

*THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY.*

III. PARALLELISM AND RHYTHM IN THE BOOK OF  
LAMENTATIONS.

THE Book of Lamentations has played a conspicuous part in the constantly renewed discussions of the subject of Hebrew rhythm. Apart from any analysis of its cause, and without any exceptional degree of attention, the reader of the Hebrew text, or even indeed of the English version, of the Lamentations, perceives something in the rhythm or cast of the sentences that is common to practically the whole of the first four chapters of the book. This same something that brings these four poems into a common class, sharply marks them off from the fifth chapter or poem, and at the same time, too, from the greater quantity of the poetry of the Old Testament, though careful examination has discovered not a little in various books of the Old Testament that resembles the first four chapters of Lamentations in the peculiarity in question.

But though this striking peculiarity is common to the four poems constituting the first four chapters of Lamentations, there are other features that distinguish them one from another—the differing alphabetic sequences that are followed by the initial letters of successive divisions of the poems (D preceding V in ii., iii., and iv., following it in i.), the differing lengths of the divisions, the differing degrees of passion, spontaneity and vividness with which the subject, common to them all, is handled. These differences have attracted and received attention; but, so far as I am aware, the differences in the use of parallelism as between the four poems, have not yet been analysed: and, yet, such differences exist. Owing to uncertainties of text and interpretation, it does not seem to me easy or even practicable to give exact statistics of these differences; yet, by the

help of a more accurate measurement of parallelism, such as I suggested in the previous articles, it will, I hope, be possible to make manifest the existence and general character of the differences ; and, in any case, by an examination of these chapters, I hope to carry further my line of approach to rhythmical questions through parallelism.

Though I cannot undertake any comprehensive survey of the history of the study of rhythm in Lamentations, it will be worth while to refer to two discussions of the subject—that of Lowth, who was the first to point out and to attempt to analyse the rhythmical peculiarity of Lamentations i.-iv., and that of Budde, who, by a series of contributions to this subject, beginning with his fundamental article in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* for 1882, has profoundly influenced subsequent investigation and terminology.

Lowth devoted his 22nd and 23rd lectures to the Hebrew elegy, and he returned to some of the points then discussed in the preliminary dissertation to his *Isaiah* (vol. i., pp. xxxiv.-xliii. : ed. 3). The genius and origin of the Hebrew elegy, of the *kinah* or *nehi* as the Hebrews called it themselves, he traces to their manner of celebrating the funeral rites ; and in particular to the employment of professional mourners who sang dirges. The natural language of grief, he remarks, “ consists of a plaintive, intermitted, concise form of expression ” : and as in other arts, so in that of the Hebrew elegy, “ perfection consisted in the exact imitation of nature. The funereal dirges were, therefore, composed in general upon the model of those complaints which flow naturally and spontaneously from the afflicted heart : the sentences were abrupt, mournful, pathetic, simple and unembellished. . . . They consisted of verse and were chanted to music.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures* . . . (ed. Lond. 1787), ii. 123, 127.

Lowth then points out the peculiarity of the first four poems in Lamentations, and remarks: "We are not to suppose this peculiar form of versification utterly without design or importance: on the contrary, I am persuaded, that the prophet adopted this kind of theme as being more diffuse, more copious, more tender, in all respects better adapted to melancholy subjects. I must add, that in all probability the funeral dirges, which were sung by mourners, were commonly composed in this kind of verse: for whenever, in the prophets, any funereal lamentations occur or any passages formed upon that plan, the versification is, if I am not mistaken, of this protracted kind. . . . However, the same kind of metre is sometimes, though rarely, employed upon other occasions. . . . There are, moreover, some poems manifestly of the elegiac kind, which are composed in the usual metre, and not in unconnected stanzas, according to the form of a funeral dirge."<sup>1</sup>

The peculiarities of this elegiac versification are best summarised in the *Isaiah*, as follows: "The closing pause of each line is generally very full and strong: and in each line commonly, towards the end, at least beyond the middle of it, there is a small rest, or interval, depending on the sense and grammatical construction, which I would call a half-pause. . . . The conjunction ו . . . seems to be frequently and studiously omitted at the half-pause: the remaining clause being added, to use a grammatical term, by apposition to some word preceding; or coming in as an adjunct, or circumstance depending on the former part, and completing the sentence."<sup>2</sup>

The parallelism accompanying the versification of this kind is, according to Lowth, for the most part of the constructive order,<sup>3</sup> which is, as we have previously seen,

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures*, ii. pp. 136, 137.

<sup>2</sup> *Isaiah*, ed. 3, p. xxxix.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. xxxv.

Lowth's way of saying that strict parallelism is at best incomplete, and is more often entirely absent.

There is in the passages just cited or summarised a surprising amount of correct and acute observation or fruitful suggestion. Some subsequent scholars neglected this important part of Lowth's inquiries, and, in consequence, Ewald, for example, never clearly saw, as Lowth had seen, the sharp distinction between Lamentations i.-iv. and v.

For our present purpose it will suffice to refer much more briefly to Budde's important discussions. In the main his advance on Lowth consisted in the detailed working out of two important points: (1) the nature of the unequal division of the rhythmical periods; and (2) the extent to which the rhythm characteristic of Lamentations i.-iv. occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament. As to the division of the rhythmical periods, Budde's position may be stated thus:—(1) the *Kinah* rhythm rests on the division of the rhythmical period into two unequal parts of which the longer part precedes the shorter part; (2) the normal length of the longer part is three words, of the shorter two words: (3) but by legitimate variations a longer part consisting of four words may be followed by a shorter consisting of (a) three, or (b) two, words; (4) the period is never equally divided;<sup>1</sup> if, as sometimes happens, each part consists of two words, the two words of the first part are heavier and weightier than the two words of the second part: (5) between the two parts of the verse, there is no strict and constant rhythmical relation beyond the fundamental fact of inequality of length.

To some of these metrical questions I shall return: meantime I proceed to examine the parallelism of the poems, and I will begin with the isolated fifth chapter which happens to be an excellent storehouse of examples of the types of

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschr. für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1882, pp. 4 f.

parallelism occurring in poetry that is free from the well-marked peculiarities of Lamentations i.-iv. By comparison with the more ordinary parallelism of Lamentations v., any peculiarities in the parallelism of Lamentations i.-iv. may be the better discerned.

The majority of the twenty-two verses of Lamentations v. may be treated as containing six terms *equally* divided among the two stichoi that compose each verse, i.e. each stichos normally contains three terms. Seventeen of these distichs shew strict parallelism between at least one term in each stichos; of the remaining five distichs, one (v. 5) is too uncertain to classify, and two (vv. 8, 16) are best regarded as lacking strict parallelism. In the two verses or distichs that still remain (vv. 9 and 10) the stichoi are certainly not parallel to one another: but these two verses in their entirety seem to be (incompletely) parallel to one another: for, disregarding the first half of v. 10, which may be corrupt, we may represent the parallelism between the two verses thus:—

a . b . c . d . e . f  
 . . . d' . e' . f'

If this parallelism of the last parts of these verses was intentional, it is likely enough that such naturally parallel terms as עֲרִנְנִי, נַפְשִׁנִי, which occur in the first parts of the verses, were originally more really parallel than they now are.

Of the twenty-two distichs, then, contained in Lamentations v., seventeen at least show parallelism between the stichoi. In five, or, on one interpretation of v. 12, in six, of these the parallelism is complete:<sup>1</sup> in the remaining twelve (or eleven) incomplete. The several examples may be classified thus:—

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, July 1913, pp. 45 ff.

## I. EXAMPLES OF COMPLETE PARALLELISM.

Form.	Number of Occurrences.	Verses.
a . b . c]	3	4, 13, (17)
a'. b'. c'		
a . b . c	(1)	12 (on one interpretation)
b'. a'. c'		
a . b2	1	15
a'2 . b'		
a . b	1	22
a'2 . b'2		

## II. EXAMPLES OF INCOMPLETE PARALLELISM.

## (1) With compensation.

a . b . c	4	1, 11, 12 (on one interpretation), 20
a'2 . b'		
or similar types		
a . b . c	2	6 . 7
a' . d . e		

## (2) Without compensation.

a . b . c	4	2, 3, 14, 18
a' . b'		
or similar types		
a . b . c . d	1	19
a' . c'2		
a . b . c . d		
a'2 . e	1	21

The occurrence in this poem of incomplete parallelisms without compensation raises questions that must be considered later.

In turning now to consider Lamentations i.-iv. we are faced with a difficulty of terminology. Lamentations iii., as is well known, consists of sixty-six Massoretic verses distinguished from one another by the occurrence, at the beginning of each, of the letter of the alphabet appropriate to the alphabetic scheme, so that each of the first three verses begins with א, each of the next three with ב, and so forth. Chapters i. and ii., though they number each but

twenty-two Massoretic verses, contained<sup>1</sup> each of them sixty-six sections of the same length as the Massoretic verse in iii., and these sections are still easily distinguishable, though the letters of the alphabetic scheme occur at the beginning of every fourth section only. Chapter iv. consists of forty-four similar sections. What is the proper term to apply to these sections: are they lines or couplets, stichoi or distichs? Are they, as compared with the stichoi of chapter v., "protracted lines," as Lowth described them, or, as compared with the distichs of chapter v., truncated couplets or distichs, as Budde considers them? These questions can best be considered later: I will, for the time being, use the neutral term section, meaning by that a Massoretic verse in chapter iii. and the equivalent sections of the remaining chapters, i.e. the third of a Massoretic verse in i. and ii., and the half of such a verse in iv. Similarly, for the two parts of these sections, the longer first and the shorter second part, I will use the term subsection.

As the normal number of terms in a verse of chapter v. is six, so the normal number of terms in each section of chapters i. and iv. is five. It follows from this at once that in chapters i.-iv., the common form of complete parallelism

$$\begin{array}{c} a . b . c \\ a' . b' . c' \end{array}$$

will not readily<sup>2</sup> occur in a normal section, and, as a matter of fact, it does not, I think, occur at all in any section, whether

<sup>1</sup> In the present text, owing to what is generally recognised as textual expansion (in i. 17, ii. 19), the number of sections is sixty-seven both in chaps. i. and ii. The R.V. for the most part distinguishes the sections correctly, but occasionally so divides the verses (e.g. i. 1, ii. 2 and even iv. 22) as to give them the appearance of consisting of four sections.

<sup>2</sup> The force of this qualifying adverb will become clear later. As a matter of fact though  $\begin{array}{c} a . b . c \\ a' . b' . c' \end{array}$  does not occur, a corresponding type of incomplete parallelism with compensation does occur: see iv. 11.

normal or abnormal. This, however, is not equivalent to saying that complete parallelism between the subsections is either impossible or actually non-existent in these poems; on the other hand complete parallelism actually occurs, though relatively with much less frequency than in chapter v. An example is ii. 11.

כלו בדמעות עיני | המרמרו מעי

Consumed with tears are mine eyes, | in a ferment are my bowels.

The scheme is : a 2 . b | a' . b' ; and it is preferable to regard iii. 4

He hath worn out my flesh and my skin, | he hath broken my bones, as an example of a . b . 2 | a' . b' rather than of the scheme a . b . c | a' . b'.

Other examples of complete parallelism in chapters i.-iv. occurring in sections that are not perhaps strictly normal are

עליההרים דלקנו | במדבר ארבו לנו

Upon the mountains they chased us, | in the wilderness they lay in wait for us.

השביעני במרורים | הרוני לענה

He hath filled me with bitterness, | he hath sated me with wormwood.

These will be found in iv. 19 and iii. 15 ; they are both examples of a . b . | a' . b' ; another example occurs in iv. 13, and there are perhaps a few others : but in the 242 sections of chapters i.-iv. there are but few, if any, more examples of complete parallelism than in the twenty-two distichs of chapter v.

If, however, the section of chapters i.-iv. be a "protracted line," we might expect to find complete parallelism occurring as between the sections rather than as between the subsections. As a matter of fact, incomplete parallelism between the sections is not uncommon in chapters i.-iv. ; it is less common, indeed, than parallelism between the stichoi in chapter v. ; it is, on the other hand, much

commoner than parallelism between whole verses, of which we noted but one example, in chapter v. And yet *complete* parallelism between sections is exceedingly rare, and in fact, I think, does not once occur. Probably the nearest approach to complete parallelism between sections is where four of the five terms correspond, as in ii. 2a, b, where the scheme is

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

The Lord hath swallowed up unpityingly all the homesteads of Jacob,  
He hath thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Zion.

A much greater relative amount of those forms of what Lowth called synthetic or constructive parallelism, in which there is a complete absence of strict parallelism, is another feature of Lamentations i.-iv. which sharply distinguishes these poems (with one exception) from Lamentations v. Other differences exist as between one or more of these poems and chapter v.; and these will appear when we turn, as we must now, to a closer examination of the parallelism in chapters i.-iv., and of the differences in this respect to be discerned as between these chapters considered severally.

Budde quotes with approval a remark of De Wette's that in Lamentations "merely rhythmical parallelism," another term for Lowth's constructive or synthetic parallelism, is most prominent, and that parallelism of thought, when it occurs, occurs mostly as between the subsections, i.e. between the clauses or sentences which consist alternately (as a rule) of three and two terms, not between the sections, which consist, as a rule, of five terms; put otherwise, this amounts to the assertion that parallelism in these poems is chiefly of the type

a . b . c  
a' . b'

not of the type

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

Budde's only criticism of this is that De Wette considerably underrates the extent of this sub-parallelism. But neither De Wette nor Budde carried the analysis of this feature sufficiently far; had they done so they would have seen that a general statement such as they make cannot be rightly made with reference to all the poems indiscriminately. I hope to shew that the statement that "merely rhythmical parallelism" is most prominent is substantially true of chapters i. and iii. and very misleading in reference to chapter ii., and in a less degree in reference to chapter iv.; and also that the statement that parallelism, when it occurs, occurs mostly between the subsections is the very opposite of the truth with regard to chapter ii., though substantially correct with regard to chapter iv.

I will examine chapter iii. first. In a certain sense the whole of the first eighteen verses or sections might be said to consist of eighteen parallel statements of the fact that Yahweh is chastening the speaker; the first person singular pronoun appears in each separate verse, and gives a certain degree of parallelism to them all; and similarly throughout the poem large groups of sections express, mainly by a succession of figurative statements, the same thought: but beyond this general repetition of thought there is seldom any real parallelism of individual terms or even of groups of terms. Moreover, there is a feature of this poem that suggests that some even of the apparent examples of parallel sections are due more to accident than design; I refer to the fact that the clearest apparent examples of sectional parallelism occur between the last sec-

tion beginning with one letter of the alphabet and the first section beginning with the next letter;<sup>1</sup> thus, there are throughout the poem no sections more parallel to one another than, and few as much so as, the following (*vv.* 12, 13; 48, 49; 60, 61).

He hath bent his bow and set me as a target for his arrow;  
 He hath caused to enter into my kidneys the shafts of his quiver.  
 In streams of water my eye runs down for the destruction of my  
 people;  
 My eye hath poured down unceasingly, because there are no  
 respites.

Thou hast seen all the vengeance they took, all their devices against  
 me;  
 Thou hast heard all their reproaches (of me), O Yahweh, all their  
 devices against me.

The first of these couplets consists of the last line beginning with  $\aleph$  and the first with  $\beth$ , the second of the last line with  $\gimel$  and the first with  $\daleth$ , the third of the last with  $\aleph$ , and the first with  $\psi$ .

There are not more than about a dozen<sup>2</sup> couplets of contiguous sections that are as parallel to one another as the foregoing, or indeed that are strictly parallel to one another at all.

In about one-third of the entire number of sections parallelism more or less clear and conspicuous between subsections<sup>3</sup> occurs; examples are *vv.* 10 (a . b . c 2 | a' . b') and 14 (a . b . c | b' d):—

<sup>1</sup> The significance of [this does not seem to me to be affected by the fact that in *Pss.* cxi, cxii. the alphabetic scheme distinguishes each stichos, not each [distich, by successive letters of the alphabet, and therefore regularly and necessarily gives to parallel stichoi different initial letters.

<sup>2</sup> The sections that may most reasonably be regarded as more parallel (though whether or always by the intention of the writer is doubtful) to one another than is almost any section of the poem to any other are: 12, 13; 19 (pointing  $\aleph \beth$ ), 20; 28, 29, 30 (?); 34, 35, 36 (?); 40, 41; 48, 49; 60, 61; 64, 65. The italicised numbers are cited above.

<sup>3</sup> The clearest examples of subsectional parallelism occur in the following fifteen verses: 4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 33, 47, 58, 60, 61.

As a bear lying in wait is he unto me, | a lion in secret places.  
I am become a derision to all peoples, | their song all the day.

Clearly, then, since subsectional parallelism occurs in considerably less than half, and probably in not more than a third, of the sixty-six sections of the poem, and sectional parallelism, which might have occurred thirty-three times, actually occurs scarcely a dozen times at most, "merely rhythmical parallelism" is more conspicuous here than real parallelism of thought and terms; whether subsectional is much or any more relatively frequent than sectional parallelism depends on the view taken as to the real parallelism of the couples specified above and as to the character of the more doubtful examples of subsectional parallelism given in the footnote.

Chapter ii. differs greatly from chapter iii. The repetition in chapter iii. of the initial letter before each of the three sections belonging to it corresponds to a real independence, as a general rule,<sup>1</sup> of the sections in that poem. On the other hand, the three sections which belong to each letter of the alphabet in chapter ii., but of which the first section only is distinguished by beginning with that letter, are closely connected with one another; and this connexion is formally marked by the frequency with which *the entire sections* within the several alphabetic divisions *are parallel to one another*. The exact number of these sectional parallelisms depends on interpretation, and in some cases on textual questions: but I believe it may be safely asserted that in a large majority at least of the twenty-two alphabetic divisions two at least of the three sections are parallel to one another, and in several all three sections are so. I

The text of some even of these (e.g., 22, 23, 33) is open to question: but probably parallelism existed in the original text. Eleven more doubtful examples may be found in vv. 5, 7, 11, 16, 19, 30, 39, 48, 53, 56, 65.

<sup>1</sup> Vv. 34-36 form an exception.

should myself put the number of parallelisms between two, if not all three, sections as high as eighteen, if not higher.<sup>1</sup>

Over against this frequency of sectional parallelism we have to set the relative infrequency of subsectional parallelism: this latter kind of parallelism which might have occurred sixty-six times actually occurs only a dozen<sup>2</sup> times, more or less, according to the view taken of two or three doubtful cases.

Thus it is not true of chapter ii. that "merely rhythmical parallelism" is more frequent than real parallelism of thought and term, nor is it true that parallelism occurs mainly between the subsections; quite the reverse: we must, to be accurate, put the case thus: In chapter ii. real (though incomplete) parallelism is very frequent; the *fundamental* parallelism is between the sections; but this is *occasionally* reinforced by an additional and *secondary* parallelism between the subsections, much in the same way that the fundamental rhymes at the close of the lines of a quatrain are in some English poems occasionally reinforced by an additional rhyme in the middle of one or more lines, as often in Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" e.g.—

The sun came up upon the left,  
Out of the sea came he;  
And he shone bright, and on the right  
Went down into the sea.

The fact is, parallelism in Lamentations ii. is singularly intricate and skilfully varied. It is rarely complete either as between sections or subsections, but it is generally clear enough and sufficient to constitute a real formal connexion between the three sections of the several alphabetic divi-

<sup>1</sup> Absence of parallelism or a near approach to it will be found in *vv.* 4, 17, 18, 22, but even this may be partly due to textual corruption. In most of the remaining verses parallelism is obvious, in all it was probably intended.

<sup>2</sup> See *vv.* 4a (?), 5b, 6a (?), 7a, 9a (read וְשֶׁנֶרֶךְ for וְשֶׁנֶרֶךְ), 10b, 11a, (not 13a: A. V.), 15c (present text), 17ac, 18c, 20b, 21c.

sions, or at least between two of them, the remaining section being sometimes not parallel, as is frequently one stichos of a tristich in other poems. Since the nature of the parallelism in chapter ii., and consequently an important formal difference between chapters ii. and iv., have hitherto not been clearly observed, I give a few verses of this poem in translation with notes on the parallelism:—

1 How hath the Lord beclouded<sup>1</sup> in his anger | the daughter of  
Sion!  
He hath cast down from heaven to earth | the ornament of  
Israel;  
And he hath not remembered his footstool | in the day of his  
anger.

Here all three sections are parallel: observe *the daughter of Sion* (d 2) || *the ornament of Israel* (d' 2) || *his footstool* (d" 2), and *beclouded* (a) || *cast down from heaven to earth* (a' 3) || *hath not remembered* (a"). Moreover, the unity of the entire alphabetic division is emphasised by the additional parallelism *in his anger* (b) || *in the day of his anger* (b' 2) in the first and last sections; a similar effect is obtained in v. 13 which opens with *לְאִמֹתָם*, *to their mothers*, and closes with *אִמֹתָם*, *their mothers*. Variety is obtained not only by varying the number of terms by means of which corresponding ideas are expressed, but also very effectively by bringing the object of the verb much nearer to the beginning in the third section than in the two that precede: a somewhat similar effect is obtained in v. 8 (cp. also i. 1).

There is no subsectional parallelism in any of these three sections.

2 The Lord hath destroyed unsparingly | all the homesteads of  
Jacob;  
He hath pulled down in his wrath | the strongholds of Judah;  
He hath brought to the ground, hath profaned | the realm and  
its princes.

<sup>1</sup> *Hath . . . beclouded*: read הִיטִיב for הִיטִיב, *beclouds*.

Here, again, all three sections are parallel, but in none is there parallelism between the subsections. This time all the object-clauses stand at the end of their respective sections and, as in v. 1, the parallel verbs or verbal clauses *לל* *בלע*, *הרס*, *הניע* *לארץ חלל* at the beginning. The additional parallelism of terms is not as in verse 1 between the first and third, but between the first and second sections (*unsparingly* || *in his wrath*), unless, indeed, with Löhr, we emend by transposing the clauses *He hath brought to the ground* and *in his wrath*; then, as before, the fuller parallelism will be between the first and third sections.

10 They sat on the ground dumb— | the elders of Sion ;  
 Lifted up dust on their head, | were girded with sackcloth ;  
 They lowered to the ground their head— | the virgins of Jerusalem.

Here in the second section we find subsectional parallelism ; each clause in it mentions one sign of mourning and grief ; parallel to each of the *ע* clauses and to one another are the first clauses of the first and third sections, but these sections contain no subsectional parallelism : on the other hand, the second parts of the first and third sections are very strictly parallel to one another (*בתולות ירושלם* || *זקני*) (*בת ציון*). But there is still further and in part rather subtle verbal parallelism between the *sections* : note *לארץ* in the first and third sections : *ראשם* and *ראשן* in the second and third respectively ; and the antithesis *הורידו* and *העלו* which is emphasised by the parallelism in a way which it is impossible to represent adequately in translation : what they lift up is dust, what they cast down is their heads ! Very clearly, then, *sectional* parallelism is again primary ; but here it is reinforced by subsectional parallelism in *one* of the three sections.

A correct appreciation of the main and secondary parallelism in this poem may set some questions of textual interpretation in a new light. Verse 3 reads—

He hewed off in fierce anger | all the horn of Israel ;  
 He turned backward his right hand | from the face of the foe ;  
 And he kindled in Jacob a flaming fire | which devoured round about.

Whose is the right hand here referred to, Israel's or Yahweh's ? It is commonly taken to be Yahweh's, and there is certainly much to be said for this view. But the parallelism of the sections, which certainly exists in any case, would become still clearer and more complete if the right hand be Israel's. Then, for the use of the pronoun only in the middle section corresponding to the two parallel proper names for the nation in the first and third sections, there are two exact parallels in this poem : see *vs.* 5 and 10.

In both 4a and 15c it is generally admitted that a word or more has intruded. But which word or words should we omit ? If subsectional parallelism was primary and frequent as in Lamentations iv. and Isaiah xiv., parallelism would furnish a strong argument for those who retain כַּצַּר, *as a foe* (parallel to *as an enemy*), in verse 4, and both the clauses *perfection of beauty* and *joy of the whole earth* in verse 15. But, since subsectional parallelism is merely secondary and not very frequent in this poem, such an argument has little if any weight : and it may certainly be doubted whether it is nearly strong enough to justify those who omit שִׂאֲמָרוּ, with the characteristic  $\psi$ , in verse 15, in order to retain both the parallel clauses at the end of the verse without at the same time keeping a section so long as the existing text presents.

Verse 8 is also interesting. Had subsectional parallelism been primary, the author would naturally have written—

Rampart and wall lament ; | together they languish ;

but to gain a closer parallelism with the two preceding *sections* he avoided what would have been a more perfect subsectional parallelism and wrote instead—

Rampart and wall he caused to lament ; together they languish.

By many who refrain from postulating unity of author-

ship for the book of Lamentations, chapters ii. and iv. at least are attributed to the same writer. Be this as it may, there is an appreciable difference, though it has hitherto been overlooked, in the use of parallelism in the two poems, just as there is a difference in the length of the alphabetic divisions. In chapter ii. sectional parallelism is fundamental and frequent, subsectional parallelism secondary and relatively rare: in chapter iv. subsectional parallelism is relatively more frequent, perhaps even considerably more frequent than sectional parallelism, though neither type is quite so unmistakeably primary or quite so persistent as the sectional parallelism in chapter ii. Subsectional parallelism occurs in nearly, if not quite, or even more than, a half<sup>1</sup> of the sections in chapter iv. as compared with a bare fifth in chapter ii.; on the other hand, less than half, perhaps scarcely a third, of the sections are parallel to one another,<sup>2</sup> and there is little or nothing of that subtle linking of the sections which occurs in chapter ii.

<sup>1</sup> The sections in Lamentations iv. number 44, of which two (v. 13) are through corruption very uncertain. Subsectional parallelism is clearest in these 16 sections—1a (see below), 2a,b, 3a,b, 7a,b, 8a,b, 11a,b, 12a, 13a, 16b, 18b, 19b, 21a. To these should be added the two similarly constructed sections, 6a, 9a, perhaps also 5ab (antithetical parallels), 6b, 14a, 15a, 21b, 22a,b. Subsectional parallelism is at all events sufficiently frequent to raise the question whether the text of verse 1 is correct; subsectional parallelism would indeed be perfect even in the present text if we ventured to divide the section equally (cp. R. V.): but rhythm, as we shall see later, forbids this, and if the text is sound Dr. Smith (*Jerusalem*, ii. 279) rightly arranges as follows:

How bedimmed is the gold, how changed

The best of the gold.

I suspect, however, that either (1)  $\text{יִשְׁנָא}$  is a gloss (Aramaic?) on  $\text{עָלַי}$ , or (2) that  $\text{הַיָּצִיב}$  should be omitted, leaving  $\text{כֶּהֱנֵה}$  parallel to  $\text{הָיָה}$  as in Job xxxi. 24. Then we have either

How bedimmed is the gold,

Even the best fine gold,

or

How bedimmed is the gold,

Changed the fine gold.

<sup>2</sup> The most conspicuous sectional parallelisms will be found in vv. 4, 5, 8, 17, 22: see also vv. 1, 7, 19, but in these latter verses, as also in the anti-

In Lamentations i., in spite of the sustained and well varied parallelism of the first three sections, strict parallelism is decidedly less frequent than in either chapter ii. or chapter iv., or even than in chapter iii. Subsectional parallelism is perhaps rather more frequent<sup>1</sup> than in chapter ii., where it is infrequent and secondary: but sectional parallelism is very decidedly *less* frequent<sup>2</sup> than in chapter ii.: the result is that it is difficult to select either type of parallelism as primary; and the more important fact is that the form of the greater part of this poem is independent of strict parallelism.

It is not surprising that the Book of Lamentations has driven even unwilling scholars to the consideration or reconsideration of the question of metre or rhythm in Hebrew poetry. Budde, who, like many others, had in 1874, after an examination of existing theories in regard to Hebrew metre, rejected them all and expressed the most thorough-going scepticism with regard to any new theories that might arise, found himself eight years later, after a study of Lamentations, venturing, to quote his own phrase, "on the dangerous slippery ice"; and it has generally been admitted that he skated with considerable skill over the corner of the ice to which he confined himself.

The challenge lies here: there is a common and well-marked peculiarity in the 242 sections that make up the first four chapters of Lamentations; it is a rhythmical peculiarity, and yet a rhythmical peculiarity that cannot be explained by the parallelism. In putting it thus, I recog-

theoretical sections of vv. 3 and 4, the sectional parallelism is much less conspicuous than the synonymous subsectional parallelism in one or, in most of the verses, in both sections.

<sup>1</sup> See vv. 1 (three antithetical parallels), 2a, c, 3a, b, 4b, c 5a, 7c, d, 13c, 16a, b, 18b, 20a, c, 22a; possibly also vv. 8a (omit כִּי־וָיָדָעְתִּי), b (omit וְיָדָעְתִּי), c, 10b, 13a.

<sup>2</sup> See vv. 1, 10 a, b, 11 a, b, 12 b, c, 15, 20 a, b: perhaps also 2 b, c, 4 a, b, 5 a, c, 8.

nise, as I think we well may, that parallelism might create rhythm, and may even, as a matter of fact, in the remote past have created the dominant Semitic and Hebrew type of rhythm in particular: a habit of expressing a thought in a given number of terms, and then repeating it by a corresponding term would necessarily produce a certain rhythmical effect: thus, for example, the habit of expressing thought in the mould symbolised by

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

would produce a *rhythm* which may be expressed by 3 : 3 ; and thought expressed in a mould symbolised by

a . b . c  
a' . b'

would produce a rhythm that may be expressed by 3 : 2.

But as soon as parallelism becomes incomplete, and still more when it becomes merely synthetic, i.e., strictly speaking, disappears, and yet the lines retain the same number of words or terms, obviously the rhythmical relation between the lines is no longer, even if it was originally, merely secondary: thus rhythm is no longer a mere result of parallelism, but an independent desire for rhythm is at least a contributory cause if with

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

such schemes as

a . b . c  
a'2 . c'  
or  
a . b . c  
a' . d . e  
or  
a . b . c  
d . e . f

constantly alternate, but schemes such as

a . b . c  
 a'2 . b' . c'  
 or  
 a . b . c  
 a' . b' . c' . d

rarely or never ; or, again, if with schemes such as

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

there alternate schemes such as

a . b . c . d . e  
 a' . b'2 . d' . e' .

but not such as

a . b . c . d . e  
 a' . b'2 . c' . d' . e'

or with schemes

a . b . c  
 a' . b'

schemes such as

a . b . c  
 a' 2  
 or  
 a . b . c  
 a' . d

but not such as

a . b . c  
 a'2 . b'

Now, if my analysis is even approximately correct, what, stated in general terms, are the facts of the Book of Lamentations, and the questions, which, once the facts are analysed and classified, almost necessarily arise? Lamentations iii. contains sixty-six sections unmistakably marked off from one another by the alphabetic scheme: there is no *complete* parallelism between any two successive sections: there is *incomplete* parallelism between perhaps fifteen groups of two sections: there is none at all between the

rest. Why are these sections nevertheless of equal length, or at least even in the present text so closely approximated to equality of length? Again, these sections fall into subsections: in some twenty sections the two subsections are parallel to one another, though often only incompletely parallel; why alike in these twenty sections and in the remaining forty odd sections in which there is no parallelism between the subsections does the longer subsection precede the shorter: why is the ratio between the two subsections so constant?

Again, why are the twenty-two alphabetic divisions of Lamentations ii. each divided into three equal divisions marked off from one another by a strongly marked division of sense, each section again into subsections by a less strong but still clearly marked pause? Why do the sections so constantly consist of five terms, the subsections of three terms and two terms respectively, the shorter regularly following the longer? Why all this, though, while many of the sections are parallel to one another, *complete* parallelism between sections scarcely, if ever, occurs, and though in only about a dozen out of the sixty-six sections does even incomplete parallelism occur between the subsections?

The answer to all these questions and the similar questions which Lamentations i. (with a difference) and Lamentations iv. provoke has been increasingly found by admitting the play of a rhythmical principle; and what is called the *Kinah* rhythm has accordingly gained recognition amongst many who still remain sceptical of other Hebrew rhythms.

What, then, is really meant by the *Kinah* rhythm? A certain ambiguity seems to lurk in the usage of the term. Does it mean five terms forming a complete sentence with a well-marked pause after the third? or a *succession* of such sentences? If the first sentence of Genesis—בראשית ברא—occurred in any of the first

four chapters of Lamentations, every one would accept it as a rhythmically normal line. Is, then, the first sentence in Genesis an example of *Kinah* rhythm occurring sporadically in prose, as hexameters occur sporadically in the Authorised Version? Scarcely, for it is probable that those who define *Kinah* rhythm as verse unequally divided by a pause, and normally in the ratio 3:2, tacitly mean by *Kinah* rhythm a *succession* of such verses. And certainly it was the frequent repetition of such verses in Lamentations i.-iv. that first drew attention to the peculiarity of their style or rhythm.

Five words with a pause after the third is, even in Hebrew prose, too frequently occurring and too easily arising a phenomenon to possess by itself anything distinctive. An hexameter is a noteworthy phenomenon wherever it occurs; five words with a pause after the third are not; on the other hand, a dozen or twenty repetitions of five words with a pause after the third do constitute something as noteworthy as an hexameter.

Not the sporadic occurrence, but the regular recurrence of a particular type of word-combination is apart from, or in addition to, any parallelism that may accompany it, the peculiarity of Lamentations i.-iv. And yet, as soon as we frame the conclusion thus, it is necessary, if all the facts, especially of chapter i., are to be recognised, to add that the particular type of word-combination in question falls into two sub-types; and as soon as we define the sub-types as consisting respectively of combinations of five words with a pause occurring after the third, and combinations of four words equally divided by a pause, we may at first appear to destroy the whole theory of a *Kinah* rhythm which we were attempting to formulate. The actual fact is not quite so serious as this, for while the normal section of five accented words, unequally divided, may contract to

four words equally divided, it probably does not expand to six words equally divided.

However, whether the facts seriously weaken the theory or not, the main question at present is this: is Budde correct in denying that the sections in Lamentations were ever (in the original text) equally divided? And is his attempt to maintain the appearance of inequality by calling two words "heavy" as against two others that are to be called "light," any better than the attempt to cover up the absence of parallelism between two lines by speaking of them as synthetic parallels?

To this question we shall return. Meantime, I will only say that the theory of light and heavy groups of words seems to me to suffer shipwreck on the very first verse of the book: for it is very difficult to believe that if רבתי בנוים at the end of the second section is light, שרתי במדינות at the beginning of the third is heavy. The truth is rather that Lamentations i. 1b,c are both lines of four words equally divided: and Sievers is probably not far wrong in finding a full half of the entire number of lines in Lamentations i. to be of the same nature.<sup>1</sup> In any case, Lamentations i. is of crucial importance in the study of the *Kinah* rhythm: any one who has sufficient ingenuity to discover an unequal division in all its sections need have little fear of being able to do the same for the three succeeding chapters or any other passages where the occurrence of some unequally

<sup>1</sup> The sections treated by Sievers as containing four accented words and as being equally divided by the *cæsura* are, b,c, 2b, 4c, 5b,c, 6a,c, 7a (to ויכריתיה) e, 8b,c, 9b, 10a,b, 11a, 12c, 13a,b,c, 14b,c, 15a,b, 17c, 18b,c, 19a,b,c, 22b,c; marked as less certain sections of the same kind are 2c, 3b,c, 4b, 15c. Sections of this kind are far less frequent in the remaining poems; those treated as such by Sievers are: ii. (12a,b) c, 14a,b,c. (19d); iii. 8, 10, 13, 15, 23, 24, 50 (58, 59, 60); iv. 3b, 5a,b, 6a, 13a,b (14a), (15a,b), 18a(b), 20(a)b, 21(a)b. Uncertain examples are enclosed in brackets.

divided lines suggests to him the "*Kinah*" rhythm. If, on the other hand, the occurrence in the present text of Lamentations i. of equally divided lines of four terms is too frequent to admit of doubt that *some* such lines occurred in the original text, then we may suspect that the same variations also occurred or may have occurred in other *Kinah* poems.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

## THE AIM AND SCOPE OF PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

### I. THE SERVICES OF PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY.

THIS short series of articles is to deal with the aim and scope of philosophy of religion. The precise definition of this department of theological study shall be attempted later: in the present article, which may be regarded as in part introductory, I propose to describe some of the indispensable services which philosophy is capable of rendering to dogmatic theology, and to touch upon some of the general relations which necessarily subsist between these two departments of knowledge.

Any attempt, however unsystematic, to relate religious beliefs with a philosophic or scientific conception of the world might be called a philosophy of religion, or at least an endeavour in philosophy of religion—in the broadest sense of that phrase. And in this sense, which shall be adopted in the present article, philosophy of religion may be said to be as old as reflective thought. For from the earliest times philosophy has possessed a theological side. From the dawn of Greek science and metaphysic, philosophy has produced a very large amount of speculation concerning the existence and nature of God, His relation to the world