# Theology on the Web.org.uk

## Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

the initial presumption is now rather against His being the speaker, since He is referred to several times in the third person. It may, therefore, be asked whether verses 1–8 (omitting ver. 2) are not, after all, a Servant passage with the Servant as the speaker throughout. On this hypothesis the Servant addresses the Jews and refers unmistakably to the coming restoration of the people, quite in the manner of the Babylonian Isaiah. In spite of xlix. 6, such a feature is so unlikely to occur in a Servant passage that probably its presence is by itself sufficient to negative the supposition. Some parts of the previous argument for the division of the passage, slightly restated, are also still relevant. The conclusion, therefore, remains that only verses 4–6 constitute the Servant passage and that the adjoining verses are an utterance of the Babylonian Isaiah in which Jehovah is the speaker, although He refers to Himself in the third person.

WILLIAM B. STEVENSON.

## THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY.

### IV. THE ELEMENTS OF HEBREW RHYTHM.

THE study of parallelism must lead, if I have so far observed and interpreted correctly, to the conclusion that parallelism is but one law or form of Hebrew poetry, and that it leaves much to be explained by some other law or form of its being. Complete and exact correspondence of all the terms in two parallel lines necessarily produces the effect of exact or approximate rhythmical balance. But such complete parallelism is relatively rare in Hebrew poetry ; the parallelism is more often incomplete ; and, moreover, along with lines completely parallel and lines incompletely parallel there frequently occur also lines unconnected by the presence in them of any parallel terms. And yet, alike in the incompletely parallel, and in the non-parallel couplets,

there will often be found, consistently maintained, the same
kind of rhythm as in those that are completely parallel·
We are thus driven back behind parallelism in search of
an independent rhythmical principle in Hebrew poetry
which will account for the presence of balance, or other
rhythmical relation, as between two lines in which the
parallelism is not such as necessarily to involve this balance
or other rhythmical relation.

Some such rhythmical principle, whether or not its nature
can ever be exactly and fully explained, seems to govern
much of the present text of the Old Testament, sometimes
for long consecutive passages, as for example in Lamentations
and many parts of Job and Isaiah xl.–lv., sometimes for
a few lines only, and then to be rudely interrupted by what
neither accommodates itself to any rhythmical principle
that can be easily seized, nor produces any rhythmical
impression that can be readily or gratefully received.

The difficulties in the way of discovering and giving
any clear and full account of this principle are considerable.
In the first place, as was pointed out in the first article,
no clear tradition or account of the rhythmical or other
laws of Hebrew poetry has descended to us from the age
when that poetry was still being written. The remarks
of Josephus are interesting, but in themselves anything
but illuminating. Then we are faced with serious textual
uncertainties in all the so-called poetical books and in the
prophetical books, and in the ancient poems, such as the
song of Deborah, and the blessing of Jacob, embodied in
some of the narrative books. Feeling, as in my opinion
we ought to do, that much of the poetical contents of the
Old Testament has suffered serious textual corruption, we
might well view with suspicion any metrical theory that
found all parts of the existing text equally metrical; for
though a textual corruption may accidentally at times

have the same metrical value as the original reading, this is the kind of accident that cannot happen regularly. On the other hand, a metrical theory which finds innumerable passages corrupt, though they show, metre apart, no sign of corruption, has this disadvantage : given the right to make an equal number of emendations purely in the interests of his theory, another theoriser might produce an equally attractive theory ; and we should be left with the uncertainty of choice between two alternatives both of which could not be right, but both of which might be wrong. A sound metrical theory, then, must neither entirely fit, nor too indiscriminately refuse to fit, the present text of the Old Testament. A third serious difficulty lies in our imperfect knowledge of the vowels with which the texts were originally intended to be read. This last difficulty may, perhaps, always leave a considerable degree of detail ambiguous, even if the broader principles of rhythm become clear.

In spite of these difficulties, how far is it possible in the first instance to determine the exact *rhythmical* relations between, let us say, the several examples or types of two sections, sentences, lines, call them what we will, that are associated with one another by some degree of parallelism of terms or at least by some similarity of structure, by being, if not parallel, yet parallelistic ? Parallelism both associates and dissociates ; it associates two lines by the correspondence of ideas which it implies ; it dissociates them by the differentiation of the terms by means of which the corresponding ideas are expressed as well as by the fact that the one parallel line is fundamentally a repetition of the other. The effect of dissociation is a constant occurrence of breaks or pauses, or rather a constant recurrence of two different types of breaks or pauses : (1) the break between the two parallel and corresponding lines ; and (2) the greater break at the end of the second line before the

thought is resumed and carried forward in another combination of parallel lines. And even when strict parallelism disappears, the regular recurrence of these two types of pauses is maintained. Thus there are in Hebrew parallelistic poetry no long flowing verse-paragraphs as in Shakespearian or Miltonic blank verse, but a succession of short clearly defined periods as in much English rhymed verse and in most pre-Shakespearian blank verse. Rhyme in English and parallelism in Hebrew alike serve to define the rhythmical periods ; but the relation between rhyme and sense is much less close than between parallelism and sense, and consequently rhyme in English has nothing like the same power as parallelism in Hebrew to produce coincidence between the rhythmical periods and the sense-divisions ; accordingly, though rhyme very naturally goes with "stopped-line" verse, as it is called, it is also compatible with non-stop lines ; so that non-stop lines and verse paragraphs that disregard the line divisions almost as freely as Shakespearian or Miltonic blank verse are by no means unknown in English rhymed poetry. On the other hand, parallelism is, broadly speaking, incompatible with anything but "stopped-line" poetry. Whether or not there may be in Hebrew a non-parallelistic poetry in which rhythmical and sense divisions do not coincide is not, for the moment, the question ; it is rather this : parallelism, even incomplete parallelism in its various types, offers a very large number of couplets in which we can be perfectly certain of the limits of the constituent lines ; how strict, how constant, of what precise nature is the rhythmical relation between these lines which are thus so clearly defined ? If we can determine this question satisfactorily, we may obtain a measure to determine whether the same rhythmical periods occur elswehere without coinciding with sense divisions.

I have referred to two types of English verse ; but the closest analogy in English to Hebrew poetry is probably to be found neither in blank verse nor in rhymed verse, but in the old Anglo-Saxon poetry, and its revival (with a difference) in Chaucer's contemporary, the author of Piers Ploughman. That poetry has one feature which is no regular, nor even a particularly common, feature of Hebrew poetry, viz., alliteration ; but that feature, though a most convenient indication of the rhythm, is absolutely unessential to it.   Apart from the references to this alliteration how admirably does Professor Saintsbury's description of this type of English poetry correspond, *mutatis mutandis*, to the *rhythmical* impressions left by many pages of Hebrew psalms or prophecy.   " The staple line of this verse consists of two halves or sections, each containing two ' long,' ' strong,' ' stressed,' ' accented ' syllables, these same syllables being, to the extent of three out of four, alliterated. At the first casting of the eye on a page of Anglo-Saxon poetry no common *resemblances* except these seem to emerge. But we see on some pages an altogether extraordinary *difference* in the lengths of the lines, or, in other words, of the number of ' short,' ' weak,' ' unstressed,' ' unaccented ' syllables which are allowed to group themselves round the pivots or posts of the rhythm.   Yet attempts have been made, not without fair success, to divide the sections or half-lines into groups or types of rhythm, more or less capable of being represented by the ordinary marks of metrical scansion. . . .   A sort of monotone or hum . . . will indeed disengage itself for the attentive reader . . . but nothing more . . . the sharp and uncompromising section, the accents, the alliteration—these are all that the poet has to trust to in the way of rules *sine queis non*.   But before long the said careful reader becomes aware that there is a ' lucky license,' which is as a rule,

and much more also ; and that this license . . . concerns the allowance of unaccented ,and unalliterated syllables. The range of it is so great that at a single page-opening, taken at random, you might find the lines varying from nine to fifteen syllables, and, seeking a little further, come to a variation between eight and twenty-one." [1]    In Piers Ploughman the verse still consists of " a pair of sharply-separated halves which never on any consideration run syllabically into each other, and are much more often than not divided by an actual stop, if only a brief one, of sense " [2] ; but there is a greater approximation, though only an approximation to regularity in the length of the lines : and the first hemistich (measured of course syllabically not by its stressed syllables, which are always equal in number) is generally longer than the second. [3]

As between Anglo-Saxon poetry or " Piers Ploughman "

[1] G. Saintsbury, *A History of English Prosody*, i. 13 f.

[2] Ibid. i. 182.

[3] Cp. ibid. i. 184. Prof. Saintsbury gives the well-known opening lines of the poem as an illustration. A briefer specimen from elsewhere (ed. Wright, i. 6442–6457) may serve for the comparison with Hebrew poetry made above.

> On Good Friday I fynde · a felon was y-saved,
> That hadde lyved al his life · with lesynges and with thefte ;
> And for he beknede to the cros, · and to Christ shrof him,
> He was sonner y-saved · than seint Johan the Baptist ;
> And or Adam or Ysaye, · or any of the prophetes,
> That hadde y-leyen with Lucifer · many longe yeres,
> A robbere was y-raunsoned · rather than thei alle,
> Withouten any penaunce of purgatorie, · to perpetuel blisse.

The most famous example in later English literature of rhythm resting on equality in the number of accented syllables accompanied by great inequality in the total number of the syllables is Coleridge's " Christabel." The accented syllables in the lines are always four ; the total number of syllables commonly varies, as Coleridge himself puts it, from seven to twelve, and in the third line of the poem drops down to four. For reference I cite the five opening lines :—

> 'Tis the middle of night by the castle clock,
> And the owls have awakened the crowing cock ;
> Tu-whit !—Tu-whoo !
> And hark, again ! the crowing cock,
> How drowsily it crew.

and Hebrew parallelistic poetry these resemblances are
certain : (1) the isolated verse in Anglo-Saxon corresponds
to the parallel distich in Hebrew ; (2) the strong internal
pause in Anglo-Saxon to the end of the first parallel period
of the Hebrew distich ; (3) there is a correspondingly great
irregularity in the number of the syllables in successive
lines of Anglo-Saxon, and in successive distichs of Hebrew.
Yet whether the two poetical materials, the Anglo-Saxon and
the Hebrew, agree in what is after all most fundamental
in Anglo-Saxon, viz., the constant quantity of stressed
syllables in a verse, and the constant ratio of the stressed
syllables in the two parts of a verse to one another remains
for consideration ; the answer is not immediately obvious,
for Hebrew does not so unambiguously and conveniently
indicate what are the stressed syllables in a line as does
Anglo-Saxon by its alliterative system.   In many Hebrew
lines we cannot immediately see for certain either which,
or how many, are the stressed syllables : what means exist
for ultimately determining these uncertainties in part or
entirely I will consider later.   But first I return to a point
already reached in the last article.

   Even parallelism suggests a division of Hebrew distichs
into two broad types of rhythm : in one of these two types
the two parallel lines balance one another, whereas in the
other the second comes short of and echoes the first.   No
great attention is required in reading Lamentations v., or Job
xxviii., or many other passages in Job or the Deutero-Isaiah,
or many Psalms, such as, e.g., li., in order to become aware
of the dominance and, in some cases, of the almost uninter-
rupted recurrence of balance between the successive couplets
of mostly parallel lines ; nor, again, in reading Lamenta-
tions ii., iii., iv. to become aware of the different rhythm
produced when a shorter line constantly succeeds to a
longer one.   So far we can get without any theory as to

the correct method, if there be one, whereby these rhythms
should be more accurately measured or described, or as
to the best nomenclature wherewith to distinguish these
differences when we wish to refer to them. But if we get
thus far, it further becomes clear that, if we admit the
prevalence in Lamentations iv. of a clearly defined rhythm
fit to receive a name of its own, whether or not the name
*ḳinah* by which this rhythm commonly goes be the best
term to define it, then Lamentations v. and Job xxviii.
also have, though a different, yet a no less clearly defined
rhythm whether we give it a name or not ; and of course,
if we wish to discuss the subject, we must find some con-
venient way of referring to this rhythm no less than to
the other.

To distinguish these two broad classes of clearly dis-
tinguished types of rhythm I have suggested the terms
*balancing rhythm* and *echoing rhythm*.[1] This terminology
seems to me free from some of the objections which attach
to the term *ḳinah* as a term for the echoing rhythm, even
if we could discover a good companion term to *ḳinah* to
describe the other type. As I pointed out in the last
article, *ḳinah* rhythm is really a rather ambiguous term,
meaning either the total rhythmical effect of a poem in
which a particular echoing rhythm is prevalent, or that
particular echoing rhythm even though it be confined
to a single line or period. And one serious disadvantage of
the term *ḳinah* rhythm lies in the ease with which it obscures
the fact that within the same elegy or other rhythmically
similar poem more than one type of rhythm as a matter
of fact occurs.

But whether even *echoing rhythm* and *balancing rhythm* be a
satisfactory terminology for the two broad classes of Hebrew
rhythm under which sub-classes may be found, this broad

[1] *Isaiah* ("International Critical Commentary"), i. p. lxiii.

fundamental distinction itself is nevertheless worth keeping
clear ; it forms a comfortable ;piece of solid ground from
which to set out and to which to return from excursions
into the shaking bog or into the treacherous quagmire that
certainly needs to be traversed before the innermost secrets
of Hebrew metre can be wrested and laid bare.

In Lamentations v. a balancing rhythm, in Lamentations
iv. an echoing rhythm prevails ; a rapid reading of the
two chapters will suffice to verify this general statement.
But, if the reader will re-read the chapters with closer
attention to details, he will probably feel that Lamentations
v. 2—

נחלתנו נהפכה כזרים
בתינו לנכרים

Our inheritance is turned unto strangers,
Our houses unto aliens,

differs not only in respect of its parallelism but also of its
rhythm from most of the other verses in the same chapter,
and also that, while it is rhythmically unlike most of chap.
v., it is rhythmically like most of Lamentations iv. ; it is,
for example, rhythmically unlike Lamentations v. 13—

בחורים טחון נשאו
ונערים בעץ כשלו

it is, on the other hand, rhythmically like, e.g., Lamenta-
tions iv. 8.

זכו נזיריה משלג
צחו מחלב

Her nobles were purer than snow,
Whiter than milk,

One or two other verses in Lamentations v. may at first
seem ambiguous : are verses 3 and 14, for example, in
balancing or echoing rhythm ?   Again, in Lamentations iv.,
where the echoing rhythm clearly and greatly prevails, a
few verses disengage themselves as exceptions ; e.g., ver. 13—

מחטאות נביאיה
עונות כהניה

For the sins of her prophets,
The iniquities of her priests,

gives the impression of balance rather than echo, though
the entire rhythmical impression is not quite that which
is left by the balancing rhythm of Lamentations v.

Thus, without any more detailed examination or exacter
measurement of lines, we reach the important conclusion,
which a close study of Lamentations i. abundantly confirms,
that the same poem may contain distichs of different metri-
cal character.

But within what limits may or do these and other differ-
ences occur within the same poem ?   If that question is
to be answered we must discover some principle of measure-
ment which will enable us to determine in less simple cases
than those just cited when the rhythm remains constant
and when it changes, and how.

Is balance, then, due to (1) equality in the *number* of
syllables in the two lines, and echo to inequality in the
number of syllables ?   If this be so, then Lamentations
v. 3,

יתומים היינו אין אב
אמותינו כאלמנות

is in balancing rhythm, the number of syllables in each line
being eight.

Or (2) is balance due to the sum of the metrical values
of all syllables in each line being the same, even though
the number of the syllables differs ?   The number of syllables
in a Latin hexameter varies ; but the sum of the metrical
values of the syllables must always be equivalent to six
spondees.   If this were the true account of Hebrew rhythm,
it would become necessary to determine what syllables are
metrically long, what short.

Or (3) is balance due to equality in the number of stressed or accented words or syllables in the two lines, echo to the presence of a greater number of stressed syllables in the first line, and a smaller number in the second ? If so, is there *no* limit to the number of unstressed syllables that each stressed syllable can carry with it ? If there is a limit, what is it ? Is it no wider than in " Christabel " ? or is it as wide as, or wider than, in Anglo-Saxon poetry ?

Of these three possibilities, the first two seem to me to have been ruled out in the course of discussion and investigation concerning Hebrew metre. I confine myself to some discussion of the third.

It is just possible that some of the ancients had analysed the laws of Hebrew poetry sufficiently to detect the essential character of the stressed syllables. The interesting suggestion has been thrown out [1] that the author of Wisdom, who certainly attempted to naturalise parallelism in Greek, also attempted a new Greek rhythm on the model of the Hebrew by making the parallel periods in Greek contain the same number of accented syllables. Then again in the opinion of some the difficult passage in Origen which refers to the subject of Hebrew metre implies an appreciation of the stressed syllables.[2]

Be this as it may there has certainly been an increasing

---

[1] *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 5344.·

[2] Origen's scholion has already been cited (May, 1913, p. 427, *n.* 4). The subject of the scholion is Psalm cxix. 1—

אשרי תמי דרך
ההלכים בתורת יהוה

which contains six fully stressed words and is rendered in the LXX—

Μακάριοι οἱ ἄμωμοι ἐν ὁδῷ,
οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου,

which contains six accents. Ley (*Zeitschr. für die A.'T. Wissenschaft*, 1892, pp. 212 ff.) argues that one of the things which Origen is struggling to express is that in this particular verse we find the unusual phenomenon of text and translation containing the same number of stressed words and consequently the same rhythm.

agreement among modern students of this subject, particularly under the influence of Ley, to find in the stressed words or syllables the " pivots or posts," to use Professor Saintsbury's phrase, of the Hebrew rhythm.

But allowing this, what is the limit—for there surely must be some limit—to the number of unstressed syllables that may accompany each or any of the stressed syllables ? Again, is there any law governing the position of the stressed syllable in relation to the unstressed syllables that go with it ?

Taking the first of these two questions first :—Does a single word extending beyond a certain given number of syllables *necessarily* contain more than one stress ? or is such a word ambiguous, capable of receiving two, but capable also of receiving only one stress ?   And is the actual number of unstressed syllables that may accompany a stressed syllable neither less nor more than the number of syllables in the longest Hebrew word with inseparable attachments such as a preposition at the beginning and a suffix at the close ?   In other words, is the general rule : one word, one stress, to which words of more than a certain number of syllables, say four, so far form an exception that they *may* receive a second stress ?   Or, to put it otherwise, in such longer words may the counter-tone as well as the tone count as a full stress ?   I incline to the opinion that by the rule that words of a certain length may, but do not necessarily, receive a double stress, we at least approximate closely to an actual law of Hebrew rhythm.   But there is a second question : does every single word receive a stress, or, as in several lines of " Christabel," may we in Hebrew poetry have not only several syllables but also more words than one to each stress ?

We obtain some light on both these questions from certain characteristics of the Massoretic punctuation, and on the

second of them from Assyrian analogy also. The effect
of *makkeph* in the Massoretic system is to render vowelless
any word which is thus joined to a succeeding word. We
may believe that the principle of the Massoretic *makkeph*
corresponds to a principle in the ancient language without
accepting every particular use of *makkeph* in the Massoretic
text as corresponding to the intention of the original writers.
Nothing is more probable than that the negative particle
לא, conjunctions like כי, and other particles were frequently
toneless : but were they so regularly ? If not, and if also
we cannot unquestioningly follow the Massoretic punctua-
tion, then an element of uncertainty arises as to the number
of stressed syllables in a given line ; for example, do the
two lines in Isaiah i. 3,

$$\text{ישראל לא ידע}$$
$$\text{עמי לא התבונן}$$

contain each three stresses (as in MT), or each but two ? We
cannot determine this off-hand. If, indeed, we lay down
the principle that two stressed syllables must not immedi-
ately follow one another, then the two לא's must be mak-
kephed, for in each line the syllable that precedes לא is
stressed ; but it is decidedly dangerous to lay this down
as a rigid principle, in spite of the strong tendency in MT
to use *makkeph* in order to avoid such concurrences. Modern
Palestinian popular songs, which have much that is analogous
to Hebrew poetry, according to the express testimony of
Dalman,[1] admit the concurrence of two tone-syllables.
And the importance of לא in the two lines above cited
rather strongly indicates that it there received the stress
in each line.

But there are other combinations of words that are
frequently makkephed in the Massoretic text ; for example,

---

[1] " Zuweilen stossen auch zwei betonte Silben unmittelbar auf einander,"
*Palästinischer Diwân*, p. xxiii.

constructs and genitives. Again the question arises ᠄ were
such combinations regularly read with a single stress ? if
not, has the MT always preserved a correct tradition of the
intention of the original writer ? We are thus faced with
another group of uncertainties. These can perhaps be
reduced by observing that in MT there is a far greater
tendency to makkeph construct and genitive if the construct
case is free from prefixed inseparable particles such as
prepositions or the copula ; so, e.g., in Lamentations iv. 9
we find חללי־חרב, but מחללי׳ הרב is without *makkeph.*

The Massoretic punctuation rests partly on an ancient
tradition, partly on an exegetical theory, partly on an
accommodation of the text to a recent mode of reading it.
It is valuable, therefore, to have such principles as that
the negative particles are normally, and construct cases
often, toneless, supported by Assyrian analogy.

In the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* for 1895 (pp. 11 ff.)
Zimmern published an interesting Assyrian poem, as it
appeared to be, though Dr. Langdon tells me that neither
Zimmern himself nor any one else has yet succeeded in
making a consecutive translation of it, and that it may be
in reality a succession of disconnected verses written out
in illustration of scansion. In any case the interesting
point is that here we seem to have visualised a mode of
scansion that throws light on the composition of the feet
or rhythmical units in Assyrian, for these verses are divided
by longitudinal lines into four sections, and by latitudinal
lines into groups of eleven. The longitudinal lines mark
off into separate compartments the four-stressed syllables
or words with their accompanying unstressed syllables,
which here, as in most Assyrian and Babylonian poetry,
compose the line.

I will briefly summarise the statements made by
Zimmern at the time based on his first examination of this

document ; these were amplified in a later article, to which reference will be made below. According to Zimmern, then, the following metrical facts are attested by these scansion tablets :—

(1) Normally there is to one word, one stress ; but (2) the relative pronoun (monosyllabic in Assyrian), the copula, prepositions, the negative particles *la* and *ul*, and the optative particle *lu* receive no stress, but go with the following word to form a single-stress group of syllables ; so also (3) the status constructus and the genitive generally receive but one stress ; on the other hand, if the second substantive has a pronominal suffix they receive two ; (4) two particles and a word, or one particle and a word with a pronominal suffix, form single-stress groups ; (5) two words expressing closely related ideas form a single-stress group ; e.g., *abi u banti* ; (6) a vocative may be inserted without being reckoned in any of the four stress-groups that compose the line.

Though we make the most of the suggestions from both sources, the Massoretic punctuation of the Hebrew text and the scansion of the Assyrian tablets, we shall still be left with a fair range of uncertainty, and many lines of Hebrew poetry will occur in which, judged by themselves, the number of stresses will remain ambiguous. And that ambiguity will be still further increased when we attempt to determine what single words, if any, may receive two stresses ; here again some light is cast on the possibility of such double stress by the Massoretic punctuation ; for as the effect of *makkeph* is to bring two or more words under one tone, so the effect of *metheg* is to indicate the presence in the same word of two tones, of a countertone in addition to the main tone. But there is no probability that all the countertones marked by *metheg*, such, for example, as the first syllable in forms like קְטַלְלִי, really received a

stress ; and for this theory of double-stressed words we receive, I think, no very helpful analogy from Assyrian.

The question, then, arises ; Can we discover a more accurate method of determining the limits of what may accompany a stressed syllable ?   It is the attempt to answer this question that occupies in the main the attention of recent theorisers on Hebrew metre, and it is in the attempt to answer it that they diverge from one another.

The popularity which for a time was enjoyed by Bickell's system has waned in favour of that of Sievers, which has the advantage of being very much more elaborately and systematically worked out.   I propose very briefly to sum- marise some of the chief points in Sievers' system, premising at the outset that if it could be held to be established it would (1) greatly reduce, though not entirely eliminate, lines of ambiguous measurement ; and (2) give for every line, regarded by itself independently of its association with any other line, a clear rhythmical definition.

In connexion with the present discussion the two funda- mental laws of Sievers' system can, perhaps, best be stated thus ;  (1) the number of unstressed syllables that may accompany a stressed syllable must never exceed four, and only in a particular type of cases may it exceed three. Corollary ;  every word containing more than five syllables must have two stresses.   (2) The stressed syllable regu- larly *follows* the unstressed syllables that accompany it ; and more than a single unstressed syllable may never follow the stressed syllable that it accompanies.

Using the term anapaest not of course of a combination of two short followed by a long syllable, but of two unstressed syllables followed by one that is stressed, Sievers claims that the Hebrew rhythm rests on an anapaestic basis, and that the normal foot is

$$\times \times \angle$$

examples of such feet being יְקָטְלוּ ,דְּרָכִים, עַל־בְּנֵי. Possibly
variations of the normal foot are—

    (1) × × × ⌣
    (2) × ⌣, and even
    (3) ⌣

Moreover since the stress may fall on a syllable which
with an additional and secondary short syllable corresponds
to an original single syllable, as in the segholates, further
variations are × × ×⌣×, × × × ×⌣×, etc., an example of such
feet being לִפְנֵי־הַמֶּלֶךְ.[1]

If this theory be entirely sound, or even if it closely
approximates to the truth, it will considerably diminish
the range of uncertainty that must remain so long as we
leave entirely undetermined the limits of the unstressed
syllables that may accompany a stressed syllable. This may
be illustrated by an example : how many stressed syllables
are there in each of these lines in Psalm i. 1—

ובדרך חטאים לא עמד
? ובמושב לצים לא ישב

The question turns on the treatment of לא; was it
stressed or unstressed ? The Massoretic punctuation leaves
the negative in each line disunited from the rest and there-
fore capable at least of being stressed ; and Dr. Briggs [2] in

---

[1] After Sievers had indicated his theory in outline, Zimmern (*Zeitschrift
für Assyriologie,* xii. 382–392) returned to the examination of the scansion
tablets referred to above and found that between two stressed syllables
at least one, generally two, and not rarely three unstressed syllables
occurred, but never or quite rarely more than three.

It may be worth while adding here that Dalman (*Palästinischer Diwân,*
p. xxiii. with footnote) has found that, in the modern Palestinian (Arabic)
poems that follow not a quantitative but an accentual system, one to three
and occasionally four, unstressed syllables occur between the stressed
syllables. The value of these Palestinian analogies lies in the fact that
we are dealing not with speculations as to how a written poem was or
could be pronounced, but with the manner in which hitherto unwritten
poems were actually read to the editor who committed them to writing.

[2] Since these articles were written and the earlier ones published
Biblical scholarship has suffered a heavy loss through the lamented

calling the lines tetrameters certainly allows a stress to each
לא.  I think it may be urged against this that לא has nothing
like the need of emphasis and stress here that it has in the
lines previously cited from Isaiah i. 3, where לא ידע is anti-
thetic to ידע in the previous distich.  I should therefore
think it most probable that the lines were three-stressed
and not four-stressed ; but apart from the bearing of the
rest of the Psalm on the question we cannot determine
the point unless we are justified in calling in such a theory
as that of Sievers.  Now it is perfectly true that even on
that system monosyllabic feet are possible, and that לא in
particular at times, as in Isaiah i. 3, stands by itself
as a foot ; but if the anapæst is the basis of the rhythm,
we cannot naturally divide each of the two perfectly normal
anapæsts לא־ידע and לא־ישב into a monosyllabic and a dis-
syllabic foot ; on Sievers' theory the only natural way of
reading the two lines is with three stresses ; they are, to
use Dr. Briggs' terminology, trimeters, not tetrameters.

Sievers' theory, then, if established, would reduce the
number of lines which, measured with exclusive reference
to the stressed words or syllables only, are ambiguous.  Is
the theory, then, as a matter of fact, so firmly established
on perfectly certain data that it does actually diminish
the number of uncertainties that are left when we attempt
to count stressed syllables simply without very closely
defining either the position which such stressed syllables
must occupy, or the number of unstressed syllables which
may accompany them ?  I doubt it.  I cannot here under-
take any examination or criticism of Sievers' long and

death of Dr. Briggs.  It so happens that I have mainly referred to details
in Dr. Briggs' work with which I disagree ; I therefore seize this oppor-
tunity of recalling the fact that in the subject with which I am now dealing
Dr. Briggs was a true pioneer, and that he was one of the first writers
in English to insist on the fundamental importance in Hebrew prosody
of the stressed syllable.

exhaustive exposition of his theory ; nor can I examine his arguments, worthy as most of them are of the closest attention, by which he supports certain theories of vocalisation on which his metrical system rests. But these theories, however much may be said for some of them, are not all of them as yet so certainly established as to allow the metrical system, which in part suggests them, but which also certainly rests upon them, to furnish a sufficiently sure instrument for eliminating the uncertainties that arise when we measure a Hebrew text by the stressed syllables only. The degree of uncertainty which the theory would remove is largely counterbalanced by the insecurity of the basis on which it rests.

In illustration of what I have just said it must suffice to refer to a few classes of the conjectural vocalisation adopted by Sievers, all of which are more or less essential to the smooth working out of his system.

(1) Partly on general phonetic grounds, partly from actual features of the Massoretic vocalisation, such as the alternative forms of the type לַמְּלָכִים and לַמְלָכִים, and the complete abandonment of the reduplication and also of the following syllable in such inflexions as זִכְרוֹן from זָכָר, שִׁנְיוֹנוֹת from שִׁנְּיוֹן, Sievers infers that *regularly* when, owing to inflexion, the full vowel after a reduplicated consonant is lost, the reduplication and also the vowel that followed it were entirely lost also ; and that for example, למלכים was always pronounced *lamlachim* in three syllables, never *lammᵉlachim* in four, and ויהי always *waihi* (cp. מִידֵי not מִיְדֵי) and never *wayᵉhi*.

(2) Certain classes of verbal forms were always, according to the theory, a syllable shorter than in MT ; e.g. תָּבֹאן not תְּבֹאןִ. Again, the two forms of the second masc. sing. perfect were not, as in MT, pronounced alike ; קְטַלְתָּה was trissyllabic—*kaṭalta*, but the far more frequent form

קָמַלְתְּ was dissyllabic—*katalt* ; so in the second sing. fem. קָמַלְתִּי was trissyllabic—*katalti,* קָמַלְתְּ dissyllabic—*katalt.*

(3) Certain pronominal forms were originally pronounced with a syllable less than in MT ; thus MT יָדֶךְ, pausal יָדְךָ, has replaced יָדְךָ; cp. such forms in Origen's *Hexapla* as ηχαλαχ=הֵיכָלְךָ, βαχ = בְּךָ, and in Jerome *goolathach*= גְּאַלְתָּךְ. And it is also argued that the endings ךָ-, הֹ- were once monosyllabic.

It will be seen from the foregoing examples that the tendency of Sievers' vocalisation is to reduce the number of syllables below the number produced by the received system. Consequently what I stated as the first fundamental law of his metrical system, viz. that not more than four unstressed syllables may under any circumstances accompany one stressed syllable, often means not more than five stressed syllables counted according to the received system.

One other of Sievers' theories with regard to the pronunciation of Hebrew poetry must also be noted ; it works in an opposite direction, and is designed to supply unstressed syllables when their absence would be too keenly felt. Sievers admits monosyllabic feet, but he abhors the concurrence of two stressed syllables ; he calls to his aid the analogy of singing : as in singing a single syllable is sung to more than one note by virtually repeating the vowel sound, so Sievers postulates that when tone-syllables appear to follow one another immediately the long tone-syllable was broken up into two in pronunciation ; e.g. in such circumstances לֹא was pronounced not *lō,* but *lŏ-ō,* and קוֹל not *kōl,* but *kŏ-ōl,* and the metrical foot is in each case not ∸ but × ∸.

Two things seem to me to gain probability from Sievers' exhaustive discussion, even though the elaborated system rests on too much that is still uncertain or insecure : (1)

the natural basis of Hebrew rhythm is anapæstic rather than dactylic ; this is really an obvious corollary from the regularity with which the Hebrew accent falls on the last syllable of words, and the infrequency of detached monosyllables, and earlier metrists also have for the most part detected a prevalence of anapæstic or iambic rhythm in Hebrew ; (2) in the union of two or more words under one stress, and in the distribution of long words among two stress groups we should be guided by the principle that the stress groups within the same period are likely to be not too dissimilar in size and character ; and in general it is safer to proceed on the assumption that particles like עַל, בְּ, etc., rarely receive the stress unless for some reason an actual sense-emphasis falls upon them.

The sum of the whole matter is that we are left with an instrument of measurement capable of doing some service, but much less delicately accurate, or much less clearly read, than we could wish. With this instrument we must work at the difficult question, which I have so far but indicated, but which I shall examine more closely in the next article : What limits, if any, are set to the number of different rhythms that may be introduced into the same poem ?

In concluding the present article I will consider one further possible, and even probable, service which it appears to me that parallelism may render in reducing the element of uncertainty in determining the rhythm of particular lines. In Anglo-Saxon, alliteration clearly distinguishes three of the stressed syllables in a line leaving only the fourth outwardly undistinguished ; Hebrew has no such outward indication of this all-important element in the rhythm ; in particular all particles, all construct cases and some other types of words are rhythmically ambiguous ; in a given line they may be stressed or they may not. What

I suggest is that parallel verses tended at least to receive
the same treatment in respect of stress or non-stress. I
will give one or two illustrations of the value of this law if
its probability be admitted. If we take by itself the line
(Isa. i. 10)

<div dir="rtl">שמעו דבר יהוה קציני סדם</div>

we may certainly be in doubt whether דבר יהוה received
one stress or two, and whether the whole line was read
with four stresses or five. Sievers gives it but four, and
thereby in its context, as I believe, treats it wrongly. I
suggest that דבר ought to receive the same metrical value
as its parallel term in the completely and symmetrically
parallel line or period that follows, and that we should
read both periods alike with five stresses—

<div dir="rtl">שמעו דבר יהוה קציני סדם|<br>
האזינו תורת אלחינו עם עמרה</div>

A more troublesome example is Isaiah i. 4—

<div dir="rtl">הוי גוי חוטא<br>
עם כבד עון</div>

This Sievers reads thus—

<div dir="rtl">הוי גוי־חוטא<br>
עם־כבד עון</div>

and so far observes the rule which I am suggesting that
he leaves both the parallel terms גוי and עם unstressed;
on the other hand, חוטא and its parallel כבד עון do not
receive the same treatment, though they are quite capable
of so doing. A more probable reading of the lines will be
either—

<div dir="rtl">הוי־גוי חוטא<br>
עם כבד־עון</div>

or

<div dir="rtl">הוי | גוי חוטא<br>
עם כבד־עון|</div>

I take as a last example an *apparent* exception to the law.
Lamentations i. 1 reads—

איכה ישבה בדד | העיר רבתי עם
היתה כאלמנה | רבתי בגוים
שרתי במדינות | היתה למס

Budde suspected העיר in the first line on the ground that
at present the second half of the first line contains three
stresses, whereas it should only contain two. Sievers
removes the ground for suspicion by treating רבתי־עם
together as a single stress. At first this seems, by making
רבתי unstressed, to give a term in the first line a metrically
different character from that of corresponding terms, רבתי
and שרתי, in the second and third lines. But the parallelism of
רבתי in the first line with רבתי in the second and שרתי in the
third is, as a matter of fact, not complete ; the real parallel
in the first line to רבתי in the second line and שרתי in the third
is not רבתי by itself but רבתי עם, which, so taken together,
is also an antithetic parallel to the single stressed word
בדד in the first half of the line ; it is only when taken together
that the words רבתי עם express the idea in the mind of the
writer, viz., the populousness of the city, whereas רבתי in
the second and שרתי in the third line sufficiently express
by themselves the ideas of the " great lady " (in antithesis
to " the widow ") and " the princess " ; בגוים and במדינות
respectively serve merely to amplify the two ideas. The
distinction between רבתי עם and רבתי בגוים is shown gramm-
matically by the difference in construction ; and the writer
probably allowed himself to repeat the same word רבתי in
the two lines instead of using two different and synonymous
terms on the same kind of principle as that of the well-
known law of Arabic poetry that the same word may be
repeated in the course of a poem as the rhyme word, pro-
vided that the word is used on the two occasions with
some difference of meaning.

Thus, perhaps, a close examination of Lamentations i. 1 confirms, rather than reveals an exception to, the law which I have suggested, and incidentally shows that הָעִיר is not merely metrically possible, which Budde had denied and which is all that Sievers claimed, but metrically required.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE OF ENDEARMENT TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

### I.

No term of endearment to Christ in N.T. by the disciples. ATLHOUGH the New Testament enshrines for us the ardent devotion of the disciples to their Lord, it does not contain in all the varied range of its writings one single expression of endearment which is applied either directly or indirectly to Him. In the present day we are familiar with such expressions as "precious Saviour," "dear Jesus," "my Jesus." A well-known hymn contains the lines :

"To Thee, O dear, dear Saviour,
My spirit turns for rest."

In a justly valued book of devotion, an eminent divine writes : "In this, as in all things, Jesus left us an example that we should follow His dear and worshipped steps." But familiar as this usage is to-day it has no parallel in the whole of the New Testament.

Not because first disciples were cold. It was not that the first disciples were cold, formal or impassive. The mere memory of the names of Peter, John, Paul, Mary, and even Judas, puts such an idea at once to flight. Nor was it that the first disciples were deficient in the phraseology of endearment. In the Pauline letters, Amplias, Stachys, Persis, Timotheus, Philemon, Tychicus, Luke, Onesimus, are among those referred to as "beloved" (ἀγαπητοί). In the Petrine