
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost,' the rejuvenescence of the inner soul-life, the life of life made young? With a new self, cut off from this dreadful moral continuity with the past, eased of one's inheritance of self-reproach, and made quick within with the seed of a new future, all things seem possible to a man. The whole world changes when we change. Old things pass away; all things become new.—J. OSWALD DYKES.

A MAN may work brass to great beauty and perfection, but no artificer can work it into gold. To change our natures must be the work of Omnipotence. The change required to make us fit to enjoy heaven is not like that of the snake which has cast its skin, and yet remains a reptile still, it is the change of the caterpillar when it dies, and its crawling life ceases; but from its body rises the butterfly, a new creature with a new nature. To hew a block of marble from the quarry and carve it into a noble statue; to break up a waste wilderness and turn it into a garden of flowers; to melt a lump of ironstone and forge it into watch-springs; —all these are mighty changes. Yet they all come short of the change which every child of Adam requires, for they are much the same thing in a new shape; but man needs a change as great as a resurrection from the dead. He must become a new creature.—J. C. RYLE.

Faith working through Love.—On the occasion of a great public calamity which happened during the third century, Dionysius writes as follows: 'After a breathing-time of short duration, which both they and we enjoyed, we were smitten with the plague, of all dreadful things the most dreadful to the heathen, but which to us was a special trial and exercise of faith. A vast number of our brethren, out of affection for their friends and neighbours, did not spare themselves in their attentions to the sick, but, unmindful of the danger visited them, perseveringly waited upon and ministered to them in Christ, and at last were happy to die along with them. Many lost their lives in the room of those who, by their care, had been restored to health. In this way the worthiest of the brethren made their exit from the world by a death which, as it proceeded from ardent piety and strong faith, seems in no degree inferior to martyrdom. Some also, who after closing the mouth and eyes of their dying brethren, had carried them away upon their shoulders, washed their bodies, and wrapped them in their shrouds, themselves experienced erelong the same fate. Totally different was the conduct of the heathen. They drove out the sick on the appearance of the first symptom of infection, abandoned their dearest friends, cast them when half-dead upon the street, from apprehension of the spread of the fatal distemper, and yet could not escape its attacks.'—A. THOLUCK.

Sermons for Reference.

Brook (S. A.), Spirit of the Christian Life, 109.
Cooper (S.), Fifty-two Family Sermons, 42.
Harcourt (W. V.), Sermons, 86.
Hatch (E.), Memorials, 89.
Holland (H. S.), Pleas and Claims, 124.
How (W. W.), Twenty-four Practical Sermons, 194.
Jay (W.), Short Discourses, ii. 349.
Maclaren (A.), Sermons, i. 207.
,, ,, Christ in the Heart, 229.
Maurice (F. D.), Lincoln's Inn Sermons, iv. 43.
Murphy (E. G.), Larger Life, 121.
Temple (F.), Rugby Sermons, iii. 181.
Tholuck (A.), Hours of Devotion, 295.
Trench (R. C.), Studies in the Authorized Version, 192.

The Iranian Background of Tobit.

BY THE REV. J. H. MOULTON, M.A., LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

DR. RENDEL HARRIS has been lately showing, in *The Story of Aḥikar*, how a Semitic folk-lore story leaves traces on *Tobit*. There is a great deal of folk-lore underlying this romance, as I hope to show. A certain amount of Iranian influence upon the book has long been admitted, since the recognition of Asmodæus as the Avestan demon *Aēšma*, and the action of the story is connected with Media and especially 'the Zoroastrian Ragha.' Before indicating other Iranian features I will describe my theory of the book, and then fit the various items into it one by one. We have taken one step back in the history of the book when we have recognized with Dr. Harris[1] that there was an original Aramaic, of which the Sinaitic LXX has preserved primitive features that have been edited away in the Vatican to a considerable extent. Let us take another step, this time out of Jewish territory altogether.

Tobit is Median folk-lore. In Media the Semitic and Iranian elements meet:[2] the Aḥikar points may very well have belonged to the earlier stage of development. A Jew resident in Media found a romance, written perhaps in Old Persian, which he rewrote in Aramaic, accommodating it throughout for the edification of his co-religionists. He has

[1] *Am. Journ. of Theol.* 1899, p. 541 ff.

[2] For a discussion of the view that the Medes were essentially Iranian, see my notice of Tiele's book on Iranian Religion in the March issue of the *Critical Review*.

made it very orthodox, but we can guess with considerable plausibility what lies behind some of the passages which are now so eloquent for the Law.

There were two peculiarities of the Magian religion which specially struck outsiders, to judge from our classical witnesses, namely, their method of disposing of the dead and their glorification of consanguineous marriage as a religious duty. Both are distinctly called *Magian*, by which I understand a foreign, probably Semitic, element, which fastened on Zoroastrianism as it spread westward from Bactria, and was responsible for nearly all its ritual. In the Vendîdâd, the Leviticus of Parsism, immense stress is laid on the importance of properly building the 'tower of silence,' so that the birds of prey may strip the flesh from the corpse; and it is a highly meritorious act when a faithful Parsi (with a companion, for it is mortal sin to do it alone) removes to this place a corpse that is polluting the holy earth. In the Median *Tobit* I imagine the hero is distinguished for this pious observance, which the Jewish adapter of course transforms into a practice more in accordance with Hebrew ideas. In a Parsi funeral a dog (with certain spots) is brought in to look at the corpse, and so exorcise the *Nasu*, or corruption fiend. In the tale as adapted the dog was in danger of joining the unemployed, but our Jewish writer found him a place. In 6^2, according to ℵ, we read, 'And the youth went forth and the angel with him, and the dog went forth with him and travelled with them.' B has nothing about the dog there, but in 5^{17} and 11^4 the dog is described as going with them. In B, however, he is 'the young man's dog,' which is, I believe, an incorrect gloss, due to the necessity of explaining his presence somehow: it is unnecessary to show how superfluous such an attendant was to Jewish ideas. If Tobit's dog in the original story played the important part above described, Tobit would never go out without him, and the adapter could hardly avoid mentioning him. That there is some allusion to Parsism in the extraordinary insistence of this book upon burial, can hardly be denied; and we may probably agree with Kohut in explaining by this principle the enigmatical verse 4^{17}—the 'bread' is the *draona*, or small round cake, consecrated and eaten in honour of the dead; see West's note in *S.B.E.* v. 283 f. Quite possibly 8^{19} ℵ originally stood in connexion with the preparation of a grave for Tobias, and has been moved thence to its present position. The 'corpse cake' is, however, very far from being peculiar to the Iranians; see Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, ii. 288–312 (pointed out to me by Dr. Harris).

Next as to the consanguineous marriages.[1] This abominable practice was normal among the Iranian Scyths, and it was fervently preached by the Magi as the highest of religious duties. It seems fairly clear that they did not succeed in foisting it into the Avesta; but they glorify it in their patristic writings with a fervour which suggests that they found it hard to persuade the laity of its virtues. For centuries past the Parsis have warmly repudiated the very existence of the practice; and it is probable that the people, as distinct from the priests, never to any large extent came nearer to it than the marriage of first cousins.[2] Now in our *Tobit* we find remarkable stress laid on the duty of marrying within the tribe. The declaration in 6^{12}, which singles out Tobias as the only husband possible for Sarah, cannot be fairly got out of Nu 36^8; and the great desirableness of marriage within the 'kindred' has to be bolstered up by the examples of the patriarchs (4^{12} B). No reason is given for Tobias's 'inheriting' her, a statement so curious that ℵ tries to soften it by adding an assertion that he is heir of her father's property. (Note the double contradiction as to συγγενής 3^{15} and $6^{11f.}$ and the statements about the property: presumably Sarah is talking at random.) Let us now suppose that in the Median original Tobit and Raguel were brothers (cf. 7^4 ℵ, though its weight is diminished by the indiscriminate use of the title: the ἀνεψιός of 7^2 B and 9^6 ℵ is an editorial attempt to disentangle the relationships.) In that case we have the *khvētukdas* in its popular form, and all the eagerness of Polonius-Tobit is accounted for. Let us next turn to the demon and the means by which he is vanguished. His name is generally equated to *Aēšma daēva*, 'the fiend Violence,' who appears as early as the Gâthâs, though not once in a passage where we are forced to write 'violence' with a capital letter. In the later Avesta he is more often named than any other individual demon except Angra Mainyu (Ahriman) and the Druj ('Lie'); but as it

[1] Generally known by the Pahlavi technical term *khvētukdas*. See West's dissertation in *S.B.E.* xviii. 389 ff.

[2] So the modern Parsis interpret the Pahlavi passages generally.

happens the collocation *Aēšma daēva* never occurs till the Bundahish, a Sassanian Pahlavi work based to some extent on lost Avestan material. Since there is no question that Aēšma was a *daēva*, and the prince of them after Angra Mainyu himself, this may well be accidental. What is more difficult to explain is the fact that Asmodæus in *Tobit* is clearly lust, which may be 'hard by hate,' but is not the same thing: in the Avesta Aēšma is always *wrath* or *rapine*,[1] generally with the epithet 'of the murderous spear.' Now if the *Grundschrift* of *Tobit* were a priestly writing, this incorrect rôle for the demon would be a serious difficulty; but we have already had one piece of evidence that it is *popular*, and in such literature technical precision is not to be expected. Asmodæus uses his 'murderous spear,' anyhow, so that we need not be troubled at his having enlarged the sphere of his unamiable activity.

The manner of disposing of him is thoroughly Iranian, though I cannot suggest an exact parallel for the fish's heart and liver. The final conqueror of Aēšma at the world-renewal is to be Sraoša, the angel of obedience, who is specially linked with the six Amshaspands, and answers to Raphael very fairly. His *binding* Asmodæus suggests the binding of the old serpent Aži Dahāka on Mount Dimâvand in Mâzindarân by Thraētaona.[2] I find it hard, despite Nöldeke's objections, to resist Kohut's acute suggestion that Αἴγυπτος in 8^3, going back to מצרים, is ultimately from *Mâzindarân*, which being misunderstood by the Jewish adapter, was easily changed into the name of the country with which the Jews especially connected sorcery. In that case ἄνω (א) suits a mountain: B altered ἄνω εἰς τὰ μέρη to εἰς τὰ ἀνώτατα μέρη, in order (as I am told Dr. Swete has suggested) to remove the scene from Alexandria's country!

In the Shâh Nâmeh of Firdausî[3] we read how the great hero Rustem attacks the White Demon, by whose enchantments king Kâûs and his warriors have been blinded. He is bidden to tear out the heart (or liver) and squeeze the warm blood in the eyes of the blind, which done they all recover sight. This passage seems to throw light on Tobias's use of the fish's gall to cure his father's blindness. In the Median *Tobit* I have no doubt the fish was a demon, and quite possibly the sparrows also: notice how in א Tobit's blindness is increased by the physicians, who might have been reasonably expected to understand the use of a counter-irritant such as the rationalising B[4] makes of the fish-gall in $11^{11\text{-}13}$. The gall being a spell or charm, it seems natural to follow the Shâh Nâmeh story a step further and make the blindness caused by demons' enchantment. The difference between gall (Tobit) and heart (Firdausî) is lightened by the use of the fish-demon's heart against the demon in another way.

I have not yet mentioned an obvious Parsi trait, which, however, is not peculiar to Tobit, and cannot be conclusively proved due to Jewish borrowing: I mean the 'seven angels who stand in the presence and go in before the glory of the Lord' (12^{15} א). The addition of B (cf. 12^{13} א), that they present the prayers of the saints, is not specially Parsic. The six archangels (Amshaspands) of Parsism are made up to the number seven very frequently, either by the inclusion of Ahura Mazda himself, or by adding their constant associate Sraoša, the antagonist of Aēšma. I am abstaining of set purpose from discussing here whether the later Jewish angelology does not owe much to impulses derived from Parsism.[5] I might perhaps add that the glorification of the angels seen in 11^{14} (especially in א) suits an Iranian atmosphere exceedingly well. Nor is it, perhaps, a mere coincidence that the title 'God of heaven' (7^{12} א; cf. 'Belshim and Shimil and Shamin,' in *Aḥikar*, p. 24) is especially associated with Cyrus and Darius (Ezr 1^2 6^9). We naturally connect the statement of Herodotus (1^{131}) that the Persians 'call the whole vault of heaven Zeus' (*i.e.* Auramazda).

In view of the manifest Parsism of the original *Tobit*, the eschatology of our Book is somewhat surprising. The two texts present no variation in this respect, unless א's definition of Hades as κατωτάτω τῆς γῆς (13^2) counts for anything. The only quotable passages are, however, in prayers and moralizing sections which pretty certainly belong to the Jewish adapter's own additions; and if the

[1] Correct the meaning given to the word in the *B.D.*, *s.v.* ASMODÆUS.

[2] See Bundahish, 29^9 (*S.B.E.* v. 119).

[3] Vol. i. pp. 256, 260. (I owe the reference to Professor Cowell's kindness.) English readers may conveniently see the passage in Atkinson's epitome (Chandos Classics), p. 106.

[4] א says beforehand the gall would act as an astringent (ἀποστύψει), but in the actual narrative he does not use the explanatory words about the smarting and rubbing of the eyes.

[5] See my article, 'Religion of Persia,' in the *B.D.*

adapter, like his heroine, belonged to the Northern Israelites who were settled in 'the cities of the Medes' (2 K 17^6), we hardly expect from him the developed resurrection hope which appears among the Pharisees of Judæa. But what was the eschatology of the Median original? Very likely there was none: it would be difficult to deduce the average English belief as to a future life from a novel or a fairy tale. And if there was, we have no evidence that the populace of Media, at the fairly early date which we naturally postulate for this romance, were permeated by the lofty doctrines introduced by Zoroaster. They probably took a long time to rise out of the negation of belief which was common to Indo-Germanic and Semitic nations alike till God sent Zoroaster and Socrates and the prophets of Israel to reveal a light from the shadow of death. There is, of course, the famous passage in Herodotus (3^{62}), where Prexaspes, the agent of Cambyses in his fratricide, assures the conscience-stricken king that his brother is really dead, and that if the dead rise again he might imagine Astyages come to life, as reasonably as his brother Smerdis. It is impossible to build anything on this, which at most could only prove that Herodotus knew the (by that time thoroughly Zoroastrianized) Magi to hold the doctrine of a resurrection in his own day. Moreover, the doctrine of a *final* resurrection does not help the interpretation. It seems more likely that Prexaspes is made to travesty some doctrine (Babylonian?) which made the dead by a rare miracle return to this life on earth. And if this evidence be thus eliminated, there is, as far as I know, no other bearing on *popular* Median eschatology.

Kohut's paper (in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*) —in which I now remember my illustration from the Shâh Nâmeh was anticipated—adds a few details which are too slight to be reckoned here. It is, however, his conclusion with which we must mainly quarrel. To read *Tobit* as a veiled polemic against Parsism, and especially against the forbidding of burial—which leads the learned Rabbi to fix on the third century A.D. as the date of the Book!—makes half the coincidences noted above absolutely unintelligible. The key to them all is found at once when adaptation instead of polemic is recognized.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Guthe's 'History of the People of Israel.'[1]

THIS is the latest volume of a series which is best known in England from such representatives as Cornill's *Alttest. Einleitung* and Benzinger's *Heb. Archäologie*. Unlike some other recent works on the subject it embraces the period which ends in the middle of the second century of the Christian era, treating, however, the later portion of the history, from 333 B.C. onwards, much less fully than the preceding part. It consults the interests of the student by prefixing to every section a list of the authoritative literature. It is written out of a great fulness of knowledge, but the author's acquaintance with what others have done and said seems in no case to overweight his judgment or prevent his using his own eyes. It is perfectly lucid and exceedingly interesting: there is hardly a dull page. Written from the critical standpoint it, of course, begins the history proper at a much later date than we were once accustomed to. Jacob, Israel, Joseph, Judah, etc., are not regarded as individuals but as tribes. A complete set of rules is given for the interpretation of the narratives in which these names occur: what the narrative employs as the name of a man or a father is really the designation of a people or a locality; the name of a wife or mother points to the smaller element in the eventually united whole; marriage is the blending of these elements; concubinage is the absorption of an inferior clan. Moses is a genuinely historical personage, the founder of law and religion amongst his people. On their behalf, too, he exercises priestly functions, and he led them out of Egypt. But he did not promulgate a code of laws. His name is a mutilated form of a longer one, resembling Thutmosis, Ahmosis: the portion which has survived being the Egyptian *mes*, *mesu* = son.

[1] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* Von D. Hermann Guthe. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899.