

NOTES

I. PARALLELISM AND POETRY

1. On Lowth's forerunners see Kugel, *Idea*, 96-286; Cooper, 17-19, 150-62; Lundbom, 121-27.

2. This point is made by Dennis Pardee in two unpublished papers.

3. Biblicists are divided on the question of whether biblical poetry has meter, and if so, how it is to be measured. For a summary of metric studies see Stuart, 1-49; Cooper, 11-33, 147-49; Kugel, *Idea*, 287-304; O'Connor, *HVS*, 29-41. For a discussion of the tension between parallelism and meter in Ugaritic studies see S. Parker in *UF* 6 (1974), 283-94.

4. Kugel's definition of parallelism is broader than the semantic one in most earlier biblical studies. He calls parallelism a style in which syntax, morphology, and meaning establish a feeling of correspondence between the two parts (*Idea*, 2). Although he begins to examine the nature of certain correspondences, his criteria for recognizing parallelism are not always clear. In the end, his insistence that the essence of parallelism is that B goes beyond A, seconds it, contrasts with it, etc., and that parallelism does not consist of "stringing together clauses that bear some semantic, syntactic, or phonetic resemblance" (*Idea*, 53) threatens to reduce parallelism once again to a semantic correspondence.

5. Cf. *Idea*, 85: "It may strike the reader as perverse to refuse simply to call the relative concentration of heightening factors 'poetry' and their relative absence 'prose.'" Actually, Kugel is opposed to the polarity, the all-or-nothingness, that the use of these terms generates. "To see biblical style through the split lens of prose or poetry is to distort the view."

6. Compare Segert, in reference to Ugaritic poetry: "Features known as parallelism may also occur in prose texts. . . . This criterion alone cannot determine whether the text is poetry or prose" (*UF* 11, 730). Still, on p. 731 he says: "The most prominent feature of Ugaritic poetry is its parallelistic structure." See also Dahood, *RSP* III, p. 5.

7. Cf. Geller, "Theory and Method," 75-77. This issue was the subject of a piece by Kugel in *Prooftexts* 1 (1981), 217-36 and my response in *Prooftexts* 2 (1982), 323-32.

8. Thus Whallon's attempt to find a distinction between prose and poetic parallelism (*Formula*, 196-99) seems misguided.

9. Kugel puts the same idea somewhat differently: "The fact is that very often there is little connection between one verse and the next, and when such a connection does exist, quite often it is left to the reader or listener to figure it out" (*Idea*, 92).

10. Cf. Hrushovski: "These basic units are not equal; all attempts to correct the text in order to achieve strict numbers make no sense from any textual point of view. . . . But there is no need of this. The rhythmic impression persists in spite of all 'irregularities.' The basic units almost never consist of one or of more than four stresses, that is, they are simple groups of two, three, or four stresses. . . . the stresses are strong, being major stresses of words. . . . and being reinforced by the

syntactic repetition. Thus the groups can be felt as similar, simple, correlated units. As the number of stresses in such a unit is small, they become conspicuous, giving special weight to the words" ("On Free Rhythms," 189).

11. Michael O'Connor has reminded me (in a private communication) that such lists may also occur in poetry—e.g., "Shiloh, Antietam, Malvern Hill, Bull Run" in Allen Tate's "Ode to the Confederate Dead"; the names at the end of Book II of the *Iliad*; and, I would add, the names of Marduk at the end of *Enuma Elish*.

12. Parallelism was defined in this study as 1) the repetition of two or more words of the same form-class or 2) the repetition of two or more constructions of the same grammatical classification in 3) the same functional or syntactic situation (Hiatt, 118).

13. Erlich, 12, uses the term "literarily active."

14. This could also be shown in Ex 2:1-7 as compared with Ps 106:29-34, two passages which Kugel finds to be "structurally identical" (*Idea*, 60-61).

15. Kugel, *Idea*, 43, hesitates to accept the two-action interpretation but bases this reluctance on the possibility that יתר and הלמות are the same weapon. He is not able to decide if יד // ימין "was always equative," but if it were this would strengthen his one-action interpretation. My view is the reverse: I see יד // ימין as "equative" but would still allow that two weapons, and two actions, are present.

16. This view is most frequently associated with Dahood (cf. *Psalms* III, 281; *RSP* I, 195-96) but Pope points out in *JBL* 85 (1966), 458 that there are antecedents for this view in rabbinic exegesis.

2. THE LINGUISTIC STUDY OF BIBLICAL PARALLELISM

1. This survey does not attempt to be a comprehensive presentation of all that these studies contain; it will concentrate on their use of linguistics for describing parallelism. There are, of course, many other studies of particular phenomena that occur in parallelism—e.g., word pairs, certain verbal patterns, chiasm, etc. These are far too numerous to be reviewed here (consult the bibliography); relevant studies will be mentioned in the appropriate places in subsequent chapters. It should be noted, however, that most of these studies represent a continuation of older approaches to parallelism and are not linguistically oriented. This does not mean that they are wrong or useless; on the contrary, they have done much to improve our powers of textual observation. This book will combine the insights of these studies with the broader framework provided by a linguistic approach, and thereby integrate a number of apparently different features into a more unified picture of parallelism.

2. Collins omits from consideration nominal sentences and sentences with any tense of the verb "to be."

3. Unfortunately, Geller's method is terribly cumbersome, and because it includes semantics and analyzes all of the surface permutations in detail, it directs attention away from the fact that grammatical parallelism involves grammatical equivalences.

4. "By parallelism . . . is understood the regularly recurring juxtaposition of symmetrically constructed sentences" ("Parallelism in Hebrew Poetry," *Jewish Encyclopedia* 9:520b—quoted in Greenstein, 45).

5. This was also my assumption in *HUCA* 50 (1979), 35 note 46. I showed there a number of specific transformations that occur in parallel lines.

6. I should also mention here the work of R. Sappan. Unlike the studies by Geller and Greenstein, which are studies of parallelism that utilize grammatical

analysis, Sappan's is primarily a study of the grammar of biblical poetry that includes a consideration of parallelism. Sappan considers as parallel those lines that are *semantically* parallel and then proceeds to examine their grammatical structure. He finds that semantically parallel lines often do not have the identical grammatical structure, but that in most cases there is some degree of structural correspondence between them (V). He discusses the levels on which these correspondences may be found (there is some overlap here with the methods of Geller and Greenstein). His conclusion, derived from the work of S. Levin, is that "instances of parallelism of all types are generally characterized by the special structural feature that corresponding semantic units usually occur at equivalent positions . . . [as defined by Sappan] in their respective syntactical frame" (XI).

7. Collins finds that his Type II sentences (i.e., matching without gapping) account for about one-fourth of his corpus, and his Type III sentences (matching with gapping) account for approximately the same percentage. He does not, however, give percentages in terms of parallelism.

8. Cf. T'sou, 319, and Pardee, "Types and Distribution" and "Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry: Parallelism."

9. Dahood included words in juxtaposition and collocation only if they also occur in parallelism elsewhere (in Hebrew or Ugaritic). He does not list words which occur in juxtaposition only. His lists are descriptive, based on attested occurrences, not on a theory of linguistic correspondences. I would theoretically include combinations that do not actually occur in parallel lines if they manifest the same kinds of linguistic correspondences as those that do. However, in practice I will refrain from this since there is more than enough material in parallel lines to illustrate the linguistic correspondences that I wish to demonstrate.

10. They may be part of a series, joined with a connective or not, or part of a continuous grammatical unit (e.g., a noun and its verb), or two nouns in construct (cf. Avishur, *The Construct State*).

11. Actually, the grammatical relationship here is a displacement of the one that obtains in Ps 78:55 and Ps 120:5.

3. THE GRAMMATICAL ASPECT

1. Many of these grammatical equivalences were first presented in Berlin, *HUCA* 50. Kugel (*Idea*), Geller (*Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry*), and Sappan independently put forth a few of the same and others. I will here combine and enlarge upon all of these studies.

2. A relative clause is not a morphological element; a relative pronoun is. But since the relative pronoun is often omitted in poetry, I will speak of relative clauses. This is actually more correct, for it is the whole clause, not just the pronoun, which is equivalent to the noun in the parallel line.

3. The lexical pair עבר // בחר has been conventionalized, occurring in different parts of speech in Isa 41:8, 9; 42:1; 43:10; 44:1, 2; 65:9, 15 (noted in Watters, 174) and also in Ps 89:4; 105:6 and perhaps Hag 2:23.

4. יום is more often paired with לילה, which serves as the adverbial form—compare, for example, Ex 13:21, 22; Isa 4:5. But an adverb can be introduced by a preposition—cf. Blau, *Grammar*, 103.

5. Cf. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies* II, 58–59; Held, "The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and in Ugaritic"; Dahood, *Psalms* III, 420–23.

6. Cf. Yoder, *Fixed Word Pairs*, p. 9, n.21.

7. Cf. Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, 127–28; D. N. Freedman, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, 210; Clines, *I, He, We*, 47–48.

8. I have limited this section to verbs from the same root because different verbal roots occur in different conjugations. Therefore, the pairing of, say, *bqš* in the *pi'el* with *mš* in the *qal* is not a strong morphological contrast because these are simply the conjugations in which these verbs are used. The contrast is most perceptible when different conjugations of the same root are paired. (This pairing also adds a lexical and phonetic dimension to the parallelism.)

9. *The Goddess Anath*, 47–48 = *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, II, 58–59 (original: *Turbiz* 14, 1–10).

10. *Psalms* III, 414. Dahood also lists Ps 29:5; 38:3; 69:15.

11. The verses listed by Cassuto and Held are: Isa 6:11 (?); Jer 15:19; 17:14; 20:7; 31:3, 17; Ps 19:13–14; 24:7; 69:15; Lam 5:21. Held hesitates to include Isa 6:11 because many modern commentators, following the reading of the LXX, emend תשאר to תשאה. This emendation, notes Held, seems to be supported by Isa 24:12 (*JBL* 84, 275, n. 2). However, while it is true that Isa 24:12 contains the same idea and many of the same terms found in 6:11, this does not mean that all of the terms need be identical. The word נשאר may have been used in 24:12 because it makes a good phonologic complement to the word שער at the end of the verse. The phonetic pattern in 6:11 is entirely different. Here one might see an ABBA pattern composed of שוא-אדם-אדם-תשאה. In my opinion emending תשאה is unnecessary; the verbs תשאה and שאר exemplify a contrast in tense, conjugation, and number.

12. Cf. Kselman, *JBL* 97, 168. There is no need to change יולד to אוילד or to explain the *lamed* as emphatic, as Kselman does. The syntax of the two parallel lines need not be identical—see below, Syntactic Parallelism.

13. *The Goddess Anath*, 44–46 = *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, II, 66–68 (original: *Lešonenu* 15, 97–102). Cf. also Watson, *JBL* 99 and Watson, *UF* 13.

14. The pair *Jerusalem // Judah* also creates a merismus by employing a part and its whole. The effect of totality is emphasized by the chiasmic word order. The verbs also constitute a totality since both verbs can apply to both subjects: Jerusalem and Judah have stumbled and fallen. This is a distributional reading, something warned against by Kugel (*Idea* 40–41). Heeding the warning, and influenced by Kugel's discussion of "sharpness" (*Idea*, 7–11), I would go on to see an even more dramatic picture of totality in Isaiah's words: Jerusalem's stumbling will lead to Judah's fall. Thus the grammatical and the lexical parallelisms work toward the same end.

15. A person has only one father but more than one elder (or perhaps even "grandfather"—cf. Pr 17:6).

16. This follows the rule for paralleling numbers: $x // x + 1$.

17. Watters has also observed the paralleling of a singular with a plural, but explains the phenomenon as being necessary for metric reasons: "By so varying the singular-plural aspect of the words in pair, the lines are balanced in more uniform lengths" (105). Cf. Kugel, *Idea*, 20–21.

18. On אחדים cf. Ezek 37:17.

19. ברמים and ברגע are not normally considered word pairs, but can be construed here as such because they each occupy the same position in their respective lines. The fact that they are phonologically similar, and that both are modified by similar adjectives, adds to the impression that they are parallel terms.

20. Cassuto comments on this verse: "The difference between the plural *those*

who bless you and the singular *him who curses you* was introduced, it seems, for the sake of diversification and variation in the parallelism, for which reason a change was also made in the order of the words of the two clauses" (*From Noah to Abraham*, 315).

21. For a similar approach to textual traditions see S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook."

22. Cf. D. N. Freedman, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, 2 and now F. I. Andersen and A. D. Forbes, "'Prose Particle' Counts of the Hebrew Bible."

23. Cf. Andersen, *Job*, 101, where the correspondence between the indefinite and definite is recognized in this verse.

24. The pair *מִבְּלִי יוֹשֵׁב* and *מִמְּעוֹן תָּנִים* are neither lexically nor grammatically parallel, but they are phonologically similar (both begin with *mem* and have the same number of syllables and accent pattern), and they occupy the same position in otherwise parallel lines.

25. Greenstein ("How Does Parallelism Mean?") defines parallelism in terms of this syntactic equivalence (see above, chapter 2). I would allow for the possibility of other kinds of parallelism in which the syntax is not equivalent. (Cf. chapter 4, note 42.)

26. Both clauses are verbal but there is still the contrast between *yšlm* (a verb) and *šlmh* (an adjective).

27. Most positive rhetorical questions imply a negative answer, and vice versa. For exceptions see R. Gordis, "A Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew," *The Word and the Book*, 152–57.

28. The jussive and the imperfect indicative are indistinguishable in form in most cases, so the identification is based on the context. The sequence of imperative followed by jussive (or other similar combinations) often has a causal nuance: "Do X so that he may do Y." For various combinations see Andersen, *The Sentence*, 112–13. The combinations in parallel lines are the same as those found in prose sentences.

29. This transformational grammar model is for the purpose of analysis only. I am not suggesting that the biblical author consciously performed these transformations when composing parallelisms any more than we do when we form interrogative or passive sentences. The legitimacy of such an analysis, however, is reinforced by Jakobson when he says that "the analysis of grammatical transformations and of their import should include the poetic function of language, because the core of this function is to push transformations into the foreground. It is the purposeful poetic use of lexical and grammatical tropes and figures that brings the creative power of language to its summit" ("Verbal Communication," 80).

4. THE LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC ASPECTS

1. The scholar primarily associated with this enterprise in recent years was M. Dahood. Cf. *Psalms* III, 445–56; *RSP* I, 71–382; *RSP* II, 1–39; *RSP* III, 1–206. The list of others who have contributed in this area is too long to cite here; for summaries of the early work on word pairs see Yoder, *Fixed Word Pairs and the Composition of Hebrew Poetry*, 2–10 and Watters, 20–38. For specific articles consult the bibliography.

2. There was at least one attempt to show that actual formulas existed in Hebrew poetry—cf. Culley, *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms*—but this was refuted by Yoder (*Fixed Word Pairs and the Composition of Hebrew Poetry*), who reassessed that it was indeed the word pairs (not formulas) that made oral composi-

tion possible. The issue was again raised by Watters, who questioned the assumption of oral composition and the role of word pairs in it.

3. Cf. Kugel, *Idea*, 30, 34. This argument has been voiced before. Defenders of the oral theory usually respond that written poetry preserved the conventions of its oral forerunner.

4. The total number of pairs listed in *RSP*, I, II, III is 1019.

5. On pairs in construct see Avishur, *The Construct State of Synonyms in Biblical Rhetoric*.

6. The same unevenness of attestation pertains even among fixed pairs—some are more common than others. This has always been one of the problems in defining a fixed pair. How many times must it occur? At least twice? Three or more? Are pairs that occur ten times more "fixed" than those that occur five times? Biblical scholarship, sensing the arbitrariness of this numbers game, has settled in to viewing any pair that occurs in both Hebrew and Ugaritic as fixed. Pairs that occur in only one or the other seem to have an indeterminate status. In recent years, even the term "fixed" is employed less often; scholars simply speak of "parallel pairs."

7. Cf. Clark: "Word associations should be thought of as a consequence of linguistic competence" (272).

8. Watters adds to this the strange idea that "word pairs which repeat are common associations fostered by limited vocabulary" (78). That is, certain combinations recur because the choice for different combinations was limited by a paucity of words in the Hebrew language. This is linguistically untenable for two reasons: 1) A language would not develop a device for which it had "too few words"—a language's vocabulary is presumably adequate for its needs. 2) There is no evidence that languages with larger vocabularies have fewer recurring associations.

9. *UF* 11 (1979), 135–40.

10. *UF* 11, 136. See also Craigie's articles in *Semitics* 5 and in *Ugarit in Retrospect*.

11. Cf. O'Connor: "Most parallelistic usages result from ordinary facts of language, not specific poetic features" (*HVS*, 101). In a similar vein Kugel states: "There is nothing 'poetic' or literary in the pairs per se" (*Idea*, 33–34).

12. The idea that texts once circulated in slightly different but equally valid forms is gaining support. S. Talmon cites many examples suggesting stylistic fluidity and discusses the implication this has for textual study ("The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook"—cf. also his earlier article, "Synonymous Readings in the Old Testament").

13. Based both on responses from a number of different players and on multiple responses from one player.

14. On the ordering of Hebrew word pairs see Boling, *JSS* 5; Watson, *UF* 13. Dahood discusses this matter briefly in *RSP* I, pp. 77–78 and his lists carefully note the order of the paired terms. O'Connor, *HVS*, 97–102 presents the linguistic criteria for the ordering.

15. On particularizing see Berlin, *JANES* 10.

16. See above, chapter 3, p. 36. This would also include shifts to other conjugations and other causative transformations involving different verbal roots.

17. Clark, 281–82, explains how this accounts for the fact that nouns usually elicit other nouns (i.e., are paradigmatic), while other parts of speech produce more syntagmatic responses.

18. This scheme corresponds approximately to what O'Connor calls the tropes of coloration: binomination, coordination, and combination (*HVS*, 112–15). However, I would specify the conventionalized status of the coordinates in my first cate-

gory. And I do not agree with many of O'Connor's examples of "combination." See below, note 23.

19. Cf. Melamed in *Sefer Segal* and in *Scripta* VIII.

20. This of course, is true for all word associates. To think of them as synonyms occasionally puts one into the kind of bind that Talmon found himself in when, observing that the verbs *השליך* and *מאס* are associates, he felt compelled to add: "In spite of the difference in meaning between the two verbs . . . , they were apparently used synonymously" (*Scripta* VIII, 353). Much misunderstanding has been promoted by scholars who, less sensitive than Talmon, forced certain word pairs to mean the same thing.

21. "Binomination" is a term close to "binomial"—a linguistic term employed somewhat differently. "Binomial" has been defined as "the sequence of two words pertaining to the same form-class, placed on an identical level of syntactic hierarchy, and ordinarily connected by some kind of lexical link" (Malkiel, 311). Theoretically, this would then include any word pair used in juxtaposition. To the extent that the binomial has become formulaic or idiomatic, it would be included in my category of conventionalized coordinates (and O'Connor's "coordination," which involves two parts of a basic pair—*HVS*, 114). Binomination, as it is being used here, is a much more restricted term.

22. It may be that *ירושלם* // *יהודה* is also a case of binomination; cf. Jer 4:3-5 and passim; Isa 3:8 and passim. This is different from *ירושלם* // *ערי יהודה* which was discussed above. *Jerusalem-Judah* seems similar to *Edinburgh-Scotland* and *Oxford-England*, both listed by Deese as word associations. I consider them to be syntagmatic responses, although they might be considered superordinates.

23. I feel that O'Connor goes much too far in finding examples of "the rupture of the construct relation" (*HVS*, 114). Combinations like *mdbr* // *šymwn* (Ps 107:4); *rwk* // *s'rh* (Ps 107:25) and many others that O'Connor perceives as broken constructs (*HVS*, 380-82) could just as easily have been paradigmatic associates. The same is true of his adjectival combinations (*HVS*, 384) and his appositional combinations (*HVS*, 385).

24. Even though *עמל* is singular and *מרי נפש* is plural. This would be an example of both syntagmatic and paradigmatic (singular // plural) pairing.

The recognition that such word pairs may be syntagmatic is not to suggest that we should reunite them into the continuous expressions whence they came. It is the ingeniousness of biblical parallelism that allows such breakups to be made and such linguistic ambiguity to be sustained. The urge to read syntagmatic pairs distributively should be held in check, for, as Kugel (*Idea*, 40-45) has noted, this does violence to the form of the parallelism. Job 3:20 may have meant something like "Why did he give the light of life to the embittered toiler," but a translation like that would suck the blood out of the poem.

25. Word pairs may figure over sections larger than a verse or two; compare for example, the play involving *day* and *night* in Job 3:3-9. Talmon has shown that word pairs can substitute for one another in similar contexts, even though only one of them is present at a time. For instance, the pair *איש-אדם* alternates in Ps 105:14 (*לא הניח אדם לעשקם*) and 1 Chr 16:21 (*לא הניח לאיש לעשקם*). The two appear together as a parallel pair in Isa 31:8 and elsewhere. Cf. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," 338, and also *Scripta* VIII.

26. Thus it is misleading to say, as Dahood did in *RSP* III, that "the Canaanite scribes and poets apparently thought in binomials" (5). Everyone, in every language group, thinks in binomials.

27. The methodology of word association has been applied to the study of cultural views by Szalay and Deese in *Subjective Meaning and Culture: An Assessment Through Word Associations*.

28. On this pair see O'Connor, *HVS*, 115, 384. He views the pair *פלישתים* // *הערלים* in 2 Sam 1:20 as the breakup of the phrase "the uncircumcised Philistines," i.e., an example of "combination" of a noun and an adjective, which would place it in my third category of syntagmatic pairings. However, I see no compelling reason to view it as such. It could possibly be a case of conventionalized coordinates—cf. 1 Sam 17:26, 36; Jud 14:3—but O'Connor does not use this argument. It is more likely, though, that this is a normal paradigmatic association. (O'Connor, *HVS*, 115, states that "appositional combination most closely approximates ordinary dyading.") An American analogy is *Russian-Communist*. Now we know that not all Russians are Communists, and not all Communists are Russian, but this remains a strong association nevertheless. Therefore, just because not all uncircumcised persons are Philistines (O'Connor's argument), it does not mean that the two words cannot be considered paradigmatically associated. This example illustrates my main point, namely that parallel word pairs are best understood as word associations, regardless of whether we can classify them as synonyms, stereotyped phrases, superordinates, or any other subcategory.

29. *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry*, 31-42. Geller's basic categories are synonym, list, antonym, merism, epithet, proper noun // common noun, pronoun // antecedent, whole // part, concrete // abstract, numerical, identity, metaphor.

30. But the reverse is true when it comes to the penalties for seduction and adultery, for, from a legal point of view, illicit sex with a married woman is a greater offense than with an unmarried one.

31. The first to do this, as far as I am aware, was Perry Yoder who, in his 1970 dissertation, excluded semantics from his definition of word pairs. He defined them as "any two terms having the same grammatical class which occur more than once in parallelism" (40). Yoder stressed that "it is recurrence, not semantic relationship, which is decisive in defining a 'fixed pair'" (41). The distance between semantics and fixed pairs grows wider later on: "Not only may a traditional formula [= fixed word pair] be used regardless of context, but it may also be used regardless of the semantic content of the A word itself" (106), and "formulas exist to meet formal, not semantic, exigencies" (107).

It is important to understand why Yoder said this, for his view of word pairs is not the same as mine, and the distinction that he made is therefore different from the one that I am making. Yoder viewed word pairs as serving the same function in Hebrew poetry as formulas did in Homeric poetry—they existed as aids in oral composition. In order to prove this, Yoder had to demonstrate that the use of word pairs was automatic under certain circumstances; that is, they were not chosen for their semantic value but rather for their prosodic value. I seriously question Yoder's premise and conclusions, but I see here an important insight nevertheless. Yoder realized that the pairing of certain terms had nothing to do with their similarity in meaning, and that the lexical aspect of the parallelism could be divorced from its semantic aspect.

32. Another facet of the life of word pairs is "metathetic parallelism," discussed by Bronznick.

33. This technique of using word order to create the illusion of lexical, syntactic, or semantic equivalence is not uncommon, and it is effective in increasing the perception of parallelism. It is primarily their positions in Isa 54:7 that permit an

equation between כְּרֹגֶעַ and בְּרַחֲמִים. Likewise word order is responsible for the syntactic illusion in Ps 105:6 and Ps 49:5. Cf. also מְעוֹן חַנּוּם and מְבִלִי יוֹשֵׁב in Jer 9:10.

34. On chiasmic word patterning see the articles by Ceresko; on chiasm in general see di Marco.

35. Cf. Berlin, *JANES* 10, 40–41; Gordis, *Poets, Prophets, and Sages*, 79–82.

36. See Gordis, *Poets, Prophets, and Sages*, 79.

37. Ceresko occasionally mixes morphological patterns with his lexical patterning.

38. Cf. Gordis, *Poets, Prophets, and Sages*, 79.

39. Greenstein ("How Does Parallelism Mean?") mentions this among various types of closure involving parallelism.

40. Compare the discussion of Greenstein in chapter 2, p. 22. Greenstein stressed only the similarity in syntax in such sentences since that was what interested him. Deese stresses the words that are used to fill in the syntactic structure.

41. Compare the statement in G. Steiner, *After Babel*, 261: "Inside a language synonymy is only very rarely complete equivalence. 'Rewording' unavoidably produces 'something more or less'; definition through rephrasing is approximate and reflexive."

42. All of the grammatical equivalences presented in chapter 3 are paradigmatic (cf. Holenstein, 142). In a syntagmatic grammatical construction one line would not replace the other but would be a grammatical continuation of it, as in

Ps 115:18

ואנחנו נברך יי
מעתה ועד עולם

But we will bless YH
From now until eternity.

These two lines constitute one syntactic unit—one sentence. The question is: can we consider such lines to be grammatically equivalent or parallel? One might argue against this equivalence by saying that a syntagmatic relation in the grammatical aspect (and also in the phonological aspect) is not the same as in the lexical and semantic aspects. In grammar, the syntagmatic is not equivalent—it is simply contiguous. In the lexical and semantic aspects the syntagmatic may be considered equivalent in that both parts come from one "thought-mass" or contain entities that would be grouped together. Grammar provides the structure of the parallelism. This structure can itself project equivalence onto contiguity through grammatical parallelism; or it can simply provide the contiguity and allow the lexical and semantic elements to project their equivalences onto it.

This is somewhat opposed to Jakobson's view; he seems to permit both semantic and grammatical syntagms to be called parallel. "On the semantic level, we observed that parallels may be either metaphoric or metonymic, based on similarity and contiguity respectively. Likewise the syntactic aspect of parallelism offers two types of pairs: either the second line presents a pattern SIMILAR to the preceding one, or the lines complement each other as two CONTIGUOUS constituents of one grammatical construction" (*GPRF*, 428).

Theoretically, then, a definition of grammatical parallelism could accept as parallel those lines which manifest a grammatically syntagmatic relationship, such as

two parts of one sentence. But from a practical viewpoint this runs the risk of stretching the definition of grammatical parallelism beyond meaningfulness. (Since this is mainly applicable to verse, the discussion should take into account at this point what constitutes a line of verse, but this issue is beyond our scope and therefore the discussion of syntagmatic grammatical parallelism will not be pursued.)

43. This syntagmatic relationship underlies some of Lowth's "synthetic parallelism." He did not have our linguistic model or terminology and therefore could not formulate a definition for this term that would seem rigorous enough for us. But despite the criticism of Lowth's third category of parallelism, I would not be so quick to dismiss it as a worthless catchall. Compare also P. D. Miller's "synonymous-sequential parallelism" (*Biblica* 61) which is a subspecies of syntagmatic semantic parallelism.

44. Tension between grammatical paradigm and syntagm is present in a verse like

Ps 135:5

כי אני ידעתי כי גדול ה'
ואדנינו מכל אלהים

For I know that YHWH is great;
And our lord than all gods.

Is this verse one sentence: "I know that YHWH, our lord, is greater than all gods"? (cf. Freedman in Gray, XXX). Or is it two sentences: "I know that YHWH is great. Our lord [is greater] than all gods"?

45. It is difficult to find a proper rendering for *zkr*. It has the range of meaning that includes "name, appellation, mention, that which is invoked."

46. Greenstein makes a similar point in "The Phenomenology of Parallelism." Textlinguistics, too, is always conscious of context, of the fact that the form and meaning of any textual segment are dependent on the text as a whole and on the place of that segment within the text.

47. Cf. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 150.

48. Kugel, *Idea*, 11, introduces a metaphor-like interpretation into Pr 26:9 with his "sharp" reading.

Isaiah moves from a simile to a metaphor in his use of Sodom and Gomorrah in 1:9–10: "We were like Sodom. . . . Listen, captains of Sodom. . . ." There is a wonderful "play on imagery" in these verses, for in the simile Sodom and Gomorrah represent completely destroyed cities, but in the metaphor they take on their other connotation—completely corrupt cities. Isaiah has successfully "set up" his audience; if they accept their likeness to Sodom in the first instance they must accept it also in the second.

49. Cf. Song 1:3 which equates *name* and *oil*.

50. Commentator after commentator attempts to make a connection between oil and birth and name and death. On oil used to rub the newborn see Scott, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, 235 and Gordis, *Koheleth*, 267. Zer-Kavod ("Koheleth," 38 in *Hamesh MegiHor*) suggests that "name" refers to the eulogy for the righteous at the time of his death. Gordis cites other links between "name" and "death." Landy ("Poetics and Parallelism," 62–63), improving on Kugel (*Idea*, 10), interprets the metaphor as "the day of death leaves us with but a name, while at the day of birth we are entirely physical, fragrant with possibility, but nameless."

26. Ancient versions and modern scholars are divided on whether to read \aleph or \aleph . The negative expression \aleph can be defended on the basis of Aramaic \aleph , and the similar construction in Ps 135:17— \aleph . Cf. Tur-Sinai, *Sefer Iyyob*, 105.

27. For \aleph cf. Song 1:3.

28. \aleph , \aleph , and \aleph also figure in Gen 4:1–2, 10–11; 9:6; Isa 6:11; 15:19, and perhaps Pr 28:17.

29. Cf. Berlin, *HAR* 3.

30. Cf. M. Weiss, *Biblica* 42.

31. Boström, 258, notes the sound correspondence between \aleph and \aleph in Job 8:22, where they both occur in the same line.

32. For an analysis of 2 Sam 1 see Holladay, *VT* 20.

33. G. Blakemore Evans, ed., *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

6. PARALLELISM AND THE TEXT

1. In addition to the verses presented below, compare Ps 5:2–3; 6:9–10; 17:1,6; 27:7; 28:2; 30:11; 31:3; 39:13; 55:2–3; 64:2; 69:14; 86:1,6; 119:169–170; 130:2; 141:2–3; 142:7.

2. On the “forgetting” of parallelism by the rabbinic exegetes see Kugel, *Idea*, 96–134. Kugel points out that while the Rabbis seemed blind to parallelism in their exegesis, they used it in their own poems. The inability of the Rabbis to perceive parallelism in the biblical text was largely due to their refusal to admit that the text contained any type of redundancy. As I discussed in chapter 4, parallelism is poised between redundancy and polysemy; to accept only one of these facets—polysemy as the Rabbis did or redundancy as modern scholars did—is to risk a misperception of parallelism.

3. It makes no difference if this is considered to be a refrain or communal response; the effect is the same.

4. I would draw an analogy between this and the perceptibility of rhyme schemes in English poetry. Rhyme is most easily perceived when it appears in consecutive lines (*aabb*), slightly less perceptible in every second line (*abab*), etc. The rhyme in Robert Browning’s “Song from Pippa Passes” is more distantly spaced (*abcdabcd*) and it takes the reader longer to become aware of it.

The year’s at the spring
And day’s at the morn;
Morning’s at seven;
The hillside’s dew-pearled;

The lark’s on the wing;
The snail’s on the thorn;
God’s in his heaven—
All’s right with the world!

5. Greenstein (“How Does Parallelism Mean,” 54) makes a similar observation.

6. Cf. *RSP* I #233.

7. For example, the similar syntax of 10a and 13a; the similar syntax and word repetition in 11a and 14a; the grammatical and semantic equivalences in the two parts of 12a.

8. This may also explain other poetic lists—cf. chapter 1, note 11.

9. On a larger scale, the Bible as a whole has “made sense of history,” that is, it has given pattern and significance to historical events. But the way it is done in Ps 136 is much terser.

Poetry that gives meaning to history is, of course, not confined to one time or place. American readers recognize it in “The Battle Hymn of the Republic,” which suggests that the Civil War is the battle par excellence, the apocalyptic Battle of Armageddon: “Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.” But more apropos to our discussion, the last stanza of this poem contains a parallelism which, like Gen 27:36, Ps 114:3, and Ps 136, equates two separate events: “As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free.” By means of this parallelism the deaths of the Civil War soldiers are equated with the death of Jesus, thereby giving the highest significance (to a Christian) to the lives lost in this war. Moreover, not only are their deaths like Jesus’ death, but freedom is equated with holiness; the purpose for which the soldiers died is no less exalted than the purpose for which Jesus died. This line, like the poem as a whole, embodies an American blend of patriotism and religion. Notice that the parallelism not only utilizes lexical and syntactic repetition, but actualizes the metaphoric function of parallelism through the word “as.”

10. Waugh, 65—cf. above, chapter 1, p. 11. Holenstein also discusses contrast, although somewhat more cryptically: “Jakobson’s structural definition of poetry within the framework of the theory of the two axes can be extended as follows. Besides the projection of the principle of similarity from the axis of selection into that of combination, there also occurs in poetry a projection of the principle of contrast from its usual level of latent prerequisite for linguistic relations into the level of an obvious, ‘palpable’ form” (152).