
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE LITERARY FORM OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS

HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

THE first chapter of Genesis has long been a storm center. It seemed for a time as though the disturbance was over; but it now appears that the change was only a lull in the tempest, and that there is more to come. Not only is there an effort on foot to restore the old literal interpretation of the English Version and discredit all the conclusions of science but also there is a pronounced difference of opinion as to the literary form of the chapter, and no little disposition to become indignant over some of the claims made.

Certain critics have treated it as a poem, and the conservatives resent any such implication. They see in the treatment an effort to belittle the chapter and so reduce it to the level of mere poetry, and such probably was the animus of the action. Nevertheless, there may be a certain element of truth in the critical contentions; but it is likely to operate against their main position for all that and turn out to be a boomerang. What the form really is and what it signifies is certainly an important question, and it is in order to institute an inquiry along those lines.

With that end in view, it will be necessary, as a preliminary requirement, to sketch briefly the general character of prosody; for in its present form it is based on a false premise, is illogical in its conclusions, mixes things that differ, is inconsistent with itself, warps poetry out of all semblance to its true nature, and disregards the most fundamental principles of the very thing from which it originated. And, moreover, it assumes to speak with authority.

Lest this indictment should seem too severe, let it be said that the writer has now spent twenty-five years in the study of this problem; has carefully and repeatedly weighed all that the Greek and Roman grammarians have to say on the subject; has solved the riddle of Classical prosody which had stood for about twenty centuries and

has been called impossible of solution; has prepared a reference work of some four hundred thousand words embracing some English and all Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit poetic forms, with a brief allusion to Hebrew ones; and has been successful in devising a mechanical method of testing results with accuracy. It not only proved more things than he had dared to hope but also enabled him to solve some puzzles in rhythm whose character was such that they could not have been solved otherwise.

Incidentally, elision in both Latin and Greek has been studied and its nature determined, and proof has finally been found in one of the Latin grammarians that the solution obtained is sound. It removes all inconsistencies, present and past, and is both natural and in keeping with known linguistic facts and practices. The old treatment produced more difficulties than it removed.

Quantity also has been investigated with unusual care, and here, again, the ancient authorities were found to substantiate all that had been tentatively assumed. Finally, time relations and popular errors therein have been exhaustively considered, because they are the very foundation of rhythm, and, without accuracy there, everything else becomes vitiated and worthless.

It has been necessary to travel far afield to cover all this territory, but no other course was possible, if the quest was to succeed, since failure to obtain reliable results in any one of these subjects meant failure to solve the problem itself in the long run. That is why it has never been done before. Investigators have not had the time and the patience to follow out all these minor features to their ultimate and logical conclusion, and, without that as a preliminary accomplishment, correct results have been an impossibility. Of necessity, feet have been critically studied from the beginning.

Now, consider a few basic facts. Imagine yourself playing a tuba or some other bass instrument, such as a bassoon, in a band and then suppose that the musicians are playing a march in four-four time while you are required to put three equal notes into each successive bar,

or into most of them. In other words, imagine yourself superimposing a three-four movement upon a somewhat faster four-four one and then synchronizing yours so that it coincides accurately with the other. Could you do it? There are savages who can do that sort of thing and do do it.

There is no question whatever about their ability to make use of complicated rhythms; for the objective proof has been found by students of their practices. What do they know, however, about the theory of such things? And what do they know, in particular, about meters? Could you explain such things to them?

Furthermore, the first time that any prehistoric man ever tried to speak or move in balanced measures, rhythm was born. Was meter born with it or was that an afterthought? As you contemplate these things, especially the ability of savages to use complex rhythms, is it possible to escape the conclusion that rhythm must have been instinctive at the start, and that it must therefore have been hoary with age before meter was even thought of?

Did you ever hear of such a thing as Metrics in Hebrew? If not, why not? Has it no poetry? What are the Psalms? Do you not realize that it may be entirely possible for a language to have poetry that is rhythmical without being metrical, simply because its authors have concentrated their attention on applied rhythm and, mayhap, have never given a thought to the theoretical side of the matter, to say nothing of the requirements of meter? Meter demands regularity. Rhythm does not. Do you question that statement?

What about music? Its rhythmical character is unquestionable. It is, in fact, a form of applied rhythm. Is it metrical? Can you get regular feet out of it and scan them? Is not the very idea absurd? Suppose you try it. You can use the syllables *ty, tum* and *toom* for eighth-, quarter-, and dotted quarter-notes respectively, but what sort of a jumble of feet will you get even in hymn tunes, which are more nearly regular than other music?

When you are through with that, consider these lines from Byron's "Bride of Abydos":—

Know ye the land where the Cyprus and Myrtle
    Are emblems of deeds that are done in their clime—
Where the rage of the vulture, the love of the turtle,
    Now melt into softness, now madden to crime?

Scan them, please. What do you get? You begin with dactyls and a trochee; but the next line calls for an iambus and anapaests, the third for anapaests and a syllable, and the last for another iambus and anapaests. Now, try this:—

Many are the thoughts that came to me in my lonely musing;
    And they drift so strange and swift
There's no time for choosing which to follow;
    For to leave any, seems a losing.

The lines are from C. P. Cranch, and Poe said that he had never found a man who could scan them. He regarded them as trochaic, and he claimed that the other selection was to be written as prose and scanned with dactyls. Was he right in his diagnosis? Would Byron agree to that? Would you?

Does it not begin to dawn upon you that meter is not basic, as you and I were taught to believe, but subordinate, rhythm being basic? Both selections are beautifully rhythmical. Scanning ruins both. To get a meter, however, we all scan, even if we do camouflage it now, by calling it a metrical reading and trying to retain some semblance of the sense in the process.

Did you ever beat time to a stanza in poetry? Try it with the second selection. First, however, determine the main bar divisions with the help of the sentence accent. That simply means find the important words and place them after the perpendicular lines used in marking bars, after this fashion:—

Many are the | thoughts that come to | me in my | lonely musing;
    And they | drift so strange and | swift
There's no | time for choosing | which to follow;
    For to leave | any, seems a | losing.

Now read naturally, putting in the pauses which the sense requires. Then try the time beats. Begin with a half- bar, beating to the left for *many* and upward for *are the,* then downward and to the right—two beats—for *thoughts that,* and so on. It is really not difficult. The second trial enabled me to do it and come out right, with a half-bar at the end, although there were no bar divisions to help in the process. In fact, it took about four hours to find out just what was done with each syllable in reading, although the reading itself was instinctive and not at all difficult.

When you have mastered this, you will have the rhythm of the lines. It is four-four time, while Poe's scansion is three-eight. That is what meter does to poetry. It is merely a makeshift, devised by metricians to help them in their efforts to measure verse material. In other words, it is nothing but a metrical yardstick.

The Byron lines, unfortunately, are too complex to be considered here; for they have two distinct rhythms, one of which is accentual, while the other is divisional. The ear takes the lines in sections, and the second rhythm is the result of that process. It is a most remarkable phenomenon for English.

Now consider another point. Did you ever watch a poet at work? He gets a line that suits him and then proceeds to match it. If you ask him what meter he is using, the chances are that he will be unable to tell you. If he knew, it would be likely to ruin his work, because his lines would at once become mechanical. He would be building by meter and not by rhythm. That was the difficulty with Edgar Allen Poe. He used a scheme, and his contemporaries denied that he was a poet. His verses will scan beautifully, but they are extremely hard to read properly. That is what meter did in his case.

Are you beginning to wonder where that scansion idea came from? It originated for modern grammarians with their Latin predecessors. The familiar Aeneid first line, of Vergil, *Arma virumque canō Trōiae quī prīmus ab ōris,* is thus scanned by them, writing and all—

Armavi rumqueca notro iaequi primusab oris.

But note this fact. It is scanned for the feet alone. No attention whatever is paid to pauses. When the feet have been determined, the question of caesuras is raised, and two are given for this line, although one grammarian does suggest that there are three. In a way he is right, but two are sufficient.

Curiously enough, the modern idea of a caesura is entirely wrong. The ancient idea must prevail, and the two caesuras are portions of the line itself. The first is *Arma virumque cano,* and the second includes the first. It is *Arma virumque cano Troiae.* That is the only sense in which the term, or its substitutes, was used in Latin, and it is the only sense in which the Greek word which caesura translates is used in that tongue. That is the exact truth, regardless of anything now to be found in modern authorities.

The third caesura would be *Arma virumque cano Troiae qui;* but it would be Bucolic, since the division comes between the fourth and fifth feet and not within a foot as it should. In practice, only the third and fourth feet were considered pertinent. Divisions occurring in other feet were disregarded. Please observe that the word *caesura* means a cutting, then what is left by cutting, or, as its Greek equivalent plainly indicates, a stump. It is a portion of a verse left apart from the rest by a cutting.

The only possible cutting that can do that sort of thing is a pause within the line, coming between the syllables of the third or fourth foot. The pause is not the caesura, but it makes the caesura inevitable, and there must be as many caesuras as there are pauses of the right sort in the lines affected. It will now be clear why modern scholars have blundered in this matter. They confused cause and effect, and the mistake was a natural one.

There were two good reasons why they failed to understand what was meant. To begin with, they did not have mentalities of the sort that would approach the subject from any such angle, and, in the second place, they were not compelled by a limited vocabulary to avoid an awkward circumlocution in that fashion. It is true that the Greeks recognized pauses in poetry and named and de-

fined them; but the metricians had no use for such things for reasons that will appear as the argument proceeds. That complicated matters and helped produce the confusion now found in our grammars.

It may explain why the lexicographers have never discovered the truth. One of the Greek terms is cited where both occur together and are defined; but it is said to mean a fragmentary tone in music, whereas it really means an eighth-rest. The other means a quarter-rest. Each is a "vacant time," and the first is a "least vacant time." That should be plain enough for almost anyone to understand, if he was not prevented from doing so by a preconceived theory. The investigators, having confused pauses with caesuras, were in no position to recognize the pauses when they were named and defined. The field had been preempted.

Another interesting fact is brought out by a Latin grammarian in dealing with the line quoted above—the pauses were those required by the sense. Note this important point, however, they are not metrical elements but rhythmical ones! That explains why metricians had no use for them. They upset the feet, and the fact was duly recognized. It was also commented on by some of the authorities, and the further fact was observed that the regular caesura of a heroic line is penthemimeral, while the remaining portion is hephthemimeral. Both words are therefore pertinent and appropriate—"consisting of five halves" and "consisting of seven halves." There is nothing haphazard about them. They fit exactly.

When the method thus briefly outlined above is applied to Latin or Greek verse, it will furnish all of the supposedly impossible schemes of Hephaestion; for he is almost invariably right, and his meters are correct, because they are based on rhythm as they should be. But metricians recognized two quantities and that was all, while the musicians recognized four. Some of the grammarians, indeed, went further than that, but the majority said something to this effect: "It is sufficient for our purpose to approximate values, let the musicians fuss with minute details."

That explains much. Long syllables were not all alike, and they say so in so many words. Nor were short syllables all alike, and that they admit with the same candor. Moreover, the so-called common syllable, which you and I were taught, could be either long or short, was in reality an "ordinary" syllable, being neither long nor short. That is what all the grammarians actually teach, even if they do say that such syllables can be used in place of longs or shorts: They can be; but there is always some compensating element. A single scholium in Hephaestion, so far as has been observed, is the only authority for the either-long-or-short notion, and the scholiast is plainly careless elsewhere.

Verily, the ideas that have had to be discarded in my investigation are legion, and the surprises have equaled them in frequency. Some of the things discovered have been little short of amazing; but in the end they have had to be accepted, because the evidence was too strong to be questioned further. Nothing has been accepted until critically examined and put to the proof. If it stood the test, well and good. If it did not, the whole investigation was undertaken anew. Sometimes it has taken four years to settle a point, but in the end the truth has been found.

Look back a moment at the lines of C. P. Cranch. Take the bars as they appear in the second quoting, working with a line at a time. Use only the two metrical quantities called long and short and fill in the bars on that basis. You will be doing approximately what Hephaestion did with such verses, and you will get results that are quite as "impossible" as any that he can furnish; but your process will be correct as far as it goes for all of that, since your scheme will be based on the rhythm—not your rhythm on an artificial scheme as the habit has been heretofore. The Greek and Roman method was the one you will use, and it explains the compound feet which modern metricians discard with so much disdain. They are all needed, and they are all correct analyses of the metrical facts.

From what has now been said it will be clear that the

contention put forward by conservatives to the effect that the first chapter of Genesis cannot be poetry because it will not scan properly but presents a strange medley of feet, can hardly be accepted as valid. The chapter is not a poem; but the reasons are of a totally different sort. Some English poetry will not scan properly; but it is among the most masterly products of English poetic genius.

The same thing is true to some extent in Sanskrit, which has four syllables free in a stanza with the next four fairly stable. Moreover, in the Greek and Latin dramatists the most extraordinary contortions, including metrical emendations, are indulged in to obtain the feet required by the scansion theory. Such authors seemed to deny my own theory for a time, but the discovery was soon made that metrical emendations were the source of the trouble, since the theory would work easily with the manuscript reading! When that was restored the trouble disappeared.

Having come this far, if you are a Hebrew scholar, try scanning the twenty-third Psalm. If I mistake not, you will find it easier to get a rhythmical rendering for the first chapter of Genesis than you will for the twenty-third Psalm, in spite of the fact that the latter is avowed poetry, to say nothing of making meter out of it. It does not take kindly to a Classical treatment of any sort, and there is a reason for the fact. A Psalm is never read by a Jew. It is always chanted or intoned. Keep that fact in mind. It is important.

Each Psalm has a regular conventional chant, as a rule; but anyone is at liberty to improvise another, so long as it is appropriate. Avowed Hebrew poetry, therefore, implies a composition intended to be chanted. No such thing was ever contemplated for the first chapter of Genesis, and it is, consequently, in no sense a poem. Certainly no Jew ever so regards it.

Poetry, to the Jews, was something of the Psalm type. It resembled the Lyrics of Greek literature, which were always accompanied by music. Indeed, music and poetry began life together among them, and dancing, or rather

posing, was an additional feature. It was often of a religious sort; for dancing for men had its origin in religious enthusiasm such as David exhibited on one occasion. In the case of women, dancing had its origin in prostitution; for that was the business of female *hierodouloi* as well as of *orchestriae.*

Now, entirely apart from this sort of thing, another phenomenon appears, and it must be considered. Scholars hold that all literature began as rhythmical compositions. For this, there are two good and valid reasons: no change of the original form was tolerated, and the literature was transmitted by word of mouth with the help of verbal memory. Rhythm tends to fix linguistic form permanently, and such compositions are far easier to remember than mere prose. Religious literature was no exception, and it found rhythmical forms most appropriate.

In Sanskrit, practically all the literature that can be classed as such is of the rhythmical type, although books of ritual and certain didactic compositions are in prose. Religious teachings in the law books are either wholly or partially in verse form, and the verse used in the *çāstras* is that employed in the two epics. The most important law book is the *Mānavadharmaçāstra,* and it is an extremely interesting document.

It begins with an account of creation, the first statement of which is as follows:

> (There) was this (universe), enveloped-in-darkness, undistinguished, without-characteristic-mark,
> Unthinkable, unknowable, sunk-in-sleep, as-it-were, altogether.

The poetic form does not in the least diminish the seriousness or the dignity of the lines. On the contrary, it rather enhances both. Moreover, it makes the picture even more vivid and impressive. The universe existed; but it was without form and void.

From what is found here and elsewhere in the world, it ought to be expected that the earliest forms of Hebrew composition would be rhythmical in type, even if the rhythm was instinctive and unconscious. Certain it is that much of the Hebrew Bible, with its divisions into verse portions, points directly to the use of a rhythmical

delivery, and modern Jews employ such a delivery though it seems to be unconscious on their part. As the text is regularly committed to memory, there is a reason for such a treatment.

Moreover, in other literatures exalted topics are not relegated to prose, but are expressed in verbal form that is poetic in some sense. Milton's "Paradise Lost" is a case in point. A prose version would be tame and inappropriate. He chose the best linguistic vehicle for his thought and acted accordingly. It is therefore not to be wondered at that the first chapter of Genesis has every appearance of being a rhythmical composition. It is an extremely ancient document, so ancient that some of its words are of doubtful meaning, as an eminent Hebraist once remarked in my hearing, and one that must have been transmitted by memory for ages before Moses committed it to writing.

That, at least, is what everything goes to indicate. But if such was the case, nothing short of a rhythmical form ought to be expected, and such a form, far from being a detriment, would rather tend to exalt the chapter and make it more impressive than it would be otherwise. The chapter as a whole is an amazing bit of work in brevity, dignity, completeness, vividness, simplicity, suggestiveness, appropriateness, and general linguistic form. If the rhythm seems to labor at times, there are places where it ought to labor to be appropriate, precisely as there are places where music must appear discordant if it is to fit the situation properly and harmonize with its environment.

We moderns know little of such things. Plato talks of "appropriate rhythms." What does he mean? Rhythms that fit the sense. The Greeks used ionics—two short syllables followed by two long ones in three-four time —for drinking songs. Why? Because there is hilarity in every bar. Similarly, pure iambics were employed for unrestrained emotion, while mixed iambics were used for strong feelings under control. They produce a bar in four-four time, divided in the ratio 5:3, and they are effective.

Try this line for yourself, putting into the syllables all the contempt you can, while observing natural length—

tum toom ty tum|tum toom ty tum|ty tum ty:tum|
tum toom ty.

The colon indicates a pause, and the last bar has but three syllables. The intention will be clear without real words. The rhythm takes care of that.

Rhythm has in itself a potency that has never been adequately recognized. Is it to be supposed that the Hebrew Bible has not utilized that potency in its attempt to convey to the human mind thoughts that transcend human wisdom? Words always mean more in poetic form than in prose, and if there is any place in the literature of the world where their meaning is taxed it is in the first chapter of Genesis. Topics are there dealt with that surpass human experience, ideas are expressed for which no adequate human vocabulary is available, and man can only reach upward in helplessness toward the Infinite.

Compare the lines quoted above with the opening verse of Genesis. The Sanskrit starts with matter, inchoate and formless. The Hebrew starts with God. Both attempt to express conditions at the beginning of things, and the two are in substantial agreement. Where Genesis speaks of God as brooding or moving on the face of the waters, the Hindu law-book says that the self-existent heavenly one, not being manifest himself, was making the universe manifest in its grosser forms, while dispelling the darkness.

God says, "Let there be light"; but nothing is said of his personality. In the Sanskrit story the heavenly one is "transcending-the-senses-perceivable," or, in other words, is intellectually discerned, being "minute, not-manifest, everlasting, possessing-all-creatures-as-his-make-up, and incomprehensible." Having shone out and sunk himself in contemplation, desiring to let loose various creatures from his body, he first let loose the waters,

putting seed into them. A golden egg at length resulted, from which he framed the earth and sky.

Considerable mysticism intervenes between the appearance of the egg and its division—after it has been occupied for a year by the heavenly one himself—so that it becomes evident that the whole attitude is pantheistic and quite unlike that found in Genesis. Nevertheless, the parallelism is remarkable up to the point where the egg is mentioned, if due allowance is made for the materialism of the Hindu cosmogony. The content of the language is not the same.

Now, the form used in the Sanskrit is the *epic çloka*, a couplet consisting of lines, in which there are two free feet and two fairly stable ones. Each contains four syllables, the stable feet occupying the even places. The result is a line in four-four time, with four bars of different sorts. The first one, *āsīd idam*, happens in this instance to be a greater ionic followed by a quarter-rest. The initial statement is thus set off from its modifying elements. The next bar, *tamobhūtam*, is an antispast—the regular form, though the foot may be a first epitrīte—the *o* standing for *au* in English. The next, *aprajñātam*, is a fourth epitrite; and the last, *alaksanam*, is an imperfect ditrochee, or a second paeon as may be preferred. Both feet are used.

A short pause completes two of the bars, the second having seven counts because of the pronunciation of both elements in *bh*. A longer one comes at the end, and the next line is of the same general character, even if it does contain some irregularities. Using, now, the method of Hephaestion, we may thus compare the results obtained by the two processes:

Rhythmical analysis—

2-2-1-1(2) 1-3-2-1(1) 2-2-2-1(1) 1-2-1-2(2)

Metrical analysis—

2-2-1-1 1-2-2-1 2-2-2-1 1-2-1-2

The second suggests some of Hephaeston's schemes. Thus, he gives for the Epionic tetrameter two possibilities:—

1-2-1-2 2-2-1-1 2-1-2-1 2-1-1
2-2-1-2 1-2-1-1 2-1-2-2 2-1-2

He writes them in the same way, using Greek numerals, 2 standing for a long syllable and 1 for a short. On the same basis, one form of the Prosodiac tetrameter would be—

2-2-1-1 2-1-1-2 1-2-1-2 1-2-2

The first of the above schemes is the only one representing the true form of a poetic line. The rest omit everything but conventional syllabic values. That is characteristic of Meter, and the absurdity of making meter basic must be apparent. Look, now, at Hephaestion's Minor Sapphic schemes:—

2-1-2-1 2-1-1-2 1-2-2
2-1-2-2 2-1-1-2 1-2-1

Next apply them to the *Iam satis terrīs nivis atque dīrae* of Horace. It will be necessary to take two measures from the second line and one, the last, from the first to get the feet, which are simple enough.

The rhythm is a different proposition; for the words must be pronounced naturally, as in prose, with their normal accent. All metricians violate that consistently. Then such pauses as the sense may demand must be inserted, although metricians have never discovered that pauses take time. The result will be—

2-1-2(1)2 3(2)1-1(1) 2-1-3-2

The feet are scrambled and the pause is eliminated from between the lines, but the bars are equal, the rhythm is satisfactory, the sense is kept, and the effect is far better than any metrician ever gets. The grammarians, moreover, intimate plainly that rhythm upsets the feet, and they say in so many words that it is a matter of time. They are quite right. It is exactly that.

Looking at these ancient schemes and knowing little

or nothing of rhythm or of the true nature of bars, the metricians shook their heads and said dubiously, "Impossible, the bars are not equal!" They proceeded to make them equal, according to their idea of things. The result was a self-contradictory medley, but it took the world over fifty years to begin a serious revolt and even then it did not understand. The pauses—indicated above in parentheses—mean nothing to the average grammarian, in spite of the constant use of rests in music, and the employment of heavy syllables has never been really comprehended by any of them. Such syllables, however, are extremely important.

Their value is 3, not 2, and they determine, oftentimes, the character of the rhythm. A metrical analysis cannot possibly do that in some cases, because the meter cannot be determined from the syllables so treated. In my own collection of examples, for instance, a Heroic line from Ovid, a Katenoplion one from Homer, and a Prosodiac tetrameter from Pindar all have exactly the same series of long and short syllables—conventionally. The facts are these:—

Conventional syllables, 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 2
Heroic line, 2-1-1 2-1-1 2(2) 2-2 1-1-2 1-1-2 2(2)
Katenoplion line, 2-1-1 (2)2 1-1-2 (2)2 2-1-1 (2)2 1-1-2 2(2)
Prosodiac tetrameter, 3-1-1-3 1(2)1-2-2 3(1)1-1-2 1-1-2-2(2)

These lines are typical. The Heroic has seven bars, the Katenoplion eight, and the Prosodiac the equivalent of eight, since its four are in four-four time instead of two-four. Moreover, the second and third are closely related; for the second passes into the third when read with a slight change—

2-1-1(1)3 1-1-3(1)2 2-1-1(2)2 1-1-2-2(2)

Heavy syllables, properly located, will produce the alteration from dactylic forms of the ordinary sort to the tetrameter, and the grammarians recognized their existence. They refused to consider them, however, because

of the bother involved. That shows how reliable they really were. "Irrational spondees," are usually produced by such syllables, which also account for the "seven timed" ditrochees and diiambi. The bars are eight-timed as indicated above in *tum toom ty tum.*

It will now be clear that the Sanskrit *çloka* has the general characteristics of the Prosodiac tetrameter, using, as it does, such feet as 1-2-2-1, 2-2-1-1, and others like them, such as 2-1-1-2, 1-1-2-2, and 1-2-1-2. The time is four-four, or Common, the Greek and Latin being necessarily two-four, which is also classed as Common. Greek and Latin, however, are lighter than Sanskrit, and the difference is therefore appropriate. Sanskrit has various heavy syllables; for it retains the old diphthongs with a long initial vowel, and it has plenty of long vowels or diphthongs in strong positions, both *e* and *o* being diphthongs,—for *ai* and *au,* as distinguisehd from *āi* and *āu.*

It may be inferred that anything in Hebrew corresponding to the Heroic measures of other tongues must have been in Common time. No more dignified time exists, and there is none more in keeping with Hebrew thought and expression. It is used by modern Jews without hesitation and, apparently, without consciousness of what they are doing. It seems, in fact, to be instinctive, very much as poetic form always is to those who can write anything worth the name of poetry. It comes to them, so they say, and they do not know the meaning of schemes.

Analysis, however, is by no means easy, when Hebrew lines are recited by a Jew according to their practice. Syllabification differs radically from that used in Aryan tongues, as a rule, and a change of treatment becomes necessary. For instance, we write Elohim and give the word three syllables. In Hebrew it has but two, and on that basis it must be treated, even if the initial E may at some time have had a real vowel value, as has been supposed. Indeed, it is entirely possible that rhythmical considerations furnished the incentive for the development and use of partial vowels in place of short or obscure ones.

Perhaps the point can be illustrated by English "the

horse," which so often becomes "th'horse," in conversation and poetry. It counts for but one syllable in poetic schemes; but it never becomes *thorse* for all that. The fragmentary vowel still persists, and it persisted in Greek, where it is written precisely as it is written in English when it is recognized. The Latin practice was like the ordinary English one which writes the vowel and obscures it.

How such vowel fragments fit into rhythmical schemes has never been determined; but they do not always behave in the same way. Some of them are like the "Grace-notes" found in music; for they obtain their time from adjacent vowel sounds with which they practically coalesce. But they do not all do that. At times they are like sixteenth-notes, with a value of their own; for they are needed to provide the necessary length, which would be defective without them. Both phenomena can be found in Latin and Greek; but one tongue tends toward one method of treatment, while the other tends in the opposite direction. This lack of sufficient length was the first significant thing discovered in my own studies and experiments, and it was nebulously recognized by one of the Latin grammarians. In the end, it furnished the needed clue to the solution of the riddle which had defied scholars for so long a time.

For Hebrew, the Grace-note method is usually the better one, because the half-vowels do not differ much in reality from the parasitic sounds developed in pronouncing the initial consonants of many a Greek word, although the ordinary ear never hears them. They are there, and they make length and produce quantity. The Hebrew sounds do something similar, and they can be treated accordingly. It is impossible to do this, however, with the ordinary transliteration, and a correct one taxes a printing office unduly. Neither can be used in consequence, and only the most general method of treatment is available.

Keeping strictly to the Hebrew syllabic units and omitting all reference to the half-vowels, but recognizing breaks between words where they occur and the fact that

even Hebrew employs half-bars in Common time, the first line of Genesis yields eight measures, two of them containing quarter-rests:—

(2)2 3-1 1½(½)2 3(1) 2-1-1 1-2(1) 3-1 1-1(2)

The last measure tends to become 1-2 (1), and that analysis may be preferred. As recited to me by a man brought up to be a Hebrew rabbi, the second verse exhibits some remarkable peculiarities; but its effect was certainly surprising and suggestive. It consists of two sections, which also shows half-bars:—

(2)2 1-1-1-1 1-1½(½)1 1-2(1) 1½-1(½)1 2-2
(2) 2-1½(½)2 3-1 1½-1(½)1 3-1 1-1(2)

The monosyllable beginning the second division runs over into the second bar like a tied-note in music, because it has a vanishing consonant at the end. It is a phenomenon very common in rhythm; but its meaning has never been correctly interpreted. It occurs also with vowels and is especially deceptive there.

The old scansion of Vergil's *Arma virumque* line illustrates the point. It was actually scanned with these values—

2-1-1 2-1-1 3(1) *2-2-2* 2-1-1 2-2

No one dreamed that the syllable *no* received three units of time, and still less did anyone imagine that the next three longs were forced into the time of two, like triplets in music, as is indicated by the italics. That was what happened, however, as you can determine for yourself, by beating time to the old scansion, if it was ever taught to you. The fourth bar was really read as 1-2-1.

Now, note another thing. In spite of all that is said to the contrary, a few of the grammarians recognized the anapaest (two shorts and a long) the proceleusmatic (four shorts), the cretic (a short between two longs), the molossus (three longs), and the antibacchius (a short and two longs) as feet occurring in the dactylic hexameter. They cited examples. They cited also other feet; but they managed to force them, especially the tribrachs, into the dactylic mould, regardless of consequences.

As a matter of fact, in every instance the peculiarity is not a blemish, and often it is actually a help in expressing the thought appropriately. What the metricians really do is to ruin the effect of the lines by insisting on conformity to their measuring rod. They care nothing for rhythm or sense, and one is often tempted to wonder whether they have either as a part of their needed equipment. Their work resembles that of a tinman on a delicate watch.

It must now be clear that Homer was no slave to metrical conventionalities but an artist of amazing powers. His word picturing is well nigh perfect. The very form suggests what he means. Is it possible, then, that there is nothing parallel in the Hebrew Bible, which so far surpasses anything that Homer ever wrote? Was the word-picturing found there inferior to his? Is it inconceivable that its authors were led to employ rhythms appropriate for the purpose?

Rhythm certainly started as a free and unhampered product of the human mind, and it must then have been instinctive, as it still is among savages. It may also have been unconscious; for it seems even now to be so, though traditional, on the part of modern Jews who make use of it in connection with the Scriptures. That fact may account in large measure for its peculiarities, in Hebrew.

However that may be, rhythm began as a free and untrammeled mode of expression in the field of man's creative literary art, and it continued to be so for many ages, or until its peculiarities were recognized as features of verbal expression. That led to an effort to keep it regular as a help to the one reciting. Finally, there arose a desire to obtain complete regularity, with little or no regard for appropriateness in detail; and Meter was enthroned.

Meter clipped the wings of the poet and so destroyed his powers of flight, and, if yielded to, it debases many a line of Homer that is intrinsically beautiful and singularly appropriate as a mode of expressing the thought. The metrician knows only feet. Aesthetic considerations do not move him. Assuming for his art a prominence

far from deserved, he will have none of the poet's conceptions in the matter, and, like the grammarians of old, he will not bother his head concerning fine details or the laws of rhythmical expression, although the latter constitute the very essence of poetic form and the basis of its beauty.

Exaltation of thought seems to carry with it some form of rhythmical expression, as if it were the only appropriate mould. Was Moses, then, restricted to prose in his majestic passages dealing with Jehovah and His works? Has the Hebrew no possibilities such as Greek and Sanskrit show? Is the language of the first chapter of Genesis less appropriate than that of the Law-book of the Manavans mentioned above? On the contrary, may it not be merely a specimen of the capacity of Hebrew to express fittingly the most exalted conceptions?

The situation calls for study and a careful weighing of facts. Verse divisions in this chapter and elsewhere mean something, and the natural inference is that they indicate a rhythmical treatment of verbal expression. Meter is not to be looked for, unless it is such meter as Classical dramatists show with over a thousand variations allowed in the lines, a fact which clearly points to free rhythm as the basic form. Meter would have destroyed the effectiveness of verbal expression and produced the same sort of verbal paralysis that it does in Homer's wonderful lines. It is artificial always, never natural.

A rhythmical form, therefore, in Genesis is no detriment, even if a metrical one would be. It is rather a help and an addition to the weightiness of the words; for it justifies the assumption that the ideas expressed are beyond mere prosaic utterance and therefore to be taken as depicting wonders surpassing man's comprehension. God is pictured at his work, with all the ages before Him as He moves onward in orderly progress toward his goal. Man's sin marred the final product; but man's redemption will yet make it glorious.

PAUL'S ROMAN CITIZENSHIP AS REFLECTED IN HIS MISSIONARY EXPERIENCES AND HIS LETTERS

REV. JAMES L. KELSO, B.D.

WHEN the apostle Paul first appears in the narrative of the Acts, there is no hint that he is a Roman citizen. Indeed, it is not until he has arrived at Paphos in the course of his first missionary journey that the record gives us any clew to his Roman citizenship. Prior to that time he is known only as a Jew and a Tarsean, and is spoken of as Saul. The fact that he was a Jew and a Tarsean would not indicate anything as to whether he was a Roman citizen; but the Hebrew name Saul would seem to indicate that he was not a Roman, for a Latin name was inseparably connected with Roman citizenship.

In the record of the happenings at Paphos, however, we find that Saul has another name which is Paul. This name Paul is Latin, as is witnessed by the name of Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul of Cyprus, whom Paul met on this occasion. In the first part of the Acts where Paul's work was essentially wrapped up with the Jews, Luke apparently preferred to speak of him by his Jewish name; but after Paul actually became a missionary to the Gentiles, Luke usually spoke of him by his Latin name. It would be of interest for us to know Paul's complete name—a Roman always had three—for the full name would probably give us a clew to how Paul's family had received the grant of citizenship, and would thus throw considerable light on his family history. Luke, however, was a Greek and apparently had no interest in such details as full Roman names. He does not even have a uniform method of using them; the proconsul of Achaia is spoken of as Gallio, but the proconsul of Cyprus is called Sergius Paulus, and the successor of Felix is spoken of as Porcius Festus and again simply as Festus.

In all the work that Paul and Barnabas had been engaged in as co-laborers before the incident at Paphos, Barnabas seems to have been the leader, but when they

were summoned into the presence of the proconsul of the island, Paul acted as the spokesman. The shift of leaders at this particular point is plain, however, for Paul was a Roman citizen and Barnabas was not. Paul's Roman citizenship gave him an exceptionally fine approach in conversation with the proconsul. In the course of Paul's remarks and miracle-working, the Roman governor was converted. This seems to have made a very strong impression upon Paul, for he apparently accepted it as a divine sign urging him to hasten to his special field as "Apostle to the Gentiles." From this time on, he laid increasing emphasis on the Gentile mission field, where his rare combination of Jewish, Greek and Roman knowledge fitted him as a special leader.

The next definite point in the narrative of the Acts where Paul's citizenship was especially involved was at Lystra, where he was stoned at the hands of a mob incited by Jews from Antioch and Iconium. Here was a critical situation for a Roman citizen. Citizenship meant above all else that the citizen should be protected by his government. But here was a *Roman citizen* "lynched" in a *Roman colony!* It seems most unlikely that Paul would let such a crime go unnoticed. Upon this point the narrative of the Acts is very interesting:—

> "They stoned Paul, and dragged him out of the city, supposing that he was dead. But as the disciples stood round about him, he rose up, and entered into the city: and on the morrow he went forth with Barnabas to Derbe."

There is one preeminent reason why he should return to the city, *i. e.*, to report the case to the governing officials and to rebuke them for permitting so serious a breach of Roman law. His departure on the morrow is perfectly logical in connection with this interpretation. If Paul remained to press his case in the court, he would (in accordance with Roman law) have had to conduct the prosecution of those that had assaulted him. But such action would have been seriously detrimental to his past and future evangelistic efforts in the colony. His wisest policy was to forgive his enemies and to leave the city

till the whole affair had quieted down. This he did, departing from Lystra the next morning after the stoning and going to Derbe where he preached for some time.

After the affair had quieted down, Paul returned to Lystra, "confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith," and also arranging for elders in the church. This work took some little time but it was all done in peace. Then Paul returned to Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, where he was also permitted to work in peace, although he had been persecuted at both cities on his former visit. It seems that the Lystrian officials were trying to atone for their negligence by giving Paul proper protection upon his return to Lystra. And since the riot had been instigated by Jews from Antioch and Iconium, it is likely that the Lystrian officials had reported the affair to the officials of those cities with their consequent protection of Paul as a Roman citizen. On Paul's second missionary journey he again stopped a considerable time in Lystra, in order that Timothy might receive the rite of circumcision. But this stay also seems to have been quiet.

At Philippi, Paul's Roman citizenship again came to the fore. Paul had healed the "maid with the spirit of divination" and had thereby ruined the financial income of her owners, for she was a slave. These men brought Paul and Silas before the local magistrates—in Roman law, the accuser acted both as sheriff and prosecuting attorney—and insisted that Paul and Silas, "being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and set forth customs which it is not lawful for us to receive, or to observe, being Romans." As the local magistrates were not only the judicial authorities of the colony, but also its supreme religious authorities, they were directly involved in the case. They were made to appear in an unfavorable light, as if they were not doing their full duty in keeping the Roman faith pure. Furthermore a mob was rising and mobs were serious things for an official to explain. So, in the excitement, to justify themselves as zealous for the Roman faith, and also to prevent mob rule, the magistrates order Paul and Silas to be beaten by the lictors and to

be cast into prison. This course was apparently taken without giving Paul and Silas a chance to defend themselves; the nature of the accusation and the rising mob easily account for the action of the officials—it was another example of the political theory of the age, "peace at any price."

After the earthquake that night, however, the tables were turned. The magistrate sent word that Paul and Silas were to be released, but Paul replied:

> "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men that are Romans, and have cast us into prison; and do they now cast us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and bring us out."

When the officials received this news they were terrified and went in person to the prison and brought out Paul and Silas, begging them to leave the city. Paul with the true spirit of forgiveness complied with their request, but not until he had first seen the little Christian group and comforted its members.

It is to be noted that Paul's companion Silas, who had taken the place of Barnabas on the second missionary journey, was also a Roman citizen; the choice of such a man shows another step in Paul's policy of evangelizing the Gentile world. This same idea was also carried out at Corinth where Aquila was associated with him, and where the Christian church met at the home of Titus Justus, after Paul had been driven from the synagogue. Both of these men were Latin or Roman citizens—there was a slight difference in the rights of the two classes. The use of a Gentile's house for the Christian Church was surely a far reaching step toward the evangelization of the Gentiles of Corinth.

In that city Paul was again arrested, but his case was not tried by the local court as at Philippi, but by Gallio the proconsul of Achaia. From the records of the trial we know that Paul was acquitted, or rather that the case was thrown out of court; and that Paul tarried after this yet many days. But greater than Paul's acquittal and his opportunity to work longer in the city was the apparent

sanction by the proconsul of the preaching of Christianity. Gallio doubtless never meant that his judgment should carry any such interpretation, for he seems to have thought Christianity and Judaism the same; but his action, nevertheless, was a legal blessing to the church.

In connection with the riot of Ephesus, there is a statement that sheds a peculiar light upon Paul's friendship with high government officials, whose duties were distinctly religious.

> "And certain also of the Asiarchs, being his friends, sent unto him and besought him not to adventure himself into the theatre."

This statement shows an unexpected realm of Paul's acquaintanceship, and we wish that the record might have been more in detail. It is sufficiently long, however, to show us at least these two points: that as yet, Christianity was not receiving any hindrance from those men who had charge of the worship of "Rome and the Emperors"; and that Paul had been able to make several personal friends among this important official class.

With Paul's rescue from the temple mob by the Roman soldiery under Claudius Lysias, begins a great legal struggle whose record is not completed even at the close of the Acts. When Claudius Lysias was unable to get any definite idea from the crowd as to why they had attacked Paul and when Paul's address to the mob only created more uproar, he ordered Paul to be removed to the castle and to be examined by scourging. The centurion who had received these orders proceeded to put them into execution and was binding Paul preparatory to the scourging, when Paul addressed him saying, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" At once the centurion hastened to the commanding officer with this knowledge saying, "What art thou about to do? for this man is a Roman!" Immediately Claudius Lysias came to Paul to investigate the matter, and in conversation with his prisoner found out that Paul was a *freeborn Roman!* whereas he himself was only a citizen by purchase right.

From that time on, although Paul was held as a pris-

oner, he was treated with the highest courtesy. His nephew was allowed to visit him, and when he informed Paul of a plot against his life, he was sent at Paul's request to the commanding officer who at once took special means to protect Paul's life by transferring him to Caesarea under a strong military guard. And with Paul went a letter written by Claudius Lysias explaining the case to the governor. In this letter the facts were slightly warped so as to make it appear as if Paul had been rescued because he was a Roman citizen—more glory to Claudius Lysias! —but Paul's legal position was stated honestly. As a Roman citizen Paul could ask for no better treatment than he received from the soldiery after they became aware of his citizenship.

After a preliminary examination by the governor at Caesarea, Paul was returned to prison there, but the guards were given specific orders "that he should have indulgence; and not to forbid any of his friends to minister unto him." For two years he remained a prisoner here until Felix, the governor, was succeeded by Festus. During these two years Paul was often invited into the presence of Felix and various hearings granted.

Felix was governor of Judea, and it was his supreme duty to keep peace in the country and to prevent any serious uprisings. This was an almost impossible task in Judea at any date before the destruction of Jerusalem. To have released Paul at any time during the two years imprisonment would have been to jeopardize at least to some degree the peace of the country. The Jews were determined now to kill Paul; they were like wolves waiting for their victim who, they were sure, could not escape them. So to protect the peace of the country, Paul was refused his freedom, though Felix recognized that he was innocent.

When Festus became governor, the Jews immediately clamored for Paul's trial. They thought their chance to kill him had at last arrived. In the course of the trial, however, the whole question as to Paul's release was settled by his appealing to the Emperor, and Festus' sending him to Rome. The question is naturally asked why Paul

did not make this same appeal to Felix. Probably this is the point at which the bribe Luke speaks of is involved. It was in the hand of the governor to send these appealed cases to the Emperor, and Felix may have delayed Paul's appeal to the Emperor hoping that he might receive a bribe to expedite the appeal.

But during all Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, there is no record of ill treatment, and upon his actual sailing to Rome the same courteous treatment was furnished him. Aristarchus and Luke accompanied him on the journey. At Sidon Paul was permitted to go ashore and refresh himself among his friends. He was on good terms with both the captain of the ship and the centurion in charge of the prisoners, and took the liberty to advise them to winter in Fairhaven. And later during the wreck, Paul virtually took command of the ship by dictating orders to the centurion. This action was somewhat audacious, for if Paul's orders had proved incorrect and any of the prisoners had escaped, the centurion and his soldiers would have paid dearly for their loss under such conditions. At Melita Paul was entertained at the home of the chief man of the island. Thus all through his journey, although a prisoner, he traveled as a Roman citizen of consequence.

Upon his arrival at Rome this courtesy was continued and he was placed under the lightest type of custody. He was allowed to live in his own hired house, guarded only by a single soldier; and was free to preach during the two years' stay in Rome. To realize just what treatment Paul received at Rome, it is interesting to note that Gallio, former proconsul of Achaia, under whom Paul had been tried and acquitted at Corinth, was a prisoner in Rome at approximately the same time as Paul and under the same type of custody.

At this point it might be well to crystallize these remarks on Paul's Roman citizenship by comparing the courtroom experiences of Christ and Paul as they stood before the governors of Judea. Both of them were charged with inciting a Jewish insurrection against the Roman government. Both were shown innocent by the evidence

produced. Each Roman governor, however, was more anxious to keep peace and to court Jewish favor than to administer Justice. Pilate, fearing that the Jews would betray his maladministration to Caesar, ordered Christ to be crucified. Festus, like Pilate, courted Jewish favor, and to that end he requested Paul to submit himself to a second trial at Jerusalem (which was an illegal procedure). But Paul turned to Festus and said:

> "I am standing before Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou also very well knowest. If then I am a wrong-doer and have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if none of those things is true whereof these accuse me, no man can give me up unto them. I appeal unto Caesar."

Christ was not a Roman citizen, therefore for him the procurator's court was the last appeal. Pilate's judgment was final. Pilate's judgment was crucifixion and the sentence was executed at once.

But Paul was a Roman citizen! If a Roman citizen did not think he got justice in the procurator's court he still had the right of appeal to the emperor. And Paul, seeing that he could not get justice in Festus' court appealed unto Caesar, and unto Caesar he went. By this right of appeal and the freedom that subsequently resulted from it, approximately eight years were added to Paul's missionary career and during that time he wrote more than half of the epistles that Scripture has preserved for us.

The influence of Paul's Roman citizenship is by no means restricted to his missionary experiences as recorded in the Acts. This same influence is to be found also in the epistles which he wrote to the various churches. The presence of this Roman influence in the letters, however, is not so quickly grasped nor so easily understood as in the Acts. Therefore a few words of explanation may be helpful at this point.

There must always be a common ground between the teacher and the pupil. With a Jewish audience Paul always had this common ground in the Old Testament, since both teacher and audience accepted it. Paul's task was thus simplified into convincing his hearers that Jesus

was the Messiah. With a Greek audience, as at Athens, there was the common ground of philosophy. Paul and his audience both accepted natural theology and from this common point Paul took the next step by preaching revealed theology in the person of Christ Jesus. When Paul was in a distinctly Roman audience, it is also natural to suppose that he reached his hearers with the Gospel message through some peculiarly Roman approach. This is shown at Paphos where Paul rather than Barnabas was the spokesman in the presence of the Roman proconsul; and Paul's warm friendship with the Asiarchs at Ephesus is another example of how he was able to make a Roman approach to the Roman world.

But Paul's interpretation of Christianity to the Roman mind is best seen in his epistles. Here he often took the common ground of Roman law with which he and his readers were familiar, and then builded some metaphor of Christian faith upon this legal foundation. These legal metaphors were not only intelligible to all Roman citizens (for each citizen was ordinarily his own lawyer) but they were also quite intelligible to the non-citizens who were always waiting and watching for someone to advance them to citizenship. Let us take one of these legal metaphors and study it, namely Adoption.

In Paul's use of the word Adoption there is a distinctly Roman thought. The Jew had no relish for the word—his idea was a pure blood strain, to be a blood descendant of Abraham. True, there was a method by which a Gentile might be adopted into Israel, but a study of Paul's Adoption passages shows that he could not have had reference to the Jewish custom. But a glance at the Roman law of adoption shows instantly that this is the basis of Paul's metaphor.

By the legal act of adoption, a Roman citizen might admit into his family any relative or even a total stranger, and this adopted son would then have the same rights and the same privileges as any natural born sons that were in the family. Technically speaking, he became a new person. His old personality was lost at his adoption and if he had had the legal power to contract debts and was

in debt at the time of his adoption these debts were no longer collectible. This practice of adoption was very common and well known by all classes of the Empire; most of the Roman emperors of the first century were adopted sons of the preceding Emperors.

This legal policy of adoption lent itself in fine form to Paul's ideal of the Christian's relation to God. Just as the adopted son was dead to his former family and alive to the family adopting him, so was the Christian dead unto sin and alive unto God; nor could the debt of sin ever be collected from him. The figure of adoption also helps us to understand how we can be considered as brothers of Jesus Christ—He being the born Son, we being the adopted sons.

Several minor details in connection with the legal rite of adoption and its consequent privileges are shown in Rom. 8:15-17a. Note that this passage was written to the church in Rome where the Roman metaphor would be instantly understood.

15. "For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.
16. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God:
17. and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ;"

In verse 15 the "Spirit of bondage" is brought into close contrast with the "Spirit of adoption." The significance of this juxtaposition lies in the formula of the legal act of adoption. This formula is almost identical with that used for a sale into slavery; and well might the candidate for adoption rejoice upon hearing the particular word that gave him the right to say "Father" rather than "Master." And to the Roman's mind the spirit of gratitude toward the father who had adopted such a son would remain all through life.

In the 16th verse, the Spirit is spoken of as a witness to our adoption. In Roman law the act of adoption demanded the presence of witnesses whose testimony would at all times prove the validity of the adoption. The Holy

Spirit is our witness to the world that "we are children of God."

In the 17th verse, we have the strange expression "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." According to American legal theory God can have no heirs since he will never die. But in Roman legal theory a son was considered an heir as soon as he was born or adopted into the family. Thus the expression "Heirs of God" was full of pregnant meaning to the church at Rome, for as soon as a Christian was born into the kingdom he became thereby an heir of God. Furthermore in Roman law, an adopted son shared equally in the inheritance with a natural born son and thus comes the expression "joint-heirs with Christ."

Truly the Roman metaphor of Adoption conveyed a wealth of spiritual thought to the early church. And many other technical Roman legal terms served likewise as a vehicle of spiritual truth.

These remarks upon the Roman influence in Paul's life and letters, are perhaps sufficient to show that Paul was not only "called" to be an apostle but was also richly "endowed" for that task. He was the ideal evangelist of his generation for the Roman world.