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Abstract

This article aims to demonstrate that fine-grained analysis of the poetry of prophetic verse leads to illuminating results. The discussion focuses on prosodic structure and the phenomenon of parallelism. Largely unexplored avenues of research are highlighted. Isa 1:2-20 is the focus of analysis. It is shown that Isa 1:2-20 forms a prosodic unity and displays a panoply of parallelisms throughout. Its poetry conforms to a text model of ancient Hebrew verse worked out over a large portion of the extant poetic corpus.

1. Text, Prosody, and Tropes

Prosodic structure is the mold into which a poet pours semantic content. In accordance with specific expectations, poetry, generally speaking, takes the form of verse in which phonological segments of certain shapes and sizes continuously correspond. The segments are grouped into larger units whose dimensions are likewise predetermined. Prosodic structure is realized as a hierarchy of forms. The prosodic regularities of ancient Hebrew verse and their instantiation in Isa 1:2-20 are central to the discussion following.

The organizing principles of ancient Hebrew poetry, insofar as they are thought to be understood, are most usefully expressed in terms of a text model. A model for a genus of texts may be compared to a sieve. Species of the genus should pass through it. Species of other genera should not.

Text models are widely employed in the study of ancient Hebrew poetry. The Kampen school model, van Grol’s model, and Fokkelman’s model are cases in point.1 The text model of the present writer is another. It stands to

* A version of this essay was presented at the 2006 meeting of the Midwest Region of SBL. I wish to thank Kevin Chau, John Cook, Benjamin Harshav, and Horacio Simian-Yofre for comments and advice. Remaining shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

1 For a presentation of the Kampen school model, see Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, “Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry,” UF 18 (1986) 173-212, repr. in The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry (ed. Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor; JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988) 1-61. For an example of
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reason that ancient poets composed their works according to established
collection and parameterized forms. A text model seeks to describe the
dimensions of these forms. Other scholars, it must be noted, operate on the
assumption that ancient Hebrew poetry lacks a set of describable prosodic
regularities.2

A précis of the debate is not possible here. Nor is a full presentation of the
text model in terms of which Isa 1:2-20 is analyzed below. I offer both
elsewhere.3

The text model of reference employed in this essay may be summarized as
follows. Ancient Hebrew poetry is characterized by a series of continuously
repeated forms. The central form may be called a line. It consists of two to
three parts. A part may be termed a verset. A set of lines, two to three, may
be called a strophe. A verset ends in a pause, however minor; a line in a
stronger pause, or a full stop; a strophe most often in a full stop. Prosodic,
semantic, syntactic, morphological, and sonic parallelisms recur across

its application, see Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, The Structure of Classical
laid out in De versbouw in het klassieke hebreuws: Fundamentele verkenningen, Deel 1:
Metr. (diss., Catholic Theological Univ. of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, 1986). For an
example of its application, see idem, “An Analysis of the Verse Structure of Isaiah 24-27,”
in Studies in Isaiah 24-27: The Isaiah Workshop (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman and Harm van
Grol; OTS 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 51-80. Jan Fokkelman’s text model is spelled out in
Dichtkunst in de bijbel: Een handleiding bij literair lezen (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000); ET
Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide (tr. Ineke Smit; Louisville: Westminster
John Knox, 2001). The results of its application to the Psalter are described in idem, Major
Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis. II. 85
Psalms and Job 4-14. III. The Remaining 65 Psalms. (SSN 43, 47; Assen: Van Gorcum,
2000, 2003); The Psalms in Form: The Hebrew Psalter in its Poetic Shape (Leiden: Deo,
2002).

2 Collins and O’Connor describe ancient Hebrew verse in terms of syntactic regularities.
See Terence Collins, Line-forms in Hebrew Poetry: A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic
Study of the Hebrew Prophets (Studia Pohl, Series Maior 7; Rome: Biblical Institute Press,
1978); Michael Patrick O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns,
Hebrew Verse Structure” [pp. 631-61]). Pardee and LeMon apply a battery of analytical
methods to sample poetic texts, but do not address the question of prosodic regularities head
on. See Dennis Pardee, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut (‘nt 1 and
Proverbs 2) (SupVT 39; Leiden: Brill, 1988); and Joel L. LeMon, “The Power of

3 “Meter in Ancient Hebrew Poetry: A History of Modern Research,” and “Retaining and
Transcending the Classical Description of Ancient Hebrew Verse,” respectively, at
www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com; for the text model alone, see “Regularities in
versets, lines, and strophes. Prosodic parallelisms alone are obligatory: a verset of two to three stress units is unfailingly followed by another verset of two to three stress units, until a poem’s conclusion.

A prosodic hierarchy of twos and threes structures a poem. Two to three stress units form a verset, two to three versets a line, two to three lines a strophe, two to three strophes a stanza, and two to three stanzas a poem or section thereof.

The basic levels of the prosodic hierarchy instantiated by ancient Hebrew verse have counterparts in the prosodic structure hypothesis pioneered by Selkirk, Nespor, and Vogel, and applied to poetry by Hayes, Kiparsky, and Zec. In the terms of this linguistic theory, a stress-unit corresponds to a prosodic word, a verset to a phonological phrase, a line to an intonational phrase, and a strophe to an utterance. I explore these correspondences elsewhere.  

Many poetries are subject to length rules. An English sonnet, for example, is expected to have 14 lines. Verse in ancient Hebrew, if it contains more than 10 lines, typically consists of 12, 18, 22, 28, or 36 lines, or combinations thereof. Among the Psalms, 14 lines is also a common length.

Based on a study of a large corpus of texts, that is how ancient Hebrew poetry works. An analysis of Isa 1:2-20, it will be shown, bears this out. The text’s prosody is laid out for the eye to see at essay’s conclusion. Tropes of parallelism are noted in the margin.

The discussion of a single example of Hebrew poetry cannot substantiate a text model that claims to describe regularities characteristic of a larger

---

corpus. But one has to start somewhere. Isa 1:2-20 is a logical choice. Its poetry and prosody have been canvassed on numerous occasions.\(^5\)

A text model, it might be noted, is of heuristic value even if it is flawed. Most of the observations made below would retain their validity if the text model of reference were replaced by another. In academic inquiry, the questions asked and the integrity of the process of research are just as important as the answers to which one comes.

The conventions that govern the length of a composition in ancient Hebrew verse, if they were known, would clarify the question of discourse unit delimitation immensely. Insofar as they are not yet recovered with certainty, it makes sense to address the question of discourse unit delimitation from a multiplicity of directions. Delimitations suggested by a hypothesis about the organizing principles of ancient Hebrew verse ought to be compared on a case by case basis with what might be proposed on the basis of other data, with an eye for a convergence of results or a lack thereof.

If we assume for the sake of argument that the conventions governing the length in poetic composition are those the text model stipulates, where the unit beginning with Isa 1:2 concludes is not thereby a foregone conclusion. If

---

it is a unit of more than 10 lines, we would expect it to consist of 12, 18, 22, 28, or 36 lines, or combinations thereof.

Isa 1:2-9, 10-20, and 21-31 work out to be 18, 22, and 19 line units, respectively. 1:21-31, many have argued, is a non-original unity. This might account for its failure to adhere to the text model in terms of compositional length. 1:21-26’s original conclusion, in my view, is 2:2-5. A scansion of 1:21-26 + 2:1-5, which works out to be a 22 line unit, is offered elsewhere. Whether the unit of speech beginning with Isa 1:2 ends at 1:9, 1:20, 2:5, or at some other juncture, has to be decided on the basis of extra-prosodic criteria. The question is reviewed elsewhere.

2. Textual Criticism and Prosodic Analysis

Prosodic analysis is highly sensitive to textual difference. Textual criticism and prosodic analysis thus go hand in hand.

The consonantal text of MT Is a 1:2-20 makes use of medial *matres lectionis* and orthographic conventions for the indication of pronominal suffixes which are unattested in epigraphic Hebrew of the 8th – 6th cent. BCE. A reconstruction of the text’s original orthography, propaedeutic to the task of textual criticism, is presented elsewhere. The received orthography and vocalization represents a disambiguation of forms that were present in an earlier text. The disambiguation was not necessarily always correct. I argue below that a *yodh* was mistakenly added to an original זֵרֶם in 1:7.

The tetragrammaton יהוה (1:2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 18, 20 [7x total]) was most likely pronounced until the late Second Temple period, not replaced by ’Adonai.’ לָאֵהַ חֹּנַךְ ‘to show oneself [before] my face’ (1:12) should probably be read as לָאֵהַ חֹּנַךְ ‘to see my face,’ in accordance with an idiom preserved elsewhere with a synonymous verb (Ps 11:7; 17:15). תְּאֻכְּלוּ ‘you will be devoured’ (1:20) is best understood as a G passive reparsed as a D passive after G passives fell out of use. כָּלוּאְתֻּ ‘you will be eaten’ is a possible reconstruction of its original vocalization. A systematic reconstruction of pre-Masoretic Hebrew phonology lies beyond the scope of this essay. Here and there I offer a piecemeal reconstruction.

---

8 “Isa 1:2-20: Reconstructed Original Orthography,” ibid.
Blenkinsopp regards אָחוֹר נָזֹרוּ, ‘they turned back’ in 1:4 and וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרִים, ‘a devastation like the overthrow of strangers’ in 1:7 as glosses. If the phrases are removed, 1:2-9 conforms to the text model just the same. But אָחוֹר נָזֹרוּ (1:4) ties in nicely with סָרָה תּוֹסִיפוּ, ‘you continue to turn away’ in 1:5. Emended per Ibn Ezra, כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרִים, ‘a desolation like a storm’s devastation’ (1:7) also suits the context. Strangers (זָרִים) consume the land, and leave devastation like that caused by a torrential rain (זרם) (1:7). Zion is left over, like a watchman’s hut left standing, its purpose come to naught, in the midst of a vineyard picked clean by intruders (1:8).

3. Prosodic Analysis

Prosodic analysis is the business of correctly delimiting the parameterized forms that make up an example of verse. According to my analysis, 1:2-9 contains 18 lines and 40 versets; 1:10-20, 22 lines and 50 versets.

A key issue in prosodic analysis concerns patterns of stress retention and deletion. In 1:5, I stress the twice occurring כל, on the assumption that rhetorical emphasis would be appropriate in both cases. In 1:11 רָב יִבְחוֹת, אָחוֹר נָזֹרוּ is not cliticized. The result is a stress and sound rhyme with a cognate phrase in 1:16. 1:15, I suggest, contains a double cliticization מַעַלְלֵיכֶם רֹעַ. The result is a stress rhyme with זָרִים מַעַלְלֵיכֶם of the preceding aligned verset.

To be sure, it is possible to retain MT’s stress retention and deletion patterns regardless of possible arguments to the contrary, and accommodate the text model in all but a few instances. But the prosodic phrasings preserved in MT do not necessarily accord with those originally intended.

MT inconsistently retains and deletes stress in a variety of circumstances. אֲרוֹמָא in 3:6, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 3:8; אֲרוֹמָא in 1:3, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 1:13; אֲרוֹמָא in 3:3, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 9:14; אֲרוֹמָא in 8:12, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 8:11; אֲרוֹמָא in 6:5, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 1:6, but אֲרוֹמָא מִרְיָמִית in 1:5.

---

9 Joseph Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 19; Garden City: Doubleday, 2000) 177. אָחוֹר נָזֹרוּ lacks an equivalent in OG. This probably means the phrase was missing in its Vorlage. But it is hard to see why someone would add the two words. A clarifying gloss they are not. The phrase may have seemed awkward or nonsensical to a copyist, and dropped for that reason.

10 The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah (ed. and tr. Michael Friedländer; New York: Feldheim, 1966 [1875]) 3 [Hebr.]. A destroying foe is elsewhere compared to זָרִים in Isaiah (28:2).
Given this state of affairs, it seems appropriate to explore the possibility that constraints governing stress retention and deletion were operative in ancient Hebrew poetry such that permissible variation occurred in a more limited range of contexts than obtains in MT. According to a working hypothesis the details of which cannot be set out here, function words like מִי (1:12) and כִּי (1:2, 12, 20) and prepositions like עַל (1:5) were regularly cliticized. Negatives like לֹא (1:3, 6, 11, 13) and אֵין (1:6) retained stress except in medial prosodic position. These and like differences vis-à-vis MT, miniscule though they are, give rise on occasion to a division of a line into versets or of a verset into stress maximum units at variance with MT.  

Aggregate numbers of versets and stress units, not just lines, may have been stylized in ancient Hebrew poetry. Totals that consist of combinations of 12, 18, 22, and 28 seem to occur more often than chance would account for. Isa 1:2-20 has a line total of 18 + 22 = 40; a verset total of 40 + 50 = 90 (3 × (12 + 18)), and a stress unit total of 100 + 116 = 216 (12 × 18). But it must be stressed that totted up totals of prosodic units are artifacts of analysis, not statements of fact. They are subject to margins of error such that claims made about them are tentative by definition.

4. Hierarchical Divisions

Isa 1:2-20 divides into two parts: 1:2-9 and 10-20. Text breaks found in 1QLs, OG, Peshitta, and Masoretic mss. back up this division insofar as they indicate a break after 1:9 and 1:20. Codex Aleppo has major breaks after 1:9 and 1:20 and a lesser break after 1:17. Leningradensis has minor breaks after 1:9, 1:17, and 1:20, and a greater break after 1:23. A threefold division with lesser breaks after 1:9 and 1:17 preponderates among Masoretic mss. 

As just observed, traditions of unit delimitation in ancient mss. agree only in part. Nevertheless, traditional sense divisions form a baseline against which subdivisions proposed on other grounds ought to be compared.

---

1 For the working hypothesis, see the writer’s “Stress in Ancient Hebrew: A Tentative Reconstruction,” [www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com](http://www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com).

In 1:2-9, the division into strophes is self-evident and exactly coincides with MT’s division of the whole into pesuqim. The division into stanzas is also straightforward. The structure is 1:(1:1) in which the strongest caesura, between 1:3 and 1:4, coincides with a change in addressee.

According to the text model of “two and threes,” the strophe, more than the line, turns out to be a self-contained semantic, syntactic, and prosodic unity in ancient Hebrew verse. This may be verified by taking stock of the parallelisms that characterize Isa 1:3, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Each of these verses, as stated before, equals a strophe. The parallelisms are noted in the margin to the scansion found at essay’s conclusion.

The macrodivision of 1:2-9 is not cut and dried. An alternative division is conceivable. Parallelisms across 1:5b + 6a are stronger than those across 5a + 5b. The syntactic dependency of 6b-c on 6a militates against it, but the case for understanding 1:5b + 6a as a couplet of lines is otherwise strong.

Text models rarely exclude all but one division of a whole into smaller units. This is not to suggest that arguments in favor of a particular division are unimportant. But caution and humility are in order.13

5. Word Pairs

Word pairs in ancient Hebrew poetry have received wide attention,14 but unexplored avenues of research remain. I offer a brief discussion of the first word pair to appear in Isa 1:2-20: (a) שָׁמַע, ‘hear,’ (b) זָהַע, ‘give ear’:

Isa 1:2 2:2 שָׁמַע וְזָהַע

A review of co-occurrences of שָׁמַע and זָהַע in parallelism demonstrates that the order in which they co-occur is relatively fixed.15 The parallelism is one of specification. שָׁמַע is the holonym, זָהַע the meronym, in the sense

---

13 The confidence Fokkelman places in his strophic and stanzacic divisions is misplaced. That said, his divisions of examples of poetry into strophes and stanzas deserve careful consideration, and mark an advance over previous work. For his macrodivision of Isa 1:2-20, see Reading Biblical Poetry, 100-108.

14 For an overview of research, see Adele Berlin, “Parallelism,” ABD 5 (1992) 155-162.

15 שָׁמַע and זָהַע co-occur in parallelism in that order 19x: Gen 4:23; Ex 15:26; Num 23:18; Deut 1:45; Judg 5:3; Isa 1:2,10; 32:9; 64:3; Jer 13:15; Hos 5:1; Joel 1:2; Ps 49:2; 54:4; 84:9; 143:1; Job 33:1; 34:2,16; in reverse order, 3x: Deut 32:1; Isa 28:23; 42:23. שָׁמַע and זָהַע co-occur in that order 4x: Isa 34:2; Hos 5:1; Mic 1:2; Ps 17:1; in reverse order, Isa 28:23; 42:23. The reverse order is a parallelism of consecution, with ‘giving ear / inclining (the ear)’ and ‘hearing’ presented as consecutive actions.
that the latter describes a constituent activity of the former. Or again, שמע is the hypernym, קשיבות the troponym, in the sense that the latter specifies a manner of doing of the former. The G-H (Qal-Hiphil) sequence is characteristic. An analogous pair: שמע and קשיב ‘incline (the ear).’

6. Rhythmic Configurations

Language in verse is regularized according to obligatory conventions that belong to the realm of meter. Non-obligatory stylizations of language also characterize verse. Stylized rhythmic configurations of lines and strophes are a case in point. Isa 1:4 offers an example. I repoint the text according to a reconstruction of ancient Hebrew phonology:

\[
\begin{align*}
3:3 & \quad קֹדְשָׁוֹת, עָו, בּוֹ, לָאָב, \text{ etc.} \\
2:2 & \quad נְאָו בּהוֹשׁ, אָבִי, מִשְׁחִיתָו, \text{ etc.} \\
(2:3):2 & \quad יֵנָו אָבִי, חֹטַיאוֹ, קֹדְשׁוֹנָו, \text{ etc.} 
\end{align*}
\]

Progressive lengthening occurs across foots and versets:

- (mon + mon + iamb) : (mon + iamb + iamb)
- (mon + anapest) : (iamb + anapest)
- (amphibrach + anapest) : (amphibrach + anapest + anapest)
- (amphibrach + iamb).

A mon is a single stressed syllable; an iamb ‘˘’; an anapest ‘˘˘’, an amphibrach ‘˘˘˘’. The last verset alone, pointing as it does beyond the strophe in which it occurs, does not participate in the sequence.

Rhythmic patterns like the above are possible in virtue of a frequent phenomenon in ancient Hebrew poetry: the heightening and/or lengthening of items in parallelism. Examples include G-D, G-H, and G-D-H (Qal-Piel-Hiphil) verbal sequences (1:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19-20); and G-D, G-H, G-D-H, biliteral-triliteral, masculine-feminine, simple-afformative, sg-pl, and simplex-construct chain nominal sequences (1:3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17). Lengthening sometimes occurs in tandem with compensatory shortening of an adjacent item. More often, asymmetry obtains.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{16}\) Typologies of semantic sets like those offered by WordNet or VerbOcean might prove useful in the study of semantic units that co-occur in parallelism. For WordNet, see [http://wordnet.princeton.edu](http://wordnet.princeton.edu); For VerbOcean, see [http://semantics.isi.edu/ocean/](http://semantics.isi.edu/ocean/).


\(^{18}\) G-D, G-H, and G-D-H sequences have heretofore passed unnoticed. They also occur in Isa 1:21-26. Kevin Chau notes them in Ezek 19 (p.c.) The survey of poetic techniques
Heightening, lengthening, and assonance cooperate to splendid effect in the example above. Internal rhymes lend coherence at the verset level (7x). Initial, medial, and end rhymes bind versets together at the line and strophe levels (10x). Alternation of end rhyme and lack of it from one pair of versets to the next keeps the sound orchestration from becoming monotonous. The rhymemes rarely involve complete syllables. The effect is subtle.

The rhythmic configuration of 5b+6aα is worthy of note:

\[
\begin{align*}
&3:3 & מָכַר הַרְכָּב \text{ כּוֹל לָחֳלִי} & זַז & \text{כּוֹל דַּוָּי} \\
&2:3 & אֲנִי בֹּ מְתֹם & מֵעַד־מִכַּף רֹאשׁ־רֶגֶל
\end{align*}
\]

If we vocalize לָחֳלִי as לְחֹלִי (as in pause), רֶגֶל as לגְרַ, and אֵין as ןיְאַ to reflect pre-Masoretic Hebrew, the rhythm would be:

(mon + mon + iamb): (iamb + iamb + iamb)
(anapest + anapest): (mon + mon + iamb)

A rhythmic inclusio (mon + mon + iamb) frames and participates in a progressive lengthening of items (mon → iamb → anapest) in parallelism.

7. Enjambment

Enjambment occurs frequently in ancient Hebrew verse. Clauses and phrases are divided across the versets of a line, and less commonly, across the lines of a strophe or stanza, in accordance with natural syntactic breaks.\textsuperscript{19}

1:4-6 may illustrate. 1:4-5αα is an apostrophe consisting of appositionally concatenated phrases and unmarked relative clauses occupying a whole strophe (1:4). The clause for which 1:4 serves as a kind of extraposed vocative occupies a single verset at the onset of the next strophe (1:5αα). 1:6 consists of enjambed phrases and unmarked relative clauses which concatenate asyndetically at the major caesurae within the enjambed structure, and conjunctively across the members of verset and line.

---

\textsuperscript{19} One third of the lines in his corpus, O’Connor remarks, exhibit enjambment (\textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 409). According to Frederick W. Dobbs-Allsopp, more than two thirds of the lines in Lamentations 1-5 are enjambed ("The Effects of Enjambment in Lamentations (Part 2)," \textit{ZAW} 113 [2001] 370-95; 371).
1:4-6 is dominated by the enjambed structures just described, but a single two beat clause, 1:5αβ, a verset more consonant with 1:4 than 5-6, constitutes the stanza and section’s (1:2-9) rhetorical peak: ‘You continue to turn away!’ The “odd man out” in a context of semantic, syntactic, and sonic parallelisms at a determinate level of the textual hierarchy tends to have a function that goes beyond that level.

8. Stanza Level Semantics

In the case of semantic structures that encompass more than one strophe, sonic parallelisms across strophes help create a sense of cohesion. Cf. 1:7-8:

\[
\begin{align*}
2:3 & \text{ שְׁמָמָה אַרְכֶּם שֵׁם} \\
(2:3) & \text{ אֵשׁ שְׂרֻפוֹת עָרֵיכֶם} \\
2:2 & \text{ בְּמִקְשָׁה כִּמְלוּנָה כְּעִיר} \\
2:2 & \text{ מִקְשָׁה כְּסֻכָּה} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This is the “odd man out” at the conclusion of the first strophe and serves to tie the successive strophes more closely together. Within the first strophe, אַרְכֶּם ‘outsiders’ metastasize into שְׁמָמָה ‘storm.’ The simile, reinforced by rhymes that cut across strophe boundaries (וּשְׂרֻפוֹת with שְׁמָמָה, כָּרֶם with זָרֶם), continues in the second strophe. Zion survives, like a flimsy structure might survive a storm, and not by its own doing.

Across 1:7, repeated שְׁמָמָה ‘devastation’ forms an inclusio. The wordplay אַרְכֶּם/שֵׁם ‘strangers/storm’ is contained within a single line, enhancing its punch. The end alignment of זָרֶם ‘storm’ (1:7) and כָּרֶם ‘vineyard’ (1:8) is poetically satisfying. The syntax of 1:7 is open to more than one interpretation. I construe the first two versets as a complex subject, and the last verset as a complex predicate introduced by an emphatic waw (compare the waw in Amos 4:10; Isa 10:15).

In 1:8, the parallelism of the א…כ comparison of 8a with the ב…ב comparison of 8b, a heightened form of a א…כ comparison, defines the 2 x 2 strophic structure. But semantic parallelisms and chiasmus cooperate to create a framing effect involving the first and last versets that counterpoints the syntactic and prosodic 2 x 2 structure:
‘And left over, lovely Zion, / like a hut in a vineyard; / like a lean-to in a melon patch, / the city preserved’. 20 Zion is ‘left over’ and ‘preserved’ by an unnamed agent, left for the hearers of the speech to supply, until the information is made explicit in the first line of the following strophe: ‘If Yahweh of Armies had not left us a remnant’ (1:9). 21

1:9 as parsed in MT is open to question. In light of Ps 81:14-15; 94:17, one would expect כִּמְעָט to be clause-initial. So construed, 1:9a becomes an enjambed bipartite line, and קִמְעָט in 1:9b part of an initial rhyme scheme. A temporal connotation for קִמְעָט fits the context. 22

9. More Hierarchical Divisions

The divisions of MT across 1:11-12 and 1:13-14 are not the most cogent imaginable. Alternatives are discussed below. It is usual to separate 1:16-17 from 18-20. MT’s setuma between 1:17 and 18 backs up this division. In my view, 1:16 and 17 read best with 1:18-20 as successive parts of the composition’s concluding parenesis. 16 contains the first three, 17 the next six, and 18 the last of ten imperatives which tie the parenesis together. Just as the imperatives of 1:10 precede a subunit marked by an introductory question and quotation formula (1:11), the imperatives of 16 and 17 precede a subunit marked by an introductory invitation and quotation formula (18):

שִׁמְעוּ ... [10]
יאמר יהוה
לָמָּה רֹב זִבְחֵיכֶם־לִּי יְהוָה יֹאמַר [11]
תְּרוּםְו נָא ... [16]
קִרְיוֹת יָרְעָהָם מֵעָזֵן רַע [17]
חִדְלוּ ... לִמְדוּ ... דִּרְשׁוּ ... אֲשֶר ... שִׁפְטוּ ... רִיבו … [18]

The two stanzas of 10-15 together with the stanza of 16-20 form a (1:1):1 section. First sg. perfect verb forms, as I divide the text, lead off units of the section’s first stanza: שָׂבַעְתִּי and חָפָצְתִּי, respectively. Five kinds of quadrupeds are listed in the second strophe, and a reference to the “trampling of my courts” concludes the third strophe, forming an inclusio. Across stanza

21 The device of delayed identification is also employed in Isa 1:2-3 (‘sons’ . . . ‘Israel’).
boundaries, the first and last versets of 11-13a form an inclusio: ‘What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? . . . It is to me an abomination.’

10. A Syntactic Crux

MT 1:12 is problematic. The preposed ki clause does not introduce subordinate clauses as one might expect (e.g. Exod 23:4,5,23-24). Two loosely joined versets follow which must be treated as a parenthesis before תוסיפה לא בד in 1:13. Making matters worse, MT 1:12 exhibits little internal parallelism and only awkward parallelism with its context. But if 1:12 is connected with חפצת לא בד of 1:11 per syntactic structures attested elsewhere (Isa 14:29; Joel 2:21; Zech 2:14; Ps 58:11; 107:30), internal and external parallelisms of the same density as the context reappear.

11. More Stanza Level Semantics

1:13a, the opening strophe of 13-15, consists of a motivated negative command that forms a logical conclusion to the preceding and anticipates the string of imperatives in 1:16. A new strophe begins in 13b. A triad of terms referring to the religious calendar shifts the focus from animal sacrifice to religious observance more generally. 13b-14 prepare the way for the stanza’s concluding strophe (15), introduced by a conjunction which temporarily relaxes the tempo. The accusatory peak towards which 11-15 climb is the “odd man out” and last verset of the entire stanza: ‘your hands are full of blood’ (15).

It might be countered that ‘your hands are full of blood’ thought to conclude one putative stanza concatenates with ‘wash and be clean’ in the first line of the next putative stanza (1:16). This is true, but concatenation is no respecter of unit boundaries. The second verset of 1:5 concatenates with the last verset of 1:4, the first four versets of 1:10 with the last two versets of 1:9, in both instances across clear semantic and form-critical divisions.

A 1:(1:1) stanza concludes the speech (16-20). Yahweh has brought charges against his client nation (2-3). Judgment, one assumes, will follow. Instead, language associated with the cult is used to demand an about-face to be marked by a cessation of cultic activity (13,16). Offerings, religious holidays, and prayer are rejected (11-15). Cessation of harsh treatment of others, the reining in of the violent, and the protection of the weak are demanded (17). Yahweh concludes with an offer and an ultimatum: your past sins will be overlooked should you take heed (18-19). If not, you will face more of the same (20).
1:10-20 as I divide it disregards a cluster of masoretic subdivisions that seem motivated by offense at the poem’s sharp rhetorical edge (4x in 1:11-13). שלָם אל תִּפְסִית of 1:11, as already argued, is to be construed with 1:12. In 1:11-13a, A’B’ follows AB repeatedly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B=topic</th>
<th>A=comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בְּחָפָצִים</td>
<td>לא לֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לָמָּה לִי</td>
<td>בָּשָׂעַת עֹלוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְרִיאִים וֹכְבָּשִׁים וָפָרִים</td>
<td>חָפָצִית לֹא תָבֹאוּ פָּנָי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּלַב לוֹא קְטֹרֶת</td>
<td>בִּקֵּשׁ מִי מִיֶּדְכֶם זֹאת חֲצֵרָי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְרִים וָמְרִים</td>
<td>תּוֹסִיפוּ לֹא מִנְחֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קְטֹרֶת בִּקּוֹדֶשׁ בָּאָה</td>
<td>שָׁוְא קְטֹרֶת לִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תּוֹעֵבָה...</td>
<td>היא...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)-(4) communicate the deity’s dismissal of the gifts offered him in the wake of the events alluded to in 1:7-9. The question (4) is in fact a denial with the implication that God requires something other than ‘this.’ It concludes the section’s first stanza. A negative command (5) opens a new stanza and anticipates the demands of 1:16. Along with (6) and (7), it brings the expression of the deity’s displeasure to a head. The ‘no!’ pronounced over אוב ‘coming’ (3) is particularized by the prohibition of הביא ‘bringing’ something in hand (5). קְטֹרֶת in (6) refers to the olfactory ‘savor’ of animal offerings as in Pss 66:15 and 141:2. I follow Duhm’s syntactic parse of 1:13a. 23 It accords with the trenchant style of the poem as a whole.

MT’s construal of 1:12-13a appears intent on avoiding a text that might appear to reject cultic offerings per se. The resultant collocation of versets and lines into pesuqim is problematic. Against MT, 13a seems to make one strophe, and 13b-14 another.24

A variant construal of 12-13a is adopted by NJPSV:

---

24 Williamson (*Isaiah 1-5*, 76-77) opts for a solution proposed by Ambrogio Spreafico, “Nahum 1 10 and Isaiah 1 12-13: Double-duty Modifier,” *VT* 48 (1998) 104-10. But Spreafico’s analysis depends on positing an example of a “double-duty” modifier where other explanations of the data seem closer at hand. The dichotomization of 1:11-15 between 13aβ and 13aγ is also open to question.
According to NJPSV, Yahweh denies requesting that the people appear before him: ‘That you appear before Me — Who asked that of you?’ The vertically aligned parallelisms deserve note: x\textsuperscript{1}b\textsuperscript{1}c\textsuperscript{1}:a\textsuperscript{1}d\textsuperscript{1} and b\textsuperscript{2}c\textsuperscript{2}:a\textsuperscript{2}d\textsuperscript{2}. But on this prosodic parse, the vertical parallelism of the versets קְטרֶתּ שָׂוְא and אָוֶן per my reconstruction is lost. So is the vertical parallelism of שָׂבַּעְתִּי, חָפָצְתִּי, and תוסִיפוּ לֹא. Foregrounding of the prohibition לֶא תוסִיפוּ לֹא also disappears. 1:11-13a as NPSV construes it foregrounds the people’s actions, whereas my construal, more appropriately, foregrounds Yahweh’s reaction to the people’s actions.

As the foregoing discussion illustrates, attention to prosodic structure yields an exegetical harvest.

Further pronouncements of displeasure follow. All acts of piety meet Yahweh’s rejection:

1. (13b) תדרש ושבת קרמא מקרא
2. (14) והעשרת החטיפת
3. (15) ולא עלי לטרת
4. (15) אםсрочכים הפרשים
5. (15) לאו עיני המצר
6. (15) ופיירירניהו תפלת
7. (15) בתחום שמע ידיכם קמא
8. (15) ידיכם קמא

Three words cap the speech up to this point and motivate the preceding: ‘your-hands are-full-of blood’ (5). ‘Your hands’ echoes כפיכם ‘your palms’ spread in prayer, and ‘your hand’ in 1:12:

מִרְבַּכְּשׁ אֲחָא מִכֶּם

‘Your hands are full of shed blood!’ ‘Who asked this from your hand?’

The יד (1:11) of ritual slaughter and the קמא (1:15) of orphan and widow whom they have not stooped to succor have become one in God’s eyes.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25} Williamson emends חָדְשֵׁיכֶם to the “expected” יכֶם גֵּחַ because יכֶם חָדְשֵׁ repeats the first word of the previous line without any apparent reason” (Isaiah 1-5, 79). The repetition does not seem odd if the above construal of 13b-14 is accepted.

\textsuperscript{26} A point made also by Spreafico, “Double-duty Modifier,” 109-10.
The poem continues with a set of ten demands, the last of which opens 1:18. If met, blood red though your sins are, you will eat the land’s bounty (reversing 1:7). If not, the sword will eat you (1:20) (blows were already threatened in 1:5).

12. *A 3 x 3 Strophe*

1:16-17 as scanned here was previously suggested by Fokkelman. MT takes מִשְׁפָּט as parallel to the following חָמוֹץ, but a construal of מִשְׁפָּט יְרוּשֶׁם with חָמוֹץ יְרוּשֶׁם (interlocking generic exhortations) and יְרוּשֶׁם יְרוּשֶׁם אֲלִמְנָה with מִשְׁפָּט אֲלִמְנָה (interlocking concrete exhortations each with an object specifying a class of people) seems more natural. The resulting 3 x 3 strophe has a 1:(1:1) structure at the strophe and line levels. The second line might also be parsed as (1:1):1.

13. *Coextensive Semantic and Prosodic Unities*

Within a context of overall coincidence of semantic and prosodic unities such that each set of unities reinforces the intelligibility of the other, the division of higher level semantic unities sometimes runs counterpoint to the organization of lower level prosodic unities. For example, 1:10-12, 13-15, and 16-20 form stanzas. Each stanza opens with parenesis. At the same time, one strophe (1:10) introduces everything that follows. The prosodic system unfolds in roughly equal parts of twos and threes. The semantic macrostructure fitted within it unfolds in unequal parts.

14. *More Rhythmic Configurations*

It is worth keeping an eye out for special rhythmic effects. It is tempting to read 1:11b-12 as follows:

```
3:2 a'b'c'd'e^1
לאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָאֲלָaֲl
רָמָאֲרָמָאֲרָמָאֲרָמָאֲרָמָאֲrָm
אֲלָאֲלָאֲלָa
אֲלָאֲl
```

Another example: 1:15:

```
כַּפֵּיכֶםוּבְּפָרִשְׂכֶםמִכְּעֵינַיםאַעְלִיםתְפִלָּה־כִּי־םתַרְבּוּגַשׁאֵינֶנִימָלֵאַוימָלֵאֳלָa
יְדֵיכֶםוּדָםוּיְדֵיכֶםוּיְדֵיכֶםוּיְדֵיכֶםוּ
```

The “a” versets of each line are exact rhythmic equivalents (4th class paean + anapest).

---

27 *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 3-5.
15. Parallelisms

Prosodic parallelisms are a constant feature of Isa 1:2-20. 2:2, 3:3, 3:2, and 2:3 lines all occur relatively frequently and in no predictable order. Where they occur, twice and thrice repeated configurations such as (3:3) (3:3) and (2:2) (2:2) (2:2) create an unusually symmetrical rhythm and cooperate in the creation of tightly cohering structures (1:3, 8, 10, 11bγ-12 [as suggested above], and 17).

Semantic, syntactic, and morphological (ssm) parallelisms are ubiquitous in Isa 1:2-20. They are the warp and woof of the text the poet spun on the prosodic framework described in the text model. Unlike the framework, the supports of which are evenly spaced in all directions, ssm parallelisms are sometimes bunched together and sometimes spread more thinly.

The notation devised to signal cases of ssm (semantic, syntactic, and morphological) parallelisms is meant to be serviceably compact. It is intended to capture cases of matching ranging from verbatim repetition across higher prosodic levels to cases of words and expressions which match in one or more morphological and one or more syntactic dimensions but parallel each other at the semantic level in paradigmatic terms only, i.e. in the occupation of equivalent slots in an internal frame of semantic reference. The match is italicized if it is concomitant with a mismatch in one or more fundamental semantic, syntactic, and/or morphological dimensions. Repetitions are noted as such in addition to being captured by the abc:abc notation. The more important cases of uni- and multidimensional ssm parallelisms across prosodic units are also noted.

The notation used to quantify the density of ssm parallelism in a given text is termed a “p” index. All x’s score 1; x|x structures score 1 (not 2); repetitions of x y times score y. Parallelisms are significantly undercounted. For example, a word matching another on 2 syntactic levels (grammatical function, order) and 1 semantic level (paradigmatic) [b₁:b² in Isa 1:15] scores 1. So does a word matching another on 3 discrete morphological levels (person, number, gender), 2 syntactic levels (grammatical function, order), and 1 semantic level (hyponym / troponym) scores 1 [a¹:a² in Isa 1:10]:

It is not as if the problem can be solved by scoring the former as 7 and the latter as 4. It’s more complicated than that. In principle, a hypernym / troponym match is weightier than a paradigmatic match, but for the purposes of this study, they are scored the same.

This is not to suggest that finer grained analysis if pursued would immediately be subject to the law of diminishing returns. It is easy to prove the opposite. For example, the micro-parallelisms noted below are not noted in the scansions I provide, but are of indubitable poetic importance [Ps 6:2]:

P indices of a rough and ready variety are nonetheless of value if calculated in a consistent manner over a particular corpus.

Phrase, prefix, lexical, root, and suffix repetitions and parallelisms are noted at the prosodic level or levels over which the repetition or parallelism would have been perceived to greatest effect. Two non-adjacent clusters of repetitions are not treated as a single series. The notes are not meant to register any and all repetitions and parallelisms, only those judged to be poetically significant. Admittedly, decisions are sometimes arbitrary.

The chief drawback of exhaustive lists of repetitions and/or parallelisms, such as those of Pardee and van der Lugt, is that they are little more than collections of raw data. That, of course, is also their strength. The strength of the notation offered with the scansions of this essay is its selectivity. That, of course, is also its chief drawback.

Sonic parallelisms are a feature of Isa 1:2-20. They are not evenly distributed throughout, but are conspicuous for brief intervals and never completely absent. Stress congruent medial and end rhymes are particularly striking and occur within and across versets. Examples within versets (reconstructed phonology*): 1:2* (2x), 4 (3x), 5* (2x), 6(2x), 7 (2x), 8, 9*, 10, 11, 15, 16*, 20*. Across versets: 1:3 (2x), 4 (2x), (2x), 8, 11 (2x), 12, 13, 15, 16*, 17* (3x), 18, 19-20*. Word-final rhymes occur in 1:2, 3, 4 (2x), 6 (3x), 7 (2x), 8 (2x), 9 (2x), 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19+20. Assonance and internal rhyme find expression in 1:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 16-17, 17, 18b, 19-20, 20.

Sonic rhymes are sometimes the fruit of rhetorical macrostructures. The ten occurrences of nouns with a 2d pl. sfx in 1:11-18 are a case in point, as are the six occurrences of nouns with a 1st sg. sfx in the same subunit. Like buoys on a sea of 2d pl. and 1st sg. forms, 1st pl. forms mark rhetorically significant junctures. Four cases join the people to the prophet (1:9 [3x].10). One joins the people to God (1:18).

In short, sonic parallelisms in Isa 1:2-20 suffuse the text but do not occur at fixed intervals. Sonic rhymes reinforce syntactic and semantic unities at the verset and line levels and rhetorical unities at higher levels.

16. Asymmetries

Asymmetries are a correlate textual feature alongside the more frequent symmetries. They break up what would otherwise be monotonous sequences. Isa 1:2-20 contains 40 lines and 90 versets. One out of four lines is tripartite (10 out of 40). Versets without an equivalent at the line level often function in concatenation or inclusio beyond the line level (1:2, 4, 7, 13, 15, 16, 20).

Two out of five versets are tripartite (36 out of 90). “Odd man out” elements are often placed first insofar as the focus is on them (1:2b, 3b, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16). Foregrounded elements in repeated tripartite versets express equivalences (1,2b, 3b, 5b, 10, 11).

---

17. Apposition, Syndetic Coordination, and Hypotaxis

A more frequent use of apposition and a more sparing use of syndetic coordination and hypotaxis vis-à-vis prose are typical of ancient Hebrew verse. In a prose peroration, e.g. Deut 4:1-20, clauses are frequently introduced by a coordinating (וְ, כֵּן, כַּאֲשֶׁר, etc.) or subordinating (כִּי, ןעַלְמַ, etc.) conjunction. In the poetic peroration of Isa 1:2-20, syndetic coordination and hypotaxis recur less often. Hypotaxis is principally found at the margins of macrounits (1:2, 9, 18-20).

In poetry, repeated apposition in contiguity is a form of parallelism, and reinforces other forms. Cf. Isa 1:4. Repeated clause and sub-clause level syndetic coordination also reinforces concomitant parallelisms, and relaxes the tempo relative to apposition. Cf. 1:5b-6. A switch from syndetic coordination to apposition creates a staccato-like, terminal intensity. Cf. 1:2-3a-b. Hypotaxis without concomitant syndetic coordination has the same function. Cf. 1:18b-20 (against MT 1:20). A switch from apposition to syndetic coordination creates a temporary relaxation within a taut environment. Examples: 1:8, 14a, and 15 excluding יִרְכָּם. The latter two examples occur in the apposition-dominated context of 10-20. The phenomena noted here deserve study over a wider text base.

The notation used to quantify placement of a given text along the apposition-syndetic coordination-hypotaxis continuum is termed an \( h \) (hypotaxis) index. Apposition is the occurrence in series of syntactic units of the same rank without a conjunction, simple or subordinating, between the items in series. The units, called appositives, must normally be identical in reference. For the purposes of the \( h \) index, enjambed structures in which syntactic units of the same rank but of dissimilar reference (like subject and predicate, or preposed subject followed by an interrogative clause) are appositionally distributed across contiguous versets score zero, as do appositives in the strict sense.

Series of syntactic units of the same rank with a coordinating (as opposed to subordinating) conjunction between the items in series are said to be syndetically coordinated. The units are normally identical in reference. A short list of clause-level coordinating conjunctions in ancient Hebrew would include וי,沉迷 יכ,沉迷,沉迷 (late); כִּי ...כִּי; after a negative clause: כִּי,沉迷 ...沉迷; for the purposes of the \( h \) index, syndetic coordination scores 0.5.

Hypotaxis is the occurrence in series of syntactic units of the same rank with an intervening subordinating conjunction between the items in series. In
the case of three or more items in series, one subordinate syntactic unit is usually superordinate relative to another. A short list of clause-level subordinating conjunctions in ancient Hebrew would include כִּי; פֶּן, אִם, לוּ, לוּלֵי;ןעַי,ןעַלְמַ,רוּבַּעֲב;אֲשֶׁר,וּז,שֶׁ;כַּאֲשֶׁר.

For the purposes of the $h$ index, hypotaxis scores 1.

18. Elements with Binding Force

Symmetric and asymmetric parallelisms characterize Isa 1:2-20 and bind its component parts together. Devices with binding force other than parallelism also occur. כִּי conjoins complexes of clauses 2x (1:8, 15), clauses 10x, and phrases 12x. In accordance with typologies peculiar to each, other function words bind discourse units of various dimensions together. כִּי functions 2x at the macrolevel of discourse (1:2, 20) and 1x as an object complementizer within a clause (1:12). כִּי conjoins the clause it introduces with the immediately preceding כִּי-introduced clause 1x (1:15). Clause-initial function words have binding force because they create the expectation that one or more dependent clauses will follow the clause they initiate. Examples: הַוָּי (1:4); עַל-מֶה (1:5); לוּלֵי (1:9); לָמָּה (1:11); מִי (1:12); and כִּי (1:18-20 [4x]). Prepositions have binding force within clauses (32x). Enjambment across versets, lines, and strophes has binding force (25x). Chiasmus occurs 6x, reinforcing the web of parallelisms where it occurs (1:3, 8, 14, 18 [2x]). Anaphoric pronouns occur 3x (1:2, 7, 13). Subject ellipsis occurs 2x (1:14, 18); verb ellipsis 1x (1:3); object ellipsis (not direct, but conceptual) 1x (1:3); and adjunct ellipsis 1x (1:9). Counts of examples of enjambment, chiasmus, and ellipsis will vary depending on the text, construal, and definitions presupposed.

19. Compositional Building Blocks

The building blocks that went into the composition of 1:2-20 are discernible. A 12 line unit (1:2-6) forms the foundation of 1:2-9. A 6 line unit (1:7-9) completes it. A 12 line unit (1:11-15) forms the foundation of 1:10-20. A 2 line introductory strophe (1:10) and an 8 line parenetic conclusion (1:16-20) were added to it.

Whether or not the composer of the whole and the author of the parts which form it were one and the same person is a separate issue. It stands to reason that authors and redactors drank from the same well of poetic convention.
20. Conclusions

Isa 1:2-20 as construed above displays a panoply of parallelisms in its every part. Prosodic, semantic, syntactic, morphological, and sonic parallelisms recur across versets, lines, and strophes, reinforce each other, and contribute to the cohesion of the whole. No single line type, 2:2, 3:2 or 3:3, dominates the unit.

The sense divisions of MT are consistent with the text model to which it was compared in all cases but two: in 1:12-13 one change is necessary, and the last clause of 1:16 must be read with 1:17. But MT’s sense divisions are not always as cogent as conceivable alternatives. It seemed best to depart from them on six occasions (1:9, 11-12, 13, 13-14, 16-17, 17).

The text model outlined at the beginning of this essay is instantiated by Isa 1:2-20. For the model to be judged valid, it has to describe how ancient Hebrew poetry works throughout the extant corpus. I present additional worked examples elsewhere.\(^{31}\)

Analysis of prosody and tropes forms a foundation for an analysis of more comprehensive questions. I take them up in another context.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{31}\) [www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com](http://www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com).

Isaiah 1:2-20: Scansion with Notes on Text, Prosody, and Tropes

Like MT, but not always in accordance with it, words dominated by a single main stress are conjoined with a maqeph (־). Prosodic variants vis-à-vis MT are noted.

Symbols

A strophe made up of three lines, 1:(1:1) in structure

concludes a strophe; a sub-stanza; a stanza; a section

A line consisting of three versets of two stress units each; the last two form a pair.

Reference to a location within the text.

MT, if preserved, would violate the general rule or the length rule.

The addition or subtraction of a maqeph vis-à-vis MT.

Change in verset division, or line division, vis-à-vis MT.

Change in strophe, stanza, or section division vis-à-vis MT.

Change in vocalization vis-à-vis MT; MT following.

Conjecture based on witness; MT following.

Conjectural emendation vis-à-vis MT; MT following.

A stanza consisting of 4 lines, 9 versets, and 24 stress units.

A poetic composition made up of 40 lines, 90 versets, and 216 stress units, with a total of 17 strophes, 6 stanzas, and 2 sections.

Cases of ssm (semantic-syntactic-morphological) parallelism (or hypotaxis) per verset, averaged over 40 versets.

The first line contains two pairs of two elements; enjambment occurs (hence the $j$); the second line begins with a pair of elements in chiastic ssm parallelism with the second pair of elements of the first line (hence the $j$); it concludes with another pair of elements that match up with elements a and b in the first line, but in reverse order (hence the $x$); enjambment occurs (hence the $x$).

The first verset’s a is not paralleled in the second, but is gapped (hence the $g$); $b^2$’s match with $b^1$ is concomitant with a mismatch in one or more fundamental ssm dimensions

9-2א

ישעיהו

(2:2)2 ab¹:a²b²:ab
3:3 ab²:ab³
3:3 a²b³:a²b³
4/9/24 3:3 x₄a²:2b₄
3:3 ab²c²:b³c²
2:2 b²c²d²
(2:3)2 ab¹:ab²:a³
3:3 ab²c²:b²c²
2:3 b²c²
2:3 j(a²b³)
8/18/44 (2:2)3 j(ab²:a²b²:a³b²)
8/18/44 3x
2:3 ab¹:a²b²
(2:3)3 a²b²j(a³b³)
2:2 ab³:j(a³d³)
2:2 x²d³:j(a²b³)
3:3 ab³cde
6/13/32 3:3 ab²c²:vdcv
18/40/100 8/3/1

p = 3 (122/40) h = 0.2 (8/40)
ישעיהו 1

7/14/34  
3:2 $a^2b^2c^2:d^2e^2$  
2:2 $ab;cd^e\mu$  
7/16/38  
2:3 $a^2b^2c^2:abc$  
2:2 $ab;cd\mu$  
8/20/44  
2:3 $a^2b^2c^2:abc$  

$p = 3$ (150/50) $h = 0.2$ (9/50)  
$8/3/1 + 9/3/1 = 17/6/2/1$