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, אָפָפוּ? 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 (παρασεύω τοις προφήταις) followed by a clause ending with (ἐλαλησαν ἣμιν ἐν υἱό, i.e. twice ὁ — ὁ — ὁ —, the omission of the definite article before υἱό 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

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 στίχου. 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 στίχου 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 genius. Out of upwards of eighty cases noted of pairs (triplets) of στίχου 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  . . . (κατάχρησ)του δαματίας } - - - -
      . . . φεύγεται δόλον
i 5  . . . (λογισμῶν ἀπονέτων
      . . . (τειλθ)ούσης ἀδικίας
i 6  . . . γὰρ πνεῦμα σοφία
i 8  . . . (αὐτῶν ἐλέγχου] ἡ δίκη
      . . . (αὐτῶν ἐλέγχου] ἡ δίκη
i 14 . . . (φάρμακον ἐλεόθεν
      . . . (βασιλόν [so Λ] ἐπὶ γῆς
i 16 . . . ἱερεὶς.
      . . . (θεν] πρὸς αὐτῶν
      . . . (με)ρίδος ἐλείαι
```

Also in i 15, 16, if we read προσεκλάσατο with Ν, substituting ἀνεβῆς for ἀνεβῆς for the sake of the sense, we get

```
(δικαιοσύνη γάρ ἀθάνατος ἐστιν
 . . . λόγος προσεκλάσατο αὐτῶν
```

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:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xvii 16} & \quad \ldots (ξ) \text{kei} \text{ katastata} & \quad \{ \ldots \text{eir} \xi \text{yv kataklymasteis} \} \\
\text{17} & \quad \ldots \text{hyn tis } \text{h} \text{ pomh} & \quad \{ \ldots \text{ergasthis moukboth} \} \\
\text{17, 18} & \quad \ldots (\gamma) \text{menen anagkyn} & \quad \{ \ldots \text{pavtes edeis} \}
\end{align*}
\]

with which we should perhaps join the next stichos:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xvii 18, 19} & \quad \ldots (\eta) \text{chos eimelis} & \quad \{ (\ldots ) \ldots \} \\
\text{19} & \quad \ldots (\alpha) \text{thorhtos} & \quad \{ \ldots \} \\
\text{20} & \quad \ldots (\kappa) \text{paristomenev petrow} & \quad \{ \ldots \} \\
\text{xviii 1} & \quad \ldots (\alpha) \text{ois sou megistov hyn fow} & \quad \{ \ldots \} \\
\text{and 21}^{b} \quad \ldots \text{morfhyn de ouchi dorrwtes}
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover xvii 21<sup>a</sup> and 21<sup>b</sup> balance each other:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots (epetastato) \text{ barea vix} & \quad \{ \ldots \} \\
\ldots \text{baveraterei skotos}
\end{align*}
\]

and 21<sup>b</sup> (ekwv tou melloyntos aitovs diadexsiama skotoues) may be a Christian interpolation. In any case the three stichoi in verse 21 end with an iambic, and all the stichoi in the page (from xvii 16 to xviii 4) with the exception of the two last<sup>1</sup> fall into couplets or triplets having at least the two final syllables of their component stichoi 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:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{viii 3} & \quad \ldots (do)\text{zalei sumblywov thov exousa} \quad \{ \ldots \} \\
& \quad \ldots \text{pantovn deiposth } \text{gymptesen aityn} \quad \{ \ldots \}
\end{align*}
\]

<sup>1</sup> Here the loss is compensated by the assimilation of the ending of verse 3 (meta)ias paragyches with the opening of the two following stichoi: δειτο μεν., ol kataklyias(του) . . (—, —, —).
With nine syllables we have:—

ix 16 ... (μο)λις εἰκάζομεν τα ἑτ' ἐπὶ γῆς
... (χερ)σιν εἰρήκομεν μετὰ πόνου

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

... κρατοῦντι βουλόμενος ἄρεσαι
... ὀμοίωτη' ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλ(λ)ον

In some cases it looks as if alternate στίχοι had been made to correspond: see iv 19 (α'φόνοις προσῆς—(αντ)ρυς ἐκ θεμελίων—(χερ)σωσθονται—(ξ)ουνται ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ and xviii 17 f. μὲν ὀπίσων—(εξετά-) μακαρίως ἀντιότης—ἀδόκητος—ἡμιθρησκος.

The most frequent ending for couplets is that of a hexameter (−)−−−−. Next comes (≈)−−−−, and almost as frequent is the termination with −−−−−, which also, it may be noted, is found seven times in the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Blass, Gramm. § 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-αχθώσιν ἀβλαβεῖς, with 7 ἄτη παρεμβολήν ... 7a and 7b, 10b and 10a, 11a and 11b, 17d and 18a.

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

xiv 7 Καὶ γὰρ κεραμεὺς ἀπαλὴν γῆν θλῆς βους ἐπίμοχθον
πλάστη ρόα ὑπηρεσίαν ἡμῶν ἐν ἑκατόν,

i.e. −−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−

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 τα: cp.

xviii 11 ... δυπα διεύθυν ἐκκλαθής
... βασιλῆς τα ἀντα πᾶσαν

12 ὁρθομαθὼν δι' ἄντες ... (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 βασιλέων which A adopts in i 14 is probably to be preferred to βασίλεως of B N. Similarly in iii 11 the spelling of B N ἀνώνυμου (for ἀνώνυμος) is explained on metrical grounds:

... έςουθενόν ταλαίπωρος {---ο---ο---ο---ο---}
... καὶ οἱ κόποι ἀνώνυμου

In vii 3 κατέπεσον of B A is to be preferred to κατέπεσα of Ν:

... (ὁμοιότατα)θῆ κατέπεσον γῆν {---ο---ο---ο---ο---}
... πᾶσιν ἵσα κλαῖων

The first aorist formation in -α is especially common in the LXX in the case of the verb πέπτω; 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 ἀστρων of B N (cp. v. 19):

... (ἀδρην εὑρεστερή ἡλίου {---ο---ο---ο---ο---ο---}
... (δ)πέρ πᾶσαν ἀστέρων θέσιν

In x 13 the scansion of the second line shows that the imperfect ἑγκατέλειπεν of A is the right reading in the first line. Metre, as well as sense, shows in xii 20 that δικαίως of Ν is to be preferred to δικαίως of B (a triplet ending with anapaests). In xv 7 quoted above ἦν should be inserted with Ν A C. In xviii 16 the perfect βεβηκε should probably be read for βεβηκει:

... (ἐπλήρωσε τὰ πάντα θανάτου {---ο---ο---ο---ο---ο---}
... (δ)πέτερο, βεβηκε 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 shows 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 δόξαρος 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 εὐαγγελίων ὅσκ Ἰστιν ἐμὸν δούναι, ἀλλ' ὁς ἐγὼ αὐτὸ τῷ πατρὸς μου.

The parallel passage in the Second Gospel runs—

τὸ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μον ἢ ἐξ εὐαγγελίων ὅσκ Ἰστιν ἐμὸν δούναι, ἀλλ' ὁς ἐγὼ αὐτὸ τῷ πατρὸς μου.

Vv. 11. are not important. In the former passage CDΔ &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