were likely to be communicated by word of mouth, and it is in the field of eschatology, angelology, and demonology that Persian influence on Judaism may most surely be recognised.

Proof post-exilic Persian or Zoroastrian influence is not easy to prove. Jewish scribes and editors had other objects than that of enlightening the historical students of to-day, and official religious writers were doubtless anxious to check foreign influences, and to conceal the tokens of their existence. Even the protests of official writers, however, are useful to the historical student. The belief in Satan, as we find it in the OT, is thoroughly Jewish, and yet it would hardly have assumed its actual form without the indirect influence of the belief in Ahriman against which it became a protest (see SATAN). So too the ancient benediction called *שמע* or must have had a polemical intention, and yet the custom of reciting it at dawn was no doubt influenced by a similar Zoroastrian usage.

It would somewhat strengthen the case for Persian influence on the Jews if we had other *linguistic* proofs besides the supposed derivation of ASMODEUS (*q.v.*) from Aêshma-daêva.

Such proofs, however, are wanting, nor can the generally accepted Zend etymology of Asmodeus be called quite certain, owing to the imperfect correspondence of the qualities of the two demons.

22. Later. The question needs examination in connection with the story of Tobit (may we refer in advance to a new explanation of Asmodeus in *Crit. Bib.*?), which seems to have passed through several phases. It is clear, however, that, as time went on, Persian and Babylonian influences in combination were more and more felt by the Jews. Hence it is difficult to say whether the seven evil spirits of Mt. 12[45] are to be traced to Babylon or to Persia, and whether the Book of Revelation (a Jewish even more than a Christian work) strikes us more by its Persian or by its Babylonian affinities.[1] Such a competent authority as E. W. West can see hardly any difference between the Devil of this book and the Zoroastrian Ahriman, whilst the eschatology of the later Zoroastrian books has a most striking resemblance to that of Revelation. The contest of Michael and his angels with the dragon and his angels is closely parallel to the contest between Vohumanô 'Good Mind' and the powers of evil, and to the 1000 years' conflict with Azhi Dahâka (the destructive serpent). Nor is the awful 'lake of fire' wanting in the later Zoroastrian books.

The seven 'men,' *i.e.*, angels, in Ezek. 9[2], together with the seven archangels of Tobit may supply evidence of an earlier date for Persian influence, though (without here raising the question as to the original setting of the story of Tobit) it may be admitted that the Persian Amshaspands developed out of Babylonian germs. In fact, it is becoming more and more clear that we cannot always draw a sharp distinction between original and imported Persian beliefs. The influence of Babylonia upon Persia must have begun earlier than used to be supposed. The religion of Aûra-mazda, in spite of its primitive Aryan roots, must have been influenced, like the religion of Yahwé, by that of Babylonia. For instance, both the seven chief good spirits and the seven chief evil spirits of Zoroastrianism have indisputable Babylonian affinities. Probably, however, it would be correct to say that Gabriel and Michael and their companions are more directly akin to the Zoroastrian Amesha Spentas or Amsha-pands (whose names are not less significant) than to the Igigi, or friendly genii, of the Babylonians. But the seven Amshaspands, even if borrowed, were modified Hebraistically, Yahwé not being (as analogy would have required) one of the seven.[2] Cp ANGELS, § 4, n. 1.

[1] Gunkel in his able work (*Schöpf. u. Chaos*) has unduly ignored the Persian elements.
[2] Cp Mills, 'Zendavesta' (*SBE*), 3 145.

It is also not improbable that the belief in gu angels (Mt 18[1] Acts 12[15]) was promoted by the Persian doctrine of *fravashi* (which may also th the Jewish belief in the angelic hosts). The doctrine has its roots in primitive Aryan beliefs.

That the *fravashis* originally meant the spirits of th (that, *manes*) is certain, but that this conception early with another, that of the heavenly prototypes of all be the good creation, which were objectified and regarded Spirits or heavenly hosts even by the Jews is equally The conception of prototypes seems to be of Semitic O origin. 'My god' or 'my goddess' in the Bab penitential hymns is to be understood of a guardian akin to the worshipper's 'better self,' or in other 'the fravashi' (*CPs* 4[1]). Cp Duhm, *Ps.* 55[4]; de *Avesta*, Introd. cxix, etc.; Mills, *Zendavesta* (*SBE*) Casartelli, *Philosophy of the Mazdayasnian Religion* *Bundahish*, 157 *f.*; Spiegel, *Eran. Alterthumskund* Che, *CPs.* 26[4], 33[5], 45[9].

How early the resurrection-idea appeared amo Jews, is uncertain (cp ESCHATOLOGY, index, possibility of escaping de certainly implied in the st Enoch; but this story was, even if not unknow popular before the post-exilic period. It appe have a Babylonian origin (see I Sec III). We on much safer ground when we connect the Jewish in the resurrection with Zoroastrianism. Zoro eschatology had a profoundly moral import whic have been congenial to the Jews. The lead Jewish religion no doubt adopted the resur doctrine long after it had been grasped by indiv They adopted it cautiously, so cautiously that we easily suppose that it arose quite naturally out necessities felt in their own spiritual life. Th certainly not the case, unless Jewish religion is viewed as a quite exceptional product. In co time, it was felt that the caution of the earlier was unnecessary. The resurrection might sab made general, and the retribution of the wick made as conspicuous as that of the righteous. the awards of the righteous would only then their full attractiveness when the punishment wicked had been made as complete as possible time went on, the indebtedness of Jewish to belief became still greater, and it is possible th Messiah's function of raising the dead (Jn. 5[25 unconscious copy of the function assigned to th Saoshyant (the Beneficent One) in the Avesta.[1]

23. Resurrection.

The Zoroastrian origin of the doctrine of the re tion and of the renovation of the world is probable. It is raised almost to a certainty w have proved the late origin of Is. 65 *f.*, which expresses the hope of the new heavens and th earth[2] (65[17] 66[22]), and of Is. 24[27], in which not only the promise of the abolition of death it the text be correct, see *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*), but distinct anticipation of the resurrection of d Israelites[2] (26[19]). This limitation of the Israelites we may, as suggested above, ascribe caution of the religious leaders of the Jews.

[1] 'Whose name will be the victorious Saoshyant, an name will be Astvatereta. He will be Saoshyant, bec will benefit the whole bodily world; he will be Astvate who makes the bodily creatures rise up), because its creature and as a living creature, he will stand aga destruction of the bodily creatures, to withstand the Lie-Demon) of the wicked brood' (*Yast*, 13[129], Darm trans.). The *Bundahish*, 30, which is an expansion of gen Zoroastrian elements, is much more explicit (see ch. 30).
[2] Dr. Charles seems too bold in pronouncing the ex of this hope an interpolation, perhaps from Mazdean (*Eschatology*, 122 *f.*). The reference in Is. 51[16] to a re tion of the heavens and the earth, has been commonly be merely figurative. This is probable, if 51[15] *f.* regarded as a part of the Second Isaiah's work. If, h chaps. 49-55 were appended to chaps. 40-48 in the time there is fairly good reason for not minimising the fore language.
[3] *Θ* perhaps gives the hope a wider scope; it rende ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μ See *SBOT*, 'Isa' Heb. 172.