The Prophetic Poetry of Isaiah 1:2-20
A Programmatic Essay*

John F. Hobbins
jfhobbins@gmail.com

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

---

[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

reason that ancient poets composed their works according to established convention 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 Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40-55* (OTS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1998). Harm van Grol's text model is laid out in *De versbouw in het klassieke hebreeuws: Fundamentele verkenningen, Deel 1: Metriek* (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, 1980; reissued 1997 with "The Contours of Biblical Hebrew Verse, An Afterword to 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 I and Proverbs 2)* (SupVT 39; Leiden: Brill, 1988); and Joel L. LeMon, "The Power of Parallelism in KTU[2] 1.119: Another 'Trial Cut,'" *UF* 37 (2005) forthcoming.

[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 Ancient Hebrew Verse: A New Descriptive Model," *ZAW* 120 (2008) forthcoming.

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.[4]

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

---

[4] "In Search of Prosodic Domains in Ancient Hebrew Verse: Lamentations 1-5 and the Prosodic Structure Hypothesis," www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com. The standard introduction to the field is Marina Nespor and Irene Vogel, *Prosodic Phonology* (Studies in Generative Grammar 28; Dordrecht: Foris, 1986). For a brief orientation, see Elisabeth Selkirk, "Sentence Phonology," in *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (2d ed.; ed. William Frawley and William Bright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 4:41-42. Seminal applications to the study of poetry include Bruce Hayes and Margaret MacEachern, "Quatrain Form in English Folk Verse," *Language* 74 (1998) 473-507, with appendices at http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/linguistics/people/hayes/metrics.htm; Paul Kiparsky, "A Modular Metrics for Folk Verse," in *Formal Approaches to Poetry: Recent Developments in Metrics* (ed. B. Elan Dresher and Nila Friedberg; Phonology and Phonetics 11; Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006) 7-49; Draga Zec, "The Prosodic Word as a Unit in Poetic Meter," in *The Nature of the Word: Essays in Honor of Paul Kiparsky* (ed. Kristin Hanson and Sharon Inkelas; Cambridge: MIT Press, in press); online: http://ling.cornell.edu/Zec/PaperFinal1.pdf.

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

---

[5] Francis Brown, "The Measurements of Hebrew Poetry as an Aid to Literary Analysis," *JBL* 9 (1890) 71-106; 82-85; Eduard Sievers, *Metrische Studien I. Studien zur hebräischen Metrik. Erster Teil: Untersuchungen* (ASGW 21; Leipzig: Teubner, 1901) 425-426; Julius Ley, "Metrische Analyse von Jesaja Kapitel I," *ZAW* 22 (1902) 229-237; 230-34; George Buchanan Gray, *The Book of Isaiah: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 1—39* [Isa 1-27] (ICC, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912) 3-31; William Popper, *Studies in Biblical Parallelism. Part II. Parallelism in Isaiah: Chapters 1-35 and 37.22-35: The Reconstructed Text (Hebrew)* (Univ. of California Publications in Semitic Philology 1/5; Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1923) 212-214, 237-249, 268-270; Eduard Sachsse, "Untersuchungen zur hebraischen Metrik," *ZAW* 43 (1925) 173-192; 177-79 [Isa 1:4-9]; Otto Procksch, *Jesaja I: Kapitel 1-39 übersetzt und erklärt* (KAT 9A, Leipzig: Deichert, 1930) 29-44; Luis Alonso Schökel, *Estudios de poética hebrea* (Barcelona: Juan Flors, 1963) 87-92, 110-113, 165-169, 220, 239-240, 260-262; Benjamin Harshav, "Prophecy," (unpublished ms., Berlin, 1983) 1-18; Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985) 142-146 [Isa 1:2-9]; Harm van Grol, *De versbouw in het klassieke hebreeuws: Fundamentele verkenningen, Deel 1: Metriek* (diss., Catholic Theological Univ. of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, 1986) 76-82 [Isa 1:2-9]; Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja: 1. Teilband: Jesaja 1-12* (2d ed.; BKAT 10/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980) 8-54; Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry*, 100-108. The scansions offered by Sievers, Ley, Gray, Sachsse, Procksch, Alonso Schökel, and Wildberger differ from the scansion I offer insofar as they variously apply a "no two stress maxima in a row" rule and insofar as they treat לֹא, אַיִן, and כֹּל as proclitics in more contexts than the text model illustrated here allows for.

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.[6] 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[7].

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 Isa 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.[8] 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 זרם 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.' לְרָאוֹת פָּנָי 'to show oneself [before] my face' (1:12) should probably be read as לִרְאוֹת פָּנָי '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. תֵּאָכְלוּ '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.

---

[6] "To Walk in the Light of the Lord: Isa 1:21-2:5," www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com.
[7] "The Rhetoric of Isa 1:2-20: An Exploration," ibid.
[8] "Isa 1:2-20: Reconstructed Original Orthography," ibid.

Blenkinsopp regards נָזֹרוּ אָחוֹר 'they turned back' in 1:4 and וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרִים 'and a devastation like the overthrow of strangers' in 1:7 as glosses.[9] If the phrases are removed, 1:2-9 conforms to the text model just the same. But נָזֹרוּ אָחוֹר (1:4) ties in nicely with תּוֹסִיפוּ סָרָה 'you continue to turn away' in 1:5. Emended per Ibn Ezra, וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זֶרֶם 'a desolation like a storm's devastation' (1:7) also suits the context.[10] Strangers (זָרִים) consume the land, and leave devastation like that caused by a torrential rain (זֶרֶם) (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 רֹב זִבְחֵיכֶם is not cliticized. The result is a stress and sound rhyme with a cognate phrase in 1:16 גַּם־כִּי־תַרְבּוּ. 1:15, I suggest, contains a double cliticization רֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיכֶם. The result is a stress rhyme with וּבְפָרְשְׂכֶם 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. כִּי־יִתְפֹּשׂ is read in 3:6, but כִּי כָשְׁלָה in 3:8; לֹא יָדַע in 1:3, but לֹא־אוּכַל in 1:13; הָעָם־הַזֶּה in 8:12, but הָעָם הַזֶּה in 9:14; וּנְשׂוּא־פָנִים in 3:3, but וּנְשׂוּא פָנִים in 8:11; אוֹי־לִי in 6:5, but אוֹי לִי in 24:16; וְעַד־רֹאשׁ in 1:6, but עַל מֶה in 1:5;

---

[9] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; Garden City: Doubleday, 2000) 177. נָזֹרוּ אָחוֹר 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, ²1966 [1875]) 3 [Hebr.]. A destroying foe is elsewhere compared to זרם in Isaiah (28:2).

in עַל כָּל־גֵּאֶה in 5:5, but אָשִׁירָה נָּא 5:1; עַל־כָּל־גְּדוֹתָיו in 8:7, but אוֹדִיעָה־נָּא in 2:12.

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.[11]

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 $40 + 50 = 90$ ($3 \times (12 + 18)$), 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 1QIs[a], 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.[12]

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.

---

[11] For the working hypothesis, see the writer's "Stress in Ancient Hebrew: A Tentative Reconstruction," www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com.

[12] Lesser breaks are attested after 1:6 and 1:16 in some mss. See Sebastian Brock, "Text Divisions in the Syriac Translations of Isaiah," in *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (ed. Ada Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg; JSOTSup 333; The Hebrew Bible and its Versions 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 200-221; 205, 209.

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) שמע 'hear,' (b) האזין 'give ear':

Isa 1:2	2:2	וְהַאֲזִינִי אֶרֶץ	שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמַיִם

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

---

[13] The confidence Fokkelman places in his strophic and stanzaic 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] שמע and האזין 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. שמע and הקשיב 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, האזין 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 הקשיב 'incline (the ear).'[16]

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.[17] 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:

3:3		עַם כְּבֶד עָוֹן	הוֹי גּוֹי חֹטֵא ✥
2:2		בָּנִים מַשְׁחִיתִים	זֶרַע מְרֵעִים ✥
(2:3):2	נָזֹרוּ אָחוֹר	נִאֲצוּ אֶת־קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל	עָזְבוּ אֶת־יַהְוֶה ✥

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; For VerbOcean, see http://semantics.isi.edu/ocean/.

[17] For the distinction between meter and rhythm, see Viktor Maksimovich Zhirmunsky, *Introduction to Metrics: The Theory of Verse* (tr. and ed. C.E. Brown; introd. Edward Stankiewicz and Walter N. Vickery; The Hague: Mouton, 1966) 171.

[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:

3:3	וְכָל לֵבָב דַּוָּי	כָּל רֹאשׁ לָחֳלִי	☞
2:3	אֵין בּוֹ מְתֹם	מִכַּף־רֶגֶל וְעַד־רֹאשׁ	☜

If we vocalize לָחֳלִי as לְחֹלִי (as in pause), רֶגֶל as רְגֶל, and אֵין as אַיִן 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.[19]

1:4-6 may illustrate. 1:4-5aα 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 (1:5aα). 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.

---

offered by Wilfred G. E. Watson does not note them (*Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* [2d ed.; JSOTSup 26, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995 (1st ed. 1984); corr. repr. with suppl. bibliog.; London: T & T Clark, 2005]; *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* [JSOTSup 170; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994]).

[19] One third of the lines in his corpus, O'Connor remarks, exhibit enjambment (*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)," *ZAW* 113 [2001] 370-95; 371).

1:4-6 is dominated by the enjambed structures just described, but a single two beat clause, 1:5aβ, a verset more consonant with 1:4 than 5-6, constitutes the stanza and section's (1:2-9) rhetorical peak: תּוֹסִיפוּ סָרָה '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:

2:3	עָרֵיכֶם שְׂרֻפוֹת אֵשׁ	אַרְצְכֶם שְׁמָמָה	[7] ꙳
(2:3):3	אַדְמַתְכֶם לְנֶגְדְּכֶם זָרִים אֹכְלִים אֹתָהּ וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרֵם		ꙸ
2:2	כְּסֻכָּה בְכָרֶם	וְנוֹתְרָה בַת־צִיּוֹן	[8] ꙳
2:2	כְּעִיר נְצוּרָה	כִּמְלוּנָה בְמִקְשָׁה	ꙸ

וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרֵם 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, זָרִים 'outsiders' metastasize into זָרֵם 'storm.' The simile, reinforced by rhymes that cut across strophe boundaries (וְנוֹתְרָה with וּשְׁמָמָה, כָרֶם with זָרֵם), 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 זָרִים/זָרֵם 'strangers/storm' is contained within a single line, enhancing its punch. The end alignment of זָרֵם 'storm' (1:7) and כָרֶם '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 ø … כְּ comparison of 8a with the כְּ … כְּ comparison of 8b, a heightened form of a ø … כְּ 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:

$a^1b^1_{:j}c^1d^1$	כְּסֻכָּה בְכָרֶם	וְנוֹתְרָה בַת־צִיּוֹן	꙳
		2:2	
2:2 $_xc^2d^2_{:jx}b^2a^2$	כְּעִיר נְצוּרָה	כִּמְלוּנָה בְמִקְשָׁה	ꙸ

'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 כִּמְעַט to be clause-initial. So construed, 1,9a becomes an enjambed bipartite line, and כִּמְעַט in 1,9b part of an initial rhyme scheme. A temporal connotation for כִּמְעַט 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):

[10] שִׁמְעוּ...		הַאֲזִינוּ...
[11] לָמָּה לִּי רֹב־זִבְחֵיכֶם		יֹאמַר יְהוָה
[16] רַחֲצוּ הִזַּכּוּ	הָסִירוּ רֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיכֶם מִנֶּגֶד עֵינָי	
[17] חִדְלוּ...לִמְדוּ... דִּרְשׁוּ	אַשְּׁרוּ... שִׁפְטוּ... רִיבוּ...	
[18] לְכוּ־נָא וְנִוָּכְחָה		יֹאמַר יְהוָה

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 לֹא 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

---

[20] The כְּ ... כְּ comparison means "like A, so B." Cf. Josh 14:11; Isa 24:2; Hos 4:9.

[21] The device of delayed identification is also employed in Isa 1:2-3 ('sons' . . . 'Israel').

[22] Discussions in Nico A. van Uchelen, "Isaiah 1,9 – Text and Context," *OTS* 21 (1981) 155-63; Hugh G. M. Williamson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1-27. Volume 1. Commentary on Isaiah 1-5* [ICC; London: T & T Clark, 2006] 53-53. For כִּמְעַט with a temporal connotation, cf. Ps 2:12; 81:15; Prov 5:14.

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 *kî* 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 לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ 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 לֹא חָפָצְתִּי 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). לֹא חָפָצְתִּי of 1:11, as already argued, is to be construed with 1:12. In 1:11-13a, A´B´ follows AB repeatedly:

	B=topic		A=comment		
	רֹב־זִבְחֵיכֶם		לָמָּה לִּי	(1)	[11]
וְחֵלֶב מְרִיאִים	עֹלוֹת אֵילִים		שָׂבַעְתִּי	(2)	
וּכְבָשִׂים וְעַתּוּדִים	וְדַם פָּרִים				
	כִּי־תָבֹאוּ לֵרָאוֹת פָּנָי		לֹא חָפָצְתִּי	(3)	[12]
רְמֹס חֲצֵרָי	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִיֶּדְכֶם			(4)	
	הָבִיא מִנְחַת		לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ	(5)	[13a]
	קְטֹרֶת		שָׁוְא	(6)	
	הִיא		תּוֹעֵבָה. . . לִי	(7)	

(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 בוֹא '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:

---

[23] Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (5th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968 [1892] 29).

[24] Williamson (*Isaiah 1-5*, 76-77) opts for a solution proposed by Ambrogio Spreafico, "Nahum I 10 and Isaiah I 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.

3:3 $x^1b^1c^1$:a^1_4 ld	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִיֶּדְכֶם	כִּי־תָבֹאוּ לֵרָאוֹת פָּנָי
2:2 b^2c^2:$_ja^2_2$ ld	לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ	רְמֹס חֲצֵרָי
3:(2:2) $x^2b^1c^1$:b^2c^2:$_jcd$ °-m	קְטֹרֶת תּוֹעֵבָה הִיא לִי	הָבִיא מִנְחַת ° שָׁוְא

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^1|x^2 and b^1c^1|b^2c^2. But on this prosodic parse, the vertical parallelism of the versets שָׁוְא קְטֹרֶת and וַעֲצָרָה חָדְשֵׁיכֶם per my reconstruction is lost. So is the vertical parallelism of לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ, לֹא חָפָצְתִּי, and שָׂבַעְתִּי. Foregrounding of the prohibition לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ 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:

[13b]	(1)	חֹדֶשׁ וְשַׁבָּת קְרֹא מִקְרָא	לֹא אוּכַל	
[14]	(2)	אָוֶן וַעֲצָרָה חָדְשֵׁיכֶם[25]	וּמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם שָׂנְאָה נַפְשִׁי	
	(3)	הָיוּ עָלַי לָטֹרַח	נִלְאֵיתִי נְשֹׂא	
[15]	(4)	וּבְפָרִשְׂכֶם כַּפֵּיכֶם	אַעְלִים עֵינַי מִכֶּם	
	(5)	גַּם כִּי־תַרְבּוּ תְפִלָּה	אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ	

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

יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִיֶּדְכֶם

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

The דָּם 'blood' (1:11) of ritual slaughter and the דָּמִים 'shed blood' (1:15) of orphan and widow whom they have not stooped to succor have become one in God's eyes.[26]

---

[25] Williamson emends חָדְשֵׁיכֶם to the "expected" חַגֵּיכֶם "because [חָדְשֵׁיכֶם] 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.

[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.[27] MT takes דִּרְשׁוּ מִשְׁפָּט as parallel to the following אַשְּׁרוּ חָמוֹץ in 1:17, but a construal of לִמְדוּ הֵיטֵב דִּרְשׁוּ מִשְׁפָּט with חִדְלוּ הָרֵעַ (interlocking generic exhortations) and אַשְּׁרוּ חָמוֹץ with שִׁפְטוּ יָתוֹם רִיבוּ אַלְמָנָה (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 1:11bγ-12 as follows:

3:2	$a^1b^1c^1{:}d^1e^1$	לִרְאוֹת פָּנָי	לֹא חָפָצְתִּי כִּי־תָבֹאוּ
3:2	$a^2b^2c^2{_2}{:}d^2e^2$	רְמֹס חֲצֵרָי	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִיֶּדְכֶם

Another example: 1:15:

	אַעְלִים עֵינַי מִכֶּם	וּבְפָרִשְׂכֶם כַּפֵּיכֶם
יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ	אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ	גַּם כִּי־תַרְבּוּ תְפִלָּה

The "a" versets of each line are exact rhythmic equivalents (4th class paeon + 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.[28] 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 multi-dimensional *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^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) [b^1:b^2 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 (hypernym / troponym) scores 1 [a^1:a^2 in Isa 1:10]:

---

[28] Words and constructions derive their meaning from both text-internal and text-external frames of reference. See Benjamin Harshav (Hrushovski), "An Outline of Integrational Semantics: An Understander's Theory of Meaning in Context," *Poetics Today* 3/4 (1982): 59-88; "Poetic Metaphor and Frames of Reference," *Poetics Today* 5 (1984) 5-43; "Fictionality and Fields of Reference: Remarks on a Theoretical Framework," *Poetics Today* 5 (1984) 227-51.

$a^1b^1{:}_j c^1_2 d$ אַעְלִים עֵינַי מִכֶּם   וּבְפָרִשְׂכֶם כַּפֵּיכֶם   15

$a^2b^2{:}_j c^2_2{:}\,\text{a̶b̶c̶}$ אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ   יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ   גַּם־כִּי־תַרְבּוּ תְפִלָּה

$a^1b^1c^1{:}_j d^1 e^1$ קְצִינֵי סְדֹם   שִׁמְעוּ דְבַר ° יְהוָה   10

$a^2b^2c^2{:}_j d^2 e^2$ הַאֲזִינוּ תוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ עַם עֲמֹרָה

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]:

יְהוָה אַל־בְּאַפְּךָ תוֹכִיחֵנִי   וְאַל־בַּחֲמָתְךָ תְיַסְּרֵנִי

$a^1.b^1{}_v c^1{}_v d^1 e^1.f^1{}_v g^1{:}_g b^2{}_v c^2{}_v d^2 e^2.f^2{}_v g^2$

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.[29] 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.

---

[29] Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*; Pieter van der Lugt, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job* (OTS 32; Leiden: Brill, 1995); idem, *Cantos and Strophes in Biblical Hebrew Poetry with Special Reference to the First Book of the Psalter* (OTS 53; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

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.[30]

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).

---

[30] For an overview of rhyme in post-biblical Hebrew poetry, see Benjamin Hrushovski [Harshav], "The Major Systems of Hebrew Rhyme: From the Piyyut to the Present Day (500 A.D. – 1970): An Essay on Basic Concepts (Hebr., with Eng. Summary)," *Hasifrut* 2 (1969) 721-49. On a theoretical level, see idem, "The Meaning of Sound Patterns in Poetry: An Interaction Theory," *Poetics Today* 2 (1980) 39-56. For sound orchestration in biblical poetry, see Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1985) 103-26.

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 (כַּאֲשֶׁר ... כֵּן ,וְ) or subordinating (פֶּן, לְמַעַן, כִּי, כַּאֲשֶׁר, אֲשֶׁר, 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 יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ. 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 וְ; גַּם, כִּי גַם, אַף; אֲבָל (late); כֵּן...כַּאֲשֶׁר; after a negative clause: כִּי, כִּי-אִם. 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, כַּאֲשֶׁר; שֶׁ, זוּ, אֲשֶׁר; בַּעֲבוּר, לְמַעַן, יַעַן; לוּלֵי. 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. וְ 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). גַּם כִּי conjoins the clause it introduces with the immediately preceding וְ-introduced clause 1x (1:15). Clause-initial function words have binding force because they create the expectation that that one or more dependent clauses will follow the clause they initiate. Examples: הוֹי (1:4); עַל-מֶה (1:5); לוּלֵי (1:9); לָמָּה (1:11); מִי (1:12); and אִם (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.

[32] "The Rhetoric of Isaiah 1:2-20: An Exploration," and "Reading Isaiah 1:2-20: A History," ibid.

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 *maqqeph* (־).[33] 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
2:(2:2)	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.
+m or –m	The addition or subtraction of a *maqqeph* vis-à-vis MT.
vd, ld	Change in verset division, or line division, vis-à-vis MT.
s_1d, s_2d, or s_3d	Change in strophe, stanza, or section division vis-à-vis MT.
cv כְּמְעָט	Change in vocalization vis-à-vis MT; MT following.
cj 4QIsaᶠ וְאָם	Conjecture based on witness; MT following.
°ce זָרִים	Conjectural emendation vis-à-vis MT; MT following.
4/9/24	A stanza consisting of 4 lines, 9 versets, and 24 stress units.
40/90/216 17/6/2/1	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.
p (or *h*)=0.5 (20/40)	Cases of *ssm* (semantic-syntactic-morphological) *parallelism* (or *hypotaxis*) per verset, averaged over 40 versets.
a^1b^1:$_jc^1d^1$ $_xc^2d^2$:$_{xj}b^2a^2$	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 $_x$); 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 $_j$).
$a^1b^1c^1$:$_gb^2c^2_2$	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

---

ישעיהו א 9-2

stats	code	notation	Hebrew (left)	Hebrew (right)	v
	(2:2):2	°+m	a¹b¹:a²b²:~~ab~~	כִּי־יְהוָה דִּבֵּר	שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמַיִם וְהַאֲזִינִי אֶרֶץ	2 ↯
	3:3	תִּי sfx 2x	a¹b¹b²:*a*²~~be~~	וְהֵם פָּשְׁעוּ בִי	בָּנִים גִּדַּלְתִּי וְרוֹמַמְתִּי	↯
	3:3	${}_g$=a²	a¹b¹c¹:${}_g$b²c²₂	וַחֲמוֹר אֵבוּס בְּעָלָיו	יָדַע שׁוֹר קֹנֵהוּ	3 ↯
4/9/24	3:3	יָדַע 2x לֹא v3a	ₓb³a³₂:b⁴a⁴₂	עַמִּי לֹא הִתְבּוֹנָן	יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יָדַע	↯
	3:3	v3 עַם|עַמִּי פָּשְׁעוּ|חֹטֵא v2	ab¹c¹:${}_j$b²c²₂	עַם כֶּבֶד עָוֹן	הוֹי	גּוֹי חֹטֵא	4 ↯
	2:2	בָּנִים	v2 יִם sfx 3x	${}_j$b³c³:${}_j$b⁴c⁴	בָּנִים מַשְׁחִיתִים	זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	↯
	(2:3):2	v2 פָּשְׁעוּ בִי|עָזְבוּ אֶת־י|נִאֲצוּ אֶת־ק	${}_j$a¹b¹:${}_j$a²b²₂:${}_j$a³₂	נִאֲצוּ אֶת־קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל נָזֹרוּ אָחוֹר	עָזְבוּ אֶת־יְהוָה	↯
	3:2	נָזֹרוּ	סָרָה v4 *°+m	${}_j$ab¹c:*b*²e	תּוֹסִיפוּ סָרָה	עַל־מֶה תֻכּוּ עוֹד	5 ↯
	3:3	כָּל 2x °-m cv	a¹b¹c¹:a²b²c²	וְכָל לֵבָב דַּוָּי	כֹּל °רֹאשׁ לָחֳלִי	↯
	2:3	רֹאשׁ	v5 °-m	b³₂:${}_j$c³₃	אֵין °בּוֹ מְתֹם	מִכַּף־רֶגֶל וְעַד־רֹאשׁ	6 ↯
	2:2	הָ v5 תֻכּוּ	מַכָּה sfx 3x	${}_j$(a¹a²:a³₂)	וּמַכָּה טְרִיָּה	פֶּצַע וְחַבּוּרָה	↯
8/18/44	(2:2):3	°-m a¹...b²|a¹a² v6b a³b³₂|a³₂ v6b לֹא	${}_j$(a¹b¹:a²b²:a³b³₂)	וְלֹא רֻכְּכָה בַּשָּׁמֶן	לֹא °זֹרוּ וְלֹא חֻבָּשׁוּ	↯
3x						
				עָרֵיכֶם שְׂרֻפוֹת אֵשׁ	אַרְצְכֶם שְׁמָמָה	7 ↯
	2:3		a¹b¹:a²b²₂	זָרִים אֹכְלִים אֹתָהּ וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת	אַדְמַתְכֶם לְנֶגְדְּכֶם	↯
	(2:3):3	שְׁמָמָה 2x sfx 4x כֶם זָרִים °ce v4 נָזֹן	a³₂:${}_j$b³₃:${}_j$b⁴₃		זָרִם	
	2:2)		a¹b¹:${}_j$c¹d¹	כְּסֻכָּה בְכָרֶם	וְנוֹתְרָה בַת־צִיּוֹן	8 ↯
	2:2	הָ v7 עָרֵיכֶם	עִיר sfx 5x	ₓc²d²:${}_{jx}$b²a²	כְּעִיר נְצוּרָה	כִּמְלוּנָה בְמִקְשָׁה	↯
	3:3	vv2,4 יְהוָה צ v8 וְנוֹתְרָה	הוֹתִיר	ab₂:${}_j$cde	הוֹתִיר לָנוּ שָׂרִיד	לוּלֵי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	9 ↯
6/13/32	3:2	°vd °cv כִּמְעַט 6x נו sfx 3x כ/כְּ כִּמְעַט	ab¹c¹:${}_g$b²c²	{פ} לַעֲמֹרָה דָּמִינוּ	כִּמְעַט כִּסְדֹם הָיִינוּ	↯

18/40/100 8/3/1

$p = 3$ (122/40) $h = 0.2$ (8/40)

ישעיהו א 20-10

	3:2	$a^1b^1c^1{:}_jd^1e^1$	˚-m v2 שִׁמְעוּ| הַאֲזִינִי|ד י |ד v2	שִׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה קְצִינֵי סְדֹם	☙ 10
	3:2	$a^2b^2c^2{:}_jd^2e^2$	עֲמֹרָה, ס v9 אֶל|לָנוּ, הָ״נוּ, דָ״נוּ	הַאֲזִינוּ תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ עַם עֲמֹרָה	☙
	3:2	$a_2bc{:}ab$	˚-m	לָמָּה־לִּי רֹב־זִבְחֵיכֶם יֹאמַר יְהוָה	☙ 11
	3:2	$ab^1c^1{:}_jb^2c^2$	זִבְחֵיכֶם|עֹלוֹת	שָׂבַעְתִּי עֹלוֹת אֵילִים וְחֵלֶב מְרִיאִים	☙
	2:2	$_jb^3c^3{:}_jc^4c^5$	ים sfx 5x	וְדַם פָּרִים וּכְבָשִׂים וְעַתּוּדִים	☙
	2:3	$a^1b^1{:}_jc^1d^1e^1$	˚ld (cf. Is 14:29) ˚*+m ˚cv לִרְאוֹת	לֹא חָפָצְתִּי ˚ כִּי־תָבֹאוּ לִרְאוֹת פָּנֵי	☙ 12
7/14/34	3:2	$a^2b^2c^2{}_2{:}_jd^2e^2$	aligned v11 מִי|לָמָּה|מִ שֶׁ|לֹא חָ|מִי v11	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִיֶּדְכֶם רְמֹס חֲצֵרָי	☙
	2:2	$ab{:}_jcd^1$-m	˚cv v5 מִנְחַת תוֹ|לֹא תוֹ|לֹא v12	לֹא תוֹסִיפוּ הָבִיא מִנְחַת	☙ 13
	2:3	$a^1d^2{:}a^2d^3c$	vd vd לִי|v11 תָבֹאוּ|הָבִיא v12↑	שָׁוְא ˚ קְטֹרֶת תּוֹעֵבָה הִיא לִי	☙
	(2:2):2	$a^1a^2{:}_ja^3{}_2{:}_jb^1{}_2$	*s₁d ˚ld -m א לֹא|חָ לֹא ˚ v12	חֹדֶשׁ וְשַׁבָּת ˚ קְרֹא מִקְרָא לֹא ˚ אוּכַל	☙
	3:3	$_xb^2{}_2a^4{:}_xa^5b^3{}_2$	vd vv13 קָ|עַ וַ|חָ חֹ|חָ וְשׁ v13	אָוֶן וַעֲצָרָה ˚ חָדְשֵׁיכֶם וּמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם שָׂנְאָה נַפְשִׁי	☙ 14
	3:2	$_gb^4{}_3{:}b^5{}_2$	g= וּמוֹ״כֶם...חָ״יכֶם וּמוֹ|מִ קְרָא v13↑	הָיוּ עָלַי לָטֹרַח נִלְאֵיתִי נְשֹׂא	☙
	2:3	$a^1b^1{:}_jc^1{}_2d$	כֶם sfx 3x vv13c-15: aligned 1sg 6x↓	וּבְפָרִשְׂכֶם כַּפֵּיכֶם אַעְלִים עֵינַי מִכֶּם	☙ 15
7/16/38	(2:2):3	$a^2b^2{:}_jc^2{}_2{:}abc$	˚+m יְדֵי|יֶדְכֶם v12 רַב|תַר v11 דָ|דְמ v11	גַּם כִּי־תַרְבּוּ תְפִלָּה אֵינֶנִּי שֹׁמֵעַ יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ	☙
	2:(3:2)	$a^1a^2{:}a^3bc{:}_jde$	s₂d {ס} v17 מַ ״ רֹעַ|רַע ז ״|כֶם רַב v11 עֵינָי|v15	רַחֲצוּ הִזַּכּוּ הָסִירוּ רֹעַ מַעַלְלֵיכֶם מִנֶּגֶד עֵינָי	☙ 16
	2:(2:2)	$a^1b^1{:}a^2b^2{:}a^3b^3$	*˚ld ˚ld הָרַע|רֹעַ ״ מְרֵעַ v4 b²|b¹ a³|a² v16↑	חִדְלוּ הָרֵעַ ˚ לִמְדוּ הֵיטֵב דִּרְשׁוּ מִשְׁפָּט	☙ 17
	2:(2:2)	$a^1b^1{:}a^2b^2{:}a^3b^3$	שַׁפְטוּ|מִשְׁפָּט b¹|b²|b³ a¹b¹|a¹b¹ v17a	אַשְּׁרוּ חָמוֹץ שִׁפְטוּ יָתוֹם רִיבוּ אַלְמָנָה {ס}	☙
	2:2	$ab{:}ab$	v11 וְ|יֹאמַר יְהוָה	לְכוּ־נָא וְנִוָּכְחָה יֹאמַר יְהוָה	☙ 18
	3:2	$a^1b^1c^1d^1{:}_xd^2b^2$	גּוֹי ח|v16 מַ ״כֶם|חַ ״כֶם v4	אִם־יִהְיוּ חֲטָאֵיכֶם כַּשָּׁנִים כַּשֶּׁלֶג יַלְבִּינוּ	☙
	2:2	$a^2{}_xb^3{}_gd^3{:}_xd^4b^4$	יַא|דָ v15 יִהְיוּ v11 דָם 2x g=c²	אִם־יַאְדִּימוּ כַתּוֹלָע כַּצֶּמֶר יִהְיוּ	☙
	2:3	$a^1b^1{:}c^1{}_2d^1$	שֶׁ|וּשׁ v10 הֵיטֵ v17 תֹּא הָ אַתָּה|ט ז אָכ זֵ v7	אִם־תֹּאבוּ וּשְׁמַעְתֶּם טוּב הָאָרֶץ תֹּאכֵלוּ	☙ 19
8/20/44	(2:2):3	$a^2b^2{:}c^2d^2{:}abc$	˚*+m cj 4QIsaᶠ וְאִם cj תֵּאָכֵלוּ	אִם־תְּמָאֲנוּ וּמְרִיתֶם חֶרֶב תְּאֻכְּלוּ כִּי־פִּי יְהוָה דִּבֵּר {פ}	☙ 20

חָ תֵּ״|כִּי־פִּי י|ד אִם 4x vv5-6   v2 וּמְרֵ|תֹּס סָרָה|וּמְרֵ v5↑

22/50/116 9/3/1 $p = 3$ (150/50) $h = 0.2$ (9/50)

18/40/100+22/50/116 = 40/90/216   8/3/1+9/3/1= 17/6/2/1