new technology must adjust to the changes around them. Even with media that carry explicit contents, such as television or print, the effect of the media themselves—in the formation of new patterns of association, valuation, and thought—parallels the effect of the light bulb. Effectively, a paradigm shift occurs with each new technology—a shift which alters both those accepting and those resistant to the new medium. The new technology does not so much create

12 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 8.
13 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 9.
14 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 57.
15 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 9.
16 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 69.
17 E.g., the Amish, who do not themselves use lightbulbs, must still use reflectors on their buggies and roadside barns to defend against the lightbulb-using cars.
thought *ex nihilo* as it changes how people think, and how they relate to one another. These principles also apply to two of the greatest revolutions in human society—the phonetic alphabet and print.

The phonetic alphabet transforms the word from sound to sight, but it does this in a way more revolutionary than the way in which ideograms or hieroglyphs do—it completely separates sound from meaning, and the individual from the group. The principles of the phonetic alphabet are fragmentation and decontextualization. It does this by reducing speech to visualized sounds which are meaningless on their own, which is unlike cuneiform, hieroglyphs, or ideograms, all of which retain residual pictorial qualities. McLuhan illustrates the type of transformation implicit in the advent of the written word by comparing the American flag with the words ‘American flag’ written on a piece of cloth:

To translate the rich visual mosaic of the Stars and Stripes into written form would deprive it of most its qualities of corporate image and of experience, yet the abstract literal bond would remain much of the same. Perhaps this illustration will serve to suggest the change tribal man experiences when he becomes literate. Nearly all the emotional and corporate family feeling is eliminated from his relationship with his social group. He is emotionally free to separate from the tribe and to become a civilized individual, a man of visual organization who has uniform attitudes, habits, and rights with all other civilized individuals.

This illustration helps to demonstrate the effects of differing media on the same abstract content; while the written words ‘American flag’ and the actual item technically contain the same content, the media they use and the likely reactions they provoke differ. The violent, emotional debates over flag-burnings are hard to imagine for a piece of cloth with the words printed upon it. The latter invites a decontextualized, non-participatory, analytical response.

It is the creation of a visually uniform conception of rationality that so shockingly changes society. The alphabet creates patterns of linearity, uniformity, increased specialization and individuation. “It is in its power to extend patterns of visual uniformity and continuity that the ‘message’ of the alphabet is felt by cultures.” This pattern of thought creates new expectations and new types of relationships with previous traditions. The link of writing with bureaucracy is here telling. Writing aids the increased complexity and uniformity on which bureaucracy and empire depend. It is no accident that the spread of
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19 Cf. Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, p. 46, 73.
the alphabet in the Near East coincided with the largest empire the Near East had yet seen, or that the advent of literacy in Greece preceded Alexander and Rome.23

The situation of contemporary technology places the scholar in a position in which it is both easier and more difficult than earlier generations to relate to the change created by the transition from orality to literacy as mediated by the phonetic alphabet. The radical message of fragmentation and repeatability propagated by print technology has dominated Western tradition for centuries.24 Print fosters the identification of logic with the linear, and amplifies the effect of the alphabet. The Western scholarly paradigm is formed with a print mentality. Academic standards of consistency and logical reasoning are entirely based upon a print-centered mentality. McLuhan notes, "We have confused reason with literacy, and rationalism with a single technology."25 Literacy does not create logic; it does, however, promote a link between logic and linearity and a focus on closed, context-less systems. It fosters individuality and specialization, enabling detailed analysis to the detriment of situational context, creating the phenomenon whereby "the specialist is the one who never makes small mistakes while moving toward the grand fallacy."26 In other words, the close analysis enabled by writing makes it easier to miss the forest for the trees. This dissertation itself, by its very printedness, is testimony to the power print technology has in modern scholarship. Yet, the advent of electronic media has to some degree broken the hegemony of the printed word and reinstated a type of 'secondary orality.' The phenomenon of 'postmodernity' as compared to 'modernity' is more linked to the advent of electronic media against print than often realized. Radio, television, film, and the Internet reinstate a kind of immediacy and 'tribal interconnectivity' which threatens the linear, visualist orientation of print. But this 'secondary orality' is one which is subsequent to, and dependent upon, print literacy;27 therefore the comparison with 'primary orality' is limited.28


25 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 16.

26 McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 135.

27 See discussion below on the overlap and amplification during the early stages of a new technology.

28 On 'secondary orality' and electronic (post-)modernity, see Ong, Orality and Literacy, p. 137; Cf. M. Jimmie Killingsworth, "Product and Process, Literacy and Orality: An Essay on Composition and Culture," College Composition and Communication 44.1 (1993): p. 30; Stephen A. Tyler, "On Being Out of Words," Cultural Anthropology 1.2 (1986): p. 133, 136. Modern sceptics of orality theory betray a misunderstanding of the nature of contemporary scholarship; while it is indeed true that 'postmodernism' is in vogue in many parts of academia, it is little recognized that this postmodernism occurs within the radically print-literate milieu of scholarship. While modern (print) paradigms are shifting, academia is more inherently print-oriented than society at large, and therefore the influence of print is more fundamental. As Ong notes, "Unlike members of a primary oral culture, who are turned outward because they have had little occasion to turn inward, we are turned outward because we have turned inward." Ong, Orality and Literacy, p. 134.
The importance of the printing press for human history is often acknowledged. The implications of that technology on social structures and patterns of thought is less so. Modern academia takes the typed word for granted; it operates using carefully indexed, labelled, sorted, and classified typographic information. All of this information is neatly ordered, both on the page in neat textual rows and on the bookshelves in neat physical rows; it all invites careful visual comparison and analysis. The drive towards standardization can be seen in the print-fostered birth of dictionaries, standardized spellings, and national languages. The Enlightenment-era (modernist) patterns of thought associated with many of these features are often challenged by post-modernist critiques, but the extent of their support in the medium of print receives much less attention.

The print paradigm is currently shifting with the advent of electronic media such as the Internet and email. These media encourage immediate access to and dissemination of bits of information. Information can be hyperlinked to other information and it can be instantly saved or passed on; it offers an ever-expanding horizon of information. This instantaneousness, however, has the effect of eliminating both depth and context; it is the medium of the 'sound-byte' (itself a phrase originally referring to another electronic medium) par excellence. New types of social interaction based on hyperlinks rather than proximity (or necessarily even of personal choice) are also created. The changes in society and the
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29 'Index' as in lists of items with pre-determined page numbers.
possibilities and tensions created thereby should be recognizable to the contemporary scholar.\textsuperscript{32} As a model of the societal and mental shifts of technological revolution it is revealing; as technology which is still dependent upon print, it is misleading.

Walter J. Ong has taken the lead of McLuhan and further explored the implications of the technology of the alphabet on society and modes of thought. Perhaps the primary consequence of writing is ‘objectivity’ and ‘distance,’ or to use other terminology, ‘alienation.’ Word as speech is of necessity tied to the existential;\textsuperscript{33} it indicates the current present-ness of the speaker. Indeed, it more directly indicates the presence of the speaker than any other sense: “Sound is more real or existential than other sense objects, despite the fact that it is also more evanescent.”\textsuperscript{34} Before the advent of literacy, humankind related to each other and to reality primarily through speech–sound. Speech necessitates the presence and direct interaction of the other; one cannot communicate with another without being in their presence. Writing changes this. “Writing introduces a whole new set of structures within the psyche: communication which lacks the normal social aspect of communication, encounter with one who is not present, participation in the thought of others without commitment or involvement.”\textsuperscript{35} This contrasts with the original (in historical and personal terms) method of communication. “The paradigm of communication is dialogue, a two-way transaction in a world of sound, which is the world of response, of echo. Vision by contrast is of itself a one-way operation.”\textsuperscript{36} It was this non-existential aspect of writing which Ong notes was a major cause of the resistance to Sophism in Greece.\textsuperscript{37}

Awareness of the changes implicit in the new medium of the alphabet was partially apprehended already in the Achaemenid period. Plato’s dialogue between Phaedrus and Socrates is very intriguing for its comment on the effects of literacy.\textsuperscript{38} Socrates cites an Egyptian myth to indict writing for causing loss of memorizing-skills, true instruction, and creating the appearance of false wisdom. He claims that written words are inferior to spoken as they can neither be questioned nor can explain nor defend themselves. He further claims that the serious philosopher will not waste his time with writing, bar providing for the “forgetfulness of old age”; writings are, therefore, never to be taken seriously. This passage presumes that written works are still considered somewhat of a novelty and disruptive of

\textsuperscript{33} The term ‘existential’ (lower case) here simply refers to ‘in relation to the moment’ rather than the body of (although related) philosophy known as ‘Existential’ or ‘Existentialism.’ For a concise explication of this difference set within a history of Western philosophy and theology see Paul Tillich, \textit{A History of Christian Thought} (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968), pp. 539–541.
\textsuperscript{34} Ong, \textit{Presence of the Word}, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{35} Ong, \textit{Presence of the Word}, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{36} Ong, \textit{Presence of the Word}, p. 167.
\textsuperscript{37} Ong, \textit{Presence of the Word}, p. 57.
traditional methods of education and learning. Socrates cites loss of context and proper instruction, and (implicitly) potential loss of traditions (due to lack of true memory). Of course this appears ironic, as the rejection is itself written. Yet, it is instructive to see how this critique of literacy parallels critiques of the computer upon its introduction. Just as the computer and other electronic media threatened the print paradigm, so literacy threatens the oral paradigm.

A further implication of writing is the process of education. The manner and function of pedagogy is radically altered by the introduction of writing. Without writing all learning by necessity must come from a master or sage, who personally imparts the relevant wisdom, skill, or knowledge to (chosen) pupils. While the skills of writing and reading must be taught, they impart to the pupil the ability to study the thoughts and works of others independently of a pedagogical relationship with them. This was a major reservation of Plato’s Socrates noted above. It also adds a dimension of artisanship to the position of sage—writing requires training amanuenses as much as it requires ‘philosophers.’ Over time, writing shifts authority and gravity away from the wise person to the wise person’s text, and from wisdom as situated in a tradition to individual interpretation and appropriation of a text. This tension between holy keepers of tradition and holy texts is paralleled with various developments of the Protestant Reformation. Eventually writing gives birth to the ‘author’ as an isolated genius rather than a shaper and transmitter of tradition.

The advent of the letter has further effects. After separating words from immediate context and participation, the linearity and visual nature encourages the dissection and comparison of the content in a manner not encouraged orally. As Ong states, “Abstractly sequential, classificatory, explanatory examination of phenomena or of stated truths is impossible without writing and reading.” Two oral stories quite simply cannot be compared in the same manner as two textual variants can be. A visualist orientation transforms ideas of logic, time, and persuasion. It is not that writing creates logic, it changes it to a new form or pattern. This fostering of new types of abstraction leads on from the decontextualization of language from existential concerns. A field study by Luria nicely demonstrates the difference between contextual-existential and decontextualized-abstract logics. Both literates and oral peoples were given cards with four items (an axe, a saw, a hammer, and a log) and asked to separate them into two groups. Literates separated out the log; oral people refused to remove
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42 Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, p. 8.
the log from the list of items the literates classed as ‘tools.’ The existential perspective quite naturally links the axe, saw, and hammer with that with which they are used (the log); the ‘detached’ view links the axe with other ‘useful’ items in general. Neither association is ‘illogical,’ they simply operate on different assumptions and in different contexts. This principle must be seriously considered when approaching texts which likely come from a residually oral background: the logic may be less abstractly systematic than a modern interpreter may desire.

The movement towards comparison and analysis flows from the nature of writing. By placing words visually before a person in sequential order—but frozen in that order—writing enables the comparison of passages repeatedly and in non-sequential order. Two speeches heard back-to-back can be compared in content, style, and theme; but it is much easier to analyze detailed differences with the transcriptions of those same speeches placed visually side-by-side. The eye is able to separate and reconnect any segment of each speech as it wills; the ear can only hear the words in the flow of context. The element of time creates a paradox—while orality is linear (i.e., sequential and evanescent), by its nature it is relational and fosters relational thought; writing, by removing the sequential element of time, allows the stable information to be dissected (i.e., analyzed and decontextualized) and reassembled into logical rows.

This difference between writing and speaking can still be observed on some level today. One has different expectations for consistency in a spoken, narrated story than from a novel. If the (oral) narrator makes a mistake and corrects it later, the audience is more likely to either miss it or accept it in passing than if it is written on paper. Tannen discusses interesting differences in this regard in reference to a scholarly conference. She makes interesting and perceptive comments on interaction between oral and literate modes and the modern expectations of each; however, her critique of Oral Theory fails to understand the concept of ‘primary orality’ (see below) or that academic thought has a literacy which is highly interiorized, such that scholars’ use of orality is therefore highly influenced by literate modes. Indeed, the concept of an academic paper presupposes a pre-prepared text, itself based on the reading of other texts. It is important to note with her that orality never vanishes; new media change the relation to, rather than replace, predecessors.

---


Ong discusses orality in three different modes: what he calls ‘primary orality,’ ‘residual orality,’ and ‘secondary orality.’ ‘Primary orality’ is the use of language before the appearance of writing; ‘residual orality’ is the use of oral modes after the introduction of literacy; ‘secondary orality’ is the reoccurrence of elements of primary orality within a mindset structured by print following the advent of electronic media. To compare secondary orality, which is based upon the previous ‘interiorizing’ of literacy, with primary orality is to completely ignore or misunderstand how writing (and in particular, print) reshapes thought. Tannen’s critique (and others like hers) therefore miss much of this point. Indeed, much of the criticism stems from literacy’s tendency to analyze and dichotomize dialectics (relationships). The work of communications theorists such as McLuhan, Ong, and Goody emphasize the necessity to understand the relation between the emerging technology (in this case literacy) and the previous ‘technology’ (in this case speech) and how complex that situation truly is. This relationship varies in contexts, but has certain similar and recognizable features: it amplifies or intensifies certain aspects of the previous technology to a degree higher than they were before; and it creates a tension between the new modes of thought/technology and the older one.

In noting the changes literacy effects, there are three basic categories to understand: orality, literacy, and the interaction between the two. It is of course the latter which is pertinent to most investigation (and the one of most relevance to Iranian influence) and the most difficult to elucidate. Both McLuhan and Ong point to a paradoxical relationship between a new technology and the previous form: the new technology does not replace the previous one, but changes the way in which a society relates to it. Indeed, a new technology tends to increase certain tendencies of the previous technology before its own hegemony sets in.

To understand this, one only need recall how the personal computer was initially expected to

---


51 McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, p. 28; Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*, p. 15; Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, p. 79.

eliminate the use of paper, but instead at first grossly increased its usage. Thus, particularly as literacy begins to be interiorized in a society, it both transforms the nature of orality while extending its patterns.53 This principle is very important, but often neglected by scholars. Many of the criticisms of Oral Theory in the work of Ong, McLuhan, and Goody seem to ignore this dynamic; when scholars critique Oral Theory by claiming that a mixture of oral and literate is more typical than pure orality, they miss both this phenomenon of intensification as well as the fact that in order for orality and literacy to interact, literacy must already be present.54

Some scholars dismiss or minimize the validity or usefulness of an understanding of orality along the lines of Ong, usually citing anti-colonialist critique, claiming inadequate anthropological proof, or linking the two.55 Oral Theory, however, does not equate literacy with intelligence or logic—it, rather, points out how the literate, scholarly world has equated logic with literacy. Orality is not illogical, it has a different type of logic, one which is suited to its medium.56 Print (and modernity) associated logic with the linear and the analytic; orality has a situational and relational logic. Indeed, in many aspects, Ong and McLuhan’s work can be seen as a critique of literacy as much as, if not more than, one of orality. This is explicitly stated by Ong as reason for his use of orality instead of preliterate or another term which would presuppose literacy.57 However, even if Oral Theory has been used in racist or colonialist terms by some scholars, the validity of a theory is independent of its potential uses or misuses. Indeed, the anthropological data seem to confirm it,58 and it must be remembered that the description of difference is a separate matter from valuating that difference.

53 Cf. Ong, Orality and Literacy, p. 80, 150.
56 Powell, Origins of Greek Literature, pp. 22–23, seems to miss this point.
57 Ong, Orality and Literacy, p. 13.
In his work Ong notes a variety of characteristics of primary Orality. For the present purposes only a few of these characteristics are discussed. Particular emphasis will be placed on the 'existential' versus detached dynamics, holistic understanding versus analysis, and the idea of visual uniformity. These issues are particularly relevant in connection with the questions of sources and traditional redaction criticism. These characteristics are carried into the early stages of literacy and are amplified before their dialectically opposite tendencies begin to take hold among the literate classes.

Susan Niditch applies orality-literacy considerations to approaching the biblical texts in her *Oral World and Written Word*. In an attempt to better understand the context of the Hebrew Bible, Niditch proposes an 'oral-literate continuum' under which it is possible to analyze orality and literacy in a more nuanced manner. Instead of arguing along the lines of Gunkel—treating oral traditions as textual chunks of a distant past—or of Millard—treating Israelites as modern literates—she explores how orality is evidenced well into the biblical period. She notes that writing has various functions, many of which operate within an 'oral register' where the written word contains religio-numinous implications. She shows that the archeological evidence towards the use of writing reveals how supposed evidence of literacy is better understood as highlighting typically oral thought-patterns, and that the basic
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*In Interfaces of the Word*, Ong notes seven general characteristics of oral thought and expression. These are a) stereotyped or formulaic expression; b) standardization of themes; c) epithetic identification for disambiguation of classes or individuals; d) 'heavy' or ceremonial characters; e) formulary, ceremonial appropriation of history; f) praise and vituperation; g) copiousness. (Ong, *Interfaces of the Word*, p. 102). In addition, in *Orality and Literacy*, he offered nine characteristics, phrased slightly differently: a) additive rather than subordinative; b) aggregative rather than analytic; c) redundant or copious (g above); d) conservative or traditionalist; e) close to the human life world; f) agonistically toned (f above); g) empathetic and participatory; h) homeostatic; i) situational rather than abstract (Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, pp. 36–57).


Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word*, ch. 3.
supposition of an original source text is problematic.\textsuperscript{63} Her analysis leads her to reject the
documentary hypothesis on the grounds that it too heavily represents literate thinking.\textsuperscript{64}

Niditch's work is an excellent starting point and heralds a more fruitful use of Oral Theory in Biblical Studies. In exploring the sources of apocalyptic, it is important to note the interaction and natures of communicative media, and to see how the radical changes in society and thought-patterns are influenced, and perhaps even partially determined, by the changes in media. These changes would have affected all of society, not just the few who were literate. The structure of authority, the nature of education, and the division of labour are all affected by the advent of literacy, just as the transmission, alteration, and preservation of traditions is altered.

To summarize this lengthy discussion of Oral Theory/ Media Theory, a few methodological principles can be distilled. The first is that oral and written modes vary in their relationship to previous traditions; orality is contextual and aggregative, while writing is more critical and distant. All oral performance is in a shared context; writing decontextualizes previous traditions. It is therefore important to analyze the logic inherent in a text before deciding that it is 'illogical' or poorly redacted: it could be the record of an oral performance. Second, the concept of verbatim quotation is a very literate idea and largely anachronistic for a largely residually oral culture. This is due to the evanescent nature of orality itself as well as the physical difficulty of consulting passages in rare, unwieldy, and expensive scrolls or tablets. Third, the introduction of writing alters social structures and patterns of thought; this is most easily recognizable in the development of bureaucracy and new types of education. This is a dialectical process, however, and proceeds through interiorization and amplification.

\textbf{Implications for Methodology}

The type of scholarship commonly known as text-critical, as exemplified by Michael Fishbane's \textit{magnum opus}, \textit{Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel}, potentially misunderstands the dynamics of the oral and literate media. Fishbane extensively documents cases of scribal alterations and textual quotations in the received biblical text. However, the type of analysis which he uses presupposes an entirely (modern) literate mindset. While he acknowledges that oral transmission must have occurred,\textsuperscript{65} he continues his analysis as if the written tradition which is extant originated, was transmitted, and was altered solely as a written tradition. The legal materials of the Hebrew Bible serve as an apt example. It is commonly recognized that

\textsuperscript{63} Niditch, \textit{Oral World and Written World}, pp. 75–76.
\textsuperscript{65} Michael Fishbane, \textit{Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), p. 23
“frequent lacunae or ambiguities” in the text make it inoperable as a law code; indeed, Fishbane admits it is “but an expression of a much more comprehensive oral law.” In the context of the limited literacy of the Ancient Near East, it is dubious to analyze the text solely in reference to itself, and to read it is as if the scribes who wrote it did the same. It is much more plausible that the legal materials were written in reference to an (common knowledge) oral tradition which, over time, was lost. It is immaterial whether or not the laws were written as innovations, clarifications, or examples of justice; what may be more important to the understanding of the texts is the change in the attitudes of the scribes towards various texts as their surrounding oral traditions and imperial contexts either alter, fade, or disappear—in other words, when the scribes begin to treat the texts as self-sufficient.

There is no doubt that scribes altered texts. Nor is the complexity of textual transmission to be understated. There is a serious question, however, as to whether every ‘deviance’ or ‘variation’ is due to exegetical or scribal written innovation—it could simply reflect an oral tradition or traditions (now lost), the typical vagaries of human memory, or, more significantly, the original author/editor might not have recognized a difficulty or contradiction at all. To cite just one example, Fishbane claims that Jer 17:21–2 is an exegetical innovation upon Deut 5:12–14. He claims the similarities and differences between the wordings of the two passages on the Sabbath reveal a need by Ancient Israel “to camouflage and legitimate its exegetical innovations.” The differences between the two, however, are more visual than aural, specific rather than general. In the prophetic passage Jeremiah takes a general principle (not to do work on the Sabbath) and in good hortatory fashion applies it to a specific (‘existential’) situation: the carrying of burdens into the city on the Sabbath. In the context of the extant book of Jeremiah, the presentation of this critique to the people at the city gates presages the entry of the city by foreign invaders as punishment for such violations. So, rather than being a scribal innovation disguised as an ancient quotation, the passage might be better understood as the typical work of a religious orator—applying principles to the here-and-now of the audience. This understanding is underscored when the two passages are read aloud, rather than viewed side by side (as Fishbane indeed presents them): as heard, the passages appear to be more parallel than they

66 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 92
67 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 95
69 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, pp. 131–134.
70 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 134.
appear to be contradictory. Even if the passage in Jeremiah is intended to allude to Deut 5:12–14, it is likely the variations are due to the nature of memory rather than calculated variance. The attempt to treat them in so exacting, verbatim manner is more likely to be misleading than illuminating.

The above example demonstrates that to think that all ‘quotations’ must refer to a previous text is to think like a modern literate scholar, not like an inhabitant of a largely residually oral culture. As the Hebrew Bible increasingly became a recognized canon, the likelihood increased that teachers and preachers, be they priest, prophet, or scribe, would directly quote the authoritative text. But even here, it is important to note that before print the notion of quotation itself is much more fluid and closer to modern concepts of paraphrase than verbatim quotation. Even after the ‘canonization’ of texts, quotation on most occasions would be from memory rather than direct visual copying. Scrolls were expensive and rare, and it was likely even the most literate and papyrus-laden of scribes more often drew on memory than on actual visual reference to a text. In addition, phrases taken from a scriptural milieu can simply be used as part of a communal vocabulary without direct, intended reference to the original passage, e.g. the career of the phrase ‘hewers of wood.’

The usage of stock phrases and epithets is here cautionary.

In discussing biblical material where texts appear to have similar language, content, or form, a literary dependency, in one direction or another, is generally assumed. While direct literary dependency is possible, it is not always necessary when dealing with ‘traditional’ materials. It is fairly clear that an Exodus tradition existed in pre-exilic Israel. At various times this tradition and its motifs were used and appropriated in the Hebrew Bible, something which must have been a common occurrence. When approaching a text which appears to utilize Exodus motifs, it is appropriate to ask whether the use is a literary quotation, or whether it is simply another use of the general tradition. Was the text in question performed orally or was it originally written? If performed orally, would the audience have viewed it as a quotation of x, or merely have understood it within the ‘Exodus’

73 Similar concerns are expressed by Schultz, Search for Quotation, in particular pp. 109–112.
75 van der Toorn, Sinthial Culture, p. 23; cf Niditch, Oral World and Written Word, p. 41; Ong, Orality and Literacy, p. 93; Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, p. 4, 40.
tradition? In any given society traditional stories, motifs, proverbs, etc., will be used, reused, and refashioned by various members of that society for various purposes. All of these adaptations of the traditions may occur independently or in tandem, but they all operate within a milieu which is understood on a broader scale than any single given representation of the tradition. In other words, an individual textual occurrence of a story, motif, or phrase is not necessarily the wellspring or touchstone of its constituent tradition.

Further, an oral tradition does not cease to exist orally once it is written down, nor does the writing of the tradition need to have an immediate impact on the oral form of a tradition (indeed, it is likely not to). The same tradition can be written more than once, each time recording the same strand of tradition in various oral forms, without any knowledge or dependency on previous or simultaneous written forms. It is therefore problematic to declare or assume literary dependency between texts dealing with traditional motifs without clear reasons to do so. Linking the date of a text to the date of a tradition (or form of a tradition) is equally problematic.

The influence of a literate 'scribality' should be understood in concert with the above considerations. The scribes were operating within an oral tradition; they were also operating in a new milieu—the increased use and hegemony of writing both for the creation and preservation of tradition. As written traditions become more normative, more of the overall culture will refer to them—developing the phenomena of re-oralized texts, the ideal of verbatim memorization, and textual hermeneutics—which seems to be the situation of the Persian and Hellenistic periods. "It is the mechanism of writing and its virtually immediate effect of decontextualization that over time opens these texts (unlike speech) to reformulation, critical attention, reflection and commentary."78

The scribal situation—in the context of the oral world—was a relatively new one. Niditch's work demonstrates how much of the Hebrew Bible still evidences oral-monumental and 'magical' uses of writing.79 Yet, the collection of texts created a new situation, one which had to alter the ways in which the scribes thought (even while their thought processes were closer to primary orality then post-print mentality). As both Fishbane and Fitzpatrick-McKinley noted above, the situation of writing—to which these scribes most likely dedicated their lives—offered these scribes a new window to evaluate, reflect upon, and edit their religious and cultural traditions. Perhaps they even discovered traditions that had been generally forgotten. It has long been noted that the apocalyptic literature is scribal

78 Fitzpatrick-McKinley, The Transformation of Torah, pp. 15–16. While this was written in regards to legal texts and codes, it can be applied to the traditional religious material in general.
in character, and it has been postulated that one of the differences between prophetic and apocalyptic literatures is their original orality and literacy, respectively. Grabbe has recently challenged this distinction, however, by claiming that both literatures and phenomena evidence orality and literacy. To what extent does the increasing interiorization in the Ancient Near East generally and in the scribal class in particular play a role in the difference between prophetic and apocalyptic literatures, if any?

It is clear from both the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern parallels that prophets operated primarily orally, even when their oracles were written. These written oracles served more as monuments to the gods or reports in lieu of presence than records in the modern sense. But to what extent do the prophetic books reflect original oral oracles, and how much later scribal redaction? That question, indeed, has been a project of biblical scholarship for many years. This question cannot be addressed here. Suffice it to say that the increasing authority of the text evident in Judaean religion had an impact not only on the genres and forms of religious expression, but on the social structures and thought patterns: it is in this context that prophetic literature ‘died’ and the apocalypse was born.

Two examples will illustrate the relevance of Oral Theory to the present study. The first, Jer 36, demonstrates the complex relationship the extant text has with literacy; the second, Second Isaiah, introduces how media analysis should inform questions of sources and foreign influence. It is not necessary or possible here to analyze each fully, rather these examples merely serve to demonstrate the usefulness of oral awareness.

84 But to what extent do the prophetic books reflect original oral oracles, and how much later scribal redaction? That question, indeed, has been a project of biblical scholarship for many years. This question cannot be addressed here. Suffice it to say that the increasing authority of the text evident in Judaean religion had an impact not only on the genres and forms of religious expression, but on the social structures and thought patterns: it is in this context that prophetic literature ‘died’ and the apocalypse was born.
85 Two examples will illustrate the relevance of Oral Theory to the present study. The first, Jer 36, demonstrates the complex relationship the extant text has with literacy; the second, Second Isaiah, introduces how media analysis should inform questions of sources and foreign influence. It is not necessary or possible here to analyze each fully, rather these examples merely serve to demonstrate the usefulness of oral awareness.

86 See Karel van der Toom “Mesopotamian Prophecy between Immanence and Transcendence: a Comparison of Old Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian Prophecy” and Martti Nissinen “The Socioreligious Role of the Neo-Assyrian Prophets” both in Martti Nissinen, ed., Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context. Symposium (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000), pp. 71—114; Cf: the primary sources edited in Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East. In this context it is interesting to consider Davis’s theory that Ezekiel was the first writing prophet. See Ellen F. Davis, Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel’s Prophecy, JSOTSS 78 (Sheffield: Almond, 1989). However, Margaret S. Odell, “You Are What You Eat: Ezekiel and the Scroll,” Journal of Biblical Literature 117.2 (1998): p. 242, 244, denies that the scroll Ezekiel eats stands for writing per se, but rather the symbolic permanence of judgment (and thus squarely in the ‘oral mode.’)
87 Niditch, Oral World and Written Word, pp. 104—105.
89 The author intends in the future to pursue such studies elsewhere.
A famous crux for the development of Prophetic Literature and the question of orality and literacy is a passage found in Jeremiah (MT 36 = LXX 43). In this passage Jeremiah dictates all of his oracles to Baruch the scribe, who then reads them to the people in the temple during a fast. Another scribe present for this recitation reports the event to the officials. Upon hearing this, they have Baruch read the scroll again to them. The officials store the scroll, tell Baruch and Jeremiah to hide, and report it to the king. The king has the scroll read in his presence, cutting off and burning four columns as it is read. In response, Jeremiah again dictates the oracle collection to Baruch, adding a further oracle of condemnation and more similar things.

Van der Toom sees in this passage a scribal obfuscation of the growth in prophetic collections. Niditch sees evidence of a still largely oral setting in the late monarchy. Whatever the relationship between the historical formation of the Jeremiah corpus and this passage, it is still revealing in its attitudes towards writing. The narrative assumes that while people can read, the standard paradigm is still the spoken word: even the group of scribe-officials have Baruch read out the scroll to them, rather than reading it themselves. After this reading they store the scroll and verbally report the contents to the king. Only upon royal request do they actually read the text themselves. While the passage clearly takes the existence of the written word for granted, it utilizes texts in two very residually oral manners. First, the scroll functions primarily as an aide to oral pronouncement in the absence of Jeremiah, and, secondly, the scroll itself functions as a witness against the king's intransigence. The scroll's physical destruction and recreation doubly guarantee the efficacy of the threat.

It is further worth noting the pericope's lack of concern for verbatim repetition. Indeed, while Jeremiah is able to recreate his oracle collection at will—presumably with no prior writing of his oracles—he is able to expand and add to it without violating the essential continuity of the second version with the first. This mindset is reminiscent of oral singers observed by Lord, who are able to note differences between separate performances while seeing no real significance in the fact. Again, verbatim replication is a literate concern.

van der Toom, Scribal Culture, pp. 186–188.
Niditch, Oral World and Written Word, pp. 104–105; cf. Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, pp. 146–147, who makes points similar to the ones below.
Second Isaiah

In a well-known article, Morton Smith proposes influence of an Iranian prophecy upon the first half of Second Isaiah (44—48). Without going into the proposition in detail, this passage still offers a valuable example of the ways in which Oral Theory can inform the weighing up of potential influences.

In the context of the Servant Texts, the anonymous prophet proclaims Cyrus as the coming agent of Babylon’s deserved destruction (44:24—45:13; 46:11; 48:14—16). Cyrus is depicted as YHWH’s anointed (המשיח), servant (עבד), and shepherd (רעה), and the prophet expects Cyrus to destroy the city of Babylon and to return the Judeans home. These expectations are placed within a greater theological construct of monotheism, creation theology, punishment and restoration. These passages are unmistakably related to several Neo-Babylonian texts, the Cyrus Cylinder, The Verse Prophecy of Nabonidus, and the Nabonidus Chronicle. The coincidences between these texts have led several scholars to conclude that Isaiah’s prophecies are in fact dependent on either the Cyrus Cylinder itself or on the Pro-Cyrus propaganda which lay behind it. In addition to the Neo-Babylonian political parallels, Smith finds a parallel to Second Isaiah’s creation theology and rhetorical questions in one of the Gāthās, Yasna 44. He therefore concludes that behind Yasna 44, the Cyrus Cylinder, and Second Isaiah lays an oral, pro-Cyrus oracle. Rather than discuss the historical probability of this suggestion itself, for the present purposes only the media-related aspects of the proposal are explored.

---

The first question involves the nature of Second Isaiah itself: is it a literary text, the record of oral performance(s), or a combination of the two? For whom was it initially created: a circle of followers, fellow scribes, inhabitants of a particular settlement, or was it meant for a wider, oral dissemination? The Servant Texts are a long-standing puzzle, but the presence of residual orality must be considered; this bears heavily on the question of the redaction-history of the section, a question by necessity bypassed here.

As noted by Niditch, the use of standard epithets or phrases does not necessarily indicate textual dependence. That both the *Cyrus Cylinder* and Second Isaiah use the same terms and even phrases to depict Cyrus as a legitimate king does not require a literary explanation on its own. The use of rhetorical questions or a dialogical format, like *Yasna* 44, points towards a more oral setting as well. The common time frame and referent for the two texts, however, may still justify Smith's search for a shared background in Persian propaganda.

Secondly, the same question must be posited of the sources behind the text. If one wishes to see Persian psychological warfare as a source, one must confront the forms this would have taken. It is prima facie unlikely that such propaganda would or could have been disseminated in writing unless carried by messengers: how would they get into Babylonia, in what language, and to whom would such texts be given? One rather thinks of a scenario similar to the one in 2 Kgs 18, where the officials of Shalmaneser yell propaganda to the populace in their own language. If such an occurrence could inspire the Cyrus texts, one would expect the original utterances to be formulaic, diplomatic speeches rather than prophetic oracles. It would also seem to require Judaean presence in a besieged city. Of course, different questions would need to be posed if one wished to follow Albertz in seeing the intended monarch as Darius I.

It is clear from the *Nabonidus Chronicle* and the *Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus* that Cyrus was known in Babylonia prior to his assault on said kingdom. Interestingly, Nabonidus even claimed to have had a dream in which Marduk promised to raise Cyrus to defeat Astyages (550 B.C.E.), enabling the reconstruction of the temple in Harran. Although Nabonidus initially seems to have favoured Cyrus as weakening his main rival Astyages, this

---


105 In the *Sippar Cylinder*. 
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attitude may not have long survived; as Briant notes, the extant textual indices appear to compress the period of hostilities between the kings. Residents of the Neo-Babylonian Empires had plenty of advance notice of the ascendancy of Cyrus, and it is not inconceivable that Second Isaiah’s prophecy draws the Judaean conclusion simply from the political situation of the day. Although evidence for avant-garde propagandists is lacking for Cyrus’s campaign, it is likely that the King of Anšan engaged in war propaganda of the time-venerable kind: he appears to have brutally sacked the city of Opis in a manner which prompted the subsequent surrender of Sippar (and then Babylon?). If such actions had come before, the prophet’s vindictive hopes for Babylon are easily understandable without recourse to more verbal propaganda. In any case, the prophecies must pre-date 539, since Cyrus did not destroy Babylon, and one must consider the media a minority would have used in a besieged empire.

Smith’s thesis still deserves a fuller examination in light of all the relevant historical information; the short discussion here, however, hopefully illustrates the importance of considering the media in examining proposed instances of influence.

Cultural Interactions in the Light of Orality and Literacy

The question of Persian influences on Judaism must be considered in the context of the primarily oral milieu discussed above as well as the increasingly important role of literacy. The import of orality affects the analysis by broadening the manner in which texts and ideas are compared and borrowings considered. Judaeans who came into contact with Persian ideas most likely came into contact with them in an oral setting: in discussion with other Judaeans, with Persians, with other peoples, rather than by reading Persian sacred texts (whether these were available for reading or not). Perhaps they heard the Gāthas or Herodotus’s Ἱέρουλινος chanted and explained or translated; perhaps they observed Persian officials practice or discuss their religion; perhaps they heard a minstrel perform songs of Iranian mythology; perhaps it was part of the general zeitgeist. Because even the scribes were more orally-oriented than today, the discussion of influence and its manifestations in

106 Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, pp. 41-43.
108 Nabonidus Chronicle 7.iii.12–13 (Pritchard, ed., ANET, p. 306, although the translation supplies a misleading parenthesis implying Nabonidus did the massacring; see the relevant snippet in Hallo, ed., The Context of Scripture I, p. 468; This translation issue has also been noted by Kuhrt, “Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood,” p. 133; Cf. Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, p. 41.)
literature needs to be alert for this subtle media-context. In any case, the likelihood is that exposure to ideas was more often by hearing rather than by sight.

**IMPORTANCE OF INTERIORIZATION FOR THE CONTEXT OF THE APOCALYPTES**

Most important to understanding the shift in communication media is the concept mentioned above, the 'interiorizing' of a technology. The shifts created by a new technology do not happen immediately, but have a cumulative effect as more and more of a society's thought and social patterns are assimilated to it. New technologies become, over time, accepted as parts of/extensions of the human body itself: writing extends the eye, telephone extends the ear, etc. Because the media are extensions of the human body they alter the ratios of use between the senses. These extensions to the body create new psychological ratios between mental faculties, just as people with physical impairments (e.g., blindness, deafness) cope through the increased reliance on the other senses. Some scholars have posited psychosis as a result. The systemic and psychological stress occasioned by the internalization of new media rather recalls the distress often associated with the advent of apocalyptic or millenarian groups.

Perhaps the Hebrew language itself gives a hint of the gradual interiorization of literacy, in the culture in general and among scribes in particular. The word נִקָּה means both 'to call' and 'to meet.' It seems likely that its use to mean 'to read' is related to an analogue with the obviously oral-personal meanings of 'calling' and 'meeting.' As late as Augustine written works were read by being pronounced aloud, in private and in public. A person, then, who נִקָּה was calling the words out of the text. Similarly, רָפָא offers an interesting hint. נא is to count and רָפָא is a scribe. This seems to pick up the historical situation that writing originated as accounting and administrative dockets. The use, then, of רָפָא, 'book,' evolved from dockets to literary works. These are only speculative considerations, but they are suggestive of the progress of the interiorization of the new medium.

The overlap, or intensification, between the appearance of writing and its complete interiorization is perhaps what Niditch intended to convey with her concept of the 'oral-literate continuum.' By this overlap Ong points to the curious effect whereby tendencies of

---

a previous technology are initially intensified before being altered or eliminated by the new technology. This can be illustrated through two examples. Mnemonic lists are characteristic of oral societies; early literature is characterized by often excessively long and detailed lists (e.g., *the Tain*, Numbers). The word has numinous connotations in oral society; in early writing this numinousness even gets projected onto script, making the individual letter a powerful talisman. To give a modern analogue, the Internet first functioned as an expansion of print media before it took on its present multimedia form.

In the context of the above discussion of McLuhan and Ong, what Niditch labels the 'oral-literate continuum' could perhaps be nuanced in terms of the increasing internalization of literacy. The use of the alphabet transforms thought and social patterns, but it does so gradually and cumulatively; the more the written word is used, the more it becomes the dominant paradigm in its users' thought. Hence, the overlap of oral and literate use and mentality which Niditch so carefully notes as well as the increased tendency towards the literate end of the continuum in the later texts are interrelated. This means that the effects of literacy would have been varied both synchronically and diachronically, as well as hierarchically (i.e., levels of education). Niditch notes several times the sense of the numinous, quasi-magical or efficacious nature which the use of the written word implies in the Hebrew Bible; this point has significant ramifications for this study, although only two examples are cited here: 1) The possibility of oracles being written down as 'sign acts' (mostly oral mindset) and then later collected and viewed as if intended as archives (more literate mindset); 2) the transfer and concomitant interiorization of the texts' numinousness and efficaciousness by scribes as literacy becomes increasingly interiorized by them. The scribes' sense of authority increased as they appropriated the growing authority (rather than numinosity) of the texts.

Perhaps a better word to describe this overlap or interaction than 'continuum'—which may imply an ease and smoothness of transition, as well as completeness—is 'dialectic.' Dialectic—in the Kierkegaardian sense rather than in the Hegelian—implies the co-existence of two related, but distinct, entities which are in perpetual tension. Orality and literacy are related, of course, because literacy comes out of and transforms oral modes. They are in tension because oral modes in some form always remain and have certain tendencies which contradict literate tendencies. Since all human beings are born into orality and only
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118 Niditch, *Oral World and Written World*, mentions that the reference to divine record books increases in later literature (p. 81); increased importance of written sources in general (p. 98); earlier prophetic texts seem to cite visions, later ones letters (p. 91).
subsequently can enter into literacy, an individual's psychology will have various levels of
tension between literate and oral modes, varying on the level of the interiorization of literacy.

When discussing the interiorization of literacy, it is important to note that there are
shades and levels of literacy, from rudimentary ability to scratch out one's signature to the
ability to compose The Lord of the Rings. Although modern literates expect one to be able to
read and write, these two skills are strictly speaking separate; the western ideal of universal
ability to read anything is highly idiosyncratic in historical and numerical terms.

The gradations of literacy (from 'artisanal' to complete) must be kept in mind when considering
the variable of residual orality. Thus, the mere cataloguing of archaeological finds with
writing on them fails to grapple with the distinction in types between highly interiorized
(print) literacy and less complete (minimal) forms. This can easily be seen (though often
unappreciated) by Paul's use of his signature.

Consequently, in the periods when prophetic literature was surrendering to the
apocalypse, many changes may not be so much in the content of the text as in the authority of
written texts themselves. Important in this respect is the formation of a scribal class—
working with traditional materials which are at the same time given an independent (textual)
existence from oral tradition—which was beginning to codify, assimilate, and question a
textual tradition. It was in a situation where 'prophetic words are no longer predominantly
living speech, but rather inscribed and inscrutable data whose true meanings are an esoteric
mystery revealed by God to a special adept and his pious circle' that literate mentalities
among a scribal elite began to notice literate tensions between the canonized traditions. This
increasing tension was an important factor which 'served to open an abyss in the religious
imagination whose ultimate expression was apocalyptic imagination.' This is a situational
dynamic beyond the class and sociological implications of scribal authorship. It implies a
different origin and literary quality to texts where created qua text from texts which were
redacted into texts. It is a context where hermeneutics gain a new speciality—no longer do
adepts of traditions have to merely interpret the signs of the times (as did an Amos, Isaiah, or
Jeremiah), but they had to interpret the meaning of texts in the light of the current situation.
While one could adequately function as a priest or prophet in a wholly oral context, one
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119 See the useful overviews by M. C. A. MacDonald, "Literacy in an Oral Environment," Writing and Ancient
Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard, eds. Piotr Bienkowski, et al. (London: T & T Clark,
2005), pp. 49–118.
120 E.g., approaches like Millard, Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus.
46–58.
122 Even acknowledged by Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 128; also noted by Schniedewind, How the Bible
123 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, p. 484.
cannot exegete texts without advanced scribal training. Whatever the nature of prophetic training, there is no doubt that the training and societal expectations of a scribe were very different.

**Enochic Literature**

The Enochic Literature offers a good example of the change in mind-set encouraged by the scribal enterprise and the resultant change in cultural-religious attitudes and traditions. In the Enochic Literature a trend towards the linking of scribality with righteousness can be detected. The angels, the righteous dead, and even G-d himself are increasingly depicted as scribes; the heavenly system of justice depends heavily on books which record the deeds of humanity. The effectiveness of G-d’s power is evidenced less by his presence and more by his literate bureaucracy; indeed, G-d becomes increasingly distant.

1 Enoch 12:4 explicitly calls Enoch a ‘scribe of righteousness’; this identification is repeated in 13:4 and 15:1. Writing is deemed so important for the identity of Enoch that learning to write is listed as one of two momentous life-events, the other being his marriage (83:2). In distinction to Deut 4:9, where the Israelites are admonished to remember and to pass their memory on to their children, 1 Enoch 81:6 equates the teaching of the law with the **writing** of it. In 103:2 Enoch is justified because he has “seen the heavenly tablets and the holy writings.” Knowledge of tradition is no longer sufficient without command of the textual versions of it.

A shift from the admonitory and ‘existential’ aspects of prophetic material is illustrated in 1 Enoch 89:62—64, 69. In these verses the sins of the shepherds are written down and recorded for future judgment, but the text explicitly states that the shepherds are not to be admonished for their sins. Rather than the immediate function of oration and the instantaneous demand which it represents, here writing functions as a score-card of sorts, enabling G-d to keep record until the final judgment; the Day of the Lord is coming rather than present. Indeed, the sapiential idea of recompense appears to be wholly suspended until the **eschaton**. Earlier in the current collation of 1 Enoch this tendency is implicit; Enoch writes a memorial prayer in 13:4, so that the supplicants will be remembered in the future.

125 Over time, the scribal training itself becomes insufficient, requiring supplementation. Cf. Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE—400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford Univ Press, 2001), who argues that the Rabbis became self-conscious of their oral interpretations, seeing exegesis alone as nothing. The present author is grateful to Professor Niditch for this reference.

126 The collection of 1 Enoch is treated synchronically here; for a more diachronic approach see Chapter IVb.


128 This was pointed out at an SBL session of “Orality and the Formation of the Hebrew Bible” section in Philadelphia, but the author cannot recall whose comment it was.
An apparent aberration in scribal glorification appears in 1 Enoch 69:8–10. Here the watcher Pinem'e¹²⁹ is condemned for teaching people “about writing with ink and papyrus,” claiming that “humans were not born for this purpose, to confirm their trustworthiness through pen and ink.” On first glance these comments appear to show an oral culture’s reservations over the changes created by writing, similar to Plato’s comments in Phaedrus (see above). However, in the context of the passage and of the collection as a whole, the comments need to be read differently. The following verses claim it is “through this, their knowledge, they are perishing.” Clearly it is not knowledge per se which condemns, but false knowledge. In the context of scribal traditions, this polemic makes sense in terms of an ‘elitist’ view towards writing and the written text. It is not writing itself which is wicked (after all Enoch is a scribe and the condemnation is itself written), but the use of writing and reading by non-scribe-sages, and therefore the misunderstanding and misappropriation of the knowledge. Writing makes heresy and falsity more difficult and problematic by making it permanent. An idea which might have passed away unnoticed, once written, gains a new authority, an authority inappropriate for those who are not worthy of it. This interpretation is bolstered with reference to 104:9–14; sinners here are indicted for inventing fictitious stories and writing “books in their own names.”¹³⁰ This strikes a scholar as bizarrely ironic in a pseudepigraphical book, but it shows how residually oral even highly literate scribes could still be; Lord notes that fidelity to a perceived tradition (in this case, the Enochic tradition) is more important than individual authorship among oral tradents.¹³¹ The passage continues by wishing these false scribes would have written faithfully, neither adding nor taking away, and then they would know the joy of the Scriptures. 104:10–13, when read with 69:8–10, clearly links sin with ‘false scribality,’ which perhaps may be understood as scribal traditions other than the authors’.

This link between false scribality and wickedness is made explicit in 98:15.¹³²

---

¹²⁹ This passage is not extant in the Aramaic or Greek. The present author has found no recent suggestions towards the possible origin or significance of this name. Is it possible that ‘Pinem’e’ is derived from ‘ב’ indicating the sense of surface, thus being a play on the idea of writing surface? Or perhaps better, it is derived from ‘ב’ ‘towards the inside,’ indicating the change caused by the false scribality? This is worth exploring. Cf. George A. Barton, “The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 AD,” Journal of Biblical Literature 31.4 (1912): p. 165.


¹³² Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, p. 151; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91–108, p. 372.
Woe to those who write lying words and words of error; they write and lead many astray with their lies.

These passages, then, seem to evidence some of the tensions created by the interiorization of writing: while it gives these scribes the access to secret heavenly knowledge, it removes the existential and communal controls on traditions and teaching, opening them up to divergent interpretations. Indeed, the problems associated with the verification of prophecy return, only now writing makes them even more permanent. The Enochic myth of demonic teaching belongs in this tension.

2 Enoch

The scribal tendencies visible in 1 Enoch are radically extended in the 2 Enoch materials. Enoch is depicted as the scribe par excellence, transcribing 366 books in 30 days and nights, including “everything that is appropriate to learn” (22:11–23:6. cf. 68:2). His work as a scribe (‘own handwriting’) testifies to G-d (33:5, 8), will bring glory to those who read it (35:2–3), and cannot be contradicted (53:2–3).

The text projects writing back into creation; Adam was the first scribe (33:10). The text echoes the sentiment of Qoh 12:12 in noting the proliferation of texts (since creation), but instead of cynically eschewing them it points to Enoch as the scribal guide to righteousness (47:2). Indeed, the author envisions an almost exclusively text-based righteousness; in 48:6, 8 Enoch is enjoined to pass on his books to future generations, much like Deut 4:9 enjoins the Israelites to pass on Torah. The ‘J’ text again equates reading with personal instruction (36:1).

Like 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch envisions a record-based final judgment. Chapter 65, however, extends this motif in a curious manner. According to this chapter, G-d created time in order to allow man to “think of his sins and so that he might write his own achievement, both good and evil” (65:4). Here, instead of angels or G-d, each person writes the record of his own life. Accountability is linked to one’s knowledge of one’s achievement, and how it compares to Enoch’s writings (65:5). There is a finality in this which seems to forestall the possibility of forgiveness: actions (including sinful ones) are recorded, making them


Interestingly, this chasm opened by writing was the impetus for the formulation of the Rabbinic concept of the ‘Orah Torah’ as a method for controlling the interpretation of texts. See Jaffee, Torah in the Mouth, particularly p. 10.

While the forms of 2 Enoch available to contemporary scholarship are of a much later period, the text contains older materials and continues the traditions of 1 Enoch, and so is still useful for the understanding of the argument.

According to the J redaction.

2 En 44:5 (A); 50:1; 52:15; 53:2–3.
permanent. Salvation is partially dependent on the ability to analyze one's life in regards to Enoch's, a very literate skill.

Further testimony to the increasing hegemony of literate thought within the Enochic strand can be seen in the later 3 Enoch book as well. Taking up the strands of the earlier Enochic literature, 3 Enoch transforms 1 Enoch 69:15–25's account of creation, where everything is created by an oath (illegitimately taught to humans by the Watchers), into an account where everything is created by letters (3 Enoch 13:1; 41). The power of letters continues to the end of the world, where the letters of the Torah and of the alphabet testify against Israel (44:9–10). Although the dominant paradigm for these authors is increasingly writing, writing retains an oral aura of numinosity and power.

Daniel

The book of Daniel also has an interesting relationship with writing. The book explicitly begins by claiming that Daniel and his colleagues were taught the literature and the language of the Chaldaeans (1:4). It may be important that the text mentions that the language and literature is of the Chaldaeans, the scribal class, rather than the Babylonians in general. The character Daniel is clearly associated with the written tradition of learning, and the Danielic author with a mysterious scribal group called the סcribes (11:33; 12:3,10). G-d's favor was not the only way in which Daniel was exceptional: Daniel's world as presented in the book is clearly a ratified and literate one. The law is conceived of as a written collection by the time of Daniel; Daniel reads the book of Jeremiah (9:2) and prays on the basis of what is written in the law of Moses (9:13). Additionally, G-d runs heaven like the Persian Empire: deeds are inscribed in the book of truth (10:21), and the righteous are found written in the book (12:1). However, the collection also notes that writing was not universally expected, even for kings. Several aspects of the collection still betray oral presuppositions.

In the story of the writing on the wall (Ch. 5), the text notes that the king was unable to read the writing inscribed on the wall (v. 8). Daniel's interpretation of the enigmatic writing (vv. 25–27) emphasizes both the oral tendency of the word's numinoseness as well as Daniel's skills in mastering it. Further, Dan 6:8, 15 considers written decrees permanent, even though the king himself only signs the law (v. 9). This seems to reflect both the increased importance of writing for bureaucracy, as well as the awe in which it continued to be held. In a stimulating study, Polaski analyzes how writing informs the stories in Dan 5 and

---

6 and the ways in which it and its virtuosi are inscribed with power. Indeed, he notes that the text even depicts scribal ability as obviating the need for revelatory vision!

Daniel simply does his (former) job as a royal official; he needs no help in reading a text. God, via scribal mediation, addresses a recalcitrant king and his bureaucracy, again showing the extent to which notions of power are “textualized” in the thought world of the book of Daniel.

Perhaps this is telling for the oft-commented visionary nature of the apocalypses. Not only can a shift from ‘word’ to ‘vision’ be found in Daniel and other apocalypses which is consonant with the shift from oral to written, ear to eye, but a shift in the source of authority over both, i.e., the scribal ability to write, read, and comment upon both utterance and vision. It is not just the ability to receive revelations, but the ability to correctly write, read, and comment upon them that matters.

It seems likely that apocalyptic literature is more thoroughly literate and scribal than prophetic, regardless of the potential reality of visions. In a very stimulating discussion, McInver and Carroll suggest that the apocalyptic passages in the gospels are some of the few text-based sources which appear in the Synoptic Gospels. This seems to have very important implications for apocalyptic literature—it may, in essence, be a wholly literate, scribal phenomenon (the phenomenon of apocalypses, not millenarianism). This link helps situate the relationships between apocalyptic and sapiential literature; wisdom and apocalyptic share a scribal origin rather than a common political or theological tradition per se.

Perhaps this can be tied to the reduction of directly existential concerns which accompanies writing and is evident to some respects in apocalyptic literature.

Perhaps one ‘apocalyptic’ community in Second Temple Judaism helps confirm this suspicion. The community at Qumran was a remarkable group in Second Temple Judaism. In particular, the level of literacy appears to have been quite high, especially in contrast to the general population. The intensity of scribal and literate activity was significant for their organization, self-understanding, and daily activities. It certainly had an effect on their theology and relation with the Jewish texts extant in their days. Whatever the situation of libraries or archives prior to this community, its concentration of literates—let alone literate

144 Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, pp. 465–466.
'sages'—devoted to textual study was unprecedented in antiquity. Considering the sparsity of Torah texts even into the Rabbinic period, a community with such a library is phenomenal. An investigation of their writings should reveal special ways in which their unusually high interiorization of the alphabet manifested itself in their texts.

When approaching the issues of the emergence of the apocalypse, the worldview which appears therein, and the potential role of external influences, one needs to carefully consider the dynamics of media. First, one must recognize that the role of the scribe is structurally different from the role of a priest or a prophet, and that the scribal role changes as a society becomes increasingly literate. Concomitant with the increased role of literacy and scribes is the rise and importance of textual hermeneutics in addition to the hermeneutics of traditions and times; this is supremely important in the fading of prophetic literature and the emergence of new genres. While it is important to recognize the effects of literacy, care needs to be taken to distinguish between oral-like elements and elements of scribal redaction. Even the most profoundly literate scribes in the ancient world were pre-print literates and a minority in their world. This means, lastly, that oral modes of discourse influence all forms of interaction and textual formation in the period. Because of this, analyses for the levels and types of influence must recognize that the subjects operate within a context which is not primarily textual: verbatim, linear, and analytic criteria are likely to misconstrue the data. Once the nature of interaction and scribal creation is recognized, it remains to be seen what evidence of interaction can be discerned in the surviving texts.

PROBLEMATICS AND DESIDERATA

Since communication touches nearly every aspect of human existence, the above considerations have broad implications within Biblical Studies. A full elaboration of them cannot be here pursued; nevertheless, it is worth asking a few of the questions raised thereby, both to better contextualize the upcoming textual analyses and to suggest potential avenues for further scholarship. No attempt is made to answer the questions posited.

A fundamental query, albeit perhaps unanswerable, is why write at all when few can read? Although the answer to this question needs vary with each text and author, it is an important consideration in an era prior to mass publication. It perhaps matters if a text was

---


147 This task is not attempted here.

written to be archival, monumental, for dictation to an audience, for fellow scribes, or as part of a pedagogical exercise.

Related to this is the question of who could write, how these learned to write, and who funded their leisure, teaching, and materials. The skills of writing and reading require education, and education further requires teachers, curriculum, and financing. Unlike traditional forms of apprenticeship, the student does not contribute to production in the beginning stages of training. Who provided all the resources necessary?¹⁴⁹

In distinction to the literary establishment, did the powers that be sponsor a Judaean oral epic tradition? Israel and Judah must have had a folkloric tradition, and it must have had tridents who were considered virtuosic in it.¹⁵⁰ Who were these tridents, what form did their material take, and what has happened to it?¹⁵¹ Further, in many societies the king and/or the aristocracy patronize such artists (e.g., Greece, Anglo-Saxon England, Parthian Iran).¹⁵² Did the aristocracy in Yehud do likewise? Did the governors and High Priests express their magnificence through patronage like the Achaemenid Satraps?¹⁵³ If so, how, in what forms, and what does this patronage mean for the development of the Hebrew Scriptures and literary traditions?

The above question is more often considered in the context of the proposed Persian imperial authorization of the Torah. Did the Great King authorize a Torah? If so, the


¹⁵⁰ Cf. the comment by David E. Bynum, The Daemon in the Wood: A Study of Oral Narrative Patterns (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978), p. 36: “…every culture has its story-tellers, even though only a minority of any given culture are recognized as competent in story-telling.”


158
question would remain as to what type of Torah, in what capacity, and what its contents were. One could also wonder if this imperial patronage would have competed with or complemented the culture of the local elites.154

The desideratum par excellence in Biblical Studies in general is the problem of the literary growth of the biblical text itself. Oral Theory has significant implications for methodology and how to understand the growth of texts. If the culture was in the earlier stages of the interiorization of literacy, how did they receive and pass on traditions? Did they edit texts in a similar manner? Can oral and written sources be distinguished in a text? Did the authors and editors even distinguish between writing and editing?155

A particularly important and potentially illuminating desideratum is the analysis of the levels and stages of the interiorization of literacy and the development of a ‘book culture’ in Second Temple Judaism. When and how did texts become important and for what segments of the Judaean society? What of the diaspora? Could debates over the authority of texts have been significant for the development of religious factions?156

IMPLICATIONS FOR INVESTIGATION OF INFLUENCE

The Persian period (as well as the Greek and Roman periods) represents a very complex interplay between Persians, prophets, (proto-)apocalyptics, scribes, orality and literacy within Judaism. It is an interplay which is not reducible merely to re-interpreted ‘failed prophecy’ (cognitive dissonance), arguments between insider-outsider groups (deprivation), or of responses to colonialism. In Second Temple Judaism new and old traditions were being written, adapted, and related to each other in the context of the Persian Empire; new forms of religious structure were evolving, and old forms had to be adapted and re-understood in a new context. In this context, a very important and defining difference between people and groups calling themselves Judaean or Jews was theology, or general religious worldview, and the medium which they used to express it. Some Judaean likely accepted various Persian ideas and integrated them into their understanding of Israel’s

154 Watts, ed., *Persia and Torah*.


156 A greater engagement with the fields of Communication Theory and Social Psychology could possibly prove very fruitful for these questions.
heritage: if so, they would have done so as part of the increasingly important project of interpreting previous Judaean writings.

Conclusions

The question of Iranian influence must be considered within two important communicative contexts. First, the high residual orality of the period and implications thus carried for the creation, reception, and adaptation of ideas and traditions must constantly be weighed. Second, the evident increasing interiorization of literacy among at least certain circles must be considered in the evaluation of the genesis of the apocalypses. The newly important tradition of textual exegesis must be appreciated in this regard. It is with both of these perspectives that a few sample texts can be approached to probe for potential Iranian influences.
IV

Textual Analyses

Part A: Biblical Literature
To begin a preliminary re-investigation of Iranian influence, a sample of texts are here analyzed, each representing important stages in the development of apocalyptic. Three canonical texts (Ezekiel 37:1–4, the Valley of the Bones; Ezekiel 38–39, Gog of Magog; and Daniel 2, the Vision of the Statue/ Dan 7) and the collection of texts known as 1 (Ethiopic) Enoch are analyzed on their own and in their respective positions towards Second Temple Judaism.

The passages and topics here are investigated for ways in which an Iranian context could prove illuminating for the history of Judaean ideas. These selections are in no ways exhaustive, but they are diverse enough to illustrate a variety of types of influence. Several recurrent themes can be discerned, however. The theme of eschatology continually rears its head, as does Achaemenid Royal ideology. Further, certain Iranian concepts also recur, such as the fraumati. None of these ideas appear in isolation, but in dialogue with other Ancient Near Eastern traditions.

Ezekiel 37:1–14 (THE VALLEY OF THE BONES)

"The hand of the Lord came upon me, and he brought me out by the spirit of the Lord and set me down in the middle of a valley; it was full of bones. 2He led me all around them, there were very many lying in the valley, and they were very dry. 3He said to me, 'Mortal, can these bones live?' I answered, 'O Lord God, you know.' 4Then he said to me, 'Prophesy to these bones, and say to them: O dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. 5Thus says the Lord God to these bones: I will cause breath (מָרָק) to enter you, and you shall live. 6I will lay sinews on you, and cause flesh to come upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and you shall live; and you shall know that I am the Lord.'

7So I prophesied as I had been commanded; and as I prophesied, suddenly there was a noise (חַוַּע), a rattling (שַׁעַר), and the bones came together, bone to its bone. 8I looked, and there were sinews on them, and flesh had come upon them, and skin had covered them; but there was no breath in them. 9Then he said to me, 'Prophesy to the breath, prophesy, mortal, and say to the breath: Thus says the Lord God: Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain (נְתַנְתִּים), that they may live.' 10I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood on their feet, a vast multitude.

11Then he said to me, 'Mortal, these bones are the whole house of Israel. They say, "Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are cut off completely."' 12Therefore prophesy, and say to them, Thus says the Lord God: I am going to open your graves, and bring you up from your graves, O my people; and I will bring you back to the land of Israel. 13And you shall know that I am the Lord, when I open your graves, and bring you up from your graves, O my people. 14I will put my spirit within you, and you shall live, and I will place you on your own soil; then you shall know that I, the Lord, have spoken and will act, says the Lord.'
This passage presents a good test for Iranian influence, with its vivid imagery of bones reconstituted and re-given דוד, a picture reminiscent of bodily resurrection. In fact, Lang offers an interpretation of this oracle as inspired by the Zoroastrian practice of the exposure of the dead, explaining the references to burial in vv. 12–13 as later interpolations.\(^1\)

His most convincing argument for this is the complete lack of purity concern in the passage—while earlier Ezekiel shows clear concern for ritual purity (cf. Ezek 4:12–15), his presence among a field of bones goes unmentioned.\(^2\) Later in the book the defiling aspect of human bones is dwelt upon somewhat at length (39:11–16), but no mention of it is made in this context. Lang rightly notes that according to Zoroastrian law, while dead bodies are defiling, dry bones are not.\(^3\) However, the likelihood of Ezekiel having actually seen exposing grounds of bones, as Lang claims, is low for several reasons: the extent of the use of the rite of exposure among Zoroastrians at that early of a date is questionable; even when left for exposure, the bones were possibly collected into ossuaries, if not kept in structures such as later became known as dāxmas or 'Towers of Silence'; and any Zoroastrian strict enough to practice exposure certainly would not have left the funeral rites or remains easily accessible to non-co-religionists.\(^4\) In his commentary, Greenberg considers Lang's thesis unlikely, preferring to look to Mesopotamian battle reliefs and annals.\(^5\) Considering the supposed early exilic setting of this oracle, this is a very likely immediate source, if one beyond the cited saying ("Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are cut off completely") is needed.

As Greenberg and Fox note, vv. 1–14 are a well-structured unity, making Lang's appeal for the redactional addition of the graves unnecessary and unlikely.\(^6\) Both the structure of the passage and its (con)textual setting make it clear that the vision promises a

---


3 See Virdištāt VIII.33, available in English translation in The Zend-Avesta I, p. 103; Cf. Lang, "Street Theatre, Raising the Dead," p. 310.


national restoration to the Land of Israel and is not preaching the idea of bodily resurrection; indeed, as Fox rightfully points out, the entire rhetorical force of the passage depends on the assumption that “the audience regards corporeal resurrection as basically absurd.” In the final context this passage is clearly about national restoration: 36 is about the desolate hills of Israel and the nations mocking G-d, both of which drive him to return Israel; 37:14–28 describes how both Judah and Israel will be united in the land of Israel. Verses 1–14 clearly, therefore, are a prophecy for the proper internal response to the promise of return to the land. Yet, this poses an interesting dilemma: the early history of interpretation of the passage clearly saw a reference to bodily resurrection in this section. Here, Lang’s example of the mural at the synagogue at Dura Europos may be revealing: while the passage clearly speaks of bones (ממהן), the mural on the wall depicts “anatomical fragments.” He suggests that the Jews of Dura Europos saw a similarity between Ezek 37 and Zoroastrian religion, and thus attempted to create what he calls “artificial dissimilation.” The early interpreters of the vision at Dura saw that the passage could be seen as consonant with other local traditions, and thus changed the bones into body-parts. This may not be as far-fetched as it first sounds; as Birkeland remarks, the ‘foreignness’ of the idea of bodily resurrection was still felt well past the Persian period; this is evident in Qoheleth, Ben Sirah, and the Sadducees.

In fact, the imagery of this passage does recall various aspects of the Zoroastrian tradition. The wording of Ezek 37 is very precise in the language it uses to describe the scenario: ממחים וaturity. This wording is strikingly different from the language of Gen 2, a passage with which one would expect similarities from a textual-redactional approach. Although some scholars claim a similarity in language, the creation account in Gen 2 uses נשא and נשמה, none of which occur in this passage. Greenberg suggests a terminological

---

9 Greenberg, Ezekiel 21–37, pp. 749–751; As he notes, “Thus the dominant trend of the earliest interpretations of our passage is furthest from its original meaning as we today understand it.” (p. 750).
12 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, p. 63 and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 261, admits dissimilarity of language, but still posits a creation parallel; indeed, there is a distant creation parallel, but it appears as if the closest one is Zoroastrian rather than Jewish.
affinity with the flood account, but this is minimal. The use of spirit, breath, and bones, however, does have a resemblance to some Zoroastrian usage.

Figure 14: Human Burials at Persepolis
Chicago Oriental Institute P-61007. Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago © University of Chicago

One of the Gathas, Yasna XXXI.7, remarks that, "Piety gave body and breath," and in Yasna XXXIV.14, another Gatha, a request is made for "the prize desirable for body and breath." This language often appears in the context of immortality and health (Amaratat and Haurvatat). That at least the Zoroastrian tradition expected bodily resurrection is quite clear. In the Zamyad Yast, a Young Avestan hymn, the refrain "...when the dead will rise, when life and immortality will come..." appears four times. A later Zoroastrian fragment of a prayer has Ahura Mazda command, "Let the dead arise...let bodily life be sustained in these now lifeless bodies."

In the Greater Bundahishn XXXIV.4–8/Shorter Bundahishn XXX.4–6, Zoroaster queries Ahura Mazda how bodily resurrection is possible. After relating a list of the feats he performed during creation, Ahura Mazda responds, "Observe that when that which was not was then produced, why is it not possible to produce again that which was? For at that time

one will demand the bone from the spirit of the earth...." This claim is directly followed in the text with a section in which it is the bones of the first man and women which are raised first, followed by the remainder of mankind. All people “rouse up from the spot where its life departs...all material living beings assume again their bodies and forms...” It may be significant that in this passage the bones are explicitly raised first and the bodies are recreated in the spot in which the person had died. This description is quite reminiscent of the rhetorical style of Ezekiel’s vision, with the bare bones receiving flesh and standing in the spot where they were left. However, the Bundahisn itself is late, so any parallels require additional corroboration.

In his discussion of 37:1–14 Russell comments on the role which both the ‘good’ and ‘evil’ Vayus (Spirits of the Wind) play in death and resurrection: the evil Vayu overcomes and kills, while the good Vayu revivifies at the resurrection. Russell finds the description of the dead as ‘killed’ (כושה, v. 9) in line with this thinking. Because death is unnatural and unoriginal to Ahura Mazda’s creation, in Zoroastrian traditions it is always attributed to the onslaught of the evil powers, often the demon of death, Astō:ništātu. The use of⊥⊥ does appear strange in the context of the vision: the simple rhetorical logic of the passage merely requires נון. However, an understanding of death as unnatural, as is found in Iranian traditions, would render it a logical choice. Note that v. 7 does describe a לסל and a שמע as the bones come together. These noises could be related to the coming of the Vayu or storm-wind. A play between wind and spirit is evident in v. 9, so the text’s repetition of יוח ישועו certainly could be seen to echo the Zoroastrian use of the (good) wind imparting life. It can also be seen to fit within a traditional Hebrew understanding of wind/breath/spirit. However, as Greenberg notes, all the truly parallel passages are also post-exilic (Jer 49:36; Zech 6:5; Ezek 42:16–20), perhaps implying the idea entered in the post-exilic period.

Ezekiel 37:10 describes the revivified group as a very vast army (היוו גזר ישועו). In the context, neither in 37:1–14 nor in the broader section of 36–37, is there a martial reference to explain the use of ‘army.’ It clearly cannot be referring to the army in 38–39,
as the army there is the army of Gog and not of reconstituted Israel. The reference to an army, however, may make more sense in the context of Iranian traditions. The final resurrection of mankind occurs in the context of the defeat of Angra Mainyu and the Daēnas, with mankind having an especial role to play in the victory of Ahura Mazda. In the Greater Bundahišn III.23–24/Shorter (or Indian) Bundahišn, II.10–11, Ahura Mazda gives the guardian spirits of men the choice of ‘contending in bodily form’ and then being resurrected perfected and immortal at the end of the world; they consent. The entire purpose of the embodiment of the human frauasi (or pre-existent spirit) is to contend with, and ultimately defeat, the forces of Angra Mainyu; the final success of this enterprise will be evidenced when men’s bodies are reconstituted out of the earth and made immortal.

While Greenberg may be right in pointing to the initial Mesopotamian inspiration for Ezekiel’s vision, it cannot be denied that the overall shape of this discourse proves very similar to various Iranian rites and beliefs to which subsequent Judean audiences/readers would have been exposed; a very good example of this is the mural at Dura Europos, as Lang notes. It is also possible, given the various parallels noted in the text, that Ezekiel intended to borrow Iranian resurrection motifs as part of his rhetorical strategy. The intended message of the passage closely refers to a national and unified restoration to Israel, but the vision itself may have helped to give a ‘canonical’ or authoritative springboard which made Iranian ideas of bodily resurrection appear less foreign, even if the initial audience (or indeed the prophet himself) did not see it that way. As Birkeland remarks, “no idea can become an integral part of a religious complex when this complex is not prepared for that idea.” Perhaps if ‘Ezekiel’ is amended to ‘Ezekiel’s inheritors’ Lang’s following statement can be useful: “The Iranian connection enabled Ezekiel to transcend the limits of Jewish belief current in his day.” While it may be remotely possible to see a negative influence here in Ezek 37, the significance of the Iranian parallels are more in their likely long-term effect among the inheritors of the text. It is worth noting how this pericope was conflated with 38–39 and interpreted eschatologically and concerning resurrection in the Pseudo-Ezekiel literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Later generations more familiar with the concept of
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28 One may even be tempted to see a polemic with Zoroastrianism; if Ezekiel was aware of the religion, which is possible but necessarily tenuous, perhaps he purposefully appropriated the language and imagery of the Magi’s or other Iranian priests’ rhetoric to argue YHWH’s strength and ability to restore Israel. Thus the vision could serve two functions—to deny the theology of the Zoroastrians and to affirm the prerogatives of YHWH. This, however, is very speculative. However, Daniel I. Block, The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 384–386, is willing to see a polemic.
30 Lang, “Street Theatre, Raising the Dead,” p. 313.
bodily resurrection and hostile, demonic forces could easily see this idea already embedded in Ezekiel's vision and thus more easily assimilate them to their understanding of the text.

EZEKIEL 38-39 (GOG OF MAGOG)

Many commentators consider this dramatic and difficult passage as either apocalyptic or proto-apocalyptic; it certainly influenced later apocalyptic texts. For the moment, the question of the authorship of the section is irrelevant: whether attributed to Ezekiel or redactors, if Iranian material can be detected, it is evidence of Iranian influence at some point. The prophet here describes a divinely thwarted invasion of reconstituted Israel by a coalition of armies from the North, led by “Gog of the land of Magog, chief prince of Meshech and Tubal” (v. 2). Gog is often connected with the Assyrian Gugu or the Gagaia of the Amarna Letters, in either case a reference to Lydia. The meaning or significance of Magog has found little agreement; it has been interpreted as 'Land

---


of Gog,' an alliteration based on Gog, or a gloss based on Genesis or 1 Chronicles. By the time of the Qumran communities, the two were seen as separate peoples.

It is common to associate Ezekiel's use of 'far north' in 38:6 and 39:2 with an 'Enemy from the North' Tradition, which is also associated with Jeremiah and Isaiah. The passage is therefore read as a reinterpretation and combination of the unfulfilled prophecies of Jeremiah and Isaiah, partially basing this upon 38:17. Block notes that both of the supposed antecedents of the Ezekiel passage were already fulfilled in the minds of the earlier prophets, and probably in the mind of Ezekiel—namely by Assyria and Babylon. In both of these cases, the enemy in question is a real, historical enemy who entered Israel from the geographic north. There seems to be little in common which could be called a 'tradition' beyond the similarities of topic (an army entering from the north). While the north may have had mythic or numinous implications for the Babylonians, there is no need to read this into the passages in Jeremiah, Isaiah, or Ezekiel. In fact, Ezek 38–39 need not be seen as claiming to reinterpret previous prophecy at all. If one follows the Massoretic text in 38:17 (with Block) G-d's statement becomes 'Are you the one of whom I spoke...'—a rhetorical question with an implied 'no.' When read in that manner, this passage ceases to be about reinterpreting a past tradition and posits a wholly new event. There is an inevitable terminological affinity due to the common topos of battle, but there is no real reason to appeal to an 'enemy from the north' tradition in this passage. If Ezekiel is not reinterpreting previous oracles, is there a specific context for this passage outside a general or mythological enemy from the north?


Thraces (he reads Θρης instead of Θρης), Nubia (Νυβια), Pontus (Πωνια), Cimmerians/Scythians (Τιμμεριανοι/Σκυθιανοι), and the Melitene dynasty (Μελιτεναι Βασιλεια). His textual emendation of the text is unnecessary: most scholars identify Νυβια with Persia, which was a vassal of Media until 550 B.C.E. The inclusion of Nubia in this list of Anatolian/ Iranian powers is strange; however, it may refer to the ‘land of the Kaššu’ along the Araxes River, which would fit the Anatolian grouping well. 1 Chron 1:8–9 and Hab 3:7 seem to indicate several relatively homonymic ‘Cushes’ in the Ancient Near East. Astour finds this contextualization problematic for several reasons: firstly, he objects that the Median-Lydid War never threatened Palestine, with Judah’s imperial lord, Babylon, even serving to mediate the peace deal in 585; secondly, the Kingdom of Judah was still real in 590; thirdly, that Ezekiel wanted the existing (Judaean) state to be destroyed to make way for the new one. A slightly broader (prophetic?) view of the historical circumstances, however, vitiates these objections. Yamauchi discusses the possibility that Indo-Iranian Scythians (the Νυβια of Ezekiel is generally identified as the Scythians) may indeed have threatened Palestine, either in independent raids in the seventh century B.C.E. or as mercenaries in the service of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in the sixth. Even if no immediate threat to Palestine is referred to or expected, the Median-Lydid War would likely have threatened Ezekiel’s real audience—Israelites and Judeans living in exile.

of Hebrew Bible 446 (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), pp. 254–267, also argues for a contextualization in the Medo-Lydid War, but uses this to argue for an identification of Gog with Nebuchadnezzar (pp. 260–261). Even if one accepts her reading of ‘ruler over the Prince of Meshch and Tubal,’ this does not privilege an identification with Nebuchadnezzar, who could not have claimed such status.


48 Astour, “Ezekiel’s Prophecy of Gog,” p. 571; this page contains all three of his objections.

As was noted earlier, deported Israelites and Judaeans were likely living around the regions of Ecbatana, the Median capital, and Nineveh, the former Assyrian capital; Media conquered Calah and Arrapha in 614 and participated in conquering Nineveh in 612. Thus it is likely that some of the text's intended audience were living under Median rule, and thus very aware of the war. Additionally, awareness of the Medes as a power and potential threat was not limited to Ezekiel—Jer 51:11, 27–28 expects an invasion of the Medes and Anatolian allies to conquer Babylon. While Holladay considers these references to be glosses, he admits that they have to predate 550; in any case, someone considered Media a credible force. It may be significant that 51:11 uses שְׁלִיטֵי, 'quivers': the Scythians were renowned for their skill as archers. Further, Jer 25:25–26 possibly links the Scythians, Medians, and Elamites together with 'all the kings of the North.' Ezekiel’s more defined description of these northern forces suggests, at the very least, a closer and more detailed understanding of the Anatolian political situation. Astour's final objection ignores the preceding context of rehabilitation and restoration in the final book. The prophet has just prophesied that Edom will be destroyed and Israel returned for YHWH's glory (36); that the scattered remains of David's kingdom will be restored and unified (37); now in 38–39 he demonstrates the completeness and inescapability of YHWH's plans to restore Israel. This message has nothing to do with the existing vassal Kingdom of Judah; it has everything to do with the upcoming restoration.

When the geographical terms are read in this manner, Ezekiel's use of 'north' applies as much to the real geographical position of the nations mentioned as it does to a quasi-mythical 'foe from the north.' If the Median-Lydian War can possibly be accepted as a contextual background, what is its significance to reading the passage? Beyond indicating a general context for the author and intended audience, it serves as a hint to look for the use of Iranian-inspired imagery in the pericope.

48 Cf. Chapter II.
50 Holladay, Jeremiah 2, pp. 397, 398, 405, 407, 427.
52 William L. Holladay, Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1986), p. 671, 675, considers this reference a later gloss, and לְהַיְתָה to be an 'athbash' for Elam. This makes little sense with Elam mentioned in the next verse. The emendation to לְהַיְתָה 'Gomer' makes more sense, especially when the ethnicities and alliances are considered. This emendation is suggested, but not discussed, in Felix E. Peiser, "Miscellen," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 17 (1897): p. 350.
Irwin argues that Ezek 38–39 paints a picture of Molek sacrifice. While the passage, particularly 39:17–20, clearly invokes the language of sacrifice, the motives for using Molek imagery in this context are unclear. The passage in Isa 30:27–33, to which Irwin compares Ezek 38–39, prophesies the destruction of Assyria in terms of a sacrifice to Molek (in the context of Isa 30–31). This is in the context of Judah’s idolatry and predicated on her return to the worship of YHWH; in fact, it seems to be a promise that if Judah will cease offering to Molek, YHWH himself will offer sacrifice to Molek, with Assyria as the victim. This focus on idolatry with Molek is not in view in 38–39. Further, Molek’s cult seems to have been a largely Jerusalem-centered cult, but no mention of Jerusalem, Zion, or the temple appears in 38–39. If the location of Ezekiel’s vision is meant to be the Jezreel Valley rather than the Hinnom Valley, as Irwin claims and seems possible, the logic for the prophet’s use of the Molek imagery seems slim. Irwin’s point on the use of הָעְנִי in 39:11 is, however, compelling. He notes that in the two other places where לֵבָנָה occurs (Judg 16:23; 2 Kgs 10:19) it is used in the context of (human) sacrifice to foreign gods. He fails to note, however, that in each of these cases the foreign imagery is ironic—both times the worshippers of the foreign god are themselves sacrificed to their own god (The Philistines to Dagan and the priests of Ba’al to Ba’al). Even if the Median-Lydian war is not the context of this passage, Mithra is more likely to be a deity of the nations listed than is Molek. In this

---

56 On Molek’s association with Jerusalem and its environs (at least in the Bible), see John Day, *Molech: a God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 1989), p. 55, who sees Molek as a Jubusite cult, and specifically Canaanite (pp. 29–31), although he may have been equated with Nergal (pp. 46–49); Cf., however, the extensive study of Heider, *Cult of Molek*, who does see Molek imagery in Ezek 39:11, pp. 356–358, but on the basis of identification with the Hinnom Valley; also see Charles C. Torrey, “Armageddon,” *Harvard Theological Review* 31.3 (1938): pp. 237–248, who links all apocalyptic battles with the Jerusalem environs.
57 Irwin, “Molek Imagery,” pp. 98–103. His argument is based on a parallel with Jer 7:1–34, which is debatable; however, his arguments against the Hinnom Valley are convincing. There is nothing in 38–39 referencing Jerusalem. However, the Plain of Megiddo has often been the scene of battles, real and mythological. These battles are often over the control of Palestine, as Nakhai has remarked, Beth Alpert Nakhai, “Review of The Battles of Armageddon: Megiddo and the Jezreel Valley from the Bronze Age to the Nuclear Age by Eric H. Cline,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 327 (2002): pp. 89–90. This suits the content of 38–39 well. Additionally, the Jezreel Valley is a major trade route, much more suiting a reference to blocking travelers than any valley around Jerusalem. However, note that Johannes Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), pp. 458–459, rejects any definitive identification of the valley.
58 Irwin, “Molek Imagery,” p. 107. The words appear together in Neh 12:43 as well, but there it is in the plural.
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context, particularly in light of the possibility of the Iranian background to the original oracle, it may be more likely that the intended sacrifice is to Mithra rather than Molek.60

Before discussing Irwin’s suggestion and the language of 38–39, a few relevant details about Mithra should be noted. The phenomenon of Mithra-worship is a complex one,61 but there are several things which can be said with relative certainty. First, sidestepping the issue of its relation to ‘orthodox’ Zoroastrian worship, Mithra was a decidedly (Indo-)Iranian deity and his cult comes out of old (pre-Zoroastrian) Iranian tradition. Second, Mithra’s primary association was with the contract, perhaps with political and international overtones.62 Third, his cult was sometimes linked with blood sacrifice, at least at Persepolis. This may have included even human sacrifice among certain Anatolian Scythian groups.63 In his later western incarnation as Mithras (whatever the precise link with Mithra) he was even especially associated with bull-sacrifice.64 Fourth, Mithra was associated with war; this association seems


to be an early one linked with his defense of the contract. Additionally, both of the yazatas most closely associated with him in Zoroastrian tradition, Sraosa (‘obedience’) and VarəGragna (‘victory’), were often described in decidedly martial aspects. VarəGragna was sometimes incarnated as an eagle or bird of prey, and Sraosa was associated with the rooster. Fourth, even in pre-Zoroastrian traditions, Mitra was given the role of judge, largely connected to his role as arbiter of contracts. In Zoroastrianism, this role is highly developed and important, extending even into primeval contract to limit the warfare between Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu. As Boyce has succinctly put it:

He keeps a daily record of men’s sins, and is their impartial judge at the Činvat Bridge. Those who have taken a false oath, or otherwise done wrong, he punishes strictly, both at the individual judgment and also at the end of the world, when he will smite the Evil Spirit. The Evil Spirit will appeal to him to uphold the ancient contract between Ohrmazd and himself, for even the powers of darkness acknowledge Mihr’s [sic], Pahlavi for Mitra] unswerving equity; but the divine contract which the great yazata guards will by then have run its course.

One of the earliest Avestan sources for Mitra even characterizes the relationship between Mitra and Ahura Mazda as pâyātā bəwərsətā yazavaide, ‘the protector and the fashioner’ (Yasna XLII.2). The antiquity of Mitra’s role as judge and his related war-like and warrior attributes are visible in the Mihr Yast, which is one of the oldest of the extant Iranian hymns. The Yast refers to Mitra ‘with a thousand ears, well-shapen, with ten thousand eyes, high, with full knowledge, strong, sleepless, and ever awake.’ He is depicted with implacable wrath towards violators of contracts (§19—21) and as protecting those who


65 For his partners and their avian manifestations, see Vidēvat XVIII.15—16 (Zend-Avesta I, p. 193); Yast X.119 (Gershevitch, Hymn to Mithra, p. 133; Zend-Avesta II, pp. 150—151); Greater Bundahishn XIII.22 (Anklesaria, Zend-Akāsīh, pp. 122—3).


Kreyenbroek, Sraosa in the Zoroastrian Tradition, p. 176, believes that Sraosa’s position in the Zoroastrian calendar near Mitra and Rāma indicates that their association dates at least to the Achaemenid period. On his links with war: see Omstead, History of the Persian Empire, p. 25. Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, pp. 251—253, links Mitra, the sun, and war to a dance known as the ‘Persica.’


67 Boyce, “On Mithra’s Part in Zoroastrianism,” p. 23; the references cited there seem to follow a different numbering than those in the SBE series. She seems to be referring to the following: Vahaman Yast (aka Zend i Vahuman Yast) III.31—36 (Pahlavi Texts I, pp. 227—229); Vidēvat XIX.15 (Zend-Avesta I, p. 208); Mnađi Xrad II.118 (Pahlavi Texts III, p. 18); Dēnkar X, XX.4—5 and IX, XXXXIX.9—10 (Pahlavi Texts IV, p. 210, 277—278).


69 X.7 (Zend-Avesta II, p. 121; Gershevitch, Hymn to Mithra, p. 76.)
honor them (§22—24). Thus, while Mitra's role in the eschatological judgment seems to have developed in Zoroastrianism with the triplication of eras, even in non- or pre-Zoroastrian Iranian traditions it seems that Mitra had deep associations with judging and war. These became deeply enmeshed in Zoroastrian eschatology. The antiquity of these associations may also be implied by the continued association of Mitra, through his festival Mihragan, with the ancient Iranian heroes Orataona and Karasasp.

These various aspects of Mitra offer more parallels to understanding the imagery of this passage than Irwin's appeal to מֶבְרִי in v. 11 as a link to Molek. Irwin claims ṭnuqin in 39:11 is a technical term, indicating 'passing through' the fires of sacrifice and thus to Molek. Verse 11 is highly problematic, with the meaning (and proper pointing) of the word in dispute. BHS recommends the emendation of the Massoretic מֶבְרִי to מֶבְרֵי, as does Eichrodt and Cooke. Zimmerli rejects the emendation's implied location in Moab, but otherwise makes no clear choice. The word מֶבְרִי occurs 25 times in the Hebrew Bible; of those not indicating 'Hebrew' or the name of a mountain, it indicates a form of 'transgression' as well as a form of 'passing through' or 'traveling.' In light of the context, it seems more likely that the use of מֶבְרִי in Ezek 38—39 is play on these two meanings, as it is in Jer 34:18—19, rather than a technical use indicating child sacrifice to Molek. A play on 'passing through' and 'transgression' would fit the context, and need not be a secondary addition. Any argument based on the use of מֶבְרִי seems dangerous, however, since the LXX drops the first reference to the valley. If one insisted on a reference to 'passing through', the idea of 'passing through' fire is at least as applicable to Mitra as it is

70 Zend-Avesta II, pp. 124—125; Gershevitch, Hymn to Mitra, pp. 84—86.
74 Eichrodt, Ezekiel: A Commentary, p. 517, 528; Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 419.
75 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 317.
76 Cf. Koehler and Baumgartner, H-A-L, p. 779 (57'); Francis Brown, et al., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as Translated by Edward Robinson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), pp. 716—720, makes no reference either to 'transgression' or to possible emendation in 37:11 to 'Abazim'. Although it has not yet been suggested, it could it also be repointed to mean 'Valley of the Hebrews' as well.
77 Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 318.
78 In v. 11a the Greek reads: τόπον ἐν οὐρανοῖς μνημείον ἐν Ισραήλ τοῦ πολυσθαλέους τῶν ἐπελθόντων πρὸς τὴν βασιλέσσα; but later in the verse it does refer to a revine (θάρραγγος) for the MT's גְּנָב מָזֶה אָב. However, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan reads the valley as 'the Valley of the Pass' (תַּחַת הַמַּעֲשֶׂה), which seems to fit the idea of the Jezreel Valley and the Hebrew meaning, even though the verse as a whole is quite glossed.
Molek, perhaps even more so in the context of judgment. Boyce notes that ordeal by molten metal was a method for testing the innocence of the accused in Iranian lands, and was a standard component of the final judgment/purification. As guardian of the contract and a judge, Mithra was associated with this event; it was believed that the innocent would be protected and the guilty consumed. An allusion in this section could imply that Gog and his allies were forced to 'pass through' the ordeal, and failed the test.

It is worth quoting the explicitly sacrificial section (39:17—20):

As for you, mortal, thus says the Lord GOD: Speak to the birds of every kind and to all the wild animals (עוף כל עוף וחי נפשו) and come, gather from all around to the sacrificial feast that I am preparing for you (לכם נקבות), a great sacrificial feast (גאונה נבוכד) on the mountains of Israel, and you shall eat flesh and drink blood. You shall eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes of the earth—of rams, of lambs, and of goats, of bulls, all of them fatlings of Bashan. You shall eat fat until you are filled, and drink blood until you are drunk, at the sacrificial feast I am preparing for you. And you shall be filled at my table (עומדים על שולחן) with horses and charioteers, with warriors and all kinds of soldiers, says the Lord GOD.

Irwin parallels the use of birds and beasts feasting in Jer 7 and Ezek 39, but it appears that the phrases used in each place are quite different. Jer 7:30—33 uses the terms סף השמש and הבאת האורן, but Ezekiel (vv. 4, 17) uses הבאת השמש and זמר מכף. Jeremiah’s use is much more stereotypical poetic/parallelistic speech; Ezekiel’s usage, however, appears to be singular in this particular combination. The ‘birds of every wing’ (עוף מכף), is odd in parallel to ‘beasts of the field’; is it possible that the variety of flesh-eating birds is intended to be emphasized? Geyer suggests that there may be mythological overtones to the term, but given his large enumeration of obscure creatures, one might expect more to appear in 39 if that were the intention in the passage. As noted above, Mithra has associations with a variety of birds, mythical and real, largely through his association with Sraosa Tindl’sdragna. Mithra is also associated with cattle, the open field, and cosmological origins. Further, in the

80 See Yarina XXX.7, XXXII.7, L.9 (Insler, The Gathas of Zarathustra, p. 35, 47, 105, respectively). See also Bundahisin XXXI.17—20 (Pahlavi Texts I, pp. 125—126).
81 Boyce, HZ I, pp. 35—36.
82 It is more of a stock phrase to use ‘beasts of the field and birds of the air,’ Cf. Hos 2:20, 4:3 which parallels היא נבוכד and זמר מכף; Gen 1:30, נבוכד and זמר מכף, ל. כ. This parallelism between היא נבוכד and זמר מכף occurs in Ezk 31:6, 13, in the context of Egypt as the World-Tree, where it also uses זמר מכף. Cook considers זמר מכף to be an Ezekielian phrase, citing 17:23, but does not mention היא נבוכד. Cook, Prophecy and Apocalypticism, p. 102 (§33). This particular phrase seems to be unique in the Hebrew Bible.
84 Two tangential but interesting notes: Lydia’s (Gog?) dynasty was named after the hawk, which was also linked with their patron deity; it was also common in Mesopotamia to offer representatives of a person to animals or
Mihr Yāšt 119 the small and large cattle, together with the birds and fowls that fly on wings are described as worshipping Miθra. Is this choice of vocabulary significant? The term ‘wild animals’ is ṣaḥaba. While this seems to be a general meaning of this phrase, Koehler and Baumgartner note that ṣaḥaba can refer to ‘beast-like’ creatures, and that ṣaḥaba can refer to pastures, open fields, meadows or hills. Both Job 40:20 and Ezek 31:6, 13 use ṣaḥaba in mythical contexts. Considering the liminal and dangerous quality of the field/wilderness in the Ancient Near East, this choice could be significant. The standing epithet of Miθra is ‘of wide pastures,’ and in a context of battle-imagery, the Mihr Yāšt praises Miθra for turning "plains and vales to pasture grounds." If mythical allusions are indeed intended by these phrases, then it is certainly consonant with Mithraic content.

The translation in vv. 17 and 19 has ‘preparing for you’ for ḫaḥm ḥaθa. Koehler and Baumgartner note, however, that the use of ḫaθa generally indicates the god to whom the sacrifice is made. Thus the wording has YHWH sacrificing to the birds and beasts in this section. Indeed, they are described as consuming the fat and blood, which were traditionally YHWH’s portion of the sacrifice. As noted above, Miθra was associated with a bird-like deity, Varathragna, as well as with cattle; if there is any validity to the reading of the birds and beasts, then this has YHWH offering Gog to the representatives of Miθra. The possibility of this nuancing may also be visible in v. 20; there the rare word translated ‘my table,’ ṣḥaṭša, could also refer to a grass mat spread out for sacrifice and meals. The traditional method of offering sacrifice in Iranian tradition, including to Miθra, was to spread a grass or twig mat on the ground to lay the victim upon.
Within the logic of the passage, *Midra* would be within his rights to claim retribution from Gog as the protector of the covenant. As noted above, Block argues that 38:17 does not claim to redefine previously unfulfilled prophecy. He takes the נ to indicate a rhetorical question with an implied ‘No!’ While Gog and his allies may think they are functioning in YHWH’s service like others before, they are merely misusing prophecy for financial gain. The exile to Babylonia has already fulfilled the covenant curses; once restored, Israel has again a covenant of peace—the covenant of punishment is over. Gog may attempt to justify his attack by claiming to be a fulfillment of foretold punishment, but this is hubris. Because Gog has violated G-d’s new covenant, rather than fulfilled an already fulfilled one, he comes under *Midra*’s wrath, the protector of covenants par excellence. Ezekiel 38—39, then, paints the image of *Midra* as the recipient of the *ינב נהירא* protecting YHWH’s covenant of peace with restored Israel and which was promised in 37:15—23. Gog and his allies are offending the covenant of peace (contract, *mitra*) and thus fully within the wrath of *Midra*. The judgment which Gog deserves is indicated by the usage of רם, ‘to assemble’ in v. 17; Koehler and Baumgartner claim the word can have connotations of judgment. Gog and his allies, by attacking G-d’s covenanted people are violating G-d’s covenant and thus liable to fall under *Midra*’s judgment. This connection with the fulfillment of the previous covenant and the institution of a new one is made explicit in vv. 22—28. Such an understanding better parallels the other ironic uses of ינב נהירא than if Molek were the recipient.

Irwin claims that the use of נח in 39:11 alludes to Jer 7:32, implying the need to shift the location from the Hinnom Valley to the Jezerel Valley for sufficient room. The phrase נח נח has occasioned debate, as it is often considered strange or bad Hebrew syntax. In the context of *Midra* sacrifice, however, the phrase ‘a place of graves in Israel’ could be an ironic punishment on an Army which considers it a sin to be buried. Although the *Videvdlat* clearly makes it a sin to be buried, it is unclear how early this development is; however, many scholars see it as a Median or ‘Magian’ introduction, which

96 In this respect Gog’s pride parallels the pride of the King of Tyre in Ezek 28:1—19.
97 In the Zoroastrian cosmology, *Midra* even guards the primeval contract between Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu (See the cosmic contract in the Bundahishn 1.17—18, Pahlavi Texts I, p. 7); once the contract expires, however, he participates in *Angra Mainyu’s* destruction (See Boyce, “On Mithra’s Part in Zoroastrianism,” p. 23); indeed, the expelling of evil-doers seems to be associated with *Midra* as late as the Islamic period. (p. 25); In the context of a discussion of ‘Mihrajan’ (sic), Al-Biruni mentions appeals to an angel to descend and dispel demons, but the angel is not specified. See Muhammad ibn Ahmad Al-Biruni, *Athey-ul-bakiya*, trans. C. Edward Sachau, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations: An English version of the Arabic Text of the Athar-ul-Bakiya of Al-Biruni or Vestiges of the Past* (London: Allen, 1879), p. 208.
98 Koehler and Baumgartner, HAL, p. 1063.
100 Zimmerli, Ezkiel 2, p. 291; Cooke, Ezkiel, p. 419; BHS notes that the Gk replaces יכ for יכ.
would be consonant with the peoples listed by Ezekiel. These connections are all very speculative, however, and hinge on the understanding of situated in a reference to the Median-Lyodian War.

Boe advances an interesting parallel to this interpretation for 1 Enoch 56:5–8’s use of Ezek 38–39. Against the common assertion that the Enochic author intends to allude to the Parthian invasion (40 B.C.E.), he argues that instead the writer understood the passage as a final, eschatological attack, with the terms ‘Parthians and Medes’ representing a more current terminology than ‘Gog and Magog’ for the same kind of assault. The Enochic author adds many features consonant with the Similitude’s interests, but the overall method of interpretation is quite similar. Just like the author of Ezek 38–39, the author of the Parables uses historical, political configurations to depict a future (eschatological?) attack on Jerusalem. Not only does this parallel the methods used in Ezekiel and help make the above interpretation more plausible, it suggests how the text itself was re-used later by hearers and readers.

The Gog pericope was very significant for the later development of apocalyptic imagery and literature. It possibly served as a template or inspiration for Joel and Revelation. But it is also significant, at least in its current placement in the text, for positing a ‘Day of the Lord’ (although that phrase is not actually used) which is in many respects larger than those posited in previous oracles. This day occurs after Israel is restored; it is not imminent but set in the distant future (38:8, 16). It links this action with earthquakes, the tumbling of mountains, pestilence, hail, and sulfur (38:19–23). These phenomena all become stock elements in later apocalyptic literature. Childs has seen in the use of a

---

102 Briant, From Cyrus to Alexander, pp. 94–95; Boyce, HZ II, pp. 113–114; Shahbazi, “Monuments,” pp. 174–189; For an idiosyncratic view of autochthonous Magi, see Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 182–253.


105 See the list, Boe, Gog and Magog, p. 182.


108 Cf. Cook, Prophecy and Apocalypticism, p. 94. Ezekiel 38:19–23 contains a list of signs which do not appear combined elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, but do become standard in later apocalyptic literature. These are internecine fighting, earthquakes, blood, pestilence, inundating rain, hail, fire, and brimstone. These verses appear to take a term generally used in contexts of judgment and expand it to a degree which becomes standard in apocalyptic literature. This combination of terrors, unique for its time, can be seen in Iranian sources.
development of the chaos motif in the post-exilic period, but the usages of this term in the Hebrew Bible appear to be more connected with theophanies and battles than with chaos. It is important to note that they all appear together here in a passage which may show Iranian influence.

The passage does not yet show apocalyptic theology or genre: there is no narrative framework, no *angels interpreters* (indeed, even missing common concerns like general judgment, afterlife). However the expectation of G-d's action is pushed into the distant future, and the judgment of G-d is expanded towards cataclysmic proportions. It is certainly significant that 38—39, when read together with 37, leaves a larger impression of both Iranian ideas and ideas to become standard in apocalyptic literature. The lack of a call towards repentance is notable in 38—39 as well. The hint of a deterministic or unwitting use of a powerful leader by G-d reminds one both of the hardening of pharaoh before the exodus and of the *Animal Apocalypse* in 1 Enoch. If negative Median influence can be seen in this passage, then the beginnings of influence are much earlier than the Hellenistic period. Such an influence also highlights the potential importance of negative influence.

**Daniel**

As the only canonical Jewish apocalypse, Daniel has long been a center of discussion for scholars of apocalyptic. Although not the earliest extant apocalypse, Daniel is extremely important for subsequent developments. The book presents a number of complex problems. The extant book contains both Hebrew (1—2:3; 8—12) and Aramaic (2:4—7:28) sections, which while in discrete sections do not coincide with a visible generic divide (tales, chapters 1—6, revelatory visions, 7—12). Further, the Greek versions of the book contain significant additions to the text. The complex tradition history of the present book also offers the potential of materials which significantly predate the final compilation of the work. For the present purposes, only the motif of four successive empires will be discussed here.

Daniel 2 and 7 contain visions which present an overview of history using a scheme of four progressively inferior empires. This trope has long been identified as deriving from Iran, although the scheme itself is a scholarly flashpoint. The present section seeks to

---

110 In theophanies: Kgs 19:11; Isa 29:6; Ezek 3:12—13; In battles: Jer 10:22, 47:3; Nah 3:2; Amos and Zechariah each use it for a historical earthquake.
112 To the point that some scholars still consider it just that. E.g., Bodi, *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra*, p. 223: "It [38—39] is an apocalyptic vision of the final, miraculous defeat of the forces of evil in the land of Israel."
113 For an overview of the early twentieth century, see H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), pp. 67—184; for more recent studies, see J. W. Swain,
evaluate the level (if any) and likelihood of Iranian influence on the current form of the
scheme as it appears in Daniel, as well as to assess the relative import of such influence.

The visions themselves appear in 2:28–45 and 7:2–27, both of which are in the
Aramaic section. Although the imagery and narrative setting for the two visions are quite
divergent, both recount a series of four kingdoms which are ultimately destroyed, and
scholarship has tended to see the same concept as underlying both.

The Vision of the Statue (2:28–45)

31You were looking, O king, and lo! there was a great statue. This statue was
huge, its brilliance extraordinary; it was standing before you and its
appearance was frightening. 32The head of that statue was of fine gold (בָּשָׂר),
its chest and arms of silver (כָּלךְ), its middle and thighs of bronze (שָׂן), 33its
legs of iron (יְלִיד), its feet partly of iron and partly of clay. 34As you looked
on, a stone was cut out, not by human hands (יָצָא מֵאָנָו), and it struck the
statue on its feet of iron and clay and broke them in pieces. 35Then the iron,
the clay, the bronze, the silver, and the gold, were all broken in pieces and
became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried
them away, so that not a trace of them could be found. But the stone that
struck the statue became a great mountain and filled the whole earth.

Daniel recounts a dream of Nebuchadnezzar in which he saw a statue with a head of
gold, breast and arms of silver, loins and thighs of bronze, and legs of mixed clay and iron.
A stone strikes the statue and destroys it, itself then growing into a mountain and filling the
earth. Daniel subsequently interprets this dream as a succession of kingdoms, beginning with
the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Two basic aspects of this vision are noteworthy: the use of a
series of metals ordered in decreasing value and a scheme of history based on the transition
of power between four empires. A further aspect which requires attention is the appearance
of ‘the end of days’ (נַחֲלָת הָעֵשָׁב) in the interpretation (v. 28) and whether or not this implies
an eschatological interpretation.

The image utilizes some traditional prophetic tropes. The description of
judgment/destruction in terms of chaff, threshing floors, and/or wind appears often in the

16; Collins, Daniel, pp. 162–164, 166–170; Ludwig Koenen, “Greece, the Near East, and Egypt: Cyclic
pp. 1–34; David Flusser, “The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel,” Israel Oriental
History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel, JSOTSS 396 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), Chapter 2. The most
comprehensive discussion known to the author can be found in Klaus Koch, Daniel 1. Teilband Dan 1–4,
203–207.

114 For a comprehensive discussion of the language and versional issues, see Collins, Daniel, pp. 12–24.
The use of these images recalls the judgment oracles of the prophets, even though the subsequent interpretation focuses more on succession than judgment. Additionally, the mountain which ultimately replaces all four kingdoms echoes the motif of the 'mountain of the LORD' found throughout the Hebrew Bible, be it Sinai or Zion. A Judean audience would no doubt connect such language with promises of the restoration of Jerusalem. Neither of these aspects are particularly dwelt upon in text's own interpretation, however, and certainly do not exhaust the pericope's imagery.

Prominent is the use of a series of precious metals ordered by descending value: gold, silver, bronze, iron mixed with clay (כָּסִי, דְּרוֹנָי). Similar series of metals ordered by decreasing value do appear in earlier biblical texts in a variety of contexts, and one even appears in a context of judgment (Ezek 22:20). Nevertheless, these antecedents do not apply the series to history, let alone to a succession of earthly kingdoms. Using the relative values of metals as a method of arrangement is logical and likely universal, yet this has no necessary connection with historical processes and is—since it places Nebuchadnezzar at the pinnacle—rather surprising in a Judean story. A tempting interpretation is to understand the original referents to be kings rather than kingdoms, thus belonging to a (Persian?) anti-Nabonidus polemic, which was altered to kingdoms at a later stage of the tradition. However, since five kings reigned from Nebuchadnezzar until Cyrus, this still demands an explanation for the shift to a fourfold scheme.

Further, a scheme of four eras or kingdoms which precede a final, everlasting kingdom appears to have no biblical precedent. This concept is intimately intertwined with the apocalyptic quagmires of determinism and eschatology. The pericope's use of the term 'בָּאוֹרַיָּה יְהוָה' draws the fourfold scheme linguistically into the 'Day of YHWH' tradition and its relation to the development of eschatology in Second Temple Judaism. Collins's reading of the eschatology in this chapter is very judicious: while an eschatology must be considered integral to the chapter, it is not an eschatology of the same type as in the second half of the

113 For example, using chaff (סְלִיל), cf. Ps 1:4, 35:5; Isa 17:13, 29:5; also using the image of the threshing floor (תְּחֵן), cf. Hos 13:3; Isa 41:15; cf. 2 Kgs 13:7.
114 For example, Ex 3:1, 15:17; Ps 48:1, 68:16; Isa 2:2, 25:6.
115 Lists of the same metals occur in 1 Chr 22:16, 29:2 and 2 Chr 2:6, 13 in the context of building the temple; Num 31:22 has a list which adds tin and lead; Josh 6:19,24; 22:8 list all four, but in different orders. Isa 60:17 also uses them all, but in a very different context.
116 Although the list starts with silver and adds tin and lead.
121 Note the discussion of theology in Chapter V and the references given there.
book. It is therefore necessary to consider whether this eschatology was adopted with the four-kingdom motif or whether it was added by the tale’s Danielic creator. This will be further dealt with below.

The identification of the four kingdoms has occasioned much discussion, although most modern scholarship accepts the intended series (both here and in 7) as Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. Several considerations make this fairly certain. The text identifies the first kingdom clearly as Babylonia (v. 38), and the reference to marriage in v. 43 is generally understood as a reference to the competing Greek kingdoms of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. The reference to the ‘world dominion’ of the third is consonant with the Persian Empire. Finally, the scheme Babylon-Media-Persia-Greece is an important structural motif for the current book.

Several scholars note the chapter contains a number of Iranian loanwords (as well as Greek words). Two of these are well-known and uncontested: מִרְשָׁא (‘mystery’) and לְפָנֵי (‘law’). Koch also identifies the words מֵסֶרָא, מֵסֶרָא, מֵסֶרָא, Mad, and the name מֵסֶרָא as Iranian. Further, the title ‘King of Kings’ (v. 37) belongs to an Achaemenid milieu despite the supposed Neo-Babylonian setting.

The Vision of the ‘Mischwesen’ (7:2—27)

The vision of Chapter 7 is considerably different from that in Chapter 2, although it is clearly related to it. In this ‘night vision’ the metallic imagery is replaced by four fantastic ‘beasts from the sea’ (v. 3), adding a throne vision and the controversial ‘Son of Man’ (v. 13). A succession of four kingdoms followed by an eternal kingdom remains, although the idea of serial inferiority is lost. A few of the details of the Chapter 2’s visions are recalled

128 Koch, Daniel 1, p. 124.
129 Collins, Daniel, pp. 159–160.
130 For overviews of suggestions on sources for the Mischwesen, see Bryan, Kosher Mentality, pp. 218–234; Collins, Daniel, pp. 280–294.
131 Note, however, Bryan’s opinion that they represent increasingly unkosher creatures, Bryan, Kosher Mentality, pp. 234–239.
in 7: the dominion given to the leopard recalls the dominion of the third kingdom (2:39),\textsuperscript{132} the iron composition of the fourth beast’s horns (the only remaining metal),\textsuperscript{133} and perhaps even the toes of statue.\textsuperscript{134}

The concepts and sources which underlie the Mischwesen and the Son of Man are highly contested and are not taken up here;\textsuperscript{135} it is for the present purpose simply worth noting that the series of Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece is retained from Chapter 2. Additionally, the vision’s main concern is evidently with the last empire, the other three barely receiving censure;\textsuperscript{136} the mention seems more to conform with a fourfold scheme than with a serious critique of the previous three per se.

**Four Period Schemes in the Ancient Near East**

The sudden appearance of the four kingdoms and four metals tradition in Daniel has long caused scholars to seek a parallel elsewhere. A variety of allegedly relevant schemes have been adduced; before discussing their relative merits and potential lines of transmission, the various passages are presented below.

**Hesiod**

One of the more oft-cited parallels occurs in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, lines 109–201.\textsuperscript{137} Here the poet describes a succession of five generations or races of men: a golden race, a silver generation, a brazen race ‘sprung of ash trees,’ a fourth race of semi-divine heroes, and a fifth generation of iron, to which the poet claims to belong. Two features immediately strike the casual reader: the strong moral characterizations of each race or generation (in a declining succession) and what appears to be an interruption of a fourfold metallic scheme with a generation of heroes. It seems likely that the poet has adapted an older fourfold scheme to accommodate Greek epic heroes.\textsuperscript{138} Besides the interruption of the metallic sequence, the additional detail ascribed to the bronze race that they were ‘sprung of ash trees’ likely dates the concept to Indo-European times; the Norse epic poem the *Völuspá*

\textsuperscript{132} Also noted by Collins, *Daniel*, p. 298.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. Collins, *Daniel*, p. 299.

\textsuperscript{134} Bryan, *Kosher Mentality*, p. 218.

\textsuperscript{135} Note, however, the interesting suggestion that Dan 7 is dependent on the Book of Watchers, Helge S. Kvanvig, “Throne Visions and Monsters: The Encounter Between Danielic and Enochic Traditions,” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 117.2 (2005): pp. 248–272.

\textsuperscript{136} Collins, *Daniel*, p. 304.


184
§§ 17–18 also describes the creation of mankind from driftwood of ash. The passage here is concerned with ritual and ethical decline, and the author is unconcerned with the passing of empires.

Ovid

A passage similar to Hesiod appears in the *Metamorphoses*. He describes a fourfold series of metallic races of increasing wickedness. To this series he appends a race of blood, whose violence prompts a deluge for their destruction. Finally, Ovid identifies the current human race with a race created from stone by the two lone flood survivors. The large number of mythic motifs and stories which are interwoven here leaves the impression that the second two races (of blood and stone) are creations of the poet and do not reflect an older tradition of six races.

Herodotus

In his account of the rise of Cyrus, Herodotus claims obliquely that the rule of Asia was passed from Assyria to Media and thence to Persia. It is important to note, however, that he did not make a clear distinction between the Assyrians and the Babylonians (e.g., I.178, 193; though he seems aware of a distinctness in I.102). For authority Herodotus explicitly claims as his source Persians who “desire not to make a fine tale of the story of Cyrus but to tell the truth” (I.95). He claims that the Assyrians ruled for 520 years, the Medes for 128 years, and then the Persians up to his time (I.95, 130). While it is true a

---


143 Herodotus, *Wars I–II*, p. 221, 243; p. 133.

144 (μετέξε τεροι λέγοθει, οι μὴ βουλάμενοι σέμνον τα περὶ κύρον ἀλλὰ τὸν ἔοντα λέγειν λόγον).
historical sequence with Media before Persia appears here, Herodotus takes no significance from the number, succession, or order of the empires; rather, he simply includes it as part of his tale of Cyrus’s rise. However, the two passages are still significant in that they attest to an Iranian view of history which imparted world rule to the Medians. Further, since Herodotus was well known in the Hellenistic world, it is quite reasonable to infer that the later presence of Assyria-Media-Persia in historical lists is due to his history.

Oracle of Hystaspes and Zand-i Vahman Yasht

Both the Oracle of Hystaspes and the Vahman Yasht are highly problematic as both currently exist only in citations and commentaries, largely in Lactantius for the former and the Zand-i Vahman Yasht for the latter. Not enough of Hystaspes has survived to ascertain the majority of its contents or whether it also contained a fourfold scheme; although Lactantius mentions a scheme of empires in contexts in which he also quotes Hystaspes, it appears to be taken from the Sibylline Oracles.145 This text can thus offer no parallels.

The text Zand-i Vahman Yasht is more readily accessible, though the relevant tradition history is problematic.146 This text is normally understood to be a précis and commentary (zand) on a lost hymn to Vohu Manah (Vahman Yasht), one of the important divine figures in Zoroastrianism.147 Since it cites zand48 it is already at two steps remove from the original. Most scholars, however, accept that the text comments on real texts, even though they are not extant.149 In the extant text, two metallic sequences are presented. In the first version, Zoroaster is shown a tree with four branches of gold, silver, steel, and one of iron mixed

---


The interpretation given is of four periods, the first identified with the period of Zoroaster and his royal patron Vistasp, the next two with legendary reigns of kings (Ardaxšir, Husraw), and the last with "the evil sovereignty of the demons with dishevelled hair of the race of Wrath." In the second version Zoroaster sees a tree with seven branches of gold, silver, bronze, copper, tin, steel, and iron mixed with dust. These are again interpreted as ages of the world, all of which are identified with reigns, from that of Vistasp to that of the badly coiffed, angry demons. The doubling of the metallic progression, its expansion from four to seven, and the changes in the interpretation clearly evince a later updating of a fourfold prophecy to fit subsequent history. The interpretation of the second vision clearly understands the final demons to refer to the Arab invasion of Iran at the end of the Sassanian Empire, and this is clearly a reinterpretation of a previous prophecy. While the dating of this interpretation (and thus the current text) is clearly very late, the question remains as to how ancient the original fourfold metallic vision is. Hultgard adduces five reasons why a supposed Vahman Yasht existed behind the current text: 1) the other three cited sources are real; 2) at the time of the compilation, extensive materials were available, so forging would be difficult; 3) There are hints of liturgical formulas, suggesting a Yasht-like Vorlage; 4) the literary character suggests an underlying zand like the Videnšt; 5) it also preserves epic fragments of other lost Avestan sources. Eddy suggests that the original prophecy intended the dishevelled hair to refer to the Greeks—or more specifically, depictions of Alexander—which would likely date the idea to the Hellenistic period. Since the Achaemenid Empire was the last Iranian empire destroyed by a foreign invasion, this identification is plausible. Besides questions of dating, however, important to note is that the text explicitly applies a fourfold metallic scheme to successive reigns. Interestingly, while the succession appears to agree with version of Dan 2 in mixing the last element, it also differs in the use of steel for bronze.

The Sibylline Oracles

A variety of historical schemes organized by world empires appear in several of the extant Sibylline Oracles, a Byzantine collection of miscellaneous texts which contains a

154 Eddy, The King is Dead, p. 19 and plate 1 (between pp. 21–22).
variety of older oracles. The closest parallel to the version in Daniel appears in Book IV, lines 49–114, which likely dates to the early Hellenistic period. In this text a series of empires rule the world from the flood until the sibyl's time for decreasing lengths of times: the Assyrians rule for six generations, the Medes for two, the Persians for 'one generation of prosperous rule,' the Macedonians (for an unspecified period of time), and the Romans. Rather than a subsequent heavenly kingdom, the text predicts a world-destroying conflagration (160–161, 171–178). Several characteristics are here worth noticing. The text posits a five-fold division of decreasing length (at least until the Persians), but there is no explicit condemnation of these empires; each receives judgment through conquest, but they are not directly accused of evil. The text focuses on the horrors of war and other disasters rather than on the relative moral qualities of the empires. Finally, a scheme of Assyria-Media-Persia-Macedonia-Rome is evidenced, which could logically be an update for an older fourfold scheme. Flusser adduces that this is the case since the addition of Rome interrupts the ten generations interwoven into the description of the first four.

Several other Sibyllines also break history into succeeding empires, although they are much more varied and removed from any relation to history. *Sibyline Oracles III.159–161* gives a list of eight empires in the order Egypt, Persia, Media, Ethiopia, 'Assyrian Babylon,' Macedonia, Egypt, and Rome. This list is notable for three things: its Egyptocentrism, the flipping of Persia and Media, and the equation of Assyria with Babylon.* *Sibyline Oracles VIII.5–9* gives a very similar list of Egypt, Persia, Media, Ethiopia, 'Assyrian Babylon,' Macedonia, and Rome. Finally, the eleventh Sibylline offers a list of Egypt, Persia, Media, Ethiopia, Assyria, Macedonia, Egypt, and Rome, although equating Assyria with the Jews.

---


158 Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," p. 365; note, however, the argument that this also represents a fourfold scheme, if the text intends the second empire to be the combined empire of Persia-Media-Ethiopia-Assyrian Babylon. See, Flusser, "The Four Empires," p. 160, n. 49.

159 Cf. III.268 where the Assyrians are said to conquer Jerusalem and III.300–304 where it refers to 'Babylon and the race of Assyrian men.' (p. 368; cf. n. e2).


**Qumran Fragments**

While several documents discovered at Qumran have clear relationships with the canonical Daniel, none of the extant sections preserve either a scheme of kingdoms or metals. However, the *Animal Apocalypse in 1 Enoch* 89–90 contains a fourfold periodization within its era of seventy shepherds, and this text is likely roughly contemporary with Dan 7. Unlike the Danielic texts, however, *1 Enoch* simply uses the fourfold division as a structural device, placing no emphasis on the number four nor giving clear indications to the significance of the eras. While it is possible that they represent a sequence of empires, Nickelsburg would deny this.

**The Origin of the Four Empire Scheme**

Scholars have often considered an Iranian milieu for the origin of the Four Empire motif, though positions vary widely. Swain claims the source was an anti-Seleucid Iranian diaspora in Anatolia. Lambert refuses to decide on an origin; Day is similarly agnostic although leans towards a Babylonian source. Kvanvig understands the idea to be a mixing of Persian and Babylonian traditions. While allowing for some influence from Hesiod, Flusser argues for an Iranian reaction against Macedon as the primary source of the metallic, four empire trope. However, West rejects any Hesiodic influence upon Daniel, seeking an Urartian or Babylonian source for the four metals. Winston unabashedly supports an

---


164 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, p. 392.


Iranian derivation; Koch supports an Iranian derivation for the four metals and a Seleucid source for the four kingdoms. Collins is cautiously willing to entertain a Persian source yet considers a common Near Eastern source as also possible. Wiesehöfer prefers to see an ultimately Herodotean source for the four-empire sequence in Dan 2, although he does not discuss the metallic symbolism. Fröhlich derives the metals from Judean traditions and the four kingdoms from a Babylonian fourfold dynastic oracle.

The variety and disparate provenances for the various fourfold motifs make it likely that it was a widespread one, and none of the extant parallels are an exact match. Yet, it is worth pursuing the possible sources and contexts, to better understand both the passage itself and its influence on subsequent Judean traditions. There are three aspects of the motif as it appears in Daniel which need to be kept in mind and considered both independently and in combination: the four empire scheme alone and as understood in the form Babylon-Media-Persia-Greece, the four metallic eras, and the implied eschatology.

Four Kingdoms or Kings

A motif of four significant periods was known in the Ancient Near East well before Daniel. Its appearance in Hesiod presents a terminus ante quem in the eighth century; Koch even suggests a similar idea can be found in earlier Hurrian/Hittite mythology. Indeed, it seems likely that a similar idea was held by Proto-Indo-Europeans. A possibility, therefore, that the idea was widely disseminated in the Ancient Near East cannot be wholly discounted. Nevertheless, four generations or eras and four world empires are not necessarily parallel.

177 The Greeks, Iranians, and Hititites were all Indo-European peoples. To reinforce the idea of a pan-Indo-European idea, the Norse Voluspa §44 mentions a variant which identifies these four ages: an Axe-age, a Sword-age, a Wind-age, and a Wolf-age. These are, however, eschatological. See Dronke, Mythological Poems, pp. 18-19. In this regard, it is interesting to note that the Zand-i Vohman Yasn describes the final age as the passing of the wolf-age into the lamb-age (VIII.3, Anklesaria, Zand-i Vohman Yasn, p. 125; III.40, Pahlavi Texts I, p. 230). Cf. J. Gwyn Griffiths, "Archaeology and Hesiod's Five Ages," Journal of the History of Ideas 17.1 (1956): p. 116 and Mallory, "Cosmology," pp. 130-131 for four color-periods in India.
ideas, and one could wonder whether the latter is not a separate or at least subsequent tradition to the former.

There can be no doubt that a historical sequence of empires presented as Assyria, Media, Persia, Greece originally represents an Iranian perspective or perhaps an Eastern Anatolian one. Two points indicate this: only Iranian lands experienced such a sequence, and Herodotus’s presentation of the said sequence explicitly names Persian sources. Although Herodotus is probably to be credited with its dissemination in Greek-speaking lands, the concept must have been borne among either Medes or Persians. However, the sequence attested in Daniel replaces Babylon for Assyria. While from a Mesopotamian point of view this is problematic, it is less so from two of the likely sources for the Danielic author, viz., Iran or Greece. The Greek authors appear to have had no clear conception of a differentiation between Assyria and Babylon; for the Persians, Babylon was combined with Abūrā in a single satrapy.178

Contra commentators who see a problem in the shift from king to kingdoms in Dan 2, the ambiguity is no basis for insisting on an adaptation of an older, dynastic prophecy. Kings can easily represent their domain just as their jurisdiction can symbolize their own power.179 A rule of a dynasty is not easily separated from the rule of one of its members. This is particularly true in an era before the modern nation-state when the idea of borders was more fluid and a kingdom more directly tied into the person of the monarch.180 In this context, the ‘you’ of Dan 2:38 could simply be understood as rhetorical flattery before a king, rather than the remnant of a previous Babylonian dynastic prophecy.181 In theory, therefore, the inspiration for Daniel’s vision could have been either a sequence of empires or individual kings representative of them.

Wiesehöfer comments that a sequence of Asian empires of increasing inferiority would be peculiar as Achaemenid ideology, but fits well within Herodotus’s concept of


179 For the Old Persian nomenclature, cf. DN a §3 and DSf §26 where Abūrā (the country) is used and DSf § 32 and the minor DN inscriptions, where Abūrīya (the people) is used (Kent, Old Persian, pp. 137–138, 141–142 and 142–144, 140, respectively).


spiralling decadence. If the concept of increasing inferiority were sustained in Daniel as in Herodotus or in Hesiod, this argument would be compelling; however, the passage as it stands in Chapter 2 is clearly only concerned with the fourth empire and its divided nature. Verse 39 briefly mentions that the second is inferior to the first, but then quickly moves on. If a post-Achaemenid Persian reaction is posited, the paradox implied by the inferiority becomes less acute: the focus is on the last empire, which is itself going to be replaced.

Four Metallic Eras

The two most relevant metallic parallels to Dan 2 are striking both in their similarities and their differences. Daniel shares the four metals with Hesiod, while altering the last metal, iron, by having it mixed with clay. This addition breaks with the metallic imagery and must in itself be significant. One could wish to see this change as an innovation of the Danielic author to suit the pater, but this simple solution is complicated by the evidence of the Zand-i Wahman Yast. This text also has iron mixed with dust/clay last. While such a parallel might indicate a relationship between these two, the Zand’s use of steel instead of bronze as the third metal and the problematic dating complicates whatever relation may exist.

Boyce believes that the metallic sequence was adapted in Iran from Greece during the wars of the Diadochi and from thence was adapted by Daniel. She originally argued that the ‘mixed iron’ of the Yast refers to iron ore still containing dross, which better fits the idea of decline as well as parallels the traditional Iranian conception of the current era as a mixture of good and evil. The author of Dan 2 would have then misunderstood the meaning of ‘mixed iron’ and understood it as clay. In this she has been followed by Koenen, who further believes the sequence to have been a Greek innovation (though prior to Hesiod). However, she has since modified her position according to a suggestion by Gignoux and sees the Pahlavi phrase to mean ‘iron mixed with dust/clay,’ making the phrases nearly identical and requiring some kind of explanation for the coincidence. Boyce’s solution accounts for the ‘mixed iron’ but fails to explain (a then doubled) switch between bronze and steel.

---

Both the Greeks and Iranians are Indo-European peoples, so one could wish to argue that a four period scheme was a mutual inheritance; indeed the use of ‘ash’ by Hesiod would seem to indicate that possibility. However, the four metal scheme could not have been developed before the separation of the Indo-Europeans, as that likely occurred before the Iron Age. The metallic version most likely predates Hesiod, although perhaps not by much. The evidence available is insufficient to decide, but either a borrowing of the metal sequence from Greece to Persia, parallel developments (each adding a fourth metal to an inherited three-metal scheme), or of both from a third, unknown source is possible. A switch between reigns and kingdoms is unproblematic since they represent similar concepts. A change from races to kingdoms might be more so, although if the kingdoms are understood as belonging to different nations, then again this idea is analogous. The form of either the Greek or Iranian versions is therefore not a hurdle. This does not solve the question of Daniel’s sources, however.

Niskanen strenuously objects to an Iranian explanation, preferring a Herodotean source. Niskanen’s arguments are highly suggestive and helpful—not because they are persuasive—but because they prompt a more thorough investigation of the potential Iranian sources. Therefore, his arguments will be used as a foil in an attempt to reconstruct what traditions may underlie the Zand-i Vahman Yast and thus what may or not be comparable to Daniel.

Daniel 2 combines two separable concepts: a sequence of four empires and a series of four metals, yet only the former receives much interpretation in the text. Niskanen argues that their combination here is misleading, since it is likely that Daniel combined two separate sources. However, the very fact which he notices—that Daniel seems to ignore the implications of the four metals—argues rather that he is adapting a sequence of empires which already utilized the metallic imagery. If Dan 2 were drawing directly on a Herodotean tradition, one would expect the Hesiod to eliminate the metallic imagery, or, if the author were combining sources, for the metals to take a more prominent place in the text. This impression is reinforced if one considers that the second half of the book (Chapters 7 and...
11) dispenses with the metallic imagery. Niskanen's appeal to these later visions to reinforce a Herodotean derivation for Chapter 2 ignores the likelihood that the source and authorship of these two is quite probably divergent from Chapter 2; if Chapter 11 derives the idea of four Persian kings from the Greeks, that does not have any necessary bearing on the vision in 2.\textsuperscript{193} The background of Chapter 2 is a different one from the second half of the book and is probably one which already combined the two fourfold motifs. This consideration, then, justifies the examination of the only other extant source which combines the two fourfold ideas, the \textit{Zand-i Vahman Yain}.

Niskanen is correct to note that the extant text of the \textit{Zand-i Vahman Yain} is late; however, he appears to miss the fact that the text is clearly composite, containing two distinct metallic sequences, the second of which is clearly a later updating of the former. He appeals to details consonant with the Turkish invasion in the second version (the sevenfold version) to discredit Eddy's arguments based on the 'tousled hair' as selective;\textsuperscript{194} however, these details are clearly updating of earlier Arab invasion, which is likely an update of one based on the Greek invasion. The impression that the original core of the vision was based on the Macedonian conquests is actually reinforced by deeper consideration of two of his objections to this thesis: that the kings listed are all Iranian and that a reference to Greece is unlikely in a Persian text.\textsuperscript{195} The first objection forgets a few relevant points. The sequence Assyria-Media-Persia-Greece already contains two Iranian empires (Media and Persia), and Assyria was viewed by the Achaemenids as a legitimate ruler of Iran.\textsuperscript{196} Further, the \textit{Zand} first uses \textit{Vilista} as the representative, who was sometimes considered a foreign king.\textsuperscript{197} Thus, the Iranian list better fits the Macedonian situation than the post-Macedonian one. The latter objection ignores two points. First, if the Persian scheme was originally a reaction to the Macedonian invasion, then it would be expected to contain a reference to the Macedonians; second, the later portions of the text do contain what appear to be vague memories of Alexander.\textsuperscript{198} The two notices of Alexander appear in the text in the second

\textsuperscript{193} Contra Niskanen, \textit{The Human and the Divine}, pp. 41–42.

\textsuperscript{194} Niskanen, \textit{The Human and the Divine}, pp. 32–33.

\textsuperscript{195} Objections are in Niskanen, \textit{The Human and the Divine}, p. 32, 34, and p. 41, n. 39.


\textsuperscript{198} This last point is actually noted by Niskanen, \textit{The Human and the Divine}, p. 34, especially n. 31.
metallic sequence and in the subsequent elaboration of eschatology. Specifically, the last reinterpretation of the sequence places ‘Aleksandar-i Kilisāyīg’ in the fourth (copper) era. This would imply that this reinterpretation was based on a text which mentioned Alexander as part of the fourth empire. If these objections can be dispensed with, then the task remains of reconstructing as much as possible the vision which finds its zands in the Zand-i Vahman Yasn.

Reconstructing the Ur-form of an Iranian Vohu Manah Yasht

The following attempt is necessarily hypothetical; however, the lateness and layers of reinterpretation which are clearly evident in the extant Zand-i Vahman Yasn require that an effort be made, if an Iranian prophecy is to be compared with Daniel at all. Only once a version which can be reasonably understood to be roughly contemporaneous or prior to Dan 2 is reconstructed can a consideration of its relevance be undertaken. If this task fails, then the investigation must conclude that further evidence is required.

The primary starting point ought to be the fourfold vision, as that is likely to be closer to the original version of the vision. It is pertinent to note that the Zand gives a series of three reigns followed by a race. The names given are Vištāspa (the legendary patron of Zoroaster), Ardaxšir ‘the Kayan King,’ Husraw son of Kevād, and the Race of Xesm ‘with disheveled hair’ (devān i vezārā-vārs i xēsm-tāhmāq). These names deserve investigation.

The name of the second king (Ardaxšir) is the Pahlavi form of the most common Achaemenid throne name, Artaxerxes (Artaxšāsā in Old Persian). Boyce argues that Ardašēr, the founder of the Sassanian dynasty, deliberately chose his name to claim continuity with the previous empire ruled from Fars, in particular with Artaxerxes II, two other sources (Syncellus and several inscriptions from Nisa) support this. Even if this is incorrect and the Sassanians had no knowledge of the Achaemenids except through Greek materials as
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199 The two most commonly cited publications of the texts are numbered differently; the two relevant verses are in IV.4 and VII.32 in Anklesaria’s (Anklesaria, Zand-i Vohuman Yasn, p. 105, 124) and II.24 and III.34 in West’s (Pahlavi Texts I, p. 200, 228). More recently Cereti, Zand-i Wahman Yasn, follows Anklesaria’s numbering.


202 Boyce, HZ II, p. 263.
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Yarshater argues, the linguistic coincidence of the names is striking. More recently, Arjomand has argued further that the names which appear as ‘Ardaxšir the Kay who will be called Vahman’ in the Zand-i Vahman Yasn and ‘Ardaxšir who is called Vahman’ in the Bundahisn are both actually Artaxerxes II Mnemnon. This is based on understanding the Greek surname which was attached to Artaxerxes II, ‘Mnemon’ (‘having good memory’), as a translation of a Persian surname ‘Vohu ManaH’ (‘Good Thought’), which is Vahmati in Pahlavi. Thus, the Ardaxšir-Vahman of the epic cycles is really Artaxerxes II. Ardašir’s claim of descent would also correspond with other, previous dynasts claiming descent from Artaxerxes II (e.g., Antiochus I and the Arsacids).

The appearance, then, of ‘Ardaxšir the Kayan King’ in the current zand would appear to be a conflation of a historical name and an epic tradition, facilitated by the identity of the names. Indeed, if Artaxerxes II was completely forgotten and morphed into the Kayanid epic cycle, a Sassanian understanding of the name as Ardašir is even more understandable.

It has long been noted that the name of Zoroaster’s patron is identical to Darius I’s father’s. It is also the pseudonymous author of the elusive Oracles of Hystaspes, which purportedly contained apocalyptic material. Additionally, it is a name which was held by a number of Achaemenid nobles. While there can be no historical connection between Darius’s father and Zoroaster’s patron, it is certainly significant that a text which is generally considered to be a reaction against foreign imperialism takes as its pseudonymous author a significant king in the religious traditions which also happens to coincide with a name from
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206 Cereti, Zand-i Vahman Yasn, p. 173, however, prefers to identify him with Artaxerxes I.
208 Cf. Herzfeld, Archaeological History, p. 43 and Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, pp. 102—103, who both identified the two people. For a discussion of the name (without an indentification of these characters), see Kent, “The Name of Hystaspes,” pp. 55—58; Koch, Daniel 1, p. 135.
Achaemenid history. This point will need further consideration. It is also worth noting that while the *Zand* places Vishtaspa first, the *Denkard* places his reign second.\(^{211}\)

It is often noted that the third name the *Zand-i Vahman Yasn* gives, Husraw son of Keväd, is the name of a Sassanian king.\(^{212}\) However, both 'the son of Keväd' (Kai Kaus) and Kai Husraw are mythical characters from the Iranian epic tradition with many attached stories.\(^{213}\) The antiquity of both of these characters is confirmed by their appearance in the Avesta and in India.\(^{214}\) It appears that the Sassanian King Husraw deliberately modelled himself on these legendary characters and/or modelled the epic traditions on himself.\(^{215}\) This adaptation seems to have effected two things: the transformation of the priestly term *kavi* into a dynastic term, and the inclusion of King Husraw in the list of the *Saosyian*’s companions.\(^{216}\)

The last reign given is a race born of the demon *Xesm* (Avestan *yiesma*), who are famously described as having wild hair.\(^{217}\) *Aesma* is an important demon in Zoroastrian tradition, the personification of Wrath, and related to destructive warfare.\(^{218}\) Indeed, he is the only demon to appear in the *Gathäi*.\(^{219}\) In later Iranian, Alexander is also associated with

---

\(^{211}\) *Denkard* IX.8.1–6 (Pahlavi Texts IV), pp. 180–181.


\(^{217}\) Eddy makes much of this detail, comparing it to depictions of Alexander on coins. See Eddy, *The King is Dead*, p. 19, plates between pp. 21 and 22.


\(^{219}\) Yasna 29:2; 30:6; 48:12 (Insler, *The Gathas of Zarathustra*, p. 29, 33, 93; Cf. Boyce, *HZ I*, p. 87, 201
It is certain that this detail, both in the first version and its subsequent reinterpretations, refers to a foreign military invasion. While the text of the Zand as it now stands regards these invaders as the Turks and/or the Arabs, it is likely that earlier interpreters understood the demonic race as the foreign invaders of their respective days, the Arabs and the Greeks. Indeed, most commentators accept the Macedonians as the original referent, since they were the first army to remove Iranian sovereignty. The text as it stands seems to confirm that this was an ancient interpretation: the fourth reign of the second vision includes that of ‘Aleksandar-i Kilsâyg,’ generally understood to be Alexander the Great.

With the exception of the third, each one of the above referents appears to combine several levels: a political level suitable to a post-Achaemenid period, legendary religious references, and Sassanian references. Given likely Sassanian re-interpretation, the text as it now stands would appear to combine two fourfold schemes: a political and a religious, a combination which was updated in the Sassanian period. That religious fourfold schemes existed is demonstrated by the Denkard’s précis of four religious eras. Further, the religious connotations of the Achaemenid names and their re-use by the Sassanian dynasts would appear to facilitate their conflation. If the conflated schemes of the Zand-i Vahman Yasn are separated, the two schemes as understood by the Sassanian commentators were:

'Religious':

Zoroaster—Vištâspa—Aturpad son of Maraspand—Period of Apostasy

'Political':

Zoroaster and Vištâspa—King Ardasir—King Husraw—The Arabs

The first one is attested independently in the Denkard, and it is clearly influenced by the developments of the Sassanian and post-Sassanian era. If the Sassanian identifications are removed from the two series, the following two schemes immediately present themselves:

'Religious':

Zoroaster—Vištâspa—Saošîiant—Final Battle

'Political':

Darius (Son of Hystaspes)—Artaxerxes II Memnon—Unattested—Alexander

The first of these is a simple sequence which can easily be derived from the Gāthās before the triplcation of millennia under Babylonian influence. The second presents itself once the Old Persian forms are used instead of the extant Pahlavi forms. Important to note in this respect is the Sassanian tradition of the occultation of Husraw, an idea which appears in the epic tradition, but for which widespread Indo-European parallels are attested. It would appear likely that the tradition of Husraw’s occultation in the Zand-i Vahman Yasn is a replacement for the previous (Achaemenid) dynast, who perhaps was also understood to have been ‘occulted.’ The immediate candidate would, of course, be Darius III, but could in theory be any of the later kings. If this theory is accepted, the root political concept behind the first chapter of the Zand is a threefold Achaemenid dynasty supplanted by Alexander. Since the concept of reign and empire are easily compatible, this series would have been easy to combine with the concept of world empires once the Achaemenid Empire had fallen. Further, the negative attitude taken to the Macedonians facilitated a religious interpretation of the significance of their victory over the Iranians, seeing it as a sign of the end of Zoroaster’s millennium.

It was already noted that the succession of empires attested from Assyria to Greece is an Iranian perspective and would suit a reaction to the fall of the Persian Empire. It can be objected, however, that this could not have been combined with the metal scheme by the Persians, since it would reflect negatively on the Achaemenid dynasty. However, the idea of inferiority appears not to be the primary intention of the imagery, either in the Iranian context or in Daniel. First, in the Zand-i Vahman Yasn the first three kings receive no censure; indeed, they are all positive. Only the last is negative—which is characterized as evil and demonic. Within the context of traditional Zoroastrian imagery, the metals utilized bear this out: metals were part of the good creation, belonging to the Amasa Spanta Xsathra (‘Dominion’), particularly appropriate for a symbol of successive reigns. Only the last, the ‘mixed’ iron, carries a negative connotation. As Boyce has commented, the idea of mixed
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225 Boyce argues that rather than Darius, Cyrus was assimilated to the character of Hystaspes, as he ruled prior to Darius and Darius’s father was known to be Hystaspes, explaining Cyrus’s eclipse in later Iranian tradition. See Boyce, HZ II, pp. 68–69. Either understanding little effects the gist of the argument.
227 An older theory understood Cyrus as the original background behind the Kaus-Husraw legends. (Yarshater, “Iranian National History,” pp. 447–448) If this Cyrus is understood as Cyrus the Younger, then perhaps one would wish to see the disappointed supporters of Cyrus occluding him, and their Anatolian descendants using it as part of their anti-Seleucid propaganda. This is, of course, nothing but pure speculation.
229 Cf. Boyce, HZ I, p. 204.
iron is an appropriate image for a period of the mixing of good and evil. In this context, the choice to use metals to represent the eras fits perfectly a religious-political reflection on the fall of Darius's dynasty.

In light of the above considerations, it is probable that the extant Zand-i Vahman Yasn combines Sassanian reflections on combined religious and political fourfold schemes. The political version could have contained either dynasts, empires, or dynasts as representative of empires. It would have used the four metals, with only the last one carrying a negative connotation. The tree may or may not be original, but this does not affect the overall form of the concept. It is this version which must be compared to Dan 2.

Although hypothetical, the above reconstruction makes sense in the overall context of Iranian developments. It also very closely parallels the vision in Daniel. It shares a fourfold political scheme, four metals in declining order while only stressing the inferiority of the last, and an eschatological and theological overall interpretation of the significance. It even shares a fictive chronological setting vis-à-vis the vision, i.e., occurring in the first era of the vision. It shares the detail of iron mixed with dust/clay and finds significance in this. Finally, both likely share a revelatory context. A difference between bronze and steel, remains, however. This may be less of a problem than it appears now. The sevenfold version of the Zand's vision lists the metals as gold—silver—bronze—copper—lead—steel—mixed iron, with bronze in the third position. All that differs from the more well-known fourfold scheme is the insertion of copper—lead—steel. It seems probable that the underlying Persian scheme was, therefore, gold—silver—bronze—iron mixed with dust, and that, after it was expanded into a sevenfold system, the last metal of the longer version (steel) was retroactively placed into the first one by a scribe more familiar with the longer version. In other words, the second version simply inserted copper—lead—steel to reach seven rather than bronze—copper—lead.

If the above reconstruction is valid, then it must be admitted that the Iranian vision is extremely similar to the dream in Dan 2, a connection between these two visions is probable, and, since the 'mixed' detail finds support in an Iranian context, that the direction
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231 Perhaps understood as Hystaspes/Assyria, Artaxerxes/Media, Darius/Persia, Alexander/Macedon. In this context it is interesting to note that several fake inscriptions purporting to be by Arsames and Ariaramnes but assigned to an Artaxerxes have been found in the region of Ecbatana. Listed as AmH and AsH in Kent, Old Persian, p. 116; Cf. the comments in Rüdiger Schmitt, “Old Persian,” The Ancient Languages of Asia and the Americas, ed. Roger D. Woodard (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2008), p. 77, where he assigns it to Artaxerxes III.
232 Hartman, “Datierung der jüngesten Apokalyptik,” pp. 62–63, seems to imply a similar understanding (albeit without discussion) in his listing of the Zand's scheme as gold, silver, copper, iron.
must be from Iran to Yehud.\textsuperscript{235} This borrowing would have to fall into a relatively short time span, long enough after Alexander's conquest for the Iranian scheme to be developed but before either the marriage of Berenice and Antochus II or of Cleopatra and Antiochus III (from post-330 and before either 252 or 193).

\textbf{Eschatology}

A further element which must be considered is the appearance of eschatology in Dan 2. Several phrases within the passage can imply or carry an eschatology: v. 28, 'what will happen at the end of days' (מַהוּ דָּוָא בֵּאָהָהַר לְלַוָּא יִמֹּהָה); vv. 29, 44, 45 'what would be hereafter' (כֵּלַוָּא לְלַוָּא אָוָּר דְָהָ); v. 44, 'it shall stand forever' (מַהוּ דָּוָא לְלַוָּא יִמֹּהָה). However, the presence of eschatology in the passage is not solely dependent on these phrases as it is implied in the form of the vision itself. Collins is right to note that the eschatology should not be excised from the passage, making it likely part of the pericope even before it was combined into the current book.\textsuperscript{234} In this respect, there are several pertinent aspects to consider. First, the passage reuses the prophetic term 'in the latter days' (בָּאָהַרת הָיְמִים). Second, the eschatology would seem to be imported with the vision itself, as it appears to be of little interest to the Danielic author.\textsuperscript{235} Third, the eschatology is a 'deferred eschatology,' quite distinct from the 'imminent eschatology' of chapters 7–12.\textsuperscript{236} Fourth, this passage plays an important role in the Book of Daniel as a whole.

The use of the term בָּאָהַרת הָיְמִים and cognate terms deliberately recalls its use in the writing prophets. This term and the related יָמִים הָיְהֵה are exegetical flash points, and can only be briefly discussed here.\textsuperscript{237} However, the distinction argued earlier—between future expectation and eschatology—is important for understanding the relation of the passage with previous Judaean traditions and with the subsequent Danielic (and other Judaean) tradition.\textsuperscript{238} The passage's imagery does appear to imply an event outside normal historical processes. The four metallic empires all hold in common the fact that they are metals, part


\textsuperscript{236} For more discussion of the importance of a distinction between 'deferred' and 'imminent' eschatology, see Chapter V. Cf. John J. Collins, \textit{Encounters with Biblical Theology} (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), pp. 134–136.

\textsuperscript{237} See Chapter V for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{238} See the Prolegomena.
of the same statue, and presumably made by man. This contrasts with the fifth empire, which is stone rather than metal, and ‘not by (human) hands’ (v. 34, ידִיוֹ). Using language of judgment, the stone destroys and then supplants the four. The historical sequence is not to be repeated.

The eschatology is implicit in the form of the vision itself; yet, since the overall context of the chapter entirely ignores the eschatology to focus on G-d’s revelatory powers, it is most probable that the eschatology was inherited from the borrowed vision. The language of the Hebrew prophets was used by the author, but he (perhaps unwittingly) placed a new interpretation onto them.

According to the logic of the chapter, Nebuchadnezzar’s dream depicts an eschaton which can be no less than three hundred years distant (since the length of the last kingdom is left unspecified). The fall of Babylon and three more kingdoms must first pass by. From the perspective of the author of the chapter, however, the eschaton is much closer, although it is still not urgent. He is living in the last kingdom, but sees no sign of the end. The end is to be expected, but more as the result of wisdom than urgency. For the later tradents, however, the scheme takes on utmost importance since they believe that the end is nigh. The shift between Dan 2 and Dan 7 is less the content of the eschatology, but the author’s perceived proximity to the eschaton. The later authors fully accept the accuracy and import of the eschatology in Dan 2 which, for that author, was incidental to his interests.

From the above considerations, it becomes clear that borrowed ideas can have an impact beyond their borrower’s intention and even their own time. If it can be accepted that the author of Dan 2 borrowed an Iranian vision to make a point about the revelatory power of YHWH, it also becomes apparent that an eschatological reinterpretation of traditions also ‘piggy-backed’ its way in. This had major ramifications for the development of subsequent Judaean traditions and played a role in the appearance of the apocalypse.

Four metallic Kingdoms with an Eschatology

The presence of relatively ignored features in Dan 2—the metals and the eschatology—make it probable that Daniel’s source had already combined the ideas of the succession of empires, four metallic ages, and eschatology. Otherwise, one would have expected the author to have utilized them more in his interpretation. The only parallel adduced which combines all three of these ideas is the likely Hellenistic source of the Zand-i Vahman Yasn (the presumed Vahman Yait). There is no firm evidence for this source. That ‘apocalyptic’ traditions and even documents existed seems to be confirmed by the references
to the *Oracles of Hystaspes* (which must have had an Iranian element). Beyond *Hystaspes*, it is possible that there existed a Persian Sibyl (which may have fragments preserved in *Sibylline Oracles III*). Taking her starting point from the Roman author Varro’s identification of the oldest Sibyl as Persian, Boyce discusses the purported existence of a ‘Persian Sibyl,’ and she sees this as a likely source for a combination of Zoroastrian eschatology with a four-empire scheme. A number of texts attributed to sibyls were circulated in the Ancient Near East, and there is no real reason why the Iranian diaspora could not have produced their own. They may even have produced several such propagandistic texts. As Boyce pertinently notes, the Persians were the only people who lost sovereignty due to the Macedonian invasion. Iranian aristocracy had reason to begrudge the Greeks; to them they lost not only independence, but suzerainty. All other peoples in the Ancient Near East merely switched their overlords, which, at first, would probably have been relatively insignificant to them. However, it must be noted that the evidence for a Persian Sibyl is slim—in fact restricted to Lactantius’s citation—and therefore cannot be the basis for a wide-ranging theory. However, the possibility remains suggestive, perhaps indicating that the presumed Hellenistic period source behind the *Zand-i Vahman Yašn* need not be a *Yaši* at all, but could conceivably be another form of oracular or revelatory literature. While Boyce’s suggestion of a Sibylline source is unlikely, it helps to broaden understanding of the genres available to the disaffected Iranian diaspora.

**Conclusion**

Although the unfortunate state of the Iranian evidence makes a definitive conclusion impossible, an Iranian source for the four empire scheme in Daniel best accounts for the available evidence. Not only does it supply the details of the vision, it helps to explain the development of the Danielic worldview itself, one which evidently began well before the historical appearance of the genre apocalypse. Perhaps it can be suggested that the four empire scheme, understood as Babylon–Media–Persia–Greece, could have appealed to the author of Dan 2 through offering a way of reconciling previous prophecy with historical
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239 Cf. David Flusser, “Hystaspes and John of Patmos,” *Irano-Judaica*, ed. Shaul Shaked, vol. I (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 1982), pp. 12–75, who understands the work to be a Judaean one, but which was based on a previous Persian one.


242 Boyce and Grenet, *HZ III*, p. 374, see also n. 48.

outcomes. Colless argues that the reference to ‘Darius the Mede’ is intended to show fulfillment of Jer 51:11. However, in the context of a borrowed oracle in chapter 2, it can instead be suggested that the sequence offered the redactor with a convenient method for reconciling these traditions—thus explaining its use as a structural device for the present book—as well as encouraging the adoption (of the validated) eschatology.

**EXCURSUS: ON THE WATCHERS**

In his paper in the Warfare in Ancient Israel session of SBL, Smith-Christopher proposed to speak of ‘an Imperial Gaze’ which affects communities (and texts) in an exilic context. By this phrase he wishes to denote the effects of imperial observation upon displaced and subject peoples in a parallel manner to the concept of the ‘male gaze.’ He further notes the language of ‘eyes’ and ‘watching’ in several of the exilic books, considering such language in the context of modern studies of refugees and of prisons. By extension, this insight offers a plausible context for the appearance of the term ‘Watcher’ (יַוֶּם, יִתְנָקָם) in Second Temple Judaism.

The term ‘Watcher’ first appears in *The Book of Watchers* and Daniel, the origin and associations of which are obscure. The early contexts of the term make clear that the יַוֶּם were understood as a class of angels which functioned in heaven, even if the *Book of Watchers*’s interest is largely on a group of them which fell. This can be seen, for example, in 1 Enoch 20:1 and 22:6, where the term ‘Watcher’ or the similar phrase ‘who watch’ is used of the seven archangels in general and Raphael in particular, as well as in the Danielic usage where it is consistently used in conjunction with יִתְנָקָם (4:10, 14, 20). The unfallen Watchers in both traditions appear in contexts of the pronouncement of judgment due to hubris: in Dan 4 the Watcher proclaims the decreed humbling of Nebuchadnezzar and in 1 Enoch 9:1–10:15, cf. 20:1–8, the archangels are in charge of executing punishment upon the Watchers,

---

244 Colless, “Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel,” p. 118, 121.
245 For the structural use of the trope, see Collins, “Court-Tales in Daniel,” p. 229; Collins, Daniel, pp. 31–32.
246 Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, “Can We Speak of the Socio-Psychology of Exile in the Bible?” (paper presented at annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, 24 November 2008), pp. 6–10. The author is deeply grateful to Professor Smith-Christopher for sending him a copy of his presentation for consultation.
248 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 40, 42.
although the proclamation of the judgment is given to Enoch. The duties of a Watcher, then, appear to be to survey the heavenly domain and to prosecute delinquents. Such a remit explains the Enochic tradition's choice of the Watcher-class for its fallen supernatural beings: it provides punch to the ironic twist (cf. 1 Enoch 15:2), perhaps even playing on the theme of theodicy so important to the tradition. Such a motif can again be seen in both the Enochic and Danielic traditions in the series of seventy shepherds in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 89:59–90:25) and in the four hubristic empires (Dan 2, 7), respectively. To this function the Book of Watchers adds an intercessory role on behalf of the righteous. The four archangels in 1 Enoch 9 appeal, at least partially, for the sake of suffering mankind and the intercessory role is explicitly charged to the Watchers in Enoch's judgment oracle against them (15:2). The overall impression given of the Watchers, then, is of beings charged with monitoring both praiseworthy and damnable actions and relaying such information above.

A similar concept of 'watchful' and prosecutorial heavenly beings appears in Zech 4, albeit without using the word 'Watcher.' In a somewhat obscure passage, Zechariah sees a seven-lamp lampstand, which the text identifies as "the eyes of the Lord, which range through the whole earth" (עֵינֵי יְהוָה מְשׁוּטְסִים בְּכָלֵדָיו, v. 10b). In the previous chapter, the Davidic scion is described as "a single stone with seven eyes" (אַלְמָן עֵינָי נֵבְנֶה עֵינִים, v. 9), possibly giving the concept a royal context. The setting of these chapters is in the Persian period, and it is plausible to understand such a vision of surveillance as based upon contemporary structures. From there, the apocalyptic literature lifts the idea into an angelic category. It is here suggested, then, that this term is an Aramaic reflex of the Achaemenid 'eye of the king' and is a part of 1 Enoch's assimilation of YHWH's administration to that of the Great King.
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249 Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, p. 36.
250 I.e., YHWH himself is not unjust, just his corrupted, delegated enforcers make it appear so.
251 Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, pp. 129–134; cf. Tiller, Animal Apocalypse, pp. 57–8, where he sees the Watchers as one of the backgrounds to the Shepherds.
252 Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, p. 36.
253 On the chapter as a whole, see Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, The Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 16–46; note that on p. 31 he finds a reference to royal surveillance probable in v. 10b.
254 Cf. 2 Chr 16: 9, where King Asa is told that the Eyes of the Lord range over the whole earth (רי הנה לדָּוִּי מְשׁוּטְסִים בָּכָלְדָיו, ensuring his reward or punishment.
Both Herodotus and Aeschylus briefly mention the existence of a royal Persian appointment to which they refer as ‘(the king’s) eye.’ Although both of these mentions are in literary rather than historical contexts per se, the manner in which they are mentioned seem to imply an office with which the expected audience was already familiar. Although they provide no historical information on the office, they arguably demonstrate its existence. Plutarch also mentions an office holder by name. In his depiction of Cyrus as philosopher-king, however, Xenophon denies the existence of such a singular informant. The importance of this denial is questionable as its basis appears not to be direct knowledge of the lack of such a system but is rather based on four postulates: 1) the benevolence of Cyrus; 2) subjects acting as if they are continually being watched; 3) people would avoid the company of a spy; and 4) a proverb “the king has many eyes and ears” (δὴ πολλὰ μὲν βασιλεὺς ὤτα, πολλοὶ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ). Instead, Xenophon claims that a wide, voluntary system of informing was supported by the Great King’s bestowal of gifts and honors. While Xenophon must be right in stressing the importance of gift-exchange, this does not exclude the possibility of a formal position. Indeed, later in the same book Xenophon claims that the kings operated a regular system of satrapal oversight using commissioners, among whom he includes the king’s brother, son, and eye. The overseers, however, are charged not only with rooting out malfeasance but also with the reporting of excellence. Tuplin opines that there was an official ‘eye’ who worked alongside an informal network of informants, combining the above Greek information. If one recalls that such modern spying organizations as the CIA operate covertly while utilizing a variety of intelligence sources with appointed, known directors, then this scenario seems plausible. Although there


are no certain Iranian sources for this system, the testimony of the Greek sources and logic argue for its existence, importance, and (in)famy.

Most commentators derive the term 'Watcher' itself from the Aramaic root רע 'to awake, to be watchful, to rouse,' even if they express some dissatisfaction with it. It seems, however, that the potential range of associations in the Hebrew and Aramaic cognate terms is slightly more broad, including protection, guarding, and going 'hither and thither.' If one is willing to accept the root as Hebrew rather than Aramaic, it may be interesting to note that Ps 35:23 uses the verb form of רע to ask for vindication for wrongs done. This is the same role imputed to the Watchers in their first literary appearances. Even if the etymology of רע cannot be directly related to a Persian or Greek word, the implied nuances as well as the context of its appearance in the early apocalyptic literature certainly recall the Greek authors' discussion of the 'King's Eye.'

If Smith-Christopher’s musings on refugees and prisoners are brought into conjunction with this thought, the choice of the word רע appears to be a logical development. Just as the temporal imperial power has those who watch out for its interests and vindicate wrongs, so the divine imperium has its own mechanism for vindication. This mechanism would, of course, be understood as largely to the benefit of Israel and one which ought to strike fear into G-d’s enemies. The importance of the oversight function also perhaps illuminates the paranoia and purity concerns of certain Judaean circles in the Second Temple Period. If this interpretation is acceptable, it represents an instance of influence without linguistic borrowing. A Hebrew term was chosen to represent a heavenly form of Persian, earthly administration, once again melding the 'political' and the 'religious.'

---

262 Cf. the brief discussion in Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, pp. 343–344. For an argument that this institution was borrowed by the Athenian Empire, see Jack M. Balcer, “The Athenian Episkopos and the Achaemenid ‘King’s Eye,’” *American Journal of Philology* 98.3 (1977): pp. 252–263.
264 See references above. This is in connection with references to the wild ass; note, however the similar application to the ‘Eyes of the Lord’ in 2 Chr 16:9, as noted above.
IV

Textual Analyses

Part B: Enochic Literature
For the sake of convenience, the Enochic materials found in the Ethiopian book will be dealt with together in this section, even though they originally derive from disparate documents. The other extant works known under the name of Enoch—2 (Slavonic) Enoch, 3 (Hebrew) Enoch and the Book of Giants—are reserved for future study.

Interest in the Ethiopian Book of Enoch (or 1 Enoch) has exploded since the discovery of Aramaic fragments at Qumran, which included Aramaic fragments of most Enochic books. Some scholars make much of the tradition’s import for Qumran and Second Temple Judaism. Ever since Charles, scholars have agreed that the extant Ethiopian text is composite, consisting of five major divisions. Nickelsburg marks the divisions as Book of Watchers (1—36), Book of Parables/Similitudes of Enoch (37—71), Book of Luminaries/Astronomical Book (72—82), Dream Visions (83—90), Epistle of Enoch (92—105), Birth of Noah (106—107), and Another Book of Enoch (108). The oldest sections of the book are the Book of Watchers and the Astronomical Book, and both are usually considered on paleographical grounds to be older than the Book of Daniel. Thus, the Enochic corpus contains some of the oldest extant fully apocalyptic Jewish works. Even though the work is ultimately composite, the Ethiopic compilation still shows signs of unity, whether one wishes to see the unifying theme as a ‘biography’ or a ‘testament’ of Enoch, although Dix’s and Milik’s suggestion of an ‘Enochic Pentateuch’ takes the unity too far.

The Enochic material contains a wide variety of genres, theologies, concerns, and myths. Some are demonstrably based on the Tanakh; others, however, are more enigmatic. Some of the enigmatic details may be explained as either borrowed or inspired by Persian ideas. The following proceeds according to the order of the books in the Ethiopic rather than by their relative dating. Viewed in relative chronology, however, it appears that the number of Iranian details within the Enochic tradition seem to increase over time.

The Book of Watchers (1–36)

The Book of Watchers incorporates a diverse variety of material. While it clearly has links with the Torah, Gen 6 in particular, it also contains motifs and ideas for which Gen 6 cannot account. One of the more significant strands is the material collected around the character of the Watcher Asael. A myth of forbidden knowledge which explains the existence of culture (Kulturentstehungsmythos) and a motif of binding until the eschaton are largely linked with Asael in the book. Both of these strands have parallels in Iranian materials. The character of Asael—even if not ‘original’ to the Enochic tradition—gradually assumed greater notoriety until he became the paradigm of the rebellious angel (54:5; 55:4). The eschatology connected with the idea of a temporary binding is also foundational for much in the work as a whole; indeed, Nickelsburg has argued it is one of the unifying themes of the Ethiopic corpus.273 Finding sources behind the character of Asael, therefore, will help illuminate the formation of the watcher tradition in both the Book of Watchers and in the later Enochic tradition. As Reed notes, the instruction motif is quite central to the form of the Book of Watchers as it is now known.274

Motif of Forbidden Knowledge as a Kulturentstehungsmythos

In both the Book of Watchers (8:1–3, 10:7–8; Cf. 7:1, 9:6; 13:1–3) and the Parables (69:6–8; Cf. 52:8) appears a myth of the human acquisition of forbidden, arcane knowledge, more or less linked with a Watcher called Asael or Azazel (ןועצ),275 which explains in some manner the state or existence of culture/civilization as it is known (Kulturentstehungsmythos).276 Both instances will be dealt with together here. Hanson argues that the Asael narrative arose from the comparison of the Semihazah narrative in the Book of Watchers with the scapegoat given over to the demon Azazel in Lev 16,277 but this explanation has not been accepted by all scholars.278 Hanson’s point of departure is the appearance of the name ‘Azazel’ in some

273 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 37.
274 Reed, Fallen Angels, pp. 30–34.
275 According to 4Q202, Col. II and 4Q204, Col II (Martinez and Tigchelaar, eds., The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, pp. 405, 413). 4Q201 (Col III), though, gives the homophonic variant הונד (p. 403).
276 Siam Bhayro, The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 322 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005), p. 11, tries to argue that the “Asael Narrative” and the “Angelic Instruction Motif” were from two separate sources. It is unclear to the present author, however, what remains ‘Asaelic’ after the removal of the instruction motif. Additionally, it seems anachronistic to base the division on comparisons with Daniel and Manichaeanism (pp. 26–27).
278 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, pp. 191–193, instead posits a borrowing from the Prometheus myth, a source which Hanson in the cited article mentions favourably, but ignores; see also Corrie Mulderberg, “A Study of the Roles of Shemihaza and Asael in 1 Enoch 6–11,” Journal of Jewish Studies 35.2 (1984): pp. 136–146; Carol A. Newsom,
of the versions and later parts of *1 Enoch.* Since Lev 16 does not involve any form of rumination on the origins of culture, it is more plausible that the name 'Asael' in *Enoch* was later assimilated to the Levitical form, rather than Lev 16 having served as the initial inspiration for the motif as a whole.\(^279\) Indeed, while the Greek versions read 'Azazel' here, the extant Aramaic clearly reads 'Asael.'\(^280\) While Davies cites Milik in defense of seeing Azazel as simply a variant of Asael, the comment he cites is in the context of the later 3 *Enoch,* not 1 *Enoch* itself.\(^281\) This does not defend an origin of the character from the Levitical ritual in 1 *Enoch.* Neither does an appeal to 4QEnGiants\(^5\); according to Milik 4QEnGiants was part of a scroll which contained 1 *Enoch* 1–36, 83–90, and 91–107,\(^282\) a manuscript which he dates to 50–51 B.C.E.,\(^283\) considerably later than the original writing of the *Book of Watchers.* Since the name *Asael* is more or less homophonic with *Azazel,* it is easy to see how the latter variant could be assimilated to *Asael.*\(^284\) If Pinker is correct in claiming that the 'scapegoat' in Lev 16 was simply a memory of YHWH's desert origins (as in the Song of Deborah),\(^285\) then it seems most likely the Asael *cum Azazel* tradition evident in 1 *Enoch* is the source of the later demonic interpretation of Lev 16 than the other way around. Without the name 'Azazel' Lev 16 becomes unlinkable to the pericope, and the question of the primary source of inspiration for the Asael myth remains. It seems, then, another explanation is needed.

Scholars generally agree on separate provenances for the Šemihazah and Asael stories in the *Book of Watchers.*\(^286\) It is also generally agreed that the Šemihazah motif is the older and the Asael material was interpolated later, even if the details of how this happened vary

---


\(^{283}\) This is also the opinion of Devorah Dimant, "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): pp. 94, n. 19. Cf. 4Q203 and the comment on the form 'Azazel' in Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran,* TSAJ 63 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), pp. 77–79.


This sequence is usually interpreted to indicate the relatively younger age of the Asael tradition, but there is no solid reason for this to be the case. Even if the Asael material was worked into a pre-existing version of the Book of Watchers (which itself is not wholly certain) there is no need to assume that the negative Kulturenstehungsmythos (of which Asael is the primary Enochic representative) had not been previously circulating in Second Temple Judaism or among scholarly circles; it merely shows that the author/redactor found it useful for his purposes at a later point in his writing. The original inspiration for the motif could well be much older than the text of the Book of Watchers itself. The priority of Śemihazah or Asael in the writing of the extant book, then, tells little about its original dating or provenance. Since the story in Gen 6:1–4 contains neither motif here considered related to Asael (neither kulturenstehungsmythos nor binding), it is understood here to have been at least partially inspired by a secondary source.

The idea of a divine source for the arts of civilization (Kulturenstehungsmythos) is widespread in folklore. Sometimes this impartation of knowledge to humanity has a positive connotation, sometimes a more negative one. Often, these accounts are inherently ambivalent; the information can be beneficial to humanity but against the will of the gods, or the information could itself be detrimental. Indeed, the Watcher myth itself appears to have been ambivalent in Judeo-Christian tradition as well. Various aspects of the story extant in 1 Enoch parallel several sources, so determining primary influence is difficult. Several versions of the myth known in the Ancient Near East are analyzed below for resemblances to the Book of Watcher’s scenario.


See Figure 15.
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Perhaps most familiar in the Occident is the Prometheus myth. This myth is available in two primary versions, by Hesiod and by Aeschylus. Beyond a basic motif of forbidden, divinely sourced knowledge, Aeschylus's version offers more details for parallels then Hesiod's. According to Aeschylus, Prometheus taught men not only the use of fire, but also astronomy, writing, pastoralism, horse-riding, sea-faring, medicine, astrology, dream interpretation, augury, extispicy, and metallurgy. This patronage was an affront to Zeus, who had Prometheus bound to a rock as punishment. Rather than being a curse, the knowledge which Prometheus imparts humanity is described as raising them up from a beast-like condition to civilization. This version of the myth parallels the accounts given in 1 Enoch in certain arts (astronomy, astrology, various magic arts, writing, and metallurgy), but the context and significance are quite different. The various references in 1 Enoch either imply or state that the Watchers' knowledge is the cause of humanity's miserable and sinful state, or at least contributes to it; in the Greek versions of the story, man's difficulty comes not from Prometheus's teachings, but Zeus's attempts to neutralize their benefit. Indeed, Aeschylus's Prometheus suffers wrongly due to the arbitrary authority of Zeus. This indictment of arbitrary authority is totally foreign to the theology of the Book of Watchers; 1 Enoch focuses on the Watchers' failure to fulfill their necessary and proper roles vis-à-vis humanity. The problem in view is the fallen angels, not G-d's rule; G-d's judgment is consistently presented as a sign of his justice, not of his arbitrariness. Thus, in both intention and focus, the Prometheus myth shows little resemblance to the Asael myth. In light of West's suggestion that the Greek versions of the myth are themselves dependent on an 'oriental' prototype, perhaps it is better to look farther East for parallels.
There are several Babylonian variations on the *Kulturrentsiehungsmythos*. According to Berossus, a fish-man named Oannes (or Adapa) imparted all the knowledge of civilization to men. In this version, the knowledge is wholly beneficial—indeed necessary—for mankind and contains no overtones of being illicit. The version of the Adapa story Dalley offers could perhaps be read as slightly more ambiguous. While there is no condemnation of the knowledge *per se*, Adapa offends the gods with its improper use, and Ea must give further knowledge to protect Adapa before them. The story is quite fragmentary, and the final extant episode is notoriously ambiguous. It is unclear whether Ea means to protect or punish Adapa with the information which causes him to lose out on eternal life. As Dalley comments, the ambiguity may be intentional “and a crucial *double entendre* may attribute man’s folly to a simple misunderstanding.” On a whole, however, there appears to be no condemnation of Ea or Adapa in this version. The fragments presented by Pritchard, however, offer hints of a myth of forbidden knowledge. Fragment B, line 58, may imply that Ea imparted esoteric knowledge to Adapa along the lines of the Asael myth; Fragment D states that Adapa’s actions had brought disease and death upon mankind. Fragment D certainly preserves a serious story with more transgressive implications than the other versions of Adapa so far mentioned; however, the council of the gods are quick to rectify any harm caused by Adapa. Ultimately, Adapa’s loss of immortality (something to which he had never held claim anyway) is the only misfortune to result.

West also briefly cites the myth of *Labar and AINAN* in connection with the Prometheus myth, but it does not offer a useful parallel to Asael. According to Kramer’s version, the story depicts the arts of agriculture and pastoralism as divine gifts, or, more correctly, considers their existence to be dependent on the creation of patron deities for each. The myth contains no reference to nor discussion of humanity, forbidden knowledge, nor even the receipt of knowledge. Even if many aspects of Enoch’s character parallel Babylonian prototypes, the negative *Kulturrentsiehungsmythos* motif does not seem to have an adequate Babylonian parallel extant.

---

209 See the version in Stanley M. Burstein, *The Babylonian of Berossus*, Sources and Monographs on the Ancient Near East 1.5 (Malibu: Undena, 1978), pp. 13–14. Note 6 claims that the recipient of the knowledge was the king Alorus, but this is not stated in this text itself.


212 West, *The East Face*, p. 582.


The *Kulturentstehungmythos* appears twice in Persian traditions, one linked directly to sin, the other more with the loss of a golden age. The first version is the story of the first human couple, Maşye and Maşyane (also called Maşya and Maşyānag). The second story deals with the reign and fall of the first king, Yima.

The *Greater Bundahisn* XIV.11–34/Indian *Bundahisn* XV.19–21 describes how, prompted by demons, Maşye and Maşyane discover fire, kill animals, invent metallurgy, make weapons, make clothes, and worship demons. Two things are notable in this story: that the sins are committed by humans on the prompting of avowedly evil spirits and that the couple are described as creating both good things (fire, ritual) and as well as negative things. The story thus also has an ambiguous element; while the author of the *Bundahisn* clearly viewed the couple as inveterate sinners, they also put into place many of the things needed for the functioning of civilization. That the author of the passage deemed them sinners is seen by the use of the term 'to lie' (Pahlavi *druxtan*, *drōz*, Old Persian *dūr-jē*). This version of the motif represents a more moralizing reflex than the Prometheus or Adapa versions. At least some of the knowledge is itself wicked, and the protagonists are considered to be held guilty.

The *Kulturentstehungmythos* also appears in Iran in the stories around the primeval king Yima. The character of Yima (Yama) is Indo-Iranian, although his roles in Iran and in India were quite different. In the *Gāthās*, Yima only appears as having sinned, with no explanation of what the sin entailed. In the *Zāmyād Yāst*, however, he appears as a king of a golden age who lost his *Xūrnavab* ('royal or heroic glory or fortune') through lying. In the *Zāmyād Yāst* version, Yima forces the demons to impart to mankind the positive arts of civilization, listed largely in vague terms (XIX.32). Yima is able to do this because of his *Xūrnavab*. His subsequent fall is due to pride at his achievements, which caused him to lie

---


Thus, in this version, the acquisition of knowledge was itself a beneficial thing; the sin was the subsequent hubris (lying and pride) rather than an effect of the knowledge.

The *Shahnameh* of Firdausī explicitly links the *Kulturentstehungsmythos* with Yima, a primaeval human king in Iranian tradition. Firdausī credits Yima with the discovery of metallurgy, weapons and warcraft; of clothing, castes, and jewelry; of perfume and medicine, and with forcing the demons to serve rather than harm humans. All of his achievements cause him to become prideful and claim to be god, whereupon he loses his glory and fortune. Thus, in this story, the knowledge is of supernatural origin, but is of itself a good thing and reflective of the power of Yima’s *Xaranaq*, it does not cause Yima’s later misfortune. Firdausī’s version appears to be largely an expansion or filling out of the myth as it is visible in the *Zānyād Yāst*, although the lateness of the *Shahnameh* makes using it very dubious. It is worth noting in this context, however, the statement in the *Aogamadacē* §§91—93 that Tāhmūr, son of Vīvāngān, acquired ‘Seven kinds of writing and penmanship from Angra Mainyu.’ The deed is left unevaluated; interestingly, *1 Enoch* 69:8–11 also attributes diabolic teaching to the creation of writing. The *Aogamadacē* is a Parthian period liturgy which assembled, translated, and commented on now lost Avestan verses, so a diabolic culture myth certainly did circulate in Iran prior to *1 Enoch*. Yima is also described as the ‘son of Vīvāngān,’ so it is possible that the diabolic inspiration comes from another *Kulturentstehungsmythos* tradition associated with Yima. In any case, several versions of the motif of forbidden knowledge circulated in Iran, although attached to a variety of figures; Boyce sees an alternate protagonist with a similar role in the character of Hāosīiąňja/Hōşang, and she suggests different heroes for different tribes. Hāosīiąňja appears in *Yāst* V.21–2; IX.3–4; XV.7–8; XVII.24–5, the *Denkard* VIII.13.5, the *Aogamadacē* §§88–89, and in the *Shahnameh* I.17–20. In all of these texts he is depicted as a primaeval king who defeated demons. In this role he parallels Yima, and the *Zānyād Yāst* and the *Denkard* even have him usurp Yima’s role as the first king. However, there seems to be no evidence for a negative *Kulturentstehungsmythos* being connected with Hāosīǐąňja. If his myths

---

312 Cf. the comments in Hintze, *Zānyād Yāst*, p. 37.
were associated with royal ideology as Shahbazi suggests, then it seems highly unlikely they were negative in any case.\footnote{Shapour Shahbazi, “Hōšāng,” Encyclopædia Iranica 12 (2004): pp. 491–492, http://iranica.com/newsite/} Interestingly, Camoy, citing Yait XVII.25, suggests it was Yima who was the original giver of forbidden knowledge rather than Mašya and Mašyānag.\footnote{Camoy, “Iranian Mythology,” pp. 296–310.} If this is true, then the dating for the sinful \textit{Kulturentstehungsmythos} would be pushed back comfortably into the Achaemenid period; however, the present writer cannot see how such an interpretation can be culled from that text.

Of the two Persian versions of the story, the myth of Mašya and Mašyānag parallels the Asael story in \textit{1 Enoch} more closely than the myths associated with Yima. The focus of the story in \textit{1 Enoch}, however, has shifted from the human protagonists to their demonic inspirations, which is consonant with the Enochic traditions’ preoccupation with angelic figures in general. Unfortunately, this parallel cannot as comfortably be considered to be an older survival as the Yima myths can; indeed, Boyce considers Mašya and Mašyānag to be a later elaboration.\footnote{Boyce, HZ L, pp. 96–97.} However, one could wish to see an Indo-European reflex in the story of the first human couple, since a story also appears in the Norse text, the \textit{Völuspá}.\footnote{Dronke, \textit{Mythological Poems}, pp. 122–123.} The first human pair, Ask and Embla, are there said to be fashioned out of two pieces of driftwood. While it is interesting that this first couple is fashioned from plant material (the Bundahišn describes Mašya and Mašyānag’s birth from a rhubarb stalk), the association between humanity and driftwood in particular appears to be well situated in Norse tradition itself.\footnote{See Evelyn-White, ed., \textit{Hesiod}, p. 13; Dronke, \textit{Mythological Poems}, pp. 122–123.} One may even wish to see the allusion to the ashtree (\textit{askr}) as Indo-European as it also appears in Hesiod, but it does not appear in Iran.\footnote{Dronke, \textit{Mythological Poems}, p. xi.} Additionally, the manuscript which preserves the \textit{Völuspá} (the Codex Regius) dates to 1270 C.E.,\footnote{Ake V. Ström, “Indogermanisches in der Völspsá,” \textit{Numen} 14.3 (1967): pp. 167–208; he even claims influence of the trope on Daniel via Persia, see pp. 197–198; Hans P. Hasenfratz, “Iran und der Dualismus,” \textit{Numen} 30.1 (1983): pp. 44–45, arguing that the parallel proves antiquity; cf. Anders Hultgård, “Persian Apocalypticism,” \textit{The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Vol I: The Origin of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity}, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 2000), p. 69.} even later than the manuscripts of the Bundahišn. The possibility that the Scandinavian story was influenced by the biblical story of Adam and Eve cannot be eliminated, and while Ström and Hasenfratz may be convinced of the Indo-European origins of both the Bundahišn and the \textit{Völuspá} due to parallels,\footnote{Katherine Nielsen, “Hver ti Sendi eru at segja fra timragnarokr?” The Debate over Christian Influences in Norse Indo-European Tradition,” \textit{Journal of Indo-European Studies} 30.1–2 (2002): pp. 61–77} the parallel of interest here—a negative \textit{Kulturentstehungsmythos}—is not found in

Scandinavia. Thus, despite the excellent parallels with the story in *1 Enoch*, it seems that the negative *Kulturentstehungsmythos* would need to have been associated with characters other than Mašya and Mašyānag to be viable as a source for the *Book of Watchers*.²²⁵

It is possible that the authors of this story in its Enochic version adapted it from an Iranian source for their own ends. It is also possible they adapted a version of the Prometheus myth, either from Greek sources, or from a Hellenized Persian source (such as Commagene). The scant hints make a definitive identification impossible, but a Persian source for the diabolical *Kulturentstehungsmythos* is at least as likely as a Greek or Babylonian one. Sadly, only vague hints of the Iranian myth survive for comparison. It may be worth noting that Aeschylus’s version of Prometheus appears during the Persian period. The Greeks’ fascination with ‘oriental’ wisdom is commonly acknowledged—it has even been suggested that the Greeks were quite open to Persian ideas until Darius’s or Xerxes’s invasions.²²⁶ Potential links between Greek philosophy and Persia were noted above,²²⁷ and, if this is true, perhaps the choice between a Persian source and a Greek source is, in the final analysis, no real choice at all.

None of the parallels discussed here offer an exact match to the Asael version of the myth. However, each of the versions discussed here are probably but single reflexes of a variety of oral variations on the *Kulturentstehungsmythos*. Ancient Near Eastern scribes would have come into contact with a variety of oral traditions, and most likely would have also known some of the written, scribal traditions as well. A scribe who wished to use the *Kulturentstehungsmythos* most likely had an eclectic mix of ideas available for use, stemming from around the Ancient Near East. One should perhaps posit a scholarly *koine* or stock of tropes from which the scribe could adapt or borrow. In this *koine* it is just as likely that the authors of *1 Enoch* knew the current Persian variations on the myth as the Greek or Babylonian ones.²²⁸


²²⁷ See Chapter I.

### Asael Myth

**Types of knowledge acquired**
- Weapons, metallurgy, cosmetics, sorcery, astrology, 'iniquity'

**Weapons,** astronomy, writing, pastoralism, horse-riding, sea-faring, medicine, astrology, dream interpretation, augury, exispicy, metallurgy

**Morality of knowledge**
- Morally evil

**Divine sanction**
- Against will of God

**Giver of knowledge**
- Asael (Watcher)

**Results of knowledge for humanity**
- War, death, sin, birth of the Giants

**Results of knowledge for the Giver**
- Bound in abyss until final judgment

---

### Prometheus (Aeschylus)

**Types of knowledge acquired**
- Fire, (bad) sacrifice, clothing, well-making, metallurgy, weapons, cannibalism

**Fire,** astronomy, weaving, pastoralism, horse-riding, sea-faring, medicine, astrology, dream interpretation, augury, exispicy, metallurgy

**Morality of knowledge**
- Morally neutral

**Divine sanction**
- Against will of Zeus

**Giver of knowledge**
- Prometheus (Titan/god)

**Results of knowledge for humanity**
- Civilization; both good and bad ritual; increase in demons

**Results of knowledge for the Giver**
- Bound to rock and liver eaten (Prometheus)

---

### Masye and Masyane (ANET)

**Types of knowledge acquired**
- Not extant: wisdom not including immortality

**Fire,** (bad) sacrifice, clothing, well-making, metallurgy, weapons, cannibalism

**Morality of knowledge**
- Morally neutral

**Divine sanction**
- By Ea, unknown to divine council

**Giver of knowledge**
- Ea (god)/Adapa

**Results of knowledge for humanity**
- Civilization; temporary illnesses

**Results of knowledge for the Giver**
- Loss of immortality (Adapa)

**Morality of knowledge**
- Morally evil

---

### Adapa (Yt 19)

**Types of knowledge acquired**
- Prosperity, reputation, flock and cattle, satisfaction and honour

**Fire,** astronomy, weaving, pastoralism, horse-riding, sea-faring, medicine, astrology, dream interpretation, augury, exispicy, metallurgy

**Morality of knowledge**
- Morally neutral

**Divine sanction**
- Against will of Damaus; by implication, according to will of Ahura Mazda

**Giver of knowledge**
- The Daeuudis (demons)/Yima

**Results of knowledge for humanity**
- no frost, heat, no death or age, envy

**Results of knowledge for the Giver**
- Became prideful and lied (Yima)

---

### Figure 15: Kulturenstehungsmythos Table

**Author's Own**

---

**Excursus: The Šemihazah Myth**

Most scholars consider the Šemihazah myth to be some form of an interpretation of Genesis 5–6, which saw in the neutral account in Genesis a myth of the origins of evil. It is impossible to know exactly the extent of the tradition which was referenced/excerpted by Gen 6:1–4 or how much of said tradition survived orally, nor, therefore, how much of the interpretation in Book of Watchers is original to the Enochic tradition or was merely an

---

elaboration of lost oral material. It is highly likely the Torah’s version was known to them, even if other versions were known as well. Since the story in 1 Enoch adds narrative causality where there is none stated in Genesis, it is most probable that whomever created the Šemihazah myth in the Book of Watchers interpreted Gen 6:1–4 negatively as an explanation for the existence of demons as part of their dualistic theodicy. Such an interpretative narrative could have been inspired by a parallel story. It is worth, then, noting a parallel story which may have inspired such a reading of the Pentateuchal account.

An Avestan text, the Zāmyād Yašt §§80–81, records a myth of the demonic subjugation of women (and the demons’ subsequent defeat by Zarathuštra). The passage is quoted below in two recent translations.

80 Vor (aller) Augen pflegten vor seiner Zeit die Dämonen einherzustürmen;
Vor (aller) Augen pflegten ihre (Liebes-)Freuden stattzufinden;
Vor (aller) Augen pflegten sie
Die Frauen von ihren Männern weg zuschleppen;
Dann pflegten die Dämonen diese weinenden (und) klagenden (Frauen)
Der Gewalt zu unterwerfen.
Aber ein einziges Ahuna-Vairīia-Gebet
Welches der wahrhafte Zarathustra zu Gehör brachte,
Idem er es viermal in abschnittig gliederte,
Den hinteren (Abschnitt) mit lauterem Vortrag,
Trieb alle Dämonen hinab, so daß sie sich in der Erde verkrochen,
Die verehrungs unwürdigen, lobes unwürdigen.330

81 Before that the daēnuas would run about in full view.
(Their) pleasures would *take place in full view.
In full view they would drag off
The women from the humans.
Then the daēnuas would by force debase
Them, as they plaintively wept.
Then a single Ahuna vairīia of yours (=Ahura Mazda’s),
Which orderly Zarathustra chanted…
Drove all the daēnuas underground
Depriving them of sacrifices and hymns.331

This brief passage describes how Zoroaster ejected the Daēnuas from earth with a single recitation of the most sacred Zoroastrian formula, the so called Ahuna Vairīia prayer (=Yasna XXVII.13).332 The detail of primary interest here is the habitual activity attributed to the Daēnuas while on the earth: the violation of human women. This aspect also appears in

the version told by Moses of Khoren. Hintze notes that the language of §81 inverts the traditional Indo-European epithets of the Daenmas to underscore their demonic/non-Ahuranic attributes. This suggests a context in which some still viewed the daevic gods as valid deities. It is interesting that illicit relations with human women are discussed in the context of the demonization of heavenly figures; this is largely the same context as the Šemihazah narrative in 1 Enoch—not all Watchers are fallen (1 Enoch 20:1–8 mention the ‘holy angels who watch’). But, contrary to the Book of Watchers, the purpose of the Zamyad Yalt passage is not to explain the current situation as under demonic influence, but to explain why the current situation is not under demonic influence.

Perhaps, however, in the first Enochic version this is not so much of a difference. Chapters 12–16 describe how the flood will destroy the giants, but their spirits will proceed from them and still inflict humanity. Yet in the first version (ch. 6–11) the Watchers themselves were bound while their progeny destroyed. It is afterwards that there is an admission of their continued presence on earth. The Zoroastrian material also does not deny the current presence of evil activity on the earth, though it implies that Zoroaster curtailed the brazenness of their activity. Thus the basic outline is still similar in form—divine beings ravishing human woman are defeated, but still cause havoc in the human world. The Zamyad text, however, makes no mention of giants as progeny. Ultimately, while this passage cannot be used to argue direct influence, it is still suggestive: such a story could plausibly interact with the re-interpretation of Gen 6:1–4.

The Binding of Asael (Asael) (10:4–8, 11–14; Cf. 54:1–6)

In 10:4–8 Raphael is commissioned to bind and imprison Asael until the final judgment in the unidentified place called ‘the wilderness that is in Doudael (Δουδα'ελ/duda'el).’ The Enochic author has Asael (and vv. 11–12 Šemihazah and the

533 History of Armenia 1.24, 27 (Khorenats'i, History of the Armenians, p. 114, 117).
534 Hintze, Zamyad-Yalt, p. 345.
537 See the discussion in Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 215, 220–223, where he again discusses a parallel with Prometheus. For the reading 'Δουδα'ελ' see p. 215. There is no extant Aramaic. Doudael could be read as the Greek rendering of ננדא (‘dwelling of G-d’) (On ונדא see Koehler and Baumgartner, HAL, p. 1849; cf. p. 217; David J.A. Clines, ed., Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, vol. II: 2–1 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], p. 427). On ונדא see Koehler and Baumgartner, HAL, p. 215), which misread the resh as a dalet, or perhaps it could be understood as a rendering of a Hebrew ננדא (‘cooking pot of G-d’), (supported by Black, Book of Enoch, p. 134; Michael A. Knibb, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, vol. 2, p. 87, discusses various suggested interpretations, but does not decide between them) but both create difficulties for understanding their intended meaning.
538 Doudael could also be seen to be derived from or alluding to Hebrew ננדא, ‘mandrakes.’ (Clines, ed., Dictionary 2.1, p. 424.) Josephus notes that the mandrake had magical associations, including exorcism (Josephus, The Jewish
other Watchers) confined until the eschatological judgment rather than receiving immediate judgment or destruction like the giants and wicked humanity (10:9–10, 15). The force of this rhetoric indicates an emphasis by the author on the coming judgment rather than the one ostensibly in focus in the passage (the Flood). The text describes Asael’s ‘binding’ (δέσσω, from δέω; Aramaic not extant) and imprisonment in a pit. Nickelsburg suggests that ‘bind’ (רדט) is a semi-technical term for exorcism.338 This is possibly an intended connotation, but the eschatological context suggests that there could be more to the idea; Asael is not merely exorcised, but is held for future punishment. With the possible exceptions of the ‘Isaian Apocalypse’ and Job 7:12, this motif of binding until delayed punishment does not appear in the Hebrew Bible, somewhat surprisingly; typological enemies are slain. This is also true of the primaeval enemy per excellence, the dragon.

Nickelsburg parallels the binding motif with the Prometheus myth.339 This parallel is not compelling; in addition to the general unsuitability of the parallel argued above, Prometheus’s fate lacks both the permanence and the eschatological aspects of Asael’s binding. Prometheus is promised hope of salvation from his punishment; indeed, Hesiod indicates that Heracles ended Prometheus’s binding.340 Further, if there is an eschatological link to the Prometheus myth at all, it is to the fall of Zeus himself (line 940), not to a future judgment of Prometheus341 Certainly a threat to YHWH’s role is not intended by the Enochic author. Prometheus is not the only available regional parallel; indeed, a better parallel presents itself. The direct link with eschatology which is so present in the myth’s context in 1 Enoch makes a parallel which also shares this concern desirable. The Iranian myth of the binding of Aži Dahāka parallels the binding, a future release to judgment, the
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339 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, pp. 221–222.
340 See Aeschylus, Plays, p. 309 (line 1025); Evelyn-White, ed., Herodot, p. 117 (lines 520ff).
341 Aeschylus, Plays, p. 301.
theme of violence, and the motif of illicit marriage in the Asael narrative. The myth of the bound arch-demon present here (and recurring in Revelation) is best explained by a post-exilic combination of the Ugaritic-Canaanite *Kaoskampf* motif and the Iranian legends of Aži Dahāka.

In Iran an overtly eschatological myth of a demon-dragon bound until the last days developed around the character Aži Dahāka. Persian sources locate Dahāka’s prison inside Mount Damavand (*Qūleh-yé Damavand*), an inactive volcano 42 miles north-east of modern Teheran (see Figure 16). This mountain is well-known not only for being the highest mountain in the Near East, but for its volcanic fissures which leave sulphuric deposits and generate warm springs at the foot. Aži Dahāka is consistently portrayed as a monstrous dragon (*ažay*), although the details varied over time. *Yāt* XIX describes him as having three-muzzles, three heads, six eyes, one thousand *druj*-like senses, and having been created by Angra Mainyu to destroy the good creation. Significantly, he shares the epithet ‘of bad religion/conscience’ (*duzdainu*) with Angra Mainyu in the Avesta. He was later anthropomorphized into a human king (albeit with serpents growing from each shoulder), yet Firdausī still periodically describes Dahāka as a dragon. An appeal to this myth can answer several problems in Second Temple Judaism: it not only locates a source for the binding myth, but it also helps explain the rise of eschatology and the re-emergence of Canaanite myth in the post-exilic period.

![Figure 16: Mount Damavand](Public Domain)

---
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The defeat of a dragon or evil character is a common folk motif, and the motif of dragon combat is widespread in world mythology generally and in Semitic and Indo-European mythologies in particular. In Biblical Studies, much has been made of the fight against the 'chaos-monster'/dragon in Ugaritic and biblical materials. Yet in these the context is creation, and the emphasis is on the destruction of the monster—the dragon (תֶּרֶם, לֹא תֵּלֵי) is often described as slain (רָדָת), a description which precludes a future judgment (see Isa 51:9; Ps 74:12–17; 89:9–13; Ps 44:18–19; Ezek 29:3, 32:2; Job 26:5–14; 7:12). The Ugaritic material is very fragmented, but it appears that there were two combat stories: a 'recurrent' battle between Ba'al, Mot, and Yam, and a primeval slaying of Leviathan and his dragonic compatriots by either Ba'al or Anat. Both Anat and Ba'al claim to have killed Leviathan, but the Ugaritic tablets describe how Yam is held captive and how Ba'al was unable to overcome Mot. With the possible exception of Isa 27:1 and Job 7:12, the biblical material appears to either characterize the dragon as killed at creation, uses it as a metaphor for historic enemies, or affirms the creature's status as part of G-d's creation. This primeval defeat is used by biblical authors as evidence of YHWH's kingship and as a guarantee that he is able to defeat the audience's current enemies as well. A needed future defeat would undercut the rhetorical force of such a claim. Indeed, this usage is in contrast with Ba'al at Ugarit, who requires aid in his battles.

In Indo-European tradition, the most prominent aspect of the dragon-battle is either one of primeval defeat or of the initiation of a hero. This reflex is well attested in Iranian literature through all time periods, with the motif using several heroes and dragons as antagonists. The most common in Iran appears to have been of Thraetaona's defeat of the monster Aži Dahâka, to which allusions are found in many Avestan passages (Yašt V.29–35; XIX.14; XIV.40; XV.23–25; XVII.34; XIX.37, 92; Yáma X.9–11). The typical allusion refers to his 'smiting' (jân) of Aži Dahâka. Particularly interesting is the brief notice of a
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347 For Leviathan's death see de Moor, Religious Texts from Ugarit, p. 11, pp. 69–71; for Yam and Mot, pp. 38–42; 93–99, 131–134.
348 E.g., Ps 93:3; Nah 1:4; Hab 3:8–9; Job 3:8; Job 41:1–34; Ps 77:17–21; Dan 7. See Day, God's Conflict, p. 22, 39–40, 72–75; Watson, Chainless Unchained, p. 389, 392.
349 Day, God's Conflict, p. 22.
350 For Leviathan's death see de Moor, Religious Texts from Ugarit, pp. 95–99; 131–134.
351 Watkins, How to Kill a Dragon, p. 303.
354 Bartholomae, Adiraniranisches Wörterbuch, p. 605, for the forms jatay, jaidyai, jantay.
myth of Aži Dahāka’s illicit marriage, which does not occur in the other Indo-European versions of the motif.\(^{355}\) In Yātīt IX.14, V.34, XV.24, and XVII.34 Ôraētaona prays to a deity to help him free the two women from the dragon’s control,\(^{356}\) the motif of the women, however, is not further elaborated in the Avesta.

This (past) reflex of the Ôraētaona/ Dahāka myth stands solidly in Indo-European tradition and parallels the Babylonian and Ugaritic primaeval conflicts, but it is not the only interpretation available in the sources. The Pahlavi works mention the myth that while Ôraētaona defeated Dahāka, he was unable to kill him due to the defilement of the earth caused thereby. Instead, Ôraētaona imprisoned the monster. This is recounted in the Denkard, Book IX, a late Pahlavi text which purports to summarize the contents of (now) lost Avestan books.\(^{357}\) Further, the Denkard recounts that at the eschaton Aži Dahāka will be released upon the earth and the slumbering hero Karasaspa will be awakened to finally kill him.\(^{358}\) The Bundahšin, the Menēg-i Xrad, and the Zend-i Vahman Yāsīn also attest the story of Ôraētaona’s temporary binding of Aži Dahāka to a mountain and Karasaspa’s final victory over him at the end of history (at Frātōkāroti, i.e., the eschaton).\(^{359}\) These Pahlavi texts are late, but there are hints that this interpretation is significantly older than the Pahlavi documents. Yātt XIII.61 (ca. 800–400 B.C.E.)\(^{360}\) records that Karasaspa is asleep and watched over by the frauvasīs, implying his later reawakening.\(^{361}\) Karasaspa’s association with dragon-slaying is well-attested in the Avesta, although in connection with dragons other than Aži Dahāka.\(^{362}\) This indicates an antiquity for the sleeping hero motif, but not for the victim itself. Skjærvo suggests that the bound-until-the-eschaton-monster may be of Indo-European antiquity due to the similarity with the Fenris-wolf myth in Scandinavia, although other scholars see independent parallel developments.\(^{363}\) The important question is the dating of the alteration from slaying to temporary binding: does it date prior to 1 Enoch? Hintze suggests that the

\(^{355}\) Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, pp. 464–468, where the illicit marriage replaces stolen cattle.

\(^{356}\) The Ahan, Got, Ram, and Aži Yāts, respectively. See The Zend-Avesta II, pp. 61–2, 113, 254–255, 277.

\(^{357}\) Denkard X.10.8–11 (Pahlavi Texts IV’, p. 214).

\(^{358}\) Denkard X.15.2 (Pahlavi Texts IV’, pp. 198–99).


\(^{362}\) See Yasna 9.7–11 (Zend-Avesta, III, pp. 233–234) and references cited above.

use of the epithet Karsaspa—(used of the weapon with which kraetaona killed Aziz Dahaka) for the Saosiant (the eschatological savior) in Yast XIX already implies a conscious eschatologization of the hero myth, here associated with the saosiant rather than Karasaspa.\(^{364}\) If this is true, it would date the motif to the seventh or sixth centuries B.C.E.

The 'new' aspect to the Pahlavi descriptions, then, would not be the interim binding of the dragon, but rather Karasaspa's role as the slayer. As Hintze notes, Yast XIX fuses the Indo-European heroic tradition with Zoroastrian religious traditions of the eschatological savior.\(^{365}\) The eschatological extension of the dragon slain by the hero was a natural development from there.

There are further indications that this dating is correct. One uncertain hint is the festival of *Midrakana. In Islamic times, the festival of *Midrakana celebrated the binding of Aziz Dahaka.\(^{366}\) The same festival was celebrated in the Achaemenid period, although the sources do not indicate clearly what kind of festival it was nor whether it was already associated with the defeat of Dahaka. If Krasnowolska is correct in linking the festival with kraetaona is certainly possible.\(^{367}\) Further, the use of the motif of Karsaspa and Dahaka in the Zand-i Vahman Yasht—almost certainly originally a reaction to the fall of the Achaemenid Empire (even though the extant redaction is very late)\(^{368}\)—suggests the altered myth predated Alexander. The myth is also hinted at in the Aogmadacca §§100–101, again implying an Achaemenid dating.\(^{369}\) Thus, it seems likely that the bound and to-be-killed monster motif dates to the latter Achaemenid period at the latest, though the identification of his slayer with Karsaspa came later. The myth itself certainly predates the era of 1 Enoch.

The motif's extensive representation and linkage with eschatology make it an important aspect of Iranian religious tradition, and it fits organically into the overall belief structure. The arch-villain of created creatures is left to await his judgment at the one which

---


568 Cf. The discussion of this in the Daniel section above. Eddy, *The King is Dead*, pp. 26–32; see the references in Hultgard, "Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse," p. 119; Chapter IVa.

will befall all of Angra Mainyu’s creations—the same time when Ahura Mazda is finally able to overcome his enemies once and for all. This ‘suspended’ defeat does not sit well with pre-exilic Israelite ideas. Day argues that the conflict myth is—in both the Hebrew Bible and Ugarit—intimately intertwined with the enthronement of the chiefly worshipped deity (YHWH or Ba’al, respectively). If Day is correct about the enthronement context in the Hebrew Bible, then the image must be understood as slaying; the dragon’s temporary binding would imply that YHWH’s kingship was also only temporary, or at least could be imperilled (indeed, Ba’al’s reign was). That is certainly unacceptable in a monotheistic context. It is also foreign to the so-called Deuteronomistic historical-theology which sees G-d’s workings happening within history, rather than deferred into a post-historical time. Indeed, the idea of a binding-until-future-judgment practically requires an eschatology to merely make sense. It would be reasonable, however, for the motif to be borrowed with or formed following the development of the accompanying eschatology.

Nevertheless, the parallel between Asael and Dahaka faces a difficulty: the Book of Watchers does not describe Asael as a dragon—rather, he is called a ‘Watcher’ (ני, יָעִי), a term first appearing in the Book of Watchers and Daniel. The origin and associations of this term are obscure. Although another heavenly creature, the ‘seraph,’ has serpentine associations, it is unlikely that ‘watcher’ carried the same associations. However, both the characters of Asael and Azi do have two common traits: supernatural origin and association with blood-thirst. Azi Dahaka is noted for his desire to eliminate all humankind. In Yasti V.29–31 and Yasti XV.19–21, he is depicted praying to gods for the

570 Day, God’s Conflict, pp. 18–38.
573 It may be worth noting, however, that the word ‘dragon’ in Greek (δράκων) was possibly derived from the word δέρκεσαι, ‘to see clearly,’ (Liddell and Scott, GEL, p. 448, 379; Carol Rose, Giants, Monsters, and Dragons (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2000), p. 104) even though the Greek lexicon of the Book of Watchers used ἱεράγος to translate ‘Watchers.’ Perhaps the author’s monstrous allusions are the referent of the mysterious usage of Behemoth in 60:8, who is also thrown into Doudael. The text of the Parables is corrupt, however, and may originally be from a lost Noahic work. Cf. the discussion by Black, Book of Enoch, p. 227, 56; see a slightly different translation in Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, p. 76. This is not say the fabled Book of Noah, per se (for a critique of the Book of Noah thesis, see Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3–4,” Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich, eds. Peter W. Flint, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 231–242).
ability to clear the entire earth of inhabitants. After Dahaka’s transformation into an (Arab) usurper king, the Shahnameh still describes the blood-thirstiness of the serpents which grew from Azi’s shoulders; Firdausi actually links the blood-thirst of the serpents with Ahram’s scheme to destroy humanity. Asael is also associated with a critique of violence. Asael is blamed for teaching ‘swords of iron’ and ‘every instrument of war’ (8:1), both obviously linked with violence. The result of all of the Watchers’ teachings combined caused men to perish (8:4, 9:1); further, their progeny also caused war and bloodshed (7:3–6;8:4, 9:9c). The critique of violence was certainly associated with Asael, even if it was not the most important aspect of his narrative. Violence is certainly prominent enough to see it as a significant parallel with the character of Dahaka.

Dahaka’s monstrous/demonic qualities and his blood-thirstiness combined with his abduction of beautiful human women (see above) is certainly suggestive in the Asael context—the Book of Watchers is also concerned with illicit marriage and monstrous, numinous creatures. Even though the motif of the illicit marriage is connected with the Semihazah layer and drawn from Gen 6, it helps to explain why an Iranian myth would be useful for combining the Asael story with the Semihazah material. A blood-thirsty, woman-defiling demon bound until the final judgment certainly resonates with the Book of Watchers’ interests. In this light, it may be more useful to discuss sources of ‘inspiration’ or ‘influence’ rather than source documents. As Collins notes, perhaps the inconsistencies noted by scholars in the Book of Watchers are due less to different documents badly redacted together than to a different literate mindset. If one speaks of ‘inspiration’ rather than source documents, the possibility arises that the Asael material could well have been more instrumental in the initial compiling of the story than is sometimes considered. Perhaps it was an Asael-like story which inspired the scribe to write the Book of Watchers in the first place.

Hintze discusses the motif of the bound dragon in Zoroastrian and Jewish texts, including the passage in 1 Enoch 54:1–6. In her opinion, this motif in Judaism was adopted from the old chaos myth motif under the influence of the Iranian model. Thus, the

375 Firdausi, Shahnameh, pp. 138–139; Cf. p. 163.
376 Firdausi, Shahnameh, p. 139.
eschatologization of the Ugaritic conflict-kingship motif (and indeed its rise) can be explained through an Iranian backdrop. The Ugaritic myth resurfaces in the post-exilic (Persian) period because the themes associated with the parallel myth in the Persian setting—eschatology, dualism, coming judgment and resurrection—gave them new meaning and relevance. While the polytheistic motif of a warrior god’s ascent to kingship loses its vitality in monotheism, the eschatology of dualism returns the motif to prominence on the behalf of the deity, i.e., the messiah or saosiant brings victory on behalf of the increasingly transcendent deity. The Persian parallel, then, does not deny the relevance or importance of the Ugaritic-Canaanite parallels, but it provides a logical catalyst for their resurgence and re-adoption in post-exilic Judaism. Motifs associated with gods like Ba’al were able to be reused in a new monotheistic and future-oriented perspective without threatening YHWH’s kingship.

It has been noted that the role of the Messiah in Jewish apocalyptic literature takes over much from the divine warrior traditions of the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East. In so doing, motifs from the older religious traditions—quite possibly associated with other deities—were reinterpreted. It is suggested here that the adoption of aspects of the structurally-intertwined matrix of the Iranian system helped make such reinterpretation attractive and useful for the Second Temple scribe. The Asael narrative is one example of detailed parallels between Judaean works and Iranian myths. The parallels are at least as striking as the ones with the Prometheus myth, but they have a greater structural affinity to the Enochic work as a whole.

Whether one accepts the Asael material as original or as secondary, it cannot be denied that it was extremely important for the formation of the 1 Enoch corpus as it is currently known. Even if Šemihazah was the ‘original villain’ in the tradition, Asael eventually usurps that role, becoming a kind of embodiment of evil. While part of the origin of the Book of Watchers comes from traditions associated with Gen 6, the analyses above suggest that certain aspects of the Asael material for which the biblical verses cannot account—the motif of forbidden, cultural instruction (negative Kulturusstehungsmythos) and the temporary, eschatological binding—are at least partially due to Iranian inspiration. If one credits the responsible scribe(s) with a ‘persophilic’ hermeneutic, the Book of Watchers’s differences with Genesis become much more understandable.
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582 On a post-exilic resurgence, see Watson, Chaos Uncreated, p. 394.
585 Cf. the suggestion in Watson, Chaos Uncreated, p. 395.
Conclusions

A comparison of the various motifs associated with Asael directly or indirectly in the Book of Watchers with the Iranian traditions of the *Kulturkthungsmythos*—associated with either Yima or Mašya and Mašyânag—and the myth of Aži Dahâka’s imprisonment until the eschaton offers several useful insights. It offers an explanation for why the much older Ugaritic-Canaanite myths make a reappearance after the exile; it offers sources for the important Asael layer in the book; and, perhaps most importantly, it points to the potential importance of a new hermeneutic which developed in Second Temple Judaism.

Book of Parables/Book of Similitudes (37—71)

The dating of the Book of Parables is controversial since it was the only major section of the Ethiopic *Book of Enoch* not to have any identified Aramaic fragments at Qumran. With no physical evidence for dating, it is difficult to determine whether this lack is due to the book’s lateness, separate provenance, or the vagaries of survival. While the work probably dates later than the other Enochic books since it assumes the Book of Watchers, the identification of the Son of Man with Enoch (71:14) and similarities with the Gospels seem to require a pre-Christian date, contra Milik’s argument for a very late date. Parables is understood here to be a pre-Christian, Jewish work later than the remainder of the Enochic corpus, though Charles’s attempt to place the Parables between 94—76 B.C.E. is too precise for the available evidence. The work is important for understanding the context of the theology and ideas of the early Jesus Movement.

The Book of Parables contains many intriguing details of varying importance, many of which could be analyzed for the relevance of Iranian ideas. Only one—the motif of the weighing of souls—is discussed here; other ideas are reserved for future study.

---

**Weighing of Souls**

The image of human souls being weighed for judgment appears twice in the Book of Parables (41:1, 61:8), in neither case elaborated. This image appears once in the sapiential tradition of the Hebrew Bible. In Job 31:6 Job asks for his righteousness to be weighed (יָתוּשׁ) by G-d. It also occurs in Daniel (Dan 5:27): Belshazzar’s vision weighs him (יָתוּשׁ) and finds him delinquent. The misuse of weights is condemned and occurs often in the prophets as an indicator of justice (Deut 25:13–16; Prov 11:1, 20:23; Hos 12:7; Amos 8:5; Mic 6:11), but it is not applied directly to the judgment of people. Only in Daniel is this image used as a prerequisite or synonym for G-d’s judgment of the wicked, and the influence of Daniel on the Similitudes is hard to determine. Some translations read a reference to weighing in the closely parallel verses of Prov 16:2, 21:2 and 24:12, but the word used in each of these verses is פְּנֵי, which BDB gives as ‘regulate, measure, estimate’ and Koehler-Baumgartener as ‘examine, check.’ The latter further note that the root is cognate with פְּנֵי, ‘to make straight.’ That the latter may be a better way to read the word is supported by the reading of the LXX for 21:2, Καταλαμβάνει δὲ καρδίας χύρος, “but the Lord directs/straightens the heart.” The Targum to Proverbs translates 16:2 as “sets ways in order” and 21:2 as “sets hearts aright,” suggesting that this is the better way to translate the verses, and that no mention of ‘weighing’ is intended. Thus the verses in Job and Dan are the only clear references in the Hebrew Bible.
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390 Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch*, p. 55, 78.
392 The NRSV translates 16:2b and 21:2b as “but the Lord weights the spirit” and “but the Lord weighs the heart” respectively. R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Bible 18 (New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 106, translates 16:2 as “weighs the heart,” and parallels the phrase with Egypt, but also claims it is used here of “judgment in this life.”
394 Koehler and Baumgartner, *HAL*, p. 1784
Considering the sapiential influences on 1 Enoch in general and the Book of Parables in particular, one could argue that the idea was taken from the brief mention in Job. The question remains how such a brief mention, however, would be brought into prominence (particularly in the later Testament of Abraham). It will be suggested here that this motif was selected out of sapiential tradition under the inspiration of the Zoroastrian preoccupation with the balancing of deeds.

The eschatological weighing of the deeds of mankind holds a fundamental centrality in the Zoroastrian system that is traced to the Gāthās. This poetic-ethical idea was later expanded and taken to its logical conclusions by scholar-priests, but it retained its original relevance to Zoroastrian thought. Already in the Gāthās a three-fold division of people can be found, between the ‘truthful,’ the ‘deceitful,’ and the ‘indifferent.’ The most prominent image of judgment in the Gāthās is the one of the Bridge of Judgment or Separation, over which souls must travel to heaven or fall to hell; the hymns repeatedly hint at the motif of this individual judgment which precedes the final, eschatological one. That Raīnu was especially associated with judgment can be seen in the fact that the Yāst dedicated to Raīnu invokes him to come witness an ordeal. The cult of Raīnu was known in Achaemenid Persia, which is demonstrated by the occurrence of his name in the onomastica found at Persepolis and Egypt. Later, the Ardā Virāz Nāmag refers to Raīnu as the one with ‘the yellow golden
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401 Already suggested by Hinnells, Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies, p. 78.


403 Yasna XXXIII.1 (Insler, The Gathas of Zarathustra, p. 51).

404 On the Bridge, see Yasna XLVI.10—11, 51.13. For various allusions, see XXXI.3, 13, 20, XLV.7, XXLIX.10—11 (Insler, The Gathas of Zarathustra, p. 37, 41, 43, 51, 77, 97; in H. Humbach, et al., The Gathas of Zarathustra vol. 1, pp. 126—127, 129, 131, 165, 182, the allusions are less obvious.)

405 Cf. Māh Yast 42—43, 100, 126 (Gershevitch, Hymn to Mithra, p. 95, 123, 135). On the close connections between Sraoša, Raīnu and Mithra, see Zaehner, Dawn and Twilight, pp. 111—113.

406 See Minokhirad 119—121 (Pahlavi Texts III, p. 18).


Although Arda Virāz is a late text, the idea of the threefold division of souls (righteous, wicked, and 'indifferent,' as implied by the existence of a limbo) is a Gathic idea, mentioned in Yasna XXXIII.1, even though the Gathic support for a 'purgatory' per se appears to be about as elusive as it is in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Boyce suggests that the Gathic verse Yasna XLVIII.4 refers to a 'separate place' for the 'indifferent,' but in Insler's translation the text does not clearly refer to three places at all. However, the term Misvan Gātu—denoting a place for the 'indifferent'—does appear in the Young Avesta (Videvdat 19:36), making its currency by the end of the Achaemenid period most likely. The idea was definitely developed further by the time of the redaction of the Bundahishn, however.

It is not only Zoroastrian religious tradition which displays this preoccupation with balance; indeed, it has even been claimed that Achaemenid jurisprudence closely parallels the conception of justice as the totality of life. Herodotus relates a story of Darius I's justice which appears to support this. After crucifying a judge for accepting a bribe, Darius discovered that the man's "good services to the royal house were more than his offenses," and Darius had the man removed from the cross. While this story may be dubious historically, it is adequately illustrative of jurisprudence as the balancing of good and bad deeds in toto, rather than individual deeds or conversion experiences. Diodorus also offers a story which supports this conception. When Artaxerxes examines three judges' reasoning for the acquittal of Tiribazus, the second judge replies that Tiribazus's benefactions outweighed the accusations against him. This reply seems to have pleased the king. Claims to justice do appear in the Old Persian inscriptions, at least those of Darius (DB I.20–

---

411 I.e. the later debates and developments around 2 Macc 12:38–45, which in no way mentions a 'purgatory' but was later taken to imply one.
412 Boyce, HZ I, p. 237.
416 Moulton, Early Zoroastranism, p. 170.
24, IV.61–67, DNb 5–11),

215 but these inscriptions vary little from the stereotypical language of royal ideology in this regard. The idea of balance may have been merely a juridical ideal among the Iranians, however, as it is certainly true that all justice ultimately depended on the king's grace.220

The strict application of justice fits well into an Iranian context, but it does not fit so snugly into the Jewish system (e.g., Ezek 3:16–21). While YHWH was a god of justice, Judaism did not tend to picture him as a strict, balancing judge like Ra`inn. Indeed, there is a strong tradition stretching through the rabbinic writings which emphasize the necessity of mercy for the existence of justice itself,221 and mercy is by definition not strict. It is quite possible, however, under the influence of the Zoroastrian-Persian preoccupation with balance that the verse in Job was selected out and utilized in the Book of Parables as the symbol of the individual judgment.

The image of a divine scale-holder is not limited to Iran; it also occurs in Egypt. The Book of the Dead depicts the hearts of the dead being weighed against Ma`at, to determine whether or not they are worthy of eternal life,222 and an Egyptian background is typically conceded for parts of Proverbs.223 The basic idea is the same in the Persian and Egyptian systems, but the emphasis is slightly different. In the Iranian version, the person's good actions, words, and thoughts are weighed against his or her own bad actions, words and thoughts; in the Egyptian version, the person's heart is weighed against Ma`at. Although either could have in theory served as a catalyst towards the choice of the scales-image, the Persian version is technically closer in terminology—in both 1 Enoch 41:1 and 61:8 it is the deeds224 rather than the hearts of humanity which are weighed. For this particular detail, then,


424 No Greek or Aramaic versions of the Book of Parables have yet been found, so the original word has been left out here. See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 15.
the closest parallel is Persian, and it represents an example of influence by the selection of pre-existing ideas.

**Conclusion for Book of Parables**

It is unfortunate that the provenance and dating of the *Parables* is so uncertain, but the detail of the weighing of souls offers another example where the re-interpretation and selection of Judaean material could have been in dialogue with Iranian ideas. This particular detail did not have a particularly distinguished afterlife in Judeo-Christian traditions, but it may serve as an indication that further research into the *Similitudes* could prove fruitful.

**Astronomical Book/ Book of Luminaries (72–82)**

The *Astronomical Book*, also called the *Book of Luminaries*, is often considered among the oldest of the *1 Enoch* corpus, perhaps dating to the Persian Period. Considered on its own, the *Book of Luminaries* may not strictly be an apocalypse, but the worldview it evidences is significant for the remainder of the *1 Enochic* corpus and is foundational to the understanding of the remainder. Indeed, the matrix of ideas and influences evidenced in the *Astronomical Book* is suggestive of those which influenced the Enochic scribes in general.

The *Book of Luminaries* contains two enigmatic details—the concept of astronomical solar 'gates' and the mythical geography of chapter 77. Although the document is highly indebted to Mesopotamian traditions, it is argued here that the direct source of these two details can be best explained as mediated by an Iranian source. The ultimate Mesopotamian origin of the astronomy cannot be gainsaid, but the exact formulations found in the extant book may be shaped by intermediate Iranian hands.

**Solar Gates**

The treatise describes a series of twelve gates, six on the east and six on the west, through which the sun and moon enter and exit in their daily motions (72–73, 75),

---


427 This section benefited from Helen R. Jacobus (University of Manchester) discussing the Babylonian aspects of the *Astronomical Book* and highlighting several useful resources.
accounting for the variation in day-length. As Neugebauer notes, the linear scheme given to the variation in the ratio of day to night (‘linear zigzag function’) is most likely of Babylonian origin.\textsuperscript{428} The detail of the ‘gates’ to which the text gives so much attention is paralleled in the cosmologies of Babylonia, although there related to the Zodiac.\textsuperscript{429} This detail is also paralleled in the Iranian cosmological collection, the \textit{Bundahišn}. It seems likely—in view of the similarities with the Iranian material—that either the Enochic book derives its information from an Iranian source, or both of these are dependent on the same Babylonian one.

In the \textit{Greater Bundahišn} Vb.1–11; IX.5–6/ //\textit{Shorter Bundahišn} V.3–9,\textsuperscript{430} the sun, moon, and constellations come and go through a series of 360 ‘apertures’ in Mount Alburz, 180 in the East and 180 in the West, with five overlapping re-uses of apertures. Mount Alburz was viewed as both a peak in the center of the world and as the mountain range which ringed the disk of the world.\textsuperscript{431} These apertures in the world-mountain appear to be the exact parallel of the gates in the \textit{Book of Luminaries}. The gates or apertures in each are symmetrical, at the east and west horizons, and linked to specific calendrical units of time. The Iranian origin of this detail seems to be confirmed by the note in \textit{1 Enoch} 72:5. This verse describes how the sun moves north during the night in order to return to the east for the morning. The \textit{Greater Bundahišn} Vb.11/ \textit{Shorter Bundahišn} V.4 describes how it is the Peak of Mount Alburz (in the centre of the world) which hides the light of the sun, moon, and stars when they are not visible, while they travel behind it.\textsuperscript{432} As the Iranians viewed the human habitation to be south of this peak, this implies that the heavenly bodies travel to the north, and thus behind the peak from the point of view of human observers. It is the cosmic mountain in the center and ringing the earth which hides the sun in the night-time hours. Perhaps the seven mountains where ‘days, seasons and years pass by’ in \textit{1 Enoch} 77:4 confirms the idea of mountains being related to these astronomical phenomena.

\textsuperscript{428} Neugebauer, \textit{The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters}, p. 11. See the helpful Figure 1 on the same page, illustrating the linear scheme.
\textsuperscript{430} Ankesaria, \textit{Zand-Akāstih}, pp. 64–67, 94–95; \textit{Pahlavi Texts I}, pp. 22–24. West already noted this similarity, although did not seem to see a significance in it; \textit{Pahlavi Texts I}, p. 23, n.1. Cf. a footnote in West, \textit{The East Face}, p. 143, n. 186, although he seems to view the Bundahišn’s account as a later culmination.
A further hint of the Iranian origin of this detail is the description of the sun riding a chariot across the sky (72:5; 75:4). This is typical language in the Iranian traditions and is mostly likely to be of Indo-Iranian date due to its occurrence in the Rig Veda. Although the image of the sun riding a chariot is common to mythological language and so cannot be used to prove influence from any direction, it does fit well into a thesis for a Persian source-mediated source for the solar gates in the Book of Luminaries. This conception of multiple gates for the sun’s chariot-drive across the sky appears to be a combination unique to the Book of Luminaries and Iran.434

While cosmologies of the sun’s daily journey are important in Egypt, Babylonia and Greece, the details of that journey are significantly different than the picture presented in the Book of Luminaries. In these, the sun travels in a boat or barque through the heavens during the day and through the underworld at night.435 The Astronomical Book gives no hint of an underworld journey for the sun in the text; indeed it specifies a northerly path. The idea of cosmological gates also appears in these systems, but they function in several different ways. When gates appear there, they are either the gates into/from the underworld or are the stations along the spiritual highway from the netherworld to heaven, as later appeared in the Mithraic Mysteries.436 In neither of these cases are the gates linked to calendrical observance or the variation of day-length as in 1 Enoch and the Bundahisn. A third use is a division of the sky as West describes (although he does not discuss the connection between the underworld associations on the one hand, or the calendrical ones on the other).437 The other descriptions of heavenly gates for the winds in 1 Enoch 74:5–6 and 76 do sound more like the meteorological/astrological gates West describes. However, it is possible these are intended to be the ‘windows’ mentioned in 72:3, or they could stem from a separate tradition.

433 In the Mibor Yalt §13, the sun is described as ‘swift-horsed sun’; in X.141–143, the sun is described as the wheel of Mithra’s chariot. See Gershevitch, The Avestan Hymn to Mithra, p. 80, 135.
434 Albani, Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube, pp. 155–156, however, notes that this image was known in Palestine prior to the exile, but sees it as a sign of a Babylonian origin nevertheless. The present author sees it as more of an ambiguous note that is simply congruent with a Persian source (amongst the other influences).
439 West, The East Face, pp. 139–143.
than the one of the solar gates. A closer parallel is a tradition of four ‘seasonal’ gates (for the equinoxes and solstices) in Babylonia and Greece. These four gates were associated with the zodiac, but the constellations—let alone the zodiac—are an aspect of astronomy strikingly absent from the extant Book of Luminaries. It should be noted, however, that Bundahisn II also makes much of the zodiac.

Albani, followed by Gleßmer, argues that the gate idea is borrowed from Babylon. Yet his argument is not an exact correspondence between the two systems; he claims, rather, that the author of the Astronomical Book combined the ideas of the zodiacal gates and the solar (horizontal) gates to make room for his angelic theology. Later, even though he finds it most unlikely, he refuses to totally rule out the possibility of Persian influences. While the overall astronomical system does indeed appear to be based on the MUL.APIN, the extremely close correspondence between the solar gates in the Bundahisn and the Astronomical Book requires an explanation, and it is worth investigating.

Both the Enochic and Persian systems seem to be originally based upon a 360-day scheme; the Bundahisn has the Sun using an aperture per day, and the Book of Luminaries has the Sun using one per month. Both texts graft epagomenal days onto a 360-day system, 5 apertures re-used by the former, and 4 months with 31 days in the latter. The attempt at adaptation of a 360-day scheme to 364-days in the Astronomical Book can be seen in the linear adaptation of the mathematics involved is simple (p. 260). A simple summary and explanation of the relevant mathematics is available in Helmer Aslaksen, "Fake Leap Months in the Chinese Calendar: From the Jesuits to 2033," http://www.math.nus.edu.sg/aslaksen/calendar/2033-talk.pdf, pp. 2-9.


442 Neugebauer, The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters, p. 4. Cf. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic, p. 69. While the stars and zodiac are absent from the Astronomical Book, they certainly were not from Qumran, e.g., 4Q318 (4QBrontologion), which mentions the zodiac (Martinez and Tigchelaar, eds., The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, pp. 677–679).

443 Ankleština, Zand-Akäwüns, pp. 30–35.


446 Albani, Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube, pp. 170–171.

447 See the detailed and complex discussions of the mathematics and astronomy in Albani and in Gleßmer. (Albani, Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube, and Gleßmer, “Horizontal Measuring,” pp. 259–282). It is amusing that Gleßmer implicitly claims the mathematics involved is simple (p. 260).
360-day scheme in chapter 72 and the note in 83, and is perhaps hinted at in 75:1-2 and 82:4-6, 11-12. The official Old Persian calendar was based on a simplification (or 'schematization') of the Babylonian (lunar) calendar: 360 days plus intercalated months, and the original Zoroastrian calendar also was 360-day. Whatever the actual calendrical practices used or implied by the *Astronomical Book*, it is clear the Enochic scribes were not ignorant of the complexities of solar and lunar reckoning. Thus, it seems probable that the scheme of apertures/gates was both devised and borrowed in a context which presumed a 360-day year. It is unclear when a 365-day calendar was adopted in Iran, but in any case the aperture-scheme must have pre-dated its adoption by a significant amount of time. Segal argues that *1 Enoch*’s insistence on a 364-day calendar implies the introduction of a 365.25-day one, such as operated under the Seleucids. The complexity of the text makes this highly uncertain—is the *Book of Luminaries* advancing a new calendar, or defending an old one? Since both 360-day and 364-day schemes appear to have been known in Babylonia and in Israel for many centuries prior to *1 Enoch*, just as the 365-day scheme was in Egypt, it is difficult to determine priority. Segal takes the reaction against 365.25-day scheme to be indicative of a Hellenistic/Seleucid date, but, according to Hartner, a 365.25-day calendar

---


452 It is worth noting that 364-day schemes apparently were known in Babylonia as well; see Uwe Gießener and Matthias Albani, “An Astronomical Measuring Instrument from Qumran,” *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 442, n. 81.


454 Segal, “Intercalation and the Hebrew Calendar,” pp. 293–301.

was introduced in the Achaemenid Empire between 457–454 B.C.E.\(^{556}\) This would seem to require the aperture/gate motif to date to the fifth century at the latest, and most likely a good deal earlier.

The difference between the systems of the gates and apertures—namely, between 360 and 12—can be explained by the rhetorical intent of the Book of Luminaries. 1 Enoch 82:4–6 makes the religious-polemical point of the gates apparent: the placement of the four epagomenal days is determined by the sun’s movement through the gates. If gates existed for each day, then the placement of the extra days would be of little cosmological consequence; they could be placed wherever. However, because the sun enters and exits through four gates 31 days rather then 30, the placement of the days must belong in those particular months to correspond with the divine ordinance, the discrepancy with reality notwithstanding. Thus, the polemic of the Book of Luminaries easily explains the change of gates/apertures from days to months. If a further reason was required, the symbolic resonances of the number twelve for Judaean tradition could also have played a part.

Neugebauer notes that there are ‘windows’ on either side of the gates in 72:3, presumably through which the stars travel.\(^{457}\) This may be an accommodation to the Zodical gates, which do not play a significant role in the Astronomical Book like the sun or the moon. The relative reticence of the text about the stars and constellations may be motivated by the Enochic corpus’s angelology—rather than focusing on the (calendrically irrelevant?) movement of the stars,\(^{388}\) the text reserves discussion of them to their theological relevance, as one finds in 1 Enoch 82. In the logic of the book, the angelic hierarchy is not discussing a fundamentally different reality; it certainly is not imperative to consider it an interpolation.\(^{459}\)

The role of angelic beings is a significant motif of the Enochic literature, and the idea of divinities being associated with or identified with the stars is common in the Ancient Near East, including Persia and Israel. In fact, in Zoroastrian cosmology, the stars were created by Ahura Mazda to withstand the attack of Angra Mainyu against his creation.\(^{460}\) As Collins

---


\(^{457}\) Neugebauer, The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters, p. 10.

\(^{458}\) The stars are important for time-reckoning, but the Book of Luminaries does not appeal to them in this capacity. The book limits its discussion to the sun and moon. Qumran, however, did allow for the calendrical usefulness of the stars; see the discovery of the astronomical instrument from Qumran, Gießener und Albani, “An Astronomical Measuring Instrument from Qumran,” pp. 407–442.


notes, the concept of astral divinities was old in Israel, and astral warriors can be found in the Ugaritic-Canaanite mythology. The identity of the stars and (some of) the angels is more important to the Enochic author than their calendrical or zodiacal aspects. This is not a real difference with the Iranian ideas, as the Persians themselves seem to have borrowed the zodiac from Babylon. If an Iranian-mediated source is therefore posited for the Astronomical Book, then this would perhaps date it before the Iranians absorbed the zodiac but after borrowing calendrical reckoning.

Ravid claims that the astronomical calculations of 1 Enoch 72 point to an origin in modern Turkey; this would place the borrowing of the motif of the solar gates among the Iranian diaspora in Anatolia. If this is correct, then the relationship between the calendars in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and at Qumran becomes even more complex. However, this claim would appear to be astronomically unsubstantiated.

Another minor detail in the Astronomical Book—which is later taken up in the Enochic tradition—is an unexpected emphasis on cold as a negative or inherently evil phenomenon (76:6,11,12; Cf: 17:7, 6:7; 34:2–3; 60:17–19; 67:11–13; 100:13). Elliot has already noticed the unexpectedness of this meteorological opinion in the context of the Book of Luminaries, which he interprets as 'novel directions' in the interpretation of the covenant curses. He explains these references as a peculiar 'familiarity with the ravaging effects of cold' (emphasis original). In Iranian tradition winter and cold are themselves creations of Angra Mainyu; hell itself is described as cold. This belief makes perfect sense in a tradition which was born in the central Asian steppes with its long, harsh winters. It seems likely therefore that this detail was picked up from the general milieu by the early Enochic tradents and from there become a stock part of the tradition, even in areas where cold presents little real difficulties.

---


642 For example, see Dennis Pardee, Ritual and Cult at Ugarit, Writings from the Ancient World 10 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2002), Text 18 (pp. 69–72).


645 Brian R. Espey, personal communication to author (4 Apr 2008). The author is grateful to Professor Brian Espey, Trinity College Dublin, who attempted to correlate the information in the Astronomical Book to a latitude, but could not correlate it with an Anatolian setting.


The details discussed above in the *Astronomical Book* are in the sections most likely to be original, making them part of the oldest surviving strands of the Enochic tradition. The use of such details is to be expected; the overall number of scholar-scribes in the Ancient Near East can never have been a massive number (like modern academics in a given field), and ideas must have been shared among scribes of different backgrounds, particularly in massive multi-ethnic empires like the Persian or Hellenistic ones. In the discussion over Babylonian 'science' in *1 Enoch*, the Persian details have gone largely unnoticed. While the vast majority of the Ancient Near Eastern 'scholarly community' was most likely from the old Babylonian and Assyrian centres, the above discussion seems to imply that Persian scholars participated in the general intellectual milieu alongside their more famous Babylonian colleagues. Babylon was not the only source of learning from which the Judaean scribes likely drew. Perhaps in this context, Mowinkel's 'Irano-Chaldaean syncretism' is in fact apt.\textsuperscript{168}

*Mythic Geography*\textsuperscript{169}

*1 Enoch* 77 (and parts of 76) contain a mythological geography of the world which is rather laconic and peculiar, bearing little resemblance either to traditions in the Hebrew Bible or to traditions in the book of *Jubilees*.\textsuperscript{170} The text of the *Book of Luminaries* is particularly problematic; while Aramaic fragments have been found which have been assigned to the Enochic work, they often do not overlap or closely correspond with their Ethiopic counterparts.\textsuperscript{171} Parts of these chapters do have some surviving Aramaic fragments relevant to the mythical geography of the world (of interest here are 4Q209, frag. 23 and 4Q210 ii 13–20).\textsuperscript{172} Although the textual problems and the paucity of elaboration make the task difficult, it is worth attempting to identify some of the sources or influences behind the traditions extant in the passage. While the geographical traditions evidenced in these chapters most likely contain a scholastic amalgam of Hellenistic and Near Eastern traditions,

\textsuperscript{168} Mowinkel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 432–433.

\textsuperscript{169} The author is grateful to Dr. Mark Geller and Dr. Joan Taylor for their help and advice on this section.


there are several details which may find a suitable location in Iranian traditions. The topics considered here are a schematic division of the world into sevenths, the identification of the seven islands, and the import of royal Iranian ideology.

In his presentation of the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, Milik proposes that the closest parallel to the Enochic geography is the so-called ‘Babylonian World Map’. He bases this claim on two points: the appearance of the word ‘seven’ in 77:4 of the Aramaic text and a circular river, which he claims parallels seven outer, triangular regions beyond an encircling river on the Babylonian map; in this he has been followed by several scholars (See Figures 17–18). The relevance of the number seven for the text of the *Book of Luminaries* could derive from several textual bases: the appearance of the number seven in line 9 of 4Q209, fragment 23, the Ethiopic version of verse 3 (which implies a six-fold division around a central location), or the reference to ‘islands’ in verse 8.

---

**Figures 17 and 18: Milik’s Reconstruction of the Babylonian World Map and of 1 Enoch 77**


The so-called ‘Babylonian World Map’ (British Museum BM92687, Figure 19) is only partially extant. Only five of the outer triangles are (partially) visible. However, upon closer inspection of the artifact it appears to the present author that the Babylonian map originally had *eight* rather than seven outer regions. The reverse inscription describes eight regions or *nagu*, and, although Horowitz cautions against identifying them with the

---

475 A redrawing and photograph is available in Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*, pp. 402–3, 405–6, respectively. I am grateful to Helen Jacobus for this reference.
transmundane regions on the obverse, the available space seems to make eight original regions most likely.\textsuperscript{476} In his discussion of the parallel, Milik himself notes that the geographical/cosmological horizons of the passage in \textit{1 Enoch} are ‘astonishingly wide,’ particularly in comparison with the Babylonian Map, which only depicts the environs of the city from the source of the Euphrates to Elam. If neither the geographical horizons, the content, nor the number of regions corresponds to the Babylonian Map, one wonders in what respect they are similar. VanderKam rightly rejects the dependency of \textit{1 Enoch 77} on the Babylonian map, but due to his focus on the text of v. 3, he rejects the import of the number seven, ignoring the general motif of seven in the chapter (possibly v. 3, vv. 4, 5, 8) and the possible appearance of the word ‘seven’ in the Aramaic of 77:4.\textsuperscript{478} VanderKam argues that the author of 77 knew two world division schemes (a fourfold and a threefold) so that there is no support in the Aramaic text for Milik’s appeal to seven in 23:9.\textsuperscript{479} While this may be true for 23:9, it ignores chapter 77. In his and Nickelsburg’s new translation of \textit{1 Enoch}, 77:3 retains the threefold division (making a total of seven), although it lacks the reference to seven in v. 4.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{Figure_19}
\caption{Babylonian World Map \newline BM 92687. Used by Permission of the British Museum. © The Trustees of the British Museum.}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{477} Milik, \textit{Books of Enoch}, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{478} VanderKam, “Babylonian Map,” p. 272. See Tigchelaar and Martinez, “4Q Astronomical Enoch\textsuperscript{a,b},” pp. 159–161. In line 9, $\Psi$ and $\Psi$ are extant, and they reconstruct the $\Pi$. This seems to be the seven on which Milik made his claim, rather than v. 3. However, James C. VanderKam, “The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition,” \textit{Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables}, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), p. 96, finds this reading dubious.

The first necessary consideration, in light of the textual difficulties, is whether a sevenfold schematic division of the world is relevant at all to the mythic geography in Chapter 77. The Ethiopic texts of vv. 1–3 describe four quarters, the north one of which is divided into three parts, making a total of six regions.480 This would equate to a seven-region scheme if a central region (Jerusalem/Judah) was implied. However, the word רדניא preceded by a lacuna, appears in the text of 4Q209 and no word for north. On this basis, Knibb, Tigchelaar and Martinez, and VanderKam see two original, unconnected schemes in the Aramaic: a four-fold and a three-fold.481 However, the part of the phrase preceding ‘earth,’ ‘and I saw three’ (הלך ויהיו) is reconstructed, not extant. It is possible that the original text did describe the northern quarter rather than the entire earth, but the fragments cannot demonstrate it definitively either way. However, 4Q209 when paralleled with 4Q210 implies that the fourfold scheme applied to a quartering of the sky, and thus not relevant to the mythic geography at all.482 A mysterious ‘seven’ is reconstructed further in the verse (in line 9) by Milik and by Martinez and Tigchelaar, which Martinez and Tigchelaar understand as a reference to Milik’s ‘ultra-terrestrial regions.’483 If this reconstruction is correct, then a sevenfold scheme is still applicable to the Aramaic.484 As seen above, the Babylonian Map contained eight regions rather than seven, troubling Milik’s comparison. Further, the text of 77 does not mention a surrounding river, which was Milik’s other point of comparison.

The attempt to see a sevenfold scheme in vv. 1–3 is admittedly difficult. However, a better case can be presented for its relevance later in the chapter. The last verse of chapter 77 contains an enigmatic sentence, in Nickelsburg’s translation, “I saw seven large islands in the sea and on the land—two on the land and five in the Great Sea.”485 Even on first glance this verse appears corrupted—what is the meaning of ‘islands on land’? However, Neugebauer, following Dillman, identifies the two islands ‘on land’ as Mesopotamia and Meroe, ‘land[s] between rivers.’486 The textual data is in fact problematic. In their respective translations, both Isaac and Nickelsburg and VanderKam note that the Ethiopic manuscripts vary between the ‘Great Sea’ and the ‘Erythrean Sea,’ as well as in the numbers.487 There is no extant Aramaic. However, the Greek fragment Oxyrhynchus 2069 (fragment 3, line 37)

484 The photographs in Milik and Martinez and Tigchelaar, however, do not clearly show anything but the lamed to the present author.
486 Neugebauer, *The Astronomical Chapters*, p. 27.
mentions the ēρυθρα Ὠκεανός in the text for v. 8. The evidence of the Greek fragment and common logic favours accepting Isaac’s suggestion for reconstructing the original: “I saw seven big islands—two in the Great Sea, and five in the Red Sea” or a similar phrasing. The Greek name ‘Erythrean Sea’ can apply to either or both of the bodies of water currently called the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. In both Greek and Persian usage, the Red Sea and Persian Gulf appear to have been considered a single body of water. This reconstruction still begs the question of the significance of these islands and their placements in their respective bodies of water; all of the bodies of water potentially concerned (the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf) all contain more than seven islands each.

Several interpretations could be considered. 1) They refer to real islands. These islands could be islands either well-known to the author, considered particularly large, or perhaps which housed Judaean communities. If one wished to see these islands as related to a general sevenfold division of the world, then perhaps the geographer here intended to imply that the Mediterranean and the ‘Erythrean’ Seas surrounded the whole world. If one wished to identify real islands as the intended referents, one is left to speculation as to their significance. A quick glance at an atlas reveals well over seven islands in each respective body of water. Since Judaeans probably did live on islands in both seas, it is possible that the number is related to islands with Judaean compatriots. Such an enumeration would be unique, however, and either a reference to world regions or else an expansion on the number seven would seem more likely explanations; 2) The number is merely symbolic, or perhaps corrupted. Such an interpretation cannot be wholly discounted, but one would expect either three or four if such were the intent. Rather than seeing a corruption in the number, however, one could argue that ‘islands’ is a poor translation of the intended

689 Isaac, “1 Enoch,” p. 56, n. s.
690 Liddell and Scott, GEL, p. 693.
692 The status of the Persian Gulf region in the Achaemenid period is still poorly known. See Jean-François Salles, “Les Acheménides dans le Golfe Arabo-Persique,” Centre and Periphery: Achaemenid History IV, eds. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg and Amelie Kuhrt (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1990), pp. 111–130; The present author is grateful to Fr. Murray Watson for translating this). However, Heinrich Schiwek, “Der Persische Golf als Schiffahrts- und Seehandelsroute in achämenidischer Zeit und in der Zeit Alexanders des Grossen,” Bonner Jahrbücher 162 (1962): p. 17, claims that the voyages of Scylax and Nearchus demonstrate that the islands in the Gulf were controlled, at least from Darius I–Artaxerxes II (pp. 19–20).
693 Upon inspection of the Times Atlas of the World (1994) by the author, there appears to be over 50 islands in both the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, and easily over 100 islands in the Mediterranean.
A word for 'island' in Hebrew and in the Aramaic of Qumran is "N. While often translated 'island' or 'coastland,' the context of its use in the Hebrew texts often stretches that meaning to the point of meaning rather 'region' or 'dry land' (e.g., Isa 42:15; Ezek 26:15, 18; 39:6; Ps 97:1). If this word underlies the Ethiopic translation, then the difficulty of the distinction between 'on land' and 'in the sea' is removed, and a sevenfold continent-like scheme emerges. The best interpretation then is 3) they refer to general regions rather than islands.

If the Babylonian World Map was inadequate, from where could a sevenfold scheme be derived? A Greek source for the sevenfold scheme is unlikely. The basic paradigm for world-division was either a fourfold division based on the cardinal directions or a threefold division along the three known continents (Europe, Asia, Africa). Indeed, this appears to have deeply influenced the author of Jubilees, in which Greek traditions are merged with traditions of the Hebrew Bible. Similarly, insofar as there is a Judaean tradition, it is also based on either a three- or fourfold division—either a basic 'four-corners of the earth' scheme or a division between the three sons of Noah. Even though seven is a common symbolic number in the Ancient Near East and in Israel, it does not appear to have been applied to a schematic understanding of geography; schematic geographies tend to be three- or fourfold rather than sevenfold. Another geographical scheme was, however, known in the region, the Iranian scheme of seven *karšuwar* (Pahlavi *kišvars*), or world-regions.

Of course, the number seven long had significance in Judaean traditions, and one may wish to see this chapter as simply an extension of this tendency, even though it is nowhere previously connected with geography. However, if a sevenfold division is accepted, it can be suggested that in the greater apocalyptic context these seven large regions derive from the Iranian idea of *karšuwar*, as part of a developing understanding of the divine empire à la the Persian Great King.

494 The author is grateful to the audience at the International SBL in Rome, 2009, for making this observation.
497 Alexander, "Imago Mundi," pp. 197–213. It is worth noting that the author of Jubilees is aware of the many islands of the Mediterranean as well as the Iranian plateau (pp. 206–207, 208).
In part of various Iranian traditions of many eras, in particular royal ideologies, the world was believed to consist of seven island-regions, or *karšnuar.*\(^{500}\) Perhaps the most complete explication of the concept can be found in the Pahlavi work, the *Bundahisn,* although the concept is mentioned in much earlier Avestan texts as well. According to this text, the middle *karšnuar,* *X'anirada,* was the largest, as well as the one inhabited by men. These *karšnuars* are not strictly speaking ‘islands’—separated by bodies of water—but were separated from each other by a variety of means, such as water, forest, or mountain, much like the modern continent.\(^{501}\) Indeed, *X'anirada* was separated from the eastern and western *karšnuars* by two great rivers.\(^{502}\) The *Bundahisn* describes a central *karšnuar* surrounded by six *karšnuars* on the east, south-east, south-west, west, north-west, and north-east.\(^{503}\) This formulation seems designed to represent the geographical situation of Iran, as Iran was typically identified with the central *karšnuar* (See Figures 20–21). The concept of the seven-part world became important for Persian royal ideology, and was utilized by many native Iranian dynasties as part of their claim to be *Iranian* rulers.\(^{504}\) Claims to rule over the ‘seven part earth’ can be found in royal discourse in many eras in Iran,\(^{505}\) and in the context of Achaemenid ideology, the rhetoric would have served the Great Kings’ claims to be Ahura Mazda’s agents of reform on earth.\(^{506}\) That the concept and importance of the sevenfold division can be reliably dated to at least the Achaemenid period and is not merely a later formation is due to several important archaeological finds: an Achaemenid period earring, a papyrus, and several of Darius the Great’s inscriptions.\(^{507}\)

---


For royal connotations, see the argument set forth below as well as the following: *Yima and the seven-part earth: Yalt* XIX.31; *Shāhnāme* I (p. 123, 238, etc.); *Vidērdaht* I.4 (*The Zend-Avesta* I, p. 12).


\(^{505}\) Cf. Its use as an imperial trope in the *Shāhnāme,* Firdausī, *Shāhnāme,* vol. 1, p. 123, 238; vol. 2, p. 15, 372, etc.


\(^{507}\) This was first pointed out by A. Shapur Shahbazi, “Darius’ ‘Haft Kešvar,” *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* Supp 10 (1985): pp. 239–246. The following argument for dating largely follows his demonstration.
An Egyptian Aramaic papyri published by Kraeplng contains a mysterious title for an Achaemenid commander, $\text{NaNAN}$.

Contrary to Kraeplng’s opinion, Henning argues that this title ultimately reflects an original Aramaic $\text{NaNAN}$, which would reflect a Persian title $\text{HAFT} \times \text{WAPATA}$, or ‘protector of the seventh.

Although this form is unattested, he argues a

---


similar form is found as a toponym on the Persian coast. From this title he tentatively adduces that a sevenfold division of administrative districts was a typical part of Achaemenid administration, and sees a parallel in the idea of karšunār. While this conclusion is a bit over-reaching, at least an ideological aspect of administration seems to be implied by it. The ideological importance of seven, at least for Darius I, can be demonstrated by additional means.

It has long been noted that in several of his self-depictions, Darius is surrounded by six supporters, and this has been compared to Ahura Mazda and his six Amāz Spāntas. On his tomb Darius is flanked on both sides by six supporters, although on his apology at Bisotun/Behistun only two figures stand behind the king. The accompanying inscription at Behistun, however, identifies Darius’s six co-conspirators by name. The numerical parallel could imply a deliberate parallel between Ahura Mazda and his six Amāz Spāntas, Darius and his six Supporters, and Iran and the world’s subject six karšunār (See Figure 22). While the parallels between the Amāz Spāntas and Darius have been challenged, as Shahbazi demonstrates, a gold Achaemenid earring seems to more clearly represent the import of a centre with six supports.

A gold Achaemenid earring held in the Boston Museum of Fine Art (and apparently elsewhere as well) has a winged figure in a disk surrounded by six figures in disks and another disk with a water lily in it (see Figure 23). Shahbazi notes that the design on the earring matches Iranian geographical conceptions in several ways: both consist of a round plate, encircled by pointy objects (mountains or triangles), containing a large central region surrounded by six smaller regions. The water lily on the earring symbolizes the mythical surrounding Vouru-kasā sea, which Shahbazi identifies with the “Sea which flows from Persia” (DZc) (see Figure 24). That the image preserved on this earring has religious

---


512 Shahbazi, “Darius’ Haft Kilvar,” p. 246, understands Henning’s article as confirmation of his own thesis (which is discussed further below).


significance in the context of Iran is clear; its political import is made apparent when one realizes that the central winged figure is closely allied with the Great King in Achaemenid iconography. In Shahbazi’s opinion, a political connection also explains a comment by Plato in his *Laws* that Darius divided the empire into seven parts. As far as the satrapal system organized by Darius is known, it did not consist of a sevenfold organization; however, Plato could very well be transmitting a (misunderstood) part of royal ideology here, just as he repeated the Behistun story in the previous paragraph of *Laws*. In other words, it is a conceptual rather than an administrative division. Shahbazi believes that such an ideological division further explains the order of subject peoples listed on Darius’s tomb (DNa §3). Taking the geographical distribution and sequence of the peoples listed into account, Shahbazi finds seven conceptual regions in the list: which he labels as central, western, east/north east, ‘borderlands’, western lowlands, north/northwest, and the southern coast (see Figure 24); this pattern parallels both the Iranian *Kariyuurs* and a motif of a central figure surrounded by six supports. This earring, in connection with the other pieces of evidence, would seem to confirm, then, that the traditional Iranian royal claim to rule the seven-part earth played an important role in the ideology of Darius the Great.

![Diagram of Darius and His Supporters and Ahura Mazda and his Amaša Spantas](image)

**Figure 22: Darius and His supporters and Ahura Mazda and his Amaša Spantas**

Author’s Own.

---

519 Indeed, Shahbazi argues that it symbolizes the Great King’s *Xwaranid, or ‘Kingly Fortune’; see Shahbazi, “An Achaemenid Symbol I,” pp. 135—144; Shahbazi, “An Achaemenid Symbol II,” pp. 119—147. Whatever the case about his identification, it cannot be denied that the symbol is ubiquitous on official inscriptions, reliefs, and seals.


If one takes the current form of the Ethiopic in 77:3, the early Iranian map bears striking resemblances to the Enochic one. A central (important) region is surrounded by six other regions, and two religiously significant mountains (Hara/Ushendava and Zion/Sinai respectively) appear in the centre and on the periphery. The idea of a sevenfold conceptual division has been altered to a Jerusalem-centered one from an Iran-centered one. However, as noted above, the extant Aramaic of verse three probably has two distinct divisions, a fourfold and a three-fold. Unfortunately, the lacuna in 4Q209, 23, lines 8—9, do not seem to allow much confidence in how this division was understood. The appearance of most of the word 'seven' in line 9 could imply a similar sevenfold division as reconstructed above, or it could be part of one of a tripartite scheme (as Milik and Tigchelaar and Martinez seem to understand it).

However, although very different in wording, commentators agree that the 'general sense' of vv. 2–3 are the same in both the Ethiopic and Aramaic versions, presenting the possibility that an Ethiopic's conflation of three+four still preserves the intended meaning of the Aramaic. Yet, a more solid basis for a division is seven islands in verse 8.

Figure 23: Achaemenid Earring
BMFA.1971.256. Used by Permission of the BMFA. © Boston Museum of Fine Arts

The parallel adduced here is very slim, but the possibility that *1 Enoch* 77 echoes the Iranian *karsuuars* must be set within a context of Persian imperialism and of developing views of cosmology in Second Temple Judaism.

The Achaemenid kings inherited a rich tradition of royal ideology, one strain of which extends well into the Indo-Iranian past. The various mythic and religious traditions associated with kingship (and in particular, the first king, *Yima*) appear to have undergone a distinctive development in Iran.\(^{526}\) Despite the obscurity of the Indo-Iranian origins of the Yima myths, he has long functioned as the symbol of ideal kingship, despite a tradition of his hubris and fall.\(^{527}\) The name ‘Yima’ is attested in Persia.\(^{528}\) Two aspects of this royal ideology are of relevance to *1 Enoch* 77: the sevenfold division of the world and the paradisal nature of Iranian rule. Yima has two connections to the *karsuuars*: as the ‘king of the seven part earth’ (Zāmyad Yāst 31)\(^{529}\) and potentially as responsible for the population of the six outer *karsuuars*.\(^{530}\) Although there is variety in the traditions associated with his name and the other

---


\(^{528}\) The name ‘Yima’ appears in the onomastica preserved in the Persepolis tablets (in the Elamite forms *Yamakka* and *Yamaksēdēs*, the latter of which corresponds to Old Persian *Yama-xšaita*, the equivalent of modern Jamsīd. See the index and linguistic explanation at Hallock, *Perseopolis Fortification Tablets*, pp. 771–772. The relevant tablets are PF 403, 808–9, 890–95, 1025, 1774, 1795, 1833–34, 1943, 1961, 1997.


\(^{530}\) Although not mentioning the *karsuuars* directly, Vīdēvdāt II.8–19 (*Zend-Avesta* I, pp. 12–15) tells of Yima’s increase of world-size three times, and three times implies that Yima added to the territory’s population (§11,
mythical kings, the Achaemenids would have likely seized upon the positive and paradisical elements in the Yima myth (rather than the demonic aspects which he came to have in India). Several scholars have attempted to understand Persepolis as connected with an annual festival associated with Yima, although this is now generally rejected.\(^{531}\) It is possible that the mysterious Mubarakana-/Mibragan festival known from Greek sources has some connection with Yima and kingly ideology;\(^{332}\) however, the overtones of paradise in Achaemenid ideology are well attested on other grounds.

It is well-known that the word \textit{paradise} comes from Iran, and that the Greeks were acquainted with the Great King's patronage of walled 'paradises.'\(^{533}\) In fact, it appears that both Pasargadae and Persepolis integrated elaborate gardens into their construction, as did the area below Darius's inscription at Behistun.\(^{534}\) Beyond concrete practical considerations, these paradises appear to have intentionally carried political and religious connotations.\(^{535}\) Potential connotations include Yima's \textit{var} (or enclosure, related to the etymology of the word \textit{paradise} itself), the Ahuranic (i.e., perfect) creation, and the empire itself.\(^{536}\) Other similar royal political-religious ideologies were certainly exploited by the Great Kings (like Xerxes's
claim to be the eschatological savior), even the general tenor of the official inscriptions and reliefs indisputably impart a sense of serene order all in the name of Ahuramazda. Even accounting for the standards of ancient inscriptions, Darius's apology at Behistun places remarkable emphasis on his divine election (he cites the 'protection' of Ahura Mazda or the like 62 times, not counting other mentions of the god's name). When all these elements are considered together, an ideology of divine fertility and peace beyond that typical of the Ancient Near East appears to be part and parcel of the Great Kings’ ideology.

The Ethiopic Enochic corpus constructs its understanding of the divine administration of the cosmos. If this little detail is accepted, it serves as one brick in the edifice of a heavenly economy remarkably patterned on the Achaemenid empire. It is worth noting with Milik that the scope of the geography in the Book of Luminaries is large, corresponding more or less with the scope of the Achaemenid Empire. Although in the extant text of the Ethiopic book this information interrupts the astronomical information on solar and lunar movements, it fits within a broadly Enochic attempt to describe the divine economy vis-à-vis the Persian Empire: just as the 'luminaries' follow the Lord's intricate commands, enabling regular seasons (and calendars), so his control extends over vast horizons.

Conclusions

While the main focus of scholarly appraisal of the Astronomical Book has been on the Mesopotamian precedents, an analysis of elements related to an Iranian milieu can also prove suggestive. A possible link with geographical traditions and royal Iranian traditions dovetails with the possible overall import of Iranian imperial ideology and administration for the developing views of the cosmos and YHWH's heavenly empire in Second Temple Judaism and apocalyptic specifically. In any case, these details plausibly imply at least a modicum of acquaintance with Iranian ideas in the earliest levels of Enochic literature.

539 In the Babylonian version.
540 See the Excursus: On the Watchers; perhaps this could be connected to the Ancient Near Eastern diplomatic practice of kings displaying their wealth, as suggested by Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," p. 324; cf. Wright, Origin of Evil Spirits, pp. 43–44.
541 Milik, Books of Enoch, p. 17
The Birth of Noah / Noahic Fragment (106–107)

1 Enoch 106–107 is generally considered an independent unit which perhaps derives from a longer narrative. The fragment’s position is old, since it follows the Epistle in 4Q204. A similar (longer) narrative also appears in the Genesis Apocryphon, although the birth narrative itself is not extant. Nickelsburg considers this section to be a concluding summary of the “whole gamut of Enochic eschatological thought,” which served to encourage the reader, who was in the same historical position vis-à-vis God’s wrath as Lamech. This view is more probable than Milik’s contention that 106–107 represent a transition between the Enochic Corpus and the lost Noahic Corpus, since this section summarizes the Enochic tradition so well, and since the phrase “words of the Book of Noah” appear in the Genesis Apocryphon after the birth narrative. Whatever the details of the sources used by the author of this section, it most likely dates between the second and first centuries B.C.E. due to the evidence of the Aramaic fragments.

The birth of Noah in 1 Enoch 106–107 is described as a profoundly strange incident, requiring the explanation of the departed Enoch. When born, Noah’s body was whiter than snow and redder than a rose, his hair was all white and like white wool and curly. Glorious was his face. When he opened his eyes, the house shone like the sun (106:2; Cf vv.10–11).

He also immediately praised the Lord (v. 3, 11). This abnormality causes Lamech and Methuselah to suspect that Noah is the illegitimate child of a Watcher and to seek an answer from Enoch ‘at the ends of the earth’ (v. 8). This situation enables Enoch to recount the scenario of the Watchers (vv. 13–14), the Flood and Noah’s role in it (vv. 15–18), and the future (final) destruction of evil (vv. 106:19–107:1). The basic outline of this scenario is paralleled in the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen, 1Q19, 1Q20, 4Q537, 4Q538), although the manuscripts are very fragmentary.

While the section contains much material which occurs previously in 1 Enoch, the details of Noah’s birth are new. The child is described as numinous and precocious, with white and red body, white hair, glowing face and eyes, and the ability to speak from birth. The motif of an abnormal pregnancy and precocious child is widespread in folklore, although

542 Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91–108, p. 1, 4; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 539.
545 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 540.
546 Milik, Books of Enoch, pp. 55–57; Cf. The comments in Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, pp. 541–542.
548 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 542; Alexander, “Enochic Literature and the Bible,” p. 69, appears to date the section to ca. 130 B.C.E.; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91–108, p. 616.
549 Following the text in Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, 1 Enoch, p. 164.
the motif does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{551} Rabbinic legends portray Moses as having an extraordinary gestation.\textsuperscript{552} Legends of Zoroaster portray an unusual pregnancy and precocious signs.\textsuperscript{553} A parallel passage in 2 Enoch 71:1–23 combines both an unusual pregnancy with an unusual child, although the child is not described like Noah in this passage.\textsuperscript{554} While the child Noah is remarkable, there is no indication in either the 1 Enoch text or its expansion in the Genesis Apocryphon that the pregnancy was in anyway abnormal. It is noteworthy, therefore, that only the physical appearance of the child itself is unusual in 1 Enoch. The particularly notable aspects of the child—white hair and glowing face—are otherwise only used in Jewish literature to describe G-d himself or his representative.\textsuperscript{555}

Thus, Nickelsburg suggests a divine characterization of Noah in the passage, but one which is merely in service of the revelation of the section.\textsuperscript{556} Similarly Huggins considers it to emphasize Noah’s divine role.\textsuperscript{557} In a brief note, Bailey suggests that the name of Noah may be related to either an Akkadian or Hurrian god; Koehler-Baumgartner seems to agree and consider it assimilated to the Hebrew נֵּבֶך, so the image could be an old vestige of the Noah story which appears only here.\textsuperscript{558} Stuckenbruck understands the divine imagery to be denying traditions that giants survived the flood by claiming that Noah was not in fact a giant.\textsuperscript{559} While this passage does deny Noah’s evil pedigree, this does not explain the unique combination of the red and the white skin, white hair, and shining eyes. However, this


\textsuperscript{552} Rabbinic legends appear to have seen Moses’s role presaged by an unusual pregnancy; see Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrait of Moses,” pp. 301–302. Cf. Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, vol. 2, pp. 262–265. White hair is not one of the signs he mentions.


\textsuperscript{555} Cf. Holden, Forms of Deformity, p. 97; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91–108, pp. 626–627. The only other instance of which the author is aware is Jobolae 23:25, which uses the motif of grey-haired children as the symbol for the nadir of decreasing human longevity, which occurs just before the exaltation.

\textsuperscript{556} Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, pp. 543–544.


\textsuperscript{559} Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91–108, pp. 633–635.
particular combination of physical features and normal pregnancy is paralleled by the story of the birth of the Persian hero Dastan, better known as Zal-i-Zar or just Zal, as recounted by Firdausi in his *Shahnameh.*

When Zal is born, he has ‘beauty like the world-illuminating sun,’ ‘loveliness of face,’ ‘hair as white as snow,’ and ‘ruddy cheeks.’ There appears to have been some ambivalence in the Persian traditions towards the appearance Zal’s skin, as some sources depict him with dark body and white face, white skin and red face, or red and white skin. When the father, Sam, learns of the child’s appearance, he assumes the child has a demonic paternity and abandons him in the wilderness. For the present purposes, the physical features of the child are most relevant. In both stories, the child is described having a radiant face, a strange ambivalence between a red and white body, and white hair, and in both the father suspects demonic illegitimacy. While it is true that albinos are often considered suspicious in many pre-modern societies, neither the description of Noah nor of Zal can properly be described as Albino. In both cases, the character involved in the story is situated in a context connected with wisdom. Noah, in the milieu of the Enochic and Noahic traditions, is associated with ancient revealed wisdom; Zal became in Persian literature a ‘personification of wisdom.’ Perhaps most interestingly, Zal became a ‘last bastion of hope’ for the Iranian monarchy, a fitting parallel for the hero of the deluge.

While this parallel is interesting, it is problematic for two reasons: the date of the *Shahnameh,* and the folkloric nature of the motifs. It is certain that Firdausi’s version of the story dates between 936—1026 C.E., and other known written antecedents to it still appear to only date to the tenth century. While Firdausi’s poetic form is very late, much of the legendary material contained within the poem is very ancient; parallels and allusions to the stories fleshed out by Firdausi are found in the Avesta and in the *Bundahish,* as well as some Indian sources. Indeed, the Rustam cycle, of which the Zal stories are a part, is generally

---

564 Omidial, “Rostam’s Seven Trials,” p. 265.
agreed to have been adopted in Parthia from the Saka/Scythians; nevertheless, there are
hints of a poorly remembered Achaemenid history. Colarusso would suggest that the
whiteness motif is of Indo-European origin due to Irish and Germanic parallels. However,
Davis sees the whiteness of Zal as the mythic reflex of racial tensions from the Indo-Iranian
invasions. Thus, while it is difficult to reconstruct early forms of the myths with any
certainty from the Shahnâmeh, it is likely that many of the discrete stories in it are quite old.
Widengren’s suggestion that this detail is evidence of a ‘Zurvanite’ influence on Judaism is
even more tenuous, as Zurvanism most probably did not exist as a separate tradition. If the
hero’s description is indeed an old Indo-European motif, Colarusso’s suggestion that this
characteristic was related to the possession of ‘prophetic powers’ is certainly provocative in
the context of this Enochic passage.

The other difficulty is the possibility of a common folkloric impulse rather than a
direct borrowing. Yet, while the story of Dastan/Zal clearly contains the reworking of
tales folkloric motifs, such a context appears to be lacking in 1 Enoch. Firdausi’s story includes the
common motif of the abandoned and rescued child, which is completely absent in 106–107:
consultation of Enoch precludes the child’s abandonment. The details of Zal’s appearance
appear to be designed to highlight his role as wise (rather than purely martial) hero, whereas
the details of Noah’s appearance take back seat to the need for consultation with Enoch.
While it certainly is possible that folkstories circulated about the birth of Noah, some of
which may have found their way into the Genesis Apocryphon and 1Q19, it is also possible
these texts are based on 1 Enoch. Indeed, the details of Noah’s birth do not seem to reappear
in any other early Jewish or Christian exegesis of the Flood. When 1 Enoch 106–107 was
composed as a conclusion to the Enochic Corpus as it stood at the time, the author could
have picked up the details of Noah’s birth from popular folk traditions, invented them
himself, or have borrowed them from a Persian source. It is impossible to tell for certain,
but considering the Persian motifs which are evidenced throughout the previous Enochic
Corpus and in other more or less contemporary Qumranic Documents, the possibility of

Persian borrowing is quite plausible. However, until an older parallel than Firdausi is found, it must remain only an intriguing possibility. One could argue for the reverse influence of the Enochic passage on Firdausi, perhaps via the Manichaean dissemination of the Book of Giants, but there is little evidence of the eastern dissemination of the five main sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.

Conclusions

The 1 Enochic Corpus represents an extended period of time and a variety of authors, albeit within what was most likely a continuous tradition. It is significant that in each of the major sections of the Ethiopic text of 1 Enoch discussed above parallels or points of contact were found with the Iranian traditions, most of which implied the reinterpretation of native Judaean ideas. The Book of Watchers paralleled the negative Kulturentstehungsmythos and the eschatological binding of a (dragon-)demon. The Parables evidenced influence in the concepts of the weighing of souls, yet much more remains to be done. The earliest work, the Astronomical Book, modified the concept of horizontal solar gates and used a seven-part geographic scheme. Finally, the Noachic Fragment offered an intriguing possibility with Noah’s white hair and glorious visage. None of the parallels are in themselves certain, but the number of parallels and structural considerations within a single tradition suggest that they may be more than mere coincidences. A more thorough look at the Enochic traditions with an eye towards Iran remains an important critical disideratum. Preliminarily, however, it would appear that the authors of the corpus as currently extant had access to, and were influenced by, Persian traditions.

CONCLUSION

Only a small number of texts have been considered here, and even these were only analyzed in part; no doubt the overall picture presented will vary as more texts are analyzed. Yet, the few parallels discussed here imply some very suggestive avenues for further research. A preliminary summary of the findings of this chapter will prepare for the subsequent chapter’s look at the significance of the present chapter’s findings.

The small number of analyses attempted here evince several potentially important trends. First, most of the texts could be best analyzed in the context of multiple traditions; it was not always a matter of either/or, but often of both/and. Ezekiel 37 may have been partially

inspired by Mesopotamian reliefs, but subsequent audiences were more likely to have Iranian themes in mind. Daniel 2 likely evidenced dependency upon an Iranian oracle which itself utilized a variety of motifs, potentially some from Greece. *The Book of Watchers* used Iranian concepts to rehabilitate older Canaanite mythology. These examples, then, suggest that in any investigation of influence few cases will be discrete, ‘pure’ transfers from one context into another.

Second, every analysis above highlighted how traditions were re-interpreted. This was evident in the use of foreign material, native materials, and in the reception of the materials. Ezekiel 38–39 transformed prophetic threats against Israel into a future promise of protection while potentially inverting Median rhetoric. Daniel 2 borrowed the language of the Day of the Lord to color an Iranian oracle, in the process reinventing the term’s meaning. *The Book of Watchers* transformed its understanding of Genesis in dialogue with a number of traditions, including Iranian ones.

Third, many of the contexts proposed for the parallels were related to Iranian royal ideology. The source behind Dan 2 was a reaction to the loss of Iranian sovereignty. The concept of the Watchers was modelled after Achaemenid functionaries. Some of the mysterious geographical traditions in the *Astronomical Book* potentially derived from Achaemenid geographical rhetoric. A supplementary bonus to this result is the potential of alleviating the difficulty inherent in using ‘religious’ sources from Iran; as a rule, material pertaining to the Great Kings is more securely dated and more widely attested. Subsequent research into the effects of Imperial administration on Yehud and the Torah could prove to be highly illuminated by such a trajectory.

For each individual text discussed, the criteria for influence were continually considered: dating (criterion 1); context (criterion 2); relative structural logic (criterion 3); a space or ‘hook’ for the foreign element (criterion 4); discrete, distinctive elements (criterion 5). As it was possible, an attempt at assessing the relative interpretive or structural change effected by the proposed instance of influence was made. However, a broader canvass in the context of Second Temple Judaism as a whole is needed to better consider the sixth criterion of structural and interpretive change. The next chapter will attempt to situate the individual elements here considered into an intellectual and sociological context in which such changes can be profitably explored.

---

577 See the Prolegomena.
V

An Apocalyptic Hermeneutic
INTRODUCTION: THE PROPOSAL

After showing that the time is ripe for a reassessment of Iranian influence, discussing the nature of the Iranian evidence, setting the stage in the Achaemenid Empire, applying principles of Oral Theory, and tentatively analyzing several passages, it remains to assess the framework in which these considerations may be applied to the continuing study of Judaean apocalyptic and of Iranian influences. As argued in the Prolegomena, an understanding of influence requires consideration of the systemic import of any proposed details analyzed, rather than leaving them as a list of isolated instances of borrowing. Having amassed a number of potential discrete parallels, a method for understanding their significance is needed. The best way, it is here argued, to understand and pursue both the micro- and macroscopic questions is through appeal to an Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. This Apocalyptic Hermeneutic has two substantial contributions: the relationships between apocalypticism, millenarianism, and the apocalypses and the ‘ground zero’ for Iranian influences in Second Temple Judaism.

Six criteria for determining influence are proposed in the Prolegomena. Chapter I demonstrates the existence of Iranian material pre-dating apocalyptic (criterion 1). Chapters II and III present a historical context for interaction (criterion 2). In the analyses of Chapter IV, discrete elements are analyzed in terms of structural contexts in foreign and Judaean sources, as well as for plausible ways they were utilized (criteria 3–5). The final criterion—interpretive change—remains outstanding. The Apocalyptic Hermeneutic helps to fulfill that criterion.

A number of the analyses pointed to the importance of the reinterpretation of previous Judaean traditions for their interaction with Iranian ideas. It is therefore proposed here that the best place to envision Iranian influence on Jewish apocalyptic is within the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic.

The ‘hermeneutic’ of the term ‘the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic’ can be defined as the point of departure and reflexive personal alignment from which, through which, and by which an individual and/or community receives, understands, interprets, and re-creates traditions, circumstances and ultimately worldview, involving some specific content which supports favored methodologies and media, while occurring with specific reference to a real social context. This may but need not be held exclusively of other hermeneutics by the same individual or group.¹

This type of hermeneutic is thus differentiated from a worldview by being a mechanism which both creates and comes out of a worldview (via the well-known

¹ Author’s own definition for present purposes.
hermeneutic circle’); a worldview is more comprehensive and may utilize multiple hermeneutics in its self-creation, sustenance, and evolution. Two important aspects are included in the definition above: methodologies and media, each deserving some comment.

The importance of ‘methodology’ for intellectual thought is axiomatic for the academy, and the results of the application of differing methods upon the same questions can be startling. Very different results are created by application of Rabbinic methods of midrash to a text than application of Philonic ideas. It is useful in the context of the human life-world, however, to broaden the concept of methodology from merely the self-conscious application of methods within a particular field to the strategies which people adopt for reception, understanding, and re-interpretation in their lives. In the life of an individual or a community, the application or non-application of ideas or traditions to daily life is as significant as purely ‘intellectual’ methodologies. A community which interprets texts as socially binding laws will differ significantly from one which interprets them as ennobling myths even in the nitty-gritty of life. This sort of application deserves to be included in considerations of methodology. The use of the term ‘methodology’ is meant, therefore, to include intellectual and pragmatic ‘methods’ and values.

Questions of media were discussed at length above, and they hold import here again. The medium or media in which one chooses to respond to a tradition or situation reverberates in the life of the individual and community—does the catalyst prompt a speech, a text, a mosaic floor? Perhaps it involves the carving of a new community, which again could be accomplished via several media; perhaps it prompts the creation of a previously non-existent genre or medium. The question of the media preferred or ignored for the purposes of hermeneutics ought to be integrated into the way the interpretive process is understood. An individual or group which considers textual study and creation the dominant paradigm will surely differ significantly from one which prefers oral modes—or, indeed, even from one which prefers an architectural response.

It stands as obvious that hermeneutics as defined above will vary drastically between peoples in their sophistication, their self-reflection, and their comprehensiveness. They need not be based purely on rational-logical arguments or principles, and even those which utilize such elements are likely to include some elements (at least) which Fisher would characterize as ‘narrative’ or ‘the logic of good reasons.’ In other words, a hermeneutic includes reason,

values, and actions. While the formulation above is an intellectual abstraction based on modern understandings of human knowledge, it is meant to describe the real workings of humans, whether 'intellectuals' or not. All people by needs must respond to and recreate traditions. This concept of hermeneutics is thus meant to be much more comprehensive than simply the exegesis and expansion of biblical texts, which is so often discussed with regards to Second Temple Judaism.4

Before discussing the implications and contours of this proposal, it is necessary to clarify what this Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is and what it is not. The Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is primarily to be regarded as a shared interpretive framework which interrelates apocalypticism, the apocalypses, and millenarianism. It is not a shared theology, nor is it a coherent, systematic philosophy. It is a method of receiving and reshaping traditions which shares identifiable aspects while producing noticeably divergent results.5 It is an intellectual and social paradigm through which many Judeans of the Second Temple period channelled their concerns, queries, and teachings. By positing a shared framework one is able to account for both the similarities and the differences which are manifested in the extant texts and between various apocalyptic groups; developments in the cultural, sociological, political, economic, etc., situations will produce corresponding variations in the formulation of specific doctrines and ideas. By primarily placing the locus of Iranian influence in this hermeneutic one is able to better understand recurrent motifs which have Iranian parallels, as well as discern reasons for the divergences between acceptance and rejection of individual motifs. Ultimately, it offers the potential for a more nuanced appreciation of the levels of influence on individual texts while relating each to Second Temple Judaism as a whole.

It must be stressed that the proposal here called the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is entirely historiographical rather than prescriptive; it attempts to solve the problems of Iranian influence and its relation to apocalyptic in the Second Temple period. It is based on reflections on the foregoing analyses and methodological considerations.6

Towards these ends proceeds the following arguments. The first argument examines how the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic relates to the creation of the apocalypses and the potential impact of Iran thereupon. Second, the analyses of Chapter IV are drawn upon to flesh out

---


6 The larger questions of apocalyptic through the ages or its relevance to modern thought or dogma are not within its scope. Such questions are left to others.
the nature of the hermeneutic and how Iranian considerations impact upon it. Lastly, an attempt to construct a preliminary model of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic provides a framework for a preliminary assessment of the significance of the analyses in Chapter IV. Further considerations of Iranica are reserved for the Metalegomena.

**Hermeneutics: The Re-interpretation and Application of Tradition**

The term 'hermeneutics' has of late acquired the patina of a scholarly commonplace and correspondingly appears in a variety of discussions on topics biblical, theological, and ethical. The majority of analyses of Chapter IV highlighted the importance of (re-)interpretation for the understanding for each passage; this chapter expands that observation to suggest that re-interpretation is the dialectic connecting and separating the apocalypses, apocalypticism, millenarianism, and Iranian influences.

**Relation of Hermeneutics to Apocalyptic**

The relation of hermeneutics to apocalyptic and its three manifestations was hinted at in the Prolegomena. A brief overview of how this fits into the phenomena of apocalyptic can here be sketched; a diagram of the terms appears as Figure 1.

A fairly widespread scholarly consensus distinguishes between apocalypticism (worldview), apocalypses (written genre), and millenarianism (social movement) and cautions against a one-to-one correspondence between any of them. The proper understanding of how these three relate to each other or more broadly to Second Temple Judaism is much more contested. An infuriating ambiguity causes this impasse: each of the three is similar while retaining significant differences; further, none of the three is in itself monolithic. How can the chaos of the details be reconciled without undermining the significance of the multiplicity? Appeal to a shared hermeneutic offers a way beyond this impasse: shared methods, media predilections, and values—rather than particular instances of exegesis—


8 See the Prolegomena.
relate the three and their constituents. Such a tie explains the 'instinctive' scholarly feeling of a similarity between the apocalypses while simultaneously explaining how individual apocalypses could interpret a tradition and/or circumstances divergently. If this idea is accurate, then one of the great impasses in modern apocalyptic studies can be surmounted. Further, a likely vista for Persian interaction in the Second Temple period is opened. Before attempting to sketch the preliminary outline of this Apocalyptic Hermeneutic in the next section, the function of this hermeneutic needs further explication.

An Apocalyptic Hermeneutic both comes out of and creates apocalypticism. As tradents interpret their traditions and circumstances, they refine patterns of interpretation which in turn form their worldview. Part of this process is the generation and refinement of ideas—doctrines, myths, philosophies, etc. These discrete ideas form part of the constellation of apocalypticism and are communicable beyond the confines of apocalypticism per se; the general culture and broader religious traditions can pick up and adopt ideas from the apocalyptic worldview without adopting it wholesale. If a group adopted the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic—and not just aspects of the worldview—it would likely (but not necessarily) begin to generate its own apocalyptic tradition and participate quite fully in apocalypticism. In this respect it is important to remember that apocalypticism can contain multiple apocalyptic traditions, i.e., more specific constellations of understandings;9 Danielic and Enochic traditions can be distinguished within the greater umbrella of apocalypticism.

If a number of individuals who share the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic consciously form a group, they may be considered an apocalyptic movement. If such a movement expects an imminent appearance of the eschaton, perhaps taking actions to hasten it, it may be considered millenarian.10 Even if a group adopts substantial aspects of apocalypticism but does not also adopt the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, it is unlikely to appear to be an apocalyptic movement: it will function as part of the general tradition more broadly.

As part of the construction and dissemination of their worldview, some apocalyptic tradents write apocalypses. The writing of an apocalypse will be a single instance of the utilization of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic; different instances will therefore produce differing results. Inasmuch as two historical-critical scholars may reconstruct the history of a text differently, so two apocalyptic writers—even from the same tradition—may write diverging apocalypses. Each, however, share methods of interpretation as well as a common medium.

---

9 See the Prolegomena.
10 The importance of a distinction between imminent and deferred eschatology was touched on in the analysis of Dan 2 (Chapter IVa), and is discussed again below.
The construct just described indicates how the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic interrelates the various apocalyptic categories while hinting at how individual catalysts could produce startlingly unique specific results. Since it is clear that apocalypticists were reshaping and receiving traditions, it is in this context that foreign influences—including Persia—should be considered. So doing broadens the concept of interaction and influence from just text-reception and text-creation to oral intercourse and community formation. It now remains to begin to reconstruct the architecture of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic and how this involves the Iranian question. A few examples from the preceding analyses will help to sketch out such a structure.

**THE APOCALYPTIC HERMENEUTIC'S BLUEPRINT**

It was stated above that the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic consists of preferred methodologies, media, and specific content which supports these. A few examples from the previous discussion will help to illustrate this concept in the context of Second Temple Judaism.

**Afterlife and the Resurrection: Ezekiel 37:1–14**

Collins proposes to view the apocalypses as a means for the individual's transcendence of death. He does this in the context of debate over the relevance of 'apocalyptic eschatology' for the study of the apocalypses. The question of eschatology will be dealt with separately; the first test case here discussed is individual post-mortem expectations ('personal eschatology'): afterlife and resurrection. The related concept of judgment will be treated separately.

That a decisive shift in expectations for the individual afterlife occurred between most of the Hebrew Bible and the apocalypses is nearly a scholarly cliché. This has been analyzed in terms of a shift from collective (or nationalist) to individual focus, a response to


12 For the present study's view on these questions, see the Prolegomena.

persecution of the faithful, or the absorption of Greek ideas of a separable soul. Yet it must be stressed that there is no single or uniform expectation in Second Temple Judaism: the unifying aspect is more the types of expectations than the details of those expectations. Part of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, then, must pertain to the kinds of afterlife which can be expected by the individual, with room left for the results of such expectations to be refined based on specific apocalyptic worldview of the individual or group in question.

The basic hope for afterlife in the Hebrew Bible had two aspects: a long, prosperous life followed by a good name remembered by one’s descendants. These hopes should not be seen as disappearing in later eras and literatures, but they cease to be sufficient for many: additional expectations are added. These additional hopes appear to be a meaningful (beatific) immortality and a final rectification of ideals not fulfilled in earthly life. The latter receives its fullest expression in terms of a Day of Judgment. The exact depiction (content) of these hopes vary; of interest here is the construction of the hope for individual ‘transcendence’ (so Collins) and what it means for the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic.

A simple appeal to deprivation or persecution is insufficient to explain these additional hopes (although they make the ideas more widely palatable)—such considerations appear well before the Antiochean crisis once considered so important for the appearance of apocalyptic. While the roots of such expectations are likely pluriform, there are several aspects which can be profitably analyzed in regards to the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. First, the new hopes distance perceived cause and consequence. No longer do actions directly proceed via present consequences but via displacement (both temporal and spatial). Second, the hopes are by needs based on a perception of YHWH as just and not capricious. Third, the new hopes carry implicit cosmic implications. These new hopes involve the relation of the individual to the totality of YHWH’s creation rather than to just the individual’s family, tribe, or nation: the continued existence of the individual with recompense implies a transmundane community which in principle is broader than the existential horizons of any one earthly life. If one takes these three implicit principles, the re-interpretation of Ezek 37 in terms of bodily resurrection can be set in a useful framework.

---

14 E.g., Charles, Religious Development, cited persecution and nationalism (p. 96, 113); Russell, Method and Message, appeals to ‘corporate personality’ and Greek pre-existent souls; Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 270–1, appeals to an increased individualism; George W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, HTS 26, Expanded ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ Press, 2006) appeals largely to persecution, although the preface to the revised edition (pp. 5–6) notes that this is now problematic; Claudia Setzer, Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition (Boston: Brill, 2004), p. 20, disputes the concept of a progression in ideas at all. George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Where is the place of Eschatological Blessing?,” Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone, eds. Esther G. Chazon, et al., SJSJ 89 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 53–72, is careful to highlight how ‘earth-based’ many of these expectations remain.

15 E.g., Job 7:9; Ps 6:6; 21:5; 25:13; 30:4; 39:14; 49:12, 15; 88:11–13, etc.

16 E.g., Russell, Method and Message, p. 16; Cf the recantation in Nickelsburg, Resurrection, pp. 5–6.
The imagery of Ezek 37:1–14 is very vivid and strongly implies bodily resurrection when one accepts such an idea as reasonable. As discussed above, it seems that the similarities of this passage to Zoroastrian conceptions of bodily resurrection was already noted by some Jews in the Parthian empire. The passage itself, however, declares national restoration for both Israel and Judah. A return to Yehud did indeed later occur, albeit along differing lines. Subsequent interpretations of the text would likely alter the political understanding of the oracle in light of the community in Yehud and in light of the known conceptions of bodily resurrection. What if a subsequent receiver of this text applied the above three principles to this text? A distancing of cause and consequence mean the two stages of revival in the vision (vv. 7, 10) could be interpreted as belonging to different times, places, and protagonists; even if the revival is attributed to a return to the land, the breath of YHWH could come subsequently. The rhetorical addition of graves in vv. 12–13 could also tend towards a secondary, individualized interpretation. The description of the bodies as slain also invites a re-interpretation along lines which view death as unnatural. Further, since YHWH is just, the idea of a resurrection brings to bear questions of who is resurrected (can only some be resurrected, and if so, on what criteria?). Lastly, if YHWH has a broader than Israel, then how do individual Judeans relate to this greater cosmos and the populations there implied? When these questions are added to a non-metaphorical interpretation of the oracle, very clear trajectories for afterlife speculations and ideas of bodily resurrection are thereby created. The potential influence of Iranian ideas of resurrection find a logical place within the re-interpretation of the passage in the post-exilic period.

For those for whom the older Hebraic hopes for the afterlife were insufficient, Ezek 37 provided a vivid hook whereby ideas of resurrection and immortality could be profitably explored within the Judaean tradition. When these questions are placed within a context of broader cosmological speculation, the development of the ideas of eternal heavenly life and resurrection are quite natural. It must be noted in this regard that Iranian conceptions of resurrection and human immortality are tightly bound up with the eschatological drama which is the raison d'etre of the material creation. The pre-existent, spiritual forms of humans

---

17 See Chapter IVa.


19 After writing this analysis, the author was surprised to discover a rather similar analysis of the passage by Paul Ricoeur in LaCocque and Ricoeur, Thinking Biblically, pp. 165–183.

20 Cf. Chapter I and the note below.
decided to enter physical form, die, and be bodily resurrected to enable the defeat of Angra Mainyu—these bodily resurrection is one of the very mechanisms whereby evil is to be definitively defeated. This is inherently bound up, then, in an understanding of the cosmos itself, the relation of the individual to it, and the manner of divine justice and administration. Death itself plays a role in assuring its own defeat, and humanity’s happiness is guaranteed by its tardiness. The potential impact of the Achaemenid Empire upon Judaean visions of the divine cosmos is periodically noted in Chapter IV. Rather than attempting to see a one-to-one correspondence between individual Iranian views of the afterlife and Jewish ones, it is pertinent to note the similarities between the structure of the Iranian drama with the types of expectation within the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. If one looks to the hermeneutic, Iranian influence on the questions for which Judaeans were seeking answers appears more likely than upon each individual Judaean’s answers to these questions.

Ezekiel 37:1–14 and its likely reception nicely illustrates how the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic helps to find a locus for situating potential Iranian influence within Second Temple Judaism, specifically within apocalyptic traditions. A closely related issue to understandings of the afterlife is the concept of a Day of Judgment, or cosmic Day of YHWH. This will be explored in light of Ezek 38–39.

The Day of Judgment: Ezek 38–39

The previous analysis of the Gog pericope proposed to see a more direct use of Iranian traditions within the passage itself, as well as a subsequent impact upon its interpretation. The direct use of this passage in apocalypses is important (e.g., 1 Enoch, the War Scroll, Sibylline Oracles 3, and Revelation); the present analysis, however, intends to discuss how the passage can be understood within the context of a developing Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. Of particular importance in this instance is the concept of negative or rhetorical influence, and the re-interpretation of previously present tradition, in this case the ‘Day of YHWH’ traditions.

---

21 Yasna XXVI.6 (The Zend-Avesta III, p. 279); Yalt XIII.76 (The Zend-Avesta II, p. 198); Shorter Bundahish II.10–11, cf III.1–7 (Pahlavi Texts I, pp. 14–16) = Greater Bundahish III.23–24 (Anklesaria, Zend-Akasish, p. 45); Plutarch, Isis and Osiris, 370 (p. 115) may also supply support this with his 24 gods in an egg, which de Jong relates to the Zoroastrian calendar. The nineteenth day and the first month of this calendar were dedicated to the frauasti (Jong, Traditions of the Magi, pp. 195–196, although he does not mention the frauasti connection); for general discussion see Boyce, HZ II, pp. 243–250; Boyce, “Further on the Calendar of Zoroastrian Feasts,” pp. 1–38; Malandra, The Fravashi Yast, Zaehner, The Dawn and Twilight, pp. 269–270.

22 E.g., Excursus: On the Watchers.

23 While attention to the function resurrection ideas played in communities is important, as Setzer, Resurrection, this does not explain the emergence of the ideas in the first place or how anyone first came to espouse them.

24 Chapter IVa.

The Iranian influence proposed upon Ezek 38–39 above was one of appropriation for the sake of rhetorical combat, and as such, could be termed a conscious, negative influence. The author made use of the religious imagery of the north-western Iranian peoples, in an ironic mode, to refute potential religious justifications for an invasion of (yet to be reconstituted) Israel, and thereby to strengthen the preceding prophecies. The rhetoric appropriated, however, became part of the tradition, coloring subsequent discourses within this receiving tradition. Several aspects of the rhetoric of Ezek 38–39 are notable in this regard. First, the oracle is neither predicated on a particular response on the part of Israel, nor is it viewed as imminent; it is a depiction of the revocation of the exile. This is in contrast to the divine threats which appear in other prophetic literature. Further, this distant future is depicted as already determined: there is no if. Gog is to marshal his allies for a call which will come, human responses notwithstanding. Lastly, the overthrow of the invading army is described as a purely divine effort in colorful, hyperbolic language, using a number of terms and motifs which would become stock apocalyptic language. The use of divine warrior imagery is drawn upon to its final extent to emphasize the purely divine nature of the war in view. Like the story in Dan 2, this oracle appears to have inadvertently imported an (implied) deferred eschatology in its utilization of imagery to declare the power of YHWH: G-d is not merely working through history, but has predetermined (at least some) aspects of human history for his intended ends. What would appear to have been intended as a historical guarantee—by its sequential placement in the book and its language—was susceptible to being re-read eschatologically (on eschatology, see below). Further, the apparent use of less-common referents for nations by the author gave rise to a situation where the historically specific grouping could be easily re-read as an universal attack (as, indeed, most modern scholars do). Such a grouping further encourages a re-interpretation on a supra-historical level, particularly if one wishes to posit an eschatological battle.

The use of Ezek 38–39 by the Parables of Enoch is extremely suggestive in this regard. Using similar imagery, the Enochic author replaces Gog from Magog with the Parthians and

26 See Prolegomena.
28 Chapter IVa.
30 For a lucid discussion of the similarities and differences between the two passages can be found in Boe, Gog and Magog, pp. 178–184. 272
Medes, who controlled a number of the regions identified in Ezekiel. A similar phenomenon can be found in each passage: real, contemporary powers are depicted as playing a predetermined role in an unspecified future. This has several implications for the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. First, the oft repeated (and criticized) dichotomy between history and myth is inadequate: both of the passages in Ezekiel and 1 Enoch utilize historical events to describe an ahistorical event which is itself still envisioned as taking place on the earth. This historical typology, however, also utilizes mythological imagery and ideas as part of its understanding of the historical typology. In short, 'history' and 'myth' are fused. Second, both passages tap into the Day of YHWH tradition, yet both passages describe a battle which implies judgment which is both ultimate and final: it is the Day of YHWH not just a Day of YHWH. This would imply an interpretive process which is in some ways the inverse of the previous—not only can events or myths be types of events to come, they may also be the shadow of the 'real' ones to come. Such an interpretive principle would lead very readily into the abstract speculations which are so significant in many apocalypses.

The Day of YHWH tradition has long been a focus of scholarly rancour as well as a point of appeal for the origins of apocalyptic. It would seem best to understand the pre-apocalyptic tradition as a depiction of a theophany of YHWH, one which was expected both in sacred war on behalf of Israel and in cultic settings. The first thing that can be noticed in this regard is that the very conception of the Day of YHWH seems to embody the fusion of history and myth which was claimed as characteristic of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic: this aspect can be seen in full continuity with earlier Judaean traditions. Yet, two disconnects with the earlier form of the Day can also be seen: a transfer of focus from a Day to the Day and a concomitant eschatologizing of the idea. Once the Day of YHWH becomes a consummate event, the cosmological and juridical aspects of the idea necessarily increase in importance: the Day of Judgment. The importation of eschatology into the Day of YHWH transforms it

31 Chapter IVa.
32 Cf. the similar opinion of Boe, Gog and Magog, p. 107, 184.
34 As pointed out by Rowland, The Open Heaven.
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from a historical rhetoric (whether promise or threat) into a teleological point to which all other aspects of the Day must refer.

This passage, then, serves as an important crux for subsequent Judaean re-interpretation: it appears to offer the seeds where the particularization of typology could easily occur in its wake. This was done on the basis of previous traditions marshalled against a (presumably) Median rhetoric/ideology. Wide scope was thus open for a variety of speculations on the nature and timing of YHWH's judgment, without any need for the tradent to feel like an innovator. Ample scope is left for individuals and groups to accept or reject more specific Iranian concepts within this sphere.

As repeatedly noted, the concept of a Day of Judgment, whether individual or universal, is intimately intertwined with the problem of the emergence of eschatological thought.

**Eschatology: Daniel 2, Book of Watchers**

While the apocalypses are more than just eschatological treatises, eschatology is an essential part of what differentiates them from other genres of revelatory literature. Two important aspects of eschatology are not always sufficiently noticed: the interpretive role of eschatology and the distinction between imminent and deferred eschatology. Eschatology shapes an important part of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, as by its very nature eschatology is an interpretive concept. This has been stated very well by Franke:

> It cannot be overemphasized that the very soul and inspiration of apocalyptic is the application to contemporary history of a theologically revealed vision of the end. This intrinsically hermeneutic dimension is the element in which apocalyptic springs to life, and it must be heeded if we are to understand apocalypse at a deeper level than that of its surface imagery, which is indeed meant to horrify and appall, but as a means of pointing out what is actually horrifying and appalling in the realities being lived historically.

The previous analyses of Dan 2 and of the *Book of Watchers* indicate some of the ways this ought to be understood. In the analysis of Dan 2 above, it was argued that a deferred eschatology was imported along with an Iranian political oracle in a context which deliberately re-used prophetic language. It becomes apparent, then, that subsequent receivers accepted this eschatology in a context which implied that all previous prophetic uses of the terms related to the Day of YHWH also refer to eschatology. This point highlights a

---

57 See Prolegomena.
59 See Chapter IVa.
neglected aspect of debate over 'prophetic' and 'apocalyptic' eschatology: one's presuppositions greatly influence the way the relevant prophetic passages are read; the future expectations of many oracles can be read to describe the eschaton, but only when one accepts the concept that there is a coming eschaton. Once a group of Judaeans accepted the eschatology implicit in Dan 2, it was only a matter of simple extrapolation to read other texts eschatologically. As such, eschatology functions as a hermeneutical principle. That this occurred can easily be seen in extreme form in several of the pesarim found at Qumran.40

The other important aspect is the distinction between deferred and imminent eschatology, one which cannot be over-stressed. As noted above, the content of the eschatology in the two parts of Daniel is quite similar; they differ most prominently on the authors' perceived proximity to the eschaton itself. In fact, many of the differences between subgroups of various traditions can be understood as reflexes of the perceived imminence of shared eschatological ideas: even if person \( x \) and person \( y \) agree exactly in the content of eschatology, the importance of the eschatology and the likely modes of expression between the two will drastically vary if \( x \) thinks the eschaton is tomorrow and \( y \) in three thousand years. Urgency of the end would be more likely to produce millenarian groups and new apocalypses than its long-term deferral and more likely to make eschatology more prominent in the authors' works.41

The importance of these two points can be seen in some of the more 'encyclopaedic' sections of the apocalypses.42 Enoch's journeys in the Book of Watchers are a good example.43 Enoch travels throughout the cosmos and learns arcane knowledge about many aspects of the world, yet much of the vast array of information is united by an orientation towards a deferred eschatology; he sees the prison for the Watchers and erring stars (19, 21), the place where the dead await judgment (22), the tree of life (25), a valley of punishment (27), and the future paradise (28—32). The author of this journey certainly had eschatological beliefs, but


there is no indication of their imminence; later Enochic authors, however, seem to have interpreted their times as falling much closer to the end (e.g., the Animal Apocalypse).  

An important aspect, therefore, of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is eschatology, as well as the hermeneutes' perception of their own temporal relation to it. Following the rule that the most violent disputes are between those whose positions are most similar, it is to be expected that the interpretation of the temporal relations to the end are a major factor in schism and controversy without negating overall shared features.

Although the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic (as well as apocalyptic) consists of much more than just eschatology, eschatology is an underlying factor for much of it: cosmic, personal, national; afterlife, justice, the interpretation of the Day of the Lord, etc., are all affected by it, and can be teased out once it is accepted as a principle of interpretation. This will need to be further discussed, making careful distinctions which are sometimes conflated.

(Re-)Constructing the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic (With an Eye Towards Iran)

The thesis advanced here is that the connecting thread between the various apocalypses, apocalypticism, and millenarian groups is an Apocalyptic Hermeneutic which consists of shared interpretive principles and some shared content, and that the most likely locus for Iranian influence is to be found therein. This is not to discount the importance of the likely variety of influences and borrowings in different apocalypses and other, non-apocalyptic Judaean texts, rather, placing the central focus here helps to contextualize and explain the more individual and scattered borrowings or influences which may be found.

Having preliminarily sketched out the concept of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic above, it remains to more adequately describe it and its potential relations to Iran. This will be attempted in three brief movements: first, a number of suggested potential shared principles and contents will be listed—these are largely understood as dialectics and in relation to earlier extant Judaean traditions; second, the importance of textual and oral hermeneutics will be discussed; and lastly, a few suggested examples of how Iranian concepts can be seen to impact on the principles set forth first.

Shared Principles of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic

The Jerusalem Temple

Of fundamental importance to Judaean apocalyptic was the Jerusalem temple, a feature shared with most Judeans. This can be seen in Daniel's indignation over its desecration and in IV Ezra's distress over the temple's destruction. Few scholars would deny

44 Tiller, Animal, p. 126.
this point, but it is worth making explicit as a twofold reminder: first, that references to the sacrificial cult need not necessarily imply a priestly origin, and second, that for all its abstract speculations, the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic relates to people within a concrete historical situation.

Nevertheless, in addition to the concrete elements, the theology/ideology of the temple was susceptible to reformulation and divergent interpretation by different Judaean circles. It must be queried, then, how these supra-cultic ideas may have interacted with other ideologies within the Achaemenid Empire (and its heirs)—whether along the lines of Imperial policy, official cults, or general Iranian attitudes.

Immanence and Transcendence

An important dialectic for apocalyptic is the immanence and transcendence of the divine. This dialectic is a consequence of the increased importance of monotheism; the one and only G-d becomes increasingly transcendent, creating a religious need for more immanent divine manifestations. This gap is susceptible to a variety of solutions, depending on the inclinations of the hermeneute in question. As is commonly noted, angels, a 'second power in heaven,' and other mediatory figures are methods for reconciling the tension between the immanence and transcendence of the divine. This has several implications which bear on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic.

First, the radical transcendence of G-d tends towards determinism: the farther above he is, the less involved in minutiae he must be, and thus control must be predetermined. The second derives from the first; the minutiae of life must relate to subordinate characters, such as angels and demons. This construct not only helps to explain the common fascination with angelology in the apocalypses, it helps to explain their divergences. Depending on the issue in focus, the necessary intermediation will vary. It also offers a space for foreign interactions: the roles and functions of angels and gods of other systems can be re-appropriated to serve YHWH's minutiae.


The increased transcendence of YHWH is also likely to increase the dramatic nature of any posited divine intervention in history: the less immanent his workings, the more external and disruptive his interventions will appear. If the apocalypticist no longer sees YHWH's work directly in each historical moment, when YHWH does intervene in the moment, the consequences are likely to be viewed as catastrophic. Thus, the corollary to the increased transcendence of G-d is the increased uniqueness of the Day of YHWH. If the prophets saw YHWH directly at work behind the historical moment, the apocalyptic hermeneute saw YHWH directing all towards its ultimate culmination.

As mediators and managers for YHWH's celestial Imperium become more desirable, the hierarchical systems of Iran were surely influential (as was argued above for the concept of the Watchers)—both the 'secular' system inherited by Alexander as well as the complex of Iranian deities.

**Theodicy and Pessimism**

Sacchi highlights the importance of theodicy to the *Book of Watchers* and apocalyptic in general—even as he overstates the case—and there can be no doubt that theodicy is an important theme for the apocalypses (as, indeed, for religions in general). While it is true that crises are likely to increase the urgency of theodical concerns, they are problems which occupy thinking peoples of all circumstances. As with the dialectic of transcendence, the principle of monotheism pushes this issue to the fore. This is a problem which the apocalypticists shared with all their Judaean compatriots. However, it may not be unfair to claim that for them the problem of evil and suffering was more urgent than for others: 'apocalyptically important' to use the colloquial phrase. It is this pre-occupation with evil which exposes the apocalypses—like their prophetic forebearers—to the charge of pessimism.

As Russell points out, the charge of pessimism is unfair: a long-term hopefulness can just as rightly be seen in them. G-d's justice *will* prevail, evil *will* be destroyed. This hope,
however, is forged in the face of seemingly intractable evil. A principle of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, then, must be the utmost seriousness of the problem of evil. This principle then leaves open a space for consideration of one of the major solutions to theodicy: ontological dualism. Whether it is ultimately accepted or rejected, it is difficult to envision anyone who took theodicy seriously—as do the apocalyptic hermeneuticsto completely ignore a system built upon the seriousness of evil (such as that ascribed to Zoroaster).

In this regard, a dialectic of evaluations of the cosmos should perhaps be posited within Second Temple Judaism, one in which Ben Sirah and the Book of Watchers would represent opposite poles: whether the world is good though prone to the invasions of chaos or whether creation itself is broken and in need of a fundamental replacement. One’s response to this would determine whether the purpose of humankind was to maintain order or to fight evil.

Within this dialectic, a Yahwist who saw evil as a radical problem—for whatever reasons—would be more prone to accepting and utilizing a persophilic theodicy than one who did not. In either case, however, a variety of competing philosophies must have been available and in dialogue.

**Teleology**

One of the more neglected aspects in the study of apocalyptic is the issue of teleology. The teleology of relevance here is twofold: of history and of the person. The Apocalyptic Hermeneutic moves beyond the teleology found in the prophetic literature: the prophets declare the purpose behind a historical moment or series of moments, while the apocalypses find a purpose behind history as such. This represents a major intellectual shift, which has implications for both eschatology and free will/determinism. For Jeremiah the fall of Jerusalem is a work of YHWH, for Daniel it is merely a step in the progression of YHWH’s plan for the earth. For the sages of Proverbs, righteousness will ensure long life; for the Parables of Enoch it will ensure eternity with YHWH. The teleological concerns of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic have expanded. There is a massive leap between claiming that YHWH is at work behind the present moment (and that one knows what this is) and claiming that he is behind the sweep of history.

53 E.g., Jer 1:15.
54 E.g., Prov 9:11.
As teleology expands, the perspective of ethical-demands (the so-called 'Paraenesis') will change: rather than warning that order is being subverted, the addressee must orient to an order which will replace the current one, towards an order which requires a striving towards. Covenantal terms thus alter from a return to a prerequisite. This shift in teleology is largely a matter of hermeneutics, and the historical moment loses its importance qua moment, and remains merely in relation to time as a whole. Again, this is not merely a question of future expectation nor of history versus eschatology or myth, but of how history is understood and interpreted (i.e., the philosophy of history).

The broadened concept of teleology is much more at home in Iran than in Israel (as Cohn fluently argues); therefore, ways in which the Iranian conceptions may have intersected with Judaean concepts of history must be considered.

**Determinism and Freedom**

The dialectic of determinism and free will is no stranger to western theological or philosophical thought, nor to debates on apocalyptic literature and its antecedents. Nevertheless, it is worth stating that most apocalypses can be understood as preserving the tension between the two: insofar as they hold to the eschaton, history is pre-determined; insofar as they make ethical demands on their audience, they affirm free will. Nevertheless, the extant apocalypses place much less stress on the freedom of YHWH than previous Judaean literature and place more on his sovereignty. This is to be expected as a corollary to the increased transcendence of G-d and the implicit determinism behind a teleological and eschatological theory of history. Such a perspective is conducive towards rampant cosmological speculations towards the methods, manners, and details of YHWH's control over his empire. This speculation, of course, must have interacted with the knowledge of the relevant temporal empires: not only Ptolemaic, Seleucid, and Roman, but Achaemenid and Parthian as well.

**Eschatology, Imminent and Deferred**

The issue of eschatology has been broached several times in this study. The interpretive functions are discussed above, and a discussion of the imminent-deferred dialectic and its implications is overdue. That the world should terminate is not self-evident, nor is the idea that this terminus is the fulfillment of history.\(^\text{55}\) Indeed, Cohn would argue

that this concept is highly distinctive in the Ancient Near East.\(^56\) Be that as it may, the acceptance of the idea of an *eschaton* combined with a *telos* is highly significant for a worldview and its methods of interpretation.\(^57\) However, the centrality of eschatology for a given interpretative system will vary in accordance to the manner in which the interpreter views the *eschaton*’s imminence or remoteness; the closer an interpreter believes the *eschaton* is, the more important it will be in their overall worldview. If it is far from nigh, a calm appraisal of speculations concerning it may be sufficient; if it is tomorrow, then not much else is likely to matter to them. Much in terms of perceived crisis relates directly to this aspect. An extremely deferred eschatology can even lead to the rhetorical downplaying of its importance.\(^58\)

Not only the relative urgency of the eschatology is altered by its imminence or deferral; the popular acceptability of the concepts is also highly affected thereby. The concept of a teleological *eschaton* is much easier to accept as a distant concept than as a present reality. Two things follow from this. First, a general tradition is more likely to adopt a deferred eschatology than an imminent one. Second, the role of crises should be viewed not as *creating* eschatological hopes, but in making their difficult aspects more popularly palatable. A period of intense suffering can be more easily depicted as the end than a blissful one. Thus, the relation of deprivation to the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is less in the creation of eschatology and more in the ratcheting up of the popularly-sensed imminence of an idea already existent.

From the hints adduced by Kingsley,\(^59\) it may be profitable to explore whether the Achaemenid Great Kings propagated a deferred or an imminent eschatology as part of their own ideology (ones which may have been subsequently re-used in reaction to their fall). In any case, a closer look into the interpretive function of eschatology—as a historical and philosophical-theological concept—should help to better frame the question of whether/how much/where Iranian eschatology influenced its development in Second Temple Judaism.

---


\(^{57}\) Evidence of this can easily be seen in the history of millenarianism; e.g., Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*; Newport and Gribben, eds., *Expecting the End*; Christopher Rowland and John Barton, eds., *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. JSPSS 43 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).


Typology, Mythology, and Prediction

The definition of myth is perhaps more fraught than that of apocalyptic;\(^\text{60}\) rather than attempting to solve this dilemma, the implications of the apocalypses’ use of myth is here explored for their methods of interpretation.

For the present purposes, myth is defined as ‘an attempt to understand and impart meaning to reality in narrative and symbolic form without regard to empiricist concerns.’\(^\text{61}\) In this sense, myth is characteristic of almost all Judaean literature. Yet, myths are particularly important in most apocalypses, and their authors’ use of them is significant for their hermeneutic.

There are at least two methods of utilizing myth which must be distinguished: typological\(^\text{62}\) and predictive. Myths can be used as a way of interpreting an event or person: this is like or foreshadowed by that. A good example of this is the common use of Exodus motifs to describe a return from exile,\(^\text{63}\) or in depicting a prophet like Moses.\(^\text{64}\) Here myth is used to explain or characterize something else, much like an elaborate metaphor. As described by Burkert, “Myth usually takes what has happened once as a model for what is now.”\(^\text{65}\) However, myth can also be used predictively: examples would include expectations of a second Elijah.\(^\text{66}\) These two uses are quite distinct, but often conflated in discussion of myth in the apocalypses. There is no reason why typological (or aetiological) use of myth need lead to predictive use of myth. A case in point is the ‘Endzeit wird Urzeit’ trope and its often associated *Kaoskampf* motif. When one investigates these, it is appropriate to ask whether they are being used typologically or predictively. Is the imagery of *Urzeit* hyperbolic or prognostic? Is the situation *like* a return to chaos or predicting an actual return of chaos?

---


\(^{61}\) Author’s own definition; see a longer explanation in Appendix IV. Without digressing into the complexities of the debate over what myth is, the definition above was crafted since other current definitions are defective, either placing too much emphasis on one type of myth (usually gods) or excluding more modern forms of myth (such as nationalistic myths of formation). This definition is meant to correct the deficiencies of myth in debates over apocalyptic, particularly in works such as Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic or Arthur, A Smooth Stone*, p. 278, who bases his analysis of Ezek 38–39 on a myth-history dichotomy. This dichotomy is not a vice restricted to Biblical Studies, as it can be seen in Robert Scholes, et al., *The Nature of Narrative*, 40th Anniversary, Revised and Expanded ed. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006), p. 55.

---

\(^{62}\) Much use of this word has been unnecessarily restricted to the New Testament.


\(^{66}\) E.g., Mal 4:5; Mark 9:11; Matt 11:14; 17:10.
The two are cognitively very different even if literarily they can be quite difficult to distinguish.

It is here suggested, then, an element of the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is the addition of a predictive element to myth to its inherited typological use. The interpretative principle is an eschatologizing, predictive use of myth rather than merely its use instead of history (contra Hanson).

Just as the other Ancient Near Eastern societies, Iran had a rich mythological tradition. If investigations into apocalyptic are open to the subtleties possible in the use of myth—to interpret as well as to predict—a wide vista for and broad array of possibilities towards the use of Iranian myths is opened. This need not in any way exclude the use of other mythologies (as was argued for the Asael myths, above).

**Epistemology**

One's hermeneutic is highly impacted by one's epistemology. The apocalypses, by definition, evince a revelatory epistemology. This epistemology, however, appears to have three bases: first, the acceptance of the revelatory nature of the nascent Hebrew Bible; second, the revelatory nature of their interpretations of that scripture; and third, the legitimacy of their own revelatory experiences. The first of these was likely shared with most Judaean. The second and third, however, were as liable to the problems of verification as that which attends prophecy.67

The importance of this threefold epistemology can be seen in Ben Sirah's reaction to it (34:1,8).68 Both the apocalypticists and Ben Sirah agree on the revelatory nature of texts and of their own interpretations; however, they disagree on the nature of their interpretations and on the value of personal revelations (visions, dreams).

If one accepts the possibility of real visionary experiences behind at least some of the apocalypses,69 then a wide vista for interaction is opened up within the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. Since the material of visions and dreams is constituted from the life-world of the visionary/dreamer, real visions offer a potential locus for (unconscious?) interactions to surface. Since the apocalypses accept these as revelatory, the content thus received would then become more consciously integrated into the tradents' apocalypticism. In other words, latent ideas have the potential of becoming explicit in visions.

---

Perhaps an investigation into the scholarly paradigms of the Achaemenid Empire would discover parallel divergences in epistemologies elsewhere. 'Ecstatic' traditions (such as Haoma use) could perhaps be explored for their impact either on the deuteronomistic rejections of divination or upon the source of the apocalypses' visions.

Textual and Oral Hermeneutics

The importance of textual interpretation cannot be overstated for the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. The Apocalyptic Hermeneutic was fostered in a context in which Judaean traditions were being increasingly and authoritatively mediated by texts and their interpreters rather than by more oral means. Yet this textual context was within a greater oral context: most Judaeans were not literate, and texts themselves still relatively rare. This was briefly explored in Chapter III.

It is in the context of texts that prophecy 'died'—texts usurped their role, and scribes took over their mediatory function. This is a situation in which questions of authority were highly fraught—prophets still existed in reality, but they had to prove their authenticity in the face of the written oracles of previous prophets which were held to have been already vindicated. Any 'oracles' thus had to directly deal with the textual remains of previous oracles to guarantee their true prophetic status. This is a sign that re-interpretation is an important nexus of apocalyptic thought and a context for pseudepigraphy. This is a dialectical context, however, where texts are being re-oralized and the oral becoming new text.

Examples of Potential Iranian Impact

If the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic is shown to be tenable, it has broad implications for conceptualizing Iranian interactions. For the present, the nature of such a re-evaluation can only be sketched; it will remain for future work to refine the details.

Past attempts to discuss Iranian influence have largely focused on categorial parallels. This approach is an unsatisfactory starting point yet is still a legitimate consideration. Such parallels ought to serve as a spur to detailed research as well as a way of synthesizing the results of varied textual analyses. The following merely lists severally

70 E.g., John the Baptist, Jesus of Nazareth, or Josephus's anonymous false prophets (War 6.5.2; Josephus, Jewish War III, p. 459). Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets," p. 159, cites 4Q375 and the Temple Scroll as evidence of contemporary prophets.

71 Cf. a tantalizingly similar understanding in Davis, Swallowing the Scroll, chapter 6.

commonly cited categories by way of noting how they relate to the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, and how this should focus future research into the question.

The spectre of dualism is often raised in the context of Iran. Beyond careful delineation of what is meant by the word (ethical, ontological, etc.), the concept needs to be related to the theodical project in which the apocalyptic hermeneutes were laboring. How would consideration of dualisms and their themes have helped or challenged them in their ideas? Could they have appropriated aspects of Iranian dualistic schemes without appropriating the whole?

Another typical category compared is angelology (and demonology). This category needs to be evaluated in the context of the increasing transcendence of the divine as well as the apparent battle against remaining elements of heno- or polytheism within Judaean traditions themselves. Very closely related to this issue is the vexed question of messianic expectations; these are undoubtedly related to the method whereby G-d's transcendence is mediated, as well as the method of mythological typology used.

The most problematic question involves the issue of eschatology: can the apocalypses' versions of eschatology be compared with versions from Iran? Since eschatology largely plays an interpretive role, it seems likely that for questions of comparative eschatology entire, overall systems need to be compared. Similarly, distinctions between personal and universal eschatology and imminent and deferred eschatology must be remembered.

Finally, an area which deserves consideration is the area of ritual purity, although this is less often used as a category of comparison. Considering the importance of the temple for the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic as well as the complex questions concerning Ezra's Torah and the development of purity laws in Second Temple Judaism, a valid question to be asked is whether some of the conflict between groups in Yehud or the diaspora related to rituals or purity laws derived from, or perceived to have been derived from, Iran.

CONCLUSIONS

A focus on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic as a locus for Iranian influence helps to correlate disparate discrete proposed parallels, while pointing towards a way of assessing their overall significance to the evolution of Second Temple Judaism. This is not to revert to abstract parallel-seeking, or to claim a back-door method for non-textual-based theorizing. Rather, focusing on the hermeneutic draws attention to the real-life processes in which these

---

texts were created, drawing attention to the process in addition to the product. Further, it helps bring clarity to a number of terms often used imprecisely, namely imminent and deferred eschatology, teleology, and mythology. Of course, a similar focus would be equally beneficial for the investigation of influence from other quarters as well.

In conclusion, there is ample scope for re-investigating the importance of Iranian interactions on the formation of Judaean apocalyptic in Second Temple Judaism. The phenomenon of the reinterpretation of traditions, both textual and contextual, offers the best way to understand both the situational context and the unity behind the diversity of the texts and their likely approach to ideas Persian. Paradoxically, the foci of scholarship on either individual apocalypses or on conceptual parallels has obscured how Iranian ideas could inform the process of their creation. It remains for scholarship to investigate more apocalypses individually and to relate them to the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic for a better picture to emerge of just how significant Israel's first encounters with Iran were.

Scholarship still needs, then, for more textual analyses to be done and for these to be related towards the overall Apocalyptic Hermeneutic. This ought to be done with reference to Achaemenid (and later Parthian) contexts, and with careful consideration of the oral-literate dialectic. As such a study advances, it will be possible to better answer the question—what was the significance of Iranian influence upon Jewish apocalyptic?

---

74 In the realm of aesthetics, this also seems to be the intention of David Davies, “Artistic Intentions and the Ontology of Art,” British Journal of Aesthetics 39.2 (1999): pp. 148–162.
Metalegomena
While it is hoped that the preceding discussion has adequately demonstrated the viability of and need for a reappraisal of Iranian influence upon Jewish apocalyptic, much which is relevant remains unsaid and untouched. Implications of the study herein and intended future research are therefore mentioned.

Adopting the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic as a framework for investigating Iranian influence carries a wide-ranging array of implications and ramifications which could prove fruitful for further study. A focus on hermeneutics could very productively interact with Boccaccini’s attempts to define ‘traditions’ within Second Temple Judaism,1 different traditions and/or sects likely operated with different hermeneutics. Each one of these hermeneutics—apocalyptic or not—would have likely interacted with Iranian ideas in divergent ways. Understanding how a group—or its text(s)—interpreted earlier traditions should help clarify the group’s openness and potential to adapt from Iran, as well as its differences from other contemporary groups.

Based on the foregoing preliminary analyses, the Enochic tradition appears as a potential candidate for the most thoroughly ‘Iranicized’ of traditions within Second Temple Judaism, evidencing complex interactions throughout its literary history. In contrast, groups like the Sadducees or scribes like Ben Sirah may have had much less (positive) influence, due primarily to the way in which they interpreted Judaean traditions. This does not mean, however, that such Yahwists could not have been unconsciously and negatively influenced.2

Further, understanding eschatology as a method of interpretation which was adopted by some in the Persian period has implications for the study of the final form of the Hebrew Bible. For example, perhaps the eschatologizing of the Day of YHWH influenced the final presentation of the Twelve Minor Prophets in the Masoretic Text.3

This study focused in and advocated a closer engagement with the Achaemenid Empire. Since all Yahwists lived subject to the Great Kings for 200 years, this is historically justified and serves as a healthy balance to foci on the Neo-Babylonian and Hellenistic (Ptolemaic and Seleucid) empires. Nevertheless, Iran’s significance is not limited to the direct heirs of Cyrus. The results of the analyses of Ezekiel above suggest that closer, sustained research into the Median Empire could prove rewarding, perhaps in conjunction with the

---


2 See the Prolegomena.

Assyrian exiles of North or South, or later Jewish enclaves. Perhaps Tobit could belong within such a remit. For the study of Early Christianity in particular, the role of Parthia and the Parthian Period should not be ignored, either. As the major rival to Imperial Rome, Parthia had an important presence in the Ancient Near East, an importance which potentially included its religious and imperial ideas.

A complex desideratum highlighted by this study is the need to investigate the effects and dynamics of the gradual interiorization of literacy in the Persian (and Hellenistic) periods, how this related to the emergence of the apocalypse, and how this interacted with the Persian bureaucracy and its heirs. Since Judeans indeed served within the various administrative systems, these must have had important interactions. Perhaps one of the intersections of Persian interaction and literacy's interiorization will prove to be the Aramaization of the Judeans' language. If indeed the initial genesis of the apocalypse is a highly literate phenomenon, a final result of this slow progression of interiorization may prove to have been Qumran.

FURTHER AREAS FOR RESEARCH INTO IRANIAN INTERACTION

Persian Administration of Yehud and Diaspora and the Authorization of Torah

A relevant consideration which is not taken up in this study in any detail is the theory of Persian imperial authorization of the Torah. This idea is largely based on an interpretation of Diodorus Siculus's Library of History, the inscriptions of Udjahorresne, and the Book of Ezra. Such an interpretation beggs the question of the identity of the 'law of Moses' in Ezra as well as the level of imperial input into its contents. Fried and Fitzpatrick-McKinley argue

---

6 For a recent discussion of this theory, see the papers in Watts, ed., Persia and Torah. See now Cataldo, A Theocratic Yehud.
that it is more likely that Ezra's mission was to set up Imperial judges rather than a lawcode. In either case—lawcode or judges—the answer would carry significant implications for Iranian interactions. Of course, the increased use of writing for Judaean traditions and their concomitant authority must be considered in conjunction with the imperial administration. The potential relevance of this line of enquiry is not limited to Ezra-Nehemiah; the general religious policy of the empire—towards cults, cultic sites, proselytizing, self-governance, etc.—are still imperfectly understood. In this respect, renewed examination of the implications of the Elephantine papyri and of the Persepolis tablets could prove groundbreaking. If the Persians were even partially instrumental in the written codification of Torah, by fiat or by example, this would have been a watershed in the development of Second Temple Judaism and the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic, indeed.

Ritual and Attitudes towards Purity

Boyce has suggested that Judaism inherited some of its purity concerns from Zoroastrianism. While concern for ritual purity must extend well into the early history of Israel, there is no doubt that their formulation and practice evolved during the Persian period. The impact of ritual practices deserves investigation; perhaps the apparent increase in ritual concerns in Zoroastrianism up to the Sassanian period (and the extension of purity laws from priests to laity) had reverberations within the practices of Second Temple Judaism. Maybe some of the disputes between factions, such as the Pharisees and Sadducees, relate to such dynamics.

Related to purity is the possibility that behind the apocalypses (and the Merkabeh tradition) lay deliberate cultivation techniques. If this is true, then the practices associated with Haoma use in Iran could prove an interesting addition to the Egyptian, Greek, and Babylonian traditions.


10 Boyce, HZ II, p. 189; Boyce, Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices, p. 43.


12 E.g., Yarbro Collins, Cosmology and Eschatology, p. 8.

13 On Haoma, see Boyce, HZ I, pp. 157—159; Jong, Traditions of the Magi, pp. 357—362. For objects potentially related from Persepolis, see Bowman, Aramaic Ritual Texts From Persepolis, pp. 6—7; for names with a Haoma-
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Qumran

Qumran is often invoked in discussion of Iranian influence, and a thorough analysis is necessary. In light of the results of this study, a close look at the implications of the reinterpretation of previous traditions through the lens of the apocalyptic hermeneutic should illuminate more clearly the significance of works such as the War Scroll. Further, since Qumran represents a remarkable congregation of highly literate Jews, it ought to exhibit a fascinating relationship with the orality-literacy dialectic and its implications for Iranian influence.

Further Texts

Only a very small sample of relevant texts are discussed here. A number of texts deserve closer scrutiny. Isaiah—in particular Second and Third Isaiah and the ‘Isaiah Apocalypse’—ought to be analyzed in terms of its likely Achaemenid setting. As the brief discussion of Smith’s thesis of Persian influence on Second Isaiah demonstrated, ample work remains to be done here. Beyond Isaiah, the formation of the prophetic corpus as a whole needs to be evaluated in terms of their textualization in the Persian period. A solid understanding of how apocalyptic related to both prophecy and Iran will require a thorough analysis of this process. It is to be expected that works such as Joel and Zechariah will prove highly significant in this development.

Early Christianity

Only Judaism per se was addressed in this study, but a crucial consideration for the overall impact of Iran on apocalyptic is the nascent Jesus movement. Since ‘the parting of the ways’ can no longer be invoked easily within the period of Second Temple Judaism, the early Jesus movement represents a strain of Judaism particularly influenced by the apocalyptic hermeneutic. Several aspects of study require exploration: the historical Jesus and his role as an ‘apocalyptic prophet,’ Christian apocalyptic, the relations of this movement theophoric, see Bezalel Porten, “Persian Names in Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt,” Iran-Judaica V, eds. Shaul Shaked and Amnon Netzer (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 2003), pp. 183–184.


17 E.g., as implied by recent titles like Sean Freyne, Jesus: A Jewish Galilean (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

to other Jewish traditions, and the relations of all of these to Iran. A closer look at the Parthian Empire and its ideologies and religions will be required for this effort to succeed. It, nevertheless, promises to be extremely fruitful.

SYNTHESIS

A simple yes or no to the question posited by this study is no longer tenable; previous studies need to be replaced by a new paradigm founded on the apocalyptic hermeneutic and complex oral-literate interactions situated within the Achaemenid and later Parthian contexts. A wide array of ideas—from sociological affinities to royal ideologies to religion—need to be considered separately and in concert. Once such a broad spectrum of studies has been completed, biblical scholarship should finally be able to synthesize a sound answer to the question ‘what has Persepolis to do with Jerusalem?’

Appendix I

Textual and Archaeological Sources
Iranian Sources Cf: (Kellens 1989), (Malandra 1983), (Skjærvø 1995).

A comprehensive anthology of the many sources for the Achaemenid Empire is now available in (Kuhrt 2009). The following considers each category of source separately.

1. THE AVESTA. The Avesta is a collection of the sacred texts of the Zoroastrian community. Only a small portion of the originally oral material is extant (perhaps about one third). The Avesta can be divided into two main divisions based on dialect: the ‘Old Avestan’ sections (the Gāthās and the Yasna Haftanghaiti) which date around 1000 B.C.E., and the ‘Young Avestan’ sections (the remainder of the Yasna, the Yātis, and the Vidērvā) which date roughly to the Achaemenid period. The extant Avesta largely consists of the liturgy of the Zoroastrian sacrifice (the Yasna), but it also includes a purity code (the Vidērvā) and hymns (the Yātis). Some miscellaneous prayers and fragments are also included (the Niyayes and Siroqahi). The Old Avestan sections are obscure hymns which have been embedded in the liturgy, and are obviously much older than the surrounding liturgy of which they are now a part. Many of the Yātis are also quite archaic, perhaps preserving features of the old Indo-Iranian religion. Rather than viewing the Avesta as the ‘Zoroastrian Bible’ it is perhaps better to compare it to the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. The only comprehensive translation of these texts in English is still the collection in the Sacred Books of the East Series; even though the translations are outdated, they have been continually referenced here due to their accessibility. In addition, a variety of selected passages are presented in Boyce, Textual Sources.

Translations and critical editions:


2. VARIOUS PRAYERS AND FRAGMENTS. In addition to the Avesta proper, various other texts in the Avestan language have survived. A funeral liturgy, the Aogamadaëca, quotes both extant and lost Avestan passages. The Niyayeš, Sirozahs, and various other prayers and fragments also exist.

Translations:


3. THE OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS. A number of inscriptions in Old Persian cuneiform have been found throughout Iran from the reigns of Darius I to Artaxerxes II. These are from the palaces at Persepolis, Pasargadae, and Susa, as well as from the Behistun cliff, Naqš-š Rustam, and Ecbatana/Hamadan. While largely concerned with commemorative
and political issues, various religious concepts known from the Avesta do appear. A full list of the Old Persian inscriptions can be found in Kent; a number of critical editions and facsimiles have been produced by Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum.

Translations and Critical Editions:


4. Various Tablet Archives. Several large deposits of clay tablets from the Achaemenid period have been found which can be used to cull details on the actual conditions and mechanisms of daily life in the empire. Most relevant are the Elamite cuneiform archives found at Persepolis (The Treasury Tablets and the Fortification Tablets.) These tablets are largely receipts and ration documents showing the economic and administrative activities around Persepolis. The topics disclosed include religious rations and a mysterious, otherwise unknown Lan ceremony. Not all of the tablets have been published to date. In addition to the Persepolis tablets, the Akkadian tablets of the Murašu Archive help to illuminate the situation in Achaemenid Babylonia.

Translations and Critical Editions:


5. Various Papyri. A number of Aramaic papyri from the Achaemenid period have been discovered, most notably in Egypt. Administrative notes belonging to the Satrap Aršam are known, as well as a remarkable collection from the Yahwistic military colony on the island of Elephantine. Like the tablet archives, these provide valuable insights into the daily workings of the empire, and they occasionally mention religious issues. A collection of Persian period papyri from Samaria is also available.

Translations and Critical Editions:


6. The Pahlavi Writings. A variety of religious writings in Pahlavi (Middle Persian) from the ninth and tenth centuries C.E. have also survived. These preserve translations and commentaries on the Avesta, both extant and (now) lost, digests of theological literature, and
new compositions. While the date of these texts is extremely late, they cannot be ignored when discussing early Iranian religion for several reasons. Firstly, most of the Avesta is lost and much of Pahlavi writings are translations, epitomes, or commentaries on the Avestan text; they thus preserve valuable additional information which is otherwise lost and must be considered when evaluating the extent Avesta. Secondly, perhaps more dangerously, the Pahlavi writings preserve earlier interpretations of the Zoroastrian traditions which are again useful for assessing the continuity and evolution of that tradition. These texts must be used very warily, with the understanding that some of the material must be late, even though some of it may be incredibly ancient. It is wise to try to parallel materials in the Pahlavi material with the extant Avesta and Greek sources when trying to evaluate the usefulness of a particular work. Among the Pahlavi writings are the Bundahisn (An epitome largely on mythology, cosmogony, and eschatology), the so-called Zand-i Vahman Yasn (supposedly a commentary on a lost Yast), the Ardâ Virâz Namag (report of an ecstatic vision), the Denkard (a summary of the contents of the Avesta), the Mênôg-i Xrad, and the Selections of Zatspram (an epitome and letter by a theologian). For a List of a variety of other texts and the editions of them available, see Nyberg, A Manual of Pahlavi. The only comprehensive English translation is again in the Sacred Books of the East.

Translations and Critical Editions:


Classical Sources. Cf. (Clemen 1920), (Benveniste 1929), (Jong 1997)

1. THE GREEK HISTORIANS. A number of Greek writers wrote directly about the Persian Empire and the religion of its inhabitants, and they provide valuable, if difficult to use and assess, information. The more complete and important writers are Herodotus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Strabo, and Arrian, but various small notices and details appear in many writers. Perhaps most significant for the history of Persian religion are the comments in Plato, Aristotle, and Xanthos the Lydian. All these sources must be carefully weighed and used as they represent a Hellenized view of the Persian Empire and its religion which is not always completely trustworthy. A complete collection of all the classical texts relevant to Persian religion (Greek and Latin) has been compiled by Clemen. Several have been critically discussed by de Jong.

Translations and Critical Editions:


b. Individual Sources. A variety of editions for most classical sources are available. The ones consulted in this study are here given for convenience and transparency.


Archaeological Sources. Cf. (Root 1979).

1. MONUMENTAL REMAINS. Excavations have been conducted at the imperial capitals of Pasargade, Persepolis, and Susa, but not yet at Ecbatana. These sites provide invaluable
information on the official ideology and iconography of the Great Kings, as well as details about the administration.

Reports:


2. OTHER MATERIAL REMAINS. The vast territory of the Achaemenid Empire still hold untold potential for archaeological information. An inklng of some of types of information is given below.


3. SYNTHETIC PUBLICATIONS. A number of excellent publications display a range of photographs of sites and artefacts from Achaemenid Iran, and are well worth consulting. For some excellent works, see:

Appendix II

Orthography of Languages
A variety of ancient languages are relevant to the topic of this dissertation, and most of them display multiple methods of transcription into Roman characters. For clarity and ease of reference, the methods of dealing with each language employed in this study are noted below. Direct quotations from authors retain the author’s orthography.

HEBREW AND ARAMAIC

Words are displayed using the square ‘Aramaic’ characters without pointing, unless the pointing is necessary for the argument, and English transliteration is avoided.

GREEK

Words appear using the Greek alphabet; transliteration is avoided.

OLD PERSIAN

Words appear in English transliteration in italics, without reference to the cuneiform script. The spellings of words conform to that given by Schmitt (2008) with reference to Kent (1961), except where a conventional spelling prevails (e.g., Ahura Mazda for Anumazda). As a rule, the Latinized Greek forms of Persian names are used in lieu of the Persian forms (e.g., Darius for Darayaud). A * prefix indicates a reconstructed form.

AVESTAN

Words appear in English transliteration in italics. The spellings of words are simplified, but based on Hale (2008:1), except for the letter ṣ, where the older š is retained; common words follow conventional spellings (e.g., Gāthās for Gābās). See also (Hoffman 1988). A * prefix indicates a reconstructed form.

2 Kent, Old Persian.
PAHLAVI

The Pahlavi script has its own difficulties; for a discussion see Hale (2008:2). The 'Transcriptions' of Pahlavi follow those in MacKenzie (1967; 1971). The exception to this rule is Hale's character 5, for which MacKenzie and Hale use \( \varkappa \); since Boyce, Bailey, and other scholarship familiar to Biblical Studies use \( v \), the standard spellings here retain the older orthography. Other, related languages (Parthian, Manichaean Middle Persian) are based on the orthography in Boyce, *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian.*

\[ a \ b \ c \ d \ e \ f \ g \ h \ i \ j \ k \ l \ m \ n \ o \ o \ p \ r \ s \ t \ u \ u \ v \ w \ x \ y \ z \]

OTHER LANGUAGES

Any other language incidentally encountered (e.g., Elamite, Akkadian, Ge'ez) are transcribed in English following their scholarly sources and no attempt at normalization is made.

---

Appendix III

Glossary of Iranian Terms
When possible, words appear initially in their Avestan form, followed by the Pahlavi in parenthesis, e.g., Miθra (Mihr).

Achaemenid: Dynasty which ruled from Persia from Cyrus II to Darius III (ca. 600–332 B.C.E.). Although Cyrus’s line was broken by Darius I (522), it was continued by Xerxes I, whose mother was Cyrus’s daughter, Atossa.

Aēšma (Xēšm): Personification of 'wrath' and one of the principle demons in Zoroastrianism. First appears in the Ḡāthās.

Ahura: Avestan equivalent of Sanskrit ‘Asura,’ meaning ‘lord.’ Originally a class designation of Indo-Iranian deities.


Amaša Spānta (Amahraspand): A group of personified abstractions which emanate from Ahura Mazda. Originally a fluid group, by the Young Avesta they were standardized into a group of seven (Spānta Mainīu, Vohu Manah, Spānta Armāiti, Āša Vahīšta, Xšātra Vairīa, Haurvatat and Aṃrōtat).

Arādvī Sūrā Anāhitā (Ardvīsūr): Goddess, probably originally the deification of a spring or river. Popular in the west, she was later assimilated to/identified with Anāītis and Istar. One of three deities which appear in Old Persian inscriptions.

Aŋra Mainīu/Angra Mainyu (Ahriman): ‘The Devil’ of Zoroastrianism, technical name derived from ‘evil/malignant spirit.’ He is the inverse of Ahura Mazda in all respects. There was some ambivalence in the tradition over whether Aŋra Mainīu was properly the evil counterpart to Ahura Mazda or Spānta Mainīu.

Aogamadaēca: A late Avestan funeral liturgy.

Apadāna: Old Persian word for a columned hall, as at Pasargadae, Persepolis, and Susa.

Apocalyptic literature: literature in Second Temple Judaism which is related to the genre ‘apocalypse’ but not strictly an apocalypse.

Apocalypse: A genre of literature which appears in Second Temple Judaism and has parallels in other contexts. It takes a narrative form and depicts a revelation. See the standard definition in Semeia 14 and amended in Semeia 36.

Ardā Virāz Nāmag: A ninth–tenth century Pahlavi apocalypse, with a tour of heaven and hell. Often described as ‘the Persian Divine Comedy.’

Armāiti (Spandārmad): Personification of obedience or religious devotion, patron of the earth, and one of the Ameša Spāntas.

Arštāt (Aštād): Personification of justice.
Aša: ‘Truth’ or ‘Order,’ the good principle of the universe and the quality of all Ahura Mazda’s creation. Appears as Rta in Sanskrit and Arta in Old Persian.

Aša Vahista (Ardvahīst): The personification of Aša as one of the Amāla Spāntas.

Aši (Ard): Personification of ‘Reward, recompense.’

Astuvat.ārata: The given name of the only Saosīiant in the original eschatological framework and of the final Saosīiant in the tripled version.

Astōdān: Old Persian for an ossuary.

Avesta: The sacred writings of the Zoroastrians. Originally transmitted solely orally, only approximately one quarter is today extant.

Aži Dahāka: Mythical dragon who became an arch-accomplice of Angra Mainyu. He had three heads and killed the primeval king Yima. He was defeated by Ṭrātaoma, in some versions, he lays bound inside Mount Damavand, awaiting his release and death at the hands of Karasaspa.

Barōsman (Barsom): Originally a mat of grass or twigs upon which sacrifice was performed. Later became a bundle of twigs held by the priests during the ceremony, as is visible on a number of Achaemenid archaeological remains.

Behistun: Cliff face on the road from the Iranian plateau to the Mesopotamian plains upon which Darius I inscribed his account of his accession to the throne (also spelled Bīstun).

Bundahišn: A ninth—tenth century Pahlavi epitome and commentary on the Avestan creation and eschatological myths. Some parts are clearly translations of lost Avestan sections; others are later interpretations. Contains the most systematic presentation of Zoroastrian eschatology extant.

Činvatō Poretu (Činvat Puhl): Precise definition of the term is debated; bridge over which the newly deceased soul must pass to reach paradise. If the soul is wicked the bridge reduces to a hair’s breadth and the soul plunges to hell; if it is righteous the bridge becomes wide.

Daēna (Dēn): Common noun means ‘religion.' As a personification, it appears to represent a deceased soul's conscience. It appears after death to reward or rebuke the soul. Also sometime personified as a separate yazata representing Zoroastrianism itself.

Daēuua (Dēv): Avestan for ‘demon.’ Originally a class of Indo-Iranian deities.

Dādestān ī dinig: A late Sassanian priest’s response to a series of questions on Zoroastrian doctrine.
Daxma: Originally a grave; after the widespread adoption of exposure became a technical term for the places of exposure later termed ‘towers of silence.’

Dēnkard: A ninth century Pahlavi work which lists the contents of the Avestan Nasks and summarizes some of them.

Drui (Drōz): ‘Lie,’ ‘deceit,’ the evil principle of the universe; the opposite of Aša.

Frašo.koṛtī (Frašegird): ‘Making wonderful,’ the eschatological restoration of the world to the perfection originally created by Ahura Mazda.

Frauuašī (Fravard/Fravahr): A band of warrior deities, spirits of the ancestors, and the eternal ‘essence’ of a righteous entity; which meaning is intended at a given time is not always clear.

Gāthās: Esoteric religious poems in Old Avestan traditionally ascribed to Zarathuṣtra which form the central portion of the Yasna. Roughly equivalent to the psalms.

Haoma (Hōm): The juice pounded from an unknown plant and used during the Yasna. The juice most likely had some kind of hallucinogenic, intoxicating, or narcotic effect. The mortars and pestles found at Persepolis are usually connected to the pounding of Haoma. Paralleled by the use of Soma in the Rig Veda.

Haurvātat and Amōratat (Hordād and Amurdād): Personifications of ‘Health’ and ‘Immortality’ respectively and two of the Amūla Spāntas. Usually appear together.

Herā (Harburz, Alburz)/ Taēra (Terag): The mythical mountain both in the centre of the world and the range ringing the world; later identified with Mount Damavand north east of Tehran. The Tāera is its peak.

Kavi Viśtāspa: The legendary first convert and patron of Zarathuṣtra; also the namesake of Darius I’s father and the Oracle of Hystaspes.

Karōsāspa (Garšāsp): One of the great heroes of Iranian tradition, known for his exploits fighting dragons. In some myths he is asleep to be awoken at the end of time to defeat the bound Aēzī Dabāka.

Karšuuar (Kešvar): ‘Continent,’ ‘island,’ ‘region.’ Iranian mythology traditionally held that the earth was composed of seven karīnuvars.

Xšātra Vairia (Shahrevar): Personification of ‘rule, dominion.’ One of the Amūla Spāntas.

X’arōnah (Khwarrah, Farnah): Exact translation of this word is disputed; generally translated as ‘glory,’ ‘fortune,’ or ‘Glückglanz.’ Usually reserved for kings, heroes, and divinities. Some scholars identify the Achaemenid winged disk with the kings’ X’arōnah.
Mainiavaka/*Gaœhiiaka (Mênôg/Gêtig): Spiritual/Material or intangible/tangible. Ahura Mazda first created the world in a mênôg state and then in a gêtig state. Neither state has any ethical implications.

Mênôg-i Xrad: A ninth century Pahlavi writing on miscellaneous issues, of unknown authorship.

Miôra (Mihr): Indo-Iranian deity, personification of ‘contract,’ and related to the sun. Appears in Sankrit as Mitra and Old Persian as Miya. His relationship to the Roman Mithras is unclear.

*Miôrakâna (Mihragan): Annual autumnal festival. Al-Biruni reports that it honoured the binding of Aêj Dahâka, and Herodotus reports of a festival in honour of Miôra on which the Great King became drunk.

Magus/Magi: Scholar-priests of Western Iran. Their precise understanding is contested.

Nask: A ‘book’ or major division of the Avesta. Originally there were 21.

Niyâyeš: Daily prayers for times of the day, largely extracted from the Avesta.


Ossuary: A receptacle for the disarticulated bones of the deceased.

Pahlavi: The form of the Persian language after Old Persian and before Modern Persian/Farsi.


Pešôtanu (Pešôtan): The immortal son of Kavi Vištâspa.

Rašnu (Rašn): ‘The Judge;’ yarzata who, with Miôra and Sraos, will judge the souls of the dead.

Saošiian (Sôšyant): ‘The Over-comer, Savior;’ Originally used of Zarathustra himself, later of the believer, and ultimately for the eschatological savior who will usher in the Fratâksri.


Spânta Mainiuiu (Spennâg Mênôg): ‘The Beneficial/Bountiful/Holy Spirit;’ sometimes considered simply an aspect/emanation of Ahura Mazda, sometimes identified with him; usually (but not always) counted as one of the Amsola Spântas.

Sirozahs: Dedictory prayers to the patron deities of the Zoroastrian calendar.

Sraoša (Srôš): Personification of ‘(Religious) Obedience;’ one of the yarzatas who judge the individual soul.
Tiri (Tir): An obscure Western Iranian deity who does not appear in the Avesta, but appears in the Zoroastrian Calendar and in Western Iranian names. Later identified with the Avestan deity Tištrya.

Tištrya (Teštar): Rain deity usually identified with the star Sirius.

Thraetaona (Fredon): Indo-Iranian heroic figure, associated with the defeat of dragons, especially Aži Dabákā.

Vāta (Vād): Indo-Iranian Yazata of the winds.

Vayu (Vāy): Indo-Iranian personification simultaneously of the wind, the breath of life, and of death. Was divided in Zoroastrianism into two, a 'good Vāyu' associated with resurrection and an 'evil Vāyu' associated with death.

Vidēvdāt (Vendidād): 'Laws against the demons;' a Young Avestan text which compiles a variety of ritual purity laws and some fragments of myths.

Vizidagīhā i Zādspram: 'The Selections of Zadspram,' a ninth century Pahlavi theologian's selections from the Bundahīšn.

Vṛ̤̃r̥̃raghna (Vahrām, Bahrām): Personification of 'victory.' Often associated with Mithra, but has his own Yāšt (XIV).

Vohu Manah (Vahman): 'Best Thought,' the Amsa Spenta who, according to tradition, imparted revelation to Zarātūštra. Usually contrasted with the demon Aka Manah, 'Bad Thought.'

Yasna (Yašn): 'Worship.' Used as the technical term for the liturgy and sacrifice, as well as the Avestan sections recited during the sacrifice.

Yasna Haptaqhāiti: Seven Old Avestan poems which surround the Gāthās in the Yasna. Considered either slightly younger than or contemporaneous with the Gāthās.

Yašt: Young Avestan hymns dedicated to various deities, of varying antiquity and quality. Many contain very archaic elements.

Yazata: Zoroastrian term for 'deities worthy of worship' to differentiate them from the evil deities not to be propitiated or worshipped (i.e., Angra Mainyu and his hosts.)

Yima (Yam, Jamšed): Indo-Iranian first human king, with whom a variety of traditions are associated. In India, he became the king of the dead, a role he does not appear to have had in Iran.

Young Avestan: The language of the newer sections of the Avesta (parts of the Yasna, the Yašts, Aogāmudaēca, and the Vidēvdāt.) Generally considered contemporaneous with Old Persian.
Zāmyād Yašt: Important Young Avestan Yašt (XIX), dedicated to the earth, which praises Xarənah and alludes to mythological and eschatological characters associated with it.

Zand: 'Interpretation or Commentary.' Used of the Pahlavi commentaries to the Avesta. In nineteenth century scholarship was mistakenly thought to be the proper name of the Avesta.

Zand-i Vahman Yašn: A ninth century Pahlavi work, supposedly an epitome and commentary upon a lost Avestan Yašt. Certain aspects of the work are clearly archaic, but other sections most clearly post-date the Arab conquest of Iran.

Zaobera (zōhr): libation or blood sacrifice.
Appendix IV

Annotated Definitions of Terms
This study uses a number of problematic concepts over which scholarship has fought bitter battles of definition, and for some of these, the definitions presented and utilized above may be viewed as somewhat idiosyncratic. A selection of these terms and their definitions are therefore listed below, with brief glosses explaining the choices involved. More contextualized discussion and references can be found in the relevant chapters. All definitions, unless otherwise cited, are the author's own.

**Apocalyptic**

**Definition**

Apocalyptic is a collective noun to describe the genre of apocalypse, apocalypticism, and millenarianism.

**Comments**

The study of apocalyptic has made significant strides since the common refinement of 'apocalyptic' into three more specific referents. However, since all three retain relations, it is expedient on occasion to refer to them collectively, particularly for a study such as this, which seeks backgrounds for all of them. The collective use does not question the import or utility of the more precise terms (apocalypse, apocalypticism, millenarianism).

**The Genre of Apocalypse**

**Definition**

"'Apocalypse' is a literary genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spacial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world, intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority." ¹

**Comments**

This definition has received numerous criticisms, but a better replacement has yet to emerge. Even though neither 'genre' nor 'apocalypse' are terms which were contemporary with their creation, as a heuristic device for clarity in modern discussion it remains very useful, and it adequately describes the similarities in the multifaceted books typically called

---

apocalypses. The retention of eschatology as part of the definition is important as one of the distinguishing features of these books from other (contemporary) revelatory genres.

DIALECTIC

Definition

Dialectic is the interplay and relationship between two opposites which remain in perpetual tension.

Comments

This understanding of dialectics is based on the works of Kierkegaard, and explicitly contradicts the Hegelian and Marxist notion of Thesis–Antithesis–Synthesis (there is no synthesis). It is necessary to carefully distinguish between 'dialectic' and 'dichotomy,' the two of which are often unfortunately confused. Dichotomies are merely opposites which fail to interact, and thus fail to explain complex relationships.

ESCHATOLOGY

Definition

Eschatology is a category of beliefs regarding the decisive termination or transformation of the cosmos or the individual, beyond which present historical processes can never recur.

Comments

Conflating future predictions and hopes with eschatology confuses the very different kinds of understanding involved with each. Restricting eschatology to a decisive end does not impinge recognition of the vast array of ends which can be imagined or advocated. The differences between these are often involved with some form of teleology (ultimate goal) of either the world or the individual. The idea of purpose, however, is independent from termination.

HERMENEUTIC

Definition

A hermeneutic is the point of departure and reflexive personal alignment from which, through which, and by which an individual and/or community receives, understands, interprets, and re-creates traditions, circumstances and ultimately worldview, involving some specific content which supports favored methodologies and media, while occurring with
specific reference to a real social context. This may but need not be held exclusively of other hermeneutics by the same individual or group.

Comments

The definition used here is meant as a description of the way humans practically interpret their traditions and surroundings rather than as a philosophy of textual interpretation per se, as in much of the post-Schleiermacher tradition. Human beings cannot avoid interpretation, and the manner and principles by which this is done—however intuitively or explicitly—is open to analysis and investigation. This study argues that these hermeneutics are vitally important for understanding any tradition’s relationships with previous traditions.

Influence

Definition

Influence designates the reshaping, selection, and/or interpretation of native ideas, stories, characters, or doctrines due to interaction with another culture or tradition which occurs within living traditions.

Comments

This definition is designed to highlight the complexity involved in influence and its dialectical rather than dichotomous nature. Influence relates ‘native’ and ‘foreign,’ intentionality and unconscious processes, and calls for an analysis of hermeneutics as well as ideas and myths.

Interiorization

Definition

Interiorization is the process whereby a technology becomes integrated into individual and societal psychological processes and becomes part of the cognitional and functional norm. The first stage of this is called amplification, the phenomenon whereby aspects of a previous technology are at first increased by the advent of a new technology.

Comments

This concept is derived from the work of McLuhan and Ong and is an important tool for understanding how a technology transforms and is transformed by a society and an individual. Interiorization allows for a nuancing of effects synchronistically and
diachronistically due to variations in the extent of its process. A falsely dichotomous 'Great Divide' is thus avoided without neglecting the severe implications—psychologically and communicatively—of technological-communicative change.

MYTH

Definition

A myth is an attempt to understand and impart meaning to reality in narrative and symbolic form without regard to empiricist concerns.

Comments

This definition focuses more on function than on content; this is contra to much discussion in Biblical Studies, which is limited to cosmogonic/theogonic myths, an approach which neglects how other stories function symbolically and meaningfully in the same manner. The qualifier 'without regard to empiricist concerns' is essential to this definition because it highlights two aspects: one, myth and history are not dichotomous—they simply relate differently to empirical evidence; two, a story's mythic and historical natures are independent. This requires a little unpacking.

Modern societies have stories which function as myth just like ancient ones, although they tend to be dressed differently; the myth of George Washington in America or of the 800 years of English oppression in Ireland have the same culturally-defining and -orienting function as the myth of Athena or even Abraham. When these modern stories are told not as historiography but as explanations for the way things are or ought to be, they are myths. It is this function which is important—the teller is not concerned with the evidence per se but with how it explains and imparts meaning to reality, and thus function is mythic regardless of what the teller thinks of the story's historicity.²

This definition therefore transcends specific genre categories, as the function can be served in many different settings; the only generic necessity is narrative. While myths may often utilize gods or superhuman heroes, these are not strictly speaking necessary for the function.

PROPHET

Definition

² Of course, in some cases, a story's perceived historicity can be used to justify its normativity.
A prophet is a person who fulfills the role of speaking a message from YHWH to his or her contemporaries, which is characterized more by revelatory acumen than learned skill.\(^3\)

**Comments**

Again, this definition is mostly functional. The understanding of the relationship between the concepts of revelation, divination, and human intermediation are very complex, but it is still useful to retain at least an ideal distinction between ‘technical’ and ‘intuitive’ approaches to the impartation of revelation. Even though the borders are necessarily fuzzy in reality, the fact that oracles were double-checked through mantic means in the Ancient Near East helps to justify a continued distinction between them. By focusing on prophet as a role, this definition ameliorates the difficulties caused by instances of prophets using divinatory techniques on occasions (i.e., on such occasions, they are fulfilling the role of diviner rather than the role of prophet, even if their authority as a prophet validates their divination). The exact forms of prophets and prophecy are necessarily highly culturally dependent.

**TRADITION**

**Definition**

A tradition is a mid-level term to describe currents of thought or elements of culture which share recognizable traits while displaying elements of growth and divergence which are due to “inheritance and development.”\(^4\)

**Comments**

The necessary problem with this term is its all-encompassing vagueness, as it can refer to macro- and micro-traditions, but English at present does not facilitate a less nebulous terminology without descending into incomprehensible jargon. It is sufficient here to assert that a tradition can simultaneously be a sub-tradition of another while containing sub-traditions within itself. For example, a ‘meta-tradition’ could be Western culture, which contains Christian, Jewish, and secular traditions, each of which also contain traditions, like Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, etc. In the context of Biblical Studies, Second Temple Judaism can justifiably be considered a ‘meta-tradition’ with sub-traditions of apocalyptic, sapientialism, and prophecy, as well as groups such as Sadducees, Pharisees, etc. It should be remembered, however, that traditions are neither exclusive nor static (i.e., a person or text can simultaneously interact and partake in multiple traditions of varying levels).

---
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