they reproduce *verbatim et literatim*. Again the Masoretic reading in Genesis comes unscathed out of the text-critical ordeal; and the occasional Elohim of the LXX have no greater probability than they acquire from purely textual evidence (here sufficiently slender), as in all other cases.

JOHN SKINNER.

THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY.

II. PARALLELISM: A RE-STATEMENT—continued.

I pass now by a different method to a more detailed examination of parallel lines, and of the degree and character of the correspondence between them. Irrespective of particles a line or section to which another line or section approximately corresponds, consists of two, three, four, five or six words, very seldom of more. Complete parallelism may be said to exist when every single term in one line is parallel to a term in the other, or when at least every term or group of terms in one line is paralleled by a corresponding term or group of terms in the other. Incomplete parallelism exists when only some of the terms in each of two corresponding lines are parallel to one another, while the remaining terms express something which is stated once only in the two lines. Incomplete parallelism is far more frequent than complete parallelism. Both complete parallelism and incomplete parallelism admit of many varieties; and this great variety and elasticity of parallelism may perhaps best be studied by means of symbols, even though it is difficult to reduce all the phenomena to rigidly constant and unambiguous symbolic formulae. I have already elsewhere¹ suggested that the varieties of parallelism may be conveniently described by denoting

the terms in the first line by letters—\( a \), \( b \), \( c \), etc.—and those in the second line by the differentiated letters—\( a' \), \( b' \), \( c' \), where the terms, without being identical (in which case \( a \), \( b \), \( c \) would be used for the second line as well as for the first), correspond, or by fresh letters—\( d \), \( e \), \( f \), where fresh terms corresponding to nothing in the first line occur.

The simplest form of complete parallelism is represented by

\[
\begin{align*}
& a \cdot b \\
& a' \cdot b' 
\end{align*}
\]

here each line consists of two terms each of which corresponds to a term in the corresponding position in the other line. Examples are—

נָפְּטָם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
I-will-divide-them in-Jacob,
And-I-will-scatter-them in-Israel.—Gen. xlix. 7c.d.

וּמְשַׁמְיָה מְרוּדָהלוּת
וְשִׁמְעָא מְרָדוֹנוֹת
He-looketh-in at-the-windows,
He-glanceeth through-the-lattice.

Cant. ii. 9 (the same chapter contains several other examples).

נְחַיתָי מַשָּׁמְעָא
נְבָאָתִי מִרְאוֹת
I-am-bent-with-pain at-what-I-hear,
I-am-dismayed at-what-I-see.—Isa. xxxi. 3.

כִּי רָבָּב פְּשֻׁעָה
עֹצָמָו מְשָׁבְרוֹתִיָּה
For their-transgressions are-many,
Their-backturnings are-increased.—Jer. v. 6.

\[\text{Where the suffix in one line corresponds to a noun in the other it may sometimes be convenient to represent the suffix by an independent symbol.}\]

If both suffixes were so represented here the scheme would be

\[
\begin{align*}
& a \cdot b \cdot c \\
& a' \cdot b' \cdot c'
\end{align*}
\]
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Hear Thy-servant,
And-give-ear-to my-petition.—Apoc. Bar. xlvi. 12.

Complete parallelism between lines each containing three terms will be represented by—

\[ a \cdot b \cdot c \]
\[ a' \cdot b' \cdot c' \]

Examples are:

יהו אבות
ולב ימים

Red-are his-eyes with-wine,
And-white-are his-teeth with-milk.—Gen. xlix. 12.

כי שמים י濟י
ומורה אופי

By-the-breath of-God they-perish,
And-by-the-blast of-his-anger are-they-consumed.—Job iv. 9.

כרכיסים גם השבלה
והארת גבעת השבלה

For the-heavens like-smoke shall-vanish-away (?),
And-the-earth like-a-garment shall-wax-old.—Isa. li. 6.

More frequent than the fundamental scheme as given above and just illustrated are variations upon it, of which examples will be given below.

Complete parallelism of lines with four terms each, the terms being symmetrically arranged, will be represented by—

\[ a \cdot b \cdot c \cdot d \]
\[ a' \cdot b' \cdot c' \cdot d' \]

An example is—

וף רד ישיב שמח
وبر עזב וחלה אתי

A-soft answer turneth-away wrath,
But-a-grievous word stirreth-up anger.—Prov. xv. 1.

This scheme occurs not infrequently in antithetic proverbs, and Proverbs xv. contains several other examples;
but it is rare elsewhere. Variations on this scheme also will be given below.

Where the parallel sections consist of more than four terms, and sometimes when they contain as few as four terms, each section tends to break up into two of those independent clauses which we have seen to be in part the necessary consequence of parallelism, and in part a common, even when not a necessary, accompaniment of the style distinguished from simple narrative. For example, Isaiah xl ix. 2 is one of the nearest approximations to the scheme,

\[
a . b . c . d . e . f \\
a' . b' . c' . d' . e' . f'
\]

but here the last two terms in each section stand independent of the foregoing; thus:

And-he-made my mouth as-a-sharp sword: \hspace{1cm} \text{in-the-shadow}
\hspace{1cm} \text{of-his-hand he-hid-me;}
And-he-made-me\textsuperscript{1} into-a-polished arrow: \hspace{1cm} \text{in-his-quiver}
\hspace{1cm} \text{he-concealed-me.}

Such a combination of clauses is commonly termed "alternate parallelism" and is said to consist of four lines, of which the third is parallel to the first and the fourth to the second. This may be a convenient description: but the main point is that, within the main independent sections indicated by the parallelism, other almost equally independent breaks giving rise to subordinate independent clauses occur. This fact is emphasised in many specimens of Arabic "rhymed prose"; in the passage already cited from Hariri, almost all the parallel sections fall into two independent clauses; and it is these independent, but, from the point of view of

\textsuperscript{1} The suffix \((b')\) is here parallel to the independent term \((b)\); and so is the suffix "his" in "his quiver" to the independent term "his hand"; in this case, however, I have represented "shadow of his hand" under the single symbol \((o')\).
the parallelism, subordinate, sections that rhyme with one another; that is to say, similarity of rhyme connects, while emphasising their distinction, the shorter independent clauses which are commonly not parallel to one another, and change of rhyme marks off the well-defined longer sections which are regularly parallel to one another. It is interesting to observe that in the lines cited from Isaiah xlix. it is the entire parallel periods and not the subsections that rhyme with one another, though in view of the irregular use of rhyme in Hebrew this may be a mere accident—

In the illustrations of parallelism which have been given so far not only has there been complete correspondence, term by term, between the parallel lines, but each corresponding term in the second line has occurred in the exactly corresponding position in the second line. But in any considerable passage Hebrew writers introduce in various ways great variety of effect, a far greater variety, I believe, than was commonly sought or obtained by Arabic writers. These varieties of parallelism can be readily and conveniently shown by a use such as I have suggested of symbols. I proceed to classify and illustrate some of the chief classes of variations on the fundamental schemes which have been already described and illustrated.

1. Variety is attained by varying the position of the corresponding terms in the two lines.

In the simplest form of parallelism, which consists of lines containing two terms only, only one variation is possible from the scheme

\[ \begin{align*}
a & . b \\
a' & . b'
\end{align*} \]
of which several illustrations have already been given. This of course is

\[
a \cdot b
\]
\[
b' \cdot a'
\]

and this variation occurs very frequently, e.g.—

If thou-seek-her as-silver,
And-as-for-hid-treasures search-for-her.—Prov. ii. 4.

Go-not-forth into-the-field,
And-by-the-way walk-not.—Jer. vi. 25.

As the number of terms increases the greater becomes the possibility of variety and the number of actual variations, thus:

\[
a \cdot b \cdot c
\]
\[
a' \cdot b' \cdot c'
\]

can alternate with—

\[
a \cdot b \cdot c
\]
\[
a' \cdot c' \cdot b'
\]
or any of the other four possible permutations. One or two illustrations must suffice: of the variation just given, Proverbs ii. 2 is an example—

So-that-thou-incline unto-wisdom thine-ear,
(And-) apply thine-heart to-understanding.

The tendency in poetry to give the verb its normal (prose) position at the beginning of the first line, but, in order to gain variety, to throw the verb to the end of the second line renders the scheme

\[
a \cdot b \cdot c
\]
\[
b' \cdot c' \cdot a'
\]
very frequent, though of course this same scheme may also arise from other causes (e.g. Job iv. 17). Examples are—

עִלָּאנָם הָכַבְּדֵי אֲרִיאָה מִימֵר
וְאֵֽזְבֵּרֵבָּה יָשִׁדוּ

Therefore shall slay them a lion out of the forest,
A wolf of the steppes shall spoil them.—Jer. v. 6.

עַל־רַהֲקִי לֵפִי מֶלֶךְ
בְּמַקְמוֹ נְרֵלִים עַל־רַהֲקִי

Glorify not thyself in the presence of the king,
And in the place of great men stand not.—Prov. xxv. 6.

Four further examples may be found in Proverbs ii. 5, 8, 10, 20.

The possible variations on

a . b . c . d
a' . b' . c' . d'

are of course much more numerous; the actual examples are far fewer, partly because complete parallelism over these longer periods is much rarer, partly because these parallelisms in four terms occur particularly in Proverbs, which as complete in themselves do not call for the variety which is naturally enough desired in a long continuous passage.

2. Another way of obtaining variety is to use in the second line two or more terms which, taken together, are parallel in sense to a corresponding number of terms in the first line, though the separate terms of the one combination are not parallel to the separate terms of the other combination. In its extreme form parallelism of this variety consists of two entire lines completely parallel in sense but with no two terms taken separately parallel to one another. Denoting correspondence as before by a . a', etc., and the number of terms above one in which particular correspond-
ing ideas are expressed by a figure attached to the letters, the kind of schemes that occur are—

\[
\begin{align*}
a_2 & \cdot b \\
a'_2 & \cdot b'
\end{align*}
\]

For example—

\[
\text{Adah and-Zillah, hear my-voice,} \\
\text{Ye-wives of-Lamech give-ear-to my-word.—Gen. iv. 23.}
\]

Further variety is possible here again by varying the position of the corresponding terms or groups of terms, so that such schemes as—

\[
\begin{align*}
a & \cdot b_2 \\
b_2' & \cdot a'
\end{align*}
\]

arise; an example of this is Proverbs ii. 17.

\[
\text{Who-forsaketh the-friend of-her-youth,} \\
\text{And-forgetteth the-covenant of-her-God.}
\]

And another very effective variation arises when what is expressed by two terms in the first line is expressed by one in the second line, which in turn has two other terms corresponding to one in the first; for example—

\[
\begin{align*}
a_2 & \cdot b \\
a' & \cdot b_2'
\end{align*}
\]

which is exemplified by Genesis xlix. 24.

\[
\text{And-his-bow abode firm,} \\
\text{And-the-arms of-his-hands were-agile—}
\]

where the two words taken together are parallel to וּרְשֵׁב בְּאַרְרוֹת קֶשֶׁר, וּרְפָאֹת וּרוּפֵי דוֹי, and the single term קֶשֶׁר to the terms וּרוּפֵי דוֹי.
An example of
\[
\begin{align*}
a & \cdot b & \cdot c^2 \\
a' & \cdot c & \cdot b' & \cdot c^2
\end{align*}
\]
is afforded by Job iii. 17,

Wherefore did-the-knees receive-me,
And-why the-breasts that I-should-suck,—Job iii. 12.

Examples of these are—

Wherefore did-the-knees receive-me,
And-why the-breasts that I-should-suck.—Job iii. 12.

and

Anguish hath-seized-me,
unless we prefer to treat the former of these examples on
the ground of the differentiation of the interrogative par-
ticles as an example of

\[ a \quad b \quad c \]
\[ a' \quad c' \quad d \]

and the latter example as

\[ a \quad b \]
\[ a'2 \]

The latter kind of ambiguity frequently arises.

Further variety is obtained when variations corresponding
to those illustrated under (1) and (2) are combined with
incomplete parallelism; this frequently happens especially
when one at least of the parallel members contains more than
two terms. But, before giving illustrations of such vari­
tions it will be convenient to point out that incomplete
parallelisms fall into two broad classes which may be dis­
tinguished as **incomplete parallelism with compensation** and
**incomplete parallelism without compensation**. If one line
contains a given number of terms and another line a smaller
number of terms, the parallelism is necessarily incomplete
and may be termed incomplete parallelism without com­
pensation; but if the two lines contain the same number
of terms, though only some of the terms in the two lines are
parallel, the lines may be said to constitute incomplete
parallelism with compensation. Thus such schemes as

\[ a \quad b \quad c \]
\[ a' \quad b' \]

or

\[ a \quad b \quad c \]
\[ a'2 \]

are incomplete without compensation; whereas such
schemes as

\[ a \quad b \quad c \]
\[ a' \quad d \quad c' \]
or

\[ a \quad b \quad c \\
\quad a' \quad b' \]

are incomplete parallelism with compensation.

I now give illustrations of different schemes of both types.

(a) Incomplete parallelism without compensation—

I-will-restore thy-judges as-at-the-first,
   And-thy-counsellors as-at-the-beginning.—Isa. i. 26.

is

\[ a \quad b \quad c \\
\quad b' \quad c' \]

and so is Proverbs ii. 18, Canticles ii. 1, 14, Numbers xxiii. 19c.d., 24a.b., xxiv. 5a.b., Psalm vi. 2.

Who-rideth through-the-heavens as-they-help,

is an example of

\[ a \quad b \quad c \\
\quad c' \quad b' \]

(b) Incomplete parallelism with compensation.

Yahweh, when-thou-wentest-forth out-of-Seir,
   When-thou-marchedst out-of-the-field of-Edom.—Jud. v. 4.

is an example of

\[ a \quad b \quad c \\
\quad b' \quad c' \]

and other examples are Deuteronomy xxxiii. 23, Job iii. 11.

And-so-dwelt Israel securely,
   By-itself the-fountain of-Jacob.—Deut. xxxiii. 28.

is an example of

\[ a \quad b \quad c \\
\quad c' \quad b' \]

and other examples are Proverbs ii. 1, 7, Job iii. 20. In
Judea v. 26a.b., Psalm xxi. 11 will be found examples of—

\[ a \cdot b \cdot c \]
\[ a' \cdot b' \cdot c' \cdot d' \]

An example of compensation by means of a fresh term may be found in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2.

Yahweh from-Sinai came,
And-beamed-forth from-Seir unto-them.

This is—

\[ a \cdot b \cdot c \]
\[ c' \cdot b' \cdot d' \]

Other examples of the same general principle with different arrangement of the terms, etc., will be found in Psalm xxii. 12 (11), Job iii. 21.

I will conclude with two illustrations of the value of a minuter analysis of parallelism than has hitherto been considered necessary, and of some such method as I have been suggesting of measuring or classifying the various types of parallelism.

An effective scheme of parallelism that occasionally occurs consists of two lines each containing three terms but held together by a single parallel term in each line, these parallel terms standing one at the end of the first line, and the other at the beginning of the second. The scheme is—

\[ a \cdot b \cdot c \]
\[ c' \cdot d \cdot e \]

Now, if the articulation of the parallelism is not observed, couplets of this type are reduced to ordinary prose, or even to nonsense, or at best feeble repetition; but if it is properly articulated, the couplet is an effective form of "synthetic parallelism" as Lowth would have called it, of
incomplete parallelism with compensation as I have pro-
posed to term it. Examples of this type occurring in
Genesis xlix. 9 (cf. Num. xxiv. 9) and Deuteronomy xxxiii.
11 are correctly articulated in the Revised Version:—

He stooped down, he couched as a lion,
And as a lioness; who shall rouse him up?
Smite through the loins of them that rise up against him,
And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.

But if the parallelism is not correctly perceived, and the
words otherwise articulated, how unsatisfactory does the
former of these couplets become! “He stooped down, he
couched as a lion and as lioness: who shall rouse him up?”
this suggests a comparison with two different beasts, whereas
the parallelism really expresses comparison with the lion-
class, which it denotes by the use of two synonymous terms.
Yet this very mistaken articulation is found in Numbers
xxiii. 23, both in the R.V. and, I regret to say, in my com-
mentary on Numbers. If we articulate

Now shall it be said of Jacob and Israel,
What hath God wrought!

the natural suggestion is that Jacob and Israel are differ-
ent entities, which they are not; Jacob and Israel are here,
as elsewhere in these poems (Num. xxiii. 7, 10, 21, 23;
xxiv. 5, 17, 18 f.), synonymous terms belonging to different
members of the parallelism. The proper articulation of
the passage is—

Now shall it be said of Jacob,
And of Israel, What hath God wrought!

and it is interesting to observe that this not very common
type of parallelism occurs twice (see also xxiv. 9) in the
oracles of Balaam.

My second illustration of the advantages of some method
that enables similarities and dissimilarities of parallelism
to be easily detected and presented is of a different character, and shows the bearing of these studies on textual criticism.

Psalm cxiv. consists of eight couplets, each of which, in the present text at all events, shows one form or another of incomplete parallelism, for the most part with compensation. The characteristic incompleteness of the parallelism rings through even a translation:

1 When Israel went forth out of Egypt,
   The house of Jacob from a barbaric people,
2 Judah became his sanctuary,
   Israel his dominion,
3 The sea saw it and fled,
   Jordan turned backward,
4 The mountains skipped like rams,
   The hills like young sheep.
5 What aileth thee, O thou sea, that thou fleest,
   Thou Jordan, that thou turnest back?
6 Ye mountains that ye skip like rams,
   Ye hills like young sheep?
7 At the presence of the Lord tremble, O earth,
   At the presence of the God of Jacob,
8 Which turned the rock into a pool of water,
   The flint into a fountain of water.

The scheme is as follows:

1 a . b . c
   b'2 . c'2.
2 a . b . c
   b' . c'.
3 a . b . c
   a' . c'2.
4 a . b . c
   a' . c'2
5 a . b . c
   b' . c'2.
6 a . b . c
   a' . c'2.
7 a . b . c
   a2.
8 a . b . c
   b' . c'2.

There seems to me strong ground for holding that this consistent use of incomplete parallelism was intentional,
or, at any rate, if not intentional, it is at least an unconscious expression of the writer's general preference—in a word, it is a stylistic characteristic; as such it ought not without good reason to be obliterated. For this reason Dr. Briggs's reconstruction of this Psalm in the *International Critical Commentary* is open to grave objection. The emendations proposed by Dr. Briggs and the effect of them on the parallelism is as follows: (1) he strikes out as glosses verses 2 and 8, though both verses show the characteristic incomplete parallelism; (2) in verse 7 he deletes "tremble"; then "Lord of the earth" becomes parallel to "God of Jacob," and the verse as a whole an example of complete parallelism

\[ \text{a . b . c} \]
\[ \text{a . b' . c'} \]

(3) in verses 4 and 6 he inserts (of which in verse 7 is supposed to be a misplaced corruption), thus again turning incomplete into regular complete parallelism

\[ \text{a . b . c} \]
\[ \text{a' . b' . c'} \]

Thus merely by a study of the parallelism this reconstruction is rendered improbable quite apart from the question whether metre requires any such changes, or whether Dr. Briggs's is not a much more prosaic poem than that of the Hebrew text.

In the LXX Psalm cxiv. is united with Psalm cxv. This union has been very generally regarded as not representing the original text; in addition to the reasons commonly given for holding that the division between the two Psalms in the Hebrew text is correct, we may now add the difference in the type of parallelism. In cxv. 5–7 we find three successive examples of complete parallelism, and although
elsewhere in the Psalm there are examples of incomplete parallelism, these are mostly incomplete parallelisms of a different kind from those which occur in Psalm cxiv.

G. Buchanan Gray.

THE IRONY OF JESUS.

The irony of Socrates consisted in the fact that he always pretended to be on a level with, or even inferior to, those with whom he conversed. Himself the wisest man of his time, he gave himself out to be the most ignorant and foolish: of better life and manners than the vast majority of the Athenians, he associated with persons of loose morals, as though he were one of themselves: one of the ugliest of men, he drew attention to his ungainly features, and at the same time saved himself from the ridicule of others by claiming to be one of the most handsome.

Jesus never put Himself on a level even with the best of His contemporaries. The Jew of His day was, both in point of enlightenment and in point of morality, far superior to the citizen of Athens of the time of Socrates, yet Jesus consistently claimed to be superior to the best men of His nation, not merely of His own day, but of the best age in its history. He claimed to be a greater legislator than Moses, wiser than Solomon, and a preacher of more authority than Jonah. But although He never pretended to be on the level of those whose teacher He was, He not unfrequently made His hearers imagine that they were on a higher level than, in His opinion and in point of fact, they were. When He spoke of ninety and nine righteous persons (Luke. xv. 7, cf. on the other hand, Matt. xviii. 17: a publican and a Gentile), the Scribes and Pharisees whom He was addressing inevitably took the compliment to themselves and were doubtless intended to do so, however little in the eyes of Jesus they deserved it.