IV

THE LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC ASPECTS

If the grammatical aspect provides the skeleton of the parallelism then the lexical and semantic aspects are its flesh and blood. It is, after all, the words and what they signify that give meaning to a verse or phrase. Since these aspects are most obvious, it is not surprising that they have historically received the most attention. At first it was the semantic aspect alone—that is, the sense of one line and its relationship to the sense of the parallel line—that was described. Lowth's contribution in this area, both concep-- tually and terminologically, has been difficult to supercede; most discussions of parallelism still speak of synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic parallelism. To be sure, Lowth deserves praise for his insights, but in some ways his model for describing the semantic relationship between parallel lines inhibited the development of this subject for a long time. Although many over the years expressed dissatisfaction with it, added to it, or modified it, only recently has biblical scholarship been able to free itself totally of Lowth's tripartite semantic division.

Most of the credit goes to Kugel, who offered the longest, most anti-Lowthian description of parallelism (cf. *Idea*, 12–15). Kugel sees the semantic relationship between *all* parallel lines as being basically always "A, what's more, B"—that is, the second line goes beyond (in any one of a number of ways) the meaning of the first (cf. especially *Idea*, 51–54). "Biblical parallelism is of one sort, 'A, and what's more, B,' or a hundred sorts; but it is not three" (*Idea*, 58). Thus Kugel destroys the notion of a tidy number of discrete semantic categories and replaces it with a general overarching semantic concept which may be realized in so many different

ways that they defy all but the most superficial description. I will return to consider the semantic relationship between lines later, but first I will discuss the lexical aspect of parallelism.

The lexical aspect has to do with the specific words or word groups that are paired in parallel lines. This is, of course, not totally separable from the semantic aspect, since words affect meaning (although later I will suggest that the two can and should be separated to a certain extent). But as I have done in the previous chapter, I will distinguish, for purposes of presentation, the word-level phenomenon, which I will call the lexical aspect, from the line-level phenomenon, which will be called the semantic aspect. This is especially appropriate here, because historically the study of biblical parallelism has also made this distinction. Again it was Lowth who provided the model for distinguishing "parallel lines" from "parallel terms": "When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it . . . equivalent, or contrasted with it, in Sense . . . these I call Parallel Lines; and the words or phrases answering one to another in the corresponding Lines Parallel Terms" (*Isaiah*, viii). Lowth himself did not investigate parallel terms, but this aspect of parallelism, it turns out, benefited from much more fruitful study in later years than did the semantic aspect.

THE LEXICAL ASPECT: WORD PAIRS

The discovery of Ugaritic poems at Ras Shamra beginning in 1929 had a major effect on the study of biblical poetry. Not only did Ugaritic and Hebrew prove to be closely related languages, but the two poetic traditions had so much in common that some considered them part of one Canaanite tradition. The most obvious similarity was that both Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry used parallelism extensively and, upon closer examination, it was found that the two even used the very same parallel terms in many cases. This observation led to the monumental effort of collecting what came to be known as fixed word pairs—parallel terms that occur frequently in the Bible and in Ugaritic texts. Begun a half century ago, it continues still, and it is one of the major achievements of modern biblical research.[1]

But collecting data is one thing and interpreting it is another. What was one to make of the fact that there were a large number of parallel pairs that recurred? The conclusion reached was that there existed a stock of fixed word pairs which belonged to the literary tradition of Israel and Canaan,

and that poets, specially trained in their craft, drew on this stock to aid in the oral composition of parallel lines. If, for example, a poet generated a line containing the word *ksp*, "silver," his next line would be formed around its fixed pair, *ḥrṣ*, "gold."

There are actually two separate issues involved here. One is the issue of oral composition, which remains a hypothesis for biblical poetry. The other is the issue of the existence of fixed pairs as opposed to nonfixed pairs. The connection made between theories of oral composition and word pairs is an accident of intellectual history. The discovery of Ugaritic word pairs and their similarity to Hebrew word pairs came at the same time that the Parry-Lord theory was in ascendence. Scholars simply linked newly emerging evidence with newly emerging theories. Since it proved impossible to find in Hebrew poetry the same kinds of metrical formulae that were present in Greek poetry, biblical scholars substituted what they had in abundance—parallel word pairs—and declared them to be the functional equivalents of formulae.[2] Word pairs existed, according to this line of thought, to enable a poet to compose orally.

But this leaves much unaccounted for. For one thing, it does not explain how the rest of the line, besides the word pairs, was composed. For another, the same word pairs occur in poetry that was almost certainly not composed orally.[3] For these reasons, as well as because of recent doubts about the Parry-Lord theory, the time has come, as others have already suggested, to remove the issue of oral composition from the discussion of word pairs.

That leaves us with the notion of a stock of fixed pairs—the poet's dictionary, as it has been called. This was presumably a poetic substratum of biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic, the privileged knowledge of trained poets. But this stock of pairs, once numbering a few dozen, is now over a thousand and still growing.[4] Moreover, the same pairs that occur in poetic parallelism also occur in prose—in juxtaposition, collocation, and even in construct with one another.[5] If these pairs were indeed reserved for poets, then they threaten to leave the ordinary speaker without a vocabulary. It seems obvious that we cannot separate them from the total lexicon of Hebrew. Having said that, it becomes clear that there is no qualitative difference between the so-called fixed pairs and pairs that have not been so labelled. The only difference is that fixed pairs are attested more often than nonfixed pairs.[6] This is a quantitative distinction which is of some interest in regard to specific pairs and to ancient Israelite language behavior in general; but it does not alter the fact that the process whereby words are paired is the same in all instances.

If the phenomenon of word pairs cannot be explained as a part of a literary substratum or as a necessity for oral composition, then how is it to be explained? Here, again, linguistics offers a solution, a way of understanding word pairs in a broad sense and a way of comprehending their function in parallelism. However, this time it is not structural linguistics which provides the insight, but psycholinguistics—specifically the area of psycholinguistics that concerns itself with the process of word association. For word pairs, I will shortly attempt to demonstrate, are nothing more or less than the products of normal word associations that are made by all competent speakers.[7] Biblical scholarship has been inching slowly towards this view, but since most biblical scholars lacked any knowledge of the linguistic theory of word associations they were not able to make this connection. Before I present the theory and relate it to Hebrew word pairs, let us see how close others have come to it, and yet, like Tasman, who circumnavigated Australia without ever discovering it, they were unable to perceive what lay just below their horizon.

W. Watters, whose book, though flawed, succeeds in its critique of certain assumptions about fixed word pairs, explains that "many recurring pairs may be ascribed . . . to borrowing, coincidence, or idiom" (73), and "pairs which are deemed 'rare associations' by modern scholarship, were but common associations to the poet and the public" (75). The implicit assumption here, although it is developed no further, is that both common and rare pairings (i.e., fixed and nonfixed pairs) derive from commonly held associations between words.[8] Kugel echoes this when he says that "Hebrew and Ugaritic, like most languages, had their stock of conventionally associated terms, of synonyms and near-synonyms, and of antonyms and near-antonyms" (*Idea*, 33). Kugel, too, seems to feel that there is nothing extraordinary about Hebrew word pairs—they are just conventionally associated terms. (But several of Kugel's own terms are unfortunate: "stock" brings to mind the old notion of fixed pairs, or a given body of words that could be used for pairing; and "synonyms" and "antonyms" are inaccurate, as we will see below.)

P. C. Craigie approaches the issue of word pairs from a different direction. In the context of questioning the Ugaritic origins of Psalm 29, which he feels is a *Hebrew* (not a Canaanite) psalm with a Canaanite theme, Craigie notes that some of the same word pairs occur in many different, even unrelated languages.[9] His conclusion is that "a basic parallel word pair . . . can carry no particular significance with respect to the literary interrelationship between Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry." (*UF* 11, 137). In other words, Craigie argues that the similarity between Hebrew and Ugaritic

pairs cannot be used to support the view that the two poetic traditions are
interrelated. Actually, though, his observation poses an even more funda-
mental question: is the use of word pairs a distinctive Ugaritic-Hebrew
poetic device? Craigie answers in the negative: "Any poetry, in which
thought parallelism is employed, will inevitably employ similar or com-
mon parallel word pairs."[10] However, Craigie does not pursue the matter;
he offers no thoughts on what word pairs are or where they come from.

O'Connor, who has the most to offer on this subject, goes further by
stating that "the psychotherapeutic exercise of free association reveals, if it
is not obvious, that any single word in a language can be paired with any
other" (HVS, 96). In other words, every word has a potential word pair
that can be generated by every competent speaker. There is no stock of
word pairs except in the sense of those pairs which occur frequently—i.e.,
those associations which are realized more often. Although O'Connor
makes an important point here, he does not investigate the general process
of word association, but restricts his study to certain specific kinds of asso-
ciation, and the linguistic rules whereby associated terms are ordered (that
is, why A words precede B words). I want to go back to the process of
association itself; I am not so much interested in the rules which govern
the *order* of the terms as in the rules which explain how the terms were
generated in the first place. I want to answer the question: Where do word
pairs come from? In order to do this I will have recourse to the area of
psycholinguistics that investigates the process of word association through
word association games. The particular studies to which I will refer are
H. Clark, "Word Associations and Linguistic Theory" and J. E. Deese,
The Structure of Associations in Language and Thought. These studies are
based on English word associations, but when we apply their observations
and results to the lists of Hebrew word pairs we find remarkable similarities.
The general rules that pertain to English word associations also pertain to
Hebrew word pairs. Thus the two begin to appear as results of the same
process. In this way Hebrew word pairs—all Hebrew word pairs—can be
understood as the product of normal linguistic association.[11]

Before summarizing the specific rules whereby word associations are
generated, there are several general observations that will clarify points
that have always created confusion in biblical research.

Psycholinguists vary the time limits for responses in their word associa-
tion experiments, and this leads to different results, which have been clas-
sified into three groups. When the player in a word association game is
given a great deal of time, he responds with unusual associations, rich in
images, and reflecting personal or idiosyncratic choices. When asked to

respond more quickly, the player produces more "superficial" and more
common associations. These tend to be the same ones produced by most
other players, and are therefore predictable to a large extent. Finally, when
pressed even faster, the player gives "clang responses," words that sound
like or rhyme with the stimulus (Clark, 272–73). It is the second group of
associations, those elicited most often by most players, that usually inter-
ests psycholinguists. And it is this same group that biblicists call "fixed
word pairs." They are simply the most common, easily produced, word
associations. There are, of course, less common pairs in the Bible, and
these could be considered members of the first group—the products of
more careful thought. Of course, one would not expect "clang responses"
in a context where meaning is essential.

The second observation from the psycholinguistic approach is that a word
may elicit itself as an association. This rarely occurs in free-association ex-
periments because it is in the nature of the instructions of these experi-
ments to discourage a response that is identical to its stimulus. Neverthe-
less, it has become a psycholinguistic assumption that "a word serving as a
stimulus in free association not only yields the overtly given associate *but
also yields itself as a response*" (Deese, 47). Now this corresponds to the rep-
etition of the same word in parallel lines, which occurs so often that
Dahood began to list examples in his word pair lists. Although he didn't
quite know how to explain this type of pairing, he sensed that it was in
some way related to the use of word pairs. Indeed, he was right. The use of
a repeated word in parallel lines is part of the same phenomenon as the use
of an associated word. (This applies to any word, not just the specific ones
listed by Dahood.)

More dramatic proof that a repeated word and a parallel word are part of
the same phenomenon can be found when we are fortunate enough to have
two versions of the same parallelism. It is well known, for instance, that
2 Sam 22 and Ps 18 are the same psalm in slightly different forms. It is not
a question of which is correct, but a matter of comparing alternate forms
which were equally acceptable to the ancient poet.[12] In the case of word
pairs, we find that in the following verses one version repeats a word while
the other substitutes a parallel word.

2 Sam 22 : 1   מכף כל איביו ומכף שאול

From the *palm* of all his enemies and from the *palm* of Saul.

Ps 18 : 1   מכף כל איביו ומיד שאול

From the *palm* of all his enemies and from the *hand* of Saul.

2 Sam 22:7

בצר לי אקרא ה'
ואל אלהי אקרא

When I am in distress I *call* to YHWH;
And to my God I *call*.

Ps 18:7

בצר לי אקרא ה'
ואל אלהי אשוע

When I am in distress I *call* to YHWH;
And to my God I *cry out*.

2 Sam 22:32

כי מי אל מבלעדי ה'
ומי צור מבלעדי אלהינו

For who is a god *except* YHWH?
And who is a rock *except* our God?

Ps 18:32

כי מי אלוה מבלעדי ה'
ומי צור זולתי אלהינו

For who is a god *except* YHWH?
And who is a rock *besides* our God?

The same sort of replacement occurs in repeated phrases in the prophetic books.

Isa 16:7

לכן ייליל מואב
למואב כלה ייליל

Therefore let Moab *howl*;
As for all Moab, let it *howl*.

Jer 48:31

על כן על מואב איליל
ולמואב כלה אזעק

Therefore I will *howl* about Moab;
For all Moab I will *cry out*.

Jer 23:19

הנה סערת ה' חמה יצאה וסער מתחולל
על ראש רשעים יחול

Lo, the storm of YHWH goes forth in fury, a *whirling* storm;
Upon the head of the wicked it will *whirl*.

Jer 30:23

הנה סערת ה' חמה יצאה סער מתגורר
על ראש רשעים יחול

Lo, the storm of YHWH goes forth in fury, a *raging* storm;
Upon the head of the wicked it will *whirl*.

These verses confirm that a word may be paralleled by itself or by a parallel word—i.e., a word that is in some sense equivalent. This shows that in parallelism absolute identity is acceptable on the lexical plane just as it is acceptable on the grammatical plane (when the grammar of the two lines is identical).

Closely related to the identical repetition of a word in parallel lines is the repetition of the same root in a different form. Chapter 3 contains many examples of the same root with some grammatical change: masculine // feminine, singular // plural, *qtl* // *yqtl*, and so forth. Related also is the phenomenon in which a single word is paralleled by a phrase containing that word. Y. Avishur (*Beth Mikra* 59, 520–21) designates this as x // x + y, as in Song 1:10–11, where תורים, "wreaths," parallels תורי זהב, "wreaths of gold" (cf. also Song 1:3, שמן תורק // שמניך). I would include other combinations that are not strictly x // x + y, such as Job 6:15 אפיק נחלים // נחל and Jud 5:28 פעמי מרכבותיו // רכבו (see below). Such pairings are analogous to English associates like *affirm-confirm*, *amongst-among*, *berry-strawberry*. In all of these cases the paired words share the same lexical base, but their forms have been differentiated by the addition of other linguistic features.

A third observation is that a word may elicit a number of different associations.[13] Linguists usually rank them statistically, from the most common to the least. For example, *man* will usually elicit *woman*, but it will elicit *boy* in a smaller number of cases (Clark, 276). For our purposes it is enough to realize, as Dahood's lists show, that a word may be paired with several others. For instance, *'rṣ* may be paired with itself (*RSP* I, #62), with *ym* (*RSP* I, #64), *'pr* (*RSP* I, #67), *šmm* (*RSP* I, #71), and so on. What determines which association is made in a given verse in the Bible? To some extent it may be the strength of the association; that is, in the general population what the most common response to *'rṣ* would have been. Another factor is the particular connotation which the word conjures up to the person making the association. This affects the choice of associate even in free-association games, and how much more so when the word is part of a larger semantic context, as in a line or a poem. If *'rṣ* is understood to mean "country" it will elicit a different term than if it is understood to mean "earth" or "dry land." So at work in any specific pairing are the normal strength and frequency of a particular association—how conventional or stereotyped it has become—and the semantic requirements of a particular context or the playfulness of a particular poet.

A final observation has to do with the reciprocity of associated words. In

some cases X will elicit Y and Y will elicit X—for example, in English *soft* elicits *hard* and *hard* elicits *soft*. This is analogous to situations in which the order of the paired words may be reversed. For example, *ʾrṣ* elicits *šmm* and *šmm* elicits *ʾrṣ*; *ʾrṣ* may serve as either the A or the B word.[14] (Compare, for example, Isa 45:12 and Ps 96:11.) However, in other cases X elicits Y, but Y does not elicit X. In English *frigid* elicits *cold*, but *cold* does not elicit *frigid* (Deese, 53). (*Cold* usually elicits *hot*, for reasons discussed below.) In Hebrew *ʾkl* elicits *šth*, but *šth* rarely if ever seems to elicit *ʾkl* (but cf. Num 6:3 and Amos 9:14). This would explain the word pairs in which there is always a fixed order: always A and then B; never B and then A.

The general rules governing the formation of word associations can be divided into paradigmatic rules and syntagmatic rules (Clark). Sets of elements which can be substituted one for another in a given context are paradigmatic. In English this usually involves words of the same part of speech, e.g., *tree-flower*, *cold-hot*, *run-jump*. Syntagmatic elements are those which combine to form a larger unit, e.g., *green-grass*, *sit-down*. A word may generate both a paradigmatic and a syntagmatic associate, for instance, *stop* generates both *go* and *sign*; but the response correlates to some extent with the part of speech of the stimulus. Thus grammar is at work also, even though it might appear that word association is purely a lexical procedure. The following observations have been made for English: nouns tend to be paradigmatic, adverbs are syntagmatic, and verbs and adjectives fall in between, with about 50 percent of the associates of each being syntagmatic (Deese, 105). An interesting aside: children tend to give more syntagmatic responses than adults. For instance, when presented with the word *good*, most adults will give *bad*, but children will give *boy* (Deese, 53, Clark, 275).

A. The Paradigmatic Rules

1. The Minimal Contrast Rule

If a word has a common "opposite" it will elicit that opposite more than anything else. This is most evident in adjectives: *good-bad*, *long-short*. But many nouns also work this way: *man-woman*, as do prepositions: *up-down*, *above-below*, and also verbs: *give-take*, *go-come*. Biblical examples are the pairing of אם־אב, על־תחת (*RSP* I, #589), and עלה־ירד (*RSP* I, #421). This creates the impression that many word pairs are antonyms.

Other single-feature contrasts involve grammatical contrasts of the type discussed in chapter 3. In verbs we find ± plural (*is-are*, *has-have*), ± past tense in strong verbs (*are-were*, *take-took*). This would explain the *qtl-yqtl* pairing of the same root. (The pairing of *qtl-yqtl* forms of different roots involves a double-feature contrast.) In pronouns there may be a ± nominative contrast: *he-him* (cf. Ps 2:7 אתה // ך), and in deictic words a ± proximal contrast: *here-there*, *this-that*.

The rules for minimal contrast are actually more complex than this. They are hierarchic; there are rules for which feature is chosen for contrast and in what order features tend to be chosen. This explains, for example, why *man* elicits *woman* more often than it elicits *boy*. We must remember, however, that these rules are not meant for predicting the associate of a particular word at any given time. They merely explain and categorize a great many word associations by a large group of people.

2. The Marking Rule

This is a particularization of the minimal contrast rule. It states that there is a greater tendency to change a feature from, rather than to, its marked value. Marking can be illustrated in nouns by *dogs*, the marked form, and *dog*, the unmarked (or zero-marked) form. The marking rule means that *dogs* elicits *dog* more than *dog* elicits *dogs*. The same is true for pairs such as *brought-bring*, *better-good*, *useless-useful*. If this holds true for Hebrew, and there is no assurance that it does, then one would expect more cases of *yqtl* // *qtl* than the reverse, more cases of plural // singular of the same word, and feminine // masculine of the same word. I have no idea if the actual occurrences of such pairs bear this out.

Clark notes, however, that there are many cases which seem to contradict the marking rule. For instance, *man*, the unmarked form, elicits *woman* more than *woman* elicits *man*; *he*, the unmarked form, elicits *him* more than the reverse. Clark therefore cautions against using the marking rule as a general rule (278). In biblical parallelism the presence of the semantic context may limit the use of the marking rule even more severely. But it would appear that some form of marking is at work when singulars and plurals of the same root are paired, masculines and feminines of the same root, and so forth (see chapter 3, p. 35).

3. The Feature Deletion and Addition Rule

The features of a word are listed hierarchically by linguists; for example, *father* = noun, singular, animate, human, male, parent. If a feature is de-

leted, and it is usually done from the end of the list, it generally produces a superordinate, as in *father-man, apple-fruit*, etc. This is, in other words, a part and its whole, or a specific member of a class and the entire class. (The tendency towards expansion of the members of a class in this kind of association may also be at work in the many cases where כל is added to the second term, cf. Kugel, *Idea*, 47–48.) A Hebrew example is ירושלם // ערי יהודה (Isa 44:26—cf. ציון // ערי יהודה in Lam 5:11). The addition of כל appears in Jer 34:7, where ירושלם parallels כל ערי יהודה. Isa 40:9 has taken the pair ציון and ירושלם, and added to it ערי יהודה.

The addition of a feature (instead of its deletion) yields a subordinate, as in *fruit-apple, animal-dog*. The same Hebrew pair, ירושלם // יהודה is put in this order in Jer 4:3–5. Another example is ארז // עץ (which is also used in reverse, cf. *RSP* I, #442). The device known as particularizing, common in Hebrew and other ancient near eastern parallelism, can be considered a form of feature addition.[15]

It is the feature deletion and addition rules that account, in a number of complex ways, for the large number of synonyms and near-synonyms produced on word association experiments. In general, this involves the selection of another word with the same or a similar list of features. For example, *dog* and *cat* share the following features: noun, singular, animate, mammal, small, domesticated, etc. Combinations like *dog-cat, apple-orange* are coordinates; in Hebrew one finds coordinates like *heart // liver* (*RSP* I, #323), *water // oil* (*RSP* I, #354).

Many associates share the same properties or appear in the same context. They can usually be explained by the deletion or addition of one or two features. In verbs one finds ± cause, yielding *kill = die, teach = learn*. The Hebrew counterpart would be the pairing of *qal* and *hiphᶜil* verbs.[16] In nouns the changed features may be ± abstract: *knowledge-school*, ± animate: *pill-doctor*. Hebrew pairings like ים // תנינים (Ps 74:13), *kings // throne* (Pr 16:12), those listed in Dahood, *Psalms* III, 411 as abstract // concrete, and many others can be explained by the feature deletion and addition rule.

4. The Category Preservation Rule

This rule states that the higher a feature is on the list, the less likely it is to be changed. This accounts, first of all, for the tendency toward paradigmatic responses, since part of speech is high on the list. It also explains why certain contrasts or deletions (e.g., singular-plural) occur less often than others. In general, the rule for paradigmatic responses is to "perform the least change on the lowest feature, with the restriction that the result

must correspond to an English word" (Clark, 280). The least change would be changing the sign of a feature, the plus or minus, which yields a minimal contrast. Deletion of features is preferred to addition of features, and single deletions or additions are preferred to multiple ones.

In general, the paradigmatic rules of association account for a large number of Hebrew word pairs, especially the more frequently occurring ones. They also explain why so many can be called synonyms or antonyms, and, at the same time, why so many others do not fit these labels.

B. The Syntagmatic Rules

The syntagmatic rules are, according to Clark, more difficult to characterize than the paradigmatic rules. He finds that there are two which account for the bulk of syntagmatic responses.

1. The Selection Feature Realization Rule

A word often contains selectional features that limit the context in which that word may occur. To illustrate, let us take the word *young*. It has selectional restrictions on what it can modify; one can say *young boy* but not *young book*. In other words, *young* can modify animate nouns but not inanimate nouns. The syntagmatic response to *young* is one realization of the possible nouns that *young* can modify—e.g., *boy, woman*, etc. To simplify the procedure further: the respondent thinks, "What can this word be used with?" and gives that word as a response.[17] Other examples of syntagmatic responses are *bend-over, pencil-write, pickle-sour*.

2. The Idiom Completion Rule

This is related to the selectional feature realization rule. The idiom completion rule seeks a selectional feature that has only one realization. Clark states the rule as: "Find an idiom of which the stimulus is a part and produce the next main word" (282). Examples are *cottage-cheese, apple-pie, Oxford-University*. There are also a number of apparently paradigmatic responses which Clark feels are better understood as idiom completions. He lists *ham-eggs, bread-butter*, and *needle-thread*. The importance of the ambiguity of such combinations will become clearer in my discussion of Hebrew syntagmatic pairs. Clark also stresses that syntagmatic responses "are not merely continuous fragments of speech . . . , but rather responses that bear only an abstract relationship to normal speech" (283). For one thing, they do not include functional words such as *and, the*, but only the lexical items.

C. Syntagmatic Pairing in Hebrew

There are several different types of syntagmatic pairings in Hebrew. I will consider them under the headings of 1) conventionalized coordinates, 2) binomination, and 3) normal syntagmatic combinations.[18]

1. Conventionalized Coordinates

The idiom completion rule explains the association of two or more terms that belong to an idiom or conventional expression. For instance, the word *free* elicits *easy* because the two are part of the common expression "free and easy." The Hebrew counterparts of such associates are what E. Z. Melamed has called the breakup of stereotype phrases.[19] These consist of word pairs, in most cases coordinates, which derive from expressions which have achieved the status of idioms, such as סוס־רכב ("horse-driver") and חסד־אמת ("loyalty-truth"). The breakup of such a phrase or idiom constitutes a syntagmatic pairing, even if the pair itself appears paradigmatic, as we saw from Clark's discussion of sets like *bread-butter* and *ham-eggs*. The objections to Melamed's thesis brought by C. Whitley actually center around the problem of whether pairs like סוס // רכב really derive from idioms or are simply paradigmatic associations. To the extent that we can prove idiom status—and this may sometimes be done on the basis of the frequency of the continuous phrase (i.e., in juxtaposition, not in parallel lines)—we can speak of the breakup of idioms. It is hard enough to decide this for certain English coordinates, like *coffee-tea*; how much more would we expect disagreement for certain Hebrew coordinates. It would seem, though, that the principle of the syntagmatic pairing of conventionalized coordinates is firmly established in Hebrew. This would include the use as parallel word pairs of words normally forming hendiadys (e.g., חסד // אמת, "loyalty // truth"), merismus (שמים // ארץ, "sky // earth"), and conventional coordinates like שור // חמור, "ox // ass" and אלמנה // יתום, "orphan // widow." The origin of such idioms, however, is a separate question; they may have arisen from paradigmatic association. (It bears repeating that such coordinates, regardless of how close in meaning they appear, are not synonyms.)[20]

2. Binomination

Although there may be some question concerning the status as syntagmatic constituents of certain coordinates, there is no doubt about the elements of binomination. This is a term used by O'Connor (*HVS*, 112–13,

371–77) for the splitting up of the components of one personal or geographic name. Both elements clearly refer to one individual (whereas coordinates refer to two), and form one two-part name.[21] Examples are

Jud 5:12	ברק // בן אבינעם	[cf. *HVS*, 374–75]
Num 23:7	בלק // מלך מואב	[cf. *HVS*, 374–75]
Ruth 4:11	אפרתה // בית לחם	[cf. Melamed, *Scripta* VIII, 122–23][22]

3. Normal Syntagmatic Combinations

The previous two categories would fit under Clark's Idiom Completion Rule. The last category, which, for lack of a better term, I call normal syntagmatic combinations, is a manifestation of The Selectional Feature Realization Rule. It pairs words in parallel lines that are not necessarily idioms but that would normally be combined in ordinary discourse. Here, as in English, the clearest examples are those in which the part of speech of the paired words is different. For example, we find כסא, "chair, throne," paired with ישב, "sit" in Isa 16:5 and Lam 5:19.

Isa 16:5

והוכן בחסד כסא
וישב עליו באמת באהל דוד . . .

And a throne shall be established in kindness;
And he shall sit on it in faithfulness. . . .

Lam 5:19

אתה ה' לעולם תשב
כסאך לדור ודור

You, YHWH, will sit forever;
Your throne is for eternity.

Another case is the pairing of כתב, "write," and ספר, "book" in Job 19:23

מי יתן אפו ויכתבון מלי
מי יתן בספר ויחקו

There is a double parallel in this verse. First, the phrase ויכתבון בספר has been split, so that there is a syntagmatic pairing in parallel lines of these two elements. Second, the entire phrase ויכתבון בספר then parallels ויחקו. The verse should not be translated distributively either as "O that my words be written and inscribed in a book" or as "O that my words be written down, O that they be inscribed in a book." Job intends a poetic pro-

gression in 19:23–24 which should not be levelled by trying to decide what kind of material he had in mind for his inscription. He moves from the softest and least permanent to the hardest and most permanent: from parchment to stone; and does so with three verbs for writing: to write, to inscribe, to engrave.

> O that my words be written down,
> O that they be in a book, firmly inscribed,
> With a pen of iron and lead (a chisel),
> Forever engraved in rock.

It is easy to recognize syntagmatic pairs involving a verb and a noun (although these do not seem to occur frequently); somewhat more problematic is the splitting of a noun and a noun-adjective-participle combination. Difficulties arise because, while one can differentiate *morphologically* between nouns, adjectives, and participles, *syntactically* they all function the same way and therefore may all be considered the same part of speech. If we recall our definition that paradigmatic words substitute for one another and that syntagmatic words combine with one another to form a larger unit, we see that pairings of nouns, adjectives, and participles are ambiguous. Let us look at a simple demonstration. Deut 22:22 speaks of האש השכב, "the man who lies"; Lev 14:47 reads והשכב בבית, "the one who lies in the house." In Hebrew a participle (in this case שכב) or an adjective can replace a noun or can be used together with it. Thus the pairing of an adjective or participle with a noun in parallel lines is both syntagmatic and paradigmatic. It becomes a matter of judgment as to how we perceive them in a given case.[23] The same is true for nouns in construct, both of which may be used independently. Without going further into the matter, I offer the following as possible syntagmatic pairs. They occur as parallel terms, but I have translated them as continuous expressions in order to point out their syntagmatic nature.

Ps 3:2	צרי // קמים עלי
	"The enemies who attack me"
Ps 19:13	שגיאות // נסתרות
	"Hidden errors"
Job 3:20	עמל // מרי נפש
	"Embittered toilers"[24]

These are not, as far as I know, idioms or conventionalized expressions, but seem to be elements of phrases that would normally occur in combination.

It is not my purpose to explain all biblical word pairs by one or another of the rules which have been presented here. It is enough to see that the linguistic rules underlying word associations also seem to fit when applied to word pairs, and in many cases provide better explanations for certain pairs than were heretofore available. Moreover, the theory of word associations is a "unified theory." It provides one explanation for a large variety of related phenomena. This theory shows that the pairing of *yqtl-qtl* forms and the breakup of idioms are of the same nature as the pairing of apparent synonyms and antonyms. It shows that the pairing of words in parallel lines is no different from the pairing in juxtaposition, collocation, and construct, and even over greater distances.[25] And it shows that the poetic pairings are the same as those in prose. All of these associations belong to the same linguistic phenomenon. Much of this was already sensed by biblicists but there was no model around which to structure the discussion. The linguistic theory of word association provides that model.

This approach to word pairs leads to the conclusion that they were not specially invented to enable the composition of parallel lines. Word pairs exist, at least potentially, in all languages, whether or not they use parallelism;[26] and in those that do use parallelism, the word pairs are not restricted to parallel lines but may occur in nonparallelistic writing as well. *It is not word pairs that create parallelism. It is parallelism that activates word pairs.* Since parallelism is essentially a form of projecting equivalences, it produces equivalents on all linguistic levels. On the lexical level these take the form of the realization of two or more words which are normally (or sometimes not so frequently) associated by speakers of the language. The lists of pairs that scholars have collected are not part of a poetic or even literary tradition. They are much more: they are a window into what psycholinguists would call the language behavior, and ultimately the whole conceptual world, of speakers of biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic.[27] They evince mundane connections like *ox* and *ass* and ethnic prejudices like *Philistine* and *uncircumcised*.[28] Not only should we continue to collect them, but we should document their frequencies and patterns to the extent that textual remains permit. This is the linguistic task. The literary task is to see how a given author or verse uses a specific pair for his own purpose—to create his own emphasis or meaning. Does he use an unexpected

or rare association to shock his readers? Does he originate a new association of words much as he does in a simile or metaphor? Or does he give new life to a common association? Poets, after all, use the same language and the same linguistic rules as their audience, but it is the way in which they use these that makes them poets.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE LEXICAL AND THE SEMANTIC ASPECTS

The theory of word association explains the relationship between paired words in psycholinguistic terms rather than in semantic terms. That is, words are paired not on the basis of a particular semantic principle (e.g., sameness of meaning), but as a result of a complex psycholinguistic process. This is not to say, however, that word pairing does not have a semantic component. For one thing, the pairs can be considered semantically equivalent "insofar as they overlap in cutting up the general 'thought-mass'" (Levin, *Linguistic Structure in Poetry*, 25); in other words, they are part of the same semantic field. For another, it is possible to categorize the semantic relationships between word pairs: Geller has done so in one manner[29] and even the linguistic terms that I have used—coordinate, subordinate, etc.—have overtones of semantic categorization. And, most important of all, the choice of word pairs affects the meaning of the parallelism.

How it affects the meaning is difficult to describe except by example, for, while the process by which word pairs are matched may seem almost automatic or instinctive, I do not think that we can dismiss their use so easily. What we have explained so far is the process of pairing in and of itself, divorced from the context in which it occurs. But the specific pairs that are chosen, and how they are ordered, are both dependent on that context and contribute to it. One illustration will have to suffice.

Lam 5:11

נשים בציון ענו
בתלת בערי יהודה

Women in Zion they ravished;
Virgins in the cities of Judah.

This verse is composed entirely of word pairs plus a verb that is gapped in the second line. The relationship between *women* and *virgins* is either superordinate // subordinate (women in the sense of all adult females)

or two coordinates (married women as opposed to virgins). In either case, the second term is more restrictive or specific than the first, since even if the terms are coordinates, married women are the more numerous, hence the more common element, while *virgins* represents a special category within society. So the way in which this word pair is ordered has the effect of restricting the meaning of the parallelism. But the other word pair, *Zion // cities of Judah*, moves in the opposite direction. Here clearly there is a subordinate // superordinate; Zion refers to one city among the cities of Judah. The effect of the second word pair is to expand the meaning of the parallelism. It might seem, then, that the two pairs are working at cross purposes, but this is not so. On the contrary, their effect is to make the sense of the verse more intense and dramatic: the action described becomes more atrocious and more widespread. Raping virgins is more offensive than raping married women,[30] and it was not confined to the capital but occurred throughout the country. So we see that the lexical and semantic aspects are intertwined.

But in another sense the lexical aspect is to be distinguished from the semantic aspect.[31] To be sure, lexical pairs are often semantic pairs (and grammatical pairs as well), but there are a number of verses in which the lexical pairs function independently of the other aspects—they are neither semantic nor grammatical equivalents. The following verses are presented in order to show that word pairs have a life of their own,[32] and that the lexical aspect is a distinct aspect of biblical parallelism.

Ps 15:1

מי יגור באהלך
מי ישכן בהר קדשך

Who will live in your *tent*?
Who will *dwell* on your holy mountain?

The lexical pair ʾhl // (m)škn (RSP I, #15) does not function as a semantic pair. The semantic and grammatical equivalents are ygwr // yškn and ʾhlk // hr qdšk.

Ps 111:6

כח מעשיו הגיד לעמו
לתת להם נחלת גוים

The power of his deeds he told to his *people*
In giving to them the inheritance of *nations*.

These lines are not syntactically parallel and the terms ʿm and gwy, a known pair (compare, for example, Isa 1:4), are not semantic equivalents here.

Ps 11:6   ימטר על רשעים פחים אש וגפרית
                     ורוח זלעפות מנת כוסם

> He will *rain* upon the wicked blazing coals and sulphur;
> A scorching *wind* will be their portion.

Semantically, רוח זלעפות parallels פחים אש וגפרית but the verse also contains the lexical pair רוח // מטר (*RSP* I, #520).

Job 31:18   כי מנעורי גדלני כאב
                     ומבטן אמי אנחנה

> For from my youth he [the orphan] grew up with me as with a *father*;
> And from my *mother*'s womb I guided her [the widow].

The semantic pair is מנעורי and מבטן אמי, but the common lexical pair אם // אב is also present.

Pr 4:1   שמעו בנים מוסר אב
                     והקשיבו לדעת בינה

> *Heed*, sons, a father's discipline;
> And listen in order to know *understanding*.

הקשיבו and שמעו are both a lexical and a semantic pair, but there is an additional lexical pair: בין // שמע (*RSP* I, #567). Pr 4:1 contains a three-way play among lexical associates. This happens in a different manner in

Isa 54:2   הרחיבי מקום אהלך
                     ויריעות משכנותיך יטו . . .

> Enlarge the place of your *tent*;
> Let the *curtains* of your *dwellings* be extended. . . .

Both אהל // משכן and יריעה // אהל appear as parallel word pairs; here instead of choosing one the prophet used both. Isa 54:2 is an example in which a term with one component parallels a term with more than one: *tent* parallels *curtains of dwellings*. The terms of the double component are *both* lexical associates of the first term. A similar phenomenon is found in the following examples except that here the double component consists of a repeated term and an associate.

Job 6:15   אחי בגדו כמו נחל
                     כאפיק נחלים יעברו

> My brothers are as treacherous as a *wadi*;
> Like a *wadi-stream* they run dry.

Jud 5:28   מדוע בשש רכבו לבוא
                     מדוע אחרו פעמי מרכבותיו

> Why does his *chariot* tarry in coming;
> Why have the *poundings of his chariots* delayed.

Finally, a verse which sets up a false relationship based on a word pair—a play on a word pair (not unlike the play on grammar that I discussed at the end of chapter 3).

Job 5:14   יומם יפגשו חשך
                     וכלילה ימששו בצהרים

> By day they encounter darkness;
> And as in the night they grope at noon.

The familiar associates *day* and *night* are a lexical pair. They may at first seem to be a semantic pair as well since they often occur as such and because here each occupies the same position in its respective line.[33] But actually the semantic pairs are *by day* // *at noon* and *darkness* // *night*.

All of the verses cited in this section, whether they contain word pairs or variations on the same root, show that lexical parallelism is to be distinguished from semantic and grammatical parallelism. Words may be lexically associated but need not be used as semantic or grammatic equivalents. Or, one might say that it is the lexical associations that promote the perception of parallelism when grammatic or semantic equivalences are absent, and reinforce it when they are present.

•

LEXICAL, GRAMMATICAL, AND SEMANTIC PATTERNING

Further proof that these three aspects can be analyzed separately comes from verses in which there are two (or more) sets of lexical, grammatical, or semantic elements occurring in a pattern. If we limit ourselves to two pairs, there are three possible patterns: *aabb*, *abab*, *abba*. Biblicists are most familiar with lexical patterning of the *abba* type (chiastic[34]), but all three aspects can be found in all three patterns, and furthermore, they may be found in different patterns within the same parallelism.

A. Lexical Patterning

1. *aabb*

Gen 37:8   המלך תמלך עלינו
                        אם משול תמשל בנו

Will you really reign over us; [mlk-mlk]
Will you really rule us. [mšl-mšl]

Isa 66:23   והיה מדי חדש בחדשו
                        ומדי שבת בשבתו

It will be from one *new moon* to another *new moon*;
From one *sabbath* to another *sabbath*.

Perhaps the ultimate in this type of patterning is

Isa 28:10, 13   כי צו לצו צו לצו
                        קו לקו קו לקו
                        זעיר שם זעיר שם

Mutter upon mutter, mutter upon mutter;
Murmur upon murmur, murmur upon murmur;
A little here, a little there.

2. abab[35]

Ps 33:10–11   ה' הפיר עצת גוים
                        הניא מחשבות עמים
                        עצת ה' לעולם תעמד
                        מחשבות לבו לדר ודר

YHWH frustrates the *plan* of nations;
Brings to naught the *designs* of peoples.
YHWH's *plan* endures forever;
His heart's *designs*, for eternity.

Note that the semantic pattern is *aabb*, as is the syntactic pattern; but mor-
phologically there is an *abab* alternation between singular and plural
which matches the lexical pattern. Compare also Isa 51:6.

Ex 29:27   . . . את חזה התנופה ואת שוק התרומה
                        אשר הונף ואשר הורם . . .

. . . the *wave* breast and the *heave* thigh
which was *waved* and which was *heaved*. . . .[36]

Sometimes the words which are patterned are not word pairs, as in the
following:

Isa 54:7–8   ברגע קטן עזבתיך
                       וברחמים גדלים אקבצך
                       בשצף קצף הסתרתי פני רגע ממך
                       ובחסד עולם רחמתיך . . .

For a small *moment* I forsook you;
But with great *compassion* I will gather you in.
In slight anger I hid my face from you for a *moment*;
But with eternal kindness I will be *compassionate* to you.

Ps 126:5–6   הזרעים בדמעה
                       ברנה יקצרו
                       הלוך ילך ובכה נשא משך הזרע
                       בא יבוא ברנה נשא אלמתיו

Those who *sow* in tears;
In *joy* will they reap;
He who indeed goes crying, carrying the *seed*-bag;
Will indeed come *joyfully*, carrying his sheaves.
[zrʿ-rnh–zrʿ-rnh]

3. abba[37]

Jer 17:7   ברוך הגבר אשר יבטח בה'
                       והיה ה' מבטחו

Blessed is the man who is *secure* in *YHWH*;
And *YHWH* will be his *security*.

Ps 132:13–14   כי בחר ה' בציון
                       אוה למושב לו
                       זאת מנוחתי עדי עד
                       פה אשב כי אותיה

For YHWH has chosen Zion;
He has *desired* it for his *seat*.
This is my resting-place for all time;
Here I will *sit*, for I *desire* it.

Notice that here only two lines out of four are involved in the *abba* lexical
patterning, yet all four are involved in an *aabb* semantic pattern. There is
only partial grammatical correspondence.

B. Grammatical Patterning

1. *aabb*

Ps 126:5-6 has arranged its singulars and plurals in this pattern. Ps 33:10-11 has an *aabb* syntactic pattern.

Ps 33:10-11

ה' הפיר עצת גוים
הניא מחשבות עמים
עצת ה' לעולם תעמד
מחשבות לבו לדר ודר

YHWH frustrates the plan of nations;
Brings to naught the designs of peoples.
YHWH's plan endures forever;
His heart's designs, for eternity.

2. *abab*

Jer 31:16b-17

כי יש שכר לפעלתך נאם ה'
ושבו מארץ אויב
ויש תקוה לאחריתך נאם ה'
ושבו בנים לגבולם

For there is a reward for your labor, says YHWH:
They shall return from the enemy's land;
And there is hope for your future, says YHWH:
The children shall return to their own territory.

The syntactic, lexical, and semantic patterning are in harmony here.

3. *abba*

Ps 137:5-6a

אם אשכחך ירושלם
תשכח ימיני
תדבק לשוני לחכי
אם לא אזכרכי

If I forget you, Jerusalem,
Let my right hand wither;
Let my tongue stick to my palate,
If I do not remember you.

C. Semantic Patterning

In many cases the syntactic and semantic patterns are the same, but there may be a definite semantic pattern even when a grammatic pattern is lacking.

1. *aabb*

Joel 1:2

שמעו זאת הזקנים
והאזינו כל יושבי הארץ
ההיתה זאת בימיכם
ואם בימי אבתיכם

Hear this, elders;
And listen all dwellers of the land.
Was there ever such a thing in your days;
Or in the days of your fathers.

Cf. also Ps 132:13-14; Isa 51:6.

2. *abab*

Ps 33:20-21

נפשנו חכתה לה'
עזרנו ומגננו הוא
כי בו ישמח לבנו
כי בשם קדשו בטחנו

Our being hopes on YHWH,
Our help and our shield is he;
For in him our heart rejoices,
For in his holy name we trust.[38]

Cf. also Isa 54:7-8 and Jer 31:16b-17.

3. *abba*

Pr 23:15-16

בני אם חכם לבך
ישמח לבי גם אני
ותעלזנה כליותי
בדבר שפתיך מישרים

My son, if your heart is wise,
My own heart will rejoice;
My kidneys will be glad,
When your lips speak rightly.

I have chosen the simplest, most obvious examples of patterning. There are more intricate ones, too, containing more than two sets of terms or structured less symmetrically, e.g., *abac*, etc. In a segment involving four lines it is not uncommon for the last line to break the pattern suggested in the first three. This often serves as a link to other segments or as a type of closure.[39]

My purpose in presenting these patterns was to bring once more the lexical, grammatical, and semantic aspects into clearer focus. All of these as-

pects have a role in parallelism. Their patterns may correspond, or they may be different, but all of them add to the effect of the parallelism. Although I have taken pains to separate them for heuristic purposes, they interact with one another in a variety of ways. Parallelism is the result of the effects of its many aspects.

THE SEMANTIC ASPECT

The lexical aspect of parallelism consists of lexical equivalences which, as we saw in the two preceding sections, are not to be confused with semantic equivalences. Let us now turn our attention to the semantic aspect: the relationship between the meanings of parallel lines. But first let us establish a link between the methodology used to describe the lexical aspect and that applied to other aspects of parallelism.

The first part of this chapter showed that lexical equivalences—that is, the equivalence that constitutes word pairs—is best explained as the same equivalence that exists in word associations. The corollary is that the process whereby word associations are generated can be used to explain the generation of word pairs. In doing this we seem to have left the realm of structural linguistics, where we first sought a description of parallelism, to sojourn in an alien linguistic land. In reality, though, we have not traveled far, for while structural linguists and psycholinguists speak different metalanguages and employ different methodologies, at a more profound level they seem to be saying the same thing. Deese, a psycholinguist whose studies are far removed from poetry and parallelism, sums up his work on associations as follows: "The two associative laws may be stated as follows: (1) Elements are associatively related when they may be contrasted in some unique and unambiguous way, and (2) elements are associatively related when they may be grouped because they can be described by two or more characteristics in common" (165). These "contrasting relations and grouping relations" (cf. Deese, 160, 164) are the psycholinguistic equivalents of "equivalence" and "contrast"—the terms which structural linguists find basic to the definition of parallelism. Can association be used to explain parallelism as a whole? Deese's following statement may be viewed as having implications in this direction (although he does not mention parallelism).

A more difficult question, however, is whether or not these same associations have any influence upon the generation of sentences. It is certain that sentences are not merely concatenations of associations. Sentences are composed of syntactic structures, though it is less certain at what level these structures are generated. Class membership which makes assignment of words of different syntactic value possible, however, may well be determined by the same functional properties, namely, contrast and grouping, that determine the patterns among manifest associations. *We can imagine sentences, then, in which the structural properties are syntactic but for which the choice of the particular elements that fit into various positions is determined by associative processes.* Such sentences, of course, would assert very unlikely things. While such sentences do occur in poetry and in similar kinds of writing, they are not ordinary sentences. [167]

In the context of a discussion of biblical parallelism it is not at all difficult to imagine the kind of sentences that Deese describes in the words which I have italicized. Many biblical verses seem to have been composed in just this way.

Deese goes on to quote some data on the generation of sentences by association. A typical response to *The wide road spoiled the park* is *The narrow path hid the beauty*. Thus not only does the second sentence reproduce the syntax of the first—i.e., parallel it grammatically[40]—but, in Deese's words, "the distribution of individual words substituted for particular words in these sentences are remarkably like the distributions of free associations" (169). Deese adds: "Despite semantic constraint, the distribution of verbal elements is very much like what one would expect from simple associative processes. Thus, syntactic and semantic constraint provided by words in ordinary sentences do not eliminate or replace associative processes" (170).

If nothing else, these statements support my contention that parallel word pairs and word associations are one and the same. But I think there *is* something else—namely, that the whole process of paralleling is related in some way to the process of association. Just as any competent speaker can generate a word pair, so any competent speaker can generate a parallel line. Presumably this is done through an associative process similar to that of word association. But is this simply a result of duplicating the grammatical form of the sentence and substituting lexical associates? Or is there an associative process on the semantic level, comparable to the one on the lexical level? This is suggestive, but I know of no psycholinguistic experiment or theory that sheds further light on the matter. So I will not deal with the

semantic aspect from a cognitive perspective but will explore other linguistic avenues.

Let me make clear that the semantic aspect of parallelism does not refer to the meaning of a line, or even the meaning of the parallelism as a whole. *The semantic aspect is the relationship between the meaning of one line and its parallel line.* It is this relationship which Lowth categorized as synonymous, antithetic, or synthetic, and which Kugel described as "A, what's more, B." My thesis is that parallel lines are in some way linguistically equivalent. One type of equivalence is semantic equivalence. But how is semantic equivalence to be defined? Lowth's system is too rigid, basically limiting equivalence to synonymity or opposition; and Kugel's seems to exclude equivalence by definition. Equivalence, as I use the term, does not mean identity or synonymity. Two lines do not have to mean the same thing in order to be semantically equivalent; semantic equivalence does not imply sameness of meaning any more than lexical equivalence does. Even a paraphrase, which is one type of equivalence, is not identical with its original.[41]

The semantic equivalence between parallel lines may be perceived as either paradigmatic or syntagmatic. These are the same categories that were used to classify word pairs (lexical equivalents), and they are, in fact, the major binary opposition of structural linguistics. As such, they can, theoretically at least, be used to describe any linguistic aspect of parallelism.[42] We usually think of semantic parallelism only as paradigmatic—that is, one thought can substitute for the other. But we should not exclude the possibility of a syntagmatic semantic relationship where the two lines contain a semantic continuation, a progression of thought.[43] This may be independent of the grammatical relationship of the lines, and of the relationship between word pairs. A semantic syntagm may be expressed in grammatically paradigmatic or syntagmatic lines, using paradigmatic or syntagmatic word pairs.

Isa 40:9   על הר גבה עלי לך מבשרת ציון
                             הרימי בכח קולך מבשרת ירושלם

Ascend a high hill, herald to Zion;
Lift your voice aloud, herald to Jerusalem.

The actions of the herald are presented in the order in which they would naturally occur. Thus I would say that these two lines are syntagmatically related in their semantic aspect, although the word pair *herald to Zion* and

herald to Jerusalem is paradigmatic. Another syntagmatic semantic pairing is found in

Isa 16:5   והוכן בחסד כסא
                             וישב עליו באמת באהל דוד . . .

A throne shall be established in kindness;
And he shall sit on it in faithfulness. . . .

In this verse the lines as a whole are syntagmatic—the chair is first prepared and then occupied; and the word pairs חסד // אמת and כסא // ישב are also syntagmatic pairs.

Less easily classified as either paradigmatic or syntagmatic are verses like

Hab 3:3   כסה שמים הודו
                            ותהלתו מלאה הארץ

His glory covers heaven;
And the earth is full of his praise.

This looks like a merismus and would therefore be paradigmatic. But it could just as well be interpreted as embodying a cause and result relationship which would make it syntagmatic. Lowth would call it synonymous, and Kugel would say that B goes beyond A. We will see shortly that this ambiguity—the tension between the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic—is at the heart of parallelism, which, after all, imposes similarity upon contiguity.[44]

Once we allow for equivalences that are more than paraphrases the possibilities multiply and the assignment of a particular verse to a specific type becomes subjective (as in the case of Hab 3:3). This is so because the parallelism itself does not always make the relationship between its lines explicit. It usually juxtaposes them paratactically or joins them with the multivalent *waw*. It is then up to the reader to decide if the *waw* means "and," "but," "moreover," etc. This is the crux of the semantic aspect.

The area of linguistics that has the most potential for clarifying the semantic relationship between parallel lines is textlinguistics (or text grammar). Unlike generative grammar and formal semantics, which view the sentence as the maximum linguistic unit, textlinguistics looks at larger units and is especially concerned with describing the relationship between adjacent sentences in a text or discourse, and with global relationships throughout the discourse. The work that I have found most relevant in this area is that of Teun van Dijk, even though van Dijk intentionally excludes

parallelism from his studies since he considers it as having a rhetorical or stylistic function but not a purely linguistic function (cf. *Text and Context*, 4). Nevertheless, several of van Dijk's points have a bearing on the semantic aspect of parallelism, especially insofar as they justify the concept of syntagmatic equivalence, and so I will bring them into our discussion.

Van Dijk examines connections and connectives in both compound sentences and sequences of sentences. While he is correct to distinguish between the two, it is immediately apparent that both are included in parallelism. It remains for future studies to see whether this makes a difference in parallelism. But more striking is van Dijk's statement that "Connectedness seems to be a condition imposed upon PAIRS OF SENTENCES" (*Text and Context*, 45). This was said of ordinary discourse, not poetic texts; it applies much more to lines in biblical poetry. In other words, the normal connectedness of ordinary discourse is heightened, or taken to an extreme, in poetry by parallelism.

Van Dijk examines different types of connectives (conjunctions, adverbs, particles, etc.) as well as sentences with no specific connection between them. He concludes that "connection is not dependent on the presence of connectives" and, conversely, "the presence of connectives does not make sentences connected" (*Text and Context*, 46). In other words, there is an inherent semantic connectedness that is perceived in a coherent discourse; in an uncoherent one (as in the isolated sample *We went to the beach and Peter was born in Manchester*) the use of a conjunction or other connective is not enough to generate a semantic connection between the clauses.

There are certain things that help to link two sentences besides specific connectives. Mainly it is a matter of their relating to the "topic of conversation" (the subject of the discourse, the point being made), giving a cause or reason, or making a temporal or local connection. (I oversimplify here.) Van Dijk again emphasizes that "sentential and especially sequential connection need not be expressed by explicit connectives . . . the connections between propositions in sentences and sequences may be 'expressed' by the very co-occurrence of the sentences expressing them" (*Text and Context*, 87).

Parallelism can easily be related to this discussion, for the types of connectives and connectedness between sentences in a discourse also pertain to parallel lines (simply because they are also sentences in a discourse). Some parallel lines are linked by specific linguistic connectives like כִּי

("for"), some have the ambiguous *waw* (van Dijk notes that "and" is often ambiguous also), and some have no connective at all. Moreover, parallelism itself serves as a rhetorical connective, in addition to the semantic connectedness of coherent discourse. Therefore, parallel lines are doubly connected; once by virtue of their role in a coherent text (with or without connective particles), and again by the linguistic equivalences which constitute parallelism. In the semantic aspect of parallelism, the normal semantic connectedness between sentences is enhanced by other linguistic equivalences so that semantic equivalence is promoted. What I have called semantic equivalence can also be viewed as van Dijk's semantic connectedness.

This discussion may make it seem that all parallel lines are, by definition, semantically equivalent. In a sense this is true, for as mentioned in chapter 2, even lines which have no apparent semantic relationship tend to be perceived as semantically related when they are grammatically equivalent. The question then is: do parallel lines manifest an inherent semantic equivalence aside from that described by van Dijk or projected by the equivalence in other linguistic aspects.

Actually, most of what van Dijk describes as semantic connectedness is the same as what I have called syntagmatic semantic connectedness. This connectedness is merely the result of contiguity—the logical development of coherent discourse. We are still left with the question of paradigmatic semantic equivalence, which is the most obvious type of semantic parallelism and would constitute the "inherent semantic equivalence" sought in the preceding paragraph. For this, the notion of generative semantics may be helpful. Modelled on generative grammar, generative semantics posits a deep semantic structure which may be realized through a number of different surface structures. To take a mundane example, the questions *How are you?*, *How are things?*, *How do you feel?* could be said to be different realizations of the same underlying semantic entity. The notion of paraphrase—that the same thought can be expressed through different words and forms—is based on the existence of a semantic deep structure (cf. van Dijk, *Some Aspects of Text Grammars*, 14). Since most of what is usually considered semantically parallel involves some sort of paraphrase, it is appropriate that we investigate this in greater detail. What needs to be stressed here, as it was in the case of syntactic equivalence, is that the same deep structure can be reflected in different surface structures. In this case it means that the same semantic equivalence can be expressed through dif-

ferent grammatical and lexical choices. Ultimately, what is interesting about paraphrase—or paradigmatic semantic equivalence—is that it can take so many different forms.

In order to demonstrate this with as much control as possible, we will present parallelisms whose first lines are identical (or nearly identical) and whose second lines are semantically equivalent but differently phrased. Here it is not a question of the stylistic variation within the same parallelism, but of two completely different parallelisms which have one line in common.

Ps 39:13
שמעה תפלתי ה'
ושועתי האזינה

Hear my prayer, YHWH;
And give ear to my cry.

Ps 102:2
ה' שמעה תפלתי
ושועתי אליך תבוא

YHWH, hear my prayer;
And let my cry reach you.

Semantically, both verses seem the same, although Ps 39:13 is grammatically identical while Ps 102:2 is grammatically equivalent (subject-object parallelism).

Ps 55:2
האזינה אלהים תפלתי
ואל תתעלם מתחנתי

Give ear, God, to my prayer;
And do not hide yourself from my plea.

Ps 86:6
האזינה ה' תפלתי
והקשיבה בקול תחנונותי

Give ear, YHWH, to my prayer;
And harken to the sound of my pleadings.

This example is similar to the preceding one. The difference between the verses is grammatical, not semantic. The grammatical equivalence in Ps 55:2 involves positive-negative parallelism; in Ps 86:6 there is a morphologic shift from singular to plural (*prayer // pleadings*).

Pr 10:15
הון עשיר קרית עזו
מחתת דלים רישם

The wealth of a rich man is his fortress;
The ruin of the poor is their poverty.

Pr 18:11
הון עשיר קרית עזו
וכחומה נשגבה במשכיתו

The wealth of a rich man is his fortress;
And like a high wall in his fancy.

The semantic equivalence is slightly different in the two verses. In Pr 18:11 there is a semantic extension of *fortress* while in Pr 10:15 there is a contrast between the two lines. This may sound suspiciously like new labels for old distinctions—Lowth's synonymous and antithetic parallelism—but it is not. The terms "equivalence" and "contrast" are the same that I have been using throughout this book, and they can be applied to the semantic aspect as well as to the grammatic. Semantic equivalence is a much broader term than Lowth's synonymous parallelism, and would include much that he might have considered "synthetic parallelism." "Contrast" is also broader than "antithetic parallelism" and includes not only semantic opposites but also other types of contrast (which Lowth might have thought of as synonymous), such as "Water he asked; Milk she gave" (Jud 5:25).

Note also that the semantic parallels in each of these verses are not only equally acceptable, neither being "more parallel" than the other, but that the choice of parallel in each case fits the larger context in which the verse is situated. Pr 10 contains many other contrasts, between the righteous and the wicked, the wise and the foolish, and so the contrast between the rich and the poor is quite at home. Pr 18, on the other hand, is structured much differently; it is not built on quick contrasts but on more prolonged images, and v. 11 fits into one of these.

Lam 5:19
אתה ה' לעולם תשב
כסאך לדור ודור

You, YHWH, will sit forever;
Your throne is for eternity.

Ps 102:13
ואתה ה' לעולם תשב
וזכרך לדר ודר

You, YHWH, will sit forever;
Your fame is for eternity.

The parallelisms in these verses are almost identical; only one word differs. But that makes all the difference in meaning—a whole different thought is stressed. And like Pr 10:15 and 18:11, each thought is the appropriate one for its context. Lam 5:19, by pairing *sit* and *throne*, emphasizes the idea of God's sitting enthroned forever as a reigning monarch. This is a fitting antidote in the context of the destruction of Mt. Zion, God's seat of power (cf. Lam 5:18). The second line of Ps 102:13, however, does not direct attention to sitting, but rather to "being, presence."[45] This verse speaks of the permanence of God in contrast to the transience of the psalmist (Ps 102:12). Here semantics gives way to pragmatics; the larger context of the poem determines the form of the semantic equivalence within the parallelism.[46]

We should learn from these examples that generating a semantic parallel is not automatic—a formulaic reflex, as it were. The parallel must fit the semantic and structural context, and, indeed, is fashioned to do so. In the majority of parallelisms this is accomplished by choosing which components to repeat or parallel and which to leave unparalleled. Both Lam 5:19 and Ps 102:13 pair *forever* and *eternity*, for this idea is important to both. Lam 5:19 pairs *sit* and *throne*, thereby confirming the idea of sitting on a throne, while Ps 102:13 pairs *you* and *your fame*, ignoring the sitting aspect and underlining the "being" or "you-ness" aspect. This point about contextual appropriateness has certain implications for understanding semantic parallelism and parallelism as a whole. Not every part of the first line need be paralleled in the second, and, in fact, it rarely is. But it is a mistake to perceive such parallelisms as "incomplete" or otherwise defective. The words which are gapped or left unparalleled are those which the verse wants to deemphasize; the emphasis is on the words that are repeated or paralleled.

A. Disambiguation and Ambiguity

This brings us to one of the main semantic functions of parallelism: disambiguation and ambiguity. One of the functions of the second line of a parallelism is to disambiguate the first, especially if the first does not make clear what the topic of conversation is. This occurs in nonparallelistic discourse as well. Van Dijk gives an example, *Please go to the store and buy me some beer*, in which the first clause does not contain enough information and the second is used to fill in this missing information. The hearer only knows what kind of store is meant after he interprets the second clause

(cf. *Text and Context*, 60). The terseness of the poetic line always puts it at risk of being misunderstood, either because information is omitted or because the reader/hearer is unable to focus on the main point (the topic of conversation). This can be partially overcome through parallelism, for the second line directs the interpretation of the first; the first line comes to be understood in terms of the second. On the other hand, the second line may introduce an element of ambiguity into the first. The first line takes on a new shade of meaning when it is read in terms of the second. Both disambiguation and ambiguity coexist in parallelism. Let us see them at work in a passage from Isaiah which Kugel (*Idea*, 9) has explained at some length and which I will explore even further.

Isa 1:3

ידע שור קנהו
וחמור אבוס בעליו
ישראל לא ידע
עמי לא התבונן

An ox knows its owner;
And an ass its masters' trough.
Israel does not know;
My people does not understand itself.

The first line is a relatively straightforward statement, but its exact shade of meaning—i.e., the point that Isaiah wants to make through it—does not become clear until later. Isaiah begins to clarify his point about the ox by bringing in the ass. Now the prophet does not come to praise the ox or denigrate the ass. He uses two examples to make one point. The ox, being a relatively superior animal, but an animal nevertheless, can recognize who its owner is. The ass, an inferior counterpart, at least knows where its feeding trough is. Both animals have primitive, animal knowledge—each in a measure appropriate to its status on the intellectual hierarchy—by which they comprehend that they are controlled and provided for by masters.

A closer look at these lines is in order. The verb *ydᶜ* is gapped, so our attention is withdrawn from it. Whatever kind of knowledge the ox has, the ass has the same. But the object of the knowledge is different: owner vs. masters' trough, which implies that the degree of knowledge is not equal. This contrast within equivalence matches the contrast within equivalence of *ox* and *ass*. On one hand, the two are similar, but on the other hand, they are different.

Of course, these lines are merely paving the way for the clincher in the next two. The progression continues from ox to ass to Israel. If the terms

are all counterparts (equivalents) that is bad enough—Israel is situated among the animals. If a progression is intended, then the matter is even worse, for Israel is the stupidest. And here the parallelism becomes an optical illusion, like the picture in psychology books that is both a vase and two profiles. Before, lines 1 and 2 seemed to be a paraphrase; now they suddenly become a progression. Israel is more stupid than an ass because it doesn't *know* anything at all. The verb ידע, which was gapped in the second line reappears in the third; but instead of having an object—that which is known—it occurs without an object, hinting that its object is nothing—"Israel doesn't know (anything)." Even the kind of knowledge that was credited to the animals is lacking in respect to Israel; Israel does not possess even primitive animal knowledge. What is this animal knowledge? A sense of who one's master is. It is this that Israel lacks. This thought reaches its climax in the fourth line. Kugel has made much of the verbal form of התבונן, claiming that the *hitpaᶜel* form intensifies in some vague way, yielding "does not understand at all." It is true, as Kugel notes, that when בון is paired with ידע, it is usually in the *hiphᶜil* (הבין), not the *hitpaᶜel* (התבונן). But the word התבונן, "consider, pay attention to," is not so unusual; it is found a number of times in conjunction with שמע, "to hear" (Isa 52:15; Job 26:14), ראה, "to see" (Jer 2:10; Job 11:11), זכר, "to remember, pay mind to" (Isa 43:18), and ידע, "to know" (Job 11:11; 38:18). If one must find in the choice of the *hitpaᶜel* some extra shade of meaning, it is perhaps best to render it in its common reflexive sense: "does not understand itself." This, I think, is the sense of the line, and it is brought home by the word עמי, "my people." What is it that Israel does not understand? "[Israel] does not understand itself [to be] my people." This is what the first three lines have been building toward: Israel has no sense of who its master is or from whence it receives its sustenance.

What I have called disambiguation is this kind of clarification, redefinition, unfolding of development. I think this is what Kugel often means by his "A, what's more, B." But this should not be understood to mean that B is not equivalent to A. A and B are not independent lines; we read one in terms of the other. They need not be synonymous, of course, but they are certainly equivalent—they correspond semantically, in any one of a number of ways.

The other side of the coin is ambiguity or polysemy, and it is present along with disambiguation. We have seen the tension between the two in the lines involving the ox and the ass; they are the same and yet different, they signify one thing and two things simultaneously. In Hab 3:3, too, which can be viewed as a merismus or as a progression, we waver between

the paradigmatic and syntagmatic reading. In parallelism after parallelism we are torn between the similarity of the lines and, at the same time, their dissynonymity. Parallelism is forever poised between redundancy and polysemy.

This is nowhere more evident than in the paralleling of numbers: one // two, three // four, six // seven, and so on. This piques the modern scientific mind no end; how can three be four? Do the two numbers represent the same quantity or different quantities? We feel compelled to choose between "synonymous" and "goes beyond" here just as we do between Lowth and Kugel. But both are correct. Both facets of parallelism coexist. This is a manifestation of what Waugh referred to as *redundancy* vs. *ambiguity*, one of the major dichotomies in linguistic discourse (cf. chapter 1, p. 16). Redundant signs do not provide independent information, but inform about other signs in the text. "They are used in a sense to insure that the given information is provided" (73). This is disambiguation. Ambiguous signs provide more than one interpretation, "even when in context of other signs." A parallel line does both; it insures the delivery of the information in the first line and, even in the context of that first line, it encourages a second view of things, an alternate interpretation. Redundancy and ambiguity (disambiguation and polysemy) are locked in eternal struggle in parallelism. To choose one is to lose the other, and thereby lose the major dialectic tension of parallelism. There is no better way to sum this up than to quote

Ps 62:12   אחת דבר אלהים
                                      שתים זו שמעתי

One thing God has spoken;
Two things I have heard.

This verse not only lends itself to discussions of hermeneutics—that one statement has many interpretations—but it also reflects the essence of parallelism. Parallelism is constituted by redundancy and polysemy, disambiguation and ambiguity, contrast within equivalence. Parallelism focuses the message on itself but its vision is binocular. Like human vision it superimposes two slightly different views of the same object and from their convergence it produces a sense of depth.

B. Parallelism as Metaphor

A final facet of semantic equivalence is the metaphoric function of parallelism. I have already discussed the fact that syntactic equivalence pro-

motes the perception of semantic equivalence. Two contiguous lines which
have the same syntactic structure tend to be viewed as having some correla-
tion in meaning, and even when there is no obvious semantic connection
between them, we seek a correlation through our interpretation (cf. chap-
ter 2, p. 23). In this way one aspect of parallelism affects other aspects.
Equivalence in one aspect is projected onto another aspect. The result is
that even lines that do not have the same semantic deep structure are con-
sidered equivalent. This is one of the ways in which parallelism gains its
power and effectiveness: from partial equivalence it creates the illusion of
total equivalence. Equivalence is transferred from one aspect to another,
and from one line to another. In this sense, parallelism is metaphoric.

Roman Jakobson has elevated this metaphoric function to a principle of
parallelism: "anything sequent is a simile" and "metonymy is slightly meta-
phorical and any metaphor has a metonymical tint" (*LP*, 370). Jakobson
uses these terms to explain the mutual effects of similarity and contiguity,
and by so doing he broadens "metaphor" to include all parallelism. Francis
Landy follows him in saying that "two halves of a clause are juxtaposed
and held to be alike; the basic form of parallelism is metaphor" ("Poetics
and Parallelism," 80). I do not want to pursue the concept of parallelism as
metaphor on such a grand scale, although I appreciate the metaphoric ef-
fect of reading any B line after, and in terms of, any A line. Rather, I want
to show that parallelistic structuring can become the medium for a com-
parison, a form for figurative language.[47] Parallel lines always have the po-
tential to be understood metaphorically—this is in the nature of parallel-
ism, as Jakobson has suggested. But only in specific cases is this potential
actualized; here parallelism, and parallelism alone, conveys a simile or a
metaphor.

This is clearest in proverbial sayings like

Pr 26:9   חוח עלה ביד שכור
                              ומשל בפי כסילים

> A thorn comes to the hand of a drunkard;
> And a proverb to the mouth of fools.

The two juxtaposed lines are grammatically equivalent but, on the surface
at least, semantically unequivalent. Nevertheless, it is immediately appar-
ent that a semantic relationship is intended. We understand it as an anal-
ogy: "Just as a thorn . . . so a proverb. . . ." There is ample support from
the text itself for such a reading, for this and other similarly structured
verses alternate with verses containing the particles כ . . . כן, "just as . . .

so" throughout Pr 26 (cf. McKane, *Proverbs*, 593–94). Either form, with
or without "just as," is equally effective. A simile does not have to be spe-
cially marked; it can be conveyed through parallelism.

Ps 125:2   ירושלם הרים סביב לה
                              וה' סביב לעמו . . .

> Jerusalem—mountains surround it;
> And YHWH surrounds his people. . . .

The natural physical protection of Jerusalem serves as the comparison for
God's protection of his people. There is no particle "as, like" to mark this
as a simile, yet it is immediately understood as such from the structure of
the lines. It is not quite a metaphor, in the conventional sense, for God is
not identified with the mountains, and Jerusalem is not a metaphor for the
people, although it may symbolize them. As mountains protect the city of
Jerusalem, so God protects the people in it.

It is but a small step from simile to metaphor.[48] The interpretation of
Eccl 7:1 is an interesting case in point.

Eccl 7:1   טוב שם משמן טוב
                              ויום המות מיום הולדו

> Better a name than good oil;
> And one's death-day than one's birth-day.

The verse as a whole is read as an analogy, like Pr 26:5—"Just as a name is
better than good oil, so death is better than life." But this verse is more
complex than Pr 26:5 because each line contains its own internal com-
parison. The first line, טוב שם משמן טוב, has all the earmarks of a popular
proverb in its form and sound play (compare "Better red than dead"). It is
quite plausible, as Gordis has suggested, that Koheleth is quoting a well-
known saying and joining to it his own interpretation or application. Pre-
sumably, his audience understood the saying, so he could use it as the basis
of his analogy to life and death. If one accepts the first premise, then one
must accept the second. In order for the analogy to work, it must proceed
from the known to the unknown; the second line makes sense only when it
is read in light of the first.

Now just the opposite happens when a modern reader approaches this
verse. He, too, understands that there is an analogy being made between
the two lines, but, unlike Koheleth's audience, he is not familiar with the
comparison in the first line. How can a name be contrasted with oil?[49]

Since there is an inherent comparison in this line, the reader seeks to understand how the two things are related. He may see them as a contrast between the physical and the nonphysical, the ephemeral and the lasting, or the cosmetic appearance and the true essence of a person. But there is nothing to tell him which of these, if any, is correct. In Eccl 7 : 1, however, something else enters the picture: the second line of the verse—which is immediately used to solve the riddle of the first line. The modern reader *reads the first line in light of the second*. He reads the analogy from back to front, and in doing so he makes the first line a metaphor (or to be more correct, a metonymy) for the second. Oil is equated with birth (oil is rubbed on the newborn) and a name (all that remains when life is finished) is equated with death.[50] I am not sure that this is the correct interpretation of "Better a name than good oil." As an independent proverb it may have had no connection with life and death. But I am reasonably certain that this interpretation owes its existence to the parallel structure of the lines and the urge to make sense of their combination. In the modern reading of Eccl 7 : 1 parallelism has indeed become metaphorical.

I have attempted to explain the semantic aspect of parallelism in terms of semantic equivalences ranging from paraphrase to progression to metaphor. When it comes to the semantic aspect, which is dependent on, yet separate from, the formal constructions within a text, the boundary between what is equivalent and what is not is hard to draw; for it is usually possible to find some relationship in meaning between two lines. That relationship is both enhanced and inhibited in poetry. We expect a poem to have a unity of theme and we expect its parts to relate to one another—and parallelism contributes to the unity of the parts. But at the same time the terseness of the poem and the parataxis of parallel lines do not permit the unity among the parts to be spelled out directly. So we are left very often with ambiguity or polysemy in regard to semantic relationships. But this, after all, is the core of poeticalness and the crux of poetic interpretation.

V

THE PHONOLOGIC ASPECT: SOUND PAIRS

Just as parallelism activates the grammatical, lexical, and semantic aspects of language, so, too, it activates the phonologic aspect. Phonologic equivalences and contrasts are often present in parallel lines and they contribute to the perception of correspondence between the lines.

Scholars of literature and linguistics have discussed many types of phonologic equivalence in language, especially in poetry. The most common in the English literary tradition are alliteration and rhyme. Biblical scholars, on their part, recognized long ago the Bible's penchant for wordplay or punning, and have taken note of various kinds of phonologic repetition in a wide variety of passages. These phenomena are generally subsumed under the term paronomasia.[1] My discussion will not be concerned with the many types of phonologic repetition in the Bible, nor with the importance of sound in biblical poetry; it will be limited to the repetition and contrast of sounds in parallel lines. More specifically, I will deal with sound pairs.

WHAT IS A SOUND PAIR?

Linguists speak of assonance and consonance. While the former term is sometimes applied to all types of sound repetition, it is properly confined to the repetition of like vowels or diphthongs. Consonance designates the repetition of the same or a similar sequence of consonants with a change in