

Lamentations 1-5: The Corpus

Introduction

John F. Hobbins

It is safe to assume that MT Lam 1-5 transmits a text that differs from the text in origin on multiple levels. It probably contains a number of errors of the kind that accumulate in texts copied by hand many times over. MT's orthographic consistencies are datable to the 4th-2nd cent. BCE.¹ They differ in systematic ways from the orthographic consistencies of the corpus of ancient Hebrew inscriptions (8th-6th cent. BCE). The received orthography reflects an interpretation of earlier orthographic instantiations of the text, the ambiguities of which in all probability were not always rightly disambiguated. The pronunciation and stress rules of Tiberian Biblical Hebrew (TBH) are not identical to the pronunciation and stress rules of ancient Hebrew as known to us from a variety of sources. Because the Hebrew language evolved, the original sound orchestration of the poetry of Lam 1-5 is obscured in TBH. Finally, the prosody of MT Lam 1-5 and that of the underlying text of Lam 1-5 do not align except at an inchoate level.

The ideal basis for a study of Lam 1-5 insofar as it represents a corpus of ancient Hebrew literature would be a reconstruction of the text, orthography, pronunciation, and prosody one would expect it to have had at the time of composition. A reconstruction along these lines requires making decisions and testing hypotheses in a number of fields of inquiry: prosodic theory, the history of orthographic conventions, the history of phonology, and text criticism. A reconstruction of the text, orthography, pronunciation, and prosody of Lam 1-5 is offered below.²

The text-critical and prosodic reconstruction of Lam 1-5 offered here is not different in kind from that found in BHS, BHQ, NJPSV, AB, or HCOT.³

¹ Examples: m pl nouns in ם- and ן- as the 3 m sg sfx to sg nouns. These features are first attested non-sporadically in 3rd cent. DSS, but then, 5th-4th cent. texts are lacking. the equivalent of the first is not found in 5th-4th cent. Aramaic.

² Text critical characterizations and related sigla are modeled on those of BHQ. A list of abbreviations and expanded source references are provided below. Important text-critical discussions are found in BHQ, CTAT, and Bertil Albrektson, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (Studia Theologica Lundensia 21: Lund: Gleerup, 1963).

³ Wilhelm Rudolph, "Threni אִיכָה," in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* [BHS] (ed. Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph; 5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1997 [¹1967-77]) 1354-67; Rolf Schäfer, "Lamentations אִיכָה," in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* [BHQ], *Fascicle*

An orthographic and phonological reconstruction of Lam 1-5, on the other hand, has not been offered before. As argued in the body of this essay, retroversion to the orthography and phonology the text would have had in origin and in the first centuries of its existence is integral to proper text-critical methodology. Phonological reconstruction, furthermore, enables the critic to tend the ear for potential textual error resulting from aural misapprehension. Insufficient allowance is made for aural error by a majority of text critics.⁴

To be sure, some will dismiss the task of phonological reconstruction of pre-Tiberian Hebrew. In the same way, the vocalization of Ugaritic is often regarded with suspicion. Pardee provides a spirited defense of the work of phonological reconstruction.⁵ His arguments, which will not be repeated here, have never been rebutted. They apply no less to the work undertaken here.

Those who value phonological reconstruction may still find bewildering a presentation of Lam 1-5 in reconstructed phonological dress. On grounds of familiarity alone, the MT as found in BHS, BHQ, or the JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh, reformatted against the neumes as the prosody of the underlying text seems to require, with proposed changes to textual content in an apparatus rather than in the text itself, will remain the text of choice for a majority of its students. But revised editions of MT like the aforementioned three mislead the incautious user. They set aside the prosody of MT on numerous occasions, but do not make a note of it when they do, and provide no information as to why MT's prosody is sometimes followed and sometimes set aside. They tempt the naïve reader into taking Tiberian phonology at face value, as if it represented the sounds of the text in the 6th cent. BCE, whereas what we know for sure is that it represents the sounds of the text in a reading tradition of the 9th-10th cent. CE.

18: *General Introduction and Megillot* (ed. Adrian Schenker; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004); *JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1999) 1749-64; Delbert R. Hillers, *Lamentations: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (2d rev. ed., AB 7A; New York: Doubleday, 1992; Johan Renkema, *Lamentations* (tr. Brian Doyle; HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 1998). The appearance of OHB *Lamentations*, to be edited by F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp and Eunny Lee, is eagerly awaited.

⁴ For an attempt to address the issue, see David Toshio Tsumura, "Scribal Errors or Phonetic Spellings? Samuel as an Aural Text," *VT* 49 (1999) 390-411.

⁵ Dennis Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut ('nt I and Proverbs 2)* (VTSup 39; Leiden: Brill, 1988) 1, n. 3.

A reproduction of MT's orthography, vowels, consonantal diacritics,⁶ cantillation marks, and other prosodic signals, with departures from MT's prosody marked as such in the text, would represent an advance over revised editions of MT currently in use. A prosodic workup of TBH Lam 1-5 along these lines is offered below.

MT and reconstructed Lam 1-5 are presented below in congruent configurations. The differences one will find by reading a line of reconstructed text and comparing it with MT have their justification, in terms of prosody, in the body of this essay; in terms of orthography and phonology, in the observations below; in terms of text, in the apparatus.

In the work of text-criticism below, matters of orthography, phonology, and prosody receive more than the usual attention. P. Kyle McCarter's text-critical methodology is otherwise followed. According to him, it is wrong to assume that textual criticism is unnecessary when the meaning of MT is clear. Semantically unobjectionable readings are not necessarily original. Conversely, it is wrong to assume that when MT seems awkward or corrupt, it should nonetheless be accepted. Objectionable readings are not necessarily original. The basic principle of text criticism is another: "Which reading is more likely to have given rise to the other(s)?"⁷ This principle, rather than reliance on the alleged superiority of MT vis-à-vis attested or conceivable alternatives, is the basis for sound textual reconstruction.

An unattested reading which stands a fair chance of having given rise to the attested reading(s) is sometimes reconstructible. Reconstruction of a reading that adequately explains attested readings is to be welcomed. To be sure, a hypothetical text is and should be the subject of intense scrutiny. But MT is a hypothesis, too, when retrojected to a time frame for which textual witnesses are lacking. In the case of Lam, witnesses are lacking for the first four hundred years of the text's presumed existence. All texts are hypothetical within that time frame. Retrojection of MT to that period without remainder is a particularly weak hypothesis.⁸

⁶ Per the usual, *rafe* as a marker of spirantized stops and quiescent gutturals is omitted.

⁷ P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 13-14; 72-75.

⁸ A few scholars emend more often than considered prudent here. The reconstructions of Frank Moore Cross are a case in point ("Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Verse: The Prosody of Lamentation 1:1-22," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman* [ed. Carol L. Meyers and Michael P. O'Connor; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983] 129-55; idem, "The Prosody of Lamentations 1 and the Psalm of Jonah,"

Few deny the value of sound text-critical reconstruction. The same judgment should be rendered with respect to the value of prosodic reconstruction. A text's prosody needs to be understood if the text as an act of communication is the object of study. This is obvious in the case of verse. By definition a versed text is subdivisible into continuously recurring segments of approximately equal length. In the course of transmission, faulty prosodic subdivision, it is safe to assume, sometimes occurred in the mind of copyists. Prosodic misdivision is the result of textual misunderstanding and sets the stage for textual corruption. Conversely, comprehension of a text's prosodic structure acts as a safeguard of the text's semantic organization, enabling the interpreter to avoid misinterpretation. The masoretes did very well in preserving through notation a prosodic map of the text as they understood it. If we fail to do so in accordance with our best understanding of the text, we have chosen not to follow in their footsteps. MT is an extraordinary linguistic artifact with a prosody and phonology of unparalleled beauty, but to refrain on those grounds from restoring the beauty one assumes the text had in an earlier life is a *non sequitur*. MT's disjunctives and conjunctives are deployed below for the purpose of representing the original prosodic structure of Lam 1-5.

The reconstruction of the orthography and phonology Lam 1-5 once would have had is based on a comparative study of 8th-6th cent. BCE Hebrew inscriptions, cuneiform, Greek and Latin transcriptions of Hebrew words, and the DSS, Secunda, Samaritan, Palestinian, Babylonian, and Tiberian Hebrew traditions. What these data sets tell us about the history of sound change in the Hebrew language is the subject of ongoing debate. The best one can do is to formulate hypotheses that are compatible with all the available data.

The system of seven simple vowels plus *schwa* of the Tiberian tradition makes phonological distinctions not all of which are phonemic.⁹ Minimal pairs demonstrate *a:i:u:o* and *a:i:e:o:aj:ay* contrasts. Examples קָטַל (noun) : קָטִיל (adj) : קָטוּל (inf abs): קָטוּל (Gp ptcp); סוּסָה : סוּסִי : סוּסִי : סוּסוּ : סוּסִי : סוּסִי. But *ε:e* minimal pairs are non-existent. Also non-existent: *â:o* and *â:a* minimal pairs, except when, on independent grounds, it can be shown that *â*

in idem, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998] 99-134).

⁹ In this discussion, Tiberian vowels are represented as follows: *i:e:ε:a:â:o:u* = $\aleph:\aleph:\aleph:\aleph:\aleph/\aleph:\aleph/\aleph$. In the reconstructions below, *i:e:r:e:a:r:o:u* = $\aleph:\aleph:\aleph:\aleph:\aleph/\aleph:\aleph/\aleph$.

= **a* and *â* = **o*, respectively. *ε:e* and *â:a* reflect non-phonemic phonological distinctions which occur or do not occur depending on closed/open and stressed/unstressed syllable contrasts. That *â:a* is a non-phonemic distinction is confirmed by the verb forms that co-occur with *qâṭal* nouns of the same root: G *qâṭal* verb forms are hardly found. Instead, we find G *qâṭel*; D; and/or H. In short, *â:a* and *ε:e* are lexically and morphologically unproductive distinctions, i.e., non-phonemic in nature.

It is customary to assume on the basis of the evidence just discussed that the Tiberian qualitative non-phonemic *â:a* and *ε:e* distinctions evolved from pre-Tiberian quantitative non-phonemic distinctions. In the reconstructions, *ṣ* = *a*, *ṣ̣* = *aː*, *ṣ̣̣* = *e*, and *ṣ̣̣̣* = *eː*. The *o* vowel in closed, unstressed syllables, a well-attested non-Tiberian feature reflecting a pre-Tiberian stage of phonological evolution, appears as *ṣ̣̣̣*.

A five vowel *i:e:a:o:u* system (plus *schwa*) is attested in the vocalization of Geniza fragments of Palestinian *piyyuṭim* studied by Yahalom. The fragments are 8th-9th cent CE, predate vocalized biblical texts for the most part, and do not represent a *ṣ̣̣̣* / *ṣ̣̣̣̣* or *ṣ̣̣̣̣* / *ṣ̣̣̣̣̣* distinction. Sáenz-Badillos pointed out the importance of this data set for an understanding of the history of the Hebrew language.¹⁰

I:e:a:o:u vowels that reduced to *schwa* in TBH show up fitfully but systematically with their original coloring in Secunda Hebrew (SecH).¹¹ In this regard and others, SecH reflects a less advanced stage of the language than TBH. In pre-TBH, it appears that *i:e:a:o:u* vowels that reduced to *schwa* in TBH shorten without change in quality in some contexts and reduce to *schwa* in others; assimilation to a tense phone following (*o*, *u*, or *y*) also occurs.¹² A cross-linguistic comparison may be helpful. The word *potato* has

¹⁰ Joseph Yahalom, *Palestinian Vocalised Piyyut Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections* (Genizah Series 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (tr. John Elwode; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 89.

¹¹A. Juditzky, “Reduced Vowels in the Transcriptions from Hebrew in the Hexapla”, *Lešonenu* 67 (2005), 121-141, discussed by Shai Heijmans, “The Short Vowels of the Hexapla,” <http://hebphil.blogspot.com> (2005). In an early treatise on Tiberian pronunciation, the *schwa* is described as a set of allophones of the seven vowels (Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* [Subsidia biblica 14; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991] 52, n. 6). The theory which requires a univalent interpretation of *schwa* in Tiberian Hebrew is not supported by ancient witnesses.

¹² Progressive vowel assimilation is attested in Greek transcriptions (Σοδομ; Γομορρα) and DSS Hebrew.

five major realizations in American English: (1) hypercorrect *poteto*, (2) careful *p^oteo*, (3) unmarked *p^oteo*, (4) casual *pteo*, and (5) substandard *p^oteo*. In my view, pretonic shortened vowels in CH would have been pronounced like *o* in *p^oteo*, propretonic vowels, like *o* in *p^oteo*. SecH has βανη for TBH גַּנִּי; μεσιω for TBH יחִישָׁה.

The repertoire of reduced vowels in MT is unsuitable for the purpose of representing the ultrashort vowels to which SecH bears witness. The *hatephim* express a three way $\text{ḥ}:\text{ḥ}:\text{ḥ}$ rather than five way distinction and leave the impression that the vowels in question are a cross between one of three vowels and *schwa*. In the reconstruction, *rafe* (ֿ) in conjunction with the signs that mark the *i:e:a:o:u* vowels serve to mark ultrashort versions of same; *rafe* with *ε* serves to mark epenthetic *ε* in **qat^(a)l* and **qet^(e)l* nouns; *rafe* with *schwa*, a vowel reduced to *schwa*.

The *dagesh* is used to express gemination in medial and final position, not a contrast (non-existent in ancient Hebrew) between spirantized and non-spirantized allophones of the */b/ /g/ /d/ /k/ /p/ /t/* stop sequence. Gemination in final position is attested in BabH. Gemination of *resh* is attested in Greek transcriptions (Σαρρα) and in BabH and PalH.

In Karaite transcriptions of biblical texts in Arabic characters, vowels are long in open unstressed syllables and in stressed syllables, open and closed; they are short in closed unstressed syllables.¹³ Vowel length is thus not an independent phonological variable, but a function of syllable type and stress. The Karaite transcriptions describe universal tone-lengthening under stress, but in pre-Tiberian Hebrew, the evidence of Secunda Hebrew suggests that vowels were short in stressed, doubly closed syllables. Counterexamples are not available. On the other hand, it is best not to claim, as Janssens does, that *e* and *o* are not tone-lengthened in stressed, singly closed syllables. Counterexamples, in which *e* = η and not ε, and *o* = ω and not ο, suggest the contrary.¹⁴ In the history of the language, tone-lengthening coincident with

¹³ Geoffrey Khan, "Vowel Length and Syllable Structure in the Tiberian Tradition of Biblical Hebrew," *JSS* 32 (1987) 23-82.

¹⁴ Gerard Janssens, *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen's Secunda* (Orientalia Gandensia 9; Leuven: Peeters, 1982) 132. Counterexamples include: θηληχ (*teqtel* ← **tiqtil*), εσωρ (*eqtol*), φαλητ (*qattel* inf abs), ηλ (*qel* ← **qil*), εκκης (*qittel* noun), βλωμ (*q^otol* inf constr), βχωρ (**q^otol* ← **qot^(o)l* ← **qutl* noun). Janssens classifies these as errors, derives them from originally open syllables as if examples like εχαζεβ (*aqattel*), ερδοφ (*yiqtol*), μαλλαμεδ (*m^olammed*) might not also be so described, or fails to note they contradict his rule.

word-final stress was lost as the *e*, *a*, and *o* vowels split in two (*e:ε*, *a:ā*, and *o:ō*, respectively). Later on, vowels under maximal stress were tone-lengthened again and across the board, as the Karaite transcriptions show. In brief, the six putative proto-Semitic vowel phonemes, short and long *a*, *i*, and *u*, were not completely neutralized in the history of the Hebrew language. Preservation depended on doubly closed/closed/open and stressed/unstressed contrasts.

A transcription of Lam 1:1-7 incorporating the working hypotheses just outlined will be found below.¹⁵ Other aspects of ancient Hebrew phonology are discussed further on.

Statistics regarding syllable counts and other parameters are offered at the bottom of each page of reconstructed text. Cumulative statistics appear at the end of every chapter and following Lam 1-4. The results of a data analysis may be summarized as follows.

The four poems of Lam 1-4 are examples of verse written in what one may refer to as *qinah* meter. *Qinah* poetry is dominated by lines with a syncopated second half, where “halves” are defined as the text on either side of the major caesura (in a three verset line, the third or “c” verset constitutes the second half). Length is most easily measured at the prosodic word (ω) level; indeed, a 3:2 line is typical in *qinah* poetry. But syncopation may be achieved in more subtle ways. Lines with halves of equal length in terms of ω , or a second half longer than the first, usually have a shorter second half in terms of syllables (σ) and/or absolute words (*w*). “Compensation,” as I will term it, also occurs in reverse, such that lines with halves of equal length or a second half longer than the first in terms of σ often have a shorter second half in terms of ω . Lam 1 contains many compensatable lines; Lam 3 relatively few, an index of style. Lines whose second half is not shorter than the first half in terms of ω or σ are uncommon in *qinah* meter.

Lam 5 is an example of verse written in *mashal* meter. *Mashal* poetry is dominated by lines with halves of approximately equal length, where “halves” are defined as the text on either side of the major caesura as above, and “approximately equal” is defined as plus or minus 3, or in some cases, 2 σ . Versets, furthermore, are characteristically 4 to 8 σ in length. The parameters of *mashal* meter are more defined than those of *common* meter.

¹⁵ The conventions used in the transcription build on those proposed by Matthew P. Anstey, “Towards a Typological Representation of Tiberian Hebrew,” *HS* 46 (2005) 71-128.

Versets in *common* meter vary more in absolute (2 to 10 σ) and relative length (plus or minus 6 σ). Isa 40-66, for example, is common meter poetry.

It is not necessary to reference foot (*f*) counts or *w* counts in order to define *qinah*, *mashal*, or *common* meter. ω and σ counts are sufficient indicators of phonological length in most cases; rarely, absolute word (*w*) counts are diagnostic. *f* counts per verset and line are constrained quantities but within less stringent parameters (2 to 4 per verset and 4 to 7 per line, excluding outliers) than ω counts (2 to 3 per verset and 4 to 7 per line, with no outliers). *f* and *w* counts across the components of a line do not with the same regularity exhibit the stylized relative proportions that ω and σ counts do. *f* and *w* counts are given below so that the grounds for this conclusion will be easily reviewable.¹⁶ *W* counts are given only when they differ from ω counts; *x* = “a” verset; *y* = “b” verset; *z* = “c” verset. For definitions of ω , *f*, and σ , see the body of this essay.

Additional Notes on Orthography and Phonology

Ancient Hebrew phonology and orthography as understood here was introduced above. Three additional working hypotheses govern the reconstruction. (1) So-called penultimate stress obtained in the 6th cent. BCE and before both in context and in pause, where MT preserves in pause only. (2) By the 6th cent. BCE, to a lesser extent earlier, to a greater extent later, *ay* and *aw* diphthongs reduced to \bar{e} and \bar{o} , respectively, in some words and contexts but not others, with monophthongization more widespread in the case of *ay* than *aw*. A parallel process is documented in Aramaic of the same time frame. (3) Final unstressed vowels in ancient Hebrew, as in Old and Imperial Aramaic, went unindicated in more circumstances than usually thought.¹⁷

¹⁶ For additional specifics on varieties of ancient Hebrew poetry, and an explanation of terms like ‘line’ and ‘verset,’ see the present writer’s “Regularities in Ancient Hebrew Verse: An Overview,” available online at www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com.

¹⁷ Assumption (1) is not controversial, even if the prosodic implications of reconstructing ancient Hebrew phonology in accord with it have rarely been explored. Important discussions of the problematic addressed in (2) include W. Randall Garr, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) 35-40, 91-93, 97-99, 101-103, 106-111; Margaretha L. Folmer, *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation* (OLA 68; Leuven: Peeters, 1995) 173-188; Takamitsu Muraoka and Bezalel Porten, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1: The Near and Middle East 32; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 26-38; for (3), see Edward M. Cook, “The Orthography of Final Unstressed Long Vowels in Old and Imperial Aramaic,” in *Sopher Mahir: Northwest Semitic Studies*

Orthographic standards were not always adhered to in antiquity. Examples of non-adherence provide a window into the world of actual pronunciation. Orthographic variation in the relatively large and varied corpus of Persian period Aramaic documents is enlightening in this regard.¹⁸ It is plausible to assume that a text like Lam was written down in accordance with established conventions applicable to the transmission of a high status text. On the continuum of strict versus relaxed adherence to established spelling tradition, one would expect it to locate on the stricter, more conservative side. I reconstruct Lam's orthography accordingly.

In 8th–6th cent. BCE Hebrew inscriptions, medial ו and י and final ו, י, and ה stand either for consonants, for consonants that have become vowels, or, in final position from the start and medial position subsequently, for vowels that were such from the beginning. A medial ו or י is an historical spelling if it was no longer pronounced as a consonant at the time of the text's production. Probable examples from the inscriptions include Hurr. *ewir* 'lord' = Ug. *iwr* → *'ūr in cun. u-ri-ia-a; אוריהו (Arad 31:2; Ophel 1:8) next to אריהו (Arad 26, Ein Gedi 1:1); the former is the historical spelling, the latter, a phonetic spelling; *'āy⁽ⁱ⁾r (reflected in the rare pl עַיְרִים and in MH עַיְרוֹת) → *īr* in העיר (Arad 24:16-17) and העירה (Lachish 4:7) next to הער (Avigad [1976] 3:1; Barkay [1977] 1:1); the former is a historical spelling, the latter phonetic. Historical spellings and defective spellings exist side by side in the orthography and vocalization of MT. For example, cun. *ḥaurānu* → חוֹרָן (*ḥawrān* Ezek 47:6, 8) → *ḥō_wrōn* in חוֹרְנִים (Isa 15:5; Jer 48:5) → חוֹרְנִים (Jer 48:34); contrast **gāw_wyum* → Akk. Mari *gā(/w/y)um* → **gāw_(i)y* → MT גוי with ו in virtually every instance (*gō_wy*; **gāw_(i)y* in the 6th cent. is possible, but so is *gō_wy*; pl **g^awāyīm* rather than גוֹיִם is unlikely; cf. מְוֵת vs. מְתֵי [Isa 53:9]).

By analogy with its established use for *ū* in final position, ו is sporadically but increasingly used for medial *ū*. Examples include ארוּר (Silwan 2:2) and [יהוד] (Arad 40:13) beside יהד (cun. *ya'ūdu*; יהד Kh. Beit Lei [per Avigad], coins and jar handles; יהוד in later texts: Eg. Aram.; coins and jar handles; Bib. Aram.; in my view, *yahūdu* [nom.] → יהד and יהוד; *yahūda* [oblique] →

Presented to Stanislav Segert (ed. Edward M. Cook; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990 [= *Maarav* 5-6 (1990)] 53-67.

¹⁸ Folmer, *Aramaic in the Achaemenid Period*, 49-188, 691-705.

יהודה Kh. Beit Lei [per Cross] / יהודה Kh. Beit Lei [per Lemaire] → יהודה
[accent shift yielding a final *ā*] DSS; MT.

By analogy with its established use for *ī* in final position, *י* is sporadically but increasingly used for medial *ī*. For example, **ש**א (Siloam 1:2, 4) is replaced by **שי**א (Lachish 3:9-10; Arad 40:7, 8). In Arad 24:14-15, we find **הבקי**ד**ם** (=הפקי**ד**ם); traces of the earlier spelling without a *mater* are found in MT (Jer 36:20; 37:21; Gen 39:4; with *mater* in Josh 10:18; 1 Chr 26:32). Epigraphic **ים** is a phonetic spelling (*yōm*), as is **קל** (*qōl*), it seems to me, whereas the usual biblical orthography **יום** and **קול** reflects later widespread use of *י* to mark an *ō* vowel of whatever origin.

Monophthongization had occurred or was occurring in some words and environments but not others in 8th-6th cent. BCE Judahite Hebrew. The triphthong *awa/aya* of final *ו*/*י* verbs (with a few exceptions) is reduced to *a*; the *ay* in the 3 sg sfx to pl nouns *ayhúwa* (*ay+húwa*) is also reduced to *a*, the *úwa* to *u*, with syncopation of *h*. In a few heavily used monosyllabic nouns (*yōm*, *qōl*), *aw* is reduced to *ō*. It may be conjectured that unstressed *ay* → *ē* if preposed to syllable(s) with a weight of three morae or more. Thus, in somewhat later Hebrew, we find **אנאן** (= **ענין**; MT **ענין**), but **נאנא** (= **ענין**). Spelling of the inflected preposition **בנין** in conservative examples of biblical orthography points in the same direction; Persian Period Aramaic attests to the same phenomenon.¹⁹ Based on [**אלן**] in Arad 3:9 where we would expect **אלין** (cf. **לפנין** in Arad 7:6), it seems likely that the stressed plural marker *ay* also reduced to *ē*. Stressed and unstressed *aw* and stressed *ay* otherwise, on the other hand, retained, so far as we know, diphthongal force in First Temple Judahite Hebrew. **נין** would have been pronounced *yáyⁱn* (anaptyxis without resyllabification). MT preserves a more evolved pronunciation with a full *i* vowel and and bisyllabification: **נין**.

Vowel dissimilation in nominal and verbal forms is more advanced in TBH than in other attestations of ancient Hebrew. The effect of the dissimilation is pleasing to the ear, an application of what phonologists call the Obligatory Contour Principle. The reconstruction reverts to the undissimilated form if such a form, with regard to a particular lexeme, is attested in cuneiform, Greek, or Latin transcriptions, and/or non-Tiberian Hebrew traditions. The following noun formations are in play: **qatlā* → **qitlā* → *qitlā*; **maqtāl* → **miqtāl* → **miqtāl*; **qutqōt* → **qotqōt* → **qitqāt*

¹⁹ Folmer, *Aramaic in the Achaemenid Period*, 175-76.

→ *qitqāt*; **qatlōn* → *qitlōn*; **qatlān* → **qitlān* → *qitlān*; **qutlā* → **qātā*
 → **qitlā*; **qutlān* → **qatlān* → *qitlān*, **qutlōn* → *qitlōn*.

The application of Philippi's law, whereby **i* → *e* → *ε* → *a* in a stressed word final syllable closed by a consonant/consonant cluster, plus/minus a following unstressed *a*, *i*, *o*, or *u*, is frequent but not universal in TBH and Babylonian Hebrew. The reconstruction reverts to pre-Tiberian forms, partially preserved in Secunda Hebrew. It is assumed that word final *i* lowered to *e* by the 8th cent. BCE. Thus *dibbér* as in MT pausal, derived from **dibbír*, not MT contextual *dibbér* or *qittál*, as often; *bet* as in LXX βῆθσαβεε (= MT בֵּת־שֶׁבַע), not MT *bát*. The older phonology is occasionally preserved in MT, as in abs. and constr. *leb* (alongside constr. *leb*), not **lab*, and *ʿqattélna*, not **ʿqattálna*.

Some *qVtl* nouns exhibit considerable variation in the quality of the vowel, both synchronically and cross-linguistically. The reconstruction tends to be conservative in such cases, on the hypothesis that analogical sound changes via lexical diffusion in TBH are only one or two steps removed from the situation in 6th cent. Judahite Hebrew, not a full nine yards. Proto-segholates are vocalized with minimal anaptyxis (an ultrashort vowel, not a full vowel, as in TBH). In TBH, the epenthetic vowel in *qatl*, *qitl*, and *qotl* nouns is *ε*. Vowel harmony in this context, as in Akkadian, is attested in DSS Hebrew for *qotl*: *qot^ol*, and is assumed original. The epenthetic vowels in *qat^al* and *qet^el* (assuming vowel harmony, as in *qot^ol*) would have willy nilly been pronounced in near identical fashion. In the reconstruction, both appear as *qv^el*. Tone-lengthening is assumed to occur in pause: thus *qv^vl* in context, *qv:^vl* in pause.

The case for the view that unstressed final vowels in conservative orthography went unindicated in a number of contexts is strong. Examples: the spelling η for the 2 sg sfx, $\eta\aleph$ for the 2 m sg pronoun $\eta\aleph$, and $\eta\aleph\aleph$ alongside $\eta\aleph\aleph$, all of which are attested in Epigraphic Hebrew ($-k^a$, $\eta\aleph^a$, $q\aleph\aleph^a$, respectively); a probable example: $\eta\aleph = \eta\aleph^a$ in MT. The spelling $\eta\aleph$ for *hayát^a* (Siloam 1:3) is instructive. Comparable phenomena in Old and Imperial Aramaic are documented.

The 3 m sg pronoun, attested as $\eta\aleph$ in epigraphic Hebrew, and by analogy, the 3 f sg pronoun, were pronounced $hú:\eta^a$ and $hí:\eta^a$, respectively, based on cun. *yahūa* for MT $\aleph\eta\aleph$ ‘Jehu.’ 3 sg pronouns in ^a are attested in DSS Hebrew, as is a 3 m pl sfx in ^a. They are probably hangovers from an earlier

stage of the language. As a working hypothesis, I assume the long 3 m pl sfx was retained in pause in the 8th-6th cent. BCE.

The pronunciation of toponyms poses difficulties. The citation forms of Syro-Palestinian toponyms in cuneiform and Egyptian sources are sometimes relatively fixed with an *u* or *a* ending, sometimes not; forms with final unstressed *-a* occur in MT as well regardless of clause syntax: יְטִבְתָּהּ; אֶפְרַתָּהּ; הַגְּדִדָּה alongside הַר הַגְּדִדָּה; תְּמַנָּה alongside תְּמַנְתָּהּ. In my view, *yahūda* and *yahūdu* [\rightarrow $y^{\text{h}}hūd$] coexisted as citation forms from the start, though a spelling with final ה is not attested with certainty before the Hellenistic period. Evidence for the existence of a byform of יְרוּשָׁלַיִם with a final *-a* is suggestive only (final α in Greek transcriptions may be nothing more than a reflex of the nativization process); as a working hypothesis, it is restored in pause.

Symbols

$\overline{\text{פּ}}$	A strophe made up of three lines, 1:(1:1) in structure
פּ	
$\underline{\text{פּ}}$	$\underline{\text{פּ}}$ concludes a strophe; $\underline{\text{פּ}}$ a sub-stanza; $\underline{\text{פּ}}$ a stanza; $\underline{\text{פּ}}$ 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 or length rule.
+m or -m	Addition or subtraction of a <i>maqquph</i> vis-à-vis MT.
cv כל	Change in vocalization vis-à-vis MT; change following.
cj G וַיִּרְדְּנָה	Conjecture based on witness; conjecture following.
vd, ld	Change in verset division, or line division, vis-à-vis MT.
= BHS, BHQ	Scansion is in agreement with BHS, BHQ
4/9/24	A stanza consisting of 4 lines, 9 versets, and 24 stress units.
40/90/216 17/6/2/1	A poetic unit made up of 40 lines, 90 versets, and 216 stress units, with a total of 17 strophes, 6 stanzas, and 2 sections.

In the first workup, when MT's accents and use of *maqquph* (◌), by which conjoined words receive a single dominant stress, clash with the proposed scansion, the fact is noted. Prosodic revisions to MT are based on a reconstruction of stress retention and deletion patterns in ancient Hebrew.

The rule of twos and threes would not be violated if in the unasterisked cases MT were retained.²⁰ With respect to division into versets and lines, in controversial cases agreements with earlier authorities are noted.²¹

Where provided, the second workup includes an apparatus with justifications for text-critical decisions. On the left hand margins, prosodic word counts are given first, then foot counts, then syllable counts, and then absolute word counts if they differ from prosodic word counts; x = “a” verset; y = “b” verset; z = “c” verset.

²⁰ For “lines,” “stress,” “parallelism,” and other technical terms; abbreviations, and full bibliographical references, see “Retaining and Transcending the Classical Description,” “Stress in Ancient Hebrew,” “Parallelism,” “Glossary,” “Abbreviations,” and “Annotated Bibliography,” respectively, available online at www.ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com. For a first orientation to the prosodic information encoded by the masoretic accents, see Bezalel Elan Dresner, “The Prosodic Basis of the Tiberian Hebrew System of Accents,” *Language* 70 (1994) 1-52; “The Word in Tiberian Hebrew,” 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://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~dresner/tibhebword.pdf>.

²¹ Expanded references for BHS, NJ(PS)V, BHQ, AB, and HCOT are found at the conclusion of the Corpus.

Lamentations 1:1-7

Prosodic Workup

	3:3 =HCOT, BHQ	הָעִיר רָבַתִּי עִם	אִיכָהּ יִשְׁבֶּה בְדָד	1
	2:2 *ld=all	רָבַתִּי בַגּוֹיִם	הִיְתָה כְּאַלְמָנָה	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
3/6/14	2:2 {ס}	הִיְתָה לָמָס:	בְּכֹו תִבְכֶּה בְּלֵילָה	2
	3:2 cj וְדַמְעָתָהּ; +m	וְדַמְעָתָהּ עַל לַחֲיָהּ	אֵינָה מִנְחָם	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
	3:2 -m; vd=all; *-m cv כל	מִכָּל־אֲהָבֶיהָ	כָּל־רַעֲיָהּ בְּגָדוֹ בָּהּ	3
3/6/16	3:3 {ס}	הִיוּ לָהּ לְאֵיבִים:	גִּלְתָּהּ יְהוּדָה מֵעַנִּי	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
	3:2 =BHS, HCOT, BHQ	וּמְרַב עֲבָדָהּ	הִיא יִשְׁבֶּה בַגּוֹיִם	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
	3:3	לֹא מִצָּאָה מְנוּחַ	כָּל־רַדְפֶיהָ הַשִּׁיגוּהָ	4
3/6/15	2:2 {ס}	בֵּין הַמְּצָרִים:	דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבָלוֹת	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
	3:3	מִבְּלִי בְּאֵי מוֹעֵד	כָּל־שְׁעָרֶיהָ שׁוּמְמִין	שְׁרָתִי בַמְּדִינֹת
	2:2	כְּהִנְיָה נְאֻחִים	בְּתוֹלְתֶיהָ נוֹגֹת	5
3/6/15	2:3 -m {ס}	וְהִיא מְרֹלָה:	הִיוּ צָרֶיהָ לְרֹאשׁ	כִּי־יִהְיֶה הוֹגָה
	3:2	אֵיבִיהָ שָׁלוֹ	עוֹלְלֶיהָ הִלְכוּ	6
	2:2 +m; -m	עַל רֵב־פְּשָׁעֶיהָ	וַיֵּצֵא מִן בֵּת־צִיּוֹן	הִיוּ שְׂרֵיָהּ כְּאֵילִים
3/6/13	2:2 vd=BHS, HCOT {ס}	שָׁבִי לַפְּנֵי־צָר:	וַיִּלְכוּ בְּלֹא־כַחַח	7
	3:2 +m; -m; vd=all; *-m cv כל	כָּל־הַדָּרָהּ	זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יָמֶי	כָּל מַחְמַדֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר הִיוּ
	3:3 vd=all; -m	לֹא־מִצָּאוּ מְרַעָה	בְּנִפְל עֲמָה בִיד־צָר	רְאוּהָ צָרִים שִׁחְקוּ
3/6/15	2:2 {ס}	לַפְּנֵי רוֹדְף: ס		
	3:2 cj יהוה 4QLam	עָנְיָהּ וּמְרוֹדֶיהָ		
	(2:2):2 vd ≈NJV cj כָּלוּ	מִימֵי קֶדֶם		
	3:3 cj מְשַׁבְּתָהּ ↓	וְאֵין עוֹזֵר לָהּ		
4/9/22	3:2 vd=BHS, NJV, HCOT {ס}	עַל מְשַׁבְּתָהּ:		
22/45/110	6/12/30 + 6/12/30 + 6/12/28 + 4/9/22		8/4/2/1	

Lamentations 1:1-7

Full Reconstruction

	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	הָעִיר רִבְתִּי עָם	אֵיכָה יִשְׁבֶּה בְּדָד	1	
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	רִבְתִּי בַגּוֹיִם	הֵיטָהָה כְּאֶלְמָנָה	2	
<u>3/6/14</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:4	{ס} הֵיטָהָה לְמָסָ:	שָׂרְתִי בַמְּדִינָת	3	
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 3:3	יָדְמַעְתָּה עַל-לִחְיָהָ	2	
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 5:5	מִכָּל אֹהֲבֵיהָ	אֵינָן לָהּ מִנְחָם	3	
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:4	<i>s</i> 6:7	<i>w</i> 4:3	{ס} הָיוּ לָהּ לְאֹיְבָם:	כָּל-רֵעֵיהָ בִגְדוּ בָּהּ	
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:6	וַיִּמְרָב עֲבֹדָהּ	גָּלְתָה יְהוָה מֵעֲנִי	3	
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	לֹא מִצָּאָהּ מִנַּח	הָאָ יִשְׁבֶּה בַגּוֹיִם	4	
<u>3/6/15</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	<i>w</i> 3:2	{ס} בְּיַד הַמְּצָרִים:	כָּל-רֵדְפֵיהָ הַשְּׂגָה	
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	מִבְּלִי בְּאֵי מוֹעֵד	דָּרְכֵי צִיָּן אֶבְלַת	4	
	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:4	<i>s</i> 7:6	<i>w</i> 3:2	כִּהְגִּיחָה נְאֻחָם	כָּל-שְׂעָרֶיהָ שָׁמֵמָן	
<u>3/6/15</u>	2:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4	{ס} וְהָאָ מָרָה לָהּ:	בְּתִלְתֵּיהָ נִגְתָּ		
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4	אֹיְבֵיהָ שָׁלוּ	הָיוּ צָרֶיהָ לְרֹאשׁ	5	
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 5:4	<i>w</i> 3:3	עַל-רֵב פְּשָׁעָהּ	כִּי-יְהוּהוּ הַגּוֹהָ	
<u>3/6/13</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 5:4	<i>w</i> 2:3	{ס} שָׁבִי לְפָנַי-צָרָה:	עַל-לִיָּהּ הִלְכוּ	
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 7:4	<i>w</i> 4:2	כָּל הַדְּרָהּ	וַיִּצְאָ מִזִּבְחַת צִיָּן	6
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	לֹא מִצָּאוּ מִרְעָה	הָיוּ שָׂרִיָּה כְּאֵילִם	7	
<u>3/6/15</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:4	<i>w</i> 3:2	{ס} לְפָנַי רִדְדָהּ:	וַיִּלְכוּ בְּלֹא-כֹחַ	
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	עֲנִיָּה וּמְרִדִיָּה	זָכְרָה יִרְשָׁלַם יְהוָה	8	
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (3:2):3	<i>s</i> (5:4):4	מִיָּמֵי קְדָם	כָּלוּ מִחֲמַדֶּיהָ אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ	9	
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	<i>w</i> 4:3	וְאֵינָן עוֹרָ לָהּ	בַּנְּפֹל עֲמָהּ בַּיַּד-צָרָה	
<u>4/9/22</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4	{ס} עַל מִשְׁבְּתָהּ:	רָאָה צָרָם שָׁחֲקוּ	10	

22/45/110

6/12/30 + 6/12/30 + 6/12/28 + 4/9/22

8/4/2/1

1:2 <עָתָה> | <יָדְמַעְתָּה> | <יָדְמַעְתָּה> M assim-usu || 4 <נִגְתָּה> = נְהוּגוֹת <α'> <σ'> | = nifal ptc יגה V S T err-lex || 5
 <פְּשָׁעָהּ> | <פְּשָׁעִיהָ> M assim-usu || 6 מִזִּבְחַת M^{ket} | מִבַּת M^{qere} 4QLam assim-usu || 7 זכרה ירושלם יהוה ||
 M aur; כָּלוּ-מִחֲמַדֶּיהָ | מִחֲמַדֶּיהָ <כָּלוּ> || ירוֹ-יְהוּ 4QLam homoi זכורה יהוה; מִזִּבְחָהּ | יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמִי
 4QLam facil || מִשְׁבְּתָהּ | <מִשְׁבְּתָהּ> M vocal; מִשְׁבְּתָהּ G vocal ||

x, y	$x = 5$ to 8	$y = 4$ to 7	$x + y = 9$ to 14	$x - y = -1$ to 3
x, y, z	$(x + y) + z$	$x = 5$	$y = 4$	$z = 4$
			$(x + y) + z = 13$	$(x + y) - z = 5$
compensatable lines:	14 of 22		lines compensatable in reverse:	4 of 22
σ ($y + 1$ to 3): y compensations:	13x		ω ($y + 1$): y with σ ($x = y$):	3x
f ($y + 1$ or 2): y compensations:	8x		f ($y + 1$): y with σ ($x = y$):	1x
w ($y + 1$ or 2): y compensations:	6x		w ($y + 1$): y with σ ($x = y - 1$):	1x

1:2 <דַּמְעָתָהּ | וְדַמְעָתָהּ M assim-usu

The archaic fem sfx *āta* occasionally attested in poetry (Ex 15:16; Hos 8:7; Job 5:16; Ps 3:3; etc.; a vestige of the time when the case endings *ātul/ia* were operative) was misunderstood as a pron sfx when it ceased to be used at all in the language of the day. The pron sfx is tautological in the context, as Cross pointed out (“Lamentations 1,” 107-108). *דַּמְעָה* is a collective sg. Cp Lam 2:18; Ps 126:5.

1:4 <נָגַת = נָהוּגוֹת G <α' < σ' | = nifal ptc √גה V S T err-lex

Syncopation of ה is also attested in Lam 2:11. This understanding of the form constitutes the more difficult rdg. The sense 4c thus has is confirmed by parallelism with 5c and 6c. V S T probably capture the subordinate element of a double entendre. M itself is ambiguous.

1:5 <פְּשָׁעָהּ | פְּשָׁעֶיהָ M assim-usu

On this proposal, the text originally read *פְּשָׁעָהּ*; subsequently, the pl marker י was added to bring the text into line with a more common idiom. *פְּשָׁע* is a collective sg in affine texts (Isa 24:20; 53:5; Mic 1:5; 3:5; Ps 89:33; Job 8:4) and suits the context here. Bound structures of the type רב + collective sg noun + pron sfx are attested (Jer 30:14, 15; Ezek 28:18; Hos 9:7; cp Ps 25:11). Bound structures of the type רב + pl noun + pron sfx, however, are the norm, and the pl of *פְּשָׁע* is attested in Lam 1:14, 22. Vis-à-vis M, *פְּשָׁעָהּ* represents the more difficult rdg. If *פְּשָׁעֶיהָ* is read, the “b” verset becomes one syllable shorter than the corresponding “a” verset. In qinah meter, “b” versets are often shorter than “a” versets. Furthermore, *פְּשָׁעֶיהָ* end-rhymes with the preceding verset. Rhyme-schemes, while not obligatory, are ubiquitous in the context. None of these arguments is decisive, but the balance of probability favors *פְּשָׁעָהּ*.

1:6 מִן־בַּת M^{ket} | מִבַּת M^{qere} 4QLam assim-usu

M^{ket} preserves an unusual construction. The poet may have chosen dissimilated מן to achieve a 3:2 line.

1:7 ירוֹיֶהוּ 4QLam homoi זכֹּרָה יְהוּהּ M aur; יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמִי | זכֹּרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְהוּהּ

The rdgs of M and 4QLam may be explained as corruptions of the proposed rdg. Once the long impv was misconstrued as a *qatal* vb form with Jerusalem as subj, the stage was set for a reappréhension of *yahwé*: as *y^ame*: in a copy ancestral to M. The reinterpretation would have been facilitated by affine texts (Deut 32:7; Ps 137:7). A PN direct obj complement to זכֹּר is unusual but clearly attested (Gen 8:1; Ps 105:42; cf. Jer 15:15). Ps 105:42 demonstrates the possibility of non-isosemantic obj complements in sequence with זכֹּר. The long impv זכֹּרָה occurs in entreaties of later literature (2 Chr 7:42; Neh 5:1; 6:1, etc.). 4QLam preserves יְהוּהּ, but omits, by homoiarkton, יְרוּשָׁלַם. Cp 4QLam’s omission further on of עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּה. For a semantic-syntactic parallel to the line as reconstructed here, see Lam 3:61.

4QLam facit כל מכאובנו M aur; כָּלוּ | מַחְמְדִּיָּהּ

In M and 4QLam, the phrase beginning with כל must be the object of זכֹּר. This is semantically unfitting in the case of M. 4QLam has מכאובנו instead of מחמדִיָּהּ. M may be explained as an aural misapprehension of the proposed rdg. 4QLam attests to the same misapprehension, and to the omission, by parablepsis, of עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּהּ, with מחמדִיָּהּ → מכאובִיָּהּ → מכאובנו. An evocation of Jerusalem’s state of impoverishment is expected at this point. The proposed rdg provides it. Cp Lam 5:1-3. For כלה here – “finished are her coveted objects,” see Gen 41:30; Isa 15:6.

<מִשְׁבֹּתָהּ | מִשְׁבֹּתָהּ M vocal; מִשְׁבֹּתָהּ G vocal

The proposed rdg is a virtual ketiv of M. G’s morphological parse is identical to the one proposed; its lexical parse, awkward in context, is not. In TBH, after the application of the reverse of Philippi’s law (the so-called law of attenuation), the vocalization would have been מִשְׁבֹּתָהּ. “Demise” seems an appropriate gloss for the lemma, a hapax legomenon. The *qere* assimilates, one might assume, to a non-extant idiomatic expression.

Lamentations 1:1-7

Full Reconstruction

The reconstruction of the phonology of 6th century BCE Hebrew is a matter of educated conjecture. Allowance for stress shifts and adherence to the principle that non-Tiberian Hebrew traditions sometimes provide access to less advanced linguistic forms than does Tiberian Hebrew characterize the reconstruction. A block of text = U. A line = I. A half-line (in a tripartite line, a third of a line) = φ. A free standing orthographical unit = ω. An intonational break within a φ: ι; at the conclusion of a φ: a blank space. Hypothetical lengthening of the vowel at the conclusion of a φ: ::; of an I: ::. Vowels marked *acute* carry maximal stress; *grave*, medium stress; plain *grave*, minimal stress; ultrashort vowels are superscripted and are not stress bearing. Words with a maximum and a medium stress are double-footed. The right foot consists of a non- or minimally stressed syllable followed by the maximally stressed syllable if preceded by another foot. Subscript *h*, *y*, *w*, and *?* refer to orthography.

1:1	ʔaj:ká:h ja:ʃá:b ^a _h ba:dá:d ha:já:t ^a _h k ^o .ʔàl.ma:ná:h šar.rá:t ⁱ _y bàm.m ^o .di:y.nó:t	ha:ʃí:y _r rab.bá:t ⁱ _y ʃá::m: rab.bá:t ⁱ _y bàg.go:w.jí::m ha:já:t ^a _h la:má::s:
1:2	ba:kó:h tib.ké:h bal.láj ⁱ _l ^a _h ʔáj ⁱ _n lá:h m ^o .naḥ.hé:m kòl.re:ʃé:y ^a _h ba:gá:d ^u _w bá:h	w ^o .dim.ʃá:t ^a _h ʃàl.leḥ.já::h mik.kó:l ʔo:h ^e .bé::y ^a _h ^a há:j ^u _w lá:h l ^a .ʔò:j ^e .bí::m
1:3	ga:lá:t ^a _h ja:hú:d ^a me:ʃó:n ⁱ _y hí:ʔ ^a ja:ʃá:b ^a _h bàg.go:w.jí:m kòl.ro:d ^e .pé:y ^a _h hiš.ši:gú:h ^a	w ^o .me:rób: ʃ ^a .bo:dá::h ló:ʔ ma:ts ^ʃ á:ʔ ^a _h ma:nó::ḥ báj ⁱ _n hàm.m ^o .ts ^ʃ a.rí::m
1:4	da:r ^a .ké:y ts ^ʃ ij.jó:n ʔ ^a .be:ló:t kòl.ʃ ^o .ʃa:ré:y ^a _h ʃò:me:mí:n b ^u .tù:lo:té:y ^a _h nù:gó:t	mib.bél ⁱ _y ba:ʔé:y maw.ʃé::d kò:h ^e .né:y ^a _h nè:ʔ.na:ḥí::m w ^a .hí:ʔ ^a már:lá::h
1:5	ha:jú:w ts ^ʃ ar.ré:y ^a _h la:rò:ʔj kì:y.jah.wé:h haw.gá:h ʃò:la:lé:y ^a _h ha:lá:k ^u _w	ʔò:j ^e .bé:y ^a _h ʃa:lú::w ʃal.rób: piʃ.ʃá::h ʃéb ⁱ _y lip.nè:y.ts ^ʃ á::r:
1:6	wàj.je:ts ^ʃ é:ʔ min.bé:t ts ^ʃ ij.jó:n ha:jú:w šar.ré:y ^a _h k ^o .ʔàj.ja:lí:m wàj.je:lé:k ^u _w b ^o .lo:ʔ.kó:ḥ	kó:l: h ^a .da:rá::h ló:ʔ ma:ts ^ʃ á:ʔ ^u _w mar.ʃé::h lip.né:y ro:dé::p
1:7	z ^o .kó:r ^a _h j ^u .rù:ʃa:lé:m jah.wé:h ka:lú:w māḥ.mu:dé:y ^a _h ʔ ^a ʃé:r ha:jù:w bì.n ^o .pó:l ʃam.má:h b ⁱ .jad.ts ^ʃ á:r: ra:ʔú:h ^a ts ^ʃ ar.rí:m ša:ḥá:q ^u _w	ʃon.já:h wì.m ^o .ru:dé:y ^a _h ^a mí.j ^a .mè:y qé::d ^e _m w ^a .ʔáj ⁱ _n ʃo:zé:r lá::h ʃál màʃ.ba:tá::h

Lamentations 1:8-11

Prosodic Workup

	3:3	cj 4QLam	חטא	על־בֶּן לְנִידָה הִיתָה	חטא חטאה ירושלם	8
	2:2	cj	לניד ↑	בִּירְאוֹ עָרוֹתֶיהָ	כל־מכבדיה הזלוה	9
3/6/14	2:2		{ס}	וּתְשֵׁב אַחֲזֹר:	גם־היא נאנחה	9
	2:3			לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֵיתֶיהָ	טמאתה בשוליה	9
	2:3	cj	σ' V	וּתְרַד מִנַּחֲסִים לָהּ	ותרד פלאים	9
3/6/15	3:2	+m		כִּי הִגְדִּיל אוֹיֵב:	ראה יהוה את־עניי	9
	3:2	+m; -m	cj	מִחֲמַדֶּיהָ	ידו פרש צר	10
	2:2	cj		בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשָׁהּ	כי־ראתה גוים	10
3/7/15	(2:2):2	-m; vd	≈BHS, NJV	בַּקְהָל לָדָּ: {ס}	אשר צויתה לא־יבאו	10
	2:2			מִבְּקָשִׁים לָחֵם	כל־עמה נאנחים	11
	3:2	ketiv		לְהַשִּׁיב נֶפֶשׁ	נתנו מחמודיהם באכל	11
3/6/14	3:2	+m		כִּי הִיִּיתִי זוֹלֵלָה:	ראה יהוה והביטה	11

12/25/58

4/2/1

Lamentations 1:8-11

Full Reconstruction

	3:3 <i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 8:6 <i>w</i> 3:4	עַל־כֵּן לָנִיד הִיָּתָה	חֲטָא חֲטָאָה יִרְשָׁלַם 8
	2:2 <i>f</i> 5:4 <i>s</i> 8:6 <i>w</i> 3:3	כִּי־רָאוּ עֵרוֹתָהּ	כָּל־מְכַבְּדֶיהָ הִזְלָה 9
<u>3/6/14</u>	2:2 <i>f</i> 2:2 <i>s</i> 5:4 <i>w</i> 3:2 {ס}	וַתָּשָׁב אַחֲרָי: {ס}	גַּם־הָא נְאֻמָּהּ 9
	2:3 <i>f</i> 3:4 <i>s</i> 6:6	לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֶתָהּ	טַמְאָתָהּ בְּשִׁלְיָהּ 9
	2:3 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5	אֵינָן מִנְחָם לָהּ	וַתִּרְדַּף פְּלֹאִים 9
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 <i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 7:5 <i>w</i> 4:3 {ס}	כִּי־הִגְדִּיל אֵיבָ: {ס}	רָאָה יְהוָה אֶת־עֵנָי 9
	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 5:5 <i>w</i> 3:3	עַל־כֹּל מַחְמְדֶיהָ	יָדָה פֶּרֶשׁ יָצָר 10
	2:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:4	בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשֶׁהּ	כִּרְאֹתָהּ גּוֹיִם 10
<u>3/7/15</u>	(2:2):2 <i>f</i> (2:2):3 <i>s</i> (4:3):4 {ס}	בְּקֶהֱל לָדָ: {ס}	אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָהּ לֹא יָבֹאוּ 10
	2:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> 3:2	מִבְּקֶשֶׁם לֶחֶם	כָּל־עַמָּה נְאֻמָּחֶם 11
	3:2 <i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 8:4	לְהִשָּׁב נַפְשׁ	נִתְּנוּ מַחְמְדֵיהֶם בְּאֶכָּל 11
<u>3/6/14</u>	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:4 <i>s</i> 7:6 <i>w</i> 3:3 {ס}	כִּי־הִיָּיתִי זֹלָלָה: {ס}	רָאָה יְהוָה יְהוָה בְּטָה 11
12/25/58		6/12/29 + 6/13/29	4/2/1

1:8 <חטא> 4QLam | חטא M assim-usu || <לניד> 4QLam ו' confusion; לנידה M ס' S ה ditt/aur err, assim-לנידה Lam 1:17 || 9 <ותרד> ס' V ותרד M assim-ctext || 10 <מחמדיה> M vocal || <כראתה> M aural || 11 <מחמדיהם> M^{ket} | מחמדיהם M^{qere} vocal

x,y	$x = 5 \text{ to } 8$	$y = 4 \text{ to } 7$	$x+y = 9 \text{ to } 14$	$x-y = 0 \text{ to } 4$
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 4$	$y = 3$	$z = 4$
			$(x+y)+z = 11$	$(x+y)-z = 3$
compensatable lines:		7 of 12	lines compensatable in reverse:	2 of 12
σ (y+1 to 4):y compensations:		6x	ω (y+1):y with σ (x=y):	1x
f (y+1 or 2):y compensations:		2x	σ (y+1):y with σ (x=y):	1x
w (y+1 or 2):y compensations:		3x	w (y+1):y with σ (x=y):	1x

1:8 <חטא> 4QLam | חטא M assim-usu

On this hypothesis, M's vocalization assimilates the text to a frequent cognate accusative construction (vb חטא with חטא, חטאת, or חטאתה). The inf abs construction, otherwise unattested for this verb, represents the more difficult rdg, and is more suitable semantically. Cp Lam 1:2; 3:20. Long before the discovery of חטוא 4QLam, Ehrlich proposed to read חטא (*Randglossen VII*, 31; cited by Cross ["Lamentations 1," 141]).

<לניד> 4QLam ו' confusion; לנידה M ס' S ה ditt/aur err, assim-לנידה Lam 1:17

M is unobjectionable but not necessarily original. M's consonantal text and vocalization are reflected in ס' and S; G, <א'>, V, and T are compatible with it. However, an original לניד with a meaning similar to that one usually supposes לנידה has, 'for (head/lip) wagging' (in sympathy/scorn), explains 4QLam לניד by positing one error, not two as would be the case if it derived from לנידה (ו' confusion and homoio ה־ה), and does not require assuming the occurrence of an otherwise unattested word. Cross ("Lamentations 1," 141) and Shäfer ("Lamentations," 115*) propose that 4QLam preserves the original reading, but once again, two errors must be posited to derive M from it. If M is retained, a 15 σ line results, but this is not a strong argument against M, since an occasional outlier with respect to the norm (in qinah meter, 9 to 14 σ lines) is to be expected in poetry.

1:9 <וַתִּרְדּוּ> σ' V | M assim-ctext

The vocalization proposed is a conceivable *qere* of the consonantal txt; σ' V so read. On this hypothesis, M represents a syntactical assimilation to the preceding line. If וַתִּרְדּוּ is read, the “a” verset becomes one syllable longer than the corresponding “b” verset. In qinah meter, “a” versets are often longer than “b” versets. In addition, תִּרְדּוּ rhymes with טְמֵאתָהּ (possibly טְמֵאתָהּ in origin), the cause of Jerusalem’s downfall. These arguments are not decisive, but the balance of probability favors וַתִּרְדּוּ .

1:10 <מִחֲמִדֶּיהָ> | מִחֲמִדֶּיהָ M vocal

On this proposal, in classical Hebrew מִחֲמֵד ‘coveted object’ was distinct from מִחֲמֵד ‘darling, object of delight.’ מִחֲמֵד fits in Lam 1:7, 10; מִחֲמֵד in Lam 2:4. For 1:11, see below.

<כִּרְאֲתָהּ> | כִּרְאֲתָהּ M aur

M’s כִּי clause seems inappropriate in context. It is explainable as a misinterpretation of an original consonantal txt כראתה facilitated by aural congruities and prevailing orthographic conventions (final ה came to signal *-a* almost without exception). In the proposed rdg, the sfx to the inf is proleptic vis-à-vis מקדש.

11 <מִחֲמִדֵּיהֶם> M^{ket} | מִחֲמִדֵּיהֶם M^{qere} vocal

מִחֲמִדֵּיהֶם ‘their coveted objects’ [= ketiv] is preferable to ‘their darlings = children sold into slavery’ [= qere]. The latter seems over the top, especially if we follow Hurowitz and take the following זִלְלָה to mean ‘beggar’ (“Lamentations 1:11,” 544). For a different proposal, see Linafelt (*Surviving Lamentations*, 40).

Lamentations 1:12-15

Prosodic Workup

				12	זֹא אֵלֵיכֶם כָּל־עֲבָרֵי דָרְךָ הִבִּיטוּ וּרְאוּ
	(2:2):2	cj σ' V T	לֹא		אִם־יֵשׁ מִכְאוּב כְּמִכְאֲבֵי
			3:3		אֲשֶׁר עוֹלָל לִי
3/7/17	3:2	cj 4QLam	חֲרוֹנוֹ {ס}	בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ :	אֲשֶׁר הוֹגְהָ יְהוָה
	3:2	-m; vd = all; cj G	יִרְדְּנָה	בְּעֲצַמְתִּי וַיִּרְדְּנָה	13 מִמָּרוֹם שָׁלַח־אֵשׁ
	3:2			הַיִּשְׁבָּנִי אַחֲזֹר	פָּרַשׁ רֶשֶׁת לְרַגְלֵי
3/6/15	2:3	-m cv	כֹּל {ס}	כָּל־הַיּוֹם דָּוָה:	נִתְּנִי שִׁמְמָה
	3:2	cj T	נִקְשָׁה; vd = all	בִּידוֹ יִשְׁתַּרְגֵּוּ	14 נִשְׁקָד עַל פְּשָׁעֵי
	3:2	cj G ^L	עָלָה	הַכְּשִׁיל כַּחֲוִי	עָלוּ עַל־צִוְּאָרָי
3/6/16	3:3	vd = BHS, NJV; -m	{ס}	לֹא־אוּכַל קוֹם:	נִתְּנִי אֲדֹנֵי בִידֵי
	3:2	-m cv		אֲדֹנֵי בְּקִרְבֵי	15 סֵלָה כָּל־אֲבִירֵי
	3:2			לְשֹׁבֵר בַּחֲוֵרֵי	קָרָא עָלַי מוֹעֵד
3/6/15	3:2	{ס}		לְבַתּוֹלֵת בַּת־יְהוּדָה:	גַּת דָּרְךָ אֲדֹנֵי
12/25/63				6/13/32 + 6/12/31	4/2/1

Lamentations 1:12-15

Full Reconstruction

	(2:2):2 <i>f</i> (2:3):3 <i>s</i> (4:5):5 <i>w</i> (2:3):2	הַבִּטּוֹ וְרָאוּ	כָּל־עֵבְרֵי דָרְךָ	12	לֹא אֵלֵיכֶם
	3:3 <i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 8:4 <i>w</i> 4:3	אֲשֶׁר עָלָל לִי	אִם־יֵשׁ מִכָּאֵב כִּמְכַאֲבִי		
<u>3/7/17</u>	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:2 <i>s</i> 6:5	בָּיִם חֲרָנָה : {ס}	אֲשֶׁר הוֹגָה יְהוָה		
	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:7	בְּעֲצַמְתִּי יוֹרְדָנָה	מִמָּרָם שָׁלַח אֵשׁ	13	
	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:2 <i>s</i> 6:5	הַשְּׁבָנִי אַחַר	פָּרַשׁ רֶשֶׁת לְרַגְלִי		
<u>3/6/15</u>	2:3 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> 2:3	כָּל הַיָּם דָּוָה : {ס}	נִתְּנָנִי שִׁמְמָה		
	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:6	בַּיָּדָה יִשְׁתַּרְגֵּוּ	נִקְשָׁה עַל פְּשָׁעֵי	14	
	3:2 <i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 8:4 <i>w</i> 4:2	הַכֶּשֶׁל כַּחֲוִי	עָלָה עָלוּ עַל־צוּאָרָי		
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:3 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 8:4	לֹא אוּכַל קָם : {ס}	נִתְּנָנִי אֲדָנִי בְיָדֵי		
	3:2 <i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 6:6	אֲדָנִי בְּקַרְבִּי	סָלְהָ כָּל אֲבָרָי	15	
	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5	לְשֹׁבֵר בַּחֲרָי	קָרָא עָלַי מוֹעֵד		
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 <i>f</i> 3:4 <i>s</i> 6:6 <i>w</i> 3:3	לְבַתְּלַת בַּת־יְהוָה : {ס}	גַּת דָּרְךָ אֲדָנִי		
12/25/63		6/13/33 + 6/12/30		4/2/1	

1:12 <לֹא> σ' V T | לוא M assim-usu || <חֲרָנָה> 4QLam | אפּוּ M assim-usu || 1:13 <יּוֹרְדָנָה> G | <יּוֹרְדָנָה> M metath || 1:14 <נִקְשָׁה> T* | נִשְׁקָד M metath, ה/ד confusion; נקשרה 4QLam assim-ctext || <עָלָה עָלוּ> G^L | עולו 4QLam σ' homoi על על M homoi על על, assim-ctext ||

x,y	$x = 6 \text{ to } 8$	$y = 4 \text{ to } 7$	$x+y = 10 \text{ to } 13$	$x-y = -1 \text{ to } 4$
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 4$	$y = 5$	$z = 5$
			$(x+y)+z = 14$	$(x+y)-z = 4$

compensatable lines:	3 of 12	lines compensatable in reverse:	3 of 12
σ (y+1 to 5):y compensations:	3x	ω (y+1):y with σ (x=y or y-1):	3x
f (y+1 or 2):y compensations:	1x	f (y+1 or 2):y with σ (x=y or y-1):	1x
w (y+1 or 2):y compensations:	1x		

1:12 <לֹא> σ' V T | לוא M assim-usu

On this hypothesis, the conditional particle לֹא (spelled thus in 2 Sam 18:12; 19:7, cf Job 9:33; לוא in 1 Sam 14:30; Isa 48:18; 63:19; otherwise לוּ), perhaps on account of its unusual and ambiguous spelling, with or without 1 added beforehand, was misread as לוא by the tradition preserved in M. For לוּ with an aposiopesis elsewhere, cf. Ps 27:13.

<חֲרָנָה> 4QLam | אפּוּ M assim-usu

4QLam has חרונו; M assimilates to the more common חרונו אפּוּ (Isa 13:13; Jer 4:26; Nah 1:9; Ps 69:25; Lam 4:11; etc.). The bare חרונו or equivalent, while rare, is attested (Ex 15:7; Ps 2:5; Ezek 7:14).

1:13 <יּוֹרְדָנָה> G | יּוֹרְדָנָה M metath

Graphic confusion of י and later disuse of postpositive *yiqtol* in reference to past events would have facilitated the corruption. Against MT's parse, BHS, NJV, AB, HCOT, and BHQ concur in reading בעצמתי 'in my bones' with the verb following. The virtual *ketiv* of בעצמתי is 'in my strength' (f sg), which accords with M יּוֹרְדָנָה and may help account for it, assuming it was understood as follows: 'And it (the fire) dominated it (my strength).'

1:14 <נִקְשָׁה> T* | נִשְׁקָד M metath, ה/ד confusion; נקשרה 4QLam assim-ctext

On this hypothesis, נקשה על → נקשרה על 4QLam by assimilation to the semantics of the “b” verset, though the resultant grammar is forced, whereas נקשה → נשקד M by metathesis and ה/ד confusion. The result, understood as נשקד ‘keep watch’ (G M^{Mss}), is awkward at best. נשקד (M^{Mss}), on the other hand, is unintelligible. T* translates as if it read נקשה (though נשקד may have stood in its Vorlage). For other proposals, see Hillers, *Lamentations*, 73.

על־על M homoi על־על σ' homoi 4QLam עולו] G^L <עלה עלו>

G^L translates as if it read על־על. For the idiom, see Num 19:2. G^L consistently corrects OG to agree with a proto-MT Vorlage. The latter, however, is not identical to MT. Loss of עלה in MT by hapl is plausible. 4QLam σ' read עולו (עלו) alone. M reads עלו, an assimilation to the preceding ישֶׁתְּרַגּוּ. The semantic parse preserved in M 1:14a-b is clumsy and results in three versets where we expect four.

Lamentations 1:16-22

Prosodic Workup

	3:3	cj G V 4QLam ditt	עֵינַי עֵינַי יִרְדָּה מַיִם	עַל־אֵלֶּה אֲנִי בּוֹכֶיָה	16
	3:2	⤵cj 1:17 before 16 4QLam	מִשִּׁיב נִפְשֵׁי	כִּי־רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם	⤵
3/6/16	<u>3:2</u> +m		כִּי גָבַר אוֹיְבִי: {ס}	הֲיִזְוּ בְּנֵי שׁוֹמְמִים	⤵
	3:3	cj פְּרָמָה cj בְּדִיָּה	אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ	פָּרְשָׁה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ	17
	3:2	cj 4QLam צָפָה cj סָבְבוּ	סָבְבוּ צָרִיו	צוּהָ יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב	⤵
3/6/15	<u>2:2</u>		לְנִדְחָ בִּינֵיהֶם: {ס}	הֲיִתָּה יְרוּשָׁלַם	⤵
	3:2+m		כִּי פָּיְחוּ מְרִיתִי	צָדִיק הוּא יְהוָה	18
	2:2	ketiv	וְרָאוּ מְכַאֲבֵי	שְׁמַעוּ־נָא כָּל־עַמִּים	⤵
3/6/13	<u>2:2</u>		הֲלָכוּ בְּשֹׁבֵי: {ס}	בְּתוֹלְתֵי וּבַחֹרֵי	⤵
	2:2		הֵמָּה רְמוּנֵי	קָרָאתִי לְמַאֲהָבִי	19
	2:2		בְּעִיר גִּזְעוּ	כִּהְיִי וְזִקְנִי	⤵
3/6/13	<u>3:2</u> cj	כְּבִקְשֵׁי {ס}	וַיִּשְׁיבוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם:	כִּי־בִקְשׁוּ אֶכֶּל לָמוֹ	⤵
	(2:2):2	-m; ≈all	מֵעַי חֲמַרְמָרוּ	רְאֵה יְהוָה כִּי־צָר־לִי	20
	3:2+m		כִּי מָרוּ מְרִיתִי	נִהַפְּדוּ לְבָבִי בְּקִרְבִּי	⤵
3/7/16	<u>3:2</u> -m		בְּבַיִת כְּמוֹת: {ס}	מִחוּץ שִׁכְלָה־חָרֵב	⤵
	3:3	*+m	אֵין מְנַחֵם לִי	שְׁמַעוּ כִּי נִאֲנַחָה אֲנִי	21
	<u>2:2</u>	vd; cj בְּרִעְתִּי; ld	רְעֵתִי שָׁשׂוּ	כָּל־אֵיבֵי שְׁמַעוּ	⤵
	2:2	+m; -m ld	הִבָּאת יוֹם	כִּי אֶתָּה עֲשִׂיתְ	⤵
4/8/19	<u>3:2</u>	cj G add מוֹעֵד	וַיְהִיו כְּמִנִּי: {ס}	קָרָאתְ	⤵
	3:2		וְעוֹלָל לָמוֹ	תָּבֹא כָּל־רְעֵתָם לְפָנַי	22
	3:2	+m; -m	עַל כָּל־פְּשָׁעֵי	כַּאֲשֶׁר עוֹלֵלְתָ לִי	⤵
3/6/14	<u>2:2</u>		וְלִבִּי דוּי: {פ}	כִּי־רַבּוֹת אֲנַחְתִּי	⤵

Lamentations 1:16-22

Full Reconstruction

	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	אַיִן מְנַחֵם לָהּ	פְּרָמָה צִיּוֹן בְּיַדֶּיהָ	17
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 7:4	סָבְבוּ צָרוֹ	צִפְּהָ יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב	
<u>3/6/15</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	לְגַדָּה בֵּינֵיהֶם: {ס}	הִיטָה יְרֻשָׁלַּם	
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 4:3	עֵינַי יִרְדֹּה מֵאֵי	16
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 8:4	<i>w</i> 4:3	מִשֵּׁב נַפְשִׁי	כִּי־רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	<i>w</i> 3:3	כִּי־גָבַר אֵיבִי: {ס}	הָיוּ בְנֵי שָׁמַמִּים
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 5:4	כִּי־פִיהוּ מְרִיתִי	צִדֵּק הָאֵל יְהוָה	18
	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:4	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 4:2	וְרָאוּ מִכְּאֲבֵי	שָׁמְעוּ־נְאֻם כָּל־עַמִּים
<u>3/6/13</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 8:4	{ס}	הִלְכּוּ בַשָּׁבִי: {ס}	בְּתַלְתֵּי אֲבַחְרֵי
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 7:3	הִמָּה רִמְנִי	קָרָאתִי לְמַאֲהָבִי	19
	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 7:4	בְּעִיר גֹּזְעוּ	כִּהְנִי וְזִקְנִי	
<u>3/6/13</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 3:3	אִישְׁבוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם: {ס}	כְּבִקְשֵׁי אֲכָל לֶמָּה
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2	<i>s</i> (4:3):3	<i>w</i> (2:3):2	מֵעֵי חֹמְרֵמְרוֹ	20
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	<i>w</i> 3:3	כִּי־מָרָה מְרִיתִי	נִהַפְּדָ לְבִי בְּקִרְבִּי
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 5:4	{ס}	בְּבֵית כְּמוֹת: {ס}	מִחֵץ שִׁפְלָה חָרַב
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	<i>w</i> 4:3	אַיִן מְנַחֵם לִי	21
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	<i>w</i> 3:2	בְּרַעַתִּי שָׁשׂוּ	כָּל־אֲבֵלֵי שָׁמְעוּ
	2:2	<i>f</i> 2:2	<i>s</i> 4:3	<i>w</i> 3:2	הִבְאֵתָ יָם	כִּי־אָתָּה עָשִׂיתָ
<u>4/8/18</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 2:2	<i>s</i> 4:5	{ס}	אִיהִיו כְּמִנִּי: {ס}	קָרָאתָ מוֹעֵד
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 9:4	<i>w</i> 4:2	אֶעֱלֵל לָמָּה	22
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:5	<i>w</i> 3:3	עַל־כָּל פְּשָׁעֵי	כִּאֲשֶׁר עָלְלָתָ לִי
<u>3/6/14</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 6:5	<i>w</i> 3:2	אֲלֵבֵי דָוִי: {פ}	כִּי־רִבַּת אֲנַחְתִּי

22/45/105

7/3/1

1:17 before 1:16 4QLam] after 1:16 M assim-usu || < פְּרָמָה צִיּוֹן בְּיַדֶּיהָ > | M crpp ||
 < צִפְּהָ > 4QLam] צִפְּהָ M פ/ו confusion || < סָבְבוּ > | M assim-ctext || 1:16 < אֵינִי בְּכִיָּה עֵינַי > G V |
 עֵינַי 4QLam homoio אֵינִי בְּכִיָּה עֵינַי עֵינִי, assim-ctext; M G⁰ G^{mss} σ' T S ditt || 1:18 עֵינַי
 M^{ket} | M^{qere} העֵינַי assim-usu || 1:19 < כְּבִקְשֵׁי > | M assim-ctext, /ו/ confusion || 1:21 < בְּרַעַתִּי > |
 יהִיו מוֹעֵד | M err-synt, homoi קָרָאתָ G | קָרָאתָ מוֹעֵד | M /ו/ hapl ||

x, y	$x = 4$ to 9	$y = 3$ to 6	$x+y = 7$ to 13	$x-y = -1$ to 5
x, y, z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 4$	$y = 3$	$z = 3$
			$x+y+z = 10$	$(x+y)-z = 4$
compensatable lines:		12 of 22	lines compensatable in reverse:	5 of 22
σ ($y+1$ to 4): y compensations:		8x	ω ($y+1$): y with σ ($x=y$):	1x
f ($y+1$ or 2): y compensations:		6x		
w ($y+1$ or 2): y compensations:		6x	w ($y+1$ or 2): y with σ ($x=y$):	2x

1:17 before 1:16 4QLam | after 1:16 M assim-usu

It is more probable that the unusual פ – ע sequence was changed to the usual sequence than the reverse. 1:17 is a narrative introduction to the soliloquy of 1:16, 18-22.

פְּרִשָּׁה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ | פְּרִמָּה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ M crpp

M is awkward if not impossible. Reminiscence of Lam 1:10 and the rarity of the vb פּרם (Lev 10:6; 13:45; 21:10) and noun בְּדִים (Ezek 9:3; cp Lev 16:32) would have facilitated עָשָׂה בְּיָדֶיהָ and בְּיָדֶיהָ. Stripped of the accoutrements of her former state, humbled to the point of wearing linen vestments only (see *y. Yoma* 7:3; cited by Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1016), Zion rends these in an act of abject grief.

צָפָה > 4QLam | צָנָה M פ/ו confusion

M 1:17ba is unproblematic per se, but difficult to square with 17bβ as it stands (see below). 4QLam's rdg seems preferable. For ל צָפָה with the same sense, see Ps 37:32. As Cross notes ("Lamentations 1," 147), M צוה may have been triggered by צויתה (reminiscence) in 1:10.

סָבְבוּ | סָבְבוּ M assim-ctext

M is syntactically awkward. On this hypothesis, it represents a misconstrual of an original סבבו often elsewhere expanded to סביביו in later orthography. For objectless סבב 'gathered round,' see Gen 37:7; Judg 16:2; 2 Sam 18:15. On Yahweh's watch, Jacob's enemies gather round. Yahweh, it is silently noted, did not intervene. It is also possible that the text in origin read: וסבבו... צוה, an attested syntactic idiom.

1:16 <אני בוכיה עיני> G V | <אני בכיה עיני> 4QLam homoio בכיה אני, assim-ctext; עיני עיני M G⁰ G^{mss} σ' T S ditt

On this hypothesis, אני was omitted in 4QLam via haplog; בכיה rather than בכיה is an assim-ctext once the unusual sg עיני was construed as du (cp Lam 1:2 sg לחיה as du in M^{Mss} G V S T); מים further on is replaced by a facilitating דמעתני. Double עיני has defenders; Jer 4:19; 2 Kgs 4:19 provide parallels. There, however, the doubled subjects are fronted, as one would expect. Metrically, as CTAT (878) notes, double עיני and single עיני both work. Single עיני is attested in G, 4QLam, and V, a strong combination.

1:18 עמים M^{ket} | העמים M^{qere} assim-usu

The ketiv represents the unusual construction. The qere assimilates to the usual. The poet may have chosen the anarthrous construction to achieve a quadruple syncopation in this strophe.

1:19 <כִּי־בָקְשׁוּ> | <כִּי־בָקְשׁוּ> M assim-ctext, ו/י confusion

On this hypothesis, the received text reflects the assimilation of an original inf construct with Zion as subj (cp 1:19a) to the vb forms of the immediate context. In the process an awkward כי clause was created, which in turn occasioned the gloss וְלֹא מָצְאוּ reflected in G S. ו/י confusion would have facilitated the assimilation. After a main clause, it should be added, a כי clause with a concessive or temporal rather than a causal function is unexampled. See Aejmelaeus, "Function and Interpretation of כי," 205-208.

1:21 <בָּרַעְתִּי> | <בָּרַעְתִּי> M ו/ב hapl

The received text is garbled. שמע does not take an obj like רַעַתִּי. The proposed rdg assumes the accidental omission of ב following the similar (5th-4th cent BCE), contiguous ו.

ויהיו מועד | קראת M err-synt, homoi מועד

On this hypothesis, once קראת was construed with יום מועד following, attested in G, was widowed, triggering its omission. The omission was facilitated by homoio: מ is similar to וי, וי to וי, and ד to ו in the script, e.g., of 4QSam^b. The sense: "Since you are the one who acted you brought the day you proclaimed the occasion may they become as I have." 1:21c-d lead into 1:22a-b. A four line acrostichon, matching that of 1:7, emerges. 1:22c is shorter than expected: perhaps יהוה was omitted after עשית via aur

הַבְּיָהוּהוּ הוֹמּוִיּוֹ. Asymmetrical distribution of semantic and syntactic parallelisms across adjacent lines is deployed elsewhere in the context (1:4, 12, 17, 20, 22).

Aggregate Statistics for Lamentations 1

Comprehensive

x,y		$x = 4$ to 9	$y = 3$ to 7	$x+y = 7$ to 14	$x-y = -1$ to 5
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 3$ to 5	$y = 3$ to 5	$z = 3$ to 5	$(x+y)+z = 10$ to 14 $(x+y)-z = 3$ to 5

Excluding Outliers

x,y		$x = 5$ to 8	$y = 3$ to 7	$x+y = 9$ to 14	$x-y = 0$ to 4
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 3$ to 5	$y = 3$ to 5	$z = 3$ to 5	$(x+y)+z = 10$ to 14 $(x+y)-z = 3$ to 5

Versets Producing Outliers: 5 of 140 (< 5%)

9 σ “a” verset 5 σ longer than “b” verset: 1:22a α (unless כַּל is omitted)

4 σ “a” verset producing 7 σ x,y line: 1:21c α (unless יְהוּה is added)

“b” verset 1 σ longer than “a” verset: 1:2c β (unless לֵה is omitted); 1:13a β ; 1:21d β

NB: elision of the ultrashort vowel in a c^v syllable in a “b” verset apparently 1 σ longer than an “a” verset was hypothesized in 1:15c β , yielding $x-y = 0$

Macro Symmetries

1:1-11	22/45/110 + 12/25/58 = 34/70/168	1:12-22	12/25/63 + 22/45/105 = 34/70/168
1:1-22	68/140/336	68 = (2 x 12) + (2 x 22)	140 = 5 x 28 336 = 12 x 28

NB: 12, 22, and 28 are recurrent numbers in the compositional technique of ancient Hebrew verse

Uniformity of length in strophes, substanzas, and stanzas tends to increase with size

2/5/11	1:7a-b	(1x)	
2/4/11	1:7c-d; 1:21a-b	(2x)	4 to 5 versets, 8 to 11 ω 's
2/4/8	1:21c-d	(1x)	
3/7/17	1:12, 21	(2x)	
3/7/16	1:20	(1x)	
3/7/15	1:10	(1x)	
3/6/16	1:2; 14, 16	(3x)	6 to 7 versets, 13 to 17 ω 's,
3/6/15	1:3; 4; 6; 9; 13; 14; 15; 17	(8x)	with a “target” range of 14 to 16 ω 's
3/6/14	1:1; 8; 11; 22	(4x)	
3/6/13	1:5; 18, 19	(3x)	
4/9/22	1:7	(1x)	
4/8/18	1:21	(1x)	8 to 9 versets, 18 to 22 ω 's
6/13/32	1:12-13	(1x)	
6/13/29	1:10-11; 19-20	(2x)	
6/12/31	1:14-15	(1x)	12 to 13 versets, 28 to 31 ω 's,
6/12/30	1:1-2; 3-4; 13-14	(3x)	with a “target” range of 29 to 31 ω 's
6/12/29	1:8-9; 16, 18	(2x)	
6/12/28	1:5-6	(1x)	
9/21/45	1:1-3	(1x)	
9/21/44	1:17, 16, 18	(1x)	21 versets, 43 to 45 ω 's
9/21/43	1:4-6	(1x)	

There is a strong tendency to finish a strophe with a highly syncopated 4 or 5 σ verset: 17 of 24

Lamentations 2:1-4

Prosodic Workup

	3:3 -m	אֲדַנִּי אֶת־בֵּית־צִיּוֹן	אֵיכָה יָעִיב בְּאֶפֶן	1
	3:2	תִּפְאֲרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל	הַשְּׁלִיךְ מִשָּׁמַיִם אֶרֶץ	2
3/7/17	(2:2):2 -m -m	בְּיוֹם אֶפֶן: {ס}	וְלֹא זָכַר הַדָּם רִגְלוֹ	3
	(2:2):3 ketiv +m; -m	אֶת כָּל־נְאוֹת יַעֲקֹב	בִּלְע אֲדָנִי לֹא חָמַל	2
	2:2	מִבְּצָרֵי בֵּית־יְהוּדָה	הָרַס בְּעִבְרָתָהּ	3
3/7/16	3:2vd = BHS, AB; NJV {ס}	מִמְלָכָה וְשָׂרִיָּה:	הִגִּיעַ לְאֶרֶץ חָלָל	4
	3:3 -m	כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	גָּדַע בְּחָרֵי־אֶף	3
	3:2	מִפְּנֵי אוֹיֵב	הִשָּׁיב אַחֲזֹר יְמִינוֹ	4
3/7/17	(2:2):2 vd	אֶכְלָה סָבִיב: {ס}	וַיִּבְעַר בְּיַעֲקֹב כַּאֲשֶׁר לַהֲבָה	3
	3:2 *vd = BHS; AB	נָצַב יְמִינוֹ	דָּרַךְ קִשְׁתּוֹ כְּאוֹיֵב	4
	2:2 *cj וַיִּצַּר +m; -m	כָּל־מַחְמַדֵּי־עֵינַי	כְּצֹר וַיִּהְרֹג	3
3/6/14	3:2 vd ≠ all	כַּאֲשֶׁר חָמַתּוֹ: {ס}	בְּאַהֲלֵי בֵּית־צִיּוֹן שָׁפַךְ	4
12/27/64		6/14/33 + 6/13/31	4/2/1	

Lamentations 2:1-4

Full Reconstruction

	3:3 f 3:3 s 7:7	אֲדַנִּי אֶת־בֵּית צִיּוֹן	אֵיכָה יַעֲבֵב בְּאֶפֶן	1
	3:2 f 4:3 s 6:5	תִּפְאֲרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל	הַשְּׁלִיךְ מִשָּׁמַיִם אֶרֶץ	2
3/7/17	(2:2):2 f (2:2):2 s (4:4):4	בְּיוֹם אֶפֶן: {ס}	וְלֹא זָכַר הַדָּם רִגְלוֹ	3
	(2:2):3 f (2:2):3 s (5:3):6	אֶת־כָּל־נְאוֹת יַעֲקֹב	בִּלְע אֲדָנִי לֹא חָמַל	2
	2:2 f 3:4 s 6:6	מִבְּצָרֵי בֵּית־יְהוּדָה	הָרַס בְּעִבְרָתָהּ	3
3/7/16	3:2 f 3:2 s 6:6	מִמְלָכָה וְשָׂרִיָּה: {ס}	הִגִּיעַ לְאֶרֶץ חָלָל	4
	3:3 f 3:3 s 5:5	כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	גָּדַע בְּחָרֵי אֶף	3
	3:2 f 4:3 s 6:5	מִפְּנֵי אוֹיֵב	הִשָּׁיב אַחֲזֹר יְמִנָּה	4
3/7/17	(2:2):2 f (2:2):2 s (6:5):4	אֶכְלָה סָבִיב: {ס}	וַיִּבְעַר בְּיַעֲקֹב כַּאֲשֶׁר לַהֲבָה	3
	3:2 f 3:4 s 7:7	נָצַב יְמִנָּה	דָּרַךְ קִשְׁתּוֹ כְּאוֹיֵב	4
	2:2 f 3:3 s 5:5	כָּל־מַחְמַדֵּי עֵינַי	כְּצֹר וַיִּהְרֹג	3
3/6/14	3:2 f 4:2 s 7:5	כַּאֲשֶׁר חָמַתּוֹ: {ס}	בְּאַהֲלֵי בֵּית־צִיּוֹן שָׁפַךְ	4
12/27/64		6/14/33 + 6/13/31	4/2/1	

2:4 כָּצַר | וַיִּצַּר M כ/וי confusion; assim-ctext

On prosodic grounds, M 2:4b seems defective. כָּצַר in M 2:4a is unobjectionable per se, but not necessarily original. On this proposal, M reflects a misreading of וַיִּצַּר as כָּצַר in assimilation to כאויב preceding. The proposals of BHS (word-level metathesis כְּצֹר/וַיִּהְרֹג) and Hillers (הִכָּה to add after כָּצַר [*Lamentations*, 98]) require the assumption of greater error. For an idiom like the one reconstructed here, see Job 16:13.

Lamentations 2:5-10

Prosodic Workup

	3:2	בַּלַע יִשְׂרָאֵל	חֵ 5	הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאוֹיֵב
	3:2	שַׁחַת מִבְּצֻרָיו	ח	בַּלַע כָּל-אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ
3/6/15	3:2 -m	תִּאֲנִיָּה וְאֲנִיָּה: {ס}	ח	וַיִּרֶב בְּבֵית־יְהוּדָה
	3:2	שַׁחַת מִעֵדוֹ	ח 6	וַיַּחְמֹס כַּגֵּן שָׂבוֹ
	3:2	מוֹעֵד וְשִׁבְתָּ	ח	שָׂבַח יְהוָה בְּצִיּוֹן
3/6/15	3:2 -m	מִלֶּדֶ וְכֵהֵן: {ס}	ח	וַיִּנְאֹץ בְּזַעַם־אָפוֹ
	3:2	נָאֵר מִקִּדְשׁוֹ	ח 7	זָנַח אֲדֹנָי מִזְבְּחוֹ
	3:2 -m	חֹמֹת אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ	ח	הַסְגִּיר בְּיַד־אוֹיֵב
3/7/16	(2:2):2 -m	כִּיֹּם מוֹעֵד: {ס}	ח	קוֹל נִתְנָו בְּבֵית־יְהוָה
	3:2	חֹמֹת בַּת־צִיּוֹן	ח 8	חָשַׁב יְהוָה לְהִשְׁחִית
	(2:2):2 -m	יָדוֹ מִבַּלַע	ח	נָטָה קוֹ לֹא־יָשִׁיב
3/7/16	3:2 -m	יַחֲדוֹ אֲמַלְלוּ: {ס}	ח	וַיִּאֲבֹל־חַל וְחֹמָה
	3:3 cj om †	אֲבָד וְשָׁבַר בְּרִיחֶיהָ	ח 9	טָבְעוּ בְּאַרְץ שְׁעָרֶיהָ
	3:3 cj add	אֵין תּוֹרָה בְּכִהְנֶנָּה	ח	מִלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ בְּגוֹיִם
3/6/17	3:2 -m	חֲזוֹן מִיְהוָה: {ס}	ח	גַּם־נְבִיאֶיהָ לֹא־מָצְאוּ
	3:2	זָקְנֵי בַת־צִיּוֹן	ח 10	יִשְׁבוּ לְאַרְץ יְדָמוֹ
	3:2	חָגְרוּ שָׁקִים	ח	הִעֲלוּ עֵפֶר עַל־רֹאשָׁם
3/6/15	3:2	בְּתוֹלַת יְרוּשָׁלַם: {ס}	ח	הוֹרִידוּ לְאַרְץ רֹאשָׁן
18/38/94		9/19/46 + 9/19/48		6/2/1

Lamentations 2:5-10

Full Reconstruction

	3:2 f 3:3 s 8:5	בִּלְעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל	הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאֵיב	5
	3:2 f 4:3 s 6:5	שַׁחַת מִבְּצָרוֹ	בִּלְעַ כָּל אַרְמְנֹתֶיהָ	פ
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 3:4 s 6:6	תִּאֲנִיָּה וְאֲנִיָּה: {ס}	וַיִּרְבַּ בְּבֵת יְהוָה	פ
	3:2 f 4:3 s 7:5	שַׁחַת מוֹעֲדָה	וַיַּחֲמָס כְּגֹן שֹׁכֶה	6
	3:2 f 3:2 s 7:5	מוֹעֵד וְשֹׁבֵת	שֹׁכֵחַ יְהוָה בְּצִיֹן	פ
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 4:2 s 7:4	מֶלֶךְ וְכֹהֵן: {ס}	וַיִּנְאָץ בְּזַעַם אִפָּה	פ
	3:2 f 4:3 s 8:5	נָאֵר מִקִּדְשָׁהּ	זָנַח אֲדֹנָי מִזִּבְחָהּ	7
	3:2 f 3:3 s 6:5	חֲמַת אַרְמְנֹתֶיהָ	הַסֵּגֵר בְּיַד אֵיב	פ
<u>3/7/16</u>	(2:2):2 f (2:2):2 s (3:4):4	כָּלִים מוֹעֵד {ס}	קָל נִתְּנָו בְּבֵית יְהוָה	פ
	3:2 f 3:3 s 7:5	חֲמַת בַּת-צִיֹן	חָשַׁב יְהוָה לָהּ שַׁחַת	8
	(2:2):2 f (2:2):3 s (3:3):5	יָדָה מִבִּלְעַ	נָטָה קוֹ לֹא הַשֵּׁב	פ
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2 f 4:3 s 7:4	יַחֲדוּ אֲמֹלָלוֹ: {ס}	וַיִּאֲבָל חַל וְחֲמָה	פ
	3:3 f 3:3 s 7:7	אֲבָד שִׁבְר בָּרַחֲמֶיהָ	טָבְעוּ בְּאֶרֶץ שְׂעָרֶיהָ	9
	3:3 f 4:4 s 8:7	בְּכַהֲנִיָּה אֵין תּוֹרָה	מִלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ בְּגוֹיִם	פ
<u>3/6/17</u>	3:2 f 4:3 s 7:5	חֲזֹן מִיְהוָה: {ס}	גַּם-נִבְאִיָּה לֹא מָצְאוּ	פ
	3:2 f 3:3 s 6:6	יִקְנִי בַת-צִיֹן	יֵשְׁבוּ לְאֶרֶץ יְדֹמוֹ	10
	3:2 f 4:2 s 7:4	חָגְרוּ שִׁקָּם	הָעָלוּ עֵפֶר עַל-רֵאשָׁם	פ
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 4:3 s 6:7	בְּתֵלֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל {ס}	הוֹרְדוּ לְאֶרֶץ רֵאשָׁן	פ
18/38/94		9/19/46 + 9/19/48		6/2/1

2:9 אֲבָד וְשִׁבְר | אֲבָד שִׁבְר M assim-usu

On this hypothesis, qatal verbs in apposition as classical norms dictate were conjoined by a ו in accordance with later norms. Examples of the classical construction: Ex 15:9; Deut 32:15; Jdg 5:27; Am 5:21; Ps 14:1 (modernized in 53:2); Job 20:19; 29:8; Lam 2:10. M is not impossible metrically; cp 1:13a.

בְּכַהֲנִיָּה בְּגוֹיִם M homoio | אֵין תּוֹרָה | בְּכַהֲנִיָּה אֵין תּוֹרָה

In the received text, אֵין תּוֹרָה must be construed as an adverbial modifier of the preceding. The resultant sense is: ‘her king and her officers . . . and her prophets, too’ are without instruction or revelation from Yahweh to transmit. The sense is inappropriate. An addition is required by the context. מֶלֶךְ וְכֹהֵן in Lam 2:6 anticipates the parallelism restored here. כַּהֲנִיָּה would have dropped out by aur homoioarkton בְּכַהֲנִיָּה, or by graph homoioarkton בְּכַהֲנִיָּה [יה] בְּגוֹיִם. כַּהֲנִיָּה in 2:9b forms a pair with נִבְאִיָּה in 9c. 2:9 as a whole is reminiscent of 1:4; 2:2; and 2:5 for the description of iconic devastation embracing first the architectonic and then the human.

Lamentations 2:11-16

Prosodic Workup

	3:2		חִמְרָמְרוּ מְעִי	כָּלוּ בְדַמְעוֹת עֵינַי	11
	3:2		עַל־שֶׁבֶר בַּת־עַמִּי	נִשְׁפָּד לְאָרֶץ כְּבָדִי	כ
3/6/15	3:2		בְּרַחְבוֹת קַרְיָה: {ס}	בְּעֶטֶף עוֹלָל וַיּוֹנֵק	ג
	2:3		אֵיךְ דָּגַן וַיָּזֶן	לְאַמְתָּם יֹאמְרוּ	12
	2:2		בְּרַחְבוֹת עִיר	בְּהִתְעַטְפָּם כְּחֹלֵל	כ
3/6/13	2:2		אֶל־חֵיק אַמְתָּם: {ס}	בְּהִשְׁתַּפֵּד נַפְשָׁם	ג
	(2:2):2	-m cj +m -m;	מֵהָ אֲעִידֶךָ מֵהָ אֲדַמָּה לְךָ הַבַּת יְרוּשָׁלַם	מֵהָ אֲעִידֶךָ מֵהָ אֲשׁוּה לְךָ וְאַנְחִמֶךָ	13
	3:2	+m -m	בְּתוֹלַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן	כִּי־גָדוֹל כִּיָּם שִׁבְרֶךָ	כ
3/7/17	3:3	-m	מִי יִרְפָּא לְךָ: {ס}		ג
	3:2	vd = all	שָׂוֵא וְתָפֵל	נְבִיאֶיךָ חֲזוּ לְךָ	14
	3:2	-m ketiv	לְהַשִּׁיב שְׁבִיתֶךָ	וְלֹא־גָלוּ עַל־עוֹנֶיךָ	כ
3/6/15	3:2	cj מְשֹׂאוֹת	שָׂוֵא וּמַדּוּחִים: {ס}	וַיַּחֲזוּ לְךָ מְשֹׂאוֹת	ג
	3:2	vd = all but BHQ↑	כָּל־עַבְרֵי דָרְךָ	סִפְקוּ עֲלֶיךָ כַּפִּים	15
	3:2	vd = all but BHQ↓	עַל־בַּת יְרוּשָׁלַם	שָׁרְקוּ וַיִּנְעוּ רֵאשִׁים	כ
3/7/17	(2:2):3	-m cj om {ס}	כָּל־הָאָרֶץ: {ס}	הַזֹּאת הָעִיר שִׁיאֲמְרוּ	ג
	3:2	*-m	כָּל־אֲיִבֶיךָ	פָּצוּ עֲלֶיךָ פִּיהֶם	16
	3:2	-m	אָמְרוּ בְלַעֲנוּ	שָׁרְקוּ וַיַּחֲרְקוּ־שֵׁן	כ
3/6/15	3:2	*+m	מִצָּאֵנוּ רָאִינוּ: {ס}	אֵךְ יֵה הַיּוֹם שִׁקּוּיִנְהוּ	ג
	18/38/92		9/19/45 + 9/19/47	6/2/1	

Lamentations 2:11-16

Full Reconstruction

	3:2 f 4:2 s 8:5	חִמְרָמוּ מְעִי	כָּלוּ בְדַמְעַת עֵינַי	11
	3:2 f 3:3 s 7:5 w 3:4	עַל־שָׂבַר בַּת־עַמִּי	וְשִׁפְךָ לְאָרֶץ כְּבִדִּי	ש
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 4:3 s 8:6	בְּרַחֲבַת קִרְיָה: {ס}	בְּעֶטֶף עֲלֵלִי וַיִּנֶּק	ש
	2:3 f 3:3 s 6:6 w 2:3	אֵיָה דָגַן וַיֵּזֶן	לְאִמְתָּם יֵאמְרוּ	12
	2:2 f 5:3 s 8:5	בְּרַחֲבַת עִיר	בְּהִתְעַטְפָּם כַּחֲלֵל	ש
<u>3/6/13</u>	2:2 f 3:3 s 6:5 w 2:3 {ס}	אֶל־חֶק אִמְתָּם: {ס}	בְּהִשְׁתַּפֵּךְ נַפְשָׁם	ש
	(2:2):2 f (3:3):3 s (4:5):6 w (2:3):2	הִבֵּת יִרְשָׁלַם	מָה אֶעֱרֹכֶךָ מָה־אֲדַמָּה לָךְ	13
	3:2 f 4:3 s 8:6 w 4:3	בַּתְּלַת בַּת־צִיֹּן	מָה־אֲשׁוּה לָךְ וְאִנְחִימֶךָ	ש
<u>3/7/17</u>	3:3 f 4:3 s 8:6 w 4:3 {ס}	מִי יִרְפָּא לָךְ: {ס}	כִּי־גִדְל כִּיָּם שְׁבַרְךָ	ש
	3:2 f 3:2 s 6:4	שׁוּא אֶתְפֹּל	נְבִיאֶיךָ חֲזוּ לָךְ	14
	3:2 f 4:2 s 8:6 w 4:2	לְהִשָּׁב שְׁבַתְךָ	וְלֹא גָלוּ עַל־עֲוֹנֶיךָ	ש
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 4:3 s 7:5 {ס}	שׁוּא אִמְדַּחֶם: {ס}	וַיַּחֲזוּ לָךְ מִשְׁאֵת	ש
	3:2 f 3:2 s 6:4	כַּל־עֲבָרֵי דָרְךָ	סָפְקוּ עֲלֶיךָ כַּפָּיִם	15
	3:2 f 3:2 s 6:4	עַל־בַּת יִרְשָׁלַם	שָׁרְקוּ וַיִּנְעוּ רֵאשִׁים	ש
<u>3/7/17</u>	(2:2):3 f (3:2):3 s (5:4):6 {ס}	מִשֵּׁשׁ לְכָל הָאָרֶץ: {ס}	הַזֹּאת שִׁיאֲמָרוּ כְּלַלֵּת יִפִּי	ש
	3:2 f 3:3 s 6:4	כָּל אֲבָבִיד	פָּצוּ עֲלֶיךָ פִּיהֶם	16
	3:2 f 4:2 s 6:4	אָמְרוּ בִלְעֵנוּ	שָׁרְקוּ וַיַּחֲרְקוּ שֵׁן	ש
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2 f 4:2 s 8:4 w 4:2 {ס}	מִצָּאֵנוּ רָאִינוּ: {ס}	אֲדַזֶּה הַיָּם שִׁקוּיָנְהוּ	ש
	18/38/92	9/19/45 + 9/19/47	6/2/1	

2:13 אֶעֱרֹכֶךָ V | אֶעֱיִדֶךָ M G S T La and ו/ר confusion

For unconvincing attempts to squeeze sense out of M, see Albrektson, *Studies*, 107-108. The proposed graphic confusions are plausible in the 5th-4th cent. BCE. ערך and דמה are paired in Isa 40:18 and Ps 89:7, as here, *ex hypothesi*. V's Vorlage was probably no different than that of G S T La, but V depends on a tradition that hit on the right interpretation. Meinhold, followed by BHS, NJV, AB, and HALOT, emend to אֶעֱרֹךְ. The proposal made here fits the context more tightly, and conforms more closely to V's gloss.

2:14 מִשְׁאֵת | מִשְׁאוֹת M assim-usu

On this hypothesis, a string of nouns in apposition were construed as a bound phrase in assimilation to the more common construction. The first to revocalize מִשְׁאוֹת as proposed here was Budde, “ “. To be sure, enjambment part way through a bound phrase is not out of the question in poetry. Cp Isa 28:1.

2:15° | הָעִיר M ampl

The first to propose omitting הָעִיר on metrical grounds was Bickell. Others omit the entire last colon, thus reducing the line to a bicolon, but as Renkema observes, this overlooks the frequent deployment of a tricolon at the end of a strophe or larger subunit of a poem.

Lamentations 2:17-22

Prosodic Workup

	(2:2):2	בַּצַּע אֶמְרָתוֹ	עֲשֵׂה יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר זָמַם	17
	(2:2):3	הָרַס וְלֹא חָמַל	אֲשֶׁר צָוָה מִימֵי־קֹדֶם	ש
	<u>3/8/19</u> 3:3	הָרִים קִרְוֹן צָרִידָּ: {ס}	וַיִּשְׁמַח עַל־יָדְךָ אוֹיֵב	ש
	3:2	חֹמַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן	צָעַק לִבָּם אֶל־אֲדֹנָי	18
	3:2	צַעֲקֵי מִלִּבָּךְ cj	הַזֹּרֵדִי כַנְחַל דְּמַעַה	ש
	<u>3/6/15</u> 3:2	אֶל־תִּדְדִם בַּת־עֵינֶיךָ: {ס}	אֶל־תִּתְנֵנִי פּוֹגַת לָךְ	ש
	(2:2):3	שִׁפְכֵי כַמִּים לִבָּךְ	קוּמִי רְנִי לְרֹאשׁ אֲשֶׁמְרוֹת	19
	3:3	שָׂאֵי אֱלֹוֹ כַפֶּיךָ	נִבַּח פְּנֵי אֲדֹנָי	ש
	<u>3/8/21</u> (2:2):2	{ס} בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל־חֻצּוֹת: {ס}	עַל־נַפְשׁ עוֹלְלֶיךָ הָעֵטוּפִים	ש
	3:3	לְמִי עוֹלְלֹת כֹּה	רְאֵה יְהוָה וְהִבִּיטָה	20
	3:2	עַל־לֵי טַפְחִים	אִם־תֹּאכְלֶנָּה נְשִׁים פְּרִים	ש
	<u>3/6/16</u> 3:2	כֹּהֲן וְנָבִיא: {ס}	אִם־יִהְיֶה בְּמִקְדָּשׁ אֲדֹנָי	ש
	3:2	נָעַר וְזָקֵן	שָׁכְבוּ לְאַרְץ חֻצּוֹת	21
	3:2	נָפְלוּ בַּחֲרָב	בַּתּוֹלְתֵי וּבַחֲוָרֵי	ש
	<u>3/6/15</u> 3:3	טַבַּחַת לֹא חָמַלְתָּ: {ס}	הַרְגַתְּ בְּיוֹם אֶפְדָּךְ	ש
	3:2	מְגוּרֵי מִסְבֵּיב	תִּקְרָא כְיוֹם מוֹעֵד	22
	(2:2):2	פָּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד	וְלֹא הָיָה בְּיוֹם אֶף־יְהוָה	ש
	<u>3/7/16</u> 3:2	אֵיבֵי כָלָם: {ס}	אֲשֶׁר־טַפַּחְתִּי וּרְבִיתִי	ש
	18/41/102	9/22/55 + 9/19/47	6/2/1	

Lamentations 2:17-22

Full Reconstruction

	(2:2):2		בַּצֵּעַ אֲמַרְתוּ	עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר זָמַם	17
	(2:2):3		הָרַס וְלֹא חָמַל	אֲשֶׁר צָנָה מִימֵי־קֶדֶם	שׁ
<u>3/8/19</u>	3:3		הָרִים קֶרֶן צָרִידָ: {ס}	וַיִּשְׁמַח עָלֶיךָ אוֹיֵב	שׁ
	3:2	ej	חֹמַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן	צָעַק לִבָּם אֶל־אֲדֹנָי	18
	3:2		יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה	הוֹרִידִי כַגֹּחַל דְּמַעָה	שׁ
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2		אֶל־תִּדְּם בַּת־עֵינָדָ: {ס}	אֶל־תִּתְּנִי פּוֹגַת לְךָ	שׁ
	(2:2):3		שָׁפְכִי כַמַּיִם לִבָּדָ	קוֹמִי וְרַנִּי לְרֹאשׁ אֲשַׁמְרוֹת	19
	3:3		שָׂאִי אֵלָיו כַּפַּיֶךָ	נִכַח פְּנֵי אֲדֹנָי	שׁ
<u>3/8/21</u>	(2:2):2	{ס}	עַל־נַפְשׁ עוֹלָלֶיךָ הָעֵטוּפִים	בְּרָעַב בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל־חֹצוֹת: {ס}	שׁ
	3:3		לְמִי עוֹלָלְתָּ כֹּה	רְאֵה יְהוָה וְהִבִּיטָה	20
	3:2		עָלְלִי טַפְחִים	אִם־תֹּאכְלֶנָּה נָשִׁים פְּרִים	שׁ
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2		כִּהֵן וְנָבִיא: {ס}	אִם־יִהְרַג בְּמִקְדָּשׁ אֲדֹנָי	שׁ
	3:2		נָעַר וְזָקֵן	שָׁכְבוּ לְאָרֶץ חֹצוֹת	21
	3:2		נָפְלוּ בַחֲרָב	בְּתוֹלְתֵי וּבַחוּרֵי	שׁ
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:3		טִבַּחְתָּ לֹא חָמַלְתָּ: {ס}	הַרְגִתָּ בַיּוֹם אֶפְדָּ	שׁ
	3:2		מְגוּרֵי מִסְבֵּיב	תִּקְרָא כְיוֹם מוֹעֵד	22
	(2:2):2	om	פָּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד	וְלֹא הָיָה בַיּוֹם אֶף־יְהוָה	שׁ
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2		אִיבֵי כָלָם: {ס}	אֲשֶׁר־טִפַּחְתִּי וּרְבִיתִי	שׁ
18/41/102			9/22/55 + 9/19/47	6/2/1	

$$(12/27/64 + 18/38/94) + (18/38/92 + 18/41/102) = 66/144/352$$

Lamentations 3:1-18

A Reconstruction

(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (3:3):5	בְּשִׁבְט עֲבָרְתָּהּ:	אָנִי הַגִּבֹּר רָאָה עֵנִי	1
3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4	חֲשֵׁךְ וְלֹא־אֹר:	אֶתִּי נָהַג וְיִלְךְ	2
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> 4:3	{ס} יָדָה כֹּל־הַיָּמִים:	אֶדְרְכֵי יֹשֵׁב יְהִפֹּךְ	3
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 8:5	שִׁבְר עֲצַמֹתַי:	בָּלָה בְּשָׂרֵי וְעוֹרֵי	4
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 7:5	רָאֵשׁ וְתִלְאָה:	בָּנָה עָלַי וַיִּקְרַף	5
<u>3/6/14</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 7:5	{ס} כִּמְתִי עֲלָם:	בְּמַחְשָׁכֶם הוֹשַׁבְנִי	6
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2 <i>s</i> (4:4):5	הַכְּבִיד נַחֲשֵׁתִי:	גָּדַר בְּעַדֵי וְלֹא אֶצְאָ	7
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 7:6 <i>w</i> 4:2	שָׁתָם תִּפְלֹתַי:	גַּם־כִּי אֲזַעַק וְאֲשׁוּעַ	8
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 8:5	{ס} נִתְבַּתִּי עוֹהָ:	גָּדַר דְּרָכֵי בְּגִזִּית	9
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):3 <i>s</i> (3:2):5	אָרִי בְּמִסְתָּרָם:	דָּב אַרְבֵּי הָאֵל לִי	10
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 8:4	שָׁמְנֵי שָׁמָם:	דְּרָכֵי סָרַר וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי	11
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3 <i>s</i> 8:6	{ס} כַּמְטָרָא לַחֲץ:	דָּרַךְ קִשְׁתָּהּ וַיִּצַּבְנִי	12
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3 <i>s</i> 6:5	בְּנֵי אֲשַׁפְתָּהּ:	הִבִּיא בְּכִלְיֹתַי	13
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):4 <i>s</i> (4:4):7	נִגְנַתָּם כֹּל־הַיָּמִים:	הֵייתִי שֹׁחֵק לְכָל עַמִּי	14
<u>3/7/14</u>	2:2	<i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 7:4	{ס} הִרְוִנִי לַעֲנָה:	הִשְׁבַּעְנִי בְּמִרְרָם	15
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2 <i>s</i> 8:5	הַכְּפֹשֵׁנִי בְּאֶפְרָ:	וַיִּגְרַס בְּחֻצַּי שְׁנֵי	16
	3:2	<i>f</i> 5:2 <i>s</i> 8:4	נְשִׁיתִי טֹבָה:	וְתוֹזַנַח מִשְׁלֹם נַפְשִׁי	17
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:4 <i>s</i> 7:7	{ס} וְתוֹחַלֹתִי מִיְהוָה:	וְאָמַר אֲבָד נִצְחִי	18

18/40/92

(9+9 lines; 20+20 versets; 47+45 prosodic words)

8/4/2/1

1:11 <וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> | <דְּרָכֵי> | <סָרַר וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> | <וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> M vocal || 17 <וְתוֹזַנַח> | <וְתוֹזַנַח> M vocal ||

x,y	$x = 6$ to 8	$y = 4$ to 7	$x+y = 10$ to 14	$x-y = 0$ to 4
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 3$ to 4	$y = 2$ to 4	$z = 5$ to 7
			$(x+y)+z = 10$ to 14	$(x+y)-z = 0$ to 3
compensatable lines:	4 of 18	lines compensatable in reverse:	2 of 18	
σ ($y+1$ to 3): y compensations:	$4x$	ω ($y+1$): y with σ ($x=y$ or $x+y=z$):	$2x$	
f ($y+1$ or 2): y compensations:	$2x$	f ($y+1$): y with σ ($x+y=z$):	$1x$	

1:11 <וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> | <דְּרָכֵי> | <סָרַר וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> | <וַיִּפְשַׁחְנִי> M vocal

If M is retained, the verset is uniquely long (10 σ). The proposed rdg is an equally conceivable *qere*.

17 <וְתוֹזַנַח> | <וְתוֹזַנַח> M vocal

M seems awkward. The proposed rdg presupposes a rarer form but is an equally conceivable *qere*.

Listed below are alternate reconstructions of Lam 3:1, 7, 10, 14 which will not be discussed here:

(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (3:5):5	בְּשִׁבְט עֲבָרְתָּהּ:	אָנִי הַגִּבֹּר רָעָה אֲדֹנָי	1
3:3	<i>f</i> 4:4	<i>s</i> 6:7 <i>w</i> 4:3	{ס} כִּמְתִי עֲלָם:	בְּמַחְשָׁכֶם הוֹשַׁבְנִי	7
(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (3:2):5	אָרִי בְּמִסְתָּרָם:	דָּב אַרְבֵּי הָאֵל לִי	10

Lamentations 3:19-36

A Reconstruction

	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 8:4	לְעֵנָה וְרֹאשׁ:	19	זָכַר עֲנִי וּמְרֹדִי
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 7:4	עָלִי נִפְשִׁי:	20	זָכַר תְּזַכֵּר וְתִשְׁיַח
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:4 <i>w</i> 4:3	{ס} עַל-כֵּן אֶחְיֶל:	21	זֹאת אָשִׁיב אֶל-לִבִּי
	(2:2):3	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (4:4):6	כִּי-לֹא כָלוּ רַחֲמוֹ:	22	חֶסְדֵי יְהוָה כִּי-לֹא תִמָּמוֹ
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:6 <i>w</i> (2:3):4	רַבָּה אֲמַנְתָּד:	23	חֲדָשָׁם לְבַקְרוֹם
<u>3/8/18</u>	(2:2):3	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (4:4):5 {ס}	עַל-כֵּן אֶחְיֶל לֹו:	24	חֶלְקֵי יְהוָה אָמְרָה נִפְשִׁי
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> (2:2):4	לְנִפְשׁ תִּדְרֹשְׁנוּ:	25	טֹב יְהוָה לְקִוּוֹ
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:6	לְתִשְׁעַת יְהוָה:	26	טֹב וַיִּחֵל וּדְמָם
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> 4:2	{ס} עַל בְּנֵעֵרוֹ:	27	טֹב לְגִבֹּר כִּי-יִשָּׂא
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	כִּי-נִטַּל עָלוֹ:	28	יֵשֵׁב בְּדַד וַיִּדָּם
	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	אֵלֵי יֵשׁ תִּקְוָה:	29	יִתֵּן בַּעֲפָר פִּיהוּ
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 6:5	{ס} יִשָּׁבַע בְּחֶרְפָּה:	30	יִתֵּן לְמַכְהוֹ לְחֵי
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 7:5 <i>w</i> 4:2	אֲדַנִּי אָדָם:	31	כִּי-לֹא יִזְנַח לְעֵלָם
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:2	<i>s</i> 7:5 <i>w</i> 4:2	כָּרַב חֶסְדּוֹ:	32	כִּי-אִם הוֹגָה וְרַחֵם
<u>3/6/15</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 7:6 <i>w</i> 4:3	{ס} וַיּוֹגֵה בְנֵי-אִישׁ:	33	כִּי-לֹא עֲנָה מְלִבָּה
	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	כָּל חֲסִירֵי אָרֶץ:	34	לְדַכֵּא תַחַת רַגְלוֹ
	2:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5 <i>w</i> 3:3	נִגְדַּד פְּנֵי עֲלִיז:	35	לְהַטֵּת מִשִּׁפְטֵי-גִבֹּר
<u>3/6/17</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	{ס} אֲדַנִּי לֹא רָאָה:	36	לְעוֹת אָדָם בְּרַבָּה

18/38/96

12/26/64 + 6/12/32

8/3/2/1

3:20 <M^{ket} G^L V] וְתִשְׁיַח M^{qere} graph וְתִשְׁוֹחַ > ||

x,y	$x = 6$ to 8	$y = 4$ to 6	$x+y = 11$ to 14	$x-y = 1$ to 4
x,y,z	$(x+y)+z$	$x = 4$	$y = 4$	$z = 5$ to 6
			$(x+y)+z = 13$ to 14	$(x+y)-z = 2$ to 3
compensatable lines:		5 of 18	lines compensatable in reverse:	0
σ ($y+1$ to 2); y compensations:		5x		

Lamentations 3:37-54

A Reconstruction

	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 4:3	אֲדַנִּי לֹא צוּהָ:	מִי־זֶה אָמַר וַתְּהִי	37
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):3	<i>s</i> (4:3):6		הֲרַעַת וְהִטָּב:	מִפִּי עַל־יָן לֹא תִצָּא	38
<u>3/7/17</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:4	{ס}	גָּבַר עַל־חֲטָאָה:	מִה־יִתְאַנֵּן אָדָם חַי	39
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	<i>w</i> 3:3	וְנִשְׁוֵבָה עַד־יְהוָה:	נִחַפְּשָׁה דְרָכֵנוּ וְנִחַקְרָה	40
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	<i>w</i> 4:3	אֶל־אֵל בַּשָּׁמַיִם:	נִשְׂאָ לִבֵּנוּ אֶל־כַּפָּיִם	41
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4	{ס}	אֲתָה לֹא סִלַּחְתָּ:	נִחַנוּ פָשְׁעֵנוּ וּמְרִינוּ	42
	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5		הֲרַגְתָּ לֹא חֲמַלְתָּ:	סִפּוֹת בָּאֵף וַתִּרְדְּפֵנוּ	43
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:6		מִמַּעַבְר תִּפְלֶה:	סִפּוֹת בִּעְנֵן לְךָ	44
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	{ס}	בְּקִרְבַּ הָעַמִּים:	סָחִי וּמֵאֵס תִּשְׁמְנוּ	45
	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:4		כֹּל אֵיבָנוּ:	פָּצוּ עַלְנוּ פִיהֶם	46
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2	<i>s</i> (3:3):5		הִשָּׂאת וְהִשְׁבַּר:	פָּחַד וּפְחַת הִיָּה לָנוּ	47
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	<i>w</i> 4:4	עַל־שִׁבְר בַּת־עַמִּי: {ס}	פְּלִגֵּי־מַיִם תִּרְדַּ עֲנִי	48
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2	<i>s</i> (4:4):5		מֵאֵיִן הַפְּגֵת:	עֲנִי נִגְרָה וְלֹא תִדְמָה	49
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:5		מִשָּׁמַיִם עָנִי:	עַד־יִשְׁקִיף וַיֵּרֶא יְהוָה	50
<u>3/7/17</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:6	{ס}	מִכָּל בְּנוֹת עִירִי:	עַל־לֹ עַל־לֹ לְנַפְשִׁי	51
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 6:5		אֵיבֵי חֲנָם:	צֹד צְדוֹנִי כַצֶּפֶר	52
	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5		וַיִּדּוּ אֶבֶן בֵּי:	צָמְתוּ בַבּוֹר חַיִּי	53
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 5:4	{ס}	אֲמַרְתִּי נִגְוַרְתִּי:	צָפוּ מַיִם עַל־רֵאשֵׁי	54

18/39/98

(9+9 lines; 19+20 versets; 49+49 prosodic words)

8/4/2/1

<i>x,y</i>	<i>x</i> = 5 to 8	<i>y</i> = 4 to 6	<i>x+y</i> = 9 to 14	<i>x-y</i> = 0 to 4
<i>x,y,z</i> (<i>x+y</i>)+ <i>z</i>	<i>x</i> = 3 to 4	<i>y</i> = 3 to 4	<i>(x+y)+z</i> = 11 to 13	<i>(x+y)-z</i> = 1 to 3
compensatable lines:	5 of 18	lines compensatable in reverse:	2 of 18	
σ (<i>y</i> +1 to 3): <i>y</i> compensations:	4 <i>x</i>	ω (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> with σ (<i>x</i> = <i>y</i> or <i>x+y</i> = <i>z</i>):	1 <i>x</i>	
<i>f</i> (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> compensations:	1 <i>x</i>	<i>f</i> (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> with σ (<i>x+y</i> = <i>z</i>):	1 <i>x</i>	
<i>w</i> (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> compensations:	1 <i>x</i>	<i>w</i> (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> compensations:	1 <i>x</i>	

Listed below is an alternate reconstruction of Lam 3:39 which will not be discussed here:

<u>3/7/17</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 7:4	{ס}	גָּבַר עַל־חֲטָאָה:	מִה־יִתְאַנֵּן אָדָם חַי	39
<u>3/8/16</u>	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (3:2):3	<i>s</i> (4:4):5	<i>w</i> 4:4 {ס}	עַל־שִׁבְר בַּת־עַמִּי:	פְּלִגֵּי מַיִם תִּרְדַּ עֲנִי	48
	2:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 5:5		יְהוָה מִשָּׁמַיִם:	עַד־יִשְׁקִיף וַיֵּרֶא	50
<u>3/7/17</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	{ס}	מִכָּל בְּנוֹת עִירִי:	עֲנִי עַל־לֹ לְנַפְשִׁי	51

Lamentations 3:55-66

A Reconstruction

	3:2	<i>f</i> 3:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	מִבֶּר תַּחֲתִית׃	קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ יְהוָה	↻ 55
	(2:3):2	<i>f</i> (2:3):3	<i>s</i> (4:5):6	לְרוּחֹתֶי שׁוֹעֲתִי׃	אֶל תַּעֲלֶם אֲזַנְךָ	↻ 56
<u>3/7/18</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:5	אֲמַרְתְּ אֵל תִּירָא׃ {ס}	קָרַבְתָּ בָּיִם אֶקְרָאֲךָ	↻ 57
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2	<i>s</i> (4:4):4	גֹּאֲלֹת חַיִּי׃	רַבַּת אֲדֹנָי רַבִּי נַפְשִׁי	↻ 58
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	שִׁפְטָה מִשִּׁפְטֵי׃	רָאִיתָ יְהוָה עֲוֹתָי	↻ 59
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:6	<i>w</i> 3:3	{ס} כֹּל־מַחְשַׁבְתָּם לִי׃	↻ 60
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 7:7	<i>w</i> 3:3	כֹּל־מַחְשַׁבְתָּם עָלַי׃	↻ 61
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	<i>w</i> 3:3	עָלִי כֹל־הַיּוֹם׃	↻ 62
<u>3/6/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:5	{ס}	אֲנִי מִנְּגַנְתָּם׃	↻ 63
	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:2):2	<i>s</i> (4:4):6	כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה יְדֵהֶם׃	תִּשָּׁבֵב לָהֶם גְּמוּל יְהוָה	↻ 64
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	תִּאֲלָתֶךָ עֲלֵהֶם׃	תִּתֵּן לָהֶם מִגְּנַת־לֵב	↻ 65
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:2	<i>s</i> 8:4	{פ}	מִתַּחַת שְׁמִיךָ יְהוָה׃	↻ 66
12/27/66				6/14/34 + 6/13/32		8/4/2/1

<i>x,y</i>	<i>x</i> = 6 to 9	<i>y</i> = 5 to 7	<i>x+y</i> = 11 to 14	<i>x-y</i> = 0 to 3
<i>x,y,z</i> (<i>x+y</i>)+ <i>z</i>	<i>x</i> = 4	<i>y</i> = 4 to 5	<i>(x+y)+z</i> = 12 to 15	<i>(x+y)-z</i> = 2 to 4
compensatable lines:	1 of 12	lines compensatable in reverse:	2 of 12	
σ (<i>y</i> +2): <i>y</i> compensations:	1x	ω (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> with σ (<i>x</i> = <i>y</i>):	2x	
		<i>f</i> (<i>y</i> +1): <i>y</i> with σ (<i>x</i> = <i>y</i>):	2x	

Listed below are alternate reconstructions of Lam 3:56, 60, 64, and 66 which will not be discussed here:

	(2:2):2	<i>f</i> (2:3):3	<i>s</i> (4:4):6	לְרוּחֹתֶי שׁוֹעֲתִי׃	אֶל תַּעֲלֶם אֲזַנְךָ	↻ 56
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 6:5	{ס} כֹּל מַחְשַׁבְתָּם׃	רָאִיתָ כֹּל נִקְמָתָם	↻ 60
	3:2	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	תִּאֲלָתֶךָ עֲלֵהֶם׃	תִּתֵּן לָהֶם מִנְּגַנְתָּם	↻ 64
<u>3/7/16</u>	3:3	<i>f</i> 4:3	<i>s</i> 8:6	{פ} מִתַּחַת שְׁמִיךָ יְהוָה׃	תִּרְדֹּף בְּאֵף וְתִשְׁמַדֵּם	↻ 66

Aggregate Statistics for Lamentations 3

Comprehensive

x,y $x = 5$ to 8 $y = 4$ to 7 $x+y = 9$ to 14 $x-y = 0$ to 4
 x,y,z $(x+y)+z$ $x = 3$ to 4 $y = 2$ to 5 $z = 4$ to 7 $(x+y)+z = 10$ to 15 $(x+y)-z = 0$ to 4

Outlying Versets: 4 of 144 (less than 3%)

2 σ "b" verset in $(x+y)+z$: 3:10
 7 σ "b" or "c" versets: 3:14; 18; 61

Outlying Lines: 1 of 66 (less than 2%)

longer than 14 σ : 3:56 (15 σ)

Excluding Outliers

x,y $x = 5$ to 8 $y = 4$ to 6 $x+y = 9$ to 14 $x-y = 0$ to 4
 x,y,z $(x+y)+z$ $x = 3$ to 4 $y = 3$ to 5 $z = 3$ to 6 $(x+y)+z = 10$ to 14 $(x+y)-z = 0$ to 4

Macro Symmetries

3:1-36 $18/40/92 + 18/38/96 = 36/78/188$

3:37-54 $18/39/98 + 12/27/66 = 30/66/164$

1:1-22 $24/12/4/2/1$ $66/144/352$

$66 = 3 \times 22$

$144 = 12 \times 22$

$352 = 16 \times 22$

(12 and 22 are recurrent numbers in the compositional technique of ancient Hebrew verse)

Pro forma stanzas are uniform in length and structure:

6 lines, 12 to 14 versets, 29 to 34 ω 's, with a "target" range of ω 's of from **31** to **33**

6/14/34 3:55-60 (1x)
 6/14/33 3:19-24 (1x)
 6/14/32 3:7-12 (1x)
 6/13/33 3:37-42; 49-54 (2x)
 6/13/32 3:43-48; 61-66 (2x)
 6/13/31 3:1-6 (1x)
 6/13/29 3:13-18 (1x)
 6/12/32 3:31-36 (1x)
 6/12/31 3:25-30 (1x)

Pro forma strophes: 3 lines, 6 to 8 versets, 14 to 18 ω 's, with a "t" range of ω 's of from **15** to **17**

3/8/18 3:21-23 (1x)
 3/7/18 3:55-57 (1x)
 3/7/17 3:1-3; 37-39; 49-51 (3x)
 3/7/16 3:7-9; 10-12; 46-48; 58-60; 64-66 (5x)
 3/7/14 3:13-15 (1x)
 3/6/17 3:34-36 (1x)
 3/6/16 3:28-30; 40-42; 43-45; 52-54; 61-63 (5x)
 3/6/15 3:16-18; 19-21; 25-27; 31-33 (4x)
 3/6/14 3:4-6 (1x)

A strophe often finishes with a highly syncopated [σ (x-y) or σ (x+y)-z = 2 to 4] verset: 14 of 22

Expanded References

AB. See Hillers, *Lamentations*.

Aejmelaeus, "Function and Interpretation of כַּי"

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Function and Interpretation of כַּי in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 105 (1986) 193-209.

BHQ. See Schäfer, "Lamentations."

BHS. See Rudolph, "Threni."

Cross, "Lamentations 1"

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "The Prosody of Lamentations 1 and the Psalm of Jonah." Pages 99-134 in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1998 [revision of earlier articles].

Ehrlich, *Randglossen*

Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches*. 7 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908-1914. Repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968.

HCOT. See Renkema, *Lamentations*.

Hurowitz, "Lamentations 1:11"

Hurowitz, Victor Avigdor. "זוללה = Peddler/Tramp/Vagabond/Beggar: Lamentations I 11 in light of Akkadian *zilulû*," *VT* 49 (1999) 542-45.

Milgrom, *Leviticus*

Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus*. 3 vols. AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991-2000.

NJV

Renkema, *Lamentations*

Renkema, Johan. *Lamentations*. Tr. Brian Doyle; HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Schäfer, "Lamentations"

Schäfer, Rolf. "Lamentations." Pages 113*-136* in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta, Fascicle 18: General Introduction and Megillot*. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.