

木象眼の問題などいろいろ考究すべきものが多い。パネルや小箱に塗られた油先りのする塗料は、私どものもち帰った同種のをスペクトル分析で調べることによつて、鉛を含有するいわゆる密陀油風のものであることがたしかめられた。例の正倉院のものと同じ手法とみられるわけである。

こうして考えてゆく時、まだ知られぬものが何と多いことであろう。ガラスもそのひとつである。中近東のガラスはソーダ系であるけれども、まだいろんな金属塩が同時に混ぜられているようである。しかしそれらはつきりせず、時代的な先後も十分に判らない。イスラム世界に残された問題は、まだ無数といつてよいのであろう。

JACQUES DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN : THE WESTERN RESPONSE
TO ZOROASTER, OXFORD 1958.

伊 藤 義 教

This is the Ratanbai Katrak Lectures delivered in 1956, which however is supplemented in the Postscript with several important results published thereafter up to September 1957. Besides, the "Lectures" have recently sent to world various works likewise brilliant, such as E. Benveniste's The Persian Religion according to the chief Greek Texts, 1929; H.W. Bailey's Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books, 1943 and W. B. Henning's Zoroaster, Politician or Witch-doctor, 1949.

As a well known Iranist, Prof. J. Duschesne-Guillemin of the University of Liège is also an able and talented advocator of Prof. G. Dumézil and has published, since before and after Les Comosés de l'Avesta, 1937, many works microscopic or macroscopic. Besides a fine lot of Iranistic, Hittitic and other thesis and articles appeared in various magazines and periodicals, the field of his activities covers so large an area that it has extended from Zoroastre, Etude critique avec une traduction commentée des Gâthâ, 1948; Ormazd et Ahriman, 1953; La Religion Iranienne 1957, etc., further to various books and articles concerning Paul Valéry.

To come to the present work, The Western Response to Zoroaster is divided into 6 chapters, viz. I. the Pre-History of Iranian Studies; II. the Indo-Iranian Perspective; III. the Amesha Spentas; IV. the Great God and Zoroaster's System; V. Iran and Greece, and VI. Iran, Israel, Gnosticism - to which chapters are added the above stated Postscript, and a Bibliographical Index. In the first chapter, the author depicts mainly how Zoroaster has been understood and interpreted with the Greek and the Christians as well as in the Western Medaeval times, etc. But the year 1832

is an epoch-making, because thereafter the Western interests centering about the Iranian Prophet and his peripheral various problems began to be placed on a sound philological basis and justified or rejected by the scientific Studies. Chapt. II is a sort of résumé of these Studies, in their vicissitudes, renovations and developments up to the year 1956. But what the utmost stress seems to have been laid upon by the author, is perhaps Chapt. III. Concerning the Aməša Spəntas, we have B. Geiger's work Die Aməša Spəntas, 1916 which still holds good. Prof. J.D.-G. treats these Entities in their origins just as in his works Zoroastre, Ormazd et Ahriman and La Religion Iranienne, but in the Response he supports and insists upon more tenaciously and rather strongly than in those previous books the theories of Prof. G. Dumézil who has elucidated the Entities' back-grounds not only Indo-Iranian but Indo-Germanic as well. Of the divine beings he found the tripartite classes as well as subordinate deities belonging to the respective principal gods, and has thus attempted to explain the origins of the Aməša Spəntas and the various problems concerned. This line of Dumézil's thought from its departure up to its final completion has successfully been depicted in Chapt. III., consulting chronologically his works: Ouranos-Varuna, Étude de mythologie indo-européenne 1934; Flamen-brahman 1935; Mythes et dieux des Germains 1938; Mitra-Varuna 1940 (2. ed., 1947); Jupiter Mars Quirinus 1941; Naissance d'Archanges 1945; Tarpeia 1947; Aryaman 1949; Les Dieux des Indo-Européens 1952. In Chapt. IV., the author makes treatments of Ahura Mazda(!), Zurvān, two Mainyu, Evil, haoma-cult, dāenā, Eschatology and Renovation, Mithra mysteries, Yima - Manu or the so called Primal Man, the tri-millennia and the Saošyants (Renovators), with all of which Zoroaster is supposed to have been connected either in reality or in appearance. Judging from the floating situation which our present day Iranian Studies find themselves to be in, this chapter may rightly be said to have much more elements open to controversy than those foregoing chapters. In his work, Zoroastre, the author said that Ahura Mazdāh(!) had been previous to Zoroaster, but, eight years later in the present book, taking the God as the Prophet's original proposal he has had to "confess, in Moulton's words (Early Zoroastrianism, p.56), to not a few pendulum swings from one side to the other". Eight years' period, however, cannot be said too short. Why? To take Yasna 29 as an example would suffice to make the matter quite clear. Dealing with the Ahriman's attack on the Primal Bull told in the Bundahišn, Prof. J.D.-G. is right when

he says that, following their Prophet's view-point, the Zoroastrians, while accepting later God Mithra whose ox-slaughter plays an important rôle in the Mithra mysteries, did ascribe the evil deed to the demoniac Ahriman; but question arises, so seems to me, when he says that "as for Zoroaster, he propounded instead the drama of the Ox's soul." (p.67) Evidently the author refers to Yasna 29. The question is whether the author's view is the only way of interpretation or not. Prof. J.D.-G., on the one hand, interpreting *gəuš urvan-* "the ox's soul", thinks the drama as showing Zoroaster's attitude against the cosmogonical myth and on the other he compares (cf. also *La Religion Iranienne* p. 134) it (Yasna 29) to the Slavonic Enoch chapt. 58 where the souls of animals accusing man can be seen. Here, the only interpretation of *gəuš urvan-* "cow's self, i.e. cow herself" (cf. H. Humbach in *Indogerm. Forschungen* Bd. 63, Heft 1) would suffice to give the scene far more e a r t h l y religious-socialistic meaning and to modify the author's statements. Lastly, one of the largest problems throughout the remaining two chapters is Gnosticism. Referring to M. Wellmann and W. Kranz the author excludes Alb. Götze's insistence upon the alleged agreement between Pseudo-Hippocrates' *περὶ Ἐρδου ἁδιν* and the Iranian Bundahishn: both of them describe the micro-macrocosmic parallelisms, but the parallelisms on one side, so says Prof. J.D.-G., cannot find their correspondences on the other. He has thus denied Götze's proposal, according to which the Dāndāt Nask, alleged sources of the Ir. Bundahishn, must have existed as early as the fifth century B.C. and Platon's idealism and dualism might be ascribed to the Iranian sources, Platon being taken with high probabilities to have had some knowledge of the said Nask. With all these denials, however, the author insists upon that the sheer fact of describing the micro-macrocosmic parallelisms on both sides may best be explained from a common source, mainly Indo-Germanic among other ways. This method of explanation is what he has applied to many other cases, mostly with success. For example, apart from the divinization of Chronos "Time" with Pherecydes and others, which reminds us of Iranian Zurvān, and the constant alternate rulership of Love and Hatred over the world with Empedocles which is strongly reminiscent of Iranian Good and Evil Spirits' rule (although this rule is respectively only once), we can best understand from common sources, rather than from an Iranian influence upon the other, the case of Heraclitos who regards the Fire

as a substance of Logos or Nomos (with the Indo-Iranians, Rta ~ Aša "the Universal Order" has a very close connection with the fire) and the early Greek thinkers like Anaximenes and Pythagoras as well as the Orphics who have doctrines resembling the Iranian "cosmic breath" Vāyu ~ Mainyu. The same is the case, so says the author, with the so-called gnostic dualism between God and the world conceived by Platon as well as the dualistic attitude of the Neo-Platonians for whom matter is equal to evil and is another principle, irreducible to God, and Zoroaster's optimistic and ethical dualistic thought — both of them, though different kinds of thought, should be explained from common sources, so the Belgian savant asserts in the 6th chapter. According to him, on the Iranian side, this alleged common trend, though shadowed and disguised temporarily by Zoroaster, later revealed the original appearance of its own which, together with the above-mentioned Greek dualistic trends, has amalgamated the Babylonian and other Semitic elements, so as to constitute gnosticism. Be that as it may, the author here aims at synthesizing two quite opposite arguments: R. Zaehner and G. Widengren. The former insists exclusively upon the Greek origin while the latter rather the Iranian or Indo-Iranian one. I think that prior to Prof. J.D.-G.'s conclusion, there remain not a few data still to be dealt with. To take an example, the stand-point of the Swedish savant Prof. Widengren can be justified, say, with the Sukhāvativyūha sūtra of the Pure Land Buddhism. Concerning the so-called redeemed redeemer, saved savior or der erlöste Erlöser, we may consult the story of Amita Buddha when he was still in Bodhisattvahood, while, concerning the robe Vohu Manah gives the righteous soul^(*) one may refer to the said Scripture where we read: the bodhisattvas clothe themselves with an armour of all-salvation vow.^(**) Bodhisattvas have their final goal in attaining Buddhahood on the one hand and in salvating all of the sentient beings on the other. As such, they are warrior-like champions, and leaders of all beings. The armour is after all nothing but to be dressed by all rescued. No wonder that the armour reminds us with good reason of the warrior-robe of Vāyu (Ir. Bundahišn pp. 31-32) who acts also as a soul-leader and has his own replica in the said Vohu Manah. These parallelisms between Iranian texts and the Buddhist scripture may contribute rather to elucidating the Indo-Iranian elements of gnosticism. Besides the gnostic problems, what are most concerned with chapt. VI are the Messiah, and Satan and the doctrine of the two Spirits — the problems already dealt

with elsewhere in La Religion Iranienne having been left aside. Concerning the Messiah, there prevails an argument that the Iranian eschatological theory of Saošyant has influenced the universal kingdom of God preached by the second Isaiah, although the kingdom is purely ethical, and not eschatological as is supposed to be by some scholars. Various fundamental data concerning the Messiah ~ Saošyant, when subjected to minute examinations, may rather lead to the denial of an Iranian influence on Israelite side, so says Prof. J.D.-G. To deal with the conception of Satan and the doctrine of the two Spirits, he, on the contrary, insists upon the Iranian influence. At first, Satan was only an prosecutor as God's humble servant, but later he appeared as an opposite adversary of Him. Concerning Yahweh's Spirit originally good and evil, there arose an independent treatment of two Spirits, Good and Evil, opposite each other (the Manual of Discipline found in the Dead Sea scrolls has a little tract on the two Spirits!). All of these should be ascribed to Iranian influences. Especially, the Dead Sea scroll's identifications of both Spirits, Good and Evil, respectively with Light and Darkness rather point to a non-Gathic origin, like Zurvanism, although there seems to be a starting point for it in Yasna 31. That the Zurvanism, along with the conception of Satan as God's adversary and the doctrine of the two Spirits, developed into pessimistic direction so as to have a common feature therein with gnosticism, is, according to the author, nothing but a natural course of its own.

To sum up, the present work, sometimes answering the Swedish school which criticizes at times the author's too much attachment to G. Dumézil's stand-points, can best be called a second "Stand und Aufgaben der iranischen Religionsgeschichte" (by G. Widengren, in Numen 1954-55). Almost all of the present day Iranistic problems, important and fundamental, are referred to there, but it is with such an extremely abridged style that all of the attempts to make its further abridgement are practically impossible. This is the reason why the present review of mine contains so little résumé thereof.

Prof. Atsu'uji Ashikaga kindly read through my manuscript. Thanks are due to him whose suggestions and advices have been constant and unfailing sources of my studies.

G. Y. Ito.

*1 Aogmadaēcā § 17 (Pāzand text), cf. also S. Wikander: Vayu I 1941 pp. 26-43.

