

of the Old Testament Scriptures. But now let me return for a moment to Kuenen the critic. How great he was, was hardly seen in his lifetime. First, because he wrote in Dutch, and next because he was far above "the last infirmity of noble minds." Read, if you will, a few of his numerous criticisms on books in the Dutch periodical (the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*) of which he was a chief editor. How mild and gracious is his treatment even of those from whom he differs! Fairness one expects in an opponent, but *graciousness*—how seldom is this Christ-like temper found in a critic! I have already said that Kuenen was "moderate"; so he was. Sobriety was the dominant tone of his intellectual character. It was to this sobriety that we owe that vast accumulation of well-arranged facts which meets us in the *Onderzoek*, and in that marvellous series of articles on the criticism of the early narratives contained in the *Tijdschrift*. He was possessed by the genius of order, and it is this which permits us to cherish the hope that the third part of his great work (in the second edition) is sufficiently ready to be printed. For this restless writer was always far in advance of his printer. Alas! the tireless brain is stilled. Suddenly came the summons, but the servant was ready. *Pendent opera interrupta*. But he who has left his work was one who believed in spiritual immortality,

"Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake."

T. K. CHEYNE.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

A New View of Psalm xvi. 1-4.—May we permit our general view of the purport of a psalm to react upon our view of the text of a difficult passage? Professor Wildeboer is convinced that in Psalm xvi. the speaker is not a pious individual, but the Church-nation, in fact, the "Servant of Jehovah," of whom we read in the second part of Isaiah. The psalm is, on this as well as other grounds, not Davidic, but Exilic, or post-Exilic, and we may, in correcting the text of the very obscure second, third, and fourth verses, look for hints to the "Second Isaiah." Now it appears to Professor Wildeboer (of Groningen) that there is an allusion in vers. 2 and 3 to Isaiah lxii. 4 (Beulah . . .

Hephi-bah), and with this clew and the help of the Septuagint he proceeds to correct the text with the following result.

1. A Davidic jewel [*nichtam*]. Preserve me, O God, for with thee do I seek refuge. 2. I say unto Jehovah [Yahveh]: Lord, thou art the good of (the people which thy prophet called), thy "wedded one" [בְּעֻזְתֶּךָ]. 3. To the holy ones who dwell in the land (say I therefore), They are the noble ones (of whom that saying is true), "In them is all my delight." They increase their own pains who give the dowry [*mōhar*] to another (god); (but) I will not pour out their libations of blood, nor take their name upon my lips [Exod. xxiii. 31].

The reader will do well to compare the Septuagint and the Peshitto. Mr. Burgess, as our author remarks, has already taken a hint from the latter; he produces the poor rendering, ". . . My goods are at thy disposal." There are great difficulties however in Professor Wildeboer's version. In ver. 2 the rhythm requires a pause at אֱלֹהִים. It would be more natural to render, "I say unto Jehovah: My Lord art thou, my (one earthly) good is thy wedded one (the people which thy prophet called Jehovah's Beulah, or 'wedded one')." But then, of course, an *individual* must be the speaker, and the psalm must be divided (like other psalms) between the Church-nation and any pious Israelite. In ver. 3, I am doubtful about the excision of the ו in אֱלֹהֵיךָ, and about the strange genitive to אֱלֹהֵיךָ. In ver. 4, I cannot help thinking the sense given to מַהֲרֵי difficult, in spite of Professor Wildeboer's reference to the Arabic *mahr*. In Hebrew usage, so far as we know, מַהֲרֵי is always the purchase-money which the bridegroom gives to the bride's father. The theory is very ingenious, and shows at any rate that the author is not satisfied with Baethgen's very clever emendation of ver. 3 in accordance with the Septuagint, illustrated by Isaiah xlii. 21. For my own part, I still think that הַמַּהֲרֵי . . . הַקְּרוֹשִׁים is a gloss. (The above "new view" is set forth in one of the articles which together constitute a tribute of respect to Professor de Goeje on occasion of his professorial jubilee, *Feestbundel aan Prof. M. J. de Goeje*, etc, Leiden, 1891).

The Hebrew Idea of Wisdom.—It is well known that, according to some advanced critics, the book of Proverbs bears the stamp of the pure theology of the post-Exilic age. In connexion with this it will be not unimportant to inquire whether

the growth of the conception of the heavenly Wisdom, found in Proverbs viii., may not have been facilitated by the analogous conception of the *ásnya khratu* or *ásno-khart* found in the *Avesta* and in the (very late) *Minókhired*. No doubt the description of this heavenly wisdom (which Ahura Mazda had before all heavenly and earthly creations) in the latter book has been influenced by a Hellenizing intellectual movement; Dastur Jamasp Asa in vain attempts to prove that Hellenism borrowed from Zoroastrianism. But the fundamental idea is clearly pure Zoroastrian; it belongs to the same circle of ideas as the other personified qualities and Divine attributes.¹ When for instance we read in *Yasna* xxii. 25, "For the propitiation of the Zarathustrian law, (and) of the understanding which is innate and Mazda-made," we are not in Greek, but in Persian surroundings, and we have a right to infer that wise men of Israel who knew something of Zoroastrianism might have heard of the heavenly wisdom. See *Oxford Zendavesta* i. 4, and Darmesteter's note; Shiegel, *Eranische Alterthümer* ii. 34; Casartelli, *Philosophy of the Mazdayasnian Religion under the Sassanians* (Bombay), p. 41; and cf. the comparison which I have ventured to institute between the Hebrew and the Zoroastrian conceptions of the Divine glory in the *Expository Times*, August, 1891, p. 252.

Jewish Influence on Persian Beliefs.—It is well known that Persian influence upon Judaism increased considerably in the first four Christian centuries. But we have not yet found evidence of Jewish influence on Persian beliefs or forms of worship during the same period. M. James Darmesteter has given much attention of late to the Pehlevi texts relative to Judaism, and shown that under the Sassanid kings the conditions were altogether favourable to a reciprocity of religious influences (see *Revue des études juives* xviii. 1-15, xix. 41-56). He has now published a Parsí prayer to Ormazd, called *Namázi Ormazd*, which is upon the whole both beautiful in itself and remarkable as containing passages which are certainly derived from Judaism.²

¹ So Mr. Alger, in his *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, sees no reason to believe "that important Christian ideas have been interpolated into the old Zoroastrian religion." The *Dastur* referred to above quotes this passage (in the translation of Casartelli) on his side; but Mr. Alger carefully guards himself by inserting the word "old."

² *Une prière judéo-persane*. Par James Darmesteter. Paris, 1891.

Ver. 7 begins thus: "O Créateur, je te remercie de ce que tu m'as fait iranlen et de la bonne religion."

Ver. 10 contains these words: "Merci à toi, ô Créateur, de ce que tu m'as fait de la race des hommes; . . . de ce que tu m'as créé libre et non esclave; de ce que tu m'as créé homme et non pas femme."

These passages at once recall three of the benedictions in the Jewish morning prayer:

"Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, our God, King of the world, who hast not made me a heathen (or, originally, who hast made me an Israelite).

Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, our God, King of the world, who hast not made me a slave.

Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, our God, King of the world, who hast not made me a woman."

These three Jewish benedictions have a history. They have a different origin from the series of blessings in which they are inserted. This series admittedly comes from the schools of Babylonia; the Babylonian Talmud ascribes it to rabbins of the third and fourth centuries A.D. But the three inserted blessings are more ancient, and come from Palestine. After proving that the latter were not inspired by Zoroastrianism, M. Darmesteter argues convincingly that the parallel passages in the *Namâzi Ormazd* were borrowed from the Jewish formulæ in the fourth or at the beginning of the fifth century, when learned Jews were all-powerful at the Sassanid court. Would that we could discover equally direct evidence as to the relations between the Zoroastrian and the Mosaic religion, in the pre-Maccabæan period! But we may be sure at any rate that the Jews must have looked with respect on a religion, honoured in the person of Cyrus by one of their greatest prophets, and presenting such striking affinities with their own. Nor is probable evidence of religious intercourse between the Persians and the Jews altogether wanting.

T. K. CHEYNE.