
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

light, others have lamps that show a cold green, others again have lamps that glimmer a muddy purple. But some of us carry lamps whose flame shines steady gold. That sounds as mysterious as the bulge under the overcoat—doesn't it?

What colour of lamp have you? I can tell you; for though I don't see the actual flame I can tell by your face and your actions, the colour your lamp is burning. Is your lamp burning red? Then I'm afraid there will be angry sparks in your eyes and a black line between your brows. Your hands will be often clenched. Your feet will be given to stamping. You will flare up at trifles. And people will say, 'What a dreadful temper!'

Is your light green? Then your eyes will always be looking round the corner at some one else's belongings. 'I wish I had nice clothes like so and so.' 'It's a shame that such and such a person has so many treats.' 'I want this.' 'Give me that.' 'Me too!' will be the words that are oftenest on your lips. Hard lines will grow round your mouth, and your companions will say, 'Grabby thing!' because your lamp will be showing the green light of jealousy and greed.

Does your lamp burn darkish purple? Then your mouth will have a droop at each corner and a pout in the middle. Your eyes will seem only half-open. You will skulk about in corners and look altogether a most unpleasant person, and outsiders will remark, 'The sulks again!'

Does your lamp give a beautiful golden glow? Then your eyes will be clear and bright. Your lips will be ready to smile. You'll be jolly and happy, and willing to run an errand or lend a helping hand. You'll sing or whistle at your work, and your friends will say—well, I think I had better not tell you what they will say. It might make you conceited.

Have you caught the idea? Our hidden lamps are our characters, our natures, our dispositions, our tempers—whichever you like to call them. They shine out unmistakably in our faces and our actions. We may try to pretend to others that we are burning a golden light when our flame is really red or green or purple, but we shall not be able to keep up the pretence long, for sooner or later the true colour will show.

Now, how shall we contrive to burn a golden flame? It depends on who lights our lamp and how we trim it. You see it is not a case of the glass being coloured. It is the case of the flame itself having a colour.

If we ourselves light our lamps we shall find that our flames will be at the best unsatisfactory. Some days they will burn one colour, some days another. We shall never be able to depend on them. The only way to make sure of the true golden light is to ask God to light them for us. Our text says, 'Thou wilt light my lamp.' And 'Thou' is just God. If we tell Him that we want to be His lamps and to shine for Him He will pour into us the oil of His Holy Spirit and set us afire with His love.

Then when He has lit the flame we must trim it carefully, for, of course, you know that a badly trimmed lamp never burns well. The trimming is our duty—not God's—and trimming our lamps means prayer. That is the best preparation for any day's work. That will keep our flame pure and bright. Then the world will see that we are trying to be God's children, for our lamps are burning steady gold.

Pioneers in the Study of Old Testament Poetry.

By Professor the Rev. A. R. Gordon, M.A., D.Litt., Montreal.

Ley and the Metricists.[1]

As the result of continued study of the poetical texts, Lowth's principle of parallelism had become firmly established; and this being now related to the 'pulse-beat' of rhythm, it was widely assumed by Old Testament scholars about the middle of the nineteenth century that practically the last word had been said on the subject. Representative critics like De Wette, Olshausen, and Hupfeld all operate with the formula of 'rhythm of thought.'

[1] The English reader will find the most careful and complete survey of this whole field in W. H. Cobb's *Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre* (Oxford, 1905), a work to which the present writer is greatly indebted, though he has closely studied at first hand the various systems passed in review.

But it was felt increasingly that parallelism was too much of an external form to be an adequate expression of the rhythmical throb of poetry. To communicate to other hearts the 'pulse-beat' he first felt in his own, the poet must impart a rhythmical movement to his words also. This movement being equally subject to the law of 'measure,' Hebrew poetry, like that of other nations, must be in some sense metrical. To this question the succeeding generation of scholarship seriously addressed itself.

No real help was to be derived here from tradition. The Jewish writers, Josephus and Philo, and Christian scholars like Origen, Eusebius and Jerome, had indeed spoken of Hebrew poetry as metrical, and compared the structure of the battle-songs, Psalms and Job, with the hexameters, tetrameters, and trimeters of Greek verse. But the only result of such comparisons was to lead subsequent investigators astray. The first Western scholars to raise the problem of Hebrew metre—Gomarus, Meibomius, Clericus, etc.—all attempted to force the texts into classical *schemata*. It was an easy matter, therefore, for each to expose the weakness of the others' theories, and for a careful scholar like Lowth to dismiss them all as baseless. Yet the instinctive feeling prevailed that their searchings were not after mere delusions. As we have seen, while Lowth recognized that he had 'embarked upon an ocean dishonoured by the shipwreck of many eminent men,' he was convinced that there was a real land to be discovered, if only one could strike the course. For sixty more years this course remained shrouded in impenetrable mists, until a bright gleam was thrown into the darkness by J. J. Bellermann's *Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer* (Berlin, 1813). Like his predecessors, Bellermann began with the fixed idea that Hebrew metre depended on the quantity of the syllables. But instead of determining this quantity by classical standards of measurement, he fell back on the Massoretic theory of *morœ*, or time-units.[1] As a further help in this direction, he introduced the then novel principle of *accentuation*, happily supposing that the accent must rest on the long syllable of the poetic foot. Treating the Massoretic system as a sufficiently exact representation of the original, he found the prevailing foot to be iambic or anapæstic, thus freeing himself from the old classical tradition of epic hexameters and the like. On this basis Bellermann erected a metrical system which often strikingly anticipates the results of more modern investigators. The most interesting example of this *rapprochement* is seen in the analysis of La 3, where he observed that 'the second hemistich 50 times over consists of two feet, while the first hemistich as a rule counts three.' In consequence he proposed to describe this measure as 'five-footed' (p. 137)—a considerably nearer approach than Lowth had made to Budde's *kînāh* measure. Nothing could show more clearly that Bellermann had touched a true line of progress.

The new theory was subjected to a searching analysis by the Jewish scholar Saalschütz in his learned work *Von der Form der hebräischen Poesie* (Königsberg, 1825). The keenest criticism is naturally directed against Bellermann's use of the *morœ* doctrine, which is virtually discounted by his own appeal to accent. On one or two other weak spots he likewise lays his finger—especially the treatment of the sh^{e}va. But Saalschütz goes much further astray in frankly abandoning the Massoretic system, and placing the accent as a rule on the penultimate syllable, as the majority of modern Jews do. Thus he resolves Hebrew poetry into a scheme of trochaic and dactylic feet, riding roughshod over the difficulties that still present themselves by an indiscriminate elision of troublesome syllables.

At this stage Ernst Meier entered the field. With the more technical equipment of a Professor of Oriental languages in Tübingen he combined a genuine appreciation of poetry, and a long and loving interest in Suabian folk-lore. For the understanding of the literature of the Old Testament he felt he had 'gained far more through his travels of discovery in Suabia than he could ever have done by a journey to Jerusalem.' This preparation, at all events, led him to study Old Testament poetry mainly from the æsthetic point of view. In his prefatory volume on *Die Form der hebräischen Poesie* (Tübingen, 1853) he begins with a clear recognition of the priority of lyrical poetry, and the essentially lyrical character of Hebrew poetry. This, he argues, of necessity involves a rhythmical

[1] According to this theory, a long vowel has two *morœ*, a short vowel one, and the sh^{e}va, whether simple or composite, none; each consonant again has one *mora*, unless they be divided by sh^{e}va, when the two are credited with but one. Thus the normal quantity of each syllable is three *morœ*. The tone-syllable has also usually three, though by rule of accent sometimes two or four.

measure, not merely of the thoughts, as Ewald and De Wette had maintained, but of the flow of sound as well, such being the only real channel through which the poet can convey the play of his feeling to other hearts. The many attempts to extract a syllabic measure from the Hebrew texts had failed; but there still remained the possibility of a *purely accentual metre*—as seen, for example, in the old German songs he knew so intimately. This principle Meier found by repeated experiment to be the actually determining one in Hebrew poetry. 'The rhythmical measure, the musical tact, that can be wanting in no true song, is marked by the accent, which is precisely the same in poetry as in common prose. It depends on the poet's pleasure in the arrangement of the verse which syllables in a word shall receive the chief tone and accent. . . . The accented syllables may be preceded or followed by as many subordinate unaccented syllables as can be pronounced within the given duration of time' (p. 24 f.). Thus at a single stroke Meier freed the accentual principle from its old 'quantitative' envelope. Unfortunately, he insisted on reducing the poetical texts into uniform verselets of two tone-syllables, yielding much the same metrical effect as the modern march-rhythm. To carry out this scheme he had no hesitation in freely altering the texts wherever the theory demanded it. This has naturally exposed Meier to sharp criticism, and in many quarters even to a species of contempt. But he deserves the credit of having cleared the way for more systematic work along natural lines.[1]

Julius Ley is justly regarded as the father of modern metrical criticism. Earlier scholars had made valuable suggestions; but Ley was the first to develop an all-round system on a firm basis of principle. For over thirty-five years he laboured incessantly at the subject, passing his views through the crucible of constant scrutiny and revision, quick to profit by reasonable criticism, and never hesitating to amend his scheme when fresh facts required it. His first published work on *Die metrischen Formen der hebräischen Poesie* (Leipzig, 1866) was a renewed attempt to find in the length of syllables the characteristic law of Hebrew metre, with alliteration as the 'binding principle.' But this crude theory he soon left far behind. The general tendency of the rule of *morœ* to make all syllables equal in value seemed of itself sufficient to disprove the various quantitative systems. Thus he was led with Meier to accept the accent as the determining principle of Hebrew metre. This view he elaborated in a series of careful studies, the most complete statement being found in his *Grundzüge des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebräischen Poesie* (Halle, 1875), the first really scientific hand-book on the subject. The treatise opens with a general presentation of the case for metre, and a vindication of the value of the Massoretic system in determining the position of the accent. Ley then proceeds to build up his metrical structure. The basis, as has been stated, is the accent. In the normal verse each significant word has at least one accented syllable; and as a rule this constitutes the most important element in the word. But the remaining syllables are not metrically indifferent. According to the 'law of ascendency,' which Ley derives directly from the principle of symmetry, each tone-syllable is approached by a series of accentual gradations, forming a *scale of harmonies* in tone. The actual number of these subordinate syllables is limited by no fixed rule, though naturally a change in the number tends to prolong or quicken the movement, and thus to produce the effect of quiet meditation or pathos on the one hand and animation or impetuosity on the other (p. 14 ff.). This statement of general principles is followed by detailed Grammar of metrical forms and values, which remains the foundation for all future discussions of the subject. Here Ley canvasses such questions as the accentual significance of construct phrases, pausal forms, particles, enclitics, etc., and thereafter proceeds to a classification of metrical lines, on the familiar model of the octameter, hexameter, etc. (p. 22 ff.). The most interesting of these verse-forms is what Ley describes as the 'elegiac pentameter' of Lamentations, that measure to which Lowth and Bellermann had already directed attention, in the sinking cadence of which he finds 'the most affecting and awe-inspiring expression of pain, despair, and weariness' to be met with in poetic literature (p. 52).

As a practical test of Ley's metrical theory, a number of Psalms and other poetical pieces are selected for rhythmical analysis. Dr. Cobb has

[1] The writer is glad to find himself in such cordial agreement with Dr. Cobb in his appreciation of the value of Meier's work (*op. cit.*, p. 73 ff.).

pointed out that some of the most difficult are carefully avoided. But even in those we are invited to study, after all necessary excisions have been made, there remain irregularities which Ley at this stage can explain only through the hypothesis of 'compensations,' that is, the tacking of a short line upon a long one, or *vice versa*, to enable both to be regarded as normal (p. 77 ff.). This and other glaring defects in Ley's original presentation of his system made him the object of much damning criticism. The most effective attack was delivered by Karl Budde, then a young man of twenty-four, just beginning his distinguished career as a student of Old Testament literature. The subject of his inaugural lecture was 'On certain supposed metrical forms in Hebrew Poetry,' and the most important part of the lecture was published in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, p. 747 ff.[1] After a running refutation of earlier theories, Budde opens fire direct on Ley. He assails the whole position. He will not even admit the general principle that a metrical movement is necessary to song and music, pointing to the earliest Egyptian and German melodies, and the chants of the English Church service, which in his judgment prove conclusively that what is demanded in poetry is not a strict rhythmical measure, but rather harmony with musical time (p. 748 f.). He next pours contempt on Ley's supposed rules of metre. 'In reality Ley knows so well how to make a fresh rule out of every exception, that one feels much less inclined to offer objections to the rules themselves, than to pit them against the author' (p. 759). Coming to closer quarters with the system itself, he applies Ley's principles to some thirty poems, with the result that he finds 'not a single one which did not show marked departures from Ley's rules, and many in which he could discover no possible ground on which he might propose to base his system.' Till Ley's actual analysis of texts appeared, he 'must be permitted to regard the system in question as but a huge delusion of the author's,' the only real value of the work, so far as he could see, consisting in the fresh emphasis it had laid on 'the peculiarly pleasing equipoise of rhythm' which prevails through much of the poetry (p. 764).

From the general wreck Budde was able to bring to land but one precious piece of salvage. Ley had once more called attention to the peculiar metrical structure of Lamentations. Budde submitted the Book to a fresh analysis, and found that, with the exception of ch. 5, the whole was cast in the same 'limping' rhythm, a full *stichos* of three or four words being followed by a broken one of two or three. This measure he traced through many elegiac passages in the prophetic literature (*e.g.*, Am $5^{1ff.}$, Is $14^{4ff.}$, Ez $19^{1ff.}$, etc.), and in Psalms of lamentation, as well as those bearing on the fortunes of Jerusalem (notably the 'Songs of Ascent'), finding in its broken accents a deliberate echo of the usual lament for the dead, and naming it in consequence the *ḳînāh* rhythm. The publication of Budde's observations in the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1882, p. 1 ff., and 1883, p. 299 ff., marked a real epoch in metrical research. At least one 'definite rhythmical form' had been established beyond possibility of doubt or cavil. Thus a sure basis was laid for future advance. Pursuing his investigations, Budde discovered that the *ḳînāh* measure was by no means confined to songs of lamentation, but was widely employed in prophetic outpourings and Psalms (like $19^{8ff.}$ $27^{1ff.}$ 84, etc.) where the feeling rose to unwonted heights of jubilant joy or triumph. In the *Z.A.T.W.*, 1891, p. 234 ff., and 1892, pp. 31 ff., 261 ff., he published these fresh results, with the explanation that the *ḳînāh* note came to be associated specially with 'songs of Zion,' and was thence transferred to others of peculiarly intense lyrical quality. It must be generally felt that this explanation is too artificial to be really satisfying. We should be inclined rather to regard the breaking of the measure as a genuine reflexion in rhythm of the choking utterance which any keen emotion tends to induce, whether the emotion be one of joy or of sorrow. In this connexion one may point out that the elegiac measure in both Greek and Latin poetry came likewise to be extended to love-songs, epigrams, and other outflowings of the passion of affection, friendship or hatred.

While the storm thus raged around Ley's head, the Roman Catholic scholar, Gustav Bickell of Vienna, launched his remarkable *tour de force*. Coming to the subject fresh from the study of

[1] Budde's assault was delivered, of course, not against the *Grundzüge*, which only appeared in 1875, but against the earlier statement of Ley's views in the *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 1871–72. Here the illustrative examples were wanting, but the general principles were essentially the same as in the formal treatise.

Syriac poetry, he maintained that Hebrew verse also is measured by a strict alternation of accented and unaccented syllables, whether in the iambic or the trochaic mode. This new syllabic system Bickell developed in the Introduction to his two principal works, *Metrices biblicæ regulæ exemplis illustratæ* (Innsbruck, 1879) and *Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrice* (Innsbruck, 1882), at the same time giving a compendious statement of his general principles in the *Z.D.M.G.*, 1881, p. 415, as follows: — 'Hebrew metrics rest on the same foundations as the *Syriac*, and its daughter the Christian Greek, namely, on the *counting of syllables*, the disregarding of quantity, the regular alternation of accented and unaccented syllables, the identity of metrical and grammatical accent, the exact coincidence of the verse-lines (*stichoi*) with the divisions of the sense, and the combination of homogeneous or heterogeneous *stichoi* into symmetrical strophes.' The scheme of metrical rules drawn up by Bickell is so cumbrous, and the application of the rules the occasion of so much arbitrary manipulation of the text, the scansion too is often so stilted and wooden, that the system has now become thoroughly discredited, even though Bickell's poetical instinct, and his many brilliant emendations, have won deserved admiration, and contributed in no small degree towards a more convincing solution of the problem.

Yet another metrical suggestion was put forth during these years of ferment. Hubert Grimme acknowledged himself a grateful and loyal disciple of Ley's. But he saw certain defects in his system, notably his entire disregard of the *time* element in rhythm, which he himself proposed to remedy. If poetry was to be brought into spiritual harmony with music, he felt, there must be certain limits imposed upon the length of the feet. To effect this quantitative requirement, Grimme reverted to the old principle of the *morœ*. No difficulty was involved either in the case of the main tone-syllable, on which the full stress rested, or in that of the weak syllable, which was as invariably unaccented; the question of quantity arose only in regard to the secondary accents, the bearers of which were raised to full tone-syllables or reduced to weak ones according to the sum of the *morœ* (cf. Grimme's articles in the *Z.D.M.G.*, 1893, p. 276 ff.; 1896, p. 529 ff., etc.; and the more systematic treatises, *Grundzüge der hebräischen Akzent. und Vokallehre*, 1896, and *Psalmenprobleme*, 1902). It may well be questioned whether this yields the true time quantity of which we are in search; and in any case Grimme is far from consistent in his carrying through of the principle. But he has earned the sincere gratitude of students for having set in such clear light an essential element that was almost neglected.

In the meanwhile Ley was quietly perfecting his own system. Amid so much harsh criticism he was greatly encouraged by the sympathy he received from the veteran Olshausen, as well as by Riehm's appreciative review of the *Grundzüge* in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1877, p. 573 ff. Riehm still remained convinced that the metrical form was but an accident, and that the only real principle of Hebrew poetry was the 'rhythm of the sentences.' He perceived, too, the fatal weakness of Ley's rule of compensation. But he admitted that, if there is such a thing as metre in the poetry, Ley's principle of accentuation 'is the only possible one.' He cordially acknowledged, too, the great service he had rendered in opening the eyes and ears of students to the fine rhythm of tone that distinguishes Hebrew lyrics 'to a far greater degree than is usually imagined.' Ley was not slow to accept Riehm's suggestion. In his supplementary *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebräischen Poesie* (Halle, 1887) he entirely discarded the objectionable principle of compensation, and allowed a far greater measure of freedom in the metrical movement than his original hypothesis warranted. Nor was this the last of his concessions. In two posthumous articles in the *Z.A.T.W.*, 1901–02, on the metrical analysis of Ps 45 and Is 1, he abandoned the misleading classical terminology of his earlier works in favour of the simple notation, *4-*, *3-*, *2-pulse measure*, etc. In a still further investigation of the metre of Deutero-Isaiah, published in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1903, p. 1 ff., he admitted Grimme's main contention that a certain weight ought to be attached to the number of unaccented syllables in determining the character of the feet, though the nearness of his end prevented his completing the system in this respect.

As his theory developed, Ley was steadily gaining adherents. The most notable was Professor Eduard Sievers, the distinguished exponent of German phonetic principles. He had hitherto taken practically no interest in Hebrew metre, accepting the current *dictum* of Old Testament scholars that Hebrew poetry was non-metrical.

About the beginning of 1898, however, his Leipzig colleague and friend, Franz Buhl, handed him a few selected transcripts of poetical passages, such as Dt 32, La 3, and Job 3. The very first he examined, Dt 32, he was delighted to find 'clearly and almost completely metrical,' in the general form of anapæstic verse. This first impression was strengthened by each successive examination of poetical texts. Within a month he was able to present before the Leipzig Academy of Science a paper 'On the rhythmical principles of Hebrew verse-structure.' Extending his studies over a still wider field, he published in 1901 the first of a projected series of elaborate *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik*, a work that created a profound impression, both from the philological reputation of its author and from the importance of the results.

In his specially valuable 'Preliminary discussions on universal rhythm' Sievers puts himself into complete *rapport* with the general principles on which Meier and Ley had based their systems. Like all other expressions of musical art, poetry is marked by a 'movement in time,' which is described as *rhythm* when 'regularly measured and articulated.' The substratum of this movement can be no mere relation of thoughts, but must consist in successions of sound and pause. The constitutive factors of rhythm are *division of time* and *gradation in stress*. In music the time-values are exact, and the rhythm in consequence 'rational'; but in poetry much more freedom is allowed, the rhythm being thus 'irrational.' Much of the confusion regarding metre, according to Sievers, arises from applying musical time-values to poetry, and thus insisting that the normal principle of metre is quantity. He holds that no real progress in metrical theory can be made, unless we admit the equal claims of 'accentual' rhythm. The actual character of the metre must be decided by the ear, the test being the immediate rhythmical effect the poetry produces on the hearer (p. 3 ff.). By this test Sievers finds Hebrew poetry as completely rhythmical as any other. Nor is he long in detecting that the metrical principle here is *accentual*. Thus far he is in perfect accord with Meier and Ley. But their disregard of the falling syllables leaves them without control of the verse as a whole. Ley's verses, in fact, are 'no verse-structures at all, but simply conglomerates of numbered syllable-heaps of rhythmically indifferent form and length' (p. 83 ff.). Taking both elements into account, and studying the texts with sufficient attention, one must observe, he thinks, that the predominant character of the Hebrew verse is *anapæstic*, though protractions of the previous rise in accent will yield us the iambic, and resolutions of the main accent into its component elements, with 'hovering rhythms' and other such ingenuities, provide us with any required type of foot (p. 149 ff.).

The importance of Sievers' contribution can hardly be exaggerated. For the first time Hebrew metrics stood vitally related to general rhythmical principles. This won the sympathy of many who had hitherto remained sceptical or indifferent. The decision with which Sievers placed himself on the side of the 'accentual' theory accelerated its victory. He filled up, too, various gaps in the system, especially through his clear intuition of the relation of poetry to music, and his recognition of the metrical value of unaccented syllables and even of pauses. But his resolution of the whole scheme of Hebrew poetry into anapæstic feet constitutes a narrowness of vision. His confusion of poetic metre with simple rhythm also leads to an obliteration of the lines that distinguish prose from verse, and hence to a theory which treats practically the whole of Hebrew literature as poetry (cf. his later *Studien* on the metrical form of Genesis, etc.). There was still need, therefore, for a treatment of the problem which should draw the lines more precisely, and yet allow for legitimate freedom of movement. The last important work on metrical principles, J. W. Rothstein's *Grundzüge des hebräischen Rhythmus* (Leipzig, 1909), supplements Sievers mainly in these two directions. At the outset a clear distinction is drawn between poetry and prose, however elevated and even rhythmical the latter may be. For Rothstein the essential connexion of poetry with song and dance involves a *regular* measure, while prose rhythm is restrained only by the movement of the sentence (p. 5 ff.). He is insistent, therefore, on the regularity of the metre. Each poem is a rhythmical unity, the keynote of which is struck in the opening measure, and which maintains its metrical harmony through successive verses and strophes (p. 43 ff.). Thus Rothstein claims the right of eliminating all that offends against regularity. The second main objection he had brought against Sievers was the inadequacy of his textual criticism. And certainly

this charge cannot be laid to his account. No recent scholar has gone further than Rothstein in his merciless excision of words, lines, and verses that would leave us with mixtures of metre. But along with this he combines the truest feeling for poetic *freedom*. 'The rhythmical speech moves within fixed bounds, and presses forward by well-marked steps, yet within these limits it enjoys a remarkable measure of freedom and elasticity' (p. 27). Rothstein recognizes that Hebrew rhythm is mainly rising, and that the predominant measure is anapæstic; but he refuses to follow Sievers in confining the rhythm to any one definite mould. He holds fast to the principle of freedom in the number of unaccented syllables in a foot, though the musical time of the poetry will hardly find room for more than three (p. 40 f.). In the same way he pleads for more freedom than Ley had allowed in his scheme of metrical values. As we find in the case of modern poetry, the feeling of the poem will often make rules for itself. Thus to catch the real pulse of poetry, it is above all necessary to enter sympathetically into the poet's heart (p. 34 f.). In other respects as well, Rothstein does justice to the importance of the feeling. The broken rhythm of elegiac poetry he explains, in the way we have suggested above, as the natural accompaniment of intense emotion. Other measures are brought into the same immediate relation with feeling (p. 57 ff.). In his Commentary on selected poems this psychological aspect of rhythm receives far more attention than the usual commentator deigns to bestow on the subject. Nor should one fail to notice the admirable reflections on the melodious effects produced by the interplay of vowels and consonants—a subject that has hardly yet been touched by Old Testament scholars, but which is surely of vital significance for the æsthetic appreciation of the poetry.

The general impression left on our mind by this survey of metrical theories, checked by a study of the texts, and comparison with the rhythmical form of ancient Babylonian poetry and modern Palestinian folk-song,[1] is that the main trend of opinion represented by Meier, Ley, Sievers, and Rothstein marks a real advance, but that much ground still remains to be covered. We imagine few will share Rothstein's confidence that the whole problem of Hebrew metre is now 'solved through positive knowledge of its principle and forms,' only a few details yet remaining to be filled in (*op. cit.*, p. 23). In books like Lamentations, and in many of the Psalms, and large sections of Job, the rhythmical movement can be followed with comparative confidence. But other poetical passages, especially the folk-songs and certain of the Psalms, refuse to be bound within the limits of any fixed metrical form. We must either assume that in these cases the text is corrupt beyond present hope of amendment, or extend Rothstein's principle of freedom considerably further than he would allow. It may be trusted that many of the difficulties will yield to keener criticism of the texts, so that Hebrew poetry may yet be read with the same intelligence and pleasure as classical or modern verse. The results already achieved by metrical investigation encourage this faith. And the nearer it finds realization, the more vital will be our touch on the spiritual pulse of those great men of God, and the closer our access to the heart of Him in whom they had their being.

[1] On the rhythm of Babylonian poetry, cf. Zimmern's articles in the *Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie*, 1895, p. 1 ff.; 1897, p. 86 ff., etc. On that of modern folk-song, cf. Dalman, *Palästinischer Diwan*, p. xxii ff.

Literature.

THE WORK OF CHRIST.

By *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2 vols., 18s. net), the Rev. Robert S. Franks, M.A., B.Litt., Principal of Western College, Bristol, has placed himself in the front rank of British theologians.

What is the Work of Christ? There are two extreme views of the expression. To some it means no more (though that is much) than the results of Christ's death—in other words, it is a synonymous expression for the Atonement. By others it is made to include the work of the pre-incarnate Logos as well as the expected results of the Parousia. Mr. Franks takes a middle way. By the work of Christ he means all that Christ