“apocalyptic”, and Enoch is clearly related also to the myth of the fallen angels, the “giants”, and the “watchers”. The subject is surveyed concisely and competently, although in a somewhat schematic way, by Ms. Peters. The title of the publication, clearly meant as a captatio attentionis, is somewhat misleading (quite apart from the fact that Enoch does not figure among the canonical biblical “prophets”). That most syncretistic of all religions, Manichaeism, also adopted Enoch and the “Enochian” literature (cf. Mani’s version of the Book of Giants), and on his Manichaean trek through Central Asia Enoch also acquired an Uighur name which can mean, in addition to prophet, saint, religious founder, apostle, also Buddha. The title is clearly inspired by H.-J. Klimkeit’s “Buddha-Enoch” article (ZRGG 32, 1986) and is reminiscent of the Manichaean Buddha-Christ of Light with which Klimkeit had dealt elsewhere. The value of this M.A. thesis (the title of which, as indicated before, is rather misleading) resides not so much in the rather incidental Buddha-theme as in the competent summary of the whole Enochian complex (sources as well as secondary literature). The author deserves special praise for not limiting herself to texts but including also iconography. The very full bibliography (pp. 160-180, up to 1988) is equally useful. What is needed now is a study of the subsequent history of the Enochian literature, and more specifically of the “watchers”, especially in the late 19th cent. occultist renaissance.
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Nigosian’s book intends to serve as “an instructive analytical work on the Zoroastrian faith” (p. xi) but it only can be recommended with much hesitation to a very general readership. Even the undergraduate student of history of religions can easily find better books on Zoroastrianism.

In five chapters N. deals with his subject: In the first one (pp. 3-24) he describes the life, date and place of Zarathustra reaching the tentative conclusion that Zarathustra preached somewhen before Cyrus II., probably at the end of the seventh or at the beginning of the sixth century BCE.
in Iran, without specifying a more precise area for the prophet’s homeland. But it is worth mentioning that within the last few years there has been a growing consensus to propose as a date for the prophet’s lifetime the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 1st millennium BCE. The next chapter (pp. 25-45) is an outline of the history of Zoroastrianism from the Achaemenian era up to the presence; the period after the Muslim conquest is very short focussing mainly on the arrival at India according to the “History of Sanjana” (qissa is consequently misspelled as quissa [!!]). Dating the exodus from Iran to India in the 8th and 9th century (p. 42) is too early; the first leaving to India took place only in 936. Chapter 3 (pp. 46-70) introduces the Zoroastrian scriptures. I am not convinced by N.’s conclusion that some parts of the Avesta are as late as the Sasanian time in the fifth century CE (p. 48). N. gives a short description of the different parts of the Avesta and of some Middle Persian writings, quoting passages at some length, but these quotations are often from dated translations (e.g. Darmesteter and Mills, West). In my opinion chapters 4 and 5 are the more interesting parts of the book: Here N. gives an outline of Zoroastrian teachings (pp. 71-97) and observances (pp. 98-118). Although both parts are not always accurate in all historical details they are worth to be read because N.’s description is in accordance with the view-point of faithful Zoroastrians. Therefore the reader gets some “inside” information that sometimes differs from a purely historical and analytical view. Endnotes (pp. 123-132), an extensively compiled (but in the arguments often not used) bibliography (pp. 133-149), and an index (pp. 151-154) conclude the book.

The most serious limitation of this book is its philological weakness. Just some flaws: The names khshathrita and phraortes cannot be equated but have quite different meanings (p. 7). The given translation of the Avestan words xvaetu, verezema and airyanma is wrong, thus also the socio-historical conclusion based thereupon (p. 13). The sentence “The Arsacid rulers … made the Pahlavi language … the official Parthian language” (p. 31) shows that the author has only a very limited idea about Pahlavi or Parthian. The sentence “The agent through whom Ahriman works is Angra Mainyu” (p. 85) makes clear, why there are two sub-chapters on “Ahriman” and “Angra Mainyu” (pp. 84-86); but: Ahriman is the Middle Persian equivalent to Avestan Angra Mainyu, thus the quoted sentence becomes nonsense. I must conclude: Writing on Zoroastrianism—even on an introductory level—depends on at least some rudimentary knowledge of Iranian philology. The above mentioned mistakes give the impression that the author has not been fully aware of this starting point. Therefore his “Zoroastrian Faith” can give some