

The Concept of Glory and the Nature of Man.
A Study of Jewish, Christian, Buddhist
and Zoroastrian Thought.

ABSTRACT

This study of the concept of glory across four different religions begins with Christianity. There the term 'glory' translates Greek doxa, a word which, deriving from a root meaning 'to seem', denotes 'outward appearance', and has in secular Greek the basic meaning 'opinion'. The New Testament, however, not only omits this connotation but gives doxa an entirely new one (radiance, divine Presence). Given that symbols are rooted in the experiential well-springs of a people, why did the Christian experience not bring a totally new symbol to birth? The answer is two-fold: (a) Christians took the word from the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Bible wherein it was used to translate Kavodh (glory) and (b) the meaning of doxa resonated with the Christian Encounter. It had first resonated with the Hebrew experience.

It is this thesis that doxa was used by Christians and Greek-speaking Jews precisely because of its root meanings ('to seem' 'outward appearance' 'manifestation') and that these meanings, resonating also with the experience of Zoroastrians and Buddhists, are reflected in their ideas of glory, albeit within their different conceptual frameworks. 'Glory' in all four religions is related to man's experience of polarities: Immanence/Transcendence, Manifestation/Hiddenness, Presence/Absence, and it speaks of a Reality beyond appearance.

Man longs for the Real; he seeks Self-transcendence. In the measure that he becomes 'selfless' he comes closer to that which he seeks and sees things as they really are. He grows from glory to glory until he becomes what he is. In Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism man is of the essence of glory.

THE CONCEPT OF GLORY AND
THE NATURE OF MAN. A STUDY OF
JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, BUDDHIST AND
ZOROASTRIAN THOUGHT.

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Leicester

by

Maureen Lilian Banyard M.A. (Melbourne)

Department of Religion
University of Leicester

May 1989

UMI Number: U016880

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U016880

Published by ProQuest LLC 2015. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

To
my mother
and also my FMDM sisters
especially Anne.

CONTENTS

Introduction

Abbreviations

1. Glory (doxa) in Christian usage and understanding.	1
2. The roots of doxa in Hebrew experience of the Glory of God (<u>Kavodh Yahweh</u>).	18
3. Jewish interpretation and understanding of the <u>Kavodh Yahweh</u> .	44
4. A symbol of Transcendence: the Buddhist 'Body of Glory' (Sambhogakaya).	73
5. Glory (<u>Khvarenah</u>) in Zoroastrian thought and belief.	97
6. <u>Khvarenah</u> and the Kingdom of Ohrmazd.	131
7. Stages of enlightenment and rule: Glory and the Transcendent state.	151
8. The Kingdom, the rule and the Glory.	176
9. Man in Jewish thought and belief.	204
10. Man in Zoroastrian thought and belief.	232
11. Man in Buddhist thought.	250
12. Man in Christian thought and belief.	268

Bibliography.

INTRODUCTION

It was just before lunch time on a day in mid-April when the clouds, urged on by a brisk wind, were scurrying across the sun making it blink. I was sitting alone at one end of our long narrow dining room. Under the one and only window at the opposite end my three sisters stood closely together absorbed in conversation. Suddenly a very bright shaft of light beamed through the window, broke on the little group and radiated from it. The three were aureoled; it was as though they emanated light.

The phenomenon was unusual but not extraordinary; light is versatile in the tricks it plays. Outside of the ordinary was the intensity of my own inner experience. For a split second my whole being was caught up in a concentrated awareness of the beauty of human folk- not just of the three in front of me but of everyone everywhere. I was in the presence of Beauty. I suppose because glory is associated with light, the word 'glory' flashed across my mind and with it the saying of Irenaeus: "The glory of God is man fully alive". 'But what is glory?', I asked myself. This question and the experience which prompted it was the genesis of the present thesis.

In exploring the idea of glory in Judaism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism my intention has been to delineate rather than to compare; any comparisons made have been incidental and in the interest of further delineation.

No two religions are identical; any attempt to syncretize them is productive only of indecipherable smudge. In the following pages, therefore, each of the four religions stands alone. None, however, is isolated, nor totally different from the rest. In each religion there

is 'glory' highlighting its uniqueness and relating it to the other three. Since a religion belongs to people, how could it be otherwise?

People look to their respective religions for an answer to the meaning of human existence, what life is all about. In Paul Tillich's view a particular religion "will be the bearer of the religious answer as long as it breaks through its own particularity" and this break-through occurs when the individual penetrates into the depths of his own religion "in devotion, thought and action".¹ It is my hope that the following study may help the reader in some small way to penetrate his own religion more deeply.

A few points of detail need to be mentioned. All Biblical quotations are from the Revised Standard Version unless otherwise stated. Non-Christian quotations have been drawn from a number of different sources and therefore include variants of transliterated terms.

In the typing of this manuscript a modern word processor and a venerable old Greek typewriter have been used; the generation gap between them is obvious. I apologise to the reader for the instances of imperfect spacing.

There are a number of people to whom my thanks are due. Maureen Raine and Pat Miller came to my rescue with the typing. At considerable cost to themselves Anne Hawkins and Norah Rohan worked indefatigably in helping to correct the proofs - theirs was a labour of love.

1. 'Christianity Judging itself in the light of its Encounter with the world's Religions', Christianity and other Religions ed. John Hick and Brian Hebblethwaite. Collins, Fount Paperbacks, Glasgow 1980, p.121.

Without the support and encouragement of all my sisters, particularly those with whom I live, this work would not have been possible. They have my special thanks. Finally, if the goal of the thesis is in any way realised, it will be due in no small part to the counsel, kindness and encouragement of Dr. Peter McKenzie and Doug Brear to whom I take this opportunity of extending my gratitude.

Maureen Banyard

May 1989.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abr.,	De Abrahamo
Acts.,	Acts of the Apostles
ARN.,	Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan
B.B.,	Baba Batra
Ber.,	Berakot
Chag.,	Chagigah
Chr.	Chronicles
Col.,	Colossians
Conf.,	De Confusione Linguarum
Cong.,	De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia
Corinth.,	Corinthians
C.W.,	Colson, FH and Whitaker G.H.
Dd.,	Dadistan -i-Denik
Det.,	Quod Deterius Potiori insidari soleat
Deut.,	Deuteronomy
Eccles.,	Ecclesiastes
Eph.,	Ephesians
Er.,	Erubin
E.T.,	English Translation
Fug.,	De Fuga et Inventione
Gal.,	Galatians
Gen.,	Genesis
Gig.,	De Gigantibus
Gt.,	Greater
Heres,	Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit.
Immut.,	Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis
(J)	for the Study of Judaism
Jer.,	Jeremiah
Leg. All.,	Legum Allegoriae
Lev.,	Leviticus
Lxx,	Septuagint

Maccab.,	Maccabees
Migr.,	De Migratione Abrahamae
Mut.,	De Mutatione Nominum
N.P.,	New Persian
Num.,	Numbers
Opif.,	De Opificio Mundi
Pes.,	Pesahim
Plant.,	De Plantatione
Post C.,	De Posteritate Caini
Praem.,	De Praemiis et Poenis
Prov.,	Proverbs
Ps.,	Psalms
Qu. Ex.,	Questions in Exodum
Qu. Gen.,	Questions in Genesin
Q.H.,	The Hymns
R.,	(before names), Rabbi
R.,	(after names), Rabbah
Rev.,	Revelation
Riv.,	Rivayat
Sam.,	Samuel
SBE,	Sacred Books of the East
Sanh.,	Sanhedrin
Shab.,	Shabbath
Skt.,	Sanskrit
Sobr.,	De Sobrietate
Som.,	De Somniis
Sot.,	Sotah
Spec. Leg.,	De Specialibus Legibus
Suk.,	Sukkah
Taan.,	Taanith
TDNT.,	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT.,	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Thess.,	Thessalonians
Tim.,	Timothy
v.contempl.,	De Vita Contemplativa

Virt., De Virtutibus

Ys., Yasna

(Z), for the Study of Zoroastrianism

Zech., Zechariah

Chapter One

" 'There's glory for you!' " (said Humpty Dumpty to Alice).
'I don't know what you mean by "glory", Alice said.
Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. 'Of course you
don't - till I tell you. I meant "there's a nice knock-
down argument for you!"
'But "glory" doesn't mean "a nice knock-down
argument", Alice objected."¹

Since for Humpty Dumpty words meant what he chose them to mean, "neither more nor less"² Alice could hardly be expected to know what he was talking about. Perhaps in the unreal world through the Looking Glass words can mean anything to anyone, but in the real world of real people words mean something (or some things) to more than one; their meaning is recognisable. "Words" writes Paul Tillich "are the result of the encounter of the human mind with reality. Therefore they are not only signs but symbols".³ Symbols are not the consequence of a capricious whim, but, rooted in the experiential well-springs of a people, grow and find expression in that people's history, language and culture. They imbibe and embody, therefore, not only ways of life but also ways of thinking and understanding which, even if analogous with those of other folk in other contexts, are nevertheless unique. Words in turn extend their own influence. The interplay of thought on language and language on thought is a subtle process, making translation and, therefore, comparison difficult. If no two synonyms within one language are identical, then the differences in meaning and nuance between synonyms of different languages, cultures and religions

¹ Lewis Carroll, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through The Looking Glass - J.M. Dent & Sons London 1973 ed. p.185.

² Ibidem.

³ Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology. Part III. SCM. 2nd ed. London 1978. p.19.

must go even deeper. And the differences are compounded by the sheer versatility of the symbol whose character is the antithesis of Humpty Dumpty's "neither more nor less" and whose extraordinary richness can render it ambiguous.⁴ Indeed, "meaning" is itself an extremely ambiguous symbol;⁵ its meaning is manifold. 'Concept' is just as equivocal a word. If, as Gilbert Ryle asserts, "many people can talk sense with concepts but cannot talk sense about them",⁶ it is no wonder that a Humpty Dumpty can do neither. My use of the term 'concept' is in its ordinary, generally accepted sense. In the phrase 'concept of glory' it is to distinguish the associations that the symbol 'glory' has in Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian and Buddhist thought and culture. It is to consider the encounters of mind and reality that brought the symbol to birth and it is to examine its life story.

Some symbols do not continue to find validation in the experience of a people; they are short-lived. Others know long life. If longevity of a symbol is an indication of the value placed on it because of its experiential resonance, then the word 'glory' has been and still is validated in Judaeo/Christian experience and valued deeply in its thought. It is with its life story within this tradition and within its Greek context that I will begin.

Following the conquests of Alexander, Judaism, like other near Eastern

⁴ Although rich in meaning, the symbol is not without its limitations. As J. Danielou remarks, the boundary is fixed by "the natural qualities of the symbol" which reveal only what it has within it to reveal. See J. Danielou The Lord of History. Longmans Green 1958 P.133.

⁵ A.J. Ayer Language, Truth and Logic London: Victor Gollancz Ltd. 1936 2nd Ed. 1946. p.68.

⁶ Gilbert Ryle, The Concept of Mind Hutchinson & Co Ltd., London 1963 reprint. p.7.

religions, became exposed to Greek influence. But influence is never totally one-sided. When the Hebrew bible was translated into Greek, a sort of 'rubbing off' process was inevitable. Greek words in greater or lesser degree received something from the Hebrew words they translated while imparting in turn new associations to the original meaning. Thus the Septuagint and Hebrew Bibles are not identical; neither is Hellenistic Judaism exactly the same as the Judaism which preceded it or the Rabbinic Judaism which followed. Christianity was born into a Hellenistic Jewish milieu and a Greek speaking world.

Of the two different Greek words, 'δόξα' and 'τιμή', which are represented by the English word 'glory', only δόξα need concern us here, since of the many meanings which τιμή bears,⁷ that of 'honour' is the one relevant to our thesis and this meaning is included in that of δόξα. Indeed, δόξα and τιμή are often combined in Hellenistic thought and literature. With specific reference to New Testament literature, Schneider writes "when δόξα and τιμή are associated, δόξα is the higher term. Τιμή in the sense of a position of honour constitutes only one part of δόξα".⁸ It is thus to δόξα and its word group that we now turn.

In secular Greek the relationship between the verb δοκέω and its noun δόξα is apparent. The meanings of δοκέω (a) to think, to believe (b) to seem, to appear and (c) to be of repute, are reflected in the basic

⁷ τιμή(τιμάω) in Greek and Hellenistic literature means (1) the honour and esteem given (a) to people (b) to Deity in worship and (2) the cost, price or worth of things (in legal terms: compensation, penalty, value). Initially materialistic in conception τιμή evolved into a more abstract term. Plato gave the word a more ethical connotation; the Stoics gave it almost exclusively the sense of 'inner worth'. It translates 12 different Hebrew words including תִּבְיָאָה which is rendered in Greek by δόξα. Its many facets make for a tangled web of meaning and in translation inconsistencies abound.

⁸ J. Schneider, 'τιμή' in TDNT Vol VIII p.175.

meaning of δόξα which is not that of 'glory' but of 'opinion'.

There are two aspects to opinion: (1) the subjective (what I think) and (2) the objective (what others think, for example, of me). The first aspect includes meanings such as 'prediction', 'expectation' and 'conjecture'. The second, generally omitting any negative connotations of 'reputation', concentrates instead on the positive idea of "good repute", the 'renown' by which in ancient Greek thought, a person's worth is estimated.⁹ It comes to include not just 'honour' but related ideas such as fame, praise and glory.

The estimation of worth by renown rather than of renown by worth, is an indication of the extrinsic character of δόξα in secular Greek where the attributing of 'glory' to gods, men or objects is dependent on the judgement of the observer, on how things seem or appear to him. The glory of anyone or anything does not exist in its own right but is derived from the opinion of another.

The Jewish historian and Greek literary scholar, Josephus, writes of the opinion held of him by others "they professed to be delighted at the honour (τιμή) in which I was held, remarking that my reputation (δόξα) was a tribute to themselves".¹⁰ Generally speaking Josephus patterns his use of glory (δόξα) on Greek custom, making 'glory' dependent on the opinion of others. Very rarely, however, there are passages in which he gives the word independent status as when he mourns the departed 'glory' of the Temple.¹¹ Kittel writes of such passages, "The author is hardly

9e.g. δόξαν ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἡρημένοϛ. Demosth. Or. 2:15. I owe this reference to Kittel, TDNT Vol II p.234.

¹⁰ Josephus: The Life ed. G.P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library. W. Heinemann. London 1976. p.102.

¹¹ Josephus: Jewish War VI ed. G.P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library. W. Heinemann. London 1979 p.452.

conscious of the transition, since he is speaking only of objects which arouse admiration".¹²

With one exception, Philo of Alexandria's use of glory (δοξα) concurs with that of Josephus and other non-Biblical Hellenistic writers.¹³ Since δοξα occurs some two hundred and fifty times in Philo's writings, the one exception in meaning seems all the more extraordinary. In a paraphrase of Exodus 33:18 ("Moses said 'I pray show me thy glory'"), Philo has Moses pray "I bow before Thy admonitions, that I never could have received the vision of thee clearly manifested, but I beseech Thee that I may at least see the glory that surrounds Thee, and by Thy glory I understand the powers that keep guard around Thee".¹⁴ There is here a remarkable shift in the usage of a word. Not only has 'glory' an existence independent of the opinion of the beholder, but it has assumed also the non-Greek meaning of 'Splendour' or 'Radiance'. In equating 'Glory' with 'Powers', Philo is following the language of the Septuagint version of the Bible in which he was steeped and in whose verbal inspiration and inerrancy he firmly believed. The Bible identifies glory with powers as in Psalm 24:10 where the 'King of Glory' is the 'Lord of powers' (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων), so Philo likewise identifies one with the other. Scholars speculate on the exact meaning of 'powers' within a given context.¹⁵ It is certain, however, that for Philo they here imply light or radiance. In another passage he writes of the "powers which stand around him (God) and flash forth light of surpassing

¹² In TDNT Vol II p.236.

¹³ i.e. In the Greek sense of 'opinion' or 'glory' (honour).

¹⁴ Spec Leg I 8:46 See also H.A. Wolfson. Philo Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts 1947 Vol. II p.143.

¹⁵ Various interpretations are possible, e.g. hosts, stars, angels. Philo interprets 'powers' as meaning 'ideas'.

splendour".¹⁶

Kittel speaks of this sense of 'radiance' as a "foreign body in Philo's total use of the word",¹⁷ as indeed it is. But what sort of a foreign body is it? Powers, with which glory is identified in this instance, play a central role in Philo's metaphysics together with the figure of light. His concept of 'powers' flows from the two tributaries of Greek and Jewish thought;¹⁸ not only are powers equated with glory but also with Platonic ideas.¹⁹ Since the originality of Philo's philosophy has been held in question,²⁰ the extent to which his thinking echoes that of his Hellenistic environment is debatable as is also the degree of influence exercised by the latter on early Christianity. We shall look more closely at Philo's concept of powers in a later chapter, for the moment, however, we shall concentrate on the employment of the word 'glory' (δόξα) in Christianity itself, which is not only a new phase and a new setting in the life story of the word but an experience which appears to impart to 'glory' new meaning.

In Matthew's gospel Jesus asks "what do you think, Simon?" (Τί σοὶ δοκεῖ, Σίμων;)²¹ Paul, in the letter to the Galatians, speaks of those who "were of repute" (οἱ δοκούντες).²² In both these instances, as throughout the New Testament, the verb δοκέω has retained its usual Greek meanings

¹⁶ Immut 17:79 VII p.49.

¹⁷ TDNT op.cit. Vol II p.236.

¹⁸ See Grundmann, 'δύναμις' in TDNT op.cit. Vol II p.298.

¹⁹ "Some among you call them not inaptly *idéas* since they bring form into everything that is". Spec Leg. I. 8:48.

²⁰ See E. Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus Basil Blackwell. Oxford 1962 p.96.

²¹ Matthew 17:25.

²² Galatians 2:2.

without further development. But of its noun $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ the story is different. Nowhere in the New Testament or in the writings of the post-apostolic Fathers does $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ carry its former basic meaning of 'opinion'. It is used throughout these writings with a variety of meanings such as repute, honour (usually that given to God), fame and praise, which it shares with secular Greek. But as though to compensate for the loss of one meaning, $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ has picked up another. It is the non-Greek use of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ as 'glory', 'radiance', as used in the one instance by Philo and but rarely by Josephus, and it is this meaning which achieves prominence over all other meanings ascribed to $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ in Christian usage.

'Glory' in Christian terms is the Majesty, Lordliness, power, strength and splendour of God; the visible radiance of his presence. In the New Testament as elsewhere in Christian literature, these meanings merge into one another so as to make differentiation between them not only difficult but also in a sense unreal, since 'glory' is always the manifestation of God's being. Even when the word is used as an ascription of praise as, for example, in Paul's injunction "whatever you do, do all to the glory of God"²³ and in Luke's account of the heavenly host praising God and saying "Glory to God in the highest ...",²⁴ it is not a question of either men or angels giving glory to God in the sense of adding something to him; it is rather their actively acknowledging the glory God has and is.²⁵ His glory exists whether it is acknowledged or not; it is completely independent of

²³ 1 Corinthians 10:31.

²⁴ Luke 2:14.

²⁵ See 1 Peter 4:11 "To him belong glory ... " In the doxologies of the N.T. as George Molin notes, "the word needed to complete the sense is not $\epsilon\lambda\eta$ = let it be but $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ (literally: it is)" See Encyclop. of Biblical Theology ed Bauer, Sheed & Ward. London 1970 Vol. I p.348.

the opinion of others. To 'give God glory' is also to recognise his Kingship, his Divine Majesty.

Perhaps one of the best known instances of 'glory' as the 'visible radiance of God's presence' is that in Luke's account of the shepherds, who, while watching their flocks by night, saw an angel of the Lord appear to them "and the glory of the Lord shone around them."²⁶ In Christian experience and understanding this glory which is the presence of God is manifested in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. It is a glory made specially visible in the Transfiguration which is recorded by all three synoptic writers.²⁷ Matthew writes "And he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun and his garments became white as light."²⁸ Only Luke finds reason to add "they (i.e. Peter, John and James) saw his glory"²⁹ (εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) . This seeing of glory is, however, generally reserved for the eyes of faith. Paul comments "the God of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ",³⁰ and again "it is the God who said 'let light shine out of darkness', who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ".³¹

Glory is revealed in the works that Jesus performs as at Cana of Galilee where "he manifested his glory; and his disciples believed in

²⁶ Luke 2:9.

²⁷ Matthew 17: 1-7; Luke 9: 28-36; Mark 9: 1-8.

²⁸ Matthew 17:2.

²⁹ Luke 9:32.

³⁰ 2 Corinthians 4:4.

³¹ 2 Corinthians 4:6.

him".³² THE work that Jesus performs is that of salvation.³³ The Christian concept of 'glory' is salvific; it is, above all, the Divine Presence in salvation.

In Christian usage, 'glory' as Presence has reference to both present and future. Its eschatological use is as a place of heavenly light, the light of God's Presence into which Jesus was exalted through suffering. "Was it not necessary that Christ should suffer these things and enter into his Glory?".³⁴ Christians through suffering share in the glory, "The inheritance of the saints in light",³⁵ but it is a sharing which is anticipated in the present, "if you are reproached for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the spirit of glory and of God rests on you",³⁶ and it is through the power of the Spirit, the source of which is the crucified Christ.³⁷ Writing to the people at Ephesus, Paul prays that "according to the riches of his glory he may grant you to become strengthened with might (*δύναμις*) through his Spirit in the inner man"³⁸ and adds that this means being "rooted and grounded in love". Although the fullness or completion of glory is a future event, the beginnings are in time because the Eternal has

³² John 2:11.

³³ Luke 2:11, 30 - 32; John 17:1-5. 20: 30 - 31; Romans 5:6 - 11; 2 Corinthians 5:18.

³⁴ Luke 24:26.

³⁵ Col 1:12.

³⁶ 1 Peter 4:14. See also 2 Corinthians 3:7. Kittel comments that in this passage the "bridge between the present and eschatology is to be found in the ἀπο δόξης εἰς δόξαν. The present is ἐν δόξει but the εἰς points to a coming consummation" TDNT Vol.2 p.251.

³⁷ 1 Peter 3:18; 1 Corinthians 15:45.

³⁸ Ephesians 3:16 - 17 " ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς...
" ... Note that ' ' is not merely 'in' but also 'into'."

been projected into time through the Christ event; the Divine, through Jesus, has shared in man's humanity, so that man might share in his divinity here and now. God who is love has manifested himself through his Christ.

In a rather complicated passage in the second letter to the Corinthians, Paul writes of Christians who, "beholding the glory of the Lord are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another".³⁹ The verb 'to change' is here μεταμορφῶ , the same as that used in Matthew's and Mark's accounts of the Transfiguration⁴⁰ of Jesus on the mountain. It is used passively in the present tense (μεταμορφουμένη) , for a continuous transformation is in process in the believer in the core of his being. As A.M. Ramsey commenting on this passage remarks, "Μορφή means real being in contrast with outward appearance; it is in respect of our real being that we are changed. It is a transformation of the essential man".⁴¹

This dynamic concept of 'glory' is of vital importance in Christian thought. "Christ is illumined let us shine forth with him"⁴² exhorts St. Gregory Nazianzen. He is entreating Christians to fulfil their Christian vocation, their Christian ministry. He continues "Be like lights in the

³⁹ 2 Corinthians 3:18 Literally 'from Glory to Glory' 'ἀπο δόξης εἰς δόξαν'. The glory of the Lord shines in the gospel. Christians beholding that glory are doing so in a mirror which, as it were, reflects. They are thus (in Paul's thought) being 'transfigured into Christ's likeness.

⁴⁰ Mark 9:2; Matthew 17:2.

⁴¹ A.M. Ramsey. The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ: Longmans London 1949 p.54. In philosophic language μορφή refers to the specific character or essential form. See Abbott-Smith Manual Greek Lexicon of New Testament. T. & T. Clarke. Edinburgh 1964.

⁴² St. Gregory Nazianzen Or 39, 14 - 16. 20 in The Divine Office Liturgy of the Hours accord. to Roman Rite. Collins. London 1974. Vol I p.379.

world, a life-giving force to all other men, and stand as perfect lights beside that great light, and learn the mystery of the illumination of heaven, enlightened by the Trinity more purely and clearly, of which even now you are receiving in a measure the One Ray from the one Godhead in Christ Jesus our Lord; to whom be the glory and the power ... " The dynamism of the concept is tersely expressed by St. Iranaeus: "God is man's glory, but it is man who receives the effect of God's activity".⁴³ Humanity is God 'presenced' in the person of Christ who is the manifested glory of God.⁴⁴ The glory of God is man fully alive.

Used eschatologically "glory" refers also to the Parousia. Jesus at his ascension returns to his heavenly glory.⁴⁵ But he will come again. Then, records Mark, the Son of Man will be seen "coming in great power and glory"(μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης).⁴⁶ The author of the letter to Titus writes rather more directly of the "appearance of the glory of our great God and saviour Jesus Christ".⁴⁷ Both are voicing the same Christian belief: Christ who is and who has the glory will come again; then his Kingship will be manifested and the faithful will enter definitive communion with him; they will experience the fullness of glory in his Kingdom.⁴⁸

⁴³ Against the Heresies Bk 3. 20:2 in The Writings of Iranaeus tr. Roberts and Rambaut. T & T Clarke. Edinburgh 1910 Vol I.p.348.

⁴⁴ This is particularly clear in John's Gospel. See B.F. Westcott The Gospel according to St John Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. Michigan 1881 reprint 1981.

⁴⁵ 1 Tim 3:16.

⁴⁶ Mark 13:26.

⁴⁷ Titus 2:13.

⁴⁸ Philippians 3: 20 - 21; Col 3:4 See also 2 Peter 1: 17.20 where the writer speaks of those who were "eye-witnesses of his majesty"; a reference to the Transfiguration and to the exhibition of divine power. The Majestic Glory (V.17) seems to be a periphrasis here for God himself.

Indeed, the Parousia is often spoken of in terms of 'the coming of the Kingdom'⁴⁹ (i.e. the Kingdom of God) when Jesus will sit on his 'throne of glory' (θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ) and "the righteous will shine like the sun",⁵⁰ fulfilled in glory.

But there is a double aspect to 'Kingdom'; it is a present and future reality as is 'glory'.⁵¹ God's Kingdom is to be fully realised in the future but it is operative and active in the present in a lived metanoia, that is, in those who lead a life of loving fidelity to God's will. For Kingdom, most often to be interpreted as 'reign' rather than 'realm', is synonymous in Christian thought with the carrying out of God's will.⁵² Christ Jesus is the effective agent of the Kingdom since it is through him that God's will is effectively fulfilled: "I have come down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me".⁵³ "The Kingdom of God is in your midst".⁵⁴ In Jesus, the union of Father and Son, of God and man, is complete.⁵⁵ The Kingdom and Jesus are synonymous: the Kingdom and the glory are one. The Christian doxology "for thine is the Kingdom, the power and the Glory"⁵⁶ is the acknowledgement not simply of possession but of

⁴⁹ Matthew 16:28.

⁵⁰ Matthew 13:43 .

⁵¹ As seen in the parables. Matthew 13; 20: 1 - 16; 25: 1 - 13.

⁵² Luke 11:2 Matthew 6:10.

⁵³ John 6:38. See also John 4:34; 5:30. Hebrews 10: 5 - 7.

⁵⁴ Luke 17:20.

⁵⁵ John 17: 20 - 24.

⁵⁶ Doxologies, i.e. 'the acknowledgement of glory', are numerous throughout the New Testament. Sometimes they are addressed to God the Father as in Eph. 3:20; sometimes to Christ, e.g. 2 Tim 4:18; that in 1

being.

At the Parousia "the son of man will come in all his glory and his angels with him".⁵⁷ This full manifestation of the divine glory in Jesus thus involves the presence of angels which, in Christian as in Jewish writings and belief, are spirits created and missioned by God to carry out his will.⁵⁸ They therefore participate in his glory by being a perpetual praise of it. Betokening God's power and presence, they seem at times to be personifications rather than personal entities.⁵⁹ As members of the heavenly court or retinue, these heavenly beings are closely linked with the concept of glory denoting divine Majesty/Kingship. New Testament accounts of the manifestation of an angel or angels emphasise visible radiance; Paul states unequivocally that the angel of God is an angel of light.⁶⁰

On two occasions in the New Testament, once in the Epistle of Jude and once in the Second epistle of Peter, angelic powers are referred to as

Peter 3:11 is addressed to the Father through Christ and also to Christ as well. Note Ephesians 3: 20 - 21 where Paul's expression "in the church and in Christ Jesus" is equating Jesus with the Church. In the New Testament at times church and Kingdom are identical as in Col. 4:11; Hebrew 12:28; Matthew 13:38. See also Jude 1: 24 - 25 "To the only God our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord be Glory, Majesty, dominion and authority before all time and now and for ever.

⁵⁷ Matthew 16:27, Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26.

⁵⁸ Hebrews 1:14; Matthew 1:20; 2:13,19. The Jewish concept of angels develops considerably. Prior to the exile angels act as God's messengers doing his bidding, good or bad. After the Exile they become divided into two diametrically opposed groups of 'good' angels and 'bad' angels. The latter are those who revolted against God (Jubilees 4:22; 1 Enoch 6 - 9). New Testament writings concede but do not explain presence of 'bad' spirits/angels. Only in Jude 6, 2 Peter 2:4 does the concept of 'fallen angels' occur.

⁵⁹ As in the phrase 'the angel of the Lord'. e.g. Acts 8:26 "But an angel of the Lord said to Philip". In Verse 29 it is the Spirit speaking to Philip.

⁶⁰ 2 Cor 11:14.

δόξα.⁶¹ Similarity between the two epistles is indicative of a relationship of dependence. It is not our concern to enter here the lively debate amongst scholars as to which (if either) might be the copy;⁶² it is sufficient to note that one instance of the naming of angelic powers (δόξαι) is evidence of further development in the meaning of the word 'glory'.

Although the linguistic history of the noun δόξα is characterised by development, that of its verb δοκέω is not. Within Christianity, δόξα and δοκέω have a more tenuous relationship than they have in secular Greek, though bonds remain. But another relationship has evolved. From δόξα has come δοξάζω, a substitute verb which shares with δοκέω the meaning (1) 'to think', 'hold an opinion', 'suppose', but has in addition the meaning (2) 'to clothe with splendour', 'to extol', 'to glorify', 'to honour'. The first meaning of δοξάζω, though common in secular Greek and in Philo, is never found in the New Testament. The second meaning occurs often both in the ordinary extra-biblical sense of 'to honour' etc., and in the new specifically scriptural and Christian sense which is that of involving participation, causing to share, in the glory. As with δόξα, this includes the concept of 'giving glory' in the sense of active acknowledgement of the Glory God is. On earth Jesus 'glorified' (i.e. gave glory to) God the Father by perfect conformity to his will: "I glorified (ἐδοξασα) thee on earth, having accomplished the work which thou gavest me

⁶¹ Jude 8; 2 Peter 2:10. In Jude the reference is to good angels. But in 2 Peter it is most probably referring to bad/fallen angels. According to B. Reicke δόξα refers here to social dignatories, see The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude Anchor Bible N.Y. 1964, p.167, 202.

⁶² It is more commonly the opinion of scholars that 2 Peter is a copy of Jude. See Richard Kugelman, James and Jude. New Testament Message 19, Veritas Publications, Dublin. J. Chaîne Les Epitres catholiques. E Bib. Paris 1939 pp. 18 - 24.

to do".⁶³ Conversely, Jesus' own glorification is the Father's will made manifest in him. It is a process or interaction which is climaxed in the Passion. As Judas leaves on his errand of betrayal, Jesus says, "now is the Son of Man glorified, and in him God is glorified (ἐδοξάσθη)".⁶⁴ Christians are glorified with Christ through their sharing of his sufferings. In turn, the glorification of Christ is completed in them: "all mine are thine and thine are mine and I am glorified in them".⁶⁵

Thus in the New Testament the relationship between the noun δόξα /glory and its verb δοξάζω /to glorify, is close and clear; theirs is a working partnership in what is primarily a specifically religious role. Their linguistic history within the Christian tradition is of the same stamp; both have lost a part of their earlier Greek meaning and have acquired a specially religious and Christian sense.

This in broad outline is the life story of the word 'glory' from its Greek secular setting to its adoption by and new role in the Christian community. In this present chapter, study of the word's usage and meaning within Christianity has been concentrated almost exclusively on New Testament documents as these are the earliest written expression of Christian thought and an encapsulation of Christian faith/belief of successive ages. The concept of glory as the majesty, power and splendour of God, the radiance of his Presence, is as central to Christianity today as

⁶³ John 17:4. Jesus, through an obedience of love has 'glorified', i.e. 'revealed', the Father. See B. Westcott. op.cit.

⁶⁴ John 13:31 Although Jesus' death has not yet taken place, the means for it have been initiated in his life and particularly at this moment of betrayal. Thus 'Jesus is glorified'. It is a present reality, to be consummated in the actual death/resurrection of Christ. Thus ἐδοξάσθη, since attainment of glory is past event.

⁶⁵ John 17:10. This glory of the disciples is abiding.

it was two thousand years ago.

Yet the use of the word $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ (and its substitute verb $\delta\omicron\Xi\alpha\zeta\omega$) to convey this concept raises important questions. Why was this particular word used and not some other? Given that symbols are rooted in the experiential well-springs of a people, why did the Christian experience not bring a totally new symbol to birth? Was it because Christianity found something in $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ that resonated with its own encounter? If so, what was this something and where lie its roots?

An experience necessarily precedes any attempt to describe it. So obvious a statement as this most probably appears redundant, yet it is the 'obvious' that is sometimes missed, and in this case the obvious is important. First generation Christians did not have a New Testament, not at any rate, a written one. Their experiences, beliefs and traditions when verbalised became the subject of oral tradition, somewhat fluid in form until 'fixed' in its final format a generation or more later, as the written expression of Christian encounter, Christian experience of the glory, the Presence, the Christ event.

The first Christians were not without a written expression of encounter, one still cherished by Christians as an integral part of their own; they had the Jewish Bible in Hebrew and in Greek, the 'Old' Testament. Indeed, everything in the New Testament presupposes that they did have a scripture. "Jesus is what he is only in the context of Israel's expectation. Without the background of this tradition, Jesus would never have become the object of a christology",⁶⁶ writes Wolfhart Pannenberg. Jesus' whole life and message is made intelligible in the light of the Old

⁶⁶ Wolfhart Pannenburg. Jesus God and Man SCM 1968. p.32. See also p.116.

Testament. "To him" preached Peter, "all the prophets bear witness".⁶⁷ New Testament writers take the Old for granted. Old and New form one Christian Bible. This does not mean that the conceptions of one are necessarily (or identically) the conceptions of the other. Some are, others are not. As James Barr states "the conceptuality of the New Testament does not derive equally, evenly or exclusively from the Old".⁶⁸ The New Testament's distinctive concept of glory is at least partly derived from the Christian experience itself. There are several other possible sources, direct or indirect, in Christianity's pre-history, but because, as mentioned earlier, 'glory' is also an Old Testament notion, it is to the Old Testament and to Judaism before Christ that we now turn, keeping in mind the important question: "Why the Christian choice of δόξα and not some other word?"

⁶⁷ Acts 10:43.

⁶⁸ James Barr. Exploration Theology SCM 1980 p.117.

Chapter Two

When Paul, writing to the folk at Corinth, states that his hardships are only slight and momentary compared to the 'eternal weight of glory'¹ which awaits him, he is using an expression that has definite Hebrew resonances. The Hebrew word 'Kavodh' which signifies the English word 'glory', has as its root meaning 'to be heavy'; it signifies weight.² Since in ancient near Eastern thought and culture the 'weight' of anything is a designation of its value, 'Kavodh' is a synonym for riches. But it has other connotations. In materialistic terms wealth engenders respect, esteem; the man of substance is a man of importance, one who is accordingly respected. When used of persons, therefore, 'Kavodh' includes meanings such as honour, importance, status and reputation, terms which are not always easily separated one from the other.

In the Hebrew Bible, the concept of glory embraces the secular meanings. Abram was "very rich (Kavodh) in silver, in cattle and in gold".³ When Joseph bids his brothers "you must tell my father of all my splendour (kavodh) in Egypt",⁴ he is referring to the social prestige, the authority, honour and reputation he enjoys. For Job, however, such enjoyment is only a memory. Attended now by misfortune, Job has lost his honour, his reputation for righteousness, not through deeds of unrighteousness but because he has

¹ 2 Corinthians 4:17.

² כָּבֵד to be heavy, weighty: כָּבֵד adjective: heavy.
כָּבוֹד noun (m) 1. Heaviness, weight, 2. mass, abundance. 3. vehemence. From A Hebrew and English Lexicon (based on the lexicon of William Gesenius). Tr. Robinson. Oxford Clarendon Press 1907 p. 459.

³ Genesis 13:2.

⁴ Genesis 45:13.

been afflicted by God and bereft of possessions. He laments "He has stripped from me my glory (kavodh)".⁵

A nation or people may also lose its glory: "And in that day the glory (Kavodh) of Jacob will be brought low".⁶ The prophet is here forewarning that the Northern Kingdom of Israel, personified as Jacob, will lose its reputation, honour and respect; the Kingdom's 'standing' among its neighbours will be greatly diminished. The loss of glory in this instance is ascribed to lack of fidelity.⁷

Glory (Kavodh) is manifest in the power and strength of the Assyrian army,⁸ in the magnificence and splendour of first and second temples⁹ and in the beauty of garments as, for example, in the priestly vestments.¹⁰ Above all, glory is the characteristic of Kingship.¹¹ A King shows "the riches of his royal glory (Kavodh) and the splendour and pomp of his majesty".¹²

The operative word in this last quotation is 'shows'. Whether 'Kavodh' (glory) is in beauty or in power, in might or in riches, whether applicable

⁵ Job 19:9.

⁶ Isaiah 17:4 The Verse continues with a reference to outward appearance "and the fat of his flesh will grow lean" to indicate the fate that will befall Israel.

Kittel, however, sees Kavodh used here as "an expression for the secret inner might which alone constitutes Israel" TDNT p.238.

⁷ In this instance 'loss of glory' is a punishment. Job, by contrast, is innocent, his deep suffering and 'loss of glory' is depicted as a testing or trial which lasts for a certain period. His loss is temporary. See also Ps. 49:16 - 17; Hosea 4:7; 9:11; 10:5.

⁸ Isaiah 8:7.

⁹ 1 Chr.22:5; Haggai 2:3,9.

¹⁰ Exodus 28.2,40; Psalm 45:13.

¹¹ 1 Chr 29:28: 2 Chr 17:5: 1 Kings 3:13: Daniel 5:18.

¹² Esther 1:4.

to peoples or to individuals, to animate creation or to inanimate objects, it is that which is demonstrable, made manifest, able to be seen. Even the 'Kavodh' (glory) which signifies notions such as reputation, respect, honour and prestige, stems from visible circumstances or actions. Reputation is manifested achievement, respect and honour the consequence of observable wealth, prestige accompanies discernible status and so on. Not that such differentiation is easy or even always possible. As we have already noted, the meanings most often merge, the more so when they are the effects of the one visible cause.

This purely secular concept of 'Kavodh' (glory) bears some comparison with the meaning of ' δόξα ' (glory) in secular Greek usage. The extrinsic character of the secular meaning of ' δόξα ' (glory) has been delineated in the previous chapter. Like 'Kavodh', it is concerned with outward appearance, what is seen. Derived from the verb 'to seem' 'to appear' 'to think highly of', objective ' δόξα ' is dependant on the subjective judgement of the observer by whom it is bestowed. There is a sense in which 'Kavodh' also owes its existence to being seen. For example, if there is no witnessed authority there is no prestige; no visible riches means no honour accorded. Yet there is a basic difference between the two words. The root meaning of 'Kavodh' is not 'opinion' but 'weight', something of which existence can be predicated independently of what I think. 'Kavodh' is that which is 'manifested,' i.e. is there to be seen whether it is in fact seen or not.

In the Hebrew Bible the usage of 'Kavodh' is not confined to the ordinary secular sense. At times the word forms a parallel to 'soul' or to 'heart' and is used to describe the spirit of a man, his inner spiritual nature or self as in Psalm 16:9, "Therefore my heart is glad and my Kavodh

(soul/glory) rejoices". However, not all scholars are in agreement concerning this usage.¹³ Some prefer to read 'Kavedh' (liver) instead of 'glory', arguing that in Hebrew as well as in Assyrian and Babylonian thought, 'liver' is the seat of the emotions and of inner life¹⁴ and therefore a suitable synonym for soul.

By far the most significant as well as most frequent use of 'Kavodh' in the Hebrew Bible is that expressed in the theological term 'Kavodh Yahweh' (Glory of God). It is a complex concept whose life-story is impossible to recount in any certain order though attempts have been made.¹⁵ But as G. Henton Davies remarks, such attempts tend to "ignore the significance and influence of the cult in the development of the concept".¹⁶

The concept itself is epiphanic; God manifests himself. He does so in

¹³ A A Anderson (The New Century Bible Commentary: Psalms Vol 1 Grand R. Mich. Eerdmans 1972 p.145.) R. Kittel (TDNT op. cit. p.238) A M Ramsey (The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ Longmans 1949 p.12) Arthur Weiser (The Psalms. SCM Press London 1959 p.176.) are among those who accept 'glory' meaning 'soul' in this context. Others see such an interpretation as questionable e.g. Georg Molin ('Glory' Encyc. Biblical Theology op. cit. Vol I Sheed & Ward 1969 p.295).

¹⁴ The Septuagint has translated Gen.49:6 (where Kavodh parallels soul) as τά ἥματα μου (my liver). Yet, as G.B. Gray notes, the LXX translation of the Psalms is δόξα. See 'Glory' in: Dictionary of the Bible Ed. Hastings. Vol. II T & T Clarke, Edinburgh (6 imp) 1905.p.183.

¹⁵ Attempts have been made according to the chronological order of the texts in which 'Kavodh' is found (see, for example, G.B. Gray Ibid P.185). But material generally accepted as later may contain much older thinking. Von Rad suggests this is so with The Priestly document for example, which though centuries later than the Yahwist, has preserved in it "an older form of cosmological thinking". (Von Rad. O.T. Theology Vol 1 SCM Press London 1965 (1975 ed.) p.140).

¹⁶ G. Henton Davies 'Glory' Interp. Dict. of the Bible ed. E.S. Bucke, Abingdon, Nashville 1962, p.402. Ringgren sees the concept as deriving from priestly circles (especially P in Ezekiel) so actually looks at the cult itself. He admits, however, that it is "impossible to be more specific". See Helmer Ringgren. Israelite Religion SPCK London 1966 p.91ff.

two main ways in (1) acts of power and (2) apparitions of his glory, his radiant holiness. The 'Glory of God' (Kavodh Yahweh) is not, therefore, simply a synonym for God's honour; it is the visible manifestation of his power and majesty, the radiance of his being.

God's activity on earth is manifested in many ways, not sporadically but continually as an on-going reality. The whole of creation gives evidence of this reality; it is God's handiwork, created, sustained and preserved through his loving care. The psalmist proclaims "for his steadfast love endures forever"¹⁷ and "the heavens are telling the glory of God and the firmament proclaims his handiwork".¹⁸

The power of God's action is evidenced in history through his interventions, judgements and signs.¹⁹ The miraculous crossing of the Red Sea,²⁰ a recurrent theme in Hebrew writings, is accepted as sign of God's protective presence as is the total event of Exodus. God sustains his people with manna in the desert; on the day before its provision the Israelites are told "in the morning you shall see the glory of the Lord (Kavodh Yahweh)"²¹. In Jewish as in Christian thought the Exodus becomes

¹⁷ Psalms 118, 136, 106:1, 107, 100:5, 117. This is a liturgical formula, possibly a congregational response. It is a cry of joyful belief in the reliability of God and in his covenant loyalty. (Hesed is a covenant term). But as Samuel Terrien comments "it is the peculiarly Hebraic theology of presence which explains the importance of covenant in Israel's religion, and not the covenant". See The Elusive Presence. Harper & Row. San Francisco 1978. p.3.

¹⁸ Psalm 19:1. Šāmāyīm (heavens) can also refer to the dwelling place of God. The psalmist is here saying that Yahweh's 'Kavodh' fills the whole of creation. Nature is a manifestation of majesty and presence.

¹⁹ Numbers 14:22.

²⁰ Exodus 14:18.

²¹ Exodus 16:7.

type and pledge of all God's saving acts wherein he manifests his glory (Kavodh). Thus glory is almost synonymous with salvation. Psalm 96: 2-3 parallels the two concepts as though they are one "Tell of his Salvation from day to day. Declare his glory (Kavodh) among the nations".

Salvation and creation both reveal God's glory but this is not their only similarity or link. History for the Hebrew writer is not simply a record of events but the account of encounter with and response to Yahweh; it is the theological reality of God acting and is therefore salvific. But history starts with creation which means that the creative act is also salvific. In Hebrew thought creation is thus understood in this soteriological sense;²² the two acts are combined: "Thus says the Lord your Redeemer who formed you from the womb. I am the Lord who made all things".²³ The creative/redemptive act is for God's glory. Israel is explicitly informed of this fact; she is the one "whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made".²⁴ It is not Israel only but "everyone who is called by my name".²⁵

Man fulfils his ultimate function and purpose when he recognises God's divinity and gives him praise. As in Christian thought, "to give God Glory"²⁶ is a term for active response to and acknowledgement of the glory God has and is. Although the prophets lament that God's glory is not generally acknowledged, they (and others) look forward to an age when all

²² See G. Von Rad Vol I op.cit. p.136ff.

²³ Israel 44:24.

²⁴ Isaiah 43:7.

²⁵ Isaiah 43:7.

²⁶ This 'active' response is not meant to be simply verbal praise but an orientation of the whole person to God.

will "see the glory of the Lord, the majesty of our God".²⁷ This is the eschaton which will involve a new creation, a new heaven and a new earth. From beginning to end God does not cease to act and thus his glory does not cease to be revealed.

Yet this concept of glory is not without seeming paradox. God's revelation of himself in his activity has an aspect of "hiddenness", what is manifested is not always seen nor seen generally. "Truly thou art a God who hidest thyself"²⁸ cries the prophet. There is need for a final and total revelation of glory when "all flesh shall see it together".²⁹ This 'Kavodh' will be the Kingdom of Yahweh, the messianic age. As with the New Testament concept of glory, there synonymous with Kingdom, so too with the old Testament concept; 'Kavodh Yahweh' is a present reality to be fully realised in the future.

"God of the Old Testament is the God of experience and not of speculation".³⁰ The Hebrew scriptures do not argue the question of God's existence, nor do they attempt to prove it. He is. God is 'known' by them in the Hebrew sense of the verb 'to know'.³¹ This 'knowing' is not to be confused or equated with 'seeing'. God as he is cannot be seen; He is intrinsically unseeable, 'hidden'. Though the great longing of men is to

²⁷ Isaiah 35:2.

²⁸ Isaiah 45:15.

²⁹ Isaiah 40:5.

³⁰ H.H. Rowley. The Faith of Israel SCM Press London 1965 reprint. p.48.

³¹ A knowledge of the heart rather than of the intellect. "To know" yadha in Hebrew, is to experience e.g. Jer. 16:21; Isaiah 53:3; 47:8.

see God "eye to eye"³² there is also the realisation that no-one can see God and live.³³ Yet the Hebrew concept of 'Kavodh Yahweh' as we have noted, is precisely concerned with 'seeing'. Indeed, as S. Aalen notes, "characteristically Kavodh is linked with verbs of seeing and appearing".³⁴

The second aspect of Kavodh Yahweh concerns the seeing of actual physical phenomena, described differently by different writers but understood as the reality of the divine presence, the brilliant dynamism of his being. This presence is not, however, God in his essence, in the fullness of his being, but God as he allows himself to be seen. Only in the last days will there be the full manifestation.

God manifests himself to the Israelites as a people and to Moses in particular during their wanderings in the desert. There, Mount Sinai becomes the place of epiphany. According to the Priestly tradition, Sinai is the site from whence Yahweh's glory is revealed in the form of a consuming fire which is visible to all the people: "Now the appearance of the Lord was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the sight of the people of Israel".³⁵ Only Moses, however, is allowed direct access to the 'presence'. He returns from it unaware that "the skin of his face shone because he had been talking with God".³⁶ This 'shining' is not for Moses a transfiguration or metamorphosis; it is a reflection of the divine

³² Isaiah 52:8. Psalm 42:2 is an example of the cultic desire to see the 'face of God'.

³³ Judges 13:22.

³⁴ S. Aalen 'Glory, honour' in The New International Dictionary of N.T. Theology Vol. 2. Editor Colin Brown. Paternoster Press. English edition 1976 p.45.

³⁵ Exodus 24:17.

³⁶ Exodus 34:29.

glory. So bright is the reflection, however, that it inspires awe and fear among the people, and Moses, for their protection, covers his face. Paradoxically the 'Presence' is here depicted as 'transcendence'. God who is near is far off. In Otto's terms He is 'wholly other', the 'mysterium tremendum'.³⁷ The Israelites cannot and dare not approach. Only the man Moses bridges the gap between the awesome terrifying 'glory' and an awed, terrified people. The gap must be bridged for Yahweh's will to be transmitted.

The transmission includes instructions for building a tabernacle or tent which, on completion, is consecrated by Yahweh's glory. "The glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle".³⁸ Mount Sinai, the sacred place of theophany, of encounter, had to be left behind; Israel needed to move on. She would still know the Presence of Yahweh's glory and in all her wanderings be at its behest. "Throughout all their journeys whenever the cloud was taken up from over the tabernacle the people of Israel would go onward but if the cloud was not taken up then they did not go onward".³⁹ The 'cloud by day and fire by night' are symbolic representations of Yahweh's protective, guiding presence. They are symbolic too, of awesome mystery, of the extraordinary paradox of Immanence inaccessible and far off.

There are two Hebrew words for tabernacle: (1) *miskan*, 'dwelling' and (2) *ohel mo'ed* 'tent of meeting'. They denote respectively (1) the 'presence' of Yahweh (2) the point of encounter between Moses and God. Both words are different from 'aron habberit', the Hebrew term for the 'Ark'

³⁷ Rudolph Otto: The idea of the Holy. O.U.P. reprint 1971. ch.4.

³⁸ Exodus 40:34,35.

³⁹ Exodus 40:36,37.

which Moses was also commanded to build.⁴⁰ It would seem that the Tent of Meeting is linked with the idea of 'encampment', an act which punctuates the wanderings or movement of nomads. The Ark, a portable sanctuary, appears to be more closely connected with the movement itself. It is also intimately linked with the glory. Although the Ark is never actually called a Throne, it is conceived as such. The 'Kavodh Yahweh' is 'enthroned' on the Mercy Seat;⁴¹ it is from here that Yahweh speaks with Moses.⁴² The Ark is the permanent sign of Presence. The Priestly account of the Tabernacle is based on two different traditions: the tradition of the 'Tent of meeting' and that of Solomon's Temple. The Ark,⁴³ as in Solomon's Temple, is stated by the Priestly writer to be housed in the Tabernacle (Tent). There are, however, inconsistencies in the different traditions.

Von Rad considers the Tent of Meeting and the Ark to be each representative of a specific theology. Each is the site of Yahweh's glory but with a different emphasis. The Tent is the point of encounter where Yahweh manifests himself from heaven, albeit in a veiled manner, surrounded by cloud. The Ark, on the other hand, denotes Yahweh's constant dwelling. For Von Rad it is a question of two opposed concepts: that of manifestation

⁴⁰ Exodus 25:10 - 22.

⁴¹ Ps. 132:7; 1 Chr 28:2.

⁴² Exodus 25:22.

⁴³ The Ark, a battle emblem, e.g. Num 10:35, 1 Sam 4:5, was given the name 'glory of Israel' 1 Sam 4:22, and identified with God Numb. 10:35. The Philistines captured the Ark when they defeated Israel 1 Sam 4:10 - 11 but were plagued by its presence 1 Sam 5:6. It is only mentioned again in David's time when he gave it a new sanctuary in Jerusalem 2 Sam 6:2. It is put finally in Solomon's Temple and not mentioned again in the historical books. The destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C. was probably the end of the Ark. It seems to have varied, therefore, in importance, over time, and it is most possible that the concept of it also varied.

and that of dwelling.⁴⁴ It is debatable however, whether such concepts really are in opposition. They may be simply separate attempts to come to grips with an experience which evades articulation. So elusive is the 'Presence' that it is not within man's power to grasp nor to manipulate either in fact or verbally. "Glory", states L.H. Brockington, "is an apt word for the apprehended presence of God".⁴⁵ But apprehension is often more intuitive than intellectual in nature, more "felt" than accurately conceptualised. The concept 'Kavodh Yahweh' holds in creative tension contradictory notions, not least those of Immanence and Transcendence which are somehow brought together in experience. The Ark on which the 'glory' is enthroned is at once intimidating and joy-giving, dangerous and benign.

Certainly other traditions within the Old Testament differ from those of the Priestly school. The Yahwistic writings do not normally use the expression 'Kavodh Yahweh' but the concept is present. For them Yahweh dwells above but descends at times in the pillar of cloud. This and the pillar of fire by night cloak Yahweh's presence. Julian Morgenstern comments that the pillars "no doubt are supposed to reach from earth to heaven".⁴⁶ This 'shape' and 'reaching' would seem to symbolise the union of two poles, the meeting of opposites.

The ancient verses 12 - 33 embedded in Exodus 33, contain Moses' request "I pray thee show me thy glory" and Yahweh's reply "you cannot see my face (panim), for no man can see me and live". Even Moses the mediator is denied the vision of Yahweh's face (here designate for 'glory'), but he

⁴⁴ G. Von Rad op.cit Vol I. p.237.

⁴⁵ L.H. Brockington. 'The Presence of God'. The Expository Times Vol. 2 LVII October 1945. p.21.

⁴⁶ Julian Morgenstern. 'Biblical Theophanies' Zeitsch.f.Assyriologie 25(1911) p.154.

is allowed a vision, one as it were from behind. He is told "and while my glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock and I will cover you with my hand until I have passed by - then I will take away my hand and you shall see my back". Moses is sheltered from the glory by the glory, he is protected from God by God. In this extraordinarily anthropomorphic account the same contradictions are inherent, as are the same truths: Yahweh's essence is beyond man's apprehension and vision, yet there is for man a mediate vision overwhelming in its awefulness.

The Theme of the Glory/Presence is central to the conflation of stories that make up Exodus 33. The Glory in turn, is here as elsewhere, closely linked with the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. 'Kavodh Yahweh' has a moral dimension. The whole chapter is set within the context of Moses interceding on behalf of Israel for the forgiveness of her sins. Yahweh responds but requires Israel to reciprocate in ethical conduct. The Hebrew concept of the Glory is one in which judgement and forgiveness are held in tension; the unutterably Holy is totally just.

For Isaiah, Yahweh's utter 'otherness' is expressed as his 'holiness' of which glory is the radiation. The prophet's vision of the Glory is set in the Temple and in an ethical context. It is a vision of the incomparable Majesty, the royal Glory; the Lord is seated on a throne, his train fills the Temple; accompanying seraphim unite the concepts of Glory and Holiness as they cry "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory".⁴⁷ In his spiritual experience of the unutterable holiness of Yahweh, Isaiah is overwhelmed with the sense of his own sin and that of his people. The radiant 'Kavodh Yahweh' lights up and lays bare the inner recesses of mind and heart.

⁴⁷ Isaiah 6: 1 - 6.

Like Isaiah, Ezekiel 'sees' in visions. His extraordinary mystical experiences are also of Yahweh enthroned in majesty. The manifestation of the Kingly glory does not, however, happen for Ezekiel in the Temple but in the land of captivity. In vision the prophet is carried to Jerusalem, to the Temple now defiled. He sees the Glory depart from thence, but he also foresees its return after the exile when the Temple city will be restored and free of defilement. Then the Kingly Glory will be at its heart, the focal point of its people. The Temple is THE Sacred centre.

Ezekiel's visions are expressed in terms of a blinding light which haloes everything in its radiance. "Like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about",⁴⁸. It is an attempt to express the inexpressible, to explain in terms of physical vision that which was seen with mystical sight. Evidence of the prophet's struggle to communicate lies in the phrases he frequently uses such as "the appearance of", "as it were", "resembling", "something like". "Such was the appearance of the Glory of the Lord".⁴⁹

These two facets of Yahweh's manifestations in (a) acts of power and (b) apparitions of his glory, are not always clearly differentiated in the Old Testament. It is in Trito-Isaiah that both aspects are brought together. In a general transformation all peoples will be drawn, as by a magnet, to Zion from whence radiates intense light: "nations shall come to your light and Kings to the brightness of your rising".⁵⁰ This will be Yahweh's doing and this will be the place of Presence, the Sacred Centre.

⁴⁸ Ezekiel 1:28 The rainbow is sign of the covenant and of Yahweh's fidelity; it is cosmic in sweep. The Glory is not to be confined to Israel.

⁴⁹ Ezekiel 1:28.

⁵⁰ Isaiah 60:3.

From here "his glory will be seen".⁵¹

If visionaries like Ezekiel and Isaiah must struggle in their attempts to put their experience into words, so too must translators struggle in their efforts to convey the same meaning as the original in translation. The Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible chose ' δόξα ' to render 'Kavodh'. ' Δόξα ' also renders twenty four other Hebrew words which are equivalent in meaning to 'Kavodh'. The most important of these are 'hadar' (esteem, honour), 'hod', (splendour, majesty, renown) and 'tifara' (beauty, magnificence, honour, glory). ' Δόξα ' is therefore used essentially in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew concept of glory. As in the New Testament, the secular Greek meaning of 'opinion' is excluded.⁵² Referring to the Greek translator of the Old Testament, Kittel comments "taking a word for opinion which implies all the subjectivity and therefore all the vacillation of human views and conjectures he made it express something absolutely objective, i.e. the reality of God".⁵³ In both Old and New Testaments, in Jewish and in Christian thought, this extraordinary linguistic change is highly significant. We therefore repeat at this point the question posed at the end of the first chapter "why the use of δόξα and not some other word?". Why, for example, did the Greek translator not use δύναμις (power, force, host)? In Old Testament thought, God's essence is in his power (hayil);⁵⁴ it is the energy of his holiness and the manifestation of his Kingship. "His power is in the skies ... whose majesty

⁵¹ Isaiah 60:2.

⁵² The one possible instance is Ecclesiastes 10:1 regarded as a corrupt passage. See R. B. Scott (tr.) Proverbs Ecclesiastes (Anchor Bible) Doubleday & Co. Inc. New York 1965.

⁵³ Kittel in TDNT op.cit. p.245.

⁵⁴ Verb: δύναμαι to be able, capable of.

is over Israel",⁵⁵ cries the psalmist. Psalm 24 asks "who is the King of Glory?" and answers, "He the Lord of armies" (i.e. the all-powerful). In Greek thought *δύναμις* refers to the dynamic force behind all life; it is equated with God. Once, at least, it is said by Plato to be the absolute mark of being.⁵⁶ The word includes concepts such as ability, the outward expressions of power (miracles, wonders), as well as the more ordinary externals, i.e. resources, armies and wealth. It can, of course, be argued that the Hebrew concept of power is linked with that of a God who is not neutral, but who is intimately related with history and that *δύναμις* is, therefore, an unsuitable translation. This argument is invalidated by the fact that *δύναμις* is used by the Greek translator to translate several Hebrew words. *Hayil* (power), for example, which is associated with God, occurs two hundred and forty times in the Hebrew Old Testament; the septuagint translates it with *δύναμις* one hundred and sixty five times.⁵⁷

There are various reasons which can be argued against the use of *δύναμις* ⁵⁸ as a translation for 'Kavodh', just as there are reasons why other Greek words should not be used. But the same applies to *δόξα*. There must, therefore, be an extremely powerful reason for its use which overrides the reasons against. What is this reason? Kittel suggests that *δόξα* came into Septuagint use because the concept 'Kavodh Yahweh' "overlaps

⁵⁵ Ps. 68:34. This psalm speaks of God appearing amongst his people; it is linked with the concept of theophany.

⁵⁶ Plato Soph. 247 de. Discussed by C Ritter, *Platon II* (1923) p.126ff and 172ff, cited by Grundmann in TDNT Vol II p.295.

⁵⁷ Given by Grundmann in *TNDT* p.286 who takes his data from Hatch-Redpath.

⁵⁸ For example, it is plausible that since *δύναμις* is God in his 'transcendence' it is inappropriate as a designate for 'presence'.

the ideas of the honour of God (Ehre) and the fame of God (Ruhm) and that these 'secular' conceptions provide a groundwork of language for the Biblical conception".⁵⁹ Ramsey finds Kittel's argument "somewhat inconclusive". I find it unconvincing, for the concept 'Kavodh Yahweh' overlaps other ideas besides those of honour and fame. Moreover, the 'provision of a groundwork of language' by the use of a term which, by Kittel's own admission "implies all the subjectivity and therefore all the vacillation of human views and conjections" makes for shaky foundations to say the least. And even though the word 'opinion' never appears in the Septuagint, the associations and implications of the basic meaning of δόξα are not so easily shrugged off. But perhaps the groundwork of language and/or of concepts is not the right place or level to start, anyway. Roots go below the surface; experience precedes verbal expression of it. Any attempt to discover the reason for the Greek translator's use of δόξα necessitates an attempt to understand something of the experience which lies behind the word it translates. What then is the encounter of mind and reality that brought the biblical symbol 'Kavodh' to birth?

Experience is an ambiguous term. My use of the word has not to do with the familiar or repeated action that enables a person to feel and/ or be called 'experienced' in a particular area of work or life. Biblical accounts of encounter and visions have nothing to do with this practical aspect; they have to do with the extraordinary rather than with the ordinary. Nor is experience here used as a synonym for knowledge, not at least in the Western philosophical sense of an intellectual grasp of reality. Experience goes deeper than assent to an intellectually perceived

⁵⁹ H Kittel Der Herrlichkeit Gottes, Giessen 1934. pp. 59-68.
Quoted by A.M. Ramsey op.cit. p.24.

truth; it involves the whole man in his psychic activity. The more complex Hebrew concept of knowledge as experiential relationship and heart 'knowing' is apposite. Bernard Lonergan speaks of experience as an "infra structure within knowing",⁶⁰ with inner and outer aspects. The inner experience is a consciousness of something other than the self; it is not to be confused with solipsism. The outer experience is "sensation as distinct from perception".

Of the Hebrew religious experience which gave rise to the concept of $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$, obvious questions come to mind concerning the inner and outer experience. Yet inherent in any attempt to explain or describe an experience is something more than the original experience; a development has taken place. Processes of consciousness and sensation, of perception and imagination have interacted; subsequent reflection has led to a synthesis in which inference and interpretation have played a part. And all this has occurred within a social/cultural context which has helped shape the inner processes of development as well as influence, or even determine, the choice of language to put the experience into words.

Words are never wholly adequate vehicles for experience, the less so when the experience is of a religious nature. Human language is rooted for the most part in the ordinary and the practical; the extraordinary and non-practical is further disadvantaged in verbal expression. Religious experience of the transcendent, of the 'wholly other' must be articulated in terms that are not 'other'. Religious writers, therefore, often have recourse to a form of expression which, in a sense, is other than it seems, i.e. they use non-literal, symbolic language. But this sometimes compounds

⁶⁰ Bernard Lonergan A Third Collection Ed. by F.G. Crowe. G. Chapman, London 1985 p.116.

the problem of interpretation; it is not always clear what is meant to be taken literally and what is not. Nor is poetic expression always easily interpreted.

It is precisely the difficulties of articulating and interpreting religious experience and most specifically the Hebrew religious experience, that are encapsulated in the Greek word ' δόξα ' with its associations (from δοκέω) of 'seeming' and 'appearing'. Such difficulty is epitomised in, for example, the writings of Ezekiel. In halting attempts to explain his visions, he must lean on such terms as 'seeming like' and 'appearing like'. So gripping an experience cannot in turn be gripped, it simply overwhelms. In such a moment the known becomes unknown, the unknown, known; what appeared before as real pales into unreality before the reality, nothing is as it seemed or seems. Δόξα aptly translates the divine presence/Glory as it is experienced mystically, yet there are other facets to be considered.

As Kittel notes, δόξα , with all its subjective implications has been used by the Greek translator to express the objective reality of God. But δόξα is experienced. At the moment of experience that which is wholly independent of the self, becomes invasive of it; the infra-structure of knowing is seized, as it were, by the Glory and immersed in it. Why the Greek translator's use of the word δόξα .? At least in part because in mystic experience of divine reality there is, so to speak, a fusion of the objective with the subjective; self is identified with the Transcendent Reality. The encounter language of theology speaks in terms made familiar by Martin Buber, of an I-thou relationship, but the mystical experience goes beyond this to a relationship of 'we'; to a being immersed in Being.

Heidegger speaks of such encounter as an 'occurrence of being'.⁶¹ This is not to say that in Biblical accounts of encounter (of the Glory), there is an explicit search for and reference to ontology. It is to say with Paul Tillich that "there is no symbol or theological concept in it (i.e. Biblical literature) which does not have ontological implications."⁶² The association of light with glory is apt symbolism, for light rays enfold, penetrate and delineate; in light, distinctions are at once made clear and obliterated; at the same time its 'source' is distinct.

Some biblical accounts of the Glory as, for example, that of Ezekiel⁶³ point to mystical experience, others do not. In the collective experience of the Israelites at the foot of Mount Sinai, the Glory, though near, is distanced, approachability is out of the question. This is an experience involving actual physical phenomena; it is a manifestation of the sacred. Whatever different elements the various accounts of the Glory contain, the Biblical texts make it quite clear that the Hebrew religious experience, collective and individual, has its genesis in an extraordinary manifestation. The Glory is thereafter present in Israel and experienced in different ways.

But just what is the experience of extraordinary manifestation? A

⁶¹ Martin Heidegger. Was ist metaphysik? Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt 1949 p.47.

⁶² Paul Tillich Systematic Theology Part III SCM Press London 1978 p.12.

⁶³ Not all scholars interpret Ezekiel's visions as mystical. Of the many different interpretations, some are of 'pathological features' in his prophecy. But, Zimmerli comments: "the visions are undoubtedly set out in regard to the message to be seen and heard in them. They are stylised in a reflective way so that the underlying experience and action is often no longer clearly reasonable". For a full discussion on this point see Walter Zimmerli Ezekiel Fortress Press. Philadelphia 1979. p.16ff.

careful reading of the text reveals that the qualities given by Rudolph Otto in his analysis of the 'mysterium tremendum'⁶⁴ are all present and felt: a 'wholly other' reality, awefulness, overpowering presence, a sense of urgency and fascination. Present too within the experience is the realisation that the actual place of manifestation is sacred. At Mount Horeb Moses is commanded to keep his distance and to remove his shoes, for the place on which he is standing is 'holy ground'.⁶⁵ At Mount Sinai he is told to "set bounds about the mountain and consecrate it".⁶⁶ Within the Biblical texts there are numerous examples of the experience of sacred space. Mircea Eliade comments that for religious man such experience is of "the only real and real-ly existing space",⁶⁷ and is in opposition to the profane formlessness. It is for religious man the only really existing space because of the manifestation within it of the Absolute Reality, the ground of being. Man's own mode of being, caught up in and part of a transient world is subject to all the vagaries of that world and to the precariousness of existence including certain death. Ontologically apprehensive, man yearns for self-transcendence, to pass beyond all limitations to the freedom and fulfilment of being; he seeks ultimate reality. The Exodus is an account, amongst other things, of such seeking. Freed from slavery in Egypt only to be exposed to the hazards of desert wandering, the Israelites were insecure, most often frustrated and generally fearful. The descent of the Glory on Mount Sinai meant for them a living

⁶⁴ Rudolph Otto. op.cit. especially ch.5.

⁶⁵ Exodus 3:5.

⁶⁶ Exodus 19:23.

⁶⁷ Mircea Eliade The Sacred and The Profane Harcourt Brace & World Inc. New York. p.20.

presence affording stability and security. The Israelite experience was one of dependence, within a covenant relationship, on a guiding protecting Power. It was an experience that gave meaning to their lives; the Real and the real-ly effective in their midst enabled the profane to be transcended. Where the Glory appeared was "the only real and real-ly existing space".

Linked with the experience of sacred space is another experience not less profound; it is the visual experience of the Glory. But what do the Israelites 'see' on Mount Sinai and in the desert? This question finds answer in the texts in terms of natural phenomena such as a thunderstorm. These phenomena are not equated with the Glory but are 'manifestations' of it. The Pentateuch, for example, speaks explicitly of the Presence as in a cloud or even as a cloud. Yet this cloud 'cloaks' the glory, and is, in fact, indicative of what it hides, that is, the outward appearance is indicative of a 'hidden' Reality, the effects of which are not concealed. Thus the Israelite experience of 'manifestation' comprises more than physical vision; most important within it is the inner aspect of a consciousness of something other than the self: the Glory/Presence. The experience also embodies the extraordinary paradox of the 'veiling' of Reality and the revelation of it. John Macquarie writes concerning revelation "what is revealed is not another being over and above those that can be perceived by anyone. Rather, one should say that the person who receives the revelation sees the same things in a different way ... he becomes aware of the being that is present and manifest in, with and through these particular beings".⁶⁸ The texts all point to this awareness as the pivotal experience in Israel's history. Storms and cloud could not have

⁶⁸ John Macquarrie. Principles of Christian Theology. Revised edition S.C.M. Press London 1977 p.89.

been new to the wanderers: the newness was in the manner of their "seeing". Cut deep in their experience of Sinai and the desert was their awareness of the Revelation of transcendent Reality through familiar phenomena, of the Sacred in, with and through the profane.

"It is the primary concern of religion" writes Thomas Fawcett, "to get beyond the appearances to the reality, but the language of religion has always found it necessary to make use of the language of appearances in order to speak of that reality".⁶⁹ The extrinsic character of the meaning of $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ is concerned with outward appearance, with what is seen. $\Delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ is an apt translation, therefore, for the secular concept of Kavodh, i.e. for the reputation, honour and esteem which stem from visible circumstances. But it is just as apt a translation for 'Kavodh Yahweh'. Not only is $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ the 'language of appearance', but its usage in the non-secular sense points to the Reality or Transcendence made immanent though never totally seen. 'Man cannot see God and live'. $\Delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ speaks of man's need and concern to 'get beyond the appearances'⁷⁰ to the reality'.

In an article entitled, "The Greek translator and his interest in Doxa"

⁶⁹ Thomas Fawcett. The Symbolic language of Religion. Study edition. S.C.M. Press London 1970 p.30.

⁷⁰ Appearance is an ambiguous word. In the first instance (1) seeming (which is unrelated to the senses) needs to be differentiated from (2) looking like. It is with the 2nd group, i.e. looking words that we are here most concerned. But this group also includes 'seeming to the senses' and can be divided into (a) what looks like and is, (b) what looks like and is not what it appears to be (seems) and therefore can mislead. (c) what looks like (appears to be) but is not but does not mislead. e.g. a stick in water appears bent but is known not to be so. When, however, I speak of "looking beyond appearance", I do not deny that that which appears IS (in the sense of being). Perhaps John Macquarrie's words are apt here viz: "... this does not mean seeing something else, but rather seeing the appearances as they are, in depth as it were, as bearers of the presence and manifestation of Being". op. cit. p.112.

L.H. Brockington⁷¹ draws attention to the originality of translation in the Septuagint text of Isaiah, and also to the translator's rich store of synonyms. The one Hebrew word tehillah (praise), for example, found eleven times in Isaiah, is translated by eight different Greek words. Δόξα, on the other hand, occurs sixty eight times in the Greek text and translates not only 'Kavodh' (twenty eight times) but also other Hebrew words. The word obviously had a special significance for the Greek translator. Brockington believes that the significance was "Theological and was associated, directly or indirectly with God's redemptive work among men",⁷² i.e. δόξα was chosen to emphasise and reiterate God's saving power. Certainly the theme of salvation is dominant throughout the whole of Isaiah, but why was δόξα chosen to highlight it? The purpose of the manifestation of Glory is salvific; it is the expression of God's redeeming Presence. Because δόξα signifies 'external appearance' it is an appropriate term for that external appearance which is the Glory, "or rather", writes Brockington, "how that appearance may be described in terms of its effect on those who experience God's presence".⁷³

There is, however, another important observation to be made concerning the choice of δόξα by the Greek translator of Isaiah to express God's saving power. 'Salvation' in the Old Testament is a complex concept which undergoes considerable development. Initially its meaning is simple and entails deliverance from a perilous situation. The slavery in Egypt was one such situation, from which the Israelites were led to safety by the

⁷¹ L.H. Brockington 'The Greek translator and his interest in Doxa' in Vetus Testamentum Vol 1 Jan 1951 No 1 pp. 23 - 32.

⁷² Ibid p.26.

⁷³ Ibid p.28.

Presence/Glory. "So he saved them from the hand of the foe, and delivered them from the power of the enemy".⁷⁴ But the concept develops to include the idea of judgement. The Exodus, marking the birth of a people, was a creative event; Glory/Salvation/Creation form an inseparable unity and demand response. Israel's response was tardy. In the covenant relationship her repeated infidelities met with utter and constant fidelity on Yahweh's part. He continued to 'save' but within a context of judgement. No-one can thwart Yahweh's plans, His saving power is in all events, affirms Isaiah.⁷⁵ The event of exile must have rendered Isaiah's affirmation hard to grasp. Yet this time of enormous crisis was also a watershed; during and after it the concept of Salvation deepened. The prophetic message of both second and third Isaiah is of another, even greater Exodus, of a new and more glorious covenant with a purified people, the new Israel. This 'salvation' is marked by intensive creativity;⁷⁶ 'New' is the operative word. A new revelation of Yahweh will mean new 'seeing' and involve a new confession of faith. Messianic and eternal in character, salvation will be generative not only of a new Israel and a new Zion but also of a new World in which "the Lord will be your everlasting light and your God will be your Glory".⁷⁷

Embedded within the Isaiah text and central to the prophetic vision of glory and salvation is a figure of contradiction, the Servant of Yahweh. He has "no form or comeliness that we should look at him and no beauty that we

⁷⁴ Psalm 106:10. See also Ps. 68:20; 91:3; 69:14.

⁷⁵ Isaiah 8:10; 10: 5 - 7, 28:21.

⁷⁶ The actual word for creation (bara) is used sixteen times.

⁷⁷ Isaiah 60:19. This moves beyond reference to Zion to include the whole cosmos.

should desire him",⁷⁸ so marred is his appearance.⁷⁹ Yet in and through the Servant, God "will be glorified"⁸⁰ and "all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God".⁸¹ From one whose appearance is devoid of glory, glory will radiate. Such is the appearance and such is the reality.

The visible manifestation was indicative of Divine Presence, of a hidden Reality; Belief was required in a Reality beyond appearance. This belief was not sustained during the wanderings; frequently the people rebelled. In and after the Exile, visible indications of Presence were lacking; a 'Deus absconditus' demanded belief of a deeper order. The Greek translator of Isaiah uses δόξα to emphasise the urgency and the necessity to go beyond appearance, even in the ordinary things of life. "He shall not judge by what his eyes see",⁸² is translated as οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρίνει . Of the outward appearance of the servant "he had no form or comeliness",⁸³ he construes as οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα . The Hebrew chasdo meaning 'lovely appearance' and translated "beauty" in the R.S.V., viz "all flesh is grass and all its beauty is like the flower of the field",⁸⁴ is rendered by δόξα in the Septuagint. Man's outward glory is evanescent, perishable and, in this sense, unreal; God alone is eternal. By implication, a humiliated exiled people must look beyond their

⁷⁸ Isaiah 53:2.

⁷⁹ Isaiah 52:14.

⁸⁰ Isaiah 49:3.

⁸¹ Isaiah 52:10 See also 49:6. "I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth".

⁸² Isaiah 11:3.

⁸³ Isaiah 53:2.

⁸⁴ Isaiah 40:6.

oppressor's outward manifestation of power to the reality of Yahweh's Power and will to save. His salvific will is operative at all times, even in seeming chaos. This is the Glory; faith in this reality is called for.

It is Christian belief that God's salvific will was operative in the seeming chaos of Calvary, that the cross, "the power and the wisdom of God",⁸⁵ was above all, the scene of Glory. God was most present where he seemed most absent. The Divine Presence at the heart of Christian faith is believed manifested in one who "though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men".⁸⁶ Christians see what others see but differently; they behold "the Glory of God in the face of Christ",⁸⁷ the man from Nazareth. Christian faith is in a Reality beyond appearance.

Like the Greek translators of the Septuagint, Christian writers chose **δόξα** to convey the meaning of Glory. However, in the interval of time between the composition of the original Hebrew Bible and the Christian New Testament, Judaism had been active; concepts had developed. It is to later Jewish usage of the term 'Kavodh' and its translation into Aramaic that we now turn.

⁸⁵ 1 Corinth. 1:24.

⁸⁶ Philippians 2:6-7. The title 'Servant' is applied to Jesus in the New Testament. Matthew and Luke quote the servant songs, Matthew 18:17 (loosely), 12: 18-21; Luke 22:37. See also Romans 15:21.

⁸⁷ 2 Corinthians 4:6.

CHAPTER THREE

That the Jews spoke Hebrew at the exile is an accepted and well known fact. That the ordinary Jew at the time of Christ generally spoke Aramaic and that this continued to be the language of ordinary Jewish folk¹ until about the seventh century A.D.² are other facts. What is not known is the precise time at which Aramaic assumed the ascendancy. All available evidence³ suggests, however, that as early as the fifth century B.C. Hebrew was losing ground. Nehemiah, governor of Judah in the reign of Artaxerxes I (465-425 BC) writes angrily concerning the effect on Hebrew of mixed marriages. "And half of their children spoke the language of Ashdod, and they could not speak the language of Judah"⁴. There is no certainty what language 'Ashdodite' signifies, possibly it was an Aramaic dialect⁵. Earlier there had been need for Ezra to translate the law into Aramaic for returned exiles⁶. Certainly an early date is indicated for the oral translation of

¹ Even after the advancement of Hellenism when Greek became the official cultural/political/commercial language, 7th century Aramaic was still used by the common people.

² After the Islamic conquests Aramaic was replaced by Arabic.

³ 5th century papyri (mostly legal documents) from the Jewish colony of Elephantine are Aramaic. It appears that half the 5th century jars and seals from Judah and Jerusalem bear Aramaic markings. Parts of Ezra, Jeremiah and Daniel are also in Aramaic. See J.M. Myers, Ezra Nehemiah (Anchor Bible) Doubleday & Co., Inc. New York 1965 p. 217.

⁴ Nehemiah 14:24.

⁵ Archaeological material from Ashdod bears Aramaic as well as Hebrew inscriptions. Some scholars, however, believe that Ashdod refers to the Phoenician language. See JT Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea. London SCM 1959. p.131.

⁶ Nehemiah 8:8. This may, of course, have been a projection into the past of later customs which were prevalent in the Chronicler's own day. Concerning the translation, not all are agreed that it was Aramaic. See D. Clines, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. The New Century Bible Commentary. Wm. B.

Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic for the benefit of those Jews who no longer spoke Hebrew as their first language. The exact date of their being written, however, remains obscure. All known Aramaic translations of the scriptures, i.e. Targums, post-date the advent of Christianity, nevertheless their roots go far deeper and their contents include religious concepts which pre-date the Christian era.

The precise Targumic equivalent of Kavodh Yahweh is Yequara meaning "splendour", "honour", "worth". Since, however, Targumists not only translate but also explain and interpolate, Yequara is often used in passages when Kavodh is not to be found in the corresponding Hebrew text. The role of this Aramaic word is therefore rather more complex than that of a simple synonym. It is frequently employed as a periphrastic device to remove anthropomorphisms and to present what is to the Targumist, a more refined concept of God. For example, where the Hebrew version of Genesis 17:22 has "And God went up from Abraham; Targum Onkelos"⁷ translates "And his yequara (glory) went up from Abraham". It is a question for the Targumists of placing greater emphasis on God's transcendence. In their bid to do this they often remove phrases referring to God's 'movements', e.g. his 'coming' and 'going' and put in their stead those which speak in terms of God's glory⁸ being manifested. Thus Exodus 20:20 "God has come" is rendered in Targum Onkelos as "His yequara (glory) is revealed".

In Targumic understanding God communicates with the world by means of

Eerdman's Publishing Co. Grand Rapids; Marshall Morgan and Scott, London 1984.

⁷ This targum, a translation of the whole Pentateuch, was committed to writing in the 2nd century A.D.

⁸ Any 'human' activity ascribed to God may be subject to a different rendering by the Targumist. 'Glory' often acts as a substitute in such instances.

or through his yequara (glory) which is his visible appearance⁹ and not a personal intermediary. That there is need to communicate presupposes a gap or distance, yet the communication is itself a closure of gap, a presence. Yequara (glory) thus postulates transcendence even as it signifies immanence; it helps to reconcile two concepts which are in conflict, that of nearness and that of distance.

Two other terms, often dubbed "buffers",¹⁰ support Yequara in this reconciling process. Memra (word) denoting the invisible presence of God in the lives of men, like Yequara is exclusive to the Targums. Shekhinta (Hebrew: Shekhinah) meaning literally "resting" or "dwelling" and signifying the presence of God, visible and invisible, also occurs frequently in Talmud and Midrash. That it alone of the buffer words should survive is most likely attributable to its more comprehensive meaning. It is in this vein that Abrahams writes "when the Rabbis gave vogue to Shekhina out of the three possible terms, they must have felt it desirable to have an expression which would apply equally to spasmodic and continuous, to local and universal, to earthly and heavenly, to visible and invisible manifestations of the holy spirit in its connotation of Glory"¹¹.

In the Targums, Yequara and Shekhinta are closely related but nevertheless distinct. Often they are used together to circumvent an anthropomorphic statement. For instance, Isaiah's exclamation "for my eyes

⁹ Whether Yequara signifies God himself or whether it refers to God's visible glory (as distinct from him) is debated by scholars. See I Abrahams, The Glory of God. Oxford Univ. Press 1925 p.51ff.

¹⁰ George Foot Moore: Judaism Vol I Cambridge. Harvard Univ. Press. 1966 Vol I p.434 and A.M. Ramsey. The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. Op.cit. p.21.

¹¹I Abrahams Glory of God op.cit. p.52.

have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts"¹² is rendered in the Targum to the Prophets¹³ as "My eyes have seen the yequara (glory) of the Shekhinta of the King of aeons". The connotation of Yequara is here one of radiance; the Shekhinta is God's numinous manifestation in light. Targum Pseudo-Jonathon¹⁴, a work characterised by much paraphrasing, has concerning Moses' radiant face upon his descent from Mount Sinai,¹⁵ "There shone the radiance of his features which had come to him from the light of the glory (yequara) of the Shekhinta of Yahweh". "The Glory of the Shekhinta" is a particularly common expression in the Palestinian Targums.¹⁶

The Targumists' desire to stress transcendence is not always sustained; anthropomorphisms remain, almost, it would seem, as counterweight. Their 'remaining' further reflects the continued tension between paradoxical concepts. But it is a creative tension centred in, and emanating from, the 'buffer' words denoting Glory/Presence. In them as in the Biblical Hebrew term 'Kavodh Yahweh', Immanence and Transcendence are held together in mutuality.

As already noted, yequara (glory) and Shekhinta (presence) although separate are also held together conceptually. It is this coupled concept of Glory/Presence (Kavodh/Shekhinta) which finds expression in the Greek word δόξα both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. Of the Jewish

¹² Isaiah 6:5.

¹³ 3rd to 5th century in its present form. See M. McNamara, Targum and New Testament. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Great Rapids, Michigan 1968. p. 206ff.

¹⁴ Date unknown. Its composite material contains some pre-Christian elements.

¹⁵ Exodus 34:30

¹⁶ See McNamara op.cit p.100ff.

experience which gave birth to the term $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ we have already spoken in the previous chapter. Targumic usage of Yequara and Shekhinta helps to convey another aspect of that experience. The Glory which had guided and protected Israel in her Desert days, and which later had graced the Temple, is nowhere mentioned by post-exilic writers as dwelling in the second Temple. The Shekhinta is for them linguistic reminder of one who was always with his people in their wanderings, a God who was "tented" in nomadic fashion.¹⁷ But its signification goes deeper. Referring to God's visible and invisible presence, Shekhinta is symbolic reminder also of Yahweh's intimate contact with the world and relationship with his people even when appearance might seem otherwise. In $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$, Kavodh and Shekhinta coalesce and all their deepest meanings are, as it were, kaleidoscoped. The two Hebrew words for 'tabernacle', miskan (dwelling) and ohel mo'ed (tent of meeting) which signify respectively 'presence' and 'encounter' meet together in $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$. Here, seeming paradoxes find reconciliation. If, for example, (a) the Tent of Meeting, and (b) the Ark are each representative (as Von Rad asserts)¹⁸ of a specific theology with opposed concepts of (a) manifestation and (b) dwelling, both concepts are brought together by the welding of Kavodh and Shekhinta.

The role given to Shekhina in Rabbinical literature includes that given to it in the Targums. In Talmudic and Midrashic usage, Shekhina is often a metonym for God, a means of avoiding anthropomorphic language and of containing transcendence in immanence. But it is more. John McKenzie

¹⁷ The Greek $\sigma\kappa\eta\eta\acute{\nu}\eta$ (tent, tabernacle) is representative in the LXX of both tabernacle/tent and Shekhina. A. M. Ramsey comments "There comes (in LXX) a blending of the imagery of the tent of meeting and the imagery of Yahweh dwelling with his people within a single unified concept of 'tabernacling' " p.25. op.cit.

¹⁸ See previous chapter (2) p.29.

speaks of the aim of Midrash as "practical application to the present".¹⁹ The present, however, is interpreted in terms of past and, most particularly, recent past, experience. In AD 70 the Jewish experience was one of devastating loss; loss of Temple, loss, therefore, of centre and means of sacrificial worship, loss of Jerusalem, loss of political freedom. From this experience arose old questions in the garb of a new age; they concerned God's relationship to the world, his mode of presence. In this climate of discussion the concept of Shekhina began to take on new nuances of meaning. Jewish sages (tannaim) of the first two centuries of the Christian era were preoccupied with one main problem. Their question: How are the two worlds (i.e. physical and metaphysical) bridged? In Talmudic cosmology God dwells in the seventh heaven, enormously remote from earth "the thickness of each firmament is equal to a journey of five hundred years, and so are the spaces between the seven firmaments ... Above them is the Throne of Glory ... of similar dimension ... The King, the living and eternal God, high and exalted, abides above them".²⁰ But another Rabbi writes "The Holy One, blessed be He, appears to be afar off, but in reality there is nothing closer than He".²¹ The statements appear markedly at odds with each other, but are they? A. Cohen thinks not. He writes "The Rabbis did not look upon the two conceptions (i.e. transcendence and immanence) as contradictory or mutually exclusive but rather as complementary".²² It is a question of emphasis. Nevertheless there is a tendency on the part of some

¹⁹ John McKenzie - Dictionary of the Bible, Geoffrey Chapman. London, 1978 (reprint), p.575.

²⁰ (Chag 13a) in A Cohen: Everyman's Talmud J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd. London, p.43.

²¹ Ibid p.44

²² Ibid p.43

Rabbis to emphasise the one concept to the detriment of the other. Sometimes dialectic is able to redress the balance and reach a higher synthesis. For example, "The Shekhina never came down and Moses and Elijah never ascended to heaven"²³ is a statement whose aim is to 'distance' physical and metaphysical realms from each other, or rather, to stress that 'distance' exists. Counterbalance is given in such comments as that of Rabbi Ishmael's on Exodus 19-20. "You might suppose that the Divine Glory actually descended from heaven and was transferred to Mount Sinai, but Scripture says 'I have talked with you from heaven'. Scripture thus teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, bent down the lower heavens and the upper heaven of heavens to the top of the mountain, and thus the Divine Glory descended. He spread them upon Mount Sinai as a man spreads his mattress on his bed".²⁴ Negating any need for 'descents' or 'ascensions' is the oft repeated statement that the Shekhina is everywhere, "If the sun, which is only one out of a million myriads of God's servants, can be in every part of the world, how much more so can the Shekinah radiate throughout the entire Universe".²⁵

In these examples of imbalance, counterbalance and suggestion of synthesis, it is noticeable that the concept of Shekhina (presence) though distinct from that of Glory, is so closely related to it that most times the two terms are interchangeable. Later, some Jewish philosophers equate them explicitly.

²³ R. Jose ben Halafta. Sukkah 5a. quoted by Israel I. Efros Ancient Jewish Philosophy. Wayne State University Press, Detroit 1964 p.59.

²⁴ Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael to Exodus 19-20 in Textual Sources for the Study of Judaism edited and translated by Philip S. Alexander. Manchester University Press 1984 p.65.

²⁵ Sanh.39a in A. Cohen: Everyman's Talmud op. cit. p. 10.

There are other examples of rabbinical speculation where the balance between the notions of transcendence and immanence is not regained; it is transcendence which is given most weight and God becomes utterly inaccessible and removed. Then, instead of the containment of polarities within Shekhina, there seems to be a separation of them, and Shekhina a hypostatization. At such times Shekhina, though representative of God, seems at least partly independent of him; physical and metaphysical worlds do not merge nor are they held in tension, for the Shekhina is 'here' and God is 'there'.

That the Shekhina is in fact hypostatized in Talmud and Midrashim is, however, debatable - and many have debated it. Alan Unkerman debates it thus "the term, though seemingly hypostatized in certain passages, must be viewed purely figuratively and not as representing a separable aspect of God".²⁶ His view would not have found acceptance with many medieval Jewish scholars, particularly the philosophers among them who write explicitly of the Shekhina as created by God and independent of him. Saadia Gaon (882-942), a key figure in the development of Judaism, speaks unequivocally of the Shekhina as 'the created Glory'. He emphasises the total incorporeality of the transcendent God; no one can see God, not even the prophets. What the prophets saw was the radiant light of the created Glory sent to them by God as proof of the authenticity of his words. Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), described as "the most significant Jewish philosopher of the Middle Ages",²⁷ concurs with this view. For him as for others besides Saadia Gaon the Shekhina is the Divine Glory God's mode of communication, but utterly separate from God and therefore created by him. That God is One and without

²⁶ 'Shekhina' Encyc. Judaica op.cit. Vol 14 p.1350.

²⁷ Ibid

corporeality, are respectively the second and third of the fundamental principles of the Jewish faith formulated by Maimonides. Concerning the second principle he writes "Nor is his oneness like that of a simple body which is numerically one, but capable of infinite subdivision and fragmentation. Rather he is one with a oneness that is absolutely unique".²⁸ This 'oneness' avers Maimonides, is the only acceptable attribute that can be predicated of God. Of God's incorporeality he states "whenever Scripture describes Him as having the attributes of bodies ... it speaks metaphorically ... the third fundamental principle is taught in the verse: 'you saw no image' (Deut.4:15) which means: 'You did not perceive Him as having an image' "²⁹ In Maimonides' view, to predicate positive attributes of God is to imply that creatures have an external relationship with Him. God's transcendence is absolute and paramount. Yet Maimonides does not deny relationship any more than he denies immanence; that God though apart from his creation, cares for it and is everywhere immanent in it, is accepted by the philosopher as unsolvable mystery. Prophecy is explained by him in Neoplatonic terms analogous to rays sent from the sun. From God who is light emanates light which illuminates the prophet's imagination through the intermediacy of his active intellect. Since in medieval Jewish philosophy the intellect is viewed as the probable bond between upper and lower worlds,³⁰ it is possible that in Maimonides' view the Shekhina/Divine Glory corresponds with the active intellect itself. So

²⁸ Maimonides, Commentary on the Mishna, Sanhedrin 10 (Heleg).
The Thirteen Fundamental Principles of the Jewish Faith in Textual
Sources Alexander (ed.) op. cit. p. 111.

²⁹ loc. cit. p. 111.

³⁰ See Alfred L. Ivry 'Intellect' in Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol 8
p.1410-2.

complex is his viewpoint, however, that interpreters are not always agreed as to what it really is. But there is no doubt as to his stated opinion that the Divine Glory/Shekhina is a created physical being of the nature of light.

To posit that the Shekhina is a created being keeps intact the concept of God as incorporeal and One and it avoids anthropomorphisms. But it raises questions which other medieval scholars were not slow to voice. Nahmanides, for example, asks "in regard to the verse 'and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle' and others, how can we apply thereto 'Blessed be' and 'the blessed'?"³¹ He adds, "Moreover, one who prays to a created glory is, as it were, an Idolator! However, many statements made by our sages point to the fact that the name 'Shekhina' stands for God".³²

The question as to whether or not rabbinical statements such as "The Shekhina stood before the Holy One, Blessed be He" refer to the Divine Glory as a 'created being' remains open to debate. And the debate continues. Any possible (though unlikely) outcome of it would not be of great consequence to this present thesis. What is of importance is the thinking that prompted various and variant statements concerning the Shekhina and which led to the initiation of discussion about the statements themselves. The thinking is ontologically dualistic; two worlds exist. That they are connected is a basic premise, for the Hebrew God is not the Aristotelian 'unmoved mover' but the dynamic creator who cares for, and communicates with, his creation. Problems with which Tannaitic minds struggled were those concerned with how the two worlds are connected, the Mode of Presence of the Divine. Built

³¹ Nahmanides in commentary on Genesis 46:1 quoted in: E.E. Urbach, The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs. Jerusalem 1975. p.41.

³² Ibid p.41.

within that struggle was another: to keep the polarities of Transcendence and Immanence in balance. This struggle or tension is part of the total fabric of Hebraic thought.

At the outset of the Tannaitic era, Philo's Hellenised Judaism had tilted the scales firmly and heavily in favour of transcendence. That it did not succeed in upsetting the delicate balance in main-line Judaism is due at least partly to the fact that the languages then of the Rabbinical colleges were Aramaic and Hebrew and not Greek; moreover, the Rabbis showed a distinct aversion to Greek wisdom. Philo's conception of God is ontological; God is for him pure Being, One in essence, utterly transcendent and the only Real.³³ What then is the bridge between Being and the phenomenal world? Indeed, is there a bridge at all? For Philo the devout Jew, there is no doubt that God communicates; the revelation of the Glory at Mount Sinai is at the heart of Jewish faith. As we have seen in an earlier chapter, Philo understands Glory to be the 'powers that keep guard around God'. These powers are the means of communication. Light suggests itself to Philo (as to others before and after him) as the most adequate representation of the communication process. The powers radiate from God, the Supreme power, in a series of radiations the first of which is the logos and within which the other powers are contained. It is a concept of God as ceaselessly active though unchanging. This creative uncreated Power is, with all the powers, one united Being, but as radiations the powers are created differentiated beings. Such ontological differentiation, says Yehoshua Amir "comes close to splitting the otherwise simply maintained unity of God".³⁴ But then the concepts of absolute separateness and

³³ e.g. Spec. Leg. I, 279 (CW VII, p. 261); Leg. All. III, 36 (CW I, p. 325).

³⁴ 'Philo Judaeus' Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol XIII p. 413.

togetherness, of apartness and involvement, of total transcendence and immanence when held together suggest fission not union.

Is the Glory seen? Is it known? Just as Philo unhesitatingly has Moses identify glory with powers, so he also without hesitation gives God words with which to answer Moses' request "Let me at least see your glory". God conveniently acts as a channel for Philo's own speculations when he tells Moses that neither He (God) nor his powers are discerned with the eyes: the mind is the means of discernment of them.³⁵ But here as elsewhere contradictions make the overall meaning unclear. For example, the Glory is said to be both knowable and unknowable in its essence. Harry Wolfson³⁶ takes Philo's speculations in this context to reflect the two-fold scriptural meaning of the term 'Glory of God': viz (a) God Himself (b) that which is indicative of God's presence but separate from him. Nevertheless, Philo's thinking about the second meaning (i.e. those powers which are distinct from God) oscillates from the powers being 'knowable' to their being 'unknowable'. The pendulum is left swinging.

In Philo's view only the immaterial world of Being is real. For reality to be revealed in the realm of matter, a lower manifestation of powers is required.³⁷ This is the manifestation of the Glory/Powers.

God's answer to Moses in Exodus 33:21-23 is thus interpreted by Philo as

³⁵ Spec. Leg I, 8: 45-50. Cited by Samuel S. Cohen, Jewish Theology, Royal Vangorcum Ltd. Assen, The Netherlands 1971 p.232.

³⁶ H.A. Wolfson. Philo Volume II. Harvard Univ. Press. Cambridge Massachusetts 1947 p. 146. Wolfson sees this double meaning also affected in Philo's Interpretation of Exodus 24:16. He writes "in this passage he (Philo) quite obviously plays upon the two meanings of the Greek term δόξα, that of "glory" and that of "notion". But undoubtedly behind this discussion there is the knowledge of the double meaning of the expression glory of God in scripture." Ibid p.147.

³⁷ See Erwin R. Goodenough An Introduction to Philo Judaeus Basil Blackwell Oxford 1962 p. 109ff.

"while in their essence they (powers) are beyond your comprehension, they nevertheless present to your sight a sort of impress and copy of their active working".³⁸ It is a Platonic twist to the problem of appearance and reality.

Philo's thinking cannot be taken as sure indication of the thinking of Greek-speaking Jews of the Hellenistic era, but neither can it be accepted as totally alien. The extent to which Greek thought and culture penetrated that of Judaism over centuries is just not known.³⁹ What is generally known is that similarities exist between Philonic concepts and those of the wisdom literature, particularly the Book of Wisdom.⁴⁰ Here wisdom is called power (*δύναμις*) and is a hypostatization just as are Philo's powers.⁴¹ Indeed, it would seem to be equivalent to Philo's logos:⁴² "For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty ... For she is a reflection of the eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness".⁴³ Philo himself

³⁸ Spec. Leg I, 8, 45-46. See Wolfson op.cit. p.146ff.

³⁹ See, however, Martin Hengel Judaism and Hellenism SCM Press Ltd London 1974, the thesis of which is that Hellenistic influences had for centuries been making steady inroads into Judaism. A sudden acceleration by the Greek party caused as sudden a 'clamping up' by Judaism which then became defensively xenophobic.

⁴⁰ Written in Greek, c. 2nd century B.C.

⁴¹ Not all are agreed that wisdom is hypostatized. See, for example, G.F. Moore op.cit p.417ff. Nor is there agreement that Philo's 'powers' are hypostatized. Bevan writes concerning Philo "no one has been able to define precisely how far he thought of his logos as a separate personal being and how far as a figure of speech". He adds "perhaps Philo himself did not know". See Symbolism and Belief. Fontana 1962 p.158.

⁴² See Wolfson op.cit. Vol I p.287ff where he outlines the 3 stages of existence of logos and wisdom, viz (1) as property of God (2) as a real being created by God prior to the creation of the world and (3) as being immanent in the world.

⁴³ Wisdom 7:25-26.

relates wisdom and power, describing wisdom as 'the sharp rock which he (God) cut off as the very first from his own powers'.⁴⁴ In the wisdom literature other attributes are accorded to wisdom which are those accorded by Philo to the Logos. For example, wisdom not only existed before creation⁴⁵ but was also the means by which the world came into being.⁴⁶ God's revelation to and communication with men, wisdom is sent forth from the 'throne of glory.'⁴⁷

Because certain concepts act like tangents to other concepts, it would be wrong unhesitatingly to accord them more than peripheral relationships. In Judeao/Christian thought wisdom is such a complex concept that it touches a number of others.⁴⁸ Within its network of relationships, however, that with the Holy Spirit seems rather more closely knit. In the Book of Wisdom there is an identification of wisdom with the Holy Spirit;⁴⁹ Philo likewise identifies the two.⁵⁰ Philo's conception of the Divine Spirit πνεῦμα θεῖον is one of many strands, several of which correspond to the Rabbinic Shekhina. According to Philo, the Divine Spirit is a mode of God's

⁴⁴ Leg. All.II 86. (CW I, pp. 278 - 9).

⁴⁵ Proverbs 8:22-24. This book is a compilation over centuries. ch 1:1-9:18 is post-exilic. Wolfson notes that Philo speaks of wisdom having 2 stages of existence. (a) as property of God i.e. eternal (b) real being created by God. See Wolfson op.cit.p.255. Vol I.

⁴⁶ Proverbs 3:19.

⁴⁷ Bk. Wisdom 9:10.

⁴⁸ Hebrew: Hokmah. LXX: Sophia. In O.T. wisdom is mainly concentrated in the wisdom literature (180 times) but is also in prophets (41 times) historical books (73 times) and Psalms (13 times). There are 5 other occurrences in O.T. Wisdom denotes: ability, knowledge, practical wisdom, prudence, ethical conduct, the Torah and, as in Bk wisdom, an intermediate power.

⁴⁹ Bk Wisdom 7:22-23; 9:17.

⁵⁰ Gig, 47, cf. Som II 12. (CW II, p.471 and V, p.449).

revelation, a means of his communicating with men. And as in much of medieval Jewish opinion the Shekhina/Glory is a created being separate from God, so in Philo's opinion the Divine Spirit is a separate entity, a "unique incorporeal soul".⁵¹

In Rabbinic literature Holy Spirit (Ru'ah ha Kodesh) and Shekhina are often interchanged.⁵² This is because they touch at several points although they are different concepts. It is said, for example, that the Holy Spirit rests on worthy or charismatic individuals.⁵³ The same is predicated of the Shekhina,⁵⁴ which, moreover, can be driven away by unrighteousness.⁵⁵ Both terms sometimes act as synonyms for God and both are a means of his revelation. Like the Shekhina, the Holy Spirit is at times hypostatized, though whether such 'hypostatization' is purely figurative is again hotly debated.⁵⁶

Away from the rabbinical writings a further relationship is evidenced in the Book of Sirach where wisdom says of herself "I dwelt in high places and my throne was a pillar of cloud".⁵⁷ She continues "the one who created me assigned a place for my tent. And he said 'make your dwelling in Jacob' ".⁵⁸ In her tent, wisdom is "like the smoke of incense".⁵⁹ The

⁵¹ See Wolfson op. cit. Vol 2 p.32.

⁵² e.g. Pes 117b; Shab 30b., Epstein (ed.), Seder Mo'ed Vol II and I.

⁵³ Er 64b., Epstein (ed.) op. cit. Vol II.

⁵⁴ Sot. 17a; BB 10a, Shab 92a. Epstein (ed.), Seder Nashim Vol III, Seder Nezekim Vol II, Seder Mo'ed Vol I.

⁵⁵ Sanh.7a. Epstein (ed.), Seder Mo'ed Vol I. The Holy Spirit can also be driven away. See Gen. R. LXV, 4 in A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud op. cit. p.48.

⁵⁶ e.g. Pes. 117a. Epstein (ed.) Seder Mo'ed Vol II; Eccles. R. 12:7 cited by A. Unterman, "Ru'ah Ha-Kodesh: Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol 14 p.365. See also pp. 365-8.

⁵⁷ Sirach 24:4.

⁵⁸ Ibid 24:8.

⁵⁹ Ibid 24:15 (Jerusalem translation).

allusions to tent, dwelling, cloud and smoke bring clearly to mind the events of Exodus and the concept of Glory/Presence or Shekhina. But as we mentioned in chapter two, the Glory, closely linked with the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, has a moral dimension.⁶⁰ Wisdom is also afforded an ethical role and is identified by Sirach with the Torah, God's communication, the revelation of his will.⁶¹ In Rabbinic literature too, wisdom finds identification with Torah⁶² which in turn, in some way denotes the Presence: "when ten people sit together and occupy themselves with The Torah, the Shekhina abides among them ... and whence can it be shown that the same applies even to one? Because it is said, 'In every place where I cause my name to be remembered I will come unto thee and I will bless thee'".⁶³

Holy Spirit, Wisdom, Torah, Shekhina, Glory: together they form a veritable web of relationships. Of first importance for this present thesis is not, however, the web itself but the experience, and reflection on the experience, that has gone into its making and remaking. The experience with which we are here and now concerned is that of the post-exilic period when prophecy, at first waning, then ceased, and when the Glory did not inhabit the Temple. At this time the scales were tipping surely in favour of Transcendence.

Of the tendency to holiness (transcendence) and the tendency to Glory (immanence) within the Jewish concept of God and the movement of the

⁶⁰ See p.30.

⁶¹ Sirach 24:23.

⁶² Siffre Deut. 37:76, op.cit. See A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud p.13.

⁶³ Ibid p.135.

emphasis from one to the other, Efros writes "these two tendencies need each other as the mind needs the heart, and the rhythm of their mutual succession has in it something of the systole and the diastole of the God-concept".⁶⁴ In the post-exilic period such long measure was given to the systolic (transcendent) beat that Israel's own heart grew anxious, she longed for intimacy but felt only an ever widening gap. Because of an overwhelming sense of God's divine exaltedness, Israel's experience was of aloneness, her need was for Presence/Glory. But need has its own potential for seeking and discovery. As in the later Tannaitic era when the experience of loss raised new questions so in the post-exilic Hellenistic period questions came to the fore. When God was high in his heavens all was not right with the world, not at least with the Jewish world. Answers were sought about the world, about God's relations with and activity in it. Above all, bereft of prophets, Israel sought to know her own role and the guidance she needed to fulfil it. She sought and found wisdom, "a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty".⁶⁵

Thus through post-exilic experience within a Hellenistic environment, the older Biblical concept of wisdom (Hokmah) has acquired new realms of meaning in the later Wisdom literature.⁶⁶ Breath, Spirit, Power, Glory, Torah, Presence: wisdom has all these connotations, for, coming from the throne of Glory, she is God's communication. There is no longer need to lament the lapse of prophecy, since Wisdom makes men "friends of God and

⁶⁴ Efros. op.cit. p.26.

⁶⁵ Wisdom 7:25.

⁶⁶ O.T. Wisdom was, like the wisdom of other peoples, originally an art, and was concerned with practical realities based on experience. See Vol.Rad. op.cit. Vol I p.418ff.

Prophets".⁶⁷ And guidance is assured, for she guides men wisely in their actions and guards them with her glory.⁶⁸ Through Wisdom God makes himself present.

Yet though Wisdom mediates revelation, God remains hidden and full knowledge is inaccessible to man: "who has seen him (God) and can describe him? Or who can extol him as he is?",⁶⁹ asks Ben Sirach and adds "many things greater than these lie hidden".⁷⁰ Wisdom's throne is "in a pillar of cloud".⁷¹ As the cloud in the Exodus is indicative of what it hides, so is Wisdom's revelation of herself indicative of what is not known. Wisdom is mysterious in her ways.

It is these elements of mystery and esoterism that find expression in and are characteristic of those writings termed 'apocalyptic' which were diffused in Judaism for about two centuries before and after the Christian era.⁷² Indeed, Von Rad describes knowledge as the "nerve centre" of apocalyptic and wisdom as "the real matrix" from which that form of literature derives.⁷³ It may be argued that Apocalyptic, unrecognised by

⁶⁷ Wisdom 7:27.

⁶⁸ Wisdom 9:11.

⁶⁹ Sirach 43:31.

⁷⁰ Sirach 43:32.

⁷¹ Sirach 24:4.

⁷² The origins of apocalyptic are complex. Some works may pre-date 200 B.C. See M. McNamara, Intertestamental Literature. Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware, 1983 p.

⁷³ Gerhard Von Rad op.cit. Vol II p.306 (but he also agrees that Middle Eastern Wisdom had a part to play). See also H.H. Rowley The Relevance of Apocalyptic, 2nd edit. London and Redhill 1947 p.13 Others e.g. G. Moore see Apocalyptic as deriving from prophecy. This latter view does not seem to take account of the facts that (1) secrecy is not a part of prophecy, and (2) prophecy and apocalyptic attitudes to chronological time are too different to be compatible.

Judaism, is not characteristically Jewish.⁷⁴ Such an argument does not, however, lessen the value of the study of apocalyptic for the understanding of Jewish thought and culture. Early Judaism was not simplistically normative; it was shaped by many forces and influenced by non-Jewish ideas. Apocalyptic is important for understanding the process of Judaism's shaping and, in this context, for understanding further the concept of Glory.

Apocalyptic starts from a transcendent viewpoint. "In the uppermost heaven of all dwells the Great Glory in the Holy of Holies superior to all holiness".⁷⁵ Man, immeasurably distanced from the Glory, requires angels to act as two-way mediators, from God to man, from man to God. These angels also perform the service of guide for those visionaries⁷⁶ who are to be taken up into realms of glory and initiated into heavenly secrets, then returned to earth with their esoteric knowledge.

That the "most high has made not one world but two"⁷⁷ is a belief central to apocalyptic vision and one which no doubt took its impetus from the Sitz im Leben of the post-exilic period when Jewish life in general had failed to reach that idealistic level earlier hoped for and envisaged. Since meaning cannot be found in this world, apocalyptic hopes are fixed on another in which all wrongs will be righted. On the Day of Judgment will be seen the "splendour of the glory of the most high".⁷⁸ It will be a radiant.

⁷⁴ See, for example, Moore op.cit. Vol I p.126.

⁷⁵ Test. of Levi 3:4 (2nd century B.C.) in The Old Testament: Pseudepigrapha, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments. J.H. Charlesworth (ed.) Darton, Longman & Todd London 1983. Vol I p.789.

⁷⁶ e.g. Abraham, Adam, Baruch, Enoch, Ezra and Moses all said to have 'ascended' with the help of angels.

⁷⁷ 4 Ezra 7:50. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 538.

⁷⁸ 4 Ezra 7:42(late 1st Century A.D.) ibidem.

glory before which only the righteous can stand⁷⁹ and in which they will share, for "their face is to shine like the sun and they are to be made like the light of the stars"⁸⁰ and they will be clothed with "garments of glory".⁸¹ The righteous are described as "those who planted the roots of wisdom in their heart";⁸² their splendour will be glorified by transformations.⁸³ The wicked, by contrast will wither away; they will "not be able to behold the faces of the holy ones" upon whom "the light of the Lord of the Spirits has shined".⁸⁴

This Divine Glory in which the righteous are to share and by which they are to be transformed is that which in Apocalyptic belief was man's before the fall. In the Apocalypse of Moses, Eve laments "I have been estranged from my glory with which I was clothed".⁸⁵ In Rabbinical literature also, the first man shone in the radiance of the glory but lost it when he sinned.⁸⁶ According to the Rabbis, sin and Kavodh Yahweh or Shekhina or Ru'ah ha Kadesh are incompatible; they cannot dwell together.

The Apocalypse of Enoch speaks expressly of the Shekhina's withdrawal from earth on account of man's sin,⁸⁷ not that of Adam for whom the Shekhina

⁷⁹ Eth. Enoch 50:4 (2nd cent.B.C.-1st Century A.D.) Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 36.

⁸⁰ 4 Ezra 7:97. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 540.

⁸¹ Eth. Enoch. 62:13-16. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 44.

⁸² 2 Baruch 51:3. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 638.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Eth. Enoch 38:4. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 30

⁸⁵ Apoc. Moses (life of Adam and Eve) 20:2. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol II p. 281.

⁸⁶ Gen R. 19:7 A. Cohen. Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p.47.

⁸⁷ 3 Enoch 5:5 (Hebrew Apoc. of) (5th-6th century A.D.) In this account, the Shekhina remains in the garden after Adam's fall, but leaves in Enosh's generation which is the time according to Rabbinic belief that idolatry began. See Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 260.

was visible though from a distance,⁸⁸ but that of Enosh, third in line from Adam. Since then the Shekhina has dwelt in the highest heaven, its abode on the Throne. In this particular apocalypse (3 Enoch) it is purportedly R. Ishmael⁸⁹ who relates the experience of his mystical ascension and his gaining of access to the inaccessible. He sees the Throne of Glory, the chariot and the heavenly world⁹⁰ and receives revelation from Metraton, the Angel who serves in the immediate presence of the Glory.⁹¹ Rabbi Ishmael's quest has met with fulfilment.

It is this quest for the Glory that is at the heart of Merkabah mysticism, to which 3 Enoch is related. "It was Ezekiel who saw the vision of glory which God showed him above the chariot of the cherubim" writes Ben Sirach.⁹² Merkabah mystics sought to see what Ezekiel had seen; they sought to achieve communion with God. If God was inaccessible because not 'down' on earth, then man must gain access by going 'up' to heaven by mystical ascent involving a secretly transmitted know-how.

The roots of this Merkabah movement are in Palestinian Judaism early in the Tannaitic period,⁹³ when, as we have observed, intense speculation took place. While most Tannaitic sages were concerned mainly with the question

⁸⁸ 3 Enoch 5:3 The first man and his generation dwelt at the gate of the garden of Eden so that they might gaze at the bright image of the Shekhina, and the brilliance of the Shekhina radiated from one end of the world to the other". Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 259.

⁸⁹ Enoch III is a pseudepigraphion.

⁹⁰ 3 Enoch 1:6. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 256.

⁹¹ 3 Enoch 3: 1ff. Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 257.

⁹² Sirach 49:8.

⁹³ See Charlesworth op.cit. p.232 where a number of reasons are given, including the fact that Merkabah literature makes this claim for itself and owns early Palestinian Rabbis as its authorities. Tannaitic period: first two centuries A.D.

of how upper and lower worlds were bridged, Merkabah mystics among them were deep in speculation about the upper world itself, the Ma'aseh Merkabah⁹⁴ and the means of constructing their own bridges to it by way of esoteric knowledge and ecstatic experience. Merkabah mystics sought to pierce hidden mystery, they sought to go beyond the world of appearance. The quest for the Glory was for them the quest for the ultimate reality.

Merkabah literature has important links not only with earlier pseudepigrapha but also with Qumran literature. Among the many parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls is Glory as a title for God and the designation 'seat of his glory' for throne which is also called 'throne of glory'. Members of the sect also penetrate mysteries of the heavenly world by means of knowledge mediated through the angels of light and truth; they "have gazed on that which is eternal, on wisdom concealed from men ... on a spring of glory (hidden) from the assembly of flesh".⁹⁵ Such esoteric knowledge is not a means of "ascent" as it is for the Merkabah mystics. For the Qumran community an enormous distance is believed to exist between God and man and man and angels; the upper world is utterly transcendent. But the 'sons of light' will have a glorious future. Understanding 'glory' also in its eschatological sense, they believe that they themselves will experience in the next life "every ever-lasting blessing and eternal joy without end" and will wear "a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light".⁹⁶

⁹⁴ In Mishna Hagigah 2:1 this is the name given to the first chapter of Ezekiel in Hebrew.

⁹⁵ The Community Rule XI In G. Vermes. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Penguin, 2nd Ed. Harmondsworth, 1975 pp.92-3.

⁹⁶ The Community Rule 3:13-4:8 M. McNamara Intertestamental literature Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware 1983. See also Enoch 58:6 'And there will be light immeasurable and (the elect) will not enter into a limited number of days, for darkness will first have been dissipated', Charlesworth (ed.) Vol I p. 40.

The contribution made by Merkabah mysticism to Jewish thought and culture has been considerable.⁹⁷ Although as a movement it ceased in Gaonic times, its influence nevertheless continued. It is evidenced, for example, in the mystical theology of the German Hasidim⁹⁸ where the concept of 'created glory' is dominant. The 'Hymn of Glory',⁹⁹ composed in Hasidic times, is still greatly revered by German Jewry as is clear by the special place given it in the Ashkenazi liturgy. The hymn is expressive of that awful tension between Glory and Holiness. Indeed, it is itself a piece of that Hebraic tapestry whose warp is distance and whose weft is nearness. It is a weaving of the agony and the ecstasy.

The influence of Merkabah traditions has been especially significant in the shaping of the Kabbalah¹⁰⁰ which, in its turn, has had a profound influence on Jewish life and thought. Esoteric, theosophic and mystical in its composition, the Kabbalah presents a vast array of different systems some of which are in total contradiction to each other. Nevertheless there is a common pattern of symbols and concepts and within this pattern the term Kavodh (glory) plays an important role. Central to the Kabbalah is the Zohar¹⁰¹ (splendour) a thirteenth century text written in Aramaic and embodying a coherent conceptual system. Intensely speculative, the Zohar

⁹⁷ See Charlesworth op.cit.p.Vol. I p.251 who speaks also of the contribution made by Merkabah mysticism to the liturgy of the synagogue.

⁹⁸ or Hasidei: Ashkenaz. 12th Century.

⁹⁹ See Nicholas de Lange. Judaism. O.U.P. 1987 p.94.

¹⁰⁰ 'That which is handed down by tradition'. In its wider sense 'Kabbalah' is applicable to all Judaistic esoteric movements since A.D. 70. As used in this present work, 'Kabbalah' refers only to esoteric/mystical teachings from 12th Century A.D. on.

¹⁰¹ Stemming from mystical/speculative thinking of Kabbalists of Provence and Catalonia.

directs its enquiries to the problem of the relationship between upper and lower worlds, that is, to the relationship between visible creation and the unseen God. "For all things are in him and he is in all things: he is both manifest and concealed. Manifest in order to uphold the whole, and concealed for he is nowhere".¹⁰² Encapsulated within the Zohar, as in Kabbalah generally, is the mystic's spiritual aliveness to and experience of God's transcendence and immanence.

Particularly prominent is the Kabbalistic theosophical preoccupation with the mystery of God's inner life; the Zohar seeks, indeed alleges that it has, insight into such mystery. This insight is through gnosis. Present at the same time is the contention that the Absolute One is (as in Neoplatonic philosophy) unknowable. But how is the unknowable knowable? The Zohar's answer to this question is in terms of 'correspondences' and of 'glory': "The Lord made this world corresponding to the world above".¹⁰³ And of man in particular? He is created on earth by God "after the pattern of the upper Glory".¹⁰⁴ The light from the Divine Glory is refracted and reflected in the universe and on earth.

The conceptual framework for the Zohar's analysis of God's inner life is the Sefirotic system. From the Absolute Reality (Ein Sof) emanate ten Sefiroth¹⁰⁵ each one of which channels the divine light. Corporately the sefiroth form "a whole world of divine light in the chain of being".¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² Zohar E.T. 1931-4, III 228. Quoted by G. Parrinder, Mysticism in the World's Religions. Sheldon Press, London, 1976. p.117.

¹⁰³ Zohar Shemot II 20A. Textual Sources (J) Alexander (ed.) p. 32.

¹⁰⁴ Zohar Terumak II 155a Textual Sources (J) Alexander (ed.) op. cit. p. 129.

¹⁰⁵ Seemingly from Hebrew Safor: to numerate. Some, however, have suggested it is from sappir: sapphire rays e.g. G. Parrinder op. cit. p.117.

¹⁰⁶ G. Scholem, 'Sefiroth' Encyclopaedia Judaica Volume 14 p. 1103.

Separately they are aspects of God and are his self-chosen mode of manifestation. Although such a theory is very similar to the Neoplatonic, it is not identical with it for the emanations are all within the Infinite (Ein Sof) in which there are no distinctions, only absolute Oneness.

The eighth emanation or aspect is hod Majesty, or Glory.¹⁰⁷ The tenth and last Sefirah is the Malkuth or Shekhina, the recipient of divine light from all the other Sefiroth and the one nearest to the world of creation. The Shekhina is the created world's sustaining power, the presence of God. But since the Sefiroth are aspects of the One Reality, Shekhina and Glory though conceptually distinct are one, for "Everything is linked with another down to the very lowest link of the chain and the true essence of God is above as well as below".¹⁰⁸ In the Kabbala the systole and the diastole of the God-concept are in balanced rhythm. God is both immanent and transcendent.

The concept of Glory is, as we have seen, irretrievably linked with that of Immanence/Transcendence. But what is meant by the term transcendence? In the reference to 'here' and 'there', to 'upper' and 'lower' there is a tendency, as Slater notes, "to reify each pole".¹⁰⁹ Moreover, the experience of transcendence (which is not the same as a definition of it), comes from the "interplay between two poles, not the

¹⁰⁷ The Sefiroth: (1) Crown (Keter), (2) Wisdom (Hokmah), (3) Understanding (Binah), (4) Greatness (Gedullah), (5) Power (Gevurah), (6) Beauty (Tiferet), (7) Victory (Nezat), (8) Majesty, Glory (hod), (9) Foundation (Yesod), (10) Sovereignty (Shekhina or Malkuth).

¹⁰⁸ Words of Kabbalist master Moses de Leon in his Sefer Harimmon. Quoted by Leo Schaya The Universal Meaning of the Kabbalah. London. George Allen & Unwin 1971 p.166.

¹⁰⁹ Peter Slater. 'The Transcending Process and the Relocation of the Sacred', Transcendence and the Sacred, ed. Alan M. Olson and Leroy S. Rouner, Univ. Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana 1981, p.46.

contrast in status ascribed to either end of a relationship taken in isolation".¹¹⁰ But even the word 'poles' has spatial connotation and to some extent, therefore, reifies. The operative word is 'interplay' which, denoting movement, denies staticity; the experience of transcendence stems from the dynamic interaction of opposites which are mutually attractive. The 'trans' of transcendence is not meant to imply a fixed point or barrier dividing the 'beyond' from the 'accessible'.

In Judaeo-Christian understanding the 'beyond' points to the 'wholly other', the ultimate Being, that which is beyond existence as we understand it, yet is the cause of being and manifest in it. But the term 'beyond' can only point. To do more would be to objectify and thereby detranscendentalise. Man, moreover, though transcending the world of which he is a part, is distanced from the 'beyond' by his own limitations. Human sight and insight, fallible as well as limited, 'sees' only in part what is there to be seen and that not infallibly. Behind or 'beyond' that which man conceives to be, IS; the 'beyond' refers to the reality beyond appearance. And there is a moral connotation attached to the 'beyond'. Integrity is deemed to afford a transparent quality to seeing, so the person of integrity sees the same things as others but differently,¹¹¹ appearance becomes for him/her like a glass through which reality is viewed. The Kantian contention that access to reality is gained by moral experience is in some sort a converse echo of Eve's lament "I have been estranged from my glory",¹¹² and also of the Rabbinic belief that the Shekhina, Glory or Holy Spirit cannot dwell with sin. The 'loss' of Glory is loss of vision, or

¹¹⁰ Ibid p.44.

¹¹¹ See chapter 2, p.40.

¹¹² See note 85.

rather an imposition of limitation, appearance becomes opaque and the 'beyond' concealed. But the 'loss' is not necessarily permanent; glory remains always a possibility, for integrity is restorable. Sometimes, as we have seen, stress is on the eschatological aspect of glory; the righteous (and this includes those who have repented) will experience glory as a future-reality. At other times the emphasis is on Glory (in medieval Jewish philosophy, Shekhina/presence, and malkuth/Kingdom) as a present, sustaining salvific reality. At all times in Jewish experience and belief, God seeks man even more than man seeks God and therefore never ceases to communicate. It is as though the unseen craves to be 'seen', the Hidden to be revealed. And so God chooses to reveal himself in glory. This vision or insight granted to man is guarantee of God's love but not guaranteed: Man cannot take hold, manipulate or possess. God in his essence remains ever hidden; the Glory is indication and attempted articulation of experience of the elusive presence, it is neither explanation nor description of it.

Elusiveness is a tantalising quality, for man has an inner compulsion to seek the evasive and to grasp the ungraspable. Thus throughout the ages Jewish sages have grappled with the problem of God's mode of Presence and his relationship with the world. In so doing, they have woven (as can be seen in retrospect) the two separate strands of Transcendence and Immanence into a uniform pattern. Though at any one time in the weaving process one strand receives greater attention, within the overall pattern of Jewish thought the two concepts are in harmony.

Part of the 'grappling' experience within Judaism has found expression in esoteric ideas and theosophical literature which reflect gnostic concepts. The Zohar in particular, is the result of the blending of two

streams of thought, one of which is distinctly Gnostic.¹¹³ Jewish gnosticism is part and parcel of the quest for the Glory, the seeking of the reality beyond appearance. Concerning gnosticism in general, it is Bianchi's opinion that its entire problem, which is the problem of docetism, is that of "defining a specific mode of presence for heavenly beings in this world", that is, docetism is "a particular theory of the ambivalence of the presence of the divine".¹¹⁴

Docetism (δοκητισμός) the first known Christian heresy and one which denies reality to Christ's human body, is a term which comes, of course, from the same root as δόξα (glory), that is, it comes from the Greek verb δοκέω (to think, seem, appear). Docetism admits of a number of gradations, from strong to very mild. In its milder form it approaches, as Rudolph avers "fundamentally close to hypostatic Christology".¹¹⁵ Christians in faith move beyond the Christ who appeared only human, to acceptance of his divinity.

But docetism is not simply a special, strange Gnostic christology and confined to Christianity; it is found elsewhere. In Mahayana Buddhism, for instance, meta-physical speculations on the relationship between Truth (Reality) and the Tathagata (revealer of truth) have led to ideas such as the "semblance body" of the Buddha which are generally accepted as docetic. In Whalen W Lais' view the acceptance is too readily and too easily given even by Buddhologists themselves. He writes "the common charge that Mahayana is docetic is unfortunate, especially in view of the bad press

¹¹³ i.e. that of the Castilian 'Gnostics'.

¹¹⁴ U. Bianchi. 'Docetism', Myths and Symbols ed. by Kitagawa and Long. University of Chicago Press. 1969 p.265.

¹¹⁵ Kurt Rudolph. Gnosis T & T Clarke Ltd. Edinburgh 1983 p.158.

docetism has traditionally received from the Christian Fathers".¹¹⁶

Regardless of whether docetism is given good or bad press, we need to ask if the common charge that Mahayana Buddhism is docetic is correct. Are notions like 'the Buddha's semblance body' a docetic denial of reality, or are they pointing to a reality beyond appearance? Are they indicative of reality made immanent or of utter transcendence? These and other questions will be the subject of our next chapter.

¹¹⁶ Whalen W Lai. 'The Predocetic "Finite Buddhakaya" in the Lotus Sutra: In search of the illusive Dharmakaya therein.' Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLIX-3 1981.

Chapter Four

"Did Buddha die from eating pork?", asks A. Waley in an article published in 1932.¹ The question had been asked by others before Waley and it very likely has been asked by others since, for, according to Buddhist tradition, either truffles or pig's flesh are to be blamed for the Buddha's fatal illness.² Whether a meat or a fungus is to be held accountable is not of concern to our present thesis. But though the answer does not seem to be of importance here, the question is, for it enshrines a belief that Buddha's death was the consequence of food poisoning of some sort. It indicates, therefore, that the Buddha, like all mortals, was vulnerable, that he suffered the pain and the indignity of acute indigestion from which he died.³ Belief in Buddha's real vulnerability and real pain can hardly be dubbed docetic.

Of the two main divisions within Buddhism, it is the Theravadins⁴ (those who adhere to the older school) who hold (or purport to hold) firmly

¹ In Melanges chinois et bouddiques I. Geuther 1932 Cited by L. de la Vallee Poussin, 'Buddhism' in Studies in Comparative Religion ed. E. Messenger CTS London Vol I p.4.

² Maha Parinibbana Sutta. 4:21 in The Buddha's Philosophy of Man. Early Indian Buddhist Dialogues arr. and edited. Trevor Ling. Dent 1981 p.182 (here 'pork' is given as cause). See Dialogues of the Buddha part III trans. T.W & C. Rhys Davids being Vol III Sacred Books of the Buddhists ed. T.W. Rhys Davies London 1935. Reproduced by permission in Bible of the World ed. Ballou. Kegan Paul, London 1940 p.227 (here 'truffles' given).

³ Not all Buddhists are agreed on this issue. C. Humphreys writes "That a man such as Gotama the Buddha, of perfect mental and physical purity and in full possession of his faculties should die of eating pork is absurd". Buddhism Penguin. Reprint 1975. Harmondsworth, Middlesex p.41. For the historical background showing differences of opinion on the question see A. Bareau. Les Sectes Bouddiques du Petit Vehicle, Publications de l'Ecole francaise d' Extreme-Orient Vol. 37, Saigon 1955.

⁴ One of the Hinayana Schools and an offshoot of the Vibhajyavadins.

to belief in the humanity of the Buddha.⁵ He is not for them a mythological personage or a god but a human being born in a definite place (a town in North India) within a specific period (600 to 400 BC)⁶ to a family by the name of Gotama (Sanskrit, Gautama) belonging to the Sakya clan. For the Theravadins, Buddha is firmly rooted in history. It is necessary that he be thus rooted, for "a man and only a man can become a Buddha".⁷

Gotama⁸ was not born perfected nor was perfection thrust upon him, unaided he worked hard to achieve it. Thus, when after his enlightenment he proclaimed the first of the four noble truths, namely the omnipresence of dukkha (suffering/impermanence/imperfection), Gotama become Buddha spoke experientially though the actual experience lay behind him. Susceptible still to sickness and to that which generally causes pain, Buddha in his perfected nature did not 'suffer' these things; he had transcended them. Although his body may have experienced bodily pain, Buddha had no mental feeling of pain; as the perfect yogin he had risen above it.⁹ This belief held by the Theravadins cannot rightly be called docetic. But what of the beliefs of other Buddhists?

All non-Theravadin Buddhists come under the umbrella of the Mahayana

⁵ They nevertheless accord Buddha extraordinary powers, e.g. He worked miracles, was omniscient and infallible. His body had the thirty two marks of a superman. See Conze, Buddhism. Its Essence and Development, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford 1974 edition. pp. 36-37.

⁶ The date is controversial. Most, however, accept c.486 BC for Buddha's death. See Ling The Buddha's Philosophy of Man op.cit. p.IX introd.; Humphreys op.cit.p.30.

⁷ Walpola Rahula What the Buddha Taught Gordon Fraser. London and Bedford. Reprint 1985 p.1.

⁸ Also called Siddhattha (Sanskrit Siddhartha).

⁹ Bodily pain is dependent on the body; mind pain is dependent on the will. See Milinda. Panha II:2.

(Great Vehicle).¹⁰ It is a vast canopy covering many different ethnic and cultural groups which together present a diversity of philosophies and beliefs. The sacred writings are multifarious as are linguistic difficulties for translators.¹¹ Those scriptures which have been translated into occidental languages form only a very small part of the whole and this part is extremely complex. Nevertheless, clearly discernible amidst all the complexity is a general belief that Buddha is more than human; his historical personality has been ignored or forgotten, he has been 'glorified'. This 'glorification' (i.e. raising to the supra-mundane) of Buddha without obvious trace of historical roots lays (or appears to lay) the Mahayana wide open to the charge of being docetic. Is such a charge in fact justified? Before attempting to answer this question it is necessary to look more closely at the meaning of 'glorification' in relation to the Buddha.

In Mahayana writings Buddha's 'glorification' or 'Transcendence' is repeatedly expressed in terms of light; he is invested with a radiance which is capable of illuminating the universe. "From each pore of his body he emits rays of light as numerous as the atoms of the sands of the Ganges".¹² This view of the glorified Buddha finds expression in Buddhist iconography in which he is depicted, for example, in a golden glow or with flames

¹⁰ The Theravadins are the only remaining school of the Hinayana (lesser vehicle).

¹¹ It is not known which, if any, language was the original. Major languages: Chinese, Japanese, Sanskrit and Tibetan. See Joachim Wach. Types of Religious experience. Routledge and Kegan Paul. London 1951 p.104.

¹² 'The Meditation Sutra' tr. Kojiro Miyasaka, in The Three Fold Lotus Sutra Tr. Bunno Kato, Yoshiro Tamura and Miyasaka with revisions by W.E. Soothill, Wilhelm Schiffer and P. Del Campana. John Weatherhill, Inc. New York 1975 p.358.

flashing forth from a vesica or nimbus.¹³ Christian iconography likewise represents its saints as aureoled, in accordance with Christian belief that they participate in the glory of God. Buddha, however, does not share in the glory of a God or gods; rather his is the glory for he has transcended the human condition, has gone beyond the conditioned state. "Phenomenologically considered", notes Ninian Smart, Buddha has been made divine.¹⁴

Buddha has achieved this glory by two main means (1) his acts of compassion performed over countless ages and (2) his perfect knowledge and understanding of the nature of true reality.¹⁵ The radiant light of Buddha's glory denotes, therefore, not only his transcendence but also his compassion, infinite knowledge and revelation. Buddha's glory (light) is salvific. "Why has the world-honoured One emitted such a ray of light? ... For what abundant benefits has he spread such a ray of light?" Maitreya Bodhisattva asks of Manjusri, in the Lotus (Saddharmapundarika) Sutra,¹⁶ taking for granted that the emission is beneficial. Maitreya is given a full and comprehensive answer which is encapsulated most succinctly in "the

¹³ See, for example, D. Seckel. The Art of Buddhism in 'Art of the World'. Methuen London 1969. Plate 22 (536 BC) showing flames flashing from Vesica; Plate 11 (2nd Cent.AD) aureole.

¹⁴ Buddha and Christ, Saviour God: Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation. ed. S. Brandon. Manchester Univ. Press, p164. See also Mircea Eliade, The Two and the One tr. J.M. Cohen. Harper and Row, New York, and Harvill Press, London 1965. ch.1. 'Experiences of the Mystic Light'.

¹⁵ Wisdom, Prajna (Pali: Panna) "the methodical contemplation of 'Dharmas'" (Conze. Buddhism Bruno Cassirer. Oxford 1974 ed. p.105) is the supreme virtue and must be attained in equal measure with compassion, Karuna, for perfection to be realised. See Rahula op.cit. p.46.

¹⁶ Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op. cit. p. 41.

Buddha sends forth a ray to help reveal the Truth of Reality".¹⁷ This revelation is an expression of Buddha's compassion; it is his saving help.

Salvation viewed negatively is liberation from suffering,¹⁸ viewed positively it is the attainment of Nirvana.¹⁹ Buddhists have also always spoken of it as "crossing over".²⁰ Whatever description be given of it, Salvation involves an awakening to the truth of Reality and the realisation of the Buddha nature within. For in Mahayana Buddhism, Buddhahood is not restricted to Gautama Buddha but is that state to which all beings are destined and for which all have the potential.²¹ There are, therefore, an infinite number of Buddhas all of whom are similarly invested with light/glory, sign and symbol of their saving power. "All the Buddhas, saviours of the world, dwelling in mighty divine penetration reveal their infinite powers divine ... Their bodies emit countless rays of light".²² So intense is the radiance that a single ray from a Buddha is able to illuminate innumerable domains.²³

¹⁷ Ibid. p.50.

¹⁸ Salvation which is what Buddhism is about, is variously defined. Release (moksha) from the bondage of ignorance and the Law of Cause and Effect (Karma) and thus escape from rebirth, it is ultimately Nirvana.

¹⁹ Ultimate Reality. Explained more fully in chapter 11.

²⁰ See Conze 'Buddhist Saviours' in The Saviour God: (ed. Brandon) op. cit. p. 69.

²¹ Buddha-nature, also known as 'Buddha-seed', see Lotus Sutra op.cit p.373; L. de la Vallee Poussin. Bouddhisme: Opinions sur l'histoire de la dogmatique. Paris. Bouchesne 1925 p.282; ch.11 of this thesis. A small number of Mahayanists hold that certain beings called Icchantikas are excluded. See Conze 'The Mahayana' The Concise Encyclopaedia of Living Faiths ed. R.C. Zaehner. Hutchinson, London 1971 p.298.

²² Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op. cit. p. 299.

²³ Ibid. p.46.

The stage preceding Buddhahood, namely that of the Bodhisattva,²⁴ is also characterised by extreme radiance. We are told, for example, in the Lotus Sutra, that the countenance of Bodhisattva Wonder Sound "surpassed the combined glory of hundreds and thousands of myriads of moons". His body was "of glowing majesty, radiant and shining".²⁵ This radiance was also salvific, causing "sufferers in hell ... to enter the Buddha way".²⁶

The Bodhisattva's glory, like that of the Buddha is realised from within. What was potential becomes actualised through the resolve for enlightenment and by commitment to a pure life of selfless compassion. The resolve itself, activated by Buddha's saving power is a commitment in faith which, broadly speaking, may take one of two faith forms. The first exemplified by Amidism or Pure Land Schools,²⁷ and generally accepted as the easier way to Salvation, is a total faith reliance on 'other-power' and not on the self. Salvation is attained through grace²⁸ dispensed by Buddha (in a plurality of manifestations), with faith rather than works being the pre-requisite for grace, though it is assumed that an initial grace precedes the

²⁴ One who, having traversed certain stages of awareness/knowledge/the Path, has come closest to total realisation. Uppermost in his mind, however, is not Nirvana, but the saving of others. See ch. 7. for fuller treatment.

²⁵ Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op. cit. p. 315.

²⁶ Ibid p.38.

²⁷ Amidism was popular among the masses long before its actual formation as a school after 500 AD. See Conze A Short History of Buddhism George Allen and Unwin, London 1980 p.71.

²⁸ A term used by Buddhists in relation to Amidism e.g. Conze Short History op.cit.p.96; B.L. Suzuki, Mahayana Buddhism George Allen and Unwin London 1981 p.73. J. Takakusu. The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy ed. Wing-Tsit Chan and C. Moore. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut 1975 (reprint) p.175. Since, however, M. Buddhism preaches 'non-duality', in the last analysis the 'grace' is from within (i.e. all are Buddha).

initial faith.²⁹ Indeed, simply to utter the name of Amitabha is to ensure salvation, that is, rebirth in the Pure Land.³⁰ This 'rebirth' is the main concern and goal for adherents of Amidism. The gaining of Paradise is simultaneously the realisation of Bodhisattvahood (with Buddhahood its finality). Glory, therefore, in this instance is ostensibly dependent on an external source and is double-aspected since it (a) is concomitant with Bodhisattva status and³¹ (b) is indicative of, or indeed is, Paradise itself. In the larger Sukhavati Vyuha (Land of Bliss) Sutra which is one of the basic texts of the Pure Land School,³² Buddha Amitabha's Western Paradise receives full description in rather materialistic terms. Amitabha, meaning 'possessed of infinite light', is himself given various appellations. He is "Amitaprabha (possessed of infinite splendour), Amitaprabhasa (possessed of infinite brilliancy), Asamaptaprabha (whose light is never finished), Asangataprabha (whose light is not conditioned), Prabhasikhotsrish-taprabha (whose light proceeds from flames of light). The list seems endless. As it grows in length so do the titles in their attempt to express the intensity of light which "bends the full moon and the sun" and indeed everything. Amitabha's Bliss Land of Sukhavati in which the

²⁹ Takakusu op.cit. p.175 notes that according to Shinran "even the believing thought is the grace of the Buddha".

³⁰ In theory, the Pure Land is not the final goal but the place from which Nirvana may be attained. There is no relapse from there according to the Amitayur-Sutra, cited by A. Verdu. The Philosophy of Buddhism, Martinus Nijhoff. The Hague 1981 p.121.

³¹ i.e. it is where the 'enlightened' are reborn. See e.g. The Larger Sukhavati-Vyuha 23, 25, 27, 38. In SBE Vol. XLIX (Part II) tr. E.B. Cowell, Max Muller & J. Takakusu, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1968 (reprint).

³² The other texts: Small Sukhavati-Vyuha; Amitayur dhyana-sutra.

said to be reborn basks in his brilliance.³³

The second faith-form does not objectify Buddha and therefore does not objectify the saving power. It is a faith exemplified by the Ch'an (Jap.Zen) School's well known phrase "If you meet Buddha and he gets in your way, kill him",³⁴ though this faith does not belong exclusively to the Ch'an School. It considers that Buddha objectified may well get in the way, since the objectification involves the attributing of multiplicity and form to the One who is beyond or free from form. For those who are committed to this faith-form, "I am Buddha" is the statement of faith and not "I shall be Buddha". Thus here Buddha-power and self-power are considered to be the same and Glory achieved, not received.

It is not always easy for the non-Buddhist to see how or where the Bodhisattva concept fits in with those schools of thought which espouse the second faith-form. That it does fit in with and is a cardinal doctrine of the various schools is clearly demonstrated by their writings. For example, the Saddharma Pundarika (Lotus) Sutra in which a great number of Bodhisattvas appear, is recited daily in Zen Temples. The Hua-Yen school was inspired by the Avatamsaka (flower-wreath) and the Sraddhotpada (Awakening of Faith) Sutras both of which espouse the Bodhisattva concept. We might well ask the question, How can the statement "I am Buddha" be applicable to one who is as yet a Bodhisattva? One possible response is that the Bodhisattva - meaning 'enlightened being', is Buddha in an unfulfilled manner; ontologically he has not yet been freed from individuality. The Hua-yen-tsung school answers the question in terms of

³³ Larger Sukhavati-Vyuha op.cit.p.29.

³⁴ Attributed to a Ch'an master. Cited by Conze. Short History op.cit.P.90.

interpenetrability, i.e. the many stages in the life of a Bodhisattva interpenetrate so that "the last stage of marvellous enlightenment is already contained in the first stage of initial faith".³⁵ The various stages of Glory, therefore, likewise interpenetrate. Another response could stress non-duality and the nature of Mind. "When a man knows that the Mind is the creator of worlds he sees the Buddha, he knows the true nature of Buddhahood", states the Avatamsaka Sutra, and explains "because Mind, Buddha and Beings are the same".³⁶ In this instance, the glory of the Buddha is therefore the glory of all beings or conversely the glory of all beings is one and the same as that of the Buddha.

Yet, according to the Trikaya theory, the Bodhisattva is recipient of a vision or view of glory not his own but that of the Buddha. Nevertheless, it is a vision achieved by the Bodhisattva in lieu of the Transcendent state that is his. He sees the Sambhogakaya, the second of the three (or four)³⁷ bodies of the Buddha.

The term Sambhogakaya holds within it the concept of that bliss or enjoyment which is derived from selflessness and therefore from sharing. It is literally shared bliss, a state of glory. Described as a refulgent body, the Sambhogakaya has two aspects: (a) that which is seen by the Bodhisattvas and which is termed Parasambhogakaya and (b) that which is known and seen only by Buddhas and called Svasambhogakaya. The manifestation to the Bodhisattva of this Body of Glory has for its purpose the teaching of the Law to and through the recipient. "The Buddha-

³⁵ Sung Bae Park, Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment State University of New York Press Albany 1983 p.5.

³⁶ B.L. Suzuki op.cit. p.105.

³⁷ The number (3 or 4) is dependent on whether the Sambhogakaya is accepted as one, or two.

Tathagatas teach only Bodhisattvas. Whatever they do is always for one purpose, that is, to take the Buddha knowledge and reveal it to all living beings".³⁸

Buddha knowledge or Law (dharma) is not simply a moral code, it is the truth of Reality. Enlightenment, which is the attainment of this Truth, is the immediate outcome of Wisdom (prajna). Morality, however, plays an important role³⁹ in the enlightenment process. Though inadequate on its own, when practised in conjunction with Dhyana discipline (inner, spiritual training) it helps in the preparation of the mind for the full flowering of wisdom. Thus the glory of the Sambhogakaya has an ethical dimension. The similarity in this respect with the 'Kavodh Yahweh' and the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai is obvious.

Since each Buddha is in possession of his own Sambhogakaya, these 'bodies of glory' abound. The One Dharmakaya, however, is possessed by all Buddhas, of which they are the manifestation. The Dharmakaya usually (and very inadequately) translated as 'Body of the Law' is the highest being, logically prior to the other 'bodies' and inclusive of them. Different Mahayana schools of thought have their own definition for this One, unique body: it is "the metaphysical principle of real Thought/Mind (citta)"⁴⁰

³⁸ Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op. cit. p. 60.

³⁹ "Without higher morals one cannot get higher thought and without higher thought one cannot attain higher insight". Takakusu, op.cit p.18. See also B. Suzuki op.cit. p.73. For Herbert Guenther, however, "morality has little value ... it is the outcome and corollary of knowledge which is grounded on freedom". Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex. 1972 p.50. But Morality only has little value without Dhyanic discipline. Of course, it has no value at all for the Shin sect for whom only faith matters; but this is an exception.

⁴⁰ Commentaries on the Siddhi. Cited by Nalinaksha Dutt; Mahayana Buddhism Motilal Banarsidass. Delhi 1978 p.166

"the transformed asraya (substratum)"⁴¹ "the beginningless body of Being itself".⁴² In effect, the Dharmakaya is the Absolute, the Reality, the Supreme Truth, that which underlies all things and is the cause of them all.

The Body of Dharma is invisible and can only "be realised within one's own self".⁴³ Those who are at the peak stage of this realisation, (i.e. the Bodhisattvas) but who have postponed Nirvana, experience and see that which is visible of the invisible One. They see the Glory (Sambhogakaya). But what of those who have not achieved this level of wisdom and illumination? Mahayana Buddhism assures us that these 'ignorant' ones are not forgotten. Not only do they have the Law transmitted to them through the Bodhisattvas, they have also the Body of Transformation, the Nirmanakaya, which is created specifically for their instruction. The Nirmanakaya is the Truth made present. A creation of compassion, it is also an assurance to all of the possibility of realising their own potential for Buddhahood. It is assurance because it is not other-worldly nor an abstract truth but the visible, natural body of a living being who has attained to the fullness of truth, that is, who has become a Buddha, a fully enlightened one.

Pre-eminent among these 'transformed bodies' is that of Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism. Since Gautama achieved enlightenment at a specific time and place in this world, his 'transformation body' is set within a historical context and is historical fact. Nevertheless, the bodies of Buddhas (Nirmanakayas) in their plurality are generally understood by Mahayanists to be fictitious creations for the benefit of those folk who are as yet unwise and without spiritual insight enough to see the glory. These

⁴¹ Trimsika cited by Dutt op.cit. p.166.

⁴² Daijogisho cited by B. Suzuki op.cit. p.53.

⁴³ Dutt op.cit. p.163.

ordinary people think they see the Buddha; the actuality is otherwise, for they gaze only on his shadow or reflection. Nirmanakayas, like Sambhogakayas, are ontological manifestations of the Dharmakaya; there is but One Truth or Absolute, the bodies are aspects of this indivisible One. "All Buddhas move in mysterious fields which are beyond comprehension", states the Avatamsaka-sutra, "they manifest each in his one body all the Buddha-bodies ... they identify themselves in one thought with all the Buddhas of the past, present and future, showing that they are in substance one".⁴⁴

The Trikaya theory, said to be first systematized by Asvaghosa,⁴⁵ did not mushroom overnight but germinated slowly. It is probable that the Lotus Sutra is one expression of its earlier germinating period. In this Sutra, Gautama Buddha, identified with the One, omniscient Buddha, appears in this world simply as an expedient "to lead (all living beings) to beatitude".⁴⁶ He is, in fact, without beginning or end. "We can easily see", comments M. Anesaki, "how, according as the emphasis is laid on one or other of these two aspects of the Buddhahood - the eternal and the temporary - one who derives his ideas from this book may be led to an anti-docetic or a docetic view of the Buddha".⁴⁷ Those, however, whose reading of Buddhist texts is less circumscribed, will have noted that the two aspects of the Buddhahood are found together not only in other scriptures of the Mahayana but also in

⁴⁴ B. Suzuki, op.cit. p.110.

⁴⁵ A great Indian poet of the 1st Century AD; purportedly author of The Awakening of Faith which is manifestly the first attempt to systematize M. Buddhist thought.

⁴⁶ Lotus Sutra tr. Kern S.B.E. vol XXI in Bible of the World, ed. Ballou op. cit. p. 321.

⁴⁷ 'Docetism (Buddhist)' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics ed. J. Hastings. T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1911 Volume 4. P. 832.

those of the Theravada. One oft-quoted statement from the Samyutta-Nikaya is Buddha's own affirmation, "He who sees the Dhamma sees me; he who sees me sees the Dhamma".⁴⁸ This "identification of one side of the Buddha with the Dharma" is, as Conze reminds us "of the essence of Buddhism",⁴⁹ for, in Buddhist belief, samadhi (enlightenment) is a state of oneness with ultimate reality. A Buddha (enlightened one) and the Dharma are therefore one. Theravadin writings, like those of the Mahayana, express this concept of unity or enlightenment in terms of light. "Buddha, the awakened, is bright with splendour day and night".⁵⁰ Awakened, Buddha is fully alive; united with Being, his is the glory. Buddhahood is perfected humanity. The Dharma is a historical manifestation, though in history it may be unrecognised and unknown. The glory in this sense is invisible to those who see only the appearance and not the reality.

If the label of 'docetic' cannot be made to stick to the Buddha/Dharma identification, the concept of "semblance" or "phantom" body seems ready glued for the labelling. In Whalen Lai's view, however, it is the glue which is without substance. Referring specifically to the "manifestation" body of the Lotus Sutra, Whalen Lai argues that the reality of a human Buddha is not therein denied but is "retrojected to a previous career". He comments "If we have to call the Buddha in the Lotus Sutra 'docetic' then we would have to call the Christ Jesus that appeared to his disciples after his resurrection - the one that walks through walls - 'docetic'".⁵¹

⁴⁸ Samyutta-Nikaya III 120.tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids & F.L. Woodward. Pali Text Society Translation Series (5 Vols) 1917-1930.

⁴⁹ Shorter History op.cit.p.52.

⁵⁰ Dhammapada XXVI, 387. tr. M. Muller in SBE Vol X Part I.

⁵¹ 'The Humanity of the Buddha: Is Mahayana Docetic?' in Ching Feng 24:2 June 1981 p.100.

The Christ who appeared to his disciples after his resurrection is not termed docetic because, as presented in the Gospels, his glorified risen body although not subject to the natural and normal conditions of material existence, is neither phantom nor semblance but real Presence. The record is one of experience of actual encounter, with Christ taking the initiative. John's gospel in particular stresses the reality of the encounter.⁵² Luke records Christ as saying to his disciples "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have".⁵³ Nowhere does the New Testament speak of a 'phantom' or 'fictive' body.

But too often it is taken for granted that Buddhist texts speak of a "fictive body" in the sense of which I have denied it of Christ's risen body, that is, the sense of 'fictive' that is commonly supposed. To the Westerner, that which is 'fictive' is generally understood to be that which is fabricated or false and therefore in opposition to the truth: fictive is unreal. Within the Buddhist context, however, the concept 'fictive body' is consonant with truth. Pretence is not a part of it since it is what it is said to be. It points to the One Eternal Truth to which all else is relative; its purpose is to help reveal the Truth of Reality. "Body" moreover, is a translation that is open to misinterpretation. In the previous chapter we spoke of the tendency within both Judaism and Christianity when referring to the concepts of immanence/transcendence, or "upper" and "lower", to reify each pole,⁵⁴ thereby neglecting the interplay

⁵² Chapters 20 - 21.

⁵³ Luke 24: 39 - 40.

⁵⁴ The term 'reify each pole' is Slater's. See chapter 3, note 109.

or movement between the two 'poles'. A similar tendency exists with regard to the Mahayanan concept of 'body'; the word becomes concretized and interplay between the Kayas neglected or even excluded. Yet it is the motion of 'interplay' that is vital to an understanding of the Trikaya and therefore to the concept of glory within it.

"The Three Kayas" writes Herbert Guenther, "are value experiences and principles of interpretation".⁵⁵ They are illustrative of the dynamic movement⁵⁶ from one stage of transcendence to another, that is, through all three levels. There is a movement from 'individual' to 'shared' to 'universal', for human potential (which is unlimited) finds total expression in the Unlimited, Universal Buddhahood (Dharmakaya), which is the state of complete freedom from selfishness and therefore is freedom from individuality. And since Buddhahood transforms by its presence there is interplay and not simply one way movement. Moreover, the saving experience is itself salvific; cause and effect are merged. Particularly symbolic of the transforming presence and of the dynamics of the transcendent experience is the Body of Glory, often translated as the 'Body of Shared enjoyment'. Concerning this glorified or mystic Kaya, Verdu writes "the body of the Buddha transfigures itself into a glorified state which is not 'this worldly' in the narrow sense of the word. It is like the sun of the realised essence letting its beams pass through the usually 'hindered' state of material embodiment. Thus the principle of interpenetrability between

⁵⁵ Op.cit. p.102. Guenther considers the lexical translations as "utterly misleading".

⁵⁶ That this movement is sudden is agreed by most schools. For some, however, there is variation in the degree of intensity. See Verdu op.cit. p.83 where he speaks of "Weak and Strong cases of Satori".

the universal and the particular becomes 'corporeally' manifest."⁵⁷ The Sambhogakaya is but one aspect of the Buddha; the three are One.⁵⁸ Glory, manifest in the Sambhogakaya, is sign and symbol of the saving power which is universally present.⁵⁹ It is symbol also of unity, of the Truth which is One.

The Trikaya does not answer questions so much as reveal meaning. Indeed, to posit questions of it such as "Did Buddha die of indigestion?" is akin to asking if God's working week, as described in Genesis I, allowed him (God) any time off apart from Sunday. In both instances (Trikaya and Genesis I) we are in the realm of myth. Through contact with this realm, notes Mircea Eliade, "one resumes contact with the sacred and with reality, and in so doing one transcends the profane condition, the 'historical' situation".⁶⁰ The pre-Trikaya 'fictive' body of the Lotus Sutra likewise transcends the 'historical' situation; it is where 'Time' as we know it, does not exist.

But Time itself has a docetic tinge. St. Augustine in the fifth century grappled with its illusiveness. "What is time?" he questions. "If no one asks me, I know; if I want to explain it to a questioner, I do not know. But at any rate this much I dare affirm I know: that if nothing passed there would be no past time; if nothing were approaching, there would be no future time; if nothing were, there would be no present time. But the two times, past and future, how can they be, since the past is no more and the future is not yet? On the other hand, if the present were always

⁵⁷ op.cit. p.85.

⁵⁸ See B. Suzuki op.cit. p.49.

⁵⁹ Seen as present in the self by those who depend on self-power.

⁶⁰ Images and Symbols Sheed and Ward. New York 1961 p.59.

present and never flowed away into the past, it would not be time at all but eternity. But if the present is only time, because it flows away into the past, how can we say that it is? For it is, only because it will cease to be. Thus we can affirm that time is only in that it tends towards not being."⁶¹

In Buddhist understanding, Time is cyclic and unlimited. Man, trapped within its enormous rhythms seeks escape from the ceaseless round of rebirths. He seeks the non-historical, the timeless. Historical time passes from moment to moment, always in a state of flux and, thus conditioned, the 'now' is unreal. All that is manifested in time is likewise conditioned, transitory and unreal. Man seeks Reality. The Buddha sends out a ray (glory) to help reveal the truth of Reality. But how does it (the glory) perform this function? Before attempting to answer this question we need to ask another: what is the Buddhist understanding of (a) Truth and (b) Reality?

"What is truth?", is the question asked of Christ by Pilate in the Gospel of John. It is Pilate's response to Christ's self-proclamation "For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears my voice".⁶² Elsewhere in the same Gospel Christ declares, "I am the Way and the Truth and the Life".⁶³ It is a declaration that is capable of being understood at more than one level. In Joannine usage, as in non-Biblical Greek, the word for truth -- ἀλήθεια -- means unconcealment, that which is revealed or

⁶¹ The Confessions of St. Augustine Bk XI ch.14. tr. F.J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward London 1944.

⁶² John 18: 37 - 8.

⁶³ 14:6.

disclosed. It refers to things as they are in contrast to things as they appear to be; ἀλήθεια denotes 'Isness', the essence of Being, divine Reality. This is the deepest meaning of Christ's declaration: He is God's disclosure, divine revelation, sacred Being.⁶⁴

In Theravadin understanding Buddha achieved knowledge of the Truth which he then taught to others. In Mahayana belief Buddha, like Christ, has come into the world for the revelation of the Truth. The glory which emanates from a Buddha has, as we have seen, this purpose. The Diamond Sutra states "The Tathagata speaks in accordance with reality, speaks the truth, speaks of what is, not otherwise".⁶⁵ In the Lotus Sutra, Buddha says of himself, "I am the Leader who speaketh infallible Truth, and my knowledge is unlimited".⁶⁶ Buddha not only speaks and reveals the Truth, but as the Transcendent Dharmakaya he is the Truth. "He who sees the Dhamma sees me; he who sees me sees the Dhamma"⁶⁷ is Buddha's own affirmation. The body of Dharma, eternal Truth and Absolute Reality are One.

For all the apparent similarities between the foregoing statements of Christ and those of or about the Buddha, it should not be assumed that such statements are necessarily similar in meaning. For example, speaking of the concept of Truth in world religions, Frederick Streng comments, "it not only has different meanings and uses in religious language but also indicates different approaches to the religious concern for the becoming self-

⁶⁴ The Joannine meaning of Truth includes also the Hebrew concept of truth ('emet): reliability, trustworthiness, truth encounter, experience, and is linked with knowledge.

⁶⁵ In Buddhist Wisdom Books tr. Conze. George Allen and Unwin, London 1975 p.54.

⁶⁶ Lotus Sutra in S.B.E. (ed. Muller, tr. Kern) Vol XXI, p.291.

⁶⁷ Samyutta-Nikaya III 120. (tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids and F.L. Woodward).

conscious of what-is that makes possible the attainment of the highest well-being".⁶⁸ The term 'What-is' likewise admits of many meanings. Nowhere are these meanings more explored or more variously expressed than in the different schools of Buddhist religious philosophy.

In Sanskrit, the word denoting 'what-is' Satya, derives from the root as 'to be' (sat: 'being') and refers not only to reality across a whole range of meanings but also to the truth concerning reality. Its connotations include reality as against appearance, the true as against the false, the absolute as against the relative, and the Truth which, synonymous with Reality, is One. The genesis of different schools within Buddhism is due in no small part to philosophical differences concerning Satya, that is, to differences concerning the nature of reality and the truth about it. With reference to the two major 'vehicles', (Hinayana⁶⁹ and Mahayana) and the conceptual gulf between them regarding Reality, Dutt observes that they "look upon everything including the Buddhistic practices from two quite different angles of vision".⁷⁰ Since it is not here possible to treat all of the concepts of Truth/Reality in the number of different Buddhist Sects, we will confine our discussion to the two main forms of Buddhism and in a generalised way.

The Buddhist belief that everything manifested in time is conditioned, transitory and unreal includes man himself. It was Buddha's own assertion that the physical and mental make-up of human beings is but an aggregate of

⁶⁸ 'Truth' in Encyclopaedia of World Religions, ed. Eliade. Macmillan New York 1987 Vol.15. p.71.

⁶⁹ Hinayana covers early Buddhism and is inclusive of Theravada. The latter term, however, is often preferred as a designation for non-Mahayana Buddhism in general since Hinayana 'lesser vehicle' is deemed by some to be a derogatory term.

⁷⁰ Op.cit. p.244.

forever changing factors called dharmas. It is the interaction of interdependent dharmic forces which brings about and perpetuates 'existence' as we experience it; there is no permanent self (atman). In the Buddhist view, therefore, those who wrongly assume that the self permanently exists, fail to see things as they really are; they are not cognizant of the Arysatyas: Dukkha, Samudaya, Nirodha and Magga. These Four Noble Truths state (1) all existence involves dukkha (suffering, impermanence, insubstantiality and imperfection), (2) Dukkha is caused by craving (3) the cessation of Dukkha involves the cessation of craving (4) the way to achieve cessation of Dukkha involves following the Noble Eight-fold Path, which leads, say the Theravadists, to the ultimate goal, Nirvana.

The second and third truths in particular are expressive of a notion central to Buddhist thought, namely that of 'dependent co-origination' (pratitya-samutpada) whereby everything is dependent on some cause for its origin. But since every cause becomes an effect and every effect a cause, all things in this world are unsubstantial. They are in a constant state of 'becoming' and nothing really 'is'; all is illusion. This, according to the smaller vehicle is the nature of reality, how things really are. Truth and Reality are two sides of the one coin. The four Truths (including the law of dependent co-origination) are real, related as they are to the Absolute Truth which alone IS and, synonymous with Nirvana, is Ultimate Reality.⁷¹ The ideas of the great vehicle go beyond those of the Theravada. Although they accept the Arysatyas and the pratitya-samutpada as a form of teaching, Mahayanists deny any final reality to them contending that the Causal Law is as applicable to Truths and laws as to everything else in the world; everything, including the causal law is ontologically empty (sunya).

⁷¹ See Rahula. op.cit. p.39.

Referring to the derivation of Sunya (from root 'swell'), Conze writes "etymologically, sunya conveys the idea that something, which looks like something much, is really nothing. From outside there appears to be a lot, but there is really nothing behind".⁷² The perception that this is so, that beyond appearance is Sunyata, is the highest wisdom (prajna); it is the Truth experienced, i.e. known from within; it is enlightenment. This existentialist approach is fundamental in the Mahayana tradition which rejects the ideas that there can be an object of knowledge and that sunyata can be in any way conceptualised. Indeed, Sunyata (emptiness) is itself empty and without differentiation, and 'multiplicity' does not exist. Dualism, i.e. a distinction between the 'here' and the 'there' is accordingly eliminated in Buddhist thought, for the conceptualised 'there' is also empty. 'Here' and 'there' are one, Samsara is Nirvana.⁷³ The phenomenal world is thereby sacralised; glory (though "unseen" and unrealised by those who have not experienced Sunyata) is in daily living in the here and now.

The application of the term 'Sunyata' to both every day living and to Ultimate Reality is attributed to Nagarjuna, founder of the Madhyamika (Middle-Path) School. For this great second century philosopher all statements about Absolute Reality/Truth are dross. Silence alone is golden. As for the pursuit after 'final answers' about Ultimate Reality, Frederick Streng comments that for Nagarjuna this was sophistry. "For him, these

⁷² Buddhist Wisdom Books op.cit. p.80. Some scholars prefer a different translation to that of 'emptiness'. See Guenther op.cit. p.224.

⁷³ Since 'reification' is rejected, Sunyata alone is left. And so says the Prajnaparamita "Although the Bodhisattva leads an infinite number of creatures into Nirvana, in reality there are neither any Bodhisattvas to do the leading, nor any creatures to be led". quoted by H de Lubac. Aspects of Buddhism Sheed and Ward London 1953 p.129.

'final answers' were not to be found because there were no essential self-determined questions ... Ultimate Truth, however, is not a fact about an absolute 'real', or even intuitive knowledge of such a 'real'. Such a 'thing' does not exist (ultimately). Ultimate Truth, rather, was a power for release from attachment to such a phantom reality."⁷⁴

The preceding final phrase 'phantom reality' brings us back to the Mahayanan concept of Nirmanakaya (phantom body) and to our earlier question as to how the Sambhogakaya (Body of Glory) helps reveal the Truth of Reality.

That there are two truths in Buddhism (as in Vedanta) is generally well known. That Nagarjuna is one of the main protagonists of the 'two truths' theory may be less well known. Nevertheless, his words from the Madhyamakakarika are often cited: "By the two truths Buddha's teachings are given: Samvrti Satya and Paramartha Satya. Those who do not know the difference of these two truths, do not know the deep truths of Buddhism. Without depending on the Samvrti Satya the Paramartha Satya cannot be expressed. Without knowing the Paramartha Satya, no one enters Nirvana".⁷⁵

Etymologically Samvrti is the antithesis of ἀλήθεια (unconcealment, disclosure) for it refers to that "which covers up entirely the real nature of things and makes them appear otherwise."⁷⁶

Translated as "conventional" or "relative" truth, Samvrti is used by Buddha as a vehicle for teaching those whose manner of perception limits them to

⁷⁴ Emptiness. A Study in Religious Meaning Abingdon Press 1967 p.87.

⁷⁵ Quoted by Sung Bae Park op.cit. p. 49 - 50.

⁷⁶ T.R.V. Murti, 'Samvrti and Paramartha in Madhyamika and Advaita Vedanta' in The Problem of Two Truths in Buddhism and Vedanta, ed. M. Sprung. D. Reidel Pub. Co., Dordrecht, Holland 1973 p.17 (note: Murti is here giving Candrakirti's definitions).

seeing appearance only. The Nirmanakaya is the mundane conventional form assumed by Buddha for the transmission of mundane conventional truth and a means of enabling the realisation of paramartha satya (Ultimate or Absolute Truth) to come about. When realisation does dawn, the transformed one sees the same things but differently; for him 'reification' has ceased and intuition has replaced conceptualisation. This is a saving experience, it is to experientially 'see' the Sambhogakaya, to 'know' the glory.

In the previous chapter we referred to Bianchi's opinion that the entire problem of gnosticism is that of the "ambivalence of the presence of the divine" and docetism a particular theory of it. If docetism is to be predicated of Mahayana Buddhism, is it (docetism) not here just the expression of a different kind of truth, a truth moreover, which, experiential in nature, is not able to be 'grasped' and which, therefore, in human experience shows some ambivalence? Although most Buddhist schools speak of sudden, immediate enlightenment, some believe it to be a gradual process with the possibility of 'back sliding'.⁷⁷ It is to this latter group that the problem of 'ambivalence' might be most relevant.

As for the question concerning the function of the Sambhogakaya, it must be noted that it is illustrative of the midpoint of the dynamic movement from one stage of transcendence to another. It is the Body of shared enjoyment, whose brilliant rays of light/glory "Illuminating the Buddha lands universally"⁷⁸ symbolise the sharing whilst pointing to the universality of the Dharmakaya. Although transcendent, the Sambhogakaya

⁷⁷ See Sung Bae Park op.cit. p.59 where he speaks of doctrinal faith as a function of will and reason "both of which are fallible and can weaken ... therefore, there can be no guarantee against retrogression".

⁷⁸ Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op.cit. p.44.

belongs to the world of form, albeit 'pure' form in a pure land. It thus helps reveal the Truth of interpenetration, that Time is in the Timeless, the Timeless in time. The Dharmakaya, Reality, Truth "manifests itself in the universe in and through all its parts";⁷⁹ it is One.

Referring to the Christian 'Trinity', John Macquarrie states "if one is to think of Holy Being in dynamic rather than inert terms, as both transcendent and immanent and not just one or the other, as the mysterium that is both tremendum and fascinans, then if God had not revealed himself as triune, one would need to have invented the idea of his three in oneness, or at least something like it".⁸⁰

The Mahayananan Trikaya has been seen by some ⁸¹ as 'something like it'. However dissimilar it may in fact be to the Christian Trinity, the Trikaya in its Sambhogakaya aspect has many points which bear comparison with the Christian concept of Glory, and, indeed, to the non-Trinitarian Jewish view. Glory in all cases is that which may be 'seen' of the invisible One. It generally is indicative of a reality beyond appearance and, whether seen or not, is everywhere.

⁷⁹ B. Suzuki op.cit p.53.

⁸⁰ op.cit. p.188.

⁸¹ See Sung Bae Park op.cit. p.34 where he refers to A.K. Coomaraswamy's view that the Sambhogakaya corresponds to the figure of Christ in Glory.

Chapter Five

According to Buddha's own words in the Digha-Nikaya "the light that rises and the glory that shines"¹ acts as a harbinger for the manifestation of Brahma. Concerning the conception and birth of the Buddha himself we read in the Jataka, "the instant the future Buddha was conceived in the womb of his mother, all the ten thousand worlds suddenly quaked, quivered and shook ... and immeasurable light spread through ten thousand worlds; the blind recovered their sight, as if from desire to see this glory".² This luminous phenomenon or glory, mentioned also in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke³ as heralding the birth of Christ, has within its wealth of symbolic meaning, that of holiness or perfection. Not only divine beings (or Being) but also perfect human beings are said to radiate light. This usage of the symbol of light to denote the 'glory' of human perfection, is widespread among world religions.⁴ It is no surprise, therefore, to find in Zoroastrian writings accounts of the birth of Zoroaster⁵ which parallel those, for example, of the birth of Buddha. Indeed, the term 'parallel' is at times inapt, since certain elements in one religion do not run for ever side by side and apart from those in the other religion, but converge,

¹ Digha-Nikaya XIX 15 in Dialogues of the Buddha Part II in SBE Vol 3 tr. by T.W. and C.A.F. Rhys-Davids, O.U.P., 1938.

² Introduction to the Jataka in The Bible of the World (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p.184.

³ Matthew 2: 2-10 Luke; 2:9. The star is most likely an Iranian motif. See Mircea Eliade. The Two and the One. Harper and Row, New York 1965 p.52. Also the Apocryphal Gospel of James (Protoevangelium XIX 2) in The Apocryphal New Testament translated by M.R. James. O.U.P. 1924 p.46.

⁴ See Edwyn Bevan: Symbolism and Belief. Allen and Unwin 1938 p.111 and Mircea Eliade: Shamanism London and N.Y. 1964 p.409.

⁵ Zoroaster is the Greek form. The Avestan is Zarathushtra, and the Pahlavi: Zartusht (Zardusht). The family name of Zoaroaster is Spitama.

bringing thereby into focus the knotty problem of influence. Such a complex issue is, however, outside of the scope of this present thesis.

A legendary account of Zoroaster's life is given in Book Seven of the Denkard.⁶ In it we are told that that which had primary place in the creation of the prophet was his glory, sent from the 'Endless Light' via the sun, moon, stars and fire to "Zoish's wife, at the time when she bore the daughter who became Zardust's mother"⁷ Thus the glory with which Zoroaster's grandmother was resplendent heralded the births of mother and child which were to follow. It denoted also the holiness of the prophet's life and the lives of those who were his forbears. Implicit also within the account is belief in a struggle between the forces of good and those of evil. The glory, denotative of good, is a threat to maleficent beings from whom a response is evoked. The demons (devs) try to discredit Oish's wife by inciting others to accuse her of witchcraft. In her defence her father stresses the quality and intensity of his daughter's light and comments, "anyone who possesses so much glory cannot have been a witch".⁸

Of Zoroaster's own radiance, the Denkard relates that during the last three nights before the prophet was born, his glory was manifested to the multitude "in the manner of the sun, at the approach of its uprising, when its first advancing twilight is diffused"⁹ and was of such intensity that it

⁶ The Denkard is an enormous and diverse collection of texts compiled in the 9th and 10th centuries. J. Duchesne - Guillemin views Book Seven as "expressing a philosophical history which places the person of the prophet right in the middle of a chain of prophecies". See Religion of Ancient Iran Bombay K.M. Jamasp Asa 1973 p.44.

⁷ Denkard 7 ch.2. in Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism edited and translated by Mary Boyce Manchester University Press 1984 p.72.

⁸ Denkard loc.cit.

⁹ Denkard 7 ch.2. in "The Bible of World" (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p. 160.

totally lit up the village of Porushaspo where Zoroaster's parents lived.

Whatever be the factual name of the village¹⁰ from which Zoroaster hailed, scholarly opinion generally inclines towards Eastern Iran as his country of origin. Of his actual birth date there is no certainty; all that is known for sure is that it pre-dated the era of Cyrus¹¹ by at least a few generations. Mary Boyce, on the basis of the Gathic language¹² (in which Zoroaster's hymns are recorded) being close to that of the Rigveda (c.1700 BC) conjectures a date for the prophet, "some time between 1700 and 1500 BC",¹³ a conjecture with which a number of scholars¹⁴ concur. Gnoli, however, following Widengren, considers this too early and puts forth a date c.1000 BC.¹⁵ Some other scholars prefer to accept the chronology of Zoroaster's life given by the Zoroastrians themselves in the Pahlavi¹⁶

¹⁰ A Zoroastrian 19th century catechism states that Zoroaster was born in the city of Ragha (Pahlavi:Ray) and cites Yasna 19 (18) as evidence. The commentator argues that according to the Yasna Zoroaster was simply The Spiritual Leader of Ray. See A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion. A 19th Century Catechism edited and translated by Firoze M. Kotwal and James W. Boyd. Studies in World Religions 3. Harvard University 1982 pp. 13-14.

¹¹ Cyrus the Great (II) founder of first Persian Empire 549 BC.

¹² Gathic: an East Iranian language. Gatha: psalm or hymn. Zoroaster is said to have composed 17 Gathas in the Avesta.

¹³ M. Boyce Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley 1984, p.18.

¹⁴ See John Hinnells: Spanning East and West. Unit 26 Man's Religious Quest. Open University Press. 1982 reprint; Charpentier in Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London, 1925 No. 3. pp. 747-755.

¹⁵ "Zoroastrianism" in The Encyclopedia of Religion ed: in chief Eliade, Macmillan New York and London. 1987. Vol. 15 p.557.

¹⁶ Middle Persian. Most of the works in Pahlavi are of 9th century composition and/or compilation.

texts. This places Zoroaster's birth much later at about 628 BC.¹⁷

According to A nineteenth century catechism by Erachji,¹⁸ the name Zoroaster means 'divine light'. That this is the religious significance and not the philological meaning is recognised by the translator/editor of the catechism who gives two possibilities concerning the philological meaning "he who can manage camels" or "one possessing yellow (golden) camels". Other suggestions are offered by various scholars,¹⁹ all, however, that can be said for certain is that the ushtra element (Zarathushtra) signifies camel.

Although Zoroaster's name does not have the etymological connotation of light, divine or otherwise, in the religion he founded the concept of light is prominent. Zoroaster's inaugural revelation is said to have occurred within a context of blazing light. The Wizidagiha i Zadspram²⁰ records that he had a vision of a transcendent Being "in the shape of a man, fair, bright and radiant" whose silken-like garment was "as light itself". Led by this Amahraspand²¹ into the presence of Ohrmazd and other radiant Beings, Zoroaster "no longer saw his own shadow on the ground because of the great

¹⁷ See e.g. R. Zaehner 'Zoroastrianism' in Concise Encyclopedia of Living Faiths. Hutchinson and Co Limited. London 1977 Edition p.200; A.V. Williams Jackson, Zoroastrian Studies Columbia University Press New York 1928 p.17. The later date does not allow sufficient time for transmission of ideas.

¹⁸ in A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion (ed. & tr. by Kotwal and Boyd. op. cit. p.11.).

¹⁹ e.g. 'possessor of old camels', 'Tormenting a camel'. See A.V. Williams Jackson op.cit p.16 and Gnoli 'Zoroastrianism' in The Encyclopedia of Religion ed-in-chief M. Eliade; op.cit. Vol 15, p.556.

²⁰ Ch.21. in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) p.75. The Zadspram is a ninth century compilation.

²¹ A Holy Immortal, denizen of the Spiritual realm. The Amahraspands or Amesha Spentas together with Ohrmazd (God) himself and/or his Holy Spirit comprise the Zoroastrian heptad.

light".²² "Light", states the Greater Bundahishn, "is the space and place of Ohrmazd. Some call it Endless light".²³ This realm of light or glory is a synonym for heaven where the righteous will go when they die. The entrance of the soul to this realm is through three stages of light (star, moon and sun stations).²⁴ Once there, the righteous "walks in the atmosphere of light ... radiant, full of glory and every happiness and joy, from which none knows satiety".²⁵ First, however, the soul must have undergone the trial of crossing the narrow Bridge Chinvat. The unrighteous fail this ordeal and fall into the realm of darkness.²⁶

The antithesis between light and darkness, generally known to be a fundamental feature of Zoroastrian religion, is a radical ethical dualism; the forces of good (light) and those of evil (darkness) are waged in constant warfare. During Zoroaster's inaugural vision, this duality, which is one between "original principles", is shown to him by Ohrmazd himself who explains: "Of these two spirits he who was wicked, that is Ahriman, chose the worse actions; the Holy Spirit, (I whom am) Ohrmazd, chose righteousness . . ."²⁷ That there are "two primal Spirits, twins, renowned to be in conflict"²⁸ is made clear also in Yasna 30 which states "when these

²² W. Zadspram ch. 21,22 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit.p.75.

²³ 1:2 in Textual Sources.(Z) op.cit p.45. Bundahishn, (9th century Pahlavi) is in two recensions: Indian and Iranian or Greater (longer). It means: Creation.

²⁴ Arda Viraz Namag. Ibid p.86. These stages are also associated with (1) good thoughts (2) good words (3) good deeds.

²⁵ Ibid p.87.

²⁶ For those who do not deserve Light or Darkness, a shadowy Limbo realm exists named Hamistagan.

²⁷ W. Zadspram ch. 21,22 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit.p.75.

²⁸ Yasna 30:3 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 35.

two Spirits first came together, they created life and not-life".²⁹

Prior to their coming together, endless light (Ohrmazd) and endless darkness (Ahriman) were separated by a great void.³⁰ Ohrmazd (Avestan: Ahura Mazda) created life in order to destroy the void and to do battle with the Darkness. "Ohrmazd by his omniscience" relates the Bundahishn, "knew that the Evil Spirit existed, what he plotted in his enviousness to do, how he would commingle".³¹ Ohrmazd also knew that ultimately good would triumph. At the final battle, a scarred, war-torn world would be transformed, Light would be invasive of Darkness, Glory would reign.

According to Zoroastrian belief, the creative act of Ohrmazd was a two-staged process. First came the spiritual (Pahlavi: menog) creation of which the second stage, that of material creation (Pahlavi: getig) is both manifestation and a sort of fulfilment. The first stage of creation alerted Darkness to the existence of Ohrmazd. Then, says the Bundahishn, Ahriman (Avestan: Angra Mainyu) "arose from the deep, came to the boundary and beheld the light".³² This marked the beginning of the combat, and it marked also the Lordship of Ohrmazd: "Before creation Ohrmazd was not Lord. And after creation He was Lord".³³ The second (getig) stage of creation was the seal of his 'Lordship'. This is because Ahriman is now ensnared in the material world with surety of final defeat. As an evil spiritual being he is limited to the mustering of evil spiritual forces to combat the good, that is, he is confined to the waging of spiritual warfare. Material

²⁹ Yasna 30:4.

³⁰ G. Bundahishn 1:6-10 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.45.

³¹ Ibid verses 13,14.

³² Ibid. verses 15,17.

³³ Ibid, verses 34,35.

creativity is outside the power of the evil one who is inherently destructive; it is a prerogative only of the all-good Ohrmazd. The material world is thus intrinsically good. Though sullied and dulled for a time (six thousand years)³⁴ by the intrusion of Darkness and subsequent commingling with it, the world at the end of the period will be restored to its original perfection. Then it will again be radiant with glory.

In the Zend-Avesta there is a yasht (hymn of praise) devoted specifically to the praise of the Glory (Khvarenah) which "belongs to Ahura Mazda" and through which he "made the creatures ... many and bright".³⁵ The Yazatas, radiant beings seen by Zoroaster in his inaugural vision, are described as being incarnations of Glory. Yasht 17 extols Ashi, Yazata of piety "O great Ashi! thou art well-made and of a noble seed; thou art sovereign at thy wish: thou art Glory in a bodily form".³⁶ In various other Yashts, the praises are sung of Sun, Moon and Stars which, created by Ohrmazd, pour Glory upon the earth "for the increase of the world of holiness".³⁷ Glory is "seated in the waters"³⁸ which, in turn give "splendour and glory, with health and vigour of the body and prominence of

³⁴ In the Bundahishn the first stage of spiritual creation is of 3000 years duration. The second lasts 3000 years until Ahriman erupts. After a third period of 3000 years Zarathustra is born. At the end of a fourth period of 3000 years, evil is overcome.

³⁵ Zamyad Yasht (19) verse 10. In S B E Vol XXIII Part II tr. Darmesteter ed. Max Muller. Clarendon Press Oxford. 1883 p.290. This Yasht is devoted to the Kingly Glory.

³⁶ Ashi Yasht verse 15 ibidem p.274.

³⁷ Khorshed Yasht Verse I. Ibidem pp.85-6.

³⁸ Tir Yasht verse 34. Ibidem p.102. Tistrya (Sirius) is the star in this Yasht, leader of the stars.

form"³⁹ to those who sacrifice to them. Those who are in receipt of glory are also given 'possessions' which entail "abundant glory, a legitimate scion, a long enduring life, and (Heaven at the last), the best life of the saints, shining, all glorious".⁴⁰ That man especially should be richly endowed with glory is Ohrmazd's will; it was so in the beginning and will be at the end. Hell itself cannot endure when Darkness is obliterated. A recurrent phrase in the Yashts is "The will of the Lord is the law of holiness",⁴¹ the Glory is its sign.

In all the above instances of Glory in Yashts and Yasna (and there are many more instances there and elsewhere), the word Khvarenah is used. It is a specific term different from the word for light (raocao)⁴² and that for fire (atash, atakhsh)⁴³ but inclusive of both meanings. Its wide range of connotations with applications which stretch from the religious to the profane, from the Kingly to the common and from the individual to the communal and which, at times, are applicable to only one of these, render Khvarenah difficult to define and subject, therefore, to different interpretations by different scholars.

Khvarenah is the Avestan form of the word. Other forms in which it is found are many and include Farnah (old Persian), Khvarr (Pahlavi) and Khurra

³⁹ Yasna LXVIII Verse 10 Zend Avesta Part III (tr. Darmesteter) Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna. 1965 reprint. Vol 31 p.322.

⁴⁰ Ibidem.

⁴¹ e.g. in Zamyad, Astad and Ashi Yashts.

⁴² See L. Gray, 'Light and Darkness' in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics ed. Hastings. op.cit Vol 8 p.61.

⁴³ See Boyce. Zoroastrians op.cit glossary p. XV.

or Farr (New Persian).⁴⁴ Its etymological meaning is the subject of some debate although most scholars are of the opinion that the root of Khvarenah is Khvar meaning "to illuminate", "to shine", and thus the word is related to that for the sun (hvar). In the view of Duchesne-Guillemin, Khvarenah is "an emanation of the sun, the heavenly fire, a luminous life-force which is communicated to men".⁴⁵ H.W. Bailey and others proffer a quite different meaning drawn from a different etymological connotation. In Bailey's thesis of 1943 which we will look more closely at later, Khvarenah denotes 'the thing gotten' or rather 'the thing desired', from the root Hvar meaning 'to take', 'to get', it means in effect 'riches, good fortune, fortune'.⁴⁶ In a later (1971) introduction to the same thesis Bailey mentions that he now prefers a different connotation for hvar.⁴⁷ The base is still ar - 'to get' but in Xvarnah he now sees a compound - hu-arnah - "a good possession". Thus for Bailey, Khvarenah retains its meaning of 'fortune'.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of etymology, let us focus again on the actual usage of the term Kvarenah in the texts. In the first place, Kvarenah "belongs to Ahura Mazda"⁴⁸ who dwells in the space and place of light.⁴⁹ We have already made mention of Zoroaster's inaugural vision in which he was brought into the presence of radiant beings and to the radiance

⁴⁴ G. Gnoli 'Khvarenah' in Encyclopedia of Religion Ed. Eliade op.cit. p.297.

⁴⁵ J. Duchesne-Guillemin. Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism Harper and Row. New York 1966 p.141.

⁴⁶ H.W. Bailey. Zoroastrian Problems in the ninth-century Books. O.U.P. 1971 (reprint) p.75.

⁴⁷ Proposed by Bailey as early as 1956. See Zoroastrian Problems 1971 edition, introduction.

⁴⁸ Zamyad Yasht See note 35.

⁴⁹ Gt. Bundahishn 1:2. See note 23.

of Ohrmazd himself. Arda Viraz Namaq records a vision in which Viraz too is carried to the "Endless Light and the Assembly of Ohrmazd and the Amahraspands (divine beings)". There, Ohrmazd speaks to him; there is sound but not form: "I remained astonished, for I saw a light, but I saw no-one; and I heard a voice and I knew that this was Ohrmazd".⁵⁰ Viraz, like Zoroaster before him,⁵¹ enters the realm of heaven through stages of light. He tells us "I took the first step to the star station, to 'good thought' ... the second step was to the moon station, to 'good word' ... the third step was to the sun station, to 'good act' ... The fourth step I took up to the light of heaven, which is all bliss'.⁵²

Explicit within this account, as in other texts, are the facts delineated earlier in this chapter, namely, that in Zoroastrian belief (a) Ohrmazd is a moral God, whose total goodness and Being is symbolised most forcefully and adequately in terms of Light and (b) created light in any form (e.g. sun, moon and stars) has a moral connotation. It is this moral connotation which belongs to Khvarenah. According to the Khorshed Yasht, Yazatas gather the Khvarenah of the sun and pour it upon earth for the 'increase of the world of holiness'.⁵³ The emphasis within this last phrase lies more on the noun 'holiness' than on the verb (increase); holiness is at the heart of the issue as can be seen by the prayer within the same context, that man will be given 'brightness and glory' (Kvarenah) so that increasing in holiness he will experience at the end "the bright all-happy abode of the

⁵⁰ Arda Viraz Namaq. 10:2 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 89.

⁵¹ See note 20.

⁵² Arda Viraz Namaq. 6:1-2 in Textual Sources, (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 86.

⁵³ Khorshed Yasht (to the Sun) Verse 1. S B E Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 85.

Holy Ones."⁵⁴ For, runs the refrain within this Yasht, "the will of the Lord is the law of holiness". The sun's role is to "withstand darkness, to withstand the Daevas born of darkness, to withstand the robbers and bandits",⁵⁵ in a word, to confront and hold out against all that is evil. In acknowledgement of this and for the increase of holiness, man offers sacrifice to the 'Sun' for his brightness and 'glory' (Khvarenah).⁵⁶

The pervasion of holiness i.e. the thwarting of evil, is, as we have noted, the purpose of Ohrmazd's creative activity. In the first, spiritual (menog) stage of creation, "Ohrmazd", states the Greater Bundahishn, "fashioned forth the form of his creatures from his own self, from the substance of light-in the form of fire, bright, white, round, visible afar".⁵⁷ But the Zamyad yasht states explicitly that the fashioning of creatures is effected through the Khvarnah which, more than anything else, is able to destroy evil, to heal and to restore.⁵⁸ Light, fire and Khvarenah are so closely related as to be at times quite indistinguishable one from the other. All are in some way purifying and salvific and all are characteristic of divine beings. Ashi, the personification of piety, described in the Yasht dedicated to her as "fair, radiant with joy ... far-piercing with her rays",⁵⁹ is addressed there as "Khvarenah in a bodily form" and recognised as one whose role is to dispense Khvarenah. In all these examples, Khvarenah is not something forcibly 'seized' or 'taken',

⁵⁴ Ibidem v.7.

⁵⁵ Ibidem V.4.

⁵⁶ Ibidem V.6.

⁵⁷ Great Bundahishn 1:47-9 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 47.

⁵⁸ See especially verses 9 and 11.

⁵⁹ Ashi Yasht, .6. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit.p.85.

rather is it something given, even shared and always gratuitously. It can only be 'seized' or 'taken' in the sense of 'accepted'. In the Sirozahs⁶⁰ corresponding to the Zamyad and Ashi yashts there is an invocation to "that Khvarenah that cannot be forcibly seized". Khvarenah comes ultimately from Ohrmazd and is gift. A suitable translation for this mysterious gift is 'divine grace'⁶¹ for which a synonym is 'glory'.

Ashi dispenses this 'divine grace' or 'glory'. The Yasht makes clear, however, that she also dispenses many material benefits, such as a well equipped home, family health and fortune, "hoards of silver and gold brought together from far distant regions and garments of splendid make".⁶² Ashi is regarded, therefore, not only as an impersonation of piety but also as Yazata of riches and fortune. In H.W. Bailey's opinion her role has been misunderstood due to the occurrence of homonyms only one of which is associated with the Yazata's name. He writes "the Zoroastrian commentator was partly misled by the identity of sound of art (from O. Iran. rti, Av. ashi) and art (from O. Iran. rta, Av. asha) to confound the two".⁶³ Since, says Bailey, the name Ashi is clearly a derivative of the verb ar "to get", this Yazata is associated with rti 'the act of obtaining', and the thing she obtains, Kvarenah, applies to fortune, not to glory. Beginning with Yasht 17, Bailey traces what he considers to be the semantic evolution of

⁶⁰ Prayers of invocation. Literal meaning: thirty days.

⁶¹ This is the term given by Boyce, along with 'glory'. See Zoroastrians op.cit p. XV (glossary).

⁶² Ashi Yasht V.14.

⁶³ Zoroastrian Problems 1943 op.cit. p.4. In 1956 Bailey abandoned the idea he put forward in 1943 that hvar meant 'to take hold of' and then "saw in Xvarnah a compound hu-arrāh. 'A good possession', where arrāh - is the same word as in Vedic arnas - of go-arnas - 'possession of cattle'. The base is the ar - 'to get' ". See 1971 edition, introduction.

Khvarenah through four stages. At Stage 1 the word has the primary meaning of 'good things'. In Stage 2 it becomes the force which obtains the 'good things'. Stage 3 is one of hypostatization; Khvarenah becomes a Yazata. By Stage 4 Khvarenah, as a being of the invisible world, is assumed to have the luminous quality of such beings. "But", adds Bailey, "no such association is stressed and the primary sense and essential nature of the hvarnah is throughout the 'good fortune' which belongs originally to this world".⁶⁴

In an article⁶⁵ in which he refutes Bailey's thesis, Duchesne-Guillemin notes, among other things, that those texts used to justify the third and fourth stages are just as old as Yasht 17. He considers, moreover, that Yasht 19 'consecrated to the Kingly Khvarenah' is almost certainly older. For the present writer, linguistically unqualified to take issue with other scholars on questions of etymology and chronology, it is the overall sense of the text that is paramount. Nor is this to be seen in isolation but within the context of the Zoroastrian Scriptures generally, together with tradition and observance.⁶⁶ In the text in question (Yasht 17) the emphasis is on holiness. That holiness should be associated with 'good things' such as material possessions, is not surprising. Such an association was common in ancient Middle Eastern thought. "Ever since my youth I never saw a virtuous man deserted or his descendants forced to eat bread" runs Psalm 37. Although experience ran counter to the theory, men

⁶⁴ Ibidem p.29.

⁶⁵ 'Le Xvarenah' in Annali Dell Instituto Orientali Di Napoli 1963 pp. 19-31.

⁶⁶ Boyce, for example (in relation specifically to the Gathas) laments that many philologists, "like Haug, were happy with an "interpretation which allowed them to ignore complex traditions and a living faith" See 'The Continuity of the Zoroastrian Quest' in Man's Religious Quest ed. Whitfield Foy, Croom Helm London in Assoc. with Open University Press. 1982 (reprint) p.603.

clung tenaciously for a long time to the idea that piety was rewarded with happiness and wealth, or, conversely, that lack of 'good things' must be attributed to sin. Thus Ashi, yazata of piety, is also yazata of 'good things'. She is fashioned by the all-holy Ohrmazd, as is all his spiritual creation "from his own self, from the substance of light". from Khvarenah, and for the purpose of combating evil. Ashi, extolled as Khvarenah (glory) incarnate, dispenses glory (light) as part of the fight against darkness. 'Good things' are considered to follow.⁶⁷

Precisely because they are believed to follow on from Khvarenah, 'good things' stand, as it were, on the periphery of those 'rays of glory' which are sent down. They too are received as gift. While, therefore, wealth, power, prestige etc are not at the heart of the meaning of the term Khvarenah, they come to be included at its edges. Here there is part-parallel with the Hebrew word Kavodh which has both secular and religious meanings. In its secular sense Kavodh finds good illustration in Joseph's injunction "You must tell my father of all my glory (Splendour) in Egypt and of all that you have seen".⁶⁸ In its non-secular usage, Kavodh denotes that inner quality of integrity that is demanding of respect. Human respect, however, shifts too often and too quickly from what a person is to what he has. After all, material goods and worldly power etc. are more clearly and easily evidenced; they are apparent. The Hebrew term (Kavodh from the root 'weight') denotes the real value. Whether this is perceived in religious/ethical or in material terms depends on the observer's manner of seeing.

⁶⁷ Ashi in addition to 'thing attained' means 'reward' 'recompense'. Good things are seen as a reward of a good life.

⁶⁸ Genesis 45:13.

The association of Khvarenah with holiness or integrity is clearly seen in the legends concerning Yima (Skt.Yama) who, in Zoroastrian tradition, was the first King to rule over earth and who did so in a Golden Age. One of the three hypostases of Khvarenah in the Avesta is that which accompanies rightful and just Kings. For a long time Khvarenah accompanied Yima,⁶⁹ called the 'shining one'. In Fargard II of the Vendidad, Yima is described as "stepping forward, in light",⁷⁰ "That is to say", notes Darmesteter, "his body being all resplendent with light".⁷¹ Khvarenah is an emanation from light and is in turn, reflective. A fiery, divine force, the special Khvarenah of Kings, is conceived as that which empowers its 'possessor' to maintain the common weal, keep evil at bay and to have all things prosper. Khvarenah has the characteristics of creativity. Thus Yima, continues Fargard II, "made the earth grow larger by one-third than it was before, and there came flocks and herds and men, at their will and wish, as many as he wished".⁷² In Yima's Kingdom "there was neither cold nor heat, neither old-age nor death, nor demon-created sickness".⁷³ All this was "before he lied,

⁶⁹ Indo-Aryan: Yama. First man, King of lower regions. In Rig Veda, Yama is tempted by his twin sister, Yami. In N. Persian Yima is Jamshed (Shining One).

⁷⁰ Vendidad. Fargard II V.10. SBE Vol IV (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit.p.13.

⁷¹ Ibidem. Footnote which continues "cf.Albiruni's Chronology (tr. by Sachau, p.202): 'Jam rose on that day (Nauroz) like the Sun, the light beaming forth from him, as though he shone like the sun' ". In contrast, E. Wilhelm speaks of 'splendour' and quotes Tabari's assertion that Yima was called 'shining' on account of his beauty. See 'Hvareno' in Sir Jejeebhoy Zarthusti Madressa Jubilee Volume Bombay 1914 pp.159-65.

⁷² Verse II. For Duchesne-Guillemin, Yima's 3-fold extension of the earth recalls "Vishnu's three steps and earlier still, in Hesiod and Plutarch, the measured distances, between the different parts of the world". See Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit p.143.

⁷³ Zamyad Yasht Vv. 31-34 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.30.

before he brought the lying untrue word into his mind".⁷⁴ Then, "Khvarenah was seen to depart from him in the shape of a bird".⁷⁵ Then, too, the Golden Age came to an end.

Other variants exist concerning the nature of Yima's sin,⁷⁶ what is important is that loss of integrity involves loss of the Glory (Khvarenah) which in this instance is the special Kingly form. The link between integrity and glory is one we have already viewed in, for example, the Apocalypse of Moses where Eve laments, "I have been estranged from the glory with which I was clothed",⁷⁷ and also in rabbinical literature where the first man is deemed to have shared in the radiance of the glory until he sinned.⁷⁸

Apart from a brief reference to Yima's sadness, after his loss, his dejection and his hiding upon the earth,⁷⁹ Yasht 19 which refers to the King's sin as a lie, does not dwell on his fate but, as the Yasht dedicated to the praise of the Kingly Glory, follows the course of the 'Khvarenah' itself. It leaves Yima in a threefold manner⁸⁰ and the bird shape it

⁷⁴ Ibidem

⁷⁵ Ibidem

⁷⁶ According to Firdausi, the sin was Hubris, the pretending to be divine. See also: reference to Yima's fall in Yasna 32:8; Wolfgang Lentz 'Yima and Khvarenah in the Avestan Gathas' in Studies in honour of S.H. Taqizadeh. Percy Lund, Humphries & Co Ltd, London 1962 p.132. Lentz interprets Yasna 32:5 as Yima protesting himself to be 'God, the bull'.

⁷⁷ See ch. 3. p.63.

⁷⁸ Ibidem.

⁷⁹ Zamyad Yasht v.34.

⁸⁰ Some translations imply that the Khvarenah 'broke' from Yima three times. See e.g. N. Soderblom 'Ages of the World (Zoroastrian) in Encyc. Relig. and Ethics ed. Hastings op.cit. Vol. I p.199. In other translations, the Khvarenah is divided into three parts after departing

assumes is that of a falcon-like⁸¹ bird of prey. That a bird should be the visible symbol of the Glory is not difficult to comprehend. Its power of flight, then totally inaccessible to man, was representative of mystery as well as of a certain elusiveness,⁸² and the heights to which it soared, visible sign of the heavenly source from which Khvarenah came. Without at this point delineating any similarities or differences between the Zoroastrian concept of Glory and that of Christianity, we may briefly note that in Christianity the bird is likewise a symbol of Glory. The dove which descends on Jesus at his baptism⁸³ is a manifest sign of the Spirit and of the Glory which is his. In Acts the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost is spoken of in terms of 'Tongues as of fire',⁸⁴ as a dynamic empowering force. The work of this empowering force is 'glorification' and reception of it is synonymous with reception of presence of the Glory.⁸⁵

The Iranian Kingly Glory at its departure from Yima is divided into three parts. One part finds protection in Mithra, the "profound, mighty Ahura, bestowing benefit",⁸⁶ who is yazata of the covenant and of loyalty, and, according to Eugen Wilhelm, "probable ancestor of the Kings".⁸⁷ The

from Yima. See e.g. Bailey op.cit. p.24.

⁸¹ A bird of prey of some sort as attested in Sogdian texts. See Bailey op.cit. p.24.

⁸² See Proverbs 30:19 where "the way of the eagle through the skies" is said to be one of the four things beyond man's comprehension.

⁸³ Matthew 3:16; Luke 3:22; Mark 1:11; John 1:32. The dove is, of course, also (for Christians) a symbol of love; the Spirit is love.

⁸⁴ Acts 2:3.

⁸⁵ 2 Corinthians 3:18.

⁸⁶ Mihir Yasht v.25 in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.28.

⁸⁷ op.cit p.161.

second part goes to Thraetona, 'heir of the Valiant Athwya clan',⁸⁸ and the third to Keresaspa 'the manly-hearted',⁸⁹ a slayer of dragons and great Iranian hero. This threefold division is believed by some scholars⁹⁰ to be representative of three forms of glory that belong to the King, the Warrior and to the peasant respectively. Certainly, although there is a special relationship of Khvarenah to Kingship, possession of (or attendance by) Khvarenah is not just a royal prerogative. According to Zoroastrian belief no-one on earth was endowed more richly with Khvarenah than was Zoroaster who, "spiritually fashioned and provided undefectively for the acceptance and propagation of the religion in the world,"⁹¹ conversed with Ohrmazd Himself. Zoroaster's 'provision' was as of light to dispel the Darkness; "... for the duration of life, he produced a radiance, glow and brilliance from the place of his own abode, that issued intensely and strongly, like the splendour of fire, to distant lands".⁹²

Another hypostasis of Khvarenah is a national form. Created by Ahura Mazda, this 'Glory of the Aryans' empowers the nation to withstand evil, overcome enemies and to prosper materially. Included in its benefits is a "full store of intelligence",⁹³ for Khvarenah enlightens the mind and gives spiritual vision. "The man without glory" states the Mihir Yasht, "led

⁸⁸ Aban Yasht v.33 in SBE Vol XXIII Part II (tr. Darmesteter) p.61.

⁸⁹ Zamyad Yasht v.88. In Darmesteter's translation this verse mentions "the third time when the Glory departed from the bright Yima".

⁹⁰ See e.g. Soderblom 'Incarnation' in Encyc. Religion and Ethics ed. Hastings op.cit. Vol. 7 pp. 198-9; J.H. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, London 1913 p.149.

⁹¹ Denkard V ch. 2. V. I in S.B.E. Vol XLVII Part V (tr. West) p.122.

⁹² loc cit. V.2.

⁹³ Astad Yasht V.1. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.283.

astray from the right way, grieves in his heart";⁹⁴ his perception is dulled intellectually and spiritually. The same may be inferred of a nation without glory. The 'store of intelligence' or knowledge is not here a direct means of salvation as in gnosticism. In its spiritual connotation it is more akin to the Hebrew concept of yada⁹⁵ as experiential, i.e. it is an experiential knowledge of righteousness which finds concrete expression in good thoughts, good words and good deeds. This knowledge is enkindled as it were, by the light of the Glory which is itself salvific. A middle Persian Zoroastrian Blessing contains the prayer "In the name of God, the bestower, the giver, the benevolent. May there be health and long life, complete Glory giving righteousness".⁹⁶ The ultimate source of Glory is the all-good, all-knowing Ahura Mazda (Ohrmazd). By contrast, the all-evil Ahriman, devoid of Khvarenah, is "abased in slowness of knowledge and the lust to smite."⁹⁷

According to the Zamyad Yasht, "the Turanian ruffian Frangrasyan" tried to seize the Aryan Glory from the sea: "He stripped himself naked, wishing to seize that Glory that belongs to the Aryan nations, born and unborn".⁹⁸ His quest was in vain, for, adds the Yasht "The Glory escaped, the Glory fled away".⁹⁹ Frangrasyan (Afrasiab) is a usurper without right to the

⁹⁴ 27:105. Ibidem p.146.

⁹⁵ It is the 'experience' reflected in such statements as Isaiah 14:12; 47:8 (to 'know' bereavement) 53:3 (to 'know', 'experience' pain).

⁹⁶ Prayer for Health (Tandorasti) in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.59.

⁹⁷ Gt. Bundahishn 1: 1 - 5. Ibidem p.45.

⁹⁸ Verse 56. SBE Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 300.

⁹⁹ Ibidem. Likewise, the Glory flees three times. Each time a lake is produced, viz 1st Lake Hussravah, 2nd Lake Vanghazdan, 3rd Lake Awz-danva.

Glory in either its Kingly or Aryan form. That he should seek it in the sea is explained earlier in the Yasht when, on leaving Yima, the Glory finds protection first in Mithra¹⁰⁰ and then in Apam Napat (Varuna), "the God amid the waters".¹⁰¹ Verse 51 reads, "Khvarenah departed to the Sea Vourukasha. Straightway Apam Napat, having swift horses, laid hold of it".

But if Khvarenah is of the nature of light/fire, how can it be found (and protected) in the Sea? "The seeming paradox of a fiery substance residing in water" writes Mircea Eliade, "presents no difficulty if we keep in mind that the waters symbolise the infinite possibilities of life and fertility and also the source of immortality".¹⁰² And, as Eliade further notes, in Vedic cosmology also Agni is found in water. Although the parallel is not exact, it is worth mentioning that in Biblical imagery too, water which is, among other things,¹⁰³ life-giving and salvific, is associated with light. Addressing himself to God, the psalmist in Psalm 36:9 acclaims "for with you is the fountain of life, in your light we see light". In the New Testament, Christ applies the water/light imagery to himself when he says that he gives living water,¹⁰⁴ and is the 'light of the world'.¹⁰⁵ He tells the Samaritan woman, "whoever drinks the water I give him will never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water

¹⁰⁰ Verse 35.

¹⁰¹ Verse 52.

¹⁰² Mircea Eliade 'Spirit, Light and Seed' in History of Religions II, 1971, p.15.

¹⁰³ Although meaning primarily 'salvation' and 'life', in Biblical imagery, water is also used as a symbol of disaster, chaos or threat (e.g. Ps. 32:6; 69:3) and of that which perishes (e.g. Job 11:6).

¹⁰⁴ John 7:37; 4: 10 - 14.

¹⁰⁵ John 9:5.

welling up to eternal life",¹⁰⁶ "In him was life, and that life was the light of men",¹⁰⁷ states the prologue to John's Gospel. Other comparisons abound; suffice it to say that water and fire are companionable symbols. Both are images in Zoroastrianism of creativity. From the Khvarenah belonging to Ohrmazd, creatures come into being; "from his own self, from the substance of light - in the form of fire".¹⁰⁸ But in the Pahlavi texts the 'essence of life' is said to be the 'seed' which 'flows forth',¹⁰⁹ is fluid. In the Greater Bundahishn as elsewhere in Pahlavi literature, seed is characterised as fiery and imbued with energy and power. We are told that the Yazad Neryosang "took all the light and power" of Zoroaster's seed, consigned it to "Lake Kayansih in the care of the waters",¹¹⁰ where, it is said "even now three lamps are seen shining at night in the depth of the lake".¹¹¹

In these texts, the 'seed's' characteristics - creativity, power, light, ability to find protection in the waters - are quite obviously the same as those of Khvarenah. But, says Gnoli, "the seed is not simply synonymous with light: the seminal fluid is not the luminous principle, the irradiant splendour; but it is the substance that contains this principle

¹⁰⁶ John 4:14.

¹⁰⁷ John 1:3.

¹⁰⁸ Gt. Bundahishn. 1:47 - 9. In Textual Sources (Z) op.cit. p.47. Eliade, Zaehner and Gnoli all note that in verse 41 it is stated that "animal and human seeds are made from fire, while the rest of all creation was produced from a drop of water". See Eliade 'Spirit, Light and Seed' op.cit. p.15. In Bailey's view the seed being of the essence of fire is 'modified Aristotelian doctrine'. See Zor. Problems op.cit. p.106.

¹⁰⁹ Dadistan i denik III. See Bible of the World (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p.626.

¹¹⁰ Gt. Bundahishn XXXV 56 - 60 and XXXIII 36 - 38 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 91.

¹¹¹ Ibidem.

and it is also its vehicle".¹¹² The Khorshed Yasht makes mention of Yazatas who gather the Khvarenah of the sun and pour it upon the earth for the 'increase of the world of holiness'.¹¹³ The function of the seed by virtue of the creativity of Khvarenah with which it is imbued is precisely the same: "increase of the world in holiness". Ohrmazd's creative act has as its raison d'être the defeat of evil and this, therefore, is the specific task of creation itself. It is man's role in particular to co-operate with Ohrmazd in the overcoming of destructive Darkness by creative Light. Khvarenah is the "luminous life-force"¹¹⁴ that makes this possible.

In Zoroastrian theology Zoroaster, especially rich in Khvarenah, was the inaugurator of a new age wherein light began to conquer Darkness.¹¹⁵ Zoroaster however, was aware that he would not live to see the final victory, for this there would be a further benefactor or saviour (Avestan: Saoshyant), "to teach us the straight paths of salvation".¹¹⁶ Later texts incorporate the belief that the future saviour, to be born of human parents, will come from the prophet's own seed, safeguarded miraculously in the sea. Yasht 19 states "we worship mighty Khvarenah ... which will accompany the Victorious Saoshyant and also his other comrades, so that he may make the

¹¹² G. Gnoli "Un particolare aspetto del simbolismo della luce nel Mazdeismo e nel Manicheismo". Annali dell' Istituto Orientale di Napoli 12. 1962. p.121.

¹¹³ Yasht VI verse 1 in SBE Vol. XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.86.

¹¹⁴ The phrase used by Duchesne-Guillemin in Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p.141 He concludes "The Xvarr of God is "simply" his seed". p.145.

¹¹⁵ In Zoroastrian Theology, the division of history into stages viz. 1. creation of world (3000) 2. intrusion of evil (6000), 3. ousting of evil (9000) (ending with the renovation (Frashokereti) 12000 yrs.), has Zoroaster's birth initiating the 3rd stage.

¹¹⁶ Yasna 43:3. In Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.40.

world wonderful". In the Zand text quoted earlier,¹¹⁷ there is no doubt that this "mighty Khvarenah" is that of Zoroaster; there the 'three shining lamps' show that the saoshyant concept has become broadened to include three saviours. "For each when his own time comes, it will be thus: a virgin will go to Lake Kayansih to bathe; and the Glory (of Zardusht) will enter her body, and she will become with child. And so, one by one, the (three) will be born thus, each at his own time".¹¹⁸ The Saoshyant mentioned in Yasht 43:16 is Astvatereta, a name which means 'He who embodies Asha' (i.e. righteousness/truth/cosmic principle of Order). All the Saoshyants, whatever they are named, ¹¹⁹ embody Khvarenah, the radiant force which enables evil to be overcome and order to be restored. It is true that others also possess Khvarenah, but the Saoshyants (among whom Zoroaster may be numbered) embody it in exceptional measure.

Asha (Vedic Rta) occurs frequently in Zoroastrian writings and most particularly in the Gathas, sometimes as an abstract principle or attribute, at other times as a personification. On occasions the distinction between the two usages is blurred and interpretation thus made more difficult. Hypostatized, Asha is one of the six radiant beings encountered by Zoroaster in his inaugural vision.¹²⁰ The Zadspram¹²¹ reference to the vision

¹¹⁷ See note 107. Zand (Interpretation). See Textual Sources (Z) (ed Boyce) p.4.

¹¹⁸ This is put together from G. Bd XXV 56 - 60 and XXX III 36-35 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.91. The three Saviours are believed to appear at 1000-year intervals.

¹¹⁹ According to the legend mentioned, the names of the others are Ukhshyatereta "he who makes truth grow", and Ukshyatnemah, "he who makes reverence grow". See also: Gnoli 'Zoroastrianism' in The Encyc. of Religion Vol 15 1957 op.cit p.579.

¹²⁰ Zadspram 21:13 in SBE Vol XLVII Part V transcribed by W.E. West Motilal Banarsidass. Delhi 1987 (Reprint 1959)p.157. See also Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.75.

¹²¹ See note 21.

actually mentions seven such beings called "archangels" in West's translation. This is the Divine Heptad which, in Zoroastrian belief, includes six divinities known as Amesha Spentas¹²² (late Persian: Amahraspands) or Bountiful Immortals together with Ahura Mazda and/or his Holy Spirit. These Bountiful Immortals, direct emanations from Ahura Mazda's own essence, were brought into being by him to help first in his creative activity and then in the subsequent restoration of the world to goodness: the purpose of their creation, as of all creative work, is salvific.

That the Amesha Spentas emanate from Ahura Mazda, is in no way a denial of their being created by him; indeed, in the texts the concepts of emanation and creation are combined. "And Ohrmazd parted himself among the Amahraspands when he created them"¹²³ states the Greater Bundahishn. Mardanfarrok, a ninth century Zoroastrian scholar, writes "from his (i.e. Ohrmazd's) selfhood, single in unity, he created infallibly. And through his matchless power He brought into being the seven highest Amahraspands".¹²⁴ As created beings the Amesha Spentas are distinct from and subordinate to their Creator with whom they are one. These "bright ones", states Yasht 19, are "all seven of one thought, who are all seven of one speech, who are all seven of one deed; whose thought is the same, whose speech is the same, whose deed is the same, whose father and commander is

¹²² Amesha = Immortal. Spenta = Beneficent, from root span meaning 'to augment' 'to increase'. See Williams Jackson op.cit. p.42. It is a term generally applied to the 'seven' but is applicable to other divinities as well. These other divinities are more usually termed 'Yazatas'.

¹²³ Gt. Bundahishn 1:53. in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.47.

¹²⁴ Shkand-Gumanig Vizar in Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.101.

the same, namely, the Maker, Ahura Mazda".¹²⁵

In Zoroastrian belief the Amesha Spentas are worthy not simply of honour but also of worship and they figure largely, therefore, in liturgy and ritual. When libations are offered to them, these Bountiful Immortals come down on ways or streams of light.¹²⁶ In some ways, e.g. in their sheer radiance, creativity and as emanations, the Amesha Spentas seem similar to Philo's powers (Glory) which, as radiations, are created and differentiated though one with their source. For Philo, as we noted in chapter three, light is the most adequate representation of the communication process. The Amesha Spentas are also a means of communication between God (Ahura Mazda) and his created world.¹²⁷ In Philo's thinking there is a series of emanations so that emanations and Source together form a 'seven-fold deity'.¹²⁸ The Source, however, is ontologically removed and remote from the world of corruptible and defiled matter; only the 'lower' powers can be manifested in it. These 'lower' powers are accounted by Philo to be synonymous with the 'Glory' of Moses' request to Yahweh, "I pray thee, show me thy glory".¹²⁹ In strong contrast, Ahura Mazda is not represented as

¹²⁵ Zamyad Yasht verse 16 in SBE. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.290.

¹²⁶ Ibidem Verse 17. Also Yasht 13:84.

¹²⁷ In Samuel Cohon's view Philo develops the Greek philosophical concept of Logos "within the Pythagorean scheme" purposely to "express the Sacred number seven and by analogy with the Amesha Spentas". See Jewish Theology. op.cit. p.230. Darmesteter (SBE Vol. 4 introd.) sees in Philo 'the first exact parallel to the Avestan doctrine', but gives a post-Alexandrian date for the latter. Such dating for the Zoroastrian doctrine is unacceptable and is refuted by scholars generally. See Williams Jackson Zoroastrian Studies op. cit. p. 43-44.

¹²⁸ The expression is Erwin R. Goodenough's. See his An Introduction to Philo Judaeus Second edition. Revised 1962. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, p.106.

¹²⁹ Exodus 33:18.

remote but is seen by the prophet, recognised in his (God's) action and known (i.e. experienced) as immanent in creation. "Therefore, as the first did I conceive of Thee, O Ahura Mazda! as the one to be adored with the mind in the creation, as the Father of the Good Mind within us, when I beheld thee with my (enlightened) eyes as the veritable maker of our Righteousness, as the Lord of the actions of life".¹³⁰ Most importantly, in Zoroastrian belief, the world of matter is not evil but inherently good; goodness is its *raison-d'être*. The good creation, moreover, existed in spiritual form before it was given further expression in the state of matter. Therefore the second (*getig*) stage of creation is in no way inferior to the first (*menog*) stage, but is rather its completion and manifestation.¹³¹ The great limitation of Evil (*Ahriman*) is that it cannot exist in the *getig* form and, as we have already mentioned, entrance into the *getig* state was *Ahriman*'s undoing. Commenting on this Zoroastrian belief, John Hinnells writes "whereas in hellenistic thought it was spiritual man imprisoned in an alien material universe, in Zoroastrianism it is the opposite, a non-material (or spiritual) devil ensnared in an alien material world with which man is in complete harmony".¹³²

There is nothing, therefore, in Zoroastrian thought comparable to the Philonic concept of only 'lower' powers (*glory*) being able to come into contact with the material world. Indeed, although the *Amesha Spentas* are, arranged in hierarchical order, all play a vital role not only in the fashioning of the world of matter but also in its preservation; they are

¹³⁰ Yasna 31:8 in SBE Part III, Vol XXI (tr. Darmesteter) p.44.
p.44.

¹³¹ "The *getig* existence", says Mary Boyce, is in fact "better than the previous one". See Zoroastrians. op.cit.p. 25.

¹³² In (Spanning East and West) op.cit. Unit 26, p.33.

immanent in creation. Moreover, unlike Philo's powers which, although independent, are but aspects of God and without substantial reality, the Amesha Spentas are as we shall see, both divine and human in character and are accepted in Zoroastrian belief as substantial entities; they cannot now be termed 'powers' in Philo's sense of the term. That they were separate, substantial entities from the very outset of Zoroastrianism, however, is debateable. Mary Boyce believes that they were.¹³³ Gnoli, on the other hand, contends that the Amesha Spentas were originally "mere abstractions and aspects of a divine entity or qualities of those who attain the status of ashavan (righteous)"¹³⁴ but that they got changed along the way. Admittedly their character defies definitive description and remains a subject of debate among scholars. One thing at least is certain, the Amesha Spentas, like Philo's powers (and indeed like the Rabbinic Shekhina and the Sefirotic system of the Kabbala), are a means of bridging the gap between two worlds or realms. The Amesha Spentas are not only mediators between God and Man, they are also the mode of his presence in the world. Are they a Zoroastrian concept of 'created Glory'?

We read in Yasna 27:15 and in two other Yasnas¹³⁵ that Asha Vahishta is the most beautiful or best of the Bountiful Immortals. Elsewhere in the texts, however, Asha occupies second place to Vohu Manah. The order of precedence of the Amesha Spentas as given in the Greater Bundahishn is: Vohu Manah (Good Thought), Asha Vahishta (Best Righteousness), Khshathra Vairya

¹³³ See e.g. 'The Continuity of the Zoroastrian Quest' in Man's Religious Quest op.cit. p.609.

¹³⁴ Gnoli 'Zoroastrianism' in Encyc. of Religion Vol 15. op.cit. p. 583. Zaehner is of the same opinion. See 'Zoroastrianism' in Encyc. of Living Faiths op.cit. p.200f.

¹³⁵ Yasna 37:4 and 35.

(Dominion), Spenta Armaiti (Bountiful Devotion), Haurvatat (Health, Wholeness) and Ameretat (Life).¹³⁶ It is an order which is generally¹³⁷ at variance with that of the creations in which the Amesha Spentas play so active a role and in, or with which, they remain as the inner reality.

The sequence of the seven creations is, 1. Sky, 2. Water, 3. Earth, 4. Plants, 5. Cattle, 6. The just man, 7. Fire.¹³⁸ When the members of the Heptad are arranged to correspond with the creations, the order is thus: 1. Khshathra Vairya (Pahlavi: Shahrevar) 2. Haurvatat (Hordad) 3. Spenta Armaiti (Spendarmad) 4. Ameretat (Amurdad) 5. Vohu Manah (Vahman) 6. Spenta Mainyu (Holy Spirit)/Ahura Mazda (Spenag Menog/Ohrmazd) 7. Asha Vahishta (Ashavahisht or Ardvahist).¹³⁹ Thus the material element with which Asha corresponds is Fire, the seventh creation, whose "radiance is from the Endless Light, the place of Ohrmazd" and which is distributed "within the whole creation".¹⁴⁰ But there is not simply a correspondence between Asha and Fire, there is a linking of one with the other which amounts to identification. For, beyond the visible appearance of each creation lies the invisible reality of the Amesha Spenta who informs it. Beyond the visible appearance of Fire, therefore, is the invisible or inner reality of

¹³⁶ Greater Bundahishn 1: 53 - 4. Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 47.

¹³⁷ An exception is the Shkand-Gumanig Vizar 1:6, where the 7 physical creations are listed as man, beneficent animals, fire, metal, earth, water, plants". For hypotheses concerning reasons for the order of Amesha Spentas see Duchesne-Guillemin. Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p.32f.

¹³⁸ Gt. Bundahishn 1a 1 - 4. Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 48.

¹³⁹ For a table in which the 'divinity' and its representation is set side by side, see Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 13.

¹⁴⁰ Gt. Bundahishn 3:7. In Textual Sources (Z)(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 48.

Asha.¹⁴¹ Since Asha is united with each member of the divine Heptad "whose speech is the same, whose deed is the same, whose father and commander is the same, namely the Maker, Ahura Mazda",¹⁴² the transcendent is truly immanent.

But Fire, as the dynamic, life-giving force coursing through all creation, is itself a hidden, inner reality, whose radiance is from Ohrmazd. It is that from which creatures are fashioned; it is the powerful, fiery force within the 'seed' which, in turn, is the vehicle of Khvarenah. Fire and Khvarenah are so closely associated in Zoroastrian thought as to be frequently indistinguishable one from the other.

To talk of 'inner reality' is not, thereby, to deny the outer actuality. To envisage the two (inner and outer) is to see the whole. For Zoroaster the material (getig) creation as the expression of the immaterial (menog) form is neither more nor less real than that which it expresses. Each creation (material and spiritual) needs and complements the other, for they are the twin aspects of the one reality. Though the form or aspect of each is distinct, Fire and Asha are one.

Fire is the central symbol of and plays a central role in Zoroastrianism. The reason is not hard to seek. Fire, like water, is a necessity of life ¹⁴³ and its symbolic value just as rich, versatile and

¹⁴¹ H. Lommel in Zarathustra ed. B. Schlerath, Stuttgart 1971, pp. 31-2 comments that for the Zoroastrians "Abstract and concrete appeared as unified being". (Cited by Boyce in Textual Sources (Z) p.12).

¹⁴² Zamyad Yasht.

¹⁴³ Fire was thereby regarded in ancient philosophy as life's basic constituent. According to Heraclitus (c. 500BC) the world and man (including man's soul) was formed from living fire. This fire, like the moon, waxed and waned in the process of change. Subsequent philosophical thinking was influenced by Heraclitus. The Stoics, for example, regarded fire as the functional agent and as the world's rational guiding principle. See Lang 'pyr etc.' T D.N.T. op.cit Vol. V. p.930.

obvious. Creative, enabling, purifying and protective, fire is also that which has power to destroy. Its dual character finds expression in the ritual, myth and symbolic language of religions universally. In chapter two of this thesis we have seen evidence in plenty of its usage in the Old Testament where Yahweh is a "consuming fire",¹⁴⁴ a God who reveals himself in the burning Bush,¹⁴⁵ is present in the Exodus in the pillar of fire¹⁴⁶—sign and symbol of his Glory. The concept is carried through to the New Testament where fire is likewise a manifestation of Glory.¹⁴⁷ In Buddhism also, it is an important symbol and used as a representation of the Buddha¹⁴⁸ who, in the Dighanikaya, says of himself "I have become a flame ... "¹⁴⁹

That Fire should become central to the Zoroastrian religion is no doubt due in part to the nomadic background of the Iranian people. In the harshness of a Steppe winter, fire would have been a focal point around which the nomads would gather for warmth and to cook their food, sure in the knowledge that the blaze afforded them protection from wild beasts. Fire was for them, in effect, a sustainer of life. It was essential, therefore, that for as long as there was need for its sustenance the fire should not be left unattended or allowed to expire. But the pivotal position and function

¹⁴⁴ Deut 4:24; 6:15.

¹⁴⁵ Exodus 3: 2 - 6.

¹⁴⁶ Exodus 13:21; 14:24; Numbers 14:14.

¹⁴⁷ Apoc. 1:14; 2:18; 19:21. In New Testament, Fire also symbolises judgement e.g. Matthew 3:10; Luke 3:9. Eschatological judgement, Hebrews 10:27, Apoc 8:7.

¹⁴⁸ e.g. at Amaravati. See figures 4, 5, 6 in A.K. Coomaraswamy, Elements of Buddhist Iconography, Cambridge, Mass. 1935.

¹⁴⁹ Dighanikaya 19:15 in Dialogues of the Buddha II p.264.)tr. T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids) op. cit.

of the fire in Zoroastrian belief and practice (also the common Aryan tradition) is due to something over and above historical conditioning, that 'something' was Zoroaster's vision of reality. For him, Fire was the fullest expression of reality because it embodied Asha. Although Zoroaster considered that all material phenomena embodied a spiritual reality, it was his belief that of all embodiments, that of spiritual Asha in physical Fire formed a metaphysical harmony which was the most profound. An understanding of this belief requires some understanding of the concept of Asha.

In its abstract sense (of which Asha Vahishta is the hypostatization), Asha refers (like Vedic Rta) to that which lies behind the rhythmic order of the universe and is the means of harmony within it. Various translations as 'Principle of Cosmic order', 'Justice', 'Truth', 'Righteousness', Asha refers also to moral conduct, to man's right relationship with his Creator and with all creation. It is, therefore, also a moral quality necessary for the preservation of right relationships. Thus a prayer to Asha (personified) may be a prayer for Asha (moral quality) as in Yasna 28:6 "And, thou Righteousness, when shall I see thee ..."

Asha is a quality of Ahura Mazda of which Asha Vahui is representative. Each great Yazata is likewise representative of a quality of God. Man's role is to integrate these qualities into his own life that he may fulfil the purpose for which he was created, namely the defeat of evil and the restoration of perfect harmony. Sin in thought, word or deed is disruptive of order and spells disharmony. Sacrifice atones for sin. In Zoroastrianism (as in Vedic religion) the Fire is essential for sacrifice. As a purifying agent, it removes sin and guilt thus restoring order, i.e. establishing relationships and bringing harmony. Asha operates through and is expressed in Fire.

But we have earlier defined Khvarenah as "the radiant force that enables evil to be overcome and order to be restored"¹⁵⁰ and have spoken of it as that which is accounted to have more power to destroy evil,¹⁵¹ to heal and to restore, than anything else. Khvarenah is also the sign of order/righteousness/truth. The ashavan or righteous person (epitomised in the highest degree by Zoroaster) is said to emit the radiant light that is Glory. When, at Frashgird, the world is restored to perfect harmony and righteousness, Khvarenah which is the means of such restoration will also be its expression. There will no more be Darkness, only Light. Then "The great light appearing as coming forth from the body will shine continually over the earth .. and will be their garment, resplendent, immortal, exempt from old age".¹⁵²

Khvarenah is of the essence of Fire. The trio: Asha - Fire-Khvarenah, form a relationship which is inseparable. No wonder, then, that the physical Fire is the symbol and the reality at the heart of Zoroastrian belief and practice. It is, perhaps, the fact of the centrality of Fire which attests most surely to the meaning of Khvarenah in Zoroastrian thought.

The term Khvarenah lends itself to various descriptions. It is the "luminous life-force"¹⁵³ emanating from God with power and purpose to conquer Darkness. This is precisely the purpose of the 'seed' of which Khvarenah is the fiery creative force. It is thus the Divine made present

¹⁵⁰ See p.119.

¹⁵¹ Zamyad Yasht v.9. in S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 289.

¹⁵² Zatspram. Quoted by M. Eliade in 'Spirit, Light and Seed', op.cit. p.14.

¹⁵³ See note No. 114.

in all creation but most powerfully in men of righteousness, of which Khvarenah is also the expression and the sign. Its essence is of fire; in the Fire is the Sacred Centre, for there in a special way is the God of Righteousness.

"Righteousness" writes James Boyd, "is the foundational concept in Zoroastrian theology. But righteousness, Asha, is more than just a theological concept or experiential stance. Righteousness is concretely embodied in a visible, glowing, physical fire, called the 'Son of God' "154

And so the Zoroastrian faces the qibla of fire/light when he prays, in the belief that in so doing he is orientating himself towards that which is "replete with divine presence".155 The Fire is the object of offering and Yasna for the same reason. "When a Zoroastrian leaves the fire temple", comments Firoze M Kotwal, "he feels he has received some kind of aura or glory or energy that will sustain him ... In the eyes of the faithful this glow of fire and everything surrounding it would seem to be the presence of God".156

The "Creator Ahura Mazda, the radiant, the glorious",157 like the God of the Old Testament, is unseen. Light or Fire is his manifestation; Khvarenah (Glory) which is the essence of fire, is his presence. It is God as he allows himself to be seen. Those who 'see', however, must have a vision which, moving beyond what seems to be 'only' Fire, 'sees' also an inner reality. This sort of 'seeming' has nothing to do with the

154 A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion op.cit. p. XVI (introd).

155 Ibid p. XV.

156 Ibid p.55.

157 Yasna 4.S.B.E. Vol. XXXI Part III (tr. Darmesteter) p. 213.

'semblance' termed docetic of which we have spoken in earlier chapters. Docetism, described by Bianchi as "a particular theory of the ambivalence of the Divine"¹⁵⁸ cannot be predicated of Zoroastrianism. This is because the religion of Zoroaster has no difficulty whatsoever in "defining a specific mode of presence"¹⁵⁹ for the divine in the world.

¹⁵⁸ See p.71.

¹⁵⁹ Ibidem.

Chapter Six

The belief that there are two realms (a) spiritual (menog) and (b) material (getig) is embedded foundationally in Zoroastrian theology. Ahriman (evil) belongs to the first realm but is alien to the second, unlike the all-good Ohrmazd who is operative in and the ultimate Lord of both. It is clear, therefore, as we mentioned earlier,¹ that the term "dualistic" which is generally predicated of Zoroastrianism does not refer to an opposition between spirit and matter; in Zoroastrian thought, matter is inherently good and no basic opposition between it and spirit is deemed to exist. Ahriman (spirit) is opposed to Ohrmazd (spirit) as he is to the world. The fundamental antagonism is between good and evil - termed also Light and Darkness, Truth (Asha) and Falsehood (Druj) - the expression and product respectively of "two primal spirits, renowned to be in conflict".² It is the Zoroastrian belief in these two primal ones, "the good and the bad",³ which earns for Zoroastrianism the label "dualistic",⁴ a label which bears also the phrase "with qualification". The phrase is warranted because at Frashgird, evil will be obliterated and all will be light. Then "Ohrmazd and the Amahraspands and all Yazads and men will be together ... every place will resemble a garden in spring, in which there are all kinds

¹ See Chapter 5. p.101.

² Yasna 30:3. In Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p. 35.

³ Ibid.

⁴ A few scholars do not attach a dualistic label to Zoroastrianism, e.g. Martin Haug (19th century) believed Zoroaster to be dualist in Philosophy only, not in Theology. See Man's Religious Quest (Open University). op.cit. p.604ff. More recently R.C. Zaehner speaks of Zoroastrianism as being only "nearly dualistic". See 'Zoroastrianism' in Concise Encyclopedia of Living Faiths op.cit. p.201.

of trees and flowers ... and it will be entirely the creation of Ohrmazd".⁵ This garden-like place of Glory does not refer to a heaven out (or 'up') 'there' in some distant or removed realm. It refers to the 'here' of this world as we know it, only utterly transformed. Moreover, in the 'here' and 'now' of everyday existence, the transformation process has already begun, a huge energy of good is in force bringing a 'new' world to birth. Creation itself is in travail⁶ in its war against Darkness, or, to coin another Pauline phrase, is moving from "one degree of glory to another".⁷

The sort of dualism, therefore, that is implicit in the terms 'transcendence' and 'immanence' (at least in Western religious thinking) is not properly applicable to Zoroastrianism in which the idea of two quite different worlds, one sacred, the other profane, one 'there', the other 'here', is foreign and unacceptable. In Zoroastrian belief, the spiritual and the material are, as we have seen, the twin aspects of a present reality; the two realms are interdependent.

The Fire stands as the central sign and symbol of the interdependence of menog and getig realms. It symbolises also the Order/Righteousness/Truth of Ohrmazd which will prevail at Frashgird and which will then be evidenced in the harmonious wholeness of menog and getig together. And, at the heart of the present transforming process which must precede Frashgird,⁸ the Fire is itself a transforming sign. At the last day its role of purification

⁵ Pahlavi Riv.Dd XLVIII 99, 100, 107. Cited by Mary Boyce in Zoroastrians op.cit. p.28.

⁶ Romans 8:22.

⁷ 2 Corinthians 3:18.

⁸ The Last Day (Avestan: Frasho-Kereti). K.S. Dabu gives it two interpretations (1) Renovation: a new world of Reality and Eternal bliss. (2) "going forward" (Faraz) to the highest destiny. See Man's Religious Quest (ed. Foy) op. cit. pp. 657 - 8.

will be decisive, for then there will be a mighty conflagration "Then all men will pass into that melted metal and will become pure".⁹

The great Zoroastrian feast of No Ruz¹⁰ (New Year) attests the primacy and role of Fire. As the last and most important of the seven holy feasts of obligation¹¹ which structure the devotional year, No Ruz, dedicated to Fire, anticipates and prefigures the Glory of Frashgird when all will be made new. Originally a one day festival, No Ruz was extended in the third century to six days, the third day or midpoint of which is celebrated as the day of Asha.

Extremely complex in symbolic meaning, physical Fire is also the visible symbol of the invisible fire whose energy courses through all creation. Physical fire is expressive, that is, of Khvarenah, whose power is most effective for eliminating Darkness and bringing about a world of light, and which is evident to the highest degree in Ashavans and lawful Kings whose lives witness to and promote Order.

A sign, above all, of the presence of Ohrmazd and of the reality of his Kingdom which is now and is to come, Fire is addressed as the "Son of Ohrmazd"¹² and as the Atash Bahram (highest grade of fire)¹³ which is in the

⁹ Greater Bundahishn ch. 34 "Concerning the Resurrection". The Bible of the World (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p.633.

¹⁰ Persian form. Literally "New Day", i.e. No Ruz is New Year's Day, the first day of the first month.

¹¹ Dedicated to the members of the Heptad and to their creations. With the exception of No Ruz, they each last for five days and are celebrated by folk coming together for prayer and feasting.

¹² As for example, in Yasna 1:12; 2:12; 3:2; 4:3; Gah 4:10.; Visparad 7:5.

¹³ Or Varhran. The Fire in which divinity is replete; it is totally pure. Grading is according to purity, location, social connotation.

main temples, is honoured as a King. The wood for its enkindling is arranged in the form of a throne¹⁴ and its establishment is known as 'enthronement'. Over the Atash Bahram is hung a crown as perpetual sign of the fire's royal status. Those who approach the 'King' with gifts receive blessings in return. "Atar thus blesses the man who brings incense to him" states the Visthasp Yasht.¹⁵ "Therefore do thou invoke and praise (me) excellently in this glorious world! That I may have unceasing food, full of the Glory of Mazda and with which I am well pleased". The invocation and praise is given as from a subject to a ruler and with the sense of dependence, loyalty and reverence that Divine Kingship inspires. "We go to the Atash Bahram to do bandagi (prayer) to God" declares Erachji and explains "At that time we must show much humility and a sense of "nothingness". We must consider ourselves lesser than anyone, and we must consider fire as our superior and take his ash on our head to show that we are his real servants".¹⁶

Known also as the 'Fire of Ohrmazd',¹⁷ this 'King' enthroned symbolises, and is, the sacred centre, the heart of the Kingdom of Ohrmazd. To designate the centre 'sacred' is not thereby to dub all around it 'profane'. It is not to draw a contrast at all but to emphasise the reality of which the Fire is sign and symbol, namely the interpenetration of the spiritual and the material and the sacredness of all created things. Khvarenah (Fire) always sacred, is pervasive of creation; the whole of the

¹⁴ See John R. Hinnells 'Parsi Zoroastrians' in Spanning East and West op.cit. p.44; Duchesne-Guillemin in Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit p.76.

¹⁵ Yasht 24:38, S.B.E. Vol XXIII Part II (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 338.

¹⁶ A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion (tr. Kotwall) op. cit. p.59.

¹⁷ e.g. Yasna 31:3; 34:4; 43:4; 1:2. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter).

physical creation has its inner spiritual embodiment, each part its Yazata. The Zoroastrian devotional calendar is a constant rhythmic reminder of this reality beyond appearance. Within the framework of the six gahambars¹⁸ and No Ruz feast days, every day as well as each month of the year is intricately patterned into a network of Yazata/creation relationships. Even the days themselves are subdivided; for example, midday throughout the summer time is under the protection of Asha/Fire. Prayer at this time helps keep the devout Zoroastrian in touch with the relationship which exists between Fire and Asha; indeed, it sharpens his awareness of the spiritual character of creation generally. It also reminds him that "until the coming of the Assault it was always noon"¹⁹ and will be so again in the Glory of Frashgird. His own role is to internalise Asha and to enable the power of Khvarenah to prevail.

To assert that all creation is imbued with the presence of the Holy is not to go counter to religious man's experience of the 'nonhomogeneity of space';²⁰ it is just that in Zoroastrian belief some spaces are more holy than others. The Fire of Ohrmazd is for Zoroastrians THE sacred space. Elsewhere, the good creation has been subjected to Ahriman's intrusion. The Atash Bahram Fire, purified and purifying, is free from his assault and is that from which he shrinks. "Some parts of space" writes Eliade, "are qualitatively different from others".²¹ The space wherein is enthroned the King of Fire is qualitatively different, it is, as it were, the

¹⁸ Holidays of Obligation. Erachji defines Gahambar "to assemble with one another in a work of merit" or "the period for receiving merits". See A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion (tr. Kotwal) op. cit. p. 148.

¹⁹ Greater Bundahishn ch. 3:20-1 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.50.

²⁰ See Mircea Eliade: The Sacred and the Profane op.cit. p.20.

²¹ Ibid p.20.

concentration of the sacred; here there is hierophany, the Glory is revealed. The Fire is the power point of the Kingdom.

The concept of 'Kingdom' plays an important role in relation to 'glory' in all four religions under discussion. In Zoroastrianism the term refers to the Dominion, Power, Government, Authority and Majesty of Ohrmazd as well as to his realm and finds personification in Khshathra Vairya, one of the six shining Amashaspands encountered by Zoroaster in his inaugural vision. Like the other great yazatas, Khshathra receives special honour and worship. He is "the Kingdom to be desired",²² "The good Government (of Ahura) ... which most of all brings on our happiness"²³ and the "imperishable Kingdom" which "the pious ready mind (within us) is causing to advance".²⁴

The visible creation with which Khshathra Vairya is linked and into which he enters as the invisible spiritual reality, is the sky, the first of the material world to be given form. It is to be expected, therefore, that the co-workers of Khshathra should be Khorshed (sun), Asman (spirit of the heaven) and Mihr²⁵ (God of heavenly light).

The relationship posited between Khshathra and the Sky is not hard to understand. Bent over the world as though in a caring, protective sweep, the sky was seen as representative of Ohrmazd's sovereignty and protection. At first believed by the Indo-Aryans to be made of stone, the Sky was in a

²² Yasna 16:3 S.B.E. Vol. 31. Part III (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.256.

²³ Yasna 51:1 *ibid* p.178.

²⁴ Yasna 28:4. *Ibid* p.19.

²⁵ Mihr, Mithra, Yazata of the covenant. Closely associated, therefore, with Asha which is maintained through fidelity to the covenant. Lord also of fire, Mihr is involved in judging souls at their death and in purifying the world (revealing the Kingdom) at Frashgird.

later age adduced to be of rock-crystal.²⁶ Khshathra Vairya is accordingly the yazata informing stone and metal; he is Ohrmazd's presence in them both. Khshathra is also the special guardian of those (e.g. warriors) whose specific role is one of protecting others. He is, in addition, representative of the power for goodness and Truth which good men strive to internalise so that the Kingdom might be augmented²⁷ and its glory revealed.

According to the Zoroastrian myth of creation the bent sky actually envelops the earth as an egg shell the yolk: "The sky, earth, waters, and whatever is within are in the form of an egg, just like the egg of birds. The sky above the earth and below the earth like an egg is established by the work of the creator Ohrmazd and the earth in the centre of the sky is just like the yolk in the centre of the egg".²⁸

The earth is the "centre of the sky (Kingdom)"; the Fire of Ohrmazd, centre of the earth is, therefore, at the heart of the Kingdom from whence as King he fulfils the functions of Sacred Kingship. That the primary function is one of communication/mediation is clear. The mediatory role is evidenced, for example, in the prayer "Together with this fire we first approach Thee, Mazda Ahura, who art harm then to him whom thou mayst destine for harm ... The most beautiful form of forms we then devote to Thee, Ahura Mazda, these lights (i.e. fires) here below, and that yonder, the highest of the high, which is the sun. Come to us as the most joyful, O Fire of Mazda

²⁶ Classified with metals. Stone and metals symbols of strength and used especially for implements of war, denote the strength/protection of Khshathra Vairya, their yazata, who is, in turn protected especially of warriors.

²⁷ Yasna 45:9 wherein is the prayer that Ahura Mazda will "make us vigorous through Khshathra's royal power" in the pursuit of Asha.

²⁸ Dadistan i Menog-i Xrad 48-8ff cited by John Hinnells in 'Spanning East and West' 'The Zoroastrian Quest' op.cit.p.31.

Ahura ... As Fire Thou art the help of Mazda Ahura ... We reverence, we requite Thee Mazda Ahura. With all good thoughts, with all good words, with all good acts we approach Thee".²⁹

The King (of Fires) is in contact with all parts of his Kingdom; all meet in him as radii of a circle converge at the hub. That this is so is implicit in the description we have earlier given of the Fire as a "power point".³⁰ An original rite of the Zoroastrians, but one no longer practised,³¹ appears to have symbolised the King's 'communicating' role. The rite involved the transfer of embers from a lower-grade fire³² to a fire of higher status the embers of which were transferred in turn to the 'Fire of Ohrmazd', the King. Commenting on this early practice of 'feeding back' the fires to their centre and origin, Duchesne-Guillemin writes "Alongside with the 'sociopolitical' significance of the ritual, there seems to have existed a cosmic one, in that while everybody went to sleep at night, and the fires with ashes for the night, 'the xvarr from each creation' as the Bundahishn has it, was supposed to return to Ohrmazd in heaven".³³

Let us look more closely at the sociopolitical aspect of the ritual. The King of Fires resided (and resided still) in a main temple in a city,

²⁹ Yasna 36: 1-5 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.54.

³⁰ p.136.

³¹ Ceased when the Parsi community migrated from Iran in the Tenth century. The 'founding' of a fire remains of central importance.

³² Discrepancies in written accounts concerning fire ritual present problems of interpretation. The Pahlavi Rivayat edited by Dhabdar 1913 p.115, describes transferral of the 'fire'. The Rivayat of Kam din Sapur (in Darab Hormazyar's Rivayat, 1922 I, p.67) speaks of transferral of the 'flame'. Duchesne-Guillemin sees here two different traditions viz (1) Regeneration of fire by means of glowing embers (2) purification of fire by refinement. See Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p.61.

³³ Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p. 146.

the second grade of fire (adaran) in smaller temples, in town or village, and the third grade (dadgah), belongs to the domestic hearth.³⁴ Apart from this grading according to location, there is another ranking of fires according to social class. The three most important holy fires of Zoroastrianism are 1. Adar Gushnasp 2. Adar Farnbag (or Khordad)³⁵ and 3. Adar Burzin Mihr which belong respectively to the three classes of society, namely warriors, priests and agriculturists.³⁶ Within the context of this social classification, the 'feeding back' of the second and third fires to the first (Adar Gushnasp) symbolised the bringing together of all classes of the Kingdom.

Mention of the tripartite structure of Iranian Society calls to mind the three-fold division of the Khvarenah³⁷ which departed from Yima when he lied. If, as seems highly probable, division of the Glory was representative of its societal forms, these forms again found representation in Gushnasp, Farnbag and Burzin-Mihr fires. In any case, in the rite in question, the dying embers of the lesser fires signified the diminution of

³⁴ See John Hinnells 'Parsi Zoroastrians', in Spanning East and West op.cit. pp. 44-5. The full name of the lowest grade fire (dadgah) is given by Boyce as Adorag i pad dadgah meaning 'Little Fire in an appointed Place'. See Zoroastrians op.cit. p. 110.

³⁵ Preferred name in Erachji's list in A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion (tr. Kotwal) op. cit. p.59.

³⁶ According to Duchesne-Guillemin, the Burzen-Mihr fire has never occupied other than third place because this is the ranking beyond which agriculturists have never risen. For Boyce, however, Adar Burzen-Mihr was exalted under the Parthians but then relegated by the Sassanians by their declaring Adar Farnbag (meaning 'share through Khvarenah') to be the special fire of priests and Adar Gushnasp that of Warriors. See Zoroastrians op.cit. p.89, 123 and Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p.70.

³⁷ (Zamyad) Yasht 19:35. S.B.E. Vol. XXIII Part II op.cit. p. 294. Darmesteter relates the three-fold departure of the Glory "to The King, considered as a priest, a warrior or a husbandman" and equates the three forms with the three fires in question.

their Khvarenah and indicated the need for the Glory to be replenished from the centre. Khvarenah is and provides the power for victory over evil; the King of Fires, centre of power, is known also as "The Fire of Victory",³⁸ The role of the King is to redistribute Khvarenah so that the whole Kingdom be further empowered to fulfil its own role in the fight for victory over Ahriman.

Writing of his vision of heaven, Viraz mentions the ascending order of steps or stations through which he had to pass before reaching the realm of endless light.³⁹ They are the same order of brightness through which the Khvarenah passes on its "return to Ohrmazd". The reverse order is, of course, observed when the glory returns or comes to earth as in the Denkard's account of the glory of Zoroaster, "from the light that is endless it fled on, on to that of the sun; from that of the sun it fled on to the moon; from the moon it fled on to those stars; from those stars it fled on, on to the fire which was in the house of Zois".⁴⁰ It is possible, therefore, that verse 2 of the Mah Yasht "for fifteen days does the moon wax; for fifteen days does the moon wane ... "⁴¹ has reference to the return of the glory to Ohrmazd and to its subsequent redistribution.⁴²

³⁸ Interpreted by Mary Boyce in Zoroastrians op.cit. p. 64, as 'Fire of Verethraghna' but later, in A History of Zoroastrianism Vol. 2 p. 222 reinterpreted as "Victorious Fire".

³⁹ Arda Viraz Namag ch 7 - 10 in Textual Sources (Z).(ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.86.

⁴⁰ Denkard Book 7 2:3. S.B.E. Vol. 47 Part V (tr. West) op. cit. p.16.

⁴¹ Yasht 7:2. S.B.E. Vol XXIII Part II (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.89.

⁴² Duchesne-Guillemin links this passage directly with creativity viz "it is like the sexual organ of males giving seed to females when it grows; thus the moon, too, in that manner, grows for fifteen days ... " Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p. 146. Bailey interprets the activity of the moon in this passage to be that of distributor but of 'good fortune'. See Zoroastrian Problems op.cit. p. 42.

Closely linked to the King's role as redistributor is his role as judge. In this, he acts with the holy spirit, "Therefore, wise Lord, when decision is made by thy holy spirit and fire thou wilt apportion (reward and punishment) according to guilt and merit with the help of Armaiti and Asha".⁴³ At Frashgird testing is by means of fire; glory is the final outcome.

Since the Fire of Ohrmazd, seat of the glory, was (and is) treated as a King and considered to fulfil the functions of Kingship, what, we might ask, was the position and function of the human King in Iran? Stories concerning the mythical first King⁴⁴ "Shining Yima" make it clear that the King's primary function was understood to be the promotion of justice and righteousness and thereby promotion of the Kingdom of Ohrmazd. Possession of the Kingly form of Khvarenah enabled the monarch to fulfil this function. According to Firdausi, Yima's loss of the Khvarenah was on account of his proclaiming himself to be a god.⁴⁵ Whether this account reflects a similar proclamation by historical monarchs is open to question. In Maurice Canney's opinion a claim to divinity was too common to be regarded as a sin.⁴⁶ Common or not, however, such a claim would not have been consistent with the truth. Firdausi's account, therefore, does not run counter to the

⁴³ Yasna 47:6 cited by Lang in article 'fire' in TDNT op.cit. Vol. VI p. 933.

⁴⁴ e.g. Denkard 7: ch. 1: 21 when Ohrmazd bids Yima to effect such watchfulness over the world "that no-one shall be able to occasion the wounding or injury of another". S.B.E. Vol 47 (tr. West) op. cit. p.9. Described as 'Fair Yima of goodly flocks' Yima is given a shepherd's role, i.e. of protection and care.

⁴⁵ E.G. Browne. A Literary History of Persia London 1902 p. 114.

⁴⁶ Ancient Conceptions of Kingship Oxford University Press (Reprint from Oriental Studies in honour of Dasturji Sahet Cursetji Erachji Pavry) January 1934. p. 69.

Avestan statement that Yima's downfall lay in his telling of lies. In both accounts Yima fails to fulfil his primary function because of his own lack of authenticity.

That historical monarchs of Sassanid times⁴⁷ proclaimed themselves to be gods, is a fact to which inscriptions and coins bear testimony. Shapur II, for example, called himself 'brother of the sun and moon' and claimed divine lineage.⁴⁸ At least three Parthian Kings likewise claimed divine descent using the title 'Theopater' or 'Theos'.⁴⁹ Some scholars⁵⁰ push this claim back to the Achaemenian period.⁵¹ For H.P. L'Orange, Achaemenian seals assume the form of a clipeus wherein the King is a reflection of the world god who also appears on the seals. With reference to one particular seal he writes, "in this double picture we find an expression of the true Eastern conception of the relationship between heaven and earth, of the reflection of cosmos in the sublunary world, of heavenly Kingship in earthly, of the sovereignty of the Sun in that of the Great King. Two cosmocrators, two Suns stand before us".⁵² Duchesne-Guillemin in contrast, dismissive of the idea that the ring is a clipeus, says it is "the moon

⁴⁷ C. 224 - 651 A.D.

⁴⁸ See H.P. L'Orange Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the ancient world. Oslo 1953. p.44. Also Duchesne Guillemin Religion of Ancient Iran op. cit. p. 188.

⁴⁹ Duchesne-Guillemin, following Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India. Cambridge 1950 p.92, cites Phraates IV, Artaban II and Phriapitius. The last name is not certain. See Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p. 153. The Parthian (or Arsacid) period: 141 B.C. - 224 A.D.

⁵⁰ e.g. H.P. L'Orange Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the ancient world op. cit. ch. I. John Pairman Brown: 'Kingdom of God' in Encyclopedia of Religion Eliade op. cit. Vol. 8. p. 305.

⁵¹ C. 558 - 312 B.C.

⁵² L'Orange op.cit. p. 93.

crescent"⁵³ and the Achaeminian King only the "protege of God (Ahura Mazda) with whom (he has) a reciprocal relationship".⁵⁴

Statements made by Achaeminian Kings are not supportive of the idea that they claimed to be gods. Their position is ascribed to the grace of Ahura Mazda; it is from him that the mandate to rule has come. "Ahura Mazda, when he saw the earth in commotion, thereafter he bestowed it on me, he made me King"⁵⁵ declared Darius. His son Xerxes claimed to have destroyed the daivas by Ohrmazd's grace.⁵⁶ Since the Khvarenah is the most powerful force in the destruction of evil and is given to royalty in special form for this purpose, 'Ohrmazd's grace' in this instance appears to be synonymous with the royal Khvarenah. In recent scholarly opinion it is this Kingly protective, supportive and enabling power which is represented by the winged disc in Achaeminid reliefs.⁵⁷ A number of indications in support of this interpretation is given by A.S. Shahbazi in his work "An Achaeminid Symbol".⁵⁸ First on his list of indications is the association of the symbol "with the personal Fire of each King".

That Sassanid Kings had their personal sacred fires there is no doubt; Artaxsher (226 - 241) had his own fire and so had at least five of his

⁵³ Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. pp. 95-96.

⁵⁴ Ibid p. 118.

⁵⁵ From the inscription of Darius (522 - 486 B.C.) at Naqsh-e-Rustam a. See Textual Sources (Z); op.cit. p. 105.

⁵⁶ Xerxes (486 - 465 B.C.) Persepolis h. "Then by the will of Ahura Mazda I destroyed that sanctuary of Daivas". Ibid p. 105.

⁵⁷ A.S. Shahbazi. 'An Achaeminid Symbol', Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran n.s. 18, 1980. pp. 119-147; G. Gnoli. 'Khvarenah' in Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 8. p. 297; Boyce A History of Zoroastrianism Vol. II op.cit. p. 100ff.

⁵⁸ Loc.cit.

successors.⁵⁹ Generally established at the time of the King's coronation, and always kept burning throughout his reign, the monarch's personal sacred fire was not only the symbol of his Kingship but also the power source of it; the Fire of Kings and King of Fires was the seat of the royal Khvarenah.

It would seem that the founding of a dynastic fire on the occasion of the monarch's coronation had already become a custom in Achaeminian times. Shahbazi cites Diodorus Siculus⁶⁰ as evidence for this and adds "The Achaemenids regarded their fire so auspicious and holy that they carried it on a silver altar in sacrifice processions or military expeditions, addressed prayers to it, and swore oaths by it".⁶¹ So important and central was the Fire for the Achaemenids that it found constant expression in their reliefs and seals. On the facade of the Tomb of Darius the Great at Naqsh-e Rostam, for example, the King (to the left) faces the Fire in worshipful stance.⁶² Poised above, equidistant from King and Fire is a winged circle within which is a regal figure. We have not here "two cosmocrators, two suns" but an earthly King (albeit empowered from a divine source), the royal Khvarenah and the Fire, its seat. On the far top right of the relief is set the full moon but inclusive of its crescent. This is possibly representative of both sun and moon, stations to the endless light. It may also be meant to depict the waxing and the waning of the moon and to reflect the relationship of this process to the Fire's role as redistributor of

⁵⁹ e.g. Shapur I (241 - 272), Shapur II (307 - 379), Kavad (488-531), Xosrau I (531 - 578), Xosran II (621 - 625). See Boyce, Zoroastrians, op. cit. p. 108. Also Shahbazi, op.cit. p. 131; Duchesne-Guillemin, Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p. 64.

⁶⁰ Op.cit. p. 132.

⁶¹ Ibid p. 133.

⁶² Ibid p. 127 Fig. 4a.

Khvarenah.

The depiction of the circle as 'winged' brings to mind the falcon-like form said to have been assumed by the Khvarenah when it departed from Yima.⁶³ However, in the Karnamak i Artaxsher i Papakan, a work which recounts the founding of the Sassanid dynasty by Artaxsher,⁶⁴ the royal Khvarenah assumes quite a different form. It is that of "a very large and mighty ram"⁶⁵ which pursues and finally catches up with Artaxsher as he is fleeing away on horseback. It is, as it were, the royal Khvarenah which seizes or takes possession of Artaxsher and not vice-versa. In the 'seizing' lies clear indication of the royal role of the one seized as well as of his empowerment. But why should a ram be chosen as symbol of the Khvarenah? It is because the ram, an animal renowned throughout the Middle East⁶⁶, as elsewhere, for its pro-creative ability, is apt symbolic expression for that which by nature is powerful, fiery and creative. The ram as a symbol of the Kingly Khvarenah is found, therefore, not only in post Achaeminid verbal expression but also in Sassanian pictorial art wherein it is depicted as diademed and with wings.⁶⁷ The diadem, an essential part of the royal regalia, is itself, like the wings, a sign of

⁶³ Yasht 19:36. When the winged circle is without a figure within, it is not a representation of the Royal Khvarenah but is the Iranian form.

⁶⁴ Artaxsher was crowned 'King of Kings' A.D. 226.

⁶⁵ See E.G. Browne, The Literary History of Persia. op.cit. I. pp. 137, 143.

⁶⁶ e.g. Enki (Ea) venerated throughout Mesopotamia as god of fresh water and fertility, was sometimes represented as a ram. In ancient Egypt Ram was worshipped as a procreative god and at Mendis identified with Osiris. See David Marcus 'Enki' in Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 5. p. 106; W.M. Flinders Petrie 'Egyptian Religion'. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (ed. J. Hastings) op.cit. Vol. 5. p. 244.

⁶⁷ Shahbazi, op.cit. figure 10, p. 140.

the Khvarenah.⁶⁸

Seat of the Royal Khvarenah, the King of Fires was no less important to the Sassanians than it had been to their Achaeminian predecessors. Artaxsher had the Fire founded by him pictured on his coins; several of his successors likewise had their dynastic fire figuring on their coinage. There are two distinct types of representation. In some instances a human head emerges from the fire, on other coins flames emerge from the head itself; in both types the Kingly Khvarenah is symbolised.⁶⁹ In the second kind is perhaps also illustrated the belief that the head is the part of the body to which the Khvarenah is communicated and from which it shines.⁷⁰

Belief in the sovereignty of Ohrmazd and dependence on the Khvarenah as the source and means of the Kingly power did not prevent the Sassanian Kings from proclaiming themselves to be of divine descent⁷¹ and assuming the role of cosmocrator. Their sacred Fires were for them not only the seat of the Kingly Khvarenah but also the central symbol of their own centrality. On

⁶⁸ Shahbazi, referring to Von Gall AMI N.F7. 1974 145 - 61, writes "Each ruler's crown was a manifestation of his Farnah" op.cit. p. 136. See also Duchesne-Guillemin Symbols and Values p. 123.

⁶⁹ Shahbazi op.cit. figure 6, p. 132. Figure 3, p. 124.

⁷⁰ The head was the organ of vital strength in the Greek world. Pythagoreans, for example, understood it to be where sperm was concentrated. See Michel Meslin 'Head, Symbolism and Ritual Use'. Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade Vol. 6. op.cit. p.225. Hence it is the apt place for the concentration of the fiery creative Khvarenah which also is that which enlightens the mind and gives spiritual vision. According to K.S. Dabu "each object as well as each living being has an invisible aura, halo or 'glory' radiating from a centre. In humans, therefore, this 'centre' is the head." See Man's Religious Quest (ed. Foy) op. cit. p. 659.

⁷¹ Not all scholars agree that the Sassanians made such a claim. e.g. Cristiano Grottanelli writes "The King was not himself considered to be divine but to hold his power from the divine sphere". See 'Kingship in the Ancient Mediterranean World' in Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade. op.cit. Vol. 8 p. 320.

Sassanian seals, silver plate and through other artistic media, the pivotal position of the King was amply represented. "The Sassanian Kings", writes Peter Chrysologus, "are seated on their thrones with the celestial orb beneath their feet, in the belief that they are treading on the very dome of heaven".⁷² If such a belief could be ascribed in fact to the Kings of that period, it did not necessarily preclude some of them at least, from promoting that of which, in Zoroastrian thought, the sky or 'celestial orb' is representative, namely the Dominion, Power and Kingdom of Ohrmazd. King Khosrow Anoshirvan (531 - 578), for example, referred to in the Denkard as "the righteous, glorified one",⁷³ is recorded in Arabic as saying "I have sought the course of action most pleasing to God, and have found that it consists in that whereby sky and earth continue to exist, the mountains remain immovable, the rivers flow and the earth is kept pure: that is to say, in equity and justice."⁷⁴ Commenting on this passage, Mary Boyce writes "if for the last two (Arabic) words one substitutes Avestan 'asha', it becomes plain how truly Zoroastrian this utterance is, with its affirmation of man's duty to uphold that great cosmic and moral principle, and thereby to help sustain all the good creations of Ahura Mazda".⁷⁵ In short, in Zoroastrian belief, it is the duty of every human being to promote Ohrmazd's Kingdom through Asha. This is the primary role of the King, seemingly recognised by Khosrow, and achievable through the power of the Kingly Khvarenah. It is to actively co-operate in - indeed to facilitate - the movement of the world from one degree of glory to another.

⁷² cited by L'Orange op.cit. p. 41.

⁷³ Book VII 26. S.B.E. Vol. 47 (tr.West) op. cit. p.89.

⁷⁴ From Karnamag i Anoshiravan in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.115.

⁷⁵ Zoroastrians op.cit. p. 133.

The King of Fires which symbolises the glory of Frashegird, falls, as we have seen, into the first place of a three-fold classification (Adar Gusnasp. Adar Farnbag. Adar Burzin Mihr) of fires. But there is a different classification, much broader in extent, which covers also the invisible fire coursing through all creation. Set out in Yasna 17: 11,⁷⁶ this classification is five fold. Erachji, however, following Pahlavi interpretations, in A Nineteenth Century Zoroastrian Catechism gives an outline of six fires: 1. Atash Berezi-Savangh: shining in the spiritual world, not localised, invisible. 2. Atash Vohu Friyan: in the body of man and animals. 3. Atash Urvazisht: in trees (plants and vegetation). 4. Atash Vazisht: fire of lightning. 5. Atash Spenisht: fire produced by friction. 6. Atash Nairyosangh: in the body of Kings and great ones.⁷⁷

The last named, Nairyosangh, described in Yasna 17 as "of the royal lineage" in fact within that context is not another fire but a yazata so closely associated with fire as to be invoked simultaneously with it.⁷⁸ A similar instance is found, for example, in Siroza 1:9 where we read "To Atar (fire) the beneficent, the warrior; the God who is a full source of Glory, the God who is a full source of healing. To Atar, the Son of Ahura Mazda, with all Atars, to the God Nairyo Sangha, who dwells in the navel of Kings".⁷⁹ Nairyosangh's role is one of communication; elsewhere in the Avesta he is portrayed as the herald of Ohrmazd, announcer of the divine word.⁸⁰ But the King of Fires is the communication centre. Replete with

⁷⁶ Verses 1 - 10 S.B.E. Vol 31 (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.258.

⁷⁷ (tr. Kotwal) op. cit. p.59.

⁷⁸ Vedic Naramsamsa. See Williams Jackson: Zoroastrian Studies op. cit. p. 57.

⁷⁹ S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.6. Sirozah means 'thirty days'.

⁸⁰ e.g. Denkard Book VII chapter 4: 83 - 84 S.B.E. Vol. 47.(tr. West) pp. 70-71.

the presence of Ohrmazd, it is the high point of the interpenetration of the spiritual and the material and the place of meeting to which all divinities are said to flock.⁸¹ It is the "Full source of Glory". Here, therefore, is Nairyosangh to whom is credited transmission not only of the divine word but also of the royal Khvarenah. "And it (the royal glory) came through his mother, to a descendant of Fredun and descendant of Airik; it proceeded with the angel Neryosang to Manuskihar".⁸² Elsewhere, however, as in the Zand account of the Three Saoshyants, the role of Nairyosangh is clearly seen to be inclusive of protecting and preserving the Khvarenah. We are told "the yazad Neryosang took all the light and power" of Zoroaster's seed and ... "it was consigned to Lake Kayansih, in the care of the waters".⁸³ This association of the God (Nairyosangh) who "dwells in the navel of Kings" with the "light and power" of Zoroaster's seed is reminder of the fiery creative nature of Khvarenah.

In himself the yazad Nairyosangh is not of paramount importance in Zoroastrianism. Reference to him in this thesis is on account of the nature and function of the Khvarenah which his role delineates. As herald of the divine word, Nairyosangh may be said to channel the divine will. The divine will is that mankind should internalise and thereby actively promote Asha through the power of the Khvarenah. But Asha is embodied in Fire, the Sacred Centre and distribution point of the Khvarenah. So closely associated with the Fire as to be invoked with it, Nairyosangh bears responsibility for transmission of the Royal Khvarenah to those whose

⁸¹ Denkard 522 - 21 and Pahlavi Rivayat, Dhabhar 57:10 cited by Duchesne-Guillemin in Symbols and Values op.cit. p.65.

⁸² Denkard Book VII, I:29. S.B.E. Vol. 47. (tr. West) op. cit. p.11.

⁸³ In Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.91.

primary role is to exemplify Asha to and for their subjects. Thus the Khvarenah in all its forms is not simply material "fortune" or "the good things of life"; it is a spiritual creative reality described in terms of Fire/Light. The means of renewing the good World of Ohrmazd, the Khvarenah is also the effect of its renewal. After Frashgird there will be no darkness or shadow, all will be light. And in the light of the Kingdom of Ohrmazd then fully revealed, all will be seen to be what it is; appearance will have given way to reality.

Chapter Seven

Adar Farnbag, one of the three great fires of Zoroastrianism, incorporates within its title a dialect form of the Avestan Khvarenah. Farn (from farnah)¹ together with bag, meaning 'distributor'² gives Adar Farnbag the connotation "distributor of glory",³ which is apt description of the function of the Sacred Centre. Usage of the form farnah, however, is not limited to the priestly fire; it forms a component part in Achaeminian proper names such as Farnah-ka (favoured by Farnah), Farnahbazu (whose strength is through farnah) and Farnah-data (Farnah-created)⁴ and it is found on Kushan coins⁵ whereon is depicted the Kingly Khvarenah.

Rather less expectedly, the dialect form, farnah is found outside the Zoroastrian sphere in Buddhist texts written in Sogdian and Khotanese.⁶ Its usage in these writings is concerned with the state of Bodhi, i.e. the wisdom, knowledge, enlightenment attained by a Buddha. Bailey accordingly interprets the word as here meaning 'position' or 'stage'.⁷ In so far as enlightenment, whether accepted as sudden or gradual, is understood to be preceded by stages (bhumis) of spiritual progress, the interpretation

¹ See Boyce. Zoroastrianism op.cit. p.123, and ch. 5 p.104 of this thesis.

² See Bailey. Zoroastrian Problems op.cit. p. 67.

³ For Bailey loc.cit. p. 44. Farnbag means 'distributor of good fortune'. Boyce interprets it as 'having a share/prosperity through farnah'. See Zoroastrians op.cit. p. 123.

⁴ See A.S. Shahbazi "An Achaemenid Symbol" op.cit. p. 146 where, in an appendix citing many Achaeminid Farnaphoric names, these are included.

⁵ As Φ APPO or Φ APPO . See Shahbazi op.cit. p. 133. Also Duchesne-Guillemin Symbols and Values op.cit. p. 141 and Bailey op.cit.pp. 63-4.

⁶ Bailey op.cit. p. 52 notes that forms of Khvarenah "were in regular use in Buddhist central Asia".

⁷ loc.cit. p. 54.

'position' or 'stage' is relevant and acceptable. It seems, however, more applicable to the process of enlightenment than to enlightenment itself for which state is a better term. For Bodhi, the awakening to and awareness of things as they really are, is perhaps less a final stage and more a totally new immersion into a stage-less reality.⁸

Nevertheless, though 'stage'/'position' is less preferable to signify the state of enlightenment, it is at least acceptable and Bailey's argument in defence of it as an interpretation of farnah in the languages concerned appears to be indisputable. Textual phrases cited by him such as satu pharru busta "he was enlightened to the second stage", and prodapharra "who has attained the first stage"⁹ (both from Khotanese texts)¹⁰ are followed by more evidence from other languages further afield. These languages are Kuchean and Agnean¹¹ in which a form of Khvarenah (perne and parn (or param) respectively) render the Sanskrit pada meaning 'position'.¹²

However, Bailey does not rest with the interpretation of 'stage' or 'position' but moves on to give 'farnah' outside the Zoroastrian books the same meaning he accords to 'Khvarenah' in all its forms within them, namely 'fortune'. His argument hinges largely on the usage of a Turkish word 'qut' meaning 'fortune'. Because Central Asian Turks associated with the Sogdians

⁸ The Ch'an School speaks of samadhi as "the highest stage of a hundred foot pole". But enlightenment is 'beyond' this point. It requires the ability "to take a step forward after reaching the top". See Alfonso Verdu, The Philosophy of Buddhism op.cit. p. 74 - 5.

⁹ Bailey op.cit. p54

¹⁰ Sanghata-Sutra 121 to 2 cited by Bailey op.cit. p57

¹¹ Languages of modern Kucha and Karashahr respectively.

¹² Bailey loc.cit. p57.

used this word to refer to the stages in the development of a Buddha, Bailey concludes that farrah is properly translated 'fortune'. He writes "we may understand butiyak farn to mean 'the fortune of a Buddha', that is, the rank or position to which fortune had brought him, passing simply to the meaning 'rank or position'."¹³

Yet to pass from the meaning of 'fortune' to that of 'rank or position' is by no means simple, and the statement that this was the case is purely conjectural. Other hypotheses point to a conclusion different from that of Bailey. There is, first of all, the very real possibility of an error in translation. In his notes to the translation of the 'Sutra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian,¹⁴ D.N. Mackenzie makes frequent reference to the Sogdian translator's misunderstanding of the Chinese original. Turks translating from Sogdian would not have been immune from error, either. There is also the other possibility that in Central Asian Turkish dialects of the period gut meaning 'fortune' and gut meaning 'stage' were homonyms quite unrelated to each other.

But whatever be the reason(s) for the use of Turkish gut to translate 'farrah' in the texts in question, one thing is certain: no authentic Buddhist (or non-Buddhist with an adequate understanding of Buddhism) would consider spiritual progress towards enlightenment (or enlightenment itself) to be due either in whole or in part to 'fortune'. Nor would he equate the idea of 'rank' with its connotation of prestige and worldly advancement,

¹³ loc.cit. p55 butiyak farn "the position of a Buddha" occurs in the Padmacintamani-dharma-sutra.

¹⁴ Oxford University Press 1970. Notes pp. 34-41.

with the concept of a 'stage' or 'position' attained on the path of spiritual perfection.

That there are definite 'stages' in the path to perfection is a belief in both the Hinayana and the Mahayana, though since the two vehicles differ from each other in their concept of a 'perfected person',¹⁵ they differ also in the enumeration and classification of the stages leading to the 'perfected' state.¹⁶ Indeed, even within the Mahayan tradition itself, a definitive outline is lacking.¹⁷ For both Hinayana and Mahayana, however, entrance to and progress along their respective paths, requires self-denial, and an ever deepening detachment from conditioned things. The one who pursues the Arhat¹⁸ ideal (Hinayana) or that of the Bodhisattva (Mahayana) is unworldly; "Gold and a clod of earth are the same to him", he is "averse to worldly gain and honour",¹⁹ and therefore eschews 'rank' and 'status'.²⁰

The older vehicle is unequivocal in its insistence that in his quest

¹⁵ For the Hinayana, the ideal is the Arhat who, by great self-discipline and effort achieves his own salvation. For the Mahayana, the goal is to become a Bodhisattva in order to save others.

¹⁶ Early Hinayana envisaged the Arhat career as comprising Four Stages or Paths viz: 1. Streamwinner. 2. Once-Returner. 3. Never-Returner. 4. Arhat. This was further subdivided, then later developed by the Mahayana. For a tabular statement showing the correspondence between Hinayana and Mahayana bhumis, see Nalinaksha Dutt. Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. p. 134 - 5.

¹⁷ Stages towards the bodhisattva ideal are, for example, sometimes ten in number, sometimes twelve. See Dutt. loc. cit. p. 134.

¹⁸ Arhat from 'Ari' meaning 'enemy' and 'han' meaning 'to Kill.' The enemy is the passions. See Conze. Buddhism: Its Essence and Development. Bruno Cassirer. Oxford 1954 p. 93.

¹⁹ The Avadana Sataka II 348 cited by Conze loc.cit. p.94. This Hinayana extract is applicable also to the Mahayana bodhisattva ideal.

²⁰ It is possible that the 'saint' be accorded a certain 'rank' by others. In such case, these others would be deemed ignorant and without understanding of the true meaning and nature of enlightenment or the path to it.

for salvation man must rely totally on himself and not on anyone or anything else, fortune included, since all other than the self is powerless to help. This insistence stems from what is believed to be the Buddha's own teaching: "You yourself must make an effort. The Tathagatas (Buddhas) are only preachers".²¹ "One is one's own refuge, who else could be the refuge?"²² It is Karma²³ (volitional action) that is operative in a man's life, not fortune, luck or chance. His present life is a consequence of his past and determinative of his future, according to the law of cause and effect. What a man becomes is not a question of fate but a question of the state of his mind (manas).²⁴ "All conditions have mind as their fore-runner, chieftained by the mind, they are mind-made. If one speaks or acts with a defiled mind unhappiness follows him, even as the wheel follows the foot of the drawer".²⁵ The Arhat is one who, among other things,²⁶ has practised the seven factors of enlightenment: mindfulness, investigation, energy, joy,

²¹ Dhammapada 20: 276 S.B.E. Vol X (ed. M. Muller) op. cit. p.67

²² Loc.cit XII 4. Translation: K Dhammaratana Thera (ed) Colombo 1926. Cited by W. Rahula. op.cit. p.1.

²³ Kamma (Pali).

²⁴ In Buddhism 'mind' is not in opposition to 'matter', but an organ or faculty like the others, e.g. the ear, but with the function of conceiving ideas and thoughts.

²⁵ Dhammapada 1:1. S.B.E. Vol X (ed. M. Muller) op. cit. 9.3.

²⁶ He has, for example, eliminated motives of wrong-doing, viz desire, hatred, delusion and fear; has removed the ten fetters: delusion of self, doubt concerning the truth of Dhamma, belief in power of religious rites, sensuality, unkindliness, desire for existence in the world as we know it, desire for existence in formless worlds, spiritual pride, self-righteousness, ignorance. For a full account of the Path see Christmas Humphreys. Buddhism. op.cit. chs. 8 - 9 or Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 93ff.

serenity, concentration and equanimity.²⁷ "Although he acts" states Walpola Rahula, he "does not accumulate Karma, because he is free from the false idea of self, free from the 'thirst' for continuity and becoming, free from all other defilements and impurities. For him there is no rebirth".²⁸

That Karma is operative according to the law of cause and effect is as fundamental to Mahayana thought as it is to that of the Hinayana. "When you wish to know about your previous life, know that the life you are living now is the result of it, when you wish to know about your future life, know that the cause of it lies in what you have done in this life", states the Sutra on Cause and Effect.²⁹ The prodigious powers of a Bodhisattva are on account of the immense amount of merit accrued by him through past good. "Merit" explains Conze, "is that quality of an action which leads to future happiness, either worldly or supramundane"³⁰ so the activities of a Bodhisattva are not outside the Law of Karma. But what about those others, the vast majority of ordinary folk, for whom the Bodhisattva in compassion takes his vow, those that is, who, instead of relying on themselves, place all their reliance on the power of the Bodhisattva (or Buddha) to save them? These too are subject to the Karmic law; Faith or Bhakti is a pre-requisite for their being saved. And the help they receive is the (Karmic) merit of the Bodhisattva which he has graciously dedicated

²⁷ Har Dayal. The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi. (1975 reprint).

²⁸ Walpola Rahula. Op.cit. p. 32.

²⁹ Mahayana Buddhism op. cit. p.108.

³⁰ E. Conze 'Buddhist Saviours', The Saviour God. Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation. Ed. by S.G.F. Brandon. Manchester University Press. 1963. p. 74.

to all beings³¹ who, through faith and devotion, avail themselves of it. That they may "avail themselves" is, moreover, indication that although the Buddhism of faith and devotion involves a dependence outside of the self, it does not exclude self-help; a commitment in faith requires a definite act of the will. When the commitment is made, the 'believer', 'devotee', 'Buddha-self' (perhaps this last term is preferable in Mahayana tradition) is helped to a state from which he/she can move on to enlightenment in its totality.³² Concomitant (or even synonymous) with 'movement' however, is growth in spiritual purity which excludes self-seeking.³³ There is a 'letting go'; the desire for conditioned things, for privilege, status and prestige, no longer has a hold. As Conze comments "As soon as we judge it by the standard of self-extinction, the 'Buddhism of Faith' is in the direct line of Buddhist orthodoxy. Surrender in faith involves a high degree of extinction of separate selfhood".³⁴

To affirm that Buddhism is essentially spiritually orientated is not to deny that within it magic has been practised.³⁵ Few religions, if any,

³¹ In Mahayana tradition, the law of Karma is not given the individualistic interpretation accorded to it by the Hinayana. Collective responsibility has an important part to play. See Conze. Buddhism op.cit. p. 148.

³² Whether there is a process or stages resulting in sudden and full enlightenment or whether enlightenment is itself a gradual process remains a question of dispute. See Sung Bae Park op.cit. p. 105ff.

³³ The Four Holy Truths are accepted by all schools. Non-attachment, liberation from false ideas of the self, are therefore necessary for and part of spiritual growth.

³⁴ Buddhism. op.cit. p. 159.

³⁵ Most prominently in Tantrism. But magical powers - classified in the Abhidharma Pitaka, include, of course, the extraordinary powers of Buddhahood. See articles 1. 'Magic in East Asia' and 2. 'Magical Religious Powers' by Donald Harper and Robert Thurman respectively in Encyclopedia of Religion Ed. Eliade. Op.cit. Vol 9 pp. 114-118.

laying obvious claim to the spiritual, can claim also a history totally exempt from the magical. Nor does the assertion that Buddhism stresses self-renunciation mean that all within its ranks renounce the self and shun fame and fortune. For the run of the mill 'faithful' one important role of the Bodhisattva is to respond to their prayers and petitions. Responses hoped for from the Bodhisattva include the bestowing of certain material benefits³⁶ which are not only incompatible with self-renunciation but seem also to bolster the instinct to possess. Mahayana Buddhism recognises, however, that seeming 'bolstering' on the part of the Bodhisattva is not simply a compassionate concession to the spiritual weakness of the recipient,³⁷ but also an expedient. The Bodhisattva is undeterred in his final goal which is to lead the weak to spiritual strength, to the path, that is, of enlightenment. But neither fortune (meaning wealth) nor the 'status' acquired is here synonymous with or applicable to a stage of enlightenment. Nor can fortune meaning 'chance' or 'luck' be predicated of benefits which are derived on account of the merit of the Bodhisattva.

In his argument in support of the interpretation of Khvarenah (farnah) as 'fortune', Bailey points to the fact that Central Asian Turks "used furthermore the phrase 'tort turlug qut' 'the four-fold qut' to refer to the 'four stages' of Buddhist development".³⁸ It is by examining more closely the concept of 'stage' that we can more clearly grasp the use of qut within

³⁶ The bodhisattva Avalokitesvara is, for example, comparable in role with the Christian St. Christopher. Particularly invoked for the protection of those at sea, Avalokitesvara in addition protects from hardships of all sorts and in so doing performs various "miracles" which also involve the safeguarding of earthly wealth. See Raoul Birnbaum, 'Avalokitesvara. Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol.1 pp. 11-14 and Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 152.

³⁷ See Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) ch. 2. Tactfulness.

³⁸ Bailey op.cit. p. 54.

this context, which is to translate farnah/Khvarenah as meaning 'glory'.

Buddhists very early classified four stages or paths of perfection, viz 1. Streamwinner, 2. Once returner, 3. Never returner, 4. Arhat.³⁹ Regarded by the Hinayana as the height of perfection, the fourth stage is deemed incomplete by Mahayanists because, as Herbert Guenther remarks "the obscurations of the various patterns of existence have not yet been completely removed; because the radiant light which is the very nature of mind is what constitutes Buddhahood".⁴⁰ In other words, the 'stages' are envisaged in terms of degrees of intensification of illuminating light culminating in the full light of transcendent awareness. They are not to be thought of as stationary or temporary 'platforms' but as indicators of the dynamic movement from one degree of glory to another.

If the stages in the career of the Arhat are aligned⁴¹ with those in the career of the Bodhisattva, the Mahayana view of the incompleteness of Arhatship is schematically demonstrated; beyond the Mahayanic equivalent to the Hinayanic final (Arhat) stage, there are four further bhumis through which the Bodhisattva must pass, viz:⁴²

Hinayana stages

Stage 1. Streamwinner

Mahayana bhumis

Bhumi 1

³⁹ In Pali: Sota patti, Sakadagami, Anagami and Arahatta. See Dutt. Op.cit. p. 85 and Dayal. op.cit. p.44.

⁴⁰ Herbert V. Guenther: Buddhist Philosophy op.cit. p.29.

⁴¹ The equivalents are not exact. As Dutt remarks, "The Hinayana system does not offer any parallel to the first bhumi of the Mahayanists" op.cit. p. 105.

⁴² This table excludes the preparatory periods required for both Schools. The stages are set out in Dutt op.cit. p. 132 - 135. Discrepancies occur because of lack of agreement by the Mahayana on the exact number of stages (10 or 12).

Stage 2. Once-Returner	Bhumi 2
Stage 3. Never-Returner	Bhumi 3
Stage 4. Arhat	Bhumi 4, 5, 6.

Bhumi 7

Bhumi 8

Bhumi 9

Bhumi 10

Indicative of the relationship of 'stage of perfection' to the concept of 'glory' are the names given to the different stages. As can be seen in the above table, Stage 3 of the Hinayana ideal corresponds with bhumi 3 of the Mahayana. Called 'Never-Returner' by the Hinayana, the one who has attained this level is deemed to have surety of escape from rebirth in this world. This is because for him attachment to it has been eliminated, the spirit of forbearance perfected and supernormal knowledge acquired: the darkness of ignorance has been largely dissipated. Thus the Mahayana call this third bhumi Prabhakari 'Shining Stage' or 'the stage of illumination'.⁴³ The bhumis preceding it, named respectively, 1. Pramudita 'Joyous Stage' and 2. Vimala 'Immaculate Stage', are representative of a growth in or movement into light, but only from the third bhumi is the light apparent.⁴⁴ At the fourth bhumi (which, together with fifth and sixth bhumis parallels the fourth or Arhat stage of the Hinayana) the light becomes brighter, and so this fourth bhumi is known as Arcismati 'Bright' or

⁴³ See Dutt op.cit. ch. 4.

⁴⁴ Dutt loc.cit. p. 83 writes "The bodhisattva shined on account of his perfection in forbearance (Ksanti-paramita) because he had no anger or spirit of vengeance".

'Radiant'. From this stage on the bodhisattva's illumination is taken for granted and the remaining stages variously defined.⁴⁵

According to Bailey, the Sogdian text in which butiyak farn (the stage of a Buddha) occurs is rendered from a Chinese text of the Dharani, in three extant versions of which the passage is transcribed respectively as, 1. Bodhi, 2. Buddha and 3. Knowledge.⁴⁶ These three words are, of course, synonyms within this context since the root of both bodhi and Buddha has the primary meaning 'to know' (or to " 'be aware of' or 'awakened to' ").⁴⁷ The Buddha is omniscient and the path to Buddhahood is, as we have seen, a process of overcoming the darkness of ignorance. In Indian thought, knowledge shines through the body. Thus in the Bhagavad Gita we read "when the light of wisdom shines from the portals of the body's dwelling, then we know that Sattva (knowledge) is in power"⁴⁸ and, conversely, "Darkness, inertia, negligence, delusion - these appear when Tamas (ignorance) prevails".⁴⁹ Buddhist texts are replete with similar examples. In his omniscience, each Buddha is "gold-coloured, shining like pure gold ... a mine blazing with glory, splendour and fame, a Buddha-sun removing the obscurity of darkness with his rays ... With meshes of beams full of glory,

⁴⁵ Bhumi 5 Sudurjaya 'invincible' or 'hard to win'
Bhumi 6 Abhimukhi 'Right in front' or 'Turned towards bodhi'
Bhumi 7 Duramgama 'Fargoing stage'
Bhumi 8 Acala 'Immovable stage'
Bhumi 9 Sadhumati 'Stage of good thoughts'
Bhumi 10 Dharma-megha - 'Cloud of the Law'

⁴⁶ Bailey op.cit. p. 54.

⁴⁷ See Nyanatiloka. Buddhist Dictionary. Frewin & Co Ltd Colombo, Ceylon. 1972. edition p. 34 and H. Guenther op.cit. p. 19.

⁴⁸ The Bhagavad Gita 14:11 translated by Juan Mascaro Penguin Classics 1962 p. 104. Mascaro defines Sattva as "the light and harmony of pure intelligence and goodness". p. 103.

⁴⁹ Ibid 14:13.

merits and splendour, he stands amid the darkness like the sun in three worlds".⁵⁰ "My intelligence-power is such" states the World-honoured One in the Lotus Sutra that "my wisdom-light shines infinitely".⁵¹ And we are informed in the Lalitavistara, that the ray issuing from and shining above Buddha's head is named "the Ornament of the Light of Knowledge".⁵²

So whether 'bodhi', 'Buddha' or 'Knowledge' be used to render butiyak farn, the meaning remains essentially the same. It is that transcendent state which, in Buddhism, as in Indian thought generally, is believed to be characterised by radiance. Farn (or farnah) used by Buddhists in Khotanese and Sogdian texts retains the connotation of Khvarenah which is not 'fortune' but 'glory'. Thus although the term here finds expression in a philosophical and religious system very different from that of Zoroastrianism, its usage makes clear that between both religions certain resemblances exist. In each there is not only the belief that goodness (concomitant with wisdom and knowledge) is manifested in light (glory) but there is also the understanding that a dynamic relationship exists between the concept of glory and that of Truth.

The Zoroastrian and Buddhist concepts of Truth differ, of course, from each other in meaning and usage. The difference, however, expressive of each religion's human experience, embodies also its endeavour to distinguish the true from the false, the real from the unreal. Common to both religions, therefore, is an experienced need for truth/reality and the

⁵⁰ The Sutra of Golden Light ch. 3: 61 - 63. A Translation of the Suvarna-bhasottamasutra by R.E. Emmerick Luzac & Co Ltd, London 1970 p. 13.

⁵¹ The Lotus Sutra: (tr. Kato) op. cit. p.256.

⁵² Lalitavistara 1.ed.Lefman 1902 p. 3. cited by Mircea Eliade-
The Two and the One op.cit. p. 34.

seeking to fulfil that need. Their "saints" epitomise the search and at least part-fulfilment.⁵³ The Zoroastrian Ashavan is one who, internalising Asha⁵⁴ (Truth, Righteousness, Authenticity) becomes more and more in harmony with that great cosmic order,⁵⁵ "things as they are meant to be", according to the will of Ohrmazd. In so doing (or being), the Ashavan becomes more cognizant of things as they are. Between Truth and Glory there is understood to be a sort of mutual empowerment: through the power of the Glory (Khvarenah), Asha (Truth) becomes internalised, empowering the Glory in turn to shine out.⁵⁶

In the Buddhist bodhisattva ideal, the stages towards enlightenment are indicators of progress in realisation of the Truth, of the knowledge of things as they are; they are indicators also of growth in righteousness and goodness. Commensurate with the progress is the degree of light (glory) manifested. The fully enlightened One is 'Tathagata' meaning he who has full realisation of the Truth/Reality (Paramartha).⁵⁷ Hence the Buddha's extreme brilliance, his blazing "with beams which, as it were, cause

⁵³ The Bodisattva defers Buddhahood because of his saving compassion, it may be said that he has the vision of fulfilment. The ashavan knows complete fulfilment in the glory of heaven with Ohrmazd. See ch. 5. p. 81.

⁵⁴ Asha, one of the Bountiful Immortals, is a direct emanation from Ohrmazd's own essence. But Ohrmazd dwells in the space and place of light and he is the fullness of Truth. See ch. 5. p. 96.

⁵⁵ For the discussion of the meaning of asha-rta, see Duchesne-Guillemin. The Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p. 135ff.

⁵⁶ According to Dabu, the Glory has a sort of magnetic radiation. For example, during a ritual, a priest (presumed to be 'righteous') 'charges' certain objects with his own Glory, then the objects are termed Ashaya Uzdata 'exalted through one's own pure radiation'. See Man's Religious Quest op.cit. p. 658.

⁵⁷ Literally 'he who thus comes or goes'. See B. Suzuki. Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. p. 128.

fire",⁵⁸ for he "has a pure realisation of the knowledge of existence and non-existence."⁵⁹ Endless is the Buddha's glory"⁶⁰ shining forth "to help reveal the Truth of Reality".⁶¹

The Buddha's glory may shine forth continuously but not all bask in its rays, not at least in their present existence where⁶² "like the Yak caring for its tail, smothered by greed and infatuation, blinded and seeing nothing, they seek not the Buddha, the mighty".⁶³ But for those who do seek the Buddha, who lead a good life but nevertheless are as yet not wise enough to understand the Truth of Reality, there is hope of rebirth in one of the brighter, better lands of which in Buddhist cosmology there are so many as to be countless. The earnest Buddha-Seeker is assured that from these lands rebirths are at an end, only Nirvana awaits and its attainment is certain.

One such 'paradise' (for that is what it is), is the Pure Land Sukhavati commonly translated as 'Land of Bliss'. Blissful indeed are the descriptions given of it in both the Larger and Smaller Sukhavati-Vyuhis. It is "prosperous, rich, good to live in, fertile, lovely".⁶⁴ "There is nowhere in that Sukhavati world any sound of sin, obstacle, misfortune,

⁵⁸ The Sutra of Golden Light ch. 19 'On the Praise of All the Tathagatas' verse 17. op.cit. p. 99. The Hua-Yen Ching has one chapter (nine) entitled 'Enlightenment as Light'. See Sung Bae Park op.cit. p.115.

⁵⁹ Ibid verse 20.

⁶⁰ Ibid verse 21.

⁶¹ Lotus Sutra (tr. Kato) op. cit. p.50.

⁶² 'present existence' covers five or six (the number is disputed) planes of life. These are worlds of 1. The Gods, 2. (Asuras) disputed, 3. men, 4. ghosts, 5. animals, 6. hells. See Conze Buddhism op.cit. p.50.

⁶³ The Lotus Sutra ch. II Tactfulness. (tr. Kato) op. cit. p.71.

⁶⁴ The Larger Sukhavati-Vyuha ch. 15 S.B.E. Vol XLIX part II (tr. Cowell) op. cit. p.33.

distress and destruction".⁶⁵ There, where all is shining, "no mention is ever made of the names of fire, sun, moon, planets, Nakshatras (constellations) and stars, or of blinding darkness. There is no mention even of day and night, except in the conversation of the Tathagata".⁶⁶ What need is there to talk of such things when glory is the experienced state?

There is no difficulty, of course, in finding comparable descriptions of a 'land of bliss' in the writings of other religions under discussion. In the eschatological Paradise ("new heaven and new earth") of the Book of Revelation, for example, death, mourning, crying and pain are no more.⁶⁷ There, where there is no more night,⁶⁸ the "city has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light".⁶⁹ Paradise depicted by the prophet Zechariah is likewise "continuous day ... not day and not night",⁷⁰ and in Zoroastrian texts⁷¹ it is identified with Endless Light.

Although there are obvious parallels between the Buddhist Sukhavati descriptions and those from the other religions in question, there are also less obvious but important differences.⁷² The Pure Land Sukhavati is a

⁶⁵ Ibid Ch. 18 p. 40.

⁶⁶ Ibid ch. 22. p. 43.

⁶⁷ Revelation 21:4.

⁶⁸ Ibid 22:5.

⁶⁹ Ibid 21:23.

⁷⁰ Zechariah 14:7. (Note also Slavonic Enoch 65:9A "and there will be among them neither weariness nor suffering nor affliction nor expectation of violence nor the pain of the night nor darkness. But they will have a great light for eternity".

⁷¹ e.g. Denkard 7. ch. 2:3; Hadhokht Nask, ch. 2: 33 - 4. See Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. ps. 71 & 82.

⁷² There are, of course, differences in the concept of 'bliss land' as understood also in the three religions: Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian.

penultimate temporary abode. Paradise⁷³ for Jew, Christian and Zoroastrian is ultimate and eternal, it is where the just are illuminated by and share in the glory of the God about whom each of the three faiths can declare with similar meaning he "is the fountain of life" in his "light do we see light".⁷⁴ Such a declaration, if predicated of Buddha by Buddhists, would not carry the same connotation, not even for those of Sukhavati who likewise are illuminated by and participate in glory.

Sukhavati is the Pure Land of Amitabha, the Buddha of Infinite Light who is known also as Amitayus⁷⁵ (Infinite Life). There in the Sukhavati realm Amitabha resides and over it he reigns. He is not unique. In the Buddhism of faith countless realms exist⁷⁶ and with them countless Buddhas, each with a realm, a range of jurisdiction. Amitabha is the source of light for his realm, and the other Buddhas are similarly sources of light for their realms, all of which come into being through their accumulated Karmic merit. Each Buddha Pure Land, that is, is the product of enlightenment. Enlightenment is thus creative and its creativity is without end. Those who

⁷³ Paradise a loan-word from Persian (pardes) meaning 'garden', is used literally in the LXX as well as religiously, and most often as an expectation of salvation which involves a return to the State of Eden. For New Testament meaning see TDNT op.cit. Volume V p.769.

⁷⁴ Psalm 36:9.

⁷⁵ Also called Amita (infinite) and mentioned in the Lotus Sutra as principal Buddha of the Western Region wherein is Sukhavati. Other Buddhas preside over Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern regions respectively. Some scholars are of the opinion that the cult of Amitabha was greatly influenced by Zoroastrianism. See Conze. Buddhism op.cit. p. 146. See also Henri de Lubac: Aspects of Buddhism Sheed and Ward, London and New York 1953 p. 87 and David Snellgrove, 'Celestial Buddhas and Bodhisattvas' in Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 3. p. 136.

⁷⁶ e.g. Lotus Sutra op.cit. ch. XXIV p. 312. "Sakyamuni' Buddha ... emitted a ray of light from his white hair-circle sign between his eyebrows, everywhere illuminating eastward a hundred and eight myriad kotis of nayutas of Buddha-worlds, equal to the sands of the Ganges".

dwell in the paradise are instructed by its fully enlightened One as disciples by a Master. Thus through the Buddha's enlightenment, others become enlightened. Then, as 'new' Buddhas, they in turn create their own Pure Lands.

Not all Buddha realms are Pure.⁷⁷ That our earthly realm is not pure and not all glorious is obvious, yet it is the realm in which, according to Buddhist belief, Sakyamuni Buddha chose to appear in order to preach the Dharma. This earthly realm was Sakyamuni's field of influence just as Sukhavati is Amitabha's field of influence. Whether a Buddha realm is pure or impure it is that over which a Buddha reigns; it is the realm of his knowledge, it is his Kingdom.

That Sakyamuni should have chosen an impure land as his Kingdom is a measure of his great compassion and heroic self-sacrifice. This is the view expressed in Vimalakirtinirdesa⁷⁸ and Karunapundarika⁷⁹ sutras. But Sakyamuni of course, is not the only Buddha who is possessed of such enormous altruism; there were Buddhas before him in earlier this-world ages and there will be more Buddhas to come. Sakyamuni's immediate successor who will come in the next world age is Maitreya (loving kindness), a perfected bodhisattva who, while awaiting his incarnation resides in the Kingdom of the Satisfied Gods (the Tushita heavens).

⁷⁷ Impure worlds are those wherein dwell beings in different states of existence. These states may be those of men, gods, Asuras, ghosts, animals or hells.

⁷⁸ Exposition of Vimalakirti written between 100 B.C. - 200 A.D. The Eastern Buddhist VI 394. 1926 - 28 translated by H. Izumi. See Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 155; Fujita Kotatsu. Genshi jodo Shiso no Kenkyu. Tokyo. 1970. (formation of Pure Land Texts with Summary in English) and D. Snellgrove 'Celestial Buddhas and Bodhisattvas' Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 3 pp. 133-143.

⁷⁹ See Fujita Kotatsu. 'Pure and Impure Lands' Encyclopedia of Religion ed. Eliade. op.cit. Vol. 12 p. 91.

Some scholars⁸⁰ are of the opinion that the idea of a Buddha-Saviour to come had its origin in the Zoroastrian Saoshyant concept. Others⁸¹ believe it to be firmly rooted in Indian tradition dating from Sakyamuni's own time. But whatever the origin of the Maitreya notion, the concept of his future task and its final outcome, has definite parallels with the role of the Saoshyant and with the realisation of the Glory of the Kingdom of Ohrmazd.

Maitreya's future task seems decidedly less onerous than was the task of Sakyamuni, for, in the interim between the latter's parinirvana and Maitreya's incarnation, the world will have known two distinct periods: a period of decline and a period of gradual restoration. Sometime in this second period when men will have become sufficiently amenable to instruction there will be in the world a wise and holy ruler, a cacravartin⁸² who will instruct them in the ways of wisdom and prepare them for the coming of Buddha Maitreya.⁸³ Thus when Maitreya comes to preach the Dharma, it will

⁸⁰ e.g. Trevor Ling believes it 'possibly' due to Iranian influences. See A History of Religion East and West Macmillan Press Ltd 1968 p.148. Conze sees "the legend stimulated by Persian Eschatology". Buddhism op.cit. p. 116. For Helmut Hoffman there is a strong suggestion of Iranian influence. See 'The Religions of Tibet' 1961 p. 52. quoted by D. Howard Smith The Saviour God (ed. Brandon) op. cit. p. 184.

⁸¹ e.g. D. Snellgrove, 'Celestial Buddhas and Bodhisattvas' op.cit. p.134. Lewis Lancaster quotes P.S. Jaini as suggesting the Mahasamghika school (from whence Mahayana stemmed) as the source. See Lewis Lancaster, 'Maitreya' in Encyclopedia of Religion ed. by Eliade op.cit. Vol. 9. p. 137.. Ninian Smart takes a middle position viz: "there is some evidence that at least some of this mythology derives from Persia; but it also expresses the popular devotionalism which permeated Buddhism in the last century B.C. and afterward". See The Religious Experience of Mankind Collins Fontana library 1971. p. 138. Note that Maitreya figures in all Buddhist traditions but is given little significance in the Pali canon.

⁸² (Sanskrit, Cakra: wheel: vartin: one who turns). The 'wheel' is Dharma and the one who turns it is the universal King. Gautama (Sakyamuni) is cakravartin; the stupor enshrining his relics attests to his universality. Built as a mandala, it is the sacred centre.

⁸³ See L. Lancaster op.cit. p. 137.

be to a world well advanced in perfection, a glorious world as is Sukhavati, with its inhabitants likewise ripe for the full glory of Buddhahood and Nirvana.

In Zoroastrian theological history, the world is similarly divided into different periods the last of which is initiated with the birth of Zoroaster. Subdivided into three, this last three thousand year span is envisaged as having within it times of build-up and times of decline.⁸⁴ Zoroaster inaugurated the process of eliminating Darkness and building up the Kingdom of light but at intervals of a thousand years Darkness will attempt to re-assert itself. The decline halted, a saoshyant will appear and restoration be continued. The final outcome, as we have seen,⁸⁵ will be Glory, the Light of the presence of Ohrmazd.

In Christian and Jewish belief the glory of heaven is likewise the Light of the Presence of the God with and through whom all will be in full and eternal communion. The glory of Sukhavati, as of all the 'paradises' of the Pure Land School, is different in conception. It belongs to that which is not eternal and which presages a state exclusive of the Christian/Jewish/Zoroastrian sort of communion. And the difference goes further.

Inclusion of the concept of paradises, of other worlds 'out there' seems strangely at odds with the Buddhist claim to non-duality. Yet what seems to be a contradiction is simply one more expedient used by the Buddha in order to accommodate imperfect beings and bring them to perfection. Just as in reality there is not a host of Buddhas but One only, so in reality the numerous Buddha Lands are ultimately one and the same Land, there is no

⁸⁴ See Chapter 6. Note 112.

⁸⁵ Chapter 6, p.150.

differentiation. According to the Vimalakirti nirdana Sutra, purification of the Land is concomitant with the purification of the Bodhisattva's Mind.⁸⁶ Pure Lands therefore, are products of the Mind as indeed, are the numerous Tathagatas. But so are all the multiplicity of Buddha lands or world systems whether they are purified or not. "Mind is like a clever artist", states the Avatamsaka-sutra,⁸⁷ "it paints all worlds, and out of it rise the Five Aggregates".⁸⁸ Those who are oblivious of this fact are oblivious of Reality, their vision is of multiplicity, they cannot see the Buddha. "When a man knows that the Mind is the creator of worlds he sees the Buddha, he knows the true nature of Buddhahood, because Mind, Buddha and Beings are the same. When a man wishes to understand all the Buddhas of the past, present and future, he should meditate that it is the Mind which creates all the Tathagatas".⁸⁹

The Mind's artistry is a reflection of its own state; purity paints purity, impurity produces an impure canvas. All is relative. When, in the Vimalakirti nirdana sutra Buddha is asked why this land of his is not pure he responds "it is not the fault of the Tathagata if the creatures are prevented by their evil deeds from being able to see the purity of our Land of Buddha. In truth, Sariputra, this Land is always pure: it is you who

⁸⁶ Op.cit. The Eastern Buddhist VI 394, quoted by Henri de Lubac in Aspects of Buddhism. op. cit. ' "when a Bodhisattva", said the Buddha, "wishes to gain access into a Pure Land, he must purify his mind; as soon as this is purified, his future Land of Buddha is purified too". '

⁸⁷ Extracts from Mahayana Sutras. B. Suzuki: Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. p. 105.

⁸⁸ The five Aggregates or skandhas in Buddhist philosophy are the elements of the human make-up (1) body or form, (2) sensations, feelings, (3) perceptions, (4) volition, emotions, (5) consciousness. It is the union of these which constitutes the individual.

⁸⁹ Avatamsaka-sutra. B. Suzuki op.cit. p.105.

cannot see its purity".⁹⁰ There is no 'here' versus 'there'; Buddhism is faithful to its belief in non-duality. The Kingdom is now, where Sariputra is, but because he is imperfect, without the highest wisdom (prajna) and knows only samvrtisatya or conventional truth, Sariputra sees only the mundane, things as they appear to be, not as they are. The transmundane (lokottara) escapes him, he cannot 'see' the Glory.

But even to speak of "things as they are" is to use conventional truth, it is to hypothesise. In reality "things" are generated by the mind, they are without substance, unreal, for there is only one Suchness. Non-duality cannot allow differentiation. To 'see' the Glory is not to see 'something', nor is it to 'see' with physical sight. Glory is of the stuff of experience, known from within, it is the realisation of the Transcendent Reality, the Absolute Truth (Paramarthasatya) which, identifiable with enlightenment, is Nirvana and, paradoxically is also Samsara. In the final analysis, what Glory really is and means is, of course, unutterable. "Although all phenomena are Buddhahood, no phenomenon whatsoever exists. Although it consists of virtuous qualities they do not define it".⁹¹ And in the Diamond Cutter Subhati is told "They who saw me by form, and they who heard me by sound, They engaged in false endeavours, will not see me. A Buddha is to be seen from the Law (dharmatas); for the Lords have the Law-body (dharmakaya); And the nature of the Law cannot be understood, nor can it be made to be understood".⁹² It must be realised, and to 'realise' is to

⁹⁰ The Eastern Buddhist VI 394. Quoted by de Lubac. op. cit. p.124.

⁹¹ Ornament of the Scriptures of the Universal Vehicle 9:3
Edgehill translation edited by Robert Thurman. Amherst, Massachusetts:
American Institute of Buddhist Studies 1980.

⁹² The Vaggrakkhedika (or Diamond-Cutter) XXVI S.B.E. Vol XLIX Part II
(tr. Cowell) op. cit. pp. 140-1.

soar above the duality of subject and object. When this happens the "obscurations of the patterns of existence" are removed and the radiant light which is of the nature of mind shines unimpeded and unimpaired.⁹³

This means, of course, that in the mythological system of the 'Pure Land', those who 'dwell' there do not experience the ultimate Glory. They have, as it were, a foretaste of what it might be. They 'see' the Sambhogakaya,⁹⁴ the refulgent Kaya of the Buddha. And because the "body of Glory" is a created appearance dependent on the spontaneous thoughts, imagination, feelings and emotions of the one who 'sees', it assumes a numberless variety of appearances or forms, each relative to the seer at any given moment in his overall movement from one stage of transcendence to another. In the opinion of Henri de Lubac this idea of the Sambhogakaya "is closely related" to Philo's idea of the *δύναμεις*.⁹⁵ By means (or part-means) of explanation Henri de Lubac quotes an opinion expressed by Henri Charles Puech (without reference to or comparison with the Sambhogakaya) concerning Philo's idea: " ... the Powers do not represent elements or aspects of the divine essence itself so much as forms assumed by God in the eyes of the creature at the various stages of the mystical ascension. They are 'relative' points of view adopted towards the supreme Ov, which only have meaning in and through the various relationships which man is able to have with God".⁹⁶

The centrality of the Powers in Philo's philosophy is clear indication

⁹³ See p.81 of this thesis and note 40. p.82.

⁹⁴ According to the Siddhi, the Parasambhogakaya - See chapter 4 p.82 of this thesis.

⁹⁵ Henri de Lubac Aspects of Buddhism op.cit. p. 105.

⁹⁶ Ibidem. (From Revue de l'histoire des religions (1937) vol CXVI p. 92)

of his central concern with the whole question of the relationship between heaven and earth and, most specifically with that between God and man. Nor is this concern of Philo's merely or mainly academic; in his writings philosophy is at the service of, and therefore subordinate to, the mystical. Philo the philosopher is first and foremost the mystic who is absorbed with the mode, manner and experiential meaning of what Puech terms "the mystical ascension", the union of the soul with the transcendent God.

Referring to the presence of the Divine in the world, Philo asserts "To be everywhere and nowhere is His (God's) property alone".⁹⁷ He explains that as maker God cannot be contained in anything he has made but through his Powers he has "left no part of the universe without his presence, and uniting all with all has bound them fast with invisible bonds".⁹⁸ Man, therefore, is capable of apprehending God, albeit "by means of a shadow cast",⁹⁹ through His creation, that is, through his Powers.¹⁰⁰ But man is capable of a deeper apprehension which happens in a different way. With reference to Moses, Philo writes, "there is a mind more perfect and more thoroughly cleansed, which has undergone initiation into the mysteries, a mind which gains its knowledge of the First Cause not from created things".¹⁰¹ Such a mind "sees" beyond creation and "obtains a clear vision of the uncreated One".¹⁰² The vision comes "directly from the First Cause

⁹⁷ De Confusione Linguarum XXVII, 136 (CW IV, p.83).

⁹⁸ Ibidem,

⁹⁹ Legum Allegoriae III 32 (CW I, p. 369).

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem De Posteritate Caini 48: 169 (CW II).

¹⁰¹ Legum Allegoriae III, 100 (CW I, p.369).

¹⁰² Ibidem.

Himself".¹⁰³ What is this "vision of the uncreated One"? That it is "perceived and known with the eyes of the understanding" and not by physical sight,¹⁰⁴ Philo makes clear. He also states his conviction that God Himself in His essence cannot be seen; the vision is of the Powers.¹⁰⁵ The Powers are the Glory.

As to whether or not the Powers can be known in their essence, Philo, as we mentioned earlier,¹⁰⁶ is ambivalent. Perhaps his uncertainty is reflective of his own spiritual experience and the inability of words to express it. In such passages as "he who wishes to see the Supreme Essence will be blinded by the rays that beam forth all around him before he sees him"¹⁰⁷ Philo implies that the Powers in their essence are knowable. Most other times this implication is negated as in the 'Platonic' "but while in their essence they are beyond your comprehension they nevertheless present to your sight a sort of impress and copy".¹⁰⁸ Statements like this last one support Puech's opinion that the powers are "forms assumed by God in the eyes of the creature ... " They also show a relationship between the concept of Powers and that of the Sambhogakaya. Like the Buddhist 'Body of Glory' the Glory which is 'seen' is a sort of foretaste of what is yet in store but which is denied in its fullness in this present existence. The 'seeing' is still conditioned by relative circumstances.

The similarity of the concept of Powers to that of the Sambhogakaya is

¹⁰³ Ibidem.

¹⁰⁴ De Posteritate Caini 48: 163 (CW II)

¹⁰⁵ Ibidem.

¹⁰⁶ Chapter 3,

¹⁰⁷ De Fuga et Inventione 29:165 (CW V, p.129).

¹⁰⁸ De Specialibus Legibus I 8: 46-47 (CW VII, p.125).

seen in passages from Philo other than those which refer to either intellectual or intuitive (mystical) apprehension. With reference to Exodus XXIV 17 Philo asks "what is the meaning of the words 'the form of the glory (was) like a fire burning before the sons of the seeing one?' " and responds to his own question: "the glory of God is the power through which he now appears; the form of this power is like a flame or rather, it is not but appears (to be so) to the spectators, for God showed not that which pertained to his essence but that which he wished to seem to be to the amazement of the spectators. And so, (Scripture) adds 'before the sons of the seeing one', indicating most clearly that there was an appearance of flame, not a veritable flame".¹⁰⁹ Philo's contention that God showed "What he wished to seem to be" is not so far removed from the idea of the Buddha manifesting what he wished to seem to be.¹¹⁰ In both instances of 'manifestation' there is a manipulative element, the end purpose of which is soteriological, to bring the seers to the realisation of Reality.

In the Buddhism of Faith, once a Bodhisattva has come to such purity of realisation that only compassion is preventative of his attaining the finality of Nirvana, he becomes a world-ruler, a cakravartin. His Buddha-field, notes Conze, is "a Kind of Kingdom of God", a mystical universe,¹¹¹ the product of his vow to save all beings. When this vow is fulfilled as, in the belief of Pure Land Buddhism it will be, all will then be King in the One Kingdom of perfect enlightenment or Buddhahood. What had been a 'glimpse' of Glory will then have become full 'vision'.

¹⁰⁹ Questiones et Solutiones in Exodum translated by Ralph Marcus op.cit. Supplement II p. 47.

¹¹⁰ This applies to the Nirmanakaya as well as to the Sambhogakaya.

¹¹¹ Buddhism op.cit. p. 154.

Chapter Eight

"Before his death, Moses the man of God,
blessed the children of Israel, He said,
'The Lord came from Sinai,
and dawned from Seir upon us
he shone forth from Mount Paran,
he came from the ten thousands of
holy ones.
With flaming fire at his right hand
Yea, he loved his people;
all those consecrated to him were in
his hand ...
Thus the Lord became King in Jeshuran' "1

It is not strange that this ancient poem which recalls what is at the heart of the Saving Event of Exodus, namely the Theophany on Mount Sinai, should be attributed to the one who was so intimately caught up in it as to reflect the glory.² Nor is it strange that in recalling the promulgation of the Law and the consecration of a people the poem should proclaim Yahweh as King.³ What is or what seems to be extremely strange, however, is that a biography of Moses composed centuries later should make no mention whatsoever of the Theophany on Mount Sinai. In his De Vita Moses Philo Judaeus totally omits this vitally important event and concentrates instead on Moses' roles as King, priest, legislator and prophet. The emphasis does not fall evenly on all four roles but lands heavily on that of Kingship. Of the two books composing De Vita Moses, the first and longer one is devoted

¹ Deuteronomy 33: 1-2, 3a, 5a.

² Exodus 34: 29-35.

³ Most scholars apply verse 5 to Yahweh. Jeshuran is a title, rare in the Old Testament, for Israel. Von Rad suggests that the sentence "is to be applied to the rise of the Earthly Kingdom in Irsrael". See his Deuteronomy S.C.M. Press Limited London 1966 p.205. H.A. Wolfson notes that in Jewish tradition the verse refers to Moses' Kingship. See Philo Book II op. cit. p.326.

entirely to this royal theme and concludes with an introduction to the second book: "We have now told the story of Moses' actions in his capacity of King. We must next deal with all that he achieved by his powers as high priest and legislator, powers which he possessed as the most fitting accompaniments of Kingship".⁴ Why this stress by Philo on the Kingly role and his ascription to Moses of a cosmic Kingship?⁵

The stress on the Kingly role was in accord with the thinking of Philo's own time. A dissertation on the nature and function of Kingship formed part of the literary output of almost every philosopher of the Hellenistic period.⁶ Presented in these dissertations was the concept that the ideal King should mirror the divine perfections and thereby be a light and a guide for all his subjects as well as a mediator between them and the divine. In his De Vita Moses, Philo follows the general pattern. Moses is portrayed as the embodiment of all the virtues,⁷ one, therefore, who fulfilled perfectly the role of the ideal King as envisioned in contemporary Hellenistic thought.⁸ He is presented by Philo to his gentile readers, moreover, as one in whom all their longings and expectations would find perfect realisation. As Erwin Goodenough states, "He (Moses) would be the ideal Sage of the Stoics, the 'divine man' of the Pythagoreans, the

⁴ Translated by Colson op.cit. Vol VI: 334 p. 449.

⁵ Ibidem 155 p. 357, "He gave into his hands the whole world as a portion well fitted for his heir".

⁶ Only fragments concerning 'Kingship' are extant but from these much can be surmised. See James M Reese Analecta Biblica 41 Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences Rome. Biblical Institute Press 1970 p. 73ff.

⁷ e.g. De Vita Moses I:25,26,48,50. (CW, VI).

⁸ See Letter of Aristeas 206.8. (ed. Charlesworth, Vol 2. p.26.).

'Saviour' of the Mysteries".⁹ In Philo's own view, sagacity is the equivalent of Kingship. Of Abraham he writes that those who saw his worthiness declared "thou art a King from God among us"¹⁰ (Genesis XXIII 6), and he explains "And thus they laid down the doctrine for the students of philosophy, that the Sage alone is a ruler and King, and virtue a rule and a Kingship whose authority is final".¹¹ Moses is presented as the Sage par excellence whom "God judged worthy to appear as a partner of his own possessions", giving "into his hands the whole world as a portion well fitted for his heir".¹² For this 'divine man' (theios aner) had entered "into the darkness where God was, that is into the unseen, invisible, incorporeal and archetypal essence of existing things".¹³

In Hellenistic Judaism Philo is not alone in linking Kingship with wisdom nor in ethicizing it. "If a man lives his life by the Law he shall reign over a Kingdom that is temperate and just and good and brave,"¹⁴ writes the author of the Fourth Book of Maccabees. "The desire for wisdom leads to a Kingdom",¹⁵ states the Book of Wisdom, and, in an ode dedicated to wisdom's saving power, affirms that it is the righteous who are guided by Wisdom and have the Kingdom manifested to them.¹⁶

The Book of Wisdom, a product, as was Philo, of the Egyptian Diaspora

⁹ An Introduction to Philo Judaeus op.cit. p. 33.

¹⁰ Abr. 261. (CW VI, p.127).

¹¹ Som. II. 244. (CW V, p.553).

¹² De Vita Moses I 155. (CW VI, p.357).

¹³ Ibidem 158.

¹⁴ 4 Maccab. 2:23. (ed. Charlesworth Vol 2, p.547).

¹⁵ 6:20.

¹⁶ 10:10.

and steeped likewise in Greek philosophical tradition, contains as might be expected and as we have already mentioned,¹⁷ many ideas, philosophical and religious, which are found in Philo's writings. A study of some of these ideas not only helps to delineate the concept of Kingdom and its relationship with Glory in Hellenised Judaism but it also helps shed light on the question why Philo in his life of Moses should choose to omit what, in fact, seems central to that life, namely the Revelation of the Glory on Mount Sinai.

Central, of course, to the Book of Wisdom is Wisdom itself, the creative, saving power, equivalent to Philo's powers and used by him also in that sense. Wisdom, he states, is 'the flinty rock' which God "cut off as the very first from his own powers".¹⁸ But since the powers are in turn equated by Philo with Glory,¹⁹ his equation must run: powers = Wisdom = Glory. Philo leaves us in no doubt that he is satisfied with his own equation. Wisdom, he explains, is "after the manner of light",²⁰ it is "God's archetypal luminary"²¹ of which the sun in its brightness is image and copy;²² it streams forth from God,²³ a "pure and undiluted radiance" not perceivable by the senses.²⁴ The Book of Wisdom reads like an echo, indicating a dependence of one author on the other or, at least, by both on a

¹⁷ Chapter 3, p.45.

¹⁸ Leg.All. II:86. (CW II, p.279).

¹⁹ See Chapter 1. p. 5.

²⁰ Migr.40. (CW IV, p.155).

²¹ Ibidem.

²² Ibidem.

²³ De Somniis II 222. (CW V, p.543).

²⁴ Opif.31. (CW I, p.25).

common source. There, Wisdom is "a breath of the power of God and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty",²⁵ "a reflection of eternal light",²⁶ "radiant and unfading",²⁷ "more beautiful than the sun",²⁸ she "excels every constellation of the stars, compared with the light she is found to be superior".²⁹

A major theme in the Book of Wisdom and one close to Philo's heart, is that of union with God by means of Divine Wisdom. This union is perceived by both the Sage and Philo to be man's goal on earth and his eternal destiny. By various ways and means, one of the most popular of which was the cult of Isis, goddess of wisdom, pagan mystics pursued the same goal.³⁰ Alert to the fact that these cults, not easily ignored by his fellow Jews, were also attractive to a number of them, the author of the Book of Wisdom set about to counter the challenge to Jewish faith.³¹ God, not Isis, is the source of Wisdom. Thus at the very outset of his work the Sage exhorts men to seek God: "Love righteousness, you rulers of the earth, think of the Lord with uprightness, and seek him with sincerity of heart".³²

²⁵ Wisdom 7:25.

²⁶ Ibid. 7:26.

²⁷ Ibid. 6:12.

²⁸ Ibid. 7:29.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ See E.R. Goodenough op.cit. p. 140f. Martin Hengel. Judaism and Hellenism op.cit. p. 155f; James M Reese. Analecta Biblica 41 op.cit. p. 46f.

³¹ See James M. Reese Analecta Biblica 41 op.cit. p.46ff where he compares the nature and powers of Wisdom with those of Isis and notes that the similarities indicate that the author of Wisdom "deliberately expressed his teaching on divine wisdom in language being employed in the praises of Isis".

³² Wisdom 1:1.

In exhorting men to 'seek' sincerely and with love of righteousness (here synonymous with Wisdom), the Sage expresses his awareness that the 'seeker' is also the sought, the 'finder' the one who is found. He writes of Wisdom: "she is easily discerned by those who love her and is found by those who seek her", for "she hastens to make herself known to those who desire her ... she goes about seeking those worthy of her and she graciously appears to them in their paths".³³ Like the Zoroastrian Khvarenah, Wisdom is not something to be seized; union with God is God's own gift.³⁴

It is God's own will that man, created by Him for this gift should be the recipient of it. Those, therefore, who do receive it, are those who surrender themselves to His will. 'Surrender' involves a constant metanoia, a growing in perfection; its witness is a lived response to the Covenant Law. "The beginning of Wisdom is the most sincere desire for instruction, and concern for instruction is love of her, and love of her is the keeping of her laws".³⁵ And so the desire for wisdom activates and initiates the Kingly role in preparation for the acquiring of the Kingdom.³⁶

The desire for Wisdom is, of course, the desire for God, for Wisdom and God are One; she is His Divine Presence, His saving Glory. When, therefore, the just man prays "send her forth from the holy heavens, and from the throne of thy glory send her, that she may be with me and toil and ... guide.

³³ Ibidem 6: 13,16. See also Philo: Congr. 122-123; Virt. 185.(CW, IV p.521; VIII p. 277).

³⁴ Wisdom 7:7; 8:21; 9:17.

³⁵ Wisdom 6:17-18. It is nevertheless clear, as Reese comments, that in the presentation of Wisdom as an intimate experience enjoyed by good folk, the author of the Book is saying that "long before the Law was given" men and women of integrity experienced this union. See Analecta Biblica 41 op.cit. p. 39.

³⁶ Wisdom 6:20.

me wisely in my actions",³⁷ he is asking that God may rule in and through him. That God rules, willy nilly, is axiomatic; it follows that those who are united with him also rule, theirs is the Kingdom. At the final judgement they "will shine forth, and will run like sparks in the stubble. They will govern nations and rule over peoples, and the Lord will reign over them forever".³⁸

Thus the opening address to "rulers of the earth"³⁹ is directed not to pagan Kings as is commonly supposed⁴⁰ but to Jews. Used here figuratively, the word 'ruler' denotes the potential to be realised by the Covenant people, the extraordinary prerogative that is theirs. Embedded within the exhortation to seek union with God through his Glory, the term is a reminder that the Kingdom and the glory are one. Later in the text,⁴¹ the author applies the word 'ruler' to himself by implication and the Kingship he (fictitiously) assumes is that of Solomon. "The Sage's literary identification with King Solomon in these 'autobiographical' passages" writes James Reese, "clarifies the metaphorical nature of his address to 'Kings'. He identifies himself with the patron saint of wisdom so that his

³⁷ Ibidem 9:10, 11b.

³⁸ Ibidem 3:7.

³⁹ Ibidem 1:1.

⁴⁰ See, for example, David Winston. The Wisdom of Solomon Anchor Bible Volume 43 Doubleday & Co Inc. 1979. p. 101; W. Watson, 'Wisdom'. A New Catholic Commentary Thomas Nelson & Sons London 1969. (Reprint). p.533. A different approach is taken by R.H. Charles who believes the reference is to the rulers of the Jewish community in Alexandria. See The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Oxford Clarendon Press 1913. Vol. I p. 535.

⁴¹ 7:1 - 9:18.

readers will take steps to become the true 'rulers of the earth' ".⁴² Those steps, albeit along the path of the Law which results in Kingship involve a personal experience so intense and deep, that in trying to describe it, both the author of Wisdom and Philo resort to sexual imagery.⁴³ The one who is 'wedded' to Divine Wisdom knows fulfilment; he has been made a friend of God and a prophet.⁴⁴

In Philo's view THE friend of God was Moses whose relationship with the Divine surpassed even that of the other patriarchs⁴⁵ who also had been empowered by and presenced with the Glory. Philo does not mention the Theophany or 'manifestation of God' because its signs, (clouds, smoke, thunder and fire) are only signs, the visible physical appearance. Since for Philo only the immaterial is real,⁴⁶ he is concerned not so much with what happened on the top of the mountain⁴⁷ as with what happened to Moses at the pinnacle of the mystical ascension. Befriended by God in an extraordinary way, Moses had perceived and known him with the eyes of the understanding.⁴⁸ He had not gained his knowledge of the First Cause from created things but had entered into the darkness where God was.⁴⁹ "The man that wishes to set his gaze upon the Supreme Essence" writes Philo, "will be

⁴² James Reese. The Book of Wisdom, Song of Songs. Michael Glazier Inc. Wilmington, Delaware 1983 p.73.

⁴³ Wisdom 8:2-3, 16. Philo: V. Contempl.68. Congr.5. (CW IX and CW IV).

⁴⁴ Wisdom 7:27; Philo: Qu.Gen.3:9. (tr. Marcus, Supplement I).

⁴⁵ Gig.54. (CW II).

⁴⁶ See chapter

⁴⁷ i.e. The physical appearance. Exodus 24:17.

⁴⁸ Post C. 48, 167, 169. (CW II).

⁴⁹ De Vita Moses I 155 See note 13.

blinded by the rays that beam forth all round him".⁵⁰ Moses had had a Vision of Reality, an experience that is at once one of darkness and of light; he had become a ruling partner with God.⁵¹ "Therefore each element obeyed him as its master".⁵²

The concept of Kingship as set forth by the Sage and Philo and epitomised in Philo's delineation of Moses' experience of God's friendship, has within it elements associated with and, indeed, belonging to the Theophany on Mount Sinai. In one sense, therefore, it may be said that Philo does not omit the Theophany at all but moves beyond the mention of the outward, material signs, and attempts instead to articulate their inner immaterial reality, their deeper significance. Philo intimates in effect, that the ruler of God's Kingdom through divine wisdom is himself an abode sanctified by gift, a Sinai presenced by the Glory. He is the sacred centre wherein God communicates with men and reveals his law. Indeed, the ideal King IS the law, for, writes Philo of Moses, "in himself and his life displayed for all to see, he has set before us, like some well-wrought picture, a piece of work beautiful and god-like, a model for those who are willing to copy it".⁵³ With him, "the Divine Spirit that leads along every right path abides".⁵⁴

The theophany on Mount Sinai was, above all, salvific in character; so too is the one in whom the glory abides. According to Philo, the one who

⁵⁰ Fug. 165. (CW V, p. 99).

⁵¹ De Vita Moses I 155 (CW VI p. 357).

⁵² Ibidem 156.

⁵³ Ibidem 158.

⁵⁴ Gig. 54. (CW II) Philo elsewhere identifies the Divine Spirit with the Glory. See Ch. 3. p. 46.

rules with God is "a healer of our race", a "genuine and true apothecary", a "dispeller of evils".⁵⁵ He is the Kingdom made manifest. Unlike Philo, the Book of Wisdom does not emphasise the salvific quality of the possessor of wisdom but dwells instead on the saving power of wisdom herself. Capable of doing and renewing all things,⁵⁶ Divine Wisdom "guards with her glory".⁵⁷ In chapter Ten, a lyrical address to her saving power in history, we read that Wisdom "gave to holy men the reward of their labours, guided them along a marvellous way, and became a shelter to them by day, and a starry flame through the night".⁵⁸ The reference to the pillar of cloud and of fire, that is, to the presence of the glory in the Exodus, is here obvious. The line echoes Psalm 104:39, "He spread a cloud for a covering and fire to give light by night". But the author of Wisdom does not refer only to the outward physical sign of the presence; he speaks explicitly of Wisdom (here synonymous with Glory) entering the soul of the just man,⁵⁹ whereby he is enabled to see the Kingdom of God. It must be mentioned that like Philo, he sees Wisdom as pervasive of all creation⁶⁰ but as indwelling the righteous in a very special way. In this as in some other respects, for example its

⁵⁵ Qu. Ex.III: 10. As noted in Ch. 2 of this thesis, Salvation is a complex concept in Judaism. The present quotes do not include Philo's idea of eternal salvation. The latter is more akin to pagan ideas than to those of normative Judaism. Philo envisages eternal salvation as the (spirit) leaving the flesh and returning to God, its Eternal source.

⁵⁶ 7:27.

⁵⁷ 9:11.

⁵⁸ 10:17. See also Philo: Heres. 203-4 where he refers to the cloud as "a weapon of shelter and salvation to its friends". He continues, "for on minds of rich soil that cloud sends in gentle showers the drops of wisdom". (CW IV, p.385).

⁵⁹ 10:16. See also note 58.

⁶⁰ 1:7; 8:1. Conf. 136. (CW IV, p. 83).

creative and salvific nature, the concept of Divine Wisdom bears comparison with that of the Zoroastrian Khvarenah.

As for the concept of Kingdom (Basileia), it is clear both in Philo's writings and in the Book of Wisdom that when it is linked or associated with the wisdom that comes from God's throne⁶¹ it has a mystical as well as an ethical connotation.⁶² The idea of the 'Kingdom of God' refers to men's lives being made holy here and now; the Kingdom or reign of God starts in this world. Only once does Philo speak of Kingdom as a future eventuality and this is in reference to Balaam's prophecy in the Book of Numbers.⁶³ However, eschatological references are plentiful in the Book of Wisdom.⁶⁴ The righteous man reigns now whatever hardships he may have to endure, but he will one day reign eternally and in perfect peace. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God"⁶⁵ and "in the time of their visitation they will shine forth". Then they will "rule over peoples, and the Lord will reign over them for ever".⁶⁶ Attention is not given by the author to describing this future Kingdom. As Reese remarks, "the author of the Book of Wisdom shows more interest in illustrating and justifying his eschatological beliefs than in describing the beatitude of the just in

⁶¹ 9:4.

⁶² Some scholars stress the ethical but omit the mystical. Michael Lattke, for example, writes of (Philo) "his conception of the Kingdom of God is thoroughly ethical: Basileia is for him a chapter from the doctrine of virtues. See 'Jewish Background of the Synoptic Concept' in The Kingdom of God ed. by Bruce Chilton SPCK. London 1984 p. 76. See also 'Basileia in Hellenistic Judaism', Karl Ludwig Schmidt TDNT op.cit Vol. I, p. 575.

⁶³ Vita Moses 1.290 (CW, VI) op. cit. p.427.

⁶⁴ See 1:1-6: 11 and 6:17-20.

⁶⁵ 3:1.

⁶⁶ 3: 7-8.

eschatological terms".⁶⁷ The Sage is more concerned that his readers experience the Kingdom of God now and hereafter than that they be given attempted descriptions of it.

It is clear that for both Philo and the author of Wisdom the term 'Kingdom of God' denotes primarily the 'rule of God'. This is also the primary meaning of the phrase in the Old Testament.⁶⁸ "They shall speak of the glory of thy Kingdom and tell of thy power, to make known to the Sons of men thy mighty deeds and the glorious splendour of thy Kingdom", runs Psalm 145, emphasising the timelessness of this reign: "Thy Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and thy dominion endures through all generations".⁶⁹ The acclamation "God is King"⁷⁰ is expression of the general biblical belief that God is dynamically present in human history and is gradually transforming it. The covenant made with Israel was deemed a vital part of the transformation process. Whether or not it can rightly be termed a

⁶⁷ Analecta Biblica 41 op.cit. p.110.

⁶⁸ The term 'Kingdom of God' is infrequently used in the Old Testament where it is found mostly in later books. Nevertheless the concept of God's Kingship, meaning his sovereignty and power, is deeply rooted therein. See Norman Perrin 'Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom'. The Kingdom of God ed. Bruce Chilton. op.cit. p.99. Also Martin Buber Kingship of God George Allen & Unwin Limited, London, 1967. p. 14ff. Not all scholars concur with this view. For a contrary opinion see A. Alt. Gedanken uber das Konigtum Jahives, Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Munchen 1953 p. 345. quoted by Rudolph Schnackenburg God's Rule and Kingdom Herder Freiburg 1963 p.11.

⁶⁹ Verses 11-13. Also: Exodus 15:18 "The Lord will reign for ever and ever" - most probably a cultic acclamation; 1 Sam 12:12. Psalm 93:1; 97:1; 99:1.

⁷⁰ Psalm 47 and other coronation psalms. Von Rad considers these "the least 'Israelite' poems" on the grounds that in them Israel's saving history, election, the covenant etc, fall into the backgrounds. See Old Testament Theology Part I op.cit. p. 363.

'Kingly covenant' as Martin Buber entitles it,⁷¹ the object of God's covenant with Israel was to enable a people to become holy: "you shall be to me a Kingdom of priests and a holy nation".⁷² Such a Kingdom would not be one wherein the Divine King could be seen. It was therefore inevitable that people would hope for and increasingly come to expect a full and final manifestation of God's Kingly glory. although the notions concerning the mode of this manifestation of glory were various.⁷³ In Biblical Tradition two main ideas emerge. In the first, God would himself reign as King; in the second, he would appoint a human ruler, a vicegerent through whom men would become submissive to the Divine Rule. The relationship of this second belief to the idea of a full manifestation of God's Kingly glory, is not quite clear. Although a salvific figure, occupying the throne of David, the Messiah will be only an instrument of salvation; God alone saves for he alone is the Saviour and the true King.

Isaiah, whose call to prophethood is set within a vision of God's Kingly Glory, expresses the belief in the manifestation of God's rule thus "Then the moon will be confounded and the sun ashamed; for the Lord of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem and before his elders he will manifest his glory".⁷⁴ Deutero-Isaiah likewise envisages the reign of God

⁷¹ Kingship of God op.cit. chapter 7. Von Rad is one who disagrees with Buber. See 'Basileia' TDNT Vol. I. p. 570.

⁷² Exodus 19:6.

⁷³ e.g.: different interpretations as to how, where and mode: (1) gradually (2) suddenly (3) temporarily (4) eternally, in a Kingdom that would be (a) earthly, (b) heavenly, (c) earthly and heavenly, (1) spiritual, (2) political, (1) for Israel, (2) for the world, etc. For the different interpretations see George Eldon Ladd. The Presence of the Future (First Edition Jesus and the Kingdom) Harper and Row New York 1964. Reprint 1980 SPCK London ch. 2-3 See also The Kingdom of God ed. Bruce Chilton op.cit. p. 77ff.

⁷⁴ Isaiah 24:23.

himself without any vicegerent. God will establish his rule with might⁷⁵ but it will be the might of gentleness and compassion for the Divine King is also the Divine Shepherd who will "gather the lambs in his arms, carry them in his bosom, and gently lead those that are with young".⁷⁶ He will guide the blind in paths that they have not known and turn the darkness before them into light.⁷⁷ Theirs will be the experience of redemptive light in a new Jerusalem where all nations will be united in a hymn of praise to the King whose glory is revealed. Then God's covenant will be fulfilled.

Although there is no conclusive proof that the attributing of royal titles to God pre-dates the establishment of the monarchy in Israel, the most recent research⁷⁸ on the Biblical idea of covenant strongly indicates a verbalised recognition of God as King of Israel long before the time of Saul; research is supportive, that is, of Buber's description of the covenant as 'Kingly'. The ark of the covenant is itself a symbol of God's rule. Whatever the various views concerning its origin,⁷⁹ the ark was undoubtedly considered as the place where Yahweh was enthroned;⁸⁰ upon the

⁷⁵ Isaiah 40:10,26.

⁷⁶ 40:11 For shepherd imagery see also Ps 79:13; Micah 5:4. The King was generally thought of as a shepherd i.e. protector (in the ancient Orient).

⁷⁷ 42:16.

⁷⁸ See Zobel 'aron' in TDNT., op.cit. Vol I p. 371.

⁷⁹ For a discussion of these see TDOT op.cit. Vol I p.368 ff. Also George Fohrer: History of Israelite Religion SPCK 1973 p. 108ff. (Originally published as Geshichte der Israelitischen Religion Walter de Gruyter & Co Berlin 1968.

⁸⁰ I.Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2. Ps. 80:2. See chapter 2. p.27 of this thesis, also Von Rad Old Testament of Theology Vol. I op.cit p.237; John McKenzie Dictionary of the Bible Geoffrey Chapman, London Reprint 1975 p.55. For a different opinion see Zobel in TDOT op.cit. Vol. I p. 371 and Georg Fohrer op.cit. p. 109.

cherubim was his Presence⁸¹ which in later tradition would one day be manifest on Mount Zion. An edited passage in Jeremiah, anticipating this manifestation (and possibly with certain knowledge of the disappearance of the ark) states "Then people shall no more say 'the ark of the covenant of the Lord' ... At that time Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall gather to it, to the Presence of the Lord in Jerusalem and they shall no more stubbornly follow their own evil heart".⁸² They will follow instead the dictates of a heart renewed, to be transformed according to Jeremiah,⁸³ by God himself. But before this time of transformation and revelation of Glory, and prior to the loss of the ark at the destruction of the Temple in 587 BC,⁸⁴ the 'aron' would remain as the site of God's invisible Presence, his empty throne.

The name 'aron' denoting 'container'⁸⁵ gives some indication of the complexity of the symbolism of this cult object. According to Deuteronomic and Priestly traditions, the tablets of the Law were placed inside what was termed 'aron berith Yhvh' (the ark of the covenant of Yahweh) and 'aron ha'edhuth' (the ark of the testimony) by each tradition respectively, thus

⁸¹ Exodus 25:23. Efros notes that in 1 Sam 4:21-22 the ark is called 'Glory'. See Ancient Jewish Philosophy op.cit. p.13.

⁸² 3:16. This passage is most probably a later, post-exilic, insertion. See E.W. Nicholson. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Jeremiah 1 - 25. 1973 p.47. and Guy P. Couturier 'Jeremiah' Jerome Biblical Commentary op.cit. p. 307.

⁸³ Jeremiah 31: 31 - 34.

⁸⁴ In 2 Maccab. 2:5 there is an unhistorical tradition that the ark was saved by Jeremiah but it seems impossible that it could have survived the destruction of the Temple.

⁸⁵ For etymology see Zobel TDOT Vol 1 op.cit. p.363ff.

denoting the simple but important fact that Law ⁸⁶ is an integral part of covenant. The Law (as well as the Covenant) is also closely associated with the Presence.

The Biblical concept of covenant(berith)⁸⁷ is to do with relationship and relationship demands a Presence. The Covenant refers to and essentially is, God taking the initiative in forging, but never forcing, a bond, a special union with a person or persons. The Sinaitic covenant, bound up with the manifestation of the Glory of Yahweh, has set within it the Law as the expression of the Divine Will which men are free to accept or reject. The promise of Exodus 19:6 'You shall be to me a Kingdom of priests and a holy nation' is prefaced by the conditional "if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant". According to verse 8 of the same composite chapter,⁸⁸ the condition was accepted by all the people in the words "All that the Lord has spoken we will do". Subsequent Biblical history records Israel's repeated infidelity⁸⁹ to the Covenant promises, her failure to submit to

⁸⁶ The Old Testament used many words for Law. The most favoured term and one having a complexity of meanings, e.g. instruction, witness, word of God, precept, revealed will - is Torah. It is translated nomos in the LXX possibly reflecting the emphasis placed on Law after the exile.

⁸⁷ Translated διαθήκη, 'testament' in LXX but a term of great complexity. See Weinfeld in TDOT Vol 2. op.cit. p.253-279.

⁸⁸ It is probable that verses 3b-8 did not originally belong to the Sinai narrative. Scholars are not agreed as to which source the section belongs. What is integral to the Sinai narrative is the experienced Presence. The overwhelming awefulness of this experience would have brought forth feelings of submission. Verses 3b-8 encapsulate an inner truth. "The simple manifestation of His Presence" writes D.McCarthy, "was enough to prove what he could do, to make clear that his will was absolute and not to be violated with impunity". Analecta Biblica 21 Treaty and Covenant. Rome Pontifical Institute 1963. p. 154. See also J. Hyatt. New Century Bible Commentary. Exodus William B Eerdmans Publ. Company Grand Rapids and Marshall Morgan & Scott Publishers Ltd London 1971. p. 200.

⁸⁹ e.g. Jeremiah 22:9; Hosea 2:4; Ezekiel 16: 15 - 43.

Yahweh's rule. Such infidelity is preventative of God's reign being effectively realised and his glory being 'seen'. This, at least, is the theological conviction expressed in some of the writings of later Judaism. In the Book of Jubilees,⁹⁰ for example, the special holiday of Sabbath on which the Law is kept is called the 'day of the holy Kingdom',⁹¹ for it is the day on which Israel acknowledges God's royal rule. For this author, the Kingdom itself will come gradually in accordance with men's spiritual growth and their pondering of the Law.⁹² The third book of the Sibylline oracles⁹³ similarly associates the Law and the Kingdom. It speaks of the eschatological age when "he will raise up a Kingdom for all ages among men, he who once gave the Holy Law to the pious".⁹⁴ The cry of all men then will be "come let us fall on the ground and entreat the immortal King, the great Eternal God. Let us send to the Temple, since he alone is sovereign and let us all ponder the Law of the Most High God".⁹⁵ Then all will have immortal light.⁹⁶

In Rabbinic understanding the Law has assumed enormous importance. The stuff of life, it is that which affects a man's whole being. "Is it possible for the rush to grow without mire and without water, or is it

⁹⁰ Dated some time before 100 BC and based on Exodus 24:18. Purportedly an account of what was revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai.

⁹¹ 50:9.

⁹² 1:29; 4:26; 23: 26 - 25.

⁹³ Most probably 1st century BC.

⁹⁴ Verse 765.

⁹⁵ Ibidem 715.

⁹⁶ Ibidem 785. This verse is reminiscent of Isaiah 60:1 "Arise, shine, for your light has come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon you".

possible for the reed-grass to exist without water? So also is it impossible for Israel to exist unless they busy themselves with the words of the Torah".⁹⁷ The stress here is on Israel as a nation; elsewhere it is also (and mainly) on the individual. Application to Torah affects the individual in the next life as well as in this present one: "whoever makes use of the light of the Torah, the light of Torah will revive (after death) and whoever does not make use of the light of Torah, the light of Torah will not revive".⁹⁸

Written in fire,⁹⁹ and 'presenced', the Torah is understood by the Rabbis to be God's unique gift to Israel.¹⁰⁰ On each Israelite, therefore, rests the responsibility of accepting and observing this 'gift' and transmitting it to the next generation: "whoever teaches his son Torah, Scripture imputes it to him as though he had received it from Mount Horeb".¹⁰¹ Since "Moses is Israel and Israel is Moses",¹⁰² each Jew is asked in a way, to identify with Moses and to undergo the Mount Sinai experience of the glory. Whenever a Jew gathers with others, for example

⁹⁷ Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael Exodus 17: 8 - 13 Tractate Amalek Ed. J.Z. Lauterbach Vol II p. 135.

⁹⁸ Keth 111b. See also Taan 7a. "They who are ignorant of Torah will not live again". Both these are quoted by A. Cohen in Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p. 383.

⁹⁹ Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael Exodus 19:18 "Because the Lord came down upon it in fire. This tells us that the Torah is fire ... " Textual sources (J) (ed. Alexander) p.63.

¹⁰⁰ Ber. 5a in Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p. 69. In the opinion of the Rabbi, this gift was to Israel as the medium through which all nations would receive it. See Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p. 66f.

¹⁰¹ Ber. 21b. in Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p. 183.

¹⁰² Numbers Rabba. Num. 21/21 Par. 19, 28 (Ed. Wilna 82c).

for the purpose of the Torah, the Glory is present.¹⁰³ A rabbinic legend concerning a gathering of great persons for the circumcision of one named 'Abuya at Jerusalem, describes what happened when two of the Rabbis¹⁰⁴ present drew apart to ponder the Torah: 'A fire descended from heaven and surrounded them. 'Abuya said to them: 'My Masters, did you come to set fire to my house?' They replied, 'God forbid. But we were sitting and making a necklace with the words of the Torah ... and the words became joyous as they had when they were given on Sinai and the flames were licking as they were licking on Sinai'.¹⁰⁵

When a Jew reveres the words of Torah and incarnates them in his life, he is understood by the Rabbis to be one who recognises God's divine Kingship and submits to his rule, that is, he is recognised as one who freely takes on himself "the yoke of the Kingdom". According to Sifre Deuteronomy this was the purport of the Torah: "what message did the Torah bring to Israel? Take upon yourselves the yoke of the Kingdom of heaven,¹⁰⁶ vie one with the other in the fear of God and practise loving deeds towards one another".¹⁰⁷ By doing this, believe the Rabbis, the Kingdom of God, that is, his reign, will be effectively realised.

In Rabbinic belief the whole law is embodied in the prayer known as the

¹⁰³ Sanh. 39a. Ber 6a. Epstein (ed.) Seder Nezekim III; Seder Zeraim.

¹⁰⁴ Rabbi 'Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshu'a.

¹⁰⁵ P.T. Hagigah 2,77.b. Epstein (ed.) Seder Mo'ed Vol. IV.

¹⁰⁶ The term 'Kingdom of heaven' is used by the rabbis in order to avoid using the divine name. As Kuhn notes, it is an abstract construction for 'God is King'. See 'Basileus'. TDNT op. cit. Vol. I p. 571.

¹⁰⁷ Sifre Deut. 323; 138b. A. Cohen Everyman's Talmud op cit. p.226.

Shema¹⁰⁸ which is taken as Israel's confession of faith. To recite the Shema is not simply to acknowledge faith in the One God and his Law; it is to submit to the yoke of the Kingdom. The Talmudic account of the death of Rabbi Akiba is a prime example of belief in submission by recitation: "When he was taken out for execution, it was the hour for the recital of the Shema, and while they combed his flesh with iron combs he was accepting upon himself the Kingship of heaven".¹⁰⁹ A further example is the question put by Rabbi Joshua Qorha and his own response concerning the order of sections of the Shema: "Why does the section 'Hear, O Israel (Deut 6:4ff) precede 'it shall come to pass?' (Dent 11:13ff). So that a man may first take upon himself the Kingdom of heaven, and afterwards take upon himself the yoke of the commandments".¹¹⁰

There is no doubt of the importance of the concepts of God's Kingship and Kingdom in rabbinic thought, however diversely thoughts about them might be expressed. One expression voices the hope that God will soon be seen to rule, that is, his glory will soon be manifest: "Be King over us, thou alone".¹¹¹ Concerning the blessings, the saying is attributed to Rabbi Johanan "A blessing which does not invoke God's Kingship is no real blessing".¹¹² Many (but by no means all) of the blessings do invoke God's

¹⁰⁸ composed of Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41

¹⁰⁹ Ber. 61b. Epstein (ed.) Seder Zeraim.

¹¹⁰ Ber. 2:2. Epstein (ed.) Seder Zeraim.

¹¹¹ Eleventh petition of the 'Eighteen Benedictions' (Amida). These benedictions are of ancient origin. See K G Kuhn. Achtzchngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim 1950 p.10ff. Similarities with them are to be found in Ecclesiasticus 36:1f where in verse 14 we read "Fill Zion with the celebration of thy wondrous deeds, and thy temple with thy glory". See Eli Davis, 'Benedictions' Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol. 4. p. 483.

¹¹² Ber. 40b. A Cohen Everyman's Talmud op. cit. p.67.

Kingship,¹¹³ so do a number of the more important prayers. The ten central verses of the Musaf¹¹⁴ prayer for Rosh Ha Shana, for example, all proclaim the Kingship of God and anticipate the manifestation of his glory on earth: "Thou, Yahweh, our God, reign as King, with speed, over all thy works in Jerusalem, thy city, and on the mount of Sion, the dwelling place of thy glory".¹¹⁵ This prayer, known as Malkhuyyot and made obligatory by the Rabbis was originally preceded by the Aleinu Le-Shabbe'ah¹¹⁶ the main theme of which is the Kingdom of God. Now the concluding prayer of statutory services, the Aleinu praises God for his choice of Israel but looks forward to a time when men everywhere will accept the yoke of the Kingdom and be united eternally in worshipping God. Like the Malkhuyyot, the Aleinu begs haste: "and do thou reign over them speedily and forever for the Kingship is thine and forever wilt thou reign in glory".¹¹⁷ The import of this prayer is, of course, that God who reigns, willy nilly, will be seen to reign. Thus the term 'Kingdom of heaven' in rabbinical literature is applied in two different ways,¹¹⁸ (a) to a present, when an individual

¹¹³ A blessing which initiates a prayer begins "our God, King of the Universe" and occurs in two of the three types of blessings. See Eli Davis 'Benedictions' op.cit. p. 486.

¹¹⁴ Usually recited after reading of the Torah, it is an additional act of worship on Sabbaths or feasts.

¹¹⁵ Cited by R. Schnackenburg op.cit. p. 44.

¹¹⁶ "It is our duty to praise the Lord of all things". Attributed to Rav (3rd century), the prayer is considered to be much older. See Eli Davis, 'Aleinu Le-Shabbe'ah. Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol. 2 p. 558.

¹¹⁷ Translation taken from John Pairman Brown 'Kingdom of God' Encyclopedia of Religions ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 8. p. 306.

¹¹⁸ In the two different expressions: (1) 'to accept the yoke of the Kingdom of God' and (2) 'the manifestation of the Kingdom of God (heaven)'. In Kuhn's words the Kingdom of heaven is "one of the few, if not the only strict and pure concept in later Judaism ... and is

chooses freely to accept God's rule and (b) to the eschaton when all men are united in obeying God's rule. In both, the Glory is specially present but only in the second is it fully manifested. The relationship, then, between this rabbinic construct for 'God is King' and the construct Shekhina for 'God is present' is intimate indeed..

In medieval Jewish mysticism and specifically in Kabbalistic literature, the Shekhina (here also divine immanence or glory) is identified with the Kingdom (Malkuth). The tenth and last emanation of the Sefiroth, Malkuth can be and is considered from a multitude of view points, hence the symbols describing it are many and diverse. One symbol, however, which serves to delineate the whole Sefirothic world is particularly apposite for our purpose. It is the Menorah¹¹⁹ or seven-branched candlestick which, although differentiated (branches, cups etc) is One united whole. From the beginning of Kabbalah, the Menorah has been used to symbolise the undivided unity of the Sefiroth of which numbers four to ten inclusive are represented by the seven branches. The oil which lights the menorah symbolises the creative, dynamic radiance issuing from the Ein-Sof. Some Kabbalists have highlighted the importance of the central branch. This 'middle-line' as it is called, denotes the mediatory Sefirah, that is, the one through which the abundance of God's radiant energy flows and is transferred to the other Sefiroth. The name of this central Sefirah is Tiferet,¹²⁰ translated in this instance as 'glory' but in other Sefirothic systems as 'God's Beauty' (or rahamim 'mercy').

purely eschatological." Se TDNT op.cit. Vol I p. 574.

¹¹⁹ For diagram and description See Roger Cook The Tree of Life Symbol of the Centre Thames and Hudson, London. 1974. p.120.

¹²⁰ Synonym for Glory, but usually translated Beauty. See Effraim Gottlieb 'Menorah' Encyclopedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. II p. 1367.

Details concerning the symbolic meaning of the menorah are not given in the Zohar. Here, as in Kabbalistic literature generally the tenth and final Sefirah is the receptive vessel into which all the radiations pour. Representative therefore in the Divine World, of the feminine principle and known also as the 'Queen' of the 'Divine King', Malkuth (Shekhina/Kingdom) is divine Glory made immanent. But the Glory emanating from the Ein-Sof is that through which the cosmos came into being and through which it is sustained. Malkuth, therefore, as the immediate cause of creation and the loving carer of it, is known also as the 'lower mother',¹²¹ the one who enables her children to perceive the Divine King. "Had the brightness of the glory of the Holy One, blessed be his name, not been shed over the whole of his creation, how could he have been perceived even by the wise? He would have remained (totally) unapprehendable, and the words, 'The whole earth is full of his glory' (Isaiah 6:3) could never be spoken with truth .¹²²

Through the undivided unity of the Sefiroth, God governs the world. Malkuth, the final Sefirah in the hierarchy of God's government, brings the ruling power of God to and makes it present in creation; Malkuth is the Kingdom, the power and the Glory. But because Israel did not submit to God's rule the unity which originally existed between Creator and cosmos was destroyed. Man's sin, that is, has disturbed the original harmony between the Ein-Sof and the Shekhina, thus preventing a continuous and clear manifestation of Glory. Metaphysically the Shekhina (Queen) has been exiled from her husband the King and appears but sporadically. However, there will

¹²¹ Leo Schaya The Universal Meaning of the Kabbalah London. George Allen and Unwin Ltd 1971. p. 58.

¹²² Ibidem p. 28.

come a time, says the Zohar, when "the Holy One, blessed be he, will restore the Shekhina to her place, so that all things shall be joined together in a single union, as it is written: 'In that day shall the Lord be one and his Name One' (Zech 14:9)"¹²³ Anticipating a question, the text continues "It may be said: Is he not One now? No, for the sinners of the world have brought it about that he is not one. For the Matrona (Shekhina/Malkuth) is removed from the King and they are no longer united". Their reunion is the goal of existence.¹²⁴

Men, individually and communally, achieve this goal of divine unity through adherence to the Torah and by mystical communion with God: For he who concentrates his mind on the Torah and penetrates into its inner mysteries sustains the world",¹²⁵ states the Zohar. Because of God's election of Israel and her covenant promise, concentration on Torah and penetration of its mystery is Israel's special prerogative and responsibility. On Mount Sinai she had been drawn into the maelstrom of God's loving, awful Presence: she had experienced union, and in that experience had seen prefigured the restoration of the Divine Unity, the manifestation of the Kingdom of God. "When God gave the Torah to the Israelites, he opened the seven heavens to them and they saw that nothing was really there but his glory (or presence); he opened the seven worlds (or earths) to them and they saw nothing there but his glory; he opened the seven abysses (or hells) before their eyes and they saw there was nothing

¹²³ Zohar Aharei Mot III 77b. Textual Sources (J) (ed. Alexander) op. cit. p. 130.

¹²⁴ Tikkun Zohar, Terumah II 155a. Textual Sources (J) (ed. Alexander) op. cit. p. 129.

¹²⁵ II, 61a. Quoted by Isidore Epstein Judaism. An Historical Presentation Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1977 (Reprint) p. 24.

there but his glory".¹²⁶

It is important to stress the 'experiential' in Israel's reception of the Torah and in her seeing "nothing there but the Glory". In Kabbalistic teaching there is agreement that God in his Absolute Essence cannot be known; he is not an object of intellection. But if God in his Essence cannot be known, God in his activity can. Creation, result and realm of his activity mirrors in all its aspects the reality of the One who is without multiplicity. Leo Schaya expresses this Kabbalistic belief thus "In reality God the absolute One, has no 'parts' but an infinity of possibilities, of which only the creatural possibilities have the illusory appearance of separate forms; in themselves these forms are integrated as eternal archetypes, in the all-possibility of the One".¹²⁷ Man, therefore, must look beyond the various aspects of creation to the undivided Unity of which they are the expression. He must 'see' beyond appearance to Reality. This 'seeing' is by means of the 'eye of the heart';¹²⁸ it is through love of God that man attains the vision of the One and knows "nothing but the Glory". "Love" teaches the Zohar, "unites the highest and lowest stages and lifts everything to the stage where all must be One".¹²⁹

The longing of the mystic to be 'lifted to the stage of Oneness' is epitomised in the way of life of the German Kabbalists known as Hasidists whose first representative was Judah ha Hasid (d.1217). Aware that love of

¹²⁶ Moses de Leon. Sefer Harimmon. Quoted by Leo Schaya op.cit. p. 166.

¹²⁷ op.cit. p. 64.

¹²⁸ The 'inner eye', the means of man 'seeing' God, is frequently used by mystical writers. See Michel Meslin 'eye'. Encyclopedia of Religion. ed. Eliade op.cit. Vol. 5. p. 236ff.

¹²⁹ Zohar III 288a. Quoted by Geoffrey Parrinder. Mysticism in the World's Religions Sheldon Press London 1976 p. 117.

God is inclusive of love of man, the members of this medieval German School aimed to incarnate in every way possible their love of God so as to fulfil God's will and bring about his Kingdom. As a means to this end they constantly reflected on God's presence¹³⁰ which they believed to be everywhere, in everything, and most specifically in individuals. Thus by a life of contemplation, altruism and self-abnegation they hoped to attain their mystic goal. Their specific aim was the vision of the Divine Glory.

Utterly opposed to any anthropomorphic descriptions of God, the Hasidim believed (like Saadia Gaon¹³¹ by whom their thinking was profoundly affected) that Biblical descriptions in which human or other form is attributed to God, have in fact the Divine Glory (or Shekhina) as their subject. Not all Hasidim, however, were agreed concerning the exact nature of the Divine Glory. Most were of the opinion that it was created by God out of his own Divine Light.¹³² The stream and expression of His Love, it is that which God chooses to reveal of himself. It is also the source of spiritual sustenance. In this sense it bears some comparison with Zoroastrian Khvarenah.

The yearning of these medieval Jewish mystics (and of subsequent Hasidim),¹³³ to 'see' the Divine Glory finds powerful expression in some of

¹³⁰ i.e. The Godhead not the Glory which, in Hasidist theology, dwelt in heaven. See Joseph Dan 'Hasidei Ashkenaz' Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 7. p.1379.

¹³¹ See chapter 3, p.51.

¹³² Isidore Epstein op. cit. p. 230 who writes as though all the Hasidim are of the opinion the Kavodh is created. Joseph Dan treats of the differences between Hasidim and Saadia Gaon concerning their ideas of the Glory. For Saadia Gaon the Glory is a created angel. See 'Hasidei Ashkenaz' Encyc. Judaica Vol.7 op.cit. p.1379.

¹³³ Hasidim ('pious') number many diverse groups before and after the Ashkenazi. Rabbinic literature uses the term to describe those who adhere to very high moral/religious standards. The Hasidim

their hymns. The following few stanzas are taken from one - 'The Hymn of Glory' which today is an integral part of the Synagogue Liturgy:¹³⁴

How doth my soul within me yearn
Beneath thy shadow to return
Thy secret mysteries to learn.

Thy glory shall my discourse be
In images I picture Thee,
Although myself I cannot see.

In mystic utterances alone
By prophet and by seer made known,
Hast thou Thy radiant glory shown.

My meditation day and night,
May it be pleasant in Thy sight,
For thou art all my soul's delight.¹³⁵

But what does such 'yearning' say of man himself? The Kabbalists (and others) would assert that the yearning is natural and points to the fact that man is spiritual in essence;¹³⁶ he comes from the One and will return to the One. Made in the "likeness of the Upper Glory which completes and blesses the lower Glory",¹³⁷ his role on earth is to co-operate in the perfecting of the whole cosmos¹³⁸ so that the Glory/Kingdom may be fully

had a great upsurge or revival in the eighteenth century and still number many followers. See Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 7 articles: Hasidei, Hasidim, etc.

¹³⁴ Concludes the Morning Service.

¹³⁵ Alice Lucas. The Jewish Year. London 1898 p.111. Quoted also by Isidore Epstein op.cit. p. 231.

¹³⁶ Composed of the Sefiroth - Glory. See G. Scholem Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 10. p. 607.

¹³⁷ Tiqqun, Zohar. Terumah II, 155a. in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Alexander) op. cit. p. 129.

¹³⁸ Zohar, Lekh 183b: "when both the dark and the white light have been fully kindled, the white light in its turn becomes a throne for a hidden light, for what it is that reposes on that white light can neither be seen nor known. Thus the light is fully formed. And so it is with the man who attains complete perfection ... We find, too, that

revealed.

An understanding of the Concept of glory is necessarily bound to an understanding of the nature of man. What that understanding is in the religious traditions under review will be discussed in the following chapters.

there is an analogous process in the process in the upper world".
In Textual Sources (J). (ed. Alexander) op. cit. p.131.

Chapter Nine

Self-knowledge, the most relevant and important of all knowledge, is the most difficult to acquire. For the subject to become the object of his own enquiry demands an extraordinary gymnastic feat, yet it is a feat attempted by men of all sorts of religious persuasions and none. I use the word 'gymnastic' advisedly, since it stems from the Greek γυμνός meaning 'naked' and indicates the self-stripping required for self-knowledge. As a synonym for 'self-stripping' some would supply the term metanoia¹ which, as an on-going, never ending process is illustrative of man's difficulty in baring himself to himself. He finds ever new apparel.

Some there are, of course, who broach the subject of 'self-knowledge' from a different angle, their focus is less on the self than on other selves. Instead of questions such as 'who am I'? or 'what am I?', they ask 'what is human nature'? 'what is man'? 'what is self-hood'? or even 'is there a self'?² Their purpose might be primarily philosophical and/or scientific enquiry but it cannot exclude the personal. Scientists or philosophers enquiring about 'man' are enquiring, after all, about themselves.

Biblical literature makes many enquiries about the self and from different perspectives. Its conclusions, particularly those concerning man's psychological make-up, are not of a piece. Van Rad bluntly asserts, "There is absolutely no unity in the ideas of the Old Testament about the

¹ In LXX e.g. Proverbs 14:15, Wisdom 11:23, 12:10 (and in New Testament) meaning repentance.

² Not posed by those Buddhists whose basic premise is that there is no self. (Doctrine of anatta).

nature of man"³ and ascribes the lack of unity to the "diverse periods and circles" from which the source material comes. The sheer difficulty of the subject is exemplified by the diversity of ideas about it, and by its remaining a question from age to age.

Whatever the source of Psalm 8⁴ (impossible to date but traditionally attributed to David) and Psalm 144⁵ (likewise attributed to David but post-exilic in language and style) each posits the question "what is man?" and gives a conclusion which does not seem to tally with the other. The conclusion of the first (Psalm 8) is that man, though insignificant when measured against the totality of God's creation, is nevertheless its crowning glory, ordained by God to be King⁶ over it

"Yet thou hast made him little less than God,
and dost crown him with glory and honour,
Thou hast given him dominion over the works of thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under his feet"⁷

The second psalm (144) likewise ponders the insignificance of man and voices his neediness. Incomparably 'less than God', man in this psalm is depicted not as crowned with honour but as caught up with all things else. Like all creation he is transitory, his nature ephemeral, "Man is like a

³ Old Testament Theology Vol I op.cit. pp. 152-3.

⁴ Hymn of Praise. Its theme of creation causes some scholars to link this psalm with the Feast of Tabernacles and to suggest that it presupposes the creation account in Genesis I. See A.A. Anderson. The New Century Bible Commentary. The Book of Psalms. Vol. I Marshall, Morgan and Scott. London 1972. p. 100.

⁵ This too could have had Tabernacles as its cultic setting. Gunkel and others assign it to a late pre-exilic period. Anderson suggests it is post-exilic. See A.A. Anderson op.cit. Vol. II p.931.

⁶ The psalm speaks of the majesty of God (verses 1,9) whose glory and majesty is reflected in man and his role. The phrase 'son of man' in verse 4 is considered by A. Bentzen to refer to the first man who was also first King (and man generally). See King and Messiah. London, 1955. p. 42.

⁷ Verses 5 - 6. See also Genesis 1:26 ff and Sir. 17:1 ff.

breath, his days are like a passing shadow".⁸ His need, above all, is for the experience of God's presence, a manifestation of his glory. "Bow thy heavens, O Lord, and come down! Touch the mountains that they smoke".⁹ Psalm 8 in contrast displays the consciousness that God is not far off but very near. Perhaps, therefore, these two psalms are not so much drawing opposing conclusions about man's nature as together reflecting it more faithfully. They are expressive of man's changes of mood and of his experience now of divine presence and now of divine absence.¹⁰

However different the moods reflected in the psalms and elsewhere and however diverse the notions about the nature of man, there are in the Old Testament certain basic concepts concerning human make-up. Man is not a dichotomy but an animated body, a spiritual being. That which denotes his vitality, power and personhood is his nefesh¹¹ usually (though inadequately) translated as 'soul'. This, the most important concept, does not reflect Platonic¹² or Aristotelian¹³ notions of soul nor that of scholasticism.¹⁴ Nor is it possible to contain its meaning in one English word. Briefly,

⁸ Verse 4. See also Psalm 102:11; Wisdom 2:5.

⁹ Verse 5. Compare this request for a theophany with Psalm 18 and its jubilation in theophany (verses 9 - 14)

¹⁰ In Efros' opinion each of these psalms gives a different answer. They are the two answers found in the Hagiographa viz. Glory and Holiness. See Ancient Jewish Philosophy op.cit. p. 24.

¹¹ נֶפֶשׁ, that which breathes, is alive.

¹² Wherein soul is equated with man, a spiritual principle really quite separate and distinct from the body.

¹³ Wherein the soul is the form joined to the material body.

¹⁴ For whom the soul is 'a subsistent spiritual form'. See J. McKenzie Dictionary of the Bible op.cit. p. 836.

Nefesh¹⁵ is the seat of the emotions,¹⁶ partakes of experiences with the basar (flesh),¹⁷ knows¹⁸ and thinks¹⁹ and is the self.²⁰ Various definitions have been attempted. Samuel Cohon calls nefesh "the living, self conscious soul",²¹ for Edmund Jacob it is "a psycho-physical totality"²² and John McKenzie considers that "perhaps the ego of modern psychology comes closer to a parallel with nefesh than any other word".²³ Sometimes it is synonymous with ruah (spirit) which likewise empowers²⁴ and animates²⁵ and is associated with disposition²⁶ and mental activity.²⁷ Ruah in turn is often equated with Neshama, the breath which, when breathed into man by God, caused him to become a living being.²⁸ According to Proverbs 20:27, man's neshama "is the lamp of the Lord searching all his innermost

¹⁵ The Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament tr. E. Robinson. Ed. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Oxford 1907 p.659 defines nefesh as 'soul, living being, life, self, person, desire, appetite, emotion and passion'.

¹⁶ Deut: 12:20, 14:26, 2 Sam 3:21. Psalm 131:2. Genesis 42:21.

¹⁷ e.g. Job 14:22. Exodus 21:23.

¹⁸ e.g. Psalm 139:14, Pr. 19:4.

¹⁹ e.g. Pr. 23:7.

²⁰ e.g. Genesis 49:6, Job 9:21. Psalm 25:13.

²¹ Jewish Philosophy op.cit. p. 353.

²² Theology of the Old Testament. Hodder and Stoughton, London 1958 p. 157.

²³ Dictionary of the Bible op.cit. p. 836.

²⁴ Jeremiah 51:11, Haggai 1:14.

²⁵ Genesis 6:17, 7:15, 22. Ezekiel 37:5; Wisdom 15:11, 16:14.

²⁶ Exodus 6:9; Pr. 14:29; Isaiah 26:9; 1 Kings 10:5.

²⁷ Ezekiel 20:32; Isaiah 29:24.

²⁸ Genesis 2:7.

parts", that is, it is his conscience.

Another concept closely associated with nefesh and therefore with ruah and neshama is that of leb (heart) which, unlike its three associates, is not used also for other animals but is exclusive²⁹ to man. In Biblical thought the heart is not only the seat of emotional activity and experience but also of mind and will; it too is the focus of intelligence. "Take heed lest there be a base thought in your heart",³⁰ warns the Deuteronomic writer. "Wisdom" states Proverbs 14:33, "abides in the heart (leb) of a man of understanding" and that which Solomon, the epitome of human wisdom, receives from Yahweh, is the gift of 'a wise and discerning heart (leb)'.³¹ The heart in fact, is representative of man's entire inner life and therefore often interchangeable with 'spirit' and 'soul'.

Although in Biblical thought man is not a dichotomy of matter and spirit but nefesh hayyah,³² a living person, a whole, there is nevertheless stress on his inner reality as against his outward appearance and on the fact that his totality is known only to God. "Man looks on the outward appearance but the Lord looks on the heart".³³ These words addressed to Samuel speak not only of man's imperfect vision and God's omniscience but also of the value and importance of the inner man. As we have seen in an earlier chapter,³⁴ one meaning of the Hebrew term Kavodh (Glory) is that

²⁹ With rare exceptions. In 2 Sam 17:10 the term 'heart of a lion' is used as a symbol of courage. There is also the expression in Genesis 8:21, "The Lord said in his heart".

³⁰ Deut. 15:9.

³¹ 1 Kings 3:12.

³² Genesis 2:7. 'living person'.

³³ 1 Sam. 16:7.

³⁴ See p.18.

which gives weight, i.e. denotes importance. Kavodh, therefore, is used sometimes to denote that which is of utmost importance, i.e. the inner-life, self or soul. Von Rad comments on this usage and meaning of the word in Isaiah.³⁵ Of one verse in particular he writes, "In Is. 17:4 Kavodh is an expression for the secret inner might which alone constitutes personified Israel, and in this passage it is linked with the anthropological term 'flesh'. In the same way the Hebrew can speak of the Kavodh of, e.g. a forest, not in description of its aesthetic or material value, nor as a botanical term but in definition of its nature." "Hence", adds Von Rad, "we need not be surprised that Kavodh is used of men as a synonym for nephesh or hayyim".³⁶

It is in the psalms that Kavodh as a synonym for nefesh is most apparent. "Therefore my heart is glad and my soul (Kavodh) rejoices; my body also dwells secure" proclaims psalm 16:9. "That my soul (Kavodh) may praise thee and not be silent", is the desire and hope expressed in psalm 30:12, and in psalm 57:8 the poet soliloquises "Awake my soul (Kavodh)! Awake, O harp and lyre! I will awake the dawn!"³⁷ In all these instances the use of Kavodh is not in mistake for Kebed³⁸ (liver), nor is it merely a poetic term;³⁹ it is saying something of the nature of man as understood by the Biblical writers. The human nefesh, explains Efros, is regarded by them

³⁵ 'doxa' TDNT Vol. II p. 238. (Isaiah 16:14; 21:16; 35:2; 60:13; 10:18).

³⁶ Ibidem.

³⁷ See also psalms 7:6 and 108:2. Note also Genesis 49:6 "O my soul, come not into their council, O my spirit (glory) be not joined to their company." Here, strangely enough, the LXX translates this as 'liver'. See note 14 ch. 2.

³⁸ See ch. 2. p. 17.

³⁹ See A.A. Anderson The New Century Bible Commentary. Psalm 1-72. op. cit. Vol. I. p. 428.

"as a divine manifestation and is called glory".⁴⁰ Samuel Cohon puts it another way: "Divinity is wrought into the very texture of his (man's) being".⁴¹

In the Biblical accounts of man's origin⁴² emphasis is placed not simply on man's relationship with the rest of creation but especially on the uniqueness of his relationship with God. For the Yahwist writer, man is formed from the created dust but he alone is animated by God's divine breath/life.⁴³ The Priestly author declares that man is made in the image and likeness of God. It is a likeness not reserved to the first man and woman but transmitted to all generations; it is the essence of man: "When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them and named them man when they were created. When Adam had lived a hundred and thirty years, he became the father of a son in his own likeness, after his own image".⁴⁴

The Priestly writer is content to make his statement that man is created in God's image and likeness and leave it at that. Biblical scholars, not content with the bare statement, have put forth various hypotheses concerning the precise nature of the likeness. Ludwig Koehler, for example, suggests that it consists in man's upright posture which differentiates him from brute creation and symbolises his power over

⁴⁰ Ancient Jewish Philosophy op.cit. p. 23.

⁴¹ Jewish Theology op.cit. p. 293.

⁴² Genesis 1:27, 2:7.

⁴³ Genesis 2:7.

⁴⁴ Genesis 5: 1b - 3.

creation generally.⁴⁵ For C. Ryder Smith, 'image' (tzelem) literally 'something cut out', denotes 'form' and applies in this instance to man's visible form or shape, as also does likeness (demuth).⁴⁶ W. Eichrodt holds the view that the likeness rests in man's spiritual superiority especially in "his capacity for self-consciousness and self-determination; in short, in those capacities which we are accustomed to regard as typical of personality".⁴⁷

In what then does the likeness precisely consist? Since the Bible views man as a totality, the likeness must refer to that totality and the Hebrew word most descriptive of it is nefesh, synonymous at times with Kavodh, which also defines nature. There are, however, many aspects to human make-up, some manifest and some hidden. Sometimes the former may reflect the latter, sometimes not. Man's actions, for example, are not always consonant with his words, nor do his thoughts and feelings always tally with his demeanour and outward expression. The appearance belies the reality; Man is not in harmony with himself.

The Biblical writer attributes man's present condition to the Fall,⁴⁸

⁴⁵ 'Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei Lehre Genesis 1:26' in Theologische Zeitschrift Jan-Feb 1948 p.16ff. Old Testament Theology, translated by A.S. Todd. Philadelphia Westminster Press. 1957.

⁴⁶ The Bible Doctrine of Man. The Epworth Press (Frank H. Cumbers). London 1951. p. 30. Commenting on Deut. 4:12. "The children of Israel saw no form (temunah)", Ryder Smith writes, "This need not imply that there was no 'form' to see, for a temunah is ascribed to God (Ps. 17:15)". Ryder Smith takes the words 'let us make man in our own image ...' (my underlining) to imply that God, men and angels were all thought of by the Hebrews as having the same kind of form.

⁴⁷ Theology of the Old Testament S.C.M. Press Ltd London 1967 Volume II XVI, 1 IIc. Quoted also by David Cairns The Image of God in Man Fontana Library of Theology and Philosophy. 1973 p. 29.

⁴⁸ Genesis 3. In Edmund Jacob's view, man's sin was 'to abandon the role of image and bid for equality with God. See Theology of the Old Testament. Hodder and Stoughton, London 1958 p.171.

prior to which he is portrayed as being at harmony with God, creation and with himself.⁴⁹ Man's sin of disobedience thus inaugurates a state of lost personal integrity and wholeness and of disrupted relationships. It does not, however, cause him to lose his divine likeness. That this is so is confirmed by Yahweh's warning to Noah and family after the flood: "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for God made man in his own image".⁵⁰ It is as though man now needs to be reminded of his divine likeness which is no longer clearly apparent or expressed; disharmony is preventative of clear vision, it obscures reality. Sin defaces God's image but does not efface it.

It is obvious that an image has a representative function. If man is made in the image of God, he is intended, therefore, to represent God. How does he represent God? The Priestly writer gives clear indication how, in his portrayal of Yahweh first blessing Adam and Eve then delegating sovereignty to them.⁵¹ Man has a royal function, he is to exercise dominion over all creation and thereby be a sign of God's Kingship and majesty. In order to be an effective delegate and an obvious sign it is necessary that man maintain close relationship with God and channel his will. A corollary of man's fall is that generally he now does neither; God's image in him is tarnished and he fails to fulfil adequately, if at all, the function for which he was created, namely to manifest in a special way the glory of God,⁵² i.e. the divine presence. Nevertheless, as the prophets make clear,

⁴⁹ Genesis 2: 8 - 15.

⁵⁰ Genesis 9:6.

⁵¹ Genesis 1:28 - 30. See also the Yahwist account (2:19) where man is given the task of naming the animals - a sign of his power over them.

⁵² Isaiah 43:7.

man's state is not irrevocable,⁵³ he can seek forgiveness, turn to righteousness and God in his loving kindness, will burnish that which was tarnished and make his presence manifest. And, in a new creation when communion with God is restored, all men will reflect his image.⁵⁴

The prophets do not refer to man as the 'image and likeness of God', nor indeed do the rest of the Old Testament (i.e. Hebrew canon) writers other than the Priestly. It is in the Apocrypha that we again find the concept clearly articulated. Jesus Ben Sirach writes of both the limitations and strengths of man and states of the latter "He endowed them with strength like his own, and made them in his own image".⁵⁵ 'Strength' in this context refers to man's dominion which is on account of his likeness to God and not vice-versa. The author of the Book of Wisdom likewise speaks of man's dominion over creation. He is to "rule the world in holiness and righteousness and to pronounce judgement in uprightness of soul".⁵⁶ These verses are, of course, an allusion to Genesis 1:26 as is the Sage's earlier statement that God made man "in the image of his own eternity"⁵⁷ or, as in some manuscripts, "an image of his own proper being". This second

⁵³ e.g. Hosea 2: 4-24; Jeremiah 4: 1 - 2; Ezekiel 11:19; 26: 26-30.

⁵⁴ Israel Adler writes of the "pristine glory of the reflected image of God in man" being renewed. See 'Man, the nature of' Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol II p. 846.

⁵⁵ Sir. 17: 3 - 8.

⁵⁶ Wisdom 9:3; 2 Enoch 44:1(J) (date unknown) "The Lord with his own hands created mankind; in a facsimile of his own face, both small and great ... And whoever insults a person's face insults the face of a King, and treats the face of the Lord with repugnance". 58:3 "And the Lord appointed him over everything (as King). (ed. Charlesworth, Vol. I pp. 170, 184). See also The Sibylline Oracles 1:25; 3:8, 4 Ezra 8:44 (ed. Charlesworth pp. 335, 362, 543). Also in Manual of Discipline (Qumran Scrolls) "He has created man to govern the world".

⁵⁷ Wisdom 2:23.

translation, comments Ryder Smith, "describes the outward 'form' that expresses inward character. It recalls the term Glory".⁵⁸

In Aristotelian psychology that which gives form to the body is the soul.⁵⁹ It is a notion accepted also by the author of the Book of Wisdom who, although faithful to the Hebrew view of man as a totality,⁶⁰ nevertheless develops it along Greek lines. He gives fundamental importance to the soul,⁶¹ seeing it as dynamically in-forming man's personality and determining his moral direction⁶² in freedom of choice. According to the Sage, therefore, God's image in man is primarily in his soul which is destined for immortality. It is man's spiritual welfare, therefore, that is of paramount importance,⁶³ and his attaining the destiny for which God created and 'imaged' him, namely eternal union with Himself. Man, however, made "in the image of his own eternity" can only reflect that image and attain his eternal destiny through righteousness. "Perverse thoughts

⁵⁸ Ryder-Smith op.cit. p. 95. With regard to 'outward form' and 'glory', note the vision of Ezekiel in which the Glory (Kavodh) is both manifestation and real presence. In 1:26 - 28 there is above the Glory, the appearance of a human form. Thus, notes Jacob op.cit. p. 81 "The glory is the image of God just as man is". The Hebrew 'form' temunah, usually translated by homoïoma in LXX is twice translated by doxa. Nu. 12:8; Ps. 17:15.

⁵⁹ Aristotle. De Anima Book 2.

⁶⁰ Wisdom 1:4 "Because Wisdom will not enter a deceitful soul, nor dwell in a body enslaved to sin" and 9:15 "For a perishable body weighs down the soul, and this earthly tent burdens the thoughtful mind" are seen by some as platonically dichotomizing man. Others see them as examples of Hebrew parallelism. For opposing views see James Reese Analecta Biblica 41 op.cit. p. 82, and Winston op.cit. p. 29.

⁶¹ e.g. Wisdom 8:19. Idols are without souls. 13:17; 14:29.

⁶² Wisdom 1:4; 15:4.

⁶³ Wisdom 3:13; 4:1.

separate a man from God".⁶⁴ The righteous man is one who is taught by wisdom and knows her effects. Indeed, union is made possible through wisdom, "a breath of the power of God and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty".⁶⁵ Eternal life is a gift from God.⁶⁶

Generally in the Septuagint, psyche (soul) is the Greek rendering of the Hebrew nefesh and has within it, therefore, a similar complexity of meaning. This is so, for example, in the Septuagint version of Genesis 2:7 where 'living nefesh' becomes 'living psyche'. In a re-phrasing of the same verse from Genesis, the author of the Book of Wisdom likewise uses the term psyche then adds a further phrase incorporating the word pneuma. He writes "(man) was inspired with an active soul (psyche) and had breathed into him a living spirit (pneuma)".⁶⁷ The Sage's concept of pneuma is not that it is just physical air or wind (hence his deviation from the Septuagint rendering 'divine breath' pnoe, used generally there of man in a physical sense) but something very nearly, if not wholly, immaterial. Although soul and spirit are most often interchangeable terms, their usage in this context is not simply an example of parallelism but is also a means of elucidation. All that is alive, man included, is so on account of its God-given psyche (soul) but man's humanity is on account of the dynamic force, i.e. the pneuma (spirit) with which he alone is infused by God. "One must ask" writes Bieder concerning this passage, "if the author is not seeking to distinguish

⁶⁴ Wisdom 1:3.

⁶⁵ Wisdom 7:25. The term used for 'emanation' or 'effluence', apporoia, is used also by Philo for emanations of the logos. See e.g. Det. 83. (CW II).

⁶⁶ Wisdom 3:5, 9. See also Reese. Analecta Biblica 41 p. 64 ff.

⁶⁷ Wisdom 15:11.

the divine principle of life from actual life".⁶⁸ The answer would appear to be 'yes' and it is precisely here that man, a totality, is imaged in God's likeness.

For all his inconsistency and frequent lack of clarity, Philo makes it clear that in his opinion the pneuma in man is God's image.⁶⁹ He writes:-

"Our great Moses likened the fashion of the reasonable soul to no created thing but averred it to be a genuine coinage of that dread spirit, the Divine and Invisible One, signed and impressed by the seal of God, the stamp of which is the Eternal Word. His words are

'God inbreathed into his face a breath of Life' (Gen.2:7) so that it cannot but be that he that receives is made in the likeness of Him who sends forth the breath. Accordingly we also read that man has been made in the Image of God (Gen.1:27) not however, after the image of anything created".⁷⁰

Although aware of the different divisions given to the psyche (soul) in Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, Philo also states simply that in man the soul is bi-partite.⁷¹ The lower, irrational part with blood as its essence, is material and mortal and is the part of the soul which man has in common with all other animals. Unique to man is the higher 'reasonable soul' referred to in the above Philonic quotation. Immaterial and immortal,⁷² this part has pneuma as its essence and is equated with the mind

⁶⁸ 'pneuma' TDNT Vol VI p. 371.

⁶⁹ See Ryder-Smith op.cit. p. 68 ff.

⁷⁰ Plant. 18 - 19. (CW III, pp.221-3).

⁷¹ Leg Alleg. 1,24; Fug. 69.(CW I, p.163; CW V, p.47).

⁷² c.f. S. Cohon op.cit. p. 398 where he states "Philo, like the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, uses the word 'immortal' to denote indifferently the highest life on earth and the eternal life after

(nous). Of it Philo states, "Every man, in respect of his mind, is allied to the divine Reason, having come into being as a copy or fragment or ray (apaugasma) of that blessed nature".⁷³ Now a 'copy' or a 'fragment' may be thought of as being quite separate from its source; it is otherwise with a 'ray'. That the mind is, in fact, an unbroken extension of the divine nature or Logos is made clear by Philo when he says "it is the impress of a Divine word ever continuing and free from every kind of change"⁷⁴ and, "the reasoning power within us and the divine word or Reason above us are indivisible".⁷⁵ Elsewhere, Philo speaks of the mind, "illuminated by rays peculiar to itself",⁷⁶ as fiery 'spirit' all "warm and on fire".⁷⁷

Generally, man's mind (nous) is identified by Philo not only with pneuma and Logos but also with Wisdom.⁷⁸ Such an identification recalls the words from the Book of Wisdom, "she (Sophia) is a reflection (apaugasma) of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God and an image of his goodness" "a breath of the power of God and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty".⁷⁹ As we have seen, Philo likewise speaks of Wisdom streaming forth from God,⁸⁰ a "pure and undiluted radiance".⁸¹

death". Immortality of the Soul is for Philo a gift of God.

⁷³ Opif. 51: 146. (CW I, p.115).

⁷⁴ Heres 48: 230; See also Leg.Alleg 1.36. (CW IV, p.399; I, p.171).

⁷⁵ Heres 234. (CW IV, p.399).

⁷⁶ Immut. 46. (CW III, p.33).

⁷⁷ Fug. 134. Note that for Philo the stars and heavenly bodies are pure nous (Som 1:135; opif. 73) and are fire. (CW V, pp.81, 369; I, p.9).

⁷⁸ Immut. 142, 159. (CW III, pp.81, 91).

⁷⁹ Wisdom 7: 25 - 26.

⁸⁰ Som. II, 221. (CW V, p.543).

There is no doubt that for Philo the rational soul or nous is God's presence (glory) in man. Commenting on Leviticus 26:12 ("I will walk in you and be your God") Philo enjoins the soul to become "a house of God, a holy temple, a most beauteous abiding-place".⁸² But though the presence of the Divine is a fact for Philo, recognition and manifestation of it is another. Man in his God-given freedom too often chooses that which obscures, as it were, the Divine Presence in him and for him. There are, Philo explains, two kinds of men, "those who live by reason, the divine inbreathing" and those who live "by blood and the pleasure of the flesh" and only the first is the faithful impress of the divine image.⁸³ Fidelity, however, like the soul itself, is a gift from God. Man is not able of his own accord to subdue the conflict which rages in him against his higher mind;⁸⁴ for this he has imperative need of God's help,⁸⁵ that is, he needs a fresh influx of the Divine Spirit to attain an inner state of equilibrium and virtue.⁸⁶ Man, therefore, must pray for this gift if he is to attain union with God, the Mind of the Universe who contains but is not contained.⁸⁷ Union, the goal and purpose of man's life, is attainable here and now through mystic

⁸¹ Opifex 30. (CW I, p.25).

⁸² Som I, 149. (CW V, p.377).

⁸³ Heres 57. (This view is akin to that in Romans 8:6 - 7)(CW IV, p.313).

⁸⁴ See Leg. Alleg. I, 82 where Philo states "the very confession of praise itself is not the work of the soul but of God who gives it thankfulness". (CW I, p. 201).

⁸⁵ Heres 58. (CW IV, p.313).

⁸⁶ This clearly distinguishes Philo's thinking from that of Stoic pantheism. See Goodenough op.cit. p.118 and W. Bieder TDNT Vol. VI pp.368-75.

⁸⁷ Migr. 192. (CW IV, p.245).

experience which is an anticipation of what is to come.⁸⁸ At death the righteous soul undergoes a new birth to eternal union with God in heaven.⁸⁹ It is unclear what happens to the unrighteous soul except that it fares differently.⁹⁰ Philo's teaching does not allow scope for a bodily resurrection. In respect of his mind, a ray of the divine nature, man is a miniature heaven. In respect of his body "he is allied to all the world for he is compounded of the same things".⁹¹ He is indeed, a microcosm.

The idea that man is a microcosm dates back at least to Aristotle⁹² and is not unique, therefore, to Philo. Such sayings as "all that the Holy One blessed be He created in the world He created in man"⁹³ are fairly frequent in ancient Jewish literature⁹⁴ and occur also in medieval Jewish writings.⁹⁵ In the Kabbalah (as in Rabbinic Judaism) for instance, the notion takes on a new nuance for there, as in Zoroastrianism, man as epitome of the Cosmos is said to be capable of affecting all things of which he is, as it were, the hub.⁹⁶

⁸⁸ "When the mind is ministering to God in purity, it is not human but divine". Heres 84. (CW IV, p.325).

⁸⁹ i.e. the soul goes to the divine world with the angels who are also called 'powers'.

⁹⁰ In Post C II 39 Philo says, "awaiting those who live in the way of the impious will be eternal death". It is unclear what he means by "eternal death". (CW II).

⁹¹ Opifex 146. (CW I, p.115).

⁹² See Plato Timmaeus 30 - 31; Aristotle, De Mundo 6 Cited by S. Cohon op.cit. p. 288.

⁹³ ARN XXXI Quoted by A. Cohen in Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p. 75.

⁹⁴ e.g. 2 Enoch 30:13 (ed. Charlesworth Vol. I p.152), Sanh. 38a,b. Epstein (ed.) Seder Nezekim III.

⁹⁵ See Joel Kraemer, 'Microcosm' Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. II op.cit. pp. 1501-4.

⁹⁶ See Leo Schaya op.cit. p. 129f. Also Samuel S Cohon op.cit. p. 289.

The notion, however, which is at the core of Rabbinic Teaching concerning the nature of man is that he is created in the image of God.⁹⁷ It is this that procures for him a unique position in the world as centre and King. "Whatsoever the Holy One, Blessed be He, created in this world, He created only for His Glory".⁹⁸ But since, in Rabbinic thought, all things were created for man, he has the unique privilege and role of being God's presence and praise on earth. The Talmud speaks of man's function to praise: "From the beginning of the World's formation, praise ascended to the Holy One, blessed be He, only from the waters ... What did they proclaim? 'The Lord on high is mighty'. The Holy One blessed be He, declared: 'If these, which have no mouth or speech, offer me such praise, how much more will I be extolled when I create man!'"⁹⁹ Yet man of his own volition is powerless to praise; he is dependent on the presence of the Transcendent God. Meant to be co-worker with God¹⁰⁰ he can if he wishes, 'down tools' and refuse to co-operate, or do so sporadically and not well.¹⁰¹ Such actions and attitudes in man cause the divine image, which is discernible in right relationships and conduct, to be blurred or invisible.¹⁰² God's presence is not then manifest, and man does not exercise his function as

⁹⁷ Isolated references occur where man is said to be created not in the image of God but in that of the angels. Genesis R 14:3; 21:5. See Israel Adler Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol XI p.843.

⁹⁸ Abot. 6:11. Quoted by Samuel Cohon in Jewish Theology op.cit. p. 287.

⁹⁹ Genesis R.v,1. A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p. 73.

¹⁰⁰ See Isidore Epstein. The Jewish Way of Life Edward Goldston London, 1946, pp. 131-3.

¹⁰¹ Man has two impulses, The one to good, the other to evil. He is free to choose either, "All is foreseen, yet freedom of choice is granted man". Abot III 19, Epstein (ed.), Seder Nezikim Vol IV.

¹⁰² See Kittel 'eikon' TDNT Vol. II p. 393.

King and the coming of the Kingdom is impeded. "Let there come then he who is our image and likeness and reign over him who is not"¹⁰³ states the Talmud. From this it is clear that Rabbinical thinking is in accord with the Biblical concerning transmission of the divine likeness and its not being lost on account of the Fall. It is interesting to note in this regard that the Rabbis list several other things forfeited when Adam fell and which will one day be restored.¹⁰⁴ Among them is 'radiance' which may well refer to the glory which is ever present in man but only visible when his will is in accord with the will of God.

The Rabbinical concept of the nature of man is, in large part, Biblical. Asked "what is the life-force or ego in man?" the rabbis would very likely respond with "it is his nefesh".¹⁰⁵ They would also at times interchange this term with 'ruah' and 'neshama'¹⁰⁶ as do the Biblical writers. Nor would they be alone in so doing, for this Biblical usage is also evidenced, for example, in the texts of the Qumran community.¹⁰⁷ However, unlike the Biblical writers, the Rabbis stress man's dual nature, explicitly contrasting body and soul. Rabbi Simai teaches "all creatures which are formed from earth, both their soul and body are from earth, with the exception of man whose soul is from heaven and his body from earth".¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Genesis R.8 on 1:27 cited by Kittel 'eikon' TDNT Vol. II. p. 394.

¹⁰⁴ Length of days, upright stance, greatness of stature. See Foerster TDNT Vol. 3. p. 1021.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, Ber. 44b; Taan, 3,1 (66b,60f). Epstein (ed.), Seder Zeraim; Seder Mo'ed Vol IV. Biblical terms for 'soul' are given in Genesis R 14:9 in A. Cohen Everyman's Talmud op. cit. p.82.

¹⁰⁶ See also A. Cohen Everyman's Talmud op.cit. p. 82.

¹⁰⁷ e.g. Hymns 2:7, 20-23, 34; 5:12-13, 18; 9:33; 15:10. Damasc. 1:20; 11:16 in G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975 (2nd edition).

¹⁰⁸ Sifre, Deuteronomy 306: 132a. A. Cohen Everyman's Talmud op. cit. p.73.

This antithesis between the heavenly and the earthly 'parts' of man does not denote a disparagement of the latter; man in rabbinic thought remains a totality: 'As the Holy One, blessed be He, fills the whole world, so also the soul fills the whole body'¹⁰⁹ and, since the "soul dwells in the inmost part of the body",¹¹⁰ the body, as the scabbard of the soul¹¹¹ itself, must not be denigrated.¹¹²

It is because the Rabbis consider man to be a totality that Rabbi Hillel, for example, can refer to the body as God's image to be treated with care and respect.¹¹³ Nevertheless, that which is considered above all to render man like to God is his soul. Rabbinical homilies enjoin man to keep this heavenly gift free from taint: "as he gave it to you in purity, so return it in purity".¹¹⁴ A man's soul is kept pure by his making real in his life those qualities which "avail before the Throne of Glory: faith, righteousness, justice, loving kindness, mercy, truth and peace".¹¹⁵ The strength to incarnate these virtues is inherent in the soul itself whose power is augmented or activated by a fresh influx from God. This, as we have seen, is also the Philonic view.¹¹⁶

Although the Rabbis are agreed in their belief that the soul returns to

¹⁰⁹ Ber. 10a. Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p.7.

¹¹⁰ Loc.cit.

¹¹¹ Sanh. 108a. Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p.81.

¹¹² Rabbi Hillel, for example, speaks of care of the body as a religious duty Lev. R. 34:3.

¹¹³ Lev. R. 34 on 25:39. See Kittel 'eikon' TDNT op.cit. Vol. II p. 393.

¹¹⁴ Shab. 152b - Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p.82.

¹¹⁵ ARN XXXVII. Everyman's Talmud (A. Cohen) op. cit. p.84.

¹¹⁶ See page 218 of this chapter.

God after death, they are not agreed as to the nature of the soul's continued existence. One Talmudic view is that the 'pure' soul, separated from its body, ascends to the Throne of Glory from whence it first came.¹¹⁷ There in the seventh heaven (Araboth)¹¹⁸ it awaits the Messianic era, the age of glory, when, once more united with the body, it will "enjoy the lustre of the Shekhina".¹¹⁹ Impure souls are obviously deprived of this enjoyment at least for a time. A prevalent view is that the tainted soul undergoes a tantalising sort of 'yo-yo' process, ascending to and descending from the Throne of Glory for a year, then finally staying there to await the Messianic era.¹²⁰ Another Talmudic view categorises souls into 1) pure, 2) tainted and 3) totally evil, and assigns them respectively to heaven, a period of purgation, eternal misery in Gehinnom.¹²¹ As might be expected, some Rabbis deny the reality of Gehinnom, preferring to trust in and stress the abundance of God's mercy while contributing to the fundamental Rabbinical doctrines of judgement and retribution for sin.

The dictum 'where there are two rabbis there are three opinions' rings true. Rabbinical opinions about man and the manner of his continued existence after death are many and diverse, nevertheless there are

¹¹⁷ Although pre-existing, the soul is created by God ex nihilo.

¹¹⁸ Hagiga 12b. Epstein (ed.) Seder Mo'ed Vol IV. S. Cohon refers to the upper heaven where souls and qualities are stored as 'a sort of realm of ideas'. Jewish Theology op. cit. p.390.

¹¹⁹ Ber 17a Everyman's Talmud p. 388. Metempsychosis is not accepted by Talmudists. The belief is found, however, in one of the Targums to the Prophets. See S. Cohon, op.cit. p. 407.

¹²⁰ Shab. 152b. Epstein (ed.) Seder Mo'ed Vol I. See also S. Cohon op. cit. p. 395; Yehoshua Grintz, 'soul, immortality, of'. Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. Vol. 15 p.175.

¹²¹ Given various designations but meaning 'Hell'. According to schools of Hillel, Gehinnom will cease. Elsewhere (Tosifta Ber. VI.7) it is said to be eternal.

fundamental beliefs in which they all concur. No rabbi argues against the saying "Beloved is man for he was created in the image of God"¹²² though he might well argue about it. It is rabbinical belief that man is the crown of creation purposed by God for eternal glory.

Medieval Jewish philosophers generally agree with this rabbinic belief. Saadia Gaon, for example, sees man as "the axis of the world and its foundation"¹²³ and beloved of God who seeks his (man's) eternal bliss. But he disagrees with the Rabbis on other issues concerning man, for example, on the Platonic notion of the soul's pre-existence.¹²⁴ No 'storehouse' of souls for Saadia, nor for the great Maimonides who considers, rather differently from Saadia, that the creation of the soul at the birth of the child has a formative bearing or character. According to Maimonides the soul is 'in potentia', its essence is actualised only by acquired knowledge.¹²⁵ Expectedly, a number of Jewish philosophers of whom Nahmanides is one, take issue with this mode of thinking concerning the soul's nature and origin. Of Nahmanides, Cohon writes "following Halevi he affirms that the souls were created with the primal light. Dwelling in the eternal radiance and holiness of God, each soul descends into the material

¹²² Aboth III, 18. A. Cohen Everyman's Talmud p.72.

¹²³ Emmunot 4: 1 - 2 cited by S. Cohon op.cit. p. 288. Maimonides is a notable dissenter from this anthropocentric view. He sees man just as part of the cosmos. See S. Cohon op.cit. p. 290.

¹²⁴ He also rejects the notion of the soul as divided into parts and considers it as having 'qualities' or 'powers' which he calls by the Hebrew names nefesh, neshama and ruah. See Epstein op.cit. p. 201; Cohon op.cit. p. 399; Eli Davis 'Saadia (Ben Joseph) Gaon', Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. II pp. 543-555.

¹²⁵ Maimonides formulates the principle thus: "it is possible for whatever is in potentia and in whose essence there is a certain possibility, not to exist in actu at a certain time". See The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg. CUP 1982 p. 349.

body of men, trailing clouds of glory".¹²⁶ Many medieval Jewish thinkers embrace the traditional Jewish notion that it is to the Throne of Glory that the righteous will return at death.¹²⁷

In their thinking about the nature of man, medieval Jewish philosophers often adopt neoplatonic psychological opinions. Isaac Israeli (c. 845-945) a renowned North African physician and generally accepted as the first Jewish neoplatonist, considers that when man dies he "becomes spiritual and will be joined in union to the light that is created, without mediator, by the power of God and will become one that exalts and praises the Creator for all eternity".¹²⁸ Union,¹²⁹ equated by Israeli with heaven and deemed by him to be possible even before death, is the third of three stages of spiritual progress. The first stage is 'purification' and the second is 'wisdom'. This latter is acquired through illumination by the intellect which is understood to be outside as well as inside man, that is, it is believed to be all-enveloping and all-containing. The intellect is thus man's link with heaven, his means to union and to bliss. His (man's) intellect has come into being as an emanation of the Universal Intellect and is itself creative for from it or through it the soul comes into being in three hypostases: rational, animal and vegetable.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ Jewish Theology op.cit. p. 405.

¹²⁷ e.g. Solomon Ibn Gabirol in his poem 'Keter Malkhut'. See Pines ' "Soul" in 'Medieval Jewish Philosophy' Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 15 p. 178.

¹²⁸ Book of Definitions. See A. Altmann and S.M. Stern. Isaac Israeli 1958. p. 25-26. Cited by Pines, Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 15, pp. 176-177.

¹²⁹ i.e. Union with eternal wisdom.

¹³⁰ See A. Hyman 'Jewish Philosophy', Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 13, p. 434. Alfred Ivry 'Intellect', Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 8, pp. 1410-2.

A similar concept of the soul is encapsulated in the poetry of the great Neoplatonic philosopher Solomon Ibn Gabirol (c 1020-1057). He writes:-

"Of flames of intellectual fire hast thou wrought its form
And like a burning fire hast thou wafted it
And sent it to the body to serve and guard it,
And it is as fire in the midst thereof, yet doth not consume it,
For it is from the fire of the soul that the body hath been
created
And goeth from Nothingness to Being,
Because the Lord descended in him in Fire".¹³¹

For Gabirol as for Israeli, the acquisition of knowledge is all important on the road to union. The "movement from Nothingness to Being" involves movement through different levels of knowledge (and Being) to cognizance of the eternal world of God. As for Maimonides, it is through the intellect that man's potential is actualised.

'Flames of intellectual fire' recalls Philo's definition of the mind as fiery spirit "all warm and on fire" which is God's presence in man.¹³² Like Philo and others, Gabirol understands union to be the goal and purpose of human life. It is a union which allows for individuation; pure souls ascend to the Throne of Glory to rest at its base,¹³³ they are not absorbed into the Glory, God, World Soul or whatever designation be given to the Supreme Reality. However, this view of union is not that of a small number of medieval philosophers. The neoplatonist Abraham Ibn Ezra (c 1089-1164) for example, considers that the pure soul loses the individuality it acquired to

¹³¹ Selected Religious Poems of Solomon Ibn Gabirol tr. by I. Zangwill, pp. 3, 104-5. Cited by Cohon op.cit. pp. 408-9.

¹³² See p 217 of this chapter.

¹³³ See note 127 above.

some degree in life when, at death, it is re-absorbed into the Universal Soul.¹³⁴ What happens to impure souls is not quite clear, it is possible, even probable, that Ibn Ezra considers they are transmigrated.¹³⁵

The doctrine of transmigration is generally accepted by Kabbalists, in whose belief, impure souls must have some means of amendment - reincarnation or hell - before returning to their source.¹³⁶ That there is a soul and it is immortal is taken by them for granted. The influence of Isaac Israeli, Abraham Ibn Ezra and other Jewish neoplatonists is evident in the Kabbalistic understanding of the soul as tri-partite. The Zohar states "The body is bound intimately to the 'soul' and the 'soul' to the body. When the 'soul' has been perfected it becomes a throne on which the 'spirit' (ruah) may rest ... When soul and spirit have perfected themselves, they become worthy to receive the super soul (neshama), for the 'spirit' acts as a throne on which the 'super-soul' resides. This 'super-soul' stands highest of all, hidden and utterly mysterious".¹³⁷ It is through the 'mysterious super-soul', received as a result of a man's fidelity to Torah, that his highest level of consciousness is awakened, and he is able to differentiate between what is real and what is appearance only. The recipient of this gift cleaves to the real, that is, he is in communion with God. The Neshama is, in effect, the power of God's active presence and is referred to as "a

¹³⁴ See A. Hyman 'Jewish Philosophy'. Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 13, p. 437 - 8.

¹³⁵ Pre-existence logically supposes immortality. See Cohon op.cit. p. 415 also Isaac Husik. A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy New York 1916 p. 193.

¹³⁶ Reincarnation is accepted as being repeatable. Some Kabbalists, however give three reincarnations as the limit.

¹³⁷ Zohar, Lekh, 183b in Textual Sources (J) (ed. Alexander) op.cit. p.131.

part of God above"¹³⁸ with the understanding that God has no parts; he is One. In early Kabbalistic writings it is regarded as a direct emanation from God and is likened to a 'divine spark',¹³⁹ Elsewhere the emanation is sometimes said to be less direct. In the older section of the Zohar, for example, it radiates from the Throne of Glory.¹⁴⁰ However, in the main body of the text, Neshama originates in the Sefirah Binah (Intelligence)¹⁴¹ which is wrapped in every other Sefirah, in undivided unity. Man's Neshama is thus a direct emanation of the Glory of the hidden God.

In spite of the great complexity of the Kabbala, its lack of uniformity and its many contradictory ideas, there is in it a general agreement concerning the fundamental aspects of human nature. Although all creation is understood to 'image' the One who is its being, man is believed to be God's image par excellence, for he alone completely incorporates and clearly manifests all ten Sefiroth.¹⁴² He is created "after the pattern of the Upper Glory".¹⁴³ The image of God in which he is created is not, therefore, synonymous with the neshama, nor indeed with any 'part' of man; it is his essence. "The whole earth is full of his glory"¹⁴⁴ but the centre and

¹³⁸ See G. Scholem. Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 10 op.cit. p. 610.

¹³⁹ Ibidem p. 609. See also Zohar, Lekh, 183b Textual Sources(Z)(Alexander) op.cit. p. 131 and L. Schaya The Universal Meaning of Kabbalah op.cit. p. 120.

¹⁴⁰ Midrash ha - Ne'elam See G. Scholem 'Kabbala' Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 10 p. 610.

¹⁴¹ See Textual Sources (J) (ed. Alexander) op. cit. p.33.

¹⁴² e.g. Zohar Bereshith 34b Tiqqun (Zohar, Terumah, II 155a). See also L. Schaya. The Universal Meaning of the Kabbalah op.cit. pp. 30ff and ch. VI.

¹⁴³ Zohar, Terumah, II 155a in Textual Sources (J)(ed. Alexander) op. cit. p.129.

¹⁴⁴ Isaiah 6:3.

concentration of it is man.

A second idea in the Kabbala concerning the 'tzelem' (image) in man is that it acts as a facilitator or catalyst in the bonding of the material with the spiritual. Thus, as Gershom Scholem notes, in the concept of 'tzelem' two notions are combined, "one relating to the idea of human individuation and the other to man's ethereal garment or ethereal body which serves as an intermediary between his material body and (spiritual) soul".¹⁴⁵ It is Kabbalistic belief that prior to the Fall such mediation was unnecessary, for then Adam and Eve wore 'garments of light', that is, their bodies were not material but spiritual.¹⁴⁶ Through and from them radiated the divine Glory, illuminating the whole Cosmos and uniting each creature with its heavenly archetype.¹⁴⁷ Thus all were bonded with the One in the Kingdom of God. It is a bond which, disrupted when Adam sinned, has been man's function ever since to restore. Man's personal goal is to achieve union even here on earth as a prelude to the eternal goal of union after death when he will once again be resplendently clad in his ethereal garment (i.e. shine with his ethereal body). Until that time he must dwell in the earthly, physical realm, his inner, ethereal body cloaked by his outer material one and therefore hidden.¹⁴⁸ It is perceptible, however, to those with spiritual vision, those, that is, who have attained mystical

¹⁴⁵ G. Scholem, 'Kabbala' Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 10 p. 612.

¹⁴⁶ See L. Schaya. The Universal Meaning of the Kabbalah op.cit. p.128ff
Man "surpassed all other creatures in beauty, while his inner and ethereal 'body' filled and fed this whole world without distinction".

¹⁴⁷ Ibidem p. 129. "The rays of immanent man fully illuminated all created things".

¹⁴⁸ Ibidem p. 130.

union and are fulfilling their function of restoration.¹⁴⁹ The idea of a 'body of glory' perceived by the near perfected, bears comparison with the Mahayanan concept of Sambhogakaya.

It is difficult to overestimate the influence of Kabbala on Judaism. Gershom Scholem describes it as "one of the most powerful forces ever to affect the inner development of Judaism both horizontally and in depth".¹⁵⁰ "Notwithstanding the loss of its original impulse" writes Isidore Epstein, "(the Kabbala) has continued its steady and gentle flow with fructifying effects to the present generation".¹⁵¹ Our own generation reaps the benefit from Jewish thinkers of such standing as Martin Buber and Franz Rosenszweig the tenor of whose works bears witness to the influence of Kabbala. For Martin Buber the Glory of the Infinite is to be found everywhere in the finite but most especially in man who enters into an I-Thou relationship precisely through his relationship with The Divine creation providing, of course, he is open to the Revelation of the Eternal Thou.¹⁵² Explicit Kabbalistic terminology is found in Buber's works.¹⁵³ Indeed, he acknowledges his debt to later Kabbala in particular and to Hasidism.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ G. Scholem attributes this belief to the influence of Neoplatonists who held a similar doctrine. See 'Kabbala' Encyclopaedia Judaica op. cit. p.612.

¹⁵⁰ Ibidem p. 632.

¹⁵¹ Judaism op.cit. p. 251.

¹⁵² I and Thou tr. R.G. Smith. T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh 1937 pp.6, 78f, 136.

¹⁵³ See, for example, Hasidism, The Philosophical Library, New York 1948 p. 58.

¹⁵⁴ "I had been under the influence of the later Kabbala and of Hasidism, according to which man has the power to unite the God who is over the World with his shekhina dwelling in the World. In this way there arose in me the thought of a realisation of God through man". See Maurice Friedman Martin Buber's Life and Work Search Press London. Tunbridge Wells

Man's being created in the image of God he grasps as "deed, as becoming, as task".¹⁵⁵ "With his every act man can work on the figure of the glory of God that it may step forth out of its concealment".¹⁵⁶ For Rosenszweig, as for Buber, sin disguises reality; it prolongs concealment. Man must respond to God in love that the glory may be fully revealed. Rosenszweig goes further than Buber in his stated belief that until the full revelation of glory, (synonymous or concomitant with the unification of God with his Shekhina) God is, as it were, separated in Himself, willing to suffer with his people.¹⁵⁷ Insufficient man has, through grace, the extraordinary and central role of transformation and unification.

1982 p.82. Note^{that} the idea of a 'becoming God' was rejected by Buber.

¹⁵⁵ Quoted by Maurice Friedman op.cit. p. 97.

¹⁵⁶ Ibidem p. 115.

¹⁵⁷ See R. Horwitz, 'Shekhina in Jewish Philosophy'. Encyclopaedia Judaica op.cit. Vol. 14, p. 1353.

Chapter Ten

No other religion positions man more firmly at the heart of things than does Zoroastrianism. Regarded as half material and half spiritual, man is placed, comments Bode "in the middle of the two worlds".¹ According to the Denkard "all creatures are mirrored in man who is the symbol of Ohrmazd"². Man, however, is not intended simply to reflect passively all that is. His fundamental role and enormous responsibility is to radiate the good and thus to help restore Creation to its original goodness and glory. How he does this has been outlined in an earlier chapter.³

The Zoroastrian response to the question "what is man?" is more than a neat phrase summing up his parts "half material and half spiritual". Indeed, in the Scriptures there is not just one single response but several which, taken together, reflect both a tussle with the question and the inability of the tusslers to arrive at a final consensus. Nevertheless, in spite of their divergent analyses of man's nature, Zoroastrian thinkers, like their Hebrew counterparts, are agreed on certain fundamentals about man. He is made in the divine likeness; his essence is of Fire, "whose radiance is from the endless light, the place of Ohrmazd".⁴

Creation stories embody this belief. In the Bundahishn, for example, the sixth creation, Blessed Man, is described as spherical in shape, shining

¹ Framroze Bode Man, Soul, Immortality in Zoroastrianism edited and published by J.C. Tarapore for the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute. Bombay 1960 p. 12.

² 321:34 quoted by Duchesne-Guillemin Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p. 133.

³ Chapter 5, see also Chapter 6.

⁴ Gt. Bundahishn 3: 7-9. Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) p.48.

like the sun.⁵ The prototype of humanity, this flawless being named Gayomard,⁶ is of the form of fire.⁷ Although perfect, Gayomard is nevertheless subjected to the onslaught of Ahriman through whom he suffers death. Before dying, however, Gayomard emits seed,⁸ knowing that men and women will arise from it.⁹ After purification in the light of the sun, his seed is that from which the first man and woman, Mashye and Mashyane,¹⁰ are formed.¹¹ Thus the reply in the Datastan-i-Denik to the question "from what have Mashye and Mashyane arisen?" is: "Ahura Mazda, the all ruling, produced from the endless light the brilliance of fire from which Man (stih or material existence) was created".¹² A ninth century catechism answers its own questions "who am I?" "Whose am I?" and "From whence have I come?" with "I am from the spiritual world, I was not (simply) of this world. I was created, I did not (simply) exist. I belong to Ohrmazd not to Ahriman. I belong to the yazads, not to the devs, to the good not to the bad. My stock and lineage is from Gayomard. My mother is Spendarmed,¹³ my father Ohrmazd. My humanity is from Mahre and Mahryane who were the first offspring and seed

⁵ Gt. Bundahishn 1:27 as in R.C. Zaehner, The Teaching of the Magi op. cit. p.40.

⁶ Gayo-Maretan, 'Mortal Life'.

⁷ Asrok Kahrp See Duchesne-Guillemin Symbols and Values op.cit. p. 140ff.

⁸ Gt. Bundahishn 14:2. Two parts of the seed were preserved by Neryosang, one part was received for the earth from which Mashye and Mashyane were to grow first in the form of a rhubarb plant. Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.51.

⁹ Gt. Bundahishn 4:11 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.50.

¹⁰ Or Masha and Mashyanag.

¹¹ Gt. Bundahishn 14:2 in Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.51.

¹² Question No 63. See Bode op.cit. p. 16.

¹³ i.e. the Earth from which Mashye and Mashyane sprung. Note that these questions are put to Zoroaster in Yasna 43:7ff. S.B.E. Vol. XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.101ff.

of Gayomard".¹⁴

The story of the 'seed of Gayomard' seems to take a curious twist in the Denkard where we read "As Gayomard passed away, it (meaning the Khvarenah) came to Mashye and Mashyane".¹⁵ Why the Khvarenah and not the seed should be mentioned here, is made clear, however, when we remember that the seed is the vehicle of the powerful, divine, fiery Khvarenah. And, as we earlier observed, though ultimately from and of Ohrmazd, Khvarenah has its abode in Fire, its source the sun. Hence in the Gt. Bundahishn account there is mention of the return of Gayomard's seed to the sun for 'purification'. Elsewhere we are told that man's 'form' is in the station of the sun where it is preserved.¹⁶ What is this 'form'? We know for certain that it is not man's body; the Greater Bundahishn states explicitly that the resurrection (another fundamental belief) involves first a restoral of the body, then a giving of the form.¹⁷ In chapter 3 of the same book, man's 'form' is but one of five parts of which he is composed, the others are: body, breath, soul and fravahr. The nature or function of each part is delineated: "Thus body is the physical part; breath that which is connected with the wind; soul that which, together with the consciousness in the body, hears, sees, speaks and knows; form is that which is the station of the sun; and the fravahr that which is in the presence of Ohrmazd the Lord".¹⁸

'Form' (Kahrp) is a feminine word paralleling the Vedic kr'p. Bode,

¹⁴ A Brief Catechism. Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.99.

¹⁵ Book VII Ch. 1:9 in S.B.E. Vol XLVII (tr. West) op. cit. p.6.

¹⁶ Gt. Bundahishn 3:11 in Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.49.

¹⁷ 223:8 quoted by Bailey op.cit. p. 97.

¹⁸ Gt. Bundahishn 3:11-13 in Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.49.

who notes that its usage in the Rig-Veda carries the meaning 'radiance' 'splendour' or 'beauty', defines it as "an ethereal and astral constituent of human personality, an inner subtle, astral ethereal body".¹⁹ This is its connotation in the Gathas where it occurs twice.²⁰ Since 'breath' (ustana) like the Hebrew neshama denotes that which gives physical life and vitality to the body, it would seem that Kahrp within the present context refers to that which spiritualises man, distinguishes him from the other animals,²¹ in short, 'humanises' him. In Bode's view Kahrp is "the link which keeps body and soul together".²² This bonding is precisely the function of the tzelem (image) in man according to the Kabbalah,²³ wherein the image is not conceived as synonymous with any 'part' of man but is his essence. This brings us back to the Zoroastrian fundamental belief that man's essence is of the divine fire/life, it illustrates also how the concepts Kahrp (form) and Khvarenah (glory/presence) are inseparably linked. What then of the other two 'parts' mentioned in the Bundahishn account, that is, the soul and the Fravashi?

The Avestan word which is translated as 'soul' is urvan.²⁴ The uncertainty concerning its etymology is reflected in the fact that while Bode in the main text of his book Man Soul Immortality in Zoroastrianism derives the word from Avestan " 'var', meaning 'to choose', 'to select' the

¹⁹ Man Soul Immortality in Zoroastrianism op.cit. p. 23.

²⁰ Ys. 30:7; 51:17. S.BE. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 32, 185.

²¹ Also endowed with a soul.

²² Man Soul Immortality op.cit. p. 18.

²³ Chapter 9, p.129 of this thesis.

²⁴ 'Ruvan' in Pahlavi.

agentive termination 'van' ²⁵ Khurshed S. Dabu in his foreword to the same book gives the origin as Ur meaning 'within' + van 'to fight'.²⁶ But, whatever the etymology of urvan, conceptually it includes both meanings, i.e. to fight (temptation) and 'to choose'. It is that spiritual principle in man which enables him freedom of choice and which, after death, is rewarded or punished according to the choice made. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is fundamental to Zoroastrian belief.

Although the soul is free to choose, help is required in the discernment process so that freedom may be exercised for good. This help, of course, can only come from Ahura Mazda, though mediated in various ways.²⁷ One way, for example, is by refurbishment of Khvarenah (grace, glory, presence) dispensed by Ashi, Yazata of Piety, and redistributed by the 'Son of Ohrmazd', King of Fires.²⁸ The Fravashi (one in essence with Ohrmazd) has the role of guardian and spiritual guide.

The etymology of the word 'Fravashi'²⁹ is as uncertain as that of 'urvan'. Its earlier usage, however, is indicative of an origin meaning 'to protect', 'to defend'.³⁰ In Mary Boyce's view it possibly derives from the

²⁵ op.cit. p. 37.

²⁶ Ibid p.iii

²⁷ Also through the Holy Spirit. See Yasna 49: 1-2 in S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 163.

²⁸ And through prayer; participation in the Yasna and the drinking of the sacrificial (fire-like) Haoma (also termed 'Son of God') etc.

²⁹ Pahlavi: fravard, fravahr.

³⁰ See Bode. Man Soul Immortality op.cit. p.62 and Dabu (introduction iii) who give Fra = forward plus Var: to cover, protect - overshadowing principle. Duchesne-Guillemin. The Western Response to Zoroaster Oxford University Press 1958 p.42, gives root Varaθra: defence, resistance. Williams Jackson suggests pra-varti-i in the sense of pre-existence. See Zoroastrian Studies. op.cit. p.59.

same verbal root as Ham-vareti, Courage.³¹ Bailey, whose opinion here concurs with that of Mary Boyce, suggests that the word was most likely originally applied to heroes, i.e. men of 'protective valour', and then widened in concept to include all men, dead, born and unborn.³² The concept in fact goes wider; the Yazatas have their fravashis and even Ahura Mazda has his.³³ In Yasht 13 which is dedicated to the fravashis, worship is also given to the fravashi "of the sky; that of the waters; that of the earth; that of the plants; that of the Bull; that of the living man; that of the Holy Creation".³⁴ Every part of the 'good creation', animate and inanimate, seems to be endowed with its protective spirit; the number of Fravashis, therefore, is legion.

J.M. Unvala, a contemporary Zoroastrian, sees the Fravashi as comparable to Plato's ideas.³⁵ He is not alone in making this comparison. Bode, for example, outlines the similarities between the two concepts and writes concerning the Fravashis of human beings "(they) are archetypal souls clothed in ethereal forms, after whose model each human being is moulded on earth".³⁶ For Maneckji Nusservanji Dhalla, "the multifarious objects of this world are so many terrestrial duplicates of these celestial originals. The Fravashis constitute the internal essence of things, as opposed to the

³¹ Zoroastrians op.cit. p.15.

³² Problems in the Ninth Century Books op.cit. p.109. This is the opinion of Duchesne-Guillemin. See Western Response op.cit. p.42.

³³ Yasht 13:80; Yasna 26:2. S.B.E. Vols. XXIII, XXXI (tr. Darmesteter)

³⁴ Yasht 13:86. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.200.

³⁵ Wörter und Sachen 1937 p.161. Cited by Duchesne-Guillemin, Symbols and Values op.cit. p.4.

³⁶ op.cit. p.90. See also Williams Jackson op.cit. p.123.

contingent and accidental".³⁷

Comparisons with other ideas have not been lacking. These ideas have included the Pitrs of India,³⁸ the Manes of Rome,³⁹ the Egyptian Ka⁴⁰ and the Aryan Mannerbund.⁴¹ Although the similarities are real, the fravashi cannot be equated with any of these ideas. What then, is this concept of fravashi which, a pillar of the Zoroastrian edifice of faith, is integral to that faith's understanding of man?

The word is not mentioned in the extant Gathas but occurs first in Yasna 37 with reference to the worship of the Fravashis of saints, holy men and holy women.⁴² Elsewhere it is made clear that worship is given to the Fravashis of the living as well as to those of the dead.⁴³ In Yasna I, for example, the worshipper venerates the Fravashi of his own soul.⁴⁴ Yasna 24 pays homage to "those of men who are as yet unborn, and to those of the

³⁷ History of Zoroastrianism. J.C. Tarapore. K.R. Cama Oriental Institute Bombay 1963. (First published OUP 1938) p.235. See also Moulton Early Zoroastrianism op.cit. p.275 and Jackson, op.cit. p.23.

³⁸ Man's Disembodied protective spirits. See Dhalla op.cit. p.232, Duchesne-Guillemin. Western Response to Zoroaster op.cit. p.44. Gnoli, 'Fravashi', Encyclopedia of Religion ed.Eliade op.cit. Vol 5, p.413. Jackson op.cit. p.60.

³⁹ Equivalent of Indian Pitrs. Ibidem.

⁴⁰ Man's higher double. See Dhalla op.cit. p.232.

⁴¹ Early Aryan young men's societies associated with the cult of the dead, masquerades, and orgiastic festivals. See Gnoli Encyclopedia of Religion loc.cit. p.413.

⁴² Yasna 37:3. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 286.

⁴³ Yasna 24:5 also Yasna 45:6, Visparad 11:7. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. pp275, 295, 351.

⁴⁴ Yasna I: 18 (or the soul of the celebrant's client). S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 201.

prophets who will serve us"⁴⁵ thus demonstrating belief in the pre-existence of the Fravashi.

In the Farvardin Yasht (13) dedicated to them, the Fravashis are hailed by a litany of adjectives. They are valiant, liberal, powerful, strong, wise, effective, beneficent, good, excellent, bountiful, undecaying and holy⁴⁶— appellations just as applicable to the Khvarenah. Of their appearance little more is said than that they are bright, shining, full of glory. Much more attention is devoted to describing their functions. As well as carrying out the roles to which we have already referred (guardian and spiritual guide) the fravashis, like Ashi, are the dispensers of definite benefits.⁴⁷ They give victory in battle,⁴⁸ health to the sick⁴⁹ and glory to those who worship them.⁵⁰ Like the Khvarenah they are creative, that is, they are of assistance to Ohrmazd in his work of creating and maintaining as he tells Zoroaster "Had not the awful Fravashis of the faithful given help unto me, those animals and men of mine of which there are such excellent kinds, would not subsist".⁵¹ Always it is "through their brightness and glory" that such help is given and is effective.⁵² It is, of course, the radiance of the light of Ohrmazd.

⁴⁵ Yasna 24:5; also 26:6. Compare Yast 19:21 where sacrifice is made to the "Kingly Glory made by Mazda that belongs ... to the blessed ones, born or not yet born, who are to perform the restoration of the world". S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) pp.275, 279; Vol XXIII p.291.

⁴⁶ e.g. verses 1, 17, 21, 27, 30, 32, 40, 75. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter)

⁴⁷ e.g. verses 17, 30, 42. ibidem.

⁴⁸ e.g. verses 17, 23, 27, 31, 45, 46, 71. ibidem.

⁴⁹ e.g. verses 24,32. ibidem.

⁵⁰ e.g. verses 24,41. ibidem.

⁵¹ e.g. verse 12. ibidem.

⁵² e.g. verses 2, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16. ibidem.

Within the Farvardin Yasht there are other details concerning the Fravashis which are the same in effect as those applied elsewhere to the Khvarenah. They are described as 'winged', taking, as it were, "the form of a bird",⁵³ as the Khvarenah did when it departed from Yima.⁵⁴ Men desire and seek after them but are unable to seize them; the Fravashis cannot be appropriated by any sinner.⁵⁵

The picture of man's Fravashi appears even more of a complex blending of ideas when we see it described not as distinct from man's soul (as in the five-fold analysis of Greater Bundahishn Chapter 3) but as identical with it. In Yasna 26, for example, we read of worship being given to "the souls of the dead which are the Fravashis of the saints".⁵⁶ Yet in the immediately preceding verse of the same Yasna the soul and the Fravashi are clearly distinguished from each other in a classification of man's spiritual parts as: life, conscience, intelligence, soul and Fravashi.

There is a further identification made. This time it is not of soul with Fravashi but of soul with Khvarenah (reminiscent of the Hebrew references to soul as Kavodh). An occurrence is in the Greater Bundahishn with reference to the first man and woman who, when still "joined the one to the other in limb and form", had their Khvarenah hovering over them. When "they developed from plant into human form", "the Khvarr which is their soul entered into them secretly".⁵⁷ In verse 3 of this text a question is posed "which did (Ohrmazd) create first, the Khvarr or the body?" to which Ohrmazd

⁵³ verse 70. ibidem.

⁵⁴ Yasht 19:34. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter)

⁵⁵ Yasht 13:18, 24-25. 32, 36. Yasna 61:1. Compare Yasht 19: 45-6. S.B.E. Vols. XXIII, XXXI (tr. Darmesteter)

⁵⁶ Verse 7 also Gah II, 9-11. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter)

⁵⁷ Translation Zaehner. See The Teachings of the Magi op.cit. p.76.

himself makes reply, "the Khwarr was created first and the body afterwards". An exegetical comment from the writer follows: "(The Khwarr) was put into the body of him for whom it was created, for man's function was fashioned (first) and the body was created for the function. The interpretation of this is that the soul (ruvan) was created first, then the body. The soul directs the function within the body".⁵⁸ How are we to interpret the word 'function' in this context? Usage here of the Aristotelian notion of soul as that which 'forms' the body indicates that it refers simply to man's functioning in this world as a spiritual/material totality. Identification of soul with Khvarenah, however, calls to mind the function for which man was created, namely to be the main ally of Ohrmazd in his fight against Darkness. In this he is to be a praise of Glory.⁵⁹ It is precisely to this end that creation is effected through Khvarenah which is "more powerful to destroy (evil/darkness) than all other creatures".⁶⁰ It was through the Khvarenah, for example, that Zoroaster "thought according to the Law, spoke according to the Law, and did according to the Law so that he was the holiest in holiness in all the living world, the best-ruling in exercising rule, the brightest in brightness, the most glorious in glory, the most victorious in victory".⁶¹

The Denkard emphasises the priority of the Khvarenah in the creation of Zoroaster. "When Ohrmazd created the creation of Zardusht, then (first) was his glory".⁶² Zadspram makes the same emphasis, "when Freno gave birth to

⁵⁸ Ibidem

⁵⁹ See Dadistan-i-Denik III translated in Bible of the World (ed. Ballou) p.69.

⁶⁰ Yasht 19: 9-11. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) pp. 289-290.

⁶¹ Yasht 19:79 (Kingly glory). S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) pp. 304-305.

⁶² 7:2. Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) p.72.

the mother of Zaratust, whom they called Dukdak, it (the Khvarenah) came down from the endless light in the manner of fire and mingled with the fire which was before her; and from the fire it mingled with the mother of Zaratust".⁶³ Both accounts are agreed that the Fravashi of Zoroaster then entered his parents through the Hom plant.⁶⁴ The Denkard states that "the bodily substance was in the milk" that they drank, and concludes "thus the Glory, fravahr and bodily substance of Zardusht were united in his parents".⁶⁵

The image of the Fravashi as a 'winged protector' is missing from these two accounts. That its primary role here is not protection but nourishment and thereby promotion of growth is confirmed by another passage in the Denkard concerning "the invisible agents in man and their cause of action and their work".⁶⁶ The Fravashi, listed as one of four main causes, is defined as "the maintainer of visible form and nourisher of the body".⁶⁷ As Bailey's research has shown, the meaning of Fravashi in these texts is not based on the original etymology (whatever that is) but on one concerned with nourishment and growth.⁶⁸ But this usage, described by Bailey as "a break with the old tradition",⁶⁹ is not entirely arbitrary. In the Farvardin Yasht, for example, the roles of the Fravashis include those of maintenance and the promotion of growth. "Through their brightness and glory" is

⁶³ 13:1. S.B.E. Vol XLVII (tr. West) op. cit. pp. 138, 139.

⁶⁴ Zadspram 13:4, Denkard 7:14, 46. The hom is plant, god and drink. S.B.E. Vol XLVII (tr. West) pp. 139, 38, 46.

⁶⁵ 7:47. loc. cit.

⁶⁶ Denkard 241:13ff. loc. cit.

⁶⁷ Ibidem.

⁶⁸ Zoroastrian Problems op.cit. pp. 101-109.

⁶⁹ Ibidem page 109.

maintained "the wide earth ... upon which the many kinds of plants grow up from the ground, to nourish animals and men".⁷⁰ "Through their brightness and glory the females conceive offspring ... it is through their brightness and glory when they become blessed with children".⁷¹ This latter notion that the Fravashis are concerned with fertility seems connected with Zadspram's view that they enter the body with the sperm.⁷² This, in turn, is akin to the idea of the seed being the vehicle of the fiery Khvarenah. Likewise the stories in which the Fravashi of Zoroaster is said to come first into his parents through their drinking of the Hom are possibly related to the idea expressed elsewhere that the Hom is full of Khvarenah. viz: "The white hom, bright, full of Xvarrah, who has the healing, the medicine of immortality".⁷³

It does seem, as Bailey remarks, that in those texts in which the meaning of Fravashi is based on the newer etymology, the old Iranian idea that the Fravashi lives in the presence of Ohrmazd is ignored.⁷⁴ But is it "in fact contradicted"?⁷⁵ Not within an understanding of the overall picture of Zoroastrian cosmogony with its attendant conviction of Divine Immanence. Of this we have treated already at length. Put briefly: "Ohrmazd fashioned forth the form of his creatures from his own self, from

⁷⁰ Yasht 13:9-10. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p. 182.

⁷¹ Yasht 13:15. *ibidem*.

⁷² Zadspram 30:5 cited by Bailey op.cit. p. 109.

⁷³ Datastan i denik 36:86. S.B.E. Vol XVIII (tr. West).

⁷⁴ Zoroastrian Problems op.cit. p. 108. See Great Bundahishn 3: 11-13. Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.49.

⁷⁵ *loc.cit.*

the substance of light".⁷⁶ The getig creation, manifestation and completion of the menog is one with it but the latter remains invisible. The Divine Heptad is Ohrmazd's mode of presence in creation. "Seven of one deed: whose thought is the same, whose father and commander is the same, namely the Maker, Ahura Mazda".⁷⁷ Though they do not lend themselves to a precise definition, six members (Holy Immortals) of the Heptad are possibly best explained as hypostatized aspects of Ohrmazd's nature. Although One in unity, each is respectively guardian and inner reality of one of the six creations. The seventh 'member' of the Heptad (and its totality) is Ohrmazd himself whose Holy Spirit⁷⁸ is the inner reality of man.⁷⁹ Man, that is, is Ohrmazd's special creation, "fired" by him from the Kiln of his own thought⁸⁰ for the express purposes of praise and the overcoming of Darkness. Man's essence is of Fire which embodies Asha (Truth, Right, Order) and is the abode of Khvarenah, the Presence and the Glory.

The Fravashis, then, dwell in the presence of the Immanent/Transcendent Ohrmazd. To attempt their definition, however, is tantamount to trying to describe the exact colour, shape and location of fast moving clouds in a stormy sky. Fravashis belong to the Zoroastrian concept of man (and, indeed to the concept of all creation and its relationship to God) as clouds belong

⁷⁶ Great Bundahishn 1:44. Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.47.

⁷⁷ Yasht 19:16. S.B.E. Vol XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.290.

⁷⁸ Spenta Mainyu, originally one of the twin sons of Ahura Mazda. According to Yasht 19:46 Spenta M. struggled with his twin (the evil spirit) for the Glory when it departed from Yima. The Good spirit, is identified completely with Ohrmazd at least from Sassanian times in a relationship as impossible to define as that of the Christian Trinity. See Duchesne-Guillemin Religion of Ancient Iran. Op.cit. p. 4.

⁷⁹ e.g. Yasna 43:2,4,6; 45:6; 47:5. See also Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.13.

⁸⁰ Yasna 31:7; 48:4. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. pp.43, 155.

to the sky and they are just as nebulous. The analogy may be extended for as clouds are part of a rain cycle, the substance of which assumes different forms, so the fravashis are part of a spiritual cycle - that of the dynamic energy and power of Ohrmazd which finds expression especially in Fire and Khvarenah, the one part of the other. The energy of Ohrmazd IS his glory.

The rich imagery of myth and symbol does not give itself to literal interpretation, nor is it ever meant to do so. Its function is to express an experiential reality which can not properly be expressed in any other way. The Fravashi is a part of that language through or by which the Zoroastrian attempts to articulate his understanding of himself and his relationship with God and the world. Words are symbols, some more important than others.⁸¹ "Symbols are not retained which diminish man, only those that enhance him".⁸² The important word 'Fravashi' has been retained for thousands of years.⁸³ It expresses the deep conviction of man's uniqueness and prime importance; his essence was from the beginning and always will be. It asserts, as John Hinnells comments, that "man is, to a certain extent, a heavenly being".⁸⁴ In one sense he comes from the realm of Glory to which he will return. In another sense he is never absent from it. It is, perhaps, the first sense that is reflected in the Zoroastrian concept of the individual judgement and the second in that of the Final Restoration.

⁸¹ See chapter 1 page 1 of this thesis.

⁸² T. Fawcett The Symbolic Language of Religion op.cit. p. 35.

⁸³ Yasna Haptanghaiti, where it first appears, ranks next in age after the Gathas. M Boyce considers it "to be made up of what are in essence even more ancient texts". See Textual Sources (Z) (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.2.

⁸⁴ The Open University. Man's Religious Quest. Spanning East and West. Unit 26 The Zoroastrian Quest. Oxford University Press 1978. p.33.

The myth concerning the Bridge Chinvat⁸⁵ which man at his individual judgement must successfully negotiate if he is to 'go to' (rather than 'realise') heaven, is manifest example, if one were needed, of the reification of the realm of Glory; it is a definite place in space, somewhere above.⁸⁶ The bridge is the link between 'here' and 'there'. How a soul can transverse this link or enjoy the good food and other sensual delights⁸⁷ at heaven's end of it⁸⁸ is not explained. Either such questions did not enter the writers' thoughts or, if they did, were dismissed as of no consequence. Myth has its own logic.

According to the 'judgement' myth in the Menog i Khrad, when the soul of the saved has passed over the Bridge, he is met by his own daena in the form of a beautiful young maiden. In contrast, when he arrives in Hell, the soul of the condemned encounters his daena personified as a horrible hag.⁸⁹ What or who is the daena by whom the souls of both good and bad are confronted after dissolution of the body?

⁸⁵ e.g. Menok i Krat, 1:79ff; in Zaehner The Teaching of the Magi op. cit. p.134. Dadestan i denig Question 20. Textual Sources (ed. Boyce) op. cit. p.3. Bridge an ancient and common motif, is to be found also in Vedic Scriptures. e.g. Yajur Veda 28:4; Upanishad Chandogya 8,4,1 in R.C. Zaehner (tr.), Hindu Scriptures J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London 1966, p.125.

⁸⁶ This raises the problem (for some) of what happens to heaven at the Restoration. Bailey sees a partial solution in Pahlavi Rivayat Datastan i Denik 48: 98, wherein heaven is lowered and earth is raised to the star station. Is this too literal an interpretation of myth? See Zoroastrian Problems op.cit. pp.116-8.

⁸⁷ Great Bundahishn 190; Zadspram 29:6; Denkard 545:9. Menok i Khat, ed. Anklesaria. 1:97,99. Yasna 46:10. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.140.

⁸⁸ Heaven: 4 staged (or 4 heavens) Highest: Garodaman, Endless Light. General name for heaven is 'Best Existence'. Hell likewise has 4 sections. See Chapter 5, p.101 of this thesis.

⁸⁹ Chapter 2 125ff. In some accounts the encounter with Daena is before the crossing of the Bridge. For a discussion about this, see J Duchesne-Guillemin. Religion of Ancient Iran op.cit. p. 224.

Although a number of different etymologies have been propounded,⁹⁰ the original form of this Iranian word remains uncertain. Its two-fold meaning, however, is clear. Subjectively, daena refers to man's inner self, ego or conscience; objectively, it is that which reveals itself to the self and which the self is meant to embrace, namely Religion or Revelation. The most likely root for daena is therefore a word which embodies both meanings, namely Day (Skt. Dhi) 'see'.⁹¹

In its subjective meaning, daena occurs several times in the Gathas⁹² and elsewhere⁹³ but is generally replaced by a synonym in later writings.⁹⁴ Of all Ohrmazd's visible creation, only man has the invisible daena. In Yasna 45:2 we read that the Twin Spirits (and therefore, by implication, the Holy Immortals) also each have theirs. In an address to his twin, the Holy Spirit highlights the total disparity between them: "Neither our choices nor words nor acts, nor our inner selves (daenas) nor our souls agree". The daena of the Evil Spirit is antipathetic to the Good Religion, that of the Holy Spirit is one with it.

Man's daena is also intended by Ohrmazd to be one with the good religion, one, that is, with good thoughts, words and deeds. Whether intentionally or not, Erachji makes this point in response to the question

⁹⁰ e.g. (1) day (Sanskrit.dhi) 'see', 'think'; (2) Sanskrit dhena 'female'. See Duchesne-Guillemin. Religions of Ancient Iran op.cit. p.221.

⁹¹ Duchesne-Guillemin opts for this etymology while noting that it also "takes into account its morphological similarity with dhena" which means not only 'female' but also 'song' or 'prayer'. Ibidem p.221.

⁹² e.g. Yasna 31:11; 51:13; 46:11; 31:20. S.B.E. Vol XXXI (tr. Darmesteter).

⁹³ e.g. Menok i Khrat 1:79ff. (probably sixth century) Hadost Nask in Zaehner The Teachings of the Magi op. cit. p.134 and S.B.E. Vol. XXIII (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.159ff.

⁹⁴ e.g. Vendidad 10:19 "make thine own self (anhvam) pure". S.B.E. Vol IV (tr. Darmesteter) op. cit. p.141.

"What is den (religion)? He writes "The word is Pahlavi, Pazand and Arabic. It means "to praise, to obey, path, practice, dignity, to reward, piety, to offer prayers (bandagi)".⁹⁵ Within this rather mixed and untidy definition are to be found the two meanings of daena.

Another term in Zoroastrianism for Religion is Revelation, not as a propositional concept but as the Self-disclosure of Ohrmazd equatable with His presence. For only through Ohrmazd can man apprehend the revelation of Ohrmazd. And only through man can the presence/glory of Ohrmazd be one day fully revealed. That day, at the Final Restoration, the daenas of all men will be one with the daena that is Religion. Then "all men will become of one voice and given praise, to Ohrmazd and the Amahraspends".⁹⁶

Before the Final Restoration men will be resurrected from the dead and judged. The second judgement is not superfluous as some may be tempted to think but, together with bodily resurrection, is an integral part of Zoroastrian belief about the nature of man. He is menog and getig, not one or the other but both. Since he is not a dichotomy but a totality, the totality must eventually be judged. Moreover, as the corporeal is completion and fulfilment of the spiritual, final restoration demands that man be restored in his completeness and wholeness.

'Restoration' is perhaps not the best of terms to describe the dynamic reality that is Frashgird. 'Transformation' (trans:across) is more apt a description of the total change which it is believed will take place. All will be transformed; the inter-penetration of menog and getig clearly evident. Central to this transformation will be man, one now in will with

⁹⁵ A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion (tr. Kotwal) op. cit. p.188
Note den (Pahlavi), daena (Avestan).

⁹⁶ Bundahishn 30:16. in Bible of the World (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p.633.

Ohrmazd. To him and from him will flow uninterruptedly and visibly, the
Glory of Ohrmazd. Man, of the essence of fire, will be translucent.

Chapter Eleven

We have seen in the preceding chapter that though in the details of its thinking about the nature of man Zoroastrianism is not of a piece, it is very much of a whole when it comes to fundamentals. The same had earlier been observed of Judaism.¹ What is more, it is now obvious that however many the differences between them, both religions have a number of fundamental beliefs in common. When, that is, the canvas of the one faith depicts man in bold strokes, it is recognizable by and acceptable to the other. Such an outline shows man to be

A totality of body and soul,
Created by God for a divine purpose,
Peak and Centre of Creation of which he is the microcosm;
An immortal being
Though human, of the texture of divinity,
Destined by Glory for Glory.

A Buddhist gazing on this outline might well give it a caption such as 'misunderstanding', 'illusion', 'ignorance' or even 'not known'; it is extremely doubtful he would call it 'man', for his own attempts at portraiture are so very different.

In the gallery marked 'Buddhism' the many attempts at delineating 'man', like those of Zoroastrianism and Judaism, are often at variance with one another.² Only with deft, broad strokes can one Buddhist school of

¹ Chapter 9 page 204 of this thesis.

² e.g. The idea of anatta though common to all schools, is variously interpreted, so is man's goal (Nirvana) and his means of achieving it. "One may feel totally bewildered by the fact that such disparate approaches to the issues of true reality and self-realisation could have been brought under the common label of Buddhism" writes

thought make its picture representative of and acceptable to the other schools. The strokes are not (at first sight at least) complimentary: Man is a 'bundle' or 'heap' of five skandhas³ the stream of each of which is dissolved completely and finally at death. He has no permanent ego or self (atman) and is not, therefore, a 'person'. He comes into being (enters the wheel of suffering) through the interplay of dharmic forces. His aim is to escape rebirth and attain Nibbana (Sanskrit: Nirvana).

To the non-Buddhist, the last named part of the sketch (aim and its attainment) seems strangely at odds with the rest of it. Yet for the Buddhist it is that on which his thought is centred and the natural starting point for his outline of man⁴; for him all other lines of the drawing are in harmony with the first. But are they? If, for example, man is an ego-less compound the parts of which disintegrate completely and finally when 'he' dies, what is there to be reborn? What is it that is reborn? This last question is perhaps the most apposite, for something must pass on from rebirth to rebirth. Something must likewise attain the goal of perfection and experience the unutterable bliss of Nirvana.⁵ What is it that is thus saved? And, with reference to those Buddhists who do not rely on "other power", what or who does the saving? How can there be reliance on a self which does not exist? All these questions prompt us to ask another, viz:

Verdu. The Philosophy of Buddhism op.cit. Introduction.

³ "aggregate of dharmas". See chapter 4, pp.91-92. These "dharmas" are corporeality, impulses and emotions, consciousness, feelings, ability to perceive sense objects.

⁴ Buddhist thinking is based on an analysis of human existence and the needs to escape 'existence'.

⁵ If Nirvana is understood to be complete annihilation, then the problem doesn't arise. Few, however, accept this purely negative interpretation. See e.g. Dutt op.cit. p. 187 where he outlines the main ideas about Nirvana.

What is really meant by the Buddhist doctrine of anatta (Sanskrit: Anatman)?

Now if Gautama Buddha had been unequivocal in his usage of the term, we might more quickly come to a realisation of what he meant by it. The trouble is that Gautama was as much at home in using 'anatta' as he was in using 'atta', as various texts demonstrate. At times, that is, he explicitly states that there is no self,⁶ at other times he admits self to be a reality.⁷ Some there are who contend that this 'admission' of the self on Buddha's part is nothing more than his having recourse to conventional language or truth in order to make himself understood.⁸ This, however, is a dicey contention, for since Absolute Truth (Paramarthasatya) is beyond language and the scope of discursive thought, how can it be said that the affirmation of the existence of the self is a conventional statement and the denial of the existence of the self is not?⁹ One thing about the second statement seems reasonable to suppose. It is that for Buddha's religious contemporaries whose belief in the existence of the soul and its attributes was not only deeply entrenched in but central to their faith system,¹⁰ the term 'anatta' must have been startling in its unusualness. Perhaps, as

⁶ e.g. Dhammapada 277, 278, 279 S.B.E. vol. X (tr. M. Muller) op. cit. pp. 67-68.

⁷ Ibidem 236, 238, 239, 157, 160, 107.

⁸ e.g. Walpola Rahula op.cit. p. 55.

⁹ It is true, of course, that the statement "there is a self" concurs with what is 'ordinarily real', what appears to be, while the idea of 'non-self' is not what appears to be. In Buddha's usage of both expressions (atta, anatta) there can be no surety that he is saying that what does not appear to be, is, nor that what appears to be, is not.

¹⁰ Upanishadic thought, for example, takes as its basic assumption the presence in man of a soul identical with the world-soul. Man's aim/goal is to realize this identity. See, e.g. Chandogya Upanishad 7:15ff R.C. Zaehner, Hindu Scriptures op. cit. p. 121ff. There is a great deal of controversy concerning whether or not the Upanishadic concept of 'atta' brought influence to bear. For a contrary opinion see Conze Buddhist Thought in India op. cit. p.38.

Nalinaksha Dutt maintains, these shock tactics had to be deployed "in order to wipe out from the minds of the people the deep-rooted ideas".¹¹ Certainly early Buddhist ideas concerning the atman were very different from the ideas that had hitherto been in vogue. But as Conze comments "we cannot be quite sure what notions of an atman were envisaged by the early Buddhists when they so emphatically denied it".¹² He adds "it should be noted that in the basic formulas the absence of a self is confined to the five skandhas, and that nothing is said either way about its existence or non-existence quite apart from them. The Buddha never taught that the self 'is not', but only that it cannot be apprehended".¹³

Many scholars believe that Buddha's denial of a soul should not be taken literally. "The Buddha did not deny that there was something eternal" writes Trevor Ling, "only it was not to be found in the temporary agglomeration of factors, physical and psychical, which produce the appearance of an 'individual' ".¹⁴ C. Humphreys, who is of the same opinion, believes that Buddha's teaching about the self was "narrowed by later Buddhists to a doctrine of 'no soul' for which there is neither Scriptural authority nor the support of sense".¹⁵ For Zaehner "there is plenty of evidence that the Buddha recognised the existence of two 'selves' - the

¹¹ Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. p. 185.

¹² Buddhist Thought in India op.cit. p.38. Conze personally believes the notions "were of two kinds, i.e. (1) the ideas implied in the use of 'I' and 'mine' by ordinary people, and (2) the philosophical opinion that a continuing substratum acts as an agent which outlasts the different actions of a person, abides for one or more existences, and acts as a 'support' to the activities of an individual".

¹³ Ibidem p. 39.

¹⁴ A History of Religion East and West Macmillan Press Ltd 1984, p. 86.

¹⁵ Buddhism Penguin. Harmondsworth, Middlesex. 1975 edition pp. 20-21.

eternal which was real, and the empirical self or ego which was not".¹⁶ As part of this evidence Zaehner cites the advice given by Buddha to his disciples to "make of self a refuge" and "aspire for the state that changeth not". He believes that in this context the reference is to the eternal self which will experience Nirvana.¹⁷ Other texts supportive of the view that the Buddha recognised the existence of an eternal self and an empirical self include verse 160 from the Dhamma pada, "Self is the lord of self, who else could be the Lord? With self well subdued, a man finds a lord such as few can find",¹⁸ the Buddha's advice to Ananda in the Maha Parinibbana Sutta, "you are to be lamps unto yourselves"¹⁹ and, in the Vinaya Pitaka his request of others "to seek for the self".²⁰

There is no doubt that the Buddha waxed eloquent about what the soul is not²¹ but was never inclined to say what it is. This reticence on his part

¹⁶ 'Nirvana' in Hibbert Journal No. 57 1958-9 p.121.

¹⁷ Ibidem p.122. See also D.T. Suzuki, The Essentials of Zen Buddhism, Rider and Co. 1963. p.XVI (introd.), "The Great Death is also the Great Awakening, and the existential awakening to one's true self is called enlightenment" (underlining is mine). P.123, hsin, a Chinese word defying translation. "It means heart, mind, soul, spirit, each singly as well as inclusively. When (in Zen) it is intellectual as it usually is, it is not in the sense of logical or philosophical". P.373, Kokoro (hsin) "is no other than the self. P. 377, "The Self is to be definitively distinguished from the self".

¹⁸ This translation is not accepted by Walpola Rahula who argues that atta does not mean self in the sense of soul and natho does not mean lord but refuge. In the light of so many other examples supportive of the 'higher and lower selves' theory, Rahula's argument seems difficult to sustain. See What the Buddha taught op.cit. p. 59. For support of Rahula's opinion see N. Smart Doctrine and Argument in Indian Philosophy London, 1964.

¹⁹ Chapter 2: 26. (tr.) Trevor Ling The Buddha's Philosophy of Man Early Indian Buddhist Dialogues J.M. Dent & Sons 1981. p. 165.

²⁰ i,23. Also Digha Nikaya II: 100. S.B.B. Vol III (tr. T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids).

²¹ e.g. Samyutta-Nikaya 3:19, 33-4, 114-15; 4:48-50. Majjhima-Nikaya 1: 140-1. (tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids & T.L. Woodward, Pali Text Society Series).

could, of course, be interpreted as disbelief in the soul's existence. However, in the light of what we have said above, it is more probable that the Buddha declined to say anything about the nature of the soul because he felt that any such statement could only be hypothetical and in no way helpful to his hearers' spiritual progress. When, for example, Malunkya-putta asks questions which, in the Buddha's view, do not help spiritual progress he replies, "Malunkya-putta, it is as if a man were pierced by an arrow that was thickly smeared with poison and his friends and relations, his kith and kin, were to procure a physician and surgeon. He might speak thus 'I will not draw out this arrow until I know the name and clan of the man who pierced me ... whether he is tall or short or middling in height ... I will not draw out this arrow until I know of the shaft from which I was pierced what kind of feathers it had: whether those of a vulture or heron or hawk or some other bird ... Malunkya-putta, this man might pass away before ever this was known to him. And why, Malunkya-putta, has this not been explained by me? It is because it is not connected with the goal.'"²²

Not only irrelevant questions were dismissed by the Buddha but also those requiring answers which could mislead. In Buddha's opinion the question 'Is there a self?' fell into this latter category when posed by one Vacchagotta. The Mahavagga records his asking it of Buddha who does not reply. Later Buddha explains to his faithful companion " ... if I had answered 'there is a self', then Ananda, that would be siding with those recluses and brahmanas who hold the eternalist theory. If I had answered

²² From Majjhima-Nikaya I 427-432. See I.B. Horner Middle Length Sayings 1957 Vol. II pp. 98-101 and Man's Religious Quest edited by Foy, op.cit. pp. 217-8. Questions put to the Buddha by Malunkya-putta include those related to the self, e.g. "that the life-principle and the body are the same ... that the life principle is one thing and the body another thing".

'There is no self', then that would be siding with those recluses and brahmanas who hold the annihilationist theory. Again, Ananda, when asked by Vacchagotta 'Is there a self?', if I had answered 'there is a self' would that be in accordance with my knowledge that all dhammas are without self? And again, if I had answered 'There is no self' then that would have been a greater confusion to the already confused Vacchagotta".²³

It would seem from all this that what Buddha rejected was not the existence of the self/soul but Upanishadic views about it. Because he considered everything to lack permanence, to be in a constant state of flux, Buddha could not and did not understand the soul as substance; he did not reify the self. "Authentic selfhood" writes John Macquarrie "implies the attaining of a unified existence, in which potentialities are actualised in an orderly manner and there are no loose ends or alienated areas. The attaining of selfhood is therefore a matter of degree. It is clear, however, that this selfhood can never be something ready-made, and clear also that its unity is quite different from that of a thing. A thing endures through time and is the same thing ..."²⁴ All available evidence suggests that Buddha understood selfhood to be 'in potentia', not ready-made.²⁵ The Path to Enlightenment which he taught was believed by him to be the means of man's actualising his potentialities and coming to a realisation of the Eternal Self. It is an attachment to the false self that hinders progress along the Spiritual Path. A man who thus centres on his own illusory ego is off balance, unable to advance. He is like a thirsty

²³ ed. Saddhatissa Thera. Alutgama 1922. pp. 21-22
cited by Rahula op.cit. p. 62-3.

²⁴ Principles of Christian Theology op.cit. p.77.

²⁵ Compare with Maimonides' view that the essence of the soul is acquired only by knowledge. See chapter 9 p.224.

traveller in the desert who stumbles excitedly and repeatedly in the direction of a mirage, while an oasis which he cannot see, lies on the route he has vacated. Thus Buddha insisted that words such as 'I' and 'Mine' are without reality.²⁶ He therefore described himself not as 'I' but as 'Thus come' (Tathagata)²⁷ for as the enlightened One he had comprehended things as they really are; he had ceased 'becoming' and had become utterly selfless.

In Buddha's understanding those who do not cease 'becoming' in this life must face another life; they must be reborn. This belief in rebirth, taken over from Hinduism does not admit of the Zoroastrian, Jewish (and, as we shall see, Christian) view that man is a totality. It cannot, since that which transcends death is not limited to rebirth in a human body but takes the form impelled by its Karma. This form, as we have observed, may belong to any of the six planes of existence:²⁸ gods, asuras, men, animals, ghosts or hells.

All this does not seem to say much for the human body, nor does it allow for the idea of bodily resurrection. Indeed, the Jewish and Zoroastrian attitude of reverence for the body is not that of Buddhism. In Buddha's view the material body was acquired precisely through craving for it, it is therefore to be degraded. His monks are taught to do just this and to continually observe it so as to come to a realisation of its transitory nature. He tells them "moreover, bhikkhus, one contemplates the body from the soles of the feet to the crown of the head, as something

²⁶ e.g. Majjhima Nikaya, 72. (Pali Text edition) Vol. I.

²⁷ Also 'he who thus goes'. Tatha: thus. Agata: come. Gata: gone. For different meanings see Junjiro Takakusu. The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy. Greenwood Press. Westport, Connecticut 1975 pp. 38-9.

²⁸ Chapter 7 note 62. Majjhima - Nikaya iii 167-9; The 'Sutra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian edited by D.N. Mackenzie, Oxford University Press 1970 p. 27.

enclosed in skin and full of various impurities. It is as if there were a bag tied at both ends, full of various sorts of grain, paddy, beans, vetches, sesamum and rice husked for boiling, and a keen-eyed man were to consider as he poured them out 'that's rice, that's paddy, those are beans', and so forth. Even so does one reflect upon the body".²⁹

Reflection on the body and on the transitory nature of all conditioned things was considered by Buddha to be a vital step along the Path which leads to enlightenment. It is a step which only man can take since other forms of life are either not able to reflect or lack the inclination to do so.³⁰ In Buddhist thought, therefore, the human form which in one sense is degraded is in another sense given the highest importance, for only through it is enlightenment possible, that is, Nirvana is only accessible to man.³¹ Only man can attain to Glory.

Given this exalted view of humble man we might well expect him to occupy central place in the scheme of things as he does in Zoroastrian and Jewish thought. In Buddhist belief, however, the cosmos is not homocentric;³² all in it, man included, is co-created, each the immediate product not of a personal uncaused Cause but of various causes.³³ Creation

²⁹ Maha Satipatthana Sutta verse 5. Ling (ed.) The Buddha's Philosophy of Man op.cit. p. 73.

³⁰ e.g. (a) animals lack reflective power, gods are too satisfied to bother. (b) Birth as a human is rare given the length of the series. See Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 51.

³¹ Man must therefore seize the opportunity. Therigatha 500, Suttanipata 333; Dhammapada 315. S.B.E. Vol X (tr. M. Muller).

³² Guenther explains it as "a network of interdependent, co-existent and freely co-operating forces (in which network) at any given time any one factor may take the highest place in a hierarchy of causes and effects". See Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice. op.cit. p. 76.

³³ Law of Dependent Origination. Majjhima - Nikaya 1. 190-1; Samyutta - Nikaya ii, 92. Pali Text Society Translation Series (5 Vols) 1917-9130 (tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids & F.L. Woodward).

is not 'ex nihilo' and there was no beginning. In this sort of system in which room is not obviously made for a Creator God, man can hardly be thought of as "made in God's Image", not at least in the sense in which the term is usually interpreted. In what way then are we to understand the real self in man which transcends the ego?

Some Buddhists would dismiss this question at the outset; for various reasons³⁴ they would consider time spent on it as wasteful. Others, for example some from the Theravada school, might refute its content on the grounds that it conflicts with Buddhist teaching (and with their own belief) that there is no self or soul. Others, by far the greater number, would consider the question valid. This last group includes those belonging to the Great Vehicle who, unlike the Theravadins, believe that salvation is not for the few but for everyone; all are potential Buddhas for all have the Buddha-nature. This 'nature' is the real Self.

"The road to Buddhahood is open to all.

At all times have all living beings the

Germ of Buddhahood in them".

asserts the Ratnagotravibhaga and then explains

"If the Element of the Buddha did not exist (in everyone)

There could be no disgust with suffering.

Nor could there be a wish for Nirvana".³⁵

That "all life involves Dukkha" is, of course, the first of the four noble truths the realisation of which gives entry to the Path. Here translated suffering, Dukkha also means imperfection, emptiness,

³⁴ e.g. its (supposed) irrelevance to salvation, its inability to 'save'.

³⁵ 1: 28.40. tr. E. Conze in Buddhist texts 1954 p. 168ff. Cited by G. Parrinder. Mysticism in the World's Religions Sheldon Press 1976 p. 61.

impermanence and evil. The Ratnagotravibhaga is stating, therefore, that within man there is that which at some stage overcomes the ego and inclines him to pursue perfection.³⁶ The Buddha-nature within him hungers for the fulfilment, the Truth and the Glory which is Nirvana. Such hungering is in some sense echoed in St. Augustine's well known phrase "the human heart is restless until it rests in God". The human heart is, of course, here designate for Eternal Soul, for man in the depths of his being. In Christian as in Zoroastrian and Jewish thought that which tends man towards God is the Divine, the Glory within him.³⁷

The 'existence of God', a belief fundamental to Zoroastrian, Jewish and Christian faiths, is not generally thought to be that of Buddhism. 'Buddhism is atheistic - there is no doubt about it'³⁸ is the categorical assertion of Takakusu which is echoed by a number of other scholars.³⁹ Others again are of the opinion that since Buddha neither affirmed nor denied the existence of God, Buddhism should be labelled 'agnostic'.⁴⁰ But what do both these groups and others mean by the "existence of God"? It is questionable whether the ambiguity of the term is always recognised. In the

³⁶ Though all living things have Buddha-nature, only man is inclined to pursue perfection.

³⁷ According to Aquinas, desire is a state of being connoting a transcendental relation. Summa Theologiae Vol. XIX 1a-2ae p.125ff, Blackfriars London, 1964.

³⁸ The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy op.cit. p. 45.

³⁹ e.g. Walpola Rahula op.cit. p.56 John Noss Man's Religions 6th edition Collier Macmillan London 1980 p.115., A.K. Warder 'Is Najarjuna a Mahayanist' in The Problem of Two Truths in Buddhism and Vedanta. ed. Mervyn Sprung. D. Reidel Publishing Co. Dordrecht-Holland, Boston, U.S.A. 1973. p. 85.

⁴⁰ See for example, Lde la Vallee Poussin 'Agnosticism Buddhist' in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics ed. Hastings. op.cit. Vol. I p.224

first place, 'existence' is a tricky word⁴¹ to postulate of the Transcendens, that is, when used in relation to God it runs the risk of reifying him. Secondly, the term 'God' is not limited to the idea of a personal Creator God, nor to monotheistic belief, but has many meanings.⁴² Not only are there many different concepts of God, but also many different ways of thinking about a particular concept. It cannot, therefore, be guaranteed that when different people use the same term (God) they are meaning the same thing. Nor can it be guaranteed that those who fail to use the term at all necessarily exclude all its meanings from their thinking.

Buddhism does not generally talk of God⁴³ but centres itself instead on the concept of Nirvana which, as we have observed, is understood as unutterable bliss, the fullest of Truth and the supreme goal of human endeavour. Is Nirvana the 'Buddhist analogue to God' as some scholars consider it to be?⁴⁴ The answer to this question has important bearings on our understanding of the Buddha-nature (Eternal Self) in man.

Although it is given a different interpretation by different Buddhist schools, Nirvana is generally understood by all of them to be inconceivable, imperishable, unconditioned, permanent and uncreated. The following quotation from the Udana says just about all that many Buddhists believe can

⁴¹ See C.C.F. Williams What is Existence Clarendon Press 1981.

⁴² e.g. God may be conceived ontologically, existentially or anthropomorphically. He may be the major God in a pantheon of gods.

⁴³ The Gods of Buddhism are mortal beings. A reference to God occurs e.g. No. 8 of the 12 Principles of Buddhism (as drafted by the Buddhist Society, London, in 1945) "Reality is indescribable and a God with attributes is not the final Reality ... " See B. Suzuki Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. p. 130.

⁴⁴ e.g. Keith Ward. Images of Eternity Concepts of God in Five Religious Traditions Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1987 chapter 3; Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 40.

be said about it.

"There is a not-born, a not-become, a not-created,
a not-formed. If there were not this not-born, this
not-become, this not-created, this not-formed, then here
an escape from the born, the become, the created,
the formed, could not be known".⁴⁵

These words call to mind those of the great German Christian mystic,
Meister Eckhart in his commentary on the "I am that I am" of Exodus 3:14.

"His simple nature is, regarding forms, formless,
regarding being, beingless, regarding becoming,
becoming not, regarding things, thingless, and therefore
He escapes from things of becoming, and all
such things there come to an end".⁴⁶

For the Mahayanist at least, the realisation of Nirvana is a mystical
experience⁴⁷ and also a transformation. He too 'escapes from things of
becoming and finally 'becomes' in the One Eternal Now.' His true self
transcends the false and becomes one in unity with the Eternal Truth, the
'Reality beyond determination'.⁴⁸ In Christian mystical thought, in so far
as 'being' involves 'becoming', God is above Being, nor does he 'exist' as
beings do. He is, says Meister Eckhart, "as high above Being as an angel

⁴⁵ Udana VII, 1-2. Cited by W.L. King Buddhism and Christianity
George Allen and Unwin 1962 p. 223.

⁴⁶ The Work of Meister Eckhart trans. Cde B. Evans. Watkins.
England. Cited by Rudolph Otto Mysticism East and West Macmillan and
Co Ltd London 1932 p. 9.

⁴⁷ See Geoffrey Parrinder Mysticism in the World's Religions
op.cit. ch. 6.

⁴⁸ Dutt, in his exposition of Nirvana outlines the different names
by which it is called. op.cit. ch. 6.

above a gnat".⁴⁹ "When we compare the attributes of the Godhead as they are understood by the more mystical tradition of Christian thought, with those of Nirvana", states Conze "we find almost no difference at all".⁵⁰ It seems to the present writer that it is very hard to escape the conclusion that Nirvana is the Buddhist term for God.

It remains true that Buddhism does not think in terms of a Creator-'God'. That "all things are born of causation"⁵¹ is a belief common to all schools, but the idea of a personal Causer does not figure in it. Not all schools, however, hold the same theory of causation. The Hinayana theory based on the belief that the individual mind/consciousness is only a series of fleeting perceptions and therefore without any intrinsic unity, was turned upside down by the Mahayana, particularly the Yogacarīn School, in whose opinion only the Mind, Thought or Consciousness is real, one and indivisible. In this second theory all things are a function of the mind, everything issues from it even subjective individuality. "The Mind is the leader of all things. When a man understands the mind he knows all things, because all things of the world are created by the Mind"⁵² states one Sutra. "Even birth and death are caused by the Mind, and when it is quieted there is no more birth and death"⁵³ declares another. Thus, according to this school of thought, to attain quietness of mind is to attain enlightenment; it is to realise Nirvana.

⁴⁹ Cited by Rudolph Otto Mysticism East and West op.cit. p.24.

⁵⁰ Buddhism op.cit. p. 39.

⁵¹ Sandhinirmocana-sutra. See Suzuki. Mahayana Buddhism op.cit. Chapter 6 Extracts from Mahayana Sutras p. 104.

⁵² Prajnaparamita-Sutra. See Suzuki op.cit. p. 104.

⁵³ Avatamsaka-Sutra. Ibidem p.104.

"Quietness of mind"⁵⁴ is another term for 'pure consciousness'. 'Noisiness' and 'impurity' within this context are synonymous as are Mind and Thought synonymous with consciousness. Quietness or purity is attained when all forms of selfishness, particularly belief in an ego, have been eliminated and when (in idealist thinking) differentiation between subject and object has ceased. It is attained, that is, when the Mind is no longer deluded by appearance but sees/experiences things as they really are and is One with Reality. This is the perfection of wisdom. However, for those in whom any vestige of selfishness remains and/or who still deludedly dichotomize, the real nature of the mind remains shrouded, its radiance hidden. "The nature of mind is pure, but evils are the dust on it. Remove the dust of the mind with the water of wisdom" is the advice of the Manjusri-paripriccha-sutra".⁵⁵ To heed it is to come, after a long struggle⁵⁶, to the realisation that corporeal form and Mind are non-dual.⁵⁷ It is to realise Nirvana which is the same as pure Thought and is the Absolute, the Immutable, Ultimate Reality.

The Absolute is also termed Tathata (Suchness, Thusness) which, in turn, corresponds to the concept of Sunyata (Void) of which we have spoken in an earlier chapter. Tathata is the root of the whole chain of Causation. Forever unchanged it has two aspects: (a) unconditioned (b)

⁵⁴ Achieved largely by yogic methods. See Conze Buddhism op.cit. p. 67 and Dutt op.cit. p. 235.

⁵⁵ Suzuki op.cit. p. 112.

⁵⁶ "... infinite Kalpas have passed since Buddha struggled against his mind. He never yielded ..." Nirvana Sutra In B Suzuki Mahayana Buddhism op. cit. 112.

⁵⁷ The Awakening of Faith 72.

conditioned.⁵⁸ The latter refers to its manifestation in the world of phenomena or rather that which is perceived to be so by the one who, as yet unenlightened, still dichotomizes. The Awakening of Faith says of Tathata

" ... it is the same in all beings ... ; it was not born in the past, it will not pass away in the future; it remains constant and unchanged. From the first it contains in itself all virtues and there is nothing wanting in it. That is to say, it has in itself the great light of Prajna whereby the entire universe is illumined to its furthest end; it has the knowledge of Truth; it is the mind retaining its original purity; it is eternal, blissful, self-ruling and free from defilement. It thus fulfils all the Buddha-virtues and these virtues are not separable (from Suchness itself). Being thus self-containing, Suchness knows nothing wanting. It is therefore called the Tathagata-garbha, 'womb of Tathagatahood', and the Tathagata's Dharmakaya."⁵⁹

The term 'Tathata' was apparently coined to put a limit to verbalisation.⁶⁰ It is evident from the above extract that man is not easily kept within such verbal boundaries. The Mahayan Buddhist takes for granted that there IS an Absolute and finds synonyms not to explain or justify belief in it but simply to express that it is. Most often termed Nirvana, it seems to be the Buddhist equivalent for God.

We are now at the point where we can return to the question "How are we to understand the real self in man which transcends the ego?" From The Awakening of Faith and other texts it is clear that in Mahayana Buddhist

⁵⁸ See Dutt op.cit. p.277.

⁵⁹ Cited by B. Suzuki op.cit. p. 43.

⁶⁰ See Verdu op.cit p.45.

thought the essence of man is mind. The oft repeated injunction "Look within, thou art Buddha"⁶¹ can as well be phrased. 'Look within, thou art Mind/Tathata/Dharmakaya/Tathagata-garbha". The problem is that the man who is ignorant does not direct his gaze within but, stopping at the ego, perceives the manifestation not the essence, the appearance, not the Reality. When, however, man through wisdom intuitively understands that he is Buddha, he enters the realm of Mind/Nirvana, that is, he realises his real, Eternal self. In Mahayan Buddhist belief, man in his essence is of the fabric of the Absolute.

The essence (mind) of man is luminous, though where there are impurities they are preventative of its luminosity being realised. "Self-luminous through and through is that thought, but usually it is defiled by adventitious taints which come from without" states an early Buddhist text.⁶² Many other texts describe the luminosity of the mind freed from taint. For example, in the account of Asvaghosa's conversion we read of his teacher's ability to light up a darkened room through the power of mind.⁶³ A similar story is recorded in the Dirghanana-Sutra of Buddha.⁶⁴ In the Awakening of Faith the Mind is referred to as the "great light of Prajna whereby the universe is illuminated".⁶⁵ A contemporary Buddhist refers to

⁶¹ D.T. Suzuki Introduction to Zen Buddhism Rider & Co. London and New York 1959 pp.18, 231.

⁶² Anguttara Nikaya 1. 8-10. cited by Conze, Buddhism op. cit. p.162.

⁶³ Asvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith (tr. T. Suzuki), Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co., 1900. Selections reprinted in The World Bible (ed. Ballou) op. cit. p.336.

⁶⁴ Dighanikaya 10. Cited by M. Eliade. The Two and the One Harper and Row, New York 1965 p.35.

⁶⁵ See note 58.

it as "divine light".⁶⁶ He writes of enlightenment: "Having set ourselves free from the mistaken conception of self, next we must awaken our innermost wisdom, pure and divine, called the Mind of Buddha, or Bodhi, or Prajna by Zen masters".⁶⁷

The synonym for Mind which is perhaps the most expressive of radiance is the Dharmakaya whose manifestation for the benefit of Bodhisattvas⁶⁸ is the Sambhogakaya Body of Glory. In its salvific aspect the sambhogakaya makes the statement that the Buddha-nature/Eternal Self of all men will one day be realised. As a body of 'shared bliss/glory' it indicates both the Reality that is One, and the goal of realised union. As a transcendental symbol midway between Dharmakaya and Nirmanakaya, the Sambhogakaya points to the interpenetration of Samsara with Nirvana.⁶⁹ It attests above all the belief that man of the essence of Glory, is destined for Glory. Glory is his essential nature.

⁶⁶ Kaiten Nukariya. The Religion of the Samurai London 1913 p.133.

⁶⁷ Ibidem. Cited by C.G. Jung. Psychology and Religion: West and East tr. R. Hull 2nd Ed. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London & Henley p. 539.

⁶⁸ See chapter 4.

⁶⁹ In the final teaching of Mahayana, Samsara is Nirvana. See chapter 4 p.93.

Chapter Twelve

"For from him and through him and
to him are all things. To him be
glory for ever"¹

Though Buddhist thought centres on Nirvana, it begins with an analysis of man's existence and is concerned primarily with the idea of salvation. It does not worry itself with questions about Creation or a Creator, considering such topics as unhelpful to spiritual progress.² Christian thought, in contrast, grounds itself on the belief that God is Creator and that "in him we live and move and have our being".³ The first assertion, therefore, that Christianity makes of man is that he is a creature⁴; in making this assertion Christianity begins not with man but with God. When it turns to man, it is in terms of his relationship with God. In this it is akin to Zoroastrianism and to Judaism. The Scriptures of all three religions are about relationship.⁵ Those of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, however, are specifically about the encounter of God with man and man's response to God.

No early Christian writes more forcefully about Encounter than does Paul the Apostle. There is possibly no one else who had more reason to do so. His own extraordinary Encounter on the Damascus road is recorded three

¹ Romans 11:36.

² Though, as seen in the previous chapter, Buddhism does not absolutely deny the existence of a Creator.

³ Acts 17:28.

⁴ Credo begins 'I believe in One God the Father, almighty, Creator ...

⁵ The concept of 'relationship' is, of course, present also in Buddhist scriptures, but not in the sense of creature with Creator, man with God.

times⁶. The words then addressed to him "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?"⁷ brought home to Paul the real meaning of 'relationship'. After continued and ever deepening experience of it he could later say "I count everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord",⁸ "It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me".⁹

Of all the New Testament writers, it is Paul who has most to say about the nature of man. It is not that he gives, or purports to give, a philosophical description or detailed analysis of the make-up of man, rather what he has to say is incidental to and directly in line with his main purpose, from which he will not be deflected. His "anthropology serves the interests of his soteriology".¹⁰ It is with Pauline anthropology that we will begin and on which for the most part we will concentrate in studying the New Testament concept of man. It is understood, of course, that "the fundamental basis for the Christian view of man is the value which Jesus Christ placed on human nature."¹¹ This value, proclaimed throughout the whole of the New Testament writings, is 'embodied' very specially in the Gospels in the person of Christ himself who "gave himself for us".¹² "See what love the Father has given us."¹³

⁶ Acts 9:1-9; 22:6-11; 26:12-18. See also Galatians 1:12-17.

⁷ Acts 22:7; 26:14.

⁸ Phil. 3:8.

⁹ Galatians 2:20.

¹⁰ H. McDonald The Christian View of Man. Marshall Morgan and Scott, London, 1981, p.14.

¹¹ Ibidem p.1.

¹² Titus 2:14.

¹³ 1 John 3:1.

Paul writes in Greek but his thought is predominantly Jewish. Therefore he draws on Old Testament ideas about the constitution and character of man, developing them within the context of Christian theology. On most of these ideas we need dwell here but briefly.

As in the Old Testament view, so in that of Paul, Man is a 'living soul', a totality. The apostle looks forward to the day when the Lord "will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body".¹⁴ He tells the folk at Corinth who are putting undue emphasis on the Spirit, that the body is meant "for the Lord and the Lord for the body"¹⁵ and adds "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? ... So glorify God in your body."¹⁶ Time and again Paul insists that there will be a resurrection of the body through the power of Christ,¹⁷ that "This perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality."¹⁸ This is the Christian conviction. Christ's redeeming work is for man who is body and soul, not one or the other. This too is Christian belief, although down the ages there has been a tendency to stress the importance of the soul to the detriment of the body, to the detriment, that is, to the notion of man's wholeness.¹⁹

¹⁴ Phil. 3:21.

¹⁵ 1 Corinth. 6:13.

¹⁶ 1 Corinth. 6:15, 20.

¹⁷ e.g. Romans 8:11; 1 Corinth. 14; 15:35-44; 2 Corinth. 4:14; Phil. 3:11.

¹⁸ 1 Corinth. 15:53-54.

¹⁹ Jurgen Moltmann comments "The whole trend towards a 'spiritualising' of the soul and a 'materialization' of the body also unconsciously dominates the whole of western anthropological theory". God in Creation S.C.M. Press Ltd., London 1985 p.244. See also McDonald op. cit. p.23. See also Writings of St. Augustine: 'The Trinity' in The Fathers of the Church. tr. Stephen McKenna. Catholic University of America Press, Inc. Washington,

In Pauline anthropology the term 'body' (soma) is thus used primarily to denote the person²⁰ though it is also used in the physical sense²¹, sometimes synonymously with 'flesh' (sarx), which signifies man's creatureliness and therefore his weakness and inadequacy apart from God.²²

The term 'soul' (psyche) also denotes 'person'²³ in Pauline usage. Generally, it refers to man's physical, natural life²⁴ and is basically the same in meaning as the Hebrew 'nefesh'. The same may be said of general usage of the word in the New Testament.²⁵ There is also, however, a conception of 'soul' as the object of God's salvific grace as, for example, in Mark's recording of Jesus' statement "For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life (pysche)?"²⁶ In such instances the spiritual is not set over against the material so as to dichotomize. In the **present quotation** the reference is to man (a totality) who may choose to forfeit supernatural life (a loving relationship with God).

Man is related to God through the 'spirit' (pneuma) the dynamic inner power through which he is able to be aware of and respond to God. Paul

1970 reprint. pp.111, 248, 250.

²⁰ e.g. Romans 12:1; Eph 5:25; Phil. 1:20; 1 Corinth. 6:18.

²¹ e.g. 1 Corinth. 9:27; 13:3; 2 Corinth. 4:10; Gal. 6:17; See also Mk. 5:29; Matt. 6:25.

²² e.g. Romans 2:28. Sometimes flesh and spirit are contrasted as in Romans 8:14 where believing Christians "walk not according to the flesh but according to the spirit." This means in fact, that they walk in relationship with and dependence on Christ and are not left to their own inadequacy and weakness.

²³ Romans 2:9; 13:1; 2 Corinth. 1:23.

²⁴ Romans 11:3; 16:4; Phil. 2:30. In 2 Cor. 12:15 the reference is to spiritual life.

²⁵ e.g. Matthew 2:20; 6:25; Luke 12:22; Acts 2:27.

²⁶ 8:36.

tells the Romans "When we cry, 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God."²⁷ This inner force is an aspect of man, inseparable from him. In believing Christians it is empowered and renewed by the Spirit of God which dwells within.²⁸ Sometimes Paul's use of 'spirit' is indistinguishable from that of 'soul'²⁹ for "both terms denote man in his natural existence approached from within."³⁰

Of all the terms which Paul uses to designate the 'inner man' it is the heart (kardia) which takes primary place.³¹ Since New Testament usage follows that of the Old Testament, all that we have said about Leb³² applies here. Inclusive of all other terms concerning the 'within' of man, heart denotes man's whole inner being; it signifies the human person in all his/her relationships with God and all else.³³

Closely connected with the concept of heart is nous, employed by Paul in various ways but always to define the inner man. Meaning at different times 'mind', 'disposition', 'understanding', 'thought', 'judgement',

²⁷ 8:15-16.

²⁸ It is often impossible to know to which spirit (God's or man's) Paul is referring, e.g. 2 Cor. 6:6.

²⁹ As, for example, in the endings of his letters: Gal. 6:18; 1 Corinth. 16:23; Phil. 4:23.

³⁰ Herman Ridderbos, Paul. An outline of his Theology. tr. J.R. de Witt. S.P.C.K. London, 1977 p.121.

³¹ e.g. Romans 9:2; 10:1; 2 Corinth. 9:7; 6:11; 1 Corinth. 7:37; 1 Theso. 2:17. See 'Kardia' TDNT Vol III op.cit p.611; Ryder Smith. The Bible Doctrine of Man Epworth Press, London, 1951, p.151.

³² Chapter 9, p.208.

³³ e.g. Eph. 3:7; Romans 5:5; 8:27; 9:2; 2 Corinth. 4:6; 9:7.

'discernment', 'resolve', 'moral consciousness',³⁴ nous cannot be squeezed into one single English word and is therefore best left in Greek. Everyone, says Paul, should be "fully convinced in his own nous".³⁵ Human in function, nous is not, therefore, the divine element or glory in man as it is for Philo.³⁶ It points to the fact that man has the capacity to hear and respond to God, that he is a responsible being.

Man exercises his responsibility according to his conscience. The word 'conscience' (suneidesis) states Robert Koch "practically owes its place in the Christian vocabulary to Paul".³⁷ The apostle derives the word from Greek philosophy,³⁸ but the concept is his own Jewish inheritance.³⁹ In his use of the term Paul stresses that man is endowed with the gift of moral self-judgement; he knows in his heart, as it were, the difference between right and wrong and bears there the effect of the choice he makes. From a good conscience, enlightened by faith, there issues love⁴⁰ without which nothing is of any value.⁴¹ Love is the evidence and the expression of man's

³⁴ e.g. Col. 2:18; Eph. 4:17 (mind); Romans 14:5 (judgement). 2 Thess. 2:2 (resolution). See Behm 'nous etc.' TDNT Vol. 4.

³⁵ Romans 14:5.

³⁶ See Ch.9 p.217.

³⁷ 'Man' in Ency. Bib. Theology ed. Bauer Vol II op.cit p.548. "Conscience" is used 19 times by Paul and is only found 12 times in the rest of the N.T.

³⁸ Usually attributed to the Stoics but more recently to popular Greek thought. See McDonald op.cit. p.17

³⁹ The Hebrew has no single word for 'Conscience'; heart (leb) comes nearest. In the O.T. the prophets, for example, appeal to men's hearts (consciences).

⁴⁰ 1 Tim. 1:5; Gal. 5:6.

⁴¹ 1 Corinth. 13.

relationship with God⁴² for God is love.⁴³

Relationship is man's *raison d'être*. Created in and for love, man is meant to reciprocate by a loving service of the Father-God whose son he is.⁴⁴ His chief end is thus to give God glory. To this end he was created in the divine image. As Tillich remarks, "man can have communion with God only because he is made in his image."⁴⁵ For Paul, the "image of God" in man is equated with God's glory in man.⁴⁶ He writes "man ... is the image and glory of God."⁴⁷ However, an integral part of God's entering into a special relationship with human beings is their freedom to reciprocate.⁴⁸ They may choose to live in and for God or for themselves. The first man, Adam, chose to live for himself. In thus sinning⁴⁹ he estranged himself from God and thereby involved the whole human race: "Sin came into the world through one man and death through sin".⁵⁰ Paul adheres to the Old Testament belief that death is the result of sin: death is universal because sin is universal. Sin is understood as a 'power'⁵¹ which, in Karl Barth's words,

⁴² Col. 2:6-7; Eph.3:17-19; Gal.5:6,13; 2 Thess.3:5.

⁴³ Romans 5:5; 1 John 4:8.

⁴⁴ Romans 8:14-16; 9:4,7,8,26; 2 Corinth. 6:18; Gal.4:6.

⁴⁵ Systematic Theology Part I. S.C.M. Press London 1978 p.259.

⁴⁶ Paul's reference here is obviously to Gen. 1:26 which he combines with Psalm 8. Moltmann makes the same observation op.cit. p.225.

⁴⁷ 1 Corinth. 11:7.

⁴⁸ Tillich comments "Symbolically speaking, it is the image of God in man which gives the possibility of the Fall. Only he who has the Image of God has the power of separating himself from God." op.cit. Part II p.33.

⁴⁹ i.e. rebelling against God in a refusal to serve.

⁵⁰ Romans 5:12.

⁵¹ or state. See McKenzie. Dictionary of the Bible op.cit. p.820.

is derived from "an especial relationship of men to God"⁵² and is "a robbing of God."⁵³ Paul does not imply that all participate with Adam in the same act of robbery, he means that all men share in the effects of that act. Sin is the human condition.

It is a condition wherein men can no longer adequately represent God nor clearly reflect His presence; His image in them is marred. "Since all men have sinned" says Paul, they "fall short of the glory of God".⁵⁴ Paul does not here mean that the divine image is lost, as some scholars suppose,⁵⁵ only that it is not now conspicuous. Its full lustre is restorable through a relationship with God in Christ.⁵⁶ To Paul has been entrusted the mission of making this known, of preaching "the gospel of the glory of Christ who is the likeness of God".⁵⁷ He does so by means of a creation-centred spirituality, "to make all men see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things."⁵⁸ Of this 'mystery' we have spoken in part in Chapter I, let us now examine it a little more closely.

Biblical documents indicate that in ancient Israelite religion Yahweh

⁵² The Epistle to the Romans tr. from the 6th edition by Edwyn Hoskins Oxford Univ. Press 1972 p.167.

⁵³ Ibidem.

⁵⁴ Romans 3:23.

⁵⁵ e.g. Ernst Kasemann Commentary on Romans trans. and ed. G.W. Bromiley S.C.M. Press Ltd. London 1980. p.95; Brendan Byrne. Reckoning with Romans Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware, 1986. The glory/Image is not lost because, although man broke/breaks off his relationship with God, God did not/does not break off his relationship with man.

⁵⁶ Col. 3:9-10; 1 Corinth. 15:47-50.

⁵⁷ 2 Corinth. 4:4.

⁵⁸ Ephesians 3:9.

was regarded as Saviour rather than as Creator.⁵⁹ Israel's stance, like that of the Buddha, was experiential. Uppermost in her mind was the saving experience she had undergone; Yahweh had manifested his glory, he was her Saviour-God. Thus, when later a doctrine of creation was formulated it was bound up with that of salvation.⁶⁰ Certainly by the time of Deutero-Isaiah, salvation and creation had become synonymous terms.⁶¹ God's first creative act had been the putting into action of his salvific plan. His redemptive/creative acts continue throughout history and in them all he reveals his glory.

Ideas about God's mode of creating remained fluid. Biblical writers from the earliest period had likened God to a potter "shaping" his world.⁶² Later, in a different milieu, the Priestly writer described God as bringing all things into being by the power, not of hand, but of word. "God said 'let there be light', and there was light".⁶³ Belief in creation by the word took firm hold in later Judaism: "By the words of the Lord his works are done ... and the work of the Lord is full of his glory."⁶⁴ This belief was inherited by the Christians.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Statements in which Yahweh is definitively stressed as creator of the world are found in some of the psalms (uncertain of date); the Priestly document (5th century) and Deutero-Isaiah (Exilic).

⁶⁰ Von Rad thinks it likely that a soteriological understanding of creation also lies behind the Yahwist account of creation, but not for its own sake. See O.T. Theology Vol. I op.cit. p.138.

⁶¹ e.g. Isaiah 43:1.

⁶² Gen. 2:7, 8,19. man, for example is 'formed' by the Lord God.

⁶³ Gen. 1:1.

⁶⁴ Sirach 42:15,16.

⁶⁵ e.g. 2 Corinth. 4; Romans 4,17. The concept was developed as we shall see. For terms used by Biblical writers to describe creation see 'Ktizo, Ktisis' TDNT. Vol. III pp.1000-1032.

Other concepts about creation also developed in later Judaism. Wisdom, "a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty"⁶⁶ is one such concept which we have already discussed in a different, though closely related, context.⁶⁷ Within the context of creation, wisdom is assigned an important role though Wisdom literature is undecided as to what the role exactly is. According to Sirach, Wisdom is "poured" out by God on all his creation.⁶⁸ In Proverbs she is said to be that by which God founded the earth.⁶⁹ For the author of the Book of Wisdom, however, wisdom herself is "the fashioner of all things."⁷⁰ In rabbinic writings as we have seen, wisdom comes to be related with the Torah (word of God), while for Philo, Wisdom and word are so intimately connected as to be frequently synonymous.⁷¹ The New Testament identifies wisdom with Christ who is the Word of God made flesh.⁷² Through him all things were created;⁷³ in him was the "glory as of the only son through the Father."⁷⁴ Creation is a work of and for glory.

'Creation for Glory' is a many aspected concept. Firstly, God who is

⁶⁶ Wisdom 7:25.

⁶⁷ See ch.3

⁶⁸ Sirach 1:9.

⁶⁹ Proverbs 3:19.

⁷⁰ Wisdom 7:22.

⁷¹ Leg. Alleg. 1,65. (CW I, p.188).

⁷² "Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God" (1 Corinth. 1:24); John 1:1-4.

⁷³ John 1:3; 1 Corinth.8:6; Col. 1:16.

⁷⁴ John 1:14.

the Glory creates ex-nihilo⁷⁵ and thus can only create for himself.⁷⁶ Secondly, the Creator does not stand apart and aloof from the created but enters into it though remaining distinct from it;⁷⁷ God's Glory/presence is in all things and most especially in man, though obscured because of man's sin. Thirdly, God's creative/salvific act has within it both beginning and end; in time, it is of the timeless for Christ who is Alpha and Omega is its purpose as well as its agent.⁷⁸ In him and through him the Glory of God is to be revealed. Creation is thus not a 'fait accompli' but a dynamic ongoing process. "The world is charged with the grandeur of God. It will flame out, like shining from shook foil; it gathers to a greatness, like the ooze of oil crushed."⁷⁹ God is ceaselessly present and active in his creation and "all Creation" states Von Rad, "transcends itself in the direction of God. It is enclosed by a secret, encompassed by a doxa, pointing back to God."⁸⁰ Creation is itself in travail until the glory is made manifest. From the beginning until now it "has been groaning in one great act of giving birth".⁸¹

⁷⁵ Creation out of nothing, a new Testament conviction (Rom 4:17; 2 Corinth 4:6), is neither affirmed nor denied in the Genesis accounts. It is explicitly denied by the author of the Book of Wisdom (11:17) and affirmed categorically in 2 Macab. 7:28.

⁷⁶ God does not create out of need. Love expresses itself in love and so creation is an act/gift of love.

⁷⁷ This view is quite distinct from pantheism in which God is everything and everything is God. It may, however, be termed panentheism "God in everything and everything in God." Matthew Fox, Original Blessing Bear and Company, Santa Fe, New Mexico 1983 p.90.

⁷⁸ Col. 1:15-20; Hebrews 1:1-3; Eph. 1:3-10.

⁷⁹ Gerard Manley Hopkins, God's Grandeur.

⁸⁰ Old Testament Theology op.cit. Vol I p.448.

⁸¹ Romans 9:22 (Jerus. translation).

Now, if creation is not a 'fait accompli' then the creature 'man' is somehow still in the making, growing toward fulfillment. This thought in turn has a bearing on how Gen 1:26 is to be understood; it would suggest that the image of God/glory with which man is endowed must come to fruition in him. "We must think of the Imago Dei more in terms of a potentiality for being that is given to man with his being"⁸² says Macquarrie. Irenaeus⁸³ had thought in that vein way back in the second century. In his opinion, "it was necessary that man should in the first instance be created; and having been created, should receive growth; and having received growth, should be strengthened; and having been strengthened should abound; and having abounded should recover (from the disease of sin); and having recovered, should be glorified".⁸⁴ It is a process of growing from glory to glory; but one that is hindered or blocked by sin. How then, can man in his sinful condition attain fulfillment? The Christian response is "by incorporation into Christ who has conquered sin". That this is so is "the mystery hidden for ages in God."⁸⁵

Christ is the creative word of God bringing about a new creation. "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through him and

⁸² Principles of Christian Theology. op.cit. p.231. See also Moltmann op.cit. p.218 "God created human beings 'to be his image' " and p.227 "Being human means becoming human in the process." Also Edward Schillebeeckx. Jesus tr. Hubert Hoskins, Collins, 1979. pp.595-6.

⁸³ Bishop of Lyons, (c.185-c.195).

⁸⁴ Against the Heresies op.cit. Vol. II 4:3. In Irenaeus' view man was not born 'perfect' but was given the potential so to be. Potentiality, however, does not necessarily imply imperfection; the acorn is not less perfect than the oak.

⁸⁵ Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:27 " ... the mystery is Christ among you, the hope of glory" (Jerus.).

without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life and the life was the light of men"⁸⁶ states John in the prologue to his Gospel and adds "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father."⁸⁷ Excluding John's proclamation concerning the incarnation, all else that he says in the prologue about the Word has a familiar ring for we have heard it voiced of wisdom by the wisdom writers.

Paul refers to Christ explicitly as "the power of God and the Wisdom of God."⁸⁸ He tells the folk at Corinth that God is the source of their life in Jesus Christ, "whom God made our wisdom our righteousness and sanctification and redemption."⁸⁹ Paul is endeavouring to get across to them and to all with whom he comes in contact that God is salvifically active in Christ in whom all things are to be gathered up.⁹⁰ Christ is the goal for which the whole of creation has been groaning and will continue to groan until he 'be formed in us'.⁹¹ The apostle knows that he (Paul) is not yet perfect but, "straining forward to what lies ahead", must "press on

⁸⁶ John 1:4. See also 1 Col. 1:16. The parallel between "In the beginning" (verse 1) and Gen. is obvious. 'Light' also parallels the first creation in the Genesis account.

⁸⁷ John 1:14. Skenoun (R.S.V. 'dwelt') meaning lit. 'pitched a tent'; Tabernacled - recalls Sirach 24:8-10 of 'wisdom': "the one who created me assigned a place for my tent. And he said 'make your dwelling in Jacob.'" Consonantly, the Greek word resembles the Hebrew Shakhan from which Shekhina is derived. In John 2, Jesus is represented as replacing the Temple/Tabernacle. He is God's presence/glory among men. Note: the theme of 'tabernacling' occurs throughout the O.T., e.g. Exodus 40: 34-38; Levit. 26:11; Ezekiel 37:27; Zech 2:10. See also ch.3 note 17 of this thesis.

⁸⁸ 1 Corinth. 1:25.

⁸⁹ 1 Corinth. 1:30.

⁹⁰ Ephesians. 1:9-10.

⁹¹ Paul tells the Galatians (4:19): "I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you."

toward the goal of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus."⁹² For the Christian, self-transcendence is only possible in and through Christ.

The New Testament (and Paul in particular) presents Christ as the 'new' or 'last' Adam (man).⁹³ "The first man, Adam, became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit."⁹⁴ The 'old' Adam chose to obscure the divine image in him by self-worship; in thus attempting to 'seize the glory'⁹⁵ he "exchanged the glory of the immortal God for a worthless imitation".⁹⁶ The 'new' Adam "though in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men".⁹⁷ "In him the fullness of God was pleased to dwell".⁹⁸ Christ embodies the curious paradox that only by being 'emptied' is man fulfilled. It is a paradox which, though different in expression and conceptual framework, is a vital part of Buddhist belief.

Another expression for "fullness of God" within this New Testament context is image (or glory) of God. Christ is "the image of the invisible God".⁹⁹ "In the New Testament", states Kittel, "the original is always

⁹² Philippians 3: 12-14.

⁹³ e.g. Luke 3:38; 1 Corinth.15:45-9; Romans 5:12-21. 'adam' (Hebrew) means 'man' and is not, therefore, a proper name.

⁹⁴ 1 Corinth. 15:45 and adds (verse 47) "the first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven."

⁹⁵ c.f. ch.5. The Zoroastrian 'glory' cannot be seized, i.e. man cannot rightly abrogate power/glory etc. to himself; the creature is by nature dependent on the Creator.

⁹⁶ Romans 1:23 (Jerus.).

⁹⁷ Philippians 2:6-7.

⁹⁸ Col. 1:19.

⁹⁹ Col. 1:15.

present in the image".¹⁰⁰ It is thus Christian belief that God is present in Christ; that is, Christ is God's self-disclosure. Men encounter God in the person of Jesus Christ, his only Son, who elected to be born in the likeness of men so that men could be reborn in the likeness of God. As perfect man, Jesus is what man is meant to be. Man self-emptying, God-filled, is man 'completed' and therefore 'fulfilled', and that is the goal of creation. A modern hymn refrain runs "In him (Jesus) we knew a fullness never known before, in him we saw a man fully living."¹⁰¹ Another refrain which has echoed down the centuries is Irenaeus' "The glory of God is man fully alive."¹⁰² Christ came that men might have life and have it abundantly.¹⁰³ "In him was life" says John "and the life was the light of men."¹⁰⁴

The concept of 'life' (zoe) in the New Testament is eschatological but it is also a present reality. Man's becoming 'fully alive' is a gradual process not a sudden 'fullness' or 'completion'. He grows in light and life in the measure that he grows in relationship with God in Christ and, as he grows in relationship with Christ, he grows in self-realization. "The more man realises himself" declares a modern Christian theologian, "the brighter the glory radiates from him."¹⁰⁵ Paul, who had come to an intense degree of

¹⁰⁰ 'eikon' TDNT. Vol. II p.395.

¹⁰¹ H.J. Richards. 'A Man Fully Living'. More Songs of the Spirit compiled by Damien Lundy FSC. Kevin Mayhew Publishers, Essex and Dublin 1981.

¹⁰² Against Heresies IV 20:7.

¹⁰³ John 10:10.

¹⁰⁴ 1:4.

¹⁰⁵ Peter Smulders. 'Creation'. Encyclopaedia of Theology ed. Karl Rahner. Burns and Oates, London 1975 p.318.

self-realization in Christ, writes of man being renewed,¹⁰⁶ of moving towards mature personhood "to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ",¹⁰⁷ of "being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another."¹⁰⁸ The process begins now (in this earthly existence) with man's incorporation into Christ by baptism.¹⁰⁹ It is the effect of the Spirit and is gift.¹¹⁰

Yet, in the process of becoming what he is, man is not simply a passive recipient of gift. "The creative act of God" states Peter Smulders, "does not eliminate the action proper to the creature, it brings it about."¹¹¹ Man's own creativity is involved in his own becoming. Like the Zoroastrian who believes man's role to be that of a fellow-worker with Ohrmazd in eliminating darkness, the Christian believes himself called and empowered to cooperate with the creative activity of God in bringing about a Kingdom of light. By cooperating with God man becomes a channel of light for others;¹¹² his own creativity is empowered and enhanced and he is enabled to be a "fellow worker" with God.¹¹³ Paul urges Christians to cooperate more and more fully in God's creative activity by increasingly conforming

¹⁰⁶ e.g. Romans 12:2; Col. 3:8-10.

¹⁰⁷ Ephesians 4:13. Col. 1:28.

¹⁰⁸ 2 Corinth. 3:18.

¹⁰⁹ Romans 6:3-4. Col. 2:12. Baptism unites man in the life, death and resurrection of Christ symbolised by immersion in water. It is a dying to sin and the initiation of a new life in Christ. See also Gal. 2:20; Jn. 3:5.

¹¹⁰ John 3:5.

¹¹¹ Op.cit.p.3; See Philippians 2:12-13: "work out your own salvation in fear and trembling; for God is at work in you."

¹¹² Acts 13:47; 26:17; Math 5:14-16; Eph. 5:8; Romans 2:19.

¹¹³ 1 Corinth. 3:9.

themselves to his will, in faith.¹¹⁴ They are able to know what God's will for them is by putting on the mind of Christ who "emptied himself".¹¹⁵ Those who thus die to self and are "alive to God in Christ Jesus"¹¹⁶ are a new creation.¹¹⁷

In Christian understanding, Creation is a trinitarian activity.¹¹⁸ "There is then a Triad", writes St. Athanasius, "confessed to be God in Father, Son and Holy Spirit, having nothing foreign or external mixed with it, not composed of one that creates and one that is originated, but all creative; and it is consistent and in nature indivisible, and its activity is one. The Father does all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit".¹¹⁹ God's energy and activity is presented in the New Testament (as in the Old) as pneumatic. Jesus himself is led and inspired by the Spirit.¹²⁰ His followers are transformed from glory unto glory¹²¹ by the Spirit's power which is love poured into their hearts.¹²² At Pentecost that love is made

¹¹⁴ Romans 12:2; Col.1:9; Eph.5:17.

¹¹⁵ Philippians 2:1-7; Col. 3:1,12-15; Eph.4:21-23.

¹¹⁶ Romans 6:11, i.e. in a relationship of faith and love.

¹¹⁷ 2 Corinth. 5:17.

¹¹⁸ Although the basis for the doctrine of the Trinity is in the Pauline letters, the belief was not formulated until the 4th century. The Council of Florence (1330) formulated the principle that creation is the joint work of the Trinity. See F.X. Durrwell Holy Spirit of God E.T. Geoffrey Chapman, London 1986 p.181.

¹¹⁹ Letter to Serapion in J. Quasten, Patrology (3 vols) Vol III Spectrum Publishers Utrecht/Antwerp. 1960. p.66. See also Irenaeus, Against the Heresies Bk.5 ch.18; St. Basil Letters No. 189;7 in Teachings of the Church Fathers (ed.) J. Willis. Herder and Herder 1966.

¹²⁰ e.g. Matthew 4:1; Mark 1:12; Luke 4:1, 14,18. See also Galatians 5:25.

¹²¹ 2 Corinth. 3:18.

¹²² Romans 5:5.

manifest in a mighty wind and tongues of fire reminiscent of the manifestation of the Glory on Mount Sinai.¹²³ In the Pentecostal experience the disciples are filled with the Holy Spirit and empowered for mission.¹²⁴ As Paul reminds the Corinthians, the Christian is a "temple of the Holy Spirit".¹²⁵ That, in Christian belief, is what man is meant to be - God's presence/glory in the world.

It is clear from the foregoing that Biblical and therefore Christian anthropology is theocentric. The New Testament does not set out to give a systematic account of the nature of man. Its focus is on Christ who is the goal of Creation and what God intended man to be. Christ gives his life that man might achieve his potential and know love. His great priestly prayer for all believers is "That they may all be one: even as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."¹²⁶ 'Oneness' comes about because of the glory given to them from God through Christ¹²⁷ and has a twofold dimension. Just as the radii of a circle come closer to each other as they approach the centre, so do men come closer to each other as they draw nearer to Christ in a relationship of faith. Man, a creation of the Trinity, is a social being. He is meant to reflect in his relationships with others, the Community of Love which God is. The man who so reflects, albeit dimly, has a foretaste of total communion¹²⁸ which is heaven, the realm of glory.

¹²³ Acts 2:2-4.

¹²⁴ e.g. 2:14ff (Peter's Speech) and 2:44-47.

¹²⁵ 1 Corinth. 6:19.

¹²⁶ John 17:22.

¹²⁷ Ibidem.

¹²⁸ Full relationship with, not absorption in.

This, in broad outline, is the New Testament's unsystematized teaching on the nature of man. Patristic literature is replete with further interpretation and expressed opinions.¹²⁹ Down the ages Christian thinkers have attempted to produce a systematized Christian anthropology¹³⁰ but one has yet to emerge. All that is at hand are a number of rather disparate (though thought-provoking) treatises.¹³¹ To concentrate on one or more of these would not be in the interest of the subject of this present thesis, nor would it be of advantage to move hurriedly from one to the other. In Christian belief the Glory of God is entirely present in his Christ "the Lord of Glory" as presented first and foremost by the Biblical writers as encountered in human experience. Christ is the 'new man' on which are based Christian attempts to articulate their understanding of human existence, that is, who/what man is and what it means to be human. Articulation is incomplete because man is incomplete. Existentially he does not know what it is to be fully human for he is still in the process of becoming. When he finally 'becomes' there will be no need for articulation.

¹²⁹ There is a distinctive contrast between the anthropological theories of East and West. Jurgen Moltmann comments on the different analogies taken by Christian theology as a way to understanding Gen. 1:26. See God in Creation op.cit. p.234. McDonald sees the contrast best illustrated in the way Adam's sin of disobedience is interpreted by East and West. op.cit. p.53ff. See also Willis (ed). The Teachings of the Church Fathers. Herder and Herder 1966.

¹³⁰ Tertullian's De Anima was the first attempt. It is interesting to note that for Tertullian "that man was by God constituted free, master of his own will and power" indicates the presence of God's image and likeness in man. See Against Marcion Bk.2.ch 5 in Willis (ed.) The Teachings of the Church Fathers. op.cit.p.256.

¹³¹ e.g. that of Nemesisius of Emesa (4th century). Nemesisius sees man as "a planting from heaven", a microcosm, and the one for whose sake God became man. Made in God's image, man is destined to "dwell with Christ as a child of God", and 'be Throned above all rule and authority." See J. Quasten. Patrology Vol. III op.cit. p.352.

Something of the reality of man's 'becoming',¹³² of his dynamic movement toward self-realisation, finds expression in each religion under discussion. It is on this 'something' that I wish to conclude. Buddhist understanding of the nature of man seems worlds apart from that of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity which, all explicitly grounded on belief in God, though not the same are similar. Yet Buddhism teaches that each person is a potential Buddha just as Christianity teaches that each person is potentially another Christ. According to their respective beliefs the Buddhist has the 'Buddha-nature'; the Christian is in the 'image and likeness of God'. Both have open-ended potential.¹³³ This last statement applies in Zoroastrian and Jewish belief. A modern Jewish theologian writes "We should think of the soul unfolding not only through intellectual pursuits¹³⁴ but also through love that does not falter, through unwavering justice, through self-discipline and self-sacrifice, through moral courage and struggle on the battlefields of truth and duty, through lofty vision, high aspiration and steadfast devotion; in short, through a life with God."¹³⁵ The Zoroastrian would endorse all that is here said though he might well express it more succinctly in terms of man "embodying Asha by the

¹³² On the subject of man's 'becoming', see Teilhard de Chardin. The Phenomenon of Man Fontana London 1965 edition; Hymn of the Universe Fontana London, 1965. De Chardin writes within the context of evolution "... it is a question not merely of my being consoled but of my being completed". (Hymn Universe) p.77.

¹³³ "The idea of a given human potentiality for the realisation of liberating truth" writes A. Piers S.J. "is the most significant presupposition in Buddhist soteriology, though it is never explicitly analysed". 'The Buddha and the Christ: Mediators of Liberation', The Myth of Christian Uniqueness ed. John Hick and Paul Knitter S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1987 p.163.

¹³⁴ A reference to the Aristotelian belief that the soul became actualised through reason. This, as we have seen, was also Maimonides' belief.

¹³⁵ Samuel S. Cohon. Jewish Theology op.cit. p.434.

power of the Khvarenah". Whatever their mode of expression all four religions recognise that there is in or about man that which "unfolds itself, like a lotus of countless petals";¹³⁶ he is able to transcend himself.

Now it is not with the transcending process that we are here primarily concerned nor with the goal itself, however that be conceptualised. More important is the fact that a goal is conceptualised, and that man desires and is empowered to pursue it in faith, hope and love.¹³⁷ There is within him that which seeks the liberating Truth. In Buddhism the Buddha-nature is what transforms; it is the Emptiness (not in the sense of 'nothingness') bringing completion. Bassui preaches " ... resolutely go on, Your Self-nature will grow brighter and more transparent as your delusive feelings perish, like a gem gaining lustre under repeated polishing until at last it positively illumines the entire universe."¹³⁸ Zoroastrian man believes he has the divinely-given glory, the Khvarenah; Judaism, like Christianity, affirms that man was created in the Divine Image—his also is the glory. The divine in man draws man to itself. "If a man's heart has been purified from every creature and unruly affections" writes St. Gregory of Nyassa, "he will see the Image of the Divine nature in his own beauty ... do not despair

¹³⁶ Kahlil Gibran. The Prophet William Heinemann, London 1980 edition, p.65.

¹³⁷ The ambiguity of the term 'love' is particularly recognised by Buddhists for whom maitri (metta. Pali) means loving kindness, amity; Karuna: love/compassion.

¹³⁸ 'Bassui's Sermon' in The Three Pillars of Zen ed. P. Kapleau. Weatherhill 1967. p.163. cited in Man's Religious Quest ed. W. Foy op.,cit. p.252. Buddha is 'King of Kings'; man who achieves Buddhahood is therefore King. c.f. chapter 8 of this thesis. Christ is also King. Those who are in him share in his Kingship.

of ever beholding what you desire. It is indeed within your reach."¹³⁹ Elsewhere St. Gregory states in Platonic fashion, "The eye enjoys the rays of light by virtue of the light which it has in itself by nature."¹⁴⁰ The light transfigures. As man is changed from glory to glory everything else has a transparency for him. Becoming increasingly selfless he sees things increasingly as they are. "Outside of God, there is nothing but nothing".¹⁴¹ That is the Glory.

¹³⁹ Sermon on the Beatitudes in J. Quasten. Patrology Vol. III op.cit. p.300.

¹⁴⁰ De Infant., Migne, Patrologia Graeca 46, in J. Quasten. Patrology Vol. III op.cit. p.293

¹⁴¹ Meister Eckhart. cited by Matthew Fox. Original Blessing op.cit. p.149.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alexander, Philip S.(ed.),. Textual Sources for the Study of Judaism, Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Anklesaria, B.T.(ed), Zand-Akasih, Iranian or Greater Bundahishn, Pahlavi text with English translation, Bombay 1956.
- Aquinas, T, Summa Theologiae Vol XIX 1a-2ae p.125ff; Blackfriars, London 1964.
- Ballou, Robert O (ed), Bible of the World, Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1940
- Boyce, Mary (ed. and tr.), Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism, Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Charles, R.H., (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (2 vols.) Clarendon Press, Oxford 1913.
- Charlesworth, James H.,(ed.), The Old Testament : Pseudepigrapha, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments (2 vols.) Darton Longman and Todd, London 1983.
- Cohen, Abraham, Everyman's Talmud, J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London 1934 (reprint) (first pub.1932).
- Colson, F and Whitaker G.H., Philo (10 vols.+2 supp) The Loeb Classical Library, William Heinemann Ltd., London 1981.
- Conze, E (ed.), Buddhist Texts, published in collaboration with I.B. Horner, D.L. Snellgrove and Arthur Waley, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford 1954.
- _____ Buddhist Wisdom Books, George Allen & Unwin, London 1975.
- Cowell, E.B., Muller, Max and Takakusu, I, (tr.), Buddhist Mahayana Texts, Sacred Books of the East Vol. 49, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1968 (reprint) (first pub. O.U.P. 1894).
- Darmesteter, J and Mills, L.H.,(tr.), The Zend-Avesta, Sacred Books of the East, vols. 4, 23 and 31, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1895.
- DIVINE LITURGY OF THE HOURS ACCORDING TO THE ROMAN RITE (Vols 1-3) Collins, London, 1974.
- Emmerick, R.E.(tr.), The Sutra of Golden Light (the Suvarna-bhasottamsutra), Luzac & Co., London 1970.

- Epstein, Isidore (ed.), The Babylonian Talmud. London, Soncino Press 1935.
- Freedman, H., The Midrash Rabbah (5 vols.), O.U.P., 1977.
- Goold, G.P. (ed.), Josephus. The Life
The Jewish War, Loeb Classical Library, W. Heinemann, London 1976.
- Kato, Bunno; Tamura, Yoshiro and Miyasaka (tr.), The Three-Fold Lotus Sutra, (with revisions by W.E. Soothill, Wilhelm Schiffer and P. Del Campana), John Weatherhill, Inc., New York 1975.
- Lauterback, J.Z., Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Philadelphia, 1933-1935.
- Ling, Trevor, (ed.), The Buddha's Philosophy of Man. Early Indian Dialogues, J.M. Dent & Sons 1981.
- Mackenzie, D.N., (ed.), The 'Sutra of Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian, Oxford University Press 1970.
- Marcus, Ralph (tr.), Philo Supplements I & II, The Loeb Classical Library, William Heinemann Ltd., London 1981.
- Muller, Max (ed), The Zend-Avesta : in 3 vols. Sacred Books of the East, (4, 23 and 31) tr.J. Darmesteter and L.H. Mills, Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1883.
-
- The Dhammapada, (tr.M.Muller) and the Sutta-Nipata (tr.V.Fausboll), Sacred Books of the East Vol.10., Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1968 (reprint) (first pub. O.U.P. 1881).
- Quasten, J., Patrology Vol.3 (3 vols.), Spectrum Publishers, Utrecht/Antwerp, 1960.
- Rhys Davids, T.W., Buddhist Suttas, Sacred Books of the East Vol.11, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1881.
- Rhys Davids C.A.F. and Woodward, F.L., Samyutta Nikaya, Pali Text Society Translation Series (5 Vols.) 1917-1930.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. and C.A.F., Dialogues of the Buddha Part II, Sacred Books of the East, Vol 3. O.U.P. 1938.
- Roberts, A. and Rambaut W.H. (tr.), The Writings of Irenaeus Vol I, T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh, 1910.
- Speeling, Harry and Simon, Maurice (tr), The Zohar (5 vols.), Soncino Press, London 1970 (first pub. 1934).

- Thurman, Robert (ed.), Ornament of the Scriptures of the Universal Vehicle, Amherst, Massachusetts : American Institute of Buddhist Studies 1980.
- THE HOLY BIBLE Revised Standard Version.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975 (2nd edition).
- West, W.E. (tr.), Pahlavi Texts, Sacred Books of the East Part V Vols 18, 47, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1961 (first pub. 1897). Reprint 1969.
- Willis, J., The Teachings of the Church Fathers, Herder and Herder, New York 1966.
- Zaehner, R.C., Hindu Scriptures, J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London 1966.

General Bibliography

- Aalen, S., 'Glory', in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, ed. Colin Brown, E.T., Paternoster Press, Exeter 1976.
- Abelson, J., The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, Macmillan, London 1912.
- Abbott-Smith, G., A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1964.
- Abrahams, I., The Glory of God, O.U.P., 1925.
- Adler, Israel, 'Man, the nature of' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 11, Keter Publishing House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Alfaro, Juan S.J., 'The Incarnation and man's eschatological fulfilment', Theology Digest Vol 15. 1967.
- Alt, A., Gedanken uber das Konigtum Jahwehs, Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des volkes Israel, Munchen 1953.
- Amir, Yehoshua, 'Philo Judaeus' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 13, Keter Publishing House Ltd, Jerusalem 1971.
- Anderson, A.A., The New Century Bible Commentary. The Book of Psalms, Vol. 1 Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London 1972.
- Anesaki, M., 'Docetism (Buddhist)' in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol.4, (12 vols.) ed. J. Hastings. T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1911.
- Augustine, St., The Confessions, Book XI, (tr. F.H. Sheed), Sheed & Ward, London 1944.
-
- The Trinity, (The Fathers of the Church series), Catholic University of America Press, Washington 1970 (reprint).
- Ayer, A.J., Language Truth and Logic, Victor Gollancz Ltd., London 1936 (2nd ed. 1946).
- Bailey, H.W., Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1971 edition.
- Bareau, A., Les Sectes Bouddiques du Petit Vehicle, Publications de l'Ecole francaise d'Extreme-Orient Vol. 37, Saigon 1955.
- Barr, James, Exploration Theology, S.C.M., London 1980.
- Barth, Karl, The Epistle to the Romans (tr. from the 6th edition by Edwyn Hoskins), O.U.P., 1972.

- Baumgartel, F., 'pneuma' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. VI (10 vols.) ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Behm, J., 'nous' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. IV (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Bentzen, A., King and Messiah, London 1955.
- Bertram, G., 'psyche' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. IX (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Berry, G.R., 'The Glory of Yahweh and the Temple', Journal of Biblical Literature 56, 1937, pp.115-17.
- Bevan, Edwyn, Symbolism and Belief, Fontana 1962 (First published Allen & Unwin 1938).
- Bianchi, U., 'Docetism' in Myths and Symbols, ed. J. Kitagawa and C.H. Long, Univ. of Chicago Press 1969.
- Bieder, W., 'pneuma' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. VI (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Birnbaum, Raoul, 'Avalokitesvara' in The Encyclopedia of Religion Vol. 1 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Bode, Framroze, Man, Soul, Immortality in Zoroastrianism ed, and pub. by J.C. Tarapore for the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay 1960.
- Boyce, Mary, A History of Zoroastrianism (2 vols.) Leiden 1975, 1982.
- _____

Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley 1984.
- _____

'The Continuity of the Zoroastrian Quest' in Man's Religious Quest, ed. Whitfield Foy, Croom Helm (in Assoc. with Open Univ. Press), London 1982 (reprint).
- Brandon, S. (ed.), The Saviour God. Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation, Manchester Univ. Press 1963.

- Brockington, L.H., 'The Greek Translator and his interest in Doxa', Vetus Testamentum, vol. 1, Jan 1951 pp. 23-32
-
- 'The Presence of God; a Study of the use of the term "Glory of Yahweh"', in The Expository Times, vol. LVII Oct. 1945 pp. 21-25.
- Brown, Pairman J., 'Kingdom of God' in Encyclopedia of Religion Vol. 8 (15 vols.), ed. M.Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Browne, E.G., A Literary History of Persia, London 1902.
- Buber, Martin, Kingship of God, George Allen & Unwin, London 1967.
I and Thou, (tr. R.G. Smith), T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1937.
-
- Hasidism, The Philosophical Library, New York 1948.
- Bultmann, R., 'aletheia' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. 1 (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Byrne, Brendon, Reckoning with Romans (Good News Series 18), Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware 1986.
- Cairns, David, The Image of God in Man, Fontana, 1973.
- Canney, Maurice, Ancient Conceptions of Kingship, O.U.P. (Reprint from Oriental Studies in Honour of Dasturji Sahet Cursetji Erachji Pavry) Jan. 1934.
- Chaine, J., Les Epitres Catholiques, Ecole Biblique, Paris 1939.
- Chardin, T de, The Phenomenon of Man, Collins (Fontana), London 1965 edition.
Hymn of the Universe, Collins, (Fontana), London 1970.
-
- Charpentier, J., 'The Date of Zoroaster', Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies No.3. pp. 747-755 London 1925.
- Clines, D., Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, The New Century Bible Commentary, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London 1984.
- Cohon, Samuel, Jewish Theology, Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Co., N.V. Assen, The Netherlands 1971.

- Conze, Edward, Buddhist Thought in India, Allen & Unwin, London 1962.
- _____ A Short History of Buddhism, Allen & Unwin, London 1981 edition.
- _____ Buddhism. Its Essence and Development, Bruno Cassirer, Oxford 1974 edition.
- _____ 'The Mahayana' in Concise Encyclopaedia of Living Faiths ed. R.C. Zaehner, Hutchinson, London 1971.
- _____ 'Buddhist Saviours' in The Saviour God Comparative Studies in The Concept of Salvation ed. Brandon. Manchester University Press, 1963.
- Cook, Roger, The Tree of Life. Symbol of the Centre, Thames and Hudson, London 1974.
- Coomeraswamy, A.K., Elements of Buddhism Iconography, Cambridge, Mass. 1935.
- Couturier, G.P., 'Jeremiah' in The Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. by R. Brown, J. Fitzmyer, R. Murphy, Geoffrey Chapman, London 1968.
- Cranfield, C.E.B., Romans, A Shorter Commentary, T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1985.
- Danielou, J., The Lord of History, Longmans Green, London 1958.
- Dan, Joseph, 'Hasidei Ashkenaz' in Encyclopaedia Judaica vol. 7, Keter Publishing House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Davis, Eli, 'Aleinu-Le-Shabbe'ah'; 'Benedictions'; 'Saadia Gaon' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, vols. 2, 4 and 14 (16 vols.), editors in chief: Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Dayal, Har, The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1975 (reprint).
- Dhalla, Maneckji N., History of Zoroastrianism, Jamshed C. Tarapore and Ervad M.F. Kanga, The K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay 1963 (first published O.U.P. 1938).
- Dihle, A., 'Psyche', in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IX (10 vols.) ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Pub. Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, J., 'Le Xvarenah', Annali Dell Istituto Di Napoli, 1963 pp. 19-31.
- _____ Religion of Ancient Iran, K.M. Jamasp Asa, Bombay 1973.

- Duchesne-Guillemin, J., Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism, Harper & Row, New York 1966.
-
- The Western Response to Zoroaster, O.U.P., 1958.
- Durrwell, F.X., Holy Spirit of God, (tr. Sister B. Davies O.S.U.), Geoffrey Chapman, London 1986.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha, Mahayana Buddhism, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1978 (reprint).
- Efros, Israel I., Ancient Jewish Philosophy, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 1964.
- Eichrodt, W., Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. 11, S.C.M., London 1967.
- Eliade, Mircea, Images and Symbols, Sheed and Ward, New York 1961.
-
- Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy, tr. W.P. Trask, Routledge, London 1964.
-
- 'Spirit, Light and Seed' in History of Religions II, (1971): 1-30.
-
- The Sacred and the Profane, Harcourt Brace and World Inc., New York 1954.
-
- The Two and the One, tr. J.M. Cohen, Harper and Row, London 1965.
- Engnell, I., Studies in Divine Kingship in the A.N.E., Basil Blackwell, 1967 (2nd edition) (first edition 1943).
- Epstein, Isidore, The Jewish Way of Life, Edward Goldston, London 1946.
-
- Judaism. An Historical Presentation, Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1977 (reprint).
- Foerster, W., 'ktizo, ktisis' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol 3 (10 vols.) ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Fawcett, T., The Symbolic language of Religion, S.C.M., London 1970.
- Fohrer, G., History of Israelite Religion (originally published as Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 1968), S.P.C.K., London 1973.
- Fox, Matthew, Original Blessing, Bear and Company, Santa Fe, New Mexico 1983.
- Foy, Whitfield (ed.), Man's Religious Quest, Croom Helm (in assoc. with Open Univ. Press) London 1982 (reprint).

- Friedman, Maurice, Martin Buber's Life and Work, Search Press, London 1982.
- Friedman, Theodore, 'Man in Rabbinic Thought' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, vol. 11, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Gibran, Kahil, The Prophet, William Heinemann, London, 1980 edition.
- Gnoli, G., 'Un particolare aspetto del Simbolismo della , nel, Mazdeismo e nel Manicheismo', Annali dell' Istituto Orientale di Napoli 12, 1962.
-
- 'Fravashi', Vol.5, 'Zoroastrianism', Vol.15, 'Khwarenah', Vol. 8 in The Encyclopedia of Religion, ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Goodenough, Erwin R., An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1962.
- Gottlieb, Effraim, 'Menorah (in Kabbalah)' in Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 11 Keter Pub. House Ltd, Jerusalem 1971.
- Govinda, Lama Anagarika, The Psychological Attitude of Early Buddhist Philosophy, Rider & Co., London 1969 edition. (first pub. 1961).
- Gray, G.B., 'Glory', in Dictionary of the Bible (4 vols.), ed. J. Hastings. T & T Clarke, Edinburgh (6th impression) 1905.
- Greenstein, H.R., Judaism. An Eternal Covenant, Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1983.
- Grintz, Yehoshua, 'Soul, Immortality of in the Talmud' in Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 15, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Grottanelli, Cristiano, 'Kingship in the Ancient Mediterranean World', in The Encyclopedia of Religion Vol.8. (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Grundmann, W., 'dynamai' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. 11 (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Guenther, Herbert, Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice, Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1971.
- Harper, Donald, 'Magic in East Asia' in The Encyclopedia of Religion Vol.9 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London, 1987.
- Heidegger, Martin, Was ist metaphysic?, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt, 1949 edition.
- Hengel, Martin, Judaism and Hellenism, S.C.M. Press Ltd., London 1974.

- Henton-Davies, G., 'Glory' in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Bucke, Abingdon, Nashville 1962.
- Hinnells, John 'Spanning East and West'. Unit 26 Man's Religious Quest, Open University Press, 1982 (reprint).
- Horwitz, R. and Unkerman, A., 'Shekhina' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 14, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Humphreys, Christmas, Buddhism, Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1975 (reprint).
- Husik, Isaac, A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy, New York 1916.
- Hyatt, J., New Century Bible Commentary. Exodus, Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids and Marshall Morgan & Scott, London 1971.
- Hyman, A., 'Jewish Philosophy' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol.13, Keter Publishing House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Ivry, Alfred, 'Intellect' in Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol.8, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Jacob, Edmund, Theology of the Old Testament, Hodder and Stoughton, London 1958 (3rd. edition).
- James, M.R. (tr.), The Apocryphal New Testament, O.U.P. 1924.
- Jung, C.G., Psychology and Religion : West and East, tr. R. Hull, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and Henley 1977 (reprint) 2nd. edition 1969.
- Kennick, W.E., 'Appearance and Reality', The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol. 1 (8 vols.) ed. in chief P. Edwards, Collier Macmillan, London 1972 (reprint). (first pub. 1967).
- Kapleau, P. (ed.), The Three Pillars of Zen, Weatherhill 1967.
- Kasemann, Ernst, Commentary on Romans, tr. and ed. G.W. Bromiley, S.C.M. Press Ltd., London 1980.
- Kellens, Jean, 'Saoshyant', Studia Iranica Vol.3, 1974 pp. 187-209.
- King, W.L., Buddhism and Christianity, Allen & Unwin, London 1962.
- Kitagawa, J and Long, C., (ed.), Myths and Symbols, University of Chicago Press 1969.
- Kittel, G., 'aletheia' (Vol.1), 'doxa', 'eikon' (vol.11) in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Kittel tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Der Herrlichkeit Gottes, Gies en 1934.
- Koch, Robert, 'Man' in Encyclopaedia of Biblical Theology, Vol.2 (3 vols.) ed. J.B. Bauer, Sheed & Ward, London and Sydney 1970.

- Koehler, Ludwig, 'Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Gen 1:26, Theologische Zeitschrift 4, Jan-Feb 1948.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Old Testament Theology tr. A.S. Todd, Philadelphia, Westminster Press 1957.
- Kotwal, Firoze and Boyd, J.W. (ed. and tr.), A Guide to the Zoroastrian Religion. A Nineteenth Century Catechism. Studies in World Religions 3. Harvard University Press 1982.
- Kraemer, Joel, 'Microcosm' in Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 11, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem, 1971.
- Kramrisch, Stella, The Art of India: traditions of Indian sculpture, painting and architecture, Phaidon Press, London 1965 (3rd. edition).
- Kretzmann, Norman; Kenny, Anthony and Pinborg, Jan, Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy, C.U.P., 1982.
- Kotatsu, Fujita, 'Pure and Impure Lands' in The Encyclopedia of Religion Vol. 12 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Kugelman, Richard, James and Jude. New Testament Message 19, Veritas Publications, Dublin 1979.
- Kuhn, K.G., 'Basileus' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. 1 (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Kuhn, K.G., Achtzchngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim, 1950.
- Ladd, George Elden, The Presence of the Future (First edition : Jesus and the Kingdom), S.P.C.K., London 1980 (reprint).
- Lai, Whalen, 'The Humanity of the Buddha: Is Mahayana Docetic?' Ching Feng 24:2, June 1981.
- _____, 'The Predocetic "Finite Buddhakaya" in the Lotus Sutra: in search of the illusive Dharmakaya therein' Journal of the American Academy of Religion XLIX/3 1981 pp 447-469.
- Lancaster, Lewis, 'Maitreya' in The Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 9 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Lang, F., 'Pyr' in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol VI, (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Pub. Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Lange, Nicholas de, Judaism, O.U.P., 1987.
- Lattke, Michael, 'Jewish Background of the Synoptic Concept' in The Kingdom of God, ed. Bruce Chilton, S.P.C.K., London 1984.

- Lentz, Wolfgang, 'Yima and Khvarenah in the Avestan Gathas' in Studies in honour of S.H. Tagizadeh, Percy Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd., London 1962.
- Ling, Trevor, A History of Religion East and West, Macmillan, London 1968.
- Lommel, H., Die Gathas des Zarathustra, (ed. B. Sclerath), Stuttgart 1971.
- Lonergan, Bernard, A Third Collection, ed. F.G. Crowe, G. Chapman, London 1985.
- L'Orange, H.P., Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the ancient world, Oslo, 1953.
- Lubac, Henri de, Aspects of Buddhism, Sheed and Ward, London and New York 1953.
- Lucas, Alice, The Jewish Year, London 1898.
- Macquarrie, John Principles of Christian Theology (revised edition), S.C.M., London, 1977.
- _____ In Search of Humanity, S.C.M., London 1982.
- Mascaro, Jean (tr.), The Bhagavad Gita, Penguin Classics Harmondsworth 1962.
- May, H.G., 'The Departure of the Glory of Yahweh', Journal of Biblical Literature, 56, 1937, pp. 309-21.
- Meslin, Michael, 'eye' (vol.5), 'Head : Symbolism and Ritual Use' (vol.6), The Encyclopedia of Religion (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Milik, J.T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, S.C.M., London 1959.
- Modi, Jivanji J., The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsees, 2nd. edition. Bombay, 1937.
- Molin, Georg, 'Glory' in Encyclopaedia of Biblical Theology ed. J. Bauer, Sheed and Ward, London and Sydney 1970.
- Moltmann, Jurgen, God in Creation, S.C.M., London 1985.
- Moore, George F., Judaism (Vols. 1-111), Cambridge, Harvard University Press 1966.
- Morgenstern, Julian, 'Biblical Theophanies', Zeitsch.f.Assyriologie 25, 1911.
- Moulton, James, Early Zoroastrianism, Constable and Company (for Hibbert Trust), London 1913.
- Myers, J.M., Ezra . Nehemiah (Anchor Bible) Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York 1965.
- McCarthy, D., Analecta 21. Treaty and Covenant, Pontifical Institute, Rome 1963.

- McDonald, H., The Christian View of Man, Marshall Morgan & Scott, London 1981.
- McKenzie, John S.J., Dictionary of the Bible, Cassell & Co. Ltd., London, (Macmillan Pub. Co., New York) 1978 edition.
- McNamara, M. M.S.C., Targum and New Testament, Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1968.
- _____, Intertestamental Literature, Michael Glazier, Wilmington, Delaware 1983.
- Navarone, John J., 'We have seen his Glory'. The Bible Today December 1965. No.21, pp. 1390-1396.
- Nicholson, E.W., Cambridge Bible Commentary Jeremiah 1-25, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- North, C.R., 'The Religious Aspects of Hebrew 'Kingship'', Z.A.W. Zeitschrift fur Dei Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. 1932.
- Noss, John, Man's Religions, Collier Macmillan, London 1980. (6th edition).
- Nukariya, Kaiten, The Religion of the Samurai, London 1913.
- Nyanatiloka, M., Buddhist Dictionary, Frewin & Co. Ltd., Colombo, Ceylon 1972 edition.
- Olson, M and Rouner, Leroy S., Transcendence and the Sacred, Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana 1981.
- Otto, Rudolph, Mysticism East and West, Macmillan, London 1932.
- _____, The Idea of the Holy, O.U.P., 1971 (reprint).
- Pannenburg, Wolfhart, Jesus God and Man, S.C.M., London 1968.
- Park, Sung Bae, Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment, State University of New York Press, Albany 1983.
- Parrinder, G., Mysticism in the World's Religions, Sheldon press, London 1976.
- Perrin, Norman, 'Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom' in The Kingdom of God, ed. Bruce Chilton, S.P.C.K., London 1984.
- Petrie, W.M. Flinders, 'Egyptian Religion' in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol.5 (12 vols.), ed. J. Hastings. T & T Clarke Edinburgh 1911.
- Piers, Aloysius S.J., 'The Buddha and the Christ : Mediators of Liberation', in The Myth of Christian Uniqueness, ed. J. Hick and P. Knitter, S.C.M. 1987.

- Pines, Shlomo, 'Soul, Immortality of in Medieval Jewish Philosophy' in Encyclopaedia Judaica Vol. 15, Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Plato, Timmaeus, tr. R.G. Bury, The Loeb Classical Library William Heinemann, London 1952 edition (first published 1929).
- Poussin, L de la Vallee, Bouddhisme. Opinions sur l'histoire de la dogmatique, Bouchesne, Paris 1925.
- _____

'Buddhism', Studies in Comparative Religion, ed. E. Messenger. Vol.1 (4 vols.), C.T.S., London 1935.
- _____

'Agnosticism, 'Buddhist', in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics Vol. 1 (12 vols.), ed. J. Hastings T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1911.
- Puech, Charles Henri, 'dynamai (Philo)', Revue de l'histoire des Religions Vol. CXVI 1937.
- Rad, G. Von, Old Testament Theology (2 volumes), S.C.M., London 1975 edition.
- _____

Deuteronomy, S.C.M. London 1966.
- _____

'Basileus' (Vol.1), 'doxa' (Vol.2), 'eikon' (Vol.2), in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (10 vols.), ed. G. Kittel, tr. G. W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Rahula, Walpola, What the Buddha Taught, Gordon Fraser, London and Bedford 1985 (reprint).
- Ramsey, A.M., The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ, Longmans, London 1949.
- Reese, James, Analecta Biblica 41. Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences, Pontifical Institute, Rome 1970.
- _____

The Book of Wisdom, Song of Songs, Michael Glazier Inc. Wilmington, Delaware 1983.
- Reicke, B., The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, Anchor Bible, New York 1964.
- Rhys Davids, C.A.F., Buddhist Psychology. An Inquiry into the Analysis and Theory of Mind in Pali Literature, G. Bell and Sons Ltd., London 1914.
- Ridderbos, Herman, Paul. An outline of his Theology, tr. J.R. de Witt, S.P.C.K., London 1977.
- Ringgren, Helmer, Israelite Religion, S.P.C.K., London 1966.
- Ritter, C., Platon 11, Sein Leben, Seine Schriften, Seine Lehre (1910), 1923.

- Robinson, E (tr.),
(ed.) Brown, Driver and
Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old
Testament. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1907.
- Roth, Cecil and Widoger, G., Encyclopaedia Judaica, (16 vols.), Keter
(editors-in-chief) Publishing House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Rowley, H.H., The Faith of Israel, S.C.M., London 1965
(reprint).
- Rudolph, Kurt, Gnosis, T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1983.
- Ryder Smith, C., The Bible Doctrine of Man, Epworth Press
(Frank H Cumbers), London 1951.
- Ryle, Gilbert, The Concept of Mind, Hutchinson & Co. Ltd.,
London 1963 (reprint).
- Sheehan, John F.X., 'The Glory of God : Doxa-Kavodh'. The Bible
Today. Nov. 1966. No. 26. pp. 1815-1821.
- Schaya, L. The Universal Meaning of the Kabbala, tr.
N. Pearson, Allen & Unwin, London 1971.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward, Jesus, tr. Hubert Hoskins. Collins, London
1979.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, 'Basileia' in Theological Dictionary of
the New Testament Vol.1 (10 vols.) ed. G.
Kittel, tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans
Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1963.
- Schnackenburg, R., God's Rule and Kingdom, Herder & Herder,
Freiburg 1963.
- Schneider, J., 'time' in Theological Dictionary of the
New Testament Vol.8 (10 vols.) ed. G. Kittel,
tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963.
- Scholem, G., 'Kabbala', 'Sefiroth', vols. 10 and 14
in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter Pub. House
Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Scott, R.B., Proverbs .Ecclesiastes (Anchor Bible)
Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York 1965.
- Seckel, D., The Art of Buddhism (Art of the World Series),
Methuen, London 1964.
- Shahbazi, A.S., 'An Achaeminid Symbol'. Archaelogische
Mitteilungen aus Iran. n.s.18, 1980 pp 119-
147.
- Slater, Peter, 'The Transcending Process and the Relocation
of the Sacred' in Transcendence and the
Sacred, ed. A.M. Olson and Leroy Rouner,
University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame,
Indiana 1981.
- Smart, Ninian, Doctrine and Argument in Indian Philosophy,
George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1964.

- Smart, Ninian, The Religious Experience of Mankind, Collins Fontana Library, London 1971.
- Smulders, Peter, 'Creation', in Encyclopaedia of Theology, ed. Karl Rahner. Burns and Oates, London 1975.
- Snellgrove, D., 'Celestial Buddhas and Bodhisattvas' in The Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol.3 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Soderblom, Nathan, 'Ages of the World (Zoroastrian)' 'Incarnation' vols. 1 and 7 in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, (12 vols.), ed. J. Hastings, T & T Clarke, Edinburgh 1926.
- Sprung, Mervyn (ed.), The Problem of Two Truths in Buddhism and Vedanta, D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, Holland and Boston, U.S.A., 1973.
- Streng, Frederick, Emptiness. A Study in Religious Meaning, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee 1967.
- _____, 'Truth', in Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol.15 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Suzuki, D.T., An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, Rider & Co., London and New York 1959.
- _____, The Essentials of Zen Buddhism, Rider & Co., London 1963.
- Suzuki, B.L., Mahayana Buddhism, Allen & Unwin, London 1981.
- Takakusu, J., The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy, ed. Wing-Tsit Chan and C.A. Moore, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut 1975.
- Terrien, Samuel, The Elusive Presence, Harper & Row, San Francisco 1978.
- Thurman, Robert, 'Magical Religious Powers' in The Encyclopedia of Religion Vol.9 (15 vols.), ed. M. Eliade, Collier Macmillan, London 1987.
- Tillich, Paul, Systematic Theology. Parts 1-3, S.C.M., London 1978. (first published Univ. Chicago 1951).
- Urbach, E.E., The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs, Magnes Press, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1975.
- Unkerman A., 'Ru'ah Ha-Kodesh' in Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol 14. Keter Pub. House Ltd., Jerusalem 1971.
- Verdu, Alphonso, The Philosophy of Buddhism, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague 1981.

- Wach, Joachim, Types of Religious Experience, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1951.
- Ward, Keith, Images of Eternity. Concepts of God in Five Religious Traditions, Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1987.
- Watson, W., 'Wisdom' in A New Catholic Commentary ed. (General), R.C. Fuller. Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., London 1969 (reprint).
- Weinfeld, M., 'berith' In Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, Vol.2, (5 vols.), ed. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. tr. J.T. Willis. Eerdmans Pub. Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974.
- Weiser, Arthur, The Psalms, S.C.M., London 1959.
- Westcott, B. F., The Gospel According to St. John, Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1981 (reprint) (first published 1881).
- Wilhelm, E., 'Hvareno', Sir Jejeebhoy Zarthushti Madressa Jubilee Volume, Bombay 1914, pp.159-65.
- Williams, C.C.F., What is Existence?, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1981.
- Williams Jackson, A.V., Zoroastrian Studies, Columbia University Press, New York 1928.
- Winston, David, The Wisdom of Solomon, Anchor Bible Volume 43, Doubleday & Co. Inc., New York, 1979.
- Wolfson, H.A., Philo. Vols. 1 and 2., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1947.
- Zaehner, R.C., The Teachings of the Magi, Sheldon Press, London 1975. (first pub. 1956).
- _____, 'Nirvana', Hibbert Journal No. 57 1958-9, pp. 117-123.
- _____, 'Zoroastrianism' in Concise Encyclopaedia of living Faiths, Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., London 1977 edition.
- Zimmerli, Walter Ezekiel, Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1979.
- Zobel, Hans-Jurgen, 'aron', in Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, Vol.1 (5 vols.), ed. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. tr. J.T. Willis, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan 1974.

The Concept of Glory and the Nature of Man.
A Study of Jewish, Christian, Buddhist
and Zoroastrian Thought.

ABSTRACT

This study of the concept of glory across four different religions begins with Christianity. There the term 'glory' translates Greek doxa , a word which, deriving from a root meaning 'to seem', denotes 'outward appearance', and has in secular Greek the basic meaning 'opinion'. The New Testament, however, not only omits this connotation but gives doxa an entirely new one (radiance, divine Presence). Given that symbols are rooted in the experiential well-springs of a people, why did the Christian experience not bring a totally new symbol to birth? The answer is two-fold: (a) Christians took the word from the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Bible wherein it was used to translate Kavodh (glory) and (b) the meaning of doxa resonated with the Christian Encounter. It had first resonated with the Hebrew experience.

It is this thesis that doxa was used by Christians and Greek-speaking Jews precisely because of its root meanings ('to seem' 'outward appearance' 'manifestation') and that these meanings, resonating also with the experience of Zoroastrians and Buddhists, are reflected in their ideas of glory, albeit within their different conceptual frameworks. 'Glory' in all four religions is related to man's experience of polarities: Immanence/Transcendence, Manifestation/Hiddenness, Presence/Absence, and it speaks of a Reality beyond appearance.

Man longs for the Real; he seeks Self-transcendence. In the measure that he becomes 'selfless' he comes closer to that which he seeks and sees things as they really are. He grows from glory to glory until he becomes what he is. In Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism man is of the essence of glory.