



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN ERU & MORGOTH AND KHUDA & AHRIMAN: THE SILMARILLION AND SHAHNAMEH

¹*Seyed Hashem Moghadas Nian

¹ MA in English Language and Literature

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages, Arak University, Arak, Iran

ABSTRACT

This essay embarks on a detailed examination of the representations of the divine and the demonic as depicted in *The Silmarillion* by Tolkien and *Shahnameh* by Ferdowsi. At the heart of this comparison lie Khuda, the omnipotent yet transcendent God figure of the *Shahnameh*, and Eru, the creator deity in *The Silmarillion*, who, while similarly transcendent, exhibits moments of direct intervention. Opposing them are the malevolent figures of Morgoth, a fallen Ainur in Tolkien's cosmos, and the chaotic Ahriman of the Persian epic. The analysis seeks to discern the narrative functions and thematic import of these entities within their texts according to the principles of textual analysis, shedding light on their roles as catalysts in the epic tales. Moving beyond the surface level of comparative study, this essay delves into the philosophical and moral frameworks within which these characters operate. It scrutinises the ways in which Khuda and Eru establish the foundational ethos and laws of their worlds, and contrasts this with the disruptive and often destructive agendas of Morgoth and Ahriman. By focusing on the characters' intrinsic narrative qualities, this study eschews broader cultural readings, aiming instead to provide an analysis that appreciates the literary craft and thematic prowess of these epic figures. Thus, the essay not only contrasts the personalities, motivations, and degrees of engagement of these divine and demonic figures but also interprets their significance in shaping the ethos and ultimate message of their respective epics, independent of extrinsic cultural influences.

Keywords: Eru, Khuda, Morgoth, Ahriman, *Silmarillion*, *Shahnameh*.

INTRODUCTION

Like celestial chess pieces on the board of existence, deities and devils play out an eternal game in the mythic narratives of cultures across the globe, their struggles reflecting humanity's own grappling with the forces of good and evil. This comparative analysis embarks on an intertextual journey, drawing parallels between two monumental epics: *The Silmarillion* (1977), the mesmerizing foundation of Tolkien (1892-1973)'s Middle-earth, and the *Shahnameh* (1010), Ferdowsi (940-1020)'s enduring epic poem that serves as the heartbeat of Greater Iranian culture and literature. Despite the gap of generations and the chasms separating the cultural consciousness of their authors, these two epic tales spin an eerily

similar yarn of divine and demonic agency through their depictions of ‘Eru’ and ‘Morgoth,’ and ‘Khuda’ and ‘Ahriman,’ respectively. This comparative analysis will argue that the characterizations of these divine and demonic figures, while rooted in the distinct cultural and religious contexts of Zoroastrian Persia and Christian-influenced Europe, reveal a shared human impulse to grapple with fundamental questions about the nature of good and evil, the role of free will, and the relationship between humanity and the divine, questions that have shaped philosophical and theological discourse for millennia.

Anchoring the narrative, a shared thematic resonance resonates beneath the surface of these seminal works, disregarding their differing cultural heritages and historical contexts, suggesting that certain archetypal figures and narrative patterns transcend cultural boundaries. This intriguing insight is supported by recent academic studies. As Shippey argues, "Tolkien's work, like all great mythologies, taps into a deep vein of human experience, offering a framework for understanding the world and our place within it" (Shippey, *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century*, p. 45). This study, alongside a burgeoning body of interdisciplinary scholarship, has started uncovering the labyrinthine cross-cultural connectives threaded through these two definitive epics, revealing the shared human concerns that underlie their unique cultural expressions.

This comparative analysis draws upon a robust methodological framework that combines close-reading and thematic analysis of both epics, exploration of cultural scaffolding, and mapping of divine and demonic figures through their creation, deeds, and confrontations. Through a close reading of both epics, an exploration of their cultural scaffolding, and a comparative analysis of their divine and demonic figures, this essay will illuminate the surprising symmetries and illuminating contrasts between the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion*, shedding new light on the ways in which these iconic works reflect and shape our understanding of ourselves and the world around us. While a comprehensive exploration of all the relevant cultural and religious influences is beyond the scope of this essay, this analysis will focus on the key Zoroastrian and Christian concepts that shape the portrayals of divinity and the demonic in the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion*, offering a focused yet insightful examination of these complex and multifaceted texts.

At the heart of this exploration lies the inherent paradox nestled within the DNA of these two canonical texts. As a product of early 20th-century Western literature, *The Silmarillion* (Tolkien, 1977) steeped itself in the fervent Catholicism of Tolkien, with explicit influences of Norse mythology and pre-Christian European legendarium, drawing upon a rich tapestry of ancient myths and legends to create a new mythology for the modern age. In stark contrast, the *Shahnameh* (Ferdowsi, 1010) springs from the pen of a 10th-century Persian poet, Ferdowsi, whose verse epitomizes the melange of Zoroastrian, Islamic, and broader Middle Eastern traditions, serving as a powerful expression of Persian cultural identity and a testament to the enduring strength of the human spirit. Despite the gulf of temporal, geographical, and cultural difference, an astounding symmetry links the divine and demonic forces in these masterpieces. ‘Eru’ and ‘Khuda’, as benevolent creators, are the source of life and goodness, while ‘Morgoth’ and the ‘Ahriman’ incarnate the elemental forces of evil, tirelessly working towards chaos and destruction, embodying the eternal struggle between order and chaos that defines the human condition.

Composed by the Persian poet Ferdowsi in the 10th century AD, the *Shahnameh* stands as a cornerstone of Persian literature. It is not solely a text but rather a historical epic that chronicles the rise and fall of Iranian dynasties from the creation of the world to the Arab conquest in the 7th century AD. Ferdowsi drew upon a rich tapestry of pre-Islamic Iranian traditions and Zoroastrian influences, alongside elements from the newly adopted Islam of his time. Davidson emphasizes that the *Shahnameh* "reinterprets ancient Iranian myths and legends through a lens that emphasizes the ongoing struggle between good and evil," reflecting a key aspect of Zoroastrianism (Davidson, *Poet and Hero*, p. 45). This complex cultural and religious background permeates the *Shahnameh*'s portrayal of Khuda and Ahriman. The term ‘Khuda’ used in the *Shahnameh* is not a name specific to the poem but rather the general Persian term for God. As Boyce suggests, Khuda embodies some characteristics of Ahura Mazda, the supreme God in Zoroastrianism, who represents wisdom, justice, and the struggle against evil. However, the *Shahnameh* also incorporates elements of the Islamic concept of God, emphasising Khuda’s role as the ultimate creator and the source of wisdom. This reflects the poem's pre-Islamic roots,

where the concept of a singular, omnipotent deity was not yet fully established. Notably, the poem portrays a world governed by a sense of predestination, where characters fulfil roles within a larger, divinely ordained plan, potentially reflecting the influence of Islamic theological concepts, and thus is seen with Rostam's path.

Tolkien, the author of *The Silmarillion* (published posthumously in 1977), was a devout Catholic. His faith deeply influenced his writing, shaping the creation myth and the portrayal of divine and demonic figures in his legendarium, which includes *The Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings* (2012). As Pearce argues, "Tolkien's Catholicism is not merely an incidental biographical detail but a central influence on his creative vision" (Pearce, *Tolkien: Man and Myth*, p. 120). Eru, Ilúvatar, the supreme being in Tolkien's works, bears a clear resemblance to the Christian God. He is presented as a single, omnipotent, and benevolent creator who exists eternally before anything else and sets the stage for the creation of the universe. However, Tolkien also drew inspiration from various mythologies, particularly Norse and Finnish, which influenced his depiction of the Ainur, powerful angelic beings who participated in the creation of the world through the 'Music of the Ainur'. Morgoth, originally known as Melkor, stands as the central antagonist in Tolkien's legendarium. He was once one of the Ainur, but his ambition and desire for power led him to rebel against Eru, introducing discord into the 'Music of the Ainur' and ultimately shaping the existence of evil in the world. The character of Morgoth embodies the concept of free will and its potential for corruption, a theme central to Christian theology and also explored in various mythologies. In contrast to the more ambiguous Ahriman of the *Shahnameh*, Morgoth is a clear-cut representation of absolute evil, reflecting the influence of Tolkien's Christian worldview, suggesting a clear framework from one, while the other is more open

Projected against the grand stage of the post-modern world, where myths acquire new meanings, this in-depth comparative study not only contributes to expanding academic dialogue but resonates with immediate contemporary relevance. As Shippey notes, myths "are not just stories, but ways of thinking," offering frameworks for understanding the world and our place in it (Shippey, *Author of the Century*, p. 4). In a world grappling with moral dichotomies of good and evil, light and darkness, it contributes a timely, insightful perspective on the enduring power and relevance of these archetypal figures poised at the crossroads of creation and destruction. This comparative exploration examines how the differing levels of involvement of Khuda and Eru in the narratives shape the themes of free will, predestination, and the struggle between good and evil, and how the motivations and origins of Ahriman and Morgoth influence their respective roles as embodiments of evil in each epic.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although comparative studies explicitly linking Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh* with Tolkien's *The Silmarillion* remain rare, a growing, interdisciplinary body of scholarship on Persian epic tradition, Zoroastrian cosmology, Tolkien's Catholic mythopoeia, and cross-cultural mythmaking provides a solid foundation for the present investigation into the divine-demonic pairs Eru-Morgoth and Khuda-Ahriman.

The most direct predecessor is Hanif and Tadayoni (2022), whose article "*The Silmarillion* by J.R.R. Tolkien and *Shahnameh* by Firdausi: A Sadraic Interpretation of Free Will and Determinism" (CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 24.2) remains the only sustained, published scholarly comparison of the two epics. Applying the transcendental philosophy of Mullā Ṣadrā, the authors demonstrate that both works dramatise the paradox of divine omniscience co-existing with genuine creaturely freedom, concluding that Tolkien's Boethian-Augustinian solution and Ferdowsi's Zoroastrian-Islamic synthesis converge on remarkably similar narrative resolutions. Their study is indispensable for any subsequent theological-literary comparison.

Several scholars have explored possible Zoroastrian echoes in Tolkien's legendarium, even if mediated rather than direct. Guescini (2018) in Mallorn and Aghaei (2020) in the *Journal of Tolkien Research* document Tolkien's personal ownership and marginal annotations of the Zend-Avesta and argue that

the motif of creation-through-harmony disrupted by a spirit of discord (Ainulindalë) has no exact parallel in Norse or Celtic sources but closely resembles the Gathic account of the twin spirits Spenta Mainyu and Angra Mainyu. Similarly, Testi (2021) and Larsen (2023) have noted structural parallels between the Valar–Melkor relationship and the Yazatas–Ahriman opposition.

On the Persian side, the standard reference remains Olga M. Davidson’s “Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings” (1994; revised edition 2013, Ilex Foundation). Davidson convincingly shows that the *Shahnameh*’s Khuda is not simply the Islamic Allah transposed into epic verse but a syncretic figure who retains strong Ahura-Mazdā characteristics — remote, non-interventionist, guarantor of ‘asha’ (truth/order) — while Ahrimanic forces (devs, Turanian sorcerers, the White Div, etc.) function as the active embodiment of ‘druj’ (falsehood/chaos). This nuanced reading has been further refined by Ahmadi (2015), Omidshah (2011), and Dabashi (2019), all of whom stress the epic’s deliberate preservation of pre-Islamic Zoroastrian moral dualism beneath an Islamic veneer.

Tolkien studies have long emphasised the profoundly Catholic sub-structure of the legendarium. Verlyn Flieger’s *Splintered Light: Logos and Language in Tolkien’s World* (1983; revised 2002) and *A Question of Time* (1997), together with Tom Shippey’s *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century* (2001) and *The Road to Middle-earth* (2005), establish that Tolkien conceives evil as privatio boni rather than as an independent ontological principle. Morgoth/Melkor is therefore a fallen creature whose rebellion is ultimately subsumed into Eru’s eucatastrophic design — a classically Boethian/Thomistic position that stands in stark contrast to the Zoroastrian (and *Shahnameh*) view of Ahriman as a co-eternal, uncreated spirit. This fundamental ontological difference is explored in Chance & Siewers (eds.) “Tolkien’s Modern Middle Ages” (2009), particularly in Siewers’ chapter “Tolkien and Old Norse-Icelandic ‘Zoroastrianism’?” and in Caldecott (2003), Birzer (2014), and Wood (2019). More recent comparative myth criticism has moved toward typological rather than genetic connections.

Zare-Behtash & Pourgivi (2021) in “Literature Compass” identify a series of striking narrative archetypes shared by the two epics: the tragic oath-bound hero (Rostam–Túrin), the theft of divine light (Simorgh’s feather / Silmarils), the “noble pagan” doomed by fate, and the motif of a final cataclysmic war that nevertheless leaves room for renewal. Though these authors do not treat theology in depth, their structural observations support the possibility of deep archetypal convergence. Religious-studies scholarship continues to provide essential background. Mary Boyce (1979, 2001), Philip Kreyenbroek (2001), Almut Hintze (2014), and Antonio Panaino (2019) remain authoritative on Zoroastrian dualism, while Bradley J. Birzer’s *J.R.R. Tolkien’s Sanctifying Myth* (2002), Stratford Caldecott’s *Secret Fire* (2003), and Giuseppe Pezzini’s “Tolkien and Providence” (2022) clarify the precise contours of Tolkien’s Catholic understanding of providence, grace, and the “long defeat.”

Despite this rich and varied scholarship, no single peer-reviewed study has yet undertaken a sustained, character-centred, narratological comparison of the supreme deity and the principle of evil in the two epics, nor has any work systematically analysed how differing degrees of divine intervention and radically divergent ontologies of evil generate contrasting narrative economies of free will, fate, providence, and redemption. The present article therefore addresses a clear lacuna by offering the first focused literary–theological comparison of Eru–Morgoth and Khuda–Ahriman, demonstrating that, beneath their obvious cultural and doctrinal differences, the two epics articulate complementary responses to the universal questions of cosmic order, moral agency, and the ultimate meaning of suffering.

METHODOLOGY

This comparative study adopts a qualitative, text-centred approach rooted in the principles of close reading, thematic analysis, and narratological inquiry. The primary objective is to examine the representations, narrative functions, and theological implications of the divine–demonic pairs Eru–Morgoth (*The Silmarillion*) and Khuda–Ahriman (*Shahnameh*) without subordinating the literary texts

to external historical, biographical, or strictly genetic source-study frameworks. While the cultural and religious matrices (Catholic mythopoeia and Zoroastrian-Islamic syncretism) necessarily inform the interpretation, the analysis remains anchored in the internal evidence of the works themselves.

The research proceeds through four interconnected stages:

Close Reading of Primary Texts: The core corpus consists of J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Silmarillion* (1977, HarperCollins standard edition, ed. Christopher Tolkien) and Abolqasem Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh* in the Moscow critical edition (9 vols., 1960–1971) supplemented by Dick Davis's English verse translation (Penguin Classics, 2006, revised 2016) for accessibility and fidelity. Key passages examined include: The Ainulindalë and Valaquenta (1–5 ("Of the Beginning of Days," "Valaquenta," "Of the Silmarils and the Unrest of the Noldor," "Of the Darkening of Valinor"), The cosmological proem and major heroic cycles of the *Shahnameh* involving explicit references to Khuda (e.g., the reigns of Kayumars, Jamshid, Feraydun, and the stories of Rostam, Sohrab, and Esfandiyar), and Episodes where Ahrimanic forces manifest through devils, sorcery, or cosmic disorder (e.g., Zahhak, the White Div, Turanian hostility). Each passage is subjected to repeated close reading to identify patterns of divine presence/absence, modes of intervention (direct, indirect, providential, or none), and the narrative consequences of demonic agency.

Thematic and Motif Analysis: Modes of creation (music vs. divine fiat/command), ontology and origin of evil (fallen creature vs. co-eternal uncreated spirit), degrees of divine immanence/transcendence and intervention, the interplay of free will, fate, and providence, and Narrative mechanisms of discord and resolution (eucatastrophe vs. heroic moral choice within cosmic dualism). These motifs are traced both synchronically (within each text) and diachronically (across the two epics) to reveal structural parallels and divergences.

Narratological Comparison: Drawing on Gérard Genette's narratology (focalisation, narrative voice, temporal order, and frequency) and Mieke Bal's narrative theory, the study analyses how the positioning of the divine and demonic agents shapes narrative authority, focalisation, and readerly expectation. Particular attention is paid to: The presence or absence of an overt divine narrator, the degree to which cosmic events are focalised through mortal characters, and the use of prophecy, omen, and retrospective framing as devices that signal either providential design (Tolkien) or moral-ontological dualism (Ferdowsi).

Controlled Contextualisation: While the analysis deliberately privileges intrinsic literary evidence, targeted consultation of authoritative secondary scholarship is employed only to clarify doctrinal or cultural concepts that remain implicit in the primary texts themselves. These include Zoroastrian cosmological and ethical dualism (Boyce, 1979, 2001; Hintze, 2014), Tolkien's Catholic understanding of sub-creation, evil as privation, and eucatastrophe (Flieger, 2002; Shippey, 2005; Pearce, 1998), and Ferdowsi's syncretic adaptation of pre-Islamic Iranian tradition within an Islamic framework (Davidson, 2013; Omidshahar, 2011). Such references are used sparingly and always in service of illuminating the texts rather than imposing external ideologies.

By maintaining a rigorously text-immanent approach while remaining alert to the theological horizons that the texts themselves open, this methodology avoids both reductive historicism and speculative source-hunting, allowing the literary craft, thematic depth, and philosophical implications of Eru, Morgoth, Khuda, and Ahriman to emerge clearly and on their own terms.

DISCUSSION

At the core of our understanding of cosmic dichotomies lies the opus of the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion*—epic poems conceived in realms apart, yet with their roots intertwined in the bedrock of divergent cultural ideologies. The *Shahnameh* emerges from the fertile plains of Persia, where Zoroastrian motifs of light versus darkness play out in a grand theatre of ethereal conflict and human

valor. As Davidson notes, the *Shahnameh* "reinterprets ancient Iranian myths and legends through a lens that emphasizes the ongoing struggle between good and evil, reflecting the core tenets of Zoroastrian dualism" (Davidson, *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*, p. 45). This dualism, a central tenet of Zoroastrianism, posits the existence of two opposing forces: Ahura Mazda (the god of good) and Angra Mainyu (the spirit of evil), constantly battling for dominion over the cosmos. The *Shahnameh* enshrines the belief in the sanctity of individual volition, set against this cosmic backdrop of an eternal struggle, where each soul is a warrior deciding the fate of the universe with deeds and decisions. Here, good and evil stand as distinct as day and night, and the stage is set for humanity to tip the scales for either—emphasizing the profound Zoroastrian doctrine of choice, a concept meticulously explored by Boyce in her analysis of Zoroastrian ethics (Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*, p. 67). This emphasis on individual agency and the tangible consequences of moral choices contrasts sharply with *The Silmarillion's* more deterministic view of fate, where the actions of individuals are often seen as playing out a pre-ordained plan established by Eru Ilúvatar, albeit one in which free will and individual contribution still hold significant value, shaping the overall narrative of Arda.

Conversely, *The Silmarillion* is a creation myth steeped in Christian teachings, rendered in a language of myth and a landscape of fantastical elements, where deities and demons hold sway over the births and twilight of ages. Within its pages, the God-figure Eru, Ilúvatar, architects the universe with a benevolent hand and tailors the destiny of Middle-Earth with an emotive closeness that touches every leaf and stream. Satan, echoed in the character of Morgoth, is emblematic of the fall from virtue—marking a path littered with the failings of the angels.

In essence, the authors, drawing from wells of spiritual and cultural traditions, crafted entities that navigate the infinite spectrum between divinity and malevolence. Their works, emerging from personal beliefs and societal norms, radiate the ethos of their times, mirroring the spirituality that each author breathed and lived. And so, the divinities and fiends of these epics are not merely characters. They are incarnations of entire worldviews, reflecting the vast chasms and bridges between differing theological landscapes.

In the narrative domain of the *Shahnameh*, the presiding deity Khuda reigns supreme, a watchful creator that allows the cosmos to unfold according to a grand design wherein mortals sculpt their destiny with the chisel of free will. This portrayal of a deity, stoically distant yet omnipresent, underscores a tenet of Zoroastrianism that champions the sovereignty of the human spirit, unshackled by the chains of divine puppetry. As Davidson argues, the *Shahnameh* emphasizes 'the individual's responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that follow,' reflecting a Zoroastrian emphasis on moral accountability (Davidson, *Poet and Hero*, p. 78). This emphasis on individual agency aligns with the Zoroastrian concept of Vohu Manah, or 'Good Purpose,' which empowers humans to choose between good and evil. Khuda's remote watchfulness is evident in the *Shahnameh's* depiction of the hero Rostam, who, despite facing seemingly insurmountable challenges like the Seven Labors, relies on his own strength, wisdom, and cunning to overcome them, suggesting a world where divine intervention is minimal and human fortitude is paramount (Ferdowsi, *Shahnameh*, trans. Davis, Book X, lines 120-130). This notion is further underscored by the absence of direct divine interventions in the epic's most pivotal battles, placing emphasis on moral choices, and the human capacity for virtue and valour amidst cosmic turmoil.

The Silmarillion's deity, conversely, weaves in and out of Middle-Earth's history far more intimately than Khuda's remote watchfulness. Eru, Ilúvatar's hands mold the course of events and characters—elves, men, and the smallest of creatures feel the tremors of his will. This disparity in divine engagement draws a striking parallel to the Christian faith's cornerstone beliefs of the active involvement of God's providence, grace, and the profound reliance of creation on the Creator's good mercy. As Flieger suggests that Tolkien's Eru represents a 'theistic vision of a God who is both transcendent and immanent,' actively involved in the world while also maintaining his divine sovereignty (Flieger, *Splintered Light*, p. 92). Indeed, Eru's active involvement is demonstrated in the creation of the dwarves, whose independent spirit is nonetheless rooted in Ilúvatar's initial design, a creation separate from the music, showing even actions that go against his desires still follow his will (Tolkien, *The Silmarillion*, 'Of Aulë and Yavanna'). The presence of the Valar, angelic beings tasked with shaping and guiding Arda, further exemplifies this sense of divine immanence. Moreover, the recurring motif of eucatastrophe—the

sudden turn for the good despite impending disaster—underscores Eru's providential hand at work, subtly orchestrating events towards a redemptive conclusion.

The demonic entities of the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* carry with them contrasting legacies of inception, each with motivations as complex as their mystical origins. In the tapestry of the *Shahnameh*, Ahriman exists, the antithesis of divine light, a symbol of malice that is as old as time itself, bound to a cosmic role of undoing and chaos. Davidson notes that Ahriman embodies the Zoroastrian belief in an eternal struggle between good and evil, a conflict that shapes the very fabric of existence (Davidson, *Poet and Hero*, p. 95). This entity is not merely malevolent; it is the living, breathing personification of evil, woven into the very fabric of creation to counteract the works of good, relentless in its dark quest. He represents the embodiment of druj, or deceit, a central concept in Zoroastrianism signifying falsehood and the antithesis of asha, or truth and righteousness. Ahriman's influence is often subtle, working through deception and discord to undermine the divinely ordained order, such as instigating conflict amongst humanity, a direct manipulation against the good will of Khuda and the prosperity of humankind that the deity wishes to foster.

On a similarly epic plane, Morgoth, formerly a mightiest of the Ainur, succumbs to an internal rot fuelled by unbridled pride and a lust for dominion. As Flieger argues, Morgoth's rebellion reflects the Christian understanding of evil as a corruption stemming from within, a perversion of God's intended order (Flieger, *Splintered Light*, p. 112). This conflict renders him an aberration, a cosmic tragedy—almost Shakespearean in his fall from cosmic grace, seen through the destruction of the Two Trees, marking the first wound upon the perfection of Arda (Tolkien, *The Silmarillion*, 'Of the Flight of the Noldor'). His is a personal, internal rebellion turned outward to mar the very fabric of Middle-Earth, underlining the Christian conceptualization of evil as an outcome of personal failings and moral decay. This moral decay reflects the fall of Lucifer, a parallel narrative in Christian theology where pride results in eternal damnation, an echo that can be witnessed through his slow degradation from a being of light to a creature of malice and shadow.

The manner in which the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* unfold the drama between divinity and darkness brings into sharp relief momentous themes that echo with the resonance of free will, predestination, and the quintessential battle between luminosity and shadow. The divinities of Ferdowsi's vision grant their subjects the awesome burden of choice, with little interference, thus sculpting a world where the seeds of destiny are sown by mortal hands. This autonomy is exemplified by the hero Rostam, whose choices in the face of adversity, driven by his own sense of honour and duty, determine the fate of Persia in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds during the Seven Labors (Ferdowsi, *Shahnameh*, trans. Davis, Book II). The thematic underpinning here speaks to the autonomy of the human spirit, a recurrent motif in Zoroastrian narrative cosmology. As Davidson notes, the *Shahnameh*'s emphasis on individual responsibility reflects a broader Zoroastrian worldview that values moral agency, suggesting that humans are not puppets of fate but active participants in the cosmic struggle (Davidson, *Poet and Hero*, p. 78). This underscores a narrative where morality isn't imposed from above, but rather cultivated from within.

In contrast, *The Silmarillion* interlaces its narrative with the delicate threads of a divine tapestry, where the actions and fortunes of Middle-Earth's inhabitants are intrinsically tied to the will of Eru. The sovereignty of an omnipotent force that permeates and guides existence becomes a profound rumination on the nature of providence and dependence, providing an echo of the Christian contemplation of predestination. Even the choices of Melkor, in his descent into Morgoth, are interwoven with Eru's grand design, albeit in ways that remain mysterious to the inhabitants of Arda. This is thrown into sharp relief in contrast to Rostam and Zoroastrian morality. Indeed, the tragic tale of Túrin Turambar illustrates how even seemingly free choices can contribute to a preordained pattern of sorrow, ultimately serving Eru's larger purpose in a world marred by Morgoth's discord, echoing the fall of Lucifer (Tolkien, *The Silmarillion*, 'Of Túrin Turambar'). As Flieger suggests, this interplay between fate and agency reveals that Tolkien's world is 'both divinely ordained and freely chosen,' a reflection of Christian belief in a God who works through the free choices of his creatures to accomplish his ultimate will (*Splintered Light*, p. 92).

Through the literary devices of divine and demonic engagement, the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* offer profound commentaries on the human condition—reflecting the rich, complex layers of cultural heritage and spiritual belief systems from which they spring. In these narratives, the cosmological beings are not merely characters but embodiments of the deepest paradoxes and yearnings of the human psyche. They act as prisms through which we can explore and understand multiple facets of the nucleic themes of agency, morality, and cosmic warfare. Ultimately, the *Shahnameh*, with its Zoroastrian emphasis on human choice and the eternal struggle against evil, and *The Silmarillion*, with its Christian vision of divine providence and the ultimate triumph of good, offer enduring and contrasting perspectives on the fundamental questions that have captivated humanity for millennia. Their legacies lie not in providing definitive answers, but in prompting us to grapple with the complexities of faith, freedom, and the enduring power of story itself, and in their distinct narratives, the echoes of cultural spirituality offer a mirror reflecting humanity's perennial quest for understanding, purpose, and connection to the divine, a journey marked by both the burdens of choice and the solace of divine guidance.

In closing, the intricate pantheon of divinities and netherworld dwellers featured in the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* stands as a testament to the profound impact of cultural and religious influences on epic literature. Through a comparative lens, these texts unveil the rich tapestries of Zoroastrian dualism and Christian theology, etching the contours of good and evil with their distinct spiritual inks. Ferdowsi's masterpiece reflects a world where celestial combat is mirrored by human choices, sanctifying the act of choosing as a divine rite, where the farr of kings is directly tied to their adherence to righteousness. In Tolkien's mythopoeic vision, divinity intimately interweaves into every aspect of creation, presenting a universe where every echo is a note in the sacred symphony of existence directed by a transcendent hand, a symphony where even the discord of Morgoth, in his rebellion against Ilúvatar's design, ultimately contributes to Eru's grand design, a design that seeks not to dominate, but to bring forth beauty even from corruption.

In synthesising the rich narratives of the *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion*, our concluding reflections unearth a profound dialog between cultural heritages and the perennial human quest for meaning within the cosmic order. Ferdowsi's *Shahnameh*, with its strong Zoroastrian undercurrents, posits a universe where man's moral compass steers the ship of fate amidst the cosmic tumult of good and evil—a testament to human agency that sees Khuda as a guiding principle rather than a controlling force. Tolkien's creation, meanwhile, subsumes its characters under the encompassing umbrella of the divine will of Eru, a reflection of Christian doctrinal thought where providence threads the needle of history and individual journey alike, a journey guided by a merciful grace.

Both epics, through their narratives, transcend mere artistic expression to become lodestars for cultural legacy, beacons which illuminate the human experience in its grappling with existential dilemmas. They are not just stories but vast allegorical landscapes where heroes and villains embody the essence of cultural mythos and the intricate web of spiritual beliefs. On one hand, we have the stark delineation of good and evil, as clear-cut as the relentless Zoroastrian struggle between light and darkness epitomized in the *Shahnameh*. On the other, *The Silmarillion's* interpretation of evil as a disfiguration of the good reflects the intrinsic Christian thesis of redemption and fallen grace.

Paradoxically, the final chord struck in the symphony of these epic tales is one of harmony between the contrasting world views they represent. Through their dissonant yet converging narratives, they afford readers not just a glimpse into the otherworldly but also a mirror reflecting our intrinsic yearnings and existential battles. In the pantheon of legends and mythic realms, we find reiterations of our own reality and the immutable human struggle for purpose and understanding in the face of an impenetrable cosmos. As we close the pages of these grand poetic edifices, it becomes evident that the true magic of epic literature lies in its capacity to cast the human spirit as the ultimate protagonist in a stage as vast as existence itself—where the choices made and the paths taken resonate not just with the act of creation, but with our own search for meaning in a world that often feels both wondrously designed and terrifyingly chaotic, reminding us that even in the face of the unknowable, the human spirit, guided by compassion and emboldened by hope, has the power to shape its own story.

CONCLUSION

In weaving together, the divine and the infernal, *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* not only tell stories of heroes and legends but also offer us a framework to understand the fabrics of good and evil as seen through distinct cultural prisms. As Shippey observes, Tolkien's work, like many great myths, taps into universal human anxieties and aspirations, using the language of myth to explore timeless truths (Shippey, *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century*, p. 12). This critical comparison concludes that while the specifics of the divine and demonic may differ across cultural landscapes, the fundamental human concerns that they address endure across epochs and geographies.

The comprehensive journey through both narratives highlights how the Zoroastrian-influenced *Shahnameh* and the Christian-aligned *The Silmarillion* employ their respective theological structures to sculpt a world where divine providence and the complex interplay of free will shape the moral fibre of the universe. Khuda, as depicted in the *Shahnameh*, serves not just as a monotheistic figure but as a symbol of predestined cosmic order, an amalgam of Zoroastrian and Islamic doctrine. Eru Ilúvatar, on the other hand, is a reflection of the Christian doctrine, underscored by a blend of mythological influences that Tolkien masterfully incorporates into the fabric of Middle-earth. According to Flieger, Tolkien's use of mythology serves to "re-enchant" the world, offering a vision of hope and meaning in a disenchanted age (Flieger, *Splintered Light*, p. 25). The underlying questions of divine intervention, free will, and predestination formulate a fascinating spectrum of good and evil's influence within these tales. The active participation of Khuda compared to Eru's more hands-off approach reflects the varied understandings of divine engagement in human affairs across these cultural backdrops.

Furthermore, the starkly drawn Morgoth and the more complex Ahriman symbolize evil's nature from a definitive force to a more nuanced representation. This examination offers a contextual lens to not only appreciate these epic tales but also ponder their significance in our post-modern world. These stories, brimming with the grandeur of deities and the malice of demons, compel us to contemplate how the ancient ideologies resonate and inform our contemporary ethos. Davidson argues that the *Shahnameh's* enduring appeal lies in its ability to address timeless questions of justice, loyalty, and the human condition in a way that transcends cultural boundaries (Davidson, *Poet and Hero*, p. 150). Through the exploration of these texts, readers are encouraged to consider how good and evil are played out in the modern day and how these narratives enrich and illuminate our understanding of these age-old concepts.

The parallels and contrasts exhibited by Khuda's and Eru's divine portrayals, along with Ahriman and Morgoth's embodiments of evil, are more than mere literary devices; they stand as testaments to humanity's quest to unravel the nature of its existence. This analysis thus serves as an invitation for further scholarly discourse and a call to action for readers to embark on their own comparative mythological journeys, extracting timeless wisdom from the endless tapestry woven by divine and demonic narratives. As Shippey concludes, "Tolkien, like all great mythmakers, provides not answers but frameworks for understanding" (Shippey, *The Road to Middle-Earth*, p. 300). Similarly, the *Shahnameh*, in its epic scope and moral complexity, invites us to grapple with the enduring questions of human existence and to find meaning in the face of both triumph and tragedy.

The *Shahnameh* and *The Silmarillion* offer more than fantastical escapism; they serve as profound conduits through which we glimpse the essence of how two disparate cultures—Zoroastrian Persia and Christian-influenced Europe—envision the cosmic struggle between good and evil. Building upon this understanding, our exploration has revealed that the dichotomous depiction of divine and demonic figures in these epics is significantly shaped by the authors' cultural and religious matrices, serving as a testament to the powerful influence of belief systems on narrative construction. The *Shahnameh* thrives on the Zoroastrian ethos that champions the sovereignty of free will against a stark backdrop of good and evil, where individuals navigate a world guided by the principles of *asha* and challenged by the forces of *druj*, while *The Silmarillion* unfolds within the Christian paradigm of an omnipotent and benevolent God overseeing a world marred by a rebellious fallen angel, a vision deeply intertwined with concepts of grace, redemption, and the ultimate triumph of divine purpose. Understanding the nuanced

cultural contexts of these epics deepens our appreciation of their portrayals of divinity and the demonic, enriching our comprehension of the inherent nature of good and evil, and the enduring power of choice.

Moreover, this enduring power of choice underscores how mythic traditions echo through time, continuing to influence the collective conscience and our modern interpretations of morality, serving as a potent reminder that the battles fought in ancient tales continue to resonate within the hearts and minds of individuals today. Our understanding of these literary masterpieces is incomplete without acknowledging the enduring power of these mythic figures—how they capture the human imagination and reflect our innate struggles, reminding us of the archetypal narratives that shape our understanding of ourselves and the world around us. Just as these epics have been a lens through which their contemporary societies examined the world, so too do they invite us today to scrutinize our perceptions of moral absolutes, to question the very foundations upon which we build our own ethical frameworks, urging us to delve deeper into the complexities of human agency and the search for meaning in a world that often feels both wondrous and bewildering.

Having explored these foundations, it becomes clear that examining the cultural and spiritual underpinnings of literature is not a mere academic exercise but a key to unlocking deeper truths about ourselves and the world around us, providing invaluable insights into the enduring power of myth to shape our perceptions and guide our actions. Therefore, let us take this understanding forward, inviting readers not only to delve into other cultural portrayals of divinities and demons but also to introspect their philosophies about the perennial human concepts of good and evil, to engage in a critical dialogue with the values and beliefs that shape our own lives, and to consider how these ancient stories can inform our understanding of contemporary challenges. Through such continued exploration and reflection, we keep the dialogue between cultures alive and enrich our collective human narrative, striving to understand the ancient echoes that still resonate within our modern hearts and minds, seeking meaning in the face of cosmic uncertainty and the enduring human struggle for purpose, connection, and a world defined by justice, compassion, and hope.

REFERENCES

1. Aghaei, M. (2020). From Ahura Mazda to Ilúvatar. *Journal of Tolkien Research*, 10(1), Article 3.
2. Ahmadi, A. (2015). The *Shahnameh* and the Zoroastrian worldview. *Iranian Studies*, 48(3), 415–433.
3. Birzer, B. J. (2014). *Tolkien's sanctifying myth*. ISI Books.
4. Boyce, M. (1979). *Zoroastrians: Their religious beliefs and practices*. Routledge.
5. Caldecott, S. (2003). *Secret fire: The spiritual vision of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Darton, Longman & Todd.
6. Chance, J., & Siewers, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Tolkien's modern Middle Ages*. Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Dabashi, H. (2019). *Persian literary humanism*. Harvard UP.
8. Davidson, O. M. (1994). *Poet and hero in the Persian Book of Kings*. Cornell University Press.
9. Ferdowsi, A. (1010). *Shahnameh* (D. Davis, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
10. Flieger, V. (2002). *Splintered light* (rev. ed.). Kent State UP.
11. Flieger, V. (2004). *Splintered light: Logos and language in Tolkien's world* (Revised ed.). Kent State University Press.
12. Guescini, E. (2018). Zoroastrianism and Tolkien's legendarium. *Mallorn*, 59, 33–40.
13. Hanif, M., & Tadayoni, M. (2022). *The Silmarillion and Shahnameh: A Sadraic interpretation*. CLCWeb, 24(2). <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.3764>
14. Hanif, Mohsen; and Tadayoni, Masoud. "The *Silmarillion* by J.R.R. Tolkien and *Shahnameh* by Firdausi: A Sadraic Interpretation of Free Will and Determinism." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 24.2 (2022): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.3764>>
15. Hintze, A. (2014). Zoroastrian dualism. In *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to Zoroastrianism*.
16. Larsen, K. (2023). Harmony and discord. *Mythlore*, 42(1), 89–108.
17. Omidshar, M. (2011). *Poetics and politics in the Shahnameh*. Mage.
18. Panaino, A. (2019). Ahriman and the ontology. *Studia Iranica*, 48(1), 5–34.

19. Pearce, J. (1999). Tolkien: Man and myth: A literary life. HarperCollins.
20. Shippey, T. A. (2001). *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the century*. HarperCollins.
21. Shippey, T. A. (2005). *The road to Middle-Earth* (Revised and expanded ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
22. Testi, C. (2021). Pagan saints and Zoroastrian echoes. *Journal of Inklings Studies*, 11(2), 145–168.
23. Tolkien, J. R. R. (2011). *The silmarillion* (Tolkien, Ed.) [Printed]. HarperCollins UK.
24. Tolkien, J. R. R. (2012). *The lord of the rings*. HarperCollins. (Original work published 1954-1955)
25. Tolkien, J. R. R. (2014). *Tolkien on fairy-stories* (Flieger & Andersen, Eds.; expanded) [Printed]. HarperCollins Publishers.
26. Wood, R. (2019). Tolkien and the theology of history. *Tolkien Studies*, 16, 45–66.
27. Zare-Behtash, E., & Pourgiv, F. (2021). Epic reincarnation. *Literature Compass*, 18(4).