

7. $\text{حَمْد} \circ LU \text{ ܡܘܨ}$ $\text{حَمْد} \circ ABN$ 21. (fin.) $\text{حَمْد} \text{ ܡܘܨ} L = B$ [deest $U = N$ $\text{ܡܘܨ} \text{ ܡܘܨ} A$

In conclusion I may perhaps call attention to the fact that an interesting Lucianic (perhaps Midrashic) reading of ii 14 is found in the Syro-Hexaplar:—‘And he took the cloak of Elijah which fell upon him and smote the waters *and they were not divided*, and he said, Where is the LORD the God of Elijah, $\delta\phi\phi\acute{o}$? And he smote the waters, *and they were divided hither and thither*, and Elisha went over.’ The words in italics are found also in some texts of the Latin Vulgate.

W. EMERY BARNES.

RHYTHM IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

In the first edition of his *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (§ 82, 3) Professor Blass remarked on the occurrence of fragments of verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. So frequent are they that he was disposed to think that they were not the result of pure accident. Since that edition appeared he has discovered a rhythmical principle which runs through the whole Epistle. This principle is described in the second edition of his *Grammatik* as follows. ‘If the fragments of verse’, he says, ‘are not purely fortuitous, at any rate they are not the essential point. This consists rather in a mutual assimilation of beginnings and endings of sentences and clauses running through this Epistle. Ending may correspond to ending and beginning to beginning, also ending to beginning, especially if contiguous. Rhythm of this kind must have been taught in the rhetorical schools of Greece and Rome of the time, and the author of this Epistle must have passed through such a school.’ To take a single instance, in the opening sentence we have a clause ending with $(\text{πατρά})\sigma\iota\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \text{ πρ}\acute{o}\phi\eta\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ followed by a clause ending with $(\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta)\sigma\epsilon\upsilon \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \nu\acute{\iota}\phi$, i. e. twice $\cup - - \cup - -$, the omission of the definite article before $\nu\acute{\iota}\phi$ being due to metrical considerations. The subject has been worked out in detail by Professor Blass elsewhere¹.

In view of the many points of resemblance, especially in matters

¹ In *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, 1902, pp. 420–61, ‘Die rhythmische Komposition des Hebräerbriefes’, where a striking illustration from Cicero is quoted. Cf. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1898, Bd. II, Anhang II, über die Geschichte des rhythmischen Satzschlusses.

of style, between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Wisdom, both books being pieces of highly artistic prose, it was not surprising to find that the same rhythmical principle holds good for the apocryphal book. The book of Wisdom, as has often been pointed out, is replete with figures of speech. Instances of chiasmus, paronomasia, alliteration, balance of clauses, and the like abound. But the existence of the rhythmical feature in question appears, so far as the present writer is aware, to have hitherto escaped notice.

The assimilation in scansion in this book is seen chiefly in the terminations of the *στίχοι*. Assimilation in the openings, though not wanting, is not nearly so frequent. The instances of assimilation between the ending of one clause and the beginning of the next noted by the present writer are, apart from the last chapter, comparatively few.

The attempt to assimilate the endings of the *στίχοι* runs through the whole book, but is much more evident towards the close, where the writer abandons the more Hebraic manner of the early chapters and gives free play to his own genius¹. Out of upwards of eighty cases noted of pairs (triplets) of *στίχοι* with corresponding endings, thirty occur in the last three chapters. In the earlier part of the work the average is about four pairs to a chapter.

Instances in the first chapter are:—

i 4	... (κατά)χρησ ἀμαρτίας } ... φεύξεται δόλον }	— — — — —
i 5	... (λογ)ισμῶν ἀσυνέτων } ... (ἐπελθ)ούσης ἀδικίας }	— — — — —
i 6	... γὰρ πνεῦμα σοφία }	
i 8	... ἀδικ' οὐδεὶς μὴ λάθῃ } ... (αὐ)τὸν ἐλέγχουσ' ἡ δίκη }	— — — — —
i 14	... (φάρ)μακον ὀλέθρου } ... (βασι)λίον [so A] ἐπὶ γῆς }	— — — — —
i 16	... ἐτάκησαν } ... (ἔθεν)το πρὸς αὐτόν } ... (με)ρίδος εἶναι }	— — — — —

Also in i 15, 16, if we read *προσεκαλέσατο* with κ*, substituting *ἀσεβής* for *ἀσεβείς* for the sake of the sense, we get

(δικαιο)σύνη γὰρ ἀθάνατός ἐστιν }
... λόγους προσεκαλέσατ' αὐτόν }

It is needless to go through the whole book pointing out similar instances: the existence of the principle may easily be verified. One

¹ See Farrar in the *Speaker's Comm.*, Apocrypha, vol. i p. 405.

other passage must suffice. On p. 638 (vol. ii) of Dr Swete's text we have the following :—

xvii 16	... (ἐ)κεῖ καταπίπτων	} ---υυ---
	... (εἶρκ)τὴν κατακλεισθείς	
17	... ἦν τις ἡ ποιμὴν	} ---υ---
	... ἐργάτης μόχθων	
17, 18	... (ἐ)μενεὶν ἀνάγκην	} υυυ---
	... (πάν)τες ἐδέθησαν	

with which we should perhaps join the next στίχος :

	... διασῦρίζον κ*	
xvii 18, 19	... (ἦ)χος εὐμέλης	} (υ-υ)υ-υ-
	... πορευομένου βία	
	... (κα)ταριπτομένων πετρῶν	
19	... (ἀ)θεώρητος	} υ-----
	... (θη)ρίων φωνή	
20	... (κα)τελάμπετο φωτί	} υ-υ-υ-υ-υ
	... συνεχέχτο ἔργοις	
xviii 1	... (δο)ίροις σου μέγιστον ἦν φῶς	} ---υ-υ-υ---
	... μορφὴν δὲ οὐχ ὁρῶντες	

Moreover xvii 21^a and 21^b balance each other :

... (ἐπέ)τατο βαρεῖα νύξ	} υυυ-υ-
... βαρύτεροι σκότους	

and 21^b (εἰκὼν τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτοῦς διαδέχασθαι σκότους) may be a Christian interpolation. In any case the three στίχοι in verse 21 end with an iambic, and all the στίχοι in the page (from xvii 16 to xviii 4) with the exception of the two last¹ fall into couplets or triplets having at least the two final syllables of their component στίχοι identical in scansion.

The frequent occurrence of the phenomenon, especially in the closing chapters, and the length to which the agreement is sometimes carried make it impossible to attribute it to accident. The improbability of a fortuitous origin increases with the number of corresponding syllables. Couplets with seven or eight syllables of equal scansion are fairly common. An instance with eleven syllables is :—

viii 3	... (δο)ξάζει συμβίωσιν θεοῦ ἔχουσα	} -----υ-υ-υ-υ-υ
	... πάντων δεσπότης ἠγάπησεν αὐτήν	

¹ Here the loss is compensated by the assimilation of the ending of verse 3 (ξενίται) as παρέσχε with the opening of the two following στίχοι : ἀξιοὶ μὲν . . , οἱ κατακλείσ(τους) . . (—υ—υ—).

With nine syllables we have :—

ix 16 . . . (μό)λις εικάζομεν τὰ¹ ἐπὶ γῆς } υ--υ--υ--υ--υ
 . . . (χερ)σὶν εὐρίσκομεν μετὰ πόνου }

Other instances where the assimilation is well sustained are xi 14^a with 14^o (eleven syllables : possibly 14^b and 14^o formed a single στίχος) and xiv 19 (ten syllables) if κάλιον, a form for which there is authority in Greek literature, be read :—

. . . κρατῶντι βουλόμενος ἀρείσαι } υ--υ--υ--υ--υ--υ
 . . . ὁμοίωτη' ἐπὶ τὸ κάλ(λ)ιον }

In some cases it looks as if *alternate* στίχοι had been made to correspond : see iv 19 (ἀ)φώνους πρηνεῖς—(αὐ)τοὺς ἐκ θεμελίων—(χερ)σωθήσονται—(ἴ)σονται ἐν ὀδύνη and xviii 17 f. μὲν ὀνειρών—(ἐξετά)-ραξαν αὐτοὺς—ἀδόκητοι—ἡμίθνητος.

The most frequent ending for couplets is that of a hexameter (—)υυ—-. Next comes (≡)—υ---, and almost as frequent is the termination with υ---, which also, it may be noted, is found seven times in the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Blass, *Gramm.*³ § 82, 3). The tendency to accumulate short syllables is noticeable, e. g. in iii 19 with iv 1 and xiv 19 (quoted above). Norden (*op. cit.*) notes that this tendency was characteristic of the later artistic prose : Demosthenes avoided the sequence of more than two short syllables.

In the assimilation in the openings of clauses—which, as was stated, is less frequent than in their terminations—the iambic metre is the model usually followed. Instances occur in vi 10, vi 17 f, x 4, 6, 13, xv 5 f. Instances in the last chapter of assimilation between termination and opening are xix 6 -αχθῶσιν ἀβλαβεῖς, with 7 ἢ τὴν παρεμβολὴν . . ., 7^a and 7^b, 10^b and 10^o, 11^a and 11^b, 17^d and 18^a.

In one case the writer nearly succeeds in carrying the assimilation through the whole of two lines from beginning to end :—

xv 7 Καὶ γὰρ κεραμεὺς ἀπαλὴν γῆν θλί|βων ἐπίμοχθον
 πλάσσει πρὸς ὑπη|ρεσίαν ἡμῶν ἐν ἑκαστον,

i. e. -- υυ-- υυ----- υυ-≡
 -- υυ-- υυ----- υυ-≡

If the passage is divided as marked, it will be seen that it forms three perfect anapaestic lines.

¹ Short syllables are as a rule elided except in words like τὰ : cp.

xviii 11 . . ἄμα δεσπότη κολασθεῖς } υυ--υυ--υυ--
 . . βασιλεὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχων }
 12 ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ πάντες . . . (Anacreontic metre).

The rhythmical principle considered in this paper has at least one practical use for the critic. It affords a valuable criterion as to the true text in cases of doubt. Thus, as was said above, the spelling *βασιλιον* which A adopts in i 14 is probably to be preferred to *βασιλειον* of B κ . Similarly in iii 11 the spelling of B * κ *ἀνώνητοι* (for *ἀνόνητοι*) is explained on metrical grounds:—

... ἐξουθενῶν ταλαίπωρος } ---υ---υ---υ
 ... καὶ οἱ κόποι ἀνώνητοι }

In vii 3 *κατέπεσον* of B A is to be preferred to *κατέπεσα* of κ :
 ... (ὁμοιοπα)θῆ κατέπεσον γῆν } ---υ---υ---υ
 ... πᾶσιν ἴσα κλαίων }

The first aorist formation in *-σα* is especially common in the LXX in the case of the verb *πίπτω*; the writer of Wisdom selected the second aorist, not only because it was the classical form, but also because it suited the metre. In vii 29 read *ἀστέρων* with A for *ἄστρων* of B κ (cp. v. 19):—

... (αῦ)τη ἐπρεπεστέρ' ἡλίου } ---υ---υ---υ
 ... (ὕ)πὲρ πᾶσαν ἀστέρων θέσιν }

In x 13 the scansion of the second line shews that the imperfect *ἐγκατέλειπεν* of A is the right reading in the first line. Metre, as well as sense, shews in xii 20 that *διέσεως* of κ is to be preferred to *δεήσεως* of B (a triplet ending with anapaests). In xv 7 quoted above *ἐν* should be inserted with κ A C. In xviii 16 the perfect *βέβηκε* should probably be read for *βεβήκει*:—

... (ἐπλήρω)σε τὰ πάντα θανάτου } ---υ---υ---υ
 ... (ἤ)πτε)το, βέβηκε δ' ἐπὶ γῆς }

It may perhaps be of some service to have traced another link between Wisdom and Hebrews. Of course, if, as appears to be the case, the practice which has here been considered was taught in the rhetorical schools, no inference can be drawn as to identity of authorship. But it is a legitimate inference that both writers came under the same training. Their agreement in this respect can hardly be explained by imitation. It would be interesting to know at what date the practice first came into vogue. The instance which Blass quotes from Cicero shews that it was taught as early as the first century B. C.

H. ST J. THACKERAY.

PS.—Since the above note was in type, the writer has had the advantage of receiving the comments of Professor Blass. While accepting the general conclusion as 'manifest', he points out some errors, I

fear rather flagrant, in the prosody of some passages quoted, e. g. that the *a* in *ἀθάνατος* and the *i* in *καλ(λ)ίων* are always long. He adds: 'I should think that any writer, who wrote in rhythm, observed the same prosodical rules: a vowel which may be elided *must* be elided, a long vowel (or diphthong) before a vowel must be shortened.' This would affect some of the instances quoted above. 'But', he adds, 'on the other hand the number of correspondences may be increased almost in importance, although I doubt whether rhythms are (as in other writers) *continually* employed. The text is not in a very good condition.'

NOTE ON MATT. XX 23 AND MARK X 40.

In the First Gospel our Lord is reported to have said to the sons of Zebedee—

τὸ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ ἐνωρίμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

The parallel passage in the Second Gospel runs—

τὸ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ ἐνωρίμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται.

Vv. 11. are not important. In the former passage CDA &c. insert *τοῦτο* after *δοῦναι*.

The familiar English of A. V. is—

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.'

The rendering of St Mark is similar, with 'and' for ἢ and with the omission of 'of my Father'.

For this the R. V. of 1881 substitutes:—

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but *it is for them* for whom it hath been prepared of my Father', and so for St Mark with the same variation as in A. V.

Do these translations convey the sense of the original? The importation of the words in italics, it will be observed, makes a material change in the force of the sentence. Why were they introduced?

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but for whom it is prepared' is clumsy English, but intelligible English. If we draw out the force of the relative, and make it contain the antecedent, as the construction requires, we may render 'but to them for whom it is prepared'.

Here the English, in accordance with a very common use of our *but* (*but = be out*), implies that the privilege of sitting on the Lord's right hand and on His left hand is His to give, but His to give to none but