

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

AN ANALYSIS OF FOUR CURRENT THEORIES OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE

Donn Walter Leatherman
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

September 1998

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

•
Donn W. Leatherman
1998



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-50205-8

Canada

ABSTRACT

This dissertation tests and evaluates four current theories of the verse structure of biblical Hebrew poetry. These theories are: the counting of minimal units, such as poetic feet, stresses or syllables, practiced in various forms since antiquity, and recently employed by D. N. Freedman, F. M. Cross and others, the analysis of poetic line-forms proposed by Terence Collins, the syntactic structural analysis proposed by M. O'Connor, and the semantic analysis practiced by Willem van der Meer, Johannes de Moor and a group of scholars associated with the Kampen School of Theology. All of these theories purport to identify and explain the fundamentals of biblical Hebrew verse structure. Each of these theories is presented comprehensively. These presentations include a review of literature relevant to the field of Hebrew verse structure studies in general, and to these four current theories of verse structure in particular.

These four theories are applied to four poetic passages from the Hebrew Bible: Judges 5:2-31, Isaiah 5:1-7, Lamentations 1 and Psalm 126. These applications show how each of these theories describes the verse structure of each of the poems. Following this, the theories and their applications to these passages are compared to determine which, if any, of these theories are effective in distinguishing poetry from prose, distinguishing one poem from another, predicting the form of a poem, and prescribing rules for the composition of poetry. The strengths and weaknesses of each theory are identified. In addition, the reasons for the failure of these theories to provide an adequate description of the verse structure of biblical Hebrew poetry are indicated.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette thèse a pour but l'évaluation de quatre théories contemporaines sur la structure de la poésie hébraïque de la Bible. Ces quatre théories sont: l'énumération des unités minimales, tel que des pieds poétiques, des syllabes toniques, ou des syllabes, technique connue depuis l'antiquité et employée plus récemment par D. N. Freedman, F. M. Cross et d'autres; l'analyse des formes syntaxiques proposée par Terence Collins; l'analyse de la structure syntaxique proposée par M. O'Connor; et l'analyse sémantique utilisée par Willem van der Meer, Johannes de Moor et d'autres savants associés avec l'École Kampen aux Pays-Bas. Toutes ces théories tentent l'identification et l'explication des principes fondamentaux de la structure de la poésie hébraïque de la Bible. Chacune de ces théories est présentée dans sa totalité, avec une critique des études académiques au sujet de la poésie biblique en général et de ces quatre théories en particulier.

Cette thèse fait ensuite l'application de ces quatre théories à quatre poèmes bibliques: Juges 5:2-31, Ésaïe 5:1-7, Lamentations 1 et Psaume 126. Ces expériences présentent quatre descriptions différentes de la structure de ces quatre poèmes. Ensuite, cette thèse fait une comparaison entre les quatre théories en vue de savoir laquelle est la plus efficace pour faire la distinction entre la poésie et la prose, pour faire la distinction parmi des poèmes différents, pour prévoir la forme d'un poème, et pour indiquer des règles poétiques selon lesquelles les poèmes bibliques pouvaient être écrits. Les succès ainsi que les faiblesses de ces quatre théories sont indiqués. Finalement, cette thèse présente les raisons pour lesquelles ces quatre théories n'arrivent pas à une description complète de la structure de la poésie hébraïque de la Bible.

PREFACE

The present dissertation presents to the reader an analysis of four of the more common current theories of the verse structure of biblical Hebrew poetry. These theories are varied, coming from different sources, having been developed at different times, and addressing different facets of poetry and poetic language. Nevertheless, each of them purports to identify and describe the fundamental elements of the verse structure of Hebrew poetry, that is, those elements which determine the form of the poem. These theories have been applied to the texts of the Hebrew Bible by their originators and by others, sometimes cautiously and academically, sometimes quite uncritically.

What has been lacking historically is systematic testing and evaluation of these theories. This testing should have two goals: first, to determine whether any of these theories provides a fair and accurate description of the structure of biblical Hebrew poetry, and second (if it be the case that these theories do not fairly and accurately describe biblical Hebrew verse structure), to show wherein these theories fall short of such a description, and why. It is precisely such testing, evaluation and analysis which the present dissertation offers to the reader.

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance provided by his supervisor, Dr. Robert Charles Culley, without whose advice and encouragement this project would never have been possible. Other persons whose encouragement and support have enabled the completion of this dissertation include my colleagues in the School of Religion, Southern Adventist University and, of course, my wife Annette. In addition, the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE	1
The History of the Discussion	1
The Poles of the Debate	2
Traditional Metrics	3
Poetry and Semantics	4
Poetry and Syntax	6
OBSTACLES TO A THEORY OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE	7
Theories of Insufficient Extent	8
Terminological Difficulties	8
Description and Regulation: The Question of Intention	9
The Lack of Empirical Testing	11
THE PROJECT OF THE PRESENT STUDY	11
 CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	 13
CONSIDERATION OF RECENT THEORIES OF HEBREW POETICS	13
Minimal Unit Counting	13
Collins: Syntax and Line Forms	14
O'Connor: Syntax and Constriction	15
van der Meer and de Moor: Semantics and Structure	16
ANALYSIS OF THE TRIAL PASSAGES	16
The Trial Passages	16
Presentation of Results	19
 CHAPTER THREE: THE COUNTING OF MINIMAL UNITS FROM PHILO TO FREEDMAN	 20
ANCIENT SYSTEMS OF METRICAL SCANSION	20
Ancient Jewish Writers	20
Ancient Christian Writers	22
MEDIAEVAL VIEWS	24
MODERN THEORIES OF HEBREW METRICS	25
Early Modern Writers	25
Nineteenth Century Metricists	26
Johann Bellermand	27
Heinrich Ewald	29
Ernst Meier	29
Julius Ley	31
Gustav Bickell	35
Karl Budde	37
Hubert Grimme	39
Eduard Sievers	41
Twentieth Century Minimal Unit Theorists	43
William Henry Cobb	43
George Buchanan Gray	45
Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman	47
FURTHER STUDY	50
Questions Regarding Minimal Unit Counting	50
Limitations of the Present Study	52

CHAPTER FOUR: TERENCE COLLINS: LINE-FORM ANALYSIS	53
THE SYNTACTIC ALTERNATIVE	53
The Inadequacy of Other Approaches	54
Reasons for a Syntactic Approach	55
The Functions of Syntax	56
THE ANALYSIS OF SYNTAX	57
The Role of Generative Linguistics	57
Two Projects	58
Generative Rules	59
Phrase Structure Rules	59
Transformational Rules	59
The Relation of Rules and Line-Forms	61
Constituents and Sigla	62
Constituents	62
Basic Sentences	62
General Line-Types	63
Presentation of Line-Forms	64
THE POSITIVE RESULTS OF COLLINS' STUDY	65
Regularities of Line-Form Use	65
Semantic Sets	65
An Example of a Semantic Set	66
Five Semantic Sets	67
The Prophetic Function of Semantic Sets	68
INADEQUACIES OF COLLINS' SYSTEM	69
Technical Difficulties	69
Transliteration	69
Sentence or Clause?	70
The Treatment of Extensive Passages	70
The Analysis of Direct Speech	71
Failure to Cover All Possible Cases	72
The Limited Corpus of Examples	73
The Distinction of Poetry and Prose	74
Taxonomic Inconsistencies	74
One Form with Several Sigla	74
One Siglum, Several Forms	75
Sigla for Non-Occurring Forms	77
Forms without Sigla	77
Inconsistency in the Assignment of Sigla	78
Taxonomic Decisions Not Based on Syntax	78
Doubtful Colometric Analysis	79
Confusion of Line-Types	80
Doubtful Stylistic Conclusions	81
Is Rarity Stylistically Significant?	81
Does Frequency Establish Norms?	82
Major Weaknesses	86
Has Collins Completed His Project?	86
Failure to Account for Multi-Verbal Lines	88
Limited Applicability of Collins' System	89
Syntax and the Perception of Cola	90
Syntax and the Perception of the Caesura	91
Non-Syntactic Constraints Ignored	92
The Necessity of Extending Collins' System	94

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON COLLINS' SYSTEM	96
CHAPTER FIVE: MICHAEL O'CONNOR: SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS	99
CONTRAST WITH EARLIER METHODS	99
Presuppositions	99
The "Standard Description"	100
O'CONNOR'S PROJECT	103
Syntactic Constraints as Meter	103
The Regularities of Hebrew Poetry	104
The Place of Parallelism	106
The Rôle of Constraints and Troping	107
AN OUTLINE OF THE CONSTRICTION	108
The Building-Blocks of the Poetic Line	108
The Constraints of the Hebrew Verse Line	110
Line Types in Hebrew Poetry	111
THE PHENOMENA OF TROPING	116
THE SUPRALINEAR FUNCTION OF CONSTRICTIONAL LINE-TYPOLOGY AND TROPING	120
A NOTE ON UGARITIC AND HEBREW VERSE	122
POSITIVE RESULTS OF O'CONNOR'S STUDY	124
The Limits of the Verse Line	124
The Disassembly of Parallelism	126
Batches and Staves	126
Objectivity	127
WEAKNESSES OF O'CONNOR'S CONSTRICTIONAL SYSTEM AND OF THE INFERENCES DRAWN FROM IT	128
Terminological Obscurity	128
Identification of Supralinear Structures	129
CHAPTER SIX: THE KAMPEN SCHOOL GROUP: SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS	132
DELIMITATION OF STRUCTURAL UNITS	135
The Foot	135
The Colon	137
The Verse	139
The Strophe	141
The Canticle	143
The Sub-canto and Canto	144
THE FUNCTION OF STRUCTURAL UNITS	146
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES WITH O'CONNOR'S CONSTRICTIONAL SYSTEM	148
Similarities	148
The Identification of Small Structural Units	148
Differences in the Definition of Structural Units	150
Comparison of Worked Examples	152
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS PROPOSED BY THE KAMPEN SCHOOL GROUP	155
Advantages of This Method	155
The Problem of Parallelism	156
The Delimitation of Structural Units	158
The Relationship of Structural Units	159
The Rôle of Syntax	160
Minimal Units	163

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE TRIAL PASSAGES	165
THE SONG OF DEBORAH: JUDGES 5:2-31b	167
The Date of the Poem	167
Integrity	168
The Text of the Poem	170
THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD: ISAIAH 5:1-7	175
The Date of the Poem	175
Integrity	177
The Text of the Poem	179
THE FIRST LAMENT: LAMENTATIONS 1:1-22	181
The Date of the Poem	181
Integrity	183
The Text of the Poem	184
"WHEN THE LORD RESTORED THE FORTUNES OF ZION": PSALM 126:1-6 . . .	190
The Date of the Poem	190
Integrity	190
The Text of the Poem	190
CHAPTER EIGHT: ANALYSIS OF VERSE STRUCTURE	192
STANDARDS FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE VARIOUS METHODS OF VERSE	
STRUCTURE ANALYSIS	192
Minimal Unit Counting	193
Line-Form Analysis	195
Syntactic Structural Analysis	197
Strophic Analysis	197
THE SONG OF DEBORAH	198
Minimal Unit Counts	198
Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units	201
Line-Forms	206
Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms	214
Syntactic Structural Analysis	217
Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis	220
Strophic Analysis	226
Inferences from Strophic Analysis	229
THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD	236
Minimal Unit Counts	236
Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units	237
Line Forms	242
Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms	244
Syntactic Structural Analysis	246
Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis	247
Strophic Analysis	249
Inferences from Strophic Analysis	250
THE FIRST LAMENT	251
Minimal Unit Counts	251
Inferences from Minimal Unit Counts	254
Line Forms	258
Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms	267
Syntactic Structural Analysis	271
Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis	274
Strophic Analysis	279
Inferences from Strophic Analysis	282

WHEN YAHWEH RESTORED ZION'S FORTUNES	291
Minimal Unit Counts	291
Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units	292
Line Forms	296
Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms	297
Structural Analysis	298
Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis	298
Strophic Analysis	299
Inferences from Strophic Analysis	300
CHAPTER NINE: ANALYSIS OF THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE	301
WHAT SHOULD THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE TELL ABOUT A POEM?	301
THE DESCRIPTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES	302
Poetry and Prose	302
Poetry Defined by Minimal Unit Counting	303
Poetry Defined by Line-Form Analysis	307
Poetry Defined by Syntactic Structural Analysis	310
Poetry Defined by Semantic Strophic Analysis	315
The Distinction of Poetry and Prose	315
The Unity of a Poem	316
Unity as Indicated by Minimal Unit Counting	316
Unity as indicated by Line-Form Analysis	317
Unity as Indicated by Syntactic Structural Analysis	318
Unity as Indicated by Semantic Strophic Analysis	318
The Separation of Poems	319
Partition of the Text	319
Colometry and Minimal Unit Counting	320
Colometric Issues in Line-Form Analysis	321
Colometry and O'Connor's	
Syntactic Structural Analysis	322
Colometry and the Strophic Analysis	
of the Kampen School Group	323
General Conclusions on Colometry	324
Partition of Large Segments	324
The Problem of Non-Intersection	326
Poetic Enjambment	327
Can Poems be Distinguished?	328
PREDICTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES	333
The Predictive Effectiveness of Minimal Unit Counting	334
The Predictive Effectiveness of Line-Form Analysis	336
The Predictive Effectiveness	
of Syntactic Structural Analysis	337
The Predictive Effectiveness Semantic Strophic Analysis	340
The Possibility of Prediction	340
THE PRESCRIPTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES	341
Can the Mind of the Poet Be Known?	341
Prescriptive Principles in Minimal Unit Counting	342
Prescriptive Principles in Line-Form Analysis	344
Prescriptive Principles in Syntactic Structural Analysis	345
Prescriptive Principles in Semantic Strophic Analysis	347
A Summary of Prescriptive Rules	347
SUMMARY	348

CHAPTER TEN: POETICALNESS AND THE FOUR THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE . . .	349
WHAT IS POETRY?	349
Recurrence and Intersection	350
Recurrence in Biblical Poetry	355
Loss of Phonic Recurrence	357
Loss of Semantic Recurrence	360
Loss of Syntactic Recurrence	363
THE FAILURE OF VERSE STRUCTURE THEORIES TO DETECT RECURRENCE . . .	366
CHAPTER ELEVEN: CONCLUSIONS	368
THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE	368
Minimal Unit Counting	368
Syntactic Structural Analysis	369
Line-Form Analysis	370
Strophic Analysis	371
UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS OF HEBREW POETRY	371
Obstacles to a Theory of Hebrew Verse Structure	371
Terminological Difficulties	372
Theories of Insufficient Extent	373
Description and Regulation	376
Confusion of Convention and Style	376
The Distinction of Poetry and Prose	378
STEPS TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE . .	379
APPENDIX I: A CATALOG OF COLLINS' BASIC SENTENCES,	
LINE-TYPES AND LINE-FORMS	381
CONSTITUENTS	381
BASIC SENTENCES	381
GENERAL LINE-TYPES	381
NOTATION	382
SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC LINE-TYPES	383
SUBJECT DELETION	384
SPECIFIC LINE-FORMS	384
APPENDIX TWO: TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE TRIAL PASSAGES	415
THE SONG OF DEBORAH: JUDGES 5:2-31b	416
THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD: ISAIAH 5:1-7	432
THE FIRST LAMENT: LAMENTATIONS 1:1-22	434
"WHEN THE LORD RESTORED THE FORTUNES OF ZION": PSALM 126:1-6 . . .	442
WORKS CITED	446

LIST OF TABLES

NUMBER	TITLE	PAGE
3 - 1	COMPARISON OF METRICAL THEORIES	51
5 - 1	POSSIBLE LINE TYPES IN HEBREW VERSE	112
5 - 2	LINE CLASSES OF PERMISSIBLE LINES	114
5 - 3	LINE CLASSES	115
6 - 1	COMPARISON OF STRUCTURAL STUDIES OF PSALM 78	153
8 - 1	MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	198
8 - 2	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	201
8 - 3	BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	202
8 - 4	MONOCOLA AND TRICOLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	202
8 - 5	ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	203
8 - 6	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	205
8 - 7	LINE-FORMS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	206
8 - 8	ADMISSIBILITY OF POETIC COLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH" TO COLLINS' TAXONOMY	214
8 - 9	PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF DEFINABLE POETIC COLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	216
8 - 10	IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	218
8 - 11	INCIDENCE OF LINE CLASSES IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	221
8 - 12	DESCRIPTION OF BATCHES IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	222
8 - 13	IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	226
8 - 14	ARRANGEMENT OF SUB-CANTOS AND CANTICLES IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"	230
8 - 15	DIVISIONS OF "THE SONG OF DEBORAH" INDICATED BY SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND BY SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS	232
8 - 16	MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	236
8 - 17	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	237
8 - 18	BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	237
8 - 19	ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	238
8 - 20	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	240

8 - 21	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD" . . .	241
8 - 22	LINE-FORMS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	242
8 - 23	PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	245
8 - 24	IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	246
8 - 25	DESCRIPTION OF BATCHES IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	248
8 - 26	IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"	249
8 - 27	MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	251
8 - 28	ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND BICOLA IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	255
8 - 29	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	256
8 - 30	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	257
8 - 31	LINE-FORMS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	258
8 - 32	ADMISSIBILITY OF POETIC COLA IN "THE FIRST LAMENT" TO COLLINS' TAXONOMY	268
8 - 33	PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF DEFINABLE BICOLA IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	269
8 - 34	IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	271
8 - 35	INCIDENCE OF LINE CLASSES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	275
8 - 36	STAVES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	276
8 - 37	BATCHES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	277
8 - 38	IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"	279
8 - 39	DIVISIONS OF "THE FIRST LAMENT" INDICATED BY SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND BY SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS	288
8 - 40	MINIMAL UNITS IN PSALM 126	291
8 - 41	ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA IN PSALM 126	293
8 - 42	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON IN PSALM 126	294
8 - 43	COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN PSALM 126	295
8 - 44	LINE-FORMS IN PSALM 126	296
8 - 45	IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING IN PSALM 126	298

8 - 46	IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN PSALM 126	299
9 - 1	DISTRIBUTION OF COLON LENGTHS IN THE PROSE AND VERSE ACCOUNTS OF THE BATTLE AGAINST SISERA	306
9 - 2	POETIC COLA ADMISSIBLE TO COLLINS' LINE-FORM ANALYSIS . . .	308
9 - 3	INCIDENCE OF SYNTACTIC LINE CLASSES IN THE FOUR POEMS CONSIDERED IN THIS STUDY	332

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE

The present study will apply the principles of four current theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure to four sample texts from the Hebrew Bible to test the validity and effectiveness of these theories in the description, prediction and prescription of the form of Hebrew verse. The strengths and weaknesses of the four theories will be identified. The present study will indicate the ways in which these four theories succeed or fail (both separately and collectively) in providing an adequate description of biblical Hebrew verse structure. In addition, the present study will suggest the directions which should be followed if an adequate theory of biblical Hebrew verse is to be developed.

The History of the Discussion

That the ancient Hebrews (and their social and linguistic neighbors) wrote poems is widely accepted. Of all prominent modern scholars who have pronounced on the issue, only James Kugel¹ argues that "poetry," with the connotations which it carries in European thought and tradition, is not the best term to describe what was being done by Hebrew writers such as Isaiah and Jeremiah, as well as the various psalmists. Yet despite centuries of general agreement on the existence of Hebrew poetry, there is no commonly shared understanding of the principles of Hebrew verse structure. This is partly due to the fact that the Hebrew poets -- unlike their counterparts in Greece and Rome -- did not comment on their technique, or write formal and abstract

¹James L. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 69.

treatises on the subject of poetry. This lacuna in knowledge has had to be filled by men and women who were historically remote from the period in which the poetry of the Bible was produced, who were not personally involved in the production of Hebrew poetry, and who, in many cases, were not even native speakers of the Hebrew language. Several general studies of Hebrew poetry and its techniques have appeared in the last fifteen years, most notably those of Wilfred G. E. Watson,² Luis Alonso Schökel³ and Paul E. Dion.⁴

The Poles of the Debate

Consideration of the verse structure of Hebrew poetry can be traced as far back as remarks by Philo,⁵ Josephus⁶ and Jerome.⁷ But despite enormous amounts of study, explanations of Hebrew verse structure and satisfactory statements of the principles of poetry which may have guided the poets are still wanting. Historically, predominant views on the principles of Hebrew poetry have oscillated between two poles. On the one hand, some scholars have emphasized the aspects of sound and meter, in imitation of the

²Wilfred G. E. Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

³Luis Alonso Schökel, A Manual of Hebrew Poetics (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1988).

⁴Paul E. Dion, Hebrew Poetics: A Student's Guide (Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications, 1988).

⁵Philo, Contemplative Life, 80, text trans. and ed. F. H. Colson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

⁶See, e.g., Jewish Antiquities 2, 16:4, in The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William Whiston (Hartford, Connecticut: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1914), 93.

⁷Saint Jerome, "Preface to the Chronicle of Eusebius," in St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works, trans. W. H. Fremantle (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983).

traditions of European poetry. On the other hand, much attention has been given to the aspect of semantics, in particular, to semantic parallelism.

Traditional Metrics

The former concern was central, for example, in the studies of medieval and renaissance scholars (many of whom were Christians) who tended to read Hebrew poetry in the framework of the metrical feet and lines of the Greek and Latin poets. The nineteenth century saw a revival of interest in strict metrical systems among German scholars of the Hebrew Bible, including Johann Bellermann,⁸ Joseph Saalschutz,⁹ Ernst Meier,¹⁰ Julius Ley¹¹ and Karl von Budde.¹² Most of these German metricists supported theories based on the patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables or the temporal length of lines. In the twentieth century, the same concern appears, though in a much different form, and proposed with much greater diffidence, by such scholars as Frank Moore Cross¹³ and David Noel Freedman.¹⁴ Freedman, whose work on Hebrew poetry has ramifications in several areas, has characterized

⁸Johann J. Bellermann, Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer (Berlin: 1813).

⁹Joseph L. Saalschütz, Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie, nebst einer Abhandlung über die Musik der Hebräer (Königsberg: August Wilhelm Unser, 1825).

¹⁰Ernst Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie (Tübingen: Verlag der Osianderschen Buchhandlung, 1853).

¹¹Julius Ley, Die metrischen Formen der hebräischen Poesie (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1866).

¹²Karl von Budde, "Das hebräische Klagelied," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 2 (1882): 1-52.

¹³Frank Moore Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman, Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975).

¹⁴See, for example, David Noel Freedman's "Prolegomenon" in The Forms of Hebrew Poetry by George Buchanan Gray, vii-lvi. Revised edition. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972.

poems on the basis of the length of poetic lines and half lines (cola). "Length," for Freedman's purposes has usually been determined by the number of syllables in a given colon or line. Variations on this theory have counted consonants or vocables within a line or colon, the selection of numerable units frequently being determined by the practitioner's view of the dependability of the received texts of the Hebrew Bible, and the probability of determining and restoring the original pronunciation. Freedman has emphasized repeatedly that his work is descriptive only, and cannot be used to define a set of rules which controlled the Hebrew poets. Nevertheless, even without pretending to provide a system of rules which the biblical poets could be presumed to have followed (deliberately or intuitively) in the composition of their works, Freedman's methods seem to show that there is some regularity in line-lengths which cannot be explained as a mere consequence of other factors. Many others, attracted perhaps by the accessibility of Freedman's method and the success of the method for descriptive purposes (and even, in a general way, for predictive purposes), have published studies on extensive sections of the poetry of the Bible.

Poetry and Semantics

Other scholars have denied the metrical nature of Hebrew poetry, or at least the possibility of deducing metrical structures from the extant text. Of these, Robert Alter is typical.¹⁵ As mentioned above, Kugel, in his extensive and significant review of the history of Hebrew poetic studies has even rejected the validity of the idea of "poetry" in the discussion of biblical literature.¹⁶ If this is so, if a temporal or rhythmic meter is not observable in classical Hebrew poetry, if Hebrew verse is not structured by

¹⁵Robert Alter, The Art of Biblical Poetry (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 9.

¹⁶J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 69.

such a meter, and if it was not a consideration for those who composed these poems, then some aspect of the biblical poems apart from what they sound like should become the focus of study.

The semantic aspect of Hebrew poetry first received the attention of modern scholars in the eighteenth century in the work of Robert Lowth, who, although he did not deny that Hebrew poetry might have originally been metrical, asserted that modern knowledge of the pronunciation of pre-Masoretic Hebrew is so limited that it is impossible to deduce the metrical structure which might have governed Hebrew poetry.¹⁷ Believing that these metrical structures are utterly inaccessible, Lowth turned instead to consideration of the meaning of the biblical poems, and identified parallelismus membrorum as the fundamental principle of Hebrew verse structure.¹⁸ This parallelism, according to Lowth, could be of three types (synonymous, antithetic or synthetic).¹⁹ Lowth's understanding of Hebrew verse structure was considered normative (at least in English-speaking circles) for generations. Challenges from the nineteenth century metricists and from some of the new approaches suggested by twentieth-century scholars have occasioned re-consideration of Lowth's positions.

Kugel, for example, has not only rejected the ideas of "meter" and "poetry" in the study of classical Hebrew literature, but has also explicitly rejected Lowth's tripartite categorization of parallelistic phenomena.²⁰ Stanley Givirtz, on the other hand, has re-asserted Lowth's view that Hebrew poetry was probably originally metrical, but that the

¹⁷Robert Lowth, Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews trans. G. Gregory (London: S. Chadwick & Co., 1847), 44 ff.

¹⁸R. Lowth, Sacred Poetry, 209.

¹⁹R. Lowth, Sacred Poetry, 210 ff.

²⁰J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 57, 58.

system of metrical rules is not recoverable, due both to changes in the language, and to modern ignorance of its pronunciation at an early date.²¹ Despite the objections of those who saw line-length or syntax as the critical factors in Hebrew verse structure, Stephen Geller continued to affirm the importance of semantic parallelism, even though the major thrust of his work led in other directions,²² and Adele Berlin has again upheld parallelism as the fundamental principle of Hebrew verse structure, though she, like Geller, has broadened her study to include parallelism in non-semantic aspects of the poem.²³ Semantic parallelism, along with temporal measure, has also been a major factor in the structural studies of such Dutch Scholars as Johannes C. de Moor, Marjo Korpel and Willem van der Meer.²⁴

Poetry and Syntax

Thus, within the twentieth century, both of the previously mentioned aspects of poetry, sound and semantics, have been championed as the key to Hebrew verse structure. To these, a third has been added. Beginning in the 1960's a number of studies have been produced which lay the emphasis on syntax, rather than on sound or semantics. The study of syntax is an ancient one, but the application of syntactic studies to Hebrew verse structure is a relatively recent phenomenon, unknown a hundred years ago. This application is, in fact, the child of changes in general linguistic

²¹Stanley Givirtz, Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 6,7 ff.

²²Stephen Geller, Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979), 31 f.

²³Adele Berlin, The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1985), 86 ff.

²⁴Johannes C. de Moor and Willem van der Meer, ed., The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988). See especially pages 5 and 6.

theory which were promoted in the mid-twentieth century. Beginning with Stephen Geller,²⁵ Terence Collins²⁶ and Michael O'Connor,²⁷ syntactic theorists have suggested that the customary syntax of the Hebrew language, or perhaps a modification of customary syntax which was peculiar to poetry, created patterns or limitations which defined the Hebrew verse and became the matrix for classical Hebrew poems. These theories have received some support from the recent studies of Dennis Pardee²⁸ and Walter Cloete.²⁹

OBSTACLES TO A THEORY OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE

Even this brief review of the history of Hebrew poetic studies is sufficient to reflect the fact that the ancient uncertainty regarding the basis for Hebrew poetry is still with us. Not only is the polar tension between the importance of the aspects of sound and semantics in poetry still unresolved, but the additional aspect of syntax has been added. Even after the passage of several centuries of research and the publication of numerous (and highly varied) theories of Hebrew verse structure, no theory has won majority approval, and unanimous agreement is not to be dreamed of.

²⁵S. Geller, Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry.

²⁶Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).

²⁷Michael O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

²⁸Dennis Pardee, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut ('nt I and Proverbs 2) (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988). This volume and the work of Stephen Geller, cited above, have been omitted from this study inasmuch as they focus almost exclusively on the phenomena of parallelism, rather than the broader issue of verse structure.

Theories of Insufficient Extent

There are several reasons for the lack of agreement regarding Hebrew verse structure. In the first place, the theories which have been heretofore proposed generally fail to explain much of the text of the Hebrew Bible including many parts whose poetic nature is largely undebated. This failure has been camouflaged to some extent by the arbitrary and gratuitous emendation of the text. "Corrected readings" in (for example) the Biblia Hebraica often bore the footnote "metri causa," though it was apparent that the meter was determined solely by the theory of the emendator. More recent studies have suggested fewer emendations, but have frequently compensated by ignoring those passages which would be problematic for the theories. Indeed, theories have sometimes been proposed which can be illustrated only by discontinuous verses.

Terminological Difficulties

The second reason for the lack of wide acceptance of any of the current theories of Hebrew verse structure, a factor which is sufficient in itself to engender the ongoing debate about the verse structure of Hebrew poetry, is the failure of scholars of the Hebrew Bible to agree on a definition of terms. A simple example of this is the word "meter." In general, those who have denied the existence of meter have tended to do so on the basis of a rather narrow definition of the term, while those who have affirmed it have done so on the basis of much broader definitions.

Traditionally, meter has been understood to refer to the quantity or to the rhythm of poetic lines, that is, to the temporal duration or the periodic emphasis of the sound of the lines. But is meter properly limited to sound alone, or are there other domains in which the measure (meter) of a poem might be properly described? Those scholars who do not reject outright the concept of poetry as a valid literary genre in the Hebrew Bible assume that

there must have been some set of rules (whether explicit or intuitive) which governed the structure of this poetry and which resulted in any regularities which are perceptible in this literature. That some regularities occur is widely, though not universally, affirmed. But scholars are divided on the issue of whether the regularities of Hebrew verse are best described in terms of the sound, the sense or the syntax of the poems. Ought Hebrew verse structure to be defined by temporal or rhythmic factors, by semantic factors, or by the grammatical arrangement of the lines and verses? And if the description of Hebrew verse structure is written in some terms other than the temporal and rhythmic factors traditionally associated with meter in European poetry, should these principles of verse structure be called "meter?" The time-honored definitions of "meter" used in the study of European poetry may be insufficient for classical Hebrew, and a certain share of the debate may be resolved by the adoption of a new uniform definition of meter which would differ from those used in the current literature in this field.

The lack of a uniform definition of "meter" is representative of a much broader issue of terminology and definition. Traditional theories of Hebrew verse structure have been produced by writers who do not agree on even such a basic concept as the definition of a poetic line -- all use the expression, but not all use it in the same way. Not only can they not agree on the concepts, but they do not agree on what term to use to designate a concept even when the concept is mutually agreeable.

Description and Regulation: The Question of Intention

But even were the issue of the definition of terms to be resolved, another looms behind it. It is one thing to say (as some of the scholars cited above have done) that the perceptible regularities of a Hebrew poem may be understood, or are best understood, in terms of sound, or of syntax, or of

sense, or of some particular facet of one of these aspects. There are many descriptions of Hebrew verse structure, and each has its champions. It is entirely a different matter to assert that the rules which lie behind it, and which generated the poem, are necessarily a function of the same aspect. Kugel, without denying that many two-part lines in Hebrew have halves of similar length, has pointed out that the similarities in line length of the two halves of a bicolon may in fact be a consequence of the writer's intention to write a two-part line in which there was a particular semantic relationship between the half-lines (a relationship which Kugel describes as "A, and what's more, B").³⁰ Kugel's defense of this view leaves some questions unanswered, but the observation is nonetheless valid. One might just as well imagine certain constellations of rules relating to sound and syntax which might tend to produce some perceptible semantic regularities. In either case, the point is the same: any system which succeeds in describing Hebrew poetry will nevertheless be suspect if it is offered as a system of prescription or generative regulation. This is true even of systems which might succeed, not only in description, but also in prediction.

This, of course, raises the issue of the deliberate intent of the original writers with regard to verse structure. No indications remain of the intentions of the writer except what can be deduced from the text itself. It is not possible to enter into dialogue with Isaiah or the Psalmist to discover what they wished to accomplish or how they planned to do it. If the poet's mind cannot be known, is it sufficient to describe the regularities and to define any rule which explains all, most, some or any of them, and treat this as a regulative principle, whether Isaiah or the Psalmist would

³⁰J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 71.

have recognized it or not? At the best, prescriptive rules may only be evaluated for plausibility and not for historicity.

The Lack of Empirical Testing

What is wanting in the case of these more recent theories is systematic empirical testing. In each case, the proponents of a theory have employed it for the analysis and description of larger or smaller segments of the corpus of biblical poetry. In a few cases this application has been skewed by the subjective selection of passages for study, in other cases, the trial applications have been more even-handed. But only rarely has a trial been made employing more than one theory. Exceptions to this generalization are Donn Leatherman's Master's Thesis,³¹ which considers only one passage, the book of Amos, and only two theories, those of von Budde and Freedman -- both of which focus on temporal and rhythmic considerations, and Dennis Pardee's insightful work on Hebrew and Ugaritic poetry,³² which considers the theories of Collins, Geller, Barbara Kaiser and O'Connor -- all generally focussing on considerations of syntax--and applies them to a single biblical poem, Proverbs 2 (as well as a single Ugaritic poem, 'nt I). Studies of greater scope will help us, not only to evaluate the validity of the various theories which have been proposed, but also to distinguish those aspects of language which are most important in the description of Hebrew poetry.

THE PROJECT OF THE PRESENT STUDY

It is precisely this lacuna in the evaluation of theories of verse structure which the present study attempts to address: rather than proposing a new theory of Hebrew verse structure, or analyzing only one or

³¹Donn W. Leatherman, "The Metrical Structure of the Book of Amos" (M.Div. thesis, Andrews University, 1980).

³²Dennis Pardee, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism.

another of the existing theories, this study will analyze four of the current theories, by testing and comparing their usefulness in the analysis of identical passages of Hebrew poetry. The theories or systems of verse structure which are to be evaluated here are the counting of minimal units (practiced by numerous scholars over the last two centuries, but most recently championed by Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman), the line-form analysis of Terence Collins, the syntactic structural analysis of Michael O'Connor, and the strophic analysis practiced by various scholars associated with the Kampen School of Theology. Of the (admittedly limited) number of theories currently in circulation, these four are chosen because of their diversity from each other and because each of them constitutes an undertaking, in the eyes of at least some proponents, to explain adequately how Hebrew poetry is structured, and how it was written.

The present study will determine whether these theories of Hebrew verse structure can be used effectively to describe poetry, to distinguish poetry from prose, to distinguish one poem from another, to identify the limits of a poem and to differentiate various types of poems. In addition, this study will determine whether these theories can be used to predict the form of a poem, or to prescribe the rules (whether deliberate or intuitive) by which the poetry of the Hebrew Bible might plausibly have been written. These are all functions which might reasonably be expected of an adequate theory of verse structure. Finally, whenever any these four current theories of verse structure may fall short of these reasonable expectations, the present study will indicate wherein and why they have fallen short, and what remains to be accomplished in the production of an adequate description of the verse structure of biblical Hebrew poetry.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The project described at the end of the preceding chapter will be achieved by the carrying out the following procedures: first, the four theories of Hebrew verse structure which are to be tested will be described individually, and the results from their application by other scholars will be presented briefly. Second, the four poetic passages from the Hebrew Bible on which these theories are to be tested will be presented and described. Following this, each of the four passages will be submitted successively to analysis by each of the theories, and inferences from this analysis will be noted. Finally, general conclusions regarding the usefulness of the various theories of verse structure will be presented.

CONSIDERATION OF RECENT THEORIES OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE

Published studies of Hebrew poetry in the last three decades have produced several innovative but quite diverse suggestions for the regulative principles and the analysis of Hebrew verse structure. Four theories in particular have been selected for consideration. These are the counting of minimal units, the analysis of line-forms, syntactic structural analysis and strophic analysis.

Minimal Unit Counting

The first of these has seen extensive ancient and modern use. Many scholars of the Bible from the late classical period and the early middle ages described Hebrew poetry by the analogy of Greek and Latin poetry. Several nineteenth and twentieth century scholars continued this discussion of meters and metrical feet. These studies involve the counting of minimal units: words, syllables, stresses, vocables or consonants. Various

patterns of these units have been detected, and the measure of Hebrew verse lines has been described in these terms.

Both ancient and modern forms of this method of analyzing verse structure will be described in Chapter Three, though only the counting of stresses, syllables and words will be considered when the theory is applied to the test passages in Chapter Eight.

Collins: Syntax and Line Forms

A second recent theory of Hebrew verse structure was proposed by Terence Collins in his Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry.¹ Collins has exploited the notational systems of transformational grammar to describe and classify Hebrew verse lines. Collins has identified four sentence-types, which can be presented or combined into four general line-types, subdivided into twenty-four specific line-types. These line-types can be further subdivided into specific line-forms. Using these line-types and line-forms, Collins has categorized a rather large collection of sample verse lines, commenting on the similarities and differences between the various lines and the various line-forms. Very little of Collins' work applies to any unit of poetry larger than the verse line (i.e., the bicolon), though Collins does deal with the difference in the incidence of the differing line-forms and sentence types in various books of the Hebrew Bible. Collins' theories will be presented in Chapter Four and applied to the trial passages in Chapter Eight.

¹Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).

O'Connor: Syntax and Constriction

It has always been intuitively evident that there are limitations to the types of lines and half-lines (bicola and cola) which can occur in Hebrew poetry. Various means of specifying what sorts of lines were permissible, or criteria for disallowing the permissibility of certain lines, have been suggested by various theorists. Norms, maxima and minima have been proposed for the number of stressed syllables, or for the total number of syllables in a line. These norms are usually fairly elastic, and may change from one poem to another. To the traditional metrical criteria, Michael O'Connor has added syntactic constraints.² Beginning with the verse line (which most other scholars would call a colon), O'Connor divides the poem into progressively smaller elements: predications, "constituents" and "units." He then notices the maxima and minima for each of these elements within a verse line. The maxima and minima are identified as "constraints," and the whole system of constraints is called a "constriction." As obvious as some of O'Connor's constraints may seem after he has stated them, it must nevertheless be remarked that no earlier scholar has identified them. O'Connor's studies have thus specified some limitations of Hebrew verse lines which are capable of being expressed in terms of regulative syntactic principles.

In addition, O'Connor has suggested that groups of lines ("batches" and "staves") in Hebrew poems can be identified by the concentration of rarer line types and the more intense use of devices of ornamentation at the beginning and end of these groups. O'Connor's system for the analysis of biblical Hebrew verse structure is presented in Chapter Five, and applied to the trial passages in Chapter Eight.

²Michael O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

van der Meer and de Moor: Semantics and Structure

Quite recently a group of Dutch scholars, of whom Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor are principal,³ has developed a new system of analysis for classical Hebrew (and Canaanite) poetry. Like the constrictional system presented by O'Connor, this analysis considers the various elements of the poem. Unlike O'Connor, van der Meer and de Moor do not begin at the level of the line and work down to progressively smaller elements. Instead, they begin with the smallest element, which they call a "foot." Working upward to increasingly larger elements, this theory describes the colon, the verse, the strophe and the canticle. Large elements (provisionally designated as the "sub-canto" and "canto") are suggested, but not discussed in depth.

Despite some slight similarities of method, the purpose of this analysis is quite different from that proposed by O'Connor. This theory seeks to explain the semantic relationship between the various elements in the poem, particularly as the smaller elements are included in larger ones. This system of verse structure analysis is presented in Chapter Six and applied to the trial passages in Chapter Eight.

ANALYSIS OF THE TRIAL PASSAGES

The Trial Passages

The trial studies of this dissertation center on four biblical poems: Judges 5:2-30 ("The Song of Deborah"), Psalm 126 ("When YHWH Brought Back the Captivity of Zion"), Isaiah 5:1-7 ("The Song of the Vineyard") and Lamentations 1 ("The First Lament"). The selection of these passages is

³In fact, the best statement of the theory comes from a paper by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry," in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 1-61.

somewhat arbitrary, but is in no way determined by the theories which are to be tested. They have been chosen according to two criteria: variety and extent of scholarly study.

These passages differ from each other in date, having been composed over a period in excess of half a millennium. They also differ in content: some commemorate certain specific historical events; others are more concerned with the social conditions which precipitated and which resulted from the events to which they may refer. The four passages chosen for study also differ from each other with regard to their literary and social setting. Two are found in the books of the prophets, one in a narrative context, the other in the midst of a series of prophetic oracles. The second pair of passages do not occur in prophetic contexts, but are included in poetic anthologies.

Despite the considerable variety of date, content, form and function among the four passages selected for study, at least three of the four (all but Psalm 126) have been the objects of considerable scholarly attention. In some cases, these very passages have been studied by the originators of the theories of verse structure which are under consideration in this dissertation, or by their students and close followers. Thus, it is not necessary to hypothesize, for example, how O'Connor would treat "The Song of Deborah," or what results the analysis of this song by his methods might produce. The results are offered by O'Connor himself.⁴ Similarly, it is not necessary to wonder how Freedman would scan "The First Lament," as his results are published in his prolegomenon to G. B. Gray's Forms of Hebrew Poetry.⁵ Likewise, two of the Dutch scholars associated with de Moor and van

⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 487-492.

⁵David Noel Freedman, "Prolegomenon," in The Forms of Hebrew Poetry by George Buchanan Gray, (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972), vii-lvi.

der Meer have analyzed and described "The First Lament"⁶ and Isaiah's "Song of the Vineyard"⁷

An additional point of similarity between three of the four trial passages is that a traditional stichography has been preserved in the Masoretic text. This stichography is orthographically represented for Judges 5 and Psalm 126. In Lamentations 1 (and the rest of the Lamentations) the stichography is maintained at least partially by the acrostic pattern of the Masoretic verses. Thus, the only passage under study which does not have an old stichographic tradition is "The Song of the Vineyard" in Isaiah 5. The present study will observe the traditional stichography of these passages, not because the traditional stichography is always right -- contrary arguments could be defended in a number of specific cases -- but simply to avoid the risk of falling into the practice of adjusting the evidence to fit the theory. Any theory which cannot provide a generally accurate description of the majority of the received text, including its occasional errors, is unlikely to be a correct or useful theory.

Within the space limitations of the present study, it is impossible to present a larger selection of lengthy samples. More variety could be obtained by taking excerpts from several poems, rather than analyzing the totality of only four poems, but any such discriminatory process runs the risk of choosing those parts of the poem which may be most conformable to one of the theories. With the goal of being impartial, and avoiding the danger of selecting the evidence to fit the conclusions, the present study will use whole poems, rather than excerpts.

⁶Johan Renkema, "The Literary Structure of Lamentations" in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 294-396.

⁷Marjo C. A. Korpel, "The Literary Genre of the Song of the Vineyard (Isa 5:1-7)" in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 119-155.

Presentation of Results

The trial passages will be presented in Chapter Seven, and subjected to the various forms of verse structure analysis mentioned above in Chapter Eight, which will also indicate specific inferences from the application of these methods of analysis to the passages. The Second Appendix to this study will present text-critical comments on the trial passages. These comments will not be included in Chapter Seven because of the logically pre-emptive decision to apply the various methods of verse structure analysis to the unemended Masoretic Text. An analysis of the four current theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure which are under consideration here will be made in Chapter Nine, indicating the strengths and weaknesses of these theories. Chapter Ten will consider reasons for the limited success of these theories. General inferences and conclusions drawn from this study will be offered in Chapter Eleven.

CHAPTER THREE
THE COUNTING OF MINIMAL UNITS
FROM PHILO TO FREEDMAN

The history of the study of Hebrew verse structure is replete with scholars who have pursued schemes of quantitative, accentual or syllabic metrics, in which the basic structure of the poem was held to be determined by a pattern of minimal units. These units have been variously defined, and varying expectations have been expressed of their usefulness in understanding the poem. A comprehensive record of proposals for the metrical scansion of Hebrew poetry is not within the scope of the present dissertation, but a brief review is in order.¹

ANCIENT SYSTEMS OF METRICAL SCANSION

Ancient Jewish Writers

Cursory remarks about Hebrew poetry can be found in the works of Philo and Josephus. Philo, for example, speaks of "...the old poets [who] left behind them many psalms and songs in trimetre iambics..."² Josephus also makes several remarks of a general nature about the poetry of the Hebrews, stating that after the crossing of the Red Sea, "Moses also composed a song

¹General information about the attempts to apply various metrical systems (including those of classical Greek and Latin poetry) to Hebrew poetry can be gleaned from James Kugel's Idea of Biblical Poetry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981). Unfortunately, this information is not concentrated in a single chapter, but scattered throughout the book. Kugel also includes a sub-chapter on nineteenth and twentieth century metrical theories in pages 292-302. Much more comprehensive reviews of nineteenth century theories can be found in Johannes Döllner's Rhythmus, Metrik und Strophik in der biblisch-hebräischen Poesie (Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1899), and in William Henry Cobb's Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter: An Elementary Treatise (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

²Philo, On a Contemplative Life in The Works of Philo Judaeus trans. C. D. Yonge (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), 4:18.

unto God, containing his praises, and a thanksgiving for his kindness, in hexameter verse."³ The reference is clearly to the "Song of the Sea," in Exodus 15. Josephus does not explain what he means by "hexameter verse," but his Roman readers would have presumed the metrical principles of the classical Greek and Roman poets, for whom a hexameter was a line composed of six poetic feet, each made up of a uniform number of syllables, arranged in a fixed pattern of long syllables and short. This is, of course, clearly not the case with the poem in Exodus 15, whose rhythms are almost always less rigid than those of most Latin poetry. It is unlikely that Josephus, whose Hebrew education was extensive, would have mistaken the text of Exodus. As he did not usually hesitate to bend the truth, Josephus has probably seized upon the closest analogy which he feels his readers could appreciate. Another comment describes the "Song of Moses" in Deuteronomy 33 as "a poetic song, which was composed in hexameter verse."⁴ Of David, Josephus also states that he "composed songs and hymns to God of several sorts of meter; some of those which he made were trimeters and some were pentameters."⁵

These comments say little except that, in the opinion of both writers, Hebrew poetry was like that of the Romans and the Greeks. Nevertheless, despite their terseness, these remarks are of importance to us. They come from Jewish writers who were well versed in their language, culture and literary traditions, albeit one of the two was hellenized and the other latinized. Both of these writers lived in the first century, an era in which Hebrew was still widely spoken, though it had ceased to be the first language of most Jews. It is striking then, that both of these writers see a

³Flavius Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, II 16:4, in The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William Whiston (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903), 87.

⁴Josephus, Antiquities, IV, 8:44 in Whiston, 138.

⁵Josephus, Antiquities, VII, 12:3 in Whiston, 230.

similarity between the poems of the Hebrew Bible and those of the predominant Greco-Roman culture. Of course, both of these writers were consciously engaged in an apologetic task, defending Jewish religion and culture in a world which, for the most part, neither understood nor appreciated them. They might therefore have been inclined to emphasize any parallels between the traditions of the Hebrews and those of the majority culture.

Ancient Christian Writers

Three centuries later, Jerome made similar comments on the meter of the Hebrew poems. His considerable, though not native, knowledge of Hebrew was derived in part from his long sojourn in Palestine⁶ and is reflected in his translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Jerome's understanding that the Hebrews wrote poems is apparent from comments in his Epistle to Paulinus: "David, who is our Simonides, Pindar and Alcaeus, our Horace, our Catullus and our Serenus all in one, sings of Christ to his lyre . . ."⁷ Jerome is less decisive, however, in indicating the forms of this poetry.

In fact, what can be more musical than the Psalter? Like the writings of our own Falccus and the Grecian Pindar it now trips along in iambs, now flows in sonorous alcaics, now swells into sapphics, now marches in half-foot meter.⁸

From this and similar comments one may infer that Jerome was not entirely certain of the meter of the poems, despite his absolute assurance that the Hebrew poems were metrical. Other Latin Christian writers who

⁶Jerome resided in Bethlehem from the year 386 until his death in 420.

⁷Jerome, Epistle to Paulinus, chapter 8, trans. W. H. Fremantle et al. in St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works, reprint edition (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), series II, volume 6, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 101.

⁸Jerome, Preface to the Chronicle of Eusebius, chapter 2, in Fremantle et al, 484.

comment on the nature of Hebrew poetry include Isidore of Seville and Junilius Africanus. The former of these two makes the following remarks in the sixth book of his Etymologarium:

Omnes autem psalmos apud Hebræos metrico carmine constat esse compositos. Nam in morem Romani Flacci, et Græci Pindari, nunc alii iambo currunt, nunc Alcaico personant; nunc Saphico nitent, trimetro, vel tetrametro pede incedentes. . . .⁹

One might infer from this that the book of Psalms was understood to be metrical, but that the meter was variable, and changed not only from poem to poem, as Greek and Latin poems might, but even from line to line or from foot to foot. Isidore also contrasts the metrical form of the poetical books (i.e., Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs) with the "eloquent prose" of Isaiah. In addition, ascribing the Lamentations to Jeremiah, he acknowledges their metrical nature as well.

Horum autem trium librorum carmina hexametris et pentametris versibus apud suos composita perhibentur, ut Josephus, Heironymusque scribunt.

Isaias, evangelista potius quam propheta, edit librum suum, cujus omnis textus eloquentia prosa incedit. Canticum vero hexametro, et pentametro verso discurrit.

Jeremias similiter editit librum suum cum threnis ejus, quos nos lamenta vocamus, eo quod in tristioribus rebus funeribusque adhibeantur, in quibus quadruplex diverso metro composuit alphabetum, quorum duo prima quasi Saphico metro scripta sunt, qui tres versiculos, qui sibi nexi sunt, et ab una tantum littera incipiunt, heroium comma concludit.¹⁰

From this statement, it appears that Isidore regards the prophets as non-metrical and non-poetic. On the other hand, Junilius Africanus takes a different view in his brief comments on the forms of the Hebrew poems in the ninth chapter of his De partibus divinae legis.

D. Modi divinae Scripturae quot? M. Duo: nam aut metris Hebraicis in sua lingua conscribuntur, aut oratione simplici. D. Quae

⁹Isidore Hispalensis, Etymologarium, 6:17, ed. J. P. Migne, Patrologia cursus completus, Series Latina, (Paris: Garnier Freres, 1850) 82:251.

¹⁰Isidore, Etymologarium, 252.

sunt metris conscripta? M. Ut Psalmi, et Job historia, et Ecclesiastes, et in Prophetis quadam. D. Quae simplici oratione conscripta sunt? M. Reliqua omnia. D. Quare apud nos iisdem metris conscripta non sunt? M. Quia nulla dictio metrum in alia lingua conservat, si vim verborum ordinemque non motet.¹¹

Junilius, then, identifies as poetic and metrical the books of Psalms, Job and Ecclesiastes, as well as certain unspecified passages in the prophets. His reasons for doing so appear relatively naive: other languages preserve these in a poetic form.

As can be seen, after the time of Josephus, the nature of Hebrew poetry was a question discussed primarily by Christian scholars, some of whom were strikingly ill-prepared to make technical comments on Hebrew language and verse structure. Jewish writers, though usually better equipped to approach this issue, seldom concerned themselves with it. Kugel describes the nature of mediaeval Jewish thought regarding biblical poetry.¹² For the most part, it appears that mediaeval Jews were concerned primarily with the theological content of the poems.

Rashi feels the necessity, just as the Rabbis had, to explain any form of repetition or other apparently superfluous usages -- and to explain them not as a feature of rhetoric, but as signifying something¹³

MEDIAEVAL VIEWS

Other than the minimal observation that some parts of the Bible were songs or poems, mediaeval Jews did not comment on the governing principles. Since mediaeval Jewish poetry was largely influenced by the forms of Arabic poetry,¹⁴ it may be that their identification of poetry in the Bible was

¹¹Junilius Africanus, De partibus divinae legis, 1:9 ed J. P. Migne, Patrologia cursus completus Series Latina (Paris: Garnier Freres, 1866) 20.

¹²J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 170-203.

¹³J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 173.

¹⁴J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 186-200 passim.

informed by the principles of Arabic poetry, but this is difficult to determine, and in any case, there are several passages in the Bible which are internally identified as "songs." Among the few who actually assert the metrical nature of biblical poems, Kugel mentions Moses ibn Tibbon, Moses ibn Habib and the anonymous author of *שקל הקרש*.¹⁵ During the Renaissance, Azariah dei Rossi begins to speak of "meter" and "poetic feet," but he describes the poetic foot in terms of ideas, rather than syllables, insisting that "You must not count syllables nor yet the words themselves, but the ideas."¹⁶ From this point one may infer that, despite his references to meter, Azariah is actually a precursor of Robert Lowth, rather than of the metricists, though it appears that his view differs from that of Lowth in that he sees the relation of ideas as a substitute for meter, rather than as a characteristic of Hebrew poetry distinct from an irrecoverable metrical system.

MODERN THEORIES OF HEBREW METRICS

Early Modern Writers

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, more explicit theories of metrical scansion were proposed by various scholars, including Franz Gomarus, the Dutch Calvinist professor at Leyden (and subsequently at Groningen), and Francis Hare, the Anglican Bishop of Chichester, whose metrical theory was published in 1736 in the preface to his Hebrew edition of the Psalms.¹⁷ Hare based his scansion of Hebrew poetry on the relation of stressed and unstressed syllables, and insisted that all Hebrew poetic lines

¹⁵J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 195-200.

¹⁶Azariah dei Rossi, Me'or 'Eynayim, ed. D. Cassel (1866), 208, 209, cited and translated in Kugel, 201.

¹⁷Francis Hare, Psalmorum Liber in Versiculos Metrico Divisus (London: 1736). See Cobb, 35.

were either iambic or trochaic. In order to accomplish his designs he was forced to assign stresses in quite an arbitrary manner. These theories were refuted, the former implicitly, the latter explicitly, by Hare's contemporary, Bishop Robert Lowth, in his De sacra poesi Hebraeorum.¹⁸ Lowth believed that biblical Hebrew poetry was metrical, but insisted that the metrical system had been lost and could not be recovered because of the corrupt state of the extant biblical texts and because of modern ignorance of the pronunciation of Hebrew in ancient times.

Nineteenth-Century Metricists

In the nineteenth century, metrical theories took a more inductive and scientific form. Most of these theories were developed by German scholars, perhaps because they had access to a native poetic tradition from their own country in which the length of a poetic foot might vary within a poem, or even within a line. The resemblance between this and the Hebrew poems was not lost on the theorists. Among others, Ernst Meier and Julius Ley draw an explicit parallel between the meters of Hebrew poetry and of German folk poetry. Ley, for example, states that

Dem Eigenartigen des hebräischen Dialekts im Sprachbau zeigt sich auch der Metrik entsprechend; manches Analoge findet sich auch im Altdeutschen, Altitalischen und Griechischen . . .¹⁹

Ley's explanation in this context is not precise regarding what the similarities were. It is, however, noteworthy that the system of poetic

¹⁸Robert Lowth, Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, trans. G. Gregory (London: S. Chadwick & Co., 1847), 396-401. The original Latin edition was published in 1753. A revised edition, from which the English translation was prepared, was published in 1763. All editions contain a final chapter titled (in the English translation) "A Brief Confutation of Bishop Hare's System of Hebrew Metre."

¹⁹Julius Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebräischen Poesie (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875), 4.

scansion which he proposed was, in fact, based on stressed syllables. Furthermore, Ley was willing to allow for varying numbers of unstressed syllables before or after each stress. Both of these phenomena are characteristic of old Germanic poetry.

Johann Bellermann

Earliest of the nineteenth century German metricists was Johann Bellermann, who was among the first non-Jewish European scholars to break away, at least in some degree, from the classical Greco-Roman metrical theories.²⁰ Bellermann advocated a metrical system which had two foci. The first of these was the mora, a unit of time. Nearly every syllable had three morae, though tone syllables might occasionally vary from this.²¹ Thus, nearly every syllable was understood to require the same amount of time for pronunciation. The second focus was the tone. Each Hebrew word has one tone syllable. It is apparent from examples cited that Bellermann normally trusts the Masoretic accents to indicate the tone syllable. The tone syllables and unstressed syllables may be grouped into metrical feet similar to those of Greek and Latin poetry, the iamb being the most common. Bellermann is quick to point out that the iambs, trochees, anapests and dactyls thus defined are not to be scanned like Greek and Latin poetry, but only serve to show that the Hebrew poetry lends itself to song and to song-like recitation.²² Bellermann does not expect to find uniform verse systems like those of Greek and Latin poetry. In fact, he does not expect uniformity

²⁰As mentioned above, Lowth had little use for Greco-Roman metrical principles, but only because he believed the meter of Hebrew poetry to be irrecoverable. He did not, however, propose a metrical system which differed from Greco-Roman patterns, as Bellermann did.

²¹Bellermann's system is outlined and critiqued by W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 36-49.

²²cf. W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 37.

of metrical feet in any case. It is also apparent from the worked examples that he does not require the metrical feet to correspond in all cases to words or other sense units in the Hebrew texts. Generally, Bellermann follows the Masoretic colometry. His proposed textual emendations are relatively few, though some of the emendations proposed are based, at least in part, on the metrical theory. Most poetic lines are understood to consist of three feet,²³ though many exceptions are freely admitted.

Cobb recognizes that when the two foci of Bellermann's system are subject to consideration the reader will be prompted to ask "...what, after all, the system of morae has to do with the metrical division of a line of poetry."²⁴ This question is not satisfactorily answered by Bellermann. Even though he has defined the mora and stated the relation of the mora to the syllable, the mora seems to have nothing to do with either the poetic foot or the line since the foot may contain a varying number of syllables and the line a varying number of feet. The morae are therefore rather highly regular in their relation to the syllable, but otherwise irrelevant. An extensive refutation of Bellermann's work was published by Joseph Saalschütz,²⁵ who also comments negatively on the works of Marc Meibomius, Conrad Gottlieb Anton, C. Ludwig Leutwein and E. J. Greve, all of whom attempted to define the meter of Hebrew poetry. Saalschütz himself believed Hebrew poetry to be

²³Clearly, the "line" of which Bellermann speaks is what other writers call a "colon."

²⁴W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 51.

²⁵J. L. Saalschütz, Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie nebst einer Abhandlung über die Musik der Hebräer (Königsberg: August Wilhelm Unzer, 1825), 52-62, 146-178.

metrical, but his argument on this point is largely circumstantial, and did not result in a specific proposal for metrical scansion.²⁶

Heinrich Ewald

A much simpler theory of Hebrew verse structure was published by Heinrich Ewald in 1835. Ewald denied that all poetry must have a syllabic meter, and asserted in particular that Hebrew poetry does not have such a meter. He acknowledged that there can be no uniform rule for the number of syllables in any larger poetic unit. This observation notwithstanding, he notes that normally seven or eight syllables are grouped together in each member of the verse, and that an explanation is in order when a verse member occurs with fewer syllables.²⁷ Usually each member of the verse will form a complete sentence. There is no accentual meter, so parallelism, creating an inner unity of thought, is fundamental in forming the verse. The verse is normally composed of two equal members, though verses of a single member, or of three members, or even of four members (usually in two related pairs) are also known.

Ernst Meier

Ernst Meier returned to the view that the accent is fundamental in the metrical structure of biblical poetry. He denied the view, already common, that in Hebrew poetry parallelism takes the place of meter: "Sodann ist es entschieden falsch, jenen Parallelismus der Glieder für die einzige Form der

²⁶J. L. Saalschütz, Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie, 132-34. Saalschütz argues that Hebrew poetry must have been metrical because: 1) all other nations had metrical poetry; 2) some Hebrew poems were intended for musical recitation, and music is metrical; 3) altered word forms appear in poetry, most likely for purposes of accommodating the meter; 4) the relationship of lengths of successive lines implies meter; and 5) most students of Hebrew poetry have an intuitive understanding that it is metrical.

²⁷A description and critique of Ewald's theories are found in Cobb, 62-73.

hebräische Poesie zu erklären."²⁸ In fact, according to Meier, meter of some sort is necessary for the perception of poetry, and parallelism is insufficient to differentiate poetry from prose.

Ich habe zu zeigen gesucht, daß Poesie ohne ein bestimmtes Takt- und Zeitmaaß nicht denkbar sei, indem sie nur hierdurch von der Prosa sich unterscheidet. Ich glaube ferner erwiesen zu haben, daß der sogenannte Parallelismus der Glieder nicht sowohl eine innere Gedankenform, als vielmehr eine wesentlich äußere, poetische Ausdrucksweise ist, die jedoch keineswegs das Maaß, den Takt und Rhythmus der hebräischen Poesie ausdrückt, mithin ihr wahres Wesen im Gegensatz zur prosaischen, ungebundenen Rede nicht darstellen kann; sie fehlt auch in nicht wenigen Gedichten gänzlich.²⁹

Meier also asserted that Hebrew poetry had rhythmic verse-lines as well as strophes, basing this claim on the statements of Philo and Josephus,³⁰ as well as on the evident musicality of the poems, and the musical interpretation to which they are known to have been subject.³¹ But Meier's picture of the Hebrew poetic line is not in any way based on the statements of the first-century writers, as he denies any resemblance between Hebrew meter and the quantitative meters of the classical Greek poets.³² After a decade of studying German poetry, particularly the folk poetry of Swabia, he noted some similarities between that poetic tradition and the poems of the Hebrews. Indeed, Meier has occasional recourse to German examples to illustrate his views.³³ The Swabian folk verse had, according to Meier, two stresses per line. Likewise, he asserts, the Hebrew verse line consisted of two stressed syllables, which were regarded as long

²⁸Ernst Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie (Tübingen: Verlag der Osianderschen Buchhandlung, 1853), 16.

²⁹E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 19.

³⁰E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 20.

³¹E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 21.

³²E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 24.

³³E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 18.

without reference to the nature of their vowels, as well as any additional number of unstressed syllables which could be pronounced in a given duration of time.

Es herrscht also im Hebräischen das einfache poetische Sprachgesetz, wie im Deutschen, wo einzig der Accent den Rhythmus bestimmt. . . .

Was nun bestimmter den hebräischen Rhythmus und die Versbildung betrifft, so erhält jede Verszeile zwei betonte Silben, oder zwei Hebungen. Diese beiden, durch dem Accent hervorgehobenen Hauptsilben, können dann aber immer so viele unbetonte Nebensilben vorhergehen oder nachfolgen, als eben während der angegebenen Zeitdauer sich auszusprechen lassen.³⁴

No importance can be attached to the order of stressed and unstressed syllables. This theory produces very short lines. Meier does not depend strictly on the Masoretic accents, but inserts additional accents where he finds them necessary. Accordingly, his "poetic lines" are generally equal to half a colon in the scansion of other scholars. Most of the strophes which he identifies in later sections of his work, and which he identifies on the basis of parallelism and other semantic considerations,³⁵ are no longer than one or two bicola. Two obvious defects appear. First, this method divides the text into bits so small that they are usually neither syntactically complete, nor aesthetically independent. The second is that the insistence that meter is based on stressed syllables, and that there are two such syllables per line, coupled with a willingness to insert accents at will, leaves the definition of the metrical form of the text entirely in the hands of the metricist.

Julius Ley

A much more permanent and influential place in the history of Hebrew metrical studies has been taken by Julius Ley, author of three major books on

³⁴E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 25.

³⁵E. Meier, Die Form der hebräischen Poesie, 30, 31 ff.

the subject.³⁶ Ley's influence is due not only to his long career and his considerable scholarship, but also to his willingness to alter his views, even after publishing and defending them. Like Meier, Ley did not place great confidence in the Masoretic accents: indeed, he suggested that these relatively late additions to the text served more to obscure than to clarify the original pronunciation. Despite this, the accents still indicate the stressed syllable of the word, even though they may be less useful in indicating the relation of the word to the line in which it occurs: "Die Accentzeichen die Bücher des A. Test. haben auch für den Rhythmus ihre Geltung, aber nur insofern sie dazu dienen die Tonsilbe zu bestimmen."³⁷

The rhythm of the poem is based on the stressed syllables.

Der Rhythmus in der hebräischen Poesie wird, wie im Deutschen, durch den Ton (Accent) bestimmt. Die betonten Silben gelten als Längen oder Hebungen, die nicht betonten als Senkungen.³⁸

Each measure, or metrical foot contains a single stressed syllable, with the unstressed syllables dependent on it (usually preceding it, though a single unstressed syllable may follow).

Jedes Begriffswort hat zum mindesten eine Tonsilbe. Der Ton trifft entweder die letzte Silbe des Wortes, . . . oder die vorletzte Silbe, . . .

Die der Tonsilbe vorangehenden nicht betonten Silben sind dieser untergeordnet und bilden mit derselben eine Art von Tonsystem; die nicht betonten Silben nämlich bilden gewissermaßen eine

³⁶Die metrischen Formen der hebräischen Poesie (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1866); Grundzüge des Rhythmus des Vers- und Strophebaues in der hebräischen Poesie (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875), and Leitfaden der Metrik der hebräischen Poesie (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1887). The last of these is primarily an abridgement of the second, though some changes are introduced into his system.

³⁷J. Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, 125.

³⁸J. Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, 125.

Stufenleiter von steigenden Tönen deren Spitze in die Tonsilbe fällt.³⁹

Since the stress is ultimate or penultimate, it will normally be found that metrical feet consist of a series of unaccented syllables terminating with an accented syllable. The number of unaccented syllables may vary, but for Ley, it was irrelevant.

Jede Tonsilbe mit dem vorangehenden unbetonten und mit der nachfolgenden des Tonfalls bildet ein Metrum. Auf die Zahl der unbetonten kommt es hierbei nicht an.⁴⁰

This "Metrum" is apparently what other writers would call a poetic foot. Several such feet make up a verse, the decameter, octameter, hexameter and pentameter predominating. Extensive rules are given for the identification of accented syllables and for the delimitation of verse lines. Ley's results are fairly persuasive when he is dealing with some of the more regular Psalms, but when he discusses Psalms whose line-lengths (as judged from the Masoretic accents) are more irregular, problems arise. Ley does not hesitate to emend the text on the basis of meter. An example of such emendation can be found in Ley's treatment of Psalm 75:9, the first part of which reads, כִּי כּוֹס בְּיַד יְהוָה [וַיִּין חֶמֶר קְלָא חֶסֶךְ נִינְר קָזָה], usually divided into a bicolon either before וַיִּין or after חֶמֶר. Ley remarks,

Das schwierige und störende [וַיִּין חֶמֶר] kann nach dem Metrum nicht mitgezählt werden, weil es entweder nur als in Parenthese stehend ("und der Wein schäumt oder gährt") aus gefasst werden kann, da das nachfolgende קְלָא nur Prädicat zu כּוֹס sein kann, oder weil es überhaupt eine Glosse ist.⁴¹

³⁹J. Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, 126. We may also note in this quotation an intrusion into Ley's system of a semantic consideration, the "Begriffswort." It is only "significant words" which have accents. Since Ley also indicates that the metrical foot has the accent, we may infer that the number of accents is tied to the number of (semantically) significant words.

⁴⁰J. Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, 131.

⁴¹J. Ley, Grundzüge des Rhythmus, 144, n. 1.

As always, such emendation is problematic. Cobb comments that it is out of order for Ley to assert that the meter demands a certain emendation, "for the very question before us is whether there is a meter to make the demand."⁴²

Ley's contemporaries noticed this and other defects of his system. Most prominent among these critics was Karl von Budde, whose own concepts will be discussed presently. Budde's position was initially much like that of Ernst Meier, though with time his views became much more nuanced. It was his assertion that a priori arguments that poetry must be metrical were not valid. The fact that biblical poems were performed to musical accompaniment proves nothing about their metricality. Neither can meter be inferred from the elevated style of the biblical poems. Poetry may have meter, or it may not. This can only be known by inductive analysis. In addition, Budde also protested against the subjectivism of Ley's analysis.⁴³ In particular, the identification of tone syllables was largely a matter of personal whim. Ley did not hesitate to supply accents wherever they were useful to him, even on prepositional prefixes and other particles.

With the passage of time, both Budde and Ley modified their views. By the end of the nineteenth century, Ley was no longer proposing the division of the texts into the improbably short lines he had identified in earlier works, especially his Grundzüge des Rhythmus des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebräischen Poesie. In addition, he shifted his focus to the tone syllables, largely ignoring the question of unstressed syllables. His scansion of Hebrew poems therefore became much more simple, less forced, and less given to gratuitous textual emendation.

⁴²W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 97.

⁴³Karl von Budde, "Das hebräische Klagelied," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 2 (1882) 1-52.

Gustav Bickell

In the same era, Gustav Bickell also published several books on the subject of Hebrew meter, most notable of which were Carmina Veteris Testamenti⁴⁴ and Die Dichtung der Hebräer,⁴⁵ both of which presented Bickell's reconstructions of biblical poems. Reduced to simplest terms, Bickell's view was that Hebrew meter was syllabic, and that all Hebrew poetry was either iambic or trochaic. The two kinds could be distinguished by observing the last syllable of the line. If it was accented, the line was iambic. If the final syllable was unaccented, the line was trochaic. All verse lines would present accented and unaccented syllables in strict alternation.

Die hebräische Metrik beruht auf denselben Grundlagen, wie die syrische und die aus dieser entstandene christlich-griechische; nämlich auf Silbenzählung, Nichtberücksichtigung der Quantität, regelmäßigem Wechsel betonter Silben mit unbetonten, Identität des metrischen und grammatischen Accentes, Zusammenfallen der Verszeilen (Stichen) mit den Sinnesabschnitten und Vereinigung gleichartiger oder ungleichartiger Stichen zu gleichmässig wiederkehrenden Strophen.⁴⁶

Of course, this theory runs afoul of the fact that the Masoretic accents do not fall with such regularity as Bickell insists. From the outset, Bickell depended on the Masoretic accents, as Johannes Döllner noted in his critique of Bickell, "In der Regel fällt der metrische Accent mit dem Accente der Massorethen zusammen."⁴⁷ Döllner follows this, however, with several paragraphs describing Bickell's own exceptions to his rules.

⁴⁴Gustav Bickell, Carmina Veteris Testamenti (Innsbruck: Libreria Academica Wagneria, 1882)

⁴⁵Gustave Bickell, Die Dichtung der Hebräer (Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagnerschen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1882).

⁴⁶Gustav Bickell, "Die hebräische Metrik," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 1881, 415.

⁴⁷J. Döllner, Rhythmus, Metrik und Strophik, 43.

Bickell therefore presents a complicated system of rules for counting, adding, deleting and ignoring syllables. This system appeared at times to be quite arbitrary. Kugel comments on the weakness of this system:

No doubt this system will remind the attentive reader of that advanced by Francis Hare; it was not, however, for a lack of originality that Bickell was criticized, but because, in order to make good the claim of alternation, he had to resort to an arbitrary and irrational system of assigning stresses. Syllables ending in aleph and heh were sometimes elided and sometimes not, and shewa was not handled consistently.⁴⁸

An example of such inconsistency may be extracted from Bickell's transliteration and scansion of Psalm 126:2, which he describes as having a meter of "7.5 | 7.5."

Az jimmalé o'cgoq pinu,
-L'šonénu rinna
-Z jom'rú b'gojím: higdíl Jah,
La'ót 'im éllä.⁴⁹

It may be noted that the preposition וְ, which occurs at the beginning of each half of the verse, is rendered both "Az" and "-Z," apparently depending on whether Bickell thought that an additional syllable was needed. Furthermore, the divine name יהוה in the third colon of the verse is reduced in Bickell's transliteration to "Jah." This is permissible because, as Bickell remarks elsewhere,

Die Gottesnamen יהוה und יה sind für die Textkritik als vertauschbar zu betrachten, da sie in den älteren Handschriften durch eine gemeinschaftliche Abbréviatur, wahrscheinlich Jod, vertreten waren.⁵⁰

This example is, unfortunately, not rare. Bickell's work is filled with rules for adjusting the syllabification and colometry of the text. Because of such rules, and sometimes despite them, textual emendation was

⁴⁸J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 294.

⁴⁹G. Bickell, Carmina Veteris Testamenti, 90.

⁵⁰G. Bickell, "Die hebräische Metrik," 418.

widespread, a fact which did not escape the notice of Bickell's critics:⁵¹

"The text is adapted to the system, not the system to the text."⁵²

Furthermore, the sing-song nature of the poetry which would be produced by such a system seems palpably inferior to the apparent rhythms of the Masoretic text. Despite the difficulties with Bickell's theory, a similar view was proposed more than half a century later by Stanislav Segert,⁵³ though he applied this theory only to Hebrew poems of the later biblical period. Segert's system, like those of Hare and Bickell, involves metrical accents which do not necessarily coincide with the natural stress of the word.⁵⁴ Since Segert holds an unaccented syllable prior to the first accented syllable of a line, or an unaccented syllable after the last accent, to be metrically irrelevant, the measure of the line is the number of accents. This may seem to resemble the views of Ewald and Ley (as well as Budde and Gray, whose work is yet to be discussed), but this must be tempered by the fact that Segert's scansion includes accents other than those of the Masoretic text. A critique of Segert's suggestions has been included in Wilfred Watson's study of Hebrew poetics.⁵⁵

Karl Budde

In addition to critiques of the theories of Ley and Bickell, Karl Budde proposed a metrical system of his own. His work in this line began with the study of the book of Lamentations, a book which is noteworthy, not only

⁵¹Cf. W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 117.

⁵²W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 127.

⁵³Stanislav Segert, "Problems of Hebrew Prosody," in Vetus Testamentum Supplement 7 (1960): 283-291.

⁵⁴S. Segert, "Problems of Hebrew Prosody," 288.

⁵⁵Wilfred G. E. Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 103.

because of its characteristically high degree of regularity, but also because of its acrostic form, which provides a quick solution to most colometric questions. Budde noticed that each verse line in the Lamentations⁵⁶ consists of two parts. The first of these frequently has three accented syllables, the second often has two.

In den 4 ersten Capiteln des Buches der Klagelieder bildet die überall gleichwerthige Formeinheit ein kurzer Vers, dessen erste, durch einen Einschnitt des Sinnes abgegrenzte Hälfte die Länge des vollen Versgliedes eines regelrechten kurzen Verses aufweist, wie er etwa im Buche Hiob herrscht, während die zweite Hälfte, regelmäßig kürzer gehalten, als das verstümmelte zweite Versglied gelten kann. Für diese zweite Vershälfte ist, da sie eine Wortgruppe bleiben muß, als das Minimum an Länge die Verbindung zweier selbständige Worte gegeben: daraus ergibt sich als das Minimum für die erste Hälfte ein Umfang von drei Worten. Das Verhältnis von 3 : 2 ist also das erste, welches der Absicht, ein kürzeres Versglied dem ersten längeren folgen zu lassen, entspricht; doch sind damit andere Verhältnisse und längere Verse, wie 4 : 2, 4 : 3 u. s. w. keineswegs ausgeschlossen.⁵⁷

Budde called this pattern of three stresses followed by two, or of three major words followed by two, the "qinah," from the Hebrew word for a song of lamentation. The first four laments are more regular in this respect than the fifth, though none of them is perfectly regular: a number of other accentual arrangements occur. However, the arrangement of three stresses followed by two stresses is so frequent as to suggest the possibility of intention. A secondary potential conclusion from these data is that this unbalanced line is probably a modification of the balanced line which is more common elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.

Despite its apparent contributions to the understanding of Hebrew poetry, Budde's theory is immediately suspect. Critics will always wonder whether any theory which is based on a highly regular passage like

⁵⁶There are three such lines per alphabetic letter in Lamentations 1, 2 and 3, and two per verse in Lamentations 4. Lamentations 5, which is not an alphabetic acrostic, consists of twenty-two bicola.

⁵⁷K. Budde, "Das hebräische Klagelied," 5, 6.

Lamentations will be adequate to explain the much less regular passages in some of the prophets. Furthermore, Budde's theory, like several other which preceded it, fails to take account of the unstressed syllables. Even if meter is based on stresses, unstressed syllables are important nevertheless. Cobb cites an example on this point, a comic English couplet with three stresses per line, which derives its humor from the apparent assumption of the insignificance of unstressed syllables:

Wasn't Pharaoh a rascal?

He wouldn't let the children of Israel go three days' journey
into the wilderness to eat the Paschal.⁵⁸

Hubert Grimme

It is precisely this defect of several preceding metrical theories which Hubert Grimme attempted to overcome in his own presentation on Hebrew metrics. This concept was developed in several publications around the turn of the century, and found its fullest expression in his Psalmenprobleme.⁵⁹ Grimme acknowledges the impossibility of explaining Hebrew meter in the forms of Greek, Latin or German poetry.⁶⁰ Instead, one must look to two aspects of the Hebrew language, variation of stress and duration of pronunciation, which Grimme describes under the titles of "tone" and "morae." Grimme distinguishes three levels of tone in Hebrew, the main, secondary and weak tones.⁶¹ Each word or word group contains one main tone, and may contain one or more secondary or weak tones. Each verse line contains a full sentence, or at least a syntactically complete phrase. Verse lines usually contain two or three main tones.

⁵⁸W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 123.

⁵⁹Hubert Grimme, Psalmenprobleme (Freiburg: Kommissionsverlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1902).

⁶⁰H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 3.

⁶¹H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 4, 5.

Aus Hebungen und Senkungen werden im Hebräischen nicht wie in manchen anderen Sprachen zunächst Einzelfüße (Monopodien) gebildet, sondern die rhythmischen Einheiten in den hebräischen Versen sind Dipodien und Tripodien.⁶²

Doubled lines of either four or five main tones are also used.⁶³ But in addition to this quality of syllables, Grimme also describes the quantity of syllables, that is, the length of time necessary to pronounce the syllable, measured in relative terms by morae.⁶⁴ Hebrew syllables have from one to four morae, depending on their vocalization and their position relative to the tones. While the meter of the syllables is based primarily on the number of main tones, the morae determine the maxima and minima of the length of intervals between main tones. Thus Grimme's system gives some account for both the stressed and unstressed syllables of the Hebrew verse line.

Unfortunately, Grimme insisted on finding or enforcing a uniform meter on each poem which he studied, regardless of the indications of the Masoretic text, and despite the fact that even his own rules could not determine such high levels of regularity. In order to bring about this consistent uniformity, Grimme resorted, as did so many other metricists, to textual emendation. The greatest portion of his Psalmenprobleme (111 pages out of 193) is devoted to a chapter titled "Emendationen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrischen Form."⁶⁵ This is done despite his own admission that,

While metrics is well adapted to put us on the watch for certain blemishes in the text, especially for the presence of gaps or

⁶²H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 7.

⁶³H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 8. It is clear here that Grimme is speaking of individual cola, and not of bicola or longer verse units as "lines."

⁶⁴H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 5, 6.

⁶⁵H. Grimme, Psalmenprobleme, 20-131.

insertions within the verses, still it possesses no real power of positive emendation.⁶⁶

With this fault is coupled another, that Grimme, after having elaborated his system of morae so carefully, generally ignored it in his critical treatment of the poetic text, as C. H. Toy remarks, "It is noteworthy that in his emendations, he makes almost no use of his mora-system, which in his introduction he illustrates at length."⁶⁷ Grimme is therefore not entirely faithful to his own system, despite having relied on some aspects of it for extensive emendation of the text.

Eduard Sievers

Another late nineteenth-century German metricist was Eduard Sievers, who also attempted a metrical theory which would account as well for both unstressed and stressed syllables. Sievers' initial training was in the fields of Germanic language and literature.⁶⁸ This background is evident from Sievers' frequent comparisons with German poetry in his discussion of Hebrew. At the request of Frants Buhl, Sievers began to study Hebrew poetry, examining some of the biblical poems which appeared quite regular, the first of which was Deuteronomy 32. From these, Sievers inferred that the predominant metrical pattern of Hebrew poetry was based on accents, and that the normal form of the verse-foot is the anapest, a trisyllabic foot accented on the last syllable. Some variations were accepted, but Sievers insisted that the ground form of the Hebrew verse was the anapestic foot. This

⁶⁶Hubert Grimme, Vierteljahrsschrift für Bibelkunde, 1:14, quoted and translated in W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 168.

⁶⁷C. H. Toy, "Studies in Hebrew Meter," American Journal of Semitic Languages, 19 (1902): 60.

⁶⁸See, for example, Eduard Sievers, Die altschwedischen Upplandslagh nebst Proben formverwandter germanischer Sagdichtung (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1918), vol 4, Metrische Studien.

generalization was reasonably valid for the poems which Sievers had examined. But Sievers extended this gratuitously into the wider realm of biblical poetry, and set out to find the anapest wherever he could. This required him to suppose that other apparent patterns were actually modifications of the widely-used anapest. Thus the iamb is an abbreviated anapest, created by the protraction of a preceding rise. The paeon with penultimate stress is the resolution of the anapest, and so on. Cobb comments, "The theory results from a proper empirical observation, but it ought not to have been made to cover so much unsurveyed territory."⁶⁹ The realities of the observable sequences of stressed and unstressed syllables in the extant Hebrew poetry demanded a host of gratuitous explanations and exceptions, "...all resting on the assumption that because x x ' is a frequent form, all other forms must be somehow derived from it or connected with it."⁷⁰ If Sievers did not emend the text as extensively as some of his predecessors, this was at least partly due to the fact that he explained it away. In addition, Sievers abandoned to a considerable degree the conventionally accepted basis of colometry. Most scholars of Hebrew verse structure have concurred in the view that syntactic and metrical boundaries of lines coincide in all but rare cases. But Sievers was quite prepared to allow enjambment on a large scale. This allowed him to regard as poetic many parts of the Hebrew Bible traditionally regarded as prose. In his "Prolegomenon" to Gray's Forms of Hebrew Poetry, Freedman remarks,

Gray effectively criticizes Sievers' ambitious attempt as both unproven and improbable, pointing especially to the excessive amount of emendation to which Sievers resorts in order to sustain his theory. Even more destructive of Sievers' theories is the observation that if we begin with a variety of metrical patterns allowing for lines of different lengths, accept run-on lines as a matter of course, allow a wide range of variations and exceptions -- not counting emendations --

⁶⁹W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 181.

⁷⁰W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 181, 182.

then anything becomes metrical, and it is impossible to distinguish prose from poetry. Once parallelism in both form and sense, and paired cola and larger units are abandoned, then there is little left in the way of criteria to determine the presence of poetry apart from the assertion that it is there.⁷¹

Cobb goes so far as to attribute Sievers' theory to the focus of his initial exposure to Hebrew poetry. If Sievers had begun with some other poem than that of Deuteronomy 32, he might well have discovered a different fundamental foot. Had his investigations begun elsewhere,

. . . would it not have been possible to formulate rules and exceptions that would have brought all into harmony with some other fundamental foot? Would it not be better still to acknowledge frankly that Hebrew metre is as free as the German to which he constantly compares it?⁷²

Not only this, but Sievers' system fails to resolve the very difficulties which occasioned his theory, that is, the evident lack of regularity which is detected when only stressed syllables are examined. On this point, G. B. Gray comments,

I cannot here undertake any examination or criticism of Sievers' long and exhaustive exposition of his theory. . . . But these theories, however much may be said for some of them, are not all of them as yet so certainly established as to allow the metrical system, which in part suggests them, but which also certainly rests upon them, to furnish a sufficiently sure instrument for eliminating the uncertainties which arise when we measure a Hebrew text by the stressed syllables only. The degree of uncertainty which the theory would remove is largely counterbalanced by the insecurity of the basis on which it rests.⁷³

Twentieth Century Theorists

William Henry Cobb

William Henry Cobb, though his metrical work was largely critical, nevertheless offers some positive statements on the nature of Hebrew meter.

⁷¹David Noel Freedman, "Prolegomenon" to The Forms of Hebrew Poetry by George Buchanan Gray (New York: KTAV, 1972), xxi.

⁷²W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 182.

⁷³George Buchanan Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry (1915; reprint, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972), 147.

He asserts the existence of poetry in the Hebrew Bible, though this was hardly doubted in his era. On the other hand, he acknowledges that the form of this poetry may be misunderstood.⁷⁴ Furthermore he insists that at least some of this poetry was metrical. Following a discussion of Psalms 54 and 67, he comments,

No one ought to deny that the evidence for a true metre in the Hebrew Psalms is much strengthened by the existence of a second psalm that answers all the tests of English meter. We are very far from asserting that all the psalms are metrical; that is a very different statement.⁷⁵

But in what does this meter consist? On the one hand, Cobb says that "Our induction is leading us to discard the syllable as a unit of measure, provided we regard the psalm as metrical at all."⁷⁶ On the other hand, in his analysis of Psalm 54, he says

The caesura separates each line into equal groups of three feet, marked in every case by three tones or accents, two of these groups making a Massoretic verse, save that verse 5 has three groups.⁷⁷

Cobb's consistent practice is to count stresses, though in some cases he takes note of the unstressed syllables as well. He observes regularities in some psalms which he cannot regard as chance occurrences. From these regularities he infers the metricality of at least some Hebrew poetry. In his analysis of Psalm 94, Cobb remarks,

Inasmuch as the book of Psalms has come down to us through long generations of copyists who were utterly ignorant of metrical form, it is certainly surprising that twenty-one out of these twenty-three verses are in perfect threes. The candid reader must acknowledge by this time that chance could not have produced such a result. Suppose we hereafter find a multitude of poems in the Old Testament that defy

⁷⁴W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 6.

⁷⁵W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 14.

⁷⁶W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 8.

⁷⁷W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 5.

all metrical laws, this cannot alter the fact that we have found others which would be recognized in any language as real poetry.⁷⁸

It may be presumed that he means that these poems would be recognized as "real poetry" because of their metrical nature. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that "irregular poems greatly preponderate,"⁷⁹ and that metrical regularity, even as measured by stresses, is not a norm for Hebrew poetry. Much of Hebrew poetry, if it is metrical, follows rules which Cobb has not been able to deduce.

If all Hebrew poetry is metrical its metrical principles are not yet manifest, and are very different, at all events from those of English poetry. We are sure, though, that it is not all non-metrical. It may be more rhythmical than metrical -- if any one can maintain such a distinction. It is certainly strophic now and then, but it is hard to believe that it is strophic entirely.⁸⁰

Because of the uncertainty of Hebrew meter, even though Cobb clearly believes that some Hebrew poetry is metrical, and that the meter is based on stresses, he rejects the practice of emending the text on the basis of meter: "One thing is certain: no critic has a right to say 'the metre demands' this or that change . . ."⁸¹ Apparent deviations from metrical regularity may be part of the design of the poem.

George Buchanan Gray

Cobb's cautious approach to metrics and his advocacy of accentual meter were also represented in the work of his contemporary, George Buchanan Gray. Gray recognized that Hebrew poetry was made up, for the most part, of two-part lines, and that these could be distinguished as being of two kinds.

⁷⁸W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 17.

⁷⁹W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 30.

⁸⁰W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 33.

⁸¹W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 33.

parallelism suggests a division of Hebrew distichs into two broad types of rhythm: in one of these two types, the two parallel lines balance one another, whereas in the other the second comes short of and echoes the first.⁸²

But the intuitive recognition of these two types of bicola is insufficient. Some formal means to describe the distinction between these two must be discovered. Gray briefly considers three possibilities: syllabic meter, quantitative meter, and stress or accentual meter. The first two of these he considers to have been "ruled out in the course of discussion and concerning Hebrew metre."⁸³ With regard to the third, he asserts that

. . . there has been an increasing agreement among modern students of this subject, particularly under the influence of Ley, to find in the stressed words or syllables the "pivots or posts" . . . of the Hebrew rhythm.⁸⁴

Gray also considers the issue of whether there is any law governing the position of the stressed syllable relative to the unstressed syllables which surround it (i.e., are there regular metrical feet), and whether there is some limit to the number of unstressed syllables which can accompany the stress. It is on these points that he sees the greatest divergences among the metricists of his era.⁸⁵ But throughout his consideration of these questions, he consistently refers to the number of stressed syllables in determining the length of the line.

⁸²G. B. Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 130.

⁸³G. B. Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 136.

⁸⁴G. B. Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 137.

⁸⁵G. B. Gray, The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 137, 147.

David Noel Freedman and Frank Moore Cross

By the middle of the twentieth century, students of W. F. Albright had proposed theories similar to those of Heinrich Ewald. Albright himself wavered between syllabic and accentual theories of meter.

. . . it is already certain that Phoenician and Hebrew poetry were to a large extent word-for-word echoes of Canaanite verse, . . . There is as yet no evidence that Canaanite poetry was quantitative, but there are increasing indications that it was partly accentual and partly syllabic (i.e., it depended partly on counting syllables), though the precise laws governing it are still obscure and there was certainly a great deal of possible variation within still uncertain boundaries.⁶⁶

This caution was shared by Albright's students, F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, whose earlier works on Hebrew verse structure focussed on accentual meter without ignoring syllabic considerations.

The basic building blocks in Canaanite and early Hebrew metrical structure are the two-stress colon and the three-stress colon. The dominating principle is that of balance or symmetry: parallelismus membrorum. The Ugaritic texts seem mainly to be in the 3:3 pattern, as would be expected in epic poetry; but the 2:2 pattern is not uncommon, and there are numerous instances of mixed patterns of 3:3 and 2:2.

In addition a remarkable regularity obtains in the oldest Hebrew verse (as in early Canaanite poetry); This is easily recognized in spite of numerous corruptions in the preserved text. This regularity lies somewhere between a simple stress meter (i.e., matching accented syllables without regard to the number of unstressed syllables), and a complex meter involving syllable count and division into metrical feet. The symmetry is exhibited chiefly in parallel cola.⁶⁷

That this statement was not intended as an absolute rule is apparent from subsequent comments in the same work:

⁶⁶W. F. Albright, review of Introduction to the Old Testament, by Robert H. Pfeiffer, in The Journal of Biblical Literature 61 (1942): 117.

⁶⁷Frank Moore Cross, Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1950), 18, 19. Despite its publication by Cross, this dissertation is described on the flyleaf as "the second of two joint doctoral dissertations submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University by David Noel Freedman and Frank Moore Cross, Jr." It may be supposed that this work expressed the views of both Freedman and Cross at the time of its writing.

. . . the balance or equality in the number of stressed syllables has always been regarded as a fundamental principle of Hebrew metrical structure. Nevertheless, there are cases in which this balance apparently does not obtain, without however violating the canons of symmetry. It may be very difficult or impossible to assign the same number of stresses to parallel cola; at the same time they may have an equal number of syllables and balance perfectly. Thus it appears that a deep sense of symmetry is the guiding principle of metrical structure, and that the stress pattern (3:3, 2:2) is only the most convenient, and generally adequate method of expressing this symmetry.⁸⁸

Both Cross and Freedman subsequently advocated systems for the analysis of verse structure which were based fundamentally on the counting of syllables. It is perhaps incorrect to refer to these as theories of meter, inasmuch as the proponents do not claim to be formulating rules, but only observing phenomena and drawing statistical comparisons. Examples of Freedman's work in this line can be found in his "Prolegomenon" to Gray's Forms of Hebrew Poetry, and more extensively in his "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry."⁸⁹ In the latter essay, Freedman counts the syllables of each verse line in two sets of Hebrew poems, calculates averages and establishes maxima and minima. He then remarks,

While these statistics cannot be used to control or emend specific lines or stanzas, since deviations and other eccentricities are an integral and inescapable part of poetic strategy, nevertheless they give a thoroughly adequate metrical description of prevailing usages in the 6th century B.C.E.⁹⁰

Freedman has also given some attention to the accentual metrics favored by many of the nineteenth century German scholars. Several of his essays on Hebrew poetry present the counts of stresses and syllables in verse lines. In some cases he has even included counts of vocables (consonants and

⁸⁸F. M. Cross, Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, 20.

⁸⁹David N. Freedman, "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry," Harvard Theological Review 65 (1972) 367-392. Both this essay and the "Prolegomenon" are reprinted in Freedman's Poetry, Poetry and Prophecy (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

⁹⁰D. N. Freedman, "Acrostics and Metrics," 62.

vowels).⁹¹ The counting of individual letters in a poem has been undertaken by others, including Steven Byington, who makes a mathematical comparison of several different theories of metrical scansion, and concludes

. . . we can hardly exclude the idea of an accentual meter . . . and we can hardly exclude the idea of quantitative meter But I am much more impressed by the quality of evidence for quantitative meter. . . . I conclude that Hebrew has a quantitative meter.⁹²

But is primarily the system of counting syllables which has attracted the attention of other scholars. Among those who have made some use of this system for larger or smaller studies of Hebrew poetry are Douglas Stuart,⁹³ R. C. Culley⁹⁴ and J. J. McCarthy.⁹⁵ In all of these cases, the users of this method have commented on statistical generalizations without attempting to find, much less enforce, a regular pattern in the text. They have called attention to certain patterns inherent in the text which are most easily explained in terms of constraints on line length, rather than as consequences of other poetic phenomena. As a result, textual emendation has not been widely employed by the practitioners of this method, unless the emendations were justifiable on some basis other than meter. The method has

⁹¹E.g., David Noel Freedman, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15," in A Light unto My Path, ed. Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim and Carey A. Moore (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974), reprinted in Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry by David Noel Freedman (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 187-228.

⁹²Steven T. Byington, "A Mathematical Approach to Hebrew Meters," The Journal of Biblical Literature 66 (1947): 75.

⁹³Douglas K. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).

⁹⁴R. C. Culley, "Metrical Analysis of Classical Hebrew Poetry," in Essays on the Ancient Semitic World ed. J. W. Wevers and D. B. Redford (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 12-28.

⁹⁵J. J. McCarthy, "The Metrical Structure of Psalm 137." Journal of Biblical Literature 100 (1981) 161-167.

been critiqued by Tremper Longman,⁹⁰ but remains the most common system of minimal unit counting in use at the end of this century.

FURTHER STUDY

Questions Regarding Minimal Unit Counting

From the presentation of these theories, three thoughts may be abstracted, which are not statements but questions. First, if the counting of minimal units is a key to the verse structure of Hebrew poetry, what kind of units should be counted? Should these be morae, vocables (sonants), syllables or stresses? If syllables are to be counted, should a distinction be made between stressed and unstressed syllables, and should the sequences formed by stressed and unstressed syllables be noted? Second, what can the reader expect to learn from counting? Can consistent, regular patterns (of so many syllables per line, for example) be found, or will students of Hebrew verse structure have to content themselves with norms and distributions and with maxima and minima? Third, do the results of counting have any distinguishing or predictive value? Can they help differentiate poetry from prose, or one kind of poetry from another? Can they inform the reader what to expect in a poem: can anything be known about the tenth line of a given poem on the basis of the reading of the first nine? Varying answers have been given to these questions. For convenience of comparison, the views of some of the more significant metricists discussed in this chapter are presented in summary form in the following table. This table will attempt to answer the first two questions indicated above. Discussion of the third will be undertaken only briefly, fuller treatment being offered in the chapter on the inductive trial of the recent theories of metrical structure.

⁹⁰Tremper Longman, "A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems," Biblica 63 (1982): 230-254.

TABLE 3 - 1

COMPARISON OF METRICAL THEORIES

METRICIST	MINIMAL UNIT COUNTED	PATTERN EXPECTED
Johann Beller mann	morae and tones	various metrical feet, usually three per line
Heinrich Ewald	syllables	usually seven or eight per line, lines in pairs or triplets
Ernst Meier	stressed syllables	two stresses per line
Julius Ley	metrical feet containing one stressed syllable per foot	consistent number of feet per line within a given poem
Gustav Bickell	stressed and unstressed syllables	strict alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables
Karl Budde	stresses	balanced lines of three or four stresses per half-line, except for <u>qinah</u> lines which have three stresses in the first half and two in the second.
Hubert Grimme	morae and tones	two or three main tones per line
Eduard Sievers	metrical feet containing one stressed syllable per foot	anapestic feet (two unstressed syllables followed by a stressed syllable), with many variations permissible
William Henry Cobb	stressed syllables	usually three (sometimes four) stresses per line, paired lines
George Buchanan Gray	stressed syllables	various patterns, usually balanced lines
David Noel Freedman	syllables	tendency for similar line lengths within a given poem

Limitations of the Present Study

Despite the considerable variety of approaches described in this table and in this chapter, the present study will concentrate on only two minimal units, the syllable and the stress, since these are the two units which still frequently considered in the metrical study of Hebrew poetry at the end of the twentieth century. Those who still engage in some sort of minimal unit counting are virtually unanimous in asserting that there is no poem which maintains a consistent number of minimal units per colon, or a consistent pattern of colon lengths. An unusually long colon or verse may be noted as anomalous, but twentieth century minimal unit counters have hesitated to emend such passages unless they have some reason other than lack of conformity to customary colon lengths.

This deficiency of minimal unit counting is compensated, at least to a small degree, by its usefulness as a descriptive device. There are certain patterns, of which Budde's qinah is a striking example, which are most simply explained as relationships of length, or of the number of units in a colon or line. Among other things, this suggests that there are constraints operating in Hebrew poetry which cannot or ought not to be explained by reference to syntax or semantics. There are some who have rejected more or less categorically the practice of describing Hebrew poetry by reference to the numbers of minimal units. Wilfred Watson is typical of these.

Syllable-counting has many advocates and is no new approach. Its principle drawbacks are that it relies on reconstructing the vowels and that it ignores stress. At best it is useful for lineation.⁹⁷

Watson may be right in saying that Hebrew poetry cannot be explained entirely on the basis of minimal unit counting. Yet it seems that there are some aspects of Hebrew poetry in which the numbers of minimal units appear significant, at least as statistical generalizations.

⁹⁷W. G. E. Classical Hebrew Poetry, Watson, 105.

CHAPTER FOUR

TERENCE COLLINS: LINE-FORM ANALYSIS

THE SYNTACTIC ALTERNATIVE

Terence Collins' Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry¹ was one of the first modern attempts to find a basis for the study of biblical poetry which depended on neither the semantic structures which Lowth had identified nor the temporal or accentual metrics of mediaeval and nineteenth century scholars. After indicating the weaknesses of both Lowth's parallelismus membrorum and the metrical systems of the German scholars, Collins asserts, "...we need a third alternative in the debate, one which will give us an entirely fresh approach..."² Collins believes he has found this entirely fresh third alternative in "...an analysis of lines based on grammatical structures."³ His explicitly stated program includes respecting the valid conclusions of parallelistic studies, and inclusion of lines which cannot be explained by theories based on semantic parallelism as well as the clarification of patterns that exist in the data of biblical poetry.⁴

On its face, this would seem to require an approach which would deal with several different levels or facets of the text, the meaning as well as the rhythm and the grammar. The necessity of such an approach is indicated several times by Collins. Near the end of his book he states,

...the Hebrew verse-line is far too complex and delicate a thing to respond to any one-track investigation. The line is made up of different layers -- grammatical structure, semantic structure, stress

¹Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978)

²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 7.

³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 7.

⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 7.

patterns, syllable counts, alliteration, -- and a full stylistic analysis can only be achieved when we have observed the functioning of each layer individually and then studied how collectively they interact and contribute in different ways to the overall effect of the line.⁵

The Inadequacy of Other Approaches

The failure of attempts to find meter in Hebrew poetry was at the basis of Lowth's decision to look elsewhere for the fundamental structuring principle of Hebrew poetry. Lowth, though he believed that Hebrew poetry had been originally metrical, chose to examine semantic parallelism because of his view that the system of meter was no longer accessible. But the importance of semantic parallelism in Hebrew poetry, though it is great, has often been exaggerated. There are many cases where semantic parallelism does not really exist. Even where it does exist, it often occurs in ways and variations which defy Lowth's primitive attempts at classification. As Collins says,

There is a wide variety in the kinds of parallelism. Lines with true synonymous parallelism are fewer than the others. Some lines could hardly be said to contain parallelism at all, except by gross over-extension of the term. e.g. Isa 42:1....To call this "consecutive parallelism" is to say no more than that there is some connection between the first half of the line and the second half, which is a trite observation.⁶

Collins therefore rejects as fundamental both the traditional metrical systems and the semantic patterns which Lowth proposed. In the place of meter, in the traditional temporal or accentual sense, Collins proposes that the grammatical forms of the verse lines may serve as a basis of poetry and as a system for measuring lines.

In Hebrew poetry, syntax....becomes a formal principle, controlling not just the movement of thought but also the form

⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 227.

⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 122.

of the lines. We can even say that it becomes a principle of line measurement, determining what constitutes a "well formed" line according to a limited number of basic traditional patterns.... Thus, one of the main results of this study will be to show that in Hebrew poetry syntax is "poetic" in the strictest sense of the word, since it contributes to the aesthetic pleasure of appreciating a well formed line which satisfies the instinctive expectations already set up through familiarity with the same pattern in other known lines.⁷

This is an assertion which Collins offers both at the beginning and the end of his work. His brief conclusion is that "...we can say that the grammatical structure acts as the basic framework of the verse-line."⁸ Elsewhere Collins makes an explicit comparison of the function of meter (based on stressed and unstressed syllables) in English poetry and the grammatical structure and ordering of constituents in Hebrew poetry, noting that each of these acts in its own poetic tradition as a "permanent frame of reference."⁹

Reasons for a Syntactic Approach

Collins' argument in favour of a syntactic, rather than a metrical or semantic, basis for Hebrew poetry is associated in part with the relative ease of classification of syntactic patterns, compared with the semantic patterns.

The semantic and grammatical layers can never be entirely divorced from one another but the grammatical framework is more easily reduced to generalized categories of classification which are always open to further analysis to bring out the necessary distinctions.¹⁰

It is left to the reader to determine whether the comparative ease of classification of grammatical forms may also be understood in absolute

⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 16.

⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 227.

⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 251.

¹⁰T. Collins, Lie-Forms, 228, 229.

terms, and whether comparative ease of classification is, in any case, proof of the fundamental character of syntax in Hebrew poetry. There is, however, more behind Collins' view than this: he believes that syntax has special functions in classical Hebrew poetry, functions which differ from those of syntax in classical Hebrew prose, or from the functions of syntax in many other poetic traditions:

The neglect of the peculiar role of syntax as a stylistic value in Hebrew poetry would seem to be one of the cardinal errors of omission committed by most studies on the subject. Hence we can anticipate slightly here and say that one of the results of this investigation will be to show that syntax in Hebrew poetry has a special function quite different from its functions in modern poetry.¹¹

The Functions of Syntax

Collins specifies the functions which he attributes to syntax in poetry. First, syntax has a controlling function in Hebrew poetry, especially in the sense of controlling the order in which the reader receives impressions. Second, syntax has an expressive function: syntactical changes can alter the reader's involvement in the poem. Third -- and this function is held to be peculiar to biblical Hebrew poetry -- syntax has a formal function, operating as a principle to determine what constitutes a well-formed line.¹² It will be readily recognized that the first two of these functions operate in prose and in non-Hebrew poetic traditions. It is the third, the formal function of syntax, which is of particular interest here. In this regard, Collins suggests, "A poet's syntax is the most fundamental aspect of his effort to produce the ordered unity of words which is his poem. In many ways it is the basic layer..."¹³

¹¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 15.

¹²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 15, 16.

¹³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 11.

THE ANALYSIS OF SYNTAX

The Role of Generative Linguistics

But if syntax is the fundamental level of biblical Hebrew poetry, it demands analysis. Collins feels that the best approach for this analysis is through the use of the concepts of generative linguistics. This field has its origins in the mid-twentieth century, principally in the work of Noam Chomsky.¹⁴ The study of generative grammar goes far beyond the bounds of Collins' work and he does not attempt to describe this linguistic approach in detail, but he does assert that "...what we are borrowing from Generative Grammar is its fundamental principle rather than haphazard individual features."¹⁵ This fundamental principle is expressed by Collins: "The basic insight of Generative Grammar is that a finite set of rules can generate the infinite set of possible sentences in a language."¹⁶ This accords well with Jean Aitchison's summary of the essence of generative grammar, in contrast with older descriptive theories of grammar.

A grammar which describes actual utterances is a descriptive grammar. A grammar which consists of a set of statements or rules which specify which sequences of a language are possible, and which impossible, is a generative grammar. Chomsky, therefore, initiated the era of generative linguistics. In his words, a grammar will be a device which generates 'all the grammatical sequences of a language and none of the ungrammatical ones'. Such a grammar must also be perfectly explicit: nothing may be left to the imagination. The rules must be precisely formulated in such a way that anyone would be able to separate the well-formed sentences from the ill-formed ones, even if he did not know a word of the language concerned.¹⁷

It is this idea, that a set of rules exists (at least hypothetically), which describe all possible grammatical utterances of a language, and no

¹⁴Noam Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (Boston: MIT Press, 1965).

¹⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 33.

¹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 34.

¹⁷Jean Aitchison, Linguistics (New York: David McKay & Co. Inc., 1978), 36,37.

other utterances, which Collins appropriates. He is therefore using generative grammar

...as a tool to provide a system of classification of Hebrew verse-lines according to their grammatical structures.

Our use of Generative Grammar will, then, be limited.¹⁸

Two Projects

Collins thus proposes two projects. First, he will use the underlying concept of generative grammar (that the infinite set of utterances in a language can be described by a finite set of rules) to define the limits of the corpus of acceptable, well-formed verse lines in biblical Hebrew. Second, he will use the notational system of generative grammar to describe Hebrew verse lines, and to create a system of taxonomy for these lines. The algebraic representation of utterances which is a technical feature of generative grammars can become quite complex. Collins does not feel that such complexity is necessary for his purposes. He therefore uses only "an elementary, simplified version of the notational system"¹⁹ of generative grammar. In fact, though he produces a fairly extensive system of symbols which are to be used in his study,²⁰ he rarely uses most of them.²¹ With the relatively simple notational system which remains, Collins describes the syntax of the lines used in Hebrew poetry, and produces a taxonomy of these lines.

¹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 33.

¹⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 33.

²⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 26.

²¹The symbols proposed for Collins' notational system are reproduced at the beginning of Appendix I.

Generative Rules

As has been noted, it is inherent in the concept of generative linguistics that meaningful and well-formed utterances can be specified by rules. These rules are of two types: phrase-structure rules and transformational rules. Phrase-structure rules specify the ways in which an utterance can be re-written or expanded by the inclusion of constituents. Transformational rules specify the ways in which an utterance can be re-ordered without loss or alteration of its semantic content.

Phrase Structure Rules

Collins allows the following phrase-structure rules which may be used to write Hebrew verse lines:

1. The line may be written as a single sentence or as two sentences.²² (In fact, lines which Collins will identify as type I consist of a single sentence; lines of types II, III and IV consist of two sentences.)
2. The sentence is written as a noun phrase plus a verb phrase.²³
3. The verb phrase may be written as a verb, a verb plus a modifier (or modifiers), a verb plus a (simple or compound) noun phrase, or a verb plus a modifier (or modifiers) plus a noun phrase.²⁴

Transformational Rules

Collins does not specify all transformational rules which may apply to a Hebrew verse line, but only those which will affect his system of

²²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 36.

²³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 35.

²⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 37.

classification.²⁵ He defines three such rules: permutation, deletion and passivization. Permutation is the rule which permits the re-ordering of the constituents in a line.²⁶ Collins admits that he does not know what constraints restrict the re-ordering of constituents in verse lines, or to what extent re-ordered lines may be interchangeable, but he recognizes that re-ordering is possible.²⁷ Deletion allows the omission of an element from the surface structure of an line when the element is intuitively known to be present in the deep structure.²⁸ In practice, Collins notes two types of deletion. The Hebrew sentence may omit its subject when this can be inferred from the inflectional form of the verb, and a constituent present in the first half-line may be omitted from the surface structure of the second half-line, even though it is present in the deep structure. The first of these two deletion phenomena is called "NP¹ deletion." Collins uses the expression "identical constituent deletion" to describe the second, though other writers frequently refer to it as "gapping."

Collins does not specify the constraints which restrict deletions of either sort. This uncertainty is magnified by the fact that Collins provides two possibilities for the deletion of the NP¹. It may be deleted if it can be inferred from the verb, and it can also be deleted as an identical constituent. Collins does not provide the reader with a clear and consistent means of distinguishing which has taken place in an instance where both rules might operate.²⁹

²⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 38.

²⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 39.

²⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 39.

²⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 40.

²⁹Obviously, NP¹ deletion can be distinguished from identical constituent deletion in cases where both cola lack NP¹: If NP¹ is absent from the first colon, there is no "identical constituent" to delete from the second. In

With regard to passivization, Collins ultimately admits that because passivization is accomplished in Hebrew through the inflection of the verb³⁰ "...there is reason to doubt whether we can even talk in terms of a transformation."³¹ In fact, it is only permutation and deletion which contribute to Collins' taxonomy of line-forms. Within a given line-type, line-forms are distinguished by permutation, deletion, or both.

The Relation of Rules and Line-Forms

In brief, the basic sentences are determined by the phrase structure rules; the basic line-types are determined by the number and similarity (or dissimilarity) of sentences in the line; and the specific line-types are determined by the type of basic sentences in the line. The subdivisions of the specific line-types are determined by the subject-deletion transformation rule, and the specific line-forms are determined by the permutation and identical constituent-deletion transformation rules. These latter two rules also frequently serve to determine the subdivisions of the specific line-forms, though other factors are also used, sometimes quite inconsistently.

addition, NP¹ deletion can be ruled out in cases where the verbs differ in person, number or gender. The distinction is far less clear in cases where the verbs agree and NP¹ is absent from only one colon (usually the second). Such a distinction might be made on semantic grounds, but Collins has set out to describe and distinguish verse-lines on solely syntactic grounds.

³⁰That is, by use of the derived conjugations, particularly the niphal, pual and hophal.

³¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 42.

Constituents and Sigla

Constituents

Collins has appropriated the notational system of generative linguistics to describe Hebrew verse lines.³² The most important elements of this notational system are described thus:

"Subject": includes pronouns, nouns, noun phrases (e.g. construct chains, noun + adjective) and noun clauses. It will be referred to as Noun Phrase One and will be written NP¹.

"Object": includes the same and will be written NP².

"Verb": this may be a finite verb, a participle or an infinitive, and will be written V.

"Modifiers of the verb": these may be adverbs, prepositional phrases, locatives, etc. and will be written M.³³

Basic Sentences

Collins finds these elements grouped variously into four "basic sentences." For purposes of describing these four basic sentences, he ignores any elements of the sentence other than those described above, including particularly, conjunctions.³⁴ According to the phrase structure rules which Collins has identified, the basic sentence must contain a subject (Noun Phrase One), which may or may not be expressed,³⁵ and a verb. The basic sentence may also contain one or more modifiers of the verb as well as a simple or compound object of the verb (Noun Phrase Two). Without consideration of the order of the constituents, the four "basic sentences" which may be generated in the this fashion are:

³²The notational system is described at length in Appendix I.

³³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23.

³⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 49, note 54.

³⁵This means that the subject may appear in the surface structure of the sentence, or it may be a part of the deep structure which is only implied in the surface structure.

A	NP ¹ V
B	NP ¹ V M
C	NP ¹ V NP ²
D	NP ¹ V NP ² M ³⁶

General Line-Types

Collins finds verse lines composed of one or two basic sentences. The various possible arrangements of sentences can be grouped into four "general line-types:"

- I The line contains only one Basic Sentence.
- II The line contains two Basic Sentences of the same kind, in such a way that all constituents in the first half-line are repeated in the second, though not necessarily in the same order.
- III The line contains two Basic Sentences of the same kind, but only some of the constituents of the first half-line are repeated in the second.
- IV The line contains two different Basic Sentences.³⁷

Specific line-types can then be indicated by the Roman numeral of the general line-type, followed by the capital letter indicating the kind of basic sentence or sentences used in the line.³⁸ Collins notes that the subject (NP¹) may be deleted from any of these line-types:

"...any one of the formulae in Table I may be rewritten without the NP¹. Consequently, from a descriptive point of view, the NP¹ must be considered an optional item. This will be indicated where necessary from now on by placing it in brackets (NP¹)."³⁹

In fact, Collins does not indicate the deleted subject consistently. Usually, he will simply omit the deleted NP¹, with no indication in his

³⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23.

³⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23,24.

³⁸A summary of the specific line-types is given by Collins in Table I on page 25. This table indicates the siglum to be used for each line-type, and the possible combinations of constituents in each. This table is reproduced in Appendix I.

³⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 27.

description of the sentence. However, the deletion of the subject (Noun Phrase One) is significant in distinguishing subdivisions of the specific line-types. As Collins indicates, "In setting out the Specific Line-Types, we shall use subdivision i) for those examples which keep the NP¹ and ii) for those which do not."⁴⁰ Further subdivisions (indicated by iii) and iv), as needed) are used for line-type IV. Thus, the complete siglum for a line-type consists of the Roman numeral designating the general line-type, the capital letter or letters designating the basic sentence or sentences used in the line, and the lower-case Roman numeral designating the subdivision of the specific line-type. The line-type designations are based on the constituents of a given verse line, without regard to the order of the constituents.

Presentation of Line-Forms

The specific line-forms are based on the order of the constituents in the line, and presented in groups, depending on the line-type to which each form belongs. The siglum for a specific line-form therefore consists of the line-type siglum followed by a number assigned to the specific permutation of constituents in the line. Subdivisions of the line-forms are indicated by lower-case letters. These subdivisions are based on various criteria which are sometimes applied in a rather inconsistent way. In addition to the system of sigla just described, Collins also uses the abbreviation "var." to indicate variations of a specific line-type, a subdivision of a specific line-type, a line-form, or a subdivision of a line-form. There is no comprehensive catalogue of line-forms anywhere in the book. The catalogue contained in Appendix One is compiled from various sections of Collins' book.

⁴⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 27.

THE POSITIVE RESULTS OF COLLINS' STUDY

Regularities of Line-Form Use

Despite the very wide variety of line-forms identified by Collins, it must be noted that these are not used randomly. There is a tendency for certain writers to prefer certain line-forms. Collins points out, for example, that Jeremiah uses more type-IV lines than lines of any other general line-type, whereas Ezekiel uses type-I lines most frequently.⁴¹ Thus line-type selection may characterize certain writers and distinguish them from other biblical poets. In addition, there is a tendency for certain line-forms to be used in proximity to others of the same sort. Regarding the forms of the I D: line-type, Collins says, "There is continued evidence of the tendency for these line-forms to occur in clusters."⁴² It appears that poets may have tended, at least on some occasions, to write stanzas or at least groups of syntactically similar lines.

Semantic Sets

The interplay of the semantic and grammatical layers of the verse line is the locus of one of Collins' most important contributions to the study of Hebrew verse structure. In the process of classifying verse lines on a deliberately and pervasively syntactic basis, Collins has recognized the existence of certain groups of lines which are not only syntactically similar, but which also bear some semantic (or occasionally, lexical) similarity. Of course, it is not the case that every line-form is associated with an identifiable semantic quality, nor that every group of lines which share a semantic quality have similarities in syntax. But that such phenomena occur at all is worthy of notice.

⁴¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 199.

⁴²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 87.

An Example of a Semantic Set

One of the most striking examples of this is the III D: i) line-type, concerning which Collins says,

NP¹ appears less frequently in lines of Type D, ...but when it does appear, it produces a very interesting group of line-forms. To begin with, since there are four constituents in the first hemistich and anything from one to three in the second, the number of possible forms is considerably greater. However, this is of secondary importance here, because all the lines of this type, no matter what form they take in terms of ordering of constituents, belong together in a unified semantic set. This set is concerned with the activity of Yahweh... Further, all the examples fall easily into three distinct groups: a) those that use the name Yahweh; b) those that use a pronoun instead of the name Yahweh; c) those that use an interrogative pronoun to which the implied answer is "Yahweh." The vast majority of examples begin with NP¹ V, followed by a wide variety of arrangements for the other constituents.⁴³

Because of the ambiguity of Collins' system of classification, three of the examples which he cites for this line-type/semantic set could also be construed as belonging to the IV D/C: iii) line-type. Collins seems to ignore this fact, but is interesting to note that all other examples of this latter line-type (there are only three)⁴⁴ also belong to the same semantic set, describing the work of Yahweh. Collins has no pretensions of reading the minds of the Hebrew poets. He has specifically disclaimed this:

We are using Generative Grammar as a tool for describing what poets did, not what they thought they were doing. In other words, this study does not claim to be a reconstruction of Ancient Hebrew poetic theory.⁴⁵

Nevertheless, it is hard to accept the coterminality of this semantic set with an identifiable syntactic configuration as a mere coincidence, or as anything other than a deliberate decision to reserve this form of speech for

⁴³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 150.

⁴⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 182.

⁴⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 43.

remarks about divine activity, or at the least, a traditional poetic convention to use this form for such remarks.

Five Semantic Sets

Such semantic sets are, in fact, rather rare. Collins identifies five groups of these sets. Group I consists of lines beginning with some form of the imperative of the verb **עֲשֵׂה**. These lines, which usually serve as introductions to prophetic discourse, are mostly drawn from the I C: i)4 line-form, and usually have the subject expressed in pejorative terms.⁴⁶ Group II is much more loosely grouped, both semantically and syntactically. They are taken from six different line-forms, and coincide semantically primarily in their use of the verb **אָמַר**. Many of them make use of the formula **כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה**. In this case, the title "semantic set" is hardly warranted: it might be more appropriate to speak of a "formula." Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there are some semantic, or at least lexical, commonalities to the group. Group III is the semantic set described above, in which Collins includes all of the lines of the III D: i) line-type. Collins is apparently unaware of the syntactically and semantically similar lines of the IV D/C iii) line-type. Group IV, which consists of lines of the III C: i)1, 2 and 3 line-forms makes up

...two distinct but complementary sets. They both centre on the relationship between God and man, viewed from both sides. There are usually overtones of judgement and moral evaluation.⁴⁷

⁴⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 240, 247. It may be noted that by basing this set on the verb **עֲשֵׂה**, Collins removes the definition from the purely syntactic realm.

⁴⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 248.

This group is particularly striking in that all but one⁴⁸ of the occurrences of line-forms III C: i)1, 2 and 3 are members of this set. These line-forms, like those which make up Group III, are used almost exclusively for this semantic set. There are examples of other line-forms of the III C: i) line-type which serve other purposes, but these constitute a very small group, only 10 of the 56 occurrences of the line-type, 46 being used for the semantic set. Again, as with Group III, there is no apparent grammatical or syntactical reason why these grammatical sequences⁴⁹ should be reserved for this meaning. Group V consists of four sets, derived from four distinct line-forms which "...are unified in their semantic content which is the pronouncement of sentence and description of punishment..."⁵⁰

The Prophetic Function of Semantic Sets

Collins notes that all of these semantic sets are somehow "...related to the main essentials of the typical prophetic oracle."⁵¹ That is to say, these are formulae which were part of the prophetic tradition. Collins speaks of "standardized forms" which would "lend a certain solemnity to the message,"⁵² and remarks,

All this suggests that when a prophet came to deliver his message he was expected to follow standard formulation in the key places....The result of all this in stylistic terms is that we can say that these

⁴⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 142-145. There may be two exceptions, but the one apparent occurrence of line form III C: i)3g is dubious.

⁴⁹The line-forms in question consist of a first half-line containing one of the following three sequences:

NP¹ + V + NP², NP¹ + NP² + V or V + NP¹ + NP².

The second half-line has the same constituents, deleting one or two identical constituents, but never the NP².

⁵⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 248.

⁵¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 249.

⁵²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 249.

semantic sets serve as an important style marker, indicating the adoption of the special register of the prophetic oracle.⁵³

In fact, Collins' identification of semantic sets may be one of his most important contributions to the study of Hebrew poetry. It is particularly important to note that these semantic sets are not coincidental:

I believe that the semantic sets evident in...line-types are something quite different from the natural coincidence of semantic content and the normal grammatical forms one would expect. Semantic sets seem to take this link a step further and assume the status of standardized formulations not based on grammatical necessity.⁵⁴

It is striking that one of the most credible results of Collins' investigation points out the intersection of modes or layers in language.

INADEQUACIES OF COLLINS' SYSTEM

Technical Difficulties

Transliteration

There are several technical difficulties with Collins' presentation. It is perhaps a minor point, but deserving of passing mention, that transliteration is seldom the best way to represent a language when it is presented for technical consideration. Furthermore, Collins' decision to represent only the consonantal text, and not the vowels, is problematic. It is, of course, well to keep in mind that the original text of the Hebrew Bible was unvocalized, and that the vowel pointing is always subject to scholarly suspicion. However, when one translates the text, or analyzes it grammatically, as Collins has done, the translation or analysis will reflect, or will be reflected in decisions about the vocalization. This being the case, it would be preferable for Collins to disclose his reading of

⁵³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 249.

⁵⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 105.

the text as soon as possible, and not require others to deduce it from his conclusions.

Sentence or Clause?

In the second place, Collins is mistaken in identifying the basic syntactic building block of his system as a "sentence." In fact, the sentence is a rather elusive phantom in Hebrew syntax. Certainly Hebrew narrative prose vaults from the clause to the paragraph with hardly any perceptible intermediate levels.⁵⁵ What Collins has so carefully sorted and catalogued are really clauses, and not sentences (in the European concept of "sentence").

The Treatment of Extensive Passages

Thirdly, after Collins has completed his work, it is hard to see any results which are useful in describing anything longer than a single verse line. Even his studies of longer passages do no more than treat sequential lines individually. Collins does include a few longer passages at the end of his book⁵⁶ but largely fails to characterize them as passages. He is still dealing with them as a series of isolated verses, which just happen to occur in a certain order in the canon. As a result, Collins succeeds in describing individual verse lines, and distinguishing them from each other, but he fails to ever characterize a whole poem on the basis of the line-forms which he has identified. He has a little to say about the relative incidence of the

⁵⁵I am aware of the work of Francis I. Andersen in his Sentence in Biblical Hebrew (Hawthorn, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1980), and I respectfully tug my rather sparse forelock to the significant contributions he has made to the understanding of Hebrew syntax. Nevertheless, I must admit that my first reaction on reading his book was to wonder why anyone would spend so much time trying to describe something that doesn't exist. But perhaps I exaggerate.

⁵⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 257-273.

various line-forms, and about the patterns observable in their distribution, but his comments on these points are generalizations at best.

In the end, his work reminds one of a greengrocer who sorts his fruits and vegetables by diameter. Certainly he has accomplished something, but the average customer would probably be happier with the big apples and little apples in the same basket, and the big potatoes and little potatoes in the same sack. Whatever olives, strawberries and hazelnuts may share in dimension is probably not enough, in view of their diversity of culinary function, to persuade the average consumer to purchase all three regularly in one bag. Meaningful sorting would still have to be done at home, just as it must be for readers of Collins' work.

The Analysis of Direct Speech

The grammatical analysis of sentences containing direct speech can be a delicate matter, one which Collins has not always handled well, and which he has certainly not handled consistently. In principle, when a sentence contains an expression such as "A said X," it should be understood that A is the subject, "said" is the verb, and X (the content of direct speech) is the direct object of the verb. An example from Hebrew poetry can be found in the first line of Psalm 39:2:

אָמַרְתִּי אֲשַׁמְרָה דְרָכַי מִתְּמוֹא בִלְשׁוֹנִי

I said, "Let me guard my ways from sinning with my tongue."

Using Collins' notational system, this line may be described as V + NP² - M².⁵⁷ In the first half-line, NP² is a brief but intrinsically complete clause.⁵⁸ It should be noted that while direct speech is regularly the

⁵⁷I.e., line-form I D: ii)1a.

⁵⁸The modifier of the verb which makes up the whole of the second half-line is not necessary in order for the clause to be complete.

direct object of a verb the quotation may contain clauses within itself. Thus, complete verse lines may at times be made up of quoted direct speech.

With this understanding, some of Collins' analyses of verse lines may be corrected. For example, he describes the first verse line of Isaiah 49:4 as "tripartite,"⁵⁹ or, as some others might call it, a tricolon. But this may be construed otherwise.

נָאֲנִי אֶמְדַּתִּי לְרִיק וְנִפְתִּי לְתוֹהוּ וְתָהוּל בְּחַי כְּלִיתִי

And I said, "In vain I have laboured.
"For nothing and vanity I have spent my strength."

This may be analyzed as: NP¹ + V + NP² - M + M + NP² + V. In this analysis, it must be understood that the NP² in the first half-line is a complete clause, corresponding to one of Collins' basis sentences, type B with NP¹ deleted. Thus this verse line is not "tripartite," but IV C/D: iii)var, according to Collins' system. It is worthy of note that Collins' system allows for a noun clause to be used as either NP¹ or NP².⁶⁰ Furthermore, Collins has dealt in precisely this way with the quoted direct speech of the previous verse line, from Isaiah 49:3, where the quotation "עָבַדְתִּי אֱלֹהִים" is treated as the object of the verb. (Collins' classification of this line as III D: ii)2h⁶¹ can only be accepted if one understands both the quoted direct speech in the first half-line and the entire second half-line as constituting NP².)

Failure to Cover All Possible Cases

Collins' taxonomy of Hebrew poetic line-forms suffers from a number of unfortunate inconsistencies. In principle, Collins has promised to describe every possible line-form:

⁵⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 258.

⁶⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23.

⁶¹The description of a III D: ii)2h line offered by Collins on page 152 is V + M + NP² - NP².

...the Line-Forms are still abstract notions, in the sense that they refer to the theoretically possible arrangements of a given set of constituents and that they may or may not occur in practice. One of the results of this survey will be precisely to show which Line-Forms occur most frequently, and which occur rarely or not at all. Hence in Part Two all possible Line-Forms will be listed whether they occur or not.⁶²

This Collins does not do. He normally does not describe non-occurring line-forms, though his practice is inconsistent on this point. In fact, before he begins his presentation of the specific line-forms, he notifies the reader that he intends to restrict himself to those lines which actually occur in the corpus of examples under his consideration, the poetic sections of the latter prophets. In the introduction to Part Two of his book he states:

The principal aim of this section will be simply to classify lines from the prophetic corpus...⁶³,

Thus Collins has asserted both that he will describe all possible line-forms, but also that he will describe only extant line-forms. In fact he does occasionally list and describe line-forms which do not occur.⁶⁴

The Limited Corpus of Examples

If Collins therefore intends to describe all those line-forms and only those line-forms which occur in the poetic corpus which he has selected for study, the books of the latter prophets, this restriction is, in itself, an interesting consideration, as it omits the largest single collection of classical Hebrew poems (the book of Psalms), as well as many of the older poems (e.g., Judges 5). Certainly Collins cannot be faulted for selecting

⁶²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 29.

⁶³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 53.

⁶⁴For example, one may contrast Collins' treatment of line-form II C: i)16, which is classified, but omitted from detailed consideration, with his treatment of line-form III C: i)5, which is included in the detailed consideration of the type III C: i) lines, even though Collins has found no examples of it. See T. Collins, Line-Forms, 110, 111, 141, 146.

too small a sample. But both he and his readers might have benefitted from a sample that was more diverse. Collins asserts that the same line-forms which he has found in the prophets may also be found in the Psalms, the book of Job and elsewhere, that there is a long evolutionary development in these line-forms, and that connections may even be found with Phoenician poetry.⁶⁵ But his decision to limit his consideration to the prophetic corpus implicates Collins in two other tasks which, in some other contexts, he might avoid, namely the distinction of poetry from prose and the practice of colometry.

The Distinction of Poetry and Prose

The distinction of poetry from prose is always problematic, and is usually performed rather intuitively. This task may be relatively safe for the native speaker of a given language, but it is always subject to challenge when performed by academicians who are both historically and linguistically remote from the writer. Collins believes that he has found a syntactic key for making the distinction between poetry and prose, but this is a conclusion of his research on the syntax of verse lines, and to introduce it at the beginning of this study would beg the question. Furthermore, it will be shown that Collins' conclusion on this matter is by no means as secure as he apparently believes it to be.

Taxonomic Inconsistencies

One Form with Several Sigla

The inconsistencies in Collins' taxonomy of line-forms and in his system of sigla to represent these line-forms become apparent at the level of the specific line-type. Most obviously, in Collins' Table I,⁶⁶ which

⁶⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 192.

⁶⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 25.

summarizes the specific line-types, there are several cases where distinct sigla have been given to lines which have the same constituents. One of the forms of line-type III B, containing the constituents $NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$, is identical to line-type IV B/A.⁶⁷ Similarly, III C ($NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V$) is identical to line-type IV C/A. Collins notes in a parenthetical insertion on this table that "NP¹ is normally omitted in III D..."⁶⁸ but later indicates that there are cases of this line-type in which the subject is expressed.⁶⁹ If one allows the expression of the subject in line-type III D, there are three possible sequences in this line-type which are identical to other sequences from general line-type IV: these are specific line-type IV D/A ($NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V$), specific line-type IV D/B ($NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V + M$) and specific line-type IV D/C ($NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V + NP^2$). When consideration of Collins' taxonomy is shifted from the line-types to the level of the line-forms, the problems of inconsistency and ambiguity become even more severe.

One Siglum, Several Forms

Collins' summary of the specific line-types assigns the same siglum to several related but different sequences. All specific line-types of general line-type III have more than one possible sequence per siglum. The siglum

⁶⁷It may be argued that these two line-forms can be distinguished. This is supported by the claim that the second half of a III B: i)1a line ($NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$) retains in its deep structure a constituent identical to one which is expressed in the surface structure of the first half of the line, whereas in a IV B: i)1 line ($NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$) the grammatical constituent not included in the second half is not "gapped" from the first half, but simply absent. The problem with this assertion is that it is a very subjective judgment to determine the nature of an unexpressed constituent. Furthermore, any argument on this point must be based on semantic considerations, whereas Collins asserts that his taxonomy is based purely on syntax.

⁶⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 25.

⁶⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 150, 151.

III A represents two possible sequences and III B represents six possible sequences, as do III C and III D.⁷⁰ Thus Collins' classification of specific line-types has both multiple sequences for some single sigla, and multiple sigla for some single sequences.

Not only are there several cases where more than one line-type is assigned to a single siglum, but in addition, there are 85 cases where a single siglum is made to represent two or more distinguishable line-forms.⁷¹ This occurs even when distinguishing sigla may be suggested by Collins' system.

In his description of line-type IV, Collins becomes even less precise than usual in the identification of specific line-forms.⁷² For the most part, he lists only those line-forms which he has actually encountered, and frequently provides a single siglum for several related, but differentiable, line-forms. This may be partly due to the complexity of line-type IV, for which there are a frightening total of 868 possible line-forms (not counting possible variations). Fortunately for the reader, few of these ever occur.

⁷⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 25. Collins notes that in the III D line-type, the NP¹ is normally deleted. If it were retained, there would be 14 possible combinations.

⁷¹This occurs with I A: i)1 (which serves for 2 distinguishable line-forms), I B: i)var a (9 forms), I B: i)var b (3 forms), I B: i)var (2 forms), I D: i)var (4 forms), I D: ii)var a (4 forms), I D: ii)var b (3 forms), II B: ii)var (number of forms uncertain), II C: i)var (4 forms), II D: ii)var a (4 forms), II D: ii)var b (6 forms), II D: ii)var c (4 forms), III C: i)var (2 forms), III D: i)a (5 forms), III D: i)b (7 forms), III D: i)c (5 forms), III D: ii)var (2 forms), and an additional 68 cases, all the instances in general line-type IV in which there are two or more distinguishable sequences where first half-lines have syntactically identical constituents in the same order, and the second half-lines have identical constituents in different orders. These may be found in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58, 67-69, 82, 89-91, 108, 113, 123, 147, 150, 151, 159 and in 164-186 *passim*.

⁷²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

Sigla for Non-Occurring Forms

On the other hand, there are also many line-forms which do not occur in the text, but for which Collins has nevertheless provided sigla, even though this is not his customary practice in the case of non-occurring line-forms. Sigla are provided (without description of the line-forms) for the following line-types and line-forms which do not occur in the books of the latter prophets: I A: ii), I C: i)2, III A: iii), IV A/B: ii), and IV A/D ii). Sigla and partial descriptions (usually the first half-line) are provided for 6 non-occurring line-forms in general line-type II⁷³ and 22 others in general line-type IV.⁷⁴ Sigla and complete descriptions are offered for 66 distinguishable non-occurring line-forms or subdivisions of line-forms in general line-types I, II and III.⁷⁵ Sigla for line types III B: i) and III C: i) are indicated by description of a rule, rather than by a list of individual line-form descriptions. In these line-types there are a total of 57 line-forms or line-form subdivisions which are hypothetically described by the rule, but which do not actually occur in the texts under study.

Forms without Sigla

Collins is also aware of whole groups of lines and line-forms which are not covered by his taxonomy. Near the end of his book, Collins remarks, "Sometimes the NP¹ can be held back until the second hemistich. This produces

⁷³II D: ii)31 through 36: T. Collins, Line-Forms, 121.

⁷⁴IV B/A: i)5, IV B/C: i)5, IV C/A: i)2,4,5 and 6, IV: D/B ii)6, IV D/C: ii)4 and 6, IV B/C: iii)5, IV B/D: iii)4 and 5, IV C/B: iii)5 and 6, IV D/A: iv)4,5 and 6, IV D/B: iv)4 and 6, IV D/C: iv)4,5 and 6: T. Collins, Line-Forms, 165-167, 172, 174, 179, 181, 185, 186.

⁷⁵I D: i)4,6,9,14,15,17,18,19,21 and 22, II B: i)3,4,6,9,11, 18,23,26-30 and 34, II C: i)3-6,9-12,16,19-28 and 30-36, II D: ii)6,13,16-18,20,21,24 and 30, III A: i)1b, III D: ii)1a-d,g, 2b,d,g: T. Collins, Line-Forms, 77, 99, 101, 103, 109-112, 117, 119, 120, 121, 128, 152.

line-forms that are the reversal of Type III."⁷⁶ Such line-forms, undoubtedly rarer than type III, might have been called type V, or might even have been assigned a siglum like "III inverted," just as Collins has done with the numerous line-forms identified by "variant" (abbreviated "var"). But Collins has provided no category for such lines in his taxonomy.

Inconsistency in the Assignment of Sigla

In addition, the whole system for assigning line-form numbers is not consistent. For general line-types I and II, line-form numbers are assigned on the basis of the sequence of the constituents of both half-lines. For general line-type III, line-form numbers are assigned on the basis of the sequence of the constituents in the first half-line only. For this line-type, the kind and sequence of constituents in the second half-line determines the subdivision letter. For general line-type IV, line-form numbers are assigned on the basis of the sequence of the constituents in the first half-line, regardless of the sequence of the second half-line, and no line-form subdivisions are indicated, even when this means that several different sequences of constituents share the same siglum. The assignment of letters to indicate line-form subdivisions is even less systematic than the assignment of line-form numbers.

Taxonomic Decisions Not Based on Syntax

Despite his claim that his taxonomy is based on syntax alone, Collins makes some taxonomic decisions on other grounds. For example, the subdivisions (a through j) of the III B: line-type are distinguished by the element gapped in the second colon and by the sequence of the elements in that colon. Collins calls attention to the fact that these lines may

⁷⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 239.

resemble closely, both in constituents and ordering, certain line-forms that appear in Type IV. The only criteria [sic] for distinguishing between the two is whether or not the M can be considered as governing both hemistichs.⁷⁷

Of course, such a decision can only be taken on semantic grounds.

In contrast, the line-form subdivisions within specific line-type III D: i) are assigned on the basis of both semantic and lexical criteria, in defiance of Collins' stated intention to base his system of classification on syntactic, rather than semantic criteria.

Of all possible line-forms of the III D: i) line-type, Collins lists only 17, grouped under three designations.⁷⁸ These are, in theory, more precisely distinguishable, but are not distinguished by Collins. As before, Collins alters his sigla with scant notice: he abandons the use of Arabic numerals to indicate the sequence of the elements in the bicolon, and groups the line-forms of the III D: i) line-type into three subdivisions (a, b and c). These three consist of: those lines in which Yahweh is the subject; those in which a pronoun takes the place of the name of Yahweh, and those which contain an interrogative pronoun (consistently "Q") as subject. Collins notes that these form a "semantic set," and therefore chooses to subdivide the line-type semantically, rather than syntactically, although his system is ostensibly based on syntax alone.

Doubtful Colometric Analysis

Collins feels that the system which he has defined will be useful for the resolution of problems of colometry:

⁷⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 130.

⁷⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 150, 151.

There are various side-effects to a study of the grammatical patterns of Hebrew verse-lines. One of these is to provide some sort of guide for dividing the verses of the text into lines of poetry.⁷⁹

Several examples are offered in which the colometry of a difficult passage is determined on the basis of Collins' line-forms. Some of the weaknesses of Collins' system become apparent in this process. In particular, Collins' inability to distinguish between two successive type I lines and a single type IV line on the basis of syntax brings into question his colometric analysis of Jeremiah 12:6.⁸⁰ Collins describes this verse as being composed of three lines, a type I B i) line, a type I D i) line, and a type IV B/D: ii) line. One might argue instead (with a view to the syntactical parallelism of the two lines) that this should be construed as a type IV B/D: i) line followed by a type IV B/D: ii) line.

Confusion of Line-Types

Collins has no way to distinguish between two consecutive type I lines and a single type II line. One may well ask what makes the latter half of Isaiah 11:13 a II C: i)1 line (as Collins asserts⁸¹) and not a pair of I C: i)1 lines? Of course, there is a conjunction between the two, but Collins has earlier admitted that this is optional between half-lines. Qualifying his description of lines containing two sentences,⁸² he says,

The sentences may or may not be joined by a conjunction. This seems to me to be irrelevant to the system. However, the optional conjunction could easily be indicated by (C) if it were necessary.⁸³

⁷⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 274.

⁸⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 275.

⁸¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 109.

⁸²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 36.

⁸³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 49, note 54.

That a verse line may begin with a conjunction may be established by consideration of Lamentations 3:16-18, three consecutive verse lines, each of which begins with the conjunction. The presence of a conjunction cannot therefore distinguish the middle of a verse line from its beginning. The parallelism between the half-lines of the passage cited from Isaiah 11:13 might be noted as proof that it is a single verse line rather than two lines, but this is, of course, a semantic feature. Collins claims that his system is based on syntax, but syntax cannot determine whether this passage is one line or two. The same could be said with regard to many other passages: syntax alone cannot determine if a line like the one cited by Collins from Isaiah 11:7,8⁶⁴ is really IV D/B: 1) as Collins claims, or actually two lines, the first being I D 1)5 and the second I B:1)3. In this case, there are semantic reasons for scanning Isaiah 11:7 as a tricolon and for construing the first clause of Isaiah 11:8 with the rest of the verse. But Collins' elaborate taxonomy has no way to designate a tricolon.

Doubtful Stylistic Conclusions

Some of the stylistic implications which Collins has inferred from the syntax of the verse lines have little to recommend them. Many of these are based on one of two assumptions which are doubtful in themselves. The first of these assumptions is that rarity is significant, the second, that relative frequency establishes a norm.

Is Rarity Stylistically Significant?

An example of the first doubtful stylistic conclusion can be found in Collins' comment on a type I A line which seems to split the subject over the two halves of the bicolon. Of this line, Collins says, "This is a rare

⁶⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 169.

phenomenon and therefore stylistically significant."⁸⁵ This line of argument affirms the consequent: grammatical rarity is stylistically significant only if it has already been assumed that the writer's intentions were somehow focussed on grammar. No one would argue, for example, that the presence of relatively rare letters (e.g., ׀ or ׁ, as opposed to ׀ and ׀) was stylistically significant, because virtually everyone shares a prior assumption that grapheme selection is not an element of style -- except, of course, in acrostics. After all, why should rarity be significant? Other equally plausible explanations could be offered to explain a rare occurrence. A rare phenomenon may be produced by lack of artistry, which is stylistically significant only if one is concerned with bad style. Furthermore, certain phenomena (e.g., hithpael verbs) may be relatively rare in poetry, simply because they are generally rare in language. Their occasional presence may therefore have no particular stylistic significance. In fact, it is arguable that all of the line-forms described by Collins are rare.

Does Frequency Establish Norms?

Of the hundreds of line-forms catalogued by Collins, none accounts for more than a few percent of the whole corpus. He states:

The Hebrew Prophets produced "well formed" lines that sounded right according to patterns acquired from tradition. The point is that "well formed" lines in Hebrew poetry seem to follow grammatical patterns rather than any others.⁸⁶

But this raises the question of how well-formed lines may be distinguished from any other lines. In view of the extremely large number of line-forms used, even if they are catalogued solely on the basis of syntax,

⁸⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58.

⁸⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 44.

there do not seem to be very serious syntactic limits on the lines used. This leads us to the second questionable stylistic assumption in Collins work, that frequency establishes norms.

Collins knows of hundreds of possible lines. There is no reason to deny that other similar lines which do not happen to occur in the prophetic corpus would not be regarded as well-formed by a native speaker. Collins frankly admits that his taxonomy actually describes less than two-fifths of the lines which occur in his chosen sample. There is therefore no clear majority (or even a significant plurality) of lines which correspond to a given type or form. Even were there a single type with which one might identify more than half of all lines, it would be questionable to identify the rest as exceptional or irregular. At the least, it may be said that Collins' view of the syntactic basis of Hebrew poetry seems to draw a broader inference than the data would support.

Indications of the incidence of various word orders in the verse lines under study in Tables IV through XII⁶⁷ do reveal some customary preferences. Usually these are differences of degree rather than absolute rules. For example, there is, in general, a preference for orderings which would place the verb before the subject, but only in the ratio of 664 to 531, or about 56 % to 44 %. The preference is beyond question, but it is hardly justifiable to call this a rule, or to describe sequences which place the subject before the verb as exceptional. Indeed, of all possible orderings of three constituents in a line, only the sequence "subject-object-verb" seems to be entirely avoided. Collins might be better advised to speak of "usual" or "customary" word order, rather than "normal" or "regular" order, since it is apparent that one can not actually speak of "norms" or "rules." There is no evidence that exceptions to the patterns which Collins has correctly

⁶⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 202-211.

identified as most common were customarily regarded as abnormal or irregular: they are, at most, unusual, or perhaps merely different. Tables X, XI and XII are set up as a rectangular array, displaying the distributions of line-forms within line-types II B: i), II C: i) and II D: ii), respectively. Horizontally across each array, Collins lists the possible orderings of the first half-lines of the pertinent line-type, and vertically he lists the possible orderings of the second half-lines. Collins then specifies certain rules which appear to govern the probability of the occurrence of a given line-form. A line-form is more likely to occur, according to Collins, if the first half-line begins with a verb, if the second half-line begins with the subject, and if the sequence of constituents in the two half-lines is identical.⁶⁰ Collins asserts that there are certain areas in each array, the areas where these rules operate, which contain the line-forms which are most likely to be used. From his observations, Collins concludes,

The result of all this is that we can say that there is a broad but clearly defined area or framework within which freedom of word order normally operates. This area is not coterminous with the full range of possibilities. Examples within the area may be said to be normal, and any outside it must be considered as exceptional, and therefore of potential stylistic significance.⁶⁰

That this inference is excessive may be determined by examination of the arrays. It is beyond doubt that the incidence of line-forms within the areas which Collins has defined as normal is higher than outside such areas. He has not, however, been consistent in the application of his rules for the definition of such areas. For example, the first of those rules, that line-forms, the first halves of which begin with the verb, are more common than those which begin with some other constituent, is clearly untrue in the case

⁶⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 212.

⁶⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 213.

of line-type II C: i), as illustrated in Table XI.⁶⁰ Of the twelve possible line-forms in which the first half-line begins with the verb, seven never occur, and two occur only once. There are only twelve examples of lines of this line-type which conform to this rule, as opposed to fifteen which violate it. The second rule, which indicates a preference for an initial subject in the second half-line works more effectively in this case: 21 of the 27 occurrences of this line-type correspond to this rule. Nevertheless, of the twelve possible line-forms in which the second half-line begins with the subject, six never occur, and one occurs only once. Collins' third rule, which indicates a preference for identical constituent ordering, is represented by 15 of the 27 occurrences of this line-type. Only two of the six line-forms which meet this criterion fail to occur. Collins has disguised this fact by indicating a "normal area" on Table XI which does not correspond to the rules which he has described. The normal area thus designated does not extend to any area not specified by Collins' rules, but it omits exactly half of the line-forms which would be defined as normal by those rules. Collins then remarks that "...there are no occurrences at all outside the 'normal area'."⁶¹ This is true, and is a datum of some significance, but it allows the casual reader to overlook the fact that many of the forms which Collins has defined as normal do not, in fact, occur. Collins suggests explanations for some of these, but admits that the explanations are not consistent with data for other line-types⁶² He has presented no rules can be seen to operate consistently. In fact, in Tables X

⁶⁰T. Collins, Line-Form, 210.

⁶¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 213.

⁶²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 213. In fact, Collins has already noted on page 150 that some forms of line-type III D: i) begin with precisely the same sequence (verb followed by object) which he says is avoided here in order "to avoid unnecessary ambiguity."

through XII, he has simply defined as normal that which occurs frequently and as exceptional, that which occurs rarely. But anyone can be a marksman if he draws the target after he fires the shot. Collins' project of applying the principles of generative grammar to the verse lines of the Hebrew Bible requires him to seek for rules and constraints which will define all verse lines and no other lines. In the case of Tables X to XII, it is apparent that this has not been done.

Major Weaknesses

Has Collins Completed His Project?

It must be asked whether Collins has really accomplished that which he ostensibly set out to do. Has he indeed stated a set of rules and constraints which will generate all Hebrew verse lines, and no lines but these? Is his system more than just a descriptive taxonomy of classical Hebrew poetic utterances? These questions are not easy to answer. The knowledge of all possible poetic utterances is subjective and intuitive, the proper province of the native speaker. Modern readers have no direct access to the native speakers of biblical Hebrew, except through the Bible, as Collins himself acknowledges, though he believes that,

In the absence of intuitions of native speakers of Ancient Hebrew, Generative Grammar can function reasonably well on the basis of those acquired intuitions which are the cumulative effect of centuries of scholarship.⁸³

But even centuries of scholarship can produce no more exacting criterion for well-formed verse lines in Hebrew than the sum of examples provided in the Hebrew Bible. No one can know which utterances might be considered "possible" and "well-formed" except by observing those which have been used. In addition, Collins has listed and described some forms which do not occur,

⁸³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 32.

and some which occur so rarely that one might guess that they could be abnormal, that is, that they might appear irregular or unpoetic to the ear of a native speaker. It is doubtful whether Collins is really dealing with rules by which all possible well-formed poetic utterances, and only such utterances, might be generated. Collins' caution on the issue of the intent of the poet is important:

One final caution must be added. This study is an attempt to use linguistics as the basis for an analysis of Hebrew verse-lines which will in turn provide a starting-point for stylistic investigation. It is not meant to be an account of how the poets' minds worked when they were composing their verses, just as the grammar of a language is not meant to give an account of the native speaker's mental processes when producing sentences in that language. We are using Generative Grammar as a tool for describing what the poets did, not what they thought they were doing. In other words, this study does not claim to be a reconstruction of Ancient Hebrew poetic theory.⁸⁴

Collins thus moves away from the concept of generation to the concept of description, and from the intuition of the native speaker to the rationality of the non-native observer. The final section of Collins' book is an attempt to show that his taxonomy of Hebrew verse lines is "more than just an interesting exercise in linguistic description."⁸⁵

Collins cautions us,

It is important to remember throughout that the grouping of examples into line-forms is dependent entirely upon similarity of grammatical surface structures.⁸⁶

This abandons, at least to a degree, that feature of generative grammar which Collins has described as basic. In fact, line-forms are grouped into line-types on the basis of transformational rules. But other than descriptive comments on the occurrence or non-occurrence of various

⁸⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 43.

⁸⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 191.

⁸⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 54.

forms, Collins is unable to state systematically what constraints control the use of transformational rules, as he admits:

From a linguistic point of view, this is a rather simplified presentation, and can only be considered a provisional attempt to account for the freedom of word order apparent in Hebrew verse-lines. First of all there is the question of constraints....At this stage it is impossible to say precisely to what extent these alternative arrangements of constituents are interchangeable in Hebrew poetry. There is a need for more extensive detailed study of the environments in which they are found to tell us whether their occurrence is governed by constraints, and whether the constraints come from the context or from the lexical stock.⁹⁷

Failure to Account for Multi-Verbal Lines

One of Collins' phrase-structure rules indicates that a "...line may consist either of a sentence or of a sentence plus a sentence."⁹⁸ This is adequate for the lines which Collins has actually catalogued, though it leaves no place for verse lines with more than two predications or fewer than one. This would practically exclude lines which do not consist of complete sentences as well as tricola, which frequently have more than two predications. Not only are there tricola with three or more predications, and bicola with three or more, but the work of Michael O'Connor also shows that there are individual cola which contain as many as three predications.⁹⁹ Collins is aware of these phenomena. He offers no catalogue of lines which contain fewer than a single predication, but at the end of his work he refers to certain lines which do not contain complete sentences of any sort as "concatenations."¹⁰⁰ He also speaks of "tripartite

⁹⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 39, 40.

⁹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 36.

⁹⁹Michael O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 87.

¹⁰⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 226.

lines,"¹⁰¹ and acknowledges that there are lines which contain more than two verbs. It may afford an insight into his view to notice that he refers to these as "extra verbs."¹⁰² implying that they are somehow superfluous or out of place. Nevertheless, he frankly notes,

In linguistic terms, this means we can have lines containing more than two basic sentences in the deep structure - which moves us beyond the four major Line-Types of Part Two.¹⁰³

Collins cites examples of half lines with two or three verbs and lines with three or even four verbs.¹⁰⁴

Limited Applicability of Collins' System

One of the consequences which follows from the preceding section is that Collins' system is not applicable to many verse lines in the Bible. As Collins formulated it, his theory does not have a place for any line which is not a sentence, or which contains more than two sentences. Given Collins' use of the terms "line" and "sentence," the category of lines which are not sentences may be considerably less common than lines which are, but lines with less than one sentence or more than two occur frequently enough to merit attention.

Collins has set out to identify and classify all of the poetic line-forms in the prophet corpus. In the end, however, his catalogue of line-forms represents only 38 % of the verse lines in the prophets, by his own calculation.¹⁰⁵ The proportion of verse lines represented by Collins' line-forms varies from book to book and from section to section within books. But

¹⁰¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 223-225.

¹⁰²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 219.

¹⁰³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 219, 220.

¹⁰⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 220-222.

¹⁰⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 198.

the incidence of verse lines corresponding to line-forms identified by Collins is still less than half at best: 49 % of the lines in the last seven chapters of Isaiah correspond to line-forms in Collins' taxonomy, the highest level of correspondence in the prophetic corpus. The lowest level of correspondence, only 30 %, is found in the book of Hosea.¹⁰⁶

Syntax and the Perception of Cola

Collins does encounter some monocola, though he never uses such a term to describe them. Of these lines he says,

There are a number of lines with an interesting structural and rhythmic pattern, which do not fit easily into our preconceived notions about the Hebrew verse-line neatly divided by a caesura into two hemistichs....They are mostly of Type I and often show close interweaving, giving the line an inner cohesiveness that resists any attempt to break it down into two halves.¹⁰⁷

But despite the syntactical unity of type I lines, Collins still acknowledges the bipartite nature of most of them, though he recognizes the subjectivity of this judgment:

Most lines of Type I could be read without any marked caesura and we probably only feel the need to make the pause simply because we are accustomed to do so in lines of other types. This is a useful reminder that the grammatical framework must always be considered in relationship to the other layers and elements of the verse-line.¹⁰⁸

In other words, the bipartite nature of some verse lines, and the placement of the caesura in these lines, is not dependent on syntax. Collins' system, which is supposed to be based on syntax can provide no objective reason for dividing many lines in this fashion. This is especially true in the case of lines of type I, and other lines which do not contain two

¹⁰⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 197.

¹⁰⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 255.

¹⁰⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 57.

basic sentences. The perception of the bipartite nature of these lines must be based on some other layer or element of the language.

Syntax and the Perception of the Caesura

Collins points out that the perceptibility of the caesura is significant in certain cases. In his comments on Ezekiel 19:1-9, which Collins identifies as a qinah, or lament, he notes that,

...in this particular text the author goes out of his way to include line-types with a strong central caesura. This would appear to be a requirement for the qinah style...

Secondly, there appears to be deliberate manipulation of the line-forms to produce lines in which the second hemistich is shorter than the first.¹⁰⁹

In these comments Collins borders on explaining the mind of the poet. Nevertheless, there appear to be good reasons for accepting his observation that the qinah is characterized by a strong central caesura and by lines whose second half is shorter than the first. But neither of these characteristics is inherently grammatical. Both may be associated with the sound or the meaning, rather than the syntax, of the line. And in any case, the presence of a pattern not inherently based on grammar would imply that there are controlling constraints on the composition of at least some verse lines which have nothing to do with syntax. Collins' general conclusion on this point appears to be misguided:

All this leads toward the conclusion that in the formation of Hebrew verse-lines it is the line-forms that are the basic framework which can be adapted to produce the required rhythmic pattern. In this case it happens to be the qinah, but the same line-forms could be used to produce quite a different pattern.¹¹⁰

Again, if Collins is right in his inferences about the qinah, if it is the rhythmic pattern which is required, and the line-forms which are

¹⁰⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 272.

¹¹⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 273.

adapted, it may be asked which of the two is really basic. Surely it is the former which controls, and the latter which is controlled.

Non-Syntactic Constraints Ignored

Collins does not claim to be describing all facets of poetry or explaining all constraints of poetic speech. He intends to concern himself primarily with syntax. His incursions into other domains of language are accidental, and to some extent aberrant. He therefore frequently neglects to call attention to non-syntactic length constraints. An example of this can be found in his comments on type II C: i)var lines:

The only important variation to be considered is the reduction of the NP² to suffix form. This may occur in just one hemistich, or it may be in both at once. When it occurs in only one hemistich this is always the second, which means that there is a clear preference for grouping the main constituents as 3 + 2...¹¹¹

In cases such as these, the grouping is not fundamentally of a syntactic sort. Type II lines contain identical syntactic constituents in both half-lines. If there is a "clear preference" for a certain grouping, it must be explained on some basis other than syntax, and in this case, the grouping seems to have something to do with relative lengths of the line-halves. This is an essentially phonic constraint.

Collins notes the overall predominance of sentence types B and D among his examples, and calls particular attention to the great number of type D sentences in line-type I, where there is only one sentence per line. He asserts that "...this...is due to the semantic sets involved."¹¹² It seems equally likely that the high incidence of type D sentences in type I lines may be due simply to the fact that type D sentences, with four constituents (or more, in the case of variations with two modifiers), tend to be longer than

¹¹¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 113.

¹¹²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 197.

the other three basic sentences, which usually have only two or three constituents. It is therefore easier to fill two cola of typical length with a type D sentence than with a type A sentence (for example). But if the mere length of the cola is a factor in the selection of sentence types, it is surely a non-syntactic constraint.

Another example of a non-syntactic length constraint is illustrated by Collins' Table II,¹¹³ which summarizes the incidence of various specific line-types within line-type IV. The careful reader may perceive that, within this general line-type, there is a tendency to select those specific line-types in which the two half-lines are more nearly equal in length, such as A/B: iii) and D/C: ii), rather than those whose half-lines would be of radically different length, such as D/A: i) and A/D: iv). Since many of these forms are differentiated by the retention or deletion of the subject, it is interesting to notice that the subject appears most likely to be deleted where its presence would tend to make one half-line much longer than its partner. Collins fails to call attention to this fact. His closest approach to a recognition of length constraints in type IV lines comes in his comment on subdivision iv):

This subdivision provides the least number of examples, and fifty percent of these come from types D/A, D/B, D/C. This is normal enough when we remember that element D contains three constituents without the NP¹, so that the lines retain the normal preferences for grouping of constituents as 3+3, 2+2. [sic] 3+2.¹¹⁴

It is possible, at least in theory, to make a type I A line of any length by extending the noun phrase which serves as subject, by use of appositives or an extended construct chain. But even so, such lines are rather rare:

...it still remains remarkable that line-forms derived from this type should be regularly avoided as if there were some implicit principle that a line must contain a minimum of three constituents. Even in

¹¹³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 163.

¹¹⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 186, 187.

these examples there is evidently some effort made to fill out the line, which seems to indicate that there is some kind of interplay between the grammatical framework and the rhythmic composition of a line.¹¹⁵

Since this type of line does not usually exhibit parallelism, it appears that there are some constraints on verse lines which cannot be explained in purely semantic terms. From this, it may be inferred that there are constraints operating in at least three layers of the linguistic production which identified as a verse line. Syntax is important, though not absolutely so, and the semantic layer can frequently be shown to be important as well. But there are cases where the length of a line appears significant, apart from meaning and syntax.

The Necessity of Extending Collins' System

Having completed the description and analysis of his system of classification, Collins suggests some extensions of the system. This is quite appropriate since, at this point, his taxonomy describes rather less than two-fifths of the data,¹¹⁶ and has failed to provide for such common occurrences as monocola, tricola, nominal sentences and sentences using הַיְיָ , and the quasi-verbs שָׁׁ and יָׁ . Line-types are suggested for nominal sentences,¹¹⁷ but though a few examples are gathered, line-forms are not analyzed, or even proposed in principle. Collins offers a similarly cursory treatment of sentences which use הַיְיָ ¹¹⁸ and of tricola,¹¹⁹ which he calls

¹¹⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 59.

¹¹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 198.

¹¹⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 215, 216. The sigla suggested are quite self-explanatory for anyone who is familiar with the rest of Collins' system: I nom., II nom., III nom., IV nom./A, IV nom./B, IV nom./C, IV nom./D, IV A/nom., IV B/nom., IV C/nom. and IV D/nom.

¹¹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 218, 219.

"tripartite lines." He even offers a single example of a line which contains four basic sentences,¹²⁰ which some would classify as a tetracolon.

Collins' treatment of two-part lines containing more than two verbs is somewhat more extensive. He presents a number of examples, and describes some of the line-forms which occur, though his efforts do not result in a systematic taxonomy of these line-forms or in the proposal of sigla for these forms.¹²¹ This omission may be explained by Collins' assertion that,

...the remaining lines are simple variations on or developments of the established patterns of the line-forms studied so far. Moreover, it will be shown that these developments themselves follow to a large extent certain common patterns.¹²²

Collins thus views the lines in the prophetic corpus which do not correspond to line-forms in his taxonomy as variations of forms which he has classified. He also states,

The commonest technique for varying the lines is the inclusion of extra verbs. In linguistic terms, this means we can have lines containing more than two basic sentences in the deep structure - which moves us beyond the four Major Line-Types of Part Two. On the other hand, in the surface structure many of these new patterns can be seen as having close affinity to one or the other of the four types.¹²³

The unfortunate fact is that the forms which Collins discusses in this manner do not truly belong to any of his line-forms, and he entirely fails to extend his taxonomy to these forms. He also fails to supply phrase-structure rules, transformational rules and constraints which would allow such lines to be regarded as well-formed. To do so would

¹¹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 223-225.

¹²⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 225.

¹²¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 219-223.

¹²²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 219.

¹²³T. Collins Line-Forms, 219, 220.

require some phrase structure rules or transformation rules different than, and in addition to, those which he has already specified.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Collins has done the easy part. The classification of the four general line-types and the four basic sentences has been done clearly and followed consistently. These line-types and sentences are not sufficient to describe all possible verse lines -- for example, tricola require line-forms not specified by Collins. Nevertheless, these categories, as far as they are useful, have been carefully observed.

Collins has described possible verse lines of types I, II and III rather fully. Lines of type IV are normally listed only if they actually occur. The line-types containing nominal sentences are listed, but not described in full: examples are not comprehensively catalogued and line-forms within these types are not mentioned at all. The multitude of possible line-forms with more than two verbs are not listed, and even the smaller number of such line-forms which actually occur in the text are not presented. Simply put, as the task became more difficult, Collins has become less diligent, until at last he has thrown up his hands and abandoned the pursuit. He has not catalogued all line-forms and line-types which occur, much less all possible line-types or line-forms. He has offered a few simple phrase-structure rules and transformation rules which would generate some, but not all possible verse lines. Indeed, the rules specified would generate less than half of the lines which Collins has encountered. In addition, the same rules would generate a large number of lines which never occur in biblical poetry. He has failed profoundly to describe the constraints under which these phrase-structure rules and transformation rules must, or normally do, operate. Nevertheless, Collins is still convinced that in syntactic structures he has found the ordering principle of Hebrew poetry:

On the basis of our study so far, it is not unreasonable to put forward the hypothesis that in Hebrew poetry the permanent frame of reference is provided by the grammatical structure and the ordering of constituents. In other words, the line-types and line-forms can be looked on as a system of measurement, determining what is a well formed verse-line and thus performing the same function as the more familiar systems of meter. . . . However the suggestion would be difficult to prove and could always be criticized as an assertion which begs the question, since one can also assert that a given line-form is adopted only in order to achieve a certain number of heavy stresses, which are the real interest of the poet.¹²⁴

Collins is here suggesting that biblical Hebrew poetry has a sort of syntactical or grammatical meter, that is, its verse structure is based on syntax. He acknowledges the difficulty of proving this without access to the poets but shows some evidence that this is a usable system even though it cannot be known if it was the system that was used. However, given the enormous variety of line-forms, and the lack of consistency in their association, one may well ask what grammatical rules can be deduced or inferred from the great mass of biblical poetry. What rules will consistently, or even frequently, describe the Hebrew verse lines which the reader may actually encounter? A simple catalogue of the line-forms may be made¹²⁵ but their variety defies regulation. Tendencies may be noticed, but tendencies are not regularities. In the absence of regularities, rules (regulae) cannot be asserted definitely. Furthermore, in the face of tendencies, some which can be described as well in phonic or semantic terms as in syntactic terms, it still cannot be asserted, without access to the minds of the poets or of their native auditors, that one of these levels is basic to Hebrew poetry, and the others derived.

This is not to say that Collins has made no contribution at all. It seems, however, that his contribution was essentially preliminary. Beginning with the felicitous suggestion that the key to Hebrew verse

¹²⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 251.

¹²⁵As has been done in Appendix I.

structure might be syntactic in nature, he sought a means of categorizing verse lines, and thus of describing poems. He has fallen short in the latter endeavor, but his initial suggestion has been shown useful in the work of others, including O'Connor, and to some extent, Berlin. But a complete explanation of classical Hebrew poetry will have to account, not only for syntax, but for the phonic and semantic layers of the poem as well.

CHAPTER FIVE

MICHAEL O'CONNOR: SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

CONTRAST WITH EARLIER METHODS

Presuppositions

Michael O'Connor, writing at about the same time as Terence Collins, has also adopted a syntactic approach to the study of biblical poetry. The results of his studies, originally presented in his doctoral dissertation, suggest what O'Connor calls a "constrictional system."¹ He recognizes the impossibility of determining the intent of the writer regarding verse structure, and focusses on the text itself, adopting the assumption that the texts studied are unified and more or less faithfully transmitted.² Nevertheless, he acknowledges that the system he proposes must not only appear to function, but must also conform to the "uniformitarian axiom", that is, it must resemble some systems of verse structure known in extant languages and cultures. In O'Connor's words, ". . . only developments of a sort paralleled in the earth at present can be used to explain its history."³ For this reason, although the intention of the poets of the Hebrew Bible cannot be known, it is not permissible to posit a system which has no analogues in the intent of modern poets, or other poets who have left an unambiguous statement of a theory of verse structure. Furthermore, despite the prodigious efforts which O'Connor has invested in

¹Michael O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 67.

²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 8,9.

³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 21.

this study, he regards his work as a preliminary essay, to be tested by subsequent research.⁴

The "Standard Description"

O'Connor presents his understanding of Hebrew verse in contrast to what he calls the "Standard Description of Hebrew verse."⁵ This "Standard Description" is attributed fundamentally to Lowth and his successors, and is also contrasted with what O'Connor calls the "native description."⁶ The native description consists of whatever is indicated about poetry in the Hebrew Bible itself, primarily through the traditional stichography.⁷ This rather scanty native description has been superseded by the Lowthian Standard Description, first, because the latter deals more comprehensively with Hebrew poetry, and second, because it does this in a systematic way. Lowth's most important perception, in O'Connor's view, is that Hebrew poetry has two bases. The first of these is a feature of contiguous lines (which Lowth called parallelism) and the second a feature of the lines themselves (which Lowth called meter, though he believed that it was irrecoverable). This Standard Description has been belabored by generations of scholars, but has never been adequate for the explanation of Hebrew poetry.

⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 5.

⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 29. The capitalization of "Standard" and "Description" is O'Connor's own device.

⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 30. O'Connor does not capitalize this expression.

⁷Traditional stichometry is represented only in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Exodus 15 (The Song of the Sea), Deuteronomy 32 (The Song of Moses), Judges 5 (The Song of Deborah) and II Samuel 22 (The Psalm of David). Other passages which are today regarded as poetic are not stichographically indicated as poetry, and there is seldom any particular indication that their poetic nature was recognized in earlier eras.

It remains an attempt to solve one mystery (Hebrew poetic structure) by splitting it into two mysteries, one more obscure than the first (meter), and the other only slightly less so (parallelism)⁸

Both parallelism and meter require some further discussion.

The principal difficulty with the concept of parallelism is that it is not a discrete phenomenon, but rather, as O'Connor observes, "a congeries of phenomena."⁹ But O'Connor does not entirely dismiss the idea of parallelism. In his own system he will subsequently absorb the phenomena of parallelism into the system of tropes. He does, however, note the absence of a comprehensive and uniform system of nomenclature for parallelism.¹⁰ This lacuna he attributes to Lowth's "fundamental error" of conceiving of parallelism solely in relation to non-verbal realities. O'Connor insists, "A poem is made up of words; to describe a construct of words, terminology which refers to words must be used."¹¹ This may seem to play down the semantic layer of the poem unduly, though it is interesting to note how extensively O'Connor and some others¹² have been able to describe parallelistic phenomena in terms of words rather than meanings.

But it is not Lowth's concept of parallelism which is most objectionable to O'Connor. It is Lowth's suggestion that Hebrew poetry must be, or have been, metrical, which O'Connor finds most dubious. In the first place, meter is not a pure phenomenon. Like parallelism, meter is "a congeries of phenomena." As O'Connor notes,

⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 33.

⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 5.

¹⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 51.

¹¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 51.

¹²e.g., Adele Berlin, Johannes de Moor and Willem van der Meer

The varieties of recurrence that are gathered together under the heading meter are diverse. They involve complex phonological and syntactic facts of language, . . .¹³

This observation, that meter may be both syntactic as well as phonological, is important in view of O'Connor's intention to propose a primarily syntactical understanding of the structure of Hebrew poetry. In addition to this, however, O'Connor notes that meter is not just something produced by the poet. It is also -- perhaps even more profoundly -- something perceived by the hearer or reader, who engages in the "rather complex matching of an abstract schema with a series of instances."¹⁴ Furthermore, O'Connor observes that there is no agreement on the nature of Hebrew meter, even among those scholars who believe that it exists, or that it must have existed:

. . . proposals are still sub-scientific, i.e., without replicable results and unsupported by a scholarly consensus. We may therefore agree with those scholars who reject the applicability of a metrical scheme to Hebrew.¹⁵

Replacement of meter, in the classical European sense of the term, with syllable counting has been no more adequate to explain ancient Hebrew verse structure, in O'Connor's view,¹⁶ though he concedes that syllable counting is one of the best tools for monitoring the regularities of line-length without making claims about the structure of the poems under study.¹⁷

¹³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 64.

¹⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 59.

¹⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 65.

¹⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 38,39. O'Connor specifically mentions D. N. Freedman and R. C. Culley among those whose syllable-counting work he has considered.

¹⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 65.

Such concepts as "musicality" and "orality" are also found to be unhelpful,¹⁸ or even counter-productive.

O'CONNOR'S PROJECT

Syntactic Constraints as Meter

The feature of Hebrew verse structure Lowth believed hopelessly lost he called meter. We shall argue that the regularities he and his successors have regarded as phonological are in fact syntactic. Descriptions of the relation between clause and phrase distribution and line shape are more precise and account for a wider range of features than any phonological treatment proposed.¹⁹

From this statement two inferences may be drawn: first that O'Connor considers that syntactic phenomena may operate as a kind of poetic meter, and second, that O'Connor believes that syntax is the key to the structure of Hebrew verse. The first of these inferences means that the syntactic phenomena which O'Connor will identify as part of the constriction of Hebrew verse structure serve the same function in the ordering and structuring of Hebrew poetry as is served in many European poetic traditions by syllable count, patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables and patterns of long and short vowels. This position is made more explicit in subsequent statements by O'Connor.

The system we describe will be of the same sort as a meter, which Lotz defines as "the numerical regulation of certain properties of the linguistic form" of a verse. It may be that Lotz intended to allow for the description of syntactically regulated verse systems, since he was aware of the phenomenon

. . . Given the standard usage of meter, it seems that it would be confusing to extend the term from predominantly phonologically based systems to syntactically based systems. . . We have decided not to call the system a meter; we shall refer to its components as constraints and to the whole as a constriction.²⁰

¹⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 40, 42, 43.

¹⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 4.

²⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 67.

In this passage O'Connor declines to give the name "meter" to the system of syntactically-based constraints which he will define, though his decision, enunciated as it is, implies that he understands that he could have called it a meter, had he chosen to do so. Further, he says that this system is ". . . of the same sort as a meter, . . ." ²¹ by which he may be understood to mean that it serves a similar regulatory and constraining function.

The Regularities of Hebrew Poetry

But what does the syntactic constriction regulate? One of the faults which O'Connor has detected in the Standard Description is its failure to distinguish variations from the invariant. ²² One facet of this defect attracts O'Connor's particular attention:

The received descriptions of Hebrew poetry do not distinguish normal from exceptional line forms They do not allow the formation of any conception of the line which would guide the reader, to say nothing of the scholar. Yet anyone who has seen Hebrew verse has formulated conceptions of which line shapes are common, which are rare, and of which word sequences never occur as lines. A major part of our concern will be to set down these conceptions. ²³

It is O'Connor's view that this intuitive understanding of which lines are acceptable for Hebrew poetry and which are not can be made explicit in syntactic terms. The recurrences which alert the listener or reader to the poetic nature of the text are fundamentally syntactic.

The regularities in question are not, after all, trivial. Rather, they involve most of the verse in Hebrew. We assume such regularities bespeak an order that can be described there are significant regularities on the syntactic level. What we wish to propose is that just as most poetic systems are shaped in part by a series of phonological requirements, i.e., by a system of metrical constraints, so there are poetic systems shaped in part by a series of syntactic

²¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 67.

²²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 9.

²³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 53.

requirements, i.e., by a system of syntactic constraints. Among them is Canaanite verse.²⁴

This is O'Connor's basic claim: Hebrew verse is regular; its regularities can be described syntactically; there are poetic systems which are shaped by syntactic constraints;²⁵ biblical Hebrew poetry is among these. O'Connor therefore asserts that syntax is fundamental in regulating Hebrew verse.

The syntactic regularities, which take the form of constraints on line shapes, along with descriptions of dominant syntactic constellations and the tropes act together in structuring Hebrew verse. To be sure, there are other regularities, but these regularities and turns are more basic, more frequent and more integral to the structure of language.²⁶

This statement not only asserts the primacy of syntax in verse structure, it also mentions another important element in the system which O'Connor will define, namely the tropes. The tropes identified by O'Connor are repetition, coloration, gapping, matching, syntactic dependency and mixing.²⁷ These will be elaborated later. For the moment, it is necessary only to note that by means of these tropes, O'Connor retrieves parallelism for the use of his theory of verse structure. In fact, despite his critique of the Lowthian "Standard Description" of Hebrew poetry, O'Connor states quite bluntly, ". . . parallelism is a structural element in Hebrew poetry."²⁸ He further states,

²⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 65.

²⁵"Constriction in other languages" is discussed by O'Connor on pages 152-159. His presentation is not coercively persuasive, but does suggest that syntactic constraints may play some role in the poetic traditions of other cultures. This is important for O'Connor, since he has already asserted on page 23 that "No poetic system attested only in written form can be reconstructed as possessing features unknown in a living poetic system."

²⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 5.

²⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87, 88.

²⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 89.

We will contend that poetic structure is determined by certain parallelistic phenomena which we call tropes. There are many other parallelistic phenomena which fall into two groups: (a) those which are rare and minor and belong to the realms of figuration and ornamentation, and (b) those which result from the co-occurrence of tropes.²⁹

The Place of Parallelism

This may leave the reader wondering just what O'Connor actually thinks of parallelism. On the one hand, he dismisses the substitution of parallelism for meter common to many versions of the "Standard Description" of Hebrew verse structure. On the other hand, he has asserted that parallelism is structural. He also quotes approvingly from Jacobson, "Pervasive parallelism inevitably activates all the levels of language."³⁰ Is O'Connor trying both to affirm and to deny the structural importance of parallelism? In fact, on this point O'Connor is actually following Lowth quite closely -- more closely indeed than some other advocates of a system of verse structure based on parallelism. By his own declaration, Lowth had turned to the study of parallelism only after asserting that the system of Hebrew verse structure had originally been metrical, and that the metrical system had been irretrievably lost. As O'Connor describes it,

Lowth is commonly credited with discovering the notion of parallelism. This is on any reading a slight historical error. More importantly, it misestimates Lowth's crucial insight, that parallelistic phenomena alone cannot suffice to describe Hebrew verse; something else is going on, which Lowth called meter. Both parts of Lowth's Standard Description need refining, but his realization that two phenomena are interacting is central. The naming of the parts, which we shall undertake here, is secondary to the recognition that there are two parts to be named.³¹

²⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 96.

³⁰Roman Jakobson, "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet," Language 42 (1966): 423.

³¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 4.

In other words, Lowth had perceived a system verse structure with a metrical base (a phonological system which is now irrecoverable) on which parallelism had been superimposed. O'Connor perceives a system of verse structure with a constrictional base (still definable in syntactic terms and functioning to the same end as a metrical system) on which parallelistic tropes (as well as some non-parallelistic tropes) are superimposed. The "crucial insight" which O'Connor credits to Lowth is the realization that the patterns perceptible in Hebrew poetry are created by the interaction or coincidence of two systems of recurrence. For Lowth, the basic recurrence was phonological (meter). For O'Connor, it is syntactic. The systems proposed by Lowth and O'Connor differ in regard to the type of meter believed to have been used. They concur in the view that a second system of recurrence, parallelism, is superimposed on the metrical or constrictional system.³²

The Rôle of Constraints and Troping

It is important to note both what O'Connor is and is not saying. He does not perceive the Standard Description to be putting parallelism in the place of meter. In O'Connor's view, the Standard Description explains Hebrew poetry on the basis of two interacting systems: meter, which is irrecoverable, and parallelism, which is only partly recoverable. O'Connor does not propose syntactic constraints to fulfill the supra-lineal function

³²O'Connor points out that "...there are rarely more than three phenomena interacting at the same time in a pattern." (Hebrew Verse Structure, 18) This insight is attributed to a lecture by P. Kiparsky on "The Linguistic Basis of Literary Form," in which he also notes that there are some patterns based on the recurrence of a single phenomenon, and there are also patterns in which as many as four phenomena interact at the same time, but patterns based on the interaction of two or three phenomena are most common. This may be little more than a reflection on human psychology: the mind is overtaxed to appreciate a pattern which involves the recurrence of more than four phenomena, just as there is a limit to the number of balls a juggler can manipulate at one time.

which Lowth assigned to parallelism. Instead, he suggests the syntactical constriction as the governing factor at the level of the poetic line, and absorbs parallelism into the system of supra-lineal tropes.

It must still be asked what structures are, according to O'Connor, determined or marked by parallelistic phenomena. In brief, these are the supralinear structures, groups of lines which O'Connor will call "batches" and "staves." The size of these groups varies, but O'Connor finds them to be usually about seven lines and twenty-eight lines long, respectively. The significance of the common association of parallelism with the bicolon or couplet is minimized by O'Connor: "The couplet as a formal unit is non-existent in our description. It has no definition beyond its plainest one, a pair of lines."³³

In summary, O'Connor asserts that biblical Hebrew poetry is shaped by syntactic constraints which govern the lines, and by tropes which control the relation of lines. He proposes a classification of the lines and observation of the frequency of the tropes which will allow the reader to identify units and sub-units of the poetic text. A more complete description and evaluation of this constrictional system will be given below.

AN OUTLINE OF THE CONSTRICTION

The Building Blocks of the Verse Line

An understanding of the constraints which O'Connor identifies and the constriction which he defines must begin with the definition of some terms which he uses. O'Connor divides all words into three categories: "nomina" (consisting of substantives, adjectives, pronouns and most adverbials), "verbs" and "particles." Three other terms which refer to the elements making up a line are also identified: "unit," meaning an individual verb or

³³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 447.

noun with the particles dependent on it, "constituent," meaning a verb or nominal phrase with its particles, and "clause predicator," meaning a verb, or the zero predicator of a verbless clause. Subsequently, O'Connor offers a more detailed definition of "clause predicator."

A clause predicator is a finite verb; an infinitive which is not used absolutely or which governs only an agent; a participle which is not used absolutely or which governs only an agent, object or possessor; or a \emptyset predicator of a verbless clause . . . or a vocative or focus-marker³⁴

Interestingly, O'Connor does not, at this point define the term "line," despite the fact that he objects to earlier studies of Hebrew verse structure on the grounds that ". . . failure to define the line is an augury of failure to define the stanza and the poem."³⁵ He does, however, point out that line and clause boundaries often coincide, but may not do so in all cases. His discussion of the syntactical constriction of Hebrew verse seems to assume that the reader knows what a line is without ever having been told. A definition of "line" is finally produced, much later in the book, where O'Connor states,

"A line of Hebrew poetry is a passage of poetic discourse which obeys the overall constraints There are no lines not described by these constraints, though there remain obscure and difficult points"³⁶

This definition is overtly based on the constriction, and is not preliminary to it, despite the fact that the constriction itself is based on inferences drawn from lines. On this point O'Connor's constriction affirms the consequent. Furthermore, it is important to note at the outset that O'Connor

³⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 86, 87.

³⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 54.

³⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 315, 316.

uses the term "line" to refer to what many other scholars of Hebrew poetry call a "colon," "hemistich" or "half-line."³⁷

The Constraints of Hebrew Verse Lines

After his definition of terms, O'Connor describes the minimal limitations of Hebrew verse-lines:

. . . we can restate two fundamental results of all previous study; neither has ever been consistently rejected. The first is that no unit can stand alone as a line. The second we shall call the principal of syntactic integrity, which can be stated thus: if a line contains one or more clause predicators, it cannot contain a nominal constituent not dependent on one of them.³⁸

This means that poetic lines in Hebrew must contain at least two units, and that they will not contain nominal fragments which are syntactically unrelated to the rest of the line.³⁹ Obviously, much more can be said, and O'Connor bases the rest of his assertions about the syntax of verse-lines on empirical inferences drawn from his observations on a large poetic corpus

³⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 52-54.

³⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 69.

³⁹The first of these limitations would proscribe from Hebrew poetry anything like the first quatrain of T. S. Eliot's poem, "Mr. Eliot's Sunday Morning Service," since it contains a line composed of a single octosyllabic nominal (adjectival) unit:

Polyphiloprogenitive
The sapient sutlers of the Lord
Drift across the window-panes.
In the beginning was the Word.

The second limitation stated by O'Connor would proscribe such a poem as the first quatrain of Eliot's "Wasteland," since it contains three lines with nominal elements dependent on clause predicators in the preceding lines:

April is the cruellest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory with desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.

selected for study in his essay.⁴⁰ In this corpus he has discovered lines with as many as five units and as few as two, as many as four constituents and as few as one, and as many as three clause predicators and as few as none.⁴¹ These maxima and minima may be descriptively useful, but O'Connor does not stop with this. His clearest statement of the constriction is as follows:

Constraints. 1. On clause predicators. No line contains more than three. 2. On constituents. No line contains fewer than one or more than four. 3. On units. No line contains fewer than two or more than five. 4. On the units of constituents. No constituent contains more than four units. Constituents of four units occur only in lines with no clause predicator. Constituents of three units occur either alone in lines with no clause predicator; or as one of two constituents in 1-clause lines. 5. On the constituents of clauses. No line of three clause predicators contains any dependent nominal phrases. In lines with two clause predicators, only one had dependent nominal phrases. 6. On the integrity of lines. If a line contains one or more clause predicators, it contains only nominal phrases dependent on them.

The dominant line form. Most lines of Hebrew verse contain one clause and either two or three constituents of two or three units. A lineation which yields lines of these constellations is preferred to other lineations.⁴²

Line Types in Hebrew Poetry

In addition to listing the types of lines which may occur, O'Connor also identifies the classes of lines which occur most frequently, and which are less common. The following line types are identified with at least one example of each type which actually occurs:

⁴⁰O'Connor presents some 1225 lines of classical Hebrew verse on pages 167-296. These lines are taken from Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Numbers 23-24, Deuteronomy 32, 33, Judges 5, II Samuel 1, Habakkuk 3, Zephaniah 1-3 and Psalms 78, 106 and 107.

⁴¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 75. Some clauses consist of a single nominal phrase, with no clause predicator.

⁴²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87.

TABLE 5 - 1
POSSIBLE LINE TYPES IN HEBREW VERSE⁴³

Type	Clauses	Constituents	Units	Occurrences in O'Connor's corpus
1.	0	1	2	17
2.	0	1	3	65
3.	0	1	4	16
4.	0	2	2	13
5.	0	2	3	21
6.	0	2	4	5
7.	0	2	5	0
8.	0	3	3	1
9.	0	3	4	1
10.	0	3	5	0
11.	0	4	4	0
12.	0	4	5	0
13.	1	2	2	245
14.	1	2	3	229
15.	1	2	4	31
16.	1	2	5	2
17.	1	3	3	275
18.	1	3	4	79
19.	1	3	5	10
20.	1	4	4	20
21.	1	4	5	5
22.	2	2	2	23
23.	2	2	3	2
24.	2	2	4	0
25.	2	2	5	0
26.	2	3	3	92
27.	2	3	4	19
28.	2	3	5	2
29.	2	4	4	17
30.	2	4	5	3
31.	3	3	3	4
32.	3	3	4	2
33.	3	3	5	0
34.	3	4	4	1
35.	3	4	5	0

This table includes all and only those line types which conform to the constriction which O'Connor has defined. It is immediately obvious that some of these line types are far more common than others, and that some, though they conform to the constriction, nevertheless do not occur at all.

⁴³This table is adapted from M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 317-318.

Most common are those which contain one clause, three constituents and three units, or one clause two constituents and either two or three units. Such line types make up 749 of the 1225 lines under study. On the other hand, eight of the hypothetically possible line types never occur. It is to be noted particularly that line types which involve the highest constraint limits (three clauses and/or four constituents and/or five units) occur relatively rarely, and are not among the six most common types. O'Connor gathers these line types into four classes, grouped roughly on frequency of occurrence. Class I consists of the three most common line types, and Class II of the three next-most-common. Class IV is made up of those line types which involve high constraint limits, and Class III includes all the rest.⁴⁴ The incidence of particular line classes will become significant in the identification of supralinear structures. Simply put, lines of Class III, and especially lines of Class IV are seen as unusual, and therefore most likely to occur in situations of emphasis, particularly at the beginning or end of such a supralinear structure as a "batch" or "stave."

The relationship of these categories of lines can be illustrated more clearly by arranging them in a two dimensional array. In the following table, the sections are determined by the number of predications. Within each section, the number of constituents is represented on the horizontal axis, and the number of units on the vertical axis. At each intersection, a Roman numeral indicates the line class to which lines with that number of predications, constituents and units belongs. In cases where a particular number of predications, constituents and units cannot occur (according to the constraints specified by O'Connor) no line class is indicated. If the particular number of predications, constituents and units could occur

⁴⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 319.

(according to the constraints specified by O'Connor), but was not found in the corpus of poems examined by O'Connor, this is indicated by 0.

TABLE 5 - 2
LINE CLASSES OF PERMISSIBLE LINES

Zero Predications:

Constituents:		1	2	3	4
Units:	2	III	III		
	3	II	III	III	
	4	III	III	III	IV
	5		IV	IV	IV

One Predication:

Constituents:		1	2	3	4
Units:	2	0	I		
	3	0	I	I	
	4	0	III	II	IV
	5	0	IV	IV	IV

Two Predications:

Constituents:		1	2	3	4
Units:	2		III		
	3		III	II	
	4		III	III	IV
	5		IV	IV	IV

Three Predications:

Constituents:		1	2	3	4
Units:	2				
	3			IV	
	4			IV	IV
	5			IV	IV

If the various types of lines are gathered into the four classes identified by O'Connor, the difference of incidence of these classes becomes even more obvious, as indicated in the following table.

TABLE 5 - 3
LINE CLASSES⁴⁵

Type	Clauses	Constituents	Units	Occurrences in O'Connor's corpus
CLASS I.				
13.	1	2	2	245
14.	1	2	3	229
17.	1	3	3	<u>275</u>
		(Total occurrences of Class I		749)
CLASS II.				
2.	0	1	3	65
18.	1	3	4	79
26.	2	3	3	<u>92</u>
		(Total occurrences of Class II		236)
CLASS III.				
1.	0	1	2	17
3.	0	1	4	16
4.	0	2	2	13
5.	0	2	3	21
6.	0	2	4	5
8.	0	3	3	1
9.	0	3	4	1
15.	1	2	4	31
22.	2	2	2	23
23.	2	2	3	2
24.	2	2	4	0
27.	2	3	4	<u>19</u>
		(Total occurrences of Class III		149)
CLASS IV.				
7.	0	2	5	0
10.	0	3	5	0
11.	0	4	4	0
12.	0	4	5	0
16.	1	2	5	2
19..	1	3	5	10
20.	1	4	4	20
21.	1	4	5	5
25.	2	2	5	0
28..	2	3	5	2
29.	2	4	4	17
30..	2	4	5	3
31.	3	3	3	4
32..	3	3	4	2
33.	3	3	5	0
34.	3	4	4	1
35.	3	4	5	<u>0</u>
		(Total occurrences of Class IV		66)

⁴⁵This table is adapted from M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 319-320.

O'Connor's constriction can now be seen to serve two purposes. In the first place, the constriction informs us of the types of lines which may and which may not occur in Hebrew verse, thus providing an inductive definition of the Hebrew verse line. In the second place, the classification of permissible line types by frequency enables us to identify which are most customary, and which are atypical, thus producing a typology of verse lines, based on the constrictional system. The value of this line typology in the identification of supralinear structures will be examined following a discussion of the tropes.

THE PHENOMENA OF TROPING

In addition to the verse line constraints which O'Connor has identified, he also deals with the issue of supralinear devices. The Standard Description of Hebrew poetry classifies most of these in semantic terms under the general heading of parallelism. O'Connor claims that parallelism can be disassembled and its parts examined, a process which was inaccessible to Lowth.⁴⁶ O'Connor attributes the ability of modern scholarship to do this to an increasing knowledge of many types of poetry with which Lowth was not acquainted. Regarding the parts of the disassembled parallelism, O'Connor says,

. . . among them can be found a group of phenomena which occur regularly and serve as part of the verse structure. These we shall separate from all the others as the tropes.⁴⁷

O'Connor recognizes the fact that phonological principles affect word order in certain situations, including parallelism, and that "most parallelistic usages result from ordinary facts of language, not special

⁴⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87.

⁴⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87.

poetic features."⁴⁸ In addition, some of the parallelistic phenomena are determined in part by semantic considerations, though the semantic considerations tend to be language-specific, while the phonological considerations are more nearly universal.⁴⁹ Parallelism, and the parallelistic tropes which O'Connor isolates are therefore not purely syntactic phenomena, though syntax has a role in some of them.

There are also several phenomena which are frequently omitted from discussions of parallelism, but which O'Connor also includes as tropes. In addition, there are many phenomena of parallelism which seem to O'Connor to be non-structural, and which he either assigns to the realms of figuration and ornamentation, or explains as the co-occurrence of tropes.⁵⁰ The tropes may be divided into two groups, the tropes of parallelism: coloration, matching and mixing, and the tropes of continuity: repetition, gapping and dependency.⁵¹ It is also noted that gapping and matching overlap in part, and that mixing is a subtype of dependency. Here as elsewhere, O'Connor is not generous with definitions.⁵² Nevertheless, the terms are definable.

"Coloration" consists of any case of binomination, coordination or combination. Binomination is the use, in consecutive lines, of two terms referring to the same entity (loosely called "synonyms"), such as $\square\eta\eta\eta$ and $\eta\eta\eta$. Coordination involves the use of two terms referring to two different entities which are frequently associated with each other, such as "David" and "Solomon." Coordination occurs when a phrase consisting of terms

⁴⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 101.

⁴⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 98, 99.

⁵⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 96.

⁵¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 88.

⁵²Or else he is excessively generous, providing so much information that a concise definition eludes the reader.

frequently associated in construct or in adjectival modification is divided between consecutive lines.

"Matching" is "the phenomenon most widely referred to as parallelism."⁵³ Of it, O'Connor says, "Lines match in Hebrew if their syntactic structures are identical: that is, if they are embedded to the same degree and they contain the same constituents."⁵⁴ It is apparent from examples cited by O'Connor that the sequence of constituents within a line is not significant in the definition of matching.

Mixing is described by O'Connor as follows:

The trope of mixing involves two dependent and two independent lines which occur in sequence, in which both dependent lines depend on both independent clauses. This is the densest structural feature of Hebrew verse, and it is rare.⁵⁵

It can be seen that the trope of coloration functions between words, the trope of matching between lines, and the trope of mixing involves structures larger than lines. As with these three parallelistic tropes, the tropes of continuity can also be distinguished by their function at the word level, the line level or the supralinear level.

The trope of repetition is self-explanatory. It consists of using identical expressions iteratively. This is a word-level trope, and is the only trope which O'Connor recognizes as functioning over lines which are not contiguous.⁵⁶ O'Connor limits this trope to uses of the same lexeme performing the same syntactic function, thus distinguishing repetition from figura etymologica, in which two different words from the same root are used in reasonable proximity.

⁵³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 119.

⁵⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 119.

⁵⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 132.

⁵⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 120.

"Gapping" is a line-level trope, which consists of deletion from the surface structure of one of two consecutive lines (usually from the second) a word or expression which is identical in the deep structure of the two lines. O'Connor limits this to "ellipses which obscure the structure of one of the clauses involved."⁵⁷ For this reason, prepositions and suffixed pronouns which govern nouns of two consecutive lines are referred to as "double-duty prepositions" (or pronouns) and are not regarded as instances of gapping.⁵⁸ In Hebrew poetry gapping most frequently involves the omission of the verb from the second of two consecutive lines.⁵⁹ As with matching, constituent order in lines is irrelevant in gapping.⁶⁰

"Dependency" involves consecutive or proximate verse lines, one of which is syntactically dependent on the other, either as a dependent clause or as a phrase. This is relatively rare, since "in Hebrew verse, the clause/line correspondence dominates the verse."⁶¹ O'Connor notes,

Considering dependency as a trope suggests that syntactic relations beyond the line are less important in Hebrew verse than those that coincide with the line; this is true.⁶²

Dependency normally involves two consecutive lines. The only exceptions to this are the cases of mixing, where several dependent lines are

⁵⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 126.

⁵⁸See, for example, the double-duty pronoun in Habakkuk 3:15, cited by M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 239.

⁵⁹The gapping of relative clauses in Hebrew poetry is also recognized. Cf. M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 126.

⁶⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 128.

⁶¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 129.

⁶²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 129.

syntactically associated with several independent ones: thus the trope of mixing is, as mentioned previously, a subset of dependency.⁶³

But what is the function of these tropes? As with the definition of the constriction, the definition of the tropes enables the reader to identify two functions. In the first place, the tropes serve to bind together the verse lines. Because the tropes function in consecutive or proximate verse lines (rather than within single verse lines), they provide continuity in verse segments longer than single lines.⁶⁴ In the second place, because the tropes are poetic devices, they also serve to mark a text as poetry, and, by their presence or absence, to indicate where a poetic text begins and ends.

THE SUPRALINEAR FUNCTION OF CONSTRICTIONAL LINE-TYPOLOGY AND TROPING

Having identified the constriction which controls Hebrew verse lines, and having defined the tropes which bind these lines together, O'Connor asserts that the beginning and end of a poem are marked by the higher incidence of those features which are peculiar to verse, that is, troping, and the occurrence of line-types other than those of Class I, and particularly those of Classes III and IV. Such a claim can be found, for example, in O'Connor's comments on Genesis 49.

The most highly marked units in Genesis 49 are the marginal ones, the first and the last. The middle unit, which is insulated, as it were, from other discourse and which will be perceived as poetic in part because of what goes before and after it, is less marked as verse. This is an easy solution to the problems of setting off any patch of discourse: where does it start and stop, and how is it different? The answers are: it is different because it is more patterned than other speech; and it starts and stops just where the differences most plainly start and stop.

One way to measure the differentness of verse across a text would be by using the percentage of the text which has features

⁶³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 130.

⁶⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 133-135.

peculiar to verse and which we have seen are used to mark portions as distinctive. These are troping and line typology.⁶⁵

O'Connor establishes two ratios which may be used to distinguish the beginning and end of a poetic text from the middle and to identify other critical portions of a text, notably the beginnings and ends of subdivisions of the text. These ratios are first, the ratio of lines which are both non-class I and troped to those which are neither (which O'Connor calls the ratio of "heavy" lines to "light" lines, or the "weighting") and second, the ratio of troped lines to heavy lines.⁶⁶ By means of these ratios, O'Connor attempts to determine the subdivisions of poems in the corpus which he is examining. These subdivisions he identifies as "staves" and "batches," units of approximately twenty-eight lines and approximately seven lines, respectively. O'Connor is quite cautious in pointing out that actual batches and staves encountered in Hebrew verse frequently deviate from the average lengths of batches and staves just cited. With regard to the stave, O'Connor says,

The stave is a descriptive approximation of a poetic unit which can take two forms. The more common is the standard stave, which is between 23 and 31 lines long, generally between 26 and 29 lines long. The less common form is the half-size stave, which is between 11 and 14 lines long. Under unusual circumstances, irregular stave sizes occur; staves 18, 21 and 22 lines in length are attested in our corpus.⁶⁷

O'Connor makes a similar comment regarding the variation of actual batch lengths from the standard seven-line batch.

The batch is a descriptive approximation of a poetic unit of between 5 and 8 lines in general. Under unusual circumstances, it can vary much more widely, between 1 and 12 lines.⁶⁸

⁶⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 440.

⁶⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 441.

⁶⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 527, 528.

⁶⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 529.

This conclusion is both an inference from the data of the 1225-line corpus which O'Connor has studied, and a framework for the treatment of other Hebrew poems. In the conclusion to his essay, O'Connor attempts to forestall facile criticism of his constriction and the deductions which he has drawn from it. He did not, he avers, set out to find the structures which he has discovered: he found them by looking at the text without preconceptions.

The first great obstacle to the work will arise from a refusal to read without psychological supports, i.e., to study a text in itself, abandoning however briefly the calculus of second-guessing the supposed author. The reader will have noticed that the major gross structural units which we recognize have numerically potent bases. The commonest batch size is 7 lines, and 7 is a prime number; the commonest stave size is 28 lines and 28 is a perfect number, the sum of its divisors (1+2+4+7+14). We did not formulate our description with a view to getting these numbers, but we suspect that the generalized distrust of highly symmetrical systems will focus on those numbers in framing accusations of numerological mystificationism.⁶⁹

A NOTE ON UGARITIC AND HEBREW VERSE

O'Connor holds the view that Biblical poetry is homogeneous with Ugaritic poetry, but differs from the poetry of Qumran, and from later Hebrew poetry.⁷⁰ He sees a continuity of the poetic tradition in all of the Canaanite area from the late bronze age until approximately the end of the neo-Babylonian period.

The consensus that pre-exilic Hebrew and Ugaritic verse are similar leads to an important clue for further exploration. Insofar as the verse works the same way in the two corpora, a description of Hebrew verse will have to describe Ugaritic verse. Any description capable of fulfilling the task will have to refer to features common to the dialects. The major differences between the dialects are the result of sound shifts and changes in morphological structure; it would seem that a description suitable for both Ugaritic and Hebrew verse will not then refer to phonological patterning, but to those

⁶⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 538.

⁷⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 25.

features of language structure common to the dialects. These features are essentially syntactic.⁷¹

There are several defects in O'Connor's reasoning on this point. In the first place, this argument is circular. It begins with the consensus that Hebrew and Ugaritic verse are similar -- presumably based on scholarly understanding of how Hebrew verse works and how Ugaritic verse works, and proceeds to the conclusion that descriptions of Hebrew and Ugaritic verse must deal with the shared features because it has already been agreed that the two systems of verse structure work in the same way. In fact, if one were able to produce two dissimilar descriptions of Hebrew and Ugaritic verse, each of which worked within its own poetic corpus, the descriptions would not be invalidated simply by the fact that they differ: on the contrary, this would invalidate only the aforementioned scholarly consensus.

In the second place, even if Hebrew and Ugaritic verse are similar and a shared description of the systems of verse structure can be made, based on shared linguistic features of the two languages, this does not rule out shared rhythm and stress patterns (if such ever existed). It only rules out any system based on an identical phonemic system and identical morphology (since it seems that such did not exist). Further, as regards the phonemic systems of the two languages, it should be noted that while there are some differences, there are also many similarities, and some of the differences are issues of virtual one-to-one equivalence (a single phoneme in Ugaritic being replaced by a similar but not identical phoneme in Hebrew). It should also be remembered that much of the phonemic system of Ugaritic has been restored only conjecturally.⁷² Therefore, assertions based on the phonemic differences must remain tentative.

⁷¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 25.

⁷²And, to be entirely honest, the same is true of biblical Hebrew as well.

A third defect in O'Connor's reasoning on this point is that there is no particular reason why two languages with different phonemic systems could not use phonological patterns of a similar type. The fact, for example, that German and English each contain phonemes not shared with the other does not prevent both languages from using their phonemic systems to produce rhymes of a very similar sort.

Finally, it should be noted that, although O'Connor makes a great deal of the necessity of finding a common description for the systems of verse structure for the poetry of Ugarit and Israel, the poetic corpus which he has chosen does not contain any Ugaritic examples. In view of this omission, it may be asked whether the parallels between Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry are really so important, and whether they really ought to govern the course of studies.

Nevertheless, O'Connor's argument on this point can be allowed this far: accepting the scholarly consensus on Hebrew and Ugaritic verse as a working hypothesis, it is reasonable to seek (or, at least, to be prepared to recognize) a single description of Hebrew and Ugaritic verse, based on shared features. These shared features include, but are not limited to, highly similar syntactical systems and similar vocabularies. This is consistent with, and sufficient for, O'Connor's constrictions, which is based on syntax, and his tropes, which are based to a significant degree on the Hebrew lexicon.

POSITIVE RESULTS OF O'CONNOR'S STUDY

The Limits of the Verse Line

It has always been intuitively evident that there are limitations to the types of lines which can occur in Hebrew poetry. Various means of specifying what sorts of lines were permissible, or criteria for disallowing the permissibility of certain lines, have been suggested by various

theorists. Norms, maxima and minima have been proposed for the number of stressed syllables, or for the total number of syllables in a line. These norms are usually fairly elastic, and may change from one poem to another. Even the maxima and minima may vary between poems, so that it may appear at times that the theorist who discusses such limits is saying little more than that the longest line cannot be any longer than it is, and the shortest line cannot have fewer syllables than it does. In fact, however, careful statistical studies reveal a normal distribution of line lengths around a statistical mean, which appears to be regular, not only for a single poem, but for groups of poems.

In addition to considerations of length, certain parallelistic structures are permitted, and others disallowed. Even Kugel, who disparages Lowth's tripartite division of semantic parallelisms, and particularly his category of "synthetic parallelism" as being excessively general, to the point of meaninglessness, nevertheless affirms some limit to the semantic relationship of two line-halves.⁷³

To the traditional metrical and parallelistic limitations and criteria, O'Connor has added syntactic constraints, noting the maxima and minima for each of the syntactic elements of a poetic line, as witnessed in his very extensive sample corpus. As obvious as some of O'Connor's constraints may seem after he has stated them, it must nevertheless be remarked that no earlier scholar has identified them. O'Connor notes, for example, that the number of predications in what he calls a line (which most other scholars would call a half-line or a colon) is three. Four clause predicators will not occur together in a single line of classical Hebrew poetry. At first glance it might seem that this is merely a consequence of other constraints, constraints of a non-syntactic nature, such as the

⁷³James L. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 52-53.

limitation on the total number of syllables. This is not so. Syllable and stress limitations would permit such a line as:

קום קא'ש צא וישמע
(Arise, O Man, go forth and listen!)

This artificial line, created for purposes of discussion, contains seven syllables and four stresses. It might, therefore, seem perfectly normal with regard to temporal length but O'Connor notes that such a line should never occur in Hebrew poetry, since it contains four clause predicators (three imperative verbs and a vocative noun).⁷⁴ O'Connor's studies have thus identified some limitations of Hebrew poetic lines which are capable of being expressed in terms of regulative syntactic principles.

The Disassembly of Parallelism

A second achievement of O'Connor's study is the disassembly of parallelism.⁷⁵ By separating and analyzing the tropes, O'Connor offers the reader a much greater sensitivity to the operation of parallelism than can be provided by the Lowthian semantic categories of "synonymous," "antithetic" and "synthetic" parallelism. Instead of simply imagining a generalized relationship between two half-lines (or two lines, as O'Connor would have it), one may perceive how the writer (consciously or unconsciously) brought the relationship into existence.

Batches and Staves

In addition, O'Connor has suggested that groups of lines ("batches" and "staves") in Hebrew poems can be identified by the concentration of rarer

⁷⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 79-81. O'Connor treats all vocatives as transformations of a predication.

⁷⁵One hesitates, in view of the work of Jacques Derridas, to refer to this as the deconstruction of parallelism, but this latter expression might be close to the truth.

line types and the more intense use of devices of ornamentation at the beginning and end of these groups. O'Connor has identified "batches" which tend to be about seven lines long, and "staves" be about twenty-eight lines long. Some of O'Connor's examples are more persuasive on this point than others, and it does not seem that O'Connor has been entirely consistent in the treatment of his own evidence, as will be shown presently. However, the idea that constraints on the poetic line may also have supralinear consequences is a useful suggestion, and may aid in the understanding of some of the more conventionally accepted supralinear forms (such as the bicolon and the tricolon), despite O'Connor's own unwillingness to acknowledge the structural significance of these phenomena.

Objectivity

Finally, despite the complexity of O'Connor's system and of his presentation of the evidence to support it, this system does present a distinct advantage, not only over the Standard Description offered by Lowth, but also over the work of several more recent writers. Whatever difficulties it may present, O'Connor's work is, nevertheless, objective, and can be applied by any competent scholar to any biblical poem. As Jeffrey Galbraith has pointed out,

The system that he has developed for describing Hebrew poetry is rather complicated; it does have the clear advantage, however, that anyone can apply it to a poem under consideration. Poems may be described and then compared on specific levels, which can in turn be quantified.⁷⁸

There may be differences on issues of lineation and stichometry, and the significance of the results produced may be subject to debate, but two scholars working with the received text of the same passage will produce the

⁷⁸Jeffrey A. Galbraith, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, in The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 45 (1983): 466.

same results, at least as regards the elements of lines and the classification of lines.

WEAKNESSES OF O'CONNOR'S CONSTRICTIONAL SYSTEM

AND OF THE INFERENCES DRAWN FROM IT

Terminological Obscurity

One of the first difficulties in O'Connor's work is the obscurity and idiosyncrasy of his terminology. Typical of this is his insistence on using the term "line" to refer to what most other scholars of Hebrew poetry identify as a "half-line," a "hemistich", or a "colon". O'Connor may be forgiven for rejecting the first two of these alternatives, as his understanding of Hebrew poetry sees the "line" ("colon") as basic, and the "couplet" (or, as others would call it, "bicolon," "line" or "stich") as incidental. But there is really no reason for rejecting the well-established term "colon" in favor of this somewhat ambiguous use of "line". Many of his reviewers have noticed this tendency to terminological ambiguity, referring to "unfamiliar terms"⁷⁷ and "jargon."⁷⁸ Perhaps most pointed is the comment of Dennis Pardee:

Any reader who can define more than a few of the following terms as does O'Connor may not need to read the book: 1) repetition, 2) coloration, 3) binomination, 4) coordination, 5) combination, 6) matching, 7) gapping, 8) dependency, 9) mixing, 10) core (including: upfront core, clean core, mixed core, and upfront clean core), 11) weight, 12) swell (including reverse swell), 13) stave, 14) batch, and 15) burden. The terms just listed are not peripheral; they are used to describe the most important features of O'Connor's analysis. Just to keep the reader amused, however, O'Connor indulges in this sort of playing with words throughout the book. My favorite is "siglaed" (p. 194 -- meaning "having been assigned a siglum"). To an extent O'Connor's adventures in terminology are required by his new approach to Hebrew poetic

⁷⁷William H. Shea, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, In Andrews University Seminary Studies 20 (Summer 1982): 164.

⁷⁸D. R. Ap-Thomas, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, In Journal of Theological Studies NS 33 (1982): 224.

structure; or, a new term may have a more current linguistic usage (e.g., perhaps, "gapping" instead of "deletion"). Though I would not wish to claim that expression is more important than content, nor that O'Connor's mode of expression is impenetrable, potential readers should be aware that they are embarking as much on an adventure in English as in Hebrew verse structure. It would be fair to say that, stylistically speaking, O'Connor has given us what phonograph record reviewers would call a self-indulgent performance.⁷⁰

This liberty in word use and word-coining inevitably detracts from the clarity of O'Connor's work, and consequently from the ease of criticizing it. Unfortunately, this liberty is not limited to the sphere of terminology, but is more or less typical of O'Connor's work as a whole, and extends into modes of argumentation and inference.

One aspect of this problem is the fact that O'Connor only defines the poetic line on the basis of his constriction, even though the constriction itself is based on inferences drawn from poetic lines, whose lineation O'Connor has established prior to offering his definition of the constriction and the verse line. The argument is transparently circular, and O'Connor offers it without apology.

Identification of Supralinear Structures

Perhaps the most debatable facet of O'Connor's system is his identification of the supralinear structures. O'Connor himself recognizes that others will be inclined to doubt him in this area, and several of his reviewers have noted this problem.

Whatever the macrostructure of Hebrew poetry may be, O'Connor's willingness to describe the units as variable in length is certainly preferable to arbitrarily imposing "strophes" on recalcitrant material. There is so much latitude in his units, however, that I am not sure that they say anything more than that Hebrew poets tended to

⁷⁰Dennis Pardee, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, in Journal of Near Eastern Studies 42 (October 1983): 298, 299.

group thoughts in a progression, of which an entire poem would not have had more than a few major divisions ("staves").⁶⁰

Perhaps most striking in this context is O'Connor's refusal to accept the structural function of the bicolon in Hebrew poetry. He cannot, of course, deny categorically the existence of bicola, but he will not consider the possibility that they are devices of the Hebrew poem. Instead, he asserts that

. . . two line units have been regarded as basic in Hebrew because although all the tropes can extend over more than two lines, most of them extend over two lines most of the time. The reality of the bicolon is indisputable, but it has resisted characterization because it is a secondary reality, and as such is not uniform. The tricolon's reality is similar Because . . . troping is common and because it most commonly covers two lines, the bicolon emerges from the text.⁶¹

Thus, O'Connor recognizes the existence of bicola, and even that they are the most common supralinear pattern in poetry (i.e., more common than tricola or independent cola). Yet he regards the colon (the "line" in his terminology) as basic, and the bicolon as a consequence of the tropes which he has identified. Several questions arise, the first of which is that of normality and exceptionality. In the interests of comprehensiveness, O'Connor may be trying to write a norm which includes all of the exceptions. Clearly, from a statistical point of view, the bicolon is normal -- or at least typical -- and the tricolon and monocolon are exceptional. It might be wiser to treat them accordingly. Secondly, there is the question of the intent of the poet. O'Connor is right in asserting that the intentions of the Hebrew poets cannot be known, and that theories of Hebrew verse structure must not be based on any supposition regarding these intentions. However,

⁶⁰D. Pardee, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, 300. In a footnote on the same page, Pardee raises the additional question of whether O'Connor's batches and staves could be made to fit Ugaritic poetry, which has repetitive patterns longer than the "burdens" identified by O'Connor, but shorter than O'Connor's "staves."

⁶¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 134.

questions of possibility and probability may be pursued. Is it possible or probable that the Hebrew poets were trying to write O'Connor's lines, within O'Connor's constraints (consciously or unconsciously), using O'Connor's tropes, and incidentally producing bicola as a secondary result? Or were they (as Kugel says, for example) trying to produce seconding, and therefore writing bicola (and occasionally some other forms)? This objection is particularly potent in view of O'Connor's uniformitarian axiom, which states that one must not postulate a system of verse structure in which intent of the poet must have been different than that of any extant language. Here, D. R. Ap-Thomas' comment is appropriate:

There is no doubting the erudition and breadth of reading amply attested in the body as well as the bibliography of this tome; a noteworthy feature being the frequent reference to modern studies of the poetics of other languages ancient and modern. With immense industry the author has analysed all the syntactical constructions found in lines of Hebrew poetry, but the nagging doubt remains, whether reversing this process would produce a line of Hebrew poetry.⁶²

⁶²D. R. Ap-Thomas, review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Connor, 225.

CHAPTER SIX

THE KAMPEN SCHOOL GROUP: SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS

One of the most recent proposals for the analysis of Hebrew verse structure has come from a group of scholars, most of whom are members of the faculty or recent graduates of the Kampen School of Theology in the Netherlands. These scholars have suggested a method which defines the various structural units of a poem and identifies their relationship with each other. Apart from scattered journal articles, only one volume on this method has yet appeared in English, though some earlier work was published in Dutch.

In its initial form the method was developed by Pieter van der Lugt in his Dutch dissertation Strofische structuren in de bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie, written under the guidance of Johannes de Moor who himself contributed a number of widely scattered articles on the subject.¹

The compilation edited by Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor has not yet been the object of a serious published review in English.² This may be due in some degree to the composite nature of the book, which contains an introductory methodological essay by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, as well as fifteen examples of the application of this method by various scholars.³ Despite the lack of earlier critical comment, this work

¹Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, eds., The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry (Sheffield: The Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), vii.

²The only published review of any sort in English is a single descriptive paragraph with no evaluation whatever, published in Old Testament Abstracts 12, no. 2 (June 1989), 217.

³The essays cover a variety of Hebrew poems, as well as a single Ugaritic application and an attempt at an Aramaic reconstruction of the Lord's Prayer. The Hebrew examples studied are: Joshua 23 (by William T. Koopmans), Isaiah 5:1-7 (Marjo C. A. Korpel), Jonah 1:1-16 (Raymond de Hoop), Micah 1 (Johannes C. de Moor), Zephaniah 2-3 (Harm W. M. van Grol), Psalm 110 (Willem van der Meer), two essays on examples from the book of Job (Pieter van der Lugt), and four essays on the book of Lamentations (Johan Renkema). The Ugaritic example mentioned

deserves attention as a new approach to Hebrew verse structure. Of particular importance are the preface by the editors and the introductory essay on "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry" by Korpel and de Moor.⁴ The preface is a practical methodology, offering a step-by-step procedure for the implementation of the method which is described and used by the various contributors to this volume. This is very useful, as it allows and verifies replication of this method on other passages, as Korpel and de Moor state elsewhere.

Admittedly, the method is still far from perfect. It does not guarantee absolute unanimity with regard to the results. However, what it does achieve is a much higher degree of unanimity among different scholars analyzing the same text independently. Their reasoning is fully verifiable and therefore debatable. It does not depend as heavily as current methods on content and therefore on exegesis. Anybody knowing from experience the feeling of bewilderment pervading the scholar who compares the division of a Psalm or a prophetic discourse in a number of Bible translations and commentaries will recognize that this might be at least one step in the right direction.⁵

To the practical methodology of the preface, the introductory essay by Korpel and de Moor adds a theoretical methodology, which describes the conceptual basis for the method.

The preface describes a ten-step procedure for the identification of the structural elements of a Hebrew poem:

above was worked by Klass Spronk, and the Aramaic reconstruction of the Lord's Prayer was produced by J. de Moor.

⁴Marjo Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry," in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor (Sheffield: The Sheffield University Press, 1988). The essay on "The Literary Genre of the Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7) by Korpel and the four essays on "The Literary Structure of Lamentations" by Johan Renkema will also be of importance in the present dissertation since these two passages are among those selected for particular study.

⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 61.

1. Provisional delimitation of the passage to be analyzed
2. Translation and textual criticism.
3. . . . division of the text into poetical verses.
4. . . . description of the content of larger portions of text within the passage. . . .
5. Production of a concordance of all words
6. Detection of markers of separation. . . .
7. . . . we try to establish which verses are bonded by . . . parallelism to form a strophe.
8. Identification of strophes
9. Identification of external parallelistic bonds between canticles
10. Determination of the definitive form of the poem⁶

The second, fourth, fifth and sixth steps of this procedure are facultative or ancillary. The others all involve the division of the text into structural elements of varying magnitude, and the identification of relations between these elements. The editors indicate that the provisional delimitation of the passage to be analyzed in step one is made on the basis of the ancient traditional divisions of the text, the פְּתוּחוֹת and שְׁתוּמוֹת. The division of the text into poetical verses envisioned in step three is done on the basis of the Masoretic accents, whose reliability is considered by de Moor and van der Meer to be considerable, though not unquestionable. This division is verified by observing the internal parallelism of the verses, as well as traditional parallel word pairs. External parallelism is used to identify the larger elements of the poem in steps seven, eight and nine. It is apparent from the comments on "the content of larger portions of text" in step four that the parallelistic relationships on the basis of which the larger elements of the text are identified is primarily semantic, though the reference to "markers of separation" in step six allows some syntactic features to be considered as well.

⁶W. van der Meer and J. de Moor, Structural Analysis, vi, vii.

DELIMITATION OF STRUCTURAL UNITS

The Foot

The theoretical basis for this method is described in the introductory essay by Korpel and de Moor. Much of this essay is devoted to the issue of the delimitation of structural units of various sizes. Even some of the smaller structural elements of Hebrew poetry are sometimes difficult to identify. The smallest unit is the foot, defined by Korpel and de Moor as "a word containing at least one stressed syllable."⁷ This single-word foot is normally separated from other feet by a space in Hebrew manuscripts, or by a word divider in Ugaritic texts.⁸ The poetic feet thus defined were normally between one and five syllables in length,⁹ though they could extend to as many as eight syllables.¹⁰ Because of this latitude, Korpel and de Moor reject the possibility of strict syllabic meters of the sort found in much European poetry, and remark that "the counting of syllables or even characters is a meaningless occupation."¹¹ Of course, the broad limits identified by their definition of the poetic foot would never have been discovered if no counting had ever been done. The counting is therefore not meaningless, but its meaning must be seen as relative, and not absolute. Furthermore, The authors observe that ". . . a tendency to keep the number of stressed syllables per colon approximately the same throughout fairly large

⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 1,2.

⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 2. The use of word dividers was by no means ubiquitous in the Ugaritic texts. Nevertheless, in the absence of such marks, poetic feet can be distinguished by comparison of a text with other texts in which identical or similar lexemes are used with word-dividers.

⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 2.

¹⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 3.

¹¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 2,3.

portions of text can be observed."¹² Of course, given the vagueness of some of the terms in this comment, the same could have been said of the total number of syllables, stressed and unstressed, per colon. There is a tendency to keep the number of syllables per colon approximately the same throughout fairly large portions of text. The variation in the total number of syllables per colon is greater than the variation of the number of stressed syllables, though perhaps not proportionately so. The total number of syllables per colon regularly exceeds the number of stressed syllables, usually by a factor of two to four.

This definition of the poetic foot presumes the reader's ability to identify stressed and unstressed syllables,¹³ and also fails to account for the presence of unaccented words in the poetic texts under study. Accordingly, the definition is modified to include as single feet such multi-word combinations as the association of particles with a verb or nominal, and genitive constructions.¹⁴ These are described as "a kind of enjambment on the level of the feet, an expansion of one foot beyond its own 'territory' into that of a neighboring foot."¹⁵ Orthographic evidence of this phenomenon is found even in some of the most ancient texts. Even after this rather large allowance is made for variation in the size of the foot, Korpel and de Moor acknowledge that in native performance the poems were probably presented to musical accompaniment and

¹²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 3.

¹³This definition also tacitly assumes the accuracy of the Masoretic cantillation, i.e., its fidelity to the original pronunciation.

¹⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 3. Apparently Korpel and de Moor include all of the relationships traditionally described as "construct chains" under the heading "genitive constructions," even though many of these are hardly genitive in nature.

¹⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 3.

. . . every structural unit could be expanded or contracted as the singers saw fit. . . . This means that stressed syllables could be combined with a considerable number of unstressed syllables or could be drawn out at will to make one word sound as long as a whole phrase.¹⁶

The Colon

There is therefore a considerable variation in the size of acceptable poetic feet, and consequently some uncertainty in their delimitation. This is also true of the next larger poetic unit, the colon, which is made up of from one to five feet, the amount of text "that could be recited or sung in one breath."¹⁷ Korpel and de Moor also indicate another parameter for the limitation of colon length: ". . . the maximum length of a colon appears to be six words."¹⁸ Since, as has been noted above, a foot may contain more than one word, it appears that two definitions of colon length are in play, one based on feet, the other on words.¹⁹ This is so, even though Korpel and de Moor have previously defined a foot as "a word containing at least one stressed syllable."²⁰ Two maxima are therefore recognized: a colon contains no more than six words and no more than five feet. Other writers have noted the existence of either limits or norms for the number of accents,²¹ syllables,²² or characters²³ in a colon. One is reminded also of O'Connor's concept of constraints on the number of units, constituents and

¹⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 2.

¹⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 4.

¹⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 12.

¹⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 14.

²⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 1,2. Emphasis supplied.

²¹E.g., K. von Budde.

²²E.g. F. M. Cross, D. N. Freedman, R. C. Culley.

²³E.g., D. N. Freedman.

clause predicators in what he calls a poetic line. It is generally recognized that these norms and limits are not absolute, but they may nevertheless be significant. However, even with all of these norms, the variation in the size of a colon is rather significant.

Given this rather broad range of colon sizes, Korpel and de Moor acknowledge that,

. . . the re-establishment of the colometric division intended by the ancient poets is often a hazardous undertaking. Even the most conscientious researcher would do well to recognize this in all fairness.²⁴

Occasionally, traditional orthography will delimit the cola.

Acrostic poems also provide us with rather certain evidence of colon length.

But these relatively clear native indications are unfortunately rare.

. . . even under relatively favourable conditions it is not always easy to establish the correct colometry. Usually, however, the conditions are much worse, the scribes . . . totally ignoring the colometry which they knew by heart.²⁵

The clues which have been used to recover the original colometry of the poetic texts include internal parallelism, Masoretic cantillation (as indicated by the accents), rhythmical balance and comparison of parallel passages. Comparison of parallel passages also shows that the colon, like the foot, can be expanded or contracted in length, without thereby ceasing to be a colon. This fact also tends to refute the views of metricists who would attempt to find or impose an absolute metrical system of a temporal or accentual nature on the Hebrew and Ugaritic poetic texts.

²⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 6.

²⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 5.

The Verse

The cola identified by Korpel and de Moor may occur individually, but they are most frequently combined into units of greater length:

The colon cannot be the sole or even the most important building block of North-West Semitic poetry simply because very often the colon is an incomplete sentence, either running on in the next colon or truncated by ellipsis.²⁶

Considerations of syntax therefore determine that the colon is often, though not always, part of a larger whole. It frequently cannot be complete in itself, and requires elements which are found in an adjacent colon in order for it to be clearly comprehended. The larger whole required by the run-on sentence or the ellipsis is the verse. As with the foot and the colon, there is considerable variation in the permissible length of the verse. Korpel and de Moor state that "...in Ugarit and Israel the normal verse consists of two cola. Other numbers are possible, however."²⁷ In fact, the authors assert that in the poetic corpus which they have studied almost two thirds of the Ugaritic verses and more than three quarters of the Hebrew verses are bicola. This most common form of the verse is succeeded, in order of frequency in the poetic traditions of both languages, by tricola, unicola and multicola consisting of more than three cola.²⁸ Some verses may be as long as nine cola,²⁹ though the longer verses are exceedingly rare. Commonly, the number of feet per colon is relatively constant within a verse, though in the case of the bicolon, this simply means that the verse tends to be composed of two relatively equal halves.

²⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 14.

²⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 15.

²⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 15. Korpel and de Moor prefer the terms "unicola" and "multicola," rather than "monocola" and "polycola."

²⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 16, 27.

In accordance with the tendency towards symmetry in this kind of poetry the number of feet of the cola forming a verse is usually the same. However, unbalanced verses are quite common. A well-known example is the so-called qinah -verse . . .³⁰

The delimitation of verses, whatever their length, relies primarily on semantic and syntactic considerations of which parallelism is the most important.

Ever since the classical study of Lowth it has been recognized that usually the cola forming a Hebrew verse are connected by semantical and/or formal parallelism. . . . However, the existence of unicola and the so-called synthetic parallelism prove parallelism to be a non-vital element in this kind of poetry. . . . The main function of parallelism is to bind the structural elements of a poem together. With regard to the verse there is no need to prove this all over again. Parallelism is our most precious help in establishing which cola should be joined to form a verse. However, as with the colon it has to be recognized that often an absolutely certain delimitation of verses is impossible.³¹

Clearly, when parallelism between consecutive cola is less obvious or totally absent, it becomes very difficult to identify verses. In particular, it is hard to distinguish between a non-parallelistic bicolon and a series of two verses, each of which is composed of a single colon.³² The dependence of the authors on parallelism to identify verses is made even clearer by their statement that,

At this point it must be asked whether something like 'synthetical' parallelism really did exist. We believe it did, but find it very hard to prove this point of view in any conclusive way. Because sentences running on through more than one verse do occur, there is no reason whatsoever why we should not write a 'synthetic' bicolon as two independent unicola.³³

Korpel and de Moor also issue the caution that ". . . scholars would do well to recognize the tentative nature of their stichometric division in all

³⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 16.

³¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 17.

³²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 21.

³³M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 23.

cases where a unicolon might be present."³⁴ Unicola may indeed occur within structural elements larger than the verse, especially when they are "used to introduce a larger structural unit, e.g. a speech in the direct oration, . . ."³⁵

The Strophe

Just as feet are combined in cola and cola in verses, so also

The verse cannot be the largest building block of the poetry of the Canaanites and Israelites because in too many cases a sentence runs on from one verse to another. . . . it may be assumed that as a rule these uninterrupted sentences form higher structural units.³⁶

This assertion notwithstanding, Korpel and de Moor admit that "The on-running sentences alone do not prove the existence of strophes."³⁷ This is due to the fact that "sentences can also spill over into the next strophe(s)."³⁸ Further evidence of strophical structure may be inferred from acrostic poems and from refrains but

Mostly, however, we have to look for other means to recover the strophical structure of a poem. . . . usually the verses forming a strophe are connected by external parallelism. The outer borders of the strophe are indicated by markers securing the renewed interest of the audience, . . .³⁹

Again, as with the colon and the verse, parallelism is the primary means of identifying the structural unit in most cases. The strophes identified on the basis of parallelistic phenomena may be verified by other means, but semantic relationships between the verses are fundamental in this

³⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 19.

³⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 19.

³⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 29.

³⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 32.

³⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 32.

³⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 33.

structural analysis. The strophes may vary in length from one to four verses.⁴⁰ The apparent exception, Psalm 119, in which there are clearly sections of 8 verses, is not accepted: the eight-verse sections are indeed structural, but at a higher level than the strophe. In all cases Korpel and de Moor hold that the divisions of this Psalm must be subdivided into strophes of three or four verses.⁴¹ Just as they insist that no strophe may exceed four verses, so the authors also insist that there are strophes of a single verse, and this verse may be a single colon. "The shortest possible strophe consists of only one verse which according to the rule . . . may turn out to be a unicolon."⁴² The examples cited in support of this assertion are not convincing. In most cases, they consist of phrases which introduce direct speech, which might better be regarded as part of the strophe which follows. In any case, it seems likely that they are correct in stating that "No strophical theory requiring a fixed number of verses per strophe can do justice to the flexibility of all North-West Semitic poetry."⁴³

With regard to the results of the application of this method, Korpel and de Moor are guardedly cautious.

This approach promises to make the discussions about the strophical division of the North-West Semitic poetry much more objective. However, a lot of work still has to be done before the results can be termed absolutely reliable.⁴⁴

⁴⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 35, 37.

⁴¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 38. This follows the lead of Pieter van der Lugt in his doctoral dissertation, Strofische structuren in die bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie (Kampen, 1980), 477.

⁴²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 35.

⁴³M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 37.

⁴⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 35.

The Canticle

Strophes identified by this method may be grouped into larger structures, which Korpel and de Moor call canticles.⁴⁵ This is necessitated by the fact that "The strophe is not the highest structural unit in North-West Semitic poetry because fairly often a sentence runs on through several strophes."⁴⁶ It should be noticed again that semantic and syntactic considerations have determined the existence of the unit. In an extensive discussion of a Ugaritic example⁴⁷ Korpel and de Moor state, ". . . we observe that there is a unity of thought per canticle."⁴⁸ Semantic clues are also used to define the relation of the strophes within the canticle. In a comment on Psalm 64:2-5, Korpel and de Moor state, "The external parallelism between these four verses renders it absolutely certain that in spite of the on-running sentence they have to be grouped into two strophes of two verses each."⁴⁹ In a more general statement of this principle, the authors state,

Usually the strophes belonging to the same canticle are held together by external parallelism, sometimes a very clear and repetitious type of parallelism, more often only a few words here and there.⁵⁰

A general phenomenon can be seen here: the more extensive and complex an entity is, the harder it is to define. We have already noted some difficulties in defining even the colon, verse or strophe. This difficulty is magnified in the case of the canticle.

Unfortunately it is often much more difficult to establish the boundaries of a canticle than it is in the cases discussed thus far.

⁴⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 41.

⁴⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 38.

⁴⁷KTU 1.3 III.32 - IV.20

⁴⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 51.

⁴⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 39.

⁵⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 41.

Unity of thought, external parallelism between the strophes, ancient divisions like selah, petuchah and setumah may be helpful here, but it is still impossible to obtain absolutely reliable results. We consider it imprudent to draw up a list of all forms of canticles we believe to have identified in the poetry of Ugarit and Israel. Thus far we found no less than 67 different combinations of strophes . . . Regular patterns . . . seem to prevail over canticles with unbalanced numbers of verses.⁵¹

The uncertainty of defining the canticle emerges again when the authors discuss the permissible length of this structural unit. They affirm that the shortest canticle may consist "of only one strophe. Of course the latter may comprise only one verse."⁵² But the maximum length is less certain. Korpel and de Moor have identified canticles as long as five strophes, but they also assert that

Because of the difficulties involved in the delimitation of canticles it is impossible to pronounce a definitive judgment on the question of what the maximum length of a canticle could be.⁵³

The Sub-canto and Canto

The authors are even more tentative in the definition of larger structural units than the canticle. One notices immediately the caution of their statement on this point:

One or more canticles could be combined to form higher structural units which we call provisionally sub-canto and canto. The same kind of arguments used in delimiting the canticle are invoked to describe the sub-canto and canto.⁵⁴

Several inferences may be drawn from this statement. Korpel and de Moor consider their identification of these larger units to be only

⁵¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 42, 43.

⁵²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 43.

⁵³M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 43, 44.

⁵⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 44.

provisional. They are not willing even to name them definitively, much less to describe them. Furthermore, their expression "could be" seems to imply that they are not entirely certain that this actually happens. Finally it should be noted that, if cantos and sub-cantos actually exist, they are to be delimited on the basis of "the same kind of arguments" used to identify the boundaries of the canticle, that is, by semantic clues. This is made more explicit in their comments on Psalm 78, which they have selected as an example: "Just as the verses of a strophe are usually bound together by external parallelism, so too the higher structural units."⁵⁵ Of course, no attempt is made to identify the maximum number of canticles in the sub-canto, or of sub-cantos in the canto. This lack of precision is reflected in a summary table offered in the conclusion to this essay:

The following table summarizes some of our findings:

<u>Building-block</u>	<u>Smallest</u>	<u>Expandable</u>	<u>Largest</u>
Foot	1 syllable	Yes	8 syllables
Colon	1 foot	Yes	5 feet
Verse	1 colon	Yes	9 cola
Strophe	1 verse	Yes	4 verses
Canticle	1 strophe	No ?	5 strophes ?
(Sub-)canto	1 canticle	?	? ⁵⁶

Again one may note the tentativeness with which the larger units are treated. The larger the unit, the greater the difficulty of definition.

⁵⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 57.

⁵⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 60. The expression "expandable" refers to the question of whether it is possible to add more units of the next lower degree to a given element without it becoming a unit of the next higher degree and without altering the framework of the poem. The determination of expandability is made on the basis of the comparison of parallel texts in which extra feet may be added to a colon, or cola to a verse, or verses to a strophe, in one version, as compared with the other.

Positive assertions cease with the strophe, except for the indications of minima. The canticle is the largest unit for which any attempt is made to identify the maximum. The canto is not even separately defined. This may be partly because there are other factors to be considered in definition besides the number of units of the next smaller degree which can be contained in any of these elements. Such constraints (for that is what they are) are valuable as far as they go, but they are incomplete, as O'Connor has shown. Other constraints do apply, for example, to the length of the colon (or the "line," as O'Connor would call it).

THE FUNCTION OF STRUCTURAL UNITS

Despite the lack of clarity in defining the large structural units (canticle, sub-canto and canto), Korpel and de Moor perceive a function in these units. In their study of Psalm 78, they divide the Psalm into verses, strophes and canticles, and arrange the canticles into sub-cantos and cantos. In summarizing their results, they remark,

Disregarding the slight expansion of the number of verses in the introductory canto, we find a high degree of symmetry on the level of the higher structural units of this Psalm. This is by no means a rare phenomenon. It is rather fully in accordance with what we found in numerous other cases.⁵⁷

In a similar vein they comment, "Note the symmetrical structure which is still preserved even if the strophes and canticles differ widely in length."⁵⁸ What Korpel and de Moor assert here is a regularity at a higher level than that sought by the nineteenth century metricists. The metricists wanted regularity to be temporal, at the level of the syllables. Korpel and de Moor have perceived that the regularity is semantic, at the level of groups of lines, of strophes and canticles, to use their terms. This

⁵⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 56.

⁵⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 57.

regularity can be expressed in terms of symmetry and balance. For example, in describing the arrangement of verses in a strophe, the authors comment, "As with the cola per verse, a certain preference for balanced sequences can be observed."⁵⁹ This balance may be achieved in various ways, but commonest among them is a concentric relationship of the elements in the poem.

We modern readers are conditioned to read a text in a strictly linear way, from beginning to end. However, the skilful exploitation of the repetitive effect of external parallelism tends to lend a more or less concentric structure to the larger building blocks of ancient North-West Semitic poetry. Verses many lines apart appear to form one and the same concentric shell and as we have seen they explain each other in this way. We for our part are accustomed to look at the end of a composition for the general conclusions, a pithy recapitulation of the main points or the outcome of the captivating story. In the kind of poetry we try to describe here, however, we often find the heart of the matter right in the middle where it belongs as the kernel out of which everything grew in accordance with the laws of parallelistic expansion.⁶⁰

In the same line, Korpel and de Moor offer an analogy of Hebrew verse structure:

In theory one word might form the kernel out of which a major work of art was composed by adding ever more balancing parallelistic structures. Because every structural element contained at least one element of the preceding order of magnitude such poems tended to grow in concentric circles, not in the way of ripples caused by a stone in a pond, but much more irregularly, like the rings marking the good and bad years of a tree, with knots indicating the places where new parallelistic structures branch off.⁶¹

This suggestion, that a Hebrew poem grows by the addition of "balancing parallelistic structures," may help one to understand, among other things, the phenomenon of chiasm, the simplest concentric structure, and one of the most widespread in Hebrew poetry. In this understanding,

⁵⁹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 32.

⁶⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 54.

⁶¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 60.

chiasm simply grows out of the desire for balance which is a fundamental principle in the growth of the poem.

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES WITH
O'CONNOR'S CONSTRICTIONAL SYSTEM

Similarities

Even at first glance it is observable that there are certain similarities between the constrictional system proposed by O'Connor and the semantic strophic analysis proposed by the Kampen School group. Both systems overtly seek an explanation of verse structure. O'Connor has titled his work Hebrew Verse Structure, and van der Meer and de Moor have chosen the title The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry for the compilation which they edited. Further, both systems define the colon (which O'Connor calls the poetic line) in terms of its subordinate elements, and both use the colon to define larger structural entities. In the case of O'Connor, the larger entities are the "staves" and "batches." For the Kampen school group, these larger entities are "verses," "strophes" and "canticles," as well as the still larger and less well-defined "sub-cantos" and "cantos." Both systems characterize the maxima and minima of elements to be included in structural units of the next higher order. In both cases, the norms established for the length of large structural units, expressed in terms of small structural units, are understood to be approximative and not absolute, and considerable variation in the length of units is recognized.

The Identification of Small Structural Units

Despite these similarities, there are some important differences. The first of these is that the entities which they define are, for the most part, not the same. The "foot" defined by the Kampen School group corresponds roughly to the "unit" or "constituent" identified by O'Connor,

though O'Connor defines both the "unit" and the "constituent" functionally, rather than in terms of smaller units, whereas Korpel and de Moor specify that the "foot" consists of one to eight syllables, at least one of which is stressed.⁶² In practice, this means that it normally consists of a verb with its particles, or of a nominal with its particles and any other nominals dependent on it. Since O'Connor defines the "unit" as "a verb or an individual nomen"⁶³ and the "constituent" as "a verb, or an argument of a predicator which appears on the surface, unless it includes a prepositional phrase, in which case it is split,"⁶⁴ one might conclude that the "constituent" thus defined is virtually identical to the "foot" as Korpel and de Moor have defined it. In practice, however, it appears that there is an overlap between the definitions, since a constituent may contain as many as four units, or as few as one. Thus, the smallest "feet" identified by Korpel and de Moor correspond to some of O'Connor's "units," and the larger feet correspond to some of O'Connor's "constituents." With this understanding, there is an agreement between Korpel and de Moor's observation that a colon may contain as many as five feet or as few as one⁶⁵ and O'Connor's constraints which indicate that a line may have no fewer than one constituent and no more than five units.⁶⁶ There is therefore a correspondence, if not a perfect agreement, between the two systems at the level of the definition of the smallest elements.

⁶²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 1, 2.

⁶³M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 87.

⁶⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87.

⁶⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 2, 3.

⁶⁶M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 87.

As has already been seen, the same is true at the next higher level. O'Connor defines a poetic line in terms of the maxima and minima of units, constituents and clause predicators which it may contain. Accepting that a poetic foot (as the term is used by the Kampen School group) is equivalent to either a "unit" or a "constituent" (as defined by O'Connor), one can understand that the "colon" (as defined by Korpel and de Moor) is equivalent to the "line" (as defined by O'Connor). There are occasions when it appears that the proponents of the two systems do not agree on colometry, for example, in their treatments of Psalm 78:28, which O'Connor scans as a single line,⁸⁷ whereas Korpel and de Moor apparently regard it as two lines.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, neither scansion would violate the constraints defined by either theory. If taken as a single line, Psalm 78:28 consists of five units and four constituents (in O'Connor's terms) or four feet (in the terms of the Kampen School group). If taken as a bicolon, each line would consist of two constituents (according to O'Connor) or two feet (according to the Kampen School group).

Differences in the Definition of Structural Units

But although the two theories seem to resemble each other at the level of the smallest structural units and at the next higher level, the resemblance ends there, quite abruptly. O'Connor recognizes no structural unit approximating the "verse," as Korpel and de Moor have defined it. He flatly states that his theory has no place for the bicolon: "The couplet as a formal unit is non-existent in our description. It has no definition beyond its plainest one, a pair of lines."⁸⁹ Both bicolon and tricolon are

⁸⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 565.

⁸⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 55.

⁸⁹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 447.

understood to be the products of troping.⁷⁰ O'Connor's next larger unit is the "batch," consisting of from one to twelve lines, but most commonly from five to eight lines.⁷¹ This seems to correspond roughly to the "strophe" defined by Korpel and de Moor which, in most instances presented in their essay, consists of from four to eight cola. This is not, however, a matter of definition, since the strophe may consist of as many as four verses, and the verse of as many as nine cola. In practice, however, no strophe has been identified which actually contains as many as thirty-six cola. Furthermore, the boundaries of strophes and batches (as they are identified by the proponents of the two theories) frequently fail to coincide in the examples which have been worked by both. The "canticles," "sub-cantos" and "cantos" defined by Korpel and de Moor do not seem to correspond, unless accidentally, with the "staves" which O'Connor has defined. Korpel and de Moor present canticles as short as five cola and sub-cantos as short as eleven, which O'Connor would have to describe as a "batch" and a "half-stave," respectively. On the other hand, Korpel and de Moor identify canticles as long as twelve cola (equal to one of O'Connor's "half-staves") and sub-cantos as long as twenty-six cola (equal to a stave, in O'Connor's terms). Again, there is frequent disagreement with regard to the boundaries of staves and those of canticles and sub-cantos. The relationship of canto and stave is no better. Korpel and de Moor identify cantos varying in length from fourteen to forty-four cola, far outside the range of permissible values for the stave (23 to 31 lines) as defined by O'Connor.⁷² It is clear that these two theories do not perceive the same realities in the poetic texts. This is to say that the level of agreement among those who claim to find a regularity

⁷⁰M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 134.

⁷¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 529.

⁷²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 527.

in the higher structural units of the poem is no greater than the level of agreement among the metricists, who sought poetic regularities among the syllables and stresses.

Comparison of Worked Examples

This fact is brought into even sharper focus by the comparison of the work of O'Connor and scholars of the Kampen School group on identical texts. Such parallel analysis occurs with two texts. O'Connor provides a study of both Psalm 78 and of Zephaniah 2 and 3. The two chapters of Zephaniah are considered by Harm W. M. van Grol,⁷³ and Psalm 78 is studied by Korpel and de Moor in their methodological essay. Since the work on Psalm 78 is shorter, and since in the case of the Kampen School group the analysis of this Psalm is undertaken in the context of methodology, this example is chosen for comparison. This comparison will be presented first in tabular form, with the work of O'Connor in the left column and that of Korpel and de Moor in the right column.⁷⁴ As far as possible, the two columns will be coordinated.

⁷³Harm W. M. van Grol, "Classical Hebrew Metrics and Zephaniah 2-3," in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor (Sheffield: The Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 186-206.

⁷⁴The data for this table are excerpted from M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 504-510 and M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 55-60. The notational systems used are those of O'Connor and of Korpel and de Moor, respectively.

TABLE 6 - 1
COMPARISON OF STRUCTURAL STUDIES OF PSALM 78

O'CONNOR			KORPEL AND DE MOOR		
Staves are indicated by Roman numerals, batches by lower case letters.			Cantos are indicated by capital letters, sub-cantos by numbers, canticles by Roman numerals, and strophes by numbers.		
STAVE/ BATCH	VERSE NUMBERS	LINES	CANTO/ SUB-CANTO/ CANTICLE/ STROPHE	VERSE NUMBERS	COLA
<u>I</u>	<u>1a-10b</u>	<u>28</u>			
I a	1a-4d	10	A.1.I.1	1b-2	2+2
			A.1.I.2	3-4	2+2+3
I b	5a-6a	5	A.1.II.1	5	2+2
I c	6b-7c	5	A.1.II.2	6-7	2+2+3
I d	8a-10b	8	A.1.III.1	8	2+2
			A.1.III.2	9-11	3+2+2
<u>II</u>	<u>11a-20e</u>	<u>24</u>			
II a	11a-13b	6	A.2.I.1	12-14	3+2+2
II b	14a-16b	6	A.2.I.2	15-16	2+2
II c	17a-18b	4	B.1.I.1	17-18	2+2
II d	19a-20e	8	B.1.I.2	19	2+2
			B.1.I.3	20	2+2
<u>III</u>	<u>21a-32b</u>	<u>25</u>			
III a	21a-23b	7	B.1.II.1	21-22	3+2
III b	24a-26b	6	B.2.I.1	23-25	2+2+2
III c	27a-29b	5	B.2.I.2	26-27	2+2
			B.2.I.3	28-29	2+2
III d	30a-32b	7	B.2.II.1	30-31	2+3
			C. .I.1	32-33	2+2
<u>IV</u>	<u>33a-45b</u>	<u>28</u>			
IV a	33a-36b	8	C. .I.2	34-35	2+2
			C. .II.1	36-37	2+2
IV b	37a-38d	6	C. .II.2	38-39	3+2+3
IV c	39a-41b	6	D.1.I.1	40-41	2+2
IV d	42a-45b	8	D.1.I.2	42-43	2+2
			D.1.II.1	44-45	2+2
<u>V</u>	<u>46a-58b</u>	<u>29</u>			
V a	46a-49c	9	D.1.II.2	46-48	2+2+2
			D.1.III.1	49-50a	2+2
V b	50a-52b	7	D.1.III.2	50b-51	2+2
			D.2.I.1	52-53	2+2
V c	53a-55c	7	D.2.I.2	54-55	2+3
V d	56a-58b	6	E.1.I.1	56-58	2+2+2

<u>VI</u>	<u>59a-72b</u>	<u>29</u>			
VI a	59a-62b	8	E.1.I.2	59-60	2+2
			E.1.II.1	61-62	2+2
VI b	63a-66b	8	E.1.II.2	63-64	2+2
			E.2.I.1	65-66	2+2
VI c	67a-69b	6	E.2.1.2	67-68	2+2
			E.2.II.1	69-70	2+2
VI d	70a-72b	7	E.2.II.2	71-72	3+2

From the simple fact that O'Connor has six major divisions (staves) and Korpel and de Moor have only five (cantos), two inferences might be drawn, first, that overall results are unlikely to coincide, and second, that both systems can hardly be correct in their analysis of this passage. The fact is that O'Connor's most significant boundaries (between staves) may coincide with Korpel and de Moor's canticle boundaries (e.g., Stave II, which ends at verse 20e) or strophe boundaries (e.g., Stave IV, which ends at verse 45b), or may even fall within a strophe (Stave III, which ends at verse 32 b). Korpel and de Moor's most significant boundaries (between cantos) may fall at the same place as O'Connor's batch divisions (e.g. Canto A, which ends at verse 16b), or within batches (e.g., Canto B, which ends at verse 31b). In no case in the analysis of this Psalm do O'Connor's staves end at the same place as Korpel and de Moor's cantos or sub-cantos.

It is clear that in some cases the two systems do not even identify the same poetic lines within the text. Unfortunately, Korpel and de Moor have not provided a complete colographic text, as O'Connor has.⁷⁵ But comparison of tabulated results will nevertheless show discrepancies between the two systems. Verses 28 and 29, identified by Korpel and de Moor as the third strophe of Canticle I in the second sub-canto of Canto B, are counted as four cola. O'Connor counts verse 28 as a single line, and verse 29 as two lines. Thus, despite the similarities in their approach, the two systems cannot agree on the number of cola (or poetic lines) in the text. The very least that

⁷⁵M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 263-278.

can be concluded from the comparison of these two systems is that they cannot both be right in their scansion of the text. Both methods may offer some useful contributions to the understanding of Hebrew verse structure, but in application it is discovered that, as least regarding the structure of Hebrew poems, one of these methods may be correct, or the other, or neither, but it seems that at least one is mistaken.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

PROPOSED BY THE KAMPEN SCHOOL GROUP

Advantages of This Method

The method of structural analysis proposed and used by the Kampen School group has the distinct advantage of being highly replicable. Because of the detailed procedure which has been set out, it is probable that similar results will be obtained by various scholars who adopt this method. Korpel and de Moor have noted the relatively high degree of unanimity which can be achieved by different students of Hebrew poetry who employ this procedure.⁷⁶ Uniformity of procedure tends to assure objectivity,⁷⁷ and to allow verification of results. A practical proof of this objectivity is that the method has, indeed, been adopted by a number of scholars, and the results produced have tended to uniformity. The same cannot be stated as confidently of methods which have heretofore been used only by their original proponents.

In addition, this method demonstrates a rather great degree of flexibility, which nearly all (modern) students of Hebrew poetry acknowledge to be a necessity. Nineteenth century metrical approaches tended to be coercive in their treatment of the text, forcing it to conform to

⁷⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 61.

⁷⁷W. van der Meer and J. de Moor, Structural Analysis, ix.

patterns which were perhaps not apparent in the text until it was modified at the whim of the metricist. Those scholars of the Kampen School group who have adopted this method have proposed no emendations of the text metri causa. Any textual criticism resulting in proposals for emendation has been based on criteria of a non-metrical nature.

Furthermore, this method proposes an understanding of Hebrew verse which is conceivable from the point of view of the intent of the original poet. It is true that in the absence of statements by the original authors or their contemporaries, the modern reader cannot know the mental processes of the Hebrew poets. This does not mean, however, that the reader is free to speculate on concepts of verse structure which would have been psychologically impossible or improbable. It cannot be asked whether the Hebrew and Canaanite poets wrote their poems according to rules which modern scholars have outlined, but it is quite legitimate to ask whether they could have done so. In the case of a negative response, it may be assumed that the metrical or poetical principles proposed are likely to be defective. The rules or constraints outlined by the scholars of the Kampen School group are at least conceivable as guiding principles in the composition of poetry.

The Problem of Parallelism

There are, nevertheless, several difficulties with this method of structural analysis of poetry. The first of these centers on the issue of parallelism. The reliance of this method on the observation of parallelism is overtly acknowledged. The text is divided into poetic verses on the basis of parallelism.⁷⁸ Strophes, canticles sub-cantos and cantos are identified on the basis of parallelism.⁷⁹ Korpel and de Moor refer repeatedly to

⁷⁸W. van der Meer and J. de Moor, Structural Analysis, vii.

⁷⁹W. van der Meer and J. de Moor, Structural Analysis, viii.

parallelism in their analysis of texts. But when does parallelism occur? How does one know that parallelism has occurred? At no time do Korpel and de Moor offer any rules for the detection of parallelism. It seems to be assumed that the reader is equipped to do this without instruction. Further, it seems to be assumed that there will be no debate on this point. Of course, this is not the case. Since the publication of Lowth's lectures on Hebrew poetry, it has been widely understood that parallelism was important in biblical poetry, but the discussion of what parallelism is and how it is achieved has not yet been concluded to the satisfaction of all. Recent full volume works on the subject⁸⁰ have not only contributed to the understanding of parallelism, but also evidenced that the question is not closed. Korpel and de Moor are frank enough to admit that it is not always easy to detect parallelism, particularly in the case of the so-called "synthetical parallelism." For this reason they acknowledge that ". . . there is no reason whatsoever why we should not write a 'synthetical' bicolon as two independent unicola."⁸¹ Within the system which they have described and used, this is equivalent to saying that in some cases one cannot tell the difference between one poetical verse and two.

The difficulty of making judgments such as the one just described is a serious defect in this method. This defect is due largely to the dependence of the method on parallelism for making such judgments, without having established a clear understanding or definition of parallelism. Since the parallelism on which the Kampen School group depend for such decisions is primarily of a semantic nature, it is particularly poignant to notice the

⁸⁰Particularly noteworthy are Stephen A. Geller's Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979) and Adele Berlin's Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1985).

⁸¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 23.

concluding paragraph of Korpel and de Moor's essay, in which they state that their method of analyzing poetry "does not rely as heavily as current methods on content and therefore on exegesis."⁸² Of course, they are relying on content, specifically on semantic content, and they are dependent on some sort of exegesis for a perception of the meaning on which their judgments are based.

The Delimitation of Structural Units

The foregoing observation is true not only with regard to the distinction of the small units of the structure of a poem, but even more with regard to the larger units. For example, after discussing the colon, verse and strophe, Korpel and de Moor remark,

Unfortunately, it is often much more difficult to establish the boundaries of a canticle than it is in the cases discussed thus far. Unity of thought, external parallelism between the strophes, ancient divisions like selah, petuchah and setumah may be helpful here, but it is still impossible to obtain absolutely reliable results.⁸³

The difficulty becomes even more acute with the sub-canto and the canto, with regard to which Korpel and de Moor are so diffident as not to suggest maximum lengths. In addition, from the passage just cited one may note that the primary means for distinguishing the boundaries of the canticle are semantic: "unity of thought" and "external parallelism." That is to say, the delimitation of the larger units of verse structure is accomplished on the basis of perceived meaning, and may therefore be dependent more on the perceptions of the reader or hearer than on any objective characteristics, despite the assertions of Korpel and de Moor to the contrary. Korpel and de Moor frequently acknowledge that the passages they have used as examples may be construed otherwise than they have

⁸²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 61.

⁸³M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 42, 43.

presented them. Since these passages are eclectic, and were chosen with a view to illustrating their argument, it is not terribly uncharitable to suppose that their contentions might appear still less convincing if tested on other passages.

The Relationship of Structural Units

It is not only delimitation of structural units which is affected by this defect of the method. The relationship of these units, as Korpel and de Moor have presented them, may also be questioned as subjective. For example, in their study of Psalm 78, they have stated,

If we adhere to our Western-European ideas of regularity Psalm 78 does not seem to be composed in a very regular way. However, if we are willing to look for their idea of poetical order and structure, regularity manifests itself on many levels.⁶⁴

An important point is made here: it is vital to set aside western and European norms of poetic regularity and even western and European ideas of poetry, as Kugel insists,⁶⁵ and look for Semitic and Hebrew ideas. Nevertheless, whether regularity manifests itself on quite as many levels as Korpel and de Moor think it does is open to debate. Certainly, as can be seen by the comparison with the work of O'Connor, the regularities detected in Korpel and de Moor's work are not universally accepted. This again may be more a matter of the reader's perception than of the poet's intention.

⁶⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 59.

⁶⁵James Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1981).

The Rôle of Syntax

Considerations of perceived meaning may be the basis for the identification and delimitation of structural units in Hebrew poetry, according to the Kampen School group. But intertwined with these are considerations of syntax. For example, the remark that "The strophe is not the highest structural unit in North-West Semitic Poetry because fairly often a sentence runs on through several strophes."⁶⁶ As an example of this, they cite Psalm 64:2-5, with the comment that

The external parallelism between these four verses renders it absolutely certain that in spite of the on-running sentence they have to be grouped into two strophes of two verses each.⁶⁷

The strophes in this example are delimited on the basis of parallelism, that is to say, on the basis of semantic clues. Syntax is not the key. But syntax, though it does not serve here to indicate breaks between lines, verses or strophes, is nevertheless used to affirm continuity through the lines, verses and strophes. Two questions arise on this point. The first is whether any phenomenon or mass of phenomena can be held to indicate continuity if they cannot also indicate discontinuity. Syntax is probably important in Hebrew poetry, as Collins and O'Connor have shown. The failure of the Kampen School group to attend more carefully to the role of syntax in Hebrew structure is another serious defect in the method they have proposed.⁶⁸

⁶⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 38.

⁶⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 39.

⁶⁸It should also be noted that on pages 1 and 2 Korpel and de Moor have defined the smallest structural unit, the foot, on a phonemic basis: it is a word (or concatenation of words) containing at least one stressed syllable. This attention to considerations of sound extends also to the definition of the colon which, as Korpel and de Moor note on page 4, is the amount of text which could be recited or sung in one breath.

But beyond this looms another question. The same syntactic phenomenon mentioned above, the run-on sentence, is used by Korpel and de Moor to support the assertion that the highest structural unit of the Hebrew poem cannot be the colon,⁸⁰ the verse⁸⁰ or the strophe.⁸¹ But the question is whether the run-on sentence is really an indication of poetic continuity, or whether it is simply a reflection of the paratactic nature of the Hebrew language. It is an arguable issue whether it is appropriate to speak of a "run-on" sentence, or in fact, of any sort of sentence in biblical Hebrew, at least in the same sense in which one speaks of sentences in English. Certainly in narrative prose, the frequent and indeed, almost ubiquitous use of the waw-consecutive creates syntactic aggregations which, when translated literally, would produce run-on sentences of a length normally intolerable in English narrative prose. Compared with English, Hebrew seems almost to skip over the sentence level in its syntax. There are clauses in Hebrew, like relatively short simple sentences in English, and there are larger syntactic arrangements which surpass, both in length and complexity what might be expected in an English sentence, approaching or even exceeding the English paragraph. But the middle level, the sentence level, is not frequently represented in Hebrew narrative. A relatively short example of this might be taken from Genesis 11:1-9, which, translated fairly strictly, becomes a run-on sentence in English, though the English versions usually treat it as a multi-sentence paragraph. Much longer examples could be cited, including some that pass the boundaries of what modern English-speaking readers (and presumably the ancient Hebrews as well) perceive as separate narratives. Genesis 12-14 is such a case.

⁸⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 14.

⁸⁰M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 29.

⁸¹M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 38.

It would not be a great surprise to find similar phenomena in Hebrew poetry. What Korpel and de Moor perceive as connections between lines, verses and strophes of a single poem may simply be expressions of the paratactic aspect of the Hebrew language, apparently linking what may more properly be regarded as separate poems. Some of the confusion regarding the numerotation of certain Psalms (e.g., the break or absence of a break between Psalms 9 and 10 in the Hebrew canon) may be due to this.

This does not mean that the ancient Hebrews were necessarily less aware than modern readers of the breaks between one narrative and another or between one poem and the next. But, given the traditional orthographic continuity, and the lack of syntactic clues, the breaks between narratives or poems may be signalled more by semantic clues than might be the case in other languages and literary traditions. For these reasons, it might be better for Korpel and de Moor, who so regularly rely on semantic considerations to delimit structural units in a poem, to look for semantic clues to continuity as well.

Even so, there are several reasons why a certain degree of caution must be exercised with regard to this reliance on semantic clues. In the first place, as many scholars of Hebrew poetry, including those of the Kampen School group, have noticed, there do seem to be regularities in Hebrew poetry which are not limited to semantics, which are most easily describe in some field other than the semantic one, or which are perhaps not even attributable to semantic considerations. This may lead one to suspect that any adequate explanation of Hebrew verse structure will involve more than the semantic aspect of the poems. In the second place, it may be noted that Korpel and de Moor have tended to see greater semantic regularities in the larger structural units. In their comments on Psalm 78, for example, they state, "Disregarding the slight expansion of the number of verses in the introductory canto we find a high degree of symmetry on the level of the

higher structural units of this Psalm."⁸² It has already been noted that Korpel and de Moor acknowledge a greater difficulty in delimiting the higher structural units of the poem (canto, sub-canto, canticle) than the lower units (strophe, verse, colon). But in contrast, they now assert that there is greater regularity at these levels. Thus, in their analysis of the poem, the more complex the entity and the more tentative the delimitation, the greater the level of symmetry. Other readers may be excused for finding this slightly suspect. Why is it that those units which are more difficult to define are easier to relate to each other? Again, the possibility arises that what is being described is not the poem itself, but the analyst's perception of meaning.

Minimal Units

A final question arises over the minima identified for the various structural units of Hebrew poetry. Korpel and de Moor have stated that the smallest colon consists of a single foot,⁸³ the smallest verse of a single colon,⁸⁴ the smallest strophe of a single verse,⁸⁵ the smallest canticle of a single strophe,⁸⁶ the smallest sub-canto of a single canticle,⁸⁷ and the smallest canto of a single sub-canto.⁸⁸ Examples of most of these minimal units are provided. Inasmuch as these data are summarized in tabular form in the penultimate paragraph of Korpel and de Moor's conclusion, the reader may

⁸²M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 56.

⁸³M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 4, 7, 60.

⁸⁴M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 16, 19, 60.

⁸⁵M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 35, 60.

⁸⁶M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 41, 43, 60.

⁸⁷M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 44, 60.

⁸⁸M. Korpel and J. de Moor, "Fundamentals," 44, 60.

infer that they consider this to be an important finding. Indeed, it may be important, but it is clearly inadequate. Can it be believed that a canto with only one sub-canto, composed of a single canticle containing one strophe which is a one verse unicolon of one foot actually constitutes a poem? It is unlikely in the extreme that such a literary production would ever be perceived as poetry. Examples may be cited from the opening chapters of I Samuel. Hannah's address to God in I Samuel 2:1-10 is readily perceived as poetic. Modern readers speak of the "Song of Hannah," and many translations set this passage colographically. On the other hand, when one reads in I Samuel 3:4 how the young Samuel responds when he hears the voice of God in the night, no one understands his address to God, "יְהוָה," to be a poem of any sort, and certainly not a one-foot unicolon making up a one verse, single-strophe, one-canticle, single-sub-canto, canto. A great deal is involved in the perception of poetry besides the maxima and minima of structural units. Indeed, a great deal is involved in the structural units besides their maxima and minima. The constraints proposed may all be true in themselves but, even taken together, they are not sufficient to describe Hebrew poetry or Hebrew verse structure.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE TRIAL PASSAGES

The four biblical poems selected as trial passages for the study of the theories of verse structure described in the preceding chapters are "The Song of Deborah" (Judges 5:2-31b), "The Song of the Vineyard" (Isaiah 5:1-7), "When the Lord Restored the Fortunes of Zion" (Psalm 126:1-6) and "The First Lament" (Lamentations 1:1-22). These four poems are selected with a view to their diversity of date, context, subject and genre.

"The Song of Deborah" is an anonymous composition produced prior to 1000 B.C.E. It is a complement to the narrative account of the battle between Barak and Sisera, and is placed in a narrative context, serving as an act of celebration by the prophetess Deborah following Sisera's defeat in the battle of Kishon. "The Song of the Vineyard" is believed to be the work of Isaiah the son of Amoz, commonly known as the first Isaiah, during the latter part of the eighth century. In its present poetic context it serves as part of a longer oracle of judgment against Judah and Jerusalem. "The First Lament" probably dates from the early exilic period (around the first half of the sixth century), and is one of five similar songs of grief pronounced over the destruction of Jerusalem. Psalm 126 is probably post-exilic, and little can be said of its context other than to note its place in the last section of the Psalter.

Before submitting these passages to analysis of their verse structure, it may be useful to consider the origin, unity and textual integrity of each of these poems. These poems will be considered in their presumed chronological order, with the greatest attention being given here to "The Song of Deborah," which is not only the earliest, but also the most obscure and one of the longest of these poems. In addition to these comments, this chapter will also present the Masoretic Text of each poem, arranged colometrically.

Beside the Hebrew text the Revised Standard Version is presented in a parallel column to provide the reader with a ready reference to the text. Where there is a traditional colometry of the poem (as is the case with the Psalm and with "The Song of Deborah") this traditional arrangement of the text has been observed. In the other cases ("The Song of the Vineyard" and "The First Lament") an attempt has been made to observe the divisions implied by the Masoretic accents.

As indicated in the Methodology, a pre-emptive decision has been taken to test the four theories of Hebrew verse structure under consideration in the present study by applying them to the unemended Masoretic text of the trial passages. It is beyond reasonable doubt that the present form of some of these passages is corrupted. It is also likely that some of the corruptions of the extant text could be corrected by careful application of the principles of textual criticism. But while some of the emendations proposed for these are quite believable, none will be adopted for purposes of this study, simply to avoid the possibility of adjusting the evidence to favor (or disfavor) one or another of the verse-structure theories. Nevertheless, selected text-critical comments are presented in Appendix Two. There are two purposes for these comments. First, textual criticism of the four trial passages has shown that while there is undeniably a certain level of textual corruption in these texts, they are still sufficiently well preserved for the modern reader to trust that the majority of even the most corrupt of these texts ("The Song of Deborah") sufficiently intact to demonstrate all of the characteristics of verse structure intended by the original poet. In the second place, some exposure to the text-critical tradition will enable the reader to determine which of the emendations proposed by the proponents of the four theories of verse structure are best supported and most probable.

The Date of the Poem

There is wide agreement that "The Song of Deborah" is a very ancient poem, almost certainly dating from the period prior to the establishment of the Israelite monarchy. J. D. Martin's comment is typical of many: "Ch. 5 is usually known as the Song of Deborah and is generally regarded as one of the oldest pieces of Hebrew literature."¹ Judges 5:1 describes this poem as a composition of Deborah and Barak, who are, with Jael, the major protagonists of both this poem and the parallel prose account in chapter 4. This identification of authorship is, however, widely doubted. Reasons for rejecting the first person authorship of Deborah and Barak include the second person references to these two in verses 12 and 15 and a probable second person reference in verse 7.² Nevertheless, there is wide agreement that the poem (unlike the prose account) was probably produced by a contemporary or near-contemporary of the events described.³ Reasons for this view are given by G. F. Moore:

The representations of the Song agree entirely with the historical situation, so far as we are able from our very scanty materials to reconstruct it. We detect in it none of the anachronisms by which a later writer so easily betrays his own age; nor does the atmospheric perspective of the narrative indicate that the writer

¹James D. Martin, The Book of Judges (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 61, 62. Cf. also J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion," Biblica 42 (1961): 69.

²George Foot Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), vol. 7 in The International Critical Commentary, 132.

³See, e.g., Arthur E. Crandall, Judges: An Introduction and Commentary (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1968), vol. 7 of the Tyndale Old Testament Commentary, 90; Jacob Myers and Phillips P. Elliott, "Judges" in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), vol. 2, 717; G. F. Moore, Judges, 129; J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah," 63; Alan J. Hauser, "Two Songs of Victory: A Comparison of Exodus 15 and Judges 5," in Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry, ed. Elaine R. Follis (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 265.

stood at a distance from the events which he relates. It exhibits neither the vagueness which is the first result of the blurring of details in tradition, nor the artificial circumstantiality which marks the subsequent attempt to recover them.⁴

Moore concedes that it is a part of literary skill to create this impression even when the writer is remote from the events, but he doubts that this occurred in the case of "The Song of Deborah."⁵ Alexander Globe's conclusion is appropriate:

There is, indeed, nothing in the Song of Deborah out of tune with its traditional setting as a twelfth- or eleventh-century Middle Eastern victory ode.⁶

Integrity

The comment of Alexander Globe, cited above in support of a pre-monarchy date for "The Song of Deborah," is actually made in the context of a discussion of the literary unity of this poem. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship has identified numerous glosses and expansions in the text of "The Song of Deborah." W. F. Albright responded to many of these,⁷ but left unanswered the fundamental question of whether the Song in its extant form was originally a unity, or a composite of several ancient poems. This issue has been discussed incidentally by J. Blenkinsopp,⁸ and somewhat more fully by H.-P. Müller⁹ and by Alexander

⁴G. F. Moore, Judges, 131.

⁵G. F. Moore, Judges, 131.

⁶Alexander Globe, "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah," Journal of Biblical Literature 93 (1974): 499.

⁷William F. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," Bulletin of the American Society for Oriental Research 62 (1936): 30.

⁸J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah."

⁹Hans-Peter Müller, "Der Aufbau des Deborahliedes," Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966): 446-459.

Globe¹⁰. Blenkinsopp and Müller detect internal divisions in the poem. Globe recognizes a strophic structure, but argues that this supports the original unity of the work. Regarding the development of this poem in comparison with other ancient Middle Eastern poetry, he states,

. . . it should be stressed how unlikely it is that the poet had an anthology of victory odes and historical texts to consult and copy. Yet when the themes, images and certain aspects of the style of these odes provide legitimate and recurring analogues to Judges 5, it seems reasonable to assume that the Hebrew poet was aware of and drew freely on a recognized tradition. There is, indeed, nothing in the Song of Deborah out of tune with its traditional setting as a twelfth- or eleventh-century Middle Eastern victory ode. While this is no absolute proof for the integrity of the poem, it should warn us to be extremely scrupulous in accounting for what we imagine to be later disturbances or additions.¹¹

Michael Coogan also proposes a stanzaic analysis. His analysis differs extensively from that of Globe, but he draws the same general conclusion in favor of the over-all integrity of the poem.¹² The studies of Peter Craigie may serve to illustrate the degree to which historical research and comparison with other Canaanite literature may elucidate some of the textual difficulties of this passage.¹³ That such study may be preferable to emendation of the text is emphasized by the comments of A. D. Crown:

In general, Judges V is so extremely difficult to read and interpret that barely a verse can be translated without recourse to conjectures and emendations. So abnormally many are the versions and conjectures that it must be suggested that it is not so much the

¹⁰A. Globe, "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah."

¹¹A. Globe, "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah," 499.

¹²Michael Coogan, "Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 40 (1978): 152, 153.

¹³Peter C. Craigie, "Three Ugaritic Notes on the Song of Deborah," Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 2 (1977):33-49. Craigie's awareness of the limitations of this approach may be inferred from his "Parallel Word Pairs in the Song of Deborah," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 20 (1977):15-22.

corruption of the text which defeats our understanding, but our own inability to comprehend what the text sets before our eyes.¹⁴

Though some degree of textual corruption can hardly be doubted, it is entirely possible that modern difficulties with the text of "The Song of Deborah" are due to its obscurity rather than to corruption, and many of these difficulties are, accordingly, to be resolved by interpretation rather than emendation. Even where emendations must be adopted, it would be well for the emendators to be as frank as C. F. Burney:

It is perhaps needless to remark that the emendations adopted in the translation are not claimed as offering more than a reasonably possible solution of textual difficulties which . . . may well be regarded as beyond the reach of remedy.¹⁵

The Text of the Poem

Verse 2

That the leaders took the lead in Israel,

בְּקִרְעַת פְּרָעוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

that the people offered themselves willingly,
bless the LORD!

בְּהִתְנַחֵב עִם בְּרַכּוֹ יְהוָה

Verse 3

Hear, O kings; give ear, O princes;

שִׁמְעוּ מְלָכִים הַאֲזִינוּ רֹזְנִים

to the LORD I will sing,

אֲנִכִּי לַיהוָה אֲנִכִּי אֲשִׁירָה

I will make melody to the LORD, the God of Israel.

אֲזַמֵּר לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Verse 4

LORD, when thou didst go forth from Seir,

יְהוָה בְּצֵאתְךָ מִשְׁעִיר

when thou didst march from the region of Edom,

בְּצִעְדֶיךָ מִשְׁרָה אֲדוֹם

the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped,

אֲרָץ רָעָשָׁה נָם-שָׁמַיִם נָטְפוּ

yea, the clouds dropped water.

נָם-עָבִים נָטְפוּ מַיִם

¹⁴A. D. Crown, "Judges V 15b-16," Vetus Testamentum 17 (1967):240.

¹⁵C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix (1903, reprint with a prolegomenon by William F. Albright, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1970), 102.

Verse 5

The mountains quaked before the LORD,
yon Sinai before the LORD, the God of Israel.

הרים נזלו מפני יהנה
זה סיני מפני יהנה אלהי ישראל

Verse 6

In the days of Shamgar, son of Anath,
in the days of Jael, caravans ceased
and travelers kept to the byways.

בימי שמגר בן-אנת
בימי יעל חדלו ארחות
נהלכי נתיבות ילכו ארחות עקלקלות

Verse 7

The peasantry ceased in Israel, they ceased
until you arose, Deborah,
arose as a mother in Israel.

חדלו פרזון בישראל חדלו
עד שקמתי דבורה
שקמתי אם בישראל

Verse 8

When new gods were chosen,
then war was in the gates.
Was shield or spear to be seen
among forty thousand in Israel?

יבחר אלהים תרשים
אז לחם שערים
מנו אם-יבאה נרמח
בארבעים אלף בישראל

Verse 9

My heart goes out to the commanders of Israel
who offered themselves willingly among the people.
Bless the Lord.

לבי לחוקקי ישראל
המתנדבים בעם ברכו יהנה

Verse 10

Tell of it, you who ride on tawny asses,
you who sit on rich carpets
and you who walk by the way.

רכבי אהנות צחרות
ישבי על-מדין
נהלכי על-דרך שיח

Verse 11

To the sound of musicians at the watering places,
there they repeat the triumphs of the LORD,
the triumphs of his peasantry in Israel.
Then down to the gates marched the people of the LORD.

מקול מתצצים בין משאבים
שם יתנו צדקות יהנה
צדקה פרזו בישראל
אז ירדו לשערים עם-יהנה

Verse 12

Awake, awake, Deborah!

עורי עורי דבורה

Awake, awake, utter a song!

עורי עורי דברי-שיר

Arise, Barak, lead away your captives,
O son of Abinoam.

קום ברק ואסכה שבניך בן-אבינועם

Verse 13

Then down marched the remnant of the noble; the people
the LORD marched down for him against the mighty.

אז ירד שריד לאדירים עם
יהנה ירד-לי נובורים

Verse 14

From Ephraim they set out thither into the valley,
following you, Benjamin, with your kinsmen;
from Machir marched down the commanders,
and from Zebulun those who bear the marshal's staff;

מני אפרים שרשם בעמלק
אחריו בגמיו בעממין
מני מכיר ירדו מחקקים
ומזבולן משכים בשבט ספר

Verse 15

the princes of Issachar came with Deborah,
and Issachar faithful to Barak;
into the valley they rushed forth at his heels.
Among the clans of Reuben
there were great searchings of heart.

ושרי בנישכר עם-דבורה
וישכר בן ברק
בעמק שלח ברנליו
בפלגות ראובן
גדלים חקקי-לב

Verse 16

Why did you tarry among the sheepfolds,
to hear the piping for the flocks?
Among the clans of Reuben there were
great searchings of heart.

למה ישבת בין הפשפים
לשמע שרקוח עדרים
לפלגות ראובן גדולים חקקי-לב

Verse 17

Gilead stayed beyond the Jordan;
and Dan, why did he abide with the ships?
Asher sat still at the coast of the sea,
settling down by his landings.

גלעד בעבר הירדן שכן
ודן למה יגור אנלח
אשר ישב לחוף ימים
ועל מסכציו שבוין

Verse 18

Zebulun is a people that jeopardized their lives
to the death;

Naphtali too, on the heights of the field.

Verse 19

The kings came, they fought;
then fought the kings of Canaan,
at Taanach, by the waters of Megiddo;
they got no spoils of silver.

Verse 20

From heaven fought
the stars, from their courses
they fought against Sisera.

Verse 21

The torrent Kishon swept them away,
the onrushing torrent, the torrent Kishon.
March on, my soul, with might!

Verse 22

Then loud beat the horses' hoofs
with the galloping, galloping of his steeds.

Verse 23

Curse Meroz, says the angel of the LORD,
curse bitterly its inhabitants
because they came not to the help of the LORD,
to the help of the LORD against the mighty.

Verse 24

Most blessed of women be Jael,
the wife of Heber the Kenite,
of tent-dwelling women most blessed.

זבלון עם חרף נפשו למות

ונפתלי על מרומי שדה

באו מלכים נלחמו
אז נלחמו מלכי כנען
בתענך על-מי מנדו
בצע בסף לא לקחו

מן-שמים נלחמו
הכוכבים ממסלוחם נלחמו עם-סיסרא

נחל קישון נרסם
נחל קדומים נחל קישון
תהרבי נפשי עז

אז הלמו עקבי-סוס
מדדורות דדורות אביכיו

אורו מרוז אמר מלאך יהנה
ארו ארור ישביה
פי לא-באו לעזרת יהנה
לעזרת יהנה בנפורים

תברך מנשים יעל
אשה חבר הקיני
מנשים באהל תברך

Verse 25

He asked water and she gave him milk,
she brought him curds in a lordly bowl.

מים שאל חלב נתנה
בספל אדירים הקריבה חמאה

Verse 26

She put her hand to the tent peg
and her right hand to the workmen's mallet;
she struck Sisera a blow, she crushed his head,
she shattered and pierced his temple.

ידה ליסר השלהנה
וימינה להלמות עמלים
והלקה סיסרא סחקה ראשו
ומחצה וחקלה רכתו

Verse 27

He sank, he fell, he lay still at her feet;
at her feet he sank, he fell;
where he sank, there he fell dead.

בין כנליה כרע נפל שקב
בין כנליה כרע נפל
באשר כרע שם נפל שרוד

Verse 28

Out of the window she peered,
the mother of Sisera gazed through the lattice:
'Why is his chariot so long in coming?
Why tarry the hoofbeats of his chariots?'

בעד החלון נשקפה נתייבב
אם סיסרא בעד האשנב
מדוע בשש רכבו לבוא
מדוע אחרו פגמי מרכבותיו

Verse 29

Her wisest ladies make answer,
nay, she gives answer to herself,

חכמות שרוסיה תענינה
אף-היא תשיב אסריה לה

Verse 30

'Are they not finding and dividing the spoil?
-- A maiden or two for every man;
spoil of dyed stuffs for Sisera,
spoil of dyed stuffs embroidered,
two pieces of dyed work embroidered
for my neck as spoil?'

הלא ימצאו חלקי שלל
רחם כחמסים לראש נקר
שלל צבעים לסיסרא
שלל צבעים רקמה
צבע רקמסים לצנארי שלל

Verse 31

So perish all thine enemies, O LORD!

כן יאבדו כל-אויביך יהנה

But thy friends be like the sun
as he rises in his might.

ואזקרו קצאת השמש בנברחה

THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD: ISAIAH 5:1-7

The Date of the Poem

There exists a large body of scholarly literature on the textual criticism of the book of Isaiah, representing a wide spectrum of theories regarding the growth of the Isaiah corpus. Suggested dates for the composition of various parts of this complex body of literature extend from the eighth century to the third. But with regard to the specific passage under study here, the range of critical opinion regarding the date is quite narrow: there is, in fact, widespread agreement that Isaiah's "Song of the Vineyard" is a genuine work of Isaiah the son of Amoz. G. B. Gray offers a typical expression of this view:

Possibly enough this poem was recited by Isaiah . . . on a great national feast day: at the close of the vintage and in the Temple Courts he would easily have found men of the country as well as of the city . . . But the year in which the poem was either written or recited cannot be even approximately determined: The thoughts expressed in it may have occupied Isaiah's mind at almost any period of his life.¹⁶

There are, to be sure, a few scholars who would take exception to this view.¹⁷ But most accept the authenticity of this song, and date it to the eighth century. Some conclusions regarding the date are even more specific.

¹⁶George Buchanan Gray and Arthur S. Peake, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949), vol. 2, 83. (The comments on Isaiah 1-39 were written by Gray; Peake commented on chapters 40-66.)

¹⁷E.g., J. Vermeylen, Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique: Isaïe I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël (Paris: Gabalda, 1977), 166. Vermeylen holds that Isaiah 5:1-7 was written during the exile. A refutation of this view is offered by Conrad E. L'Heureux, "The Redactional History of Isaiah 5.1-10.4," in In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlstrom, ed. W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), 99-119.

R. B. Y. Scott and G. G. D. Kilpatrick suggest that Isaiah 5:1-7 was part of the "first written collection of his prophecies made by Isaiah for purposes of record immediately after Ahaz' refusal in 734 to heed his message."¹⁸ Less decisively, Norman Gottwald says that "The Song of the Vineyard" dates from Isaiah's "early career."¹⁹ Robert Pfeiffer dates the song "not later than the fall of Samaria in 722, during the reign of Ahaz or shortly before his succession."²⁰ Walter Harrelson places this poem between 740 and 732,²¹ and others insist that it must have been no later than the Syro-Ephraimite war (734-733).²² Furman Hewitt concurs in this, suggesting that "The Song of the Vineyard" was composed,

. . . around 735 B.C., prior to the Syro-Ephraimite attack on Judah. . . The occasion was the festival celebrating the conclusion of the grape harvest.²³

Even if the more precise among these views is not adopted, "The Song of the Vineyard" can nevertheless be situated with reasonable certainty in the latter part of the eighth century.

¹⁸R. B. Y. Scott and G. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Isaiah Chs. 1-39," in The Interpreter's Bible, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), vol. 5, 160.

¹⁹Norman K. Gottwald, The Hebrew Bible--A Socio-Literary Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 382.

²⁰Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1948), 431.

²¹Walter Harrelson, Interpreting the Old Testament (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), 228.

²²E.g., Otto Kaiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. John Sturdy (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975), 222; Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1965), 307, 309.

²³Furman Hewitt, "The Parable of the Vineyard: An Exegesis of Isaiah 5:1-8," Faith and Mission 9 (1991): 65.

Integrity

There is virtually unanimous agreement among scholars on the integrity of Isaiah 5:1-7. W. S. Prinsloo states that "Isaiah 5:1-7 forms a demarkated whole" which is also "a structural whole."²⁴ This position is so widely held that most commentators assume the unity of this passage, rather than trying to prove it.²⁵ The only real area of debate is whether Isaiah 5:1-7 is part of the same unit as the woe poems in the subsequent verses of the chapter. On this point, Otto Kaiser observes,

There are considerable differences of opinion among commentators as to whether all the woes originally belonged together. Whereas some see in them merely a concatenation of oracles pronounced on various occasions, others see them as an original unity, or even as an interpretation by the prophet of the song of the vineyard.²⁶

Edward J. Young seems to be among those who treat Isaiah 5 as an integral whole, though he does not state this explicitly.²⁷ But the majority opinion clearly opposes this position. Robert Chisholm states that "Verses 8-30 are

²⁴W. S. Prinsloo, "Isaiah 5:1-7: A synchronic approach," in Studies in Isaiah, ed. W. C. van Wyk (Pretoria West: NHW Press, 1980), 185.

²⁵Recent examples of those who have treated Isaiah 5:1-7 as an integral unit without attempting to justify this decision would include: H. Junker, "Die literarische Art von Is 5, 1-7," Biblica 40 (1959): 259-266; Willy Schottroff, "Das Weinberglied Jesajas (Jes 5 1-7): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Parabel," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 82 (1970): 68-91; Daniel Lys, "La Vigne et le Double Je," in Studies on Prophecy, ed. G. W. Anderson et al., (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), 1-16; A. Graffy, "The Literary Genre of Isaiah 5,1-7," Biblica 60 (1979): 400-409; Gale A. Yee, "A Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 43 (1981): 30-40; Peter Höffken, "Problems in Jesaja 5,1-7," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 79 (1982): 392-410; Gary Royce Williams, "Frustrated Expectations in Isaiah V 1-7: A Literary Interpretation," Vetus Testamentum 35 (1985): 459-465; Herbert Niehr, "Zur Gattung von Jes 5, 1-7," Biblische Zeitschrift n. s. 30 (1986): 99-104; and John N. Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), 149-155.

²⁶Otto Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), 64, 65.

²⁷Edward J. Young, The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), see especially pages 205 ff.

clearly structurally distinct from the preceding 'song of the vineyard' (5:1-7) . . ."²⁸ George Buchanan Gray considers the fifth chapter of Isaiah to consist of "three very distinct and unconnected poems,"²⁹ namely, verses 1-7, verses 8-24 and verses 25-31. He also asserts that "This chapter is in no sense a continuation of ch. 4."³⁰ In contrast, Artur Weiser considers Isaiah 5:1-7 and the other poems in the chapter as parts of a collection of poems produced at different times, and subsequently edited together.³¹ Georg Fohrer regards "The Song of the Vineyard" as "the nucleus of the . . . collection," the original core to which the other parts of chapter 5 and a few other fragments were subsequently attached.³² Conrad L'Heureux, on the other hand, sees "The Song of the Vineyard" as the last element to be attached to the major unit of Isaiah 5:1-10:4, at the end of a multistage process of redaction.³³ Norman K. Gottwald envisions this redactional unit as having been composed and edited apart from 5:1-7, whose juxtaposition with it is apparently seen as incidental.³⁴ Gottwald also asserts that "3:13-15 was once associated with 5:1-7,"³⁵ a view also supported by Gerald T. Sheppard.³⁶ It is to be noted, however, that none

²⁸Robert B. Chisholm, "Structure, Style and the Prophetic Message: An Analysis of Isaiah 5:8-30," Bibliotheca Sacra 143 (1986): 57, n. 9.

²⁹G. B. Gray, Isaiah, 81.

³⁰G. B. Gray, Isaiah, 81.

³¹Artur Weiser, The Old Testament, Its Formation and Development (New York: Association Press, 1964), 188, 189.

³²Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), 366.

³³C. E. L'Heureux, "The Redactional History of Isaiah 5:1-10:4," 119.

³⁴N. K. Gottwald, The Hebrew Bible, 383-385.

³⁵N. K. Gottwald, The Hebrew Bible, 385.

³⁶Gerald T. Sheppard, "More on Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Juridical Parable," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 44 (1982): 45-47.

of these scholars ever suggests any divisive theory of the origins of Isaiah 5:1-7. It may be debated whether this passage has any connections with its proximate or remote context, and if so, what those connections may be, but it is always understood that Isaiah 5:1-7 is, in itself, an integral unit.

The judgment that Isaiah 5:1-7 is a separate unit from the material preceding and following it is made independently of decisions about the date of the passage. Naturally, those, like Robert Pfeiffer, who give differing dates for Isaiah 5:1-7 and Isaiah 5:8 ff,³⁷ must necessarily assert that they are distinct units. But this judgment is also held by those, like Otto Kaiser³⁸ and Otto Eissfeldt,³⁹ who assign similar dates to both units. In brief, no support whatever is offered for any theory of diverse origins for the unit of Isaiah 5:1-7.

The Text of the Poem

Verse 1

Let me sing for my beloved
a love song concerning his vineyard:
My beloved had a vineyard
on a very fertile hill.

אֲשִׁיכָה נָא לִידִירִי
שִׁירַת דִּירִי לְכַרְמִי
כִּרְמִים הָיָה לִידִירִי
בְּקֶרֶן עֵז-שֶׁמֶן

Verse 2

He digged it and cleared it of stones,
and planted it with choice vines;
he built a watchtower in the midst of it,
and hewed out a wine vat in it;
and he looked for it to yield grapes,

נִצְעָקָהּ וְנִסְקָלָהּ
וְנִטְעָהּ שֵׂרֵץ
וְנִבְנוֹ מִגְדָּל בְּתוֹכָהּ
וְנִחְסְבָה חֶמֶץ בָּהּ
וְנִקָּו לְעֹשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים

³⁷Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 430, 431, 433.

³⁸Otto Kaiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, 222.

³⁹Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, 307.

but it yielded wild grapes.

נִיעַשׁ בְּאֲשִׁים

Verse 3

And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem
and men of Judah,
judge, I pray you, between me
and my vineyard.

נַעֲתָה יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם
וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה
שִׁפְטוּ-נָא בֵינִי
וּבֵין בְּרָמִי

Verse 4

What more was there to do for my vineyard,
that I have not done in it?
When I looked for it to yield grapes,
why did it yield wild grapes?

מָה-לְעֲשׂוֹת עוֹד לְבְרָמִי
וְלֹא עָשִׂיתִי בּוֹ
מִדּוּעַ קִנִּיתִי לְעֲשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים
נִיעַשׁ בְּאֲשִׁים

Verse 5

And now I will tell you
what I will do to my vineyard.
I will remove its hedge, and it shall be devoured;
I will break down its wall, and it shall be
trampled down.

נַעֲתָה אוֹדִיעָה-נָא אֶתְכֶם
אֵת אֲשֶׁר-אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה לְבְרָמִי
הִסֵּר מְשׁוֹבְתוֹ וְהָיָה לְבַעַר
פָּרִץ וְנָדְרוּ וְהָיָה לְמִרְמָס וְאֲשִׁיתָהוּ בְּחָה

Verse 6

I will make it a waste;
it shall not be pruned or hoed,
and briars and thorns shall grow up;
I will also command the clouds
that they rain no rain upon it.

וְאֲשִׁיתָהוּ בְּחָה
לֹא יִזְמַר וְלֹא יִעֲרַר
וְעַלָּה שְׁמִיר נִשְׂיָת
וְעַל הָעֵבִים אֲצַנְהָ
מִהִמָּטִיר עָלָיו מָטָר

Verse 7

For the vineyard of the LORD of hosts is
the house of Israel,
and the men of Judah are his pleasant planting;
and he looked for justice, but behold, bloodshed;
for righteousness, but behold, a cry!

כִּי בְרֶם יְהִנָּה צְבָאוֹת בַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה גִּטְעַ שְׂעִשְׂעִי
וַיִּבֹט לְמִשְׁפָּט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׁפַּח
לְצַדִּיקָה וְהִנֵּה צַעֲקָה

The Date of the Poem

It is beyond question that the composition of the book of Lamentations was subsequent to the Babylonian invasion of Judah and the conquest of Jerusalem. How much later it might have been is an open issue. The problem is complicated by the fact that the laments do not form a continuous text: each is a separate literary production in its own right, so that the questions of date and provenance can be raised not only for the book in toto, but also separately for each lament.⁴⁰ Gottwald dismisses the views that would associate this book, in whole or in part, with a period later than the Babylonian exile:

The matrix of the book is intensely specific: the catastrophic fall of Jerusalem at the hands of the Neo-Babylonians in 586 B.C. Only a few dissenting opinions have been offered. S. A. Fries contended that Chapters 4 and 5 are from the Maccabean age. Hugo Winckler assigned all the poems to the close of the sixth century in connection with the suppression by Persian authorities of a supposed rebellion of the Jews. Alexander Duff argued for the book's origin in the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C. All of these views are vitiated by neglect of data, specious reasoning, or a desire to support theories independently conceived. None have evoked any following.⁴¹

In a later work, Gottwald adds more specificity to the issue of date:

In order to clear the way for fruitful study, the author wishes to make it plain that he does not believe that Jeremiah wrote Lamentations, nor is he satisfied with the usual critical alternative: three or more authors over a period of perhaps two centuries. He believes that at least the first four poems (which correspond to the first four chapters) are the work of a single poet. . . . All of the poems, however, are to be understood as stemming from the exilic period between 587 and 538 B.C.⁴²

Several scholars have placed the origins of "The First Lament" in the latter part of the exile, largely because of the focus of the poem on the consequences of the fall of Jerusalem rather than on the horrors of the invasion

⁴⁰This does not ignore the possibility that these five poems may be separate literary productions of a single poet.

⁴¹Norman K. Gottwald, "Lamentations," Interpretation 9 (1955): 320-321.

⁴²Norman K. Gottwald, Studies in the Book of Lamentations, revised edition (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962), 21.

and siege. Theophile Meek and William Merrill are typical here: "Ch. 1 is further removed from the catastrophe and is more concerned with its effect upon the city than with the catastrophe itself. This chapter should probably be dated toward the end of the Exile, . . ." ⁴³ To this may be added the comments of Robert Gordis:

Chapter 1 views the destruction of the temple as further in the background. The active period of warfare and destruction is over and the long, disheartening era of desolation is at hand: "The roads of Zion are in mourning with no one assembling for the festival." The second half of the sixth century, circa 530 B.C.E., would therefore be an appropriate date. ⁴⁴

In contrast, at least one prominent scholar of the twentieth century, Wilhelm Rudolph has argued for a date at the beginning of the sixth century for the composition of "The First Lament":

Kap. 1, das von der Zerstörung von Stadt und Tempel schweigt, ist unter dem Eindruck der Eroberung Jerusalems und der ersten Wegführung i. J. 598 geschrieben. ⁴⁵

Rudolph comes short of asserting that this poem was written in 598, but it is clear from his remarks that he believes the poet of chapter 1 knew nothing of the destruction of Jerusalem in the eleventh year of Zedekiah's reign.

Perhaps the safest position regarding the date of this poem is the moderate one, represented, for example, by A. W. Streane: "The freshness of the pictures which set before us the miseries of . . . Jerusalem suggests that the disaster was still recent. . . . it does not appear that we need place any of the

⁴³Theophile J. Meek and William Pierson Merrill, "Lamentations," in The Interpreter's Bible, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984), vol. 6: 5.

⁴⁴Robert Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, Revised and augmented edition (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974), 126.

⁴⁵Wilhelm Rudolph, Die Klagelieder (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939), 5.

poems later than B.C. 550."⁴⁶ This view is also supported by the comments of Delbert Hillers:

The view commonly held by modern scholars agrees closely with the traditional view, that is that the book of Lamentations was written not long after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. The memory of the horrors of that event seems to be still fresh in the mind of the author or authors. Moreover the book at no point testifies to a belief that things would soon change for the better; the kind of hope that appeared in later exilic times had not yet arisen.⁴⁷

In brief, "The First Lament" was probably composed after the destruction of the first temple, after it had become quite clear that the Babylonian exile would be an enduring reality, but before there was serious reason to hope that the exile would soon end.

Integrity

There is wide, though not universal, support for the view that the book of Lamentations is the work of several poets. The possibility that these poets worked at different times, and without the intention of seeing their collective works compiled in a single volume has been entertained by several scholars, though the literary similarity of these works calls this view into question. However, the integrity of the individual poems in the collection is virtually beyond doubt. Rudolph states,

Der Text von Thr is recht gut erhalten, immerhin liegen an 16 Stellen sinnstörende Textbeschädigungen vor (1 14a. 20c. 21a. c. 2 4a. 6a. 7b. 18a. 3 22. 39. 51. 63. 4 3b. 6b. 9b. 5 5); am stärksten verderbt ist 4 9b. Dazu kommen Glossen in 1 7. 12a. 2 15c. 19. 3 56. 4 15b und eine Umstellung in 3 51.⁴⁸

⁴⁶A. W. Streane, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah together with the Lamentations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913, reprint Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), vol. 21, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick, 325.

⁴⁷Delbert R. Hillers, Lamentations (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972), vol. 7A, The Anchor Bible, xviii.

⁴⁸W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 1, 2.

From Rudolph's analysis, one may infer that the defects in the texts of the various laments seem to be particular, rather than global; they appear to be the results of transmission errors, rather than the traces of the redaction of composite texts. The six problem texts identified by Rudolph in "The First Lament" will be dealt with individually below in the "Analysis of the Text."

To Rudolph's comments may be added those of Hillers: "The Hebrew text of Lamentations is in a relatively good state of preservation, compared to the text of some other biblical books."⁴⁰ The credibility of this statement is supported, for example, by the relative paucity and triviality of critical emendations proposed in the apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia for this chapter, compared with other poetic passages, such as "The Song of Deborah." Although there may be some textual corruptions, the basic text of the first lament is admitted intact by virtually all commentators.

The Text of the Poem

Verse 1

How lonely sits
the city that was full of people!
How like a widow has she become,
she that was great among the nations!
She that was a princess among the cities
has become a vassal.

איכה ישבה בדד
העיר רבתה עם
היתה באלקנה
רבתה בגוים
שרתה במקדונות
היתה למס

Verse 2

She weeps bitterly in the night,
tears on her cheeks;
[among all her lovers]
[she has none to comfort her;]

קבו הקנה עלילה
ורמשה על לחיה
אין-לה מנחם
מכל-אחביה

⁴⁰D. Hillers, Lamentations, xxxix. This statement is quoted approvingly by Mitchell Dahood in "New Readings in Lamentations," Biblica 59 (1978): 174.

all her friends have dealt treacherously with her,
they have become her enemies.

Verse 3

Judah has gone into exile because of affliction
and hard servitude;
she dwells now among the nations,
but finds no resting place;
her pursuers have all overtaken her
in the midst of her distress.

Verse 4

The roads to Zion mourn,
for none come to the appointed feasts;
all her gates are desolate,
her priests groan;
her maidens have been dragged away,
and she herself suffers bitterly.

Verse 5

Her foes have become the head,
her enemies prosper,
because the LORD has made her suffer
for the multitude of her transgressions;
her children have gone away, captives
before the foe.

Verse 6

From the daughter of Zion has departed
all her majesty.
Her princes have become like harts
that find no pasture;
they fled without strength

כל-רעיה בנדרו בה
היו לה לאיבים

נלקחה יהודה מעני
ומרב עבדה
היא יושבה בנזים
לא מצאה מנוח
כל-רדסיה השנינה
בין המצרים

דרכי ציון אכלוח
מבלי באי מועד
כל-שעריה שוממין
במניה נאנחים
בחולתיה נוגז
והיא מר-לה

היו צריה לראש
איביה שלו
כי-יהנה הונה
על רב-משעיה
עולליה הלכו שבי
לפני-צר

ניצא מן-בת-ציון
כל-דכרה
היו שריה כאילים
לא-מצאו טרעה
נלכו בלא-כח

before the pursuer.

לפני רודף

Verse 7

Jerusalem remembers

in the days of her affliction and bitterness

all the precious things

that were hers from days of old.

When her people fell into the hand of the foe,

and there was none to help her,

the foe gloated over her, mocking

at her downfall.

זכרה ירושלם
ימי עננה ומרוייה
כל סתמריה
אשר היו מימי קדם
בנפול עמה בנד-צר
ואין עוזר לה
ראויה צרים שחקו
על-משבתה

Verse 8

Jerusalem sinned grievously,

therefore she became filthy;

all who honored her despise her,

for they have seen her nakedness;

yea, she herself groans,

and turns her face away.

חטא חטאה ירושלם
על-כן לנירה היתה
כל-מבבריה הזיליה
כי-ראו ערנתה
נם-היא גאנתה
נתשב אהור

Verse 9

Her uncleanness was in her skirts;

she took no thought of her doom;

therefore her fall is terrible,

she has no comforter.

"O LORD, behold my affliction,

for the enemy has triumphed!"

סמאסה בשוליה
לא זכרה אחריתה
נסתר פלאים
אין מנחם לה
ראה יהנה את-עניי
כי הנדיל אויב

Verse 10

The enemy has stretched out his hands

over all her precious things;

yea, she has seen the nations

invade her sanctuary,

ידו פרכש צר
על-כל-סתמריה
כי-ראתה גוים
באו מקדשה

those whom thou didst forbid
to enter thy congregation.

Verse 11

All her people groan
as they search for bread;
they trade their treasures for food
to revive their strength.

"Look, O LORD, and behold,
for I am despised."

Verse 12

"Is it nothing to you, all you who pass by?
Look and see
if there is any sorrow like my sorrow
which was brought upon me,
which the LORD inflicted
on the day of his fierce anger.

Verse 13

"From on high he sent fire;
into my bones he made it descend;
he spread a net for my feet;
he turned me back;
he has left me stunned,
faint all the day long.

Verse 14

"My transgressions were bound into a yoke;
by his hand they were fastened together;
they were set upon my neck;
he caused my strength to fail;
the Lord gave me into the hands of those whom

אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָהּ לֹא-יָבֹאוּ
בְּקִהְלֵךְ לְךָ

כָּל-עַמֵּיהֶם נֹאנְחִים
מְבַקְשִׁים לֶחֶם
נִתְּנוּ סִמְכוּדֵיהֶם בְּאִכְל
לְהַשִּׁיב נַפְשׁ
רְאֵה יְהוָה וְהַבִּיטָהּ
כִּי הִייתִי זולָלָה

לֹא אֲלִיכֶם כָּל-עֹבְרֵי כְּכֶךְ
הַבִּיטוּ וּרְאוּ
אִם-יֵשׁ מִכְּאוֹב כְּמִכְּאוֹבִי
אֲשֶׁר עוֹלָל לִי
אֲשֶׁר הוֹנֶה יְהוָה
בְּיוֹם דְּרוֹן אַפּוֹ

מִמָּרוֹם שְׁלַח-אֵשׁ
בְּעַצְמוֹתַי נִירָדְנָה
סָרַשׁ רֶשֶׁת לְכַנְלִי
הִשִּׁיבֵנִי אַחֲוֹר
וְהִנְנִי שֹׁמֵמָה
כָּל-הַיּוֹם תְּנָה

נִשְׁקַד עַל פִּשְׁעֵי
בְּיָדוֹ יִשְׁתַּדְּדֵנִי
עָלוּ עַל-צַנְאוֹרִי
הַכְּשִׁיל בְּחִי
וְהִנְנִי אֲדֹנֵי בִיכְרִי

I cannot withstand.

לא-אוכל קום

Verse 15

["The LORD] flouted all my mighty men
in the midst of me;
he summoned an assembly against me
to crush my young men;
the Lord has trodden as in a wine press
the virgin daughter of Judah.

סלה כל-אבירי
אדני בקרני
קרא עלי מועד
לשבר בחורי
נת דרך אדני
לבחולת פת-יהודה

Verse 16

"For these things I weep;
my eyes flow with tears;
for a comforter is far from me,
one to revive my courage;
my children are desolate,
for the enemy has prevailed."

על-אלה אני בוכיה
עיני עיני ירדה פנים
כי-רחק ממני מנחם
משיב נפשי
היו בני שוממים
כי נבר אויב

Verse 17

Zion stretches out her hands,
but there is none to comfort her;
the LORD has commanded against Jacob
that his neighbors should be his foes;
Jerusalem has become
a filthy thing among them.

פרשה ציון בקריה
אין מנחם לה
צנה יהנה ליצקב
סביבו צרו
היתה ירושלם
לנדה ביניהם

Verse 18

"The LORD is in the right,
for I have rebelled against his word;
but hear, all you peoples,
and behold my suffering;
my maidens and my young men
have gone into captivity.

צדיק הוא יהנה
כי סיהו קריתי
שקעו-נא כל-עמים
וראו מקאבי
בחולתי ובחורי
הלבו בשבי

Verse 19

"I called to my lovers
but they deceived me;
my priests and elders
perished in the city,
while they sought food
to revive their strength.

קראתי למאדבי
הקה רמוני
בִּלְגִי וְזַקְנֵי
בְּעִיר וָנָעוּ
בִּי-בִקְשׁוּ אֶכֶל לָמוֹ
וַיָּשִׁיבוּ אֶח-נַפְשָׁם

Verse 20

"Behold, O LORD, for I am in distress,
my soul is in tumult,
my heart is wrung within me,
because I have been very rebellious.
In the street the sword bereaves;
in the house it is like death.

רָאה יְהוָה כִּי-צָר-לִי
מְעִי חֲמֻמָּה
נִהַפְּךְ לִבִּי בְּקִרְבִּי
כִּי מָרוּ מְרִיחֵי
מִחוּץ שְׂבָלָה-חֶרֶב
בְּבֵית בְּמֹת

Verse 21

"Hear how I groan;
there is none to comfort me.
All my enemies have heard of my trouble; they are glad
that thou hast done it.
Bring thou the day thou hast announced,
and let them be as I am.

שָׁמְעוּ כִּי נֹאנְחָה אָנִי
אֵין מְנַחֵם לִי
כָל-אֹיְבֵי שָׁמְעוּ רַעְתִּי שָׂשׂוּ
כִּי אָתָּה עָשִׂיתָ
הַבֵּאתָ יוֹם-קְרֹאתָ
וַיְהִיו כְּמוֹנֵי

Verse 22

"Let all their evil doing come before thee;
and deal with them
as thou hast dealt with me
because of all my transgressions;
for my groans are many
and my heart is faint."

תָּבֵא כָל-רַעְתָּם לְפָנֶיךָ
וְעוֹלָל לָמוֹ
כַּאֲשֶׁר עוֹלָלְתָּ לִי
עַל כָּל-פְּשָׁעֵי
כִּי-רַבּוֹת אַנְחָתִי
וְלִבִּי רָנִי

"WHEN THE LORD RESTORED THE FORTUNES OF ZION": PSALM 126:1-6

The Date of the Poem

Like most Psalms, there is very little evidence in this poem by which to establish the date. William Taylor and W. Stuart McCullough understand the Psalmist to refer in verse 1 to the return from Babylon, and therefore supposes a date later than 537,⁵⁰ though such a view had earlier been denied by C. A. Briggs.

The date of Ps. 126 cannot be determined by שׁוֹב שְׁבִיָּה (sic), because that phr., while it might refer to restoration from captivity, frequently means restoration of prosperity, which alone suits Str. II.⁵¹

Nevertheless, Briggs agrees that the Psalm was written after the Babylonian exile, since "The phr. הַגְדִּיל לְעֵשׂוֹת v. 2³, as Jo. 2²⁰, is postexilic."⁵² There is little more to be said. It is not possible to be more precise than to agree that this poem was written some time after the exile, and is therefore later, by generations, if not centuries, than any of the other poems under consideration here.

Integrity

Biblical scholarship offers no challenge to the integrity of this Psalm.

The Text of the Poem

Verse 1

<A Song of Ascents.>

When the LORD restored the fortunes of Zion,

שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת

בְּשׁוֹב יְהוָה אֶת-שִׁבְתָּ צִיּוֹן

⁵⁰William R. Taylor and W. Stuart McCullough, "Psalms" in The Interpreter's Bible (New York, Abingdon Press, 1955), Vol. 4, 664.

⁵¹Charles Augustus Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1925), Vol. 2, 455, 456.

⁵²C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, Psalms, 456.

we were like those who dream.

הָיִינוּ כְּחֹלְמִים

Verse 2

Then our mouth was filled with laughter,
and our tongue with shouts of joy;
then they said among the nations,
"The LORD has done great things for them."

אִז יִפְּלֵא שְׂחֹק פִּינוּ
וְלִשְׁוֹנֵנוּ הִנָּה
אִז יֵאמְרוּ בְּגוֹיִם
הַגְדִּיל יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת עִם-אֱלֹהֵי

Verse 3

The LORD has done great things for us;
we are glad.

הַגְדִּיל יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת עִמָּנוּ
הָיִינוּ לְמִחִים

Verse 4

Restore our fortunes, O LORD,
like the watercourses in the Negeb!

שׁוּבָה יְהוָה אֵח-שְׁבוּסֵנוּ
כַּאֲסִיקִים בְּנֶגֶב

Verse 5

May those who sow in tears
reap with shouts of joy!

הִזְרְעִים בְּדִמְעָה
בְּרִנָּה יִקְצְרוּ

Verse 6

He that goes forth weeping, bearing
the seed for sowing,
shall come home with shouts of joy,
bringing his sheaves with him.

הַלֹּחֵץ יֵלֶךְ וַיִּבְכֶּה נֹשֵׂא מִשְׁךְ-הַזֶּרַע
בֹּא-יָבוֹא בְרִנָּה נֹשֵׂא אֲלֻמָּתָיו

CHAPTER EIGHT
ANALYSIS OF VERSE STRUCTURE

**STANDARDS FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE VARIOUS METHODS
OF VERSE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS**

At this point it will be appropriate to undertake the analysis of the verse structure of the trial passages. Each of the passages identified and described in the preceding chapter will be subjected to analysis by the four methods described earlier: minimal unit counting, line-form analysis, syntactic structural analysis and semantic strophic analysis. An attempt will be made in each case to observe whatever contributions these methods may make to the understanding of the poem. General conclusions on the usefulness of the various methods will be reserved for the final chapter.

In order to undertake the analysis of these texts, it will be necessary to establish some standards for the application of the four methods. In the case of those methods proposed recently, and used by a single scholar (such as the methods of Collins and O'Connor), this is a simple matter. In the case of those which have been used for a longer period of time (minimal unit counting) or by a greater number of scholars (strophic analysis) it may be necessary to specify standards in greater detail. And even in the case of the work of Collins and O'Connor, some explanation is in order for the arrangement of tabular material which will be found in this chapter, as well as for any exceptions which may be made in the application of the method in question.

Minimal Unit Counting

For each of the trial passages, there is a table indicating the number of minimal units per colon. Three types of minimal units have been counted: syllables, stressed syllables (accents) and words. These counts are tabulated in parallel columns.

When counting syllables, the number of syllables is equal to the number of vowels in a word. Simple vocal shewas and composite shewas are considered vowels, but the silent shewa is not. The "furtive pathach" is also not considered to form a syllable. The divine name, יהוה is counted as two syllables (i.e., as "Yahweh," rather than "Adonai"), and the place name Jerusalem is counted as four syllables (i.e., as "Yerushalaim," rather than "Yerushalayim"). Obviously, the pronunciation of these words may have changed over the lengthy period between the composition of "The Song of Deborah" and Psalm 126. In the same way, the pronunciation and syllabification of other Hebrew words is likely to have changed between the composition of the various poems under study here and the introduction of the Masoretic accents. Were it possible to establish conclusively how Hebrew was pronounced in the era of composition of each trial passage, it might be justifiable to regard a given word or expression as containing a different number of syllables in one poem from the number assigned to the same word or expression in another poem. Unfortunately, though the pronunciation of Hebrew in the biblical era is not an utterly intractable question, not enough is yet known about it to make such differentiations conclusively. Thus, to avoid the temptation of "cutting the coat to fit the cloth" of the various theories of verse structure, uniformity of pronunciation must be assumed, as unlikely as this may be historically.

When counting stressed syllables, all Masoretic accents are counted, without differentiating between the disjunctive and conjunctive accents, or between the set of accents used in Psalms, Job and Proverbs, and the more common set used in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.

When counting words, inseparable prefixes and suffixes are not counted separately, even though they represent separate lexemes. Words joined by a maqqeph are counted separately. Thus, **עַל כֵּן-לְפָשְׁעֵי** ("regarding my transgressions") in Lamentations 1:22 will be counted as three words, **לְפָשְׁעֵי** ("because of these") in Lamentations 1:16 will be counted as two words, and **לְפָשְׁעֵי** ("against me") in Lamentations 1:15 will be counted as a single word.

Following the tabular presentation of these minimal unit counts, mathematical inferences are presented which characterize the various trial passages and compare them with each other. Among other considerations, comparison will be made between the difference in length of the two cola of bicola, and the difference in length of cola from different bicola. This is done to ascertain whether there is any systematic tendency to make the two cola of a bicolon similar in length or to relate their lengths in some other fashion. In such evaluations, a statistical analysis will be made comparing the absolute values of the differences between the first and second cola of each bicolon, and the absolute value of the differences between the second colon of each bicolon and the first colon of the next poetic line. In the case of a bicolon which is the last poetic line of a poem, the absolute value of the difference between the first and second cola will be compared with the absolute value of the difference between the last colon of the final bicolon and the first colon of the poem. Similar analyses are made of the comparison between the differences of the first cola of bicola and the second cola of the

same bicola, and differences of the first cola of bicola and the second cola of the subsequent bicola.

Line-Form Analysis

Collins states quite frankly that his taxonomy of line-forms is adequate to identify and describe only about forty percent of the poetic lines which he encountered in his study.¹ In the present study, a somewhat higher fraction of poetic lines have been classified by Collins' system, though the percentage varies from one passage to another. In order to give the most generous opportunity possible to this theory, Collins' system has been pressed as far as possible to identify specific line-forms in every case where this can conceivably be done.

For each of the trial passages, a table is presented, describing and classifying each colon. The first column indicates the chapter, verse and verse-portion of each colon. The second column describes the constituents of the line, using the same symbols employed by Collins: NP¹ for the subject of a clause, V for the verb, M for a modifier of the verb, and NP² for the object of the verb. This table also occasionally indicates syntactic elements which Collins has not identified, notably the interjection, indicated by the symbol Ij.

If two of the cola can be identified as a bicolon, a siglum identifying the line-form is given in the third column, whenever such a siglum is given by Collins for the specific sequence of constituents in a bicolon, or when such a siglum can be reasonably inferred from Collins' descriptions of the line-

¹The precise proportion indicated by Collins is 38 %. See Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets, (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 198.

types and line-forms. To Collins' sigla is added the expression "inverted" wherever one of the bicola could be made to correspond to one of the line-form described by Collins by the reversal of the first and second cola. When it is not possible to indicate a complete siglum for the line-form of a particular bicolon, a partial siglum may be given, indicating the basic line-type and sentence-type (or types) with as much precision as possible. In the case of lines which contain sequences of syntactic constituents not treated by Collins, no siglum will be supplied. For this same reason, no siglum will be supplied for apparent monocola or tricola.

In the fourth column, titled "Collins," it will be indicated whether the specific line-form described in the second column and identified in the third is also described and identified by Collins. If this column contains the indication "listed," it means that Collins lists the specific sequence of grammatical constituents in this bicolon, and associates it with the siglum indicated in the third column of this table. If this column contains the indication "not listed," it means that Collins does not indicate a siglum for the specific sequence of constituents in this bicolon.

The final column, titled "Comments," contains remarks on other possible readings of the text, and on difficulties in the syntactic structure of the bicolon which may render it intractable to Collins' taxonomy of line-forms.

Following this table, an analysis of the poem is offered, presenting any insights which may be inferred from the line-forms. Particular attention will be given to any instances of line-forms which correspond syntactically to the "semantic sets" identified by Collins.

Syntactic Structural Analysis

For each of the trial passages, a table is presented listing in parallel columns the verse reference and the number of predications, constituents and units in each colon. From these data, the line-class of the colon may be deduced, and this line-class is indicated in the fifth column. In the sixth column, titled "Troping," is an indication of the types of tropes which occur in the colon. These are abbreviated as follows: repetition (R); coloration (C); matching (M); gapping (G); semantic dependence (S); and mixing (X). In the final column is an indication of whether the colon is part of the conjunct (C) or the remainder (R), as O'Connor defines these terms.

Following the tabular material, inferences are drawn regarding the form of the poem, particularly, the incidence of heavy lines and troping, the Troping-Heavy ratio, and the weight. Tables of these data and ratios will be included as in O'Connor's own studies, even when the data do not seem to lead to clear conclusions, but particular attention will be given to any subdivisions of the text (such as O'Connor's "staves" and "batches") which might be implied by these statistics.

Strophic Analysis

For each of the trial passages, a table is offered, presenting in parallel columns the verse reference of each colon and the number of feet in that colon. Adjacent to these columns, numbers and letters are used (following the practice of van der Meer and de Moor) to indicate the beginning of each canto, sub-canto, canticle, strophe and verse. These units are determined on the basis of semantic content. Following the tabular

material, a description is given of the contents of the larger units and their relation to each other. Comparison will also be made between these fundamentally semantic divisions and the divisions of the text implied by other methods of analysis.

THE SONG OF DEBORAH

Minimal Unit Counts

TABLE 8 - 1

MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

COLON	SYLLABLES	ACCENTS	WORDS
5:2 a	9	3	3
5:2 b	10	4	4
5:3 a	12	4	4
5:3 b	12	4	4
5:3 c	12	4	4
5:4 a	9	3	3
5:4 b	9	3	3
5:4 c	12	4	4
5:4 d	8	3	4
5:5 a	10	4	4
5:5 b	14	6	6
5:6 a	7	3	4
5:6 b	10	4	4
5:6 c	17	5	5
5:7 a	13	4	4
5:7 b	7	3	3
5:7 c	8	3	3
5:8 a	8	3	3
5:8 b	6	3	3
5:8 c	9	3	4
5:8 d	10	3	3
5:9 a	9	3	3
5:9 b	12	4	4
5:10 a	9	3	3

5:10 b	6	2	3
5:10 c	9	3	4
5:11 a	10	4	4
5:11 b	8	4	4
5:11 c	9	3	3
5:11 d	11	4	5
5:12 a	7	3	3
5:12 b	8	3	4
5:12 c	14	5	6
5:13 a	10	5	5
5:13 b	9	3	4
5:14 a	11	4	4
5:14 b	12	3	3
5:14 c	11	4	4
5:14 d	12	5	4
5:15 a	11	3	4
5:15 b	7	3	3
5:15 c	8	3	3
5:15 d	6	2	2
5:15 e	7	2	2
5:16 a	11	4	4
5:16 b	8	3	3
5:16 c	12	4	5
5:17 a	10	4	4
5:17 b	9	4	4
5:17 c	8	4	4
5:17 d	7	3	3
5:18 a	10	5	5
5:18 b	10	4	4
5:19 a	8	3	3
5:19 b	9	4	4
5:19 c	9	3	4
5:19 d	8	4	4
5:20 a	7	2	3
5:20 b	16	4	5
5:21 a	7	3	3
5:21 b	9	4	4
5:21 c	6	3	3
5:22 a	8	3	4
5:22 b	10	3	3

5:23 a	10	5	5
5:23 b	8	3	3
5:23 c	9	5	5
5:23 d	9	3	3
5:24 a	8	3	3
5:24 b	7	3	3
5:24 c	9	3	3
5:25 a	9	4	4
5:25 b	11	4	4
5:26 a	8	3	3
5:26 b	9	3	3
5:26 c	12	4	4
5:26 d	11	3	3
5:27 a	10	5	5
5:27 b	8	5	4
5:27 c	10	5	5
5:28 a	12	4	4
5:28 b	9	4	4
5:28 c	8	4	4
5:28 d	12	4	4
5:29 a	10	3	3
5:29 b	9	4	5
5:30 a	11	4	4
5:30 b	11	5	4
5:30 c	9	3	3
5:30 d	7	3	3
5:30 e	12	4	4
5:31 a	11	5	5
5:31 b	13	4	4

Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units

TABLE 8 - 2

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MINIMAL UNITS
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

NUMBER OF SYLLABLES PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA	NUMBER OF ACCENTS PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA	NUMBER OF WORDS PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA
6	4	2	4	2	2
7	10	3	41	3	34
8	16	4	35	4	43
9	21	5	12	5	12
10	14	6	1	6	2
11	10				
12	12				
13	2				
14	2				
15	0				
16	1				
17	1				
n	93		93		93
μ	9.59		3.62		3.76
σ_n	2.12		0.80		0.78
median	9		4		4
mode	9		3		4

In addition to considering the cola as distinct units, it is also reasonable to compare the bicola of this poem. Bicola are identified primarily by their semantic content, and to a lesser degree by their syntactic dependency. Not all this poem can be divided into bicola. For purposes of analysis, the following passages are identified as bicola in this poem:

TABLE 8 - 3

BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

5:2 a,b	5:13 a,b	5:22 a,b
5:3 b,c	5:14 a,b	5:23 a,b
5:4 a,b	5:14 c,d	5:23 c,d
5:4 c,d	5:15 d,e	5:25 a,b
5:5 a,b	5:16 a,b	5:26 a,b
5:6 a,b	5:17 a,b	5:26 c,d
5:6 c, 5:7 a	5:17 c,d	5:28 a,b
5:7 b,c	5:18 a,b	5:28 c,d
5:8 a,b	5:19 a,b	5:29 a,b
5:8 c,d	5:19 c,d	5:30 a,b
5:9 a,b	5:20 a,b	5:31 a,b
5:11 b,c	5:21 a,b	

The following lines are identified as monocola and tricola:

TABLE 8 - 4

MONOCOLA AND TRICOLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

MONOCOLA	TRICOLA
5:3 a	5:10 a,b,c
5:11 a	5:12 a,b,c
5:11 d	5:15 a,b,c
5:16 c	5:24 a,b,c
5:21 c	5:27 a,b,c
	5:30 c,d,e

Although the bicola listed above have been identified on semantic and syntactic grounds, it is possible to establish that the bicolon is also a phonetic phenomenon in this poem. This can be done in two ways. In the first place, a comparison can be made between the first halves of the bicola and the second halves of the bicola. The same statistical analysis provided above for all cola may be presented for the first and second cola of the 35 bicola which have been identified. For brevity, the following table will indicate the first colon of a bicolon by "A" and the second colon by "B."

TABLE 8 - 5

ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
1						
2			2	1	1	1
3			13	15	10	13
4			14	16	18	18
5			6	2	6	2
6	1	1		1		1
7	4	2				
8	7	5				
9	7	10				
10	6	5				
11	5	3				
12	4	5				
13		2				
14		1				
15						
16		1				
17	1					
n	35	35	35	35	35	35
μ	9.51	9.97	3.69	3.63	3.83	3.69
σ_n	2.06	2.12	.82	.76	.74	.75
median	9	9	4	4	4	4
mode	8,9	9	4	4	4	4

It can be seen from this table that the first and second cola of the 35 bicola in this poem have very similar means, medians and modes, and tend to be distributed in a similar fashion around their means, regardless of whether these cola are measured by the number of syllables, stresses or words. The differences between their means are so slight that it may be said that, on average the first and second colon of a bicolon in this poem are virtually identical. Of course, in individual cases, this is not always so. There are, in fact, only five bicola in this poem which have the same number of syllables in the first colon as in the second. Twelve of the bicola have equal numbers of accents in their two halves, and fifteen have the same number of words in both halves. But even in these latter cases, the number of bicola whose first

and second cola are equal is less than half of the total number of bicola in the poem. Thus, the near equivalence of the averages does not imply that the first and second cola of a bicolon are regularly, or even frequently equal in specific cases. Nevertheless, the impression of approximate equivalence of length persists.

This phonetic reality of the bicolon can also be confirmed by comparing the length of the first half (the "A" half) of each bicolon with the length of the second half (the "B" half), and contrasting this with the difference between either half of the bicolon and the colon immediately before the "A" colon or after the "B" colon.

In the following table, values in the column titled |a-b| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the same bicolon. Values in the column titled |b-n| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the second colon of a bicolon and the next subsequent colon.

TABLE 8 - 6

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON
AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n
0	5	3	12	8	15	10
1	15	9	18	18	15	16
2	6	8	5	8	5	9
3	4	8		1		
4	4	3				
5						
6		1				
7		2				
8						
9	1	1				
n	35	35	35	35	35	35
μ	1.83	2.57	0.80	1.06	0.71	0.97
σ_n	1.72	2.03	0.67	0.75	0.70	0.74
median	1	2	1	1	1	1
mode	1	1	1	1	0,1	1

From these data several inferences may be drawn. First of all, it is noteworthy that of the 93 cola in this poem, 70 (75.3 %) may reasonably be grouped into bicola. The bicolon is therefore by far the most common poetic line in the poem, and it may be inferred that there was a preference on the part of the poet for such two-part lines. In addition, it may be observed that the two halves of these bicola tend to be more or less equal in length. The average difference in length between the two cola of a given bicolon is regularly less than the average difference between the second colon and the colon which follows it (i.e., the first colon of the next poetic line). This is true regardless of whether the line is measured by syllables, stressed syllables (accents) or words. In addition, it can be seen that the differences between cola of a bicolon are less widely distributed than the differences between consecutive cola which are not in the same bicolon.

Again, there is clearly a tendency in this poem to produce balanced two-part lines.

Line-Forms

TABLE 8 - 7

LINE-FORMS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

COLON CONSTITUENTS	LINE-FORM	COLLINS	COMMENTS
5:2 a M	III D:ii)5j	not listed	
5:2 b M + V + NP ²	inverted		
5:3 a V + NP ¹ + V + NP ¹			This colon contains a double predication; this may be a monocolon or the first colon of a tricolon. Both occurrences of NP ¹ in this colon are vocatives which address the subjects of the imperative verbs.
5:3 b NP ¹ + M + NP ¹ + V	III B:i	not listed	
5:3 c V + M			The first colon contains a double vocative subject.
5:4 a NP ¹ + V + M	III B:i)1e	listed	
5:4 b V + M			In the first colon, the NP ¹ is a vocative.
5:4 c NP ¹ + V + NP ¹ + V		not listed	
5:4 d NP ¹ + V + NP ²			There is a double predication in the first colon.
5:5 a NP ¹ + V + M	III B:i)1j	listed	
5:5 b M			The second colon consists entirely of an extended modifier.
5:6 a M	III B:i)6j	not listed	
5:6 b M + V + NP ¹	inverted		

5:6 c NP ¹ + V + NP ²		not listed	
5:7 a V + NP ¹ + M + V			The second colon of this bicolon contains two verbs.
5:7 b M + V + NP ¹	III B:i)6b	listed	
5:7 c V + NP ¹			In both cola of this bicolon, the expression identified as NP ¹ is in apposition to the subject which is implied by the verb.
5:8 a V + NP ¹ + NP ²	IV C/nom i	not listed	
5:8 b NP ¹ + NP			The second colon of this bicolon is obscure, but appears to be an equational sentence.
5:8 c NP ¹ + V + NP ¹		not listed	
5:8 d M			The first colon has a compound subject, divided by the verb phrase.
5:9 a NP ¹ + M		not listed	
5:9 b NP ¹ + V + NP ²			The first colon is an equational sentence; the NP ¹ in the second colon is a vocative which addresses the presumed subject of the imperative verb.
5:10a NP ¹		not listed	
5:10b NP ¹			
5:10c NP ¹ + V			The three cola in this verse cannot be grouped into bicola. All of them contain vocatives which address the presumed subject

of the imperative
verb in the third
colon.

5:11a M not listed

5:11b M + V + NP² III D:ii)5h listed
5:11c NP²

5:11d V + M + NP¹ not listed This verse is
obscure, and
difficult to
divide into
bicola, though the
second and third
cola may be so
construed.

5:12a V + V + NP¹ not listed

5:12b V + V + V + NP²

5:12c V + NP¹ + V + NP² + NP¹

This verse, which
might be regarded
as a tricolon, is
utterly
intractable to
Collins' system.
Every colon
contains more than
one verb, and the
third colon
reduplicates the
subject.

5:13a M + V + NP¹ + (NP¹)

5:13b (NP¹) + V + M

not listed

The apparent
enjambment of this
line has led
numerous
commentators to
alter the
traditional
colometry of this
bicolon. As it
stands, it does not
conform to any of
the line-forms
described by
Collins.

5:14a M + NP¹ + M

5:14b M + M

not listed

5:14c M + V + NP ¹	III B:i)6d	listed	
5:14d M + NP ¹			
5:15a NP ¹ + M		not listed	
5:15b NP ¹ + NP			
5:15c M + V + M			
5:15d M	I nom	not listed	
5:15e NP + NP ¹			In addition to its semantic obscurity, this verse is intractable to Collins' system. None of the cola can be grouped into bicola which resemble the line-forms which Collins has described. The first, second and fifth cola of this verse are equational sentences. Because of syntactic links and semantic dependency, as well as their resemblance to the last colon of verse 6, the last two cola in this verse may be regarded as a bicolon, which nevertheless does not conform to any of Collins' line-forms.
5:16a V + M	I B:11)1a	listed	
5:16b M			This bicolon could also be identified as III B:ii)1.
5:16c M + NP + NP ¹		not listed	This colon is an equational sentence. Because of its similarity with the last two

			cola of 5:15, many commentators have divided this one. In either case, it does not correspond to any of Collins' line-forms.
5:17a NP ¹ + M + V	IV B/D:i	listed	
5:17b NP ¹ + M + V + NP ²			This line-form is one of several which Collins lists with the IV B/D:i line-type.
5:17c NP ¹ + V + M	III B:i)lf	listed	
5:17d M + V			
5:18a NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M	III D:i	not listed	
5:18b NP ¹ + M			This line conforms to the syntactic pattern of Collins' third semantic set, but does not correspond to the semantic description of that set.
5:19a V + NP ¹ + V		not listed	
5:19b M + V + NP ¹			The first colon of this line contains two verbs.
5:19c M	ID:ii)var a	not listed	
5:19d NP ² + M + V			Though not listed by Collins, this line-form conforms to the general description of ID:ii)var a.
5:20a M + V	III B:i)var	not listed	
5:20b NP ¹ + M + V + M	inverted		The latter of these two cola contains two separate modifiers, a situation unaddressed by Collins. Attempts

to equalize the lengths of these two cola by dividing them after **וְהָיָה**, rather than before, do not resolve the problem which this text poses for Collins' system.

5:21a NP¹ + V-NP²
5:21b NP¹

III C:i)var not listed

Collins does not list this line-form, but this line conforms to the general description of the III C:i)var line-type.

5:21c V + NP¹ + M

not listed

This colon does not appear to be syntactically or semantically connected with those which precede and follow it. As a monocolon, it would be outside Collins' taxonomy of line-types.

5:22a V + NP¹
5:22b M

I B:i)3a listed

5:23a V + NP² + V + NP¹
5:23b V + NP²

not listed

The initial V + NP² of the first colon constitute the content of direct speech, and are thus the direct object of the verb **וַיִּשְׁמַע**. It would therefore be possible to describe this line as NP² + V + NP¹ - V + NP², which can be

			identified as III C:i)6e.
5:23c V + M 5:23d M	I B:ii)1a	listed	This bicolon may also be identified as the semantically identical III B:ii)1.
5:24a V + M + NP ¹ 5:24b NP ¹ 5:24c M + V		not listed	This verse appears to be a tricolon, and therefore is not included in Collins' taxonomy of line-forms.
5:25a NP ² + V + NP ² + V 5:25b M + V + NP ²		not listed	The first colon of this bicolon contains two verbs.
5:26a NP ² + M + V 5:26b NP ² + M	III D:ii)4e	listed	Collins lists this line-form, but knows of no occurrences.
5:26c V + NP ² + V + NP ² 5:26d V + V + NP ²		not listed	Each of the cola of this bicolon contains two verbs.
5:27a M + V + V + V 5:27b M + V + V 5:27c M + V + M + V + M		not listed	The three cola of this verse appear to constitute a tricolon. As such, this verse lies outside Collins' system. In addition, all of the cola contain multiple verbs.
5:28a M + V + V		not listed	

5:28b NP¹ + M

The first colon of this bicolon contains two verbs.

5:28c M + V + NP¹ + M

II B:i)var not listed

5:28d M + V + NP¹

5:29a Ij + NP² + NP¹ + V

IV C/D:i) not listed

5:29b NP¹ + V + NP² + M

This line-form is not listed by Collins, but it conforms to the general description of the IV C/D:i) line-type. Collins' system does not account for the interjection $\overline{\text{N}}$ at the beginning of this verse.

5:30a V + V + NP²

not listed

5:30b NP² + M

5:30c NP² + M

5:30d NP²

5:30e NP² + M

While it may be possible to group some parts of this verse into bicola, they can hardly be identified within Collins' taxonomy. All of the noun phrases in the last four cola are appositives to the direct object of the first colon.

5:31a V + NP¹ + NP

not listed

5:31b NP¹ + M

The second NP in the first colon is a vocative, and is unassociated with the verb.

Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms

At the very outset it should be noticed that the majority of the poetic cola of this passage are not definable by Collins' taxonomy, even when this system is pressed considerably further than Collins has gone in his own use of it. The poetic cola of this passage may be distinguished on the basis of whether they correspond to line-forms which Collins has listed in his studies, whether they correspond to line-forms which can be defined by Collins' system (even though he has not listed these forms), or whether they are strictly undefinable by Collins' system. Since Collins' system describes only bicola, all of the cola included in the first two categories will constitute bicola. The category of undefinable cola will include all monocola, all cola in tricola or other polycola, and any cola containing multiple predications or syntactic elements which Collins does not admit to his system (such as interjections), as well as those whose syntactic structures do not correspond to identified or identifiable line-forms.

TABLE 8 - 8

ADMISSIBILITY OF POETIC COLA IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"
TO COLLINS' TAXONOMY

LISTED	DEFINABLE	UNDEFINABLE	
5:4 a,b	5:2 a,b	5:3 a	5:14 a,b
5:5 a,b	5:3 b,c	5:4 c,d	5:15a,b,c
5:7 b,c	5:6 a,b	5:6 c	5:16 c
5:11 b,c	5:8 a,b	5:7 a	5:19 a,b
5:14 c,d	5:15 d,e	5:8 c,d	5:21 c
5:16 a,b	5:18 a,b	5:9 a,b	5:23 a,b
5:17 a,b	5:19 c,d	5:10 a,b,c	5:24 a,b,c
5:17 c,d	5:20 a,b	5:11 a	5:25 a,b
5:22 a,b	5:21 a,b	5:11 d	5:26 c,d
5:23 c,d	5:28 c,d	5:12 a,b,c	5:27 a,b,c
5:26 a,b	5:29 a,b	5:13 a,b	5:28 a,b
			5:30 a,b,c,d,e
			5:31 a,b

Only 22 of the 93 cola in this poem (approximately 23.7 %) are formed into bicola corresponding to line-forms listed by Collins. This is far less

than the approximately 40 % of poetic lines which Collins found tractable to his system from the poetic corpus which he examined. But if these are added to the 22 cola (an additional 23.7 %) which can be defined by Collins' system, even though their line-forms are not explicitly described by Collins, there is a total of approximately 47.3 % of the cola of this poem which can be described by Collins's system. However, the majority, 49 of the 93 cola (approximately 52.7 %) still lie outside Collins' taxonomy of line-forms. Furthermore, none of the 93 cola of this poem are constituted into bicola conforming to one of Collins' semantic sets. For these reasons, it is difficult to draw general descriptive inferences about this poem on the basis of Collins' conclusions on poetic syntax.

There is, however, one interesting phenomenon which arises from the syntactic classification of these cola. As the following table will reveal, the great majority of the definable line-types in this poem can be classified under one of two general descriptors.

TABLE 8 - 9

PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF DEFINABLE POETIC COLA
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

GENERAL LINE-TYPE	I	II	III	IV	TOTALS ²
BASIC SENTENCE					
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	3	1	8	1 (B/D)	13
C	0	0	1	1 (C/D) 1 (C/nom)	3
D	1	0	4	0	7
nom	1	0	0	0	2
TOTALS	5	1	13	3	

Thus, of the 22 definable poetic bicola in "The Song of Deborah," 13 are Type III lines, and 13 contain Type-B sentences (including one Type IV line in which the second colon is a Type-D sentence). Due to the overlap of 8 bicola of Type III-B, a total of 18 of the 22 bicola (approximately 82 %) can be associated with one of these two descriptors. Collins gives the reader no indication about the significance of the relative frequency of the various line-types, so any inferences from this coincidence must await further consideration.³

²The sum of the totals in this column will exceed the number of bicola in the poem because of the presence of Type IV lines, which contain two basic sentences.

³Collins discusses the relative incidence of the general line-types and basic sentences in *Line-Forms*, 194 ff, but this analysis is made only of whole books, not of individual poems. He finds that, in the latter prophets, the four general line-types occur with approximately equal frequency. The predominance of Line-type III in this poem is therefore exceptional. In contrast, Collins finds a considerable disparity in the distribution of the basic sentences, which occur in his sample with the following approximate frequencies: sentence-type A - 8.0 %; sentence-type B - 37.4 %; sentence-type C - 17.6 %; sentence-type D - 37.0 %. No statistics are offered for the incidence of nominal sentences. The relative frequency of occurrence of the four basic

Syntactic Structural Analysis

This poem presents a particular problem, inasmuch as it has already been presented by O'Connor himself.⁴ Unfortunately, in doing so, he has ignored the traditional colometry of this passage at several points. In consequence, O'Connor describes 106 cola (which he calls "poetic lines"), rather than the 93 cola in the traditional arrangement of the text. This increase in the number of cola is accomplished by various means. Most commonly, one of the traditional cola is divided in two.⁵ In some cases, two cola in the traditional colometry are redivided as three.⁶ In one case two cola in the traditional colometry are merged as a single colon.⁷ This results in a net increase of 13 cola. In addition to these changes, there are several other places where the caesura between two of the traditional cola is moved slightly, thus altering the syntactic constituents of both cola, without increasing or decreasing the number of cola in the poem.⁸ There is consequently a restructuring of the syntax of the passage, and in many of these cases, when the cola, thus defined, are subjected to O'Connor's system of analysis, they fall into different line classes than would be the case were the traditional colometry to be observed.

sentences in "The Song of Deborah" is the same as in Collins' sample, but the proportions vary. Considering only the four basic sentence-types, the absolute of occurrence of the four basic sentence-types in "The Song of Deborah" are: sentence-type A - 0 %; sentence-type B - 57 %; sentence-type C - 13 %, sentence-type D - 30 %. Thus, in this poem, the frequency of Type-B basic sentences is increased, to the loss of all other sentence-types.

⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 218-230, 487-493.

⁵Thus 5:3a; 5:3b; 5:4c; 5:12b; 5:12c; 5:18a; 5:23a; 5:26:c; 5:27a; 5:27c.

⁶Thus 5:5a,b; 5:7a,b; 5:22a,b; 5:23a,b.

⁷5:15d,e.

⁸Thus 5:10c-11a; 5:13a-b; 5:20a-b; 5:28a-b.

In the present study the traditional colometry of "The Song of Deborah" is observed and the traditionally arranged text has been submitted to analysis by O'Connor's system. It is not a surprise that the results of this analysis will differ from those found by O'Connor. This contrast will be noted frequently in the summary which follows this table.

TABLE 8 - 10

IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

COLON PREDI- CATIONS REMAINDER	CONSTITUENTS	UNITS	CLASS	TROPING	CONJUNCT OR
5:2 a 0	2	3	III	S	C
5:2 b 1	3	4	II	S	C
5:3 a 4	4	4	--	R	C
5:3 b 2	4	4	IV	R	C
5:3 c 1	2	4	III	R	C
5:4 a 2	3	3	II	S	C
5:4 b 1	2	3	I	S	
5:4 c 2	4	4	IV	RCMGS	C
5:4 d 1	3	3	I	RCMG	
5:5 a 1	3	4	II	RMS	C
5:5 b 2	3	5	IV	RMS	C
5:6 a 1	2	4	III	RS	C
5:6 b 1	3	4	II	RS	C
5:6 c 1	3	5	IV	RX	C
5:7 a 2	4	4	IV	RX	C
5:7 b 1	3	3	I	R	
5:7 c 1	3	3	I	R	
5:8 a 1	2	3	I	M	
5:8 b 1	2	2	I	M	
5:8 c 1	3	3	I	S	
5:8 d 0	2	3	III	RS	C
5:9 a 1	2	3	I	R	
5:9 b 1	4	4	IV		
5:10a 0	1	3	II		
5:10b 0	2	2	III	CM	C
5:10c 1	3	3	I	CM	

5:11a	0	2	3	III		
5:11b	1	3	4	II	RCS	C
5:11c	0	2	2	III	RCS	C
5:11d	1	3	4	II		
5:12a	3	3	3	IV	R	C
5:12b	3	4	4	IV	R	C
5:12c	4	5	6	--	C	C
5:13a	1	4	4	IV	R	C
5:13b	1	4	4	IV	RM	C
5:14a	1	3	3	I	M	
5:14b	1	2	3	I	M	
5:14c	1	3	3	I	RM	
5:14d	2	3	4	III	M	C
5:15a	1	3	3	I	M	
5:15b	1	2	3	I		R
5:15c	1	3	3	I		R
5:15d	0	1	2	III	R	C
5:15e	1	2	3	I	R	
5:16a	1	3	3	I	S	
5:16b	1	2	3	I	S	
5:16c	1	3	5	IV	R	C
5:17a	1	3	4	II		
5:17b	2	4	4	III		
5:17c	1	3	4	II		
5:17d	1	2	2	I		R
5:18a	2	4	5	IV		
5:18b	1	3	3	I		R
5:19a	2	3	3	II	R	C
5:19b	1	2	3	I	RS	
5:19c	0	2	3	III	S	C
5:19d	1	2	3	I		R
5:20a	1	2	2	I	RC	
5:20b	1	4	4	IV	RC	C
5:21a	1	2	3	I	R	
5:21b	1	2	4	III	R	C
5:21c	2	3	3	III		
5:22a	1	2	3	I	CM	
5:22b	2	3	3	II	RCM	C
5:23a	2	4	5	IV	RS	C
5:23b	1	3	3	I	RS	

5:23c 1	2	3	I	RS	
5:23d 0	2	3	III	S	C
5:24a 1	3	3	I	RS	
5:24b 0	1	3	II	S	C
5:24c 1	3	3	I	R	
5:25a 2	4	4	IV	M	C
5:25b 1	3	4	II	M	C
5:26a 1	3	3	I	M	
5:26b 1	2	3	I	M	
5:26c 2	4	4	IV	C	C
5:26d 2	3	3	II		
5:27a 3	4	4	IV	R	C
5:27b 2	3	3	II	R	C
5:27c 2	5	5	--	R	C
5:28a 1	2	2	I	CS	
5:28b 1	3	3	I	CS	
5:28c 2	4	4	IV	RS	C
5:28d 2	3	4	III	RS	C
5:29a 1	2	3	I		R
5:29b 1	4	4	IV	S	C
5:30a 2	3	3	II	RS	C
5:30b 1	2	4	III	MS	C
5:30c 1	2	3	I	RMS	
5:30d 1	2	3	I	RS	
5:30e 1	2	4	III	S	C
5:31a 2	4	4	IV		
5:31b 1	3	4	II		

Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis

The incidence of the various line-classes described by O'Connor can be summarized as follows:

TABLE 8 - 11

INCIDENCE OF LINE CLASSES IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

Class I	36 lines	38.7 %
Class II	17 lines	18.3 %
Class III	17 lines	18.3 %
Class IV	20 lines	21.5 %
Unclassifiable lines	3 lines	3.2 %

This distribution is somewhat different from that discovered by O'Connor, who finds in his over-all summary of the poems which he considered that approximately two-thirds of all lines are Class I, two-ninths are Class II, two-twenty-sevenths are Class III and the remaining lines are Class IV.⁹ In the present analysis of "The Song of Deborah", Class I lines are more common than lines of any other class, though fewer than half of the lines of this poem are Class I, and 57 of the 93 lines in the poem (approximately 61 %) are non-Class I.¹⁰ 78 of the lines in this poem (approximately 84 %) are troped, and the Troping:Heavy ratio is therefore 78:57 (58:42 %) for the whole poem. The conjunct (those lines which are both troped and heavy) is 44 (47 %) and the remainder (the lines which are neither troped nor heavy) is 6 (6 %). The weight is therefore 44:6 (88:12 %).

O'Connor theorizes that the incidence of the various classes of lines is not random, but that the heavier classes occur more frequently at the beginnings and ends of subdivisions of the poem.

⁹In fact, the precise distribution discovered by O'Connor is: Class I, 63 %; Class II, 20 %; Class 3, 12 %; Class IV, 5 %. See M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 320. Elsewhere, O'Connor specifies the proportion of Class I lines as 62 %. See O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 533.

¹⁰Thus, in O'Connor's terms, this poem is "out of range." That is, its proportion of non-Class-I lines differs by more than ten percent from the anticipated proportion of 38 %. See M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 533, 534.

The usefulness of this system in commenting on the texture of the verse is in part predictable: the stuff of it will be Class I lines and the most high-marked junctures will be tied to Class IV lines.¹¹

The "batches" of 1 to 12 lines and "staves" of approximately 28 lines identified by O'Connor might work in this poem, even if the traditional colometry is accepted. In order to accommodate the division of the text into the batches and staves suggested by O'Connor¹² it will be necessary to accept batches as short as three lines and staves as short as 21 lines. But even this division will only occasionally meet O'Connor's expectation of heavier lines and greater troping at the beginning and end of a batch or stave.

TABLE 8 - 12

DESCRIPTION OF BATCHES IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

FIRST STAVE: VERSES 2-9

Batch	Batch A	Batch B	Batch C	Batch D
Verses	vv. 2-3	vv. 4-5	vv. 6-7	vv. 8-9
Lines	5	6	6	6
Heavy lines	5 (100 %)	4 (67 %)	4 (67 %)	2 (33 %)
Troped	5 (100 %)	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)	5 (83 %)
T:H ratio	5:5 (50:50)	6:4 (60:40)	6:4 (60:40)	5:2 (71:29)
Conjunct	5 (100 %)	4 (67 %)	4 (67 %)	1 (17 %)
Remainder	0	0	0	0
Weight	100:0	100:0	100:0	100:0

¹¹M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 420.

¹²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 487-491.

SECOND STAVE: VERSES 10-16

Batch Verses	Batch A vv. 10-11c	Batch B vv. 11d-12	Batch C vv. 13-14c	Batch D 14d-16
Lines	6	4	5	9
Heavy lines	5 (83 %)	4 (100 %)	2 (40 %)	3 (33 %)
Troped	4 (67 %)	3 (75 %)	5 (100 %)	7 (78 %)
T:H ratio	4:5 (44:56)	3:4 (43:57)	5:2 (71:29)	7:3 (70:30)
Conjunct	3 (50 %)	3 (75 %)	2 (40 %)	3 (33 %)
Remainder	0	0	0	2 (22 %)
Weight	100:0	100:0	100:0	60:40

THIRD STAVE: VERSES 17-23

Batch Verses	Batch A vv. 17-18	Batch B vv. 19-21b	Batch C vv. 21c-22	Batch D v. 23
Lines	6	8	3	4
Heavy lines	4 (67 %)	4 (50 %)	2 (67 %)	2 (50 %)
Troped	1 (17 %)	7 (88 %)	3 (100 %)	4 (100 %)
T:H ratio	1:4 (20:80)	7:4 (64:36)	3:2 (60:40)	4:2 (67:33)
Conjunct	1 (17 %)	4 (50 %)	2 (67 %)	2 (50 %)
Remainder	2 (33 %)	1 (13 %)	0	0
Weight	33:67	80:20	100:0	100:0

FOURTH STAVE: VERSES 24-31

Batch Verses	Batch A vv. 24-26b	Batch B vv. 26c-27	Batch C 28	Batch D vv. 29-31
Lines	7	5	4	9
Heavy lines	3 (43 %)	5 (100 %)	2 (50 %)	6 (67 %)
Troped	7 (100 %)	4 (80 %)	4 (100 %)	6 (67 %)
T:H ratio	7:3 (70:30)	4:5 (44:56)	4:2 (67:33)	6:6 (50:50)
Conjunct	3 (43 %)	4 (80 %)	2 (50 %)	4 (44 %)
Remainder	0	0	0	1 (11 %)
Weight	100:0	100:0	100:0	80:20

With this division of the text (as proposed by O'Connor), heavy lines occur frequently at the beginning of Stave I, but hardly at all at the end of the same stave. Conversely, troping is found in every line of the first three batches, and in all but one of the lines of the final batch of this four-batch stave. The heaviest troping occurs about the middle of the stave, in the last four lines of the second batch, and the first four of the third. A concentration of heavy lines is found in the first two batches of Stave II,

and heavy troping in the last two batches. The third stave has its greatest concentration of heavy lines in the first and third batches, and troping is heaviest in the last two batches. The final stave is heavily troped in the first three batches, and the greatest concentration of heavy lines is found in the second batch. Of all of the staves identified by O'Connor in this poem, there is none in which heavy lines and heavy troping are found at the beginning and end, and large numbers of Class-I lines and little or no troping found in the middle.

Examination of the batches in anticipation of heavily marked beginnings and endings is even more disappointing. Only a few batches identified by O'Connor appear to conform to O'Connor's expectations. Among these are the third and fourth batches of Stave III, which begin and end with heavy lines, and have only Class-I lines in between. Unfortunately, these batches are both quite short, and the troping is not distributed in such a way as to mark the beginning and end decisively. The last batch of the second stave also has heavy lines at the beginning and end, with six Class-I lines (and a single heavy line) in between. Again, the troping is not distributed to mark the beginning and end. The second batch of the first stave and the first batch of the second stave also tend to concentrate heavy lines at the beginning and the end, but the corroborative marking of heavy troping is absent here as well. None of these seems to conform to O'Connor's view that heavy troping and concentrations of heavy lines mark the beginning and end of batches and staves. It might reasonably be suggested that the breaks in the text should be elsewhere than the positions identified by O'Connor.¹³

According to O'Connor's theories, the major breaks in the text should be expected in those passages which are most heavily troped. For purposes of

¹³It should, of course, be remembered that O'Connor identified these batches and staves in a text which he had radically restructured -- especially as regards its colometry -- from the Masoretic Text.

this discussion, a poetic colon will be regarded as "heavily troped" when it is troped in two or more ways. Thus verses 4c-7a (especially 4c-5b), verses 10b-11c, verse 20 and verses 22a-23c might be expected to be the sites of significant divisions in the text. In fact two of these bundles of heavily troped lines do fall on divisions proposed by O'Connor,¹⁴ though neither of these is a stave division.

O'Connor's anticipated indicators of major text divisions include not only heavy troping, but also concentrations of heavy (non-Class-I) lines. For the present discussion a "concentration of heavy lines" will be defined as two or more consecutive non-Class-I lines. Concentrations of heavy lines occur more frequently than concentrations of heavy troping. If O'Connor's expectations of heavy lines at the beginnings and ends of staves and batches is to be met, divisions in the text might be expected to fall somewhere in the following passages: verses 2a-4a, 5a-7a, 9b-10b, 11a-13b, 16c-17c, 21b,c, 22b-23a, 25, 26c-27c, 28c,d, 29b-30b and 30e-31b.

In fact, of these twelve intervals where concentrations of heavy lines occur, seven¹⁵ overlap divisions which O'Connor has identified in the text, including the division between 5:5b and 5:6a and the division between 5:22b and 5:23a, which are also marked by heavy troping.

Thus, of the fifteen divisions in the text which are indicated by O'Connor, 2 are marked by both concentrations of heavy lines and by heavy troping, and six more are marked by concentrations of heavy lines only. Of the remaining seven, six are either preceded or followed by at least one

¹⁴The concentration of troping found in verses 4c-7a overlaps the division between the second and third batches of the first stave. A second concentration of troping, in verses 22a-23c overlaps the division between the third and fourth batches of the third stave.

¹⁵The intervals in question are 2a-4a, 5a-7a, 9b-10b, 11a-13b (which covers two of O'Connor's divisions in the text), 16c-17c, 21b,c, and 22b-23a.

heavy line or by heavy troping, and only one¹⁶ is entirely unmarked.¹⁷ This might seem to be rather compelling evidence that textual divisions (such as the divisions between batches and staves) are indeed marked by troping and heavy lines, were it not for the fact that of the 93 lines in this poem, only five are neither preceded nor followed by at least one heavy line, or by heavy troping, and there is not a single line anywhere in the poem which is not preceded or followed by troping of some sort.

If O'Connor's expectations have any validity at all, it does not seem that more may be extracted from them in this case than the inference that there ought to be breaks in the text in the intervals indicated above, especially somewhere between 5:4c and 5:7a, between 5:10b and 5:11c and between 5:20a and 5:24a. Obviously, even these ranges are too broad to speak with precision about the lengths of sections within the poem which might be thus formed.

Strophic Analysis

TABLE 8 - 13

IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

COLON NUMBER OF FEET	CANTO	SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE
5:2 a 3		1	I	1	a
5:2 b 4					
5:3 a 4			II	1	a
5:3 b 4					b
5:3 c 4					
5:4 a 3				2	a
5:4 b 3					

¹⁶O'Connor indicates a division between 5:7c and 5:8a which is preceded and followed by Class-I lines, each of which is troped simply.

¹⁷This division is, of course, preceded and followed by troped lines, but these lines are not heavily troped, as the term has been defined above.

5:4 c 4				b
5:4 d 3				
5:5 a 4				c
5:5 b 6				
5:6 a 3		III	1	a
5:6 b 4				b
5:6 c 5				
5:7 a 4				c
5:7 b 3				
5:7 c 3				
5:8 a 3			2	a
5:8 b 3				b
5:8 c 3				
5:8 d 3				
5:9 a 3		IV	1	a
5:9 b 4				
5:10a 3	2	I	1	a
5:10b 2				
5:10c 3				
5:11a 4				b
5:11b 4				c
5:11c 3				d
5:11d 4				
5:12a 3			2	a
5:12b 3				
5:12c 5				
5:13a 5		II	1	a
5:13b 3				
5:14a 4			2	a
5:14b 3				b
5:14c 4				
5:14d 4				
5:15a 3				c
5:15b 3				
5:15c 3				
5:15d 2			3	a
5:15e 2				
5:16a 4				b
5:16b 3				
5:16c 4				c

5:17a	4		4	a	
5:17b	4				
5:17c	4			b	
5:17d	3				
5:18a	4		5	a	
5:18b	5				
5:19a	3	III	1	a	
5:19b	4				
5:19c	3			b	
5:19d	4				
5:20a	2		2	a	
5:20b	4				
5:21a	3			b	
5:21b	4				
5:21c	3		3	a	
5:22a	3			b	
5:22b	3				
5:23a	5	3	I	1	a
5:23b	3				
5:23c	4				b
5:23d	3				
5:24a	3		II	1	a
5:24b	3				
5:24c	3				
5:25a	4				b
5:25b	4				
5:26a	3			2	a
5:26b	3				
5:26c	4				b
5:26d	3				
5:27a	5				c
5:27b	4				
5:27c	5				
5:28a	4		III	1	a
5:28b	4				
5:28c	4				b
5:28d	4				
5:29a	3			2	a
5:29b	4				

5:30a	4			b
5:30b	4			
5:30c	3			c
5:30d	3			
5:30e	4			
5:31a	4	IV	1	a
5:31b	4			

Inferences from Strophic Analysis

The division of this song into its semantic sub-elements produces a rather striking symmetry. There are three sub-cantos, of which the first and third are virtually equal in length. Each of these two contains four canticles. In each case, the first and last canticles consist of a single strophe, and in all cases but one, this one-strophe canticle contains only a single verse. The second and third canticles in each of these two sub-cantos consists of two strophes made up of five verses. The second sub-canto is different from the first and third, but nevertheless demonstrates a symmetry of its own. It contains three canticles, the second of which is considerably longer than the first and the last. The over-all symmetry of this poem is shown in the following table.

TABLE 8 - 14

ARRANGEMENT OF SUB-CANTOS AND CANTICLES
IN "THE SONG OF DEBORAH"

SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	VERSE REFERENCE	NUMBER OF STROPHES	NUMBER OF VERSES
1	I	5:2	1	1
	II	5:3-5	2	5
	III	5:6-8	2	5
	IV	5:9	1	1
2	I	5:10-12	2	5
	II	5:13-18	5	10
	III	5:19-22	3	6
3	I	5:23	1	2
	II	5:24-27	2	5
	III	5:28-30	2	5
	IV	5:31	1	1

The symmetry of this poem is even more striking when the semantic contents of these units are considered. The three sub-cantos may be summarized as follows: the first deals with the era of the story, describing what happens before the military engagement begins; the second describes the call and gathering of the troops and the battle itself; and the last sub-canto considers the aftermath of the battle, including the assassination of the fleeing Sisera and his mother's forlorn expectation of his return. In brief, the three sub-cantos are set respectively before, during and after the military engagement, and describe the causes, the event and the consequences. If the contents of the canticles within these three sub-cantos are considered at greater length, the symmetry of each sub-canto may be seen:

Sub-canto 1

- Canticle I:** A blessing pronounced on YHWH in view of the volunteering of the people.
- Canticle II:** Praise of YHWH.
- Canticle III:** The circumstances and response of the people.

Canticle IV: A blessing pronounced on YHWH in view of the
volunteering of the people.

Sub-canto 2

Canticle I: The call to arms.

Canticle II: The gathering of the tribes who participated in the
battle.

Canticle III: The battle.

Sub-canto 3

Canticle I: A curse on the non-participants.

Canticle II: The exploits of Jael in assassinating Sisera.

Canticle III: The forlorn expectation of Sisera's mother that her
son will return in triumph, laden with booty.

Canticle IV: A curse on YHWH's enemies and blessing on those who
love Him.

Thus the first sub-canto begins and ends with a blessing, and the third begins and ends with a curse. Contained within the blessings of the first sub-canto are a description of YHWH's power and of the people's weakness. Between the initial and final curses of the last sub-canto are the perceived victory of Jael and the unperceived tragedy of Sisera's mother. The middle sub-canto begins with the call to arms and ends with the success of Israel's arms against the Canaanites. Between, in the longest canticle of the poem, is the assembly of the people in response to the divine call, which is the apex of this poem: it is the gathering of Israel which reverses the desolate conditions described in the first sub-canto and which leads to the desolations of Israel's enemies which are described in the final sub-canto.

It is noteworthy that the two major semantic divisions thus defined occur within two of the ranges of heavy troping or concentrations of heavy lines which have been identified by the use of O'Connor's system. The division between sub-cantos 1 and 2 corresponds to the division between the

first and second staves, and the division between sub-cantos 3 and 4 corresponds to the division between the third and fourth batches of the third stave. Nevertheless, the overall shape of the poem as deduced by O'Connor's methods does not conform to the shape deduced by this analysis.

It has already been noted that O'Connor's scansion of this poem varies from the Masoretic Text in its division of the poetic cola (which O'Connor calls "lines"). But even if O'Connor's system is re-applied within the strictures of traditional colometry, there are still significant differences between the division produced by his system, and the canticles and strophes which may be identified by the principles employed by de Moor and van der Meer. This may be clarified by the tabulation of the divisions of the text indicated by these two systems.

TABLE 8 - 15

DIVISIONS OF "THE SONG OF DEBORAH" INDICATED BY
SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND BY
SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS

SYSTEM OF O'CONNOR			SYSTEM OF DE MOOR AND VAN DER MEER			
COLON	BATCH	STAVE	SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE
5:2 a	I	A	1	I	1	a
5:2 b						
5:3 a				II	1	a
5:3 b						
5:3 c						
5:4 a		B			2	a
5:4 b						
5:4 c						
5:4 d						
5:5 a						c
5:5 b						
5:6 a		C		III	1	a
5:6 b						
5:6 c						

5:7 a								c
5:7 b								
5:7 c								
5:8 a		D				2		a
5:8 b								b
5:8 c								
5:8 d								
5:9 a					IV	1		a
5:9 b								
5:10a	II	A	2	I		1		a
5:10b								
5:10c								
5:11a								b
5:11b								c
5:11c								d
5:11d		B						
5:12a						2		a
5:12b								
5:12c								
5:13a		C			II	1		a
5:13b								
5:14a						2		a
5:14b								b
5:14c								
5:14d		D						
5:15a								c
5:15b								
5:15c								
5:15d						3		a
5:15e								
5:16a								b
5:16b								c
5:16c								
5:17a	III	A				4		a
5:17b								b
5:17c								
5:17d								
5:18a						5		a
5:18b								
5:19a		B			III	1		a

5:19b									
5:19c									b
5:19d									
5:20a								2	a
5:20b									
5:21a									b
5:21b									
5:21c		C						3	a
5:22a									b
5:22b									
5:23a		D		3		I		1	a
5:23b									
5:23c									b
5:23d									
5:24a	IV	A				II		1	a
5:24b									
5:24c									
5:25a									b
5:25b									
5:26a								2	a
5:26b									
5:26c		B							b
5:26d									
5:27a									c
5:27b									
5:27c									
5:28a		C				III		1	a
5:28b									
5:28c									b
5:28d									
5:29a		D						2	a
5:29b									
5:30a									b
5:30b									
5:30c									c
5:30d									
5:30e									
5:31a						IV		1	a
5:31b									

Only one of O'Connor's divisions is totally unmarked in the semantic analysis of the text. The division between batches C and D of the second stave falls in the middle of one of the semantically defined verses.¹⁸ All other divisions identified by O'Connor are some how marked syntactically, but the levels of significance proposed under the two systems are not consistent. Of O'Connor's three stave divisions, one corresponds to a division between two sub-cantos,¹⁹ a second corresponds to a division between canticles,²⁰ and the third is marked only as a division between strophes.²¹ In addition to the totally unmarked batch division mentioned above, the eleven other batch divisions are marked as follows: one comes at the break between two sub-cantos,²² four fall at the breaks between canticles,²³ four more at breaks between strophes²⁴ and two at breaks between verses.²⁵ In addition, three of the breaks between the semantically-defined canticles,²⁶ and six of the breaks between strophes²⁷ are entirely unrepresented by the divisions which O'Connor has identified.

¹⁸Judges 5:14d.

¹⁹Judges 5:10a.

²⁰Judges 5:24a.

²¹Judges 5:17a.

²²Judges 5:23a.

²³Judges 5:6a, 13a, 19a, 28a.

²⁴Judges 5:4a, 8a, 21c, 29a.

²⁵Judges 5:11d, 26c.

²⁶Judges 5:3a, 9a, 31a.

²⁷Judges 5:12a, 14a, 15d, 18a, 20a, 26a.

THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD

Minimal Unit Counts

TABLE 8 - 16

MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

COLON	SYLLABLES	ACCENTS	WORDS
5:1 a	7	3	3
5:1 b	7	3	3
5:1 c	7	3	3
5:1 d	6	2	3
5:2 a	12	2	2
5:2 b	7	3	2
5:2 c	8	3	3
5:2 d	7	3	4
5:2 e	9	3	3
5:2 f	6	2	2
5:3 a	9	3	3
5:3 b	5	2	2
5:3 c	5	2	3
5:3 d	4	2	2
5:4 a	8	3	4
5:4 b	6	3	3
5:4 c	11	4	4
5:4 d	6	2	2
5:5 a	9	3	4
5:5 b	10	4	5
5:5 c	12	4	4
5:5 d	11	4	4
5:6 a	7	2	2
5:6 b	9	4	4
5:6 c	8	3	3
5:6 d	8	3	3
5:6 e	7	3	3
5:7 a	12	6	6
5:7 b	11	4	4
5:7 c	11	4	4
5:7 d	9	3	3

Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units

TABLE 8 - 17

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MINIMAL UNITS
IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

NUMBER OF SYLLABLES PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA	NUMBER OF ACCENTS PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA	NUMBER OF WORDS PER COLON	NUMBER OF COLA
4	1	2	8	2	7
5	2	3	15	3	13
6	4	4	7	4	9
7	7	5	0	5	1
8	4	6	1	6	1
9	5				
10	1				
11	4				
12	3				
n	31		31		31
μ	8.19		3.07		3.23
σ_n	2.19		.88		.94
median	8		3		3
mode	7		3		3

It may be seen that these cola are, by any standard, somewhat shorter than those in "The Song of Deborah," being, on average, about one and a half syllables, or one half accent, or one half word shorter. This is not the only difference. In "The Song of Deborah," approximately three quarters of the poem could be arranged into bicola. In contrast, the only passage in this poem which cannot be arranged into bicola on semantic and syntactic grounds is the first part of the sixth verse, Isaiah 5:6 a,b,c. The remainder of the poem, 28 of the 31 cola (90.3 %) can be arranged into the following bicola:

TABLE 8 - 18

BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

5:1 a,b	5:3 a,b	5:5 c,d
5:1 c,d	5:3 c,d	5:6 d,e
5:2 a,b	5:4 a,b	5:7 a,b
5:2 c,d	5:4 c,d	5:7 c,d
5:2 e,f	5:5 a,b	

As with "The Song of Deborah," a comparison can be made between the first halves of the bicola and the second halves of the bicola. The same statistical analysis provided above for all cola are presented in the following table for the first and second cola of the 14 bicola which have been identified. For brevity, the following table will indicate the first colon of a bicolon by "A" and the second colon by "B."

TABLE 8 - 19

ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
2			2	5	1	5
3			8	6	7	5
4		1	3	3	5	3
5	1	1				1
6		4	1		1	
7	2	4				
8	3					
9	3	1				
10		1				
11	2	2				
12	3					
n	14	14	14	14	14	14
μ	9.14	7.29	3.29	2.86	3.50	3.00
σ_a	2.10	2.09	.96	.74	.91	.93
median	9	7	3	3	3	3
mode	8,9,	7	3	3	3	2,3
	12					

It can be seen immediately that there is a notable difference between the bicola of this poem and those of "The Song of Deborah." Whereas the first and second cola in the bicola of Judges 5 are approximately equal in length, in this poem the second cola are significantly shorter than the first, the difference being approximately two syllables, or half an accent, or half a word. This means that the difference in length which was noted above between the cola of Judges 5 and the cola of Isaiah 5:1-7 is concentrated primarily in

the second cola of the bicola. This difference between the average length of the first colon and the average length of the second colon might seem to imply that the bicola of this poem are formed purely semantically, or at least on some basis which disregards the lengths of the lines. However, despite the fact that the second cola of these bicola are shorter on average than the first cola, it might still be possible to assert that the bicolon is a phonological phenomenon in this poem. Two other comparisons can be used to determine this. Comparison of the difference in length of the first cola and second cola in each bicolon with the difference in length of the second colon of each bicolon and the first colon of the subsequent poetic line shows that the two cola of a given bicolon are typically closer in length to each other than to the preceding and following cola, at least by some of the standards which have been used for similar comparisons of the poetic lines in "The Song of Deborah." In the following table, values in the column titled |a-b| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the same bicolon. Values in the column titled |b-n| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the second colon of a bicolon and the next subsequent colon. In the case of the last colon of the poem, comparison is made with the first colon of the poem.

TABLE 8 - 20

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n
0	1	3	6	8	5	3
1	7	1	6	4	7	7
2	2	3	2	1	2	3
3	1	2		1		1
4	1	2				
5	2	2				
6		1				
n	14	14	14	14	14	14
μ	2.00	2.64	.71	.64	.79	1.14
σ_a	1.56	1.91	.70	.90	.67	.83
median	1	2.5	1	0	1	1
mode	1	0,2	0,1	0	1	1

Here the data are inconsistent. If the cola of this poem are measured by syllables or words, the first and second cola of a typical bicolon are more like each other than either is like the immediately preceding or following colon. The average difference in the number of syllables is not as great as in "The Song of Deborah," but the average difference in the number of words is considerably greater. On the other hand, when the number of stressed syllables per colon is considered, it appears that the second colon in a typical bicolon is closer in length to the first colon of the next line than to the first colon of its own poetic line. This would challenge the inference, previously exhibited in the analysis of the minimal units in "The Song of Deborah" that there is a consistent tendency to write balanced bicola. However, in all cases it may be noted that the standard deviation of the differences between the first and second cola of bicola are smaller than the standard deviations of the differences between the second cola of the bicola and the first cola of subsequent bicola.

The second comparison will be of the differences between first and second colon of a bicolon and between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the subsequent bicolon in "The Song of the Vineyard." In the following table, values in the column titled |a-b| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the same bicolon. Values in the column titled |a-d| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the subsequent bicolon. In the case of the last bicolon of the poem, comparison is made with the second colon of the first bicolon in the poem.

TABLE 8 - 21

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	a-d	a-b	a-d	a-b	a-d
0	1	1	6	2	5	3
1	7	3	6	11	7	8
2	2	3	2	1	2	2
3	1	2				1
4	1	1				
5	2	4				
n	14	14	14	14	14	14
μ	2	2.79	.714	.929	.786	1.071
σ_n	1.56	1.70	.78	.46	.87	.80
median	1	2.5	1	1	1	1
mode	1	5	0,1	1	1	1

Here it can be seen that in the typical bicolon, the first colon is closer in length to the second colon than to the second colon of another bicolon. This means that typically, the longer the first colon, the longer the second, and the shorter the first, the shorter the second. If the cola of

a bicolon were unrelated to each other metrically (as determined by the number of minimal units) there should be no such relationship between the length of the first colon and the length of the second, and the means and standard deviations of the differences indicated in the table above should be approximately equal. Since this is not so, one may infer that the bicolon is not merely a semantic phenomenon in this poem, but has a more conventional metrical character as well. It appears that the poet has produced paired lines, but that these pairs are unbalanced. These unbalanced pairs are normally produced by writing a second colon which is shorter than the first by an average of approximately two syllables, half of a stress, or half of a word.

Line Forms

TABLE 8 - 22

LINE-FORMS IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

COLON	CONSTITUENTS	LINE-FORM	COLLINS	COMMENTS
5:1 a	V + M	I D:ii)2a	listed	
5:1 b	NP ²			
5:1 c	NP ¹ + V + M	I B:i)var a	listed	
5:1 d	M			This bicolon conforms to the pattern associated with Collins' second semantic set, but it violates the semantic description of that set.
5:2 a	V-NP ² + V-NP ²	II C:ii)1 var	not listed	
5:2 b	V-NP ² + NP ²			
5:2 c	V + NP ² + M	II D:ii)1	listed	
5:2 d	V + NP ² + M			
5:2 e	V + NP ²	II C:ii)1	listed	
5:2 f	V + NP ²			

5:3 a	M + NP ¹		not listed	
5:3 b	NP ¹			NP ¹ in this line is a vocative.
5:3 c	V + M	I B:ii)1a	listed	
5:3 d	M			All lines which Collins identifies as I B:ii) contain two modifiers. This line-form is identical to II B:ii)2.
5:4 a	M + V + M	II B:ii)1 var	not listed	
5:4 b	M + V + M			There is an extra modifier in both lines of this bicolon.
5:4 c	M + V + NP ²	III D:ii)5a	listed	
5:4 d	V + NP ²			
5:5 a	M + V + NP ²	IV D/C:iv)5	listed	
5:5 b	NP ¹ + V + M			Although Collins lists this line-form, he found no occurrences of it in the texts which he studied.
5:5 c	V + NP ² + V + M	II	not listed	
5:5 d	V + NP ² + V + M			There are two predications in each colon.
5:6 a	V-NP ² + ?			
5:6 b	M + V + M + V			
5:6 c	V + NP ¹			The word $\pi\pi\pi$ is a hapax legomenon of debatable meaning. Its syntactic role is therefore impossible to determine. Verse 6a may be a monocolon or the first colon of a tricolon which includes 6b and 6c. The latter two cola are also problematic, and

none of Collins' line-forms can be associated with them, even if they constitute a bicolon.

5:6 d M + V	I B:ii)1a	listed	
5:6 e M			This line-form is identical to III B:ii)2. The second colon, which serves as a modifier to the first, could also be described as V + M + NP ² .
5:7 a NP ¹ + NP	II nom	not listed	
5:7 b NP ¹ + NP			
5:7 c V + NP ² + V + NP ²		not listed	⌈⌋ is treated as a verb in these two cola.
5:7 d NP ² + V + NP ²			

Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms

Collins' theories seem to describe "The Song of the Vineyard" more thoroughly than "The Song of Deborah." Sixteen of the 31 cola of this poem (51.6 %) can be grouped into bicola whose line-forms are listed by Collins. Six more cola can be combined into bicola which can be described by Collins' taxonomy, even though their specific line-forms are not listed by Collins. Thus, a total of 22 out of the 31 cola of this poem (71 %) can be described by Collins' system, far more than the approximately 40 percent which Collins claims to describe elsewhere. Only one of the bicola thus described belongs to one of the groups which Collins identifies as a semantic set. The bicolon in 5:1c,d, identifiable as I B:i)var a should be part of Collins' second semantic group.²⁸ Collins' description of the semantic commonality of this

²⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 241, 247. 248.

group is rather less precise than that of the other four semantic sets which Collins identifies, but even the considerable latitude of this description is not sufficient to include this bicolon, which must therefore be said to violate this semantic set. It may also be noted that the primary characteristics of the bicola of this poem tend to be different from those of the bicola in "The Song of Deborah."

TABLE 8 - 23

PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF BICOLA
IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

GENERAL LINE-TYPE	I	II	III	IV	TOTALS ²⁰
BASIC SENTENCE					
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	3	1	0	0	4
C	0	2	0	0	3
D	1	1	1	D/C 1	4
nom	0	1	0	0	1
TOTALS	4	5	1	1	

This poem shares with "The Song of Deborah" the tendency to use more Type-B basic sentences than sentences of the other types, although the proportion of Type-B basic sentences is not as overwhelming here as in "The Song of Deborah." Four of the 11 identifiable cola (approximately 36 %) use

²⁰The sum of the totals in this column will exceed the number of bicola in the poem because of the presence of Type IV lines, which contain two basic sentences.

this sentence type.³⁰ However, unlike "The Song of Deborah," this poem does not use Line-type III preferentially. The great majority of the identifiable line-forms in this poem are from Line-types I (4) and II (5). Thus, nine of the eleven (82 %) identifiable line-forms are from one of the first two types, with only one example of Type III and one of Type IV. As mentioned above, Collins gives no indication of the significance of the preference for one line-form or another. It is nevertheless possible to differentiate "The Song of the Vineyard" from "The Song of Deborah" on the basis of the most common general line-types and basic sentences in the poem.

Syntactic Structural Analysis

TABLE 8 - 24

IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING
IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

COLON	PREDI- CATIONS	CONSTITUENTS	UNITS	CLASS	TROPING	CONJUNCT OR REMAINDER
5:1 a	1	2	2	I	RS	
5:1 b	0	2	3	III	RS	C
5:1 c	1	3	3	I	RS	
5:1 d	0	1	3	II	S	C
5:2 a	2	2	2	III		
5:2 b	1	2	2	I		R
5:2 c	1	3	3	I	M	
5:2 d	1	3	3	I	RM	
5:2 e	2	3	3	II	R	C
5:2 f	1	2	2	I	RMG	
5:3 a	1	2	3	I	RCMGS	
5:3 b	0	1	2	III	RCMGS	C
5:3 c	1	2	2	I	RMGS	
5:3 d	0	1	2	III	RS	C
5:4 a	1	3	3	I	R	

³⁰This calculation excludes the single bicolon made up of nominal sentences. The proportion of Type-B and Type-D basic sentences in this poem is very close to that discovered by Collins in the sample which he examined, and the relative frequency of all four basic sentences is the same as that discovered by Collins.

5:4 b 1	2	2	I	R	
5:4 c 2	3	4	III	R	C
5:4 d 1	2	2	I	R	
5:5 a 1	3	3	I	RS	
5:5 b 1	4	4	IV	RS	C
5:5 c 2	4	4	IV	RM	C
5:5 d 2	4	4	IV	RM	C
5:6 a 1	2	2	I		R
5:6 b 2	2	2	III	R	C
5:6 c 1	2	3	I		R
5:6 d 1	2	2	I	RS	
5:6 e 1	3	3	I	RS	
5:7 a 1	3	5	IV	RCM	C
5:7 b 1	2	4	III	RCM	C
5:7 c 2	4	4	IV	RCMG	C
5:7 d 2	3	3	II	RCMG	C

Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis

This poem may be characterized according to O'Connor's syntactic structural analysis as follows: there are 31 poetic lines, corresponding to a normal stave. Of these, 15 lines are heavy (48.4 %) and 27 (87.1 %) are troped, giving a Troping:Heavy ratio of 27:15 (64:36). The conjunct consists of 14 lines, with only three in the remainder, giving a weight of 82:18. As O'Connor predicts, there are concentrations of heavy lines at the beginning and end of this stave, in 5:1a-5:2a and 5:7a-d. If O'Connor is correct in asserting that the stave should be divided into batches at points where there are heavy lines and high levels of troping, then divisions could be made somewhere in such intervals as 5:3b-d, 5:5b-5:6b and 5:6d-5:7d. There appears to be semantic corroboration for a division either before or after 5:3 and also near the end of the poem, after 5:6e. Following the indications of the heavy lines and heavy troping, it is possible to define an opening batch of approximately ten lines, followed by a second batch of about eight to ten lines, a third batch of seven to nine lines, and a final batch of four to six lines. Given the flexibility allowed by O'Connor in the length of

batches, all of these would be acceptable in his system. The batches of this stave may be described as follows:

TABLE 8 - 25

DESCRIPTION OF BATCHES IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"

Batch Verses	Batch A vv. 1-2	Batch B vv. 3-4	Batch C vv. 5-6	Batch D v. 7
Lines	10	8	9	4
Heavy lines	4 (40 %)	3 (38 %)	4 (44 %)	4 (100%)
Troped lines	8 (80 %)	8 (100 %)	7 (78 %)	4 (100 %)
T:H ratio	8:4 (67:33)	8:3 (73:27)	7:4 (64:36)	4:4 (50:50)
Conjunct	3 (30 %)	3 (38 %)	4 (44 %)	4 (100 %)
Remainder	1 (10 %)	0	2 (22 %)	0
Weight	75:25	100:0	67:33	100:0

The inferences which may be drawn from this analysis appear minimal. Overall, the only noteworthy observation seems to be that the last batch, in addition to being significantly shorter than the others, is also different from the others in the proportion of heavy lines, the proportion of troped lines, the Troping:Heavy ratio and the conjunct. More briefly, we may say that all lines are heavy and heavily troped, though it would hardly be necessary to calculate the statistics to notice that fact.

Again, in fulfillment of O'Connor's expectations, the majority of the lines in this poem are Class I, with 16 of the 31 lines (51.6 %) falling into this class.³¹ However, Class II is represented by only 3 lines, Class III by 7, and Class IV by 5 lines. This defies O'Connor's expectation that these line-classes will be represented by decreasing levels of occurrence.

³¹Though the majority of the lines in this poem are Class I, the proportion is still significantly less than the 62 % predicted by O'Connor, and the poem is "out of range" by O'Connor's definition. See M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 533.

Strophic Analysis

TABLE 8 - 26

IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS
IN "THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD"²²

COLON NUMBER OF FEET	CANTO	SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE
5:1 a 3		1	I	1	a
5:1 b 3					
5:1 c 3					b
5:1 d 2					
5:2 a 2				2	a
5:2 b 2					
5:2 c 3					b
5:2 d 3					
5:2 e 3					c
5:2 f 2					
5:3 a 3			II	1	a
5:3 b 2					
5:3 c 2					b
5:3 d 2					
5:4 a 3				2	a
5:4 b 3					
5:4 c 4					b
5:4 d 2					
5:5 a 3			III	1	a
5:5 b 4					
5:5 c 4					b
5:5 d 4					
5:6 a 2				2	a
5:6 b 4					
5:6 c 3					
5:6 d 3					b
5:6 e 3					
5:7 a 6			IV	1	a
5:7 b 4					

²²This division of the text into verses, strophes and canticles, follows that in Marjo C. A. Korpel's "Literary Genre of the Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7) in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 141.

Inferences from Strophic Analysis

This brief poem can be divided into four canticles, of which the first three are of similar length, each containing two strophes of two or (in a single case) three verses. The last canticle is about half the length of the first three, being composed of a single two-verse strophe. The contents of these canticles may be described as follows:

CANTICLE I: Introduction

Strophe 1: Introduction of the beloved and the vineyard.

Strophe 2: The work of the beloved in preparing the vineyard.

CANTICLE II: The call for judgment.

Strophe 1: The appeal for judgment between the vinekeeper and vineyard.

Strophe 2: The protestation that every possible advantage had been conferred on the vineyard.

CANTICLE III: Announcement of judgement.

Strophe 1: The reduction of the vineyard to pasturage.

Strophe 2: The reduction of the vineyard to desert.

CANTICLE IV: Identification of the vineyard.

Only one poetic colon fails to conform to the norms suggested by de Moor and van der Meer: 5:7a contains 6 poetic feet, which exceed the maximum of 5 specified by de Moor and van der Meer. All of the canticle divisions proposed in this analysis fall at points which could be supported by the syntactic analysis of O'Connor.

THE FIRST LAMENT

Minimal Unit Counts

TABLE 8 - 27

MINIMAL UNITS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

COLON	SYLLABLES	ACCENTS	WORDS
1:1 a	7	3	3
1:1 b	6	3	3
1:1 c	7	2	2
1:1 d	6	2	2
1:1 e	7	3	2
1:1 f	5	2	2
1:2 a	7	3	3
1:2 b	8	3	3
1:2 c	5	2	3
1:2 d	6	1	2
1:2 e	8	4	4
1:2 f	7	3	3
1:3 a	9	4	3
1:3 b	6	2	2
1:3 c	7	3	3
1:3 d	6	3	3
1:3 e	9	2	3
1:3 f	5	2	2
1:4 a	8	3	3
1:4 b	7	3	3
1:4 c	8	3	3
1:4 d	8	2	2
1:4 e	7	2	2
1:4 f	4	2	3
1:5 a	7	3	3
1:5 b	6	2	2
1:5 c	5	2	3
1:5 d	6	2	3
1:5 e	9	3	3
1:5 f	3	1	2
1:6 a	7	2	4
1:6 b	4	1	2
1:6 c	9	3	3
1:6 d	6	2	3
1:6 e	7	2	3
1:6 f	4	2	2
1:7 a	7	2	2

1:7 b	9	3	3
1:7 c	6	2	2
1:7 d	8	4	4
1:7 e	8	3	4
1:7 f	5	3	3
1:7 g	8	3	3
1:7 h	5	1	2
1:8 a	7	3	3
1:8 b	8	3	4
1:8 c	10	3	3
1:8 d	6	2	3
1:8 e	5	2	3
1:8 f	5	2	2
1:9 a	7	2	2
1:9 b	8	3	3
1:9 c	6	2	2
1:9 d	5	3	3
1:9 e	7	3	4
1:9 f	5	3	3
1:10 a	5	3	3
1:10 b	7	2	3
1:10 c	6	2	3
1:10 d	5	2	2
1:10 e	9	3	4
1:10 f	4	2	2
1:11 a	7	2	3
1:11 b	5	2	2
1:11 c	11	3	3
1:11 d	5	2	2
1:11 e	8	3	3
1:11 f	7	3	3
1:12 a	9	4	5
1:12 b	5	2	2
1:12 c	8	3	4
1:12 d	5	3	3
1:12 e	6	3	3
1:12 f	6	3	3
1:13 a	6	2	3
1:13 b	8	2	2
1:13 c	7	3	3
1:13 d	6	2	2
1:13 e	7	2	2
1:13 f	5	2	3
1:14 a	6	3	3

1:14 b	7	2	2
1:14 c	6	2	3
1:14 d	4	2	2
1:14 e	9	3	3
1:14 f	4	2	3
1:15 a	6	2	3
1:15 b	6	2	2
1:15 c	6	3	3
1:15 d	5	2	2
1:15 e	6	3	3
1:15 f	7	2	3
1:16 a	8	3	4
1:16 b	9	4	4
1:16 c	9	3	4
1:16 d	4	2	2
1:16 e	7	3	3
1:16 f	5	3	3
1:17 a	9	3	3
1:17 b	5	3	3
1:17 c	8	3	3
1:17 d	5	2	2
1:17 e	7	2	3
1:17 f	6	2	2
1:18 a	5	3	3
1:18 b	6	3	3
1:18 c	7	2	4
1:18 d	5	2	2
1:18 e	8	2	2
1:18 f	6	2	2
1:19 a	8	2	2
1:19 b	5	2	2
1:19 c	7	2	2
1:19 d	5	2	2
1:19 e	7	3	4
1:19 f	7	2	3
1:20 a	7	3	5
1:20 b	6	2	2
1:20 c	7	3	3
1:20 d	6	3	3
1:20 e	7	2	3
1:20 f	6	2	2
1:21 a	10	4	4
1:21 b	5	3	3
1:21 c	9	4	4
1:21 d	6	3	3

1:21 e	7	2	3
1:21 f	7	2	2
1:22 a	10	3	4
1:22 b	5	2	2
1:22 c	7	3	3
1:22 d	5	2	3
1:22 e	6	2	3
1:22 f	5	2	2

Inferences from Minimal Unit Counts

The First Lament presents the reader with several interesting and significant differences from the poems studied previously. In the first place, it is evident that the entire poem is made up of bicola. There are no monocola, tricola, polycola, anacruses, or prose interjections. There are no dubious cases. Each of the traditional verses contains 6 cola, which form three bicola (with the exception of verse seven, which contains 8 cola, formed into four bicola). Secondly, unlike the approximately balanced bicola of "The Song of Deborah" but like "The Song of the Vineyard," these bicola tend to be unbalanced, and there is a fairly consistent tendency for the unbalance to favor the first colon of each bicolon. The distributions of colon lengths are as follows:

TABLE 8 - 28

ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA
IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	1st Colon	2nd Colon	1st Colon	2nd Colon	1st Colon	2nd Colon
1				4		
2			29	41	11	35
3		1	36	19	41	29
4		6	2	3	13	3
5	5	25			2	
6	12	18				
7	25	7				
8	11	8				
9	9	2				
10	4					
11	1					
n	67	67	67	67	67	67
μ	7.34	5.84	2.60	2.31	3.09	2.52
σ_n	1.36	1.30	.55	.65	.69	.58
median	7	6	3	2	3	2
mode	7	5	3	2	3	2

It can be seen from this table that the second cola of the bicola in this poem tend to be shorter than the first cola, regardless of which minimal unit is used for calculating the length of the colon. Furthermore, it can be seen from the similarity of the standard deviations that the lengths of the first and second cola tend to be very similarly distributed, though around different means. Nevertheless, given the difference in length between the first and second cola, it may be asked (as in the case of "The Song of the Vineyard") whether the bicolon is still an identifiable phenomenon in this poem, or merely a preconception of the reader. To answer this question, it is necessary first to compare the difference between the first and second cola of a bicolon and the difference between the second colon and the first colon of the subsequent bicolon. In the following table, values in the column titled $|a-b|$ represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the first colon of a bicolon and the second colon of the same

bicolon. Values in the column titled |b-n| represent the difference in the number of syllables, accents or words between the second colon of a bicolon and the next subsequent colon. In the case of the last colon of the poem, comparison is made with the first colon of the poem.

TABLE 8 - 29

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n
0	6	5	37	25	23	29
1	24	25	25	37	36	29
2	17	12	5	5	6	9
3	9	17			2	
4	4	5				
5	5	2				
6	2	1				
n	67	67	67	67	67	67
μ	2.06	2.03	.52	.70	.81	.70
σ_a	1.50	1.32	.63	.60	.72	.69
median	2	2	0	1	1	1
mode	1	1	0	1	1	0,1

It should be noted that the data are not consistent. Depending on which minimal unit is counted, the difference between the first and second halves of a bicolon may be regarded as greater than (if words are counted), less than (counting accents), or approximately the same as (counting syllables) the average difference between the second half of a bicolon and the first subsequent colon. There is, however, one consistency. In all cases, the standard deviation of the differences between the first and second cola of the bicola of this poem is greater than the standard deviation of the differences between the second cola of bicola and the subsequent cola.

An additional insight can be gained from the comparison of the difference between the first and second colon of a given bicolon, and the

difference between the first colon of a given bicolon and the second colon of the subsequent bicolon. In the following table, the expression $|a-b|$ refers to the difference in length between the first and second cola of a given bicolon, and the expression $|a-d|$ refers to the difference in length between the first colon of a given bicolon and the second colon of the subsequent bicolon. (In the case of the last bicolon of the poem, comparison was made between the first colon of this bicolon and the last colon of the first bicolon of the poem.)

TABLE 8 - 30

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

AMOUNT OF DIFFERENCE	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	$ a-b $	$ a-d $	$ a-b $	$ a-d $	$ a-b $	$ a-d $
0	6	8	37	23	23	21
1	24	16	25	39	36	36
2	17	26	5	5	6	10
3	9	7			2	
4	4	5				
5	5	5				
6	2					
n	67	67	67	67	67	67
μ	2.06	2.00	.52	.73	.81	.84
σ_n	1.50	1.34	.63	.59	.72	.66
median	2	2	0	1	1	1
mode	1	2	0	1	1	1

From these data, in particular these standard deviations, it may be seen that there is a tendency in this poem to create lines of approximately equal length, normally by the truncation of the second colon. It is not merely the case that the poet has written lines in which the second half is shorter than the first by some interval or ratio, as in the case of "The Song of the Vineyard." Were this the case, the standard deviations of the distributions of $|b-n|$ and $|a-d|$ should be expected to be considerably greater than the standard deviation of the distribution of $|a-b|$. Despite the superficial similarity of the bicola of "The Song of the Vineyard" and

"The First Lament" -- in both cases the second halves of the bicola are, on average, shorter than the first -- it appears that the unbalanced bicola of these two poems are generated according to different standards

Line Forms

TABLE 8 - 31

LINE-FORMS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

COLON CONSTITUENTS	LINE-FORM	COLLINS	COMMENTS
1:1 a Ij + V + M 1:1 b NP ¹	I B:i)4a var	not listed	Collins' system makes no place for an interjection.
1:1 c V + M 1:1 d NP ¹	I B:i)4a	listed	
1:1 e NP ¹ 1:1 f V + M	I B:i)1b	listed	This bicolon is actually an equational sentence with the verb $\eta\zeta\eta$. Collins' system deals very inadequately with this verb.
1:2 a V + M 1:2 b NP ¹ + M	IV B/nom	not listed	
1:2 c V + M + NP ¹ 1:2 d M	III B:i)4j	listed	This analysis treats $\eta\zeta$ as a verb.
1:2 e NP ¹ + V + M 1:2 f V + M + M	III B:i)1e var	not listed	The second colon in this bicolon has two modifiers, a phenomenon not regularly described by Collins' system. In addition, the verb in the second colon is $\eta\zeta\eta$

1:3 a V + NP ¹ + M	III B:i)3j	listed	
1:3 b M			
1:3 c NP ¹ + V + M	IV B/C:iii)1	listed	
1:3 d V + NP ²			This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns this siglum.
1:3 e NP ¹ + V-NP ²	I D:i)var	listed	
1:3 f M			This line-form is one of several to which Collins assigns this siglum.
1:4 a NP ¹ + NP	I nom	not listed	
1:4 b M			
1:4 c NP ¹ + NP	II nom	not listed	
1:4 d NP ¹ + NP			
1:4 e NP ¹ + NP	II nom	not listed	
1:4 f NP ¹ + NP			
1:5 a V + NP ¹ + M	III B:i)3a	listed	
1:5 b NP ¹ + V			The first colon of this bicolon is an equational sentence with the verb $\bar{\eta}^{\bar{\eta}}$. This line could also be identified as IV B/A:i)3.
1:5 c NP ¹ + V-NP ²	I D:i)var	not listed	
1:5 d M			Though not listed by Collins, this line-form conforms to the general description of the I D:i)var line-type.
1:5 e NP ¹ + V + NP ²	I D:i)1a	listed	
1:5 f M			
1:6 a V + M	I B:i)4a	listed	
1:6 b NP ¹			
1:6 c V + NP ¹ + M	IV B/C:iii)3	listed	

1:6 d	V + NP ²			This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns this siglum.
1:6 e	V + M	I B:ii)1a	listed	
1:6 f	M			This line could also be identified as III B:ii)1.
1:7 a	V + NP ¹	I C:i)3a	listed	
1:7 b	NP ²			It is also possible to view the first four cola of this verse as constituting a tetracolon, though such a structure would be anomalous in this poem.
1:7 c	NP ¹	I B:i)1b	listed	
1:7 d	V + M			
1:7 e	M	II B:i)3j	not listed	
1:7 f	V + NP ¹ + M	inverted		This analysis treats $\eta\mu$ as a verb.
1:7 g	V-NP ² + NP ¹ + V		not listed	
1:7 h	NP ²			The first colon of this line contains two verbs.
1:8 a	V + NP ¹	IV A/B:iii)2 var	not listed	
1:8 b	M + V			Collins assigns two line-forms to this siglum. This example differs from both of them in that the second colon contains a double modifier.
1:8 c	NP ¹ + V-NP ₂	III C:i) var	listed	
1:8 d	V + NP ²			This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns the same siglum.
1:8 e	NP ¹ + V	IV A/B:iii)1	listed	

1:8 f	V + M			This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns the same siglum.
1:9 a	NP ¹ + M	IV nom/D:iii)	not listed	
1:9 b	M + V + NP ²			The first colon is an equational sentence.
1:9 c	V + M	III B:i)3e	not listed	
1:9 d	V + NP ¹ + M	inverted		This designation treats $\overline{V}M$ as a verb.
1:9 e	V + NP ¹ + NP ²	III C:i)3b	listed	
1:9 f	V + NP ¹			Collins lists this line-form but knows of no occurrences in the poems which he studied. In the first colon, NP ¹ is a vocative referring to the subject of the verb.
1:10a	NP ² + V + NP ¹	I D:i)15c	not listed	
1:10b	M			Collins knows of no occurrences of this line-form, but the siglum may be inferred from his general description.
1:10c	V + NP ²	II C:ii)1	listed	
1:10d	V + NP ²			
1:10e	V + M + V		not listed	
1:10f	M			The modifier and second verb of the first colon in this bicolon, along with the entire second colon, are quoted speech, and thus function as the direct object (NP ²) of the verb. If this line is

thought of as V + NP², it could be identified as I C:ii), a line-form identified by Collins, who claims to have seen two or three examples of it.

1:11a NP ¹ + V 1:11b M	I B:i)1a	listed	
1:11c V + NP ² + M 1:11d M	III D:ii)1j	listed	
1:11e V + NP ¹ + V 1:11f V + NP		not listed	The first colon of this bicolon contains a double predication and a vocative. The second colon is an equational sentence with the verb $\pi\eta\eta$.
1:12a M + NP ¹ 1:12b V + V		not listed	The first colon of this bicolon contains a vocative and the second colon has two verbs.
1:12c M + V + NP ¹ + M 1:12d V + M		not listed	The first colon in this bicolon contains the quasi-verb ψ , as well as the conjunction $\alpha\kappa$, which Collins does not explain adequately.
1:12e V + NP ¹ 1:12f M	I B:i)3a	listed	
1:13a M + V + NP ² 1:13b M + V-NP ²	II D:ii)var b	listed	This line-form is one of several to

1:13c V + NP ² + M 1:13d V-NP ² + M	II D:ii)var b	listed	which Collins assigns the same siglum. This line-form is one of several to which Collins assigns the same siglum.
1:13e V-NP ² + NP ² 1:13f M + NP ²		not listed	The verb [□] may take a double object, as it does here. Collins has no way to indicate this.
1:14a V + NP ¹ 1:14b M + V	IV A/B:iii)2	listed	This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns the same siglum.
1:14c V + M 1:14d V + NP ²	IV B/C:ii)1	listed	This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns the same siglum.
1:14e V-NP ² + NP ¹ + M 1:14f M + V + NP ²	III D:i)a	not listed	Collins does not list this line-form, but it resembles closely some of the forms which he assigns to this siglum. This bicolon also conforms to the semantic set which includes all of the occurrences of the III D:i line-form found by Collins.
1:15a V + NP ² 1:15b NP ¹ + M	I D:i)9c	not listed	This line-form is unknown to Collins, and is inferred from his general

			description of the I D:i line-forms.
1:15c V + M + NP ² 1:15d V + NP ²	III D:ii)2a	listed	
1:15e NP ² + V + NP ¹ 1:15f M	I D:i)15a	not listed	This line-form is unknown to Collins, and is inferred from his general description of the I D:i line-forms.
1:16a M + NP ¹ + V 1:16b NP ¹ + V + NP ²	IV B/C:i)5	not listed	Collins lists only the first half of this line-form, though the possibilities for the second half can be deduced from his general description. Collins claims to know of no occurrences of this line-form.
1:16c V + M + NP ¹ 1:16d NP ¹	III B:i)4g	listed	
1:16e V + NP ¹ + NP 1:16f V + NP ¹		not listed	The first colon in this bicolon is an equational sentence with the verb $\pi\eta\eta$. If the second NP in the first colon is regarded as the object of this verb, then this form is V + NP ¹ + NP ² , which Collins identifies as III C:i)3b. Collins lists this form but knows of no occurrences.

1:17a V + NP ¹ + M 1:17b V + NP ¹ + M	II B:i)15	listed	The second colon of this bicolon uses the quasi-verb]'X.
1:17c V + NP ¹ + M 1:17d M + NP ¹	III B:i)3d	listed	Although Collins lists this line-form, he knows of no occurrences of it.
1:17e V + NP ¹ 1:17f M	I B:i)3a	listed	
1:18a NP + NP ¹ 1:18b NP ² + V		not listed	The first colon of this bicolon is an equational sentence in which the subject and predicate adjective are linked by a pronoun.
1:18c V + NP ¹ 1:18d V + NP ²	IV A/C:iii)2	listed	
1:18e NP ¹ 1:18f V + M	I B:i)1b	listed	
1:19a V + M 1:19b NP ¹ + V-NP ²	IV B/C:iv	listed	This line-form is one of two in the IV B/C:iv line-type known to Collins to which he assigns the same siglum.
1:19c NP ¹ 1:19d M + V	I B:i)2b	listed	
1:19e V + NP ² + M 1:19f V + NP ²	IV D/C:ii)1	listed	This line could also be identified as the syntactically identical III D:ii)1a, which is listed by Collins, even though he

1:20a V + NP ¹ + NP ² 1:20b NP ¹ + V	IV C/A:i)3	listed	claims to have found no occurrences of it.
			This line could also be identified as the syntactically identical III C:i)3a, which is listed by Collins, even though he claims to have found no occurrences of it.
1:20c V + NP ¹ + M 1:20d V	III B:i)3h	listed	Collins knows of no occurrences of this line-form, even though he lists it.
1:20e M + V + NP ¹ 1:20f M + NP ¹	III B:i)6d	listed	The second colon of this bicolon is obscure, and the identification of its line-form is therefore somewhat dubious.
1:21a V + V + NP ¹ 1:21b V + NP ¹ + M		not listed	The second verb and the modifier in the first colon constitute the direct object of a verb of perception. If they are treated as a direct object, then this line- form is V + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + M, which Collins might identify as IV C/B:iv)1. Collins does not list this particular line- form, but it

			corresponds to the description of the other line-forms to which he assigns this siglum.
1:21c NP ¹ + V + NP ₂ + V		not listed	
1:21d NP ¹ + V			The first colon of this bicolon contains two verbs.
1:21e V + NP ²	IV C/B:ii)1	listed	
1:21f V + M			This is one of two line-forms to which Collins assigns this siglum.
1:22a V + NP ¹ + M	III B:i)3e	listed	
1:22b V + M			
1:22c V + M	I B:ii)1a	listed	
1:22d M			This line-form may also be identified as III B:ii)1, which is also listed by Collins.
1:22e NP + NP ¹	II nom	not listed	
1:22f NP ¹ + NP			Both cola in this bicolon are equational sentences.

Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms

As mentioned above, all of the 134 cola of this poem can be combined into bicola. Since Collins' taxonomy only deals with bicola, it may reasonably be expected that Collins' system will deal more adequately with this poem than with some others. This expectation is realized. The bicola of this poem are listed in the following table, categorized by whether they are listed in Collins' taxonomy, definable by Collins' taxonomy, or intractable to this system.

TABLE 8 - 32

ADMISSIBILITY OF POETIC COLA IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"
TO COLLINS' TAXONOMY

LISTED		DEFINABLE	UNDEFINABLE
1:1 c,d	1:11 a,b	1:1 a,b	1:7 g,h
1:1 e,f	1:11 c,d	1:2 a,b	1:10 e,f
1:2 c,d	1:12 e,f	1:2 e,f	1:11 e,f
1:3 a,b	1:13 a,b	1:4 a,b	1:12 a,b
1:3 c,d	1:13 c,d	1:4 c,d	1:12 c,d
1:3 e,f	1:14 a,b	1:4 e,f	1:13 e,f
1:5 a,b	1:14 c,d	1:5 c,d	1:16 e,f
1:5 e,f	1:15 c,d	1:7 e,f	1:18 a,b
1:6 a,b	1:16 c,d	1:8 a,b	1:21 a,b
1:6 c,d	1:17 a,b	1:9 a,b	1:21 c,d
1:6 e,f	1:17 c,d	1:9 c,d	
1:7 a,b	1:17 e,f	1:10 a,b	
1:7 c,d	1:18 c,d	1:14 e,f	
1:8 c,d	1:18 e,f	1:15 a,b	
1:8 e,f	1:19 a,b	1:15 e,f	
1:9 e,f	1:19 c,d	1:16 a,b	
1:10 c,d	1:19 e,f	1:22 e,f	
	1:20 a,b		
	1:20 c,d		
	1:20 e,f		
	1:21 e,f		
	1:22 a,b		
	1:22 c,d		

Of the 67 bicola in this poem, 40 (59.7 %) correspond to line-forms identified and listed by Collins. An additional 17 bicola (25.4 %) correspond to line-forms which are definable by Collins's system. Only 10 bicola (14.9 %) are undefinable within Collins' system. Thus almost six-sevenths of the poem can be described by Collins' taxonomy of line-forms. The predominance of certain basic line-forms in this poems may also be observed, as indicated in the following table.

TABLE 8 - 33

PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF DEFINABLE BICOLA
IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

GENERAL LINE-TYPE	I	II	III	IV	TOTALS ³³
BASIC SENTENCE					
A	0	0	0	A/B 3 A/C 1	5
B	12	2	10	B/C 5 B/nom 1	34
C	1	1	2	C/A 1 C/B 1	13
D	6	2	3	D/C 1	13
nom	1	3	0	nom/D 1	6
TOTALS	20	8	15	14	

It may be noted that lines using Type-B sentences predominate in this poem, as they do in "The Song of Deborah." More than half of the bicola in this poem (including several of the ten which cannot be classified by Collins' system) contain Type-B sentences. Of those which can be classified, 34 out of 57 (59.6 %) contain such sentences. Thirteen bicola contain Type-C sentences and an additional 13 (22.8 %) contain Type-D sentences. By contrast, there are no examples of line-forms containing only Type-A sentences. There are Type-A sentences in Type IV lines, in which they are paired with a sentence of another type, but there are only 5 of these (8.8 % of all identifiable lines). There are also only 6 occurrences (10.5 % of identifiable lines) of nominal sentences which can be classified by Collins' system. Both Type-B and Type-C sentences are more common in this poem than in Collins' sample, and Type-A and Type-D are considerably less frequent. It

³³The sum of the totals in this column will exceed the number of bicola in the poem because of the presence of Type IV lines, which contain two basic sentences.

may also be noted that lines of Type-I predominate over other line-types, though the difference is not quite as striking as the disparity between the sentence types. More than one-third of the bicola in "The First Lament" are Type I lines. This may be related to the relative brevity of the bicola in this poem: when a bicolon is so short it is sometimes easier to stretch a single sentence over both halves of the line than to put a separate sentence in each colon (especially in the typically shorter second colon). In contrast, lines of Type II, in which there are two complete sentences without gapping, are quite rare, making up only about one-seventh of the Lament. Type II lines, as previously observed, contain two sentences of the same type, and thus tend to be syntactically balanced. This poem therefore tends to avoid symmetry of syntax between the two halves of a bicolon, in favor of line-types in which there is an imbalance or lack of correspondence between the syntax of the two half-lines.

Of the 67 bicola in this poem, only 4 conform to the syntactic patterns which Collins has identified as semantic sets. Lamentations 1:9 e, f can be identified as III C:i)3b. Collins knows of no occurrences of this specific line-form, but he indicates that his fourth semantic set includes all occurrences of III C:i)1, 2 and 3.³⁴ According to Collins, all of these lines "centre on the relationship between God and man, viewed from both sides. There are usually overtones of judgement and moral evaluation."³⁵ This description is a bit general, but it can be fairly said to apply to Lamentations 1:9 e, f, "O YHWH see my affliction, For an enemy has made himself great." Lamentations 1:14 e, f is identified as III D:i)a. Collins asserts that all examples of the III D:i line-form which he has found make up the third semantic set, a group of lines in which "Yahweh is always the

³⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry, 248.

³⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry, 248.

subject (by name or implication), and the line describes his wonderful actions, with a stress usually on the beneficial aspects."³⁶ YHWH, referred to here as **יְהוָה**, is indeed the subject of this bicolon, and the line does describe his actions, which may be regarded as wonderful, though certainly not beneficial in this case: "My Lord gave me into the hands of (?); I am not able to stand up." Syntactically, Lamentations 1:16 c,d and 1:19 e,f conform to the patterns for the first and fifth semantic sets, respectively. However, neither of these bicola matches Collins' semantic description of these sets.

Syntactic Structural Analysis

TABLE 8 - 34

IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING
IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

COLON	PREDI- CATIONS	CONSTITUENTS	UNITS	CLASS	TROPING	CONJUNCT OR REMAINDER
1:1 a	2	3	3	III	RS	C
1:1 b	0	1	3	II	RCMGS	C
1:1 c	1	2	2	I	RMGS	
1:1 d	0	2	2	III	RCMGS	C
1:1 e	0	2	2	III	S	C
1:1 f	1	2	2	I	RMGS	
1:2 a	1	3	3	I	R	
1:2 b	1	2	2	I		R
1:2 c	1	3	3	I	CMGS	
1:2 d	0	1	2	III	RCS	C
1:2 e	1	3	4	II	RC	C
1:2 f	1	3	3	I	RMG	
1:3 a	1	3	3	I	CMS	
1:3 b	0	1	2	III	RCS	C
1:3 c	1	3	3	I	RM	
1:3 d	1	3	3	I	R	
1:3 e	1	2	3	I	RS	

³⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry, 248.

1:3 f 0	1	2	III	S	C
1:4 a 1	2	3	I	RCMS	
1:4 b 0	1	3	II	S	C
1:4 c 1	2	3	I	RCM	
1:4 d 1	2	2	I	CM	
1:4 e 1	2	2	I	CR	
1:4 f 1	3	3	I	R	
1:5 a 1	3	3	I	RC	
1:5 b 1	2	2	I	RCM	
1:5 c 1	2	2	1	S	
1:5 d 1	2	3	I	RS	
1:5 e 1	2	2	I	RMS	
1:5 f 0	2	3	III	RCS	C
1:6 a 1	2	3	I	RCMS	
1:6 b 0	1	2	III	RS	C
1:6 c 1	3	3	I	RC	
1:6 d 1	2	3	I	RC	
1:6 e 1	2	3	I	RMS	
1:6 f 0	1	2	III	R	C
1:7 a 1	2	2	I	RCS	
1:7 b 0	1	3	II	RCS	C
1:7 c 0	2	3	III	RS	C
1:7 d 1	2	3	I	RS	
1:7 e 0	2	4	III	RS	C
1:7 f 1	3	3	I	S	
1:7 g 2	3	3	II	R	C
1:7 h 0	1	1	--	R	C
1:8 a 1	3	3	I	R	
1:8 b 1	3	3	I	R	
1:8 c 1	2	3	I	RS	
1:8 d 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:8 e 1	3	3	I	R	
1:8 f 1	2	2	I		R
1:9 a 1	2	2	I		R
1:9 b 1	2	3	I	R	
1:9 c 1	2	2	I		R
1:9 d 1	3	3	I	C	
1:9 e 1	3	3	I	RCS	
1:9 f 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:10a 1	3	3	I	RS	
1:10b 0	1	2	III	RS	C
1:10c 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:10d 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:10e 2	3	4	III	RS	C
1:10f 0	2	2	III	S	C

1:11a	1	2	3	I	RS	
1:11b	1	2	2	I	MS	
1:11c	1	3	3	I	RS	
1:11d	1	2	2	I	RMS	
1:11e	1	3	3	I	RS	
1:11f	1	2	2	I	RS	
1:12a	2	4	5	IV	R	C
1:12b	2	2	2	III	R	C
1:12c	1	3	4	II	RS	C
1:12d	1	3	3	I	RS	
1:12e	1	3	3	I	RCS	C
1:12f	0	1	3	II	RCS	C
1:13a	1	3	3	I	CS	
1:13b	1	2	2	I	S	
1:13c	1	3	3	I	C	
1:13d	1	2	2	I	R	
1:13e	1	2	2	I	R	
1:13f	1	2	3	I	R	
1:14a	1	2	3	I	RC	
1:14b	1	2	2	I	R	
1:14c	1	2	2	I	RC	
1:14d	1	2	2	I		R
1:14e	1	3	3	I	R	
1:14f	1	2	3	I		R
1:15a	1	2	3	I	RMS	
1:15b	1	2	2	I	RS	
1:15c	1	3	3	I	RS	
1:15d	1	2	2	I	S	
1:15e	1	3	3	I	RMS	
1:15f	0	2	3	III	RS	C
1:16a	1	3	3	I	R	
1:16b	1	4	4	IV	R	C
1:16c	1	3	3	I	RCS	
1:16d	0	2	2	III	RCS	C
1:16e	1	3	3	I	RS	
1:16f	1	2	2	I	RS	
1:17a	1	3	3	I	RCM	
1:17b	1	3	3	I	RC	
1:17c	1	3	3	I	RCMS	
1:17d	1	2	2	I	RS	
1:17e	1	2	2	I	RCS	
1:17f	0	2	2	III	S	C
1:18a	1	3	3	I	RCS	
1:18b	1	2	2	I	RCS	
1:18c	1	2	3	I	R	

1:18d 1	2	2	I	R	
1:18e 0	2	2	III	RCS	C
1:18f 1	2	2	I	CS	C
1:19a 1	2	2	I	R	
1:19b 1	2	2	I		R
1:19c 0	2	2	III	CS	C
1:19d 1	2	2	I	CS	
1:19e 1	3	3	I	R	
1:19f 1	2	2	I	R	
1:20a 3	4	4	IV	R	C
1:20b 1	2	2	I	CMG	
1:20c 1	3	3	I	RCMGS	
1:20d 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:20e 1	3	3	I	CMG	
1:20f 1	2	2	I	CMG	
1:21a 2	3	3	II	R	C
1:21b 1	3	3	I		R
1:21c 1	3	4	II	R	
1:21d 2	3	3	II	R	
1:21e 2	3	3	II	R	
1:21f 1	2	2	I		R
1:22a 1	3	4	II	R	C
1:22b 1	2	2	I	RS	
1:22c 1	3	3	I	RS	
1:22d 0	1	2	III	RS	C
1:22e 1	2	2	I	CMS	
1:22f 1	2	2	I	RCM	

Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis

Of the 134 cola of this poem, only 37 (27.6 %) are non-Class-I lines. Thus, the poem is "out of range" by O'Connor's definition,³⁷ though O'Connor's expectation that the majority of lines will be Class I is fulfilled. Nearly all lines are troped (125 out of 134, or 93.3 %). This gives a Troping:Heavy ratio of 77:23. The conjunct in this poem is 36 lines, the remainder only 9, giving a weight of 80:20. It is immediately apparent that O'Connor is quite correct in asserting that the majority of a poem will be made up of Class I lines, with the heavier line-types occurring in

³⁷M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 533.

concentrations. Almost one third of the heavy lines occur in the first two or final two verses. In addition to the large number of heavy lines in verses 1, 2, 21 and 22, concentrations of non-Class-I lines can also be seen in verses 3, 6, 7, 10, 12 and 16. No other verse contains more than a single heavy line, and many contain none at all. There is one interval of almost three verses -- from 1:13a to 1:15e -- without a single heavy line. In fact, a striking contrast may be seen between these passages with numerous and the rest of the poem, as illustrated in the following table:

TABLE 8 - 35

INCIDENCE OF LINE CLASSES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

	IN THE WHOLE POEM		VERSES		REMAINING VERSES	
				1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 21, 22		
Class I	97	72.4 %	32	51.6 %	65	90.3 %
Class II	12	9.0 %	11	17.7 %	1	1.4 %
Class III	21	15.7 %	16	25.8 %	7	6.9 %
Class IV	3	2.2 %	2	3.2 %	1	1.4 %
Undefined	1	0.7 %	1	1.6 %	0	0.0 %

Thus, of the 37 heavy lines in this poem, 30 are found in these ten verses, amounting to 48.4 % of all of the cola in these verses. In contrast, among the 72 cola of the rest of the poem, there are only 7 heavy lines (9.7 %). O'Connor suggests that these concentrations of heavy lines will occur at the beginnings or ends of staves of approximately 28 cola. On the basis of this suggestion one might postulate the following staves: from verses 1-6, verses 7-10, verses 11-12, verses 13-16 and verses 17-22. These are far from uniform, but O'Connor does not expect, much less demand, perfect uniformity of the staves. These staves would have lengths of 36 cola, 26 cola, 12 cola, 24 cola, and 36 cola, respectively, and the third of them should properly be

identified as a half-stave, or semi-stave as O'Connor calls it.³⁸ All but one of these fall outside the normal range of stave lengths suggested by O'Connor.³⁹ It might be possible to identify staves of more regular length, but this could not be done without dividing the six-colon verses of the traditional text. This seems improbable because of the acrostic pattern. Nevertheless, the symmetry of this arrangement is striking: long stave, short stave, semi-stave, short stave, long stave. The staves may be analyzed as follows:

TABLE 8 - 36

STAVES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

	1ST STAVE	2ND STAVE	3RD STAVE	4TH STAVE	5TH STAVE
Lines	36	26	12	24	36
Heavy	12 (33 %)	8 (31 %)	4 (33 %)	3 (13 %)	10 (28 %)
Troping	35 (97 %)	23 (89 %)	12 (100 %)	22 (92 %)	33 (92 %)
T:H	74:26	74:26	75:25	88:12	77:23
Conjunct	12 (33 %)	8 (31 %)	5 (42 %)	3 (13 %)	8 (22 %)
Remainder	1 (3 %)	3 (12 %)	0	2 (8 %)	3 (8 %)
Weight	92:08	73:27	100:0	60:40	73:27

In addition to the notable, but imperfect, symmetry of the lengths of the staves which has been mentioned above, one may also note a similar, but imperfect, symmetry in the weights of the staves. This contrasts with the relative constancy of the levels of heavy lines (the fourth stave being the only exception) and the Troping:Heavy ratios (again, with the fourth stave as the only exception). There are few apparent markers for the division of these staves into batches. If the traditional verse divisions are accepted as batches, the poem may be analyzed as follows:

³⁸M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 456.

³⁹The normal range of stave lengths is 26 to 31 lines, as indicated in M. O'Connor's Hebrew Verse Structure, 455.

TABLE 8 - 37

BATCHES IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

FIRST STAVE: VERSES 1-6

	Batch A	Batch B	Batch C
Lines	6	6	6
Heavy	4 (67 %)	2 (33 %)	2 (33 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	5 (83 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	60:40	71:29	75:25
Conjunct	4 (67 %)	2 (33 %)	2 (33 %)
Remainder	0	1 (17 %)	0
Weight	100:0	67:33	100:0

	Batch D	Batch E	Batch F
Lines	6	6	6
Heavy	1 (17 %)	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	86:14	86:14	75:25
Conjunct	1 (17 %)	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)
Remainder	0	0	0
Weight	100:0	100:0	100:0

SECOND STAVE: VERSES 7-10

	Batch A	Batch B	Batch C	Batch D
Lines	8	6	6	6
Heavy	5 (63 %)	0	0	3 (50 %)
Troping	8 (100 %)	5 (83 %)	4 (67 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	62:38	100:0	100:0	67:33
Conjunct	5	0	0	3
Remainder	0	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)	0
Weight	100:0	0:100	0:100	100:0

THIRD (SEMI-)STAVE: VERSES 11-12

	Batch A	Batch B
Lines	6	6
Heavy	0	4 (67 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	100:0	60:40
Conjunct	0	4 (67 %)
Remainder	0	0
Weight	--	100:0

FOURTH STAVE: VERSES 13-16

	Batch A	Batch B	Batch C	Batch D
Lines	6	6	6	6
Heavy	0	0	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	4 (67 %)	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	100:0	100:0	86:14	75:25
Conjunct	0	0	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)
Remainder	0	2	0	0
Weight	--	0:100	100:0	100:0

FIFTH STAVE: VERSES 17-22

	Batch A	Batch B	Batch C
Lines	6	6	6
Heavy	1 (17 %)	1 (17 %)	1 (17 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	6 (100 %)	5 (83 %)
T:H	86:14	86:14	83:17
Conjunct	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)	1 (17 %)
Remainder	0	0	1 (17 %)
Weight	100:0	100:0	50:50

	Batch D	Batch E	Batch F
Lines	6	6	6
Heavy	1 (17 %)	4 (67 %)	2 (33 %)
Troping	6 (100 %)	4 (67 %)	6 (100 %)
T:H	85:14	50:50	75:25
Conjunct	1 (17 %)	1 (17 %)	2 (33 %)
Remainder	0	2 (33 %)	0
Weight	100:0	33:67	100:0

The results of this close analysis are perhaps not as striking as the broader analysis of the staves given above. There are, however a few points deserving of notice. The second stave is remarkably symmetrical, with regard to the number of heavy lines, which is high in the first and last batches and reduces to zero in the middle two batches, and also with regard to the Troping:Heavy ratio and the weight. The Troping:Heavy ratio is approximately 65:35 in the first and last batches, and 100:0 in the middle two batches. The weight is 100:0 in the first and last, and 0:100 in the middle. Unfortunately, there is nothing like this degree of symmetry among the batches in any of the other staves.

One other detail which may be observed is the fact that the second batch in the poem (that is, the second batch of the first stave) and the next to last batch in the poem (that is, the fifth batch of the fifth stave) are both significantly different in weight from the staves in which they are located. Batch B, with a weight of 67:33, is the only batch of the first stave whose weight is less than 100:0. Batch E of the fifth stave has a weight of 33:67, the lowest weight of any batch in a stave in which four of the six batches have a weight of 100:0. Again, there is a pattern of symmetry between the first and the last staves, which might be described thus: XoXXXX . . . XXXXoX. Thus the macrocosmic symmetry which may be seen in the syntactic structural analysis contrasts with the microcosmic asymmetry of the individual lines (as seen in the minimal unit counts and the line-form analysis) .

Strophic Analysis

TABLE 8 - 38

IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN "THE FIRST LAMENT"

COLON	NUMBER OF FEET	CANTO	SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE		
1:1 a	3	A		I	1	a		
1:1 b	3							
1:1 c	2							b
1:1 d	2							
1:1 e	2							c
1:1 f	2							
1:2 a	3							2
1:2 b	3							
1:2 c	2					b		
1:2 d	1							
1:2 e	3					c		
1:2 f	3							
1:3 a	3				3	a		
1:3 b	2							
1:3 c	3						b	
1:3 d	3							

1:3 e 2			c
1:3 f 2			
1:4 a 3	II	1	a
1:4 b 3			b
1:4 c 2			c
1:4 d 2			
1:4 e 2			
1:4 f 2			
1:5 a 3		2	a
1:5 b 2			b
1:5 c 2			c
1:5 d 2			
1:5 e 2			
1:5 f 2			
1:6 a 2		3	a
1:6 b 1			b
1:6 c 3			c
1:6 d 2			
1:6 e 2			
1:6 f 2			
1:7 a 2		4	a
1:7 b 3			b
1:7 c 2			c
1:7 d 4			d
1:7 e 3			
1:7 f 3			
1:7 g 3			
1:7 h 1			
1:8 a 3	III	1	a
1:8 b 3			b
1:8 c 2			c
1:8 d 2			
1:8 e 2			
1:8 f 2			
1:9 a 2		2	a
1:9 b 3			b
1:9 c 2			c
1:9 d 2			
1:9 e 3			
1:9 f 3			
1:10a 3		3	a
1:10b 2			b
1:10c 2			c
1:10d 2			
1:10e 3			

1:10f 2				
1:11a 2			4	a
1:11b 2				
1:11c 3				b
1:11d 2				
1:11e 3				c
1:11f 3				
1:12a 4	B	I	1	a
1:12b 2				
1:12c 3				b
1:12d 3				
1:12e 3				c
1:12f 3				
1:13a 2			2	a
1:13b 2				
1:13c 3				b
1:13d 2				
1:13e 2				c
1:13f 2				
1:14a 3			3	a
1:14b 2				
1:14c 2				b
1:14d 2				
1:14e 3				c
1:14f 2				
1:15a 2			4	a
1:15b 2				
1:15c 2				b
1:15d 2				
1:15e 3				c
1:15f 2				
1:16a 3			5	a
1:16b 4				
1:16c 3				b
1:16d 2				
1:16e 3				c
1:16f 3				
1:17a 3		II	1	a
1:17b 3				
1:17c 3				b
1:17d 2				
1:17e 2				c
1:17f 2				
1:18a 3		III	1	a

1:18b	3		
1:18c	2		b
1:18d	2		
1:18e	2		c
1:18f	2		
1:19a	2	2	a
1:19b	2		
1:19c	2		b
1:19d	2		
1:19e	3		c
1:19f	2		
1:20a	3	IV	1
1:20b	2		
1:20c	3		b
1:20d	3		
1:20e	2		c
1:20f	2		
1:21a	4	2	a
1:21b	3		
1:21c	4		b
1:21d	3		
1:21e	2		c
1:21f	2		
1:22a	3	3	a
1:22b	2		
1:22c	3		b
1:22d	2		
1:22e	2		c
1:22f	2		

Inferences from Strophic Analysis

Semantically, this poem divides into two neat halves. In the first canto, verses 1-11, Jerusalem is described in third person, with the exception of the references in A III 2 c (Lamentations 1:9 e, f) and A III 4 c (Lamentations 1:11 e, f), where YHWH is addressed directly. In these passages it appears that it is not the poet, but rather personified Jerusalem who is speaking. This is certain at least in verse 11, where the feminine participle in "כִּי הָיִיתִי וּלְלֵהָ" "for I was vile," clearly refers to Jerusalem. In the second canto, verses 12-22, personified Jerusalem bewails her

affliction in first person, except for B II (Lamentations 1:17) in which Zion/Jacob/Jerusalem (all of these terms are used, one in each of the three bicola in this strophe) is described in third person. The canticles within these cantos are of varying length, but the strophes are of uniform length: each is made up of three bicola, with the single exception of A II 4 (Lamentations 1:7), which contains four bicola. None of these semantic divisions enjambs a Masoretic verse division. The semantic development may be described in greater detail:

CANTO A Jerusalem's destruction is described.

Canticle I This canticle tells of the bitterness of the affliction, with a focus on Jerusalem itself, which is described in consecutive strophes as deserted, comfortless and deported.

Strophe 1 The isolation of Jerusalem.

Strophe 2 Jerusalem's mournful reaction to her desertion.

Strophe 3 Captivity and exile.

Canticle II The second canticle describes the losses inflicted on Jerusalem. She has been deprived of celebration and celebrants, children, leaders and all her "precious things."

Strophe 1 The completeness of the desolation, the absence of celebration, priest, virgin and child.

Strophe 2 The consequences of divine punishment (first and last bicola) for Jerusalem's transgression (second bicola).

Strophe 3 Loss of leaders.

Strophe 4 The loss of precious things and the mocking
foe.

Canticle III The third canticle describes the cause and extent
of the catastrophe. The first two strophes
attribute the destruction to Jerusalem's sin and
defilement, provoking the cry, "Look on my
affliction because the enemy has triumphed." The
latter two strophes describe the enemy
(improperly) entering the sanctuary, and the
people selling their possessions for food,
provoking the cry, "See and behold, because I have
become defiled." These two cries to YHWH are
logically reversed. The latter, which bemoans
defilement, rationally associates with the first
two strophes, which describe Jerusalem's
defilement. The former cry, which bewails the
victory of the enemy, associates with the latter
two strophes which describe that victory and its
consequences. The reversal of the two cries helps
to bind the canticle together.

Strophe 1 Sin, shame and disgrace.

Strophe 2 Defilement leading to unforeseen doom (from
which the afflicted cry out).

Strophe 3 Loss of precious things and defilement of the
sanctuary.

Strophe 4 The consequence of conquest: giving up
everything for bread (because of which the
hungry city cries out).

CANTO B Jerusalem bewails her affliction.

Canticle I

The petitions of this canticle, unlike those of the previous canticle, are addressed not to YHWH, but to the passers-by. YHWH is mentioned only in the third person. Jerusalem, which is referred to in the first canto in third person (except for the two exclamations of Canticle III) is now the first person speaker. The destruction of Jerusalem is YHWH's act of punishment.

The boundary between this canticle and the next is not sharply marked. Should the canticle end after Strophe 3 (verse 14), which discusses the theme of retribution (a theme which does not recur until verse 18)? Should it end after Strophe 4 (verse 15), which concludes the discussion of YHWH's acts, and before attention is turned in verse 16 to the reaction of Jerusalem? Or should it end after verse 16, following which the direct address of Jerusalem is suspended in verse 17?

- Strophe 1** A call to the passers-by: "Is there any suffering like that which YHWH has inflicted on me?"
- Strophe 2** Various bodily metaphors for the affliction imposed by YHWH.
- Strophe 3** Transgression as a yoke which binds the afflicted over into the hands of oppressors.
- Strophe 4** Various (predominantly social) metaphors for the conquest of the people by YHWH.
- Strophe 5** Jerusalem's uncomforted mourning.

Canticle II

Both the initial and final boundaries of this canticle are in question. As mentioned above, this canticle may begin with either verse 15, verse 16 or verse 17. Furthermore, it may end with the termination of the third person description of Jerusalem in verse 17, or with the speech about YHWH in verse 19, prior to the resumption of direct address to YHWH in verse 20. If verse 17 is to be isolated as a canticle in its own right, it is the shortest canticle in this lament: a single strophe of three bicola. Furthermore, if it is thus divided, it is followed immediately by the second shortest canticle of the poem: two strophes of three bicola each. There is a strong temptation to put the two together. This canticle is nevertheless the only portion of Canto B in which names are used in a third person description of Jerusalem (except for the reference to "the virgin daughter of Judah" in verse 15 -- and even this is preceded and followed by first person verbs and pronouns, all of which refer to Jerusalem).

Strophe 1 Zion is comfortless and defiled.

Canticle III

Like the first canticle of this canto, Canticle III describes the desolation of Jerusalem as a divine punishment against rebellion. It is distinguished from Canticle II by the use of first person for

Judah and Jerusalem, and from Canticle IV by the fact that in the latter, YHWH is addressed directly.

Strophe 1 YHWH's rightful affliction of Jerusalem by captivity.

Strophe 2 Jerusalem deserted and deprived of citizens despite her call for help.

Canticle IV The last canticle of this poem is unique in two respects: first, it contains an extensive passage (nine consecutive cola) of direct address to deity, elsewhere found only in A III 2 c (Lamentations 1:9 e, f) and A III 4 c (Lamentations 1:11 e, f); second, it calls for vengeance, or at least for parallel punishment to fall on the destroyers of Jerusalem, and on those who rejoice in Zion's downfall.

Strophe 1 Jerusalem's wail of distress.

Strophe 2 Jerusalem's moan of suffering and appeal for her enemies to suffer similarly.

Strophe 3 Appeal for evil-doers to suffer in the same way Jerusalem has.

The division of the poem proposed here may be contrasted with the division of the poem previously indicated by O'Connor's system of syntactic structural analysis.

TABLE 8 - 39

DIVISIONS OF "THE FIRST LAMENT" INDICATED BY
SYNTACTIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND BY
SEMANTIC STROPHIC ANALYSIS

SYSTEM OF O'CONNOR			SYSTEM OF DE MOOR AND VAN DER MEER			
COLON	STAVE	BATCH	CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE
1:1 a	1	A	A	I	1	a
1:1 b						
1:1 c						b
1:1 d						
1:1 e						c
1:1 f						
1:2 a		B			2	a
1:2 b						
1:2 c						b
1:2 d						
1:2 e						c
1:2 f						
1:3 a		C			3	a
1:3 b						
1:3 c						b
1:3 d						
1:3 e						c
1:3 f						
1:4 a		D	II	1		a
1:4 b						
1:4 c						b
1:4 d						
1:4 e						c
1:4 f						
1:5 a		E			2	a
1:5 b						
1:5 c						b
1:5 d						
1:5 e						c
1:5 f						
1:6 a		F			3	a
1:6 b						
1:6 c						b
1:6 d						
1:6 e						c
1:6 f						

1:7 a	2	A		4	a
1:7 b					b
1:7 c					c
1:7 d					d
1:7 e					e
1:7 f					f
1:7 g					g
1:7 h					h
1:8 a		B	III	1	a
1:8 b					b
1:8 c					c
1:8 d					d
1:8 e					e
1:8 f					f
1:9 a		C		2	a
1:9 b					b
1:9 c					c
1:9 d					d
1:9 e					e
1:9 f					f
1:10a		D		3	a
1:10b					b
1:10c					c
1:10d					d
1:10e					e
1:10f					f
1:11a	3	A		4	a
1:11b					b
1:11c					c
1:11d					d
1:11e					e
1:11f					f
1:12a		B	B I	1	a
1:12b					b
1:12c					c
1:12d					d
1:12e					e
1:12f					f
1:13a	4	A		2	a
1:13b					b
1:13c					c
1:13d					d
1:13e					e
1:13f					f
1:14a		B		3	a

1:14b						b
1:14c						
1:14d						c
1:14e						
1:14f						
1:15a		C			4	a
1:15b						
1:15c						b
1:15d						
1:15e						c
1:15f						
1:16a		D			5	a
1:16b						
1:16c						b
1:16d						
1:16e						c
1:16f						
1:17a	5	A	II		1	a
1:17b						
1:17c						b
1:17d						
1:17e						c
1:17f						
1:18a		B	III		1	a
1:18b						
1:18c						b
1:18d						
1:18e						c
1:18f						
1:19a		C			2	a
1:19b						
1:19c						b
1:19d						
1:19e						c
1:19f						
1:20a		D	IV		1	a
1:20b						
1:20c						b
1:20d						
1:20e						c
1:20f						
1:21a		E			2	a
1:21b						
1:21c						b
1:21d						

1:21e				c
1:21f				
1:22a	F		3	a
1:22b				
1:22c				b
1:22d				
1:22e				c
1:22f				

Obviously, the division of this poem suggested on semantic grounds differs from that proposed on syntactic grounds by O'Connor's system. None of the divisions proposed by syntactic structural analysis corresponds to the break between cantos, and only one of them coincides with a break between canticles. The clever symmetry of the syntactic staves and batches is quite absent in the semantic analysis of the text, except for the division of the poem into two halves of almost equal length.

WHEN YAHWEH RESTORED ZION'S FORTUNES

Minimal Unit Counts

Because of the brevity of this Psalm, it is tempting to suppose that statistical analysis might reveal very little. However, because of the over-all regularity of the poem, it may still be useful to study it. Except for the colophon in verse 1a, all of the cola of this poem are joined into bicola.

TABLE 8 - 40

MINIMAL UNITS IN PSALM 126

COLON	SYLLABLES	ACCENTS	WORDS
126:1 a	5	2	2
126:1 b	9	4	5
126:1 c	7	2	2
126:2 a	8	4	4
126:2 b	7	2	2
126:2 c	7	3	3

126:2 d	10	4	4
126:3 a	10	4	4
126:3 b	6	2	2
126:4 a	9	3	4
126:4 b	7	2	2
126:5 a	7	2	2
126:5 b	6	2	2
126:6 a	14	5	6
126:6 b	12	4	5
n	14	14	14
μ	8.50	3.07	3.36
σ_n	2.26	1.03	1.34
median	7.5	3	3
mode	7	2	2

Inferences from the Analysis of Minimal Units

On the average, the cola of this poem are approximately the same length as those in "The Song of Deborah" and "The Song of the Vineyard," and considerably larger than the average of the cola of "The First Lament." Nevertheless, it may be noted that the first cola are regularly longer than the second cola. Indeed, the difference between the average length of the first cola and that of the second is only slightly less here than in "The First Lament."

TABLE 8 - 41

ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF MINIMAL UNITS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF BICOLA
IN PSALM 126

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
2			1	5	1	5
3			2		1	
4			3	2	3	1
5			1		1	1
6		2			1	
7	2	3				
8	1					
9	2					
10	1	1				
11						
12		1				
13						
14	1					
n	7	7	7	7	7	7
μ	9.14	7.86	3.57	2.57	4.00	2.71
σ_n	2.23	2.10	.90	.90	1.20	1.16
median	9	7	4	2	4	2
mode	7,9	7	4	2	4	2

Although the mean difference between the first and second cola of bicola in this Psalm is very close to that of "The First Lament," analysis of the differences reveals that they are generated in a somewhat different manner than those of the Lamentations. This can be seen by observing two further comparisons. The first of these is the comparison between the differences between the first and second cola of the bicola in this poem and the differences between the second cola of the bicola and the subsequent cola (that is, the first cola of the subsequent bicola). In the following table, values listed under |a-b| represent the differences between the first and second cola of the bicola in this poem. Values listed under |b-n| represent the differences between the second cola of bicola and the first subsequent cola. In the case of the final colon of the poem, comparison is made with the first colon.

TABLE 8 - 42

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON
AND BETWEEN THE SECOND COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SUBSEQUENT COLON
IN PSALM 126

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n	a-b	b-n
0		3	1	2	1	2
1	2	1	3	2	2	1
2	3		3	2	3	2
3	1	2		1	1	1
4	1					1
5						
6						
7						
8		1				
n	7	7	7	7	7	7
μ	2.14	2.14	1.29	1.29	1.57	1.71
σ_a	.99	2.70	.70	1.03	.90	1.39
median	2	1	1	1	1	2
mode	2	0	1,2	0,1,2	2	0, 2

Regardless of the minimal unit considered, it can be seen that, although the means of the distribution of differences between the first and second cola are either identical or quite close to the means of the distributions of the differences between the second cola and subsequent cola, the standard deviations are quite different. By every standard, the differences between the second cola and subsequent cola are much more widely distributed than the differences between the first and second cola. This would imply that the principle by which these differences are generated is the same as that in "The Song of The Vineyard," that is, there is a tendency to write bicola in which the second cola are shorter than the first by an interval which can be characterized as approximately one and a third syllables, or one stressed syllable, or slightly more than one word.

We may also compare the differences between first and second cola of the bicola and the differences between the first cola of the bicola and the

second cola of subsequent bicola. In the following table, values listed under |a-b| represent the differences between the first and second cola of the bicola in this poem. Values listed under |b-d| represent the differences between the first cola of bicola and the second cola of subsequent bicola. In the case of the final bicolon of the poem, comparison is made between the first colon of this bicolon and the second colon of the first bicolon in the poem.

TABLE 8 - 43

COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND COLA OF A BICOLON AND BETWEEN THE FIRST COLON OF A BICOLON AND THE SECOND COLON OF THE SUBSEQUENT BICOLON IN PSALM 126

NUMBER OF UNITS	SYLLABLES		ACCENTS		WORDS	
	a-b	a-d	a-b	a-d	a-b	a-d
0			1	1	1	1
1	2	1	2	2	2	1
2	3	2	3	2	3	2
3	1	2		1	1	2
4	1					1
5		1				
6						
7		1				
n	7	7	7	7	7	7
μ	2.14	3.29	1.57	1.57	1.57	2.14
σ_s	.99	1.91	.90	.90	.90	1.25
median	2	3	1	2	2	2
mode	2	2,3	1,2	2	2	2,3

From these statistics it may be observed that not only is the average difference between the first half of a bicolon and the second half of the subsequent bicolon greater than the average difference between the two halves of a given bicolon, but also the differences are more widely distributed. Nevertheless, the distribution is not so wide as that of the differences between the second halves of bicola and the subsequent cola, as demonstrated previously. All of this would imply that the bicola in this poem, though

superficially similar to those in "The First Lament" are, in fact, formed by a different standard. Although in both cases the second colon is, on average, about one and a third or one and a half syllables shorter than the first, it appears in Psalm 126 (as in "The Song of the Vineyard") that this difference is primary, whereas in Lamentations 1 it is a consequence of the truncation of the line. To state it in other terms, in Lamentations 1 there is a tendency to write shorter than average lines, with the reduction in length usually being achieved by shortening the second half line. On the other hand, in Psalm 126 (as in "The Song of the Vineyard") there is a tendency to write lines in which the second half is shorter than the first by an interval averaging one and a third syllables, without regard to the effect which this will have on the length of the whole bicolon. In consequence, in Lamentations 1, when the first colon of a bicolon is longer than usual the second colon will tend to be even shorter than usual, in order to keep the line lengths short. By contrast, in Psalm 126, if the first colon is quite long (as it is in verse 6), the second will also tend to be longer than usual, though usually not as long as the first colon.

Line Forms

TABLE 8 - 44

LINE-FORMS IN PSALM 126

COLON	CONSTITUENTS	LINE-FORM	COLLINS	COMMENTS
126:1 a	NP ¹			Anacrusis
126:1 b	V + NP ¹ + NP ²	IV C/B:iii)3	listed	
126:1 c	V + M			
126:2 a	V + NP ² + NP ¹	III C:i)4c	listed	
126:2 b	NP ¹ + NP ²			Collins is aware of no occurrences of this line-form, even though he lists it.

126:2 c	M + V + M	III B:i)3f var	not listed	
126:2 d	V + NP ¹ + M	inverted		
126:3 a	V + NP ¹ + M	IV B/C:iii)3	listed	This line-form is one of two to which Collins assigns this siglum.
126:3 b	V + NP ²			
126:4 a	V + NP ¹ + NP ²	ID:i)7a	listed	
126:4 b	M			
126:5 a	NP ¹	IB:i)2b	listed	
126:5 b	M + V			
126:6 a	V + V + M	II B:ii) var	not listed	Collins lists this siglum, but not with this specific line-form.
126:6 b	V + M + M			

Inferences from the Analysis of Line-Forms

Again, in such a short poem, this analysis may seem rather pointless, though it may be noted that, of all of the poems examined, this one is the most amenable to Collins' system of analysis. The entire poem is made up of bicola. Five of the seven bicola of this poem correspond to line-forms listed by Collins. The remaining two are both capable of being described by Collins' system.

All four basic line-types are used, but none occurs more than twice. Basic sentences B and C tend to predominate, with no examples of type A and only one of type D.⁴⁰ There are no nominal sentences. The B and C sentence types usually present a subject, a verb and a single argument, though two

⁴⁰This contrasts with Collins' finding that sentence-types B and D tend to predominate.

cases of double modifiers occur in this Psalm. None of the line-forms in this poem corresponds to any of the semantic sets identified by Collins.

Structural Analysis

TABLE 8 - 45

IDENTIFICATION OF LINE CLASSES AND TROPING
IN PSALM 126

COLON	PREDI- CATIONS	CONSTITUENTS	UNITS	CLASS	TROPING	CONJUNCT OR REMAINDER
1b	0	3	4	III	RS	C
1c	1	2	2	I	RS	
2a	1	3	3	I	RCMG	
2b	1	2	2	I	RCMG	
2c	1	2	2	I	RS	
2d	2	4	4	IV	RMS	C
3a	2	4	4	IV	RM	C
3b	1	2	2	I	R	
4a	2	3	3	II	RS	C
4b	0	2	2	III	S	C
5a	1	2	2	I	S	
5b	1	2	2	I	RS	
6a	2	5	6	--	RM	C
6b	2	5	5	--	RM	C

Inferences from Syntactic Structural Analysis

All of the lines of this poem are troped, with more than one trope occurring in all lines except 3b, 4b, and 5a. As O'Connor might anticipate, heavy lines are found at the beginning and at the end, as well as in one segment (verses 2d-4b) in the middle of the poem. With only fourteen lines, this poem might be identified as a semi-stave, composed of two batches, the first of six lines (verse 1b-2d) and the second of eight (verses 3a-6b).

Of the fourteen lines in this poem, seven (50 %) are Class I,⁴¹ only one (7 %) is Class II, two (14 %) are Class III and two more are Class IV. Two of the lines of this poem violate O'Connor's norms: 6a and 6b each contain 5 constituents, one more than O'Connor permits. These must be considered heavy lines, but they cannot be classified. Nevertheless, O'Connor's expectation that Class-I lines will predominate is fulfilled.

Strophic Analysis

TABLE 8 - 46

IDENTIFICATION OF SEMANTIC DIVISIONS IN PSALM 126

COLON	NUMBER OF FEET	CANTO	SUB-CANTO	CANTICLE	STROPHE	VERSE
1 b	4			I	1	a
1 c	2					
2 a	3					b
2 b	4					
2 c	3					c
2 d	4					
3 a	4				2	a
3 b	2					
4 a	3					b
4 b	2					
5 a	2			II	1	a
5 b	2					
6 a	5					b
6 b	4					

⁴¹Again, the poem is "out of range" by O'Connor's standards. See M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 533.

Inferences from Strophic Analysis

This short poem is composed of two canticles, the second briefer than the first. They are distinguished by the realism of the former and the symbolism of the latter. They may be described as follows:

Canticle I Impressions of Yahweh's reversal of the fortunes of Zion

Strophe 1 This strophe describes in general terms the reaction of the people to the restoration provided by Yahweh: they rejoice.

Strophe 2 This strophe ties Yahweh's earlier beneficial actions to an appeal that He do again as He has done in the past.

Canticle II An agricultural analogy of the joy that comes with restoration.

The semantic divisions identified here in the fashion of de Moor and van der Meer do not correspond to those identified by O'Connor's system of syntactic structural analysis.

CHAPTER NINE

ANALYSIS OF THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE

WHAT SHOULD THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE TELL ABOUT A POEM?

Having applied the four theories of verse structure to the trial passages, it is in order to ask what general inferences may be drawn about the accuracy and usefulness of these theories. What can each of these theories reveal about a poem? What can be learned from these theories that is neither intuitively obvious nor insignificant? Are these theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure truthful and useful? And finally, if they are not truthful or useful, in what ways do they fail?

There are at least three major issues which deserve attention. First, the descriptive usefulness of these theories may be considered. It may be asked whether any of these theories of verse structure provides a useful description of Hebrew poems; in particular, does any of these theories enable the reader to tell whether a passage is a poem or not, and whether a given poem is an integral unit or a composite of some sort? Furthermore, do these theories of verse structure enable the reader to differentiate between various poems and between various types of poems? Closely tied to this question of description is the issue of the partition of the text. If the text of a poem is divided into sections, and if this division has any objective validity, then it might be presumed that all valid theories of verse structure would divide the text at the same points. As has been shown above, the various theories employed do not always produce the same partition of the text.

Having considered the descriptive value of the four theories of verse structure, consideration may be given, in the second place, to the predictive value of these theories. Do any of these theories have predictive value: would any of them allow the reader to detect a lacuna, to form a

reasonable hypothesis about a lacuna in the text, or to predict the form of another poem of the same type?

Third, the prescriptive value of these theories may also be considered. Could any of these theories of verse structure be related to principles of poetry which could plausibly have been used (deliberately or intuitively) by the biblical poets in the composition of their works? Is it conceivable that the poet who composed a particular biblical poem might have been directed (even sub-consciously) by rules which could be defined in the terms of any of these theories of verse structure?

THE DESCRIPTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES

Poetry and Prose

T. H. Robinson begins the first chapter of his Poetry of the Old Testament with the pronouncement that,

Most of us know the difference between poetry and prose. When we hear or see a passage we have no difficulty in deciding to which class of literature or speech it belongs.¹

Having said this, Robinson proceeds to explain aural and logical criteria which are used to justify this distinction. Robinson's presentation of this topic assumes a logical sequence: readers can tell poetry from prose long before they understand how they can tell poetry from prose. First, guided by the inner light, they determine that a given passage is a poem. Subsequently, they analyze the passage, comparing it with other passages which have been identified as poetry, and note criteria which define its similarity to those other poems (which have also been initially identified in the same subjective manner). From the beginning, the ability to make this distinction is a sort of educated intuition. Any honest student of Hebrew poetry must make this admission: that many judgements of what is or

¹T. H. Robinson, Poetry of the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1947), 11.

is not poetry are justified after the fact. This does not mean that the judgements are bound to be invalid, but it does mean that they are, and indeed must be, subject to review and re-evaluation. Individual poems must be evaluated by criteria based on the shared characteristics of other poetic works. For example, in English poetry of the last few centuries, these shared characteristics might include rhyme of the final syllables² of lines and fixed patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables in each line. But by now it is widely apparent that the shared characteristics of Hebrew poetry are rather different from these. Rhyme in biblical poetry is rare, and in the few occasions when it does occur, it may be accidental. And despite the work of Eduard Sievers and Julius Ley, it is now generally accepted that biblical poetry does not use regular patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables. The four theories of verse structure described in this study suggest different methods of justifying the distinction of Hebrew poetry from Hebrew prose, that is different criteria, based on the shared characteristics of the corpus of biblical Hebrew poetry, for identifying a passage as poetry.

Poetry Defined by Minimal Unit Counting

For those who count minimal units, the criterion which enables the reader to justify the identification of poetry is the use of lines of relatively fixed length. Of course, it must be acknowledged immediately that this length is not controlled with nearly the precision of the Greek and Roman verses, with their fixed number of syllables per line, arranged in predetermined patterns of long and short syllables. In Hebrew poetry the number of syllables may vary considerably from one line to the next. There are, to be sure, such passages as Judges 5:18, in which the two cola of a bicolon contain equal numbers of syllables, accents and words:

²The rhyme may be either of the last syllable of a line or of the last two syllables of a line.

יהנה בצאתך משעיר בצעדתך משנה ארם

YHWH, in your departure from Seir,
in your walking from the plain of Edom,

There are also extended passages in which the number of syllables per colon or per line varies only slightly. Thus the metricist is quite willing to tolerate within the definition of poetry such passages as Judges 5:19, where the number of syllables, accents or words per colon varies within a range of one:

באו מלכים נלחמו אז נלחמו מלכי קנען
בתענך על-מי מגידו בצע כסף לא לקחו

Kings came, they fought,
The kings of Canaan fought,
At Taanach, at the waters of Megiddo.
Spoil of silver they did not take.

Yet even this close approximation of regularity cannot be expected everywhere. There are also passages in this same poem where the cola within a single line are much more different in length. An example of this is found in one of the most memorable lines of this poem, Judges 5:20:

מן-שמים נלחמו הבורקים ממסלותם נלחמו עם-סיפרא

From the heavens they fought,
From their courses the stars fought with Sisera

The second colon of this poem is more than twice as long as the first.³ Furthermore, with twenty-three syllables, this is one of the longest bicola in "The Song of Deborah." Of course, there are passages of prose in the Hebrew Bible where the lines are much longer and the difference in length between one clause and the next is even greater than this, for example, Judges 4:1:

³This assumes the traditional stichography. Versions in which the stichography is emended, such as the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* do not show such a radical difference between the first and second cola of this bicolon. Nevertheless, the whole line is unusually long, and there are other bicola, such as Judges 5:5, where the difference between the first colon and the second is more than one or two syllables.

וַיַּסְפוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה וַאֲהוּד מָת

And the sons of Israel continued to do evil in the eyes of YHWH,
And Ehud died.

No metricist would recognize this line as poetry. But, in view of the wide variety of line-lengths within a single poem, the border between poetry and prose seems somewhat indistinct if the relative regularity of line-lengths (or colon-lengths) is taken as the standard, particularly in view of the fact that there are occasional passages of prose where lines of equal, or approximately equal, length may be found. However, even this relative regularity is not typical of prose. This may be established by a comparison of the prose and verse accounts of the battle against Sisera, found in consecutive chapters of the book of Judges. The following table compares the distributions of colon⁴ lengths in "The Song of Deborah" and in the prose version of this story.

⁴The use of the word "colon" in this context is admittedly questionable, as the term is usually reserved for the discussion of poetry. The lines in Judges 4 are not usually regarded as poetic. The term "colon" is used here to avoid the confusion which might arise from referring to the cola of "The Song of Deborah" as "lines," since this term has been regularly used in the present study to refer to units composed of one or more cola, including bicola and tricola.

TABLE 9 - 1

DISTRIBUTION OF COLON LENGTHS IN THE PROSE AND VERSE ACCOUNTS
OF THE BATTLE AGAINST SISERA

Judges 4 (Prose)		Judges 5 (Poetry)	
Syllables	Cola	Syllables	Cola
4	2		
5			
6	3	6	4
7	4	7	10
8	7	8	16
9	8	9	21
10	7	10	14
11	4	11	10
12	3	12	12
13	4	13	2
14	2	14	2
15	4	15	
16	1	16	1
17	4	17	1
18	4		
19	4		
20	1		
21	2		
22			
23	1		
24			
25	1		
26	2		
27			
28	1		
29	1		
30	1		
31			
32			
33	1		
n	72	n	93
μ	13.69	μ	9.59
σ	6.57	σ	2.12
median	12	median	9
mode	9	mode	9

Even the most cursory examination of these results will uncover striking differences between these two parallel accounts, the former commonly identified as prose, and the latter as poetry. Not only is the average colon in the prose version considerably longer, but the lengths of

the cola are much more widely distributed: the standard deviation of the colon lengths in the prose version of this story is more than three times as great as the standard deviation of the colon lengths in "The Song of Deborah." In addition, it should be noted that in the prose version, the mean, median and mode do not coincide, as they would if the writer were attempting (deliberately or sub-consciously) to maintain a standard line length, and as they do in fact in "The Song of Deborah." It must therefore be acknowledged in this case that minimal unit counting has uncovered a regularity of poetry which distinguishes it from prose: poetry is made up of cola of relatively fixed length, whereas the length of prose lines is much more variable. This feature appears to be consistently present in poetry, and is normally absent from prose. Thus, minimal unit counting does provide a useful and reasonably dependable criterion for the distinction of poetry and prose, even if this criterion is not absolute.

Poetry Defined by Line-Form Analysis

An entirely different criterion for the identification of poetry is suggested by the work of Terence Collins. For Collins, Hebrew poetry is marked by the use of identifiable line-forms, of which he has catalogued several hundred.⁵ But it must be asked whether, and to what extent, Collins' line-form analysis characterizes poetry in ways in which it does not also characterize prose. Collins has drawn his own conclusion:

On the basis of our study we can develop helpful criteria for determining what parts of the prophetic books are verse....if a text contains established line-forms, then it is verse.⁶

⁵See Appendix One.

⁶**Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 276. The emphasis is Collins' own.**

In fact, Collins asserts that his system describes only about two-fifths of all poetic lines in the Hebrew Bible. But a system purporting to distinguish poetry from prose is hardly credible if it also excludes more than 60 percent of the passages which are recognized as poetry.

Results on the analysis of the four poems under consideration in this study are marginally more encouraging. Of the 272 poetic lines (cola) in the present study, 128 (approximately 47.1 %) can be formed into bicola which correspond to line-forms identified and listed by Collins. An additional 66 cola can be formed into bicola whose line-forms are identifiable by Collins' system with the slight expansions of that system proposed in this study. Still, this gives a total of only 194 cola out of 272 (approximately 71.3 %). This is far less of the poetic corpus than might be expected of an adequate description of Hebrew poetry. In addition, results vary radically from one poem to another, as can be seen from the following table.

TABLE 9 - 2

POETIC COLA ADMISSIBLE TO COLLINS' LINE-FORM ANALYSIS

	JUD 5	ISA 5	LAM 1	PS 126	TOTAL
Total cola	93	31	134	14	272
Admissible to Collins' system	22	16	80	10	128
	23.7%	51.6%	59.7%	71.4%	47.1%
Admissible to expanded system	44	22	114	14	194
	47.3%	71.0%	85.1%	100%	71.3%

It may be noteworthy that there seems to be a direct inverse correlation between the age of the poem⁷ and the percentage of lines which can be analyzed under Collins' system. The number of poems in this study is too small to draw dependable conclusions on this point, but further study may be warranted. If this suggestion is substantiated by broader studies of

⁷This assumes the sequence of production of these four poems to be Judges 5, Isaiah 5, Lamentations 1 and Psalm 126. Though not unchallenged, this sequence is widely accepted.

Hebrew poetry, it may imply something about the development of the poetic art in Israel, i. e., that it became more standardized with the passage of time. This phenomenon (if it is more widely observable) may also be due to the fact that Collins did his studies on poetry in the books of the prophets. Although these books were produced over a period of several centuries, the period of their production nevertheless represents a fairly small proportion of the era of classical biblical poetry. It is quite possible that Collins' studies may thus be more representative of the way poetry was being written in a particular period, than of the form of biblical Hebrew poetry in general. Nevertheless, the exclusion from his system of more than half of the poetry of the Hebrew Bible must be seen as a major defect.

Furthermore, Hebrew narrative prose, with its typically brief clauses and pervasive parataxis, could often be construed in the same line forms which Collins has found in poetry -- at least to the level of forty percent, which is roughly the proportion of poetic lines which Collins claims will fit the line-forms which he has described.⁸ A brief example, taken from Isaiah 38:1, a verse which is indisputably prose, may be considered.

בְּיָמֵם הַהֵם חָלָה חֶזְקִיָּהוּ לְמוֹת נִבְּוֵא אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵיָהוּ בֶן-אָמוֹץ הַנְּבִיא
 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו כֹּה-אָמַר יְהוָה צוּ לְבֵיתְךָ
 כִּי מֵת אַתָּה וְלֹא תִחְיֶה

In those days Hezekiah became sick to death.
 And the prophet Isaiah son of Amoz came to him.
 And he said to him, "Thus says YHWH,
 Give orders concerning your house,
 For you will die
 And you will not live.

We may construe these lines as follows:

1. M + V + NP¹ + M - V + M + NP¹
2. V + M + NP² - V + M
3. V + NP¹ - V

⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 198.

Collins' taxonomy would classify these lines thus:

1. II B: i)33 var
2. III D: ii)2c
3. III A: i)2b

The first of these line-forms, though it is identifiable by Collins' system, has not been discovered by Collins in the poetic lines which he has considered. The other two are rare, the second having been found in only a single case, and the third existing in two examples in the corpus examined by Collins. The paucity of similar lines might be interpreted to mean that the passage in question must be prose, but there is no compelling reason for accepting this decision. On the basis of syntax alone, it could just as well be said that this is stylistically unusual poetry, consisting of rare, but not impossible, poetic lines. In any case, a system which purports to describe poetry and to distinguish it from prose is of dubious value if it is applicable to prose texts as well as to poetic ones. It should also be noted that the proposed extension of Collins' system to include a greater proportion of poetic lines would also increase the number of prose lines which could be identified by the system.

Poetry Defined by Syntactic Structural Analysis

Michael O'Connor's syntactic structural analysis suggests yet another means of identifying poetry. In O'Connor's view, the intuitively perceptible regularity of poetic lines is due, not to meter in the traditional sense, nor even to an attempt (deliberate or subconscious) to maintain a relatively uniform number of minimal units in a line, but to syntactic constraints.⁹ These constraints are limits (both maxima and minima) to the number of syntactic items which may occur in a poetic line. Having examined an extensive group of biblical poems, O'Connor shows that no

⁹Michael O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 65.

line in any of these poems violates any of the constraints he has defined. The present study identifies very few lines which violate these limits. Of the 272 poetic cola analyzed in this study, only six¹⁰ (approximately 2.2 %) do not correspond to the line classes which O'Connor has defined. For example, O'Connor has identified a constraint which specifies the maximum number of units per line as five. Lines as long as six units appear in the selected passages, such as the following line from Psalm 126:6:

הַלֹּךְ יֵלֵךְ וַיִּבְכֶּה נֶשֶׂא מְשֶׁךְ-הַזֶּרַע

Surely he walks and weeps, bearing a bag of seed.

To some degree, the discrepancy between the results of the present study, generated by using the methods of O'Connor, and the results of O'Connor's own studies may be due to a question of colometry: should this passage be scanned as a single long line (colon) or as two short lines?¹¹ Similar questions arise in the evaluation of theories other than those of O'Connor. Needless to say, there are many lines in Hebrew prose which violate the constraints identified by O'Connor. To cite again an example considered above, nearly half of the lines in the prose version of the battle against Sisera in Judges 4 violate one or more of O'Connor's constraints.¹² In this narrative there is no passage of more than four consecutive lines which comply with all of the constraints.

Not only does O'Connor show that, at least in the corpus of poetry which he has examined, the number of predications, constituents and units

¹⁰Judges 5:3a, 12c and 27c; Lamentations 1:7h; Psalm 126:6a and b.

¹¹The whole question of colometry has been explored by Oswald Loretz and Ingo Kottsieper in Colometry in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry: Introduction, Illustrations and Topical Bibliography (Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1987). Unfortunately their treatment of the issue is rather inadequate. Numerous rather significant assertions in this volume remain unproven, and a number of relevant questions are unaddressed.

¹²Of the 72 lines in this prose story, 35 contain more than 5 units, 4 constituents or three predications.

never exceeds or falls below the limits which he has stated, but he also indicates which classes of lines are most common in poetry and which are least common. O'Connor's inference from his study, that certain classes of lines are more common than certain others, is borne out in the present study. The precise ratio of line classes which he indicates is never closely matched in the four poems which have been examined here, but the distinction between the more common Class I lines and the less common "heavy" lines may be seen in all cases.

Furthermore, O'Connor has observed that heavy lines will tend to occur disproportionately at the beginning and end of a poem, and at crucial breaks within the poem. Syntactic structural analysis of the four trial passages, carried out according to principles propounded by O'Connor has produced results in at least some cases which can be compared positively with those which O'Connor himself has published for the extensive corpus of poetic passages which he has studied.¹³ In some passages under study the distribution of heavy lines, as O'Connor has defined them, occurs as he predicted. They tend to be concentrated at the beginnings and ends of poems, rather than in the middle. It is less clear that heavy lines will fall consistently at internal transitions in the poem, and the present study is unable to support O'Connor's view that the concentrations of heavy lines will divide the poems into batches of approximately seven lines and staves of approximately 28.

The present study has also not confirmed O'Connor's theories regarding the incidence of ornamentation. O'Connor believes that concentrations of heavy troping should occur at the beginning and end of a poem, and also at crucial junctures within the poem. In fact, the incidence

¹³O'Connor's sample was nothing if not thoroughly representative. He provides an exhaustive analysis of Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Numbers 23-24, Deuteronomy 32 and 33, Judges 5, II Samuel 1, Psalms 78, 106 and 107, Habakkuk 3 and Zephaniah 1-3.

of troping in the four poems examined in this study ranges from a maximum of 100 % in Psalm 126 to a minimum of 84 % in "The Song of Deborah." Heavy troping (defined as more than one trope operating on a line) occurs in almost 79 % of the lines in Psalm 126, and in more than 60% of the lines in "The Song of the Vineyard" and "The First Lament." Even in "The Song of Deborah," more than 34 % of the lines are heavily troped. It is hard to think of a phenomenon which is so nearly ubiquitous as a marker of critical junctures. In fact, though three of these poems do in fact begin and end with sequences of heavily troped lines, there are so many heavily troped lines, distributed so widely through the poems that it is difficult to see any pattern in them. In "The Song of Deborah," heavy troping cannot even be found at the beginning and end, though it marks more than a third of all lines in the poem. This poem begins with a sequence of seven singly-troped lines, and ends with two untroped lines. Overall, the present study does not reveal any significance in the occurrence of heavy troping.

Nevertheless O'Connor has found three related criteria for the distinction of poetry from prose: first, poems are made up lines subject to certain syntactic constraints, second, lines respecting certain more narrowly defined syntactic limits (i.e., Class I lines) will be more common than those which approach the broader limits of the constraints, and third, the permissible poetic lines will not be distributed randomly, but will fall into certain broadly predictable patterns. This certainly appears to be a more effective distinction of poetry and prose than that offered by Collins. Nevertheless, O'Connor's system falls short, though for a reason which is precisely the opposite of that cited against Collins. Whereas Collins fails to include all (or even the majority) of admittedly poetic lines within his system, O'Connor includes not only nearly all poetic lines, but also a great many lines which are indubitably prose. In the example previously cited, O'Connor's constriction eliminates only about half of all lines in the prose

narrative in Judges 4, allowing approximately 51.4 % of the lines in the narrative as admissible. While the relatively high incidence of inadmissible lines would imply that Judges 4 as a whole is not a poem, it would not eliminate the possibility that smaller poems were imbedded in the narrative.

In the absence of a traditional stichography, it is somewhat difficult to test O'Connor's constriction on prose. Nevertheless, there are Masoretic verses in prose passages which fall within the constriction. Genesis 6:8 may be taken as an example:

וַיִּחַם מֶלֶךְ הַשָּׁמַיִם בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה

And Noah found grace in the eyes of YHWH.

This line, with five units, four constituents and one predication, is a Class IV line by O'Connor's definition. And even though there are many Masoretic verses which contain far more than the allowable number of predications, constituents or units, it would be (hypothetically) possible to construe many of them as being made up of several lines permissible within O'Connor's constriction. I Samuel 8:21, a brief verse in a passage universally recognized as a prose narrative, may be taken as an example here:

וַיִּשְׁמַע שְׁמוּאֵל אֶת כָּל-דִּבְרֵי הָעָם וַיַּבְרִיחֵם בְּאָזְנוֹ יְהוָה

And Samuel heard all the words of the people,
And he reported them in the ear of YHWH

This verse is clearly made up of two lines or cola, each of which contains a single predication. The first colon contains three constituents and four units, making it a Class II line. The second colon contains two constituents and three units, making it a Class I line, the kind of line which, according to O'Connor, constitutes the basic stuff of poetry. But does this verse therefore constitute a poetic bicolon? Is the narrative in which it occurs to be regarded as a poem? This appears doubtful in the extreme.

In sum, it may be admitted that O'Connor's criterion for the distinction of poetry and prose is probably about as good as that provided by the minimal unit counters. It is useful and relatively dependable, at least for extensive passages, but it is not absolute, and cannot be employed on a line-by-line basis.

Poetry Defined by Semantic Strophic Analysis

The strophic analysis proposed by the scholars of the Kampen School does not offer a criterion for the distinction of poetry and prose. This distinction is, as always, assumed, but in this case no attempt is made to justify the assumption. The strophes and other poetic units are identified and described on semantic grounds alone, with the sole exception of the poetic verse, which is defined by the number of syntactic units it contains. This strophic analysis is equally suited to analyze much of the prose of the Hebrew Bible -- or of any other body of literature.

The Distinction of Poetry and Prose

It is apparent, then, that none of these theories of verse structure provides an entirely effective rule for distinguishing poetry from prose. All are too elastic to exclude many of the prose passages from the Hebrew Bible: all can analyze some passages which are indubitably prosaic just as effectively as they analyze poetry. In some cases they may rule out extreme examples, but the reader will be left with thousands of lines which cannot be conclusively shown not to be poetry, and many others which cannot be shown not to be prose. Collins' analysis of line-form has the additional disadvantage of failing to provide categories for many lines which are certainly poetic. Of the four, minimal unit counting and syntactic structural analysis seem to offer the most useful criteria for the distinction of poetry from prose, but even these are far from absolute.

The Unity of a Poem

How might a reader determine the unity of a poem? What indicator will signal whether a given passage is a single integral poem or a compilation of several poems? Biblical scholars are accustomed to speak of composite texts, and to treat them as possessing some sort of unity, despite their origins. It is quite possible for a text composed by several authors in different eras to have some thematic or literary unity, which may be attributed, at least in part, to the work of redactors. It is also entirely possible for a text written by one author at one time to lack poetic unity, that is, to consist of several disparate parts with varying forms of verse structure. The question of poetic unity does not necessarily address the issues of source criticism, but rather seeks to determine whether a given text, in its present form, possesses a uniform verse structure. Again, the four theories of verse structure suggest different means for the differentiation of poems.

Unity as Indicated by Minimal Unit Counting

There is considerable evidence from prior studies, substantiated in this study as well, that the average line lengths vary from one poem to another, and even that there are groups of poems in which the average line lengths are similar. Unfortunately, due to the wide variation in line lengths within a single poem, the occurrence of one line which is considerably shorter or longer than those in its immediate vicinity would not rule out the possibility that it was part of the same poem. For example, the bicolon in Judges 5:20 a,b contains 23 syllables, but is immediately preceded and followed by bicola of 17 and 16 syllables respectively. In contrast, the bicolon in Isaiah 5:3 c,d contains only 9 syllables, but is preceded and followed by bicola of 14 syllables. In neither case can the variation in line length be taken as presumptive evidence of corruption of

the text, much less of the conflation of two poems into one. Yet, as longer passages of poetry are examined, the reader may see distinct differences in average line lengths. Thus, juxtaposition of two passages in which the average line lengths differed significantly might be taken as evidence that the reader was seeing not one poem, but two consecutive poems. Further argument to this effect will be presented below, in the section of this chapter on the predictive value of the approaches.

Unity as indicated by Line-Form Analysis

Collins has not proposed specific methods for the differentiation of poems, though he does indicate that different biblical poets tended to prefer different general line-types and different basic sentences.¹⁴ The present study shows that these differences can be found between various poems. For example, "The Song of Deborah" uses the type-III line and the type-B basic sentence preferentially. More than 80 % of the identifiable bicola in this poem have one or the other or both of these characteristics.¹⁵ In contrast, in "The Song of the Vineyard," the type-III basic line is used only once, and more than eighty percent of the identifiable cola are either type-I or type-II. In this same poem, type-B basic sentences are used in approximately equal frequency with type-C and type D. Thus poems can be described and differentiated by the line-forms used. As in the case of minimal unit counting, it would not be possible to excise a single line because it used the wrong line-form: there is too much variation within any given poem to permit such simple decisions. There are tendencies to use certain line-forms, but these tendencies are never absolute. But it is

¹⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 194-201.

¹⁵Of the bicola in "The Song of Deborah" which can be identified by Collins' taxonomy, 23 % are type-III but not type-B, 23 % are type-B but not type-III and 36 % are both type-III and type-B.

possible that a fundamental shift in the rates of incidence of the various line-types and basic sentences in the middle of a long poetic passage could signal the change from one poem to another, or even from one poet to another.

Unity as Indicated by Syntactic Structural Analysis

O'Connor's system of syntactic structural analysis offers no clear means of distinguishing poems. His analysis of Hebrew poetry supposes that the various line classes will occur with approximately the same rates of incidence in any poem. The present study finds some differences in this respect between poems, but these are frequently not sufficiently marked to be able to make a clear distinction. O'Connor also suggests that the beginning, end and major points of transition within the poem (the beginnings and ends of staves and batches) will be marked by concentrations of heavy lines and concentrations of troping. The present study bears this out, especially with regard to the beginnings and ends of poems. It might be suggested that the occurrence of a concentration of heavy lines within a passage of poetry might indicate the end of one poem and the beginning of another. The difficulty with this is that O'Connor offers no way to distinguish between the termination of a poem and an internal transition. There are, for example, concentrations of heavy lines and heavy troping in Lamentations 1:10 and 1:12 which are just as striking as the concentration of heavy lines and heavy troping at the end of the poem in Lamentations 1:21 and 1:22. In this case, the presence of the alphabetic acrostic assures the reader that this is a single poem, and not two juxtaposed poems.

Unity as Indicated by Semantic Strophic Analysis

Of the four theories of verse structure considered in this study, the semantic strophic analysis proposed by scholars from the Kampen School is apparently the least adapted to the task of differentiating the form of

poems. The juxtaposition of two dissimilar poems might be inferred from a radical semantic disjunction within a poem. Yet, there are poems whose unity has not been seriously challenged, but where there are fairly significant semantic disjunctions. An example of this may be found in Psalm 126, where the first four verses describe the reversal of national fortunes (possibly in the return from the exile in Babylon), and the last two verses present an agricultural analogy whose correspondence to the first part of the poem is obscure at best.

The Separation of Poems

The use of the four theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure under consideration here to distinguish one poem from another does not yield encouraging results. Indeed, it appears that these theories are even less helpful in this endeavor than they were in the distinction of poetry from prose. Minimal unit counting and line-form analysis may offer some slight indications of the transition from one poem to another, or from one poet to another, but these indications are far from conclusive. Syntactic structural analysis and semantic strophic analysis offer even less.

Partition of the Text

Closely related to the distinction of poems is the issue of the division of a single poem into its constituent parts. There are a number of levels of division of the poetic text to be considered here. At the most basic level is the question of colometry, the division of a poem into lines or cola. In addition, longer units are sometimes detected and identified. As with the identification of poetry, colometry is often done quite subjectively. Unfortunately for this purpose, modern students of the Hebrew Bible lack the intuition of native speakers of biblical Hebrew. In the absence of fairly clear rules for the definition of a colon or line,

colometric judgements are always tentative. In addition to the means of identifying poetry, the various theories of verse structure which have been reviewed in this study also provide differing means for dividing the poetic text.

Colometry and Minimal Unit Counting

The variability of line lengths in Hebrew poetry has already been discussed. In those portions of the Hebrew Bible for which there is an old stichographic tradition¹⁶ there are poems in which the longest cola exceed the shortest by ratios greater than three to one. Given this elasticity, it is nearly impossible to make definitive colometric decisions in other parts of the Hebrew Bible on the basis of minimal unit counts. Occasionally it may be observed that some part of the text is too long to be a single line. Divisions of the text may be suggested on the basis that a certain undivided fragment would be too long for a single colon or a single line.¹⁷ Even in those passages where there is an old stichographic tradition, some passages may be detected as corrupt or altered simply because of the number of minimal units in a line. Nevertheless, because of the permissible variation in the lengths of cola and lines, minimal unit counting cannot be used to establish

¹⁶The Song of the Sea (Exodus 15), the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32), the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), the Song of David (II Samuel 22), the books of Psalms and Proverbs, Job 3:3 - 42:6 and Ecclesiastes 3:2-8. Although these traditions are probably not traceable to the era of the writers, they do originate in an era in which some people still treated classical Hebrew as a living language. Nevertheless, in the Song of Songs, a book which is unequivocally described as a song, the colometry of the poem is not indicated, and in the Lamentations, colometry must be deduced from the acrostic form. Since there is no reason to believe that this old stichographic tradition is original to the text it must therefore be regarded as tentative.

¹⁷For example, it is frequently noted that Lamentations 1:7 is too long to be only three bicola.

the colometry of the poetic text, and colometric decisions made on this basis must be regarded as quite tentative.

Colometric Issues in Line-Form Analysis

Various other criteria, including Collins' syntactic ones, may also be suggested to determine the colometry of Hebrew poetry. Again, modern scholars lack the intuition of the native speaker, and while there are old stichographic traditions for certain portions of the Hebrew Bible, there is no traditional colometry for the portion of the Hebrew Bible which Collins has selected for his study. Many portions of the prophetic books are represented colometrically in the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia but this colometric tradition is modern, academic and unsupported by the Masoretic Text;¹⁶ furthermore Collins explicitly denies dependence on these two editions.

...I do not wish to prejudice the issue by adopting in toto the line divisions of either BH³ or of B.H.Stutt. The verse-lines arrived at by this study may coincide with either of them or with both, or sometimes with neither.¹⁶

Furthermore, as with the distinction of prose and poetry, the colometric criteria which are implied by Collins are conclusions from the poetic line-forms which he has previously identified on other grounds. These criteria cannot be introduced at the beginning without falling into circularity of argumentation.

Debatable colometric decisions also affect Collins' taxonomy. Collins has divided line-type I B: i) into two categories, those which have the caesura after the first constituent, and those which place it after the

¹⁶Colometry in the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia is sometimes, but not always, supported by the Masoretic accents.

¹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 53.

second.²⁰ But no indication is given as to how the placement of the caesura is determined. Generally, Collins has left colometric questions unanswered and the issue of colometry is discussed only at the end of the book.²¹ The entire discussion of the phenomenon of Type-I lines is affected by this issue. Collins never explains how to distinguish between a Type-I bicolon and a monocolon. In brief, line-form analysis does not assist the reader in determining where a line begins and ends.

Colometry and O'Connor's Syntactic Structural Analysis

Although O'Connor's system is primarily syntactic, he defines the presupposed limits of a poetic line (or colon) in terms of the number of syllables, with a minimum of three and a maximum of twenty-one.²² The wide range of permissible line lengths is due, according to O'Connor, to the fact that Hebrew poetry has a constrictional basis, rather than a metrical one, that is, its poetic lines are determined by syntactic patterns, rather than by the number of minimal units.

O'Connor regularly avoids the circularity of using his constriction to establish the validity of a line. His departures from traditional colometry (in "The Song of Deborah," for example) are usually defended on text-critical or semantic grounds. Nevertheless, the presence in "The Song of Deborah" (as it is represented in the traditional stichography) of several lines which defy O'Connor's constraints²³ raises the suspicion that some of O'Connor's colometric decisions, if not overtly manipulated to favor

²⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 60.

²¹See T. Collins, Line-Forms, 274-276. The examples offered in this portion of the book are singularly unconvincing.

²²M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 149, 150.

²³Judges 5:3a, 12c and 27c.

the constriction which he proposed, are at least unduly fortuitous for his system. Nevertheless, O'Connor's constriction does offer some suggestions which might be useful for colometry. The limitations which he proposes (on the basis of his analysis of a large number of poems) for the maximum number of predications, constituents and units in a line might be used elsewhere to challenge lines which exceed these limits, even in cases where the number of minimal units does not exceed the customary range for a given poem.

Colometry and the Strophic Analysis of the Kampen School Group

Like the syntactic structural analysis of O'Connor, the semantic strophic analysis proposed by the Kampen School group also begins with poetic lines defined in terms of minimal units. In this case, the unit is the "foot," defined as a word of one to eight syllables containing at least one stressed syllable. In practice, words linked by a maqqeph are normally regarded as a single foot. The practitioners of strophic analysis have regularly accepted the traditional colometry, and rarely seem to emend the text. They thus avoid imposing their inferences on the text, but unfortunately also fail to provide the reader with a useful rule for identifying and delimiting poetic lines. But surprisingly, it is in fact the methods of de Moor and van der Meer which are most striking in addressing the question of the colometry of Psalm 126. Relying primarily on semantic analysis, with some consideration also being given to syntax, results obtained by this method indicate that the 44 "metrical feet"²⁴ of this poem can be assembled into 16 cola, which in turn form 8 "verses" (all of which are bicola). The 8 "verses" form 4 "strophes" (of unequal length), making up two "canticles." If this analysis is correct, Psalm 126:6a should be scanned as a "verse" (i.e., a bicolon), rather than as a single colon. On this point,

²⁴Excluding Psalm 126:1a, which is a superscription, and not part of the poem.

the methods of de Moor and van der Meer would confirm the results obtained by using O'Connor's method, in contradiction to traditional colometry.

General Conclusions on Colometry

Of all of the theories of verse structure examined in this study, only that of Collins fails to define the poetic line on the basis of the number of minimal units. Differing characteristics may be attributed by the various systems of analysis to the line thus defined, but none of these systems offers a secure rule for dividing a poetic text into lines. All of these systems assume the identification of the line: none provides a means of verifying the colometry of a passage other than the bald assertion that a given segment is too long to be a single colon. And all theories but semantic strophic analysis of the Kampen School group seem (in varying degrees) to risk affirming the consequent in their assertions about colometry.

Partition of Large Segments

Minimal unit counting does not offer clear suggestions on the partition of units larger than the poetic line. Some scholars who have counted minimal units have discussed not only the number of minimal units in an average line, but also the number of units in longer poetic passages, especially in the poem,²⁵ but no rule has been provided for dividing the poem into sections.

Collins indicates that similar line-forms will often occur in groups,²⁶ but he falls short of suggesting that these groups constitute stanzas. His closest approaches to the identification of units larger than

²⁵See, for example, David Noel Freedman, "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry," Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 51-76.

²⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 87.

the bicolon come in his analysis of selected passages near the end of the book.²⁷ Here he is able to cite two short passages -- Jeremiah 18:13-17 and Amos 9:1-4 -- in which bundles of lines sharing the same general line-type are set off by lines of another general line-type. He is apparently unable to find cases where specific line-types or line-forms are found in such bundles.

In contrast, both O'Connor and the scholars of the Kampen School group have placed considerable emphasis on the division of the poem into segments longer than the line. O'Connor identifies batches of approximately seven lines (i.e., cola) and staves of approximately 28 lines. The Kampen School group identify verses, strophes, canticles, sub-cantos and cantos, whose lengths vary within specified limits.

The methods of determining the boundaries of these segments of the poem differ radically, and correspond to the conceptual bases of the two systems. O'Connor identifies staves and batches primarily on the basis of the occurrence of concentrations of heavy (i.e., syntactically unusual) lines, but he also notes concentrations of heavy troping (which is frequently a semantic phenomenon). The Kampen School group identify the segments of a poem on the basis of semantic unity. Clearly, the phenomena on the basis of which these two theories would identify large divisions of the poem do occur. The present study detects both concentrations of heavy lines and semantic blocks in the poems which have been considered. It remains to be asked whether they are meaningful with regard to the verse structure, and whether they are original to the composition.

²⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 257-273.

The Problem of Non-Intersection

In contrast to the problem of colometry, where none of the theories offers a consistent rule for the partition of the text into cola, in this case, the verse structure theories of O'Connor and of the Kampen School group both offer methods of dividing the text into its constituent parts. But the two theories proceed from differing conceptual bases, and produce (not surprisingly) different results. Consequently, the segments of the text identified by the two theories will frequently not coincide. For example, the "batches" identified in Psalm 126 by the use of O'Connor's constrictional analysis do not conform to, and are not supported by the "strophes" and "canticles" which are indicated by the semantic structural analysis proposed by de Moor. On the contrary, the break between verses 2 and 3 of Psalm 126 which is indicated by the concentration of Class III and Class IV lines (as O'Connor would identify them) falls in the middle of a canticle, if the poem is divided according to de Moor's principles. The latter method would divide the poem after the end of verse 4. Thus, the divisions of the text which are indicated on the basis of the concentrations of heavy lines are not the same as those based on semantic unity. This has been observed in all of the poems which have been considered in this study, and it is clearest in the longer poems. Occasionally, a division of the text identified by one method will match a division indicated by another method, but these coincidences are relatively infrequent.

If there are indeed divisions within a poem, and if these divisions were deliberately or consciously created, or at least meaningful, it might be supposed that any valid method of analysis would identify the same divisions. Accordingly, the non-intersection of the partitions of the text indicated by syntactic structural analysis and semantic strophic analysis could raise doubts about both theories. If the two do not agree, it might

seem that they cannot both be correct; if one is incorrect, which one is it, and how can this be known?

Poetic Enjambment

Partly because of the wide-spread, though by no means ubiquitous, use of parallelism, Hebrew poetry tends to avoid enjambment, especially of the more violent types. A clause is sometimes spread over two lines; more rarely a phrase may be divided. It is almost unheard of for a clause to begin in mid-line and carry over to the next line. For this reason, a passage such as the following one, permissible in English, is virtually unknown in biblical Hebrew:

Margaret, are you grieving
Over Goldengrove unleaving?
Leaves like the things of man, you
With your fresh thoughts care for, can you?²⁸

Nevertheless, enjambment of some sorts does occur in Hebrew poetry. Wilfred G. E. Watson cites examples of single clauses spread over the two halves of a bicolon,²⁹ and all of the cases of Type-I lines discovered by Collins would fall into this same category.³⁰ Enjambment is essentially the non-intersection of partitions of the text produced by differing phenomena. In the English example above, the partition of the text indicated by meter³¹ and the partition indicated by syntax do not intersect. In the case of Collins' Type-I lines, the partition indicated by the meaning of the text

²⁸The first four lines of Gerard Manley Hopkins' "Spring and Fall," in The Poetical Works of Gerard Manley Hopkins, ed. Norman H. Mackenzie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 166-167.

²⁹Wilfred G. E. Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 334, 335. Watson cites the fourth bicolon of Lamentations 1:7 as an example of an enjambed bicolon.

³⁰See T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58-88.

³¹And by the original writer's stichography.

does not (always) coincide with that indicated by syntax. And if, as Watson and Collins show, such enjambment can occur at the level of the bicolon, there is no reason to doubt that it might occur at the level of larger segments as well. For this reason the non-intersection of the divisions of the text identified by syntactic structural analysis with the divisions identified by semantic strophic analysis might not pose a serious objection to either method, and the question of the significance of this non-intersection remains unanswered.

Can Poems be Distinguished?

Part of the process of describing a poem goes beyond merely telling what is present to indicate also the ways in which a given poem differs from others. Because of their differing methodological bases, the four theories of Hebrew verse structure which have been examined in this study tend to distinguish poems by differing criteria. The results of this study seem to indicate that some of the proposed theories are of more value than others in distinguishing poems and groups of poems.

Minimal unit counting theories distinguish poems on the basis of the number (or average number) of minimal units per line. Occasionally, poetic segments larger than the line are also measured by the number of minimal units. Freedman's analysis of "The First Lament," and similar analyses of the other trial passages seem to indicate certain regularities of average length of the cola and bicola which cannot logically be attributed to other causes than an attempt (whether deliberate or subconscious) to maintain regular line lengths.³² These conclusions are also borne out by the present

³²David Noel Freedman, "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry," 69-70. Freedman compares four alphabetic acrostic poems, Lamentations 5, Proverbs 31, Psalm 25 and Psalm 34, whose lengths are 362, 360, 362 and 351 syllables, respectively, and concludes on page 70, "The correspondence among the first four columns is so close that we are justified in speaking of at least one

study. For example, it is possible to compare "The Song of Deborah," which averages more than nineteen syllables per bicolon, with "The First Lament," in which the average bicolon is only about thirteen syllables in length. It is noteworthy that the differences in the average line lengths of these two poems are not merely global phenomena, but are maintained throughout the poem. If each of the poems is divided into segments of six bicola³³ it will be found that the average length of bicola within these six-line segments of "The Song of Deborah" never exceeds 21.5, and is never less than 17.67. The same procedure is performed on "The First Lament" will show no six-line segment where the average length of bicola is less than 12.17 or more than 14.5. In other words, the tendency to write lines of a certain length is observed throughout each of the poems.

In the same way, it has already been noted that a distinction may be made, on the basis of minimal unit counting, between the relationship of the first and second cola of bicola in "The First Lament," and the first and second cola of bicola in "The Song of the Vineyard." "The First Lament" is made up primarily of short lines, which are usually produced by the truncation of the second half of the bicolon, with the result that the average length of the second colon is less than the average length of the first colon. However (apparently in order to maintain relative uniformity of line length), the longer the first colon, the shorter the second will be, and the shorter the first colon, the longer the second. In "The Song of the Vineyard" there is also a difference in the average length of the first and second cola of bicola. But although the lines in this poem also tend (on average) to have the first cola longer than the second, the relation between the cola is different. In this case, the two cola tend to parallel each other

normative line length for alphabetic acrostics."

³³Since "The Song of Deborah" contains a number of lines which are not bicola, these lines are omitted from consideration here.

in their variations from their respective norms: the longer the first colon, the longer the second; the shorter the first, the shorter the second.

Thus minimal unit counting may be used to distinguish poems. And, in fact, minimal unit counting has frequently been used for such purposes. The other theories of verse structure examined in this study are less frequently used in this fashion.

Collins has made a very limited attempt to compare a few poems from the Hebrew Bible on the basis of the line-forms which seem to be used preferentially in the poems. This has been done somewhat hesitantly with Isaiah 49:1-4,³⁴ Jeremiah 18:13-17,³⁵ Amos 9:1-4,³⁶ Hosea 2:4-11,³⁷ Ezekiel 27:25-32³⁸ and Ezekiel 19:1-9.³⁹ In these studies, Collins has been able to identify some patterns of general line-types and basic sentences. He has also shown that the various biblical poets seem to prefer certain general line-types and basic sentences.⁴⁰ For example, Micah uses (proportionally) far more Type-III lines than any of the other prophets.

The present study also detects a difference between poems in the frequency of the use of the various general line-types and basic sentences. "The Song of Deborah," for example, uses the Type-III line and the Type-B basic sentence very preferentially. On the other hand, "The Song of the Vineyard" uses Type-I and Type-II lines almost exclusively and the Type-B, Type-C and Type-D lines in approximately equal numbers.

³⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 258-259.

³⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 260-261.

³⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 262-265.

³⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 265-267.

³⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 268-271.

³⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 271-273.

⁴⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 195 ff.

There are, however, two difficulties with the attempt to draw inferences from these facts. In the first place, as has already been noted repeatedly, Collins' taxonomy of line-forms covers fewer than half of all poetic lines. The statement that a certain poem seems to use a disproportionate number of (for example) Type-B basic sentences is subject to doubt when there are more unidentified line-forms in the poem than those which have been identified. It is always possible that if Collins' system were to be extended to cover the great majority of lines, it would be discovered that the majority of sentences in the poem under study might be found to be Type-C or Type-D, or even some type not yet named. Furthermore, it may be asked whether the differentiation of poems on this basis is really identifying different forms of poetry, or merely different styles. It may be argued seriously in the case of minimal unit counting that the distinction between the line-lengths in "The Song of Deborah" and "The First Lament" is not merely a matter of style, particularly in view of the fact that there are a number of other poems, apparently produced by disparate writers, which seem to correspond to the same pattern as "The First Lament." Such a claim cannot be made as confidently for line-form analysis.

Syntactic structural analysis could be used to differentiate poems on the basis of the relative incidence of line classes and on the length of internal intervals identified by means of the concentrations of heavy lines. The four poems considered in this study may be compared in the following table:

TABLE 9 - 3

INCIDENCE OF SYNTACTIC LINE CLASSES
IN THE FOUR POEMS CONSIDERED IN THIS STUDY

LINE CLASS	JUDGES 5	ISAIAH 5	LAMENTATIONS 1	PSALM 126
Class I	36 (38.7 %)	16 (51.6 %)	97 (72.4 %)	7 (50.0 %)
Class II	17 (18.3 %)	3 (9.7 %)	12 (9.0 %)	1 (7.1 %)
Class III	17 (18.3 %)	7 (22.6 %)	21 (15.7 %)	2 (14.3 %)
Class IV	20 (21.5 %)	5 (16.1 %)	3 (2.2 %)	2 (14.3 %)
Unclassifiable	3 (3.2 %)	0	1 (.7 %)	2 (14.3 %)

In this case it may be noted that Lamentations 1 contains far more Class I lines than any of the other poems. The reduction of the proportion of Class I lines is compensated in Judges 5 by an increase in the proportion of Class II and Class IV lines. In Isaiah the increase is in Class III and Class IV. Psalm 126 must be described more cautiously because of its size, but here the lowered number of Class I lines is compensated by an increase in Class IV lines and unclassifiable lines. It should be noted that O'Connor finds considerably less variation in the distribution of line classes between one poem and another than was found in this study. It may be at least partly for this reason that O'Connor makes very little attempt to differentiate the poems which he has studied. Again, as with the line-form analysis proposed by Collins, it may be asked whether the differentiation made here is between various forms of poetry, or is merely a question of style.

The scholars of the Kampen School who have used the system of semantic strophic analysis described in this study have made no attempt to distinguish poems on the basis of their system of analysis. Presumably this might be done on the basis of the relative or absolute length of the internal segments of a poem, or on the basis of the arrangement or the relation of

these segments to each other, but this would require some system for specifying these relationships. No such system has yet been proposed for the analysis of biblical Hebrew poetry.

PREDICTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES

It has been seen that the four approaches considered in this study have some descriptive value, at least in enabling the reader to distinguish poems. But description is a far easier task than prediction. It must also be asked whether any of these theories of verse structure could be used to predict the form of a poem. In particular, can any of these theories inform the reader well enough to enable the detection of an addition to the text, a corruption of the text, or a lacuna, or to describe any aspect of the form of a lacuna, were one to be detected? Further, could any of these theories predict the form of another poem of the same kind?

It must be noted that this is easier to do with some kinds of poetry than with others. Anyone who has examined four or five Shakespearian sonnets could predict something of the form of another. In particular, it would be possible to know the number of lines, the number of minimal units (both syllables and stresses) in each line, and the patterns of the rhymes. By contrast, exposure to forty or fifty of Walt Whitman's poems would not provide enough evidence to enable the reader to predict anything about the forty-first (or fifty-first), except that it would be written in English.⁴¹ For this reason, it must be recognized that the question of the predictive value of the systems under study resolves into two sub-questions. First, is biblical Hebrew poetry at all predictable? Second, is it predictable on the basis of the descriptions generated by the four theories under consideration here?

⁴¹Probably.

It must also be noted that this predictability might take place at different levels. On the one hand, it might be asked whether individual lines might be predicted.⁴² On the other hand, it might be asked if major portions of a poem could be predicted. Since prediction is the art of knowing what should be there, the predictability of a poem and the predictive value of a theory of verse structure can be demonstrated in the ability to detect a lacuna and to predict the form of a lacuna, once it is detected. Prediction can also be demonstrated by the detection of an anomalous insertion in the text of a poem. These two operations -- detection and description of lacunae and insertions -- will serve as indices of the predictive value of the four theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure under consideration here.

The Predictive Effectiveness of Minimal Unit Counting

A system for the analysis of Hebrew verse structure which is focussed solely on the length of lines can hardly be employed to detect a lacuna, unless this lacuna is shorter than the line. Even in the case of a very brief lacuna, the variability of line lengths in Hebrew poetry makes it doubtful whether a determination can be made, purely on the basis of minimal unit counting, between a line of normal length from which a few syllables have been omitted, and an unusually (but permissibly) short line. Since minimal unit counting is usually restricted to the lengths of lines, the omission of several lines would not be detectable by this method. In those cases where Freedman has noted relatively uniform lengths for whole poems, the number of lines in the poem is determined by an alphabetic acrostic or by some other factor extrinsic to the minimal unit counts.

Thus, minimal unit counting cannot reliably determine that there is a lacuna, nor offer more than a rough estimate of the number of minimal units

⁴²As they might in a Shakespearian sonnet.

omitted, were a lacuna to be detected by other means. Nevertheless, as the number of missing lines increases, the estimate of the number of minimal units omitted may become proportionately more accurate, due to the fact that variations from the average line length will tend to cancel each other out. For example, in Lamentations 1, the mean number of syllables per line (i.e., bicolon) is about 13.2; the standard deviation is 1.69, or approximately 12.8 % of the mean. The mean number of syllables per Masoretic verse (that is, in each six consecutive cola⁴³) is 39.95; the standard deviation is 4.23, or a little more than 10.5 % of the mean. The mean number of syllables in three consecutive Masoretic verses (normally eighteen cola) is 120.05; the standard deviation is 6.32, or slightly more than 5.25 % of the mean. The mean number of syllables in six consecutive Masoretic verses (normally 36 cola) is 239.88; the standard deviation is 8.96, or slightly less than 3.75 % of the mean. Thus, as the length of the segment increases, the number of minimal units contained may be estimated with increasingly greater accuracy, provided that the number of lines is known, or may be determined, as in the case of an alphabetic acrostic such as "The First Lament." Thus minimal unit counting might enable the reader to predict something about the form of a lacuna, provided that some other information about the lacuna was known.

On the same basis, it might be possible to detect an anomalous insertion in a poem: any extensive passage which differed radically from the rest of the poem in the average length of cola would be suspect. Such a method would be of doubtful use when applied to a single line or to a few scattered lines, but (for example) a series of ten or fifteen lines whose average length was 18 syllables in the middle of a poem where the average colon length

⁴³Eight cola, in the case of Lamentations 1:7.

(excluding the ten or fifteen lines just mentioned) was 13 syllables might be identified as foreign to the poem.

Not only could minimal unit counting help the reader in some cases to predict the form of a lacuna, but from Freedman's studies of alphabetic acrostics in the Hebrew Bible it might also be possible to infer that mean line lengths are so nearly standardized for at least two groups of these acrostic poems that it would be possible to predict the number of minimal units in one of these on the basis of inferences from the others, with a reasonably small margin of error.⁴⁴ Thus, in a few cases, minimal unit counting of a group of similar poems might enable the reader to predict something about another poem of the same type.

It should be recognized in all of these cases -- the description of lacunae and the prediction of the form of a poem or an insertion -- the predictions made would be very imprecise and quite tentative, and would be limited to the probable number of minimal units involved.

The Predictive Effectiveness of Line-Form Analysis

The possibility of detecting a lacuna through the use of Collins' line-form analysis is even slimmer than with minimal unit counting. Collins asserts that groups of similar line forms tend to be used together, and even presents instances in which this can be seen to be true.⁴⁵ The present study also reveals some such instances: for example, six of the first nine bicola of "The Song of Deborah" are Type-III lines, and all but one of these are Type-III B. Similarly, "The First Lament" contains several groups of three

⁴⁴David Noel Freedman, "Prolegomenon" in The Forms of Hebrew Poetry by George Buchanan Gray (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), xxxviii-xxxix.

⁴⁵See, e.g., T. Collins, Line-Forms, 260.

consecutive bicola of the same general line type,⁴⁶ two of which are entirely made up of sentences of the same basic sentence type.⁴⁷ Only one of these corresponds to a Masoretic verse. There is also a series of five bicola which alternate general line-types I and IV.⁴⁸ Such groups are interesting, but they hardly establish a rule by which one might predict the form of a similar poem or identify (much less restore) a lacuna in one. Just as the majority of poetic lines cannot even be identified by Collins' system of line-form analysis, so also the majority of poetic passages do not contain any recognizable patterns of line-forms, and even the patterns which are detected occur so rarely that one is tempted to suppose that they are as illusory and accidental as faces in the clouds.

Nevertheless, because of the tendency of writers to use particular basic sentence or line-types preferentially, it is conceivable that a lengthy insertion might be detected by the basic sentences or line-types which were used in it. This could only be done if the basic sentences or line-types in the insertion were consistently different than those in the primary poem, and if both the poem and the insertion were among those poetic passages where there is a very clear preference for one basic sentence or general line-type. Even were this the case, the inferences made would have to be regarded as rather hypothetical.

The Predictive Effectiveness of Syntactic Structural Analysis

O'Connor's claims regarding his system might imply the possibility of detecting a lacuna in certain circumstances. If O'Connor is right -- and he seems to be -- in claiming that poems tend to begin and end with

⁴⁶Lamentations 1:1a-f; 2c-3b; 5c-6b; 6e-7d.

⁴⁷Lamentations 1:1a-f; 2c-3b.

⁴⁸Lamentations 1:18c-19f.

concentrations of heavy lines and heavy troping, then a poem which began or ended without such indicators could be suspected as truncated or mutilated. And if O'Connor is right -- and here the evidence in the present study is far less supportive -- in his claim that similar concentrations of heavy lines and heavy troping should occur at intervals to divide Hebrew poems into staves of approximately 28 lines and batches of approximately 7 lines, then poems in which such concentrations of highly stylized lines did not occur at such intervals might also be suspected of corruption.

In fact, although concentrations of heavy lines are found at the beginning and end of all of the poems examined in this study, with the exception of the shortest, Psalm 126, which ends with a group of heavy lines, but begins with only a single heavy line,⁴⁹ the presence of intermediate concentrations of such lines (and concentrations of heavy troping) is much less systematic. Even O'Connor's own studies allow for a considerable variation in the lengths of the staves. He admits staves of from 23 to 31 lines in length, as well as semi-staves of 11 to 14 lines and irregular staves of 18, 21 and 22 lines.⁵⁰ O'Connor discovered 78 % of the 50 staves which he identified to fall within the standard range of 23 to 31 lines, and 50 % to fall within the mean range of 26 to 29 lines. Except for the semi-staves, only four did not fall within the standard range. Even greater variation than this is indicated by the present study, with staves ranging from 12 to 36 lines. Two of these are semi-staves⁵¹ and three others lie outside

⁴⁹If the scribal superscription of Psalm 126:1a, שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלֹת, were to be included in the analysis of the poem, then even Psalm 126 begins with a concentration of heavy lines. Such a procedure would seem, however, to distort the definition of a poem.

⁵⁰H. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 527-528.

⁵¹Psalm 126 (14 lines) and Lamentations 1:11,12 (12 lines).

O'Connor's standard range.⁵² Of the eleven staves identified in this study, only six fall within the standard range, and only one of these⁵³ falls within the narrower mean range. It should be noted immediately that these staves have been identified by the strict application of O'Connor's system of syntactic structural analysis in the case of all poems except "The Song of Deborah," where O'Connor's own indications have been followed.

Thus, while syntactic structural analysis might aid the reader in detecting initial or final lacunae, lacunae within the poem could not be identified dependably. But were a lacuna to be detected by other means, could syntactic structural analysis assist the reader in predicting the form of the lacuna? To a very limited degree, the grammatical complexity of the lines might be predicted: it could be anticipated that the lines of the lacuna would probably not violate the constraints proposed by O'Connor.⁵⁴ But if the lacuna was initial or final, one could not expect to find a large number of Class I lines; on the contrary, rarer line classes might tend to predominate. In any case, the number of lines in the lacuna could not be predicted, and if the four poems considered in the present study are indicative, the level of troping could not be reliably predicted either.

Regarding the prediction of the form of an unknown poem, only the broadest indications could be made. Given the inferences possible from the application of this theory of verse structure to the four poems considered here, it may be said that a Hebrew poem will probably be made up mostly of Class I lines, that the proportion of such lines may range from about 40 % to about 70 %. Furthermore, the non-class-I lines in the poem will tend to be

⁵²Judges 5:17-23 (21 lines), Lamentations 1:1-6 (36 lines) and Lamentations 1:17-22 (36 lines).

⁵³Lamentations 1:7-10 (26 lines).

⁵⁴The present study has identified a small number of poetic cola, fewer than three percent of the total, which violate O'Connor's constraints.

concentrated at the beginning and end of the poem, and in short passages between so as to divide the poem into shorter intervals (staves), ranging in length from about 12 lines to about 36 lines. Most of these staves will have lengths of 20 to 30 lines. Beyond this, prediction appears impossible.

The Predictive Effectiveness Semantic Strophic Analysis

Detection of lacunae through semantic strophic analysis would be a highly tentative process at best. It might happen that successive poetic segments, whether strophes, canticles, sub-cantos or cantos would appear semantically discontinuous. An issue raised in one segment and not subsequently resolved, an answer without a question, a gap in logic, might signal a lacuna. But the length and character of such a lacuna would remain an open issue. Restoration of the lacuna by means of semantic strophic analysis would be impracticable.

For the same reasons, precise prediction of the form of another Hebrew poem would be utterly impossible, even were the reader reliably informed that the unknown poem was of a similar character to known poems. Such a prediction could hardly be more precise than the conclusions which may be inferred from form criticism.

The Possibility of Prediction

It is clear that the predictive potential of the four theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure considered here is rather slight. Only the theory of O'Connor has the potential of detecting a lacuna, and that only most tentatively. Minimal unit counting and line-form analysis might tell a little about a lacuna, were one to be identified reliably by other means. Nor could any of the four theories predict the form of an unknown poem on the basis of known poems, beyond the barest general description.

THE PRESCRIPTIVE VALUE OF THE APPROACHES

Can the Mind of the Poet Be Known?

There have been poetic traditions in which specific rules were consciously observed. In many cases these rules have been recorded explicitly by the poets themselves, or by their contemporaries. There are other traditions of poetry in which rules are much less rigid and may in many cases be purely intuitive. Traditional poets may learn by observation and practice what sounds right and what does not, even though neither they, their fellow poets nor their primary audience may be able to state formal rules by which poetry ought to be written. Even in languages and cultures where a poetic tradition has been formalized, there may be poets who compose their works intuitively, either because they are not technically trained in the prevailing poetic tradition, or because they are so thoroughly immersed in it that they do not need to consult the rules. In some cases poets deliberately disregard the rules.

Given the variety of approaches to the formalization of poetry, in the absence of clear statements by the poets themselves, it is quite difficult to make definitive assertions about the rules followed by the poets, or about the objectives pursued in the composition of a poem. And unless the poets' contemporaries have commented on the principles of poetry in contexts which assure the reader that the poet could conceivably been aware of such principles, definitive assertions become almost impossible. Unfortunately, there are no such statements, either from the poets of the Hebrew Bible, or from their contemporaries. Although there are many references to the writing and performance of songs, there are no references to the writing of poetry. Indeed, the very concept of "poetry" seems to be unobserved in the Hebrew Bible. Although there are many passages of the Hebrew Bible which modern readers may regard as poetry, there are no treatises in the Bible or from any contemporary source which inform the reader how poetry was written.

This leads one to suspect that the rules for biblical poetry, if such existed, were intuitive rather than formal, and were probably followed rather loosely. Accordingly, the search for prescriptive rules for the poetry of the Hebrew Bible, is not a quest for anything like the precise (and deliberately executed) meters of Greco-Roman poetry. What is sought here is some principle, or set of principles by which the poet might have been guided more or less subconsciously. These rules should be reasonably flexible. They should be simple concepts, expressible in simple terms. In no case will an attempt be made to prove that such simple flexible rules have actually been employed deliberately or intuitively by the Hebrew poets. Indeed, such proof would be impossible. Yet it is possible to show the plausibility of using such rules and it is possible to say whether, if such rules were employed by the poets, the results obtained would be those discussed by the various theories of verse structure.

Prescriptive Principles in Minimal Unit Counting

It is not difficult to write poetry in lines of standardized length, as determined by the number of minimal units in the line. Great poets have done it, as have any number of very mediocre poets. To take a simple example, relatively uninformed people have written limericks, maintaining the requisite pattern of minimal units (three stresses in the first, second and fifth lines, two stresses in the third and fourth lines), as well as the rhyme pattern associated with this verse form. What would constitute a considerably greater mental feat would be to write lines which consistently maintain a given average length. And yet, as the present study shows, there are poems in the Hebrew Bible in which a certain average length is approximated fairly closely throughout the poem. Freedman has even shown that there are groups of poems which tend to maintain the same average line lengths. What simple, short, flexible rules, applied intuitively, could

have produced these phenomena? What rules could have produced the poems examined in this study? Clearly, these rules would vary from one poem to another, but the following are examples of rules which could have helped to form the poems considered here.

"Write short lines." This rule, simple enough to be employed subconsciously, could help form the lines of "The First Lament," in which the bicola, averaging only a little more than 13 syllables per line, are regularly shorter than the lines of "The Song of the Vineyard" (about 16.5 syllables per bicolon) and "When YHWH Restored Zion's Fortunes" (about 17 syllables per bicolon).

"Write long lines." This rule could help form the lines of "The Song of Deborah," in which the average line is nearly 19 syllables in length. It should be noted, that the present study has not verified the lengths of poetic lines other than bicola, except for the observation that the average length of all cola in "The Song of Deborah" is almost 9.6 syllables, considerably longer than the averages for the lengths of all cola in "The Song of the Vineyard" (8.2 syllables), "The First Lament" (6.6 syllables) and "When YHWH Restored Zion's Fortunes" (8.5 syllables).

"Write balanced two-part lines." In "The Song of Deborah," 70 of the 93 cola can be grouped into bicola, which have an average of 9.5 syllables in the first colon of a bicolon, and 10.0 syllables in the second. The average difference in length between the first and second halves of the bicola is 1.83. None of the other poems considered comes close to this balance between the two halves of the bicolon. In "The Song of the Vineyard," the first cola average 9.1 syllables, the second 7.3, and the average difference between the first and second halves of the bicola is 2. In "The First Lament," the first and second cola of bicola average 7.3 and 5.8 syllables, respectively and the average difference between the first and second halves of the bicola is 2.06. In "When YHWH Restored Zion's Fortunes," the averages are 9.1 for

first cola and 7.9 for second cola, and the average difference between the first and second halves of the bicola is 2.14. In fact, in view of the large number of cola which cannot be associated into bicola, and the fact that the difference of the averages of the first and second cola in "The Song of Deborah" is so much lower than the average of the differences between first and second cola, it might be more precise to state this rule as, "Write cola of (relatively) uniform length."

"Write two-part lines in which the second half is shorter than the first." At first glance, this might seem to apply to all of the poems except "The Song of Deborah." However, as has been noted above, the lines in "The First Lament" seem to be formed by the rule "Write short lines." The difference in length between first and second cola seems to be a consequence of the truncation of the line. However, in "The Song of the Vineyard" and "When YHWH Restored Zion's Fortunes," there appears to be a relatively consistent tendency for the second half of the bicolon to be shorter than the first..

Prescriptive Principles in Line-Form Analysis

A different set of rules for the composition of poems could be formulated using the principles of line-form analysis. Collins' theories would imply a basic rule, "Use accepted poetic line-forms." But such a rule must be suggested quite tentatively, in view of the large number of poetic lines not described in Collins' taxonomy and the fact that specific arrangements of line-forms⁵⁵ occur so seldom that it may be assumed that their occurrence is more or less accidental. Furthermore, the system of taxonomy is so complex that even the reader needs an index of specific line-

⁵⁵Such as the alternation of general line-types I and IV which Collins finds in Amos 9:3. See T. Collins, Line-Forms, 262.

forms⁵⁶ to keep track of all the forms. This index would have to be several times longer if the taxonomy were to include all poetic lines which occur in the Bible, and longer yet if it were to include all plausible poetic lines. It would be a daunting task for the poet to learn and use such an index for the selection of line-forms and the composition of lines. Furthermore, the index itself and the organization of the line-forms within it depend on principles of grammatical theories which were not formulated until the twentieth century.

Yet, bundles of similar lines occur together more frequently than such groups could be explained purely by the laws of probability, and certain poets seem to prefer certain types of lines.⁵⁷ This study has also shown that specific poems differ from each other in the basic sentences and general line-types which are used preferentially. What rules could generate these phenomena?

"Write another line similar (in grammatical structure) to the last one." Such a rule might explain the series of five III B line-forms found in Judges 5:3b-7c, the three consecutive I B i) line-forms in Lamentations 1:1 and the three consecutive III B i) line-forms in Lamentations 1:2c-3b.

"Write another line similar (in grammatical structure) to some of those already written." This may help explain the preference for type III B lines seen in "The Song of Deborah," and the large numbers of I B, I D and III D lines found in "The First Lament."

Prescriptive Principles in Syntactic Structural Analysis

Just as it would be virtually impossible for the poet to memorize an index of Collins' line-forms, so also it would be difficult and cumbersome

⁵⁶Such as that provided in Appendix 1.

⁵⁷See T. Collins, Line-Forms, 195.

for the poet to learn and consult the matrix of O'Connor's line classes. Even more demanding would be the task of selecting grammatical arrangements differentially from the matrix in order to maintain certain proportions of lines from the various classes. Again, as with line-form analysis, the entire enterprise would also be based on a twentieth-century understanding of grammar, and would therefore have been inaccessible to the poets of the first millennium B.C.E. Despite these facts, it may be observed, not only in the extensive collection of biblical poems examined by O'Connor, but also in the four poems considered in this study, that poetic lines are indeed normally chosen from among those permitted by O'Connor's constriction and differentially selected from the various line classes. In particular, there is a preference for Class I lines. Heavy lines are used, but they tend to occur disproportionately at the beginning and end of poems. What simple, flexible rules could have been used intuitively by the biblical poets to produce these results?

"Write (most of the poem) in simple lines, saying one thing about one subject." Such a rule would produce lines with a simple subject and a relatively simple predicate. Such lines would contain a single predication, two constituents and two or three units, or perhaps three constituents and three units. Such lines are identified by O'Connor as Class I. More rarely (if construct phrases occurred in the subject or object, for example) this rule might produce sentences with more units, and lines with a single predication, two or three constituents, and four units might occur. Such lines would be identified by O'Connor as Class II or III. Verb gapping would result in other Class II and Class III lines, as would double predication. This rule would explain the majority of the lines encountered in the four poems examined in this study.

"Write 'fancier' (i.e., more complex) lines at the beginning and end of the poem (and possibly at crucial junctures within the poem)." Lines with

more predications and with compound subjects or objects, lines with extended verbal modifiers, and long lines without predication would be identified by O'Connor as Class III and Class IV. In fact, all lines with three predications are Class IV lines. Such lines do occur disproportionately at the beginning and end of the poems examined in this study.

Prescriptive Principles in Semantic Strophic Analysis

Semantic strophic analysis is probably the least productive theory from the perspective of prescription. This theory describes poems, but the descriptions are unique, and tend to contain few common elements. From the consideration of the four poems examined here, one might derive, as an intuitive rule for writing poetry, "Don't carry a single thought too long." This is, admittedly, a highly subjective rule, and subject to some doubt in view of such biblical poems as Psalms 119 and 136, where a single idea seem to be belabored extensively.

A Summary of Prescriptive Rules

Several facts about the prescriptive rules indicated above will not go unnoticed. First, since it is assumed that any rules for the composition of biblical Hebrew poetry must have been used intuitively, all of the rules given here are quite general. Furthermore, this is unavoidable, given the body of data available to modern scholarship. Second, none of these rules would produce a poem like those of the Hebrew Bible; all of these rules taken together would not produce a poem.⁵⁴ Indeed, all of these rules taken together would not give as much guidance to a would-be poet as is available in

⁵⁴It is equally true that all of the rules about rhyme and meter for English poetry (for example) could not generate an English poem. Yet these rules for English poetry could determine some aspects of the poem with reasonable precision. The rules formulated thus far for biblical Hebrew poetry appear considerably less precise.

many other poetic traditions. Third, it is clear that in order to produce a poem, several of these rules would have to be used simultaneously, together with other principles not expressed by any of these rules. Finally, it is clear that the concepts behind some of these rules are implemented more frequently than others. In general, the rules produced from minimal unit counting, and from the syntactic structural analysis of O'Connor seem to embody principles which are implemented more consistently than the rules derived from the theories of Collins and the Kampen School group.

SUMMARY

As the four theories of Hebrew verse structure have been applied to the tasks of description, prediction and prescription, it has become apparent that some of them are more effective than others. Briefly, it seems that minimal unit counting is of some help in description and prescription, but only marginally useful for prediction; line-form analysis has some usefulness for description, but very little for prediction or prescription; syntactic structural analysis (like minimal unit counting) is useful for description and prediction, but of slight help in prediction; semantic strophic analysis appears to be of little use in any of these tasks. If these tasks represent reasonable expectations for an adequate theory of biblical Hebrew verse structure, then minimal unit counting and syntactic structural analysis may be regarded as qualified successes, and line-form analysis and semantic strophic analysis as qualified failures. None of them is entirely useless, but for these three tasks, only the former two are apparently effective.

CHAPTER TEN

POETICALNESS AND THE FOUR THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE

Having examined the effectiveness of the four theories of verse structure, and having discovered what these theories can and cannot do, it remains to be discovered what they have omitted, that has resulted in their failures. It is now possible to turn to general questions of Hebrew poetry and to explore both the ways in which the four theories of Hebrew verse structure considered in this study have contributed to an adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure, and some of the gaps that remain in such an explanation.

WHAT IS POETRY?

One of the more unfortunate characteristics of much study of the literature of the Bible is that such study has frequently been done in isolation from parallel studies of other literature. This may be in part a consequence of a traditional attitude of Jewish and Christian scholars toward the works which they regard as sacred Scripture. Closely connected with this attitude is the fact that many scholars of the Bible have received their initial training in theology, rather than in literature, and have frequently continued to regard this book extensively or even primarily as a religious resource, to be studied for religious purposes, often to the virtual exclusion of any other. The result is that many theorists of Hebrew verse structure betray little if any knowledge of more general studies of poetry. This problem has been somewhat alleviated with the publication of the works by O'Connor and Berlin mentioned elsewhere in this study. Nevertheless, general studies of poetry and studies of biblical poetry are still only occasionally contiguous.

Recurrence and Intersection

One of the theorists of poetry whose work may have much to offer those who study the field of biblical verse structure is Walter A. Koch.¹ His studies, published more than thirty years ago, and based in part on the work of Samuel Levin² refer only once to the poetry of the Bible.³ Nevertheless, much of Koch's work is directly applicable to classical Hebrew poetry. In particular, two strains of thought from Koch's writings may help both to correct and to integrate the rather disparate theories which are considered in this study.

In the first place, Koch offers a suggestion for a program of analysis (complete with a notational system) which may be used to describe the semantic content of a poem.⁴ This system would certainly need some refinement, but it represents a considerable advance over such relatively primitive and unadaptable systems as Lowth's description of Hebrew parallelism. It is, of course, the area of semantics which is least adequately described in the four theories of verse structure which are considered here.

In the second place, Koch attempts to show how the aspects of sound, syntax and sense integrate in the generation of what he denominates as "poeticalness." Essentially, Koch argues that poetry is based on

¹Of particular importance are Koch's 1965 article, "Preliminary Sketch of a Semantic Type of Discourse Analysis," Linguistics 12 (1965): 5-30, and his short book, published a year later, Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966).

²See, for example, Samuel R. Levin, Linguistic Structures in Poetry (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1969). Levin's work was actually written in 1961 and published in a slightly different form in 1962.

³In a footnote! Koch, Recurrence, 36, note 12.

⁴Walter A. Koch, "Preliminary Sketch," 5-30.

recurrence. This was not a new idea. Donald A. Stauffer is among the many who have recognized this phenomenon:

The words [of a poem] themselves must so fall as to give the reader a sense of a pattern in time. If the pattern of rhythm contributes something essential to a poem, then the element of pattern, however manifested, may be considered as furnishing the last of the essential qualities of poetry.⁵

Though he does not specifically address the poetry of the Hebrew Bible, Stauffer asserts that the element or concept of "pattern" is a fundamental characteristic of verse in any language or tradition. A similar view is expressed by Levin, whose work was subsequently used by Koch.

Any linguistic analysis of poetry must deal with the syntagmatic plane since this is what is immediately available for analysis. But the study of paradigms is equally important, since certain structures which poems incorporate turn out to be more readily apprehensible when we consider the poem not merely as a succession of syntagms, but rather/also as a system of paradigms.⁶

Of course, a pattern (or a paradigm) is identified by recurrence. Something which happens only once is not a pattern. Patterns in poetry are established by recurrence which may take place in any of three modes, "the 'phonic', 'syntactic', and 'semantic'."⁷ These are equivalent to the aspects of sound, syntax and sense mentioned above. These are also similar to the "sonic," "ideational" and "sensory" levels of poetry recognized by Lewis Turco.⁸ Of course, recurrence can take place, not only in poetry, but

⁵Donald A. Stauffer, The Nature of Poetry (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1946), 228.

⁶S. R. Levin, Linguistic Structures, 19.

⁷W. A. Koch, Recurrence, 36.

⁸Lewis Turco, The New Book of Forms (Hannover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1986), 4. Turco also recognizes a typographical level and actually orders these levels "sonic," "sensory" and "ideational." The boundaries between the sensory and ideational levels are not exactly as Koch has drawn them, but Turco's treatment of semantic elements is found primarily in his discussion of the "sensory" level, and his treatment of syntax forms part of the discussion of the "ideational" level. Strangely,

in prose as well. But Koch indicates that poeticalness is generated and enhanced when one form of recurrence is imposed on a second, that is, when the recurrences intersect.⁹ This can be seen readily in much traditional English poetry, as the following example will show.

Nature's first green is gold,
Her hardest hue to hold.
Her early leaf's a flower;
But only so an hour.
Then leaf subsides to leaf.
So Eden sank to grief,
So dawn goes down to day.
Nothing gold can stay.¹⁰

In this example there is a metrical recurrence, of a sort which must be familiar to minimal unit counters. There are six syllables and three stresses in each line.¹¹ In addition, there is a recurrence of specific sounds which form a rhyme. To express it somewhat technically, the last vowel sound and any subsequent consonants in each odd-numbered line is repeated at the end of the subsequent even-numbered line.

There is, of course, some poetry of which recurrence seems not to be characteristic. The following example from the writings of William Carlos Williams may be considered as an example.

grammatical parallelism is treated with the "sonic" level.

⁹W. A. Koch, Recurrence, 12, 13, 18, 19.

¹⁰Robert Lee Frost, "Nothing Gold Can Stay" in The Pocket Book of Robert Frost's Poems (New York: Washington Square Press, 1946).

¹¹Except the last line, from which the first syllable is omitted.

Why do I write today?

The beauty of
the terrible faces
of our nonentities
stirs me to it.

Colored women
day workers --
old and experienced --
returning home at dusk
in cast off clothing
faces like
old Florentine oak.

Also

The set pieces
of your faces stir me --
leading citizens --
but not
in the same way.¹²

In this poem, recurrence is certainly not a consistent factor. There is no regular pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables, no rhyme, and very little syntactic or semantic recurrence, apart from the three occurrences of the word "face" and the two occurrences of the phrase "stir(s) me." Nevertheless, it is commonly the case that poetry does explicitly exploit recurrence, that there are at least two forms of recurrence, and that these intersect at deliberate intervals.

In some cases both forms of recurrence may exploit the same aspect of the poetry. The following child's verse may be taken as an example:

Roses are red,
Violets are blue,
Sugar is sweet
And so are you.

This verse exploits two forms of sound recurrence. The first of these is rhythm: each line of the poem has two principal stresses. The second form

¹²William Carlos Williams, "Apology" in Selected Poems (New York: New Directions Books, 1985), 16.

of recurrence, superimposed on the first, is rhyme, the similar sounds at the ends of the second and fourth lines. While the poeticalness of this example may be esteemed relatively trivial, it certainly exceeds that of any parallel example in which one of the forms of recurrence is missing. The reader would intuitively recognize as "less poetic" either of the following examples, the former of which lacks rhyme, and the latter of which violates the rhythm of the poem above.

Roses are red,
Violets are blue,
Sugar is sweet
And so am I.

Roses are red,
Violets are blue
Sugar is bad for your teeth and waistline
And so is stew.

These latter two examples may be found mildly humorous, principally because they are recognized as parodies of poetry, defying ordinary expectations of the interplay of two forms of recurrence. It should also be noted that the original poem, in addition to its use of two forms of recurrence in the phonic mode, also exploits syntactic recurrence (the first three lines are syntactically identical, and the last line is identical to the third except for the gapping of the predicate and the addition of a conjunction and verbal modifier in the fourth line) as well as semantic recurrence (the mention of flowers and colors in the first two lines). For this reason, the reader will also detect as "less poetic" or "less satisfactory" both of the following verses, which preserve the phonic recurrences, the rhythm and the rhyme of the initial poem, but the former of which violates the syntactic recurrences, while the latter example violates the semantic recurrences.

Redness of roses,
Violets are blue,
As sweet as sugar,
Just so are you.

Iron is hard,
Violets are blue,
I'm going home,
What about you?

Other poems may also be based on recurrences which exploit two different aspects of the language of the poem. Koch even goes so far as to suggest that the recurrences in Canaanite poetry (under which he subsumes the poetry of the Hebrew Bible) occur principally in the semantic and syntactic modes.¹³

Recurrence in Biblical Poetry

Examples based on the four poems analyzed in this study may illustrate this point further. The canonical form of the final verse of "The Song of the Vineyard" may be considered:

כי בָּרַם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בַּיַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה נֹטַע שֶׁשָּׁשׂוּעִי
נִקְוָה לְמִשְׁפָּט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׁפָּח
לְצַדִּיקָה וְהִנֵּה צָעֲקָה

For the vineyard of YHWH of hosts is the house of Israel
and the man of Judah is the plant of his delight.
And he expected justice, but behold lawlessness;
(He expected) righteousness, but behold a wail!

Several recurrent characteristics may be noted immediately. In the area of sound, the relative uniformity of line-lengths is the most obvious trait. The four cola consist of 12, 11, 11 and 9 syllables respectively. The difference between the longest and the shortest is only 25 %, and the cola are arranged in order of decreasing length. Similarly, if one consider the number of words or the number of stressed syllables (which happen to be the same in this example), the four cola can be counted as 6, 4, 4 and 3, an

¹³W. A. Koch, Recurrence, 36.

arrangement which maintains the same sequence of decreasing length observed when the lines were measured by the number of syllables per colon. A secondary phonic phenomenon is the use of puns: **טִשְׁמִן** and **הִשְׁמִן** in the third colon and **הִקְרַץ** and **הִקְרָץ** in the fourth.

There are also several characteristics of syntax which contribute to the phenomenon of recurrence in these lines. The first two cola are syntactically identical,¹⁴ NP + NP, constituting together a line which Collins might identify as belonging to the II nom line-form. The latter two cola are syntactically identical except for the gapping of the verb. Collins does not recognize this line form (as he fails to treat all examples of double predication), but since the two lines contain only verbs and objects of the verbs, the line may be associated with the II C ii) line-type, of which there are two other examples in "The Song of the Vineyard."¹⁵ In addition, if this verse is analyzed according to O'Connor's system, it will be seen that all of the cola in this verse constitute heavy lines: the first and third are class IV, the second is class III and the last is class II. All of these heavy lines are heavily troped, which O'Connor holds to be appropriate for the last few lines of a poem.

At the level of meaning, the first bicolon contains three pairs of parallel terms: **בָּרָם**, **יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת** and **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** in the first colon and **עַם**, the pronoun suffix on **שֶׁעָשׂוּ עֵינָיו** and **אִישׁ יְהוּדָה** in the second colon. These terms are arranged in a chiasm. In contrast to this chiastic structure, the second bicolon has a parallel semantic structure with the objects of desire (**טִשְׁמִן** and **הִקְרַץ**) indicated at the beginning of the cola, and the undesired objects (**הִשְׁמִן** and **הִקְרָץ**) at the end of the cola.

¹⁴There is a chiastic arrangement of the elements in the line from the point of view of their meaning, but syntactically, the lines are identical.

¹⁵Isaiah 5:4a,b.

Thus all levels of this poetic passage are characterized by recurrence. Phonically, syntactically and semantically, the reader may detect recurrences which contribute to the perception of poeticalness in this passage. The major distinction between the recurrences of this and other biblical Hebrew poems and the recurrences found in much of European poetry can be expressed in a word: non-periodicity. In much of European poetry, recurrences, and intersections of recurrences, are periodic; they occur at regular intervals. For example, in a Shakespearean sonnet the rhyme will customarily intersect with the rhythm in a predictable pattern: every fifth stress will fall on a rhymed syllable. This is not the case with biblical Hebrew poetry. The recurrences of biblical poetry do not occur or intersect with each other at precisely predictable intervals. That recurrences may be found in the poems of the Hebrew Bible cannot be doubted, that they take place on all levels of the language cannot be denied, that they intersect is clear. But they do all these things non-periodically.

Loss of Phonic Recurrence

As with the English example presented above, the poeticalness of the Hebrew example is diminished by any reduction of the recurrences in this poem. This will be true even if the overall message of the verse is maintained. If, for example, the relative uniformity of line length is disrupted (as in the following hypothetical case), the resulting verse will commonly be perceived as less poetic than the canonical one.

כי כרם יהוה צבאות אלהי-אבותינו בית ישראל
ניהיך נקעו
ניבו למשפט ולישר ולטעם והנה משפט
לצדקה והנה צדקה

For the vineyard of YHWH of hosts, God of our fathers, is the house of Israel;
And Judah is his plant.
He expected justice, uprightness and perception, but behold lawlessness;
(He expected) righteousness, but behold a wail!

In this emended example, instead of the relative uniformity of syllable counts which is found in the canonical text, some lines are found (the first and third) which are more than three times as long as the shortest (the second) and fully twice as long as the remaining line. And if stresses are counted, one of the lines is four times as long as the shortest. It is, of course, these particular elements of recurrence which are frequently analyzed by the minimal unit counters. When the lines of a passage are of radically differing length, the passage is perceived by minimal unit counters as less poetic than it would be if the cola (or bicola) were of relatively uniform length.

This distortion also affects the perception of poetry when the passage is studied by the semantic structural analysis of O'Connor. As restructured, two of the four cola of this passage (the first and third) violate O'Connor's constraint for the number of units in a line, and one of them (the third) violates O'Connor's constraint for the number of constituents in a line. This means that the first and third cola of this verse do not fall into any of the four line classes identified by O'Connor, while the second and fourth fall into line class I. Both O'Connor's work and the present study have indicated that class I lines are less common at the beginning and end of poems. For this reason, the presence of two class I lines here appears abnormal and unpoetic. In addition, the present study confirms the rarity of lines which do not fall within O'Connor's

constriction.¹⁶ The presence of two such lines would also decrease the perception of poeticalness.¹⁷

The line-form analysis of Collins offers far less to indicate that this restructured passage is less poetic than the canonical passage. In fact, the first bicolon will scan exactly the same as the first colon in the canonical verse. Despite the considerable differences in length, the first two cola of the restructured passage, like the first two cola of the canonical passage, each consist of two noun phrases making up two verbless equational sentences. In both cases, the bicolon can be identified as II nom. The second bicolon of the restructured passage also differs from its canonical homologue only in complexity, and in the number of modifiers of the verb. It is otherwise of the same basic line-type and is composed of two similar basic sentences.

The final system for the analysis of verse structure, the strophic analysis of the Kampen school group, also detects this passage as abnormal, since the first colon exceeds five metrical feet (accented syllables) and six words, and the third colon also exceeds five feet. Thus, three of the four systems for the analysis of verse structure which are under consideration in the present study detect this restructured passage as unpoetic, or less poetic than the canonical verse. Since this perception of unpoeticalness probably mirrors the common-sense perception of most readers, it may be concluded that these theories of verse structure may have some potential for distinguishing poetry from non-poetry.

¹⁶Such lines are unknown to O'Connor, and constitute less than three percent of the poetic cola considered in the present study.

¹⁷It should be acknowledged, however, that if there is any place where such lines might be expected, it would be at the end of a poem, where non-class I lines are often found. In fact, two such unclassifiable lines are found in the last verse of Psalm 126, but, as noted above, these lines are problematic.

But this experiment may be tempered by examination of another revision of the verse which has been considered above, Isaiah 5:7. In this second restructured version, only the puns in cola c and d will be eliminated:

כִּי כָרַם יְהוָה צִבְאוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה נֹטַע שֶׁעָשָׂה עֵינִי
נִקְוָה לְמִשְׁפָּט וְהִנֵּה עֹוֹן
לְצַדִּיקָהּ וְהִנֵּה תִרְעָה

For the vineyard of YHWH of hosts is the house of Israel
and the man of Judah is the plant of his delight.
And he expected justice, but behold wrongdoing;
(He expected) righteousness, but behold evil!

In this case, the restructured verse is identical to the canonical verse in the number of syllables, stresses and words in each line, as well as being syntactically equivalent to the original. Collins, and the minimal unit counters would consider these lines to be metrically and poetically equivalent to the canonical form of this verse. Only O'Connor would detect any difference, and this difference would be only in troping. Since these lines are heavily troped in either case, the difference would not be poetically significant. Because the difference between the original and this second restructured form is fairly small, and affects the common-sense perception of poeticalness in only a small degree, the three theories which do not detect a change may be excused, but an adequate theory of verse structure should be sensitive to minor changes as well as major ones.

Loss of Semantic Recurrence

It should be noted that both of the restructurings of Isaiah 5:7 which have been presented thus far involve changes which primarily affect the level of sound, but have little effect on syntax or meaning. But it is possible to restructure this verse in ways which will alter it semantically or syntactically, without extensively disrupting at least the minimal unit

arrangements. Such a restructuring, like the two which have already been examined, will result in a verse which will probably be detected by most readers as less poetic, and which will also appear to violate the principles of at least one of the theories of verse structure under consideration here.

כִּי כָרַם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בַּיַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל
 וְדִבְרֵי נְבִיאָיו טוֹבִים בְּעֵינָיו
 וַיִּקְוֶה לְמִשְׁפָּט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׁפָּח
 אַנְשֵׁי יְרוּשָׁלַם חַטָּאִים

For the vineyard of the YHWH of hosts is the house of Israel
 and the words of his prophets are good in his eyes
 And he expected justice, but behold lawlessness;
 the men of Jerusalem are sinners.

This revision of the poem produces minimal unit counts identical to those of the canonical version of the poem. The four cola contain 12, 11, 11 and 9 syllables, respectively. Measured by stresses, these cola contain 6, 4, 4 and 3 stresses, respectively. But despite this similarity, this revision of the poem will be readily detected by even the casual reader as significantly less poetic than the canonical verse. The absence of parallelism will be noticed immediately, especially in the first bicolon. The parallels between *בַּיַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל*, *כָרַם* and *יְהוָה* in the first colon of the canonical verse, and *אִישׁ יְהוּדָה*, *נָטַע* and the suffixed pronoun on *שָׁעֲשִׂיעִיו* in the second colon are lost.¹⁸ In addition, the semantic affinity between *מִשְׁפָּט* and *צְדָקָה* in the second bicolon of this verse is lost, as is the syntactic parallelism between the third and fourth cola. Clearly this revised verse is less poetic than the canonical form. But since the minimal unit counts of all

¹⁸There are, in fact, two suffix pronouns in the second line of this revised form of the poem, each of which has *יְהוָה* as its antecedent. They have, however, differing syntactic functions. In the canonical poem, the pronoun modifies the predicate nominative of an equational sentence, whereas in the present revision of this poem, the pronouns modify the subject and the predicate adjective of an equational sentence. In both the canonical and revised poems, *יְהוָה* is a modifier of the subject of the equational sentence which forms the first colon of the poem.

cola are identical, minimal unit counting cannot be used to detect or describe this loss of poeticalness.

Collins' system of line-form analysis also offers little help. The four cola formed by this revision of the poem may be described as follows:

NP¹ + NP - NP¹ + NP II nom
 V + NP² + V + NP² - NP¹ + NP IV C/nom: iv) var¹⁹

The line-form of the first bicolon occurs fairly frequently in Hebrew poetry. In addition to the II nom line-form which occurs in the canonical version of Isaiah 5:7a,b, there are similar lines in Lamentations 1:4c,d; 1:4e,f and 1:22e,f. The IV C/nom line-form is less common, but there is a IV C/nom: i) line-form in Judges 5:8a,b. Clearly, Collins' system offers the reader no standard by which to compare the poeticalness of this revised form of the verse with canonical text.

O'Connor's syntactic structural analysis is the only system which offers the reader some means of identifying this revised verse as less poetic than the canonical version. O'Connor would describe these four cola as follows:

PREDICATIONS	CONSTITUENTS	UNITS	LINE-CLASS	TROPING
1	3	6	none	M
1	2	4	III	M
2	4	4	IV	
1	2	3	I	

There are two hints here that this is less poetic than the canonical version of this verse, but both require the reader to have made the prior determination that this verse closes the poem. The first hint is the presence of a class I line. This is unusual at the beginning or end of a poem, since poems usually concentrate heavy lines in their initial and final

¹⁹Since the first colon of this bicolon contains a double predication, this form is not actually listed by Collins, but since it contains no components except verbs and direct objects, the bicolon may be classified as IV C/nom: iv) var.

verses. This is, of course, not coercive proof: there are many examples of class I lines at the beginning or end of poems. In Lamentations 1, four of the last six cola of the poem are class I. Psalm 126 also has a class I line in its first verse. Even in "The Song of the Vineyard" there are two class I lines in the first verse. Thus, it is not too surprising to find one such line in the last verse. But there is a second hint of unpoeticalness, the overall scarcity of troping. O'Connor asserts that it is regularly the case that the initial and final passages of a poem are heavily troped, and rarely contain untroped lines. While the distribution of heavy troping which O'Connor expects is not thoroughly demonstrated in this study, it is nevertheless the case that initial and final lines are usually troped. An exception is found in Judges 5:31, where the last two lines of the poem are untroped. Nevertheless, there is no case in the present corpus of poetic examples of an untroped class I line at the beginning or end of a poem. This would seem to suggest that the revised version of the verse under consideration is less poetic than the canonical version. However, such an inference can only be made once it has been determined that this verse is the last verse (or first verse) of a poem. Had this verse been taken from the middle of a poem, it would appear to be unexceptional, as analyzed by O'Connor's method. Nevertheless, a common-sense reading of the verse will find it much less poetic than the canonical form regardless of where it falls in the poem.

Loss of Syntactic Recurrence

One last variation of Isaiah 5:7 may be considered to evaluate the effect of the loss of syntactic recurrence and the effectiveness of the various theories of verse structure in detecting a change in poeticalness due to this loss. This variation will preserve, as far as possible, the phonic and semantic elements of the verse, while altering the syntax.

כִּי בָרַם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בַּיַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל

וַיִּשְׂמַח יְהוָה בְּכָל-אֲנָשֵׁי יְהוּדָה

וַיִּקְוֶה לְמִשְׁפַּט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׁפַּח

וַיִּשְׁמַע צְעָקָה עַל-הַעֲוֹן

For the vineyard of YHWH of hosts is the house of Israel
And he delights in all the men of Judah
And he expected justice, but behold lawlessness:
A cry has been heard concerning the wrongdoing.

Here the restructured verse is identical to the canonical verse in the number of syllables and stresses per line, as well as maintaining similar semantic values in each line. In fact, the first and third lines are identical to the canonical verse. The second and fourth lines maintain, with similar words, the original meaning. In the second line, the noun **שִׂמְחָה** ("intense delight") is replaced by the cognate verb **עָשָׂה** (which, in the Hithpalpel stem has the meaning "to find oneself delighted"); the singular **אִישׁ-יְהוּדָה** ("man of Judah") is replaced by the plural **אֲנָשֵׁי-יְהוּדָה** ("men of Judah"), which is modified by **כָּל** ("all"), which has no semantic equivalent in the canonical second line. In addition, the word **עֵצִי** ("plant") in the canonical second line has been deleted, with no equivalent supplied. Nevertheless, the basic meaning of the line, that YHWH delights in the people of Judah, has been maintained. The fourth line of this revised verse is a little further from the original. While it maintains the idea of an outcry which arises because of wrong-doing, it omits the concept of YHWH's expectation of justice. Despite the changes, the revised verse transmits fairly well the message of the canonical verse. Common-sense perception will, however, detect this revision as less poetic than the original. Minimal unit counting has already been eliminated as a means of detecting the changes in this text, since the minimal unit counts are identical. Similarly, the strophic analysis of the Kampen School group will not produce useful results on a passage this short. It remains to be seen whether either of the other two theories of verse structure will be helpful in this regard.

Analyzed grammatically, the four cola of this revised verse may be described as follows: the first colon is NP + NP; the second is V + NP², the third is V + NP² + V + NP² and the last is V + NP¹ + M. If these are combined into two bicola, they will form lines whose forms can be identified as IV nom/C: iii)²⁰ and IV C/B: iv). The former of these two line-forms is not discussed by Collins, who makes only passing reference to the equational clause. There is, however, a IV C/nom: i) line-form in Judges 5:8, so the pattern is not utterly unique. Collins lists nine examples of the IV C/B: iv) line form which he found in his study of the prophetic books.²¹ Thus both of the line-forms represented by this revision of the verse are still recognizable by Collins as poetic. Neither would such a line be out of place in the present poem, since there is at least one other bicolon of the type-IV general line-type in "The Song of the Vineyard." Collins' system therefore offers no standard by which these lines may be judged as less poetic or less appropriate than the canonical bicola.

According to O'Connor's syntactic structural analysis, the first three of these cola are Class IV lines, and the last is a Class I line. The presence of a Class I line at the end of a poem is a bit unusual, but not unprecedented. The absence of troping is also anomalous since, according to O'Connor, the initial and final portions of a poem ought to be heavily troped. But nothing in O'Connor's system would suggest that this revision of

²⁰Of course, the third colon, with its double predication is undefinable by Collins system as he has presented it. But since it contains no elements other than the verbs and the direct objects (there are two of each), it may be identified as a class C basic sentence.

²¹Collins, Line-Forms, 184. Collins points out that examples of this line-form in which the direct object is first are found almost exclusively in First Isaiah, whereas example in which the verb is first are never found in First Isaiah. This would make the present revised verse an anomaly for First Isaiah, but would not make it strikingly unpoetic otherwise.

the poem is less poetic than the canonical version. Indeed, with three Class IV lines, this version is quite appropriate for the end of a poem.²²

THE FAILURE OF VERSE STRUCTURE THEORIES TO DETECT RECURRENCE

The previous chapter has shown that the four current theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure which are under consideration here are inadequate for the description, prediction and prescription of Hebrew poetry. What becomes evident in the analysis of the brief series of examples in this chapter is why none of the theories under consideration here is an effective theory. In brief, none of them will consistently identify and explain recurrence in poetry. Nor can they consistently detect the loss of recurrence in poetry. In fact, they may detect some recurrences, but they will overlook others. If Koch is right in his assertion that recurrence, and particularly the intersection of recurrences, is the mark of poetry, then these theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure not only are, but must be, inadequate for the description, prediction or prescription of Hebrew poetry. An adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure must be comprehensive. That is to say, it must identify, describe and explain the recurrences at all levels of Hebrew poetry: the levels of sound, syntax and sense.²³ In addition, the intersection of recurrences should also be identified. Obviously, this cannot be done by a system, such as minimal unit counting, the line-form analysis proposed by Collins or the semantic strophic analysis proposed by the Kampen School group, which deals with only one level of the language. Even those methods which deal with more than one level of the

²²Of course, this assumes that the reader has come to the prior conclusion that Isaiah 5:7 is, indeed, the last verse of a poem.

²³It may be argued that there is also a graphic level in language, and therefore in poetry, though evidences of the exploitation of this level of language in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible are minimal and dubious.

language, such as the syntactic structural analysis of O'Connor (which attempts to deal with the phonic and semantic levels of language in its analysis of troping), are inadequate unless they describe all of the recurrences of the poetry. But none of these theories achieves this objective.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

In closing, it is in order to identify both the contributions and the weaknesses of the four theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure which have been considered in this study, and to assess how they point to, and contribute to, an adequate theory of biblical Hebrew verse structure.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE THEORIES OF VERSE STRUCTURE

Despite the various weaknesses of the four theories of verse structure under consideration, it should be acknowledged that they have nevertheless produced some useful insights. Credit must be given for the positive contributions of the four theories under consideration. Each of them contains some insights more or less useful to an adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure. In this respect, the contributions of O'Connor and of the minimal unit counters may be judged more useful, and those of Collins and of the Kampen School group, less productive.

Minimal Unit Counting

The popularity of minimal unit counting among scholars of the Hebrew Bible may be due in part merely to its simplicity, and to its similarity to the metrical systems used in much of European poetry. Because of this, some proponents of this method have undoubtedly tried to draw more from it than the biblical poems would really permit. Nevertheless, this simple method does appear to have some real utility. Descriptively, it does apply to most of the passages commonly identified as poetry, and it excludes much of what is commonly identified as prose. Even though some prosaic lines may be admissible, it is unusual to find an extensive series of admissible lines in a prose passage. Minimal unit counting may, in some cases, allow the reader

to characterize different groups of poems, and even to differentiate two contiguous poems of differing types. While it could not be used to detect an extensive lacuna in a text, it might be used to identify an insertion. It can, as has been seen, be used to formulate plausible rules governing or controlling the composition of poetry.

Minimal unit counting recognizes limits to the length of poetic lines, and regularities in these lines. Admittedly, the limits are rather imprecise: there is no biblical poem in which all the lines are the same length. Nevertheless, there are ranges of acceptable length which seem to be observed consistently throughout a given poem. Detection of these regularities may serve as a corrective to some of the other theories of verse structure under consideration in the present study. For example, there are some lines which might be judged unproblematic by Collins' system of line-form analysis, but which might be regarded as unpoetic (or as inappropriate for a given poem) simply because of their high (or low) number of syllables (or stresses). The careful reader would probably hesitate to dismiss or emend a single line on this basis, but longer passages made up of line-forms admitted by Collins, but violating the average length established elsewhere in a poem could be questioned with greater confidence.

Syntactic Structural Analysis

O'Connor's system of syntactic structural analysis also offers a corrective to other systems for the analysis of Hebrew verse structure. As with minimal unit counting, this system recognizes limits, both maximal and minimal, to the poetic line. However, in contrast with minimal unit counting, O'Connor's system states these limits in terms of syntax, rather than sound. This may serve as a corrective to other theories of verse structure, including minimal unit counting, since O'Connor's constrictions can disallow as poetic some lines which other theories might accept. In view

of the very small number of poetic lines discovered in the present study which do not fall within O'Connor's constraints, it may be acknowledged that O'Connor's system provides a useful criterion for identifying poetic lines and distinguishing them from non-poetic lines. Despite the fact that some non-poetic lines might be admissible within O'Connor's constrictions, it is highly improbable that an extensive passage of admissible lines would fail to be regarded as poetic. A few admissible lines might be mixed into a long prose narrative, for example, but no biblical prose narrative will be made up entirely of such lines. In addition, O'Connor's constrictions are capable of being expressed in terms of rules which might have guided the writers of the biblical poems. O'Connor's distinction between Class I lines and heavy lines is also useful especially in view of the typical distribution of these lines classes which he has also recognized. The distinction between Class II, Class III and Class IV is less apparent in this study, as are O'Connor's conclusions regarding troping.

Line-Form Analysis

Collins' contribution to the understanding of Hebrew verse structure is far more slight than either of the two theories of verse structure described above. The incompleteness of his system makes this unavoidable. Because he does not provide a comprehensive catalog of poetic line-forms, it is impossible for the reader to be certain in any particular case whether a given line might be poetry. And since, as noted previously, many of Collins' line-forms can be found in passages which are indisputably prose, there is no way of knowing in any particular case whether a given line must be poetry. Absent even the most general determination of what is and what is not poetry, it is impossible to say what poetry does or does not do, or how poetry functions. In addition, much of the differentiation within the already vast variety of poetic line-forms which have been identified by Collins may be

more reflective of poetic style than of a system of verse structure. While it might be possible to use Collins' system to write prescriptive rules for the composition of Hebrew poetry, the incompleteness of the system leaves any such rule open to dispute from the outset.

Strophic Analysis

The last of the theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure to be discussed is also the least productive. The division of the poetic text into semantic sub-units according to the principles suggested by the Kampen School group may provide a helpful description of thought sequences in a poem, but it tells little or nothing about how to distinguish poetry from prose. Nor does it aid the reader in differentiating poems, in predicting the form of poems or in prescribing plausible rules by which the biblical poems might have been written.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS OF HEBREW POETRY

Obstacles to a Theory of Hebrew Verse Structure

The formulation of an adequate description of biblical Hebrew verse structure is hampered by several factors. At least one of these is entirely beyond the control of scholars of the twentieth century. The modern reader faces a total dearth of comment, contemporaneous with the composition of the biblical poems, on the subject of this poetry. Even the self-consciousness of the poet as poet is in doubt. Was there ever (in the era of the composition of the Hebrew Bible) an understanding by the writers that some of them were engaging in a particular art form? Or did spiritual, legal, moral, or even theological issues so preoccupy them that they did not think of themselves as involved in an aesthetic enterprise? Was poetry simply "the right way" to do something else (such as worship deity, or pronounce social commentary), rather than a deliberate art-form? It may also be asked whether others in

this era understood the poetry of the Bible as an aesthetic enterprise. Certainly the obvious indications for this are slight. James Kugel has pointed out the fact that biblical Hebrew knows no general term for poem or poetry.¹ Other arts had names: music and dance are identifiable, and even sculpture can be named, despite the suspicion against the visual arts because of their association with cult objects. But poetry remained unnamed.² No manuals or treatises on poetry survive for us, and it seems doubtful that any were ever written. Thus, "biblical poetry" may be, at least to some extent, a construct of the modern reader, and it will remain an open issue whether the original writers and readers (or hearers) would have held any similar understanding. None of the theories of verse structure under consideration here has adequately addressed this issue.

Terminological Difficulties

Not only is a modern reader faced with the task of describing something which may be more a phenomenon of modern reading than of ancient art, but the lack of a consistent terminology for biblical poetry has also obstructed the formulation of theories of Hebrew verse structure. Wilfred Watson comments on this difficulty:

Different scholars or writers use different names for the same components, which can lead to a great deal of confusion, even though a particular writer may use such terms consistently. What for some is a 'colon' is referred to by others as 'stichos' or even 'hemistich'; even worse, 'stanza' and 'strophe' are used almost interchangeably.³

¹James L. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 69.

²There are, of course, numerous terms for what are today identified as specific genres of poetry.

³Wilfred G. E. Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 11.

This is further complicated by the fact that O'Connor uses the term "line" for the same phenomenon identified as a "colon" by others.⁴ In addition to the terms mentioned by Watson, there are also such ubiquitous expressions as "verse" which are subject to varying definitions. This latter term may refer to a Masoretic verse, to a series of from one to nine cola (i.e., a monocolon, bicolon, tricolon or polycolon), or to the whole substance of a poem. The term "structure," used by several of the scholars considered in this study, is similarly ambiguous. This may be one of the reasons that O'Connor, when searching for terms which he may associate with poetic segments longer than the line (i.e., colon) chooses the terms "batch" and "stave." As obscure and unusual as they may be in the discussion of Hebrew poetry, they have the advantage of not having been previously defined in several different ways by scholars of the Hebrew Bible. Yet neither O'Connor nor the other theorists of verse structure whose work is considered in this study have made significant headway in resolving the terminological confusion with which this area of scholarship is afflicted. If anything, these theorists, especially O'Connor, have compounded the problem.

Theories of Insufficient Extent

One of the most crucial difficulties with the theories of Hebrew verse structure discussed in this study is their tendency to focus on a single phenomenon in biblical poetry, or at least on a single level of linguistic function. Minimal unit counting pays careful attention to some aspects of phonology, but virtually none to syntax and meaning. Line-form analysis describes syntax extensively, but pays little attention to the lengths of lines, or to meaning. Syntactic structural analysis, as practiced by O'Connor, gives careful attention at least to the complexity of the syntax of

⁴M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 52.

poetic lines, but little attention to the lengths of lines, and less to meaning.⁵ The semantic strophic analysis of the Kampen School group takes no notice of minimal units (except in the definition of the colon, and even in that case, only the broadest parameters are mentioned) or of syntax, and focusses entirely on certain semantic considerations, nevertheless ignoring such widely-demonstrated semantic features as parallelism.

Clearly, all linguistic performances operate on at least three levels: the phonological, the syntactic and the semantic. Poetry is concerned with all of these. The rules which govern sound, grammatical structure and meaning in a given language function also in the poetry of that language. There are certain permitted and meaningful sounds, and other sounds, sound sequences, stresses and similar phonological phenomena which are meaningless in the language. Generally the same sounds are meaningful or meaningless in poetry, though poetry usually restricts the use of these phonological phenomena (or, in some cases, contrives to use them) in particular ways, such as rhyme, the number of syllables or stresses in a line, patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables, alliteration and so on.

There are also permitted and non-permissible grammatical structures in all language use. For example, Hebrew permits the use of the phrase יְלֵךְ-וְיָבֵן , but does not allow the phrase יְלֵךְ-וְיָבֵן . The same restriction applies in poetry as in prose. But there are also some structures which are forbidden in poetry but permitted elsewhere. O'Connor's constriction notes certain types of lines which are not permitted in poetry, and the present study reveals that such lines are of exceedingly rare occurrence. Collins also shows that some grammatical structures are far more common than others in poetry, though he fails to distinguish between poetic and non-poetic use.

⁵Of course, many of the tropes identified by O'Connor function in the realm of meaning.

Semantic elements are harder to deal with than phonological or syntactic phenomena, although Walter Koch has attempted to formulate a notational system for describing semantic relationships within a poem.⁶ But certainly meaning is an issue in poetry, Archibald MacLeish's comments notwithstanding.⁷ An adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure must deal with all of these levels of linguistic functioning. As seen above, none of the theories examined in this study does so. It must stand as one of the primary conclusions of this dissertation that the four theories of Hebrew verse structure which have been considered here meet with only limited success. A second, and related, conclusion is that their meager success is

⁶Walter A. Koch, Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966), 43 ff.

⁷MacLeish says,

A poem should be palpable and mute
As a globed fruit,

Dumb
As old medallions to the thumb,

Silver as the sleeve-worn stone
Of casement ledges where the moss has grown --

A poem should be wordless
As the flight of birds.

.
A poem should be equal to:
Not true.

For all the history of grief
An empty doorway and a maple leaf

For love
The leaning grasses and two lights above the sea

A poem should not mean
But be.

Archibald MacLeish, "Ars Poetica," in New and Collected Poems, 1917-1976, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976), 106-107.

due, in a great degree, to the fact that none of them is comprehensive in dealing with and explaining recurrence in all levels of language.

Description and Regulation

Another fault of most theories of Hebrew verse structure involves their failure to distinguish between description and regulation and to provide adequately for both. An adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure must be capable of both. The theories considered in this study range from the semantic strophic analysis of the Kampen School group, which engages only in description, with no attempt to describe a prescriptive or regulatory system, to the line-form analysis of Collins, which implies a system of rules which could never have been used, or which could only be used in a greatly simplified form, as has already been shown. O'Connor and the minimal unit counters are less culpable in this respect. Their theories, though insufficient to explain Hebrew poetry thoroughly, are nevertheless capable of being expressed in terms which could both describe and prescribe some of the regularities of biblical poetry.

Confusion of Convention and Style

In any poetic tradition it is possible to distinguish between convention and style. There are certain shared rules, or conventions, for poetry, which mark it as poetry. Participation in these rules is expected, or perhaps required, of poetry in that tradition. In addition, there are characteristics, more or less wide-spread, which may be exploited by a poet in the exercise of this art. Participation in these characteristics is optional. That is, poetry is recognized as poetry by its participation in the conventions, and regardless of its use or non-use of particular stylistic devices. Some of the theories of Hebrew verse structure which have been considered here have failed to make a clear distinction between

convention and style. Others have made distinctions which are clear enough, but may not be correct.

The line between style and convention is blurred in O'Connor's constrictional system. The constraints on line structure identified by O'Connor and verified in this study are apparently part of poetic convention in Hebrew. The practice of writing lines which correspond to these rules appears to be obligatory. The practice of distributing the various line classes in such a way as to mark the beginning and end of the poem is evidently conventional, even if exceptions may occur. The small number of lines detected in the present study which do not correspond to O'Connor's constriction cannot be said to refute this obligation, though they may indicate that it is not as absolute as O'Connor seems to think.⁵ On the other hand, O'Connor identifies as tropes a number of phenomena, including several aspects of parallelism, which are found quite widely in poetry, but which are optional, in the sense that none of them is required at any time in any poem. Nevertheless, these tropes are part of the constriction as O'Connor defines it: they serve, in his understanding, to help mark the beginning and end of the poem, and the important internal junctures. This inference of O'Connor's has not been borne out by the present study, but it is part of the constriction as O'Connor has formulated it.

Collins is also guilty of failing to differentiate poetic convention and poetic style. If the poetic line-forms which he has identified are indeed part of the convention of Hebrew poetry (and this is not clear from the evidence of the present study), the differential incidence of their use is also a feature of poetic style. Collins is aware of this, but does not describe it systematically.

⁵It is also possible that they may indicate corruptions of the text, though to assert this on the basis of syntactic structural analysis would involve circular logic.

The Distinction of Poetry and Prose

Far more basic than the objections discussed so far is the very fundamental fact that the theories of biblical Hebrew verse structure discussed in this study generally deal very poorly with the distinction of poetry and prose. In simple terms, the problem can usually be stated as a tendency to base theories of verse structure on linguistic phenomena which are not peculiar to poetry, phenomena which, in some cases, may be found in prose as regularly as in poetry. This is partly due to the attempt to state the conventions of poetry in positive terms. However, in many cases, poetry is identifiable not only by the fact that it adopts as conventions some phenomena unknown or infrequent in prose, but also by the fact that it suspends some common prose conventions. Some examples of this in Hebrew poetry are the widespread suspension of the use of waw consecutive, and even the conventional narrative time reference of the tenses. For example, in "The Song of Deborah," there is only one indisputable case of a waw consecutive, found in Judges 5:28, where it occurs with the imperfect verb **וַיִּשְׁמַע**. An additional occurrence of the letter waw before a finite verb occurs in Judges 5:26, where it is found with the perfect **וַיִּקְרָא**. This might be understood as a waw consecutive, but it clearly refers to past time, thus contravening the narrative convention that a perfect verb with waw consecutive refers to future time.⁹ In contrast, the parallel prose account of the defeat of the armies of Jabin and Sisera, found in Judges 4, which is approximately equal in length to "The Song of Deborah," contains 54 indisputable occurrences of the waw consecutive, 46 with the imperfect, and

⁹There is, of course another imperfect with waw consecutive in Judges 5:31c, **וַיִּשְׁמַע**, but this is not regarded as part of the poem.

8 with the perfect.¹⁰ In the poems considered in this study, the narrative prose convention of the waw consecutive appears to be suspended in all but "The Song of the Vineyard."¹¹ This phenomenon, widely recognized and reported,¹² is unnoticed, or at least not accounted for, by any of the four theories of verse structure discussed in this study. If the four theories examined here seem, at times, to be unproductive, this is at least part of the reason: preoccupied as they are with what Hebrew poetry does, none of them pays sufficient attention to what poetry does not do. Furthermore, preoccupied as they are with the description of the positive characteristics of biblical Hebrew poetry, they have overlooked the degree to which these characteristics are shared with all other linguistic activities.

STEPS TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF HEBREW VERSE STRUCTURE

It would be pleasant to be able to announce that one of the theories analyzed in this dissertation has discovered the key, or perhaps placed the keystone in the arch of a thorough and adequate description of biblical Hebrew verse structure. The present study establishes conclusively that this is not the case: none of the theories under consideration provides an adequate explanation of Hebrew verse structure. While some advances have been made, it is clear that large gaps remain in the understanding of Hebrew verse structure. Of course, it is undoubtedly the case that no poetic system in any language or culture has been or can be described entirely. But even if it is not unduly optimistic to hope that biblical scholars will one day be

¹⁰An additional dubious case occurs in Judges 4:24, where the expression וַיִּשְׁׁרְרָה might be understood as a perfect with waw consecutive or an adjective with a simple waw conjunction.

¹¹In "The Song of the Vineyard," waw consecutive is used nine times in seven verses, about the same frequency that one might expect in a prose narrative.

¹²See, e.g., W. G. E. Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, 54.

able to describe biblical Hebrew verse structure as thoroughly as it is possible to describe the poetry of modern languages, it must be admitted that this has not been accomplished yet.

The present study further establishes that the limited success of the four theories of Hebrew verse structure considered here is due in a large part to the failure of each of them to consider all levels of language. Each of the theories considered here has proven incomplete precisely because all are too restricted and basically unidimensional. Each makes some contribution, greater or smaller, to the understanding of biblical Hebrew poetry. But, given that none of these theories deals comprehensively with language, none of them is adequate to explain the totality of Hebrew verse structure.

Finally, the present study shows that, even taken together, these theories will not offer the reader a thorough description of the structure of biblical Hebrew verse. None of them attends sufficiently to the phenomena of patterning and recurrence -- the fundamental characteristics of poetry in any language -- to provide a comprehensive description of the structure of biblical Hebrew verse, even with the aggregate of their understanding.

If an adequate theory of Hebrew verse structure is to be produced, it may build upon the various insights of the four theories evaluated in this study. But these must be combined to produce a comprehensive theory. In addition, such a comprehensive theory must focus on the ways in which patterns are produced in the three levels of language, and must describe verse structure on the basis of these patterns of recurrence.

APPENDIX ONE

A CATALOG OF COLLINS' BASIC SENTENCES, LINE-TYPES AND LINE-FORMS

This appendix describes the principles and rules according to which Terence Collins has described and identified the line-forms of biblical Hebrew poetic lines. In addition, a complete list of all basic sentences, general line-types, specific line-types and line-forms is provided.

CONSTITUENTS

The permissible constituents of the basic sentences of poetic lines are:

"Subject": includes pronouns, nouns noun phrases (e.g. construct chains, noun + adjective) and noun clauses. It will be referred to as Noun Phrase One and will be written NP¹.

"Object": includes the same and will be written NP².

"Verb": this may be a finite verb, a participle or an infinitive, and will be written V.

"Modifiers of the verb": these may be adverbs, prepositional phrases, locatives, etc. and will be written M.¹

BASIC SENTENCES

The four "basic sentences defined by Collins are the following:

- | | |
|---|--|
| A | NP ¹ V |
| B | NP ¹ V M |
| C | NP ¹ V NP ² |
| D | NP ¹ V NP ² M ² |

GENERAL LINE-TYPES

Collins also defines the following general line-types:

- I The line contains only one Basic Sentence.

¹Terence Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 23.

²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23.

- II The line contains two Basic Sentences of the same kind, without deletion, with or without rearrangement.
- III The line contains two Basic Sentences of the same kind, with deletion, with or without rearrangement.
- IV The line contains two different Basic Sentences.³

NOTATION

Collins actually provides a fairly complex notational system,⁴ derived from the work of generative linguists. Much of this notational system is rarely used in Collins' presentations. The following list of symbols is included for completeness, though some of it is not necessary for the understanding of Collins' work.

Classification Symbols:

- A, B, C, D, - Basic Sentences
- I, II, III, IV - General Line-Types
- i)ii)iii)iv) - Principal Subdivisions of Line-Types
- 1, 2, 3, etc. - Line-Forms
- a.b.c. etc. - Subdivisions of Line-Forms

Grammatical Symbols:

- S - Sentence
- L - Line
- NP - Noun Phrase
- NP¹ - Subject
- NP² - Object
- VP - Verb Phrase
- V - Verb
- VR - Verbal Root
- VF - Verbal Form
- V-NP² - Verb with object pronoun suffix
- M - Modifier of the Verb
- Det - Determiner
- ∅ - Zero morph
- T. - Transformation
- P.S. - Phrase Structure

³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 23,24.

⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 26.

#	-	Boundary Symbol
->	-	"To be rewritten as"
=>	-	Rewrite symbol for transformations
()	-	enclosing an optional item
{}	-	enclosing alternative items, one and only one of which <u>must</u> be chosen.

Collins also includes transliteration symbols for Hebrew.⁵ Symbols are included for consonants only.

SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC LINE-TYPES⁶

I A	$NP^1 + V$
I B	$NP^1 + V + M$
I C	$NP^1 + V + NP^2$
I D	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$

II A	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V$
II B	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V + M$
II C	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V + NP^2$
II D	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$

III A	$NP^1 + V - NP^1$
	$NP^1 + V - V$
III B	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$
	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + M$
	$NP^1 + V + M - V + M$
	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1$
	$NP^1 + V + M - V$
	$NP^1 + V + M - M$
III C	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + NP^2$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - V + NP^2$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - V$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^2$
III D ⁷	$(NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - V + NP^2$
	$V + NP^2 + M - V + M$
	$V + NP^2 + M - NP^2 + M$
	$V + NP^2 + M - V$
	$V + NP^2 + M - NP^2$
	$V + NP^2 + M - M$

⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 26.

⁶The entire table is quoted verbatim from T. Collins, Line-Forms, p. 25.

⁷The NP¹ in the first half-line is usually omitted from lines of the III D line-type.

IV A/B	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V + M$
A/C	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V + NP^2$
A/D	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$
IV B/A	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$
B/C	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V + NP^2$
B/D	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$
IV C/A	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V$
C/B	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V + M$
C/D	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$
IV D/A	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V$
D/B	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V + M$
D/C	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M - NP^1 + V + NP^2$

SUBJECT DELETION

Collins notes that the subject (NP^1) may be deleted from any of these line-types: "...any one of the formulae in Table I may be rewritten without the NP^1 . Consequently, from a descriptive point of view, the NP^1 must be considered an optional item. This will be indicated where necessary from now on by placing it in brackets (NP^1)."⁸ Collins does not do this consistently, indeed, he often simply omits the deleted NP^1 .

He further comments, "In setting out the Specific Line-Types, we shall use subdivision i) for those examples which keep the NP^1 and ii) for those which do not."⁹ Further subdivisions are necessary for Line-Type IV.

SPECIFIC LINE-FORMS

Collins does not produce a comprehensive catalogue of line-forms anywhere in the book. The following list of Specific Line-Forms is assembled from Collins' indications and descriptions throughout the book. The specific line-forms are presented in groups, depending on the line-type to

⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 27.

⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 27.

which each belongs. Footnotes will indicate the passages in Collins' book which are relevant for each line-form or group of line-forms.

I A: i)1 ¹⁰	NP ¹ - V NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V
I A: i)2 ¹¹	V - NP ¹
I A: ii)	(NP ¹) + V (no occurrences) ¹²
I B: i)1a ¹³	NP ¹ + V - M
I B: i)1b	NP ¹ - V + M
I B: i)2b ¹⁴	NP ¹ - M + V
I B: i)3a ¹⁵	V + NP ¹ - M
I B: i)4a ¹⁶	V + M - NP ¹

¹⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58. Collins notes that both of these forms are rare, and that the former, and even the latter may lengthen the verb phrase by one means or another. He gives no examples in this line-type in which two distinct finite verbs occur. It should be noted that two distinguishable line-forms are given the same designation. Repetition of the subject is not considered to change the line-form -- nor, as we shall see, is deletion.

¹¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58.

¹²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 58. Here and subsequently throughout this appendix, the indication "no occurrences" or, more briefly, "none," will indicate that Collins has found no examples of the line-form in question in the biblical poetic texts which he examined (the poetic portions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets).

¹³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 60, 61. The two subdivisions of Line-Form I B: i)1 are distinguish by the fact that subdivision a has the caesura after the second constituent, and b has it after the first. A similar division may be made in subsequent line-forms. The symbols a and b, and other lowercase letters are not used consistently by Collins. Here, with reference to Line-Form I, they are used to indicate a shift in the position of the caesura. Elsewhere, they are commonly used to indicate changes in the sequence of the constituents, though other uses also occur.

¹⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 61.

¹⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 62.

¹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 62.

I B: i)5b ¹⁷	M - NP ¹ + M
I B: i)6a ¹⁸	M + V - NP ¹
I B: i)6b	M - V + NP ¹
I B: i)var a ¹⁹	NP ¹ + V + M - M NP ¹ + M + V - M V + NP ¹ + M - M V + M + NP ¹ - M M + NP ¹ + V - M M + V + NP ¹ - M V + M + M - NP ¹ M + V + M - NP ¹ M + M + V - NP ¹
I B: i)var b ²⁰	M - V + NP ¹ + M NP ¹ - V + M + M NP ¹ - M + V + M
I B: i)var ²¹	NP ¹ + M - V + M NP ¹ + M - M + V
I B: ii)1a ²²	V + M - M
I B: ii)2a ²³	M + V - M

¹⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 63.

¹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 63, 63.

¹⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 67-69. Collins describes numerous variations of some of the line-types, for which he has no distinctive line-form identification. As with the 12 preceding line forms, the distinction between subdivisions a and b is on the basis of the position of the caesura: in subdivision a, the caesura is after the third constituent; in subdivision b, it is after the first. Among the many possible undifferentiated variants, the present table lists only those of which Collins actually discovered examples.

²⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 69.

²¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 69. This should, presumably, be variant c, though Collins does not so identify it. In fact, he cautiously indicates that, not only are there merely two forms of this variant, but in fact, only two occurrences of this variant in the biblical poetic corpus which he has examined.

²²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 70. All examples of line-forms of the I B: ii) type which Collins discovered contained an extra modifier of the verb.

²³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 71. Collins describes this form, but does not actually identify it as I B: ii)2a, even though his general description of this system of classification makes it clear that this siglum applies. His failure

I B: ii)2b	M - V + M
I B: ii)3b ²⁴	M - M + V
I C: i)1 ²⁵ a	NP ¹ + V - NP ²
I C: i)1b	NP ¹ - V + NP ²
I C: i)2 ²⁶	NP ¹ + NP ² + V (no occurrences)
I C: i)3a ²⁷	V + NP ¹ - NP ²
I C: i)4a ²⁸	V + NP ² - NP ¹
I C: i)5b ²⁹	NP ² - NP ¹ + V
I C: i)6b ³⁰	NP ² - V + NP ¹
I C: ii)3 ³¹	V + NP ²
I D: i)3 ³² 1a	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - M

to identify the form may be attributable to the paucity of examples: he has found only two such lines in the Bible, both in Ezekiel, and he is somewhat hesitant about their colometry.

²⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 71.

²⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 73.

²⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 74. Collins does not actually describe this form.

²⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 74.

²⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 74.

²⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 74.

³⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 74.

³¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 76. Collins claims "perhaps three or four examples" of this form, but cites only one.

³²The twenty-four line-forms of line-type I D: i) are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 77. Subdivisions of these line-forms are presented on the subsequent pages 78-81. All of the twenty-four line-forms are described fully, whether they occur or not in the poetic corpus examined by Collins. Non-occurring subdivisions of line-forms are not actually described in the text, but are inferred from Collins' general description of the system of classification. Since Collins has determined the subdivisions of line-forms in the I D: i) line-type on the basis of the position of the caesura, no caesura is indicated in the case of line-forms which do not occur in any subdivision.

I D: i)1b	$NP^1 - V + NP^2 + M$
I D: i)1c	$NP^1 + V - NP^2 + M$
I D: i)2a	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^2$
I D: i)2b	$NP^1 - V + M + NP^2$
I D: i)3a	$NP^1 + NP^2 + V - M$
I D: i)5b	$NP^1 - NP^2 + M + V$
I D: i)7a	$V + NP^1 + NP^2 - M$
I D: i)8c	$V + NP^1 - M + NP^2$
I D: i)10a	$V + NP^2 + M - NP^1$
I D: i)11a	$V + M + NP^1 - NP^2$
I D: i)12a	$V + M + NP^2 - NP^1$
I D: i)13c	$NP^2 + NP^1 - V + M$
I D: i)16a	$NP^2 + V + M - NP^1$
I D: i)16b	$NP^2 - V + M + NP^1$
I D: i)20b	$M - NP^1 + NP^2 + V$
I D: i)23b	$M - NP^2 + NP^1 + V$
I D: i)24a	$M + NP^2 + V - NP^1$
I D: i)var ³³	$NP^1 + V - NP^2 - M$ $V - NP^2 + NP^1 - M$ $M - NP^1 + V - NP^2$ $M + V - NP^2 - NP^1$
I D: ii) ³⁴ 1a	$V + NP^2 - M$
I D: ii)2a	$V + M - NP^2$

³³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 82. In all of the variations of Line-type I D: i) the object (NP²) appears as a pronoun attached as a suffix to the verb. There are several potential sub-forms of this line-form which Collins does not list -- he includes only those forms which he has identified in the biblical text. In addition, Collins lists several differentiable forms of this variant, but Collins fails to differentiate them by providing distinct sigla for them.

³⁴The six line-forms of the I D: ii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 83. Subdivisions of these line-forms are described on pages 83-87. Those sub-divisions which do not occur in the biblical texts under study are not actually described by Collins.

I D: ii)3a	NP ² + V - M
I D: ii)3b	NP ² - V + M
I D: ii)4	NP ² - M + V
I D: ii)5a	M + V - NP ²
I D: ii)5b	M - V + NP ²
I D: ii)6b	M - NP ² + V
I D: ii)var ^{35a}	V + NP ² + M - M V + M + NP ² - M M - V + NP ² + M M + V + M - NP ²
I D: ii)var b	V-NP ² + M - M M - V-NP ² + M M - M + V-NP ²
II A: i)3 ⁶¹	NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V
II A: i)2	NP ¹ + V - V + NP ¹
II A: i)3	V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V
II A: i)4	V + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹
II A: ii)3 ⁷	V - V
II B: i)3 ⁶¹	NP ¹ + V + M - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)2	NP ¹ + V + M - NP ¹ + M + V

³⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 89-91. Collins divides the I D: ii)var Line-type into two subdivisions, indicated by a and b. Unfortunately, these bear no resemblance to the subdivisions of earlier line-types. In this case, the a subdivision consists of those lines with an extra modifier of the verb, and the b subdivision consists of those lines which not only have an extra modifier, but which are also characterized by the fact that the object is a pronoun suffix attached to the verb. As in previous cases of variations from the line-type, several differentiable line-forms are represented by the single siglum: I D: ii)var.

³⁶The four line-forms of the II A: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 94, with examples cited on pages 94-97.

³⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 98. Collins has discovered only two examples of this line-form, and believes them to be stylistic variants.

³⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 99. Collins describes forms 1-12 of the II B: i) line-type, including even the five forms which do not occur in the texts which he has examined. This is a departure from his practice in the description of the line-form of line-type I. It will be seen that Collins is quite inconsistent in his practice in this respect. Examples of those line-forms of this category which do occur in the biblical texts are given on pages 99 and 100.

II B: i)3	NP ¹ + V + M - V + NP ¹ + M (no occurrences)
II B: i)4	NP ¹ + V + M - V + M + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)5	NP ¹ + V + M - M + NP ¹ + V
II B: i)6	NP ¹ + V + M - M + V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)7	NP ¹ + M + V - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)8	NP ¹ + M + V - NP ¹ + M + V
II B: i)9	NP ¹ + M + V - V + NP ¹ + M (no occurrences)
II B: i)10	NP ¹ + M + V - V + M + NP ¹
II B: i)11	NP ¹ + M + V - M + NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
II B: i)12	NP ¹ + M + V - M + V + NP ¹
II B: i)13 ³⁹	V + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)14	V + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + M + V
II B: i)15	V + NP ¹ + M - V + NP ¹ + M
II B: i)16	V + NP ¹ + M - V + M + NP ¹
II B: i)17	V + NP ¹ + M - M + NP ¹ + V
II B: i)18	V + NP ¹ + M - M + V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)19	V + M + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)20	V + M + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + M + V
II B: i)21	V + M + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + M
II B: i)22	V + M + NP ¹ - V + M + NP ¹
II B: i)23	V + M + NP ¹ - M + NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
II B: i)24	V + M + NP ¹ - M + V + NP ¹
II B: i)25 ⁴⁰	M + NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)26	M + NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + M + V (no occurrences)
II B: i)27	M + NP ¹ + V - V + NP ¹ + M (no occurrences)
II B: i)28	M + NP ¹ + V - V + M + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)29	M + NP ¹ + V - M + NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
II B: i)20	M + NP ¹ + V - M + V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)31	M + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V + M
II B: i)32	M + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + M + V
II B: i)33	M + V + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + M
II B: i)34	M + V + NP ¹ - V + M + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
II B: i)35	M + V + NP ¹ - M + NP ¹ + V
II B: i)36	M + V + NP ¹ - M + V + NP ¹
II B: ii)41 ⁴¹	V + M - V + M
II B: ii)2	V + M - M + V
II B: ii)3	M + V - V + M

³⁹Line-forms 13-24 of the II B: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 101, including the two forms which do not occur in the biblical texts which he has examined. Examples of those which do occur are given on pages 101, 102..

⁴⁰Line-forms 25-36 of the II B: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 103, including the six forms which do not occur in the biblical texts which he examines. Examples of the line-forms which do occur are given on pages 103, 104.

⁴¹The four line-forms of the II B: ii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 106, with examples being given on pages 106, 107.

II B: ii)4	M + V - M + V
II B: ii)var ⁴²	V + M + M - V + M
II C: i) ⁴³ 1	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
II C: i)2	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + NP ² + V
II C: i)3	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + NP ² (none)
II C: i)4	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V + NP ² + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i)5	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ² + NP ² + V (none)
II C: i)6	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ² + V + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i)7	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
II C: i)8	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + NP ² + V
II C: i)9	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V + NP ¹ + NP ² (none)
II C: i)10	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V + NP ² + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i)11	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ² + NP ² + V (none)
II C: i)12	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ² + V + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i) ⁴⁴ 13	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
II C: i)14	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹ + NP ² + V
II C: i)15	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + NP ²
II C: i)16	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ² + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i)17	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ² + NP ² + V
II C: i)18	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ² + V + NP ¹
II C: i)19	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V + NP ² (none)
II C: i)20	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + NP ² + V (none)
II C: i)21	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + NP ² (none)
II C: i)22	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - V + NP ² + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i)23	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ² + NP ² + V (none)
II C: i)24	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ² + V + NP ¹ (none)
II C: i) ⁴⁵ 25	NP ² + NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V + NP ² (none)
II C: i)26	NP ² + NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + NP ² + V (none)
II C: i)27	NP ² + NP ¹ + V - V + NP ¹ + NP ² (none)

⁴²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 108. Although only one line-form is cited here, and (as with other variations) only one designation and siglum are provided, Collins admits that the constituents may be in varying order (i.e., the extra modifier, always in the first colon in the examples cited by Collins, may occur in other positions).

⁴³Line-forms 1-12 of the II C: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 109, including the eight forms which do not occur in the biblical texts which Collins examined. Examples of the line-forms which do occur are given on pages 109, 110.

⁴⁴Line-forms 13-24 of the II C: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 110, including the seven forms which do not occur in the biblical texts which he has examined. Examples of the forms which do occur are given on pages 110, 111.

⁴⁵Line-forms 25-36 of the II C: i) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 111, 112, even though only line-form 29 occurs in the biblical texts under study.

II C: i)28	$NP^2 + NP^1 + V - V + NP^2 + NP^1$ (none)
II C: i)29	$NP^2 + NP^1 + V - NP^2 + NP^2 + V$
II C: i)30	$NP^2 + NP^1 + V - NP^2 + V + NP^1$ (none)
II C: i)31	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - NP^1 + V + NP^2$ (none)
II C: i)32	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - NP^1 + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II C: i)33	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - V + NP^1 + NP^2$ (none)
II C: i)34	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - V + NP^2 + NP^1$ (none)
II C: i)35	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - NP^2 + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II C: i)36	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 - NP^2 + V + NP^1$ (none)
II C: i)var ⁴⁶	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V - NP^2$ $V + NP^1 + NP^2 - NP^1 + V - NP^2$ $NP^1 + V - NP^2 - NP^1 + V - NP^2$ $V - NP^2 + NP^1 - NP^1 + V - NP^2$
II C: ii) ⁴⁷ 1	$V + NP^2 - V + NP^2$
II C: ii)2	$V + NP^2 - NP^2 + V$
II C: ii)3	$NP^2 + V - V + NP^2$
II C: ii)4	$NP^2 + V - NP^2 + V$
II D: i) ⁴⁸	
II D: ii) ⁴⁹ 1	$V + NP^2 + M - V + NP^2 + M$
II D: ii)2	$V + NP^2 + M - V + M + NP^2$
II D: ii)3	$V + NP^2 + M - NP^2 + V + M$
II D: ii)4	$V + NP^2 + M - NP^2 + M + V$
II D: ii)5	$V + NP^2 + M - M + V + NP^2$
II D: ii)6	$V + NP^2 + M - M + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II D: ii)7	$V + M + NP^2 - V + NP^2 + M$
II D: ii)8	$V + M + NP^2 - V + M + NP^2$
II D: ii)9	$V + M + NP^2 - NP^2 + V + M$
II D: ii)10	$V + M + NP^2 - NP^2 + M + V$

⁴⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 113. As in several previous cases, Collins fails to list numerous potential line-forms, and gathers all those variant forms which do occur under a single designation and siglum.

⁴⁷The four line-forms of the II C: ii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 114. Examples of these line-forms are given on pages 114, 115.

⁴⁸T. Collins, 117. This line-type exists only in isolated examples. Normally a line with a verb, nominal direct object and a modifier of the verb will not contain an expressed subject. The subject will be implied by the inflection of the verb.

⁴⁹Line-forms 1-12 of line-type II D: ii) are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 117. He includes line-form II D: ii)6, for which he has found no examples in the biblical text. Examples of the other eleven forms are found on pages 117-119. Despite his earlier suggestion on pages 27 and 56, of indicating a deleted subject by (NP¹), Collins does not actually adhere to this practice, but simply omits the deleted NP¹.

II D: ii)11	$V + M + NP^2 - M + V + NP^2$
II D: ii)12	$V + M + NP^2 - M + NP^2 + V$
II D: ii) ⁵⁰ 13	$NP^2 + V + M - V + NP^2 + M$ (none)
II D: ii)14	$NP^2 + V + M - V + M + NP^2$
II D: ii)15	$NP^2 + V + M - NP^2 + V + M$
II D: ii)16	$NP^2 + V + M - NP^2 + M + V$ (none)
II D: ii)17	$NP^2 + V + M - M + V + NP^2$ (none)
II D: ii)18	$NP^2 + V + M - M + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II D: ii)19	$NP^2 + M + V - V + NP^2 + M$
II D: ii)20	$NP^2 + M + V - V + M + NP^2$ (none)
II D: ii)21	$NP^2 + M + V - NP^2 + V + M$ (none)
II D: ii)22	$NP^2 + M + V - NP^2 + M + V$
II D: ii)23	$NP^2 + M + V - M + V + NP^2$
II D: ii)24	$NP^2 + M + V - M + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II D: ii) ⁵¹ 25	$M + V + NP^2 - V + NP^2 + M$
II D: ii)26	$M + V + NP^2 - V + M + NP^2$
II D: ii)27	$M + V + NP^2 - NP^2 + V + M$
II D: ii)28	$M + V + NP^2 - NP^2 + M + V$
II D: ii)29	$M + V + NP^2 - M + V + NP^2$
II D: ii)30	$M + V + NP^2 - M + NP^2 + V$ (none)
II D: ii) ⁵² 31-36	$M + NP^2 + V -$
II D: ii)var ⁵³ a	$V - NP^2 + M - V - NP^2 + M$ $V - NP^2 + M - M + V - NP^2$ $M + V - NP^2 - V - NP^2 + M$ $M + V - NP^2 - M + V - NP^2$
II D: ii)var b	$V + NP^2 + M - V - NP^2 + M$ $V + NP^2 + M - M + V - NP^2$ $V + M + NP^2 - M + V - NP^2$ $NP^2 + V + M - V - NP^2 + M$

⁵⁰Line-forms 13-24 of line-type II D: ii) are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 119, 120, including seven forms for which he has found no examples in the biblical texts. Examples of the other five forms are given on page 120.

⁵¹Line-forms 25-30 of line-type II D: ii) are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 121, including line-form 30, for which Collins has found no examples. Examples of the other five line-forms are given on page 121.

⁵²Collins never describes line-forms 31-36 of line-type II D: ii), but points out on page 121 that there are no examples of lines of the II D: ii) line-type beginning with $M + NP^2 + V$.

⁵³The various variant forms of the II D: ii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 123. Again, Collins is not consistent in his sigla. Here, the three subdivisions of the II D: ii)var line-form (a, b and c) are, respectively, those which have $V - NP^2$ suffixation in both cola of the bicolon, those which have suffixation in the second colon only, and those which have suffixation in the first colon only. As before, several differentiable specific line-forms are denoted by a single siglum.

	$NP^2 + M + V - V - NP^2 + M$
	$M + V + NP^2 - M + V - NP^2$
II D: ii)var c	$V - NP^2 + M - V + M + NP^2$
	$V - NP^2 + M - NP^2 + V + M$
	$V - NP^2 + M - NP^2 + M + V$
	$M + V - NP^2 - NP^2 + V + M$
III A: i)1a ⁵⁴	$NP^1 + V - NP^1$
III A: i)1b	$NP^1 + V - V$ (no occurrences)
III A: i)2a	$V + NP^1 - NP^1$
III A: i)2b	$V + NP^1 - V$
III A: ii) ⁵⁵	(no occurrences)
III B: i)1a ⁵⁶	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + V$
III B: i)1b	$NP^1 + V + M - V + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)1c	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1 + M$
III B: i)1d	$NP^1 + V + M - M + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)1e	$NP^1 + V + M - V + M$
III B: i)1f	$NP^1 + V + M - M + V$
III B: i)1g	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^1$
III B: i)1h	$NP^1 + V + M - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)1j	$NP^1 + V + M - M$

⁵⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 128. Again, it may be noted that Collins has altered the meaning of his sigla. In the case of Line-type III A: i), the subdivisions a and b indicate respectively the gapping of the verb and the subject. Collins lists all four forms of the III A: i) line-type, even though one of them, II A: i)1b does not occur in any of the texts which he has analyzed.

⁵⁵Collins never refers to line-type III A: ii). Its form would presumably be V - V.

⁵⁶Collins does not provide a complete list all of the subdivisions of the specific line-forms of the III B: i) line-type. However, on page 130 he describes the six specific line-forms and the nine possible subdivisions of each line-form, thus allowing for a total of 54 subdivisions within the III B: i) line-type. On pages 131-138, Collins lists and gives examples of the 27 line-forms which he has actually identified in the biblical texts which he has studied.

As with Line-type III A: the subdivisions (a through j) are distinguished by the element gapped in the second colon and by the sequence of the elements in that colon. Collins calls attention to the fact that these lines may "resemble closely, both in constituents and ordering, certain line-forms that appear in Type IV. The only criteria [sic] for distinguishing between the two is whether or not the M can be considered as governing both hemistichs."*

*T. Collins, Line-Forms, 130.

III B: i)2a	$NP^1 + M + V - NP^1 + V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)2b	$NP^1 + M + V - V + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)2c	$NP^1 + M + V - NP^1 + M$
III B: i)2d	$NP^1 + M + V - M + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)2e	$NP^1 + M + V - V + M$
III B: i)2f	$NP^1 + M + V - M + V$
III B: i)2g	$NP^1 + M + V - NP^1$
III B: i)2h	$NP^1 + M + V - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)2j	$NP^1 + M + V - M$
III B: i)3a	$V + NP^1 + M - NP^1 + V$
III B: i)3b	$V + NP^1 + M - V + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)3c	$V + NP^1 + M - NP^1 + M$
III B: i)3d	$V + NP^1 + M - M + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)3e	$V + NP^1 + M - V + M$
III B: i)3f	$V + NP^1 + M - M + V$
III B: i)3g	$V + NP^1 + M - NP^1$
III B: i)3h	$V + NP^1 + M - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)3j	$V + NP^1 + M - M$
III B: i)4a	$V + M + NP^1 - NP^1 + V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)4b	$V + M + NP^1 - V + NP^1$
III B: i)4c	$V + M + NP^1 - NP^1 + M$
III B: i)4d	$V + M + NP^1 - M + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)4e	$V + M + NP^1 - V + M$
III B: i)4f	$V + M + NP^1 - M + V$
III B: i)4g	$V + M + NP^1 - NP^1$
III B: i)4h	$V + M + NP^1 - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)4j	$V + M + NP^1 - M$
III B: i)5a	$M + NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5b	$M + NP^1 + V - V + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5c	$M + NP^1 + V - NP^1 + M$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5d	$M + NP^1 + V - M + NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5e	$M + NP^1 + V - V + M$
III B: i)5f	$M + NP^1 + V - M + V$
III B: i)5g	$M + NP^1 + V - NP^1$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5h	$M + NP^1 + V - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)5j	$M + NP^1 + V - M$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)6a	$M + V + NP^1 - NP^1 + V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)6b	$M + V + NP^1 - V + NP^1$
III B: i)6c	$M + V + NP^1 - NP^1 + M$
III B: i)6d	$M + V + NP^1 - M + NP^1$
III B: i)6e	$M + V + NP^1 - V + M$
III B: i)6f	$M + V + NP^1 - M + V$
III B: i)6g	$M + V + NP^1 - NP^1$
III B: i)6h	$M + V + NP^1 - V$ (no occurrences)
III B: i)6j	$M + V + NP^1 - M$

III B: ii)1 ⁵⁷	V + M - M
III B: ii)2	M + V - M
III C: i)1a ⁵⁸	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
III C: i)1b	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)1c	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + NP ²
III C: i)1d	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ² + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)1e	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V + NP ²
III C: i)1f	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ² + V
III C: i)1g	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)1h	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V (no occurrences)
III C: i)1j	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ²
III C: i)2a	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
III C: i)2b	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)2c	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + NP ² (no occurrences)
III C: i)2d	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ² + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)2e	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V + NP ² (no occurrences)
III C: i)2f	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ² + V
III C: i)2g	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)2h	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V (no occurrences)
III C: i)2j	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ² (no occurrences)
III C: i)3a	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
III C: i)3b	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)3c	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹ + NP ²
III C: i)3d	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ² + NP ¹ (no occurrences)
III C: i)3e	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ²
III C: i)3f	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ² + V
III C: i)3g	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹
III C: i)3h	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V (no occurrences)
III C: i)3j	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ²
III C: i)4a	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V (no occurrences)
III C: i)4b	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹
III C: i)4c	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + NP ² (no occurrences)

⁵⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 140. Collins acknowledges that, in principle, forms of the III B ii) Line-type in which the second colon deletes the modifier and contains only the verb should exist, but in fact, none occur. He does not indicate what siglum should be used for such a line-form if it did occur, and it is difficult to infer this from his system. Perhaps the forms V + M - V and M + V - V by III B: ii)1b and III B: ii)2b, respectively.

⁵⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 141. As with line-type III B:, Collins does not list every possible subdivision of each line-form. Instead, he indicates the six specific line-forms and the nine subdivisions (a through j), which are distinguished by the element gapped in the second colon and by the sequence of the elements in that colon. Only 19 of the 54 possible subdivisions within the III B: i) line-type have actually been discovered by Collins. Examples of these 19 subdivisions are given by Collins on pages 142-146.

III C: 1) 4d V + NP² + NP¹ - NP² + NP¹ (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 4e V + NP² + NP¹ - V + NP² (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 4f V + NP² + NP¹ - NP² + V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 4g V + NP² + NP¹ - NP¹
 III C: 1) 4h V + NP² + NP¹ - V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 4j V + NP² + NP¹ - NP² (no occurrences)

III C: 1) 5a NP² + NP¹ + V - NP¹ + V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5b NP² + NP¹ + V - V + NP¹ (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5c NP² + NP¹ + V - NP¹ + NP² (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5d NP² + NP¹ + V - NP² + NP¹ (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5e NP² + NP¹ + V - V + NP² (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5f NP² + NP¹ + V - NP² + V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5g NP² + NP¹ + V - NP¹ (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5h NP² + NP¹ + V - V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 5j NP² + NP¹ + V - NP² (no occurrences)

III C: 1) 6a NP² + V + NP¹ - NP¹ + V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 6b NP² + V + NP¹ - V + NP¹
 III C: 1) 6c NP² + V + NP¹ - NP¹ + NP²
 III C: 1) 6d NP² + V + NP¹ - NP² + NP¹
 III C: 1) 6e NP² + V + NP¹ - V + NP²
 III C: 1) 6f NP² + V + NP¹ - NP² + V
 III C: 1) 6g NP² + V + NP¹ - NP¹
 III C: 1) 6h NP² + V + NP¹ - V (no occurrences)
 III C: 1) 6j NP² + V + NP¹ - NP²

III C: 1) var⁵⁹ NP¹ + V - NP² - V + NP²
 V - NP² + NP¹ - V + NP²

III C: 11) 2⁶⁰ V + NP² - NP²
 III C: 11) 2 NP² + V - NP²

III D: 1) 61a NP¹ + V + NP² + M - NP² + V + M

⁵⁹r Collins, Line-Forms, 147. Again, Collins lists only those specific line forms which he has observed, rather than all those which are possible. All of these forms are gathered in a single category, represented by a single siglum.

⁶⁰r. Collins, Line-Forms, 149. Without comment, Collins lists only those forms of this line-type which he has actually encountered, omitting the hypothetical forms in which the NP² is gapped in the second colon, leaving only the V. These line-forms, V + NP² - V and NP² + V - V, might be designated III C: 11) 1b and III C: 11) 2b, respectively.

⁶¹r. Collins, Line-Forms, 150, 151. Of all possible line-forms of the III D: 1) line-type, Collins lists only 17, grouped under three designations. These are, in theory, more precisely distinguishable, but are not distinguished by Collins. As before, Collins alters his sigla with scant notice: he abandons the use of Arabic numerals to indicate the sequence of the elements in the bicolon, and groups the line-forms of the III D: 1) line-type into three

	NP ¹ + M + V-NP ² - M + V + NP ²
	V + NP ¹ + M + NP ² - NP ² + M
	V-NP ² + NP ¹ + M - V + M + NP ²
	V-NP ² + NP ¹ + M - V + NP ² + M
III D: i)b	NP ¹ + V-NP ² + M - M
	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - V-NP ² + M
	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - NP ²
	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - NP ² (double listing) ⁶²
	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - NP ² + M
	NP ¹ + V-NP ² + M - NP ² + M
	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - V-NP ² + M
III D: i)c ⁶³	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - NP ² + M + V
	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - NP ² + M + V
	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - V-NP ² + M
	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - NP ² + M
	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - M + V-NP ²
III D: ii) ⁶⁴ 1a	V + NP ² + M - V + NP ² (none)
III D: ii)1b	V + NP ² + M - NP ² + V (none)
III D: ii)1c	V + NP ² + M - V + M (none)
III D: ii)1d	V + NP ² + M - M + V (none)
III D: ii)1e	V + NP ² + M - NP ² + M

subdivisions (a, b and c). These three consist of: those lines in which Yahweh is the subject; those in which a pronoun takes the place of the name of Yahweh, and those which contain an interrogative pronoun (consistently 'Q') as subject. Collins notes that these form a "semantic set," and therefore chooses to subdivide the line-type semantically, rather than syntactically, although his system is ostensibly based on syntax alone.

⁶²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 151. Strangely enough, Collins lists the same line-form twice in the same category. Since no explanation is offered, we may assume this to be an oversight or error on Collins' part.

⁶³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 151. Collins does not list the elements of the second colon of the III D: i)c line form. The description of the elements of the second colon is supplied on the basis of the biblical examples which he has cited.

⁶⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 152. As with the III B: i) and III C: i) line-types, Collins does not list all subdivisions of all line-forms of the III D: ii) line-type, but has provided lists of the six specific line-forms (based on the sequence of the constituents in the first half of the line) and of the nine possible subdivisions of each line-form (based on the sequence of, and deletions from, the constituents of the second half of the line). Of the 54 possible line-forms, 27 are listed again on pages 152-157, including eight for which Collins has found no examples in the biblical texts which he has studied. It is possible to infer the other subdivisions of this line-type from Collins' general description of the system.

III D: ii) 1f	V + NP ² + M - M + NP ²
III D: ii) 1g	V + NP ² + M - V (none)
III D: ii) 1h	V + NP ² + M - NP ²
III D: ii) 1j	V + NP ² + M - M
III D: ii) 2a	V + M + NP ² - V + NP ²
III D: ii) 2b	V + M + NP ² - NP ² + V (none)
III D: ii) 2c	V + M + NP ² - V + M
III D: ii) 2d	V + M + NP ² - M + V (none)
III D: ii) 2e	V + M + NP ² - NP ² + M
III D: ii) 2f	V + M + NP ² - M + NP ²
III D: ii) 2g	V + M + NP ² - V (none)
III D: ii) 2h	V + M + NP ² - NP ²
III D: ii) 2j	V + M + NP ² - M
III D: ii) 3a	NP ² + V + M - V + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 3b	NP ² + V + M - NP ² + V (none)
III D: ii) 3c	NP ² + V + M - V + M (none)
III D: ii) 3d	NP ² + V + M - M + V (none)
III D: ii) 3e	NP ² + V + M - NP ² + M
III D: ii) 3f	NP ² + V + M - M + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 3g	NP ² + V + M - V (none)
III D: ii) 3h	NP ² + V + M - NP ²
III D: ii) 3j	NP ² + V + M - M
III D: ii) 4a	NP ² + M + V - V + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 4b	NP ² + M + V - NP ² + V
III D: ii) 4c	NP ² + M + V - V + M (none)
III D: ii) 4d	NP ² + M + V - M + V (none)
III D: ii) 4e	NP ² + M + V - NP ² + M (none)
III D: ii) 4f	NP ² + M + V - M + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 4g	NP ² + M + V - V (none)
III D: ii) 4h	NP ² + M + V - NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 4j	NP ² + M + V - M (none)
III D: ii) 5a	M + V + NP ² - V + NP ²
III D: ii) 5b	M + V + NP ² - NP ² + V
III D: ii) 5c	M + V + NP ² - V + M (none)
III D: ii) 5d	M + V + NP ² - M + V (none)
III D: ii) 5e	M + V + NP ² - NP ² + M (none)
III D: ii) 5f	M + V + NP ² - M + NP ²
III D: ii) 5g	M + V + NP ² - V (none)
III D: ii) 5h	M + V + NP ² - NP ²
III D: ii) 5j	M + V + NP ² - M (none)
III D: ii) 6a	M + NP ² + V - V + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 6b	M + NP ² + V - NP ² + V (none)
III D: ii) 6c	M + NP ² + V - V + M (none)
III D: ii) 6d	M + NP ² + V - M + V (none)
III D: ii) 6e	M + NP ² + V - NP ² + M (none)
III D: ii) 6f	M + NP ² + V - M + NP ² (none)
III D: ii) 6g	M + NP ² + V - V (none)

III D: ii)6h	$M + NP^2 + V - NP^2$
III D: ii)6j	$M + NP^2 + V - M$ (none)
III D: ii)var ⁶⁵	$V-NP^2 + M - M$ $M + V-NP^2 - M$
IV A/B: ⁶⁶ i)1	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V + M$ $NP^1 + V - NP^1 + M + V$ $NP^1 + V - M + V + NP^1$
IV A/B: i)2 ⁶⁷	$NP^1 + V - NP^1 + V + M$

⁶⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 159. Collins describes only one line-form in this category and gives several examples of it, most of which fall into two semantic sets. However, he cites several cases which he does not quote, and adds the note, "with varying arrangements of constituents." In the description above, the second of the two line-forms under the heading III D: ii)var is supplied from the analysis of examples cited. This process of analysis is complicated by the fact that Collins does not always indicate which line in a given verse he intends to cite as an example, or what colometry he assumes. There are some verses where a division of $V-NP^2 - M + M$ or $M - V-NP^2 + M$ seems more probable, but Collins makes no allowance for such a form and, from the general description of his system, it is not at all clear what siglum would be used to designate such a line.

⁶⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164. In his description of Line-type IV, Collins becomes even less precise than usual in the identification of specific line-forms. For the most part, he lists only those line-forms which he has actually encountered, and frequently provides a single siglum for several related by differentiable line-forms. This may be partly due to the complexity of Line-type IV, for which there are a frightening total of 868 possible line forms (not counting possible variations). Fortunately for the reader, few of these ever occur.

It may be noted again that Collins has altered his sigla, in particular, by enlarging the use of the lower-case Roman numerals. Previously, "i)" meant that NP^1 was present, and "ii)" meant that it was absent. But on page 162 Collins indicates that, when used with reference to line-type IV, "i)" means that NP^1 is present in both line-halves, "ii)" means that it is absent from both halves, "iii)" means that NP^1 occurs only in the first line-half, and "iv)" means that the subject is expressed only in the second line-half.

Collins has also altered the order in which he presents the various line-forms. With line-types I, II and III, the sequence has been A i, A ii, B i, B ii, C i, C ii, D i, D ii. That is, the sequence has been determined first by the basic sentence type, and then by the line-type subdivision. With line-type IV this rule is reversed. Line-forms within line-type IV are arranged first by line-form subdivision and second by basic sentence type. For this reason the sequence is A/B i, A/C i, A/D i, B/A i, B/C i, etc., with the sentence type sequence repeated for each of the four line-type subdivisions.

⁶⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

	NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + M + V
	NP ¹ + V - V + NP ¹ + M
	NP ¹ + V - V + M + NP ¹
	NP ¹ + V - M + V + NP ¹
IV A/C: i)1 ⁶⁸	NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V + NP ² NP ¹ + V - NP ² + V + NP ¹
IV A/C: i)1var ⁶⁹	NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
IV A/C: i)2 ⁷⁰	NP ¹ + V - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
IV A/C: i)2var ⁷¹	V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
IV A/D: i)7 ²	(no occurrences)
IV B/A: i)7 ³ 1	NP ¹ + V + M - NP ¹ + V NP ¹ + V + M - V + NP ¹
IV B/A: i)2	NP ¹ + M + V - NP ¹ + V NP ¹ + M + V - V + NP ¹
IV B/A: i)3	V + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + V V + NP ¹ + M - V + NP ¹
IV B/A: i)4	V + M + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V V + M + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹
IV B/A: i)5 ⁷⁴	M + NP ¹ + V - (no occurrences)

⁶⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

⁶⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

⁷⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

⁷¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 164.

⁷²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 165. Collins does not describe this line-type in any of its possible forms or subdivisions. Its constituents (NP¹ + V - NP¹ + V + NP² + M) may be deduced from Collins' general description of the line-types on page 25.

⁷³The six line-forms of the IV B/A: i) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 165. Subdivisions of these line-forms, where they occur, are not specifically identified by a distinct siglum.

⁷⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 165. Collins describes only the first half of this line. The second half, should such a line ever occur, would contain NP¹, V and NP².

IV B/A: i)6	M + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V M + V + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹
IV B/C: i)75 ¹⁷⁶	NP ¹ + V + M - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
IV B/C: i)2 ⁷⁷	NP ¹ + M + V - NP ² + NP ¹ + V NP ¹ + M + V - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
IV B/C: i)3	V + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + V + NP ² V + NP ¹ + M - NP ² + NP ¹ + V V + NP ¹ + M - NP ² + V + NP ¹
IV B/C: i)3var	V + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + V-NP ² V + NP ¹ + M - V-NP ² + NP ¹
IV B/C: i)4	V + M + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + NP ² V + M + NP ¹ - V + NP ² + NP ¹
IV B/C: i)4var	V + M + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V-NP ² V + M + NP ¹ - V-NP ² + NP ¹
IV B/C: i)5 ⁷⁸	M + NP ¹ + V - (no occurrences)
IV B/C: i)6	M + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V + NP ² M + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + NP ² + V M + V + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + NP ²
IV B/D: i)79	NP ¹ + V + M - NP ¹ + M + V + NP ²

⁷⁵The six possible line-forms of the IV B/C: i) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 166. Collins does not offer separate sigla for the subdivisions of these line-forms, even though such subdivisions occur in several cases.

⁷⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 166. Consistency should require Collins to identify this line-form as IV B/C: i)1 var, since it involves the reduction of the object of the verb to a pronoun suffix, but Collins does not do so. Collins omits several hypothetically possible line-forms in the IV B/C Line-type.

⁷⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 166. Again, consistency should require that the latter of these two line-forms be identified as IV B/C: i)2 var, since it involves the reduction of the object of the verb to a pronoun suffix.

⁷⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 166. Collins describes only the first half of this line-form. From Collins' general description of his system, it is possible to deduce that the second half, should such a line ever occur, would contain the constituents NP¹, V and NP².

⁷⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 167. Collins does not designate specific line-forms within this line-type. His failure to do so may be attributed to the paucity of examples: Collins has found only five lines of this type, all of

	$NP^1 + M + V - NP^1 + NP^2 + V + M$ $V + M + NP^1 - NP^1 + V + NP^2 + M$ $NP^1 + M + V - NP^1 + M + V - NP^2$ $V + M + NP^1 - NP^1 + M + V - NP^2$
IV C/A: i) ⁸⁰ 1	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V$ $NP^1 + V + NP^2 - V + NP^1$
IV C/A: i) 2	$NP^1 + NP^2 + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV C/A: i) 3	$V + NP^1 + NP^2 - NP^1 + V$ $V + NP^1 + NP^2 - V + NP^1$
IV C/A: i) 4 ⁸¹	$V + NP^2 + NP^1 -$ (no occurrences)
IV C/A: i) 5	$NP^2 + NP^1 + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV C/A: i) 6	$NP^2 + V + NP^1 -$ (no occurrences)
IV C/B: i) ⁸² 1	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - NP^1 + V + M$ $NP^1 + V + NP^2 - V + NP^1 + M$ $NP^1 + V + NP^2 - M + V + NP^1$
IV C/B: i) 1 var ⁸³	$NP^1 + V - NP^2 - NP^1 + V + M$

which differ from each other in the sequence of constituents. Nevertheless, consistency with his system would require the last two forms listed here to be identified as IV B/d: i) var, inasmuch as they involve the reduction of NP^2 to a suffix attached to the verb.

⁸⁰The six line-forms of the IV C/A: i) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 167. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions of these line-forms, even where two subdivisions occur. In the case of those which do not occur in the texts studied by Collins, only the first half of the line is described. The constituents of the second half-line (NP^1 and V) can be inferred from Collins' general description of the system.

⁸¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 167. Collins describes the first colon of IV C/A: i) 4 as $V + NP^1 + NP^2$. This is identical to the first colon of IV C/A: i) 3, and is clearly a typographical error. Comparison with earlier line-types implies that this line form should have the object before the subject, as it has been described in the table. The question is purely academic for Collins, since he has not found any occurrences of this line-form.

⁸²The six line-forms of the IV C/B: i) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 167, 168. Collins does not distinguish subdivisions of these line-forms.

⁸³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 168. Collins does not actually list this line-form. After giving the three forms of IV C/B i) 1 indicated above, he adds the note "Variation with NP^2 suffix," followed by a reference to Jeremiah 2:8. It

IV C/B: i)2	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + V + M NP ¹ + NP ² + V - NP ¹ + M + V
IV C/B: i)3	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - NP ¹ + M + V V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + M V + NP ¹ + NP ² - M + V + NP ¹
IV C/B: i)4	V + NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + M + V V + NP ² + NP ¹ - M + V + NP ¹
IV C/B: i)4var ⁸⁴	V-NP ² + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + V + M V-NP ² + NP ¹ - V + NP ¹ + M
IV C/B: i)5	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V + NP ¹ + M
IV C/B: i)6	NP ² + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + M + V NP ² + V + NP ¹ - V + M + NP ¹
IV C/D: i)	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M
IV C/D: i)var ⁸⁵	NP ¹ + V-NP ² - NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² NP ² + V + NP ¹ - NP ¹ + M + V-NP ²
IV D/A: ⁸⁶ i)	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - V + NP ¹
IV D/B: i)	NP ¹ + M + V + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + M
IV D/C: i)	V + NP ¹ + NP ² + M - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
IV D/C: i)var ⁸⁷	V-NP ² + NP ¹ + M - NP ¹ + V-NP ²

is from this verse that the line- form for IV C/B i)1 var has been deduced.

⁸⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 168. Again, the pattern is not listed by Collins, who only notes "Variation with NP² suffix," followed by verse references to Isaiah 34:11 and Amos 2:4, from which these line forms have been deduced.

⁸⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 168. These lines-forms are described in full, in exception to Collins' practice elsewhere. (Cf. Collins' treatment of IV C/B: i)4var on the same page, and of IV D/C: i)var on page 169.)

⁸⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 169. Collins does not list any of the potential line forms of the IVD/A, IVD/B or IVD/C line-types, due to paucity of examples -- he has found only one occurrence of each line type.

⁸⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 169. Collins does not list this line-form, but cites two examples from which this variant line-form is deduced.

IV A/B: ii) ⁸⁸	(no occurrences)
IV A/C: ii) ⁸⁹	V - V + NP ²
IV A/D: ii) ⁹⁰	(no occurrences)
IV B/A: ii) ⁹¹	V + M - V
IV B/C: ii) ⁹² 1	V + M - V + NP ² V + M - NP ² + V
IV B/C: ii)1var	V + M - V-NP ²
IV B/C: ii)2	M + V - V + NP ² M + V - NP ² + V
IV B/D ii) ⁹³ 1	V + M - V + NP ² + M V + M - V + M + NP ² V + M - NP ² + V + M V + M - NP ² + M + V V + M - M + V + NP ² V + M - M + NP ² + V

⁸⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 171. As noted above, with earlier line-types, Collins has distinguished divisions i) and ii) on the basis of whether the subject of the verb was expressed or implied. With line-type IV, this system must be refined. Four divisions are recognized: i), ii), iii) and iv). These are characterized as follows. Division i) consists of those bicola in which the NP¹ is present in both cola. Division ii) consists of those lines in which the subject is not expressed in either colon. Division iii) contains those lines in which the subject is expressed in the first colon but not the second, and Division iv) contains those lines in which the subject of the verb is expressed in the second colon but not the first.

Collins does not actually describe the IV A/B: ii) line-type which should theoretically contain the constituents V - V + M.

⁸⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 171.

⁹⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 171. Collins does not actually describe the IV A/D: ii) line-type, which should theoretically contain the constituents V - V + NP² + M.

⁹¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 171.

⁹²The various line-forms of the IV B/C ii) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 171, 172. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions of these forms.

⁹³The various line-forms of the IV B/D: ii) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions of these line-forms.

IV B/D ii)1var ⁹⁴	V + M - V-NP ² + M V + M - M + V-NP ²
IV B/D ii)2	M + V - V + NP ² + M M + V - V + M + NP ²
IV B/D ii)2var ⁹⁵	M + V - M + V-NP ²
IV C/A ii) ⁹⁶	V + NP ² - V NP ² + V - V
IV C/B: ii) ⁹⁷ 1	V + NP ² - V + M V + NP ² - M + V
IV C/B: ii)1var ⁹⁸	V-NP ² - M + V
IV C/B: ii)2	NP ² + V - V + M NP ² + V - M + V
IV C/D: ii) ⁹⁹ 1	V + NP ² - V + NP ² + M V + NP ² - V + M + NP ² V + NP ² - NP ² + M + V V + NP ² - M + V + NP ²
IV C/D: ii)1var ¹⁰⁰	V + NP ² - V-NP ² + M V + NP ² - M + V-NP ²
IV C/D: ii)2	NP ² + V - V + NP ² + M

⁹⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172. The specific line-forms are deduced from examples cited but not analyzed by Collins.

⁹⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172. The specific line-form is deduced from examples cited by Collins.

⁹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172. Consistency with his system should oblige Collins to identify these two line-forms as IV C/A: ii)1 and IV C/A: ii)2, respectively.

⁹⁷The various line-forms of the IV C/B: ii) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172, 173. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions.

⁹⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 173. The specific line-forms are deduced from an example cited by Collins.

⁹⁹The various line-forms of the IV C/D: ii) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 173. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions of these forms.

¹⁰⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 173. The specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

	$NP^2 + V - M + V + NP^2$
IV D/A: ii) ¹⁰¹	$V + M + NP^2 - V$
IV D/B: ii) ¹⁰² 1	$V + NP^2 + M - V + M$ $V + NP^2 + M - M + V$
IV D/B: ii)1var ¹⁰³	$V-NP^2 + M - V + M$
IV D/B: ii)2	$V + M + NP^2 - V + M$ $V + M + NP^2 - M + V$
IV D/B: ii)3	$NP^2 + V + M - M + V$
IV D/B: ii)4	$NP^2 + M + V - M + V$
IV D/B: ii)5	$M + V + NP^2 - V + M$
IV D/B: ii)5var ¹⁰⁴	$M + V-NP^2 - V + M$
IV D/B: ii)6 ¹⁰⁵	$M + NP^2 + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV D/C: ii) ¹⁰⁶ 1	$V + NP^2 + M - V + NP^2$ $V + NP^2 + M - NP^2 + V$

¹⁰¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 172.

¹⁰²The six line-forms of the IV D/C: ii) line-type are described in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 173,174. No attempt is made to distinguish subdivisions of these forms.

¹⁰³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. Collins does actually describe this line-form, but it can be inferred from his general description of the system, and from examples cited.

¹⁰⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. Collins does not describe this line-form, but it can be inferred from his general description of the system, and from examples cited.

¹⁰⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of IV D/B: ii)6. The constituents of the second half-line can be inferred from Collins' general description of the system, and from the example cited.

¹⁰⁶The various line-forms of the IV D/C ii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174,175, including partial descriptions of even those line-forms which do not occur.

IV D/C: ii)1var ¹⁰⁷	$V-NP^2 + M - V + NP^2$
IV D/C: ii)2	$V + M + NP^2 - V + NP^2$ $V + M + NP^2 - NP^2 + V$
IV D/C: ii)3	$NP^2 + V + M - V + NP^2$
IV D/C: ii)4 ¹⁰⁸	$NP^2 + M + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV D/C: ii)5	$M + V + NP^2 - V + NP^2$ $M + V + NP^2 - NP^2 + V$
IV D/C: ii)5var ¹⁰⁹	$M + V + NP^2 - V-NP^2$
IV D/C: ii)6 ¹¹⁰	$M + NP^2 + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV A/B: iii) ¹¹¹ 1	$NP^1 + V - V + M$ $NP^1 + V - M + V$
IV A/B: iii)2	$V + NP^1 - V + M$ $V + NP^1 - M + V$
IV A/C: iii) ¹¹² 1	$NP^1 + V - V + NP^2$ $NP^1 + V - NP^2 + V$
IV A/C: iii)2	$V + NP^1 - V + NP^2$ $V + NP^1 - NP^2 + V$

¹⁰⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. The specific line-form is deduced from Collins' general description of the system, and from examples cited by Collins.

¹⁰⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of IV D/C: ii)4. The constituents of the second half-line ($V + NP^2$) can be inferred from Collins' general description of the system.

¹⁰⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 175. The specific line-form is deduced from examples cited by Collins.

¹¹⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 174. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of IV D/C: ii)6. The constituents of the second half-line ($V + NP^2$) can be inferred from Collins' general description of the system.

¹¹¹The various line-forms of the IV A/B: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 177.

¹¹²The various line-forms of the IV A/C: iii) are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 177, 178.

IV A/D: iii) ¹¹³ 1	NP ¹ + V - V + NP ² + M NP ¹ + V - V + M + NP ² NP ¹ + V - M + V + NP ²
IV A/D: iii)2	V + NP ¹ - V + NP ² + M
IV B/A: iii) ¹¹⁴ 1	NP ¹ + V + M - V
IV B/A: iii)2	V + NP ¹ + M - V
IV B/C: iii) ¹¹⁵ 1	NP ¹ + V + M - V + NP ² NP ¹ + V + M - NP ² + V
IV B/C: iii)2	NP ¹ + M + V - V + NP ² NP ¹ + M + V - NP ² + V
IV B/C: iii)3	V + NP ¹ + M - V + NP ² V + NP ¹ + M - NP ² + V
IV B/C: iii)3var ¹¹⁶	V + NP ¹ + M - V-NP ²
IV B/C: iii)4	V + M + NP ¹ - V + NP ² V + M + NP ¹ - NP ² + V
IV B/C: iii)5 ¹¹⁷	M + NP ¹ + V - (no occurrences)
IV B/C: iii)6	M + V + NP ¹ - V + NP ²
IV B/D: iii)1 ¹¹⁸	NP ¹ + V + M - V + NP ² + M

¹¹³The various line-forms of the IV A/D: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 178.

¹¹⁴The various line-forms of the IV B/A: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 178.

¹¹⁵The various line-forms of the IV B/C: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 179, including a partial description of line form IV B/C: iii)5, for which Collins has found no examples.

¹¹⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 179. The specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

¹¹⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 179. As with his description of line-type IVC/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of line-form IV B/C: iii)5. The constituents of the second half-line (V + NP²) can be inferred from Collins's general description of his system.

¹¹⁸The various line-forms of the IV B/D: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 180.

	$NP^1 + V + M - V + M + NP^2$
	$NP^1 + V + M - NP^2 + V + M$
	$NP^1 + V + M - M + V + NP^2$
IV B/D: iii)2	$NP^1 + M + V - NP^2 + M + V$
	$NP^1 + M + V - M + V + NP^2$
IV B/D: iii)3	$V + NP^1 + M - V + NP^2 + M$
	$V + NP^1 + M - V + M + NP^2$
	$V + NP^1 + M - M + V + NP^2$
IV B/D: iii)3var ¹¹⁹	$V + NP^1 + M - M + V + NP^2$
IV B/D: iii)4 ¹²⁰	$V + M + NP^1 -$ (no occurrences)
IV B/D: iii)5 ¹²¹	$M + NP^1 + V -$ (no occurrences)
IV B/D: iii)6	$M + V + NP^1 - V + M + NP^2$
IV C/A: iii) ¹²²	$V + NP^1 + NP^2 - V$
IV C/B: iii) ¹²³ 1	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - V + M$
	$NP^1 + V + NP^2 - M + V$
IV C/B: iii)2	$NP^1 + NP^2 + V - M + V$
IV C/B: iii)3	$V + NP^1 + NP^2 - V + M$
IV C/B: iii)4	$V + NP^2 + NP^1 - V + M$
IV C/B: iii)4var ¹²⁴	$V - NP^2 + NP^1 - M + V$

¹¹⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 180. The specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

¹²⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 179. As with his description of line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of line-form IV B/D: iii)4. The constituents of the second half-line ($V + NP^2 + M$) can be inferred from Collins's general description of his system.

¹²¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 179. As with his description of line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line of line-form IV B/D: iii)5. The constituents of the second half-line ($V + NP^2 + M$) can be inferred from Collins's general description of his system.

¹²²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 180.

¹²³The various line-forms of the IV C/B: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 180-181.

¹²⁴T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. This specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

IV C/B: iii)5 ¹²⁵	M + NP ¹ + NP ² - (no occurrences)
IV C/B: iii)6 ¹²⁶	M + NP ² + NP ¹ - (no occurrences)
IV C/D: iii)1 ¹²⁷	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V + NP ² + M
IV C/D: iii)1var ¹²⁸	NP ¹ + V + NP ² - V-NP ² + M NP ¹ + V-NP ² - V-NP ² + M NP ¹ + V-NP ² - M + V-NP ²
IV C/D: iii)2	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - M + V + NP ²
IV C/D: iii)2var ¹²⁹	NP ¹ + NP ² + V - V-NP ² + M
IV C/D: iii)3	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + NP ² + M V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V + M + NP ²
IV C/D: iii)3var ¹³⁰	V + NP ¹ + NP ² - V-NP ² + M
IV C/D: iii)4 ¹³¹	V-NP ² + NP ¹ - M + V + NP ²

¹²⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. The IV C/B: iii)5 Line-form is cited exactly as Collins presents it. This presentation is clearly in error, since Basic Sentence C does not contain modifiers of the verb. Logically, this line form should be NP² + NP¹ + V. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line. The constituents of the second half-line (V + M) can be deduced from Collins' description of the system.

¹²⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. The IV C/B: iii)6 Line-form is cited exactly as Collins presents it. This presentation is clearly in error, since Basic Sentence C does not contain modifiers of the verb. Logically, this line form should be NP² + V + NP¹. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half-line. The constituents of the second half-line (V + M) can be deduced from Collins' general description of the system.

¹²⁷The various line-forms of the IV C/D: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181.

¹²⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. The specific line-forms are deduced from examples cited by Collins.

¹²⁹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. The specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

¹³⁰T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. The specific line-form is deduced from an example cited by Collins.

¹³¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. Strict consistency with previously established nomenclature would require that the line-form described here by Collins should be identified as IV C/D: iii)4var. Collins has encountered no occurrences of a IV C/D: iii)4 line in which the object of the verb is a noun or

IV C/D: iii) ¹³² 5	NP ² + NP ¹ + V - (no occurrences)
IV C/D: iii)6	NP ² + V + NP ¹ - (no occurrences)
IV D/A: iii) ¹³³	V + NP ¹ + NP ² + M - V V + M + NP ² + NP ¹ - V
IV D/B: iii) ¹³⁴ 1	NP ¹ + V + M + NP ² - V + M
IV D/B: iii)2	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - V + M
IV D/B: iii)3	V + NP ¹ + NP ² + M - V + M
IV D/C: iii) ¹³⁵	NP ¹ + V + NP ² + M - V + NP ² NP ¹ + V - NP ² + M - NP ² + V V + NP ¹ + NP ² + M - NP ² + V
IV B/A: iv) ¹³⁶ 1	V + M - NP ¹ + V V + M - V + NP ¹
IV B/A: iv)2	M + V - NP ¹ + V M + V - V + NP ¹
IV B/C: iv) ¹³⁷	V + M - NP ¹ + V - NP ² V + M - V - NP ² + NP ¹
IV B/D: iv) ¹³⁸	V + M - M + NP ¹ + V - NP ²

noun phrase, rather than a pronoun suffixed to the verb.

¹³²T. Collins, Line-Forms, 181. As with line-type IV C/A: i), Collins describes only the first half line of line-forms IV C/D: iii)5 and IV C/D: iii)6 the constituents of the second half-line (V + NP² + M) can be deduced from Collins' general description of the system.

¹³³T. Collins, Line-Forms, 182.

¹³⁴The various line-forms of the IV D/B: iii) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 182.

¹³⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 182.

¹³⁶The various line-forms of the IV B/A: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 183.

¹³⁷T. Collins, Line-Forms, 184.

¹³⁸T. Collins, Line-Forms, 184.

IV C/A: iv) ¹³⁹ 1	V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V V + NP ² - V + NP ¹
IV C/A: iv)2	NP ² + V - V + NP ¹
IV C/B: iv) ¹⁴⁰ 1	V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + M V + NP ² - V + M + NP ¹ V + NP ² - M + V + NP ¹
IV C/B: iv)2	NP ² + V - NP ¹ + V + M NP ² + V - NP ¹ + M + V NP ² + V - V + NP ¹ + M NP ² + V - M + V + NP ¹
IV C/D: iv) ¹⁴¹	V + NP ² - NP ¹ + NP ² + V + M V + NP ² - M + V + NP ¹ + NP ²
IV D/A: iv) ¹⁴² 1	V + NP ² + M - NP ¹ + V V + NP ² + M - V + NP ¹
IV D/A: iv)2	V + M + NP ² - NP ¹ + V
IV D/A: iv)3	NP ² + V + M - V + NP ¹
IV D/A: iv)4	NP ² + M + V - (no occurrences)
IV D/A: iv)5	M + V + NP ² - (no occurrences)
IV D/A: iv)6	M + NP ² + V - (no occurrences)
IV D/B: iv) ¹⁴³ 1	V + NP ² + M - NP ¹ + V + M

¹³⁹The various line-forms of the IV C/A: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-forms, 184.

¹⁴⁰The various line-forms of the IV C/B: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 184.

¹⁴¹T. Collins, Line-Forms, 185.

¹⁴²The various line-forms of the IV D/A: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 185, including IV D/A: iv)4, 5 and 6, for which Collins has found no examples. Collins describes only the first half-line of these last three line-forms, but the constituents of the second half-line (NP¹ + V) can be deduced from the general description of the system.

¹⁴³The various line-forms of the IV D/B: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 185, 186, including IV D/B: iv)4 and 6, for which Collins has found no examples. Collins describes only the first half-line of these last three line-forms, but the constituents of the second half-line (NP¹ + V + M) can be deduced from the general description of the system.

	V + NP ² + M - NP ¹ + M + V
	V + NP ² + M - V + NP ¹ + M
	V + NP ² + M - M + NP ¹ + V
IV D/B: iv)2	V + M + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + M
	V + M + NP ² - V + M + NP ¹
	V + M + NP ² - M + NP ¹ + V
IV D/B: iv)3	NP ² + V + M - NP ¹ + M + V
	NP ² + V + M - V + NP ¹ + M
IV D/B: iv)4	NP ² + M + V - (no occurrences)
IV D/B: iv)5	M + V + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + M
	M + V + NP ² - V + NP ¹ + M
IV D/B: iv)6	M + NP ² + V - (no occurrences)
IV D/C: iv)1 ¹⁴⁴	V + NP ² + M - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
IV D/C: iv)1var ¹⁴⁵	V-NP ² + M - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
	V-NP ² + M - V-NP ² + NP ¹
IV D/C: iv)2	V + M + NP ² - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
	V + M + NP ² - NP ² + V + NP ¹
IV D/C: iv)2var ¹⁴⁶	V + M + NP ² - NP ¹ + V-NP ²
IV D/C: iv)3	NP ² + V + M - NP ¹ + V + NP ²
IV D/C: iv)4	NP ² + M + V - (no occurrences)
IV D/C: iv)5	M + V + NP ² - (no occurrences)
IV D/C: iv)6	M + NP ² + V - (no occurrences)

¹⁴⁴The various line-forms of the IV D/C: iv) line-type are listed in T. Collins, Line-Forms, 186, including IV D/C: iv)4, 5 and 6, for which Collins has found no examples. Collins describes only the first half-line of these last three line-forms, but the constituents of the second half-line (NP¹ + V + NP²) can be deduced from the general description of the system.

¹⁴⁵T. Collins, Line-Forms, 186. These specific line-forms are deduced from examples cited, but not analyzed by Collins.

¹⁴⁶T. Collins, Line-Forms, 186. This specific line-form is deduced from an example cited but not analyzed by Collins. Collins asserts the existence of this line-form on the basis of a single occurrence, admitting, however, that this is dubious. Furthermore, the verse in question (Isaiah 62:2) contains only four words, and could best be construed as V-NP² + M - NP¹ + V-NP², i.e., line-form IV D/C: iv)1 var.

APPENDIX TWO

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE TRIAL PASSAGES

No attempt is made to be comprehensive in the following textual comments: the comments presented here are chosen for their (potential) effect on the verse structure of the texts under consideration. Since the four theories of verse structure which are analyzed in this study deal with various facets of the text, the comments included will refer to proposed emendations which would have significant effect on the number of syllables or stresses, the syntactic arrangement of the texts, and the major semantic themes. Other comments, however insightful or interesting, which do not bear on the question of verse structure have been ignored. Furthermore, emendations which have been suggested solely on the grounds of some theory of meter or verse structure will be dismissed: it is not the intention of this study to adjust the data to fit the theory, however convenient such adjustments might appear. Because of the logically prior decision to test the theories of verse structure on the unemended Masoretic text, even those emendations which have wide support on grounds unrelated to the verse structure will not actually be admitted for the purposes of this study. Nevertheless, the following text-critical comments do serve two purposes here. In the first place, they will alert the reader to some points in the text where plausible emendations would tend to make one or another of the theories of verse structure appear more probable. In the second place, although the text of every one of the poems studied here has been reasonably challenged at some points, these comments show the texts to be substantially intact, even in the most difficult case, Judges 5. Thus, a theory of verse structure which explains the substantial majority of one of these poems has a reasonable probability of being a correct theory.

THE SONG OF DEBORAH: JUDGES 5:2-31b

There is hardly a passage in the Hebrew Scriptures which has been as often and as intensively subjected to conjecture and emendation as the Song of Deborah. Comparison of the critical commentators, especially those of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reveals that hardly a verse of this song has been untouched by the proposals for emendation.¹ Despite this widespread practice, there is a growing tendency among scholars to attempt to maintain and comprehend the Masoretic Text. Gilles Gerleman's introductory statement reflects this tendency:

The interpretation of Judges V presents difficulties in many ways unparalleled in the Old Testament. Its language is stamped by an archaic quality and a brevity which makes its meaning not easily intelligible. The Song of Deborah belongs also to the most conjectured upon and the most criticized of Old Testament texts. The commentaries give one an almost helpless feeling that a critic, by nearly any variation, by any transposition of the radicals, and by any new division of the words, can produce new readable combinations possessing more or less rational meaning. Nearly all of these conjectures imply an arbitrary deviation from the transmitted text. The sense of the Massoretic text as it stands, what meaning the Massoretes themselves made of it, is a point too often absent from discussion by those eager to make brilliant conjectures. Yet it must be stated as a principle that the primary task of textual criticism in the Old Testament is to interpret the Massoretic text. Every critic who treats this matter summarily and dismisses the Massoretic tradition with a "corruptum", necessarily works without firm ground under his feet.²

To this generalization, Gerleman adds the specific note that "As far as the Song of Deborah is concerned, at any rate, textual alterations metri causa must be regarded as arbitrary."³ Others recommending that the reader hold as

¹This point may be illustrated by the commentaries of George Foot Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges, vol. 7 in The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895) and C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix, 1903, reprinted with a prolegomenon by William F. Albright (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1970).

²Gillis Gerleman, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Stylistics," Vetus Testamentum 1 (1951): 168.

³G. Gerleman, "The Song of Deborah . . . ," 169.

close as possible to the Masoretic text include Alexander Globe, who warns that the major differences in the proposed emendations on a single passage are an indication of the subjectivity of the process of textual emendation.⁴ If general, or at least wide, agreement cannot be found in favor of a specific emendation, it may be well to leave the text unemended, despite its obscurity, even in cases where there is wide or even general, agreement that the text is indeed corrupt. This is frequently the practice of G. F. Moore, who, although he notes many possible emendations in his comments on the Song of Deborah, nevertheless incorporates relatively few of them in his translation, marking the sections which he believes to be intractably corrupted with an elipsis.⁵

Verse 2: There are two issues of long standing which have been raised regarding this verse. First, there is some question as to whether this verse is,⁶ or is not,⁷ part of the poem. Second, the meaning of בְּקָרְעַ פְּרָעוֹה is debated. Does this phrase refer to volunteering for war,⁸ engaging in leadership,⁹ or wearing

⁴Alexander Globe, "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5, 4-5," Biblica 55 (1974): 174.

⁵G. F. Moore, Judges, 171-173.

⁶G. F. Moore, Judges, 137, 171; J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," in The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), 719; Robert G. Boling, Judges (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1975), vol. 6A in The Anchor Bible, 99.

⁷See, e.g., C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges, 105.

⁸Peter C. Craigie, "A Note on Judges V 2," Vetus Testamentum 18 (1968): 399; Richard Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," in Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg, ed. John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), 132; R. G. Boling, Judges, 107.

⁹This view is taken by the translators of the Revised Standard Version, and is mentioned by G. F. Moore, Judges, 137, though Moore admits that this meaning can be clearly derived only from the Septuagint. In his own translation, Moore omits this phrase as intractably corrupt.

long hair?¹⁰ Or is it possibly some sort of conventional inceptive phrase?¹¹ This study accepts verse 2 as poetic, rather than as an annotation. Furthermore, whatever is meant by this root, in the context of Judges 5 it clearly applies to the preparations for war: even the "long hair" interpretation is assumed to refer to a vow of consecration on the part of the warriors.

Verse 3: At issue in this verse is whether the religious function of the verse is out of place in the context of a war ballad, as Blenkinsopp seems to suggest,¹² and whether the verse ought therefore to be excised. This view is rejected by Boling,¹³ whose arguments seem persuasive on this point. Patterson points out that such an "opening invitation to listen closely to the poet's words is common enough (cf. Exod. 15:1-2; Psalms 49:2; 143:1)."¹⁴

Verse 4: Burney and others suggest emending ¹דָּוָה to ¹דָּוָה in the interests of parallelism,¹⁵ but as Globe points out, this is unnecessary.¹⁶ The image of

¹⁰J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 719; C. F. Burney, Judges, 103, 107.

¹¹This view is apparently adopted by Michael D. Coogan in "A Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 40 (1978): 145. A similar position is taken by Abraham J. Brachman in "Judges 5.2," The Jewish Quarterly Review 39 (1949): 413. Brachman acknowledges that his translation is guided by the Septuagint.

¹²J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion," Biblica 42(1961): 66.

¹³R. G. Boling, Judges, 108.

¹⁴R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 132.

¹⁵C. F. Burney, Judges, 112. A similar position is reflected in the translation provided in G. F. Moore, Judges, 171.

¹⁶A. Globe, "The Text . . . of Judges 5,4-5," 173, 174.

the heavens dripping provides a good transition to the next colon, and the contrast of earth and heaven is echoed chiastically by clouds and mountains.

Verse 5: There is widespread support for repointing נָזַל as נָזַלָּה .¹⁷ Globe acknowledges that the Septuagint, Targum and Syriac all agree on this point, though he also notes that the root נָזַל , meaning "flow" or "trickle" might have been intended.¹⁸ The graver issue in this verse is the inclusion of $\text{וְהָיָה$. Older commentaries often describe this as a gloss¹⁹ or excise it metri causa.²⁰ Following Albright's suggestion,²¹ many of the more recent commentators have retained this phrase, understanding וְהָיָה as an archaic demonstrative particle.²²

Verse 6: "In the days of Jael" is frequently deleted as a gloss²³ or repointed as "From the days of old."²⁴ It was considered improbable by some that Jael, whose only exploit is described later in this same poem, and who is otherwise unknown, should be mentioned in the definition of the era. This view is now generally discounted.²⁵ There is also some discussion of whether מִיָּמֵי יַעֲלֵן refers

¹⁷This is supported by R. G. Boling, Judges, 108. Boling regards נָזַלָּה as "unintelligible." This view is also taken by G. F. Moore, Judges, 141; and C. F. Burney, Judges, 112.

¹⁸A. Globe, "The Text . . . of Judges 5,4-5," 173, 174.

¹⁹G. F. Moore, Judges, 141.

²⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 113.

²¹William F. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 62 (1936): 30.

²²R. G. Boling, Judges, 108; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 131; J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style . . .," 67; A. Globe, "The Text . . . of Judges 5,4-5," 170, 171.

²³G. F. Moore, Judges, 143.

²⁴C. F. Burney, Judges, 113, 114.

²⁵R. G. Boling, Judges, 109.

to "highways" or "caravans." This is associated with a parallel debate on the meaning or meanings of לָדָן, both in this verse and verse 7,²⁶ though the fundamental point of the passage seems to be the same: the era before the battle against Sisera was marked by disruption of communication and transportation.

Verse 7: In addition to the question regarding the definition of לָדָן, the meaning of בְּרִזּוֹן is also debated: should this be "villages,"²⁷ "village-dwellers"²⁸ or "warriors?"²⁹ Moore assumes a lacuna after the second occurrence of לָדָן in this verse.³⁰ The final two cola present a problem of a different sort. The Masoretic Text twice points the verb as first person singular, which agrees with the use of the first person in verse 9, as well as the prose remark in verse 1 that this poem was sung by Deborah and Barak. (It is not relevant here to attempt to determine whether this ascription is intended historically or fictively.) On the other hand, the second person references to Deborah in verses 12 and 15 would imply that this verb should also be in the second person. Moore notes that "the verbs may be either the first person or the second person feminine with the old ending."³¹ The latter view is widely supported.³²

²⁶Peter C. Craigie, "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah," Vetus Testamentum 22 (1972): 349, 350.

²⁷C. F. Burney, Judges, 115; G. F. Moore, Judges, 143.

²⁸This concept is reflected in the use of "peasantry" in the Revised Standard Version.

²⁹Peter C. Craigie, "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah," Vetus Testamentum 22 (1972): 350, 351; R. G. Boling, Judges, 109.

³⁰G. F. Moore, Judges, 171.

³¹G. F. Moore, Judges, 144.

³²See, e.g., C. F. Burney, Judges, 116; R. G. Boling, Judges, 102.

Verse 8: This is perhaps the most obscure verse in "The Song of Deborah." Burney calls it "the greatest crux of the poem"³³ and Boling remarks "This entire verse is notoriously difficult to translate."³⁴ Even more bluntly, Moore states, "Verse ^{8a} is unintelligible."³⁵ Traditional readings have usually supposed that this verse is associating the apostasy of Israel ("They chose new gods") with the oppression which befell the Israelites ("Then war was in the gates.") This reading has been almost universally rejected by modern scholarship. However, B. Margulis, who has discussed the issues of this verse extensively, points out, "the critics themselves are far from agreeing on any single interpretation, while some scholars have abandoned the quest in despair."³⁶ In the same context, Margulis also remarks,

It can be said of the various emendatory proposals that they generally do violence to the MT (esp. v. 8a^e) and/or that they produce a meaning which ill-suits the immediate context of the verse or the more general context of the poem.³⁷

Margulis' own emendatory proposal, which has not yet received wide critical agreement, reads Judges 5:8a,b as "When Elohim sharpened 'arrows,' Then was there war at the gates (of the enemy)"³⁸ This may be compared with other recent proposals such as that of Delbert Hillers: "They chose new gods; indeed they desired demons."³⁹ Richard Patterson's suggestion attempts to preserve the Masoretic consonants, but necessitates a redivision of words, the

³³C. F. Burney, Judges, 117.

³⁴R. G. Boling, Judges, 109.

³⁵G. F. Moore, Judges, 145.

³⁶B. Margulis, "An Exegesis of Judges V 8a," Vetus Testamentum 15 (1965): 67.

³⁷B. Margulis, "An Exegesis of Judges V 8a," 67.

³⁸B. Margulis, "An Exegesis of Judges V 8a," 71.

³⁹Delbert R. Hillers, "A Note on Judges 5:8a," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 27 (1975): 124.

deletion of a mater lectionis and the movement of ןן from the beginning of the third colon to the beginning of the second in order to offer the reader: "(When) God chose new (warriors), There was not a shield in five cities."⁴⁰ The last half of the verse is somewhat less controverted: here the only major issue is whether to render ףל with the traditional "thousand," the less precise "contingent" or the equally possible "chieftain." Despite the great variation in conjectural emendations and readings, the point of the verse is basically clear: during this time of national difficulty, the Israelites were poorly equipped for combat.

Verse 9: Of verses 9-11, Moore says,

The text of these verses has suffered so badly that there is no reasonable hope that any art or skill by the critic will ever be able to restore it. The ancient versions found the text in substantially the same state in which it has been transmitted to us, and had no tradition to guide them in interpreting it. The disjointed words and phrases to which we can attach a probable sense do not afford a sufficient basis for conjecture; the connection is impenetrably obscure.⁴¹

Moore does attempt a translation of verse 9, but indicates by an ellipsis his opinion that verses 10 and 11 are original, but hopelessly obscure, as well as being textually corrupt.⁴² This is perhaps excessively pessimistic, though there can be no doubt that the problems are quite real. Verse 9 is terse. The last two words are an interjection syntactically unrelated to the context, though the call to praise the Lord at this first sight of relief from the oppressors is logical enough. Burney emends לכו חוקקי לבי לחוקקי to לכו חוקקי, "Come, ye commanders . . ."⁴³ but this is unnecessary. The verse is meaningful as it stands: the singer sees the commanders and volunteers of Israel, and is moved

⁴⁰R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 127.

⁴¹G. F. Moore, Judges, 146.

⁴²G. F. Moore, Judges, 172.

⁴³C. F. Burney, Judges, 122.

to praise God. The subsequent two verses invite various categories of persons in Israel to tell or hear of the triumph which is about to be reported.

Verse 10: Other than the trivial issues of the exact colour of the donkeys in the first colon and the precise identities of the various groups of people described in the three cola, the only serious interpretive issue in this verse is the definition of **יָדָה**, usually translated "carpet." This seems not to fit in the series which begins with the riders of donkeys and ends with those who walk the roads. Burney suggests emending **יָדָה-עַל-יְשִׁבֵי** to **יָשְׁבוּ עַל לֵב**, "recall to mind."⁴⁴ Boling, following a suggestion which he attributes to D. N. Freedman, suggests that **יָדָה** refers to "the seat of judgement,"⁴⁵ but fails to show how this would resolve the discontinuity between this colon and those which precede and follow it.

Verse 11: After a review of earlier studies of Judges 5:11a, Burney concludes,

This survey of the interpretation of the stichos may serve to show that every artifice has been employed by scholars, ancient and modern, to extract a suitable meaning . . . and that the best suggestions possess only the slightest claims to serious consideration. It is probable, therefore, that the text has suffered corruption.⁴⁶

On this basis, Burney justifies his emendation of **קוֹל תִּחְצְצִים** to **קוֹל תִּחְצְקוֹת**, "the maidens laughing,"⁴⁷ which has no textual support in Hebrew or any of the ancient versions. Other emendations or interpretations have been suggested⁴⁸ but none has been widely accepted. Morris Seale emends **פְּרִוּן** [sic]

⁴⁴C. F. Burney, Judges, 122, 123.

⁴⁵R. G. Boling, Judges, 111.

⁴⁶C. F. Burney, Judges, 128.

⁴⁷C. F. Burney, Judges, 125.

⁴⁸See C. F. Burney, Judges, 125-128.

in the third colon to **פזרן**, making it refer to acts of generous distribution.⁴⁹ It is generally agreed that the last colon should be associated with the muster of the tribes described in verses 12 to 18, particularly in view of its resemblance to the final colon of verse 13.⁵⁰ Burney, who moves verse 12 before verse 9 in order to attain a descending social sequence in the passage, deletes the last colon of verse eleven as a dittography.⁵¹

Verse 12: The authenticity of this verse is generally conceded. Burney reprints **שְׂרָיִךְ** as **שְׂרָיִךְ**, "your captors,"⁵² a suggestion which also has the approval of Moore.⁵³

Verse 13: The correct vocalization of the two occurrences of **רָיִךְ** in this verse is discussed by Burney⁵⁴ and Boling⁵⁵. The meaning of **רָיִךְ**, traditionally understood as "remnant" or "survivors," is reinterpreted as "a mailclad warrior" by Seale.⁵⁶ Nadav Na'aman takes this as a nomen loci for an Israelite town mentioned in Joshua 19:10, 12.⁵⁷

⁴⁹Morris S. Seale, "Deborah's Ode and the Ancient Arabian Qasida," Journal of Biblical Literature 81 (1962): 345.

⁵⁰Alexander Globe, "The Muster of the Tribes in Judges 5 11e-18," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 87 (1975): 169. See also R. G. Boling, Judges, 111.

⁵¹C. F. Burney, Judges, 130.

⁵²C. F. Burney, Judges, 120.

⁵³G. F. Moore, Judges, 150.

⁵⁴C. F. Burney, Judges, 130, 131.

⁵⁵R. G. Boling, Judges, 111.

⁵⁶M. S. Seale, "Deborah's Ode . . .," 346.

⁵⁷Nadav Na'aman, "Literary and Topographical Notes on the Battle of Kishon (Judges IV-V)," Vetus Testamentum 40 (1990): 425.

Verse 14: Of this verse, Moore says rather pessimistically that "In the first two lines nothing is certain but the names, Ephraim and Benjamin."⁵⁸ Even Patterson, who is normally zealous for the Masoretic Text, acknowledges that this is a "difficult line," and is prepared to consider some emendations.⁵⁹ The first colon presents two difficulties: the meaning of סָרְשָׁרְשָׁ and the original reading of עַמְלֵק . A variety of conjectures are offered for the first problem. Burney emends סָרְשָׁ to סָרְשָׁרְשָׁ , "they spread out,"⁶⁰ which is clever, but entirely gratuitous. Boling reads סָרְשָׁ as a verb, "to be rooted," implying a rebuke to Ephraim for remaining away from the battle.⁶¹ Patterson separates שָׁ as the relative pronoun before the verb סָרְשָׁ , meaning "to note."⁶² The common emendation of עַמְלֵק is קָמַע , "valley,"⁶³ though Boling believes that the Amalekites were so widely scattered that there may have been areas named for them in almost any part of the country, including that inhabited by Ephraim.⁶⁴ The second colon is equally obscure, eliciting Boling's comment, "It is extremely difficult to know what to make of this line."⁶⁵ A similar expression in Hosea 5:8,9 has led Boling and Burney to suggest that this may be some conventional military expression, the meaning of which is no longer accessible to us.⁶⁶ The second half of the verse is only a little clearer. Claus

⁵⁸G. F. Moore, Judges, 150.

⁵⁹R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 135.

⁶⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 133.

⁶¹R. G. Boling, Judges, 111.

⁶²R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 135.

⁶³See, e.g., C. F. Burney, Judges, 133.

⁶⁴R. G. Boling, Judges, 111; cf. H. Cazelles, "Déborah (Jud. V 14), Amaleq et Makir," Vetus Testamentum 24 (1974): 235-238.

⁶⁵R. G. Boling, Judges, 111.

⁶⁶R. G. Boling, Judges, 112; C. F. Burney, Judges, 133, 134.

Rietzschel deduces a complicated textual history for this passage, which implies, among other things, that a colon has been dropped from the second half of verse 14.⁶⁷ There is wide discussion regarding the identity of Machir,⁶⁸ and the meaning of מַכִּיר בְּרַחֲמֵי. The point of the verse, like much of the rest of this passage, is simply to designate which tribes did, or did not, come to the aid of Deborah and Barak.

Verse 15: Like the preceding verse, verse 15 has been the object of much discussion and conjecture. Myers and Elliot assert that "Vs. 15 as it stands is totally obscure."⁶⁹ Moore says of this verse that "The first line may perhaps be made to read, And the princes of Issachar were with Deborah, or, were the people of Deborah; the rest defies translation."⁷⁰ There is additional support for repointing the first two words as a construct phrase.⁷¹ Other conjectures do not have broad support. There is an extensive debate regarding the last colon of this verse and the very similar final colon of verse 16.⁷² Should one of these be deleted as a dittography,⁷³ should one be emended to make the two identical,⁷⁴ or should the two lines be contrasted as a play on words?⁷⁵

⁶⁷Claus Rietzschel, "Zu Jdc 5 14^b-15^a," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83 (1971): 211-225.

⁶⁸See, e.g., C. F. Burney, Judges, 134-136; R. G. Boling, Judges, 112.

⁶⁹J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 724.

⁷⁰G. F. Moore, Judges, 151.

⁷¹See, e.g., C. F. Burney, Judges, 136; R. G. Boling, Judges, 112.

⁷²See Alexander Globe, "The Muster of the Tribes . . .," 174.

⁷³Cf. G. F. Moore, Judges, 172; C. F. Burney, Judges, 163.

⁷⁴J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 723.

⁷⁵R. G. Boling, Judges, 112; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 128.

Verse 16: In addition to the final colon, discussed in connection with verse 15, several other facets of this verse have attracted critical attention. Myers and Elliott assert that a tribal name must be supplied in the first colon of verse 16, and suggest Gad.⁷⁶ There is also discussion of the meanings of the terms מִשְׁפָּחִים⁷⁷ and שְׂרָקוֹת⁷⁸

Verse 17: The word לְקַח is omitted by John Gray⁷⁹ and by Burney,⁸⁰ though Burney's principal reason for doing so is metrical. Craigie admits this same emendation, and also agrees with Gray in reparsing וְיָנִיחַ as an adverbial accusative meaning "at ease."⁸¹

Verse 18: Regarding וַתֵּרֶף נַפְשׁוֹ לְמוֹת, Burney says that "the expression is unique, and must be regarded with suspicion."⁸² Boling, however, compares this phrase with a similar one in Jonah 4:8, and sees no reason to question its authenticity.⁸³ The absence of a verb in the second colon leads Patterson to reposit עָלָה as עָלָה, "went up."⁸⁴

⁷⁶J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 725.

⁷⁷G. F. Moore, Judges, 154; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 137; William F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969), 275; Peter C. Craigie, "Three Ugaritic Notes . . .," 41-43; C. F. Burney, Judges, 141, 142.

⁷⁸G. F. Moore, Judges, 154; C. F. Burney, Judges, 142.

⁷⁹John Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth (London: Nelson, 1967), 224.

⁸⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 142.

⁸¹J. Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 287-288; P. C. Craigie, "Three Ugaritic Notes . . .," 38-40.

⁸²C. F. Burney, Judges, 143.

⁸³R. G. Boling, Judges, 113.

⁸⁴R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 137.

Verse 19: The meaning of the final colon is debated,⁸⁵ but few emendations are offered.

Verse 20: The expression מִמְּסִלֹתָם is emended to מִמְּלֹתָם by several textual critics including Douglas Stuart.⁸⁶ This is not only unnecessary⁸⁷ but also semantically insignificant.

Verse 21: The second and third cola of this verse are widely debated. Moore indicates by an elipsis that he feels these two cola are intractably corrupt.⁸⁸ Some have attempted to save the second colon by deleting the second occurrence of וְנָחַל,⁸⁹ and by repointing קָדוּמִים as קָדְמָם,⁹⁰ "overwhelmed them." The third colon is described by Burney as "barely intelligible."⁹¹ The variety of the conjectures suggested to rescue this colon from oblivion is so great as to inspire little confidence in any of them.⁹²

⁸⁵Cf. C. F. Burney, Judges, 145.

⁸⁶Douglas K. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976), 126, 136.

⁸⁷Cf. C. F. Burney, Judges, 146; M. Coogan, "A Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah," 150, n. 47; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 138.

⁸⁸G. F. Moore, Judges, 172.

⁸⁹Cf. C. F. Burney, Judges, 146; J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 726; and also the critical apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

⁹⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 147; R. G. Boling, Judges, 113; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 138.

⁹¹C. F. Burney, Judges, 148.

⁹²See, e.g., D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 130; C. F. Burney, Judges, 148; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 138; R. G. Boling, Judges, 113.

Verse 22: There is wide support for a redivision of words and cola, reading מִנְהַרְרוֹת וְסוּסִים (י) instead of סוּסִים and מִנְהַרְרוֹת.⁸³

Verse 23: There is wide support for reading אֲרוֹרֵי אֲרוֹר in both of the first two cola and for deleting אָמַר מִלֵּאךְ יְהִינָה from the first colon,⁸⁴ though the primary reason for these changes is frequently metrical. Moore and Boling resist such a change.⁸⁵

Verse 24: There is considerable support for deleting the phrase אֵשֶׁת חֶבֶר הַקִּינִי, which forms the second colon in this verse, as a prosaic insertion.⁸⁶ Boling provides the counter-argument:

This appositional phrase is often regarded by critics as secondary, originally a marginal comment based on 4:17, and that is entirely plausible. We have retained it, however, in view of the sizable number of tricola in the Song . . . and our sketchy knowledge of early Hebrew prosody.⁸⁷

The widely proposed emendation is intelligible and reasonable, but fundamentally gratuitous.

Verse 25: Few, if any, emendations have been offered for this verse. Conjectures on interpretation make only trivial differences in the meaning.

⁸³See, e.g., R. G. Boling, Judges, 113; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 138.

⁸⁴D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 136; J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 727; C. F. Burney, Judges, 151.

⁸⁵G. F. Moore, Judges, 161, 162; R. G. Boling, Judges, 114.

⁸⁶D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 126, 136; C. F. Burney, Judges, 152; G. F. Moore, Judges, 162.

⁸⁷R. G. Boling, Judges, 114.

Verse 26: There is wide support for repointing תִּשְׁלַחְנָה as either חִלְשָׁה, תִּשְׁלַחְנָה,⁹⁸ תִּשְׁלַחְנָה⁹⁹ or תִּשְׁלַחְנָה.¹⁰⁰ The latter part of the verse has been variously emended, either by the repetition of the name Sisera after מִצְרָה,¹⁰¹ by the deletion of the name of Sisera after הַלְקָה,¹⁰² or by the deletion of וּמִצְרָה.¹⁰³

Verse 27: Several deletions have been proposed for this verse. On the basis of manuscript evidence, both the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia suggest the deletion of the entire first part of the verse, as far as the verb בָּרַח. Moore's translation presupposes the deletion of the second colon, עֵין כְּנָלִיהָ בָּרַח נָסַל, presumably as a dittography.¹⁰⁴ Myers and Elliott suggest the deletion of נָסַל בָּרַח from the first colon, of בָּרַח from the second colon and of בָּרַח מִצְרָה from the final colon, in order to produce a "standard Canaanite poetic form -- a tricolon."¹⁰⁵ Somewhat more cautiously, Stuart deletes only נָסַל from the first colon as a vertical dittography, and the prepositional phrase מִצְרָה from the third colon as a prosaic intrusion, and

⁹⁸These two forms are offered conjecturally by both the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

⁹⁹D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 126; cf. R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 140.

¹⁰⁰R. G. Boling, Judges, 114.

¹⁰¹D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 127, 136, n. 33. The same emendation may be implied by the note in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹⁰²This suggestion is made rather diffidently by the Biblia Hebraica.

¹⁰³Cf. Biblia Hebraica.

¹⁰⁴G. F. Moore, Judges, 173.

¹⁰⁵J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 726.

moves **עַרְעַר** after **אִם**.¹⁰⁶ Burney and Globe are willing to admit the verse without emendation.¹⁰⁷

Verse 28: The readings of the Septuagint and the Targums would suggest substituting **אֲרִי־תִיָּהּ** instead of **בְּרִי־קָבֶה**. Moore and Burney are both aware of this possibility, though neither recommends it.¹⁰⁸ Stuart adds **אִם סִיָּקָא** to the first colon, following the Septuagint.¹⁰⁹

Verse 29: The conflict between the plural subject (either **תְּקִמּוֹת** or **שָׂרוֹתֵיהָ**) and the singular verb (**תִּשְׁמְעֵנָהּ**) has led many commentators either to read **תְּקִמּוֹת** as the singular construct **תְּקִמָּה** ("the wisest of her princesses"),¹¹⁰ or to read the verb as a plural.¹¹¹ Ze'eb Weisman proposes treating **תְּקִמּוֹת** as an abstract noun which serves as the object of the verb, and reads **שָׂרוֹתֵיהָ** ("female singers") instead of **שָׂרוֹתֵיהָ** ("princesses"), though this still obliges him to construe the verb as a plural.¹¹² Burney deletes the final **לָהּ**, metri causa.¹¹³

Verse 30: The first half of this verse is largely uncontested. A variety of emendations have been proposed for the second half. The second occurrence of

¹⁰⁶D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 136.

¹⁰⁷C. F. Burney, Judges, 105; Alexander Globe, "Judges V 27," Vetus Testamentum 25 (1975): 362.

¹⁰⁸G. F. Moore, Judges, 169; C. F. Burney, Judges, 154, 155.

¹⁰⁹D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 127, 136, n. 36.

¹¹⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 155; J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 727; R. G. Boling, Judges, 115; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 141. Cf. the critical apparatus of Biblia Hebraica and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹¹¹G. F. Moore, Judges, 170.

¹¹²Ze'eb Weisman, "שָׂרוֹתֵיהָ (JUD. V 29)," Vetus Testamentum 26 (1976): 116-120.

¹¹³C. F. Burney, Judges, 155.

שָׁלַל צְרָעִים as well as צְרָע are deleted by some as a dittography.¹¹⁴ The final שָׁלַל is deleted by some,¹¹⁵ repointed as שָׁלַל ("the spoiler," i.e., Sisera) by others,¹¹⁶ or replaced with שָׁנָל ("Queen").¹¹⁷ The commentaries of Moore and of Myers and Elliott indicate by elipses that they do not believe that the text can be conclusively restored.¹¹⁸

Verse 31: There is some doubt whether this verse should be considered part of the poem. Myers and Elliott state, "The refrain constitutes a liturgical appendage hardly a part of the original poem."¹¹⁹ Burney suggests reading אֲהַרְבֵּי instead of אֲהַרְבֵּי.¹²⁰

THE SONG OF THE VINEYARD: ISAIAH 5:1-7

There are very few emendations proposed for this poem, even though, as Gray notes, "The rhythm of the poem can be reduced to regularity by extensive omissions . . ."¹²¹ Despite this, even those text critics whose recourse to emendations metri causa is more frequent than justifiable have hesitated to

¹¹⁴See, e.g., the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹¹⁵D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 127.

¹¹⁶R. G. Boling, Judges, 115; R. Patterson, "The Song of Deborah," 142.

¹¹⁷C. F. Burney, Judges, 156.

¹¹⁸G. F. Moore, Judges, 173; J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 728.

¹¹⁹J. Myers and P. P. Elliott, "Judges," 728. See also R. G. Boling, Judges, 115; C. F. Burney, Judges, 157; somewhat less decisively, G. F. Moore, Judges, 171; and by implication, D. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 127.

¹²⁰C. F. Burney, Judges, 157. Cf. the critical apparatus of Biblia Hebraica and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹²¹George Buchanan Gray and Arthur S. Peake, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949), 82.

regularize this text. Of the handful of suggested emendations, few have significant consequences for the verse structure.

Verse 1: Gray suggests a conjectural interpretation of this verse which requires reading the second occurrence of לִי־דִרְיָ as לִי, as well as the repointing of the Masoretic דִּירְיָ as דִּירְיָ.¹²² There is no textual support for this emendation, and it is based largely on Gray's judgment that it would be improbable for any person who was as aware of the majesty of divinity as Isaiah was to call God "my darling." The argument is flatly rejected by Prinsloo.¹²³

Verses 2 and 3 No significant emendations are proposed.

Verse 4 The editors of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia cite manuscripts from Qumran to suggest וְשִׁי as an alternate reading in place of וְשִׁי].

Verse 5 The editors of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia cite manuscripts from Qumran to suggest וְסִי as an alternate reading in place of וְסִי]. Neither the suggested alternate reading in verse 4 nor this one is included in the text, which in both cases follows the tradition of the Masoretes. The alternate readings are found only in the apparatus to the text: furthermore, neither would have a significant effect on the verse structure of the passage.

Verse 6 The phrase וְשִׁי־דִּירְיָ has elicited a number of emendatory suggestions, partly because וְשִׁי is a hapax legomenon, unless, as Gray points out, it is the

¹²²G. B. Gray and A. S. Peake, Isaiah, 84.

¹²³W. S. Prinsloo, "Isaiah 5:1-7: A Synchronic Approach," In Studies in Isaiah, ed. W. C. van Wyk (Pretoria West: NHW Press, 1980), 192, 193, n. 12.

same as קָהָה, which occurs only in Isaiah 7:19.¹²⁴ Both the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia offer footnotes proposing that the entire expression be emended to וְאֶשְׂרֵיהֶוּ, though no support is offered for this suggestion. P. R. Berger has suggested that the second word may be a case of scriptio defectiva and should be vocalized קָהָה.¹²⁵ This would allow him to translate the passage "I will allow it to become desolate." Prinsloo dismisses this, as well as the emended vocalization proposed by Gray, as unnecessary: "Since there is insufficient evidence for all of these emendations, and a hapax legomenon does not necessarily warrant such emendations, we adhere to the MT."¹²⁶

Verse 7 No significant textual emendations are proposed for verse 7.

THE FIRST LAMENT: LAMENTATIONS 1:1-22

Verse 1: The initial וְאֵלֶּיךָ is regarded by the Biblia Hebraica as an anacrusis, rather than as part of the poem.

Verse 2: The Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia cite manuscript and versional evidence for pointing וְאֵלֶּיךָ as a dual.

Verse 3: The Biblia Hebraica suggests emending וְעַלֵּי to וְעַלֵּיךְ ("because of her humiliation"), but Mitchell Dahood contests the necessity of such a change, preferring to read the Masoretic Text as a scriptio defectiva for וְעַלֵּיךְ, derived

¹²⁴G. B. Gray and A. S. Peake, Isaiah, 87.

¹²⁵P. R. Berger, "Ein unerklärtes Wort in dem Weinberglied Jesajas (Jes 5, 1),"
Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 82 (1970):
116-117.

¹²⁶W. S. Prinsloo, "Isaiah 5:1-7," 193, n. 12.

The view that the second bicolon of verse 7 is a gloss has wide support.¹³¹ Rudolph, though he is aware of this view, prefers to regard the third line as the gloss:

. . . innerhalb von Kap. 1 -- 3 erscheint nur hier und 2:9 [sic] eine vierzeilige Strophe. Eine Zeile ist offenbar zu streichen. Gewöhnlich wird die zweite ausgeschieden und die erste übersetzt: "J. denkt an die Tage . . ." Aber dann müßte logischer Weise die Not schon vorbei sein . . . Um dieser Folgerung zu entgehen, nimmt man Zl. 3 ("als . . . fiel") als Näherbestimmung von 'ד' 'ע' 'מ'; aber dann müßte die Katastrophe von Zl. 3 schon lange zurückliegen . . . , was nicht zum übrigen Kap. stimmt. Vielmehr dürfte Zl. 3, die hinter Zl. 2 zu spät kommt, ursprünglich Randglosse zu dem schwierigen מַרְרֵי (Zl. 1) sein.¹³²

Meek and Merrill contest these conjectures:

This verse has four lines instead of the usual three; hence most scholars delete either the second or the third as a gloss; but it is difficult to see how such a gloss came to be inserted. Probably the two lines are variant readings, giving us a conflate text.¹³³

Even more conservative is the position of Gordis, who regards the first half of the verse as a single long bicolon.¹³⁴

Verse 8: Both the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia suggest the deletion of ל-ב, the latter version indicating explicitly that this is to be done on grounds of meter.

Verse 9: Hillers suggests the emendation of the third colon of this verse:

The text of 9b seems rather short, since there are only two words, and accents, in the first colon. The use of waw-consecutive is also unusual compared to the general pattern in Lamentations One might

¹³¹This is explicit in the textual apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹³²Wilhelm Rudolph, Die Klagelieder, (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939), 16.

¹³³T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 9.

¹³⁴R. Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, rev. ed. (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974), 154.

suppose, then, that a verb has been lost at the beginning of the line, and that wattēred was originally the second verb in the kind of coordinate construction common in the book. It would be hazardous to restore the missing word, but it may have been something like "She has fallen."¹³⁵

There is, of course, no manuscript or versional support for such an emendation. Other factors which caution the reader against accepting such a change are the fact that the only reason in favor of the emendation is meter, and the fact that there are other bicola in the Lamentations in which the first colon has only two words and two accents.

Verses 10 and 11: The emendations which have been proposed for these verses are insignificant to the verse structure.

Verse 12: The first two words are, as Hillers remarks, "generally conceded to be corrupt in some way."¹³⁶ The two most commonly proposed emendations are לֹא־לְךָ and לֹא־לְךָ. ¹³⁷ Gordis asserts that the Masoretic text should not be emended, but should be understood as "an apotropaic prayer, 'Let not this fate come to you!'"¹³⁸ Hillers finds such an interpretation forced, and prefers לְךָ. ¹³⁹

Verse 13: The last word of the first bicolon is the subject of some debate. The reading of the Septuagint suggests an original הוֹרִיךָ or הוֹרִיךָ, ¹⁴⁰ the latter

¹³⁵D. Hillers, Lamentations, 10.

¹³⁶D. Hillers, Lamentations, 10.

¹³⁷Cf. W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 16, 17; T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 12.

¹³⁸R. Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, 157.

¹³⁹D. Hillers, Lamentations, 10.

¹⁴⁰Cf. the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

of which is preferred by Meek and Merrill.¹⁴¹ Rudolph suggests reversing the waw and yodh to produce יוֹרְרָנָה,¹⁴² a view supported by Hillers,¹⁴³ though Gordis insists that no such emendation is necessary.¹⁴⁴

Verse 14: The difficulty of this verse is widely acknowledged,¹⁴⁵ though there is little agreement on the attempts to clarify the meaning. Most of the emendations proposed in the critical texts are rejected by Gordis.¹⁴⁶ In any case, few of these emendations are significant to the verse structure, though the change of עַל to עָלִי¹⁴⁷ in the first colon causes an increase of one syllable. In addition, a colometric issue is raised by the traditional reading of the fifth colon, which concludes with a word in construct. Normally, such a word should not be separated, even by the poetic caesura, from the absolute word to which it is attached.¹⁴⁸ In this case, however, there does not seem to be an expressed absolute. The last colon is usually rendered by the English translations as an implied relative clause, though there is no relative pronoun in the Hebrew. The suggested emendation of the title יְדִנְיָ to the divine name¹⁴⁹ in this verse, and twice in verse 15, is probably insignificant to the verse

¹⁴¹T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 13.

¹⁴²W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 17.

¹⁴³D. Hillers, Lamentations, 11.

¹⁴⁴R. Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, 157.

¹⁴⁵See, e.g., W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 17; T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 13.

¹⁴⁶Robert Gordis, "Commentary on the Text of Lamentations," in The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Volume of the Jewish Quarterly Review, ed. Abraham A. Neuman and Solomon Zeitlin (Philadelphia: Jewish Quarterly Review, 1967), 276, 277.

¹⁴⁷Cf. the critical apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica.

¹⁴⁸T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 13.

¹⁴⁹Cf. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

structure, assuming the oral convention of substituting the title for the divine name in reading. Even if this convention was not observed, the difference is trivial.

Verse 15: No emendations significant to the verse structure have been proposed for this verse.

Verse 16: The Biblia Hebraica suggests that the initial על-אלה should be regarded as an anacrusis. There is considerable support for deleting one of the two occurrences of וְיָיָא as a dittography.¹⁵⁰ Gordis rejects this emendation,¹⁵¹ as do Meek and Merrill,¹⁵² though in both cases the decision is based at least partially on metrical considerations. Dahood resolves this issue by repointing וְיָיָא in the first colon as וְיָיָא, "my sorrow," though this clever emendation requires him to read the first line of the verse as a tricolon.¹⁵³

Verse 17: No emendations significant to the verse structure have been proposed for this verse.

Verse 18: The qere of the third colon includes the definite article before עֲקִיָּם.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰Cf. D. Hillers, Lamentations, 13; W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 17; Biblia Hebraica; Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹⁵¹R. Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, 159.

¹⁵²T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 14.

¹⁵³M. Dahood, "New Readings in Lamentations," 178.

¹⁵⁴Cf. Biblia Hebraica and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

Verse 19: No emendations significant to the verse structure have been proposed for this verse, though some commentators have noted the unusual brevity of the second bicolon.¹⁵⁵ The Septuagint adds an extra clause at the end of this verse, "καὶ οὐχ εὖρον," which would correspond to the Hebrew וְלֹא מֵצָא.¹⁵⁶ This would allow the re-arrangement of the colometry of the verse to present it as three bicola of usual length. There is, however, no Hebrew manuscript support for this addition.

Verse 20: The final colon is widely debated. As it stands, it seems that it "cannot be made to yield satisfactory sense despite repeated efforts by interpreters to defend it."¹⁵⁷ Several suggestions have been made to emend the colon. Rudolph cautiously suggests repointing the last word as בְּמִוֶּת,¹⁵⁸ so that the colon would read "inside, captivity," the parallelistic complement of the first colon, "Outside the sword bereaves." Hillers prefers the reading וְדָבָר,¹⁵⁹ a rare word occurring in Job 5:22, 30:3, meaning "famine," in parallel with "sword" in the first colon. Less radically, Dahood emends וְדָבָר מֵת to מֵת דָּבָר, "Death himself."¹⁶⁰ The colon would, in fact, make perfect sense if the order of the two words was reversed,¹⁶¹ and even as they occur in the Masoretic Text, they may be considered meaningful, although the syntax is unusual (as poetic syntax often is). Gordis does not see any difficulty with the Masoretic Text, and identifies the first letter of וְדָבָר מֵת as an "asserative Kaph,"

¹⁵⁵Cf. D. Hillers, Lamentations, 14.

¹⁵⁶Cf. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹⁵⁷D. Hillers, Lamentations, 14; cf. M. Dahood, "New Readings . . .," 179.

¹⁵⁸W. Rudolph, Klagelieder, 18; cf. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹⁵⁹D. Hillers, Lamentations, 14.

¹⁶⁰M. Dahood, "New Readings . . .," 179.

¹⁶¹See T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 15.

translating the passage "Without the sword bereaved; within, there was death."¹⁶² The rest of the text is largely undebated, though C. L. Seow challenges the traditional interpretation (though not the reading) of the second bicolon.¹⁶³

Verse 21: The initial verb, vocalized as a perfect by the Masoretes, is widely re-vocalized as an imperative. Even Gordis, usually a conservative defender of the Masoretic Text of this chapter, offers this emendation without apology.¹⁶⁴ There is a dispute between the ancient versions as to whether this should be a plural imperative or a singular, with the Septuagint representing the former view and the Syriac the latter.¹⁶⁵

The second bicolon is by far the longest in the chapter, and a variety of emendations have been proposed. These proposals are reflected in the textual apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica, which suggests deleting either קָשָׁן, קָל-אִיָּוִי or קָלָן.¹⁶⁶ The variety of these emendations, all made without textual or versional support suggests a rather transparent attempt at metrical adjustment.

Some scholars have suggested emending קָלָן in the final colon to קָלָן אִיָּוִי, a reading which appears to be supported by the Syriac version.¹⁶⁷ Both Gordis

¹⁶²R. Gordis, "Commentary on the Text . . .," 277.

¹⁶³C. L. Seow, "A Textual Note on Lamentations 1:20," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 47 (1985): 416-419.

¹⁶⁴R. Gordis, The Song of Songs and Lamentations, 160; cf. D. Hillers, Lamentations, 14, 15; Biblia Hebraica and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

¹⁶⁵See T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 15.

¹⁶⁶Cf. T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 15.

¹⁶⁷See T. Meek and W. Merrill, "Lamentations," 15; cf. Biblia Hebraica and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.

and Hillers point out that the emendation is unnecessary.¹⁶⁸ The perfect tense of the verb can express either desire or assurance that the event described will occur, and such use of the perfect is most common in poetry.

Verse 22: No emendations significant to the verse structure have been proposed for this verse.

"WHEN THE LORD RESTORED THE FORTUNES OF ZION": PSALM 126:1-6

Verse 1: There is considerable debate on the occurrence of לְבַרְכָּהּ in this verse, frequently emended to לְבַרְכָּהּ or לְבַרְכָּהּ,¹⁶⁹ an emendation evidently accepted by the translators of the Septuagint, who have given the translation αἰχμαλωσίαν.

Mitchell Dahood takes vigorous exception to this reading of the text:

. . . the text reads b'šūb . . . šibat, and critics (e.g., Kraus, Psalmen, II, p. 853, who terms šibat "manifestly a scribal error" for š'būt or š'bīt) have not hesitated to emend šibat to š'būt. This ill-advised emendation is proposed anew by Bardtke in BHS. But this emendation is now proved unsound by the Aramaic phrase hšbw 'lhn šybt b[yt 'by], "The gods restored the fortunes of [my father's house], in the Sifire inscription (III:24) of the mid-eighth century B.C. Aram. šybt answers to Heb. šibat, while Aram. hšbw šybt shows that the noun is a cognate accusative and so supports the derivation of biblical š'būt and (vs. 4) and šibat from šūb, "to restore" rather than from, šābāh, "to take captive."¹⁷⁰

Verse 2: The tense of verbs in this poem is problematic, beginning with לְבַרְכָּהּ in the second verse. Hypothetically, as an imperfect, this should refer to an

¹⁶⁸R. Gordis, "Commentary on the Text . . .," 278; D. Hillers, Lamentations, 15.

¹⁶⁹Cf. the Biblia Hebraica and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia on this verse.

¹⁷⁰Mitchell Dahood, Psalms III: 101 - 150, The Anchor Bible, vol. 17A, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1970), 218. See also Leslie C. Allen, Psalms 101 - 150, Word Bible Commentary, vol. 21, (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983), 170; and A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms, vol. 2, The New Century Bible, vol. 19, part 2, ed. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black, (London: Oliphant, 1972), 864.

uncompleted event, presumably in future time. However, this appears to be contradicted by the tense of יִשְׁמַח in verse 1. Several commentators note that imperfects following יִשְׁמַח may be treated as imperfects with ל consecutive,¹⁷¹ which would allow the reader to understand אֲשֶׁר as a reference to an event of the past. Charles and Emilie Briggs challenge this view in a rather cryptic note on this verse:

. . . impf. after יִשְׁמַח , which in early usage has the force of ל consec., doubtful, however in this late Ps.; so יִשְׁמַח . In any case the time is present, carrying on the previous apod. as second and third members of it.¹⁷²

Nevertheless, the use of יִשְׁמַח in this verse and the two occurrences of the perfect tense in verse 3 tend to reinforce the view that all verbs in this passage should be regarded as referring to past time.¹⁷³

Verse 3: This verse has occasioned no significant text-critical comments.

Verse 4: The difficulties with the time reference of the verbs in this Psalm, already noted in connection with verse 2, can be seen again here. If the initial verb of this verse is understood as an imperative, it would refer to a desired future action of Yahweh. Briggs' solution to this, described above, is to allow the verbs of verses 1 to 3 refer to present action, so that this verse is a petition requesting Yahweh to continue what he is already doing.¹⁷⁴ Dahood objects to this solution:

¹⁷¹M. Dahood, Psalms III, 218; L. C. Allen, Psalms 101-150, 170.

¹⁷²Charles Augustus Briggs and Emily Grace Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the The Book of Psalms (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), Vol. 2:457.

¹⁷³Cf. W. Stuart McCullough et al., "Psalms," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick et al., (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), vol. 4, 665.

¹⁷⁴C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, The Book of Psalms, Vol. 2, 455, 456.

MT emphatic imperative šūbāh, "Restore!" creates the main syntactic and semantic difficulty in this psalm. In vs. 1 Yahweh is said to have restored the prosperity of Zion, but here he is being begged to make Israel prosper. . . . Hence for MT šūbāh read the qatala verb šābāh, or the Phoenician form šōbāh, where ā becomes ō, the archaic form of the classical Hebrew šāb; . . .¹⁷⁵

Verse 5: Briggs suggests an emendation of this verse metri causa, because of its brevity in the Masoretic Text.

The l. as it stands is a tetrameter; but that is improb. Probably the obj. of the first vb. שָׁב, and the emph. demonstr. as subj. of the second vb., have been omitted by txt. err.¹⁷⁶

This suggestion is supported by the Biblia Hebraica, whose note on this verse suggests inserting שָׁב after שָׁבִי.

As with verses 2 and 4, the tense of the finite verb in this verse is problematic. Some versions treat this imperfect as a jussive, making it part of the same petition as the preceding verse. To this, Allen comments, "This verse is hardly a continuation of the prayer of v 4 . . . : v 6 amplifies v 5 and v 6a cannot be so construed."¹⁷⁷ Accordingly, Allen translates שָׁבִי as "do reap," and treats the verse as a proverbial saying. Dahood takes "the yqt1 verb yiqṣōrū as a punctual form expressing past time, and not as stating a present event or wish, . . ."¹⁷⁸ Dahood is therefore able to place the action of the entire Psalm in past time, and to treat the Psalm as a "hymn of thanksgiving,"¹⁷⁹ in which there is no element of petition.

¹⁷⁵M. Dahood, Psalms III, 220. The last of Dahood's suggestions has the support of the Biblia Hebraica, which offers the reading שָׁב in a note on this verse.

¹⁷⁶C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, The Book of Psalms, vol. 2, 457.

¹⁷⁷L. C. Allen, Psalms 101 - 150, 171.

¹⁷⁸M. Dahood, Psalms III, 221.

¹⁷⁹M. Dahood, Psalms III, 217.

Verse 6: The length of this verse has attracted the attention of the commentators, though its integrity in the Qumran texts confirms the Masoretic form.¹⁸⁰ The Biblia Hebraica suggests revocalizing קָשָׁךְ to מוֹשָׁךְ (מֹשֶׁךְ in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia), but leaves the verse structure unchanged. Dahood offers a conjectural interpretation of the phrase וְנִשְׂאָה קָשָׁךְ-הַזֶּה, but leaves the Hebrew text intact.¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰The passage is found in 11QPs^a, cited by M. Dahood, Psalms III, 221.

¹⁸¹M. Dahood, Psalms III, 221.

WORKS CITED

- Junilius Africanus. De partibus divinae legis. Publication of the Series Latina, Patrologia cursus completus, ed. J. P. Migne, 20. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1866.
- Aitchison, Jean. Linguistics. New York: David McKay & Co. Inc., 1978.
- Albright, William F. "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 62 (1936): 26-31.
- _____. Review of Introduction to the Old Testament, by Robert H. Pfeiffer. In The Journal of Biblical Literature 61 (1942): 111-126.
- _____. Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969.
- Allen, Leslie C. Psalms 101-150. Vol. 21, Word Bible Commentary. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983.
- Alter, Robert. The Art of Biblical Poetry. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
- Andersen, Francis I. The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew. Hawthorn, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1980.
- Ap-Thomas, D. R. Review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Conner. In Journal of Theological Studies n.s. 33 (1982): 224, 225.
- Bellermann, Johann J. Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer. Berlin: 1813.
- Berger, P. R. "Ein unerklärtes Wort in dem Weinberglied Jesajas (Jes 5₉)."
Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 82 (1970): 116-117.
- Berlin, Adele. The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Bickell, Gustav. Die Dichtung der Hebräer. Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagnerschen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1882.
- _____. "Die hebräische Metrik." Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (1881): 415-422.
- _____. Carmina Veteris Testamenti. Innsbruck: Libreria Academica Wagneria, 1882.
- Blenkinsopp, J. "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion." Biblica 42 (1961): 61-76.

- Boling, Robert G. Judges. Vol. 6A, The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1975.
- Briggs, Charles Augustus and Emily Grace Briggs. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. 2 Vols. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1907.
- Brackman, Abraham J. "Judges 5.2." The Jewish Quarterly Review 39 (1949): 413.
- Budde, Karl von. "Das hebräische Klagelied." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 2 (1882): 1-52.
- Burney, C. F. The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix, 1903. Reprinted with a prolegomenon by William F. Albright. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1970.
- Byington, Steven T. "A Mathematical Approach to Hebrew Meters." Journal of Biblical Literature 66 (1947): 63-77.
- Cazelles, H. "Déborah (Jud. V 14), Amaleqet Makir." Vetus Testamentum 24 (1974): 235-238.
- Chisholm, Robert B. "Structure, Style and the Prophetic Message: An Analysis of Isaiah 5:8-30." Bibliotheca Sacra 143 (1986): 46-60.
- Chomsky, Noam. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Boston: MIT Press, 1965.
- Cloete, Walter Theophilus Woldemar. Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2-25: Syntactical Constraints in Hebrew Colometry. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Cobb, William Henry. Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter: An Elementary Treatise. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Collins, Terence. Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Coogan, Michael. "Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 40 (1978): 143-166.
- Craigie, Peter C. "A Note on Judges V 2." Vetus Testamentum 18 (1968): 397-399.
- _____. "Parallel Word Pairs in the Song of Deborah." Journal of the Evangelical Theologica Society 20 (1977): 15-22.
- _____. "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah." Vetus Testamentum 22 (1972): 349-353.

- _____. "Three Ugaritic Notes on the Song of Deborah." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 2 (1977): 33-49.
- Crandall, Arthur E. Judges: An Introduction and Commentary. Vol. 7, Tyndale Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1968. 90.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry. Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1950.
- _____, and David Noel Freedman. Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Crown, A. D. "Judges V 15b-16." Vetus Testamentum 17 (1967): 240-242.
- Culley, R. C. "Metrical Analysis of Classical Hebrew Poetry." In Essays on the Ancient Semitic World, ed. J. W. Wevers and D. B. Redford, 12-28. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Dahood, Mitchell. "New Readings in Lamentations." Biblica 59 (1978): 174-197.
- _____. Psalms III: 101-150. Vol. 17A The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1970.
- Dion, Paul E. Hebrew Poetics: A Student's Guide. Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications, 1988.
- Döllner, Johannes. Rhythmus, Metrik und Strophik in der biblisch-hebräischen Poesie. Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1899.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1965.
- Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
- Fohrer, Georg. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Freedman, David Noel. "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry." Harvard Theological Review 65 (1972): 367-392.
- _____. Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- _____. "Prolegomenon." In The Forms of Hebrew Poetry by George Buchanan Gray, vii-lv. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972.
- _____. "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." In A Light unto My Path, ed. Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. Moore, 163-203. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974.

- Frost, Robert Lee. "Nothing Gold Can Stay." In The Pocket Book of Robert Frost's Poems. New York: Washington Square Press, 1946.
- Galbraith, Jeffrey A. Review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Conner. In The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 45 (1983): 464-466.
- Geller, Stephen. Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Gerleman, Gillis. "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Stylistics." Vetus Testamentum 1 (1951): 168.
- Givirtz, Stanley. Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Globe, Alexander. "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah." Journal of Biblical Literature 93 (1974): 493-512.
- _____. "The Muster of the Tribes in Judges 5 11e-18." Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 87 (1975): 169-184.
- _____. "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5, 4-5." Biblica 55 (1974): 168-178.
- Gordis, Robert. "Commentary on the Text of Lamentations." In The Seventy-fifth Anniversary Volume of the Jewish Quarterly Review, ed. Abraham A. Neuman and Solomon Zeitlin, 14-33. Philadelphia: Jewish Quarterly Review, 1967.
- _____. The Song of Songs and Lamentations. Rev. ed. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974.
- Gottwald, Norman K. Studies in the Book of Lamentations. Rev. ed. London: SMC Press Ltd., 1962.
- _____. The Hebrew Bible—A Socio-Literary Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- _____. "Lamentations." Interpretation 9 (1955): 320-338.
- Graffy, A. "The Literary Genre of Isaiah 5, 1-7." Biblica 60 (1979): 400-409.
- Gray, George Buchanan. The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 1915; reprint, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972.
- _____, and Arthur S. Peake. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949.
- Gray, John. Joshua, Judges and Ruth. London: Nelson, 1967.

- Grimme, Hubert. Psalmenprobleme. Freiburg: Kommissionsverlag der Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1902.
- Hare, Francis. Psalmorum Liber in Versiculos Metricè Divisus. London: 1736.
- Harrelson, Walter. Interpreting the Old Testament. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Hauser, Alan J. "Two Songs of Victory: A Comparison of Exodus 15 and Judges 5." In Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry, ed. Elaine R. Follis, 265-284. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Hewitt, Furman. "The Parable of the Vineyard: An Exegesis of Isaiah 5:1-8." Faith and Mission 9 (1991): 65.
- Hillers, Delbert R. "A Note on Judges 5:8a." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 27 (1975): 124-126.
- _____. Lamentations. Vol 7A, The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972.
- Isidore Hispalensis. Etymologarum. Series Latina, No. 82, Patrologia cursus completus, ed. J. P. Migne. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1866.
- Höffken, Peter. "Probleme in Jesaja 5, 1-7." Zeitschrift für Theology und Kirche 79 (1982): 392-410.
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley. "Spring and Fall." In The Poetical Works of Gerard Manley Hopkins, ed. Norman H. Mackenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Jacobson, Roman. "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet." Language 42 (1966): 399-529.
- Jerome. Epistles to Paulinus. In St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works, trans. by W. H. Fremantle. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983; reprint, Series II, volume 6, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 101.
- _____. Preface to the Chronicle of Eusebius. Chapter 2, St. Jerome: Letters and Select Works, trans. W. H. Fremantle, 484. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Josephus, Flavius. The Antiquities of the Jews. In The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. William Whiston. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903.
- Junker, H. "Die literarische Art von Is 5, 1-7." Biblica 40 (1959): 259-266.

- Kaiser, Otto. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by John Sturdy. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975.
- _____. Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972.
- Kittel, Rudolph, ed. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Wurtembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1937.
- Koch, Walter A. Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966.
- _____. "Preliminary Sketch of a Semantic Type of Discourse Analysis." Linguistics 12 (1965): 5-30.
- Korpel, Marjo C. A. "The Literary Genre of the Song of the Vineyard (Isa 5:1-7)." In The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 119-155. Sheffield: The Sheffield University Press, 1988.
- _____, and Johannes C. de Moor. "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry." In The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 1-61. Sheffield: The Sheffield University Press, 1988.
- Kugel, James L. The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Leatherman, Donn W. "The Metrical Structure of the Book of Amos." M.Div. diss., Andrews University, 1980.
- Levin, Samuel R. Linguistic Structures in Poetry. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1969.
- Ley, Julius. Die metrischen Formen der hebräischen Poesie. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1866.
- _____. Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebräischen Poesie. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875.
- Longman, Tremper. "A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems." Biblica 63 (1982): 230-254.
- Loretz, Oswald, and Ingo Kottsieper. Colometry in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry: Introduction, Illustrations and Topical Bibliography. Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1987.
- Lowth, Robert. Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews. Translated by G. Gregory. London: S. Chadwick & Co., 1847.

- Lys, Daniel. "La Vigne et le Double Je." In Studies on Prophecy, ed. G. W. Anderson, 1-16. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- L'Heureux, Conrad E. "The Redactional History of Isaiah 5.1-10.4." In In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlstrom, ed. W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer, 99-119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984.
- MacLeish, Archibald. "Ars Poetica." In New and Collected Poems, 1917-1976. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.
- Martin, James D. The Book of Judges. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- McCarthy, J. J. "The Metrical Structure of Psalm 137." Journal of Biblical Literature 100 (1981): 161-167.
- McCullough, W. Stuart. "Psalms." In The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, vol 4:1-763. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- Meek, Theophile J., and William Person Merrill. "Lamentations." In The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, vol. 6:1-38. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984.
- Meier, Ernst. Die Form der hebräischen Poesie. Tübingen: Verlag der Osianderschen Buchhandlung, 1853.
- Moore, George Foot. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges. Vol. 7, The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Der Aufbau des Deborahliedes." Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966): 446-459.
- Myers, Jacob, and Phillips P. Elliott. "Judges." In The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick. vol. 2:675-826. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "Literary and Topographical Notes on the Battle of Kishon (Judges IV-V)." Vetus Testamentum 40 (1990): 425.
- Niehr, Herbert. "Zur Gattung von Jes 5, 1-7." Biblische Zeitschrift n. s. 30 (1986): 99-104.
- O'Conner, Michael. Hebrew Verse Structure. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- Oswalt, John N. The Book of Isaiah. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.
- Pardee, Dennis. Review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Conner. In Journal of Near Eastern Studies 42 (October 1983): 298-301.

- _____. Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut ('nt I and Proverbs 2). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.
- Patterson, Richard. "The Song of Deborah." In Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Finbert, ed. John S. Finberg and Paul D. Feinberg, 123-160. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Row Publisher, 1948.
- Philo. On a Contemplative Life. Translated and edited by F. H. Colson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- _____. On a Contemplative Life. In The Works of Philo Judæus, trans. C. D. Yonge. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855.
- Prinsloo, W. S. "Isaiah 5:1-7: A synchronic approach." In Studies in Isaiah, ed. W. C. van Wyk, 188-197. Pretoria West: NHW Press, 1980.
- Renkema, Johan. "The Literary Structure of Lamentations." In The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 294-396. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Rietzschel, Claus. "Zu Jdc 5 14^b-15^a." Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83 (1971): 211-225.
- Robinson, T. H. Poetry of the Old Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1947.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. Die Klagelieder. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939.
- Saalschütz, Joseph L. Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie, nebst einer Abhandlung über die Musik der Hebräer. Königsberg: August Wilhelm Unzer, 1825.
- Schökel, Luis Alonso. A Manual of Hebrew Poetics. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1988.
- Schottroff, Willy. "Das Weinberglied Jesajas (Jes 5 1-7): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Parabel." Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 82 (1970): 68-91.
- Scott, R. B. Y., and G. G. D. Kilpatrick. "Isaiah Chs. 1-39." In The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, vol 5:149-773. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Seale, Morris S. "Deborah's Ode and the Ancient Arabian Qasida." Journal of Biblical Literature 81 (1962): 343-347.

- Segert, Stanislav. "Problems of Hebrew Prosody." Vetus Testamentum Supplement 7 (1960): 283-291.
- Shea, William H. Review of Hebrew Verse Structure by M. O'Conner. In Andrews University Seminary Studies 20 (Summer 1982): 161-164.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "More on Isaiah 5:1-7 as Juridical Parable." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 44 (1982): 45-47.
- Sievers, Eduard. Die altschwedischen Upplandslagh nebst Proben formverwandter germanischer Sagdichtung. Volume 4, Metrische Studien. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1918.
- Stauffer, Donald A. The Nature of Poetry. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1946.
- Streane, A. W. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah together with the Lamentations. Vol 21, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913; reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Stuart, Douglas K. Studies in Early Hebrew Meter. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Toy, C. H. "Studies in Hebrew Meter." American Journal of Semitic Languages 19 (1902): 58-60.
- Turco, Lewis. The New Book of Forms. Hannover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1986.
- van der Grol, Harm W. M. "Classical Hebrew Metrics and Zephaniah 2-3." In The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry, ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, 186-206. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- van der Lugt, Pieter. Strofische structuren in die bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie. Ph.D. diss., Kampen, 1980.
- van der Meer, Willem, and Johannes C. de Moor, eds. The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry. Sheffield: The Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Vermeylen, J. Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique: Isaïe I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël. Paris: Gabalda, 1977.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Weiser, Artur. The Old Testament, Its Formation and Development. New York: Association Press, 1964.

Williams, Gary Roye. "Frustrated Expectations in Isaiah V 1-7: A Literary Interpretation." Vetus Testamentum 35 (1985): 459-465.

Williams, William Carlos. "Apology." In Selected Poems. New York: New Directions Books, 1985.

Yee, Gale A. "A Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable." The Catholic Quarterly 43 (1981): 30-40.

Young, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah: the English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.