



Shadow and Resurrection¹

A L B E R T D E J O N G

The Greek and Latin texts on the religion of the Persians rarely give detailed descriptions of Zoroastrian beliefs. Most Greek and Latin passages on the customs of the Persians offer no more than brief descriptions of Persian religious practices and some remarks on the divinities concerned, most often in a Greek interpretation.² From these foreign observations a picture of Zoroastrianism emerges that is in many respects different from any reconstruction of Zoroastrianism on the basis of the combined evidence of Avestan and Pahlavi literature. This is partly due to the interests of the Classical authors themselves, and the purposes they had in writing on the Persian religion. This lack of evidence for Iranian doctrine, however, is also partly to be explained as the expression of certain characteristics of Zoroastrianism in antiquity.

The best known of these is the fact that ancient Zoroastrianism was an oral tradition. Although this has generally been acknowledged in the study of Zoroastrian history, it is only recently that some of the more important implications of the oral background of Zoroastrianism have been discussed.³ One of these implications is a notable division between priestly and lay traditions. Zoroastrian literature almost entirely consists of priestly traditions, ranging from highly technical works (such as the *Dēnkard* or the *Nērangestān*) to priestly literature intended for the instruction and education of the laity.⁴ It is difficult to extract from the Pahlavi texts elements of lay religiosity other than a representation of normative religiosity the priests considered fitting for the lay members of the Zoroastrian community.

The Greek and Latin reports on the Persian religion, by contrast, mainly offer short descriptions of Zoroastrian religious life, more in particular the religious life of the laity. There is

one text, however, which reflects priestly speculations rather than popular religiosity: Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 46–47. In interpreting this text, part of which derives from authors from the Achaemenian period, we find more refined varieties of doctrine.

In this passage, which has been intensively studied by several generations of students of Iranian religions,⁵ Plutarch also gives a summary of the information on Zoroastrian eschatology offered by Theopompus of Chios, who lived in the fourth century B.C. and was well known throughout antiquity for his fifty-eight-volume *Philippica*.⁶ That Theopompus has indeed written on this subject is confirmed by comparable (independent) quotations in Diogenes Laertius and Aeneas of Gaza on the Zoroastrian doctrine of the renovation (the end of time, when evil will be defeated and creation will be made new).⁷

Theopompus' account of Zoroastrian eschatology is a mixture of elements that are known from Iranian sources and information that cannot easily be found in Zoroastrian texts. An example of this is Theopompus' version of the millenary scheme, in which Ohrmazd and Ahreman reign for three thousand years in succession and consequently wage war against each other for three thousand years, after which the renovation will take place. In the "mainstream" Zoroastrian millenary scheme, there are three thousand years of creation, three thousand years of mixture, and three thousand years of separation, after which the renovation will take place.⁸

The eschatological events are presented thus: "But in the end Hades (i.e., Ahreman) will perish and men will be happy; they will not need food and will not cast a shadow."⁹ This again gives an element that is well known from the Iranian

texts, the absence of food (actually *preceding* the renovation),¹⁰ together with an element that is unknown, the fact that the bodies of mankind will no longer cast a shadow. It is with this detail that the present article is concerned. It consists of three parts. In part 1, earlier interpretations of the absence of shadow will be discussed. In part 2, the shadowless existence will be compared with other Greek references to the absence of shadow, mainly from Theopompus and Plutarch. Finally, a new interpretation of the absence of shadow in Iranian eschatology will be offered on the basis of Iranian texts mentioning the shadow or discussing its absence.

1. Interpretations of the Absence of Shadow

The earliest interpretation of the shadowless existence in Zoroastrian eschatology can be found in the three classic works on discussions of Iranian religions by Greek and Latin authors.¹¹ The most influential interpretation was given by Bidez and Cumont. They suggested that the Evil Spirit is the creator of the shadow: with his defeat at the renovation the shadows also cease to exist. They considered this Iranian doctrine to be the basis of the similar Pythagorean speculations on the shadowless souls which will be discussed in part 2.

In support of their theory, they referred to Y 57.27 and Yt 10.68, where the horses of Mithra and Sraoša are said to cast no shadow. The reasoning is clear: divine beings do not cast a shadow; therefore, the shadow must belong to the creation of Ahreman. Their opinion can be found repeated every now and then,¹² but there are several passages in Zoroastrian literature which suggest that it is wrong.

The shadow is nowhere said to have been created by the Evil Spirit, nor to have been made out of darkness. In all cosmogonical passages mentioning the results of Ahreman's counter-creations, no mention is made of the shadow. This alone should have some meaning, but there is more. The shadow is consistently represented as something enjoyable and important. Reasons for this are obvious; the few references to the shadow in the *Draxt ī Asūrīg* perhaps suffice to show how much importance was attached to shade. In this short work—a dispute between a Babylonian tree and a goat on the question of

who is the best—the Babylonian tree includes in its boasting "I am full of shadow in the summer, on the heads of sovereigns" and "I am a nest to the little birds, shadow for the wanderers."¹³ To Zoroaster's great vision of the tree with seven branches, known from the *Zand ī Wahman Yasn* and other sources,¹⁴ one Persian poet adds that the tree produced shadow all around.¹⁵

Certain shadows, moreover, are used in the battle *against* the evil creation; the shadow of a person is the subject of inquiries into difficult questions of purity and pollution, and the division of the day is calculated according to the length of a person's shadow (these aspects will be treated below). If there had been awareness of the fact that the shadow was composed of darkness, or was among the creations of the Evil Spirit, one would not expect Zoroastrian writers to attach as much profitable importance to it as they generally do.

In a paper delivered at the Uppsala Colloquium on Apocalypticism, G. Widengren gave a different interpretation of the shadowless existence.¹⁶ Taking the information on the absence of nourishment and the absence of shadow together ("Man hat nicht verstanden, daß diese zwei Umstände zusammengehören"), he suggested that the eating of meat—recorded as one of the first sins of the primal human couple (*GBd.* 14.21–22)—caused Mašyā and Mašyānē to worship the *dēws*. Because of this act of devil-worship, light and darkness mingled in their bodies. The shadow, therefore, is a reminiscence of this primal sin (as is eating), to disappear (together with all darkness) after the renovation.

This reconstruction clearly reads Manichaean beliefs into a Zoroastrian text.¹⁷ It is, moreover, unsupported by the passage in question. The sins recorded of the first human couple in their very early existence (*GBd.* 14.12–29) are: (1) the acclamation of the Evil Spirit as creator, for which their souls were sent to hell until the renovation; (2) a lie told by Mašyā, that he did not like the first milk he drank, for which taste was largely taken away from them; and (3) a complex set of offences against fire, including the roasting of a sheep, the casting of its flesh onto the fire and into the air, and the melting of metal. These sins are summarised in the word *anespāsīh*, "ingratitude"; this act of ingratitude greatly strengthens the power of the evil beings. They become so strong, in fact, that they begin

to fight amongst each other. To divert their internal struggles, they turn their attention to the human couple and cry out to them: "You are mankind! Worship the *dēws* so that envy will take its place in you!" (*mardom hēd. dēwān yazēd tā-tān arešk be nišīnēd*). Then Mašyānē milks a cow and throws a little milk to the north. This devil-worship is the fourth sin committed by the first human couple; they are punished for it by not feeling physically attracted to each other and not producing offspring.

The only connection between the eating of meat and the worship of the *dēws* can be found in the chronology of the narrative: the devil-worship comes after the eating of meat. The human couple in fact is assisted by the gods in the making of fire to roast the sheep.¹⁸ It is impossible to give a precise interpretation of their sins, but they are connected more with their careless act of tossing three handfuls of meat into the fire as the portion of fire than with the consumption of meat. The idea of pieces of darkness mingled with light (or its reverse) is absent from this text. Similarly, the idea that the shadow is caused by pieces of darkness in the human body cannot be found in Zoroastrian literature.

The latest and most elaborate interpretation of the shadowless existence in Zoroastrianism is found in M. V. Cerutti's work on Zoroastrian apocalypticism, which is unmistakably part of the "Bianchi-school" of phenomenology.¹⁹ U. Bianchi himself had already devoted some thoughts to Plutarch's passage, suggesting that the eschatological moment in Zoroastrian doctrine was exemplified by the position of the sun, standing still in the middle of the sky, (*GBd.* 33.34) and thus returning to the earliest stage of existence.²⁰ The absence of shadow was to be connected with this return to the fixed position of the sun and the primordial existence of mankind.²¹

Cerutti takes a different approach. She rightly notices the parallelism between the situation at the beginning of creation and the eventual situation at the end of time. As a signifying element of the deteriorated state of the creation in the period of mixture, she introduces the notion of "need" (*bisogno*), which will be superseded after the renovation.²² The parallelism of the first and the last stages of world history (the "protological" and "eschatological" moments) is connected with the notions of a spiritual (*mēnōg*)

and a material (*gētīg*) existence, of which the first is original and the latter derivative.²³ At various instances, Cerutti appears to suggest that the eventual goal of mankind is to return to a *mēnōg* existence by divesting itself from the "need" that is a sign of *gētīg* reality.²⁴

Cerutti also applies this scheme to the absence of shadow. She first rejects the idea of an immaterial body and Bianchi's theory of the eschatological position of the sun. Her own interpretation of the shadowless existence focuses on the different types of corporeality occasioned by the change in diet predicted in the *Bundahišn*. The diet and the shadow of mankind are in direct relation to the measure of influence from the Evil Spirit and will therefore diminish when the Evil Spirit will be defeated.²⁵ Her position can thus be regarded as a modification of the views expressed by Widengren.

Apart from sharing the objections to Widengren's interpretation, there are more fundamental issues that need to be addressed.²⁶ First of all, the ultimate goal of mankind (and of creation) is not to return to a *mēnōg* existence, but to end up in an "improved" *gētīg* existence, in which the improvement lies in the absence of evil.²⁷ There are, furthermore, clearly divergent traditions concerning eating and procreation, the two main areas of interest of Cerutti's evaluation of Zoroastrian apocalypticism. Whereas some sources, such as the *Bundahišn*, refer to abstinence from food, other texts on the contrary stress the great enjoyment of food and the return of full taste (which was taken away from the first humans because of their sins), explicitly introducing this as a return to the first situation.²⁸ There thus existed traditions (even in the *Bundahišn*) in which something that was taken away from mankind (taste, full enjoyment) will be restored at the renovation. In these traditions, the concept "need" as referring to the essential characteristic of Ahreman's activity in the world, loses much of its meaning.

Most of the elements of the descriptions of the situation at the beginning of creation and after the renovation have multiple frames of reference. To take an example, the drinking of milk (in Cerutti's scheme one of the early signs of "need") is hailed in Zoroastrian literature as the best type of food for mankind and placed in a utopian context: the inhabitants of the six other climes of the world (excluding the centre of the world, *Xwanīras*) are said to live

exclusively on milk.²⁹ There are also possible traces of an advocacy of vegetarianism.³⁰ The *Bundahišn* story on the changing diet of the first human couple (water-plants-milk-meat) can therefore also be interpreted as reflecting a reconstruction of various degrees of civilisation; this interpretation again is not exclusive. It does show, however, how versatile and varied the Pahlavi cosmogonical and eschatological trends can be.

The main difficulty with Cerutti's approach to Zoroastrian apocalyptic ideas is that the notion "need" is used as an autonomous, almost creative structuring principle, as if it has emerged mechanically from the texts. In most cases, however, it has been read into the material, which itself allows for various other interpretations. The concept "need" is absent from the texts themselves. The Pahlavi texts have their own structuring principles, which follow an internal logic at many times lost to us. There also appear to have existed various ideas on most relevant subjects, which should not be reconciled by the introduction of an (alien) structuring principle.

2. Other Greek References to the Absence of Shadow

In the literature of the Graeco-Roman world, the shadow is also a regularly returning subject of reflection.³¹ In earlier systematic treatments of shadow-beliefs a link is usually made between a person's soul and the shadow: the shadow is part of the personality.³² One could also suggest a connection between the shadow and the body: the shadow is often considered to be a physical extension of the body, just as the (evil or beneficent) look.³³ As we shall see, at least in ancient Iran there was a strong corporeal association with the shadow.

Among the Greek references to the shadow in connection with religious beliefs, there is a special group connected with the absence of shadow in persons entering the (inner) sanctuary of Zeus Lycaeus in Arcadia.³⁴ Polybius also refers to this in his *Histories* 16.12. In the context of outlining what he himself observes with regard to the writing down of miraculous events, he blames Theopompus for having written the impossible story that "those who enter the *abaton* of Zeus in Arcadia become shadowless."

There are many stories that relate human transformations (into wolves, bears or "sterile animals") in Arcadia,³⁵ and the exact implications of the loss of shadow in this particular sanctuary are difficult to estimate. If compared with the passages given by Finkel on the physical transformation of the high priest when he entered the *sanctum sanctorum* of the temple of Jerusalem (being described as "not being a man," occupying a middle place between mortal and divine), the transformation of those entering the *abaton* of Zeus Lycaeus may be connected with a similar idea: a different type of corporeality in the presence of God or of the gods. This, however, is not as it was commonly understood in antiquity (cf. below).

What is interesting for the present article is the fact that Theopompus is quoted by two independent sources as having written on the loss of shadow. According to Polybius, he has written on the shadowless existence of those who enter the *abaton* of Zeus in Arcadia; according to Plutarch, he has given information on the shadowless existence of mankind after the renovation in Zoroastrian doctrine.

Plutarch himself also gives some interesting traditions concerning the shadow in *Quaestiones Graecae* 39.300C and *De Sera Numinis Vindicta* 24. In the *Quaestiones Graecae* 39, when speaking of the sanctuary of Zeus in Arcadia, he gives as one of the possible explanations for the loss of shadow the option that this predicts an imminent death, because "the Pythagoreans say that the souls of the deceased do not cast shadows or blink their eyes" (Τῶν ἀποθανόντων οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ λέγουσιν τὰς ψυχὰς μὴ ποιεῖν σκιάς, μηδὲ σκαρδαμύττειν).

Almost the same words occur in *De Sera*. While here the Pythagoreans are not invoked as authority, the Pythagorean background of the information is nevertheless evident. The remarks on the shadow in this text are found in the myth of Thespesios/Ardiaios, which forms the second part of the treatise (chaps. 22–33) and is one of the most interesting examples of Greek myths on soul travel. That there are links between this myth and the myth of Er in Plato's *Republic* is clear from the name of the protagonist Ardiaios, who also figures in the myth of Er.

The myth in Plutarch's *De Sera* relates how an evil person called Ardiaios (accidentally called Thespesios at the beginning of the story), from Soloi in Cilicia, having lost a fortune, chose a

criminal career and amassed great wealth in a relatively short time. One day he fell on his neck and lay in a coma for three days. When his relatives were about to bury his corpse, he returned to life and afterwards changed his vicious ways and became virtuous. In the text, he relates what happened to his soul. Having left the body, his rational soul was carried upwards, together with souls of the deceased. The souls are described as being confined in fiery-red bubbles (πομφόλυγα φλογοειδῆ) from which the miniature figure of a man emerges. These souls wander in all sorts of directions. Ardiaios recognizes some of them, but they are indifferent to his attempts at making contact. Finally, the soul of his cousin approaches him and addresses him with a new name: Thespesios. He explains to Thespesios that he has not died, but that his rational soul was brought there on the authority of the gods. As evidence for this, the cousin gives him a *symbolon*: "The souls of the deceased do not cast a shadow and do not blink their eyes." Upon this, Thespesios becomes aware of his own shadow, and of the fact that his is the only soul to cast a shadow. The other souls have different colours and different grades of radiance, but they are all shadowless.

All this has been judiciously compared with Pythagorean speculations.³⁶ The *symbolon* of the shadowless souls must be compared with *De Genio Socratis* 585C; there, the Pythagorean claim that it is possible to distinguish in dreams between the appearance of a deceased person and of a living person is discussed.³⁷ The suggestion that this is possible by checking the presence or absence of a shadow in the persons they behold is very convincing. The idea of various degrees of luminosity or of various colours to be observed in the souls of the deceased may be Platonic.³⁸ The idea can also be found in (later) Zoroastrian texts.³⁹

3. The Absence of Shadow in Iranian Eschatology on the Basis of Iranian Texts

The shadow is also a regularly returning subject in Zoroastrian literature. The absence of shadow is mentioned twice in the Avesta, in a singularly clear context and meaning. In the (identical) descriptions of the horses drawing the chariots of Sraoša and Mithra (Y 57.27 and Yt

10.68 respectively), the horses are said to be "white, radiant, transparent, bounteous, knowing [. . .], casting no shadow, belonging to the spiritual realm" (Y 57.27).⁴⁰ The same words are used in the description of the chariot drawing Mithra, except that the adjective "spiritual" (*mañiauuua-*) is added.⁴¹ The absence of shadow thus indicates a spiritual, *mēnōg*, existence.⁴²

The shadow itself is clearly part of the *gētīg* reality. It appears, moreover, to be closely connected with the body. Pliny mentions the fact that it is forbidden among the Magi to urinate on a person's shadow.⁴³ In the *PhIRDd*, we find a discussion of the question of whether it makes a man polluted if his shadow falls upon a corpse: "When the shadow of a Mazda-worshipper falls upon a corpse, it does not pollute the body and it does not strike the putrefaction."⁴⁴

In his commentary on the passage, Williams refers to passages where the idea is expressed that the shadow of certain birds does strike the (demon of) putrefaction of a corpse.⁴⁵ This belief appears to be parallel to the idea that the (demon of) putrefaction is chased away by the look of the dog (during the *sagdīd*) and by the consumption of the flesh by vultures and dogs.⁴⁶ The important notion appears to be the notion of *contact*—through the shadow, through the look, or through the eating of the flesh, a genuine contact between the pious man or woman, the beneficent animal, and the corpse is established. This contact may result in a pollution of the man or woman, or in the removing of pollution by the beneficent animals.

An interesting parallel for this can be found in the *Pahlavi Rivāyat of Ādur-Farnbāg* 64. "Question: This man who urinates over a corpse and does not cause the corpse to move, is he polluted or not? Or he urinates on the earth, he may reach the corpse, but does not cause the corpse to move, is he polluted or not? Answer: If it reaches the corpse after he has urinated, he is not polluted. If he urinates down on it, he may be polluted."⁴⁷ The point of the answer appears to be that if in the flow of urine there is actual contact between the man and the corpse, he may be polluted, but if there is no such contact, he will not be polluted.

The shadow, then, among other things, appears to be an extension of the body and is part of the *gētīg* reality. Absence of shadow is indicative of a *mēnōg* reality, as the Avestan passages show. A trace of this is also preserved in the

criminal career and amassed great wealth in a relatively short time. One day he fell on his neck and lay in a coma for three days. When his relatives were about to bury his corpse, he returned to life and afterwards changed his vicious ways and became virtuous. In the text, he relates what happened to his soul. Having left the body, his rational soul was carried upwards, together with souls of the deceased. The souls are described as being confined in fiery-red bubbles (πομφόλυγα φλογοειδῆ) from which the miniature figure of a man emerges. These souls wander in all sorts of directions. Ardiaios recognizes some of them, but they are indifferent to his attempts at making contact. Finally, the soul of his cousin approaches him and addresses him with a new name: Thespesios. He explains to Thespesios that he has not died, but that his rational soul was brought there on the authority of the gods. As evidence for this, the cousin gives him a *symbolon*: "The souls of the deceased do not cast a shadow and do not blink their eyes." Upon this, Thespesios becomes aware of his own shadow, and of the fact that his is the only soul to cast a shadow. The other souls have different colours and different grades of radiance, but they are all shadowless.

All this has been judiciously compared with Pythagorean speculations.³⁶ The *symbolon* of the shadowless souls must be compared with *De Genio Socratis* 585C; there, the Pythagorean claim that it is possible to distinguish in dreams between the appearance of a deceased person and of a living person is discussed.³⁷ The suggestion that this is possible by checking the presence or absence of a shadow in the persons they behold is very convincing. The idea of various degrees of luminosity or of various colours to be observed in the souls of the deceased may be Platonic.³⁸ The idea can also be found in (later) Zoroastrian texts.³⁹

3. The Absence of Shadow in Iranian Eschatology on the Basis of Iranian Texts

The shadow is also a regularly returning subject in Zoroastrian literature. The absence of shadow is mentioned twice in the Avesta, in a singularly clear context and meaning. In the (identical) descriptions of the horses drawing the chariots of Sraoša and Mithra (Y 57.27 and Yt

10.68 respectively), the horses are said to be "white, radiant, transparent, bounteous, knowing [. . .], casting no shadow, belonging to the spiritual realm" (Y 57.27).⁴⁰ The same words are used in the description of the chariot drawing Mithra, except that the adjective "spiritual" (*mañiauuua-*) is added.⁴¹ The absence of shadow thus indicates a spiritual, *mēnōg*, existence.⁴²

The shadow itself is clearly part of the *gētīg* reality. It appears, moreover, to be closely connected with the body. Pliny mentions the fact that it is forbidden among the Magi to urinate on a person's shadow.⁴³ In the *PhIRDd*, we find a discussion of the question of whether it makes a man polluted if his shadow falls upon a corpse: "When the shadow of a Mazda-worshipper falls upon a corpse, it does not pollute the body and it does not strike the putrefaction."⁴⁴

In his commentary on the passage, Williams refers to passages where the idea is expressed that the shadow of certain birds does strike the (demon of) putrefaction of a corpse.⁴⁵ This belief appears to be parallel to the idea that the (demon of) putrefaction is chased away by the look of the dog (during the *sagdīd*) and by the consumption of the flesh by vultures and dogs.⁴⁶ The important notion appears to be the notion of *contact*—through the shadow, through the look, or through the eating of the flesh, a genuine contact between the pious man or woman, the beneficent animal, and the corpse is established. This contact may result in a pollution of the man or woman, or in the removing of pollution by the beneficent animals.

An interesting parallel for this can be found in the *Pahlavi Rivāyat of Ādur-Farñbāg* 64. "Question: This man who urinates over a corpse and does not cause the corpse to move, is he polluted or not? Or he urinates on the earth, he may reach the corpse, but does not cause the corpse to move, is he polluted or not? Answer: If it reaches the corpse after he has urinated, he is not polluted. If he urinates down on it, he may be polluted."⁴⁷ The point of the answer appears to be that if in the flow of urine there is actual contact between the man and the corpse, he may be polluted, but if there is no such contact, he will not be polluted.

The shadow, then, among other things, appears to be an extension of the body and is part of the *gētīg* reality. Absence of shadow is indicative of a *mēnōg* reality, as the Avestan passages show. A trace of this is also preserved in the

account of Zarathustra's meeting with Ahura Mazda and the gods as told in WZ 21. Having drawn water for the Haoma-offering, Zarathustra (in a state of ritual purity) went up the banks of the river *Dāiti* and was approached by a luminous being, Wahman, who was dressed in "a garment resembling silk, in which there was no cut or seam" (*paymōzan-ē abrēšom homānāg būd paymōxt dāšt kē-š nē būd ēc brīn ud darz padīš*, 21.4). As was recognized long ago, this refers to the corporeality with which spiritual beings may be invested.⁴⁸ Zarathustra himself expressed the desire to establish justice on earth and was invited to go up to the world of the spiritual (*mēnōg*) beings. "When he came within twenty-four steps of the Amahraspands, he did not see his own shadow on the earth, on account of the great luminosity of the Amahraspands."⁴⁹ There appears to be a conflation of two different traditions here, for on the one hand, the meeting is said to take place on the banks of the river *Dāiti* (21.10), whereas the invitation of Wahman to "go up" (*abar raw*) to the assembly of the spiritual beings suggests a journey to heaven, as it is known (for instance) from the (largely parallel) story in ZN 514–15 (with variants). The same idea must also be assumed behind the story in *Dk* 7, where Zarathustra takes off his garment to go to the assembly, and returns to it when he comes back to the material world.⁵⁰

In other Pahlavi texts on heavenly journeys, the *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag* and the inscriptions of Kirdēr, as well as in the Persian story of Guštāsp's journey to heaven (ZN 1162–69), the journey to heaven is described as soul travel, mostly without references to different types of corporeality.⁵¹

One might also consider *Dk* 7.6.8, where—in the course of a story relating the presentation of a wonderful chariot to Wištāspa by a certain Srid⁵²—the words *ma pad tis ī sāyagōmand*, "not for the sake of things casting a shadow," are glossed *kū ma nīrmad ī gētīg rāy*, "that is: not for the profit of the material world."⁵³ Here then, there appears to be another reference to the equation "casting a shadow" = "material" (*gētīg*).

There thus are several passages in Avestan and Pahlavi which reflect the idea that the absence or presence of the shadow is a fundamental difference between *mēnōg* and *gētīg*. If this distinction is valid, Theopompus' reference to a shadowless

existence after the renovation can be interpreted as a reference to a *mēnōg* existence, and consequently (although Plutarch does not mention the resurrection) a spiritual resurrection.

In orthodox or mainstream Zoroastrianism, the resurrection is visualized as taking place in a *gētīg* reality. There will be a genuine resurrection, in the flesh, of those who have died. This tradition has some antiquity, as it is already referred to in *Yt* 19 and in *Vd* 18.53. The question of how the resurrection can be brought about is raised in numerous passages in Pahlavi literature. The answer to these questions always indicates the putting together of bodies (flesh and blood).⁵⁴

There were, however, other traditions, according to which the resurrection was to take place in a spiritual body. This is clear from the Arabic author Maqdisī, who claims to have heard from one of the Magians of Fārs that "the whole of mankind will become spiritual, permanent, eternal, in constant luminosity and constant repose."⁵⁵ Even if this may not refer to the actual resurrection, but to the existence after the renovation, the simplest interpretation of this passage would still imply a *mēnōg* existence, as opposed to the "orthodox" improved *gētīg* existence, which can be found with great regularity in the Zoroastrian traditions.

The clearest example of the existence of a tradition that there would be a spiritual resurrection is WZ 34.1: "It has been shown thus in the religion, that Zardušt asked Ohrmazd, "The corporeal beings who have died on the earth, will they be corporeal again at the renovation, or will they be in the likeness of those who cast no shadow?" Ohrmazd said, "They will be corporeal again and rise (?)."⁵⁶

Even though the answer settles the question in the "orthodox" fashion, the fact that the question was raised at all strongly suggests that there were currents of thought claiming a resurrection in a body casting no shadow, in other words, a spiritual resurrection.⁵⁷

One of the formidable problems of the history of Iranian religions is the impossibility of dating texts and developments. This difficulty has given rise to bitter discussions, especially in the realm of the antiquity of Zoroastrian apocalypticism and eschatology. In the latter field, opinions have varied between attributing individual and universal eschatology to be at the centre of Zarathustra's teachings and of Zoroastrianism

account of Zarathustra's meeting with Ahura Mazda and the gods as told in WZ 21. Having drawn water for the Haoma-offering, Zarathustra (in a state of ritual purity) went up the banks of the river *Dāiti* and was approached by a luminous being, Wahman, who was dressed in "a garment resembling silk, in which there was no cut or seam" (*paymōzan-ē abrēšom homānāg būd paymōxt dāšt kē-š nē būd ēc brīn ud darz padīš*, 21.4). As was recognized long ago, this refers to the corporeality with which spiritual beings may be invested.⁴⁸ Zarathustra himself expressed the desire to establish justice on earth and was invited to go up to the world of the spiritual (*mēnōg*) beings. "When he came within twenty-four steps of the Amahraspands, he did not see his own shadow on the earth, on account of the great luminosity of the Amahraspands."⁴⁹ There appears to be a conflation of two different traditions here, for on the one hand, the meeting is said to take place on the banks of the river *Dāiti* (21.10), whereas the invitation of Wahman to "go up" (*abar raw*) to the assembly of the spiritual beings suggests a journey to heaven, as it is known (for instance) from the (largely parallel) story in ZN 514–15 (with variants). The same idea must also be assumed behind the story in *Dk* 7, where Zarathustra takes off his garment to go to the assembly, and returns to it when he comes back to the material world.⁵⁰

In other Pahlavi texts on heavenly journeys, the *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag* and the inscriptions of Kirdēr, as well as in the Persian story of Guštāsp's journey to heaven (ZN 1162–69), the journey to heaven is described as soul travel, mostly without references to different types of corporeality.⁵¹

One might also consider *Dk* 7.6.8, where—in the course of a story relating the presentation of a wonderful chariot to Wištāspa by a certain Srid⁵²—the words *ma pad tis ī sāyagōmand*, "not for the sake of things casting a shadow," are glossed *kū ma nīrmad ī gētīg rāy*, "that is: not for the profit of the material world."⁵³ Here then, there appears to be another reference to the equation "casting a shadow" = "material" (*gētīg*).

There thus are several passages in Avestan and Pahlavi which reflect the idea that the absence or presence of the shadow is a fundamental difference between *mēnōg* and *gētīg*. If this distinction is valid, Theopompus' reference to a shadowless

existence after the renovation can be interpreted as a reference to a *mēnōg* existence, and consequently (although Plutarch does not mention the resurrection) a spiritual resurrection.

In orthodox or mainstream Zoroastrianism, the resurrection is visualized as taking place in a *gētīg* reality. There will be a genuine resurrection, in the flesh, of those who have died. This tradition has some antiquity, as it is already referred to in *Yt* 19 and in *Vd* 18.53. The question of how the resurrection can be brought about is raised in numerous passages in Pahlavi literature. The answer to these questions always indicates the putting together of bodies (flesh and blood).⁵⁴

There were, however, other traditions, according to which the resurrection was to take place in a spiritual body. This is clear from the Arabic author Maqdisī, who claims to have heard from one of the Magians of Fārs that "the whole of mankind will become spiritual, permanent, eternal, in constant luminosity and constant repose."⁵⁵ Even if this may not refer to the actual resurrection, but to the existence after the renovation, the simplest interpretation of this passage would still imply a *mēnōg* existence, as opposed to the "orthodox" improved *gētīg* existence, which can be found with great regularity in the Zoroastrian traditions.

The clearest example of the existence of a tradition that there would be a spiritual resurrection is WZ 34.1: "It has been shown thus in the religion, that Zardušt asked Ohrmazd, "The corporeal beings who have died on the earth, will they be corporeal again at the renovation, or will they be in the likeness of those who cast no shadow?" Ohrmazd said, "They will be corporeal again and rise (?)."⁵⁶

Even though the answer settles the question in the "orthodox" fashion, the fact that the question was raised at all strongly suggests that there were currents of thought claiming a resurrection in a body casting no shadow, in other words, a spiritual resurrection.⁵⁷

One of the formidable problems of the history of Iranian religions is the impossibility of dating texts and developments. This difficulty has given rise to bitter discussions, especially in the realm of the antiquity of Zoroastrian apocalypticism and eschatology. In the latter field, opinions have varied between attributing individual and universal eschatology to be at the centre of Zarathustra's teachings and of Zoroastrianism

and the wholesale fabrication of these elements of Zoroastrian doctrine on the basis of Jewish or Jewish-Christian prototypes.⁵⁸ The Classical texts on the religion of the Persians are frequently only applicable in the tracing of developments in religious practices (such as the introduction of statue worship), not in doctrine. Theopompus is a clear exception to this. Not only do his references to the resurrection (in Diogenes Laertius and Aeneas) provide a firm *terminus ante quem* for the development of ideas of universal eschatology in Zoroastrianism (suggesting that it was already an evolved doctrine in the Achaemenian period), his mention of the shadowless existence as rendered by Plutarch also hints at discussions, which are to be traced in the later texts, concerning the nature of the resurrected body. This subject became one of the major concerns of later Zoroastrian authors, but must have originated before the fourth century B.C.

Notes

1. The investigations were supported by the Foundation for Research in the Field of Philosophy and Theology in the Netherlands, which is subsidized by the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Research (NWO). I am very grateful to Prof. Roelof van den Broek, Prof. Shaul Shaked, and Prof. Philip Kreyenbroek for reading an early version of this paper and making useful comments. Zoroastrian literature is referred to by the following abbreviations: *AWN*: *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag*; *DA*: *Draxt ī Asūrīg*; *Dk*: *Dēnkard*; *DD*: *Dādestān ī Dēnīg*; *GBd*: *Greater Bundahišn*; *MX*: *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī Xrad*; *PhLRDd*: *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*; *SupplTxsŠnŠ*: *Supplementary Texts to the Šāyest nē-Šāyest*; *Vd*: *Vendidad*; *WZ*: *Wizīdagihā ī Zādspram*; *Y*: *Yasna*; *Yt*: *Yašt*; *ZN*: *Zarātoštnāmeh*.

2. Most texts can be found in C. Clemen, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae* (Bonn, 1920); important additions and invaluable commentaries can be found in J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (Paris, 1938). A translation of most texts is available in W. S. Fox and R. E. K. Pemberton, *Passages in Greek and Latin Literature Relating to Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism* (*Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute* 14 [1929]). See, for a substantial publication on Zoroastrianism in the Classical sources, A. de Jong, "Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature," Ph.D. diss., Utrecht, 1996.

3. Mainly in several contributions by P. G. Kreyenbroek; cf. in particular "The Zoroastrian Tradition from an Oralist's Point of View," paper read at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, 1994, to be published in *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*; "On the Concept of Spiritual Authority in Zoroastrianism," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 17 (1994), pp. 1-15.

4. For priestly and lay aspects of Zoroastrian literature, cf., for instance, the distinction made by S. Shaked between popular (secular) and more sophisticated (priestly) *andarz*-literature (*The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages* [Boulder, Colo., 1979], pp. xv-xviii) and A. V. Williams (*The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg* [Copenhagen, 1989], vol. 1, pp. 7-19).

5. Bidez and Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, vol. 2, pp. 70-79; C. Clemen, *Die griechischen und lateinischen Nachrichten über die persische Religion*, *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, vol. 17, pt. 1 (Giessen, 1920), pp. 156-59; E. Benveniste, *The Persian Religion According to the Chief Greek Texts* (Paris, 1929), pp. 69-117; F. Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien* (Berlin, 1863), pp. 279-85; E. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism* (London, 1913), pp. 399-407; M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism* (= *HZ*), vol. 2 (Leiden, 1982), p. 235; M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *HZ*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 1991), pp. 456-60, 478-79; E. Benveniste, "Un rite zervanite chez Plutarque," *JA* 215 (1929), pp. 287-96; W. Lentz, "Plutarque und der Zervanismus," in I. Afšār and T. M. Mīnovī, eds., *Yādnāmeh-ye Irānī-ye Minorsky* (Tehran, A.H.S. 1348), pp. 104-24; J. Hani, "Plutarque en face du dualisme iranien," *Revue des études grecques* (1964), pp. 489-525; J. Ries, "Plutarque historien et théologien des doctrines dualistes," in J. Ries, Y. Janssens, and J.-M. Sevrin, eds., *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique*, Institut orientaliste de Louvain, publication no. 27 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982), pp. 146-63; M. E. D. Phillips, "Plutarque interprète de Zoroastre," in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Paris, 1969), pp. 506-10; R. Turcan, "Le témoignage de Plutarque," in R. Turcan, *Mithras Platonius: Recherches sur l'hellénisation philosophique de Mithra*, *EPROER* 47 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 14-22; J. Dillon, "The Platonising of Mithra" (rev. of Turcan 1975), *Journal of Mithraic Studies* 2 (1977), pp. 79-85; M. V. Cerutti, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, *Storia delle Religioni* 7 (Rome, 1990), pp. 19-62.

6. M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1994).

7. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives and Meanings of Eminent Philosophers* 1.8; Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus*, 64.8-10 in the edition of M. E. Colonna: *Enea di Gaza: Teofrasto* (Naples, 1958).

8. Whether it follows, however, that Theopompus' calculation is Zurvanite (as proposed for example

and the wholesale fabrication of these elements of Zoroastrian doctrine on the basis of Jewish or Jewish-Christian prototypes.⁵⁸ The Classical texts on the religion of the Persians are frequently only applicable in the tracing of developments in religious practices (such as the introduction of statue worship), not in doctrine. Theopompus is a clear exception to this. Not only do his references to the resurrection (in Diogenes Laertius and Aeneas) provide a firm *terminus ante quem* for the development of ideas of universal eschatology in Zoroastrianism (suggesting that it was already an evolved doctrine in the Achaemenian period), his mention of the shadowless existence as rendered by Plutarch also hints at discussions, which are to be traced in the later texts, concerning the nature of the resurrected body. This subject became one of the major concerns of later Zoroastrian authors, but must have originated before the fourth century B.C.

Notes

1. The investigations were supported by the Foundation for Research in the Field of Philosophy and Theology in the Netherlands, which is subsidized by the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Research (NWO). I am very grateful to Prof. Roelof van den Broek, Prof. Shaul Shaked, and Prof. Philip Kreyenbroek for reading an early version of this paper and making useful comments. Zoroastrian literature is referred to by the following abbreviations: *AWN*: *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag*; *DA*: *Draxt ī Asūrīg*; *Dk*: *Dēnkard*; *DD*: *Dādestān ī Dēnīg*; *GBd*: *Greater Bundahišn*; *MX*: *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī Xrad*; *PhLRDd*: *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*; *SuppITxtŠnŠ*: *Supplementary Texts to the Šāyest nē-Šāyest*; *Vd*: *Vendidād*; *WZ*: *Wizidagihā ī Zādspram*; *Y*: *Yasna*; *Yt*: *Yašt*; *ZN*: *Zarātoštnāme*.

2. Most texts can be found in C. Clemen, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae* (Bonn, 1920); important additions and invaluable commentaries can be found in J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (Paris, 1938). A translation of most texts is available in W. S. Fox and R. E. K. Pemberton, *Passages in Greek and Latin Literature Relating to Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism* [*Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute* 14 [1929]]. See, for a substantial publication on Zoroastrianism in the Classical sources, A. de Jong, "Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature," Ph.D. diss., Utrecht, 1996.

3. Mainly in several contributions by P. G. Kreyenbroek; cf. in particular "The Zoroastrian Tradition from an Oralists' Point of View," paper read at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, 1994, to be published in *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*; "On the Concept of Spiritual Authority in Zoroastrianism," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 17 (1994), pp. 1-15.

4. For priestly and lay aspects of Zoroastrian literature, cf., for instance, the distinction made by S. Shaked between popular (secular) and more sophisticated (priestly) *andarz*-literature (*The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages* [Boulder, Colo., 1979], pp. xv-xviii) and A. V. Williams (*The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg* [Copenhagen, 1989], vol. 1, pp. 7-19).

5. Bidez and Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, vol. 2, pp. 70-79; C. Clemen, *Die griechischen und lateinischen Nachrichten über die persische Religion*, *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, vol. 17, pt. 1 (Giessen, 1920), pp. 156-59; E. Benveniste, *The Persian Religion According to the Chief Greek Texts* (Paris, 1929), pp. 69-117; F. Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien* (Berlin, 1863), pp. 279-85; E. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism* (London, 1913), pp. 399-407; M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism* (= *HZ*), vol. 2 (Leiden, 1982), p. 235; M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *HZ*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 1991), pp. 456-60, 478-79; E. Benveniste, "Un rite zervanite chez Plutarque," *JA* 215 (1929), pp. 287-96; W. Lentz, "Plutarque und der Zervanismus," in I. Afšār and T. M. Mīnovī, eds., *Yādnāmeḥ-ye īrānī-ye Minorsky* (Tehran, A.H.S. 1348), pp. 104-24; J. Hani, "Plutarque en face du dualisme iranien," *Revue des études grecques* (1964), pp. 489-525; J. Ries, "Plutarque historien et théologien des doctrines dualistes," in J. Ries, Y. Janssens, and J.-M. Sevrin, eds., *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique*, Institut orientaliste de Louvain, publication no. 27 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982), pp. 146-63; M. E. D. Phillips, "Plutarque interprète de Zoroastre," in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Paris, 1969), pp. 506-10; R. Turcan, "Le témoignage de Plutarque," in R. Turcan, *Mithras Platonicus: Recherches sur l'hellénisation philosophique de Mithra*, *EPROER* 47 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 14-22; J. Dillon, "The Platonising of Mithra" (rev. of Turcan 1975), *Journal of Mithraic Studies* 2 (1977), pp. 79-85; M. V. Cerutti, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, *Storia delle Religioni* 7 (Rome, 1990), pp. 19-62.

6. M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1994).

7. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives and Meanings of Eminent Philosophers* 1.8; Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus*, 64.8-10 in the edition of M. E. Colonna: *Enea di Gaza: Teofrasto* (Naples, 1958).

8. Whether it follows, however, that Theopompus' calculation is Zurvanite (as proposed for example

by Benveniste, *Persian Religion*, pp. 106–12; Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 2, pp. 235–36) is very uncertain. For important modifications, cf. S. Shaked, "The Myth of Zurvan: Cosmogony and Eschatology," in I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. G. Stroumsa, eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 32 (Tübingen, 1992), pp. 219–40. A millenary scheme as presented by Theopompus has not been found in any other text.

9. τέλος δ' ἀπολείπεσθαι τὸν Ἄϊδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους εὐδαίμονας ἔσεσθαι, μήτε τροφῆς δεομένους μήτε σκιὰν ποιοῦντας.

10. E.g., *GBd* 34.1–3 (Anklesaria); *DD* 34.3: "And when the time of the renovation is near, the material beings will stop eating and live without food" (*Ud nazd ō zamānag ī frašgird astōmandān az xwardārīh be ēstēnd ud pad a-xwarišnīh zīwēnd*).

11. Bidez and Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, vol. 2, p. 78, n. 25; Benveniste, *Persian Religion*, p. 112; Clemen, *Nachrichten*, p. 129.

12. For instance Hani, "Plutarque en face du dualisme iranien," p. 508; R. Klaerr and Y. Vernière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 7 (Budé edition) (Paris, 1974), pp. 218–19; surprisingly also Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 2, p. 236.

13. *DA* 18: *tābestān āsāyag hēm pad sar šahryārān*; 22: *āšyān hēm murwīzagān, sāyag kārdāgān*. For an edition and references, cf. M. Navvābī, *Draxt Āsūrīg: Matn-e pahlavī, āvā-nevešt, tarjome-ye fārsī, fehrest-e vāže-hā va yād-dāšt-hā* (n.p., A.H. 1363²). [*Draxt ī Āsūrīg*. Pahlavi text, transcription, Persian translation, glossary, and notes.] Cf. also C. J. Brunner, "The Fable of the Babylonian Tree," *JNES* 39 (1980), pp. 191–202, 291–302.

14. Cf. now C. Ceretti, *The Zand ī Wahman Yasn: A Zoroastrian Apocalypse*, Serie Orientale Roma 75 (Rome, 1995).

15. *ZN* 1309: *be-dīdam deraxtī bar-ū šāx haft / ke har jāygāhī az-ū sāyeh raft*: "I saw a tree with seven branches / that gave off shadow everywhere."

16. G. Widengren, "Leitende Ideen und Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik," in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen, 1983), pp. 77–162, p. 132.

17. This is part of a more fundamental approach of Widengren's work. Widengren seeks the origins of Manichaeism in Zurvanism and has postulated a Zurvanite background both for the passage of Theopompus and for the passage in the *Bundahišn*. Apparently, he therefore feels free to introduce elements of a strikingly Manichaean mythology (the mixture of elements of light with elements of darkness in the body of men) into passages that are Zurvanite. It must be noted, however, that it is impossible to prove, and indeed unlikely, that both passages are Zurvanite. For an introduction to Widengren's understanding

of the Zurvanite background of Manichaeism, cf. G. Widengren, "Manichaeism and Its Iranian Background," *CHIr*, vol. 3, pp. 965–90.

18. *GBd* 14.21: "And they made a fire from the wood of the lote and the box-tree, on the guidance of the spiritual beings" (*u-šan az dār ī kunnār ud šimšār pad nimūdārīh ī mēnōgān ātaxš abgand*).

19. M. V. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'enkratite' nello zoroastrismo pahlavico," in U. Bianchi, ed., *La tradizione dell'enkratite: Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche* (Rome, 1985), pp. 637–68; *idem*, *Antropologia e apocalittica*.

20. U. Bianchi, *Zamān ī Ohrmazd: Lo zoroastrismo nelle sue origini e nella sua essenza* (Turin, 1958), p. 127, n. 22.

21. Depending how one reads the evidence of *SupplTxsšnš* 21.2, this may be correct. The indication of the midday shadow is there said to be 5 *ywk p'y*, when the sun is in Cancer. The natural reading of this would be a fifth (cf. Persian *panj yak*). Since a fifth does not fit into the list given—measuring in halves—some editors have suggested that the text implies that the shadow is under the sole of the foot, whereas others have emended the words to *panzag* and taken the "sole of the foot" to be a measure (cf. F. M. Kotwal, *The Supplementary Texts to the Šāyest nē-Šāyest* [Copenhagen, 1969], pp. 111–12). Retaining the measure as "a fifth of a foot" seems preferable. However one reads this problematic passage, it does refer to a shadow when the sun is at its highest point.

22. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'enkratite,'" pp. 656–59; *idem*, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, pp. 66–78.

23. For these notions, cf. S. Shaked, "The Notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg* in the Pahlavi Texts and Their Relation to Eschatology," *Acta Orientalia* 33 (1971), pp. 59–107.

24. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'enkratite,'" pp. 667–68; *idem*, *Antropologia e apocalittica*, p. 67.

25. *La mancanza di ombra negli uomini ultimi sarebbe conseguenza e stigma, ad un tempo, di modificazioni che nella costituzione umana si vanno producendo contestualmente all'uso, approssimandosi la fine dei tempi, di un regime alimentare diverso da quello precedente o addirittura all'assenza dello stesso. Tale regime alimentare, o meglio, le sue variazioni sono in stretta relazione, da effetto a causa, con il grado di compromissione degli uomini con le forze ahrimaniche, responsabili del manifestarsi del bisogno nella fisiologia umana* (Cerutti, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, pp. 42–43).

26. For criticisms in other respects, cf. the review of *Antropologia e Apocalittica* by P. Gignoux, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 211 (1994), pp. 89–93.

27. Shown convincingly by Shaked, "Notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg*," pp. 83–87; cf. also Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 1, p. 236.

by Benveniste, *Persian Religion*, pp. 106–12; Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 2, pp. 235–36) is very uncertain. For important modifications, cf. S. Shaked, "The Myth of Zurvan: Cosmogony and Eschatology," in I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. G. Stroumsa, eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 32 (Tübingen, 1992), pp. 219–40. A millenary scheme as presented by Theopompus has not been found in any other text.

9. τέλος δ' ἀπολείπεσθαι τὸν Ἄϊδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους εὐδαίμονας ἔσσεσθαι, μήτε τροφῆς δεομένους μήτε σκιάν ποιοῦντας.

10. E.g., *GBd* 34.1–3 (Anklesaria); *DD* 34.3: "And when the time of the renovation is near, the material beings will stop eating and live without food" (*Ud nazd ō zamānag ī frašgird astōmandān az xwardārīh be ēstēnd ud pad a-xwarišnīh zīwēnd*).

11. Bidez and Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés*, vol. 2, p. 78, n. 25; Benveniste, *Persian Religion*, p. 112; Clemen, *Nachrichten*, p. 129.

12. For instance Hani, "Plutarque en face du dualisme iranien," p. 508; R. Klaerr and Y. Vernière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*, vol. 7 (Budé edition) (Paris, 1974), pp. 218–19; surprisingly also Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 2, p. 236.

13. *DA* 18: *tābestān āsāyag hēm pad sar šahryārān*; 22: *āšyān hēm murwīzagān, sāyag kārdāgān*. For an edition and references, cf. M. Navvābī, *Draxt Āsūrīg: Matn-e pahlavī, āvā-nevešt, tarjome-ye fārsī, fehrest-e vāže-hā va yād-dāšt-hā* (n.p., A.H. 1363²). [*Draxt ī Āsūrīg*. Pahlavi text, transcription, Persian translation, glossary, and notes.] Cf. also C. J. Brunner, "The Fable of the Babylonian Tree," *JNES* 39 (1980), pp. 191–202, 291–302.

14. Cf. now C. Ceretti, *The Zand ī Wahman Yasn: A Zoroastrian Apocalypse*, Serie Orientale Roma 75 (Rome, 1995).

15. *ZN* 1309: *be-dīdam deraxtī bar-ū šāx haft / ke har jāygāhī az-ū sāyeh raft*: "I saw a tree with seven branches / that gave off shadow everywhere."

16. G. Widengren, "Leitende Ideen und Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik," in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen, 1983), pp. 77–162, p. 132.

17. This is part of a more fundamental approach of Widengren's work. Widengren seeks the origins of Manichaeism in Zurvanism and has postulated a Zurvanite background both for the passage of Theopompus and for the passage in the *Bundahišn*. Apparently, he therefore feels free to introduce elements of a strikingly Manichaean mythology (the mixture of elements of light with elements of darkness in the body of men) into passages that are Zurvanite. It must be noted, however, that it is impossible to prove, and indeed unlikely, that both passages are Zurvanite. For an introduction to Widengren's understanding

of the Zurvanite background of Manichaeism, cf. G. Widengren, "Manichaeism and Its Iranian Background," *CHIr*, vol. 3, pp. 965–90.

18. *GBd* 14.21: "And they made a fire from the wood of the lote and the box-tree, on the guidance of the spiritual beings" (*u-šān az dār ī kunnār ud šimšār pad nimūdārīh ī mēnōgān ātaxš abgand*).

19. M. V. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'encratite' nello zoroastrismo pahlavico," in U. Bianchi, ed., *La tradizione dell'enkrateia: Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche* (Rome, 1985), pp. 637–68; *idem*, *Antropologia e apocalittica*.

20. U. Bianchi, *Zamān ī Ohrmazd: Lo zoroastrismo nelle sue origini e nella sua essenza* (Turin, 1958), p. 127, n. 22.

21. Depending how one reads the evidence of *SupplTtxtŠnŠ* 21.2, this may be correct. The indication of the midday shadow is there said to be 5 ʔywk pʔy, when the sun is in Cancer. The natural reading of this would be a fifth (cf. Persian *panj yak*). Since a fifth does not fit into the list given—measuring in halves—some editors have suggested that the text implies that the shadow is under the sole of the foot, whereas others have emended the words to *panzag* and taken the "sole of the foot" to be a measure [cf. F. M. Kotwal, *The Supplementary Texts to the Šāyest nē-Šāyest* (Copenhagen, 1969), pp. 111–12]. Retaining the measure as "a fifth of a foot" seems preferable. However one reads this problematic passage, it does refer to a shadow when the sun is at its highest point.

22. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'encratite,'" pp. 656–59; *idem*, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, pp. 66–78.

23. For these notions, cf. S. Shaked, "The Notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg* in the Pahlavi Texts and Their Relation to Eschatology," *Acta Orientalia* 33 (1971), pp. 59–107.

24. Cerutti, "Tematiche 'encratite,'" pp. 667–68; *idem*, *Antropologia e apocalittica*, p. 67.

25. *La mancanza di ombra negli uomini ultimi sarebbe conseguenza e stigma, ad un tempo, di modificazioni che nella costituzione umana si vanno producendo contestualmente all'uso, approssimandosi la fine dei tempi, di un regime alimentare diverso da quello precedente o addirittura all'assenza dello stesso. Tale regime alimentare, o meglio, le sue variazioni sono in stretta relazione, da effetto a causa, con il grado di compromissione degli uomini con le forze ahrimaniche, responsabili del manifestarsi del bisogno nella fisiologia umana* (Cerutti, *Antropologia e Apocalittica*, pp. 42–43).

26. For criticisms in other respects, cf. the review of *Antropologia e Apocalittica* by P. Gignoux, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 211 (1994), pp. 89–93.

27. Shown convincingly by Shaked, "Notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg*," pp. 83–87; cf. also Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 1, p. 236.

28. For example, *PhIRDd* 48.58: "There will once again be enjoyment of all food and all the things from which (there is) pleasure and comfort and enjoyment for mankind, just as *Ohrmazd created (the world) in the primal creation*" (transl. Williams, emphasis added).

29. *MX* 16.9-11: *cē paydāg kū mardōm ī pad Arzah ud Sawah ud Fradadafš ud Widadafš ud Worūbaršt ud Worūjaršt hēnd xwarišn pēm ī gōspan-dān ud gāwān any xwarišn nē xwarēnd*. "For it is evident that the people who live in Arzah and Sawah and Fradadafš and Widadafš and Worūbaršt and Worūjaršt do not eat anything else than the milk of sheep and cows." It is interesting to notice this tradition because, originally, the central part of the world, *Xwanīras*, was the only part to be inhabited by mankind. This utopia of milk-drinking civilisations can be found with great regularity in Greek and Latin literature. Cf. for instance F. Graf, "Milch, Honig und Wein: Zum Verständnis der Libation im griechischen Ritual," in G. Piccaluga, ed., *Perennitas: Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich* (Rome, 1980), pp. 209-21; H. S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*, vol. 2, *Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*, *Studies in Greek and Roman Religion*, vol. 6, pt. 2 (Leiden, 1993), pp. 107-9 (with references).

30. Cf., for example, S. Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation* (London, 1994), pp. 43-44.

31. J. Finkel, "The Guises and Vicissitudes of a Universal Folk-Belief in Jewish and Greek Tradition," in *Harry Austrin Wolfson Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 233-54; P. W. van der Horst, "Peter's Shadow: The Religio-Historical Background of Acts 5:15," *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976-1977), pp. 204-12; *idem*, "Der Schatten im hellenistischen Volksglauben," in M. J. Vermaseren, ed., *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, *EPROER* 78 (Leiden, 1979), pp. 27-36; *idem*, "Shadow," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, pp. 1148-50.

32. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, vol. 3, *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul* (London, 1911³), pp. 77-100; cf. also J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, 1983 [4th ed. 1993]), p. 78 with n. 15.

33. For the concept of the harmful look, cf. the cross-cultural studies collected in C. Maloney, *The Evil Eye* (New York, 1976).

34. Pausanias 8.5; Plutarch, *Quaestiones Graecae* 39.

35. For the background of these passages and more references to the sanctuary, cf. W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley, 1983), pp. 84-93.

36. Cf. the notes *ad locum* in the Budé edition.

37. For these subjects, cf. G. Méautis, *Recherches sur le pythagorisme* (Neuchâtel, 1922), pp. 30-35; M. Detienne, *La notion de Daïmôn dans le pythago-*

risme ancien: De la pensée religieuse à la pensée philosophique (Paris, 1963), *passim*.

38. This was suggested by Klaerr and Vernière in the Budé edition, *ad locum*. The passages to which they refer, however, *Republic* 10.611C and *Gorgias* 524D, are by no means conclusive. There is no mention of degrees of luminosity and no mention of different colours of souls in these passages, only of recognizable features which show the virtues and vices of the soul.

39. E.g., *AWN* 7-9; *WZ* 35.54-56.

40. *yim caθβārō auruaṇtō auruša raoxšna frād-ərəsra spənta vīduuāṇhō asaiia mañiuuasaṇhō vazənti*. Cf. G. Kreyenbroek, *Sraoša in the Zoroastrian Tradition* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 52-53, 91. A trace of evidence for a common Indo-Iranian usage is found in Vedic *acchāyā-*, discussed by M. Fowler, "Ṛg-Veda 10.27.14: *bṛhann achāyo apalāšo arvā*," *JAOS* 67 (1947), pp. 270-73.

41. Cf. I. Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 218.

42. The name of the mountain *asaiiā-* in *Yt* 19.4 remains unexplained. It may mean "shadowless," but nothing more can be said about it. Cf. A. Hintze, *Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, *Beiträge zur Iranistik* 15 (Wiesbaden, 1994), p. 411.

43. *Natural History* 38.69.

44. *PhIRDd* 55.1: *sāyag ī māzdēsnaṇ ka be ō nasā ōftēd tan rēman nē kunēd ud nasrušt nē zanēd*.

45. Williams, *Pahlavi Rivāyat*, vol. 2, p. 245.

46. Cf. *Vd* 8.16-18 and Boyce, *HZ*, vol. 1, p. 303 with n. 52 (giving references), for the *sagdīd*, and *DD* 16-18 for the consumption of the flesh.

47. *Pursišn*: *Mard ēd kē pad nasā abar mēzēd ud ān nasā be nē jumbēnēd rēman bawēd ayāb nē? Ayāb pad zamīg mēzēd ōh ān nasā <nē> rasēd ud nasā be (nē) jumbēnēd rēman bawēd ayāb nē? Passox*: *Ka pas az ān mēzēd ōh nasā rasēd rēman nē bawēd. Ka-š abar frōd mēzēd rēman ōh bawēd*. Cf. B. T. Anklesaria, *The Pahlavi Rivāyat of Āturfarnbag and Farnbag-Srōš* (Bombay, 1969), 2 vols. *ad locum*.

48. There are two important studies of this aspect of Zoroastrianism, H. Corbin, *Terre céleste et corps de résurrection: De l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran shī'ite* (Paris, 1960), chap. 1; M. Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien: Le problème zoroastrien et la tradition mazdéenne*, *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études* 69 (Paris, 1963), e.g., pp. 323-28. For the biography of Zoroaster, cf. A. V. W. Jackson, *Zoroaster: The Prophet of Ancient Iran* (New York, 1898; repr. 1965); M. Molé, *La légende de Zoroastre selon les textes pehlevi* (Paris, 1967).

49. *ka be ō 24 pāy ī Amahraspandān mad wuzurg rōšnīh ī Amahraspandān rāy ēg-iš sāyag ī xwēš pad zamīg nē dīd*. (*WZ* 21.9) The same detail can be found in *ZN* 516. The edition of F. Rosenberg, *Le livre de Zoroastre* (St. Petersburg, 1904), gives this verse as

Az avval be-yek anjoman benegarīd / ke az nūr-ešān sāye-ye xʷīš dīd ("First he looked at an assembly / through their radiance he saw his own shadow"). The reading of ms. P, however, is much to be preferred, for example, in view of the fact that the story is completely parallel with WZ: *az avval be-yek anjoman benegarīd / ke az nūr-ešān sāye-ye xod nadīd* ("First he looked at an assembly / through their radiance he did not see his own shadow"). Thus already Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie*, p. 326, n. 2.

50. Dk 7.3.60; cf. Molé, *La légende de Zoroastre*, pp. 40–41.

51. For these texts, cf. P. Gignoux, "Corps osseux et âme osseuse: Essai sur le chamanisme dans l'Iran ancien," *JA* 267 (1979), pp. 41–79; *idem*, *Le livre d'Ardā Vīrāz* (Paris, 1984); *idem*, *Les inscriptions de Kirdīr et sa vision de l'au-delà* (Rome, 1990). Important modifications of several of the issues discussed in Gignoux's work can be found in Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation*, pp. 27–51, and P. Kingsley, "Greeks, Shamans and Magi," *StIr* 23 (1994), pp. 187–98, both with many references to further literature.

52. On the identity of this Srīd, cf. *HZ*, vol. 1, p. 98, n. 89.

53. Molé, *Légende de Zoroastre, ad locum*, reads *sahīgōmand*, "worthy" (and translates "non pour des

choses brillantes"). The two words, *sāyagōmand* and *sahīgōmand*, are written identically. A translation "worthy," however, does not make much sense in this context and the meaning "radiant" for *sahīg* is very dubious.

54. For references, cf. Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation*, p. 33, n. 18.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

56. *kū andar dēn owōn nimūd ēstēd kū Zardušt az Ohrmazd pursīd kū tanōmandān ī pad zamīg be widord hēnd pad frašgird tanōmand abāz bawēnd ayāb a-sāyag homānāgihā. Ohrmazd <guft> kū tanōmand abāz bawēnd ud uzēnd*. Cf. Gignoux and Tafazzoli, *Anthologie de Zādspram, ad locum*.

57. A kind of halfway position between total physicality and total spirituality appears to be presented by WZ 35.50: it departs strongly from the common conception of the dead bodies rising again, by explicitly stressing that those who have awaited the resurrection in heaven (the *ahlawān*) will *not* return to the bodies in which they have died, but their corporeality will consist of "radiant clay without darkness, water without poison, fire without smoke."

58. A judicious overview is given in Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation*, pp. 27–51.