SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
10017043115

Gideon R. Kotzé

The Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations

A Text-Critical Study

BRILL / STUDIA SEMITICA NEERLANDICA

The Library of Claremont School of Theology

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
(909) 447-2589

The Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations

Studia Semitica Neerlandica

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. dr. K.A.D. Smelik

Editorial Board

Prof. dr. P.C. Beentjes, Prof. dr. W.J. van Bekkum,
Dr. W.C. Delsman, Prof. dr. H. Gzella,
Prof. dr. W. Th. van Peursen, Prof. dr. J. Van Steenbergen,
Prof. dr. E. Talstra, Prof. dr. M. Tanret

VOLUME 61

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/ssn

BM
487
.K64
2013

The Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations

A Text-Critical Study

By

Gideon R. Kotzé

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kotzé, Gideon R.
The Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations : a text-critical study / by Gideon R. Kotzé.
pages cm. – (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, ISSN 0081-6914 ; volume 61)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-23684-4 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-24209-8 (e-book)
1. Dead Sea scrolls. 2. Bible. Lamentations–Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BM487.K64 2013
224'.30446–dc23

2013021987

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0081-6914
ISBN 978-90-04-23684-4 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-24209-8 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Printed by Printforce, the Netherlands

CONTENTS

Preface VII
Abbreviations IX

1 Introduction 1
Old Testament Textual Criticism 3
Contributions of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Old Testament Textual Criticism 6
Research Topic of the Study 13
The Aims and Text-Critical Approach of the Study 15

2 Transcriptions of the Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations with an Overview of Their Formal Characteristics 21
3QLam (3Q3) 21
4QLam (4Q111) 23
5QLam[a] (5Q6) 29
5QLam[b] (5Q7) 34
Closing Remarks 34

3 Text-Critical Analyses of the Wording of Lam 1 as Witnessed to by 4QLam 36
Introduction 36
Verse 6 37
Verse 7 41
Verse 8 52
Verse 9 59
Verses 10 and 11 63
Verse 12 70
Verse 13 81
Verse 14 86
Verse 15 93
Verses 16 and 17 98
Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 1 as They Appear in 4QLam 115

4 Text-Critical Analyses of the Wording of Lam 4 as Witnessed to by 5QLam[a] and 5QLam[b] 121
Introduction 121
Verse 7 124
Verse 14 129
Verse 15 136
Excursus: The Scribal Marking in the Bottom Margin of Column II of 5QLam[a] 140
Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 4 as They Appear in 5QLam[a] 146

5 Text-Critical Analyses of the Wording of Lam 5 as Witnessed to by 5QLam[a] 148
Introduction 148
Verse 1 149
Verse 2 151
Verse 3 154
Verse 9 157
Verse 10 160
Verses 11–13 166
Excursus: The Space After כשלו in v. 13 of 5QLam[a] 170
Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 5 as They Appear in 5QLam[a] 173

Conclusions 175

Bibliography 183
Index of Ancient Sources 199
Index of Topics 206

PREFACE

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, which was submitted in 2010 to the University of Stellenbosch and successfully defended in the following year. The revision includes a reformulation of the arguments concerning certain readings and an expansion of the bibliography.

Upon the completion of this reworked version of the study, I wish to express my gratitude again to my doctoral promoters, Prof. Louis Jonker (Old and New Testament, Faculty of Theology) and Prof. Johann Cook (Department of Ancient Studies) for their joint effort of advising me in this study. I am also grateful to Prof. Christo van der Merwe of the Department of Ancient Studies at Stellenbosch, who not only encouraged me to submit the manuscript to the *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* series but also facilitated this process. A special word of thanks goes to Prof. Klaas Smelik, the Editor-in-Chief of the SSN series, and to Stephanie Paalvast at Brill for accepting the manuscript for publication. I greatly appreciate all of Stephanie's professional and kind help during the publication process.

This study benefitted from the many discussions on matters relating to textual criticism that I had with Dr Randall Gauthier. During his stay in Stellenbosch, Randy acted as a congenial dialogue partner and I thank him for challenging me to formulate my ideas more clearly.

I thank Karlien van der Schyff for reading through the entire study and for correcting my English.

Finally, I dedicate this book to my wife Manitza as a small token of my appreciation for all her support, selflessness, care and love:

כלך יפה רעיתי ומום אין בך

ABBREVIATIONS

α′	Aquila's version
AB	Anchor Bible
ANET	Pritchard, J.B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BdA	La Bible d'Alexandrie
BDB	Brown, F., S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906.
BHK	Kittel, R., ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.
BHQ	Schenker, A. et al., eds. *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato: General Introduction and Megilloth*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004
BHRG	Van der Merwe, C.H.J., J.A. Naudé and J.H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
BHS	Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.
BI	*Biblical Interpretation*
Bib	*Biblica*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BO	Biblica et Orientalia
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CAD	Oppenheim, L. et al., eds. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956–2011.
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CC	Continental Commentary
COT	Commentaar op het Oude Testament
CTA	Herdner, A., ed. *Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques: Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1963.
DCH	Clines, D.J.A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 Vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2011.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSMM	Burrows, M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
DSSR	The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader
DSSSE	García Martínez, F. and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 Vols. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1997, 1998.
ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls

ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
GELS	Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain / Paris / Walpole: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	Gesenius, W. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBHS	Waltke, B.K. and M. O'Connor. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israelite Exploration Journal*
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
Jastrow	Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JM	Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 Vols. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2005.
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSem	*Journal for Semitics*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KBL	Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
KV	Korte Verklaring van de Heilige Schrift
LEH	Lust, J., E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996.
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., R. Scott and H.S. Jones. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with rev. sup. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
LXX	Septuagint
LXX.D	Septuaginta Deutsch
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic text
MT^{mss}	Medieval manuscripts of the Masoretic text
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
Nöldeke	Nöldeke, T. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904.
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
P	Peshitta

RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RivBib	*Rivista Biblica*
σ′	Symmachus' version
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBS	Stuttgarter Biblische Studien
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal for the Old Testament*
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
θ′	Theodotion's version
T	Targum
T^{W}	Western recension of the Targum of Lamentations
T^{Y}	Yemenite recension of the Targum of Lamentations
TDOT	Botterweck, G.J., H. Ringgren and H.-J. Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
THOTC	The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
ThT	*Theologisch Tijdschrift*
V	Vulgate
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

More than sixty years after the discovery of the first group of seven manuscripts, the Dead Sea scrolls continue to arrest the attention of scholars in various fields of biblical research. The thousands of fragments found between 1947 and 1956 in the eleven caves near Khirbet Qumran comprise in the excess of 850 manuscripts. These biblical and non-biblical manuscripts have left an indelible impact on the study of the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism and the historical context in which Christianity and the New Testament came into being.[1] They also present new data regarding the development of Hebrew and Aramaic dialects,[2] the nature of biblical interpretation in Second Temple Judaism,[3] especially hala-

---

[1] Cf. J.H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Discovery and Challenge to Biblical Studies," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1–23; and A.S. van der Woude, "Fifty Years of Qumran Research," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (vol. 1; eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998), 1–45.

[2] Regarding the nature of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea scrolls, see M.G. Abegg, "The Linguistic Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls: More Than (Initially) Meets the Eye," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls. An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. M.L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 48–68; idem, "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (vol. 1; eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998), 325–358; I. Young, R. Rezetko and M. Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (vol 1; London / Oakville: Equinox, 2008), 250–279; E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); and the essays in T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde, eds., *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 2000). E.M. Cook ("The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* [vol. 1; eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998], 359–378) provides a survey of the Aramaic in which over a hundred of the Qumran documents were written.

[3] See, for example, M. Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); G.J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 287–319; M. Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (eds. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 339–377; and P.R. Davies, "Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation.* Vol. 1: *The Ancient Period* (eds. A.J. Hauser and D.F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 144–166.

khah,[4] and shed light on various aspects relevant to the study of the Septuagint.[5] Moreover, the textual finds from the Qumran caves have reopened debates concerning the canonical process and the closing of the tripartite canon of the Hebrew Bible.[6] One of the areas of biblical research that

---

[4] Concerning the impact of the Dead Sea scrolls on the study of Jewish law, see L.H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship," in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 63–78.

[5] The Qumran scrolls do not only include Hebrew manuscripts that are close to the purported wording of the *Vorlagen* of some Septuagint books but they also contribute to the credibility of the practice of retroversion. Cf. E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (eds. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 11–47. Furthermore, the Septuagint manuscripts from Qumran and the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) have had a marked influence on views regarding the origins of the Septuagint and its textual history. Cf. J.B. Faulkenberry Miller, "4QLXXLev^{a} and Proto-Septuagint Studies: Reassessing Qumran Evidence for the *Urtext* Theory," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*, (eds. M.T. Davis and B.A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1–28; H.-J. Fabry, "Die griechischen Handschriften vom Toten Meer," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel* (eds. H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 131–153; L.J. Greenspoon, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (vol. 1; eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998), 101–127; E. Ulrich, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: a Reappraisal of Their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (eds. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 49–80.

[6] In this regard, the issue revolves around the scope of the authoritative scriptures at Qumran. The question as to which books were regarded as authoritative by the Qumran community can be answered with some degree of certainty by looking at the way in which books are quoted in the writings of the Qumran community, how certain books present themselves as divine revelations, the books that became subject of the *pesher* and other commentaries of the community and the quantity of manuscripts of books found in the caves. Cf. J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 149–157. On the strength of evidence of this nature, VanderKam and Flint (*The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002], 178–180) determine that, apart from many of the books later included in the Hebrew Bible, *Jubilees*, *1Enoch*, the *Temple scroll* (4Q524, 11Q19–20) and the writing known as *Reworked Pentateuch* (4Q158, 4Q364–367) were in all probability also considered as authoritative by the Qumran community. This implies that a closed tripartite canon did not yet exist in the Second Temple period and that one can at most speak of authoritative writings during this period. For discussions on these and other issues relating to the development of a tripartite canon in Judaism, see L.M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007); E. Ulrich, "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament," in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 57–80; and J.A. Sanders, "The Issue of Closure in the Canonical Process," in *The Canon Debate* (eds.

have arguably benefited the most from the discoveries in the Judean Desert is Old Testament textual criticism.

Old Testament Textual Criticism

Old Testament textual criticism is a discipline in which all the available textual representatives of Old Testament books are analysed.[7] The main textual representatives include the Hebrew manuscripts and the ancient translations that were based on Hebrew *Vorlagen*, namely the Septuagint (LXX), Peshitta (P), Vulgate (V) and the Targums (T), but the quotations of Old Testament passages in other writings, such as the Qumran documents and the rabbinic literature, also qualify as textual representatives.[8] The focus in text-critical analyses centres on the transmission of the Old Testament books through copying and translation, since the intricate web of agreements and disagreements in the wording between the textual representatives are the result of the process of scribal transmission. The discipline therefore deals with scribal activities in antiquity, especially the practical aspects involved in the creation of readings through the processes of copying and translation.

L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 252–263. For views regarding the closing of the canon in earlier periods, see S.G. Dempster, "Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon," in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (eds. C.A. Evans and E. Tov; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 87–127; and A. van der Kooij, "Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonaean Politics," in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 27–38.

[7] On the different approaches to Old Testament textual criticism, see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd. rev. ed.; Minneapolis / Assen: Fortress Press / Van Gorcum, 2001); G.D. Martin, *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010); A. van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* (eds. J.W. Rogerson and J.M. Lieu; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 579–590; idem, "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Its Aim and Method," in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2003), 729–739; E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblica Hebraica. Second Edition. Revised and Enlarged* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Development of the Hebrew Text of the Bible: Theories and Practice of Textual Criticism," *VT* 42/2 (1992): 204–213; F.E. Deist, *Witnesses to the Old Testament* (Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1988); idem, *Towards the Text of the Old Testament* (Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1978); P.K. McCarter, *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); and R.W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).

[8] Van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism," 581.

The traditional goal of Old Testament textual criticism is to reconstruct or restore the original text (or *Urtext*) of the biblical writings.[9] Text-critics employ procedures that are appropriate to the accomplishment of its stated goal. These procedures consist of a number of phases. The phases of text-critical procedures usually involve the collation and comparison of the relevant textual material, as well as the evaluation thereof.[10] The evaluations are

---

[9] Cf. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth," *JBL* 102/3 (1983): 365–399. Van der Kooij notes that most scholars see the original text of an Old Testament writing as the form of its final redaction, i.e., the end of the composition stage of the text's development and the beginning of the transmission stage. Some text-critics prefer to define the goal of textual criticism in terms of the earliest attainable form of a writing's wording. This refers to the wordings which lay at the root of all the attested differences between the available textual witnesses. Cf. Van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," 730–731.

[10] According to Tov (*Textual Criticism*, 290–291), text-critical work proper may be subdivided into two stages. The first stage deals with the collection or reconstruction of Hebrew variants (readings that differ from the Masoretic text, such as pluses, minuses, differences in letters, words, sequence of words, or even differences in vocalization and word division), while the second stage is concerned with the evaluation of the variant readings that were created during the textual transmission and not during the literary growth of the biblical writings.

In accordance with his view that the goal of textual criticism is to recover an earlier, more authentic (and, therefore, a superior) form of the text, McCarter (*Textual Criticism*, 62–75) discusses three stages of the text-critical procedure, traditionally called *recensio*, *examinatio*, and *emendatio*. *Recensio* refers to the sorting of the various textual witnesses so as to determine which of these are not derived from other witnesses and, consequently, have the potential of witnessing to a more original phase in the development of the text. This first stage of the text-critical procedure includes the collation and comparison of the textual witnesses, as well as the attempt to establish the stemmatic relationship between the witnesses, that is, the attempt to determine which manuscript or version derives from others. Those witnesses that derive entirely from other witnesses have no independent value for recovering earlier readings and may safely be left out of further consideration. *Examinatio* entails the examination of the witnesses isolated by *recensio* in order to determine which of these manuscripts or versions have the greatest claim to originality. The third stage, *emendatio* (also called *divinatio*), comes into play if none of the extant textual witnesses preserves the most original reading. In these cases the text-critic attempts to reconstruct this reading through conjectural emendation.

Würthwein's discussion of the methods of textual criticism is also based on his views regarding the aims of textual criticism. In the opinion of Würthwein (*Text*, 106), the text-critic attempts to "ferret out all the errors and alterations (variants)" that have occurred during the transmission history of the biblical texts by editing a text which has "the greatest degree of probable authenticity or originality based on the review of the textual witnesses and the scholarly principles of textual criticism". Textual criticism therefore begins with a critical sifting of the available textual evidence in search of the text that may be regarded as the traditional text. After the traditional text has been identified the text-critic can begin with the real examination of the textual evidence on the basis of language and subject matter. A decision can then be made as to which text contains the original readings. As a general rule, Würthwein opts for the Masoretic text as the traditional text and states that its readings

based on external and internal criteria. External criteria include the privilaged status of the Masoretic text (MT) as the *textus receptus*, the nature of textual representatives as independent witnesses to a particular reading, the number of textual representatives that witness to a reading and the age of textual representatives in which a reading appears. The internal criteria for text-critical evaluations are formulated according to the rules of thumb that the more difficult reading and the shorter reading are preferable to other readings (*lectio difficilior praeferenda est* and *lectio brevior praeferenda est*), or according to the principle that the original reading is the one from which the other readings probably developed (*utrum in alterum abiturum erat*).[11] With the help of these procedures, Old Testament text-critics "criticize" the textual representatives of a biblical writing by evaluating their differences in wording and judging their worth as accurate representatives of the original text.[12] If the text-critic is of the opinion that the extant textual representatives do not preserve the original reading, it can be restored by means of conjectural emendation.

Old Testament text-critics do not only focus on readings in textual representatives that potentially qualify as the original text. They also deal with so-called textual difficulties.[13] The difficulty or problem of a reading can

---

should be preferred as original except when it can be shown that it contains errors or is corrupt on linguistic grounds or with regard to its subject matter. In these instances, the text-critic must correct the corrupt reading in the Masoretic text by substituting it with the more original reading in other witnesses. Whenever neither the Masoretic text or the other witnesses provide a reading that is linguistically or contextually probable, the text-critic has recourse to conjectural emendation or may regard the problem as insoluble (*crux interpretum*). Cf. Würthwein, *Text*, 113–119.

[11] After an overview of the usual external and internal criteria employed in evaluating variants, Tov (*Textual Criticism*, 309) concludes that "(t)he quintessence of textual evaluation is the selection from the different transmitted readings of the one reading which is the most appropriate to its context. Within the process of this selection, the concept of the 'context' is taken in a broad sense, as referring to the language, style, and content of both the immediate context and of the whole literary unit in which the reading is found". Tov (ibid., 310) goes on to note that, although abstract rules such as the internal criteria *lectio difficilior praeferenda est* and *lectio brevior praeferenda est* may be helpful in the search for the contextually most appropriate reading, that is, the reading that is to be preferred as the original one (the reading standing at the beginning of the transmission process), common sense is the main guide for evaluating variant readings.

[12] Cf. Deist, *Towards*, 11.

[13] J. Barr (*Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968], 3) defines a "difficult" reading as follows: A reader "feels that [the reading] 'does not make sense'. The grammar is 'wrong', i.e. does not fit with usual patterns of usage. The use of words is anomalous. Or perhaps the text contradicts what is said elsewhere in the same literary work, so that it seems to 'spoil the effect' of the whole; or it may contradict something well known from altogether other sources".

pertain to its semantics, the grammar and syntax of a passage and/or the content of the passage in relation to its larger literary contexts. In cases where there appears to be a textual problem or corrupt reading in the Hebrew manuscripts, the text-critic can make use of comparative philology in order to find a solution to the perceived difficulty. Instead of emending the wording of a difficult passage, the text-critic searches the cognate Semitic languages (especially Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic) for suitable meanings for the Hebrew words in question.[14]

Although original readings, accidental scribal errors and difficulties in the textual representatives are important focal points in text-critical analyses, Old Testament text-critics are also interested in readings that were intentionally created by scribes during the process of transmission. Examples of such deliberate scribal modifications are linguistic and stylistic changes, harmonizations, exegetical changes and additions to the wording of passages. These deliberate changes show that some scribes took the liberty of altering the content of the writings which they copied. Accordingly,

> textual critics are not merely interested in readings that were presumably contained in *the* or *an* original text; the study of ancient manuscripts also tells us the story of the history of the Hebrew language, of ancient exegesis, and of the history of ideas, how new ideas were developed and how earlier ideas were changed.[15]

Contributions of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Old Testament Textual Criticism[16]

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls, knowledge regarding the ways in which scribes transmitted the texts of the Old Testament books was based on the medieval manuscripts of the MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) (in the case of the Torah), the LXX and (to a lesser extent) other ancient translations, such as P, V and T.[17] The biblical scrolls that have emerged from the

---

14 Cf. ibid. 1–13.

15 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 258–259 (italics in the original).

16 On this topic, see A. van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (eds. E.D. Hiebert and E. Tov; London / New Castle: British Library / Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 167–177.

17 The histories of the ancient translations' texts are just as interesting as the history of the Hebrew texts and equally convoluted. Concerning the origins and history of the LXX, see, e.g., K.H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 29–68; and N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions*

eleven caves near Qumran and other sites, such as Masada, Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Murabba'at, afford the text-critic with a wealth of new textual data. Over 200 biblical scrolls have been recovered from the Qumran caves alone.[18] Copies of almost all the books of the Hebrew Bible were found in the library[19] stored in the caves by the Qumran community.[20] These biblical manuscripts from Qumran represent the earliest copies of the Old Testament writings in the original languages. They can confidently be dated on palaeographical grounds between the middle of the third century BCE and the middle of the first century CE.[21] The earliest copies of the biblical writings among

---

of the Bible (transl. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 2000), 35–301. P.B. Dirksen ("The Old Testament Peshitta," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* [eds. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004], 261–296), S.P. Brock (*The Bible in the Syriac Tradition: Second Revised Edition* [Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2006], 45–46) and M.P. Weitzman (*The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999], 300–306) give overviews of the history of P, while B. Kedar ("The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* [eds. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004], 299–338) and P.S. Alexander ("Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* [eds. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling; Peabody: Hendrickson], 217–253) discuss V and T respectively.

[18] E. Tov, "Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (eds. S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2010), 151–172.

[19] Opinions are divided over the nature of the collection of texts found in the caves at Qumran and whether it may legitimately be called a library or not. On the basis of resemblances between the contents of the Qumran collection of texts and libraries of the ancient Near East and Greco-Roman libraries of the eastern Mediterranean, A. Lange ("The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* [eds. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2006], 177–193) argues that the Qumran textual finds are indeed the remnant of the library of the community who occupied the settlement. In its mixture of documentary, literary, liturgical, ritual and other texts of priestly interest, the Qumran collection closely resembles ancient Near Eastern temple libraries.

[20] Not all scholars are equally convinced that the caves (and the scrolls deposited there) and the site of Khirbet Qumran are related. Magness discusses the different interpretations of the ruins of the site as either that of a villa, a fortress or a commercial entrepôt and comes to the conclusion that the majority view, according to which the buildings at Qumran were occupied by the community to whom the scrolls in the nearby caves belonged, remains the most plausible explanation of the archaeological evidence. The close proximity of the caves to the site, as well as the similarity in the types of pottery uncovered at both the site and the caves, prove important in this regard. Cf. J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 43–44.

[21] On the use of paleography and the dating of the Dead Sea scrolls, see F.M. Cross, "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (vol. 1; eds. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998), 379–402.

the Dead Sea scrolls therefore predate the medieval Hebrew manuscripts by more than a thousand years. Unfortunately, the majority of these copies consist of very fragmentary manuscripts. Notwithstanding their fragmentary nature, a comparison of the Qumran manuscripts with the textual witnesses which were available before the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls reveals a multitude of major and minor textual variations pertaining to orthography, individual words, clauses, paragraphs and even whole chapters.[22] The large amount of new and varied textual data in the biblical manuscripts from Qumran, which have the twin benefits of being of an early date and in the original languages, have opened new vistas on the scribal practices that were employed in the the transmission of ancient literary and non-literary writings. With regard to literary works such as the writings included in the Old Testament, the manuscript evidence show that ancient scribes enjoyed controlled freedom to introduce variations into the texts they transmitted. This means that "the professional scribe seldom if ever was merely a slavish copyist of the material which he handled. He rather should be considered a minor partner in the creative literary process".[23]

In his detailed account of the scribal practices and procedures reflected by the Dead Sea scrolls,[24] Tov discusses the conventions related to the writing of scrolls, as well as scribal approaches to the content of the document which they copied. The first topic deals with the technical aspects of a scroll, such as the arrangement and length of columns on sheets of leather and papyrus, the measurements of top, bottom and intercolumnar margins, ruling and the use of guide dots/strokes, conventions used at the beginning and end of scrolls (handle sheets, for example), the reparation of damages to sheets (stitching, patching, re-inking), the spaces between words and section units, the layout of poetical units, the use of various scribal marks and correction procedures (cancellation dots, crossing out of letters and words, parenthesis signs, box-like shapes around cancelled elements) and the writing of divine names.[25] Tov comes to the conclusion that the scribes who were

---

[22] It is also remarkable that many of the Qumran manuscripts of Old Testament writings exhibit the same textual tradition as was transmitted by the MT. These copies from Qumran therefore confirm the antiquity of the particular wordings of the individual writings in the textual tradition represented by the MT.

[23] S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (eds. F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 381.

[24] E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004).

[25] Some of these scribal procedures agree with the regulations for the copying of biblical

responsible for the copying of the Dead Sea scrolls employed identical procedures in copying authoritative and non-authoritative writings.[26] The same lack of distinction between authoritative and non-authoritative writings can be observed in the attitude with which scribes approached the content of the manuscripts that they copied. As is to be expected, some scribes were more careless than others in the copying of texts. Scribal mistakes such as haplography, parablepsis (homoioteleuton and homoioarcton), dittography and the interchange of similar looking and sounding letters, are common to all scribes. In this regard, Tov draws attention to the fact that neither the manuscripts of the Torah (the most authoritative part of the Jewish scriptures) nor the manuscripts of other authoritative writings give evidence of a more careful copying or fewer scribal corrections and interventions into the texts (supralinear corrections, deletions, erasures, reshaping of letters, linear and supralinear scribal signs) than non-authoritative writings.[27] As a result, there does not seem to be a correlation between the authoritative content of writings and the accuracy or inaccuracy with which the scribes copied the various texts. Similarly, the multiple copies of some of the literary writings belonging to the Qumran community, as well as writings which were, at a later stage, included in the Old Testament, exhibit quantitative and/or qualitative differences between the various copies. It would appear that certain scribes felt free to deliberately add, omit and change details in the content of the writings which they were copying. In view of the scribal practices and conventions in the writing of scrolls, especially the writing in columns, the measurements of the margins and the various correction procedures, it was not possible for the scribes either to insert or delete large amounts of text into the scrolls or make large-scale changes after the copy of the text was completed. There was, for instance, not enough space between the lines in a column or in the margins to add more than one or two lines of writing. This

---

scrolls in rabbinic literature. Tov provides a list of the agreements and disagreements. Cf. ibid., 214–217.

[26] Ibid., 251.

[27] Ibid., 252. If the degree of scribal intervention is taken as criterion for the attitude of scribes to the copying of texts, the paleo-Hebrew texts, which show very little scribal intervention, constitutes an exception to the rule. It may be suggested that scribes set out to copy these texts with more precision than texts written in the square script. That this precision in copying reflects a degree of respect for the special script and not an attitude towards a particular textual tradition of the biblical texts can be deduced from the fact that more than one textual tradition was written in the paleo-Hebrew script. It should, however, also be noticed that almost all of the representatives of the proto-MT found at sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran were carefully copied.

means that in those cases where the scribes were obliged to alter the content of the composition by inserting, omitting or changing lines of writing, they had to do so by making a new copy of the text.[28] It follows from this that the ancient scribes did not passively and mechanically copy manuscripts as accurately as possible at all times, but sometimes actively and creatively contributed to the shaping of the content of writings when they made new copies thereof.[29]

Therefore, the textual evidence in the copies of manuscripts recovered from the Qumran caves suggests that some ancient scribes acted as both copyists and authors in the transmission of literary writings. Indeed, for some of the writings of the Old Testament, the Qumran manuscripts reveal large-scale differences when compared to other textual representatives. These quantitative (and qualitative) differences display such coherence that they can be assigned to the stage of literary growth, rather than the stage of transmission.[30] This, in turn, implies that between the third century BCE and

---

[28] Cf. E. Tov, "The Writing of Early Scrolls and the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture," *DSD* 13/3 (2006): 339–347.

[29] According to Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 24–25), "The approach of scribes to literary texts changed over the course of the centuries; with regard to the biblical text it also differed from one milieu to another, and above all from person to person ... The function of the scribe was less technical and subordinate than is implied by the medieval and modern understanding of the word. The earlier scribes were involved not only in the copying of texts, but to a limited extent also in the creative shaping of the last stage of their content. Expressed differently, at one time scribes often took the liberty of changing the content, adding and omitting elements, sometimes on a small scale, but often substantially ... The nature of this creative scribal activity requires us to conceive of the persons involved as scribes-editors, who were not only active in the transmission of texts, but also in the final stage of their creative edition".

[30] In some cases, the quantitative and qualitative differences between Qumran manuscripts of Old Testament writings lead scholars to conclude that different literary versions of the writings existed in antiquity. Furthermore, some readings in Qumran manuscripts of Old Testament writings agree with readings in the ancient translations and the SP over against the readings in the MT. For examples, see the following studies (and the literature quoted there): J.R. Davila, "New Qumran Readings For Genesis One," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* (eds. Harold W. Attridge, J.J. Collins and T.H. Tobin; Maryland: University Press of America, 1990), 3–11; B. Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called "Plague Narrative" in Exodus 7:14–11:10* (OTS 56; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2009); L.J. Greenspoon, "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings: Manchester, 1990* (eds. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 159–194; J.T. Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 54 (1989): 229–245; E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978); A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (Fribourg / Göttingen: Universitets-verlag / Vandenhoeck

the first century CE, some of the Old Testament writings were still in a stage of development and that scribes could introduce changes into the wording of these writings. The fact that the wordings in some Qumran manuscripts witness to a stage in the literary growth of particular writings has important implications for the relationship between the disciplines of historical criticism and textual criticism.[31] Moreover, the textual data in the Qumran manuscripts have compelled scholars to rethink previous theories regarding the development of the texts of Old Testament writings and to formulate fresh theories in this regard.[32] The reappraisal of the *Textgeschichte* of the

---

& Ruprecht, 1981); E. Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Le livre de Jérémie: Le Prophète et son Milieu, les Oracles et leur Transmission* (ed. P.-M. Bogaert; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1981), 145–167; P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); idem, "The Book of Canticles (Song of Songs) in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Perspectives on the Song of Songs/Perspektiven der Hoheliedauslegung* (ed. A.C. Hagedorn; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 96–104.

[31] On the relationship between historical criticism and textual criticism, see G.J. Brooke, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (eds. J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 26–42; J. Cook, "The Relationship between Textual Criticism, Literary Criticism and Exegesis—An Interactive One?" *Textus* 24 (2009): 119–132; B. Lemelijn, "What Are We Looking for in Doing Old Testament Text-Critical Research?" *JNSL* 23/2 (1997): 69–80; A. Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); H.-J. Stipp, "Textkritik—Literarkritik—Textentwicklung: Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik," *ETL* 66 (1990): 143–159; idem, "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen," *BZ* 34 (1990): 16–37; A. van der Kooij, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele," in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J.A. Emerton; Leiden / New York / Köln: Brill, 1997), 185–202. These studies demonstrate, *inter alia*, that the relationship between historical criticism and textual criticism must be worked out for each writing individually, since the qualitative and quantitative agreements and disagreements between the extant textual representatives vary from one writing to the other.

[32] For an accessible overview of the theories, see R.S. Hendel, "Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran," in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302. The most important theories include the "local text"-theory of Cross, the "multiple editions"-theory of Ulrich and the contributions of Talmon and Tov. On the views of these scholars, see, e.g., F.M. Cross, "The Fixation of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *From Epic to Canon. History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore / London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998) 205–218; idem, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (eds. F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 306–320; idem, "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81–95.; idem, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964): 281–299; E. Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 77–100; idem, *The Dead Sea*

Old Testament writings, the evidence that different literary versions (or "editions") were transmittted and circulated before their literary growth was completed and the assumption that the communities who transmitted the different versions considered each of them to be authoritative have lead some scholars to question the concept of a single original text.[33] This has important implications for the aims of textual criticism.

The significance of the Qumran biblical manuscripts to Old Testament textual criticism therefore pertains to a number of related areas. First, these manuscripts are the oldest available copies of the writings of the Old Testament written in the original languages. They represent the textual situation in Palestine during the period stretching from the third century BCE to the first century CE. This situation can most aptly be described as one of textual diversity. Moreover, the wordings of the Old Testament writings in the Qumran manuscripts exhibit an intricate web of agreements and disagreements with the versions in the textual witnesses known before the discovery of the first Dead Sea scrolls in 1947 (the MT, the SP, the LXX and other ancient translations). Secondly, the early date of the manuscripts and the textual plurality which they reveal give a glimpse into the development of individual books of the Old Testament through scribal activity and, in so doing, compel scholars to formulate new theories regarding the history of these texts and the active role of scribes therein. Finally, reconsiderations of the textual history of a number of books of the Old Testament have led some scholars to give new definitions to the concept of an original text or even to re-evaluate the search for a single original text as the primary goal of Old Testament textual criticism.

Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Talmon, "Textual Study," 321–400; idem, "The Old Testament Text," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (eds. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 159–199; and E. Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11–27.

[33] Tov, e.g., argues that the Old Testament writings underwent a process of linear development and that some of these writings reached a final, authoritative status more than once. When each literary stratum was completed, it was distributed and became authoritative. After the next stratum came into being and was circulated, it could no longer replace or eradicate the previous one. This is the reason why the Qumran manuscripts exhibit such a diversity of textual forms, including literary "editions" that differ from those in other textual representatives. Cf. E. Tov, "The Status of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 234–251. See also the important arguments of E. Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1999), 99–120.

It is against the background of the reassessment of the textual history of Old Testament writings brought about by the new data from the Qumran biblical manuscripts, the knowledge of scribal practices and procedures provided by the Dead Sea scrolls, which fosters a greater appreciation for the active role that scribes played in transmitting literary writings, and the abandonment of a single original text as the primary goal of text-critical analyses that this study focuses on the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations and subjects these manuscripts to text-critical analyses.

Research Topic of the Study

Although the biblical book of Lamentations has enjoyed a resurgence of scholarly interest in recent years, Dobbs-Allsopp correctly points out that textual criticism and philology are areas of Lamentations research that deserve much more attention from scholars.[34] Concerning the available text-critical work on Lamentations, Schäfer notes that "Die Textkritik der Klagelieder steht ganz im Bann des Masoretischen Textes".[35] The influential role of the MT in text-critical work on Lamentations can be attributed to two factors. First, there is agreement among scholars that the MT version of the Hebrew text is well preserved and in need of emendation only in a few isolated instances.[36] Secondly, it is supposed that the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the ancient Greek, Syriac, Latin and Aramaic translations did not vary greatly from the consonantal base of the MT. In many of the instances where the wordings of the ancient translations differ from the wording in the MT, the differences can be explained as the result of the translation processes.[37]

The centrality of the MT in previous text-critical work on Lamentations and the abovementioned impact that the Dead Sea scrolls have had on the discipline of Old Testament textual criticism form the impetus for this

---

[34] F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, "Lamentations from Sundry Angles: A Retrospective," in *Lamentations in Ancient and Contemporary Cultural Contexts* (eds. N.C. Lee and C. Mandolfo; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 23–24.

[35] R. Schäfer, "Der Masoretische Text der Klagelieder und die Handschriften 3QLam, 4QLam und 5QLam$^{a.b}$ aus Qumran," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (eds. U. Dahmen, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 127.

[36] Cf., e.g., the comments of R.B. Salters, *Lamentations* (ICC; London: T & T Clark, 2010), 22–23; and P.R. House, *Lamentations* (WBC 23B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2004), 282.

[37] Cf. Schäfer, "Masoretische Text," 127.

study on the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations. Four manuscripts of Lamentations were discovered in three of the eleven caves near Khirbet Qumran (3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam[a] and 5QLam[b]). Since these manuscripts are the oldest extant copies of Lamentations, as well as the only other textual representatives, apart from the MT, that are written in Hebrew, detailed text-critical analyses of their wordings require little justification. It is therefore not surprising that the very few studies that have been devoted to the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations have compared their wordings to the other textual representatives (the MT and the ancient translations), identified the variant readings in the Qumran manuscripts and evaluated these variants.[38] However, these studies have not determined the effect that the variant readings in the Qumran manuscripts have on the content of Lamentations.[39] This means that there is a need for analyses in which these manuscripts and the other textual representatives are examined as witnesses to the content of Lamentations and not just as witnesses to potentially original Hebrew readings. Consequently, this study will be devoted to analyses of the four Qumran manuscripts as witnesses to the content of Lamentations. Notwithstanding the previous text-critical treatment of these manuscripts, the hypothesis of this study is that textual criticism does indeed provide a useful approach with which to examine and better understand the ways in which the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran present the content of this writing.

---

[38] Cf. the commentary of Salters, *Lamentations*; E. Ulrich, ed., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2010), 749–754; R. Schäfer, "Lamentations," in *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato. General Introduction and Megilloth* (eds. A. Schenker et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004): 54–72, 113*–136*; idem, "Masoretische Text," 127–146; F.M. Cross, "4QLam," in *Qumran Cave 4 XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; eds. E. Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 229–237; idem, "Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Verse: The Prosody of Lamentations 1:1–22," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman* (eds. C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 129–155; M. Baillet, "Lamentations," in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le Rouleau de Cuivre* (eds. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux; 2 vols; DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 95; J.T. Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," in ibid., 174–177; idem, "Lamentations (Second Exemplaire)," in ibid., 177–178.

[39] This study uses the concept of "content" to refer to what a reader interprets the wording of a literary writing to convey. In other words, it is the reader's perception of what the wording of the writing means.

The Aims and Text-Critical Approach of the Study

The aim of this study is to gain a better understanding of how the four Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran present the content of the passages that have been preserved in them. The hypothesis that guides its attempt to achieve this aim is that text-critical analyses can make a valuable contribution to the interpretation of Lamentations by elucidating the distinct wordings of this writing's textual representatives. This hypothesis is based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that, irrespective of the particular goals of their exegetical endeavours, interpreters of Lamentations will benefit from analyses that, on the one hand, explain the differences and difficulties in the wordings of Lamentations's textual representatives, and, on the other hand, demonstrate how the textual representatives' distinct wordings affect the content of the writing. The second assumption that underlies the hypothesis is that all the available textual representatives are legitimate witnesses to the content of Lamentations and not only the *textus receptus*, the MT, or the purported original text. The assumptions imply, first, that a study of how the Qumran manuscripts 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} present the content of Lamentations is valid and might produce data that are potentiallly significant to the interpretation of this biblical writing. Secondly, the assumptions highlight the necessity for such a study to engage in detailed analyses of the particular wordings of the Qumran manuscripts in comparison to other representatives of Lamentations's content. The focus of these analyses should then be on their difficulties and differences in the wordings. It is the contention of this study that the analytical functions of textual criticism are suited for such analyses.

Whereas the evaluative functions of textual criticism seek to identify original or preferable readings, its analytical functions pertain to the investigation of how readings in the textual representatives were created by scribes during the processes of transmission (copying and translation) and how difficult readings can best be understood in the context of a passage. In an approach to Old Testament textual criticism in which the textual representatives of a biblical writing are not primarily treated as witnesses to the original Hebrew texts, but rather as witnesses to the content of the writing, the analysis also attempts to establish how the readings in the textual representatives of the writing affect its content. This study on the four Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations will follow such an approach to Old Testament textual criticism. The investigation of how the readings in the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations were created during their copying, as well as

an assessment of their difficult readings necessarily involve an evaluation of their causes. The evaluation of the readings contained in these manuscripts will, however, not aim at the establishment of an original text, whether it is defined in terms of the *autographa* of the five poems of Lamentations, the earliest attainable text form, or the text that stood at the beginning of the transmission process as opposed to the stages of literary growth. Neither will the evaluation attempt to identify preferable readings or purge the wordings of the manuscripts of errors and corruptions so as to establish a more pristine form of this text. Rather, the analyses will attempt to provide the most reasonable explanations of why the wordings of the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran look the way they do. Based on these explanations, the analyses will subsequently indicate the effect that the readings in these manuscripts have on the content of Lamentations. The procedure of the approach to Old Testament textual criticism that will be applied in the analysis of the wordings in the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations involves four phases.

First, the formal characteristics of the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations must be investigated and transcriptions of the wordings must be made. In this regard, the photographs in the plates of the official DJD editions of 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} are used and the transcriptions of the wordings by the respective editors are critically examined.[40]

Secondly, the wordings of the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations are compared to the wording of the MT and the ancient translations in order to identify and catalogue the differences in wording between these textual representatives. For the purposes of the comparison, the MT is primarily represented by the eleventh century Codex Leningradensis.[41] To employ the comparative evidence from the ancient translations in the analyses of the wordings in the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations, the text-critic

---

[40] Cf. Baillet, "Lamentations," 95 (3QLam); Cross, "4QLam," 229–237 (4QLam); Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 174–177 (5QLam^{a}); idem, "Lamentations (Second Exemplaire)," 177–178 (5QLam^{b}). The photographs on microfiche are also helpful resources in the examinations of the manuscripts. Cf. E. Tov and S. Pfann, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1992–1993).

[41] The BHQ fascicle edition of the Megilloth is employed in the analyses. The BHQ fascicle edition of Lamentations is edited by Rolf Schäfer, "Lamentations," 54–72, 113*–136*. This diplomatic edition is based on Codex Leningradensis, with the exception of the stichographic layout, which is the work of the editor. The study also consults the BHS and BHK editions of this manuscript, as well as the facsimile edition of Codex Leningradensis edited by D.N. Freedman et al., *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

must make use of the original translations of the LXX, P, V and T[42] and be conscience of the ways in which the translators went about rendering their Hebrew *Vorlagen* ("translation technique").[43] A sensitivity for the translation

---

[42] The "original translations" refer to the earliest form of the text of the translations as they are established in critical editions. The following critical text editions of LXX, P, V and T are used in the analyses: J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XV: Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes: Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hanhart* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006); B. Albrektson, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations: With a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963); R. Weber, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem: Editionem quintam emendatam retractatam praeparavit Roger Gryson* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007); E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of Lamentations* (New York: Hermon Press, 1976); P. de Lagarde, *Hagiographa Chaldaice* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1873); A. van der Heide, *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

[43] For a helpful overview of the ancient translations of Lamentations, see H.F. van Rooy, "The Ancient Versions of Lamentations," *Scriptura* 110/2 (2012): 227–236. Scholars regard the LXX translation of Lamentations to be a "literal" translation. Cf. G.R. Kotzé, "The Greek Translation of Lamentations: Towards a More Nuanced View of its 'Literal' Character," in *Septuagint and Reception* (VTSup 127; ed. J. Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 77–95; P.J. Gentry, "Lamentations," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (eds. A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright; New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 934. K.J. Youngblood, "The Character and Significance of LXX Lamentations," in *Great Is Thy Faithfulness? Reading Lamentations as Sacred Scripture* (eds. R.A. Parry and H.A. Thomas; Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 64–69; R. Hirsch-Luipold and C.M. Maier, "Threnoi/Die Klagelieder," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (eds. W. Kraus and M. Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), 1349; idem, "Threnoi/Threni Seu Lamentationes/Die Klagelieder," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Band II: Psalmen bis Daniel* (eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2827–2841. Ever since the publication of Barthélemy's influential study on the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (*Les Devanciers d'Aquila* [VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963]), LXX Lamentations has also been seen as a member of the *kaige* group of translations and revisions. Cf. I. Assan-Dhôte and J. Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie* (BdA 25/2; Paris: Cerf, 2005), 155–157. According to Albrektson (*Studies*, 210), the concern of the Syriac translator of P was to provide an intelligible translation. For the sake of clarity, this translator sometimes adds copula or suffixes to the wording of the translation. He also resorts to free or explanatory renderings to make his understanding of the Hebrew text clear in his translation. Salters (*Lamentations*, 26) describes V as a stylish and readable Latin translation. There are two recensions of the Targum of Lamentations, the Western (T^W) and the Yemenite Texts (T^Y). Both versions are based on a common ancestor, although T^W is the older of the two versions. T^Y is, apparently, a revised, albeit different, version of T^W. Alexander describes the translation profile of T as follows: "Tg. Lam. is a curious mixture of a number of broad types of translation. Type A translates the original very directly, word for word. If it does make additions they are very short and intended simply to draw out the literal sense as understood by the Targumist. The bulk of T. Lam. is of this type ... Type B translation is paraphrastic and expansive and introduces considerable quantities of material that is patently not in the original". P.S. Alexander, *The Targum of Lamentations: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (ArBib 17b; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007), 39.

techniques can assist the text-critic to determine whether differences between the ancient translations and the Hebrew textual representatives can reasonably be attributed to variant readings in the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the translations.[44] The identification of variant readings in the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations is a very important part of the procedure, because these readings are one of the main sources of the kind of data that are relevant to the aims of the text-critical approach. Another important source of such data are readings in the Qumran manuscripts that can be regarded as difficult or problematic. The comparison of the Qumran manuscripts with the other textual representatives should therefore not only identify variant readings, but, with a view to the content of Lamentations, also difficult readings which it might share with the MT. As a result, both variant readings and textual difficulties in the Qumran manuscripts will make up the material subjected to text-critical scrutiny in order to establish how these manuscripts present the content of Lamentations. On the one hand, these readings demand of the text-critic to investigate how the wording in the Qumran manuscripts took on their present shapes through the process of copying. On the other hand, they allow the text-critic to compare the formulation of the content of Lamentations in the Qumran manuscripts to their counterparts in other textual witnesses and to make use of comparative philology.

The investigations of how the variant readings in the Qumran manuscripts came into being and how their difficult readings might be understood constitute the third phase of the text-critical procedure. Where the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations contain variant readings, these variants can be attributed to a number of potential factors. The reading in the Qumran manuscript might be the result of a scribal error, such as dittography, haplography, parablepsis (homoioteleuton/homoioarcton) and a confusion of similar-looking Hebrew letters or incorrect word division. Another possibility is that the reading in the Qumran manuscript differs from those in other textual representatives because a creative scribe was responsible for it. If this is the finding of the analysis, it must also determine, as far

---

[44] On the use of the ancient translations in text-critical research, see A. Gelston, "The Ancient Versions of the Hebrew Bible. Their Nature and Significance," in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (eds. A. Rapaport-Albert and G. Greenberg; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 148–164; E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research: Revised and Enlarged Second Edition* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997); and J. Adair, "A Methodology for Using the Versions in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *JNSL* 20/2 (1994): 111–142.

as possible, what the motivation behind the deliberate alteration of the wording might have been. A third plausible explanation for different readings in the Qumran manuscripts and the other textual representatives is that all of them developed from a common ancestor that is no longer preserved in the extant textual witnesses. In such a case, one must infer the existence of a hypothetical earlier reading that could have given rise to the readings in question. Finally, the analysis might come to the conclusion that the reading in the Qumran manuscript represents a text that is more original than its counterpart(s) in the other textual representatives.

Where the Qumran manuscripts and/or the MT contain wordings that exhibit some form of textual difficulty, the text-critic has recourse to information from Hebrew grammar and comparative philology to wrest sense from the passage. A comparison with the ancient Greek, Syriac, Latin and Aramaic translations might also prove to be helpful in this regard. These translations might be based on Hebrew *Vorlagen* that contained variants that do not appear in the available Hebrew manuscripts. This would give rise to the possibility that the difficult readings in the Hebrew textual representatives are corrupt and that these corrupt readings developed from the reading represented by the translations. Alternatively, the translations might bear witness to felicitous and helpful interpretations of difficult passages. The focus would then be on how the readings in the ancient translations were created during the processes of translation.

The fourth and final phase of the text-critical procedure requires that the text-critic establish the effect that the readings in the Qumran manuscripts have on the wording of passages, and by implication, the presentation of the content. To establish how the readings in the Qumran manuscripts affect the content of passages, the text-critic must take into consideration the interplay of the lexical, grammatical, syntactical and poetic features of words and clauses, as well as historical and cultural information that might be relevant to the understanding of the wording of a passage.

To sum up, the procedure of this study's approach to Old Testament textual criticism involves (1) a transcription of the wording of the four Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations; (2) a comparison of these manuscripts with other available textual witnesses and the identification of variant readings and textual difficulties in their wordings; (3) investigations into the most plausible ways in which these readings in the witnesses can be explained with reference to the process of transmission or philological information; and (4) examinations of how these readings affect the content of the passages in question. By analysing the Qumran Lamentations manuscripts'

variant readings and textual difficulties in accordance with this text-critical procedure, the study will provide sufficient relevant data to accomplish its aim.

CHAPTER TWO

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE QUMRAN MANUSCRIPTS OF LAMENTATIONS WITH AN OVERVIEW OF THEIR FORMAL CHARACTERISTICS

In this chapter, the four Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran, 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b}, are transcribed and a short overview is given of their formal characteristics. In each case, the overview of the individual manuscripts' formal characteristics and the transcription are followed by a list of the variants exhibited by these manuscripts compared to the MT, the only other available Hebrew textual representative. The evidence from the ancient translations that support either the readings in the Qumran manuscripts or the MT are also presented. This chapter mainly assembles evidence from the LXX, P and V, but also notes readings in T, σ′ and the Lucian version[1] where these have a direct bearing on the variant in question.

The purpose of the introductory remarks concerning 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} offered in this chapter, as well as the identification and cataloguing of their textual differences compared to the other textual representatives, is to set the stage for the detailed text-critical investigations into the wording of these four Lamentations manuscripts from the Qumran caves.

3QLam (3Q3)

Two small flakes of leather are all that is left of the Lamentations manuscript that was found in cave 3. The two fragments of 3QLam preserve individual words from Lam 1:10–12 and Lam 3:53–62. The manuscript seems to have been unruled and written in a Herodian script that allows it to be dated

---

[1] The Greek versions of Symmachus and Aquila are referred to by means of the sigla σ′ and α′ respectively. The evidence for σ′ and α′ as well as those for the Hexaplaric and Lucianic versions, are culled from the critical apparatus in Ziegler's Göttingen edition of LXX Lamentations, as well as the work of F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta* (Vol. 2; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875).

between 30 BCE and 68 CE.[2] Baillet,[3] remarks that the text of this manuscript is close to the MT. Despite its extremely fragmentary nature, 3QLam exhibits two interesting features. The divine name was written in paleo-Hebrew characters and the empty spaces before the words צמתו, קולו and [תה]ראֹ in Frg. 2 suggest that the lines of writing in this column were arranged colometrically (in accordance with the division of the verse lines into cola).[4]

The words on the second fragment of 3QLam are from the third chapter of Lamentations. Lam 3 comprises twenty-two sections, each consisting of three smaller units. The smaller units are made up of two cola and begin with the same letter of the alphabet in an acrostic structure. In the versification of the modern critical editions, each verse is the equivalent of a smaller unit (i.e. a bicolon). The words צמתו, קולו and [תה]ראֹ and [י]ת[פ]שׂ introduce vv. 53, 56, 59 and 62 respectively. In other words, they are the opening words of the second of the three smaller units of the *ṣade*, *qoph*, *resh* and *sin*/*shin* sections.[5] It can therefore be assumed that the three smaller units of a section were written on one line of this column. Moreover, the empty spaces before צמתו, קולו and [תה]ראֹ appear to separate the cola of a smaller unit from one another.[6]

Frg. 1: Lam 1:10–12

ב]קהל [
] ﬠﬠﬠ [
]הוג[ה

---

[2] Cf. B. Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series* (DJD XXXIX; ed. E. Tov; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 421.

[3] Baillet, "Lamentations," 95.

[4] Tov's survey of the scribal practices exhibited by the Dead Sea scrolls indicates that not all poetic texts were arranged colometrically: "The fact that for almost every occurrence of a stichographic arrangement there are scrolls displaying the same composition in prose shows that the tradition of stichographic writing was not fixed or that different traditions were in vogue during different periods". Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 167. Tov (ibid., 169) goes on to note that it is difficult to ascertain whether the textual character, chronology (when the scroll was copied) or the personal preference of scribes played a role in the use or non-use of a stichographic layout. He suggests that some scribal traditions may have favoured the use of a special arrangement for poetic units, while others did not.

[5] Verses 52–54 equals the *ṣade* section, vv. 55–57 equals the *qoph* section, vv. 58–60 equals the *resh* section and vv. 61–63 equals the *sin*/*shin* section.

[6] Baillet ("Lamentations," 95) also mentions the possibility that the spaces are the result of wear and tear at the edges of the fragment.

Frg. 2: Lam 3:53–62

] צמתו ב[
] קולי שמע[ת
] ראי֯[תה
]ש֯[פ]ת֯[י

Variants

There are no variants in 3QLam compared to the MT, with only one possible exception. According to Baillet,[7] the spacing in the first fragment might suppose that the wording of the clause in which the divine name occurs could be restored to read 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 ראה והביטה. On this reconstruction, the reading in 3QLam would be at variance with that in the MT: ראה יהוה והביטה.[8] The question mark that Baillet puts after this note on the reading ראה 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 והביטה throws the possible variant into doubt. Too little of the text has survived for it to be confidently recorded as a variant.

4QLam (4Q111)

Four fragments of the manuscript designated as 4QLam were recovered from cave 4. Three unruled columns of writing are preserved on three of the fragments. Together these three columns present portions of Lam 1:1–18. A few words of Lam 2:5 appear on the fourth small fragment from a later part of the same scroll. The fragments still have the top and bottom margins of the sheet on which Col. I and Col. II were written (although the fragment with the bottom margin is not shown on the plate of the DJD edition). The second fragment also has the left margin of the sheet intact with the stitching still visible. Each of the first two columns contains eleven lines of writing. The top, bottom, left and right margins of the third fragment have been preserved and its height measures about 11,8 cm. Stitching is also visible on the right edge of the fragment. Col. III is therefore almost double the size of Col. I and Col. II. However, this third column only has ten lines of script.

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Interestingly, one medieval Masoretic manuscript collected by Kennicott, as well as the LXX manuscript Codex Alexandrinus (ἴδε καὶ ἐπίβλεψον) omit יהוה and therefore have the reading ראה והביטה.

4QLam was written as prose in a running text, using a semi-formal Herodian script (30 BCE–1 CE)[9] and a full orthography. According to Cross,[10] the orthography of 4QLam is of a "late 'full' Palestinian type that began to develop in Maccabaean times and continued in use into the Herodian era".[11] This description of the orthography of 4QLam implies that the manuscript could have been copied anywhere in Palestine and then brought to Qumran.[12] However, Tov notes that 4QLam shares the morphological and orthographic peculiarities that are characteristic of what he labels the "Qumran scribal practice". Tov argues that some 167 biblical and non-biblical scrolls were written in a scribal practice that is unique to the Qumran community, displaying a distinctive orthography, morphology and other scribal features.[13] According to Tov,[14] this group of scrolls is closely connected to the Qumran community, since virtually all of the writings directly related to or conforming to the views and beliefs of the Qumran community (with the exception of seven or eight of these acknowledged sectarian writings) exhibit this particular scribal practice. 4QLam exhibits features that would justify its inclusion in this group of manuscripts written in the "Qumran scribal practice". The morphological feature characteristic of this scribal practice is a tendency towards lengthened pronominal, verbal and adverbial forms.[15] 4QLam (Frg. 1 Col. I line 5 [Lam 1:3]) has one example of a

---

[9] Cf. Webster, "Chronological Index," 412.

[10] Cross, "4QLam," 229.

[11] See also detailed discussion of the several types of orthography of the biblical and non-biblical scrolls in F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, ^{3}1995), 174–177.

[12] Scholars debate how many (if any) of the manuscripts found in the nearby caves were actually written and copied at Qumran itself. Two factors suggest that a number of these manuscripts were brought to the site from elsewhere in Palestine. First, some of the manuscripts predate the community's settlement at Qumran. Secondly, the manuscripts reflect different scribal conventions and, according to Bar-Ilan, it is doubtful whether the Qumran community housed more than one school of scribes. The various characteristics exhibited by the manuscripts therefore point to different scribal practices and conventions which scribes in Palestine employed in the copying of writings during the Second Temple period. Cf. M. Bar-Ilan, "Writing Materials," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (vol. 2; eds. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 996–997.

[13] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 263–268.

[14] Ibid., 261–262.

[15] These morphological features include (1) lengthened forms of the independent pronouns המה/אתמה/היאה/הואה; (2) lengthened pronominal suffixes of the second- and third-persons plural in nouns and prepositions: בהמה/מלכמה; (3) forms of the Qal *yiqtol*, e.g. תקטולו(ו), יקטולו(ו), which serve as pausal forms in the MT; (4) forms of the Qal *yiqtol* with pronominal suffixes construed as יקוטלנו; (5) the form קטלתמה(ו) for the second-person plural in all conjugations and (6) lengthened forms of מאד: מואדה/ מאודה/מודה.

lengthened independent pronoun (היאה instead of היא) and one of a lengthened pronominal suffix of third-person plural in a preposition (Frg. 3 Col. III line 9 [Lam 1:17]: בניהמה instead of ביניהם). The orthographic feature of the "Qumran scribal practice" is the abundant use of vowel indicators (*matres lectionis*).[16] The examples in 4QLam that correlate with Tov's list of orthographic characteristics for this scribal practice include the writing of לא as לוא (three times), כל as כול (three times) and כי as כיא (three times).[17] Despite the criticisms levelled at Tov's designation of these features as a distinct scribal practice employed by the Qumran community,[18] other Qumran specialists concur that at least some scrolls were produced, written and copied at Qumran.[19] The possibility that 4QLam was copied by the scribes of the Qumran community therefore cannot be rejected out of hand.

An interesting feature of this particular manuscript is that Col. I starts at the top of the sheet with Lam 1:1b. This means that the first column of the scroll (containing the words of Lam 1:1a) has not been preserved. The assumption that the first line of the book was written at the bottom of a previous sheet opens up the possibility that 4QLam might have been part of a scroll containing more than one writing, presumably two or more books of

---

[16] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 338–339) lists the following spellings as characteristic of the "Qumran scribal practice": (1) Forms of the demonstrative pronoun זאת: זואת/זאות/ זות(ה); (2) כוה as opposed to כה; (3) מושה as opposed to משה; (4) לוא as opposed to לא; (5) כול (without suffixes) as opposed to כל; (6) כיא as opposed to כי; (7) the verbal form קטלתה as opposed to קטלת and (8) the suffix כה- as opposed to ך- in nouns and prepositions.

[17] These figures are based only on what can be recognised from the photographs used for the plate in the DJD edition and not on the reconstructed text printed in the edition.

[18] Cf. the arguments of E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 86–88. He thinks that the principles and practices of the Qumran scribes regarding orthography did not differ significantly from those employed by other Jewish scribes of the same period. Consequently, he does not share Tov's idea of a distinctive "Qumran scribal practice".

[19] Three inkwells were found by archaeologists in room 30 and 31 of the site and the remains of a structure that fell from the upper floor of the buildings are reconstructed as a table where scribes could work on texts. Room 30 was identified as a *scriptorium* by de Vaux, the initial excavator of the site. Broshi ("Scriptorium," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [vol. 2; eds. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 831) notes that de Vaux's suggestion still remains highly probable, despite recent attempts to interpret the evidence differently. H. Stegemann (*The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 51–55) even argues that the facilities at the Qumran settlement and nearby Ain Feshka were employed primarily for the production of scrolls, together with preliminary stages of obtaining and working the leather for the scrolls. The study of the scrolls as a part of the religious life of those who occupied the settlement was a secondary concern.

the five Megilloth (Ruth, Song of Songs, Qohelet, Lamentations and Esther). This possibility is mentioned by both Cross[20] and Tov.[21] In this regard, it is noteworthy that all the fragments of Megilloth manuscripts found in the Qumran caves form part of individual scrolls. In other words, although these books are relatively short in comparison with other writings of the Old Testament (some of which were copied on a single scroll), they were all copied on separate scrolls. 4QLam is the only possible exception.

Scholarly opinions are divided on the issue concerning the textual tradition represented by the fragments of the manuscript. Cross remarks that despite the occasional agreement between 4QLam and the LXX and/or P, its textual tradition, like that of the LXX, P and V, is not far removed from the MT (the "Proto-Rabbinic text" in Cross's parlance).[22] Hillers,[23] however, argues that 4QLam does not conform to either the MT or the LXX, while Tov[24] classifies this Lamentations manuscript from Qumran as a so-called non-aligned text. This means that the text, in his view, disagrees to such an extent with MT and the text underlying the LXX that it can be considered as an independent textual witness.

Frg. 1 Col. I: Lam 1:1–6

top margin

[כא]למנה רׄבתי בגוים שרׄ[תי
[ת]בכה בלילה וד[
[ ]מׄכול אוׄהביהׄ[
[ ]לאיבים גלתה[
[ ]ה יׄ[ש]בׄה בג[
[ ] בין [
[ ]י מ[
[ ]חׄים[
[צר]יה לראושׄ[
[רו]ב פשעׄ[יה
[ ]א מבת[

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 1:6 מבת 4QLam MT (*qere*)] מן בת MT (*kethib*)

---

20 Cross, "4QLam," 229.
21 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 75.
22 Cross, "4QLam," 230.
23 D.R. Hillers, *Lamentations* (AB 7A; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 47.
24 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 335.

Frg. 2 Col. II: Lam 1:6–10

top margin

[ה]יו שריה כאילים לוֹא לוא מצא ומרעה
[ו]יֵלכו בלי כוח לפני רודף זכוֹרה יהוה
[ ]ל מכאובנו אשר היו מימי קדם בנפל
[ ]ה ביד צר ואין עוזר צריה שחקו על
[ ]ל משבריה חטוא חטאה ירושלם על
[ ]לנוד היתהּ[ ]ל [ ]דָּיָהּ הָזֵּילו כיא ראו
[ע]רֹותה גם[ ]אֲחורֹ
טמאתה בש[
[פ]לאות ואין [
[ ]הגדיל[
[ ]דֹ[

Variants

Lam 1:6	לוֹא לוא 4QLam] לא MT
Lam 1:6	מצאו מרעה 4QLam] מצא ומרעה MT LXX P V
Lam 1:6	בלי כוח 4QLam] בלא כח MT LXX P
Lam 1:7	זכוֹרה יהוה 4QLam] זכרה ירושלם MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:7	ימי עניה ומרודיה MT LXX P V] > 4QLam
Lam 1:7	כל מחמדיה MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$ 4QLam [ ]ל מכאובנו
Lam 1:7	לה ראוה MT LXX P $T^{W,Y}$] > 4QLam
Lam 1:7	צריה 4QLam LXX P] צרים MT V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:7	ל[ ] 4QLam] > MT LXX P V
Lam 1:7	משבריה 4QLam P] משבתה MT LXX V
Lam 1:8	חטוא חטאה 4QLam] חטא חטאה MT LXX P V T^{Y}
Lam 1:8	לנוד 4QLam LXX V] לנידה MT P
Lam 1:8	הָזֵּילו 4QLam] הזילוה MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:9	פלאים 4QLam [פ]לאות MT

Frg. 3 Col. III: Lam 1:10–18

top margin

אשר צויתה לוא יבואו מחמדיה באוֹכֵל להשיב נפשה ראה יהוה והב֯טה
כיא הייתי זולל לוא אליכ[י]הכל עברי דֹ[ ]אוֹ אם יש מכאוב
כמכאובי אשר עוללו לי אשר הוגירני י[ ]ם[חרו]נו ממרום שלח אֵ[ש]
בעצמותי ויורידני פרש רשֶׁת לרגלי חשיבנִי [ ]רֹ נתנני שומם כול
היום ודִ[ו]י נקשרה על פשעי בידו וישתרג עולו על צַ[וארי]הכשיל כוחי נתנני
יהוה ביד לוא אוכל לקוֹם סלה כול אבודי אדוֹנָי בְּקרבי קרא עלי מוֹ[עד]
לשבור בחורי גת דרך יהוָֹה לבתוֹלת בת יהודה פרשה // ציון בִּ[
מנחם לה מכול אוהביה צדיק אתה יהוה צפה אדוני ליעקוב סביב[יו
היתה ציוֹן לנדוח ביניהמה על אלה בכוֹ עיני ירדה דמעתי כיא רחק[
מִ[ ]נפש היו בנִי שוממים[ ]גבר אויב צדיק הוא אֵ[דוני

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 1:10–11 בקהל לך כל עמה נאנחים מבקשים לחם נתנו MT] > 4QLam
Lam 1:11 מחמדיה 4QLam LXX] מחמודיהם MT P $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:11 נפשה 4QLam] נפש MT LXX P V
Lam 1:11 זולל 4QLam] זוללה MT LXX P V
Lam 1:12 [י]כם אליכ לוא 4QLam] אליכם לוא MT P; LXX (οἳ πρὸς ὑμᾶς πάντες) V (*o vos omnes*)
Lam 1:12 עוללו לי 4QLam] עלל לי MT P $T^{W,Y}$; V (*vindemiavit me*)
Lam 1:12 הוגירני 4QLam] הוגה MT; הוגני (?) LXX (ἐταπείνωσέν με) P (ܐܬܚܚܢ)
Lam 1:12 נו[חרו]ם[4QLam] ביום חרון אפו MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:13 ויורידני 4QLam P] וירדנה MT; יורדנה LXX (κατήγαγεν αὐτό); וירדני σ′ (καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν με) V (*et erudivit me*)
Lam 1:13 חשיבני 4QLam] השיבני MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:13 שומם 4QLam] שוממה MT LXX P $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:13 ד[ו]י 4QLam] דוה MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:14 נקשרה 4QLam] נשקד MT נשקד MT^{mss} LXX P V
Lam 1:14 על 4QLam MT V $T^{W,Y}$] עַל LXX P
Lam 1:14 וישתרג 4QLam] ישתרגו MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:14 עולו 4QLam P Lucian] עלו MT LXX V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:14 יהוה 4QLam MT^{mss}] אדני MT
Lam 1:14 ביד 4QLam P V $T^{W,Y}$] בידי MT LXX P^{mss} (ܒܝܕ)
Lam 1:14 לקוֹם 4QLam] קום MT
Lam 1:15 אבודי 4QLam] אבירי MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:15 יהֹוֹה 4QLam] אדני MT
Lam 1:16–17 Different acrostic sequences: *pe*/*ʿayin* 4QLam—*ʿayin*/*pe* MT
Lam 1:17 מכול אוהביה צדיק אתה יהוה 4QLam] > MT LXX P V
Lam 1:17 צפה 4QLam] צוה MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:17 לנדוח 4QLam] לנדה MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:16 בכוֹ עיני ירדה 4QLam] אני בוכיה עיני עיני ירדה MT P $T^{W,Y}$; אני בוכיה עיני ירדה LXX (ἐγὼ κλαίω ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου κατήγαγεν) V (*ego plorans et oculus meus deducens*)
Lam 1:16 דמעתי 4QLam σ′] מים MT LXX P V T^{Y}
Lam 1:16 נפש 4QLam] נפשי MT LXX P V $T^{W,Y}$
Lam 1:18 א[דוני 4QLam] יהוה MT

Frg. 4: Lam 2:5

]בֹלע כל אַרמנת[ ]

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 2:5 [ ]אֹרְמְנת 4QLam] ארמנותיה MT

5QLam^{a} *(5Q6)*

Several fragments presenting portions of the fourth and fifth chapters of the book of Lamentations are all that remain of the small leather scroll designated as 5QLam^{a}. Six columns of writing have been preserved on the larger fragments. In addition, thirteen other scraps of leather from the same scroll containing the parts of individual words or letters have survived. Both the top and bottom margins of the manuscript are visible at Col. III and Col. IV, as well as at Col. V. At Col. I and Col. VI only the top margin can be seen on the plate of the DJD edition. The same holds for the bottom margin at Col. II. The left margins of the sheets on which Col. IV and Col. V were written are also preserved, while the margin separating Col. III and Col. IV is still partially intact.

To judge from Cols. III, IV and V, where both the top and bottom margins have survived, the columns of the manuscript seem to have originally consisted of seven lines of writing. The columns were not ruled and, like 4QLam, the text was not arranged stichographically. There is a major section division at Col. IV line 4 and line 5. A space extending from the last word of line 4 to the end of the line, followed by an indentation at the beginning of the next line, marks the end of ch. 4 and the start of ch. 5. Another space inexplicably appears in Col. VI after כשלו, the last word of Lam 5:13.

According to Milik,[25] the scroll was written in "écriture ornementale du milieu du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.". The Late Herodian script of the manuscript allows Webster to date it to 50 CE.[26] Concerning orthography, vowel indicators are used regularly, albeit not in a systematic way. Where the same word occurs more than once, it is written in *scriptio plene* at one place and in *scriptio defectiva* at another. For example, עוֹנֵךְ (Col. I line 2), עוונות (Col. II line 5) and עוונךְ (Col. IV line 4) have a full orthography, whereas עונותיהֶם (Col. V line 4) does not. Similarly, לוא (Col. IV line 3) was written with the *waw* as a *mater lectionis*, but at Col. I lines 3 and 5, as well as at line 1 of one of the small additional fragments from the scroll (Frg. 2 in the DJD edition), לא is spelled without the *waw*.

---

25 Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

26 Webster, "Chronological Index," 432.

The manuscript exhibits two instances of scribal corrections. At Col. IV line 6, the scribe who copied the manuscript, or a later one, inserted an *ʾaleph* in the interlinear space above the word לנוכרים. This addition changes the spelling of the word to לנוכריאם. Although there is a lacuna in the manuscript at the beginning of line 6 of Col. V, Milik indicates in his transcription of the text that a *yod* was placed above the *resh* of the first word in the line, יו[נ]עור.[27] A scribe, therefore, seems to have adjusted the spelling of the word in order to read עורינו.

Another interesting scribal intervention is found in the bottom margin at Col. II where someone inserted the sign ו after the scroll was copied. Tov is of the opinion that this scribal marking in the bottom margin of 5QLam[a]'s second column resembles a truncated paleo-Hebrew *waw* (𐤅) or a *waw* in the square Aramaic script dating from the sixth century BCE.[28] In his detailed investigation of the scribal practices reflected in the Dead Sea scrolls, Tov found that signs, such as paleo-Hebrew letters and letters of the Cryptic A script (a script that developed from late Phoenician scripts), are written in the interlinear spaces or in the margins of some manuscripts. Tov notes that the function of these signs is difficult to establish with any degree of certainty:

> Although the scribal marks written in the margins of some manuscripts have been known for some time, no satisfactory solution for their occurrence has been suggested, and some of them remain enigmatic. These signs probably direct attention to certain details in the text or to certain pericopes, but they may also refer to the reading by the Qumran covenanters of certain passages, especially in the case of 1QIsa[a]. The function of the letters in 4QCant[b] differs from that in the other texts. They may have served as a special type of line-filler or they may have been used for a very specific, as yet undetermined, purpose relating to the content of the manuscript.[29]

Tov also speculates that the Cryptic A letters might form some kind of a coded message used by the Qumran community and that the appearance of individual paleo-Hebrew letters in the margins of manuscripts possibly served such a function as well. He concedes, however, that there is no evidence to support this suggestion.[30]

5QLam[a] preserves parts of Lam 4:5–22 and Lam 5:1–17. Due to the fragmentary state of the manuscript, it is very difficult to give a detailed descrip-

---

27 Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 177.
28 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 207.
29 Ibid., 206–207.
30 Ibid., 204, 207.

tion of its textual character. Milik therefore observes that the relationship between 5QLam[a] and other witnesses to Lamentations, such as the MT and the LXX, is not clear.[31]

Frg. 1 Col. I: Lam 4:5–8[32]

top margin

[ ] למעדנים נש[ ]וֹצוֹתֹ[
[ה]בקו אשפתות ויגדֹל עוֹוֹן[
[ ]וֹכה כמו רגע וֹלֹא[
[מח]לב [א]דֹמו עצם מפֹנינֹ[ים
[ ]משחור תארם לא נֹ[
[ ]
[ ]

Variants

Apart from individual orthographical differences compared to the MT and interesting renderings of the difficult reading אדמו עצם מפנינים in the ancient translations, there does not appear to be any textual variants between 5QLam[a], the MT and the proposed Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the ancient translations for these verses.

Frg. 1 Col. II: Lam 4:11–15

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]דֹתיֹ[ה]תבֹ[ל]
כי יֹ[ ]צר וא[ויב]נֹביאיהֹ
עוונות כוה[נ]יֹה ה[ ]ם בקרבהֹ[ ]יֹקים נעוֹ
[ ]ם בחוֹצוֹת נגֹ[ ] בדם בל י[ו]כֹלוֹ יבגֹ[ ] בֹלבושיהם
[ ]ו טמֹאוֹ קראו למו סֹורו סֹ[ו]רֹו אל ת[ג]עֹוֹ כי נצו

bottom margin

---

[31] Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

[32] Although the part of manuscript 5QLam[a] on which its surviving six columns were written has broken into a number of fragments, these are all grouped together as "fragment 1" in the DJD edition. Milik distinguishes Frg. 1 from Frgs. 2–14, the thirteen other slivers of leather from the same scroll containing parts of individual words and letters.

Variants

Lam 4:14	כֻּלּוֹ[ו] בל י 5QLam^{a}] בלא יוכלו MT LXX
Lam 4:14	[ ]יבג 5QLam^{a}] יגעו MT LXX P V
Lam 4:15	טִמְאוֹ 5QLam^{a} LXX P V (?)] טמא MT T$^{W, Y}$

Frg. 1 Col. III: Lam 4:15–20

top margin

]לִגְּור פְּנֵי יהוה[ ]
]נ]שאו[ ]
]
]
]
]
]הִיּוֹם[ ]ש]מים[ ]בָּרָ[
]ם[ ]ארבו לנו רו[ח] אפינ[ו מ]שיח יהוה[

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 4:16–17	Different acrostic sequences: *ʿayin*/*pe* 5QLam^{a} 5QLam^{b} MT; *pe*/*ʿayin* MT^{mss} P
Lam 4:19	הִיּוֹם 5QLam^{a}] היו MT

Frg. 1 Col. IV: Lam 4:20–5:3

top margin

[ ]ים שיש[י]ִי בת אד[
[ ] עֹליך תעבְ[ ]וֹס תשׁ[
[ ]ת צִיון לוא יוֹסִיף לה[
פֶּ[ ]עוונְךָ[ ]אֹדום גלה על חטּ[ ] *vacat*
vacat זכֶ[ ] מֹה[ ]לְנָוֹ הביטה[ ]אֶת
חרפותי[נו]ם בתינו לְנוֹכריִם
יתומים[ ] אב אמוֹתינו לֹא בְּנָוֹת ואלמנות

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 5:1	הביטה 5QLam^{a} MT^{mss} MT (*qere*)] הביט MT (*kethib*)
Lam 5:1	חרפותי[נו 5QLam^{a}] חרפתנו MT LXX P V T$^{W, Y}$
Lam 5:2	לְנוֹכריִם 5QLam^{a}] לנכרים MT
Lam 5:3	לֹא בְּנָוֹת ואלמנות 5QLam^{a}] כאלמנות MT LXX P V T$^{W, Y}$

Frg. 1 Col. V: Lam 5:4–12

top margin

]] חירֹ [
]] לנו מ[
]] אֹשור לשֹ[
[אנ]חְנוּ עונותיהֶֹם סֹ[ב]לנו עבְֹ[ ]ק
]]מידם בנפשנו נביא לחמ[ ]י חֹרֶבְ [ה]מדבר
עור֯[נ]וּ כתנור נכמרו מֹ[פ]ני זְלפות רָעב נשים בְּציֹון
[ע]נו בתולות בערֹ[ ]דֹה שרים בְּיָדָם נתלו

bottom margin

Variants

Lam 5:10 עור֯[נ]וּ 5QLam[a] MT[mss] P] עורנו MT LXX V T[W, Y]
Lam 5:10 זְלפות 5QLam[a]] זלעפות MT

Frg. 1 Col. VI: Lam 5:12–17

top margin

]אֹ נהדרו בחורי[ם]טֹחון נשׂאו]
]] כשלו *vacat*]
[ ]
[ ]
אוי] [
על ה[אלה]
[ ]

Variants

Lam 5:17 על ה[אלה 5QLam[a] (or ר[ה על in verse 18?)] על האלה MT

Frgs. 2–14

2	3	4	5	6
]○ לא[	]ש[	]○[	]○ה[	]○
]ל[ ]ו ל[	]○ור כ○[	]○הם [	]שד○[	]○ם
		]○[		

7	8	9	10	11
]יה א[	]○תל○[	]חרי [	]ה[	]○ם [
]○[	] ·· [	]○[	]○○○[	]○[

12	13–14
]ם [	traces of letters

5QLam^{b} (5Q7)

The fragment of the second manuscript of Lamentations found in cave 5 contains individual words from four verses of Lam 4 (vv. 17–20). The leather is devoid of any ruling and the beginnings of the lines are not aligned. This can be deduced from the fact that the first three words that have been preserved on the fragment (עוד]ינה[, צָדֹו and קלים) are all from the beginning of the *ʿayin*, *ṣade* and *qoph* verses of Lam 4. The text, therefore, seems to have been arranged stichographically with two bicola per line (with or without spaces separating them).[33] In the fourth line, however, אפינו, the second word of the *resh* verse, appears almost directly under קלים. This implies that the initial word of the *resh* verse, רוח, might have been written in what, on the plate in the DJD edition, looks like the right margin of the manuscript. Nevertheless, the fragment is too small for there to be any certainty in this regard.

Milik indicates that the handwriting of 5QLam^{b} is contemporaneous with the one of 5QLam^{a} (50 CE), but that the same scribe did not copy both manuscripts.[34]

Frg. 1: Lam 4:17–20

] עוד]ינה [
צָדֹו צע[
קלים ה[
]אפינו [
]○[

Variants

Lam 4:16–17	Different acrostic sequences: *ʿayin*/*pe* 5QLam^{a} 5QLam^{b} MT—*pe*/*ʿayin* MT^{mss} P
Lam 4:17	ינה[עוד] 5QLam^{b} MT (*kethib*)] עודינו MT (*qere*) LXX P V
Lam 4:18	צָדֹו 5QLam^{b} MT] צרו MT^{ms}

Closing Remarks

The preceding overview of the formal characteristics of 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b}, the transcriptions of these fragmentary manuscripts

---

[33] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 171.

[34] Milik, "Lamentations (Second Exemplaire)," 177.

and the survey of the variants that they exhibit in comparison with the MT prepare the way for detailed text-critical analyses of their wordings. The aim of such text-critical analyses will be to gain a better understanding of the ways in which the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran present the content of the book. This desired better understanding of the wordings preserved by 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} pertains to the creation of the *variae lectiones* in these manuscripts during the processes of transmission, as well as an examination of the textual difficulties.

The current chapter's overview of 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} reveals that too little of the second and third chapters of Lamentations have survived in these manuscripts to qualify for detailed text-critical analyses of their wordings. Similarly, there is not enough text of Lam 1 in 3QLam to make an accurate assessment of how this manuscript presented the content of the passages.[35] Therefore, the next chapter will focus on the content of Lam 1 as it is presented in 4QLam, while the chapters thereafter will focus on 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b}, the witnesses to the contents of Lam 4 and 5.

---

[35] Schäfer's judgment that 3QLam contributes little to text-critical work on Lamentations therefore seems to be justified. Cf. Schäfer, "Masoretische Text," 146.

CHAPTER THREE

TEXT-CRITICAL ANALYSES OF THE WORDING OF LAM 1 AS WITNESSED TO BY 4QLAM

Introduction

In this chapter, the wording of Lam 1 in 4QLam is subjected to a detailed text-critical analysis. Only readings of Lam 1:6–17 in 4QLam are analysed and compared with the MT and the ancient translations. Parts of vv. 1–5 are preserved in 4QLam, but very little of their wordings have survived the forces of decay. Since an accurate assessment of the way in which the manuscript from Qumran presents the content of these five verses is unfortunately not possible, they are left out of consideration in the analysis.[1] It is nonetheless noteworthy that, apart from orthographical differences, the individual words of these verses in 4QLam exhibit no variant readings when compared to the wording in the MT. Furthermore, this chapter will not include Lam 1:18 and Lam 2:5 in the text-critical examination, due to a lack of sufficient data for analysis.[2] Nevertheless, there is a possible variant reading

---

[1] For discussions of vv. 1, 3, 4 and 5 in the MT and the ancient translations (especially the LXX) with references to the wordings of these verses in 4QLam, see G.R. Kotzé, "Short Notes on the Value of the Septuagint and Vulgate for the Interpretation of Lamentations 1:1," *JNSL* 36/1 (2010): 77–93.; idem, "The Greek and Hebrew Texts of Lamentations 1:4–6. Establishing the Differences in Content Between the Textual Witnesses By Means of a Text-Critical Analysis," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009): 275–292; idem, "Greek Translation," 77–95.

[2] There are allusions to phrases from Lam 1 and Lam 4 in 4Q179, a short composition from Qumran that is also referred to as *4QApocryphal Lamentations A*. These allusions will not form part of this study's text-critical analyses. For good discussions of 4Q179, see T. Ilan, "Gender and Lamentations: 4Q179 and the Canonization of the Book of Lamentations," *Lectio Difficilior* 2 (2008): 1–16; A. Berlin, "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (STDJ XLVIII; ed. E. Chazon; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2003), 1–17; J. Høgenhaven, "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (eds. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London / New Castle: British Library / Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 113–120; H. Pabst, "Eine Sammlung von Klagen in den Qumranfunden (4Q 179)," in *Qumrân: Sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*, 137–149 (ed. M. Delcor; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 137–149; M.P. Horgan, "A Lament over Jerusalem ('4Q179')," *JSS* 18 (1973): 222–234. For a good

in the wording of Lam 1:18 which can be briefly mentioned here. Only the first two words of this verse have been fully preserved on the last line of 4QLam's third column (צדיק הוא א[דוני]). The final letter on the fragment, an *'aleph*, probably introduces the word אדוני, whereas its counterpart in the MT is יהוה. Apparently, the variation in usage of the two divine designations between the Qumran manuscript and the MT, which will be discussed in greater detail in the analysis of Lam 1:14 and Lam 1:15, is also exemplified in v. 18. Finally, the partly preserved reading]ארמנת in 4QLam's wording of Lam 2:5 might merely be a defective spelling of ארמנותיה, the reading in the MT.

Verse 6

4QLam [ ]א מבת[ ] [ה]יו שריה
כאילים לוֹא לוא מצא ומרעה [ו]ילכו בלי כוח לפני
רודף

[ ]from the daughter of[ ] Her princes have [be]come like stags, they did not not find and pasture, [but] have gone away without strength before the pursuer.

MT

וַיֵּצֵא מִן בַּת־צִיּוֹן כָּל־הַדָּרָהּ הָיוּ שָׂרֶיהָ כְּאַיָּלִים לֹא־מָצְאוּ מִרְעֶה וַיֵּלְכוּ בְלֹא־כֹחַ לִפְנֵי רוֹדֵף׃

And out of the Daughter of Zion[3] went all her splendour. Her princes have become like stags; they have not found pasture, but have gone away without strength before the pursuer.

---

edition of the text of 4Q179, see M.J. Bernstein, "4Q179 (4QapocrLam A) (Preliminary Edition)," in *Poetic and Liturgical Texts* (DSSR 5; eds. D.W. Parry and E. Tov; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2005), 148–151.

[3] F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp ("The Syntagma of *bat* Followed by a Geographical Name in the Hebrew Bible: A Reconsideration of Its Meaning and Grammar," *CBQ* 57 [1995]: 451–470) argues on the basis of comparative evidence from Akkadian divine epithets and the narrative contexts in the Hebrew Bible in which בת + a geographical name occurs that this syntactical construction is not an appositional genitive, as it is generally understood, but rather a genitive of location. The result of Dobbs-Allsopp's examination is that the 18 occurrences of בת ציון (including the phrase בת עמי) in Lamentations (1:6, 1:15, 2:1, 2:2, 2:4, 2:8, 2:10, 2:13 [2×], 2:15, 2:18, 3:48, 4:3, 4:6, 4:10, 4:21, 4:22 [2×]) should be seen as an epithet for Jerusalem and be translated as "Daughter of Zion" and in the case of בת עמי "Daughter of my people". See, however, the comments of A. Berlin, *Lamentations: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 2002), 11 f., who argues in favour of the view that בת ציון and בת עמי are appositional genitives. In her opinion, בת ציון and בת עמי are personifications of the city and the people respectively. Salters (*Lamentations*, 51–53) notes that all the explanations and English renderings of these expressions are, to some extent, problematic.

The first lines of v. 6 were written at the bottom of Col. I of 4QLam and, like the previous verses, they are only partially preserved. These lines appeared on the small sliver of leather that broke off at the lower left edge of the fragment that was not included in the photograph used for the plate of the DJD edition. However, Cross notes that the reading מבת is clear on old photographs of the fragment.[4] The second fragment of 4QLam contains eleven lines of script (Col. II), including the rest of v. 6. These lines are almost fully preserved, since the part of the sheet containing Col. II was discovered in a better condition than the part on which Col. I was written. A comparison between 4QLam and MT at v. 6 reveals a number of interesting differences in wording.

מִן בַּת—מבת

The form מבת in the manuscript from Qumran merely represents a variation in the mode of writing from the *kethib* reading מן בת in the MT and not a deviation in meaning. Interestingly, מבת in 4QLam agrees with the *qere* reading which the Masoretes noted in the *masora parva*. As to the cause of the variation in wording, it could be speculated that a scribe regarded the form of the prepositional phrase מן בת as unusual and amended it into מבת. The preposition usually takes the form מן before articular words and is only irregularly joined in this form to a word without a definite article. Otherwise, the *nun* assimilates to the first consonant of the following anarthrous word.[5] Alternatively, it can also be posited that the form מן בת is an example of an Aramaism in the version of Lamentations transmitted by the MT and, as such, developed from מבת under the influence of Aramaic.[6]

---

[4] Cross, "4QLam," 231.

[5] Cf. GKC §102b; IBHS §11.2.11a.

[6] The lack of the customary assimilation of the *nun* of the preposition מן before an anarthrous noun in the prepositional phrase מן בת is a characteristic of Aramaic. M. Eskhult ("The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Hebrew Texts," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* [ed. I. Young; London: T & T Clark, 2003], 14) defines Aramaisms in the following terms: "Aramaisms may be phonemic, in which case one can see that the word is not Hebrew in form. Alternatively, a word may be judged an Aramaism when it is uncommon in Hebrew, but frequent in Aramaic, and the idea could well have been expressed by the usual Hebrew word". Dobbs-Allsopp ("Linguistic Evidence for the Date of Lamentations," *JANES* 26 [1998]: 25–31) identifies a number of features in the book of Lamentations that can either be characterized as Aramaisms or possibly exhibit Aramaic influence. These include the nouns אריה ("lion") (Lam 3:10), מדינה ("province") (Lam 1:1), מטרא ("target") (Lam 3:12), as well as the plurals שוממין ("desolate") (Lam 1:4) and תנין ("jackals") (Lam 4:3). He notes that the *hapax legomenon* מנגינתם ("their song") (Lam 3:63), as well as the forms עותתי ("my

לֹא־מָצְאוּ מִרְעֶה—לוֹא לוא מצא ומרעה

לוא is written twice in the Qumran fragment and although this is undoubtedly an example of dittography, the scribe made no attempt to erase one לוא. Apart from this clear case of dittography, the reading מצא ומרעה exhibits another scribal error in the wording of 4QLam. The immediate context demands a plural verb with the plural subject שריה. This implies that the *waw* should not have been appended to מרעה as a conjunction, but to מצא in order to form the third-person plural *qatal* form of the verbal root. The error in 4QLam can easily be explained as a wrong division of the words. The evidence from the Dead Sea scrolls shows that the spaces between words in ancient manuscripts were not always indicated very clearly and this could lead to confusion, as well as to wrong word divisions.[7] The reading מצא ומרעה in 4QLam illustrates this kind of blunder perpetrated by the scribes who copied the manuscripts in antiquity.

בְּלֹא־כֹחַ—בלי כוח

In the final bicolon of Lam 1:6, 4QLam has the adverb בלי, where the MT reads בלא (the negative particle לא with the preposition ב). Cross hazards a guess as to which one of these readings derives from the other and consequently proposes that the reading in 4QLam should perhaps be preferred over the one in MT:[8] "*bl*' arises easily from misreading *bly* as *blw* corrected

---

oppression") (Lam 3:59) and רחמניות ("compassionate") (Lam 4:10) display Aramaic traits. The following verbal roots are included in Dobbs-Allsopp's list: זעק ("to call") (Lam 3:8), חזה ("to see") (twice in Lam 2:14), נטל ("to lay upon") (Lam 3:28), סלה ("to despise"/"to flout"/"to reject") (Lam 1:15), פרק ("to cleave"/"to separate"/"to tear apart") (Lam 5:8) and סבל ("to carry"/"to bear") (Lam 5:7). Dobbs-Allsopp observes that the word כלילה in the phrase כְּלִילַת יֹפִי (Lam 2:15) is probably an Aramaism. If כלילה is taken as an Aramaism, the phrase can be translated as "crown of beauty", as opposed to the usual interpretation "perfection of beauty". Finally, the periphrastic construction with the verb היה + a participle (Lam 1:11 and 1:16) occurs often in *Reichsaramäisch* and later Aramaic dialects. It is attested in Late Biblical Hebrew as well and its usage is attributed to Aramaic influence (Dobbs-Allsopp, "Linguistic Evidence," 30). Regarding Aramaisms and especially their role in the linguistic dating of Biblical Hebrew texts, see also A. Hurvitz, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (ed. I. Young; London: T & T Clark, 2003), 24–37; idem, "The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew," *IEJ* 19 (1968): 234–240; G.A. Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Phonology," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* [ed. I. Young; London: T & T Clark, 2003], 104–128; and Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating*, 201–222.

[7] Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 209, 252–253.

[8] Cross, "Studies," 139.

orthographically to *bl'*. It is not easy to see how an original *bl'* would have been corrupted to *bly*". In his analysis of the linguistic profile of Lamentations, Dobbs-Allsopp[9] indicates that the form בלי is found in both Standard Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew,[10] but בלא is used almost exclusively in the latter, as well as in later dialects of the Hebrew language, such as Mishnaic Hebrew. Qimron notes that both בלי and בלא occur in Qumran Hebrew, although בלא is the more common of the two particles.[11] The predominance of בלא in later forms of Hebrew raises the possibility that a scribe altered the wording of the text he was copying from בלי to בלא so as to modernize the language of the text.[12] On this hypothesis, the updated form of the text is represented by the MT, while 4QLam preserves a version of Lam 1:6 before a scribe decided to revise the wording of the phrase. If this is indeed the case, the modernization of the language was not excecuted consistently, since בלי also appears in the MT text of Lam 1:4 in the prepositional phrase מבלי. Consequently, one can conclude that although a scribal attempt at modernization of the language could have caused the change from בלי to בלא, Cross's suggestion of a scribal error remains plausible. In light of the fact that both בלי and בלא are utilized as "negative adverbials meaning 'without' or the like",[13] the variation in 4QLam and the MT does not result in a difference in meaning between these two Hebrew witnesses.

Since the wording of the first line of poetry in 4QLam was almost completely lost, it is impossible to predict whether it resembled the wording in the version of the text represented by the MT.[14] Remarks regarding the

---

[9] Dobbs-Allsopp, "Linguistic Evidence," 18.

[10] In the diachronic study of Biblical Hebrew, the designation "Standard Biblical Hebrew" refers to the phase of the Hebrew language reflected in the writings of the Old Testament that date to pre-exilic times. "Late Biblical Hebrew" denotes the stage in the development of Hebrew exhibited by writings from the post-exilic period. Cf. I. Young, "Introduction: The Origin of the Problem," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (ed. idem; London: T & T Clark, 2003), 1–6. See also Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating*, 5–8.

[11] Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 77.

[12] For other examples of modernization of language, see McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 51–56.

[13] Dobbs-Allsopp, "Linguistic Dating," 18.

[14] Some scholars complain about the supposed inelegance of the *waw* consecutive at the beginning of v. 6. Cf. Cross, "Studies," 139; Hillers *Lamentations*, 67. They note that the only reason why a *waw* is used here is for the acrostic to work. Accordingly, these scholars do not see a close connection in subject matter between v. 5 and v. 6 in the MT. Conversely, it might be suggested that the conjunction of ויצא in the MT links the reference to the children that go into captivity before the foe in v. 5 (עוללי הלכו שבי לפני צר) to the statement in v. 6

content of Lam 1:6 must be restricted to the parts of the verse that did survive in 4QLam in order to avoid an *argumentum e silentio*. Based on what can be surmised about the wording that was preserved on the fragments of 4QLam, the scribal mistakes do not detract much from the sense of the verse as a whole, and despite their slightly different wordings, 4QLam and the MT essentially present the same content for Lam 1:6. In both the fragment from Qumran and the MT, a hunting image is used to portray the flight of the city's leaders. They flee the city like stags before a hunter. They will, however, not make good their escape, because, according to the text, they do not find a source of nourishment and they flee without strength (אילים is taken as the subject of וילכו and not שריה). Their capture by the enemy is therefore inevitable.

Verse 7

4QLam

זכוֹרה יהוה [כו]ל מכאובנו אשר היו מימי קדם
בנפל [עמ]ה ביד צר ואין עוזר צריה שחקו על
[ ]ל משבריה

Remember O YHWH [al]l our pains that existed from days of old. When her [people] fell in/by the hand of a foe and there was no helper, her foes laughed about [ ] her ruins.

---

regarding the departure of the city's splendour. The end of v. 5 shares with v. 6 the idea that members of Jerusalem's population have to leave the city on account of an enemy. W. Rudolph (*Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohe Lied. Die Klagelieder* [KAT; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1962], 212), I.W. Provan (*Lamentations* [NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 41) and House (*Lamentations*, 352) argue convincingly that the simile according to which the city's leaders are compared to powerless stags elaborates on the observation that the splendour of "the Daughter of Zion" has gone away. In keeping with this interpretation, הדר refers to the leaders. Nevertheless, other interpretations of הדר are also possible. H.-J. Kraus (*Klagelieder* [*Threni*] [BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, ^{4}1983], 28–29), for example, thinks of הדר in terms of the glory of Jerusalem and sees in the deportation of the leaders an example of the departure of the city's splendour. Berlin (*Lamentations*, 53) notes that הדר "may refer to the treasures of gold and silver, plundered by the enemy; or perhaps it refers to the city's leaders, described in the following lines as stags". J. Renkema (*Klaagliederen* [COT; Kampen: Kok, 1993], 86–87) deems such interpretations too narrow and, with reference to passages from the Psalms and Isaiah, he draws attention to the fact that הדר also denotes the kingship of YHWH and his majesty in creation. Renkema goes on to observe that, according to Ezek 16:6–13, 14, YHWH bestows such הדר to Jerusalem. He specifically thinks of the glory of the temple in this regard. But the destruction of the temple is but one aspect of what the departure of glory refers to. What is implicitly lamented here, in Renkema's view, is the departure of YHWH from Zion, since he is the one who imparted his glory on the temple.

MT

זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם יְמֵי עָנְיָהּ וּמְרוּדֶ֔יהָ כֹּ֚ל מַחֲמֻדֶ֔יהָ אֲשֶׁ֥ר הָיוּ֙ מִימֵ֣י קֶ֔דֶם בִּנְפֹ֥ל עַמָּ֖הּ בְּיַד־צָ֑ר וְאֵ֥ין עוֹזֵ֖ר לָ֣הּ רָא֣וּהָ צָרִ֔ים שָׂחֲק֖וּ עַל מִשְׁבַּתֶּֽהָ׃

Jerusalem remembers the days of her affliction and homelessness,[15] all her precious things that existed from days of old. When her people fell in/by the hand of a foe and there was no helper for her, foes saw her, they laughed about her downfall.

Verse 7 of Lam 1 in the MT presents the interpreter with a number of textual difficulties. First, its colometry is debatable. Based on the text's supposed *qinah*-metre, this verse is arranged in such a way that it consists of four bicola. Since the rest of the verses of ch. 1 in the MT are thought to be composed of three poetic lines each, scholars generally consider Lam 1:7 in this version to be corrupt due to its length and suggestions for its emendation abound. On the one hand, the critical apparatuses of BHS and BHK, as well as a number of commentators identify the second verse-line as the secondary addition and some prefer to eliminate it on metrical grounds.[16] On the other hand, Ehrlich, Berges, Gottlieb, Albrektson and Rudolph[17] suggest striking the third verse-line as a gloss to the problematic word מרודיה.[18] De

---

15 This translation of מרודיה is based on an interpretation of the form as an *Abstraktplural* deriving from the root רוד. Cf. IBHS §7.4.2.a-b; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 206. For other proposals on how to render מרודיה, see D. Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 864–865. For the purposes of the translation, both ימי עניה ומרודיה and כל מחמדיה are read as direct objects of the verb זכרה.

16 J. Hunter, *Faces of a Lamenting City: The Development and Coherence of the Book of Lamentations* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), 123; C. Westermann, *Lamentations: Issues and Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 112; O. Kaiser, *Klagelieder* (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 318; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 22; G.C. Aalders, *Klaagliederen: Opnieuw uit den Grondtekst Vertaald en Verklaard* (KV; Kampen: Kok, 1952), 22; M.R.H. Löhr, *Die Klagelieder des Jeremia* (HKAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893), 2; J. Dyserinck, "De Klaagliederen uit het Hebreeuwsch Opnieuw Vertaald," *ThT* 26 (1892): 363; K. Budde, "Zum hebräischen Klagelied," *ZAW* 12 (1892): 265. Hillers also excises the second verse-line from his translation, but notes that the wording of the MT still retains an acceptable sense regardless of whether the second or the third verse-line is omitted. He therefore agrees with T.J. Meek ("Lamentations," in *The Interpreter's Bible* [vol. 6; New York: Abington Press, 1956], 9) that "this strophe circulated in two different text-forms with identical first and third lines, the extant text being a conflation of the two. There seems little decisive reason to prefer either reading as the original". Cf. Hillers, *Lamentations*, 61, 69.

17 A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches* (vol. 7; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1914), 31; U. Berges, *Klagelieder* (HThKAT; Freiburg / Basel / Wien: Herder, 2002), 88–89; H. Gottlieb, *A Study on the Text of Lamentations* (Århus: Det Laerde Selskab, 1978), 13; Albrektson, *Studies*, 62–63; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 206.

18 Renkema argues that none of the explanations for the four lines of Lam 1:7 is satisfactory

Hoop,[19] however, has recently made a cogent argument against the assumption that the so-called *qinah*-metre is prevalent in Lamentations. He notes that there is no reason to emend the wording of Lam 1:7 in the MT and proposes a different colometric arrangement of the verse on the basis of the Masoretic accents.[20] In his layout, this verse consists of a tricolon and a bicolon.[21]

---

and holds the four-line strophe to be the original text. His argument rests, first, on what he considers a copyist would likely have done: "Het is nauwelijks voorstelbaar dat een glossator of overschrijver van de kanttekening niet zag dat een invoeging de overduidelijke regelmaat van drie bicola per strofe verstoorde. Het omgekeerde ligt veeleer voor de hand: bij het overscrijven bestond juist de neiging om moeilijke teksten glad te strijken". Secondly, he mentions the occurrence of expansion in Hebrew poetry. This phenomenon refers to those cases where poets or reciters disrupt the regularity of a poem by means of an elaboration. Thirdly, Renkema bases his view on his structural analysis of Lamentations, according to which what he identifies as the second and third bicola of Lam 1:7 both form integral parts of larger literary units, namely the canticle (Lam 1:7–9) and the sub-canto (Lam 1:7–11). Cf. Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 93. House and Gordis also argue against the deletion of a part of the wording of the version of Lam 1:7 in the MT. Cf. House, *Lamentations*, 335; R. Gordis, *The Song of Songs and Lamentations: A Study, Modern Translation and Commentary* (New York: KTAV, 1974), 154.

[19] R. de Hoop, "Lamentations: The Qinah-Metre Questioned," in *Delimitation Criticism* (eds. M. Korpel and J. Oesch; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000), 80–104.

[20] De Hoop demonstrates how the Masoretic accentuation can be an important source of knowledge concerning the colometry of Hebrew poetic texts. Cf. R. de Hoop, "The Colometry of Hebrew Verse and the Masoretic Accents: Evaluation of a Recent Approach (Part I)," *JNSL* 26/1 (2000): 47–73; idem, "The Colometry of Hebrew Verse and the Masoretic Accents: Evaluation of a Recent Approach (Part II)," *JNSL* 26/2 (2000): 65–100. Nevertheless, he warns that the Masoretic accents must be used with care in dividing verse lines into cola. He agrees with Yeivin and Revell that one should not only be alert to the classification of the accents into a higher and lower grade, but also take the position of the accents in relation to each other in a clause into consideration. Cf. De Hoop, "Lamentations," 90; I. Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980), 169; E.J. Revell, "Masoretic Accents," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 4; ed. D.N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 594–596.

[21] The principle of BHQ is to print poetic texts colometrically, based on the Masoretic accents: "Stichoi are always defined by the primary disjunctive accents, except in cases where a different syntactic division from the one expressed in those accents is judged to be the preferred reading of the text. In such cases the preferred reading will determine the division of the stichoi". Cf. A. Schenker et al., eds., *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato: General Introduction and Megilloth* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004), x. In the BHQ fascicle edition of the Megilloth, Schäfer does not follow de Hoop's arrangement of the wording of Lam 1:7 into a tricolon and a bicolon, but divides it into four sets of bicola. Cf. Schafer, "Lamentations," 55. Whereas de Hoop treats זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם יְמֵי עָנְיָהּ וּמְרוּדֶ֔יהָ כֹּ֚ל מַחֲמֻדֶ֔יהָ as one colon, Schäfer separates it into two with the division after יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם, which has the disjunctive accent *r^{e}bhîaʿ*. De Hoop justifies his arrangement by pointing out that a *r^{e}bhîaʿ* is often positioned at the second or third word of a colon without terminating that colon. Cf. de Hoop, "Lamentations," 96.

A second difficulty in the MT version of the verse pertains to the meaning of the rare word וּמְרוּדֶיהָ. Apart from Lam 1:7, it is also found in Lam 3:19, Isa 58:7 and Sir 35:18.[22] Commentators on the text of Lamentations derive the form from the roots רוד, "to roam"/"to wander restlessly",[23] רדה, "to tread"/"to dominate"/"to rule",[24] רדד, "to subdue",[25] and מרד, "to rebel"/"to revolt".[26] Alternatively, they think of the form as a corruption of an original מרוריה, "her bitterness".[27]

In spite of the significance of these difficulties in the MT for text-critical research, for the purposes of this study, the following analysis will be restricted to the conspicuous differences between the MT and 4QLam, which fortunately preserves almost the complete text of Lam 1:7.

---

22 Cairo Geniza Manuscript B VI *recto* line 8. Cf. P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 61. Beentjes (ibid.) gives the form of the word in this passage as מרודית, but according to Skehan and Di Lella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 415), it is מרודיה ("her homelessness"). The third-person feminine suffix would then refer to the the widow mentioned in Sir 35:17. Based on this reconstruction of the word, the Hebrew text of Sir 35:18 poses the rhetorical question whether tears do not roll down (her) cheek and whether (her) sighing is not over her homelessness.

23 BDB 923; KBL 876.

24 BDB 921–922; KBL 874–875.

25 BDB 921; KBL 874.

26 BDB 597; KBL 564; DCH V 478.

27 The ancient translations also reflect various interpretations of this word. In the LXX, מרודיה is translated as ἀπωσμῶν αὐτῆς, "her rejections"/"her repulsions" (LEH 59; GELS 89). This rendering elicits a number of different explanations from scholars. According to Rudolph (*Klagelieder*, 206), the LXX reflects an interpretation of ומרודיה as deriving from the root רוד, while Albrektson (*Studies*, 60) argues that the Greek translator possibly had a root דרה in mind, inverting the *daleth* and *resh* of ומרודיה. Barthélemy (*Critique Textuelle*, 865) translates καὶ ἀπωσμῶν αὐτῆς as "et de ses expulsions" and remarks that "(i)l s'agit d'une traduction large de l'hébreu". In the critical apparatus of BHQ, Schäfer ("Lamentations," 55) also proposes that the Greek translator took liberty in rendering his *Vorlage*. The translation of ומרודיה in P, ܡܟܬܫܬܗ ("her chastisement"/"correction"/"discipline"), can be related to the verbal root ܝܣܪ ("to instruct"/"to chastise") or to ܡܪܕ ("to rebel"). This implies that the Syriac translator derived the Hebrew form from the root רדה or מרד. In contrast to its Hebrew counterpart, ܡܟܬܫܬܗ is singular and this change in number might be a deliberate ploy on the part of the translator to foster a closer link with ܥܘܬܪܗ ("her oppression"), the equivalent of עניה in the MT. On the basis of the coordination of the words ܥܘܬܪܗ and ܡܟܬܫܬܗ, Albrektson (*Studies*, 60–61) argues that "chastisement" is the more likely meaning of ܡܟܬܫܬܗ in the context of P's version of Lam 1:7. *Praevaricationis* in V and the reading attributed to α′ in the margin of the Syrohexapla, ܘܡܫܬܡܕܘܬܗ ("and secessions/defections/revolts"), point to an understanding of the Hebrew form as deriving from מרד. The two recensions of T paraphrase the Hebrew text and interpret ומרודיה in terms of the root רדה and the word מדור, "dwelling" (Jastrow 733).

זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עָנְיָהּ וּמְרוּדֶיהָ כֹּל מַחֲמַדֶּיהָ—זכוֹרה יהוה [כו]ל מכאובנו

4QLam reads זכוֹרה יהוה where the MT, followed by the LXX (ἐμνήσθη Ιερουσαλημ), P (ܐܬܕܟܪ ܝܪܘܫܠܡ) and V (*recordata est Hierusalem*), reads זכרה ירושלם. The MT presents the verb as a Qal *qatal* form of זכר with Jerusalem as its subject, but 4QLam interprets the verb as an imperative (plus paragogic *he*) with YHWH as the one called upon to remember. 4QLam also lacks ימי עניה ומרודיה and reads [כו]ל מכאובנו in the place of the MT's כל מחמדיה. In his restoration of the text of Lamentations as it would have appeared at the time of its composition in the sixth century BCE, Hobbins does not delete any part of the wording of Lam 1:7, but argues that both the readings in the MT and 4QLam can be explained as corruptions from his proposed original text.[28] He supposes that זכרה was originally an imperative, but when it was mistaken for a Qal *qatal* form with ירושלם as the subject, יהוה came to be interpreted as ימי.[29] The shorter reading in the fragment from Qumran was caused by homoioarcton, the copyist's eye jumping over ירושלם to יהוה due to the similar forms of the consonants at the beginning of these two words (ירו and יהו). The minus of עניה and ומרודיה is then also attributed to parablepsis. Furthermore, in contrast to Schäfer and Cross, who regard מחמדיה in the MT as a corrupt reading,[30] Hobbins retains it in his version of the original text, but emends the preceding כל to read כלו. This conjectural emendation substitutes the noun כל with a Qal *qatal* third-person plural form of the verbal root כלה, "to come to an end"/"to be finished",[31] with מחמדיה as its subject. Hobbins argues that the readings in the MT and 4QLam represent aural misunderstandings of this reconstructed original reading. He also agrees with the editor of Lamentations in BHQ that מכאובנו in 4QLam constitutes a facilitation. In other words, the scribe consciously attempted to ease what he considered to be a difficulty or awkwardness in the text, namely the reading מחמדיה.

Cross reconstructs the original text of the first bicolon of this verse to read as follows: זכרה יהוה מרודיה אשר מימי קדם.[32] He regards the reading of

---

[28] J. Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5: The Corpus Introduction," http://ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com/ancient_hebrew_poetry/2006/05/index.html, 15. Hobbins attempts to reconstruct not only the original consonantal text, but also the text's purported original orthography, phonology and prosody.

[29] In Hobbins's reconstruction of the original phonology of these words, they sound alike. He also notes that the reinterpretation would have been facilitated by similar texts in Deut 32:7 and Ps 137:7. Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 16.

[30] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 55; Cross, "4QLam," 232.

[31] BDB 477; KBL 437; DCH IV 418–419.

[32] Cross, "Studies," 140–141.

the verb זכרה as an imperative in the Qumran fragment as superior to the one in the MT, since the change in subject from YHWH to Jerusalem can be explained as an assimilation to the subject of the verb in the first colon of v. 8. Moreover, in his view the phrase ימי עניה ומרודיה, conflated from the similar reading in Lam 3:19 (זכר עניי ומרודי), was added to Lam 1:7 during the transmission process. Concerning כל מחמדיה in the MT and כו]ל מכאובנו in 4QLam, Cross theorises that both readings represent corruptions and can be traced back to a proposed original reading מרודיה (כל). According to this view, the MT preserves a double reading: ומרודיה כל מחמדיה. The change in the MT could have been triggered by כל מחמדיה in v. 10 (4QLam also reads the form מחמדיה in v. 11, where the MT has מחמודיהם), while the reading in 4QLam came into being "either as a revision of the rare word under the influence of מכאוב and מכאובי later in the lament (vv 12, 18), or much more likely, as a correction, conscious or unconscious, of the impossible מחמודיה in its manuscript tradition".[33] Schäfer follows these suggestions in his comments concerning preferable readings in the critical apparatus and textual commentary of BHQ.

From the perspective of creativity in the copying of manuscripts, the changes wrought to the irretrievably lost original wording of Lam 1:7 need not only be sought in scribal mistakes. A scribe could very well have inserted עניה ומרודיה together with ימי under the influence of the similar wording in Lam 3:19 as a counterpart for כל מחמדיה אשר היו מימי קדם in the text which he copied.[34] Some scholars interpret ימי עניה ומרודיה in MT Lam 1:7 as an adverbial accusative of time.[35] On this interpretation of the MT's wording, the contrast motif can be detected in the initial part of the verse: Jerusalem remembers all her precious things of the past[36] during her times of trouble.

---

[33] Cross, "4QLam," 233.

[34] This suggestion does not account for the insertion of ימי. It might have been added before עניה ומרודיה under the influence of the prepositional phrase מימי in the subordinate clause אשר היו מימי קדם later in the verse.

[35] Cf. Salters, *Lamentations*, 56; and Gordis, *Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 154. Others translate ימי as though there was a preposition ב before it. Cf. R.A. Parry, *Lamentations* (THOTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 49; and Berlin, *Lamentations*, 46.

[36] According to House (*Lamentations*, 353–354), כל מחמדיה אשר היו מימי קדם implies that "Jerusalem remembers days of victory, days of great leaders, and days of wealth. All these are connected to her glorious past, just as misery, wandering, defeat, and contempt are part of her terrible, depressing present. Her thoughts range from the distant past, to the recent past, to the present moment". Berlin (*Lamentations*, 46) translates מחמדיה as "her treasures" and notes that its sense is things that delight the city, "treasured moments or treasured memories". Rudolph (*Klagelieder*, 212) and Provan (*Lamentations*, 43) indicate that מחמדיה may refer in general to "alles, was in Israel groß und beglückend war", but Provan also mentions the

By evoking the contrast between the city's past and the present condition, the first two bicola of Lam 1:7 in the MT recall the theme of Jerusalem's *condicio inversa*. The idea of the reversal of fortunes was already introduced in the opening verse of Lam 1 and reappears several times throughout the first eleven verses of this chapter.[37] It is therefore possible that a scribe might have wanted to transform the wording of an earlier form of v. 7 in order to promote this particular theme. Moreover, a case can be made for seeing זכרה ירושלם as the earlier reading, because it fits in well with the larger context of vv. 1–11 of Lam 1, where the third-person speaker portrays the dire straits of Jerusalem, whereas the imperatives in vv. 9 and 11 (as well as the one in v. 20) are reserved for personified Jerusalem when she calls on YHWH to take note of her distressful condition, especially on account of her enemies.

According to the version of v. 7 transmitted by 4QLam, the narrator calls on YHWH to remember all the pain suffered by him and his community from days of old. The imperative זכורה links up with the imperatives directed at YHWH in vv. 9 and 11 of Lam 1. Unfortunately, there is a lacuna in the manuscript of 4QLam where the line in v. 9 with the petition addressed to YHWH was written, but v. 11 is wholly preserved. In this passage, the speaker calls upon YHWH to see "that I have become insignificant/worthless/despised" (כיא הייתי זולל). The word זולל in the Qumran fragment is masculine singular, referring to the narrator himself, whereas in the MT it is feminine singular (זוללה), implying that the speaker is personified Jerusalem. An analogous difference between the MT and 4QLam is found in v. 13 at the phrase "He has made me desolate, ill all day long". The MT reads as follows: נתנני שממה כל היום דוה. The feminine singular form of the participle שממה and the feminine adjective דוה relate to personified Jerusalem, while 4QLam has נתנני שומם כול היום ודו[ו]י ("He has left me deserted and faint all day long"). In this case, the masculine singular participle שומם and the masculine form of the adjective ודו[ו]י refer once again to the narrator. In a similar vein, מכאובנו in v. 7 of 4QLam can be interpreted as a deliberate change, rather than an unconscious change from either מרודיה or מחמדיה. The shapes of the letters of these words are graphically too dissimilar for them to have been mistakenly interchanged by a scribe. It rather seems that a scribe created the reading מכאובנו from an earlier reading with the narrator and those

---

possibility of understanding מחמדיה as "her precious ones", namely the people who once inhabited the city. Renkema (*Klaagliederen*, 91) prefers to interpret the precious things of Jerusalem as the temple complex and the royal palace.

37 House, *Lamentations*, 338–339.

whom he represents as the antecedent of the first-person plural suffix. Furthermore, if זכרה ירושלם in the wording of the MT is accepted as the earlier reading, one can also detect the creative hand of a scribe in the variant זכוֹרה יהוה. The change of ירושלם into יהוה and the concomitant presentation of the initial verb as an imperative would then form part of a scribe's ploy to make the narrator the focus in this verse. Arguably, a scribe (or scribes) intentionally brought about these subtle modifications in wording of v. 7, as well as those in vv. 11 and 13, during the process of transmission in order to present the content of the first chapter of Lamentations from the perspective of the narrator. In contrast to the MT and the ancient translations, where the first-person voice in vv. 9 and 11 belongs to personified Jerusalem and she remains the speaker throughout vv. 12–22 (with the exception of v. 17 where the third-person voice of the narrator makes a return), it is the narrator, not personified Jerusalem, who beseeches YHWH to take his (and his community's) plight to heart in v. 7 and v. 11 (and probably v. 9) of 4QLam's version of Lam 1.

In light of the thematic connections between the respective wordings of v. 7 in 4QLam and the MT, and the wordings of the neighbouring verses in these two Hebrew versions, it follows that their departures from the lost original wording of Lam 1:7 was for the most part not due to scribal mistakes. Therefore the creative activity of the scribes who were responsible for the wording of the versions transmitted by 4QLam and the MT might be given more recognition. However, the possibility that scribal errors affected the original wording of the verse's opening clauses and not only made their way into the wording of the manuscripts from which the available Hebrew versions were made but also facilitated other deliberate changes by later scribes cannot be ruled out. This is to say that neither 4QLam nor the MT preserves the original wording of the opening clauses of Lam 1:7. Moreover, it cannot be established with absolute certainty how far removed the wordings in 4QLam and the MT are from the original form of the text. Be that as it may, the differences in wording between 4QLam and the MT could, in this case, be ascribed primarily to innovative scribes who adapted earlier versions of the wording of Lam 1:7 in diverging ways so as to better express their understanding of the passage and to link it thematically with the surrounding verses. As such, the wordings of both Hebrew versions exemplify the creative license that ancient scribes had in copying texts.

לָהּ רָאוּהָ > *4QLam*

לה ראוה is not present in 4QLam. This constitutes a minus in the Qumran fragment compared to the MT. The parablepsis can be attributed to homoioteleuton, since לה, ראוה and צריה all end in a *he*. In the script in which 4QLam was written *yod* and *waw* were, morphologically speaking, almost identical. A copyist's eye could therefore easily have skipped over לה ראוה to צריה. The effect of this omission is that the subordinate adverbial clause בנפל [עמ]ה ביד צר, which expresses the time when the actions of the main verbs take place, is connected to only one main verb, שחקו, whereas in the MT there are two main verbs, ראוה and שחקו. According to the latter version, foes saw the city of Jerusalem and laughed because of her downfall precisely when her people fell into (or by)[38] the hand of a foe and no one came to help her. In contrast, 4QLam states that Jerusalem's ruins caused her foes to rejoice and that their gloating occurred at the same time as a foe captured (or killed) her people and there was no helper.

צָרֶיהָ—צריה

The reading צריה in 4QLam has a third-person feminine singular suffix, which is absent from the form צרים in the MT. The translation equivalents in the LXX (οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῆς) and P (ܒܥܠܬܗ) agree with the reading in the manuscript from Qumran. According to Schäfer, the agreement between 4QLam, the LXX and P can be attributed to assimilation to the immediate context. In his opinion, these readings are not more original than the one in the MT.[39] Cross also thinks that צרים in the MT is more preferable than צריה in 4QLam.[40] Albrektson avers that "(t)he suffix in P and LXX's αὐτῆς do not necessarily imply a different Hebrew original, at least not for the Syriac translation, where suffixes are freely added. But the literal Greek version is perhaps based on a Hebrew text צריה, or else simply on a misreading of MT". With regard to the latter possibility, he refers to the possible confusion of the letters *he* and *mem*.[41] Eichorn mentions three passages where *he* and *mem* are accidently confused, namely 2 Sam 13:13, 2 Kgs 8:17 and Isa 30:32.[42] In the event that these two consonants could be interchanged during the

---

38 The preposition of ביד can be interpreted either as a *beth locale* or a *beth instrumenti*.

39 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 55.

40 Cross, "4QLam," 233.

41 Albrektson, *Studies*, 61.

42 J.G. Eichhorn, *Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament* (London: Spottiswoode and Co, 1888), 181.

reading of a manuscript, it is equally possible that a scribe could also have mistakenly copied צריה as צרים. From this perspective, the *lectio facilior*, צריה in 4QLam, might very well be more original than צרים in the MT.

עַל מִשְׁבַּתֶּהָ—[ ]ל משבריה

4QLam reads [ ]ל משבריה[43] in the place of the MT's על משבתה. The form משבתה in the MT, which should be vocalized as a singular noun according to Ehrlich and Rudolph,[44] can be understood as a *hapax legomenon* derived from the verbal root שבת, "to cease".[45] In its proposed meaning of "collapse"/"downfall",[46] משבתה probably refers to the capture of Jerusalem by enemy forces. This interpretation of the meaning of משבתה is based on a reading of the preposition ב plus infinitive construct נפל as forming an adverbial phrase that reflects the moment in time when the action indicated by the main verb of the sentence occurs. When the infinitive construct is used with the preposition ב, it points to an action that takes place at the same time as the action of the main verb.[47] Thus, the final clause of Lam 1:7 in the MT states that when the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell into the clutches of the enemy and no one came to help her, foes saw the fallen city and laughed about her downfall. In 4QLam, בנפל relates adverbially to שחקו, while משבריה calls to mind the physical destruction of the city more clearly than does the MT: the city's foes laughed over her ruins when her people fell into the hands of an enemy.

With regard to the relationship between משבריה in 4QLam and the variant משבתה in the MT, Cross is of the opinion that the former is the more original reading and that the latter came into being as a result of a confusion of רי with ת in a script in which *yod* was not yet reduced in size and could be mistaken for the left down stroke of the letter ת.[48] Support for this view can be found in the text of P. Although the Syriac translation agrees to a large extent with the MT version of Lam 1:7, its reading ܐܬܒܗ

---

[43] Cross ("4QLam," 233) reconstructs the word before משבריה as ל[כו] and regards it as a secondary reading, "the result of a familiar tendency for *kōl* to multiply in transmission". Schäfer ("Lamentations," 114*), however, also mentions the possibility that the preposition על was written twice by the scribe (dittography).

[44] Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 31; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 206.

[45] BDB 991; KBL 946.

[46] BDB 992; KBL 572; DCH V 509. Cf. also Berlin, *Lamentations*, 46; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 70; Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 13–14; T.F. McDaniel, "Philological Studies in Lamentations I," *Bib* 49 (1968): 53; Albrektson, *Studies*, 61; Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 3.

[47] BHRG § 20.1.5.

[48] Cross, "4QLam," 233.

("destruction"/"ruin") was in all probability based on a form such as משבריה in 4QLam. One might conclude from this that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of P was very close to the version transmitted by the MT, but represents a stage in the transmission of the Hebrew text before a scribe confused the juxtaposed *resh* and *yod* with a *taw* when he copied משבריה. This scribal error must have occurred very early in the transmission history seeing as the reading משבתה not only became part of the version that was later vocalized by the Masoretes and served as the parent text for V[49] and T,[50] but also the Hebrew *Vorlage* from which the LXX[51] was made.[52] On this explanation of the textual data, 4QLam and P preserve the earliest form of the final word of the verse.

---

[49] Concerning *sabbata eius* in V, Jerome might have connected משבתה to שבת ("Sabbath") under the influence of Jewish exegesis such as found in *Lamentations Rabbah* 1:7 §34. Cf. A. Cohen, "Lamentations," in *Midrash Rabbah* (vol. 7; eds. H. Freedman and M. Simon; London: Soncino Press, 1961), 108.

[50] T[W] appears to offer a double interpretation of משבתה. Cf. Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 115. In the clause חזוהא מעיקיא דאזלא בשביתא ("Oppressors saw her going into captivity"), משבתה appears to be derived from שבה, "to take captive" (BDB 985; KBL 939), while in the following clause, חייכו על טובהא דפסק מבינהא ("They laughed over her good, which has ceased from her"), משבתה is related to the verbal root שבת, "to cease". The Yemenite recension of T differs here slightly from the Western one: חזוהא מעיקיא דאזלא בשביתא חייכו על טובהא די פסק מבינהא ("Oppressors saw her, that they went into exile. They laughed over [the fact] that her good ceased from her").

[51] The manuscripts of the Greek translation witness to two different translation equivalents for משבתה. Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Marchalianus, Codex Venetus, as well as the majority of the Greek manuscripts contain the reading (τῇ) μετοικεσίᾳ αὐτῆς, "her deportation"/"her captivity"/"her living abroad" (LEH 302; GELS 456). Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 757) prints it as the preferred reading in his *Handausgabe* of the LXX. Conversely, Ziegler (*Septuaginta*, 469) regards the alternative reading, κατοικεσίᾳ αὐτῆς, as the reading of the Old Greek text. This reading has the meaning "her dwelling"/"inhabited area" (LEH 250; GELS 391) and appears in Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and minuscules 106, 130 and 538 (with eta instead of epsilon), according to the critical apparatus of the Göttingen edition. Driver argues that these Greek equivalents were translated from an original עַל מוֹשַׁבְתָּהּ. He derives מוֹשַׁבְתָּהּ from a hypothetical form מוֹשָׁבָה, "settlement (in a foreign land)", and claims that this was the word in the original Hebrew text and infers that the error in the MT was not because of a miscopying, but rather a misunderstanding and wrong vocalization of an unique word. Cf. G.R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes on 'Song of Songs' and 'Lamentations,'" in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (eds. W. Baumgartner et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1950), 136. In my opinion, the two translation equivalents in the Greek witnesses should rather be attributed to different interpretations of משבתה. (Τῇ) μετοικεσίᾳ αὐτῆς implies that a scribe probably linked משבתה to the root שבה, while the reading κατοικεσίᾳ αὐτῆς seems to be based on an understanding of משבתה as derived from ישב ("to sit"/"to dwell" BDB 442–443; KBL 409–410; DCH IV 317).

[52] This implies that the other changes to the hypothetical original form of Lam 1:7 that the MT, the LXX, P, V and T have in common, such as the opening clauses of the verse, must also have been made at an early stage of the transmission history.

Notwithstanding the arguments for a more original text, deliberate changes and scribal errors in 4QLam and the MT, the present forms of both Hebrew texts are intelligible. Since the wording of v. 7 in the fragment from cave 4 diverges from that in the version of the text vocalized by the Masoretes, it yields a significantly different meaning. The main difference between 4QLam and the MT revolves around the imperative directed to YHWH versus Jerusalem's reminiscence, as well as the change of speaker. Whereas the MT draws attention to the contrast between the city's past and the present, this emphasis is lacking in 4QLam. Both texts, however, give a portrayal of the enemy's *Schadenfreude* at the collapse of Jerusalem. By placing the focus on the narrator (and those whom he represents) in the opening clause of the verse in 4QLam, the wording of the verse as a whole conveys the idea that the pain of the narrator is indissolubly connected to what happened to Jerusalem and her inhabitants.

Verse 8

4QLam

חטוא חטאה ירושלם על [ ]לנוד היתהֿ[ ]ל
[ ]דֿיֿהֿ הֿזֿיֿלו כיא ראו [ע]רֿותה גם[ ]אֿחורֿ

Jerusalem sinned greatly, there[fore] [ ] she became banished/(an object of) head-nodding/unsteady. [Al]l who [ ]her despised, because they saw her [nak]edness. Also [ ] away.

MT

חֵטְא חָטְאָה יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם עַל־כֵּן לְנִידָה הָיָתָה כָּל־מְכַבְּדֶיהָ הִזִּילוּהָ כִּי־רָאוּ עֶרְוָתָהּ גַּם־הִיא נֶאֱנָחָה וַתָּשָׁב אָחוֹר׃

Jerusalem sinned greatly, therefore she became (morally) unclean/a wanderer/(an object of) head-nodding. All those who honour her despised her because they saw her nakedness. She also groans and turned away.

חֵטְא חָטְאָה—חטוא חטאה

In 4QLam, the verb חטאה is accompanied by a preceding infinitive absolute חטוא, while in the MT, the noun חֵטְא before the verb constitutes an internal object (*figura etymologica*); that is, a noun acting as object of the verb that derives from the same root as the verb.[53] In contrast to Schäfer's characterization of חטוא in 4QLam as assimilation to the standard form of

---

[53] GKC § 117p.

the expression in Biblical Hebrew,[54] Hobbins argues that the vocalization of חטא in the MT assimilates the text to the "frequent cognate accusative" construction and that the infinitive absolute in 4QLam is not only the more difficult reading, but also semantically more suitable.[55] House, who also favours the reading of חטא as an infinitive absolute, observes that the sense of the clause (an emphasis on the severe nature of Jerusalem's sin) does not change regardless of whether one takes the word as an internal object or as an infinitive absolute.[56] The function of both constructions is to strengthen the verbal idea. In the case of 4QLam, the infinitive absolute describes the intensity of the action expressed by the finite verb חטאה, since the factuality of the statement concerning Jerusalem's sin is assumed (cf. Lam 1:5).

לְנִידָה—לנוד

לנוד in 4QLam and the variant לנידה in the MT are both problematic. According to Cross,[57] 4QLam preserves the more original text and לנידה in the MT came into being as a result of assimilation with the word לנדה in Lam 1:17. The *he* at the end of לנידה can be explained as a dittograph of the first *he* of the next word היתה, while in the scripts of the Late Hasmonean and Herodian periods the *waw* of לנוד might have been confused with *yod*, giving rise to the form of the word found in the MT. Schäfer agrees with Cross, but also mentions the possibility that לנוד in 4QLam might be a facilitation of the difficult word לנידה in the MT.[58] Hobbins assumes that the readings in both 4QLam and the MT are corruptions from an original form לָנִיד.[59] The form לנוד in the fragment from Qumran was created through a confusion of *yod* with *waw*, whereas לנידה resulted from dittography of *he* (or an aural error), as well as assimilation with לנדה in v. 17. Conversely, Ilan is of the opinion that the MT reading was changed to לנוד in 4QLam as part of a process of toning down or removing feminine metaphors.[60] In this regard, Ilan[61] also

---

54 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 55.

55 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 16. It is noteworthy that Ehrlich already proposed that חטא should be read as an infinitive absolute long before the reading in 4QLam came to light. Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 31.

56 House, *Lamentations*, 335.

57 Cross, "4QLam," 233.

58 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 115*.

59 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 19.

60 Ilan, "Gender," 9.

61 Ibid.

mentions the replacement of שממה with שומם in 4QLam's version of Lam 1:13 and the changing of לנדה ביניהם to לנדות בניהמה at Lam 1:17.[62]

Apart from these different explanations of how לנוד and לנידה in 4QLam and the MT came into being, scholars also give diverging interpretations of these words. The verb נוד has a variety of meanings, including "to move to and fro", "to waver", "to wander" and "to shake the head" (sympathetically or in mockery).[63] Concerning the MT, one group of scholars derives לנידה from נוד as well. They follow the example of the medieval Jewish commentator Ibn Ezra and ascribe to לנידה the meaning "Kopfschütteln"/"head-nodding" in the sense of to mock or deride.[64] Such an interpretation links up well with what has been said at the end of the previous verse about the foes who laugh about the city's downfall, as well as with the observation in the following bicolon that those who honoured the city now despise her because they saw her nakedness. The main objection against such an interpretation of לנידה in the MT is that in other Old Testament passages where the expression "nodding the head" is used, the word "head" is required to indicate what it is that is being shaken (Jer 18:16; Ps 44:15). It is therefore debatable whether the root נוד by itself can convey the meaning "to nod the head". Another group of scholars treat the anomalous form of the word לנידה as a spelling variant of נִדָּה, meaning "impurity"/"impure thing"/"abhorrent thing",[65] which appears in Lam 1:17.[66] It is mainly used elsewhere in the Old Testament to refer to the ritual impure state of a woman when she bleeds during childbirth or menstruation (Lev 12:2; 15:19–33; 18:19). On this interpretation of לנידה, the city is in a state of impurity as a result of her sin. The mention of the city's nakedness (ערותה) and her impurity in her skirts (טמאתה בשוליה) (Lam 1:9) is also considered by some to be relevant to the view that לנידה refers to an impure, menstruent woman.[67] However, Berlin argues against such a

---

62 In my opinion, the reading in 4QLam is לנדוח בניהמה and not לנדות בניהמה. Furthermore, this reading can be explained as the result of scribal errors (see below).

63 BDB 626–627; KBL 600; DCH V 635.

64 Cf. Berges, *Klagelieder*, 89; Hunter, *Faces*, 127; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 70; Kraus *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 29, Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 206–207; and Meek, "Lamentations," 10.

65 BDB 622; KBL 596–597; DCH V 623.

66 Cf. House, *Lamentations*, 335; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 94–95; Provan, *Lamentations*, 44–45; Kaiser, *Klagelieder*, 319; and Albrektson, *Studies*, 63–64. In P, ܪܓܫܐ ("abomination") is used to translate לנידה in Lam 1:8 and לנדה in Lam 1:17. Concerning the former, the critical apparatus of BHK supposes that the Syriac translator's *Vorlage* actually contained the form נִדָּה. Albrektson (*Studies*, 63), however, considers it more plausible that the translator merely interpreted the form לנידה in the same way as many modern commentators do.

67 The word שול is usually understood as the hem of a robe. Accordingly, the phrase בשוליה in MT Lam 1:9 is often rendered as "in her skirts". Some interpreters associate טמאתה

reading of לנידה. She notes, first, that the orthography of the word does not support this interpretation, since it would have been written with a double *daleth* and without the *yod* if it derived from נִדָּה. Secondly, she points out that a menstruant woman was considered ritually, but not morally impure and that such a state was not brought about by sin.[68] Therefore, Berlin also derives לנידה from the root נוד, but prefers to read the latter in its meaning "to wander". Despite the fact that other commentators voice their doubts concerning the appropriateness of reading לנידה as "wanderer",[69] she

---

with נידה in v. 8, in its sense of ritual impurity caused by menstruation, and see in טמאתה בשוליה a reference to the ritually unclean blood that clings to the skirts of Lady Jerusalem. On this interpretation, Jerusalem's impurity brings about her isolation, especially from that which is sacred. In view of her isolation, it comes as no surprise that v. 9b states that there is no one to comfort the city. Dobbs-Allsopp (*Lamentations* [IBC; Louisville: John Knox Press, 2002], 64) mentions this interpretation of בשוליה, but he wonders whether "the blood on Jerusalem's skirts (and the 'uncleanness' this causes) evidence bleeding from an attack". Pham suggests two other possible meanings for the nominal clause טמאתה בשוליה. First, she argues that, from the perspective of a mourning ceremony, "the טמאה, 'uncleanness', on Jerusalem's skirt is the dirt of the ground she is sitting on and which possibly she sprinkled on her head. The dirt form the ground gets on her skirt and may therefore be called 'her filth, her dirt' (טמאתה)". Secondly, she notes that טמאתה can also point to Jerusalem's sins (X.H.T. Pham, *Mourning in the Ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible* [JSOTSup 302; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999], 76). שוליה would then be skirts of sackcloth, because sackcloth is not only a garment one wears as a sign of mourning. It can be worn as a penitential garb as well (ibid.). While these interpretations take שול to mean "hem"/"skirt" (i.e., the lower part of a garment), studies by Driver and Eslinger have shown that, in some occurrences of the word in the Hebrew Bible, it can also refer to the lower extremities of the body, and more specifically, the genitals. Cf. G.R. Driver, "Isaiah 6:1 'his train filled the temple'," in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. H. Goedicke; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 87–96; and L. Eslinger, "The Infinite in a Finite Organical Perception (Isaiah VI 1–5)," *VT* 45/2 (1995): 145–173. If שוליה in MT Lam 1:9 is understood as "her genitals", טמאתה might indicate the ritual uncleanness resulting from a genital discharge. However, the narrator's remark that Jerusalem's impurity is "in her genitals" can also be understood as an image that hints at the wrongdoing of the city in terms of immoral sexual conduct.

[68] Ritual impurity is a state of uncleanness which arises from contact with corpses or carcasses, scale disease, bodily discharges involved in childbirth, menstruation, as well as certain genital discharges. Cf. T. Frymer-Kensky, "Pollution, Purification, and Purgation in Biblical Israel," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman* (eds. C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 399–403. Ritual impurity is considered to be contagious. This means that a person who comes into contact with a ritually impure person or object becomes ritually impure himself. Ritual impurity only lasts for a designated period of time and can be alleviated through purification procedures. Because the sources of ritual impurity are natural and usually unavoidable, this kind of uncleanness is not sinful and, therefore, not a moral issue (ibid, 404).

[69] Salters, *Lamentations*, 61; Parry, *Lamentations*, 51; E. Boase, *The Fulfilment of Doom? The Dialogic Interaction between the Book of Lamentations and the Pre-Exilic/Early Exilic Prophetic Literature* (New York / London: Continuum, 2006), 176.

favours the idea of wandering, because, in her opinion, the consequence of Jerusalem's sin would more likely be banishment and exile than scorn and derision.[70] $T^{W,Y}$ and Rashi read the MT in the same way.[71] Finally, לנידה in the MT can be interpreted in terms of moral impurity, provided that it is seen as a different spelling of the word נדה.[72] In Lev 20:21,[73] Ezra 9:11[74] and possibly Zech 13:1,[75] נדה has the meaning of moral impurity. In contrast to

---

[70] Berlin, *Lamentations*, 54.

[71] Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 116.

[72] With regard to the vocalization of the word in the MT, see GKC § 20n remark 1.

[73] Lev 20:21, which forms part of a unit (vv. 10–21) that proscribes certain sexual relations, prohibits an Israelite man from "taking" his brother's wife; that is, he is prohibited from having sexual intercourse with his sister-in-law. Such a deed is called נדה and it is identified as a punishable offence. Although it is not a capital crime, it will result in childlessness. The translation equivalent of the clause נדה הוא in LXX Lev 20:21 is ἀκαθαρσία ἐστίν. Ἀκαθαρσία can refer to the ritually unclean state arising from menstruation (cf. LXX Lev 15:24), immorality, moral or religious depravity, as well as a religiously or morally impure object (GELS 19). This last meaning is the most appropriate one for ἀκαθαρσία in LXX Lev 20:21, because it describes a person who commits a sexual offense (cf. J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* [SBLSCS 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 325). In the Syriac translation of Lev 20:21, the Hebrew clause נדה הוא is translated as ܐܡ ܚܛܐ, "it is an iniquity/wickedness". According to the Latin translation of V, marriage to one's sister-in-law is branded as a *rem inlicitam*. These ancient translations therefore did not interpret נדה as a term for ritual impurity caused by menstruation at Lev 20:21, but rather as a reference to a wrongful act or the impurity that results from wrongdoing.

[74] In the penitential prayer of Ezra 9:6–15, Ezra confesses the present sin of the people in vv. 10–12. He admits that the people trespass the commandments of YHWH spoken by the prophets by arranging for their children to marry foreigners. Cf. M.W. Duggan, "Ezra 9:6–15: A Penitential Prayer within Its Literary Setting," in *Seeking the Favor of God. Volume 1: The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (eds. M.J. Boda, D.K. Falk and R.A. Werline; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 165–180, 170. Verse 11, which forms part of the quotation of the prophets' commandments, declares that the land is unclean (ארץ נדה היא) and ascribes its defilement to the impurity (נדה), abominations (תועבת) and uncleanness (טמאה) of the "peoples of the lands". In the Greek text of 1 Esdr 8:80, the translation equivalents of the two instances of נדה in Ezra 9:11 are a participle form of μολύνω and the noun μολυσμός. These Greek words can have the meaning of moral defilement (GELS 466, 467). Conversely, the wording of the corresponding passage in 2 Esdr 9:11 reads as follows: γῆ μετακινουμένη ἐστὶν ἐν μετακινήσει λαῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν ("a land undergoing change by the changing of the nations"). The translator of 2 Esdras evidently did not understand נדה in the sense of moral impurity.

[75] In Zech 13:1, נדה and חטאת ("sin"/"purification offering") are the objects of the unique cleansing function of the fountain (מקור) that will be opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem in an eschatological future time. Carol and Eric Meyers (*Zechariah 9–14. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 25C; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 366) argue that נדה, in combination with חטאת, "provides a comprehensive conception of the state of pollution, caused by both moral wrongdoing and contaminating activity, that will be removed by the cosmic fountain in the future age". There is no Greek translation equivalent for לחטאת ולנדה in the LXX, but in P and T, נדה is interpreted in terms of

ritual impurity, moral impurity is contracted through immoral acts such as sexual sins (e.g. Lev 18:24–30), idolatry (e.g. Lev 19:31; 20:1–3) and bloodshed (e.g. Num 35:33–34). According to Klawans,

> These acts bring about an impurity that morally—but not ritually—defiles the sinner (Lev. 18:24), the land of Israel (Lev. 18:25; Ezek. 36:17), and the sanctuary of God (Lev. 20:3; Ezek. 5:11). This defilement leads in turn to the expulsion of the people from the land of Israel (Lev. 18:28; Ezek. 36:19). Though the sinner's act defiles the land, the sinner does not defile those within his or her physical reach. There is no contact-contagion associated with moral impurity ... Moreover, there is no purification rite akin to those associated with ritual impurity: moral purity is achieved by punishment, atonement, or by refraining from committing morally impure acts in the first place.[76]

The language of moral impurity is appropriate in the context of the first bicolon of MT Lam 1:8, because Jerusalem is said to have become נידה as a result of her great sin.[77]

לנוד in 4QLam is also subject to more than one legitimate interpretation in the context of Lam 1:8. The range of possible meanings of the root נוד can be brought to bear on the clause לנוד היתהּ in 4QLam. The clause in 4QLam can be taken to mean that Jerusalem's great sin resulted in her banishment,

---

the waters of lustration (מי נדה) mentioned in Numbers (cf. Num 19:9, 13, 20, 21 and also 31:23). Cf. A. Gelston, *The Peshiṭta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 136; and K.J. Cathcart and R.P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (ArBib 14; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989), 220.

[76] J. Klawans, "The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism," *JJS* 48/1 (1997): 3.

[77] The interpretation of נידה in MT Lam 1:8 as a reference to moral impurity is all the more probable, if one bears in mind that sexual sins were considered morally defiling and if ראו ערותה in Lam 1:8b is understood against the background of Old Testament passages where accusations of fornication/"whorings" are coupled with threats that the nakedness of transgressors will be publicly exposed. Cf. Jer 13:26–27; Ezek 16:37–38, 23:10, 29; Hos 2:4–5, 2:12; and Nah 3:5. The exposure of nakedness as a punishment for harlotry in these prophetic maledictions finds a parallel in the treaty between Bir-Ga'yah and Matî'el, the king of Arpad, recorded in Aramaic on Sefîre stele I. Although the text is uncertain, Hillers argues that lines 40–41 on face A of the stele reads as follows: [*w'yk zy t'*][*rr z*]*n*[*yh*] *kn y'rrn nšy mt°l wnšy 'qrh wnšy r*[*bwh* ...] ("[And just as a pros]ti[tute is stripped naked] so may the wives of Matie°el be stripped naked, and the wives of his offspring and the wives of [his] no[bles]"). See D.R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (BO 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964), 58–59. This reconstructed reading is accepted and discussed by J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre* (BO 19; Rome Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), 57. From this perspective, the image conveyed by ראו ערותה in MT Lam 1:8 calls to mind the vulnerability of Jerusalem (see note 82 below), but also links up with the first bicolon's reference to the city's great sin and her moral impurity by portraying her humiliating exposure in terms of the punishment of a prostitute.

or made her an object of scorn, or caused the city to lose her stability.[78] Although commentators on the Hebrew texts of Lamentations do not take this last possible meaning into consideration, the LXX and V bear witness to such an interpretation of the clause. The LXX has the reading εἰς σάλον ἐγένετο ("she became unsteady"), while the V has *instabilis facta est* ("she has been made unsteady"). The word σάλος in the Greek translation refers to any unsteady, tossing motion. It follows from this choice of translation equivalent that the Greek translator either derived לנידה from the root נוד, in its sense of "to move to and fro" or "to waver", or the Hebrew text from which he made his Greek translation contained the form לנוד. Accordingly, the influence of the LXX can be detected in Jerome's translation of לנידה with *instabilis facta est* in V.[79] Thus, in their respective ways the LXX and V reproduce one of the possible meanings that the clause לנוד היתהּ in 4QLam can convey. Moreover, the evidence from the LXX and the interpretations that relate לנידה in the MT to the root נוד lend support to Cross's argument that the reading in 4QLam is the earlier one and that the *lectio difficilior* לנידה developed from לנוד through scribal errors and under the influence of לנדה in Lam 1:17.

הזילוהָ—הזילו

In the case of הזילו, the last part of the word, without the third-person feminine suffix, is clearly visible on the plate of the DJD edition of 4QLam. This variant is otherwise unattested to in the ancient translations of Lam 1:8. The minus in the reading of 4QLam strikes one as an accidental omission without anything in the vicinity of the word that could have triggered the scribal error.

With regard to the content of Lam 1:8 as it is represented by the wording that survived in 4QLam, the statements concerning Jerusalem's grave sin and the repercussions for the city thereof are followed by the observation that those who held her in high esteem now have a change of opinion after being exposed to the nakedness of the city. Whereas the opening verse of Lam 1 contrasts the miserable present circumstances of the city

---

[78] For a further discussion of these possibilities, see G.R. Kotzé, "Lamentations 1:8a in the Wordings of the Masoretic Text and 4QLam," *Scriptura* 110/2 (2012): 190–207.

[79] E. Schulz-Flügel ("The Latin Old Testament Tradition," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation I/1. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* [ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996], 642–662, 655) notes that, although his knowledge of Hebrew was impressive, Jerome would not have been able to translate the Hebrew texts without the help of existing versions.

with her honourable condition in the past, v. 8 deals with the perspective of others on the city. It bemoans the fact that their view of her has changed from honour to scorn. The causal conjunction כיא introduces the clause ראו [ע]רֹותה and, in doing so, implies that the contempt for the city is elicited by her uncovered "nakedness". In this context, the image of the city's "nakedness" is open to more than one interpretation.[80] However, Renkema argues that where a city is concerned, "nakedness" refers to the city's vulnerability or lack of protection.[81] The use of the image of nakedness to picture the exposure of the invaded and destroyed city carries with it the connotation of shame and humiliation.[82] The final part of the verse is incomplete in 4QLam, but scholars understand the Hebrew clause ותשב אחור in the MT to mean that the dishonoured city is aware of her shameful state and can either not bear to look at herself or goes off by herself in shame.[83]

Verse 9

4QLam

טמאתה בש[ ]
[פ]לאות ואין [ ]
[ ] הגדיל[ ]

Her uncleanness is in [ ]
[as]tonishingly and there is no [ ]
[ ] magnifies himself [ ]

MT

טֻמְאָתָהּ בְּשׁוּלֶיהָ לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרִיתָהּ וַתֵּרֶד פְּלָאִים אָיִן מְנַחֵם לָהּ רְאֵה יְהוָה אֶת־עָנְיִי כִּי הִגְדִּיל אוֹיֵב׃

Her uncleanness clings to her skirts; she did not remember her end. And she came down astonishingly; there is no comforter for her. See, O YHWH, my affliction, for an enemy magnifies himself.

---

[80] Some interpreters see in the phrase ראו ערותה a reference to the rape of Lady Jerusalem. In this regard, see the remarks by Boase, *Fulfilment of Doom?* 176; C.W. Miller, "Reading Voices: Personification, Dialogism, and the Reader of Lamentations 1," *BI* 9/4 (2001): 393–408, 405; and G. Baumann, *Liebe und Gewalt: Die Ehe als Metapher für das Verhältnis JHWH—Israel in den Prophetenbüchern* (SBS, 185; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), 176–177.

[81] Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 95–96. In a similar vein, Kraus (*Klagelieder* [*Threni*], 29) comments that "Die 'Verehrer' verachten die Frau Zion, weil sie im Augenblick der Katastrophe ungeschützt und unverhüllt dalag".

[82] Cf. B.J. Malina and J. Pilch, *Handbook on Biblical Social Values* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998), 136–138; K.M. O'Connor, *Lamentations and the Tears of the World* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2002), 22.

[83] Cf. the comments of Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 96; Provan, *Lamentations*, 45; and Meek, "Lamentations," 10.

Only a few words and parts of words of Lam 1:9 are preserved at the bottom of Col. II in 4QLam. Nevertheless, two of these words, לאות[פ] and ואין, differ in form from their counterparts in the MT.

וַתֵּרֶד פְּלָאִים—לאות[פ]

In the critical apparatus of BHQ, Schäfer,[84] attributes the feminine plural form of לאות[פ] to a deliberate attempt on the part of the scribe who copied 4QLam, or a predecessor, to assimilate פלאים in MT to the typical form of the expression in Biblical Hebrew. In the whole of the Hebrew Bible, the masculine plural form of פלא is found only in Lam 1:9, while the feminine plural form occurs elsewhere. The meaning of פלאים/פלאות is problematic, but Rudolph makes the cogent suggestion that the word here acts as an *accusativus adverbialis* describing the manner in which the action takes place.[85] This interpretation of פלאים/פלאות is also reflected in the Latin translation of V: *deposita est vehementer* ("she was put down vehemently"). However, the passive voice of *deposita est* could be an indication that Jerome understood ותרד as a Hophal form of the root ירד.[86] In fact, the other ancient translations exhibit interpretations of the Hebrew clause that deviate even further from the way the MT is usually understood.

Judging from the reading in the LXX, καὶ κατεβίβασεν ὑπέρογκα ("and [s]he lowered her haughty tones"),[87] it seems as though the translator read the verb ותרד as a Hiphil form of the root ירד. Ὑπέρογκα is a plural neuter adjective in the accusative. Assan-Dhôte indicates that this adjective designates that which is "puffed up" or "excessive" in a literal or figurative sense.[88] When its neuter form is used as a substantive, this Greek word can also designate pride. In the present context, it acts either as an adverbial adjective or as the direct object of the verb κατεβίβασεν. If ὑπέρογκα is taken as an adverbial adjective, the LXX would agree with the interpretation of פלאים/פלאות in the Hebrew textual witnesses. However, since κατεβίβασεν is a transitive verb, ὑπέρογκα should rather be read as its direct object.

---

[84] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 56.

[85] Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 207; GKC §118q; IBHS §10.2.2e.

[86] Hobbins reconstructs the verb as a Hophal (וַתֻּרַד) in his putative original form of this clause. In his critical apparatus, Hobbins notes that the form וַתֵּרֶד in the MT came into being as a result of assimilation to the immediate context. Cf. Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 19.

[87] I owe the translation of κατεβίβασεν ὑπέρογκα to Provan, *Lamentations*, 45–46. Gentry ("Lamentations," 936) translates ὑπέρογκα with "things of great size", while Hirsch-Luipold and Maier ("Threnoi/Die Klagelieder," 1350) render it as "das Hochtrabende".

[88] Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 203.

With reference to other contexts in which forms of καταβιβάζω is found in the LXX, Assan-Dhôte propagates the view that the Lord is the subject of κατεβίβασεν and not Jerusalem.[89] In this case, the clause κατεβίβασεν ὑπέρογκα conveys the notion that the Lord humiliated the city. It is equally plausible that Jerusalem should be seen as the subject of the verb κατεβίβασεν. On this interpretation, the focus falls on the city's reaction to the Lord's humiliation of her.[90] According to Albrektson, the unusual adverbial use of פלאים caused the Syriac translator some difficulties.[91] In the wording of P, ܘܫܘܒܚܗ ܐܬܒܪ ("and her glory/honour/magnificence went down"), ܫܘܒܚܗ, the equivalent of פלאים, has an added suffix that is absent from the corresponding Hebrew word and functions as the subject of the verb ܐܬܒܪ.[92] P therefore construes the wording of the clause in such a way that the Syriac translation differs syntactically from the MT. With regard to $T^{W,Y}$, the equivalent of ותרד פלאים in the Aramaic paraphrases is ונחתת ונפלת והות פרישן. Alexander shows that פלאים is here rendered as a predicative noun and not as an adverbial accusative.[93] Accordingly, he translates the Aramaic versions as follows: "And she sank down and fell, and became a thing of wonder".

Although I favour an adverbial interpretation for [פ]לאות in 4QLam, analogous with the wording of the MT, the loss of the part of the manuscript which contained the preceding words of the clause under discussion means that its exact phrasing in the Qumran manuscript remains unknown. At any rate, the various renderings of the clause in the ancient translations cautions against a reading of the partially preserved wording in 4QLam that agrees in all details with the interpretation of the MT.

אֵין—ואין

Schäfer treats the conjunction *waw* before אין in 4QLam as a plus in relation to the MT and characterizes the addition as a facilitation of a stylistic

---

89 Ibid., 202.

90 In contrast to the LXX, the rendering in the Lucianic version, πέπτωκεν θαυμαστῶς ("she fell astonishingly"), conforms to the use of פלאים/פלאות in an adverbial sense.

91 Albrektson, *Studies*, 64.

92 In the first apparatus of BHK, it is speculated that ܫܘܒܚܗ in P might be based on a Hebrew variant תפארתה ("her beauty"/"her glory"). Albrektson (*Studies*, 64) dismisses this suggestion as unjustified because his investigation of P shows that the Syriac translator of Lamentations often added suffixes to his translation equivalents of Hebrew words that did not have suffixes.

93 Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 117.

difficulty.[94] Both P (ܠܝܬ ܡܚܒܒܢ ܠܗ) and T^{W} (ולית דמליל תנחומין לה)[95] bear witness to a conjunction before their respective equivalents of אין. Even though Albrektson points out that the Syriac translator had a penchant for adding conjunctions where there are none in the MT and that the Aramaic translations are characteristically paraphrastic,[96] the *waw* in the wording of 4QLam raises the possibility that אין was preceded by a conjunction in the Hebrew *Vorlagen* on which these translations were based. At the same time, this possibility entails that the addition of a *waw* to אין was most likely not the invention of the scribe who copied 4QLam.

The fact that Lam 1:9 in 4QLam is very fragmentary makes it difficult to infer to what degree the wording of this manuscript diverged or agreed with the only full Hebrew version of this verse in our possession, the MT. All that remain in 4QLam are incomplete references to the city's uncleanness, her astonishing downfall, the absence of someone or something and somebody who magnifies himself. According to Lam 1:9 in the MT, Jerusalem's uncleanness clings to her "skirts". Berlin argues convincingly that טמאתה בשוליה has nothing to do with the impurity a woman incurs through menstruation, but rather denotes sexual impropriety. She concludes that "[t]he idea of a menstruant is not present at all in our verse. The phrase 'her impurity is in her skirts' means that her impurity results from her sexual immorality. She is not a menstruant; she is a whore".[97] Furthermore, in the MT Jerusalem's

---

[94] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 56.

[95] According to van der Heide's edition (*Yemenite Tradition*, 7*), T^{Y} reads as follows: ולית דימליל תנחומין עלה. Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 117, 190) gives the same translation for both versions: "And there was no-one to speak consolation to her".

[96] Albrektson, *Studies*, 210.

[97] Berlin, *Lamentations*, 55. The midrash on this verse brings the filthiness of Jerusalem into connection with illicit religious practices. *Lamentations Rabbah* 1:9 § 36 associates the Hebrew phrase בשוליה with the Valley of Hinnom situated south of Jerusalem, where infants were supposedly sacrificed to Molech at a site called Tophet. Cf. Cohen, "Lamentations," 109–111. "Her skirts" therefore refers to the area surrounding Jerusalem where these abhorrent practices were performed. Assan-Dhôte argues that the LXX translation, ἀκαθαρσία αὐτῆς πρὸς ποδῶν αὐτῆς ("Her uncleanness [was] at her feet"), recalls the midrash in *Lamentations Rabbah*. Cf. Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 201–202. However, the midrash does not make mention of "her feet", but only of "her skirts". There seems to be no direct connection between the Greek translation of בשוליה with πρὸς ποδῶν αὐτῆς and the interpretation of בשוליה recounted in *Lamentations Rabbah*. Interestingly, Jerome follows the example of the LXX in translating בשוליה as *in pedibus eius*. Concerning T, Levine (*Aramaic Version*, 94) argues that T^{W} also alludes to the midrash. Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 116–117) refutes this view on the basis that T^{W} explicitly connects the city's uncleanness to menstrual blood. Nevertheless, Alexander concedes that the geographical overtones of the Aramaic rendering בשיפולהא ("in her lower parts") is appropriate,

downfall is described as astonishing. The loss of the verb in 4QLam leaves one to speculate about its exact form in this manuscript, but the renderings in the ancient translations illustrate that it can best be understood as a Qal ("she came down") or a Hophal ("she was brought down"). The MT and V demonstrate that the adverbial interpretation of לאות[פ] works equally well with the purported verb in the Qal or the Hophal stem formations.

The observation in the MT that there is no one to comfort the city of Jerusalem is repeated five times in this version of Lam 1 (1:2, 1:9, 1:16, 1:17, 1:21). As such, it is an important recurring idea in the first poem of the writing. Unfortunately, only parts of the phrases expressing this idea are preserved in the manuscript of 4QLam at Lam 1:9, 16 and 17.

The final bicolon in v. 9 of the MT contains a significant change in voice. Here personified, Jerusalem speaks for the first time in this version of the poem. She cries to YHWH and implores him to see her affliction on account of the enemy who "magnifies himself".[98] It is a pity that only the word הגדיל survived in 4QLam. Nevertheless, the preceding discussion of Lam 1:7 in 4QLam argues that the version of Lam 1 transmitted by this manuscript witnesses to differences, when compared to the MT, that ensure that the narrator remains the speaker throughout the chapter and that there is no change in voice making personified Jerusalem the speaker. It is therefore probable that there is no change in voice intended in 4QLam's version of v. 9 and that it is still the narrator who is speaking here.

Verses 10 and 11

4QLam

[ ]ד[ ]
אשר צויתה לוא יבואו מחמדיה באוכל להשיב נפשה
ראה יהוה והב׳טה כיא הייתי זולל

[ ][ ]
concerning whom (?) you commanded that they may not bring (?) her precious things for food to restore her life.
Look O YHWH and see that I have become worthless!

---

seeing as Jerusalem is the referent of the third-person feminine singular pronominal suffix. He also notes that the cognate word in Mishnaic Hebrew can denote the lower female abdomen and therefore does not rule out the possibility that בשיפולהא has sexual connotations here.

[98] The Hiphil stem formation of the verbal root גדל indicates that the enemy causes himself to be regarded as great and so assumes great airs. Cf. IBHS § 27.2 f.

MT

יָדוֹ פָּרַשׂ צָר עַל כָּל־מַחֲמַדֶּיהָ כִּי־רָאֲתָה גוֹיִם בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשָׁהּ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָה לֹא־יָבֹאוּ בַקָּהָל לָךְ׃

כָּל־עַמָּהּ נֶאֱנָחִים מְבַקְשִׁים לֶחֶם נָתְנוּ מַחֲמַדֵּיהֶם בְּאֹכֶל לְהָשִׁיב נָפֶשׁ רְאֵה יְהוָה וְהַבִּיטָה כִּי הָיֵיתִי זוֹלֵלָה׃

A foe stretched out his hand over all her precious things. Indeed, she saw nations enter into her sanctuary, concerning whom you commanded that they not enter into your assembly.

All her people are groaning, searching for bread. They gave their precious things for food to restore life. Look O YHWH and see that I have become worthless!

What appears to be the top stroke of a *daleth* is preserved on the last line of the second column of 4QLam. The first two lines of writing in Col. III contain the rest of v. 10, as well as v. 11. The scribe who copied the text of 4QLam originally wrote והביטה without the *yod* and subsequently corrected this error by inserting the *yod* in the supralinear space between the *beth* and the *ṭeth*.

בַקָּהָל לָךְ כָּל־עַמָּהּ נֶאֱנָחִים מְבַקְשִׁים לֶחֶם נָתְנוּ > *4QLam*

Verses 10 and 11 are discussed together because there is a long minus of words from the last part of v. 10 (בקהל לך) and the first part of v. 11 (כל עמה נאנחים מבקשים לחם נתנו) in 4QLam compared to the wording found in the MT. In the opinion of Cross,[99] there is nothing in the consonantal text of the MT that would have triggered the minus and, as a result, he speculates that the text behind 4QLam might have read as follows: לוא יבואו ממועדיה כל עמה נאנחים מבקשים לחם נתנו מחמדיה. On this proposal, the parablepsis is due to homoioteleuton, since the endings of the proposed variant ממועדיה and מחמדיה in the text of 4QLam are identical. Cross refers to ובבוא עם הארץ לפני יהוה במועדים in Ezek 46:9 and באי מועד in Lam 1:4 as parallels for the proposed reading יבואו ממועדיה. Since he does not elaborate on this point, one cannot deduce from his terse remarks whether he thinks that the supposed variant reading at the end of v. 10 that was lost through parablepsis during the copying of 4QLam (ממועדיה) developed from the reading in the MT (בקהל לך) or vice versa. A third possibility is that both readings developed from an unknown, earlier reading. This, however, is a moot matter. Although Cross's solution to the problem posed by the wording in 4QLam cannot be rejected

99 Cross, "4QLam," 234.

out of hand, it raises more unanswerable questions and remains speculative at best. Hobbins ignores the difficulties of 4QLam's wording and decides to retain the form of the MT in his reconstruction of the original text of Lam 1.[100]

What makes the case of the wording of vv. 10 and 11 in 4QLam so convoluted is not only its shorter form when compared to the version in the MT and the concomitant assumption of a mistaken omission, but also the fact that the part of the manuscript that contained the first lines of v. 10 has fallen prey to worms and the ravishes of time, while at v. 11 4QLam differs in three more words from the MT (מחמדיה, נפשה and זוללל). Despite the fact that the editions of Cross and Ulrich fill in the words that are missing from 4QLam by using the MT, the damage to the Qumran manuscript means that it is impossible to know whether the wording in the lost part of the manuscript did indeed agree with the *Wortlaut* in the MT. This allows one to speculate about the sentence structure of the surviving words of vv. 10 and 11 in 4QLam. In the translation presented above, it is assumed that the pronoun

---

[100] Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 19. The ancient translations also bear witness to the form of the text of v. 10 in the MT. With reference to the reading ἃ ἐνετείλω μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν σου ("Concerning whom you commanded that they not enter your congregation") in the LXX and to ܕܦܩܕܬ ܠܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܥܠܘ ܒܩܗܠܟ (ʾ "Concerning whom you commanded that they may not enter into your congregation") in P, Albrektson (*Studies*, 65–66) argues that neither the Greek nor the Syriac translator understood the Hebrew text correctly: "The quotation after צויתה is direct, not oblique narration, and לך does not bear on Yhwh but on Israel". This interpretation of the consonantal base of the MT propagated by Albrektson is indeed plausible and followed by Renkema (*Klaagliederen*, 102), who reads the suffix of לך as a second-person feminine singular one and relates it to personified Jerusalem, rather than to Israel. Gottlieb (*Text of Lamentations*, 15) seems to agree with Albrektson's criticism of the interpretation of בקהל לך as "your assembly" and argues that לך qualifies the verb יבאו, rather than the preposition phrase בקהל. Accordingly, he also rejects the view that the second-person suffix of לך refers to YHWH. Provan (*Lamentations*, 47), however, argues that it is possible to retain the phrase following צויתה as indirect speech and to read לך in the sense of "belonging to you". In this case, the pronominal suffix appended to the preposition is not second-person feminine, but second-person masculine, referring to YHWH, who is then the addressee. This is the interpretation represented by the Greek translation. The clause לא יבאו is rendered by an accusative + infinitive construction (μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὰ) after a verb of communication (ἐνετείλω). This Greek construction introduces an indirect statement and implies that the Hebrew clause was understood as indirect speech during the translation process. With regard to the text of P, although the Syriac particle ܕ can introduce direct speech (Nöldeke § 367), the second-person masculine suffix of ܕܦܩܕܬ ܠܗ̇ suggests that the particle ܕ of ܕܠܐ ܥܠܘ acts as a relative pronoun in this case and that what follows is *oratio indirecta*. V reads as follows: *de quibus praeceperas ne intrarent in ecclesiam tuam* ("Concerning whom you had instructed that they not enter into your assembly"). The combination of the particle *ne* and the imperfect subjunctive *intrarent* clearly introduces an indirect command after the pluperfect verb *praeceperas*. Therefore, V, like the LXX and P, reproduces the Hebrew clause לא יבאו בקהל לך as indirect speech with the Lord as the one who is being addressed.

אשר introduces a dependent or attributive relative clause,[101] although the preceding noun with which it forms this syntactical relationship is not preserved. מחמדיה was taken as the object of the verb יבואו and the latter was reconfigured as a Hiphil form יביאו, in light of the almost identical forms of the *waw* and the *yod* in the script in which 4QLam was written. Furthermore, the clause לוא יבואו מחמדיה באוכל להשיב נפשה was rendered as indirect speech, but it can also be direct speech.[102] Seeing as the surviving wording of this passage in 4QLam can be construed in such a way that מחמדיה can plausibly function as the object of the verb יביאו, another explanation for the extant form of the wording in 4QLam comes into view. In this scenario, there was no accidental omission of words as suggested by Cross, but a scribe deliberately changed the wording of the version he was copying so that he could place מחמדיה after יביאו as its object. This seems unlikely, however, since it would imply that this scribe intentionally abandoned the acrostic sequence of the text by eliminating the part of the strophe that starts with the letter *kaph*.

נֶפֶשׁ—נפשה; מַחֲמַוּדֵיהֶם—מחמדיה

With regard to v. 11, the words מחמדיה and נפשה in the manuscript from Qumran have third-person feminine singular suffixes, whereas in the MT נפש has no suffix and מחמודיהם has a third-person masculine plural one. The latter is the *kethib* reading in Codex Leningradensis and might have developed from מחמדיהם,[103] which is the form recorded as the *qere* reading in the *masora parva* of this manuscript and also appears in another Masoretic manuscript. Apart from the number and gender of the suffix, מחמדיה in 4QLam is closer to the *qere* reading in Codex Leningradensis and the reading of the other Masoretic manuscript than to the *kethib* form of the former. To complicate matters even more, the Greek rendering of the clauses in

---

101 Cf. IBHS §19.3a.

102 Abegg, Flint and Ulrich give a similar translation of the words of vv. 10 and 11 that were preserved in the manuscript: "[10 The adversary has spread out his hand upon all her precious]s [things; for she has seen that the nations have entered into her sanctuary; concerning] whom you commanded that they should not *bring* 11 *her* precious things as food to refresh *her* soul". M.G. Abegg, P.W. Flint and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999), 624 (emphasis in original).

103 The suggestion that this *kethib* reading is a later form goes hand in hand with Ehrlich's proposal that the form מחמודיהם in the MT should be vocalized as מֵחֲמוּדֵיהֶם, a Qal participle passive form of the verbal root חמד with a מן *partitivum* ("[They gave] of their precious things"). Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 32.

the LXX agrees in part with the wording of 4QLam: ἔδωκαν τὰ ἐπιθυμήματα αὐτῆς ἐν βρώσει τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ψυχήν ("They gave her desirable things for food in order to restore life"). Τὰ ἐπιθυμήματα αὐτῆς was probably based on a reading such as מחמדיה in 4QLam. The LXX does, however, not have an equivalent for the third-person feminine suffix of נפשה in 4QLam. On the one hand, this means that the form מחמדיה was not introduced by the scribe who copied 4QLam, but circulated in manuscripts other than 4QLam. On the other hand, the evidence from the LXX implies that a third-person feminine suffix was added to נפש at a time during the transmission history after Hebrew versions of the text of Lam 1 with v. 11 containing the readings מחמדיה and נפש were disseminated and one of these could become the *Vorlage* of the LXX translation. Seeing as the purpose clause τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ψυχήν in the Greek text, as well as its purported Hebrew parent reading להשיב נפש (which, incidently, is also found in the MT), is rather vague and that it is not absolutely clear whose life is to be sustained,[104] it is possible that a scribe appended the suffix to נפש with the purpose of eradicating the perceived ambiguity. While נפשה in 4QLam can be explained as a *lectio facilior*, scholars disagree about the originality of מחמדיה in this manuscript and its opposite number in the MT. Cross regards מחמדיה in the manuscript from Qumran as the earlier reading,[105] but Schäfer makes the point that this view leaves the third-person plural suffix of the reading in the Masoretic manuscripts and the majority of the ancient translations unexplained.[106] He argues that the form in 4QLam constitutes an assimilation with מחמדיה in v. 10. The fact that the wording of v. 10 in 4QLam was lost means, however, that the argument for assimilation cannot be made with absolute certainty for this manuscript. It might be pertinent to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, though. In BHQ, the characterization of a particular reading as assimilation implies that it was intentionally created by a scribe and that it is not an accidental scribal error. According to this interpretation, a scribe changed the earlier form מחמדיהם into מחמדיה so that the relevant clauses in vv. 10 and

---

104 Berlin, *Lamentations*, 56.

105 Cross, "4QLam," 235.

106 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 115*–116*. The equivalent of מחמודיהם/מחמדיהם in $T^{W,Y}$ is ריגוגיהון/רגוגיהון ("their precious things"). ܚܡܕܗ in P also has a third-person masculine plural suffix, but the noun is singular in number (note the absence of the *seyame*). Albrektson (*Studies*, 66) attributes this difference in number between the Syriac and Hebrew readings to the freedom exerted by the translator of P in such matters. For his Latin translation, Jerome decided on an indirect pronoun instead of a possessive pronoun: *dederunt pretiosa quaeque pro cibo* ("They gave all the precious things for food").

11 would refer to the same object. "Her precious things" plausibly denote the temple vessels or the city's treasures. Verse 10 then observes that an enemy stretched out his hand to snatch Jerusalem's valuables, while v. 11 states that in their search for a source of nourishment, the people gave it in exchange for food. To be sure, the Greek translation of these verses can be understood in this way, whereas the version in the MT declares that the people gave up their own precious things for something to eat.[107] The meaning of the verses in 4QLam is difficult to ascertain in light of the missing part of v. 10 in this manuscript and the difficulties presented by the wording that did survive. Despite this uncertainty, 4QLam does differ from both the MT and the LXX in that it explicitly refers to the surrendering of the city's precious things in order to restore her life.

זוֹלֵלָה—זולל

As already mentioned, the third difference between 4QLam and the MT in v. 11 is the masculine form of זולל in 4QLam as opposed to the feminine form of the participle in the MT (זוללה). In view of the feminine form of the participle, personified Jerusalem is the subject of the periphrastic construction הייתי זוללה in the MT. The meaning of זוללה is disputed. The majority of commentators and ancient translations derive the form זוללה from the root זלל, "to be worthless"/"to be insignificant".[108] Certain traditional Jewish exegetes and the two recensions of T relate it to the word זולל, "glutton". Hurowitz argues that the form זולל in 4QLam might be the earliest example of this traditional Jewish understanding of the word. He also notes the difficulties in the two abovementioned interpretations of זוללה in the MT and proposes an alternative one based on comparative philology.[109] He suggests that זוללה should be understood in terms of the rare Akkadian noun *zilulû*, which, he argues, can have the meaning "vagabond"/ "tramp"/"peddlar".[110]

---

[107] מחמודיהם/מחמדיהם in the Masoretic manuscripts can either refer to the privately owned treasures of Jerusalem's citizenry or, in a figurative sense, to human beings, and more specifically to children. Cf. Hillers, *Lamentations*, 88.

[108] BDB 272–273; KBL 261, DCH III 114–115. The final clause of LXX Lam 1:11c reads as follows: ἰδέ, κύριε, καὶ ἐπίβλεψον, ὅτι ἐγενήθην ἠτιμωμένη ("Look, O Lord, and see that I have become one dishonoured"). P translated הייתי זוללה with ܗܘܝܬ ܠܫܠܝܠ ("I have become of little value/despised"), while V has the adjective *vilis* ("cheap"/"worth little") as translation equivalent for the Hebrew participle.

[109] V.A. Hurowitz, "זוללה = peddlar / tramp / vagabond / beggar. Lamentations i 11 in Light of Akkadian *zilulû*," *VT* 49 (1999): 542–545.

[110] Ibid, 543–544.

Accordingly, he opts for the translation "a beggar" for זוללה in the MT wording of Lam 1:11.[111] Thomas, however, argues that the suggestion of Hurowitz is unneccesary. According to his reading of the context and the poetic techniques in the passage, זוללה in MT Lam 1:11 can have, what he considers to be, the primary meaning of the root זלל, namely, "thoughtless" or "rash".[112] This is indeed a plausible understanding of the reading in the MT, but, in my opinion, not the most probable one. On the basis of a reading of the context and "poetics of repetition" that differs from Thomas's interpretation, one can argue in favour of the meaning "worthless" or "insignificant" for זוללה in MT Lam 1:11. In this regard, the five occurrences of the verb ראה in Lam. 1:7–11 is expecially noteworthy.[113] When the inhabitants of the city are captured or killed, the foes see the city and laugh over her downfall (Lam. 1:7b–c). The former admirers of the city see her in her shamed, vulnerable and exposed state and they revile her (Lam. 1:8b). Personified Jerusalem can do no more than look on as the nations violate her sanctuary (Lam. 1:10b). From this perspective, it is quite fitting that Jerusalem would draw YHWH's attention to the affliction she suffers on account of the arrogance of her enemies (Lam. 1:9c). In view of her downfall, violation, affliction and her enemies' *Schadenfreude* and arrogance, it makes good sense that Jerusalem would call on YHWH to see and take notice that what has happened to her and what her enemies do to her have left her feeling "worthless".[114] In addition to this type of reading of v. 11c's place in the context of MT Lam 1:7–11's wording, the translation equivalents of זוללה in the Greek, Syriac and Latin translations also support an understanding of this Hebrew word in its sense of "worthless". On such an interpretation of MT Lam 1:11c, the theme of the city's reversal of fortunes is once more echoed in this version of the text.

---

111 This proposal is accepted by Berlin, *Lamentations*, 46. Interestingly, the Greek translation of Sir 18:33 provides indirect support for the interpretation of זוללה in MT Lam 1:11 along the lines suggested by Hurowitz and Berlin. In the Hebrew text of this passage, the sage warns his audience against gluttony (זולל) and drunkenness (סובא) when there is nothing in one's purse (cf. Deut 20:21 and Prov 23:20 where these two words also appear together). The wording of Sir 18:33 in Manuscript C (IV recto) reads: אין בכיס [.]ומאום אל תהי זולל סובא. Cf. Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira*, 97. The Greek translator, however, rendered זולל with πτωχός, which can have the meaning of "beggar" (LSJ, 1342).

112 H.A. Thomas, "The Meaning of *zōlēlâ* (Lam 1:11) One More Time," *VT* 61 (2011): 489–498.

113 This is an example that Thomas (ibid, 493–494) also mentions.

114 The repeated use of the verb ראה in MT Lam 1:7–11 has the effect of drawing the audience's gaze on the destroyed, despised and desecrated city, as well as on what her enemies do to her. This, in turn, elicits sympathy from the audience for the plight of the city and her people.

Concerning 4QLam, the narrator himself is the subject of the periphrastic construction in the wording of the Qumran manuscript, due to the masculine form of the participle. He pleads with YHWH to take note of the fact that he has become insignificant or worthless. As a result, the content of the closing plea of v. 11 in 4QLam differs from its counterpart in the MT. This change in perspective, the suffixes of מחמדיה and נפשה and the shorter form of vv. 10–11 all contribute to the variations in content between the versions of these verses in 4QLam and the MT. Unfortunately, it is impossible to get a clear picture of the differences between these two Hebrew witnesses to Lam 1:10–11, because of the missing wording in the manuscript from Qumran. This lacuna in 4QLam at vv. 10 and 11 forces one to conclude that all the proposals for how the surviving wording came into being remain speculative.

Verse 12

4QLam

לוא אליכ[י]הכל עברי ד[רך]אוֹ אם יש
מכאוב כמכאובי אשר עוללו לי אשר הוגירני
י[ביו]ם[חרו]נו

Would that all those who pass by the w[ay] upon you [ ] if there is a pain like my pain, which they brought upon me, with which[ ] frightened me [on the da]y of his a[nger].

MT

לֹוא אֲלֵיכֶם כָּל־עֹבְרֵי דָּרֶךְ הַבִּיטוּ וּרְאוּ אִם־יֵשׁ מַכְאוֹב כְּמַכְאֹבִי אֲשֶׁר עוֹלַל לִי אֲשֶׁר הוֹגָה יְהוָה
בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ׃

(It is) not for you (?), all you who pass by the road. Look and see if there is a pain like my pain, which was brought upon me, with which YHWH afflicted on the day of his fierce anger.

Although marred by the ravages of decay, the surviving part of the manuscript of 4QLam containing Lam 1:12 exhibits interesting variants compared to the MT.

לוֹא אֲלֵיכֶם כָּל־עֹבְרֵי דָּרֶךְ הַבִּיטוּ וּרְאוּ—לוא אליכ[י]הכל עברי ד[ ]אוֹ

The first two words in the MT present the interpreter with a difficulty. Kraus goes as far as to say that it does not yield any sense and one is forced to have recourse to emendation in order to salvage any meaning from it.[115] Indeed,

---

115 Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 23.

a number of scholars have proposed different conjectural emendations as a solution to the perceived difficulty in this first part of Lam 1:12. Others attempt to retain the consonantal form of the text in the MT, but vocalize the word לוא differently from the way it was done by the Masoretes. Yet another group of scholars do not accept these proposed changes and interpret לוא אליכם in the MT either as a question or as a statement. Gottwald, Provan and House count amongst those scholars who treat the phrase as a question addressed to the passers by: "Is it nothing to you, all you who pass by the road?"[116] Conversely, both Ehrlich and Albrektson argue that לוא אליכם should be understood as a statement, albeit in different ways. With reference to the use of the preposition אל in Job 32:14, Ehrlich reads לוא אליכם as a statement that conveys the idea that what has happened to Jerusalem is not like anything that the passers by have experienced.[117] He thinks of כל עברי דרך in terms of "die den Lauf der Welt beobachten und darum mehr Ehrfarung haben als andere Menschen" and thus personified Jerusalem, so Ehrlich argues, says to the passers by that her fate does not correspond to their experience. Albrektson also takes the preposition אל as his point of departure, but refers to its meaning in Gen 20:2, 1Sam 4:19 and Mal 2:1.[118] Accordingly, he suggests that לוא אליכם be read as follows: "(It is) not for (or, about) you, (this is) nothing which concerns you". He goes on to interpret כל עברי דרך in a figurative sense as "the man in the street" on the basis of other passages in the Old Testament in which the expression עברי דרך (כל) is found (Pss 80:13, 89:42, Lam 2:15, Job 21:29 and Prov 9:15).[119] Therefore, the whole of the first clause in v. 12 states that what has happened to Jerusalem does not happen to everybody, in other words, something unprecedented has befallen the city. Albrektson is of the opinion that this interpretation of לוא אליכם כל עברי דרך is appropriate in the immediate context and that the clause forms a parallelism with הביטו וראו אם יש מכאוב כמכאבי.

Turning to the proposals for a different pointing of לוא, Reider suggests that לוא should be vocalized as לֻוָּא, an abbreviated form of לְוִיָּה,

---

116 N.K. Gottwald, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (London: SCM Press, 1954), 8; Provan, *Lamentations*, 48; House, *Lamentations*, 335.

117 Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 32–33.

118 Albrektson, *Studies*, 68–69.

119 Gottlieb (*Text of Lamentations*, 16–17) criticizes this view and points out that the phrase כל עברי דרך, which is found in psalms of lamentation such as Pss 80 and 89, refers to onlookers who can be expected to mock the sufferer. In accordance with this interpretation of כל עברי דרך, he argues that לוא אליכם in Lam 1:12 should be taken as a repudiation of such mockery. In turn, Provan (*Lamentations*, 48) objects to Gottlieb's interpretation and shows that it does not fit well with the invitation to look and see, expressed by the imperatives הביטו and וראו.

"wailing"/"dirge".[120] On this reading, לוא אליכם would mean "woe to you". This interpretation, he notes, is in keeping with the readings in the LXX (οἴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς),[121] σ′ (ὦ ὑμεῖς)[122] and V (*o vos*). Alternatively, Renkema takes לוא as a variant form of לו, "O that"/"if only"/"would that".[123] With reference to the syntactical connection of this conjunction and prepositional phrase with the two imperative verbs הביטו and וראו, he indicates that "bij een imperatief heeft לו een aandringende betekenis 'toch' ... Het אליכם duidt op het adres. Samen dienen beide aanvangswoorden om de aandacht te trekken en zijn de inleiding op de imperativi van het volgende colon".[124]

Concerning the conjectural emendations recommended by scholars, Dyserinck follows de Hoop Scheffer in emending לוא אליכם into לוא אניתם.[125] לוא is then also understood as a longer form of the conjunction לו and אניתם as a Qal *qatal* second-person masculine plural form of the verbal root אנה ("to mourn"). He consequently translates the first part of his altered text of Lam 1:12 as follows: "Och, of gij rouw bedreeft, al gij voorbijgangers". In contrast to this proposal of Dyserinck, Budde suggests that instead of לוא אליכם, one should rather read לוּא אֵלַי,[126] while Praetorius speculates that the text originally read לְכוּ כל עברי דרך.[127] He agrees with Budde that אליכם in the MT is a corruption from the more original reading אֵלַי and goes on to suggest that the latter was a later addition triggered by לְכוּ, the Qal imperative second-person masculine plural form of the verbal root הלך ("to go"/"to walk"). In his view, the corruption from לכו to לוא occurred when a scribe mistakenly omitted the *kaph* of לכו, which resulted in the form לו. A later

---

120 J. Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* (1954): 276–295, 294–295.

121 It should, however, be pointed out that Ziegler, in his critical Göttingen edition of LXX Lamentations, gives the reading of the LXX as οὐ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Cf. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 470. Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 765) also has this reading in his edition. Nevertheless, the majority of the Greek textual witnesses read οἴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

122 Field (*Origenis*, 749) thinks that the reading ὦ ὑμεῖς, which is found in the margin of the Syrohexapla (ܗܘ ܐܝ), was the actual reading of σ′, whereas in the margin of Codex Marchalianus, the reading of σ′ is given as οὐ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Barthélemy (*Critique Textuelle*, 869) argues that the aim of this marginal reading was to correct the reading οἴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς in this codex (and most other textual witnesses to the Greek translation).

123 BDB 530; KBL 475; DCH IV 522.

124 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 109.

125 Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 364.

126 Budde, "Klagelied," 266.

127 F. Praetorius, "Threni I, 12. 14. II, 6. 13," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 143–146, 143. Robinson documents the proposed emendations of Budde and Praetorius in his critical apparatus in BHK as possible solutions to the corrupt לוא אליכם in the MT. It is also noted here that the *lamedh* of לוא is written smaller than the other letters. Some scholars interpret this as a possible indication that the scribes also had their doubts as to the reliability of this reading.

scribe then amended לו into לוא. Hillers, Kraus and Rudolph regard Praetorius's emendation as the most satisfactory solution to the difficulties presented by the phrase לוא אליכם.[128] In addition, Rudolph draws attention to the possibility that לוא אליכם was a marginal note that was incorporated into the text and replaced the original reading by mistake: "Es handelt sich um eine Randbemerkung ("nicht euch zugedacht"), die die Angeredeten vor Unheil schützen soll".[129] This understanding of the meaning of לוא אליכם agrees to a large extent with the midrash found in *Lamentations Rabbah* 1:12 § 40,[130] as well as the translation of Berlin, "May it not happen to you", which she presents without further comment.[131] Finally, Kaiser makes mention of earlier proposals for emending the text in his commentary, as well as Albrektson's interpretation of the wording of the MT as a statement, but finds them unconvincing. With reference to Lam 1:18, 21, as well as passages from Isa 46:3, 12, 51:1, 7 and Judg 9:7, he puts forward the suggestion to read the first part of Lam 1:12 as שמעו אלי ("Hört auf mich").[132]

Hillers remarks that it is unfortunate that the uncertain reading in 4QLam does not have a "significant bearing on the old textual problem".[133] Cross expresses the view that both the readings in the manuscript from Qumran and in the MT are corrupt.[134] Due to the damage suffered by the manuscript of 4QLam, the letters both following the *kaph* of [ ]אליכ and preceding the *he* of הכל are difficult to determine. In his opinion, the break in the leather does not leave enough room for a *mem* to have been written after the *kaph* of [ ]אליכ. Consequently, he suggests that the remaining ink traces might be identified as a *yod*, resulting in the reading אליכי. In his discussion on how the readings in the MT and the manuscript from cave 4 could have come into being, Cross follows the proposal of Budde that the original text read לוא אלי ... הביטו ("Would that they look at me"), arguing that the consonants of לוא should be pointed as לוּא rather than as לֹוא and that the verb נבט in the Hiphil stem formation regularly takes the preposition אל with its object.[135]

---

[128] Hillers, *Lamentations*, 71; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 23; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 207; idem, "Der Text der Klagelieder," *ZAW* 56 (1938): 101–122, 102–103.

[129] Rudolph, "Text," 102. Berges (*Klagelieder*, 89) and Westermann (*Lamentations*, 113) concur with this proposal of Rudolph.

[130] Cohen, "Lamentations," 117.

[131] Berlin, *Lamentations*, 43.

[132] Kaiser, *Klagelieder*, 309.

[133] Hillers, *Lamentations*, 71.

[134] Cross, "4QLam," 235.

[135] Cf. DCH V 586–587. Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 21) agrees that לוא in the original text of Lam 1:12 was the conditional conjunction with the spelling לֹא. It was subsequently misread

The reading in the MT can then be attributed to an initial dittography of the letter *kaph*, which was wrongly corrected at a later stage of the copying of this form of the text. The reading in 4QLam might be explained in a similar way, according to Cross.

Notwithstanding this proposal concerning the way in which the readings in 4QLam and the MT might have come into being as corruptions from a more original text, it is also possible to explain the text of 4QLam in a different way. First, the syntax of the consonantal text can be interpreted in a number of ways. If one allows for the reconstruction of the two verbs הביטו and וראו in forms similar to the consonantal base of the MT, it should be observed that the consonants allow for them to be interpreted as either imperatives (as they are vocalized in the MT), or as *qatals*, or the one as a *qatal* and the other as an imperative. The word הכל, with the definite article, which is absent in the MT, can be taken as the implied subject of [ ]לוא אליכ, if this phrase is interpreted as expressing a question.[136] הכל can, however, also be related to עברי ד[רך] as a modifier of the substantival participle. The latter is, in all probability, to be read as the subject of הביטו and וראו. If one or both of these verbs are taken as imperatives, עברי ד[רך] would constitute the addressees of the direct command(s). As was indicated in the discussions on the different interpretations of the MT and the proposals for its emendation, the first word לוא can either be read as a negative particle לוֹא, as a variant form of the conjunction לוּ or as an abbreviated form of לְוַיָּה. Moreover, the second word of the verse in 4QLam, which Cross restores as [י]אליכ, can be reconstructed in two different ways. Accordingly, the interpretation of the syntax depends to a large extent on how this word is understood. In the form proposed by Cross, the word can be interpreted as a preposition אל plus a second-person feminine pronominal suffix כי. In his description of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea scrolls, Qimron draws attention to the fact that this Aramaic form of the second-person pronominal suffix occurs regularly in the biblical and non-biblical texts from Qumran.[137] On this reading, personified Jerusalem is addressed in the first clause of Lam

---

as לוֹא in the textual tradition preserved in the MT. However, Hobbins retains the preposition אל plus second-person masculine plural pronominal suffix אליכם as the original text.

136 The English translation of the text of 4QLam prepared by Abegg, Flint and Ulrich seems to imply that the manuscript from Qumran read אליכם. Interestingly, הכל is then treated as the subject of the supposed question expressed by לוא אליכם: "*Is all of this nothing to you, you* that pass [by? Look and se]e if there be any sorrow which *they* brought upon me". Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 624–625 (italics in original).

137 Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 58–59.

1:12. In accordance with the various possible interpretations of לוא and the syntactical function of הכל, the first part of the verse can be translated as follows: "Is all of this nothing to you (Jerusalem)?"/"Is all of this not for you (Jerusalem)?"/"All of this is not for you (Jerusalem)"/"Would that all those who pass by look at you (Jerusalem)"/"Woe to you (Jerusalem)". Judging from the photograph used for the plate in the DJD edition, the consonant *kaph* can also be interpreted as a *nun*, due to the similarity in form between these two letters in the script in which 4QLam was written.[138] In view of the almost identical form of the *yod* and *waw* in the same script, what Cross reads as a *yod* in the damaged part of the manuscript can therefore also be taken to be a *waw*. The second word might therefore be reconstructed as אלינו, the preposition אל plus the first-person plural pronominal suffix נו. The referent of the suffix would in this case be the narrator and his community. This interpretation is reminiscent of the directive addressed to YHWH in v. 7 of 4QLam, זכוֹרה יהוה [כו]ל מכאובנו, where the narrator appeals to YHWH to remember or call to mind "our pain". On this interpretation of the extant text of 4QLam, the verbs הביטו and וראו are best read as *qatal* forms with עברי ד[רך] as the subject and לוא as a longer form of the conjunction לו. The prepositional phrase אלינו is then related to הביטו, as Cross points out. Consequently, this first part of v. 12 in 4QLam can be translated as follows: "Would that all those who pass by the road look at *us* and see if there is a pain like my pain". The objection might be raised against this interpretation of the text that it creates a discrepancy between the first-person plural suffix attached to the preposition אל, whereas the suffix appended to the noun in the prepositional phrase כמכאובי is singular. According to this reconstruction of the text, the narrator would express the concern that all the passers by will look at him and his community and see if there is a pain comparable to his. However, although the disagreement in number between the suffixes might detract from the coherence of the clauses, it does not necessarily discredit the proposed reconstruction. What counts in favour of this reading of the text of 4QLam is the fact that it is in keeping with the argument presented at vv. 7 and 11 that it is the narrator who speaks in these verses of 4QLam and not personified Jerusalem, as is

---

138 Cf. Cross's description of the development of the Hebrew script as reflected in the Dead Sea scrolls. F.M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G.E. Wright; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), 133–202, 138. Admittedly, the disputed letter in 4QLam does not have a slight bend to the right at the top as the other examples of the *nun* in 4QLam seem to have. This lends support to its identification as a *kaph*.

the case in the MT. The same holds true if the second word is reconstructed as אליכי and the syntax interpreted as mentioned above: "Would that all those who pass by the road look at *you* and see if there is a pain like my pain". In this case, the pain of the narrator is directly linked with what has happened to Jerusalem. Although I favour this understanding of the Qumran manuscript's wording, it appears as though all of the possible interpretations differ to some degree from the version transmitted by the MT, regardless of which one of the reconstructions of the wording of 4QLam one considers to be the most likely. Compared to the possible wordings of the restored text of 4QLam, the reading in the MT can be taken as the earlier, more original form of the text of Lam 1:12 by virtue of being the *lectio difficilior*. However, in view of the supposed corrupted nature of the text in the MT, both it and the text in 4QLam might constitute departures from an unattested earlier wording of the verse. In both scenarios the text in the fragmentary manuscript from cave 4 throws light on the activity of a scribe, the one who copied 4QLam or a predecessor, in which the wording was changed so as to reflect a different interpretation from the one presented in the text being copied. Since the possible wordings of the first part of v. 12 in 4QLam yield good sense in the immediate context, I suggest that it did not arise as a result of a corruption of an earlier reading, but as a conscience alteration of such an earlier reading.

עוֹלַל לִי—עוללו לי

In contrast to the MT, in which the verb עלל is vocalized as a Poal and therefore has a passive meaning, the third-person plural form עוללו in 4QLam should be read as being in the Poel stem formation ("they dealt out").[139] The subject of the verb in this manuscript can either be the enemies mentioned in the previous verses, or the passers by. According to Cross, the original text would have contained a Poel *qatal* third-person singular verbal form, עוֹלֵל, with YHWH as the subject ("he dealt out").[140] He bases this view on the perceived parallelism between this purported original reading and הוגה יהוה in the next clause, as well as on the evidence from P and V. The P translation of the two Hebrew relative clauses reads as follows: ܕܥܒܕ ܠܝ ܡܪܝܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܦ ܠܝ ܡܪܝܐ ܒܝܘܡ ܪܘܓܙܗ ("Which the Lord did to me. The Lord also humbled me on the day of his fierce anger"). Interestingly, the Syriac

---

139 BDB 759; KBL 708; DCH VI 425–426.

140 Cross, "4QLam," 235.

translator treated the second relative clause in the Hebrew text as a main clause by rendering the relative pronoun אשר with the conjunction ܘ. He did, however, faithfully use ܡܪܝܐ to translate יהוה in this clause. He also inserted ܡܪܝܐ in his translation of the first relative clause so as to make the implicit subject of ܚܛܐ, namely the Lord, explicit. This indicates that the translator of P understood the Lord to be the subject of the verbs in both clauses. In Jerome's Latin translation of the two Hebrew relative clauses, *quoniam vindemiavit me ut locutus est Dominus in die irae furoris sui* ("Because the Lord gathered me in when he spoke in the day of his furious anger"), the Lord (*Dominus*) is the subject of both the verb *vindemiavit me* ("he gathered me in [as one gathers in grapes or a vintage]") and of the subordinate temporal clause *ut locutus est* ("when he spoke"). These two ancient translations therefore lend credence to Cross's proposal that YHWH was meant as the subject of the verb עלל in the unpointed Hebrew original.

Unfortunately, Cross's suggestion regarding the original wording of this relative clause does not ease the difficulty of finding a feasible explanation for the plural number of the verbal form עוללו in 4QLam. It is theoretically possible that the reading came into being as a result of dittography. The prepositional phrase לי and the final two consonants of עוללו would have looked very similar in a script where the *yod* and the *waw* were almost identical in shape. From this, one might hypothesize that at some stage during the transmission history a scribe mistakenly wrote לי twice. Another scribe could have used a copy where the spaces between the words were not adequately indicated and therefore read the *yod* of the duplicated לי as a *waw* and mistook the preposition for a third *lamedh* that was erroneously added in a previous copying of עולל. He then proceeded to rectify the corrupt reading by dropping the extra *lamedh* and in so doing created the reading עוללו, which found its way into the wording of 4QLam. However, this explanation is no more than mere speculation. It is more plausible that a scribe intentionally changed the number of the verb to a plural, given that a scribe (or maybe the same one) already altered the words of the opening clause of the verse. With regard to the impact of these changes on the meaning of the verse, the reconstructed wording of 4QLam can be interpreted in such a way that the narrator addresses Jerusalem, expresses the wish that those people who pass her by on the road would look upon the city and see in her the pain which the enemies have brought upon him. Where in v. 11 of 4QLam the narrator addresses YHWH and pleads with him to see and take note of his apparent insignificance, there is a change in addressee at v. 12. According to this verse's opening sentence, the narrator speaks to Jerusalem and seems to suggest that his pain will be evident to those who would look upon

the city. This is followed by the first of two relative clauses. מכאובי serves as the antecedent of the relative pronoun אשר, which functions accusatively with the verb עוללו. Although the plural form of עוללו might have the passers by in view, it probably refers to the foes that were already mentioned in the previous verses.

הוֹגָה—הוגירני

The form הוגירני in 4QLam is an otherwise unattested Hiphil of the root יגר. In the Qal stem formation this root means "fear"/"to be afraid"[141] and since the Hiphil stem formation commonly expresses a causative meaning, the word הוגירני probably means "he frightened me".[142] הוגה in the MT recalls the occurrence of the same form in v. 5 (יהוה הוגה). While Hobbins retains the verb of the MT in his reconstruction of the original text of Lam 1:12 (with only a change in spelling, הַוּגָה)[143] and Schäfer regards הוגירני in 4QLam as an interpretation on the part of the scribe who copied this manuscript (or a predecessor),[144] Cross prefers הוגירני as the *lectio difficilior* and notes that הוגה in the MT might be a corruption of the reading in the Qumran fragment "by reminiscence of הוגה in v 5".[145] Seeing as he mentions the readings in the Greek and Syriac translations in support of his suggestion, a closer look at the ancient translations is warranted.

The manuscripts of the Greek translation witness to the doublet φθεγ-ξάμενος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐταπείνωσέν με as counterpart of the verbs הוגירני in 4QLam and הוגה in the MT.[146] This *lectio duplex* appears to be translational and, as such, it constitutes a double rendering based on the same Hebrew form. The presence of the prepositional phrase ἐν ἐμοί and the independent personal pronoun με suggests that the Hebrew word in the *Vorlage* contained a first-person pronominal suffix. The renderings φθεγξάμενος and ἐταπείνωσέν

---

141 BDB 388; KBL 362; DCH IV 81.

142 This is the way Abegg, Flint and Ulrich (*Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625) render the word.

143 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 21.

144 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 56.

145 Cross, "4QLam," 235. The reading in 3QLam is too uncertain to be cited in support of either position. Baillet reconstructs the word as הוגה, albeit with a dot above the *he* and a circlet above the *gimel*. He notes that the reading is therefore very uncertain, "mais autorisée par un examen minutieux sous forte lumière". Baillet, "Lamentations," 95. According to this reconstruction, 3QLam agrees with the MT, at least in this one word.

146 This Greek reading is often identified as a *lectio duplex*, but Robinson claims that it is more probable that φθεγξάμενος was based on a Hebrew reading of אמר instead of אשר, because there is no rendering of the relative pronoun in the Greek. Cf. T.H. Robinson, "Notes on the Text of Lamentations," *ZAW* 51 (1933): 255–259, 257.

point towards הוגני as the reading in the *Vorlage* in view of the fact that this form can be derived from the root הגה and יגה.[147] The former can have the sense "to utter"/"to speak"[148] and the latter means "to cause sorrow"/"to grieve" in the Hiphil.[149] It therefore seems clear that the use of the Greek verb φθέγγομαι, "to utter a sound"/"to speak (loud and clear)"[150] was based on an understanding of הוגני as a form of the root הגה, while another scribe derived it from יגה, which would account for the choice for ταπεινόω, "to bring low"/"to humble",[151] as an alternative translation equivalent. Ziegler notes how difficult it is to decide which one of these renderings is original and which one is a secondary addition.[152] Nevertheless, he argues that the "Wiedergabe von יגה mit ταπεινοῦν ist der Thr.-LXX eigentümlich und findet sich auch 1_5 $3_{22\,33}$; deshalb wird sie 1_{12} ursprünglich sein. Dagegen steht φθέγγεσθαι nur hier in den Thr".[153] On the basis of this argument, Ziegler opts for ἐταπείνωσέν με as the reading of the Old Greek text for the Göttingen edition.[154] Similarly, the equivalent in P, ܐܬܚܚܕ, has an appended first-person pronominal suffix and therefore also witnesses to a form הוגני in the Hebrew *Vorlage* from which this Syriac translation was made. The Syriac translator consistently employed forms of the root ܚܚܝ ("to humble"/"to lay low") to translate the instances of the root יגה at Lam 1:5 and Lam 3:32. It therefore

---

147 Cf. Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*) 23; Rudolph, "Text," 103; and Albrektson, *Studies*, 72.

148 BDB 211; KBL 224; DCH II 487.

149 BDB 387; KBL 361; DCH IV 79.

150 LEH 502; GELS 714.

151 LEH 469; GELS 670.

152 Unfortunately, the daughter translations of the LXX are of little help in this regard. In Sabatier's edition of the *Vetus Latina*, there is no equivalent for Lam 1:12. Cf. P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu Vetus Italica et caeterae quaecunque in codicibus manuscriptis et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: quae cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparantur* (vol. 2; Remis: Reginaldum Florentain, 1743), 724. The Sahidic Coptic version also bears witness to the doublet: ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛ̅ⲣⲱϥ ⲉϫⲱⲓ ⲛ̅ⲥⲓ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁϥⲑ̅ⲃⲃⲓⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲓⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲱⲛⲧ̅ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉϥⲟⲣⲅⲏ ("The Lord opened his mouth against me, he humiliated me on the day of the wrath of his anger"). Cf. F. Feder, *Biblia Sahidica. Ieremias, Lamentationes* (*Threni*), *Epistula Ieremiae et Baruch* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 200.

153 J. Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta* (MSU VI; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), 97.

154 Idem, *Septuaginta*, 470. The renderings in LXX.D, "Gedemütigt hat mich der Herr am Tag des Zorns seines Herzens" (Hirsch-Luipold and Maier, "Threnoi/Die Klagelieder," 1351), NETS, "The Lord humbled me on the day of the wrath of his anger" (Gentry, "Lamentations," 936), and BdA, "Seigneur m'a humiliée au jour de la colère de sa fureur" (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 204), show that the modern translators uncritically followed Ziegler's emended text. Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 757) prints the doublet as part of the text of LXX Lam 1:12, because it is found in Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus.

stands to reason that he related הוגני in the present verse to יגה. According to Levine,[155] the text of T^{W}, דאסתקיף לי דתבר יהוה יתי ("Which has been inflicted upon me, werewith the Lord has broken me"),[156] like the LXX and P, also bears witness to a Hebrew version that contained the reading הוגני.

The cumulative evidence of the LXX, P and T leave little doubt that there circulated a Hebrew version of Lamentations in which v. 12 of the first chapter included the reading הוגני. Compared to the variants in 4QLam and the MT, הוגני might very well qualify as the earliest Hebrew reading. On such a reading of the textual evidence, one can agree with Cross that הוגה in the MT represents an assimilation with the identical consonantal form in Lam 1:5, while the unique reading in the manuscript from Qumran can be attributed to scribal invention. Since it is very difficult to explain how הוגירני could have developed from הוגני via a scribal error, it seems prudent to conclude that this reading was created by a scribe during the transmission process. This is all the more probable in light of the changes that this scribe (or other scribes) brought about in the earlier parts of the verse.

בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ—בי]ם[חרו]נו

Cross argues that the shorter reading בי]ם[חרו]נו in 4QLam is to be preferred over the longer ביום חרון אפו in the MT, which is then understood as an assimilation with the usual form of the expression. Hobbins expresses the same view,[157] but Schäfer is reluctant to accept the precedence of the readings in the fragment from Qumran over those in the MT.[158]

With regard to the difference in meaning between 4QLam and the MT, it is likely that the narrator voices a concern in 4QLam that all the passers by would look either upon Jerusalem (if the second word of the verse is restored as אליכ[י], in which case the city is addressed and not the passers by) or upon him and his community (if the second word of the verse is reconstructed as אלינ[ו]) and see the incomparability of the pain the enemies have brought upon him. This is the pain that YHWH then uses to frighten the narrator on the day of God's wrath. Conversely, in the MT, notwithstanding the *crux interpretum* presented by the first two words, personified Jerusalem calls on

---

155 Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 99.

156 Codex Urbinas 1, which serves as the base text for Levine's study, reads די תבר instead of דתבר. For the manuscripts that have the latter reading, see Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 119. The text of T^{Y} is the same as that of T^{W} in these two relative clauses.

157 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 21.

158 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 117*.

the passers by to look and see if there is a pain like hers, which YHWH caused to come over her and in so doing afflicted her on the day of his fierce anger.

Verse 13

4QLam

ממרום שלח א[ש] בעצומתי ויורידני פרש רשֺת
לרגלי חשיבנ֯י [אחו]רֺ נתנני שומם כול היום
וד[ו]י

From on high He sent fi[re] into my bones and brought me/it down. He spread out a net for my feet; He turned me (?) [bac]k. He left me deserted and faint all day.

MT

מִמָּרֹום שָׁלַח־אֵשׁ בְּעַצְמֹתַי וַיִּרְדֶּנָּה פָּרַשׂ רָשֶׁת לְרַגְלַי הֱשִׁיבַנִי אָחֹור נְתָנַנִי שֹׁמֵמָה כָּל־הַיֹּום דָּוֶה׃

From on high He sent fire into my bones and trampled on it. He spread out a net for my feet; He turned me back. He made me desolate, ill all day.

Some letters of words in 4QLam are obscured or lost as a result of the damages to the manuscript. Cross indicates the uncertain nature of the reconstructed form חשיבנ֯י by means of dots above the *ḥeth*, *nun* and *yod*.[159] A tear in the leather renders the *waw* of ד[ו]י illegible. Nevertheless, apart from a number of orthographical differences, the manuscript also preserves interesting variant readings compared to the MT.

וַיִּרְדֶּנָּה—ויורידני

וירדנה in the MT can be parsed as a Qal *wayyiqtol* third-person masculine singular plus third-person feminine singular suffix of the root רדה.[160] The reading is problematic on three accounts. First, the Masoretic accents assigned to the words of the first bicolon of this verse pose a problem to those scholars who insist on basing its colometry on the presumed *qinah*-metre. In BHS, the cola are divided as follows: (1:13aα) מִמָּרֹום שָׁלַח־אֵשׁ / (1:13aβ) בְּעַצְמֹתַי וַיִּרְדֶּנָּה. The first colon therefore consists of three words and the second of two. This is the characteristic 3 + 2 division of so-called *qinah*-metre.[161] However, BHS's

---

159 Cross, "4QLam," 234.

160 The reading in $T^{W,Y}$ וכבש יתהון ("and he subdued them") also seems to have derived וירדנה from the root רדה. The Aramaic translation, however, takes עצמתי as the referent of the third-person feminine suffix of וירדנה.

161 House (*Lamentations*, 333) also divides the first bicolon of Lam 1:13 into cola of three and two words respectively.

arrangement clearly ignores the Masoretic accents. The accent with אָשׁ is a *mêr*^{e}*khâ*. Since this is a conjunctive accent, the division of the cola cannot be after אש. Furthermore, the disjunctive accent *ṭiphḥā*, placed with בְּעַצְמֹתָי by the Masoretes, implies that this word belongs to the first colon of Lam 1:13. This means that the single word וַיִּרְדֶּנָּה, with the *ʾathnāḥ*, makes up the second half of the bicolon. Renkema notes that the *waw* consecutive with וירדנה lends support to this division into unbalanced cola.[162] The second problematic aspect of וירדנה in the MT is that there does not appear to be an appropriate antecedent for the third-person feminine singular suffix appended to the verb. Thirdly, some scholars have difficulties in finding a fitting meaning for the root רדה in the context of the first bicolon of v. 13. In view of the problematic nature of the reading in the MT, many scholars[163] opt to emend the text by vocalizing the consonants of the verb as וַיֹּרִדֶנָּה, a Hiphil *wayyiqtol* third-person masculine singular plus the third-person feminine singular suffix of the root ירד ("and he caused it to come down"), in line with the renderings in the LXX (κατήγαγεν αὐτό) and P (ܐܚܬܬ݂ܗ).[164] Hobbins, Schäfer, Renkema and Hillers therefore propagate the view that the original text of Lam 1:13 reads יורדנה and, in so doing, present a satisfactory solution to the syntactical and stylistic problems plaguing the text of the MT.[165] בעצמתי is then construed together with יורדנה as the second colon, YHWH taken as the subject of both verbs and אש treated as the antecedent of the suffix of יורדנה. Moreover, בעצמתי יורדנה forms a parallelism with ממרום שלח אש ("From on high he sent fire; into my bones he brought it down").

Other scholars have put forward interesting proposals for the interpretation of וירדנה on the basis of comparative philology. For example, Kopf suggests that the Arabic word *rdḥ* ("to perish"/"to be destroyed") can help to explain the difficult reading in the MT: "וירדנה steht dann für וירדינה, hat sein Subjekt in עצמתי und ist eine der seltenen Formen 3. pl. fem. mit

---

[162] Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 114.

[163] Cf. Berlin, *Lamentations*, 46; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 114; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 72–73; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 207; idem, "Text," 103; Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 33; Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 4; Budde, "Klagelied," 266; and Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 364.

[164] The LXX, however, does not include an equivalent for the conjunction of וַיֹּרִדֶנָּה and the Syriac translation has a first-person singular suffix instead of a third-person feminine singular one. Whereas P supports the reading in 4QLam, a form יורידנה might lie behind the reading in the LXX. V (*et erudivit me*) and σ′ (καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν με) also witness to a first-person singular suffix and their equivalents might be based on a reading וירדני (Qal *wayyiqtol* third-person masculine singular plus first-person singular suffix of רדה) and an understanding of the root רדה in its Aramaic meaning "to chastise". Cf. Rudolph, "Text," 103.

[165] Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 21; Schäfer, "Lamentations," 117*–118*; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 114; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 72.

präfigiertem י statt ת".[166] If the text is read in this way, it can be translated as follows: "From on high he sent fire into my bones and they were ruined". Dahood offers another possible solution based on Ugaritic evidence.[167] An energic *-n* added to *yqtl* verbal forms is well-attested in Ugaritic. Dahood interprets וירדנה in Lam 1:13 as an example of such an energic form of the verb in Biblical Hebrew. Accordingly, he revocalizes the verb as וַיְיָרַדָנָּה, with the *nun* indicating an energic form and אש serving as the subject of the verb: "From high He sent forth fire; into my bones has it descended".[168] As a result, Dahood propagates a meaning for these clauses that is remarkably similar, but not identical to the one arrived at by those scholars who favour emending the reading in the MT so as to align it with the Greek translation.

From a different perspective, Albrektson[169] follows Driver[170] in wresting sense from the MT without having recourse to emendation based on the ancient translations or to Northwest Semitic philology. These scholars take אש (which is usually feminine) as the subject of the masculine verb וירדנה and the plural noun עצמתי as the antecedent of the singular suffix of the verb. House points out that the wording of the MT makes sense in light of parallels such as Joel 4:13,[171] while Provan argues that YHWH is the subject of both שלח and וירדנה.[172] The idea communicated by the first bicolon of v. 13 is that YHWH is directly responsible for the suffering of Jerusalem. Kraus also takes YHWH as the subject of both the verbs and אש as the antecedent of the third-person feminine singular suffix of וירדנה. In his opinion, the text means that YHWH put out the fire that he sent by trampling on it and, in so doing, destroyed the city: "Nachdem das Feuer gewütet hatte, zertrat Jahwe es und zertrümmerte so die Stadt".[173]

Turning to 4QLam, the reading ויורידני, or possibly ויורידנו,[174] is clearly a Hiphil form of the root ירד. If the final letter of the verb is read as a *yod*, rather than a *waw*, it agrees precisely with ܐܰܚܬܳܐ in the Syriac translation,

---

166 L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958): 203. See also the discussion of Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 17–18.

167 M.J. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963), 4.

168 McDaniel, who is in agreement with Dahood's solution, notes that his translation leaves the conjunction untranslated, because the *waw* with a verb in the final position of a colon is pleonastic. Cf. McDaniel, "Philological Studies," 205–206.

169 Albrektson, *Studies*, 72.

170 Driver, "Hebrew Notes," 137.

171 House, *Lamentations*, 335.

172 Provan, Lamentations, 49.

173 Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 31.

174 Cf. Cross, "4QLam," 236; idem, "Studies," 145.

the Aphel form of the root ܢܚܐ plus a first-person singular suffix. The similarity between the readings in 4QLam and P can be explained either by polygenesis or by a positing that there existed a correspondence between the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Syriac translation and the text transmitted by the Lamentations manuscript from cave 4. On the first hypothesis, both the scribe who copied 4QLam (or a predecessor) and the Syriac translator changed the third-person feminine suffix of an earlier reading (possibly יורדנה) into a first-person and interpreted the consonants as a Hiphil form of ירד. According to the second explanation, the *Vorlage* of P agreed, at least in individual readings, with the text preserved in 4QLam.[175] Nevertheless, there exists a marked difference between the Syriac translation and 4QLam, since the wording of the latter leaves little room for doubt that the narrator is the speaker in these verses and, therefore, that the suffix of ויורידני refers to him, as does the first-person suffixes appended to other words in v. 13, namely בעצומתי, לרגלי, חשיבני and נתנני. Conversely, personified Jerusalem is the speaker in the text of the Syriac translation (as well as in the MT).[176] If the verb in 4QLam is read as ויורידנו, אש should probably be taken as the antecedent of its third-person masculine singular suffix. A burning text-critical question, which arises in light of the difference between the forms of the verbs in 4QLam and the MT, concerns the way in which the former came into being and how it relates to the latter. In this regard, it seems reasonable to assume that neither reading directly developed from the other but that both derived from an earlier reading. יורדנה, the form of the verb that supposedly underlies the Greek equivalent κατήγαγεν αὐτό,[177] presents itself as a suitable candidate for the earlier reading. On this hypothesis, וירדנה in the MT can be attributed to a metathesis of *waw* and *yod*.[178] The latter was subsequently interpreted as a form of the root רדה. The reading in 4QLam could have developed in two different ways from the earlier reading יורדנה. On the

---

[175] See Weitzman's discussion of parallel readings in P and Hebrew texts outside the Masoretic tradition. Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 55–57.

[176] The web of agreements and disagreements between the wordings of v. 13 in 4QLam, the MT and P seems to bolster the view that the wording of P's Hebrew *Vorlage* was, ostensibly, not identical to the consonantal base of the MT. The former agrees, at least in individual readings, with 4QLam, which, according to Tov's categorization (*Scribal Practices*, 335), does not represent the same text as the Masoretic tradition.

[177] Cross suggests that the Greek reading bears witness to the forms יורידנה or יורידנו, while the critical apparatus of BHS proposes that הרידה might underlie κατήγαγεν αὐτό. Interestingly, Westermann (*Lamentations*, 113) and Kaiser (*Klagelieder*, 309) prefer to emend the text of the MT to read הרידה.

[178] Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 246–247; Würthwein, *Text*, 108; and McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 47.

one hand, the scribe might have changed the third-person feminine singular suffix of יורדנה into a first-person singular or third-person masculine singular suffix, depending on whether one reads the verb in the fragment from cave 4 as ויורידני or as ויורידנו. Afterwards, the scribe added a conjunction to the *yiqtol* verb. On the other hand, the conjunction *waw* could have been the result of a dittography of the letter *yod*, which was later interpreted as a conjunction by another scribe due to the graphic similarity between these letters in the script in which 4QLam was copied. This same scribe, or maybe a successor, then proceeded to emend the suffix and add the *yod* between the *daleth* and the *resh* so as to make the Hiphil stem formation of the verb evident. In whichever way the creation of the readings in 4QLam and the MT is understood, it should be noticed that both Hebrew texts yield sufficient sense, despite the difficulties of the MT, and that there are striking differences between them. Whereas Kraus's interpretation of the MT is quite convincing, 4QLam either states that YHWH sent fire and brought it down into the bones of the narrator, or that YHWH sent fire into the narrator's bones and felled him.

הֱשִׁיבַנִי—חשיבנ֯י

The exact form of the word in 4QLam is difficult to make out because of the damage to the part of the manuscript on which it was written. A close look at the form of the first letter leads to the conclusion that it is a *ḥeth*, rather than the expected *he*. A lapse of concentration on the part of the scribe who copied 4QLam can explain the reading in this manuscript. The interchange of a *he* and *ḥeth* is a common scribal error, due to the graphical and phonetic similarity between these two letters in the script in which 4QLam was copied.[179]

דָּוָה—ד[ו]י; שֹׁמֵמָה—שומם

שממה and דוה in the MT are both feminine forms, while the variants in 4QLam are masculine. This is consistent with the trend in the wording of the fragment from cave 4 to portray the first-person speaker as the narrator, instead of personified Jerusalem. In the discussion of v. 7, it was argued that this might very well be a deliberate change in perspective introduced by a scribe. From this point of view, the modification of the gender of שומם and ד[ו]י in v. 13 was also intentional. Compared to its counterpart in the MT, the

---

179 Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 245, 251; Würthwein, *Text*, 108; McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 46.

conjunction *waw* with ד[ו]י constitutes a plus. The addition of a conjunction might represent an attempt on the part of a scribe to facilitate the syntax by linking the adjective דוי more closely to the clause נתנני שומם. In the closing bicolon of Lam 1:13 in the MT, the devastated city bemoans the fact that YHWH has made her uninhabited and ill all day long, while in 4QLam the narrator claims that YHWH has left him deserted and faint all through the day.[180]

Verse 14

4QLam

נקשרה על פשעי בידו וישתרג עולו על צ[ואר]
הכשיל כוחי נתנני יהוה ביד לוא אוכל לקום

It is bound about my steps by his hand/We are bound up by his hand on account of my transgressions/we are bound up to my transgressions by his hand and He fastened his yoke onto my n[eck]. He made my strength to fail. YHWH gave me into the hand of him whom I am not able to withstand/YHWH delivered me up; I am unable to stand.

MT

נִשְׂקַד עֹל פְּשָׁעַי בְּיָדוֹ יִשְׂתָּרְגוּ עָלָיו עַל־צַוָּארִי הִכְשִׁיל כֹּחִי נְתָנַנִי אֲדֹנָי בִּידֵי לֹא־אוּכַל קוּם׃

He bound (?) the yoke of my transgressions by his hand; they were fastened, they went up onto my neck. He made my strength to fail. Adonai gave me into the hands of those whom I was unable to withstand.

A cursory glance at the text preserved in 4QLam reveals a number of variant readings compared to the MT. The fragment from cave 4 reads נקשרה ("she/it is bound up"), a preposition על,[181] וישתרג ("and he fastened together") and

---

180 Dobbs-Allsopp and Linafelt suggest that שממה in the MT carries overtones of rape. They make the case that imagery of the (metaphorical) rape of the (personified) Daughter of Zion can also be found in Lam 1:8 (in the reference to the exposed nakedness of the city), Lam 1:10 (where it is said that a foe stretched out his hand over all the city's "precious things" and nations "entered" her "sanctuary") and Lam 1:12 (where the root עלל is used to convey YHWH's cruel treatment of the city). They note that throughout the book "Yhwh is depicted as exercising raw power over Judah and its environs and inhabitants. When this brutal power manifests itself in violence and is channeled against the figure of a defenseless woman the issue of rape arises". Cf. F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp and T. Linafelt, "The Rape of Zion in Thr 1, 10," *ZAW* 113/1 (2001): 80. Although this is a thought-provoking interpretation of the MT version of v. 13, it is probably not as applicable to the version transmitted by 4QLam, because the speaker here is not the female figure of personified Jerusalem, but the narrator.

181 Cross ("4QLam," 236) avers that the verb נקשרה in 4QLam imposes the vocalization עַל in accordance with the MT. This statement is not convincing, since a full orthography

עולו ("his yoke"), whereas the MT has נִשְׂקַד ("he bound"), עֹל ("yoke"), יִשְׂתָּרְגוּ ("they are fastened together") and עָלוּ ("they went up") respectively. Moreover, 4QLam has the *Tetragrammaton*, where the MT reads אֲדֹנָי. The counterpart of בִּידֵי in the Qumran fragment does not have the plural status construct form and it shows a plus of the preposition ל at the final word of the verse, the infinitive לקום.

נִשְׂקַד עֹל פִּשָׁעַי בְּיָדוֹ—נקשרה על פשעי בידו

The opening clause in the MT constitutes a *crux interpretum*. נִשְׂקַד, the Niphal *qatal* third-person masculine singular form of a root שׂקד, is a *hapax legomenon*. The meaning "to bind" is derived from the immediate context. A variant reading, נִשְׁקַד (with *shin* instead of *sin*), is found in twenty-seven MT manuscripts. It is an otherwise unattested Niphal form of the root שׁקד ("to be wakeful"/"to watch").[182] The initial clauses in the LXX (ἐγρηγορήθη ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσεβήματά μου), P (ܐܬܬܩܦ ܥܠ ܥܘܠ ܚܛܝܗܬܢ) and V (*vigilavit iugum iniquitatum mearum*) seem to be based on this reading. Evidently, the Greek and Syriac translators read the consonants על as the preposition עַל, while Jerome interpreted it as the noun עֹל ("yoke"). Berges and Gottlieb voice a preference for the Hebrew reading reconstructed from the Greek text as a substitution for the puzzling נִשְׂקַד עֹל of the MT.[183] Other scholars have recourse to conjectural emendations. With reference to 1 Kgs 12:4 and its parallel in 2 Chr 10:4, Praetorius emends the text of the MT to read נִקְשָׁה עֹל פִּשָׁעַי, "The yoke of my sin has been made heavy".[184] On this interpretation, the MT presupposes a corruption of *he* into *daleth*, as well as a change of נקשד into נשקד, since a root קשד is unknown.[185] According to Praetorius, the verb אתיקר ("it was heavy") in the two recensions of T either presents a "ratende Uebersetzung" of the corrupt verb נִשְׂקַד in the MT, or indicates that its Hebrew *Vorlage* read נִקְשָׁה, in which case the Aramaic translation preserves the earliest reading of the first clause of v. 14.[186] Rudolph[187] combines the readings in T with that

---

is used to write "his yoke" (עולו) in the same line as נקשרה על. I therefore agree with Schäfer ("Lamentations," 118*) that על almost certainly means the preposition עַל.

182 BDB 1052; KBL 1006.

183 Berges, *Klagelieder*, 89; Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 18.

184 Praetorius, "Threni I," 143–144.

185 This suggestion of Praetorius meets with the approval of Kraus (*Klagelieder* [*Threni*], 23), while Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 22) appears to arrive at the same emendation independently from Praetorius.

186 Cf. Praetorius, "Threni I," 143–144.

187 Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 207.

in P[188] in order to correct the MT. He suggests that the original text had the form נִקְשׁוּ עָלַי פִּשָׁעַי, "schwer lasten auf mir meine Sünden". Although Hillers also emends the text, he takes the consonantal base of the MT as his point of departure and goes on to vocalize the consonants differently from how the Masoretes did it.[189] First, Hillers prefers the reading נִשְׁקַד עַל in favour of the MT's נִשְׁקַד עַל. Secondly, he does not read פשעי as פִּשָׁעַי ("my sins"), but rather as פְּשָׁעַי ("my steps"), since, in his opinion, the former does not fit as the subject of the verb יְשׁוּתָרְגוּ in the next clause. Lastly, he marshals support from the Syriac word ܫܬܪܓ ("to fabricate"/"to weave"/"to entangle"), which is used of a path,[190] to interpret the expression בְּיָדוֹ יְשׁוּתָרְגוּ. According to this interpretation of the text YHWH kept watch over his people's steps, only in order to trip them up.[191]

In spite of the difficulties in the MT, House, Renkema and Albrektson retain it as the *lectio difficilior* and, therefore, as the most original wording of Lam 1:14.[192] On the one hand, Albrektson regards the ancient translations as attempts to make sense of a word that was no longer understood, while, on the other hand, he objects to proposals for the emendation of the *hapax legomenon* נִשְׁקַד. He also refers favourably to the view of Ewald that the root שׁקד might be a *terminus technicus* for putting on a yoke.[193] This not only alleviates the need to change עַל into the preposition עֲלֵ, but also fosters a link with the following clauses.

With regard to the reading נקשרה in 4QLam, Cross asserts that it, in part, justifies the emendation of Ehrlich, who suggested that the original text of v. 14 read נִקְשְׁרוּ.[194] Cross considers both the readings in the Masoretic manuscripts (נִשְׁקַד and נִשְׁקַד) to be corrupt and claims that they developed from the better reading נקשר through metathesis of *qoph* and *shin*/*sin* and through confusion of *resh* and *daleth*.[195] On this interpretation of the

---

188 The Syriac translation distinguishes itself from the other ancient versions by taking ܫܠܚܘ, the equivalent of פשעי, as the subject of the verb ܐܬܚܕܪܘ: "My sins were stirred up against me". In the critical apparatus to BHK, it is suggested that the plural form נִשְׁקְדוּ might underlie the reading in P.

189 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 73.

190 Payne Smith gives the example of ܐܪܚܐ ܕܟܝܐ ܕܡܬܬܪܓ ܒܟܫܠܐ ("A road beset/entangled with stumbling blocks"). J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902), 389.

191 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 90.

192 House, *Lamentations*, 335; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 116; Albrektson, *Studies*, 73–74.

193 H. Ewald, *Die Psalmen und die Klagelieder erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1881), 108.

194 Cross, "4QLam," 236. Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 33.

195 Cross, "4QLam," 236. Salters (*Lamentations*, 79) agrees with Cross's interpretation.

evidence, 4QLam resembles the proposed original reading more closely than the MT does. Schäfer,[196] however, argues in favour of the exact opposite position, namely that נקשרה represents a corruption from נִשְׂקַד through metathesis of *sin* and *qoph*, which afterwards led to a confusion of *daleth* and *resh*. Hobbins, who takes נִקְשָׁה עַל as the original reading, proposes that נקשרה על in 4QLam developed from this earlier reading through an assimilation with the semantics of the next clause.[197] Even though these hypotheses identify plausible candidates for the more original text, they do not explain the presence of the final *he* in the form נקשרה. The verb appears to be a Niphal *qatal* third-person feminine singular of the root קשר ("to be bound up").[198] The form demands a feminine subject. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich render נקשרה על פשעי בידו as "it was bound about my transgressions by his hand" and leave the subject of the verb undetermined.[199] Cross[200] suggests that it is the speaker: "Bound am I", but this explanation flies in the face of the tendency in 4QLam to equate the speaker of these verses with the masculine narrator. One solution to the problem would be to follow Hillers's suggestion of reading פשעי as "my steps" and to take the feminine noun רשת in the previous verse as the subject of the opening verb of v. 14. The narrator would then state that the net was bound about his steps by the hand of YHWH. This statement would parallel the one in v. 13 concerning the net that YHWH sprung for his feet. It is also possible to read נקשרה as a first-person plural *yiqtol* with a *he*-afformative. Qimron indicates that this form of the first-person *yiqtol*, which looks like a cohortative, is found sixty-six times in the Dead Sea scrolls.[201] In this case, the *yiqtol* expresses an action in the present and its subject would be the narrator and his community, while פשעי would best be read as "my transgression(s)". The preposition על can be interpreted as indicating either the joining of two entities ("we are bound to my transgression[s] by his hand") or cause ("we are bound up by his hand on account of my transgression[s]"). It follows from these interpretative possibilities that the reading in 4QLam did not necessarily result from a corruption of an earlier reading, but might reflect a deliberate change brought about by a scribe so as to convey his understanding of the text.

---

196 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 118*.
197 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 21.
198 BDB 905; KBL 860.
199 Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625.
200 Cross, "4QLam," 236.
201 Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 44.

יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ עָלוֹ—וישתרג עולו

The Hithpael *wayyiqtol* verb וישתרג in 4QLam not only has an added conjunction *waw* that is lacking in the MT, it is also singular, while its counterpart in the MT, ישתרגו, is plural. Cross argues that the structure of the bicolon requires that the original text had the form ישתרג עולו.[202] In his opinion, the added conjunction of וישתרג in 4QLam can be attributed to a wrong division of the colon, while the plural form of the verb in the MT was the result of attraction to פשעי read as a plural noun.[203] The claim that a wrong division of the colon explains the added conjunction in וישתרג is not convincing. A comparison between Cross's reconstructed text, divided into cola,[204] and the colometric arrangement of the MT in BHS and BHK[205] shows that his explanation of the reading in 4QLam is rooted in a predetermined preference for the lineation in the critical editions. According to the Masoretic accents, however, the wording in the MT from נִשְׁקַד to כֹּחִי falls into three cola. The main unit divider is the *ʾathnâḥ* with כֹּחִי. The next major disjunctive accent is the *ṭiphḥā* with עַל־צַוָּארִי. Yeivin indicates that in those cases where a main division within the *ṭiphḥā* unit is on the third word or further before the *ṭiphḥā*, it is always marked by *rᵉbhîaʿ* with a *tᵉbhîr* between it and the *ṭiphḥā*.[206] In the present verse, the *tᵉbhîr* is with יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ and the *rᵉbhîaʿ* with בְּיָדוֹ. The division of the sense unit is, therefore, after בְּיָדוֹ and before יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ. The corresponding text in 4QLam also consists of three sense units. עולו serves as the direct object of וישתרג with the prepositional phrase על צ[וארי] as an adjunct. YHWH is the implied subject of this verb. Its conjunction distinguishes the clause וישתרג עולו על צ[וארי] from the previous

---

202 Cross, "4QLam," 236. Cf. also Salters, *Lamentations*, 79. The reading of עלו as "his yoke" and, therefore, as the object of the preceding verb, is not only found in 4QLam, but also in the Lucianic version (ἐβάρυνε[ν] τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ). In the Syriac translation of P (ܡܬܚܒܫ ,ܥܠ ܥܡܗ ,ܒܝܕܘܗܝ ,ܐܬܪܘ ܥܠ ܥܡܗ) the equivalent of עלו has been interpreted as a plural noun and construed not as the object, but as the subject of the verb: "And by his hands his yokes were bound to my neck". Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 22) and Hillers (*Lamentations*, 74) propose that the original text of the verse might have read עלה עלו על ("his yoke has gone up on"), while Rudolph (*Klagelieder*, 207) suggests an interpolation of עַל between עָלוֹ and עַל. These scholars attribute the loss of the words that they add in their emendations to haplography.

203 The word עלו was also taken to be a verb and vocalized as a Qal *qatal* third-person plural of the verbal root עלה ("they went up"). Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 22) thinks that this reading in the MT represents an assimilation with the preceding יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ. Be that as it may, פִּשְׁעַי forms the subject of both יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ and עָלוֹ in the MT.

204 נקשר על פשעי / בידו ישתרג / עלו על צוארי / הכשיל כוחי. Cross, "Studies," 145.

205 נִשְׁקַד עֹל פִּשְׁעַי / בְּיָדוֹ יִשְׁתָּרְגוּ / עָלוּ עַל־צַוָּארִי / הִכְשִׁיל כֹּחִי. This is also the arrangement found in BHQ.

206 Yeivin, *Introduction*, 191–192.

one, נקשרה על פשעי בידו. In the latter, the prepositional phrase בידו forms an adjunct with the verb נקשרה. הכשיל כוחי forms an independent clause, but like וישתרג it has YHWH as its implied subject. The division of the sense units in the cave 4 manuscript therefore agrees with the colometric arrangement of the MT based on the Masoretic accents, notwithstanding the differences in syntax between the two Hebrew texts. The conjunction of וישתרג in 4QLam could be a deliberate addition, or it might have come into being through dittography of the *waw* of בידו (perhaps facilitated by the similar form of the *yod* of ישתרג and the *waw*) in a copy of the text where the consonants were crowded.

The clauses in the MT convey the metaphor of a yoke constructed from the transgressions of the speaker, personified Jerusalem. The yoke is placed on her neck and, in so doing, the yoke, or YHWH (depending on who the subject of the verb הכשיל is), causes her strength to fail. Conversely, the wording of 4QLam allows for two interpretations of these clauses in Lam 1:14. If נקשרה is taken as a Niphal *qatal* third-person feminine form with רשת as its subject, the narrator says that YHWH tied a net to his steps and fastened a yoke onto his neck. YHWH thereby causes the narrator's weakened state. Alternatively, נקשרה can be read as a first-person plural *yiqtol*. On this reading, the narrator either declares that he and his community are ensnared by the hand of YHWH because of his transgressions, or that he and his community are bound up with his transgressions by YHWH.

נְתָנַנִי אֲדֹנָי בִּידֵי לֹא־אוּכַל קוּם—נתנני יהוה ביד לוא אוכל לקום

In this last clause of v. 14, both Hebrew texts state that the deity delivered the speaker up to the enemy. While the MT transmitted by Codex Leningradensis refers to God with the designation "Adonai", 4QLam and other Masoretic manuscripts use the *Tetragrammaton*.[207] On the one hand, the critical apparatus of BHS instructs the reader to replace אדני with יהוה and, in this manner, convey a preference for the proper name of God as the earlier reading. On the other hand, Renkema identifies אדני as the more difficult reading and argues that it was adapted to יהוה in the manuscripts.[208] His structural

---

[207] In the MT of Lamentations, as represented by Codex Leningradensis, אדני appears fourteen times (1:14, 1:15 (2×), 2:1, 2:2, 2:5, 2:7, 2:18, 2:19, 2:20, 3:31, 3:36, 3:37 and 3:58) and יהוה thirty two times (1:5, 1:9, 1:11, 1:12, 1:17, 1:18, 1:20, 2:6, 2:7, 2:8, 2:9, 2:17, 2:20, 2:22, 3:18, 3:22, 3:24, 3:25, 3:26, 3:40, 3:50, 3:55, 3:59, 3:61, 3:64, 3:66, 4:11, 4:16, 4:20, 5:1, 5:19, 5:21).

[208] Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 21) also opts for אדני in his reconstruction of the original text without justifying his choice.

analysis shows that only one divine name is used per canticle.[209] In the first lament, אדני occurs in the sixth canticle (Lam 1:14–16). Moreover, according to Renkema, the passages in which this divine name is employed also differ in content to those where יהוה appears. The *Tetragrammaton* is predominantly mentioned in contexts of prayer and utterances of trust. On occasion it is said that יהוה oppresses or executes judgement. Contrastingly, אדני is found in passages with harsh terminology: Adonai hands over (Lam 1:14), piles up the strong ones (Lam 1:15), treads Daughter Zion as in a winepress (Lam 1:15), engulfs with a cloud in his anger (Lam 2:1), swallows up without pity (Lam 2:2), becomes like an enemy (Lam 2:5) and rejects his altar (Lam 2:7). This divine name is used considerably fewer times in positive statements (Lam 3:31 and 3:58). Renkema concludes from this that God's dominion and might dominate those contexts where אדני appears and, therefore, that this divine name fits the immediate context of the canticle better than יהוה does.[210]

Hillers, however, argues that the variation between the divine names does not follow a specific pattern:

> There is no convincing explanation for it from the point of view of meaning, for in a given passage one seems about as appropriate as the other. Also metrically there is not apparent ground for preference of one over the other. Finally, one may note that there is considerable variation between the two in the manuscript tradition. It seems impossible to be sure that the usage was absolutely uniform even in the original form of the book, even though it is likely that to some extent *ʾᵃdōnāy* had replaced an original *yhwh*, especially since in later periods *ʾᵃdōnāy* was being pronounced in public reading wherever *yhwh* stood in the text.[211]

From a text-critical perspective, Hillers's argument seems more convincing than Renkema's, seeing as it takes into account how the wording of copies of the book might have been changed during its transmission. Nevertheless, it is debatable whether an indiscriminate substitution of אדני with יהוה throughout the whole of the book is justified in light of the inconsistency of usage reflected in the manuscript evidence. The matter therefore remains moot.

---

209 J. Renkema, "The Literary Structure of Lamentations (I–IV)," in *The Structured Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTSup 74; eds. W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 318–320.

210 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 119.

211 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 73. Cross ("4QLam," 236) shares the view that the direction of the change was presumably from יהוה to אדני, "since in late times יהוה was not read aloud, and often the manuscripts were dictated". Salters (*Lamentations*, 77) also thinks that the *Tetragrammaton* was probably original.

With regard to בידי לא אוכל קום in the MT, Ehrlich recommends that דוה should be read instead of בידי and that לא אוכל קום should be taken as a result clause: "der Herr hat mich krank gemacht, dass ich mich auf den Beinen nicht halten kann".[212] Renkema also alters the wording and proposes that the second *yod* of בידי should be changed into a *waw*. This *waw* is then attached to לא as a conjunction: נתנני אדני ביד ולא אוכל קום, "Adonai gaf mij prijs, en ik kan niet staande blijven".[213] Neither of these proposals has met with scholarly assent. The extant forms of the Hebrew witnesses can be interpreted in several ways. Most commentators agree that לא אוכל קום in the MT forms a relative clause that stands in a genitive relationship with the status construct בידי.[214] It is possible, *mutatis mutandis*, to read 4QLam in a similar way. In this manuscript, ביד is singular and the final infinitive construct לקום has an added preposition ל. The latter can be an assimilation with the more usual way of writing the infinitive, as suggested by Schäfer in the critical apparatus of BHQ,[215] or it can be explained as a dittography of *lamedh*: לוא אוכל לקום → לוא אוכלל קום. The idea might be that God gave the speaker over to the enemy in her/his weakened state and that she/he cannot withstand them/him. Then again, קום can be understood in its more literal sense of "to stand up"/"to arise". In the case of the MT, the power of the transgressions might be in view.[216] The weight of this burden resting on the personified Jerusalem's neck prevents her from getting up from the ground. If ביד is not read as a status construct, the expression נתנני יהוה ביד ("YHWH delivered me up") in 4QLam would form a parallelism with the next clause לוא אוכל לקום, which indicates that the speaker cannot hold his ground.

Verse 15

4QLam

סלה כול אבודי אדוֹניְ בְּקרבי קרא עלי מו[עד]
לשבור בחורי גת דרך יהוֹה לבתוֹלת בת יהודה

Adonai has scorned all my perished ones in my midst. He proclaimed an app[ointed time] against me in order to crush my chosen young men. YHWH has trodden the winepress for the Virgin Daughter of Judah.

---

212 Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 33.
213 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 118.
214 Cf. GKC § 130d.
215 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 57.
216 Cf. Provan, *Lamentations*, 51.

MT

סֶלָה כָּל־אַבִּירַי | אֲדֹנָי בְּקִרְבִּי קָרָא עָלַי מוֹעֵד לְשַׁבֵּר בַּחוּרָי גַּת דָּרַךְ אֲדֹנָי לִבְתוּלַת בַּת־יְהוּדָה׃

Adonai has rejected all my mighty men in my midst. He proclaimed an appointed time against me in order to crush my chosen young men. Adonai has trodden the winepress for the Virgin Daughter of Judah.

Verse 15 is well preserved in 4QLam, with the exception of the end of line 6 of Col. III. The damage to the leather is probably the work of worms.[217] Nevertheless, the *mem* and *waw* of [עד]מו can be deciphered. Differences between 4QLam and the MT include the variants אבודי and יהוֹה for אַבִּירַי and אֲדֹנָי respectively.

סֶלָה כָּל־אַבִּירַי—סלה כול אבודי

Cross reconstructs the counterpart of the MT's אבירי in the manuscript from cave 4 as אבידי. In his opinion, this reading merely represents an interchange of *resh* and *daleth*.[218] Schäfer shares this view.[219] The almost identical shape of the letters *yod* and *waw* in the Herodian script in which 4QLam was written also allows one to reconstruct the word in question as אבודי. This would presuppose not only confusion of *resh* and *daleth*, but of *yod* and *waw* as well. If the word in 4QLam is reconstructed as אבודי, it would have the same form as בחורי in the next clause, a noun in the *qatul* pattern with a first-person singular suffix ("my chosen young men"). This noun pattern resembles the Qal participle passive form of verbs and, in the case of אבודי, the verbal root is אבד ("to perish"/"to be ruined"/"to be destroyed").[220] אבודי might therefore have the meaning of "my perished ones". Conversely, אבירי in the MT is a *qattil* word with a first-person singular suffix ("my strong ones"/"my mighty men"). Theoretically speaking, both אבודי and אבירי are suitable candidates for the earlier reading,[221] since the one could just as easily have developed from the other through erroneous copying. Although the consonantal base of the MT should not by default be identified with the original text until proven otherwise, a number of considerations point to אבירי as the earlier reading. The first consideration in favour of the reading אבירי is that it is well-known in biblical and later forms of Hebrew, whereas

---

217 Cross, "4QLam," 234.

218 Ibid., 236.

219 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 57.

220 BDB 1; KBL 2; DCH I 98–99.

221 Ehrlich (*Randglossen*, 33), however, suggests that אבירי in the MT should be replaced with גִּבּוֹרַי.

the *qatul* form אבוד is otherwise unattested and the Qal participle passive of אבד is found only in the Masada scroll containing the Hebrew text of Ben Sira 41:2.[222] Secondly, the translation equivalents in the LXX, πάντας τοὺς ἰσχυρούς μου ("all my strong men"), P, حقّدد حلهه ("all my mighty men/warriors"), V, *omnes magnificos meos* ("all my great/esteemed ones") and T^{W} כל תקיפיי ("all my mighty ones")[223] seem to support the reading in the MT. These considerations give weight to the argument that אבירי is the earlier reading and that אבודי in 4QLam developed from it. Nevertheless, this conclusion does not undermine the fact that אבודי makes sense in the immediate context of v. 15 as it is presented in 4QLam. In order to substantiate this claim, a closer look is needed at the verb סלה and its respective direct objects in the two Hebrew witnesses.

The meaning of the Hebrew verb סלה is disputed. In the MT, it is vocalized as a Piel and many scholars relate the form to the root סלה I, which, in the Qal stem formation, has the meaning "to despise"/"to make light of"/"to consider worthless"/"to toss away".[224] In view of this, a similar sense is often ascribed to the rare Piel form in the MT of the present verse.[225] Nevertheless, the divergent renderings in the ancient translations, as well as the fact that some scholars resort to emendations, imply that the meaning of the verb in the present context remains uncertain.

The first clause of v. 15 in the LXX reads as follows: ἐξῆρε πάντας τοὺς ἰσχυρούς μου ὁ κύριος ἐκ μέσου μου ("The Lord removed all my strong men

---

[222] The relevant passage in the Hebrew text of Sir 41:2 in the Masada scroll reads as follows: תקוה אפס המרה ואבוד. The corresponding part of the verse in Manuscript B from the Cairo Genizah differs from the text in the Masada scroll: סרב ואבד תקוה. Cf. Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira*, 161; Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll From Masada: With Introduction, Emendations and Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1965), 17.

[223] Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 120) notes that this plural reading is found in Codex Urbinas I, manuscript 116-Z-39 in the library of the Universidad Complutense in Madrid and manuscripts 3218 and 3231 of the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma, Italy. Conversely, the corresponding noun in manuscript Héb. 110 of the Bibliotehèque Nationale in Paris is singular in number. The consonantal base of the reading in T^{Y} is כל תקיפי, but the vocalization of the suffix indicates that it is appended to a plural noun. Cf. van der Heide, *Yemenite Tradition*, 9*.

[224] BDB 699; KBL 658; DCH VI 159.

[225] E. Jenni (*Das hebräische Pi'el: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament* [Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1968], 226) ascribes a resultative meaning to סִלָּה in MT Lam 1:15. According to this interpretation, the Piel form of the verb expresses the end result of YHWH's decision to reject the mighty men. Cf. also House, *Lamentations*, 333; Provan, *Lamentations*, 51; Kaiser, *Klagelieder*, 309; Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 205; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 22. See, however, the evaluation of this line of interpretation by Salters, *Lamentations*, 81.

from my midst").[226] Similarly, Jerome rendered the opening sentence of Lam 1:15 in his Hebrew *Vorlage* as *abstulit omnes magnificos meos Dominus de medio mei* ("the Lord removed all my great/esteemed ones from my midst"). The translation equivalent of סלה in the LXX text is ἐξῆρε, the aorist indicative third-person singular of the verb ἐξαίρω ("to drive out"/"to remove") and *abstulit* in V (the perfect indicative third-person singular of *aufero*, "he took/carried away"). Apart from the likelihood that the V text exhibits Septuagintal influence here, both the Greek and the Latin equivalents might be renderings of סלה in the sense of "to toss away"/"to do away with" or of the root סלל in its meaning "to cast up"/"to lift up".[227] Conversely, the counterpart of סלה is חדא ("to tread down") in P and כבש ("to tread upon"/"to stamp out"/"to suppress") in the two recensions of T. The Syriac and Aramaic translations might derive from סלל not in the sense of "cast up/lift up", but in the sense of "trample down"/"tread"/"to beat a path".[228] Berlin is of the opinion that the image of trampling or stamping down found in P and T is also the intended one in the Hebrew text.[229] In her commentary on the MT, she relates סלה to סלל, which is often used as stamping down the ground around a city in preparation for raising an earthen ramp during a siege, and argues that this continues the military metaphors employed in Lam 1:13 (fire to burn the city and nets to entrap the soldiers) and Lam 1:14 (a yoke placed on the neck of the conquered, which symbolizes subjugation to the conqueror). This interpretation of סלה accords well with the verbs לשבר ("to crush") and דרך ("he has trodden") later in v. 15. The effect of such an interpretation is to make trampling and crushing the controlling images in the verse.[230] Hillers, however, draws

---

[226] The prepositional phrase ἐκ μέσου μου in the Greek text and its counterpart in V, *de medio mei*, may witness to a form מקרבי in their Hebrew *Vorlagen*. It is also possible that the translators mistook the *beth* of בקרבי for a *mem*. With regard to the LXX, Albrektson argues that the use of the preposition ἐκ is a consequence of the choice of ἐξῆρε as translation equivalent for סלה. Cf. Albrektson, *Studies*, 76.

[227] In this meaning, however, סלל is used as casting up a highway (Isa 62:10) or as lifting up a song (Ps 68:5). Cf. BDB 699; KBL 659; and DCH VI 162.

[228] Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 120.

[229] Berlin, *Lamentations*, 46–47.

[230] Ibid., 57–58. Images of trampling also dominate the text of the Syriac translation. ܚܕܐ in the first clause parallels the verb ܕܪܟ ("to trample"/"to tread under foot") in the clause ܕܪܟ ܠܡܥܨܪܬܐ ܒܬ ܝܗܘܕܐ ܠܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܠܡܥܨܪܐ ("The Lord trod the winepress for the Virgin Daughter of Judah"). It is noteworthy that the word לשבר ("to crush") is rendered by ܠܡܚܒܠ, the Aphel infinitive of ܐܒܕ ("to slay"/"to destroy"/"to do away with"). The image of crushing is therefore not reproduced in the P text of v. 15.

attention to the variant reading כנש ("to gather") in T^W.[231] This reading in the Western Aramaic recension lends support to his suggestion that סלה in the MT derives from a root סלי/סלה and is parallel to the root סלל in its meaning "to heap up", which is used in Jer 50:26 for piling up of sheaves of grain for threshing as an image of the punishment of Babylon. Hillers also mentions the possibility that סלה is a scribal error for a form of סלל.[232] The reading of סלה as "he heaped up" entails that harvest imagery is employed throughout v. 15 of Lam 1. The mighty men of Jerusalem were stacked like sheaves in the middle of the threshing floor. YHWH proclaimed a gruesome harvest festival so that the chosen young men can be "threshed". This is followed by the picture of Judah as a winepress, in which the warriors are trampled like grapes until their blood runs like wine. Renkema takes over Hillers's interpretation of סלה and claims that it is not only T that presents a similar understanding of the Hebrew text, but P as well.[233]

The readings in the Syriac and Aramaic versions are therefore broached in service of scholars' different interpretations of סלה in the MT, while the LXX and V might be based on a reading of the consonants סלה as a Qal form. Alternatively, the Greek and Latin equivalents might represent attempts to make sense of the form of the word in their *Vorlagen* by relating it to a particular meaning of the root סלל. Since the meaning of סלה is difficult to determine with any degree of certainty, a few scholars have in the past given in to the impulse to emend the text. Dyserinck replaces סְלָה in the MT with סְלֵף ("to pervert"/"to subvert"/"to ruin")[234] and מוֹעֵד with מוֹעָד ("appointed place"/"horde").[235] Accordingly, his translation reads: "Verdorven heeft de Heer al mijne sterken in mijn midden; Hij heeft tegen mij een leger opgeroepen".[236] Budde approves of the emendation of סְלָה into סְלֵף, but deems the change of מוֹעֵד to מוֹעָד unnecessary.[237] These proposals for emending the text of Lam 1:15 have not gained much support in recent scholarship.

In view of the difficulties surrounding סלה in the MT, the form of the opening verb of v. 15 in 4QLam is probably best interpreted as a Qal *qatal*

---

231 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 74. The variant is found in the wording of T^W included in Bomberg's Second Rabbinic Bible, as well as in one manuscript of T^Y. Cf. Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 120.

232 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 74.

233 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 119–120.

234 BDB 701; KBL 660; DCH VI 166.

235 BDB 418; DCH V 178.

236 Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 364.

237 Budde, "Klagelied," 267.

third-person singular form of the root סלה. In this interpretation, the narrator complains that Adonai treated all the perished ones in his community[238] with scorn. Moreover, he bemoans the fact that God proclaimed an appointed time against him when the chosen young men from his group were to be annihilated. This interpretation of the first two clauses of v. 15 in 4QLam agrees, to some extent, with the exposition of the MT by scholars who ascribe a meaning to the Piel form of סלה that is very similar to the meaning of the verb in the Qal stem formation. The disagreement between the interpretations is the result of the different speakers in the Hebrew texts and the different objects of the first verb. It follows from this that אבודי in 4QLam makes good sense in the opening clause of v. 15, although it might have come into being through the confusion of letters in the earlier reading אבירי.

אֲדֹנָי—יְהוָֹה

Both 4QLam and the MT have אדני in the first clause of v. 15. The change to the *Tetragrammaton* in the final clause of the manuscript from Qumran, where the MT again reads אדני, contributes to the variation between the two designations of the deity in the Hebrew manuscripts of Lamentations. As was noted in the discussion of the previous verse, the question as to which one of the divine designations constitutes the more original reading remains uncertain.

Verses 16 and 17

4QLam

פרשה // ציון בי[ ] מנחם לה מכול אוהביה
צדיק אתה יהוה צפה אדוני ליעקוב סביב[יו]
היתה ציון לנדוח בניהמה על אלה בכו עיני ירדה
דמעתי כיא רחק[ ] מ[ ]נפש היו בני
שוממים[ ]גבר אויב

Zion spread out [ ] comforter for her from amongst all her lovers. You are righteous O YHWH! Adonai lies in ambush for Jacob. [His] neighbours [ ]. Zion has been banished amongst them (?). Over these things my eyes cry. My tears run down because [ ] is far, [ ] life. My sons have become desolate, [ ] an enemy has prevailed.

---

238 Seeing as the speaker in 4QLam is the narrator and not personified Jerusalem, בקרבי refers to the midst of a human group. In view of the first-person suffixes of אבודי, בקרבי, עלי and בחורי, it appears as though the narrator acts as the representative and spokesperson of his group or community.

MT

עַל־אֵלֶּה | אֲנִי בוֹכִיָּה עֵינִי | עֵינִי יֹרְדָה מַּיִם כִּי־רָחַק מְמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם מֵשִׁיב נַפְשִׁי הָיוּ בָנַי שׁוֹמֵמִים כִּי
גָבַר אוֹיֵב: פֵּרְשָׂה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ צִוָּה יְהוָה לְיַעֲקֹב סְבִיבָיו צָרָיו הָיְתָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנִדָּה
בֵּינֵיהֶם:

Over these things I weep. My eyes, my eyes run with water, because a comforter, one who revives my life, is far from me. My sons have become desolate, because an enemy has prevailed. Zion spread out her hands.[239] There is no comforter for her. YHWH commanded concerning Jacob (that) his neighbours (be) his enemies.[240] Jerusalem has become a "menstruating woman" amongst them.

Cross notes that after פרשה, there appears to be an erasure (indicated by the sign //) and that the end of line 7 of Col. III has suffered severe damage.[241] In addition to the several textual variants preserved by 4QLam in comparison to the MT, the fragment from Qumran exhibits a reversed order in the acrostic sequence of the verses. In contrast to the MT, the verse beginning with *pe* precedes the one beginning with *ʿayin* in 4QLam. The two verses are therefore discussed together in the following text-critical analysis.

Different Acrostic Sequences: pe/ʿayin (*4QLam*)—ʿayin/pe (*MT*)

The unusual alphabetic order in 4QLam is also found in chs. 2, 3 and 4 of the MT. In his reconstruction of the original text of Lam 1, Hobbins expresses a preference for the *pe*/*ʿayin* arrangement of the verses in 4QLam,[242] while Salters and Berges regard this order as a harmonization to the sequence found in Lam 2, 3 and 4.[243] Schäfer, Cross and Hillers are of the opinion that the question concerning the original order is a moot issue that cannot be settled satisfactorily.[244] The different arrangement of the verses does,

---

[239] According to Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 24), פֵּרְשָׂה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ in the MT is corrupt. He reconstructs the original wording of the phrase as פָּרְמָה צִיּוֹן בַּדֶּיהָ ("Zion rent her linen vestments"). Hobbins argues that the changes of מָ into שָׂ and בַ into בְּיָ were facilitated by reminiscence of יָדוֹ פָּרַשׂ צָר in Lam 1:10 and the rarity of both the verb פרם and the noun בַּדִּים. On this reading, Zion is said to have rent her linen vestments in an act of grief.

[240] סביב is taken here as a noun. Cf. Rudolph, "Text," 104; and Westermann, *Lamentations*, 113. Hobbins ("Lamentations 1–5," 23–24) emends the text to read סבבו ("they gather around"). He argues that the syntax of the MT is awkward and that סביביו was the result of an orthographical error.

[241] Cross, "4QLam," 234.

[242] Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 24.

[243] Salters, *Lamentations*, 18; Berges, *Klagelieder*, 89–90.

[244] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 118*; Cross, "4QLam," 236–237; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 75. Cross ("Studies," 148) reaches this conclusion after weighing the theories of how the book of

however, have a marked influence on how the content of the verses is presented in the two Hebrew witnesses (see the discussion below).

מכול אוהביה צדיק אתה יהוה > *MT*

The plus in 4QLam consists of two elements. First, מכול אוהביה is conflated from v. 2 where the phrase אין מנחם לה, which is also found in the present verse, is followed by מכל אהביה (מְכול אוֹהביהָ in 4QLam). In all probability, the identical wording in the two verses triggered the addition. Schäfer suggests that the scribe might have added the phrase automatically, since he knew the text by heart.[245] The observation that there is no one to comfort the city of Jerusalem/Zion is repeated five times in the first chapter of Lamentations (1:2, 1:9, 1:16, 1:17, 1:21). It is an important recurring *Leitmotif* in the first lament of the book and contributes to the image of the miserable and abandoned city. In turn, this image forms part of the theme of Jerusalem's reversal of fortunes. The conflated passage in 4QLam evokes this contrast motif more clearly than the text of the MT does by mentioning Zion's erstwhile lovers who have forsaken her. Another link with v. 2 is fostered if the end of line 8 of Col. III in 4QLam is restored to read סביביו צריו in accordance with the consonantal base of the MT. The announcement that the neighbouring nations who surround "Jacob"[246] are his oppressors recalls the note in v. 2 that all of Jerusalem's friends have dealt treacherously with her and have become her enemies.

The second added element, צדיק אתה יהוה, might well be a variant of the beginning of v. 18 that was inserted into its present position in the wording preserved in 4QLam. Cross presumes that צדיק אתה יהוה was a marginal reading that infiltrated the body of the text.[247] Bearing in mind the creative

---

Lamentations was composed: "If one posits a single anonymous author for the book, he could well argue that the order of chapters 2–4 reflects the author's preference, and that Lamentations 1 has been secondarily conformed to the standard order. However, we are not sure that the laments come from a single hand. Again, if we assume that Lamentations is the collection of a systematic editor, we might argue that the *pe-ʿayin* order is original at least in the principal edition of the book. But we do not know that the putative editor was systematic; he may have included Lamentations 1 in his collection in the form it came to him, in which case it has been secondarily conformed to the order of Lamentations 2–4 in the textual tradition preserved in 4QLam (and so on)".

245 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 119*.

246 Concerning the use of the patriarchal name Jacob, House (*Lamentations*, 361) argues that Jerusalem, Zion and Jacob are to be considered as synonyms. "Jacob", like "Zion", is therefore another designation for Jerusalem.

247 Cross, "4QLam," 237.

license of scribes at the time when 4QLam was copied, however, the possibility that a scribe adapted the wording by adding the clause in question, be it the manuscript of 4QLam itself or an earlier copy, cannot be rejected out of hand. These two explanations are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although צדיק אתה יהוה does not constitute a double reading *per se*, the addition of this clause into the wording of the *pe* verse in 4QLam might have occurred in a way similar to the creation of double readings. Talmon[248] points out that scribes sometimes made note of corrective readings or variant readings in the margins of manuscripts or in the spaces between the lines of writing in a column. A double reading comes into being when a subsequent copyist transferred these marginal or interlinear readings into the wording of the text. In the case of the corrective readings, the inclusion of the marginal or interlinear reading into the body of the text by the second scribe runs counter to the intentions of the first scribe, but in the case of a variant reading, the second scribe does what the first scribe intended, namely to preserve the variant reading. Alternatively, a double reading was created when a scribe did not bother to note the variant reading in the margin or the interlinear space, but intentionally inserted the parallel reading into the wording of a text in order to preserve two readings which he considered to be of equal value. These two different ways in which double readings came about might help to shed light on the addition of the clause צדיק אתה יהוה in the wording of the verse of Lamentations under discussion. It is possible that the clause was written in the margin by one scribe as a theological annotation and later mistakenly incorporated into the wording of the text by a subsequent scribe, as Cross suggests. Another possibility is that a creative scribe deliberately inserted the clause directly into the wording of the verse as a theological comment on its opening sentence. A closer look at the impact of the clause on the content of the verse is needed before one can decide which one of these is the most plausible explanation. The second-person independent personal pronoun אתה implies that YHWH is being addressed. This is also the case in vv. 7 and 9 of 4QLam (provided, of course, that the lost wording in these verses are restored to agree with the consonantal base of the MT), as well as v. 11. In these verses, YHWH is implored to remember, see and take note of the pain, affliction and scorn of the narrator (and the community or group that he represents). In the present verse, however, the narrator interrupts his description of Zion's futile attempts at drawing

---

248 S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132.

someone's attention to her plight by admitting to YHWH, the author of the city's troubles, that he is in the right. Seeing as the narrator's account of Zion's plight continues after the added clause, the latter disrupts the train of thought of the verse. From this perspective, Cross's suggestion that צדיק אתה יהוה was probably a marginal note that a scribe erroneously inserted into the body of the text appears to be the most credible explanation of the plus.

צִוָּה יְהוָה לְיַעֲקֹב—צפה אדוני ליעקוב

After the interpolation of צדיק אתה יהוה, the text of 4QLam reverts back in the next clause to the designation אדוני for God. In contrast, the *Tetragrammaton* is used in the version of the text represented by the MT. This variation in the corresponding passages of the two Hebrew witnesses once more gives the impression of inconsistency in usage of the divine names in Lam 1. With regard to the reading in the MT, both Cross and Hobbins regard it as extremely awkward, if not impossible.[249] Renkema, however, argues that the use of יהוה in combination with the name of the patriarch Jacob is theologically significant, since it conveys the idea that it was the God of the fathers, the God of Jacob, who exerted his power over the neighbouring nations in order to bring "Jacob", that is Judah,[250] to a fall. The text of the MT does not attribute the oppressors' victory over "Jacob"/Judah to YHWH's powerlessness in the face of the gods of the other nations or to YHWH's wrath and, therefore, his absence from "Jacob"/Judah; rather YHWH demonstrated his dominion over the surrounding peoples by commanding them to cause "Jacob"/Judah's downfall.[251] In this interpretation provided by Renkema, the wording of the MT is not as awkward as Cross and Hobbins claim it to be. The majority of scholars also think that the version of the MT is acceptable. Hillers, for example, renders צוה יהוה ליעקב as "Yahweh gave command concerning Jacob". The following phrase, סביביו צריו, then provides the content of the command: "his enemies (should be) around him".[252]

Moreover, the ancient translations unanimously witness to the reading in the MT. They do not, however, corroborate scholars' interpretations of the Hebrew sentence. In the Greek translation, ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Ιακωβ, the

---

249 Cross, "4QLam," 237; Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 24.

250 Renkema (*Klaagliederen*, 127) states that Judah is here called "Jacob", because after the Assyrians took the people of the kingdom of Israel into exile in 722 BCE, Judah became the representative of the whole of Israel.

251 Ibid., 126–127.

252 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 75. See, also, the comments of Salters, *Lamenations*, 88–89.

counterpart of צוה יהוה ליעקב constitutes a clause and κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ οἱ θλίβοντες αὐτόν, the equivalent of סביביו צריו, forms another, syntactically independent clause. Οἱ θλίβοντες is nominative and serves as the subject of the nominal clause ("Those who oppress him are all around him"), while צריו in the MT is generally regarded as the object of the verb צוה. סביביו is rendered by the prepositional phrase κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ. The dative case of τῷ Ιακωβ can be understood as a dative of disadvantage (*dativus incommodi*) ("The Lord gave orders against Jacob"). V exhibits a similar interpretation of the prepositional phrase ליעקב with its rendering *mandavit Dominus adversum Iacob* ("the Lord commanded against Jacob"). The text of V also follows the Greek version in presenting סביביו צריו as a separate sentence: *in circuitu eius hostes eius*. Like οἱ θλίβοντες, *hostes* is nominative and thus the subject of the clause ("His enemies are in his circumference"). Jerome evidently treated סביביו as a noun and translated it with *in circuitu eius*, creating the impression that the enemies are at the border of Jacob's territory. The two clauses in P, ܚܕ ܚܢܐ ܕܥܡܗ ܚܠ ܡܚܡܕ and ,ܡܥܝܢܗ ,ܡܥܝܢܗ, are joined by a conjunction ܘ (a plus in comparison to the MT). The word ,ܡܥܝܢܗ with a *seyame* can be interpreted either as a preposition plus pronominal suffix ("round about/surrounding him"), or as a plural noun plus suffix ("his surrounding places"). In the case of the first interpretation, the Syriac translation would agree with the LXX, whereas the second interpretation would be in accordance with the reading of סביביו as "his neighbours". Albrektson is of the opinion that the former interpretation was probably the one intended by the Syriac translator.[253] He also notes that the vocalization of some manuscripts indicates that a number of scribes understood the word as a form of the verb ܥܝܢ with ,ܣܚܪܘܗܝ as the subject: "and his oppressors surrounded him".[254] The relevant passage in T^W reads as follows: "The Lord enjoined upon the House of Jacob the commandments and the law to keep, but they transgressed against the decree of Word of the Lord. Therefore the oppressors of Jacob encircle him round about".[255] T^Y is slightly different: "The Lord enjoined upon the House of Israel the commandments and the law, but they transgressed against his Word. Therefore the oppressors of the House of Israel encircle him round about".[256] Both versions of T support the MT against the reading in 4QLam, but like the Greek, Latin and Syriac translations, the texts of T reproduce the Hebrew sentence as two independent ones.

---

253 Albrektson, *Studies*, 78.
254 Ibid.
255 Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 122.
256 Ibid., 191.

Regardless of the evidence from the ancient translations and the judgment that the verb צוה in the MT represents the *lectio difficilior*, Cross prefers צפה in 4QLam as the more original reading.[257] Hobbins and Schäfer agree with this assessment of the textual witnesses.[258] According to this view, the original wording of the clause, as represented by 4QLam, states that Adonai "keeps watch" (with evil intent)[259] over Jacob, or that Adonai "lies in ambush" for Jacob. On the one hand, Cross and Hobbins put the difference between the readings in 4QLam and the MT down to a confusion of the letters *pe* and *waw* (צפה → צוה), as well as the possibility that a scribe accidentally wrote צוה instead of צפה in reminiscence of צויתה in v. 10. On the other hand, Schäfer is of the opinion that the change came about through a theological consideration, rather than through a phonological or graphical error. The change effected in the text of the MT might be the result of an attempt to tone down the anthropomorphism of the supposed earlier reading. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the image of God laying in ambush is also found in the third chapter of Lamentations. In Lam 3:10, the speaker compares his tormenter (who, as it turns out, is YHWH) with a bear laying in wait and a lion in hiding, ready to pounce on the speaker. Moreover, anthropomorphic representations of YHWH occur elsewhere in the writing. The image of YHWH spreading a net for the speaker's feet (Lam 1:13), Adonai trampling Virgin Daughter Judah as in a winepress (Lam 1:15), YHWH bending his bow like an enemy and setting the speaker up as a target for his arrow (Lam 2:4 and 3:12) immediately come to mind. It therefore seems doubtful that a scribe deliberately changed צפה to צוה so as to avoid a particular anthropomorphic depiction of God in Lam 1:17. As a result, the difficult reading in the MT might very well have come into being through a scribal error.

הָיְתָה יְרוּשָׁלַ֙ם לְנִדָּ֔ה בֵּינֵיהֶ֖ם—היתה ציון לנדוח בניהמה

After noting that YHWH commanded the nations surrounding "Jacob" to be his oppressors, the text of the MT goes on to declare that Jerusalem has become a נדה among them. Berlin rejects the explanations of נדה as "filthy

---

257 Cross, "Studies," 147.

258 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 24; Schäfer, "Lamentations," 119*. Salters (*Lamentations*, 86), however, prefers the reading in the MT.

259 The combination of צפה with the preposition ל in the sense of someone keeping watch with evil intent is also found in Ps 37:32: צוֹפֶ֣ה רָ֭שָׁע לַצַּדִּ֑יק ("The wicked watches the righteous").

thing"[260] or "menstrual rag"[261] and argues that the metaphor of Jerusalem as a woman is continued in this clause:

> Having sex with a *niddâ* [a menstruating woman] is listed among the prohibited sexual relationships, like incest, and these offences against moral purity cause the land to be defiled. Leviticus 18:19, "Do not approach a woman in her menstrual impurity," is what is behind our verse. Zion is seeking a comforter, but God made those around her—her allies who should comfort her—into enemies, so that she has no comforter. She had become like a *niddâ* among them, in that no one wanted to have relations with her. Judah's erstwhile "lovers" do not want to have "sexual" relations with her because she is in a state of "impurity".[262]

Perhaps the metaphor of a menstruating woman is used in the third bicolon of the verse in order to summarize Zion's isolation from potential comforters and the enmity of her "neighbours", which are mentioned in the first two bicola, by means of an image.[263]

With regard to בֵּינֵיהֶם, Westermann, Kraus, Kaiser and Rudolph accept Delitzsch's proposed emendation of the preposition plus pronominal suffix into בְּעֵינֵיהֶם ("in their eyes").[264] The critical apparatus of BHS also marks this

---

[260] Meek, "Lamentations," 14.

[261] O'Connor, *Lamentations*, 27.

[262] Berlin, *Lamentations*, 59.

[263] According to J. Milgrom (*Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991], 745), נדה "originally referred to the discharge or elimination of menstrual blood, which came to denote menstrual impurity and impurity in general. In addition, *niddâ* came to refer not just to the menstrual discharge but to the menstruant herself, for she too was 'discharged' and 'excluded' from her society not by being kept at arm's length from others but, in many communities, by being banished to and quarantined in separate quarters". See also the discussion of M. Malul, *Knowledge, Control and Sex. Studies in Biblical Thought, Culture and Worldview* (Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center, 2002), 381–390. Cf. also the renderings in the ancient translations. According to the LXX, Jerusalem became "one who sits apart" in the midst of the oppressors (ἐγενήθη Ιερουσαλημ εἰς ἀποκαθημένην ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν). Assan-Dhôte argues that the Greek word ἀποκαθημένην refers to the situation of a menstruating woman and shows that the translator related the form לנדה to the verb נדה. Cf. Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*. 210. Interestingly, V has *quasi polluta menstruis* for לנדה. *Menstruis* can be taken as an ablative of reference. Accordingly, Jerusalem is described as one "polluted" with reference to monthly cycles. It would appear as though Jerome also associated Jerusalem's "uncleanness" with the image of menstruation. P bluntly states that Jerusalem became an abomination among the oppressors (ܩܕܡ ܥܡܡܐ ܐܬܥܒܝܬ ܗܘܬ), while the two recensions of T compare the city to an unclean woman (הות ירושלם דמיא לאתתא מרחקא ביניהון).

[264] Cf. F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese-und Schreibfehler Im Alten Testament* (Berlin / Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1920), 23. Westermann, *Lamentations*, 113; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 22; Kaiser, *Klagelieder*, 310; Rudolph, "Text," 104.

change as a distinct probability. Nevertheless, this suggested emendation is not widely approved among other scholars.

The reading in 4QLam presents difficulties of its own. Apart from the interchange of ציון and ירושלם, which might be interpreted as an assimilation with ציון in the initial clause of the verse in 4QLam, the text of the fragment from Qumran also differs from the wording in the MT in that it reads לנדוח instead of לנדה. Both Cross and Schäfer ascribe the variant in the fragment from Qumran to a graphical error, namely the confusion of the letters *he* and *ḥeth*.[265] However, the presence of the *waw* in לנדוח remains largely unaccounted for. The critical apparatus of BHK mentions the reading לנידה in five Masoretic manuscripts assembled by Kennicott. In view of the similar shape of the *yod* and *waw* in the Herodian script in which 4QLam was written, it is possible that the copy of the text of Lamentations from which 4QLam was made contained the form לנידה. On this hypothesis, לנדוח in 4QLam can be explained as a misreading and erroneous copying of לנידה by the scribe who was responsible for 4QLam. Through a confusion of the almost identical letters, the *he* of לנידה was copied as a *ḥeth*, the *yod* as a *waw* and this *waw* switched places with the *daleth* through metathesis (לנידה → לנידח → לנודח → לנדוח). Some of these scribal errors could also have occurred in earlier stages of the copying process. The scribe of 4QLam might already have found the reading לנדוח in the text that he copied and faithfully reproduced it in the manuscript that he was writing.[266] Thus, the reading preserved in 4QLam seems to have developed from the one in the Masoretic manuscripts. This means that לנדה, or its orthographical variant לנידה, represents the earlier of the two readings. From the perspective of content, it does not necessarily follow from this that the reading in 4QLam is inferior to the one in the MT. The form לנדוח can be interpreted as a Qal passive participle of the verbal root נדח ("to banish"/"to thrust away")[267] with

---

265 Cross, "4QLam," 237; Schäfer, "Lamentations," 58.

266 Cf., however, Ilan's reconstruction of the reading as לנדות בניהמה with the meaning "sending away of their sons". She also proposes that this reading represents a deliberate change in 4QLam. See Ilan, "Gender," 9. I am hesitant to accept this proposal for the following reasons: First, Ilan does not indicate in this article how the sentence structure of her version of 4QLam's wording should be understood. It is therefore not clear how לנדות (presumably the preposition ל plus Piel infinitive construct of נדה) would relate syntactically (and semantically) with היתה ציון. Secondly, concerning בניהמה, it is also not clear whose sons are being sent away. Finally, even though the letters *ḥeth* and *taw* look similar in 4QLam, they can be distinguished from one another. The shape of the final letter of לנדוח, especially the horizontal stroke, resembles the *ḥeth* of מנחם (the first word in Col. III line 8) more than it does the *taw* of היתה (the first word of Col. III line 9).

267 Cf. BDB 623.

the preposition ל, which links up with היתה in the present clause.[268] The subject of היתה, Zion, might refer metonymically to the inhabitants of the city. Although בניהמה might be interpreted as "their sons" (the noun בן plus the longer form of the third-person masculine plural pronominal suffix), it can also be read as a form of the preposition בין ("between"/ "among"). Waltke and O'Connor indicate that the shorter form of the preposition is rare but not unprecedented.[269] Such an interpretation of the wording of the clause is reflected in the translation of 4QLam prepared by Abegg, Flint and Ulrich: "Zion has been banished among them".[270] Accordingly, the text of 4QLam states that Zion stretched out her hands, presumably in supplication. This gesture of petition for help is in vain, because there is not one of her former lovers who comforts her. After acknowledging to the one responsible for Zion's plight, YHWH, that he is righteous, the narrator continues his description of Zion's lamentable situation. Adonai lies in ambush for her and the neighbours of the city, now referred to with the name Jacob, are identified as her oppressors. Moreover, Zion (or her inhabitants) has been banished among these oppressors. The image of a menstruating woman as a metaphor for the city in the MT is, therefore, absent from the text of 4QLam.

אֲנִי בוֹכִיָּה עֵינִי עֵינִי יֹרְדָה מַיִם—בכוֹ עיני ירדה דמעתי

The different wordings of the sentences in 4QLam and the MT result in syntactical differences between the two Hebrew witnesses. The word עיני appears only once in 4QLam and is a dual form of the noun עין plus a first-person singular suffix. It acts as the subject of the plural verb בכו. Conversely, in the MT, the independent personal pronoun אני, which is lacking in 4QLam, is the subject of the feminine singular participle בוכיה. In view of the gender of the participle, אני almost certainly refers to personified Jerusalem. The singular noun עיני is written twice in the MT and serves as the subject of the feminine singular participle ירדה with מים as the object of the verb. In the text of the fragment from Qumran, the variant דמעתי is the subject of ירדה.

Some scholars defend the wording of the MT as it appears in Codex Leningradensis, while others regard it as corrupt. A few medieval Masoretic

---

[268] Morphologically speaking, לנדוח can also be seen as a *plene* spelling of the Qal infinitive construct of נדח.

[269] Cf. IBHS § 11.2.6b.

[270] Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625.

manuscripts depart slightly from the form preserved in Codex Leningradensis and the ancient translations are also divided in their support of the reading found in this manuscript. Any attempt to explain how the readings in 4QLam and the text of Codex Leningradensis came into being should, therefore, take into consideration the emendations proposed by text-critics, as well as the readings in the other extant textual representatives.

The critical apparatus of BHS draws attention to the absence of the second עיני in the wording of Codex Leningradensis from a few other medieval Masoretic manuscripts, the LXX, P and V. Indeed, the Greek and Latin texts respectively have ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου κατήγαγεν ὕδωρ ("My eye brought down water") and *et oculus meus deducens aquam* ("And my eye brings down water"). Evidence form the Syrohexapla suggests that the Hexaplaric version contained a second ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου under an asterisk and that σ′ rendered the repeated עיני with the adverb ἀδιαλείπτως ("incessantly").[271] To judge from the critical apparatus of Ziegler's edition of LXX Lamentations, four Greek minuscules, dating between the tenth and twelfth centuries CE, exhibit the reading οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου.[272] The relevant passage in the Syriac translation reads ܡܚܠܝ ܥܝܢܝ ("And my eyes shed forth water").[273] Although οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου in the Greek manuscripts and ܥܝܢܝ in P agree with the plural form of עיני in 4QLam, the Greek manuscripts and the Syriac translation adopt the sentence structure of the MT and not the syntax of the text preserved in the fragment from Qumran. The phrase ותרתין עיני ("my two eyes") in the two recensions of T seems to confirm the reading in the MT (as represented by Codex Leningradensis). Schäfer[274] contends that the LXX and V were either based on *Vorlagen* in which the second עיני was lost through haplography, or that these two translations facilitate the reading of Masoretic manuscripts similar to the one transmitted in Codex Leningradensis. Furthermore, he proposes that the Greek manuscripts and

---

271 Field gives the reading of σ′ in the margin of the Syrohexapla as ܠܐ ܠܥܠܡ ("without ceasing"). Cf. Field, *Origenis*, 750. Σ′ might have understood the repetition as an expression of intensity, as Schäfer ("Lamentations," 119*) suggests. Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 121) notes that the medieval Jewish interpreter Rashi also understood the doubling of עיני as an indication of the constancy of weeping.

272 Ziegler (*Septuaginta*, 59, 79–84) assigns three of these minuscules (51, 62 and 770) to the Lucianic version, while the fourth (minuscule 26) is grouped together with other manuscripts that largely agree with Codex Marchalianus. Nevertheless, he notes that minuscule 26 exhibits strong influence from the Lucianic version.

273 It is noteworthy that both Jerome and the Syriac translator joined their respective equivalents of אני בוכיה and ירדה מים (עיני) עיני syntactically by means of an added conjunction.

274 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 119*.

P represent facilitating interpretations of the MT, rather than witness to *Vorlagen* with only one עיני. As a result, Schäfer argues that the double occurrence of עיני in Codex Leningradensis is confirmed by the Hexaplaric version, several Greek minuscule manuscripts, P and the recensions of T. Gottlieb provides a similar assessment of the textual witnesses and regards the reading in Codex Leningradensis as the *lectio difficilior*.[275] He argues that the word עיני is given greater emphasis through its repetition.[276]

Dahood has provided two possible solutions to the perceived problem of the double עיני in the MT. In an earlier contribution, he pointed out that if the final *yod* of the first עיני is deleted, the resulting reading (עין עיני) ("the fount of my eyes") would be semantically similar to the Ugaritic phrase *qr ʿnk* ("the spring of your eyes") in the legend of Keret.[277] Dahood identifies the phrase as an example of paronomasia. In view of the extensive use of paronomasia in the biblical writings and the correspondence between the images in the Ugaritic text and the slightly emended text of the MT, McDaniel concludes that Dahood's initial reconstruction is correct.[278] In a subsequent article, Dahood proposes a number of new readings for Lamentations.[279] With regard to Lam 1:16,[280] he observes that both occurrences of עיני can be retained in the text of the MT, provided that the independent personal pronoun אֲנִי be repointed as אוֹנִי ("my sorrow"). With this emendation in mind, the demonstrative pronoun אלה would refer to אבירי ("my warriors") and בחורי ("my chosen young men") in v. 15. The first עיני is modified by the participle בוכיה and the second one by ירדה. Accordingly, Dahood translates his emended text as follows: "Over these my sorrow, my weeping

---

275 Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 19. Cf. also Salters, *Lamentations*, 84.

276 Linafelt (*Surviving Lamentations. Catastrophe, Lament, and Protest in the Afterlife of a Biblical Book* [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000], 51), Renkema (*Klaagliederen*, 122) and Meek ("Lamentations," 14) agree that עיני is repeated for emphasis. Meek points out that the deletion of one עיני would result in a 3+3 metre, which does not constitute a variant of the presumed *qinah*-metre of Lamentations. The present wording of Codex Leningradensis exhibits a 3+2+2 metre. According to Meek, this is a variant of the *qinah*-metre and therefore the double עיני should be retained. Gordis (*Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 159) agrees that the second עיני need not be deleted *metri causa*, since the present metre represents a variation of the *qinah*-metre.

277 Cf. *CTA* 16 I 27; and M.J. Dahood, "Dittografia, glossa o paranomosia. Nota a Lam 1,16a," *RivBib* 8 (1960): 364–365. The article is quoted and discussed by McDaniel, "Philological Studies," 33. McDaniel also notes the similarity between the images in the aforementioned Ugaritic text, Jer 8:23 and Lam 1:16.

278 Ibid.

279 M.J. Dahood, "New Readings in Lamentations," *Bib* 59 (1978): 174–197.

280 Ibid., 178.

eye, my eye running with tears". He goes on to claim that "my sorrow" has a complement in a passage from the Ugaritic Baal cycle where a mourning ritual is described:[281] *yṣq ʿmr ʾun lrʾišh*, "He poured the dust of sorrow upon his head".[282]

Another group of scholars consider the second עיני in the MT as a clear case of dittography[283] and emends the text by removing it. The critical apparatuses of both BHK and BHS also advise the user of these editions to delete the second עיני. Rudolph is one of the scholars who argues for a striking of the repeated עיני, but proposes that "Vielleicht handelt es sich um eine ursprüngliche Randbemerkung (עין), die darauf hinweisen wollte, daß hier im Unterschied von Kap. 2–4 die ע-Strophe vor der פ-Strophe kommt".[284] Cross[285] also recognizes the corrupt nature of the MT. He suggest two possibilities for the original text: (1:16aβ) עיני ירדה מים / (1:16aα) על אלה עיני בכיה, or alternatively: (1:16aβ) עיני ירדה מים / (1:16aα) עיני בכיה. He notes that על אלה might have been added secondarily to reinforce the alphabetic sequence after the opening עיני was corrupted into אני. In this regard, he argues that two variants, עיני בכיה and בכיה עיני, lay behind the wording in the MT. During the transmission process, עיני was misread as אני. The combination of the two variants therefore resulted in the reading אני בכיה עיני of the MT. Cross attributes the wording of 4QLam to a revision of בכיה עיני, which interpreted עיני as a dual. In addition, he thinks that the second sentence probably existed in two variants: עיני ירדה מים (MT) and עיני ירדה דמעתי (4QLam). In the opinion of Cross, it is difficult to choose between these variants. With the exception of σ′, all the ancient translations witness to the reading מים. Σ′ reads δάκρυα, the standard translation equivalent for דמעה, but Cross concedes that this rendering could be interpretative. Against Cross's reconstruction, Hillers raises the objection that in Biblical Hebrew the subject of the verb בכה ("to weep") is never the eye, but a person.[286] He suggests that the reading in 4QLam might be based on the reading על אלה בכו אבכה עיני ירדה דמעתי. In this hypothetical text, בכו is not a *qatal* form of the verbal root בכה, but an infinitive absolute followed by the *yiqtol* form of the same verbal root ("Over these things I weep copiously; my

---

281 Ibid., 179.

282 *CTA* 5 VI 14–15.

283 Berges, *Klagelieder*, 90; Westermann, *Lamentations*, 113; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 75; Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 4; Budde, "Klagelied," 267; and Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 365.

284 Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 208.

285 Cross, "Studies," 148–149.

286 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 75.

eye runs with tears"). Hillers does not elaborate on this suggestion by specifying how the *yiqtol* אבכה might have been lost in the process of copying. Hobbins[287] argues that the LXX and V are the closest to the supposed *Urtext*. Like the aforementioned group of scholars, Hobbins attributes the second עיני in the MT to an accidental rewriting of the word during the process of copying. With regard to 4QLam, he asserts that the reading בכו was the result of assimilation with the context after עיני was interpreted as a dual. דמעתי is, in his opinion, a mere facilitating replacement of מים. Seeing as the *yod* and *waw* could easily have been confused due to their almost identical form, the eye of the copyist could have skipped over the *yod* of אני to the *waw* of בכו. Therefore, the independent personal pronoun אני might have been omitted through homoioteleuton, as Hobbins suggests.[288]

This short overview shows that many scholars take positions in favour of the retention of the double occurrence of עיני in the MT, while a number of others agree that the second עיני should be deleted. The evidence from the ancient translations can also be interpreted in different ways. Both groups make a strong case for their assessments of the textual witnesses. However, only a few scholars have grappled with the readings in 4QLam. Hobbins gives the most cogent explanation for how the readings in the fragment from Qumran and the MT developed from a hypothetical earlier form of the text. His reconstruction of the original text, or at least its consonantal base, is all the more credible owing to the fact that it finds support from the LXX and V. Finding plausible explanations for how the readings in 4QLam and the MT might have developed from a hypothetical earlier text is, of course, only the first step towards a better understanding of how the Hebrew witnesses present the content of the sentences. The next step is to analyse the particular wording of the sentences in relation to the immediate context of the verse as a whole as they appear in 4QLam and the MT. Before such an analysis can be undertaken, the last difference between 4QLam and the MT must be considered.

נפש[ ]מ[ ]כי־רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם מֵשִׁיב נַפְשִׁי—כיא רחק

The first-person pronominal suffix of נפשי in the MT is missing from its counterpart in 4QLam. The renderings in the Greek, Latin, Syriac and Aramaic translations all witness to the presence of the suffix. The lack of the suffix

---

287 Hobbins, "Lamentations 1–5," 24.

288 Ibid.

in the text of the Qumran manuscript can be attributed to haplography, but there does not seem to be anything in the immediate context that would have triggered the minus. Moreover, the reading in 4QLam would probably not have been influenced by the similar reading להשיב נפש found at v. 11 of the MT, because in the text represented by 4QLam, a third-person feminine pronominal suffix was added to נפש at v. 11: להשיב נפשה. It is nevertheless possible to imagine that at one stage in the transmission process the reading in v. 11 of the text transmitted by 4QLam did not have the third-person feminine suffix and therefore also had the form להשיב נפש. This similar reading in v. 11 could then have prompted the minus of the first-person pronominal suffix of נפשי in the *ʿayin* verse, resulting in the reading משיב נפש exhibited by 4QLam. On this hypothesis, the adding of a third-person feminine suffix to נפש at v. 11 occurred at a point in the transmission of the text after the reading in the *ʿayin* verse came into being.

Due to the lacunae in the line, it is difficult to gauge the effect of the reading נפש in 4QLam on the sentence as a whole. If the line is restored with the help of the wording of the MT, as Cross has done in his transcription of 4QLam's wording,[289] the minus of the first-person pronominal suffix does not have a marked influence on the meaning of the sentence. The prepositional phrase ממני would indicate that the narrator bewails the fact that a comforter is far away from him.[290] This distant comforter would also be one who revives life. Seeing as the comforter is said to be far away from the narrator, it seems as though the former's function of reviving life relates to the narrator as well. At the most, the first-person pronominal suffix of נפשי in the MT makes it clear that the comforter would revive the life of the speaker. However, in the MT it is not the narrator, but personified Jerusalem who acts as the speaker in this verse. Accordingly, the main difference between 4QLam and the MT is not the minus of the suffix of נפש, but lies in the identity of the speaker.

The full impact of the individual differences between 4QLam and the MT might be better appreciated if an overview is given of the content of the two verses. The fact that the verse beginning with *ʿayin* precedes the verse beginning with *pe* in the acrostic sequence of the MT means that the referent of על אלה will be different from its referent in 4QLam. In the MT, על אלה probably refers to what personified Jerusalem has said about her painful

---

289 Cross, "4QLam," 234.

290 Since there is no indication of a change of speaker in 4QLam, it stands to reason that in this text the first-person pronominal suffix with the preposition מן refers to the narrator.

situation in Lam 1:12–15. The city weeps continually over YHWH's treatment of her and her inability to persuade YHWH or someone else to pay attention to her.[291] Over these things, she emphasizes, does her eyes run incessantly with water (the function of the two participles בכיה and ירדה is to indicate continuous action). In vv. 12–15, Jerusalem describes her pain to those who pass her by in terms of YHWH's wrathful attack on her, but in v. 16 she recalls motifs that are also raised by the narrator in his initial speech (Lam 1:1–11). Apart from the city's weeping and tears, which were already mentioned by the narrator in v. 2, personified Jerusalem points out her remoteness from any who would comfort her (רחק ממני מנחם משיב נפשי) and the desolation of her sons (היו בני שוממים), because the enemy has prevailed (כי גבר אויב). The narrator evokes the *Leitmotif* of the absence of a comforter at v. 2 and v. 9. He calls attention to the unhappy fate of the city's children in v. 5, taken as captives by the victorious enemy. The narrator also alludes to the conquest of the enemy in v. 10 where he states that the foe spread out his hand over the city's precious things. Moreover, v. 16 once again creates the impression that the city and her inhabitants share similar experiences. In v. 4, the narrator observed the desolateness of the city gates (כל שעריה שוממין) and, in v. 10, he notices how the city's people give their precious things in exchange for food so as to revive (their) life (להשיב נפש). Now, in v. 16, Jerusalem uses similar terminology to bewail the desolateness of her sons and the distance between her and anyone who would revive her life.

Linafelt[292] characterizes v. 16 as the rhetorical climax of personified Jerusalem's speech that began at v. 12. Her description of her painful experiences in vv. 12–16 is not only an aim in itself, but is also a rhetorical device that seeks to persuade YHWH to take notice of her and to make an end to her suffering. The narrator interrupts Jerusalem's speech in v. 17. According to Linafelt, the change of speaker sets in motion a development in the poetry in which the narrator undergoes a change from the one who elegizes Jerusalem to the one who laments with the city and attempts to provide the city with the sought after response to her lament. Although this development will only reach its completion in Lam 2, Lam 1:17 already indicates that it is the narrator, not YHWH, who is being persuaded by the city's depiction of the pain caused by YHWH's attack on her: "Instead of some indication of the desired response from YHWH, the reader meets in 1:17 the persona of the poet once again, thereby beginning the inscription of the rhetoric of

---

291 O'Connor, *Lamentations*, 26.

292 Linafelt, *Surviving Lamentions*, 50.

persuasion but with the poet standing in for YHWH as the one who is persuaded".[293] In v. 17 of the MT, some of the language and images that were employed in the narrator's initial speech are repeated. In addition to the motif of the absence of a comforter, Zion is said to stretch out her hands (פרשה ציון בידיה), presumably as an act of imprecation. This echoes the narrator's remark about the foe stretching out his hand (ידו פרש צר) over the city's precious things (v. 10). While in the same verse the narrator reminds YHWH of his command (צויתה) against nations (גוים) entering his assembly or the assembly of the city's inhabitants (depending on whether the clause לא יבאו בקהל לך is taken as direct speech or not), in v. 17 of the MT, the narrator says that YHWH commanded (צוה) the neighbouring nations to be the oppressors of "Jacob". Finally, the observation that Jerusalem has become a נדה (Codex Leningradensis)/נידה (other Masoretic manuscripts) among the oppressors is reminiscent of the statement in v. 8 that Jerusalem has become נידה on account of her grievous sins.

Whereas in the MT the narrator interrupts personified Jerusalem's speech (vv. 12–16) in v. 17 and both the city and the narrator recall motifs from the latter's initial eulogy, in 4QLam the narrator is portrayed as the speaker throughout the whole of the poem. It was already indicated in a preceding paragraph that the reversed order of v. 16 and v. 17 in 4QLam and the MT implies that the referent of על אלה will be different in the two Hebrew witnesses. In contrast to the MT, where על אלה refers back to the content of vv. 12–15, על אלה in the fragment from Qumran refers to what the narrator says about Zion in the preceding *pe* verse. Accordingly, the narrator states that his eyes cry over Zion's futile attempts to get someone to show her pity, over the abandonment of the city by any potential comforter, over Adonai's readiness to ambush "Jacob", over the neighbours' new status as the oppressors of "Jacob" and over the banishment of Zion's inhabitants among these oppressors. The narrator goes on to declare that his tears roll down on account of his remoteness from anyone who can comfort and revive life. Acting as spokesman for his group, the narrator then laments the fact that his sons, בני (that is, the children of those forming part of the narrator's community), are desolate, presumably because the enemy has prevailed (גבר אויב). Moreover, the addition of מכול אוהביה and צדיק אתה יהוה to the *pe* verse in 4QLam affects the meaning of the two verses dramatically. In the discussion of 4QLam's conflated text above, the analysis pointed out that the addition of מכול אוהביה, coupled with the restored reading סביביו צריו, fosters

---

293 Ibid., 51.

a link with v. 2. The narrator's weeping in the *ʿayin* verse of 4QLam also recalls the crying of the city mentioned in v. 2 (provided that the fragmentary text of 4QLam at v. 2 is restored in accordance with the reading in the MT). Both the narrator and Jerusalem cry over what has happened to the city, including the absence of a comforter and the city's former friends becoming her enemies. Furthermore, the purpose clause introduced by the preserved conjunction כיא in the *ʿayin* verse of 4QLam indicates that the narrator sheds tears over the fact that he is far removed from any one who could give consolation. Like the city of Jerusalem, the narrator finds no comforter.[294] It would appear as though the narrator associates himself with the fate of the city in 4QLam and shares her grief over their similar experiences. At the same time, the narrator's interjection צדיק אתה יהוה implies that he draws a subtle distinction between his own situation and that of the city. In vv. 7, 9 and 11 of 4QLam, the narrator calls on YHWH to remember, see and take note of the pain, affliction and scorn suffered by himself and his community. However, when the narrator looks with sympathy at Zion stretching out her hands in supplication, he nevertheless explicitly admits to YHWH, the one who caused Zion's distress, that he was right in doing so.

Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 1 as They Appear in 4QLam

In spite of a slight difference in wording compared to the MT (מבת and בלי כוח) and two scribal errors, a dittography of the negative particle לוא and a wrong division of the words מצא ומרעה, v. 6 in both the manuscript from Qumran and the MT describes the flight of Jerusalem's princes in terms of an image of hunting. The city's שרים are said to flee before their pursuers like powerless stags that find no pasture. Their attempted flight from the city therefore seems to be doomed to failure.

Lam 1:7 is the first verse where a significant difference in content can be detected in the diverging wordings of 4QLam and the MT. The analysis concluded that neither the manuscript from Qumran nor the MT present

---

294 Assuming that v. 4 of 4QLam can be restored on the basis of the MT, another connection between the fate of the city and that of the narrator and his community can be established. Just as v. 4 mentions the desolation of the city's gates (כל שעריה שוממין), presumably on account of the siege and sack of the city by the invading enemy armies, so the *ʿayin* verse says that the children of the narrator's community are also desolate because the enemy was too powerful.

the original form of the verse and that scribes creatively adapted the opening clauses of the verse. Whereas the initial clause in the MT opens with the words זכרה ירושלם, 4QLam has זכוֹרה יהוה.[295] By changing the first word from a *qatal* to an imperative and exchanging ירושלם for יהוה, a scribe placed an appeal addressed to YHWH in the mouth of the narrator. The reading מכאובנו in the manuscript from Qumran was also attributed to the creative hand of a scribe. Accordingly, in the version of 4QLam the narrator no longer describes the thoughts of the personified city, but rather implores YHWH to recall all the pain suffered by him and his community from days of old. To judge from the surviving wording in 4QLam, v. 7 marks the first attempt on the part of a scribe to change certain words of the poem so that the narrator remains the speaker right throughout Lam 1. Comparable changes are found in Lam 1:11 and Lam 1:13 as well. The final sentence of v. 11 is particularly noteworthy in this regard, because in the manuscript from Qumran, the narrator pleads with YHWH to see how worthless he has become, whereas in the MT it is personified Jerusalem who makes this request. The narrator's plea in v. 11 in 4QLam is therefore similar to the one in the opening bicolon of v. 7. The call on YHWH to remember the pains of the narrator and the community he represents is followed by a portrayal of Jerusalem's fall and the joy of her foes on seeing her ruins. There appears to be a connection between the pains suffered by the narrator and his community and the fate of Jerusalem and her inhabitants in the wording of Lam 1:7 in the manuscript from Qumran. The wording in 4QLam also includes the accidental loss of the words לה and ראוה through homoioteleuton, as well as two readings that are possibly more original than their counterparts in the MT, צריה and משבריה.

The reading לנוד in 4QLam's version of v. 8 is identified as more original than its counterpart in the MT, לנידה. לנוד allows for different interpretations and, depending on the one that is chosen, the wording of 4QLam either states that Jerusalem's great sinfulness (expressed by an infinitive absolute plus *qatal*, חטוא חטאה) caused her to become unstable or a wanderer, or turned her into an object of ridicule. The accidental omission of the third-person feminine suffix from the word הזילוה, resulting in the reading הזילו in 4QLam, does not detract much from the sense of the second bicolon of Lam 1:8 in this manuscript. The word is part of the observation that the perspective of the city's erstwhile admirers has changed from esteem to

---

[295] 4QLam does not have the phrase ימי עניה ומרודיה. In this regard, the wording of the Qumran manuscript represents the original text. The phrase, which is found in the MT and was also in the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the ancient translations, was added during the transmission history (probably under the influence of the similar phrase in Lam 3:19).

scorn after they have been exposed to her nakedness (an image used to signify the city's vulnerable state).

There are two cases in v. 9 where the scribe, who was responsible for the copying of 4QLam, or his predecessors, altered the wording of the manuscript which was reproduced. The adverbial accusative פלאות was changed from פלאים to the form found in the Qumran manuscript, presumably because the scribe wanted it to resemble the more usual plural form of the word פלא. Furthermore, a conjunction was added to אין to facilitate the syntax by removing the asyndeton of the original wording of the phrase in question as it appears in the MT (אין מנחם לה). Since v. 9 is very fragmentary in 4QLam, the manuscript in its current condition only contains incomplete references to Jerusalem's uncleanness, her astonishing downfall, the absence of someone or something and the fact that someone magnifies himself. In the final bicolon of the version represented by the MT, there is a change of speaker where the narrator gives way to personified Jerusalem. She calls on YHWH to see her affliction on account of a boasting enemy. Although the full wording of the last part of the verse was not preserved in 4QLam, it may be assumed that there is no such change of speaker in the Qumran manuscript. This assumption is based on the analysis of vv. 7, 11 and 13, where a scribe introduced changes to the wording so as to make the narrator the speaker throughout Lam 1.

A large part of the wording of vv. 10 and 11 is not present in 4QLam. This minus can be attributed to an accidental omission. This minus in the wording and the fact that very little of v. 10 has survived in the manuscript means that it is difficult to determine how 4QLam presented the content of these two verses. Among the remaining words of v. 11 מחמדיה and נפשה were singled out for discussion. The MT preserves the original forms of these two words (מחמדיהם and נפש). It is deduced that scribes (probably at different times in the transmission history) made the third-person masculine plural suffix of מחמדיהם into a third-person feminine singular one and added a third-persion feminine suffix to נפש. The readings מחמדיה and נפשה in 4QLam are part of what seems to be a divine command that the precious things of Jerusalem may not be traded for food in order to restore the life of the city. Verse 11 in the manuscript from Qumran closes with the narrator imploring YHWH to take note of the fact that he has become worthless. The change of the original feminine singular participle זוללה into the masculine form זולל can be interpreted as another deliberate alteration of the original wording of the verse. This change entails that the narrator becomes the subject of the periphrastic construction הייתי זולל and, as such, is the one who also voices the preceding imperatives ראה and הביטה.

Verse 12 exhibits another set of differences in content between 4QLam and the MT. If the missing words in the former are restored in accordance with the wording of the latter and the reconstruction of the variant reading אליכ[י] is accepted, the opening clauses of this verse in 4QLam conveys the narrator's wish that all who pass by the road would look upon Jerusalem and see in her the incomparable pain of the narrator. On this interpretation, the pain of the narrator is again linked to the fate of Jerusalem. This theme was already found in v. 7. The two relative clauses אשר עוללו לי and אשר הוגירני convey the idea that the foes, which were already mentioned in previous verses, are responsible for the narrator's pain and that it was used (presumably by YHWH) to frighten the narrator on the day of his wrath. The verb הוגירני in 4QLam did not develop from the putative original reading הוגני by mistake, but was in all probability deliberately given this form by a scribe. In contrast to the way the wording in 4QLam presents the content of the verse, personified Jerusalem assumes the role of the speaker in the MT version. She calls on those who pass by to witness her unparalleled pain, which YHWH brought upon her and by so doing afflicted her on the day of his fierce anger.

The analysis of 4QLam and the MT shows that these two Hebrew witnesses to the content of Lam 1:13 depict YHWH's assault on the speaker in different ways, although they share the images of a fire from heaven and a net spread out as a trap. With regard to the Qumran manuscript, its initial clause states that YHWH brought fire down into the bones of the narrator and felled him (ויורידני). This last verbal form is another example of a change to the supposed original reading (יורדנה, in this case) brought about intentionally by a scribe. שומם and ד[ו]י in the final bicolon of the verse are two more examples of such changes. With these words, the scribe modified the gender so that they would no longer relate to Jerusalem, but to the narrator. Accordingly, in 4QLam the narrator complains that YHWH left him faint and deserted him all day long. Like vv. 7, 11 and 12, there is also evidence in v. 13 of 4QLam that words which were intended to be spoken by the personified city are placed in the mouth of the narrator by means of subtle changes to the original wording.

The clause נקשרה על פשעי בידו in 4QLam's version of v. 14 can be understood in different ways, since the first word, נקשרה, which was purposely created by a scribe, and the prepositional phrase על פשעי allow for more than one interpretation. The narrator either indicates that he and his community are ensnared by YHWH's hand because of his/their transgressions or that they are bound up with his/their transgressions by YHWH. Alternatively, the narrator bemoans the fact that a net was tied to his steps by

YHWH. Furthermore, YHWH is said to have fastened his yoke onto the neck of the narrator and so caused his strength to fail. In the MT, personified Jerusalem observes how YHWH fashioned a yoke out of her transgressions, tied them together and placed them onto her neck. In addition to the opening word of the verse, the differences between 4QLam and the MT at Lam 1:14 include the forms of the verb "to fasten", as well as diverging analyses of the word עלו. In the Qumran manuscript, the latter was construed as a noun with an added pronominal suffix. The orthography was adapted accordingly with the help of a vowel indicator: עולו. The Masoretes understood the syntax of the consonantal text differently and vocalized עלו as a verbal form: עָלוּ. Concerning וישתרג and ישתרגו in 4QLam and the MT respectively, the plural form without the conjunction was recognised as the probable earlier reading, while it was conceded that the variant in the Qumran manuscript could be attributed to copying errors or to the initiative of a scribe. Despite the slightly different wording in the two Hebrew versions, the final part of the verse in both 4QLam and the MT claims that the deity has delivered the speaker (the narrator in the Qumran manuscript and Jerusalem in the MT) into the hands of the enemy.

Although the reading אבודי in 4QLam might have come into being as a result of a confusion of letters on the part of a scribe, it makes sense in the context of the manuscript's wording of Lam 1:15. The narrator declares that Adonai has scorned all the perished ones in his community and that he proclaimed an appointed time when the chosen young men of the narrator's group were to be annihilated. The narrator ends the verse with the grisly image of YHWH trampling on the Virgin Daughter of Judah as in a winepress. Therefore, the misfortune of the narrator and those whom he represents is linked to what happened to Judah (and the capital city, Jerusalem, in particular).

Even though all the words of vv. 16 and 17 were not preserved in 4QLam, a clearer picture of its presentation of their content emerges when one fills in the gaps in the wording with the help of the MT. The reversed order of the verses, compared to the MT, together with scribal mistakes and sundry scribal changes, ensure that the content of these verses in the manuscript from Qumran looks very different from the version in the MT. Zion seems to stretch out her hands in supplication, but in vain. There is no one from among all her lovers to comfort her. This observation is reminiscent of the similar statement in Lam 1:2. This is followed by a theological annotation that found its way into the body of the wording. Despite the fact that the narrator has sympathy with Zion, he acknowledges to YHWH, the one who is responsible for the city's plight, that he is righteous. The narrator then

continues his depiction of Zion's difficult situation. It would appear as though Adonai laid in ambush for "Jacob", a variant designation for Zion, and that she has been banished among the neighbouring nations, who apparently have become her oppressors. The narrator evokes v. 2 again when he says that he cries his eyes out over these things, as well as the fact that he is far removed from anyone who could console him in his grief or restore life. Moreover, he complains that his "sons" (presumably members of the narrator's community) were left deserted, because of the enemy's triumph. In light of these remarks, it is clear that in the version of vv. 16 and 17 transmitted by 4QLam the narrator associates his and his community's sad circumstances with the catastrophe that has befallen Jerusalem. According to this analysis of the available evidence, the same theme is found in vv. 7, 12 and 15 in 4QLam.

CHAPTER FOUR

TEXT-CRITICAL ANALYSES OF THE WORDING OF LAM 4 AS WITNESSED TO BY 5QLAM^{A} AND 5QLAM^{B}

Introduction

The manuscript 5QLam^{a} preserves parts of vv. 5–8, 11–16, 19 and 20 of Lam 4, while only parts of single words from vv. 17, 18, 19 and 20 appear on the fragments of 5QLam^{b}. Of the passages in 5QLam^{a} where there are variants compared to the MT or where both Hebrew textual witnesses present the same textual difficulty, it is only at vv. 7, 14 and 15 where enough words survived the forces of decay for one to make a reasonable inference regarding the way in which the wordings in the manuscript from Qumran present the content of these verses. Nevertheless, at vv. 17 and 18 in 5QLam^{b} and v. 19 in 5QLam^{a} there are individual words in the Qumran manuscripts that are different from their counterparts in other Hebrew versions. These cases merit further discussion, despite the fact that too little of the wordings of the verses have been preserved in the manuscripts to deduce whether they agreed or disagreed with their opposite numbers in the other available Hebrew versions.

With regard to v. 17 in 5QLam^{b}, the final part of the restored word [עוד]ינה agrees with the *kethib* reading עודינה of Codex Leningradensis, whereas the *qere* readings in this Masoretic manuscript and in manuscript 1753 of the Cambridge University Library (designated by the siglum M^{Y} in BHQ) is עודינו.[1] The evidence from the ancient translations are relevant here, since the equivalents in the LXX (ἔτι ὄντων ἡμῶν) and P (ܚܢ ܡܬܚܡ ܣܕ) have first-person plural pronouns, while V has a first-person plural imperfect subjunctive verb (*cum adhuc subsisteremus*). Seeing as the Greek, Syriac and Latin translations were in all probability made from Hebrew *Vorlagen* that contained the reading עודינו, it is reasonable to conclude that the *qere* variants in the Masoretic manuscripts are based on readings that appeared in manuscripts. The forms עודינה and עודינו are combinations of the

---

[1] In the critical apparatus of BHQ, Schäfer ("Lamentations," 70) also indicates that the *qere* reading in M^{L34} (manuscript EBP II B 34 of the Russian National Library in St Petersburg) is עודנו.

adverb עוד and pronominal suffixes. Syntactically speaking, the third-person feminine plural suffix of עודינה relates to עינינו in the clause עודינה תכלינה עינינו ("still our eyes fail"). עודינו, with the first-person plural suffix, means "yet/still we are", which is the way that the LXX, P and V rendered their *Vorlagen*.[2] A previous generation of scholars considered neither עודינה nor עודינו as satisfactory and suggested that the original text read עד מה ("Wie lange"/"Hoe lang").[3] Conversely, Berges and Gordis express an explicit preference for עודינה over עודינו.[4] Dahood also takes עודינה as his point of departure, but proposes an understanding of this form as a verb on the basis of an Ugaritic root: "If the consonantal grouping *ʿwdynh* is read as a participle plus suffix from *ʿādāh*, Ugar. *ʿdy*, 'to advance', a good parallel to the construct chain interrupted by a pronominal suffix, *ʿezrātēnû hābel*, is obtained".[5] Accordingly, he renders the first bicolon of Lam 4:17 as follows: "Because of those advancing toward us our eyes were consumed, by our help that was in vain". In light of this proposal, as well as the interpretations in the ancient translations, the suggested emendations of Löhr and Dyserinck, and Rudolph's opinion concerning עודינה and עודינו that "Beides ist möglich, zu ändern ist nichts",[6] it follows that an argument as to which one of the variant readings gave rise to the other one (*utrum in alterum abiturum erat*) will be dependent on an interpretation of the colon's syntax. Unfortunately, there is not enough data in 5QLam^{b} to involve the manuscript in this discussion, given that only a part of one word from v. 17 survived in the manuscript and that there is no guarantee that the rest of its wording was the same as that of the MT manuscripts.

An example of an ambiguous reading compared to the vocalized Hebrew wording of the MT is found in 5QLam^{b} at v. 18. Milik restores the first word of the verse as צָדּוּ in accordance with the consonants of צדו in Codex Leningradensis.[7] The circlets above the *ṣade* and the *daleth* indicate, however, that the identification of these two letters is not certain. Another Masoretic manuscript has the reading צרו, which should be related to the root צרר, "to shut up".[8] It is not inconceivable that 5QLam^{b} could also have

---

[2] Cf. LXX, ἔτι ὄντων ἡμῶν ("while we are still alive"); P, حد صمحم سدم ("while we are still standing/alive"); V, *cum adhuc subsisteremus* ("when we were still standing").

[3] Cf. Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 22; and Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 378.

[4] Cf. Berges, *Klagelieder*, 233; Gordis, *Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 193.

[5] Dahood, "New Readings," 192.

[6] Rudolph, "Text," 120.

[7] Milik, "Lamentations (Second Exemplaire)," 178.

[8] Rudolph, "Text," 120.

had the reading צרו instead of צדו, owing to the almost identical shape of the letters *daleth* and *resh*. In fact, Barthélemy refers to Milik's restoration of the word in question and notes that "(s)ur la planche, la 2e letter paraît plutôt être un 'resh' qu' un 'dalet' ".[9] The differences between the two readings צדו and צרו can easily be explained as an interchange of *daleth* and *resh*, which is a common scribal error.[10] Even if Milik's restoration of the word as צדו is accepted, it still remains ambiguous, because the consonantal form of this verb can be related either to the root צדה, "to lie in wait",[11] or to the root צוד, "to hunt".[12] The placement of the Masoretic accent (צָדוּ) implies that צדו must be understood in the first sense in this version.[13] T[W] (הינון צדאן) and T[Y] (צדו) seem to present the same interpretation of the Hebrew word.[14] In contrast to the MT and the two recensions of T, the translations of P, ܨܕܘ ("They hunted those who belonged to the common people"),[15] and the LXX, ἐθηρεύσαμεν μικροὺς ἡμῶν ("We hunted our little ones"),[16] clearly related צדו to the root צוד.[17]

Turning to v. 19 and the variant הִיוֹם in 5QLam[a] where the MT has היו, Milik argues that the word is "peu satisfaisant dans ce passage, pourrait être

---

9 Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle*, 912.

10 Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 245–246; Würthwein, *Text*, 108; and McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 45–46.

11 Cf. BDB 841.

12 Cf. BDB 844; KBL 797.

13 Cf. GKC § 75m and § 72b regarding the accented syllable in the Qal *qatal* third-person plural forms of II *waw* and III *he* verbs.

14 Cf. Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 172, 205.

15 On the translation of P, see the discussion of Albrektson, *Studies*, 192–193. The reading attributed to σ′ in the margin of the Syrohexapla is also ܨܕܘ. Field (*Origenes*, 760) retranslates this as ἐθήρευσαν, which is also the reading in the Lucianic version.

16 The reading in the LXX can be explained either in terms of a variant צדנו in the *Vorlage* of the Greek translation or as the result of the translator's attempt to assimilate the translation of צדו to the immediate context. Cf. Schäfer, "Lamenations," 70. According to Barthélemy (*Critique Textuelle*, 913), "Il est difficile de dire si c'est dans la Vorlage du *G ou dans la transmission de son texte qu'a eu lieu une assimilation aux possessifs qui précèdent et qui suivent, ainsi qu'au verbe צפינו du vs 17".

17 Dahood and McDaniel argue that one must look to Northwest Semitic philology for an understanding of the Hebrew wording of Lam 4:18. Cf. M.J. Dahood, Review: 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), *Bib* 44 (1963): 548; and McDaniel, "Philological Studies," 49. Concerning צדו, they mention the Ugaritic root *ṣwd*, which is used at times in parallelism with the root *hlk*. Cf. for example the following two passages from the Baal and Anat Cycle: *ʾn ʾitlk wʾaṣd kl ǵr lkbd ʾarṣ kl gbʿ* ("I myself go about and wander [over] every mountain to the midst of the earth, [over] every hill") (*CTA* 6 II 15–16) and *ʿnt ttlk wtṣd kl ǵr lkbd ʾarṣ kl gbʿ* ("Anat goes about and wanders [over] every mountain to the midst of the earth, [over] every hill") (*CTA* 5 VI 26–27).

placé à la fin du v. 18: (sic) כי בא קצנו היום; mais dans ce cas la ligne 6 serait trop longue".[18] If, for the sake of the argument, one assumes that the rest of the wording in 5QLam[a] was identical to the initial bicolon of v. 19 in the MT, it might be suggested that the final *mem* of הוים was added by a scribe under the influence of the ending ים- of the preceding word, the adjective קלים.[19] The form הוים can then be parsed as a masculine plural participle of the verbal root היה, which would yield a translation that is much the same as one based on the wording of the MT, except for the added nuance of continuous action conveyed by the participle: "Our pursuers are swifter than the vultures of the heavens".

Apart from these interesting individual readings in 5QLam[a] and 5QLam[b], it should also be pointed out that both Qumran manuscripts confirm the order of vv. 16 and 17 in Codex Leningradensis. In 5QLam[a], the first two words of v. 16 (פְּנֵי יהוה) follow directly after the last word of v. 15 (לָגוּר) and, in 5QLam[b], the partly preserved word from v. 17 ([עוד]ינה) stands in the first line of the manuscript, while the opening word of v. 18 (צָדּוּ) is written in the next line. This implies that the wordings in both manuscripts had the *ʿayin*/*pe* order that is also found in Codex Leningradensis as opposed to the few Masoretic manuscripts and P where the *ʿayin* verse (v. 16) follows after the *pe* verse (v. 17).

In what follows, the wordings of Lam 4:7, Lam 4:14 and Lam 4:15 as they appear in 5QLam[a] are subjected to text-critical analyses in order to establish how this Qumran manuscript presents the content of the verses. Another interesting feature of 5QLam[a], the scribal marking ו in the bottom margin of its second column, will be examined in an excursus after the discussion of v. 15.

Verse 7

5QLam[a] [מח]לב [א]דמו עצם מפנינ[ים]

[than mi]lk. They were [ru]ddier in body than coral[s].

MT זַכּוּ נְזִירֶיהָ מִשֶּׁלֶג צַחוּ מֵחָלָב אָדְמוּ עֶצֶם מִפְּנִינִים סַפִּיר גִּזְרָתָם׃

Her Nazirites were purer than snow; they were more gleaming white than milk. They were ruddier in body than corals; their form (?) was sapphire.

---

18 Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

19 קלים is the only full word from v. 19 that has survived in 5QLam[b].

The Hebrew wording of Lam 4:7 in the MT is riddled with textual difficulties. Apart from the clause אדמו עצם מפנינים, the words נזיריה and גזרתם are also problematic. נזיריה can be interpreted as referring to princes or nobles in accordance with the meaning of the word נזיר in Gen 49:26 and Deut 33:16. Alternatively, נזיר can be taken as the technical term "Nazirite", which refers to any person who has devoted himself or herself to God for a period of time. During this time, Nazirites must abstain from drinking wine and cutting their hair. They must also avoid contact with corpses (Num 6:1–22).[20] The ancient translators unanimously understood נזיריה in this sense. However, the suggestion has been made that the form נזיריה is inappropriate in this context and that a scribal error has occurred. On this hypothesis, the *zayin* of the opening word, זכו, has found its way into the second word and replaced an original *ʿayin*. Therefore, those who propagate this view argue that נזיריה in the MT should be replaced by the putative original form נעריה, "her young men".[21] With regard to גזרתם, the word is obscure. The nominal form גזרה is usually related to the verbal root גזר, "to cut"/"to divide"[22] and assigned a meaning such as "carved shape"/"form"/"stature"/"Gestalt"/"gestalte"/"taille" when it involves human beings.[23] Nevertheless, Berges hits the nail on the head when he remarks that the meaning of גזרה "bleibt unsicher, obschon die Herleitung von גזר 'schneiden', 'abschneiden' (vgl. Klgl 3,54) als gesichert gilt".[24] The equivocal nature of the form גזרתם is also evident from the translation equivalents in the ancient translations. ܓܫܡܗܘܢ, "their body", and פרצופיהון, "their faces", in P and the two recensions of T respectively, represent the efforts of the Syriac and Aramaic translators to render the obscure Hebrew word in an understandable way from the context. Τὸ ἀπόσπασμα αὐτῶν, "their detachment/division", in the LXX implies that the Greek translator interpreted גזרה in the sense of "separation". Assan-Dhôte thinks that "le substantive, difficile à interpréter, désigne ici soit la vie menée par les nazirs à l'écart des autres, soit le groupe séparé des autres hommes que forment les nazirs" and has to do with what sets this group apart from others, namely that they do not cut their hair.[25] According to the free translation of ספיר גזרתם in V, the *nazarei* were more

---

[20] Cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Grand Rapids / Livonia: Eerdmans / Dove, 1997), 466–467.

[21] Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 248; Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 47.

[22] BDB 160; KBL 178: DCH II 341.

[23] Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 368.

[24] Berges, *Klagelieder*, 232.

[25] Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 266.

beautiful than sapphire (*sapphyro pulchiores*). Instead of resorting to such contextual interpretations or an etymological explanation, Hillers[26] finds a solution to the difficult Hebrew word in comparisons of body parts with dark blue materials, such as lapis lazuli in literature from the ancient Near East. As a result, he suggests that גזרה should be understood as referring to "beard" or "eyebrows". Conversely, Löhr[27] proposes that גזרתם should be emended to read נזרתם, "their (consecrated) head of hair", since the part of the body that is in view must be comparable in colour to that of sapphire. Given these different interpretations of גזרתם, it is fair to say that this word is enigmatic and that its precise meaning remains moot. Fortunately, the same does not hold for the difficult clause אדמו עצם מפנינים.

אָדְמוּ עֶצֶם מִפְּנִינִים—[א]דְמו עצם מפנינ[ים]

The colon in question presents a syntactical difficulty that revolves around the second word, עצם. Some interpreters construe עצם as the subject of the verb אדמו, but in this case there would be incongruence in number between the singular subject and the plural verb.[28] Furthermore, the lack of a pronominal suffix leaves עצם without an explicit link to נזיריה, the ones to whom the "bone" belongs. Those commentators who read עצם as the subject of the preceding verb usually adopt the translation "their bodies" for עצם because it fits the context, but Hillers concedes that this solution glosses over a genuine textual difficulty.[29] The Syriac translator of P, who also interpreted עצם as the subject of אדמו, recognised these problems and therefore rendered עצם by ܥܲܛܡܲܝܗܘܿܢ, "their bones". This Syriac word is plural and has an added third-person masculine plural pronominal suffix that refers back to ܢܙܝܪܝܗ ("her Nazirites"), the translation equivalent of נזיריה. As a result, P reads as follows: ܐܲܦ ܥܲܛܡܲܝܗܘܿܢ ܡܢ ܣܲܡܩܘ ܗܘܘ, "Their bones were redder than sard".[30] If עצם in the Hebrew versions is not taken as the subject of אדמו, as in these translations, an alternative syntactic function must be allocated to it. In both T^W and T^Y, עצם is translated freely as חיזו, "their appearance". This noun acts as an adverbial accusative together with the verb סמיקו, "they were red".[31] Alexander translates the wording of

---

[26] Hillers, *Lamentations*, 140–141.

[27] Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 20–21.

[28] Cf. House, *Lamentations*, 441; Berlin, *Lamentations*, 99; and Hillers, *Lamentations*, 135.

[29] Hillers, *Lamentations*, 140.

[30] According to Payne Smith (*Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, 390), sard is a shining red stone.

[31] Jastrow 1003.

T[W] accordingly: "They were redder in appearance than rubies".[32] For the wording of T[Y], he has the translation: "They were redder in appearance than crimson (מזהרין)".[33] With regard to V, Jerome opted for a free translation of the whole clause: *rubicundiores ebore antiquo*, "more ruddy than ancient ivory".

As an alternative to these different syntactical interpretations and free translations, a number of scholars prefer to emend the form עצם or exchange it for another word in order to make better sense of the colon. Westermann suggests that the word should be read as עצמיהם under the influence of the parallel ספיר גזרתם in the next colon.[34] He admits, however, that the meaning of the clause remains obscure, because the point of comparison seems to be unclear. In the opinion of Driver, אָדְמוּ עֶצֶם מִפְּנִינִים might be altered to אָדְמוּ מֵעֶצֶם פְּנִינִים, "they were more ruddy than the bone of (red) corals", i.e., more red than coral itself.[35] The misplacement of the preposition in the wording of the MT can then be attributed to the carelessness of a scribe. Gottlieb[36] accepts the correctness of Driver's conjecture and notes that on this reading, עצם designates "the essential nature of an object or thing".[37]

---

[32] Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 167) points out that both the word יוהרין and its translation is uncertain. He decided on the rendering "rubies" on the basis of the context. Levine (*Aramaic Version*, 52) prints an alternative reading, מזהורין, in his edition of T[W].

[33] Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 203.

[34] Westermann, *Lamentations*, 196–197.

[35] Driver, "Hebrew Notes," 140–141.

[36] Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 63.

[37] Concerning the Greek translation of the clause in question, ἐπυρρώθησαν ὑπὲρ λίθους ("They have become redder than precious stones"), the editions of Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*, 764) and Ziegler (*Septuaginta*, 488) incorporate a reconstruction of the original form of the first word. In Codex Vaticanus and a few minuscules, the reading is ἐπυρώθησαν ("they were burnt"). This reading is also recorded in the margin of Codex Marchalianus. The rest of the available Greek manuscripts, including Codex Alexandrinus, have the variant ἐτυρώθησαν ("they were made into cheese"). This reading is also reflected by the Sahidic Coptic translation: ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲉ ⲡⲉⲣⲱⲧⲉ ("They were thicker than milk"). Cf. Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 212. Since the proposed original reading ἐπυρρώθησαν aptly conveys the meaning of the Hebrew word אדמו, and since the readings in the extant Greek textual witnesses can be ascribed to scribal errors, the emendation seems reasonable and justified. The reconstructed original Greek wording of the clause has no equivalent for עצם and Gottlieb argues that Driver's conjecture can help to explain why this word is left untranslated in the LXX. He refers to several passages where עצם is used as an expression of the "substance" of something and not rendered in the LXX. Cf. Gen 7:13; Exod 12:17, 12:51; Lev 23:21; Deut 32:48; Josh 5:11 and Ezek 40:1. In these passages the phrase בעצם היום הזה, "on this very day", is translated in various ways into Greek, but consistently without an equivalent for עצם. See, in this regard, the discussion in G.R. Kotzé, "LXX Lamentations 4:7 and 4:14. Reflections on the Greek Renderings of the Difficult Hebrew Wordings of these Verses," *JSem* 20/1 (2011): 250–270. Schäfer ("Lamentations," 131*) also mentions the possibility that "the translator understood it in the sense of 'they themselves' and regarded it as implicit in the vb". This proposal was also made by Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle*, 911. Cf. also Salters, *Lamentations*, 299.

Rudolph[38] and Robinson[39] resort to more extreme measures for correcting the perceived corrupt reading עצם. Rudolph follows the emendation of אָדְמוּ עֶצֶם in the MT into עֹרָם אָדֵם, "röter ihre Haut (als Korallen)", which was proposed by Löhr,[40] while Robinson suggests that עצם should be replaced by שִׂפָתָם, "their lips", despite the fact that it is graphically far removed from עצם.

Such conjectural emendations can, however, be avoided. The singular form עצם in both 5QLam[a] and the MT can be interpreted as a case of synecdoche where the part stands for the whole. "Bone", therefore, points to the whole body.[41] As such, עצם, like its equivalent חיזו in the two recensions of T, functions as an adverbial accusative. It is an accusative that specifies or clarifies the action expressed by the verb אדמו. In other words, the clause אדמו עצם מפנינים in 5QLam[a] and the MT indicates that the Nazirites are ruddier than corals with respect to the body.[42] In antiquity, a reddish complexion was considered attractive in men. It was also a sign of health, youthfulness and vitality.[43] From this perspective, it follows that the observation that Jerusalem's Nazirites were redder than corals with respect to the body complements the positive depiction of them as "purer than snow" and "more gleaming white than milk" in the first bicolon of v. 7. Although the primary point of comparison in the clause אדמו עצם מפנינים is the hue of the body and the colour of corals, the hard texture of the latter might also bear comparison with human bones and this could explain the choice for the word עצם in this verse.

---

38 Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 248.

39 Robinson, "Notes," 259.

40 Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 20.

41 Berges (*Klagelieder*, 232), Provan (*Lamentations*, 114), Kraus (*Klagelieder* [*Threni*], 72) and Albrektson (*Studies*, 181) mention Prov 16:24 as a parallel, where עצם means "body" instead of "bone". However, Rudolph (*Klagelieder*, 248) is correct to point out that the meaning "body" for עצם in this proverb and the similar one in Prov 15:30 is not absolutely certain.

42 Cf. Aalders' translation of אדמו עצם מפנינים: "roder van lichaam dan koralen". Aalders, *Klaagliederen*, 92.

43 Cf. Dobbs-Allsopp (*Lamentations*, 132). As a parallel to this clause in Lam 4:7, one might cite a passage from Cant 5. In Cant 5:9, a chorus asks the girl what makes her lover more special than other lovers. She replies by giving a list of his desirable attributes (Cant 5:10–16). At the top of this list of attributes is the fact that her lover is "radiant and ruddy" (צה ואדום). With regard to the similar meaning of "ruddy" in Cant 5:10 and Lam 4:7, see the comments of J.C. Exum, *Song of Songs: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005) 203; O. Keel, *The Song of Songs* (CC; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994) 198; and M.V. Fox, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 147. For an alternative view, see M.H. Pope, *Song of Songs: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 7C; New York: Doubleday, 1977), 351–352.

Verse 14

5QLam[a] נעו[ ]ם בחוצות נג[ ] בדם בל י[ו]כלו יבג[ ] בלבושיהם

They wandered [ ] in the streets [ ] by the blood. They could not tou[ch(?)] their clothes.

MT נָעוּ עִוְרִים בַּחוּצוֹת נְגֹאֲלוּ בַּדָּם בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ יִגְּעוּ בִּלְבֻשֵׁיהֶם׃

They wandered blind in the streets; they were defiled by blood with people being unable to touch their clothes/so that no one could touch their clothes/what they were not allowed, they touched with their clothes.

No more than a few words of Lam 4:14 are visible on the plate of 5QLam[a] in the DJD edition. Milik's reconstruction of the wording of this verse make it possible to identify two variant readings compared to the MT. Both of these variants appear in the second bicolon of the verse. Only one complete word from the first bicolon is clearly visible on the photograph used for the plate (בדם). A look at the photograph reveals that בחוצות and [ ]נג are partly preserved and the dots and circlets above the letters of these words indicate that their identification is tentative. Furthermore, only the final *mem* of the second word of the verse survived the forces of decay. This is unfortunate, since some scholars suggest that עורים ("blind ones") in the MT is not original[44] and three of the ancient translations have equivalents that differ from this reading. In place of עורים, the LXX has ἐγρήγοροι αὐτῆς ("her watchers") and the Lucianic version has νεανίσκοι αὐτῆς ("her young men"). The latter seems to be based on a Hebrew reading such as נערים, while the original Greek translator either derived עורים directly from the root עור, "to arouse oneself"/"to be aroused",[45] or was guided by the meaning of עיר in Aramaic. In Dan 4:10, 14, 20, as well as passages from *1Enoch* 1–36 (the *Book of the Watchers*), the Aramaic word עיר refers to an angelic being.[46] The equivalent

---

[44] Ehrlich (*Randglossen*, 49) is of the opinion that עורים in the MT is a corruption of an original עֲרוּמִים, the adjective "naked". Houtsma ("Textkritisches," *ZAW* 27 [1907]: 57–59, 58) and Driver ("Hebrew Notes," 141) share this view, although the latter avers that the form עָרוֹם might be more suited because it does not involve any essential change of the consonantal text of the MT. Rudolph ("Text," 119) suggests that the original reading was דָּוִם, the plural of דוה, "unwell"/"faint". According to this proposal, עורים in the MT was created through a dittography of the letters עו of the opening verb נעו and the alteration of *daleth* into *resh* and *waw* into *yod*.

[45] BDB 734–735; KBL 690; DCH VI 314–315. Cf. Schäfer, "Lamentations," 69, and the discussion in Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 270.

[46] Cf. the following Aramaic passages from *1Enoch* 1–36 in manuscripts that were recovered from the Qumran caves: *1Enoch* 10:9 (4Q202 Col. IV lines 5–6), *1Enoch* 12:4 (4Q204 Col. V

of עיר is ἄγγελος at vv. 10 and 20 in the Old Greek translation of Dan 4,[47] whereas in the version of θ′, עיר is transliterated as ιρ in all three verses.[48] In the relevant passages from *1Enoch*, however, forms of ἐγρήγορος are used primarily to designate the "fallen" angels who have left heaven and copulated with women.[49] Fernández Marcos mentions the rendering of עיר with

---

line 19), *1Enoch* 13:10 (4Q204 Col. VI line 8), *1Enoch* 22:6 (4Q206 Frg. 2 Col. II line 5) and *1Enoch* 33:3 (4Q206 Frg. 4 line 19).

[47] Dan 4:14 in the LXX is very different from θ′. It contains no reference to an angelic being and exhibits a plus compared to the text of θ′ and the MT. The version of θ′ is quite close to the MT in Dan 4–6, but the LXX translation seems to have been based on a *Vorlage* that was very different from the MT in these chapters. Cf. R.T. McLay, "Daniel," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (eds. A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright; New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 991–1022, 991–992.

[48] According to the Göttingen edition of Daniel prepared by Ziegler and Munnich (*Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XVI, 2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999], 293), the θ′ text of Dan 4:10 reads as follows: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ιρ καὶ ἅγιος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ κατέβη ("I looked in the vision of the night on my bed, and behold an Ir, and a holy one came down from heaven"). In Codex Alexandrinus, ἐγρήγορος is added after μου. Walters (*The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973], 279) calls this addition a "hexaplaric doublet for the transliteration ιρ". Interestingly, at Dan 4:14, ιρ is preceded by ἐγρήγορου in minuscule 538 and in minuscule 311, ἐγρήγορου is added in the margin.

[49] Cf. *1Enoch* 1:5, 10:7, 10:9, 10:15, 12:2, 12:3, 12:4, 12:10, 14:1, 14:3, 15:9 and 16:2. For a discussion on the term "watchers" in the various textual witnesses to the book of *1Enoch*, see G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 140–141. Forms of ἐγρήγορος are also used to refer to angelic beings in the Greek version of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In Reuben's testament, the patriarch warns his descendents against the wiles of women and cites the story of the watchers and the women who, according to this text, seduced the watchers with their adornments (*Testament of Reuben* 5:6–7). "It is interesting to note that the author of the Testaments avoids saying that the angels had intercourse with the women; they appeared to the women when they were with their husbands, and because the women saw the Watchers reach unto heaven, they gave birth to giants". M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), 75. Conversely, in *1Enoch*, the intercourse between the watchers and the women is portrayed as a conscious and deliberate rebellion against God. Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 48. Ἐγρήγορος appears in the *Testament of Naphtali* as well. In *Testament of Naphtali* 3:5, the patriarch admonishes his children to recognize God in his works of creation so that they will not become like Sodom or the watchers, who departed from the order in nature and the Lord pronounced a curse on them at the time of the flood. Cf. de Jonge, *Testaments*, 60. This is again a clear allusion to the story of the "sons of God" who took for themselves wives from among the "daughters of men" (Gen 6:1–4). The *Testament of Naphtali* depicts this as a transgression of τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν. The Greek text is quoted from R.H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), 150. Cf. also M. de Jonge, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 117.

ἐγρήγορος as an example where Greek words take on a wider spectrum of meaning because they serve as the translation equivalent for polysemic Semitic words. Accordingly, ἐγρήγορος, which has the meaning "watcher", comes to denote a particular type of angel.[50] Although it is debatable whether the Greek translator of Lamentations did indeed have an angelic being in mind when he decided on ἐγρήγοροι αὐτῆς to translate עורים, it is nevertheless clear that this interesting reading in the LXX came about as a result of the translation process and was not based on a variant reading in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[51] The case of ܗܘܕܝܗ ("her nobles") in P is more difficult to decide. In its critical apparatus, BHK proposes that ܗܘܕܝܗ in the Syriac translation might be based on a Hebrew reading נגידיה (from the word נגיד, "chief"/ "leader"),[52] while Rudolph[53] puts forward two possible candidates for the Hebrew reading behind the Syriac equivalent in P, חרים ("free ones"/"noble ones")[54] and נגדים (presumably also derived from נגיד). From a text-critical perspective, it is difficult to see how any one of these proposed readings could have developed through erroneous copying into עורים or vice versa. Albrektson's solution therefore seems to be the most probable explanation of the variant in P. He takes as his point of departure Abelesz's suggestion that the Syriac translator could have read עורים as שרים: "If a carelessly written ע stands very close to a ו, the two letters could easily be taken for a ש".[55] With regard to the added pronoun αὐτῆς in the LXX and the

---

50 Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 24.

51 Albrektson (*Studies*, 186) is of the opinion that the Greek translator read a *yod* instead of *waw* and then interpreted the form in accordance with the sense of עיר in Aramaic. If the Greek translator had angelic beings in mind, he did not necessarily derive this meaning from Aramaic. Two texts from Qumran that were written in Hebrew, 4Q227 (*4QPseudo-Jubilees*[c]) and 4Q266 (4Q*Damascus Document*[a]), contain references to the watchers. In the second fragment of 4Q227, Enoch is mentioned as giving witness against all the sons of men and against the watchers (ויעד על כולם [...] וגם על עירים), while in the latter text it is stated that "the watchers of the heavens" (עירי ה[שמים) fell because of the stubbornness of their hearts and that they did not follow the precepts of God. The appearance of Enoch in 4Q227 and the fact that the *Damascus Document* goes on to say that the sons of the watchers, "whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains", also came to a fall (an allusion to the giant offspring resulting from the union between the "fallen" angels and the women) (CD A 2:19), show that the עירים in these texts probably refer to the rebellious angels that are mentioned in texts such as *1Enoch*. At the same time, this implies that a Hebrew word עיר had connotations with a particular type of angelic being, the "watchers", and that the Greek translator could have had these in mind when he read עורים in Lam 4:14 as עירים.

52 BDB 617–618; KBL 592; DCH V 606.

53 Rudolph, "Text," 119.

54 BDB 359; KBL 329; DCH III 305.

55 Albrektson, *Studies*, 186–187.

third-person feminine singular pronominal suffix of ܗܘܢܝ in P, Albrektson speculates that both the Greek and the Syriac translator may have read the final *mem* of עורים as a *he*.[56] Seeing as the Syriac translator freely added suffixes in his translation, it is also possible to explain the one of ܗܘܢܝ in this way. Schäfer remarks that the fragmentary reading of 5QLam^{a} at least confirms that the word in question ended in a *mem* and that this lends weight to the argument that the additions in the LXX and P are in all probability the work of the translators.[57]

בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ יִגְעוּ בִּלְבֻשֵּׁיהֶם—בל י[ו]כ֫לו יבג[ ] בלבושיהם

The wording of the MT is difficult. Berlin describes it as only partially intelligible,[58] while Hillers is of the opinion that the wording "is really not possible".[59] He rearranges the consonants of the MT so that the wording would be בלאי כלו ויגעו בלו לבושיהם ("By exertion they are spent and exhausted; their clothing is tattered"). Hillers posits the existence of a noun לאי, which he derives from the verbal root לאה, "to be weary"/"to toil". He arrives at the form בלאי (preposition ב plus noun לאי) by removing the initial *yod* of יוכלו and appending it to בלא. For the verbal forms כלו and ויגעו he deletes the vowel indicator, *waw*, of יוכלו and adds the same consonant as a conjunction to יגעו. He relates the latter to the root יגע, "to be weary", and not to נגע, "to touch". Hillers notes that both the verbs כלה, "to be exhausted"/"to be at an end", and יגע are frequently followed by the preposition *beth*, indicating the cause of the exhaustion. Finally, he inserts the word בלו (from the root בלה, "to be worn out"), which he assumes was lost by haplography due to the *lamedh* at the beginning of the next word, לבושיהם. Hillers's conjectural emendations to the wording of the MT have failed to convince his colleagues.[60] Other scholars attempt to wrest some sense from

---

56 Ibid.

57 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 132*.

58 Berlin, *Lamentations*, 111.

59 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 142.

60 Budde ("Klagelied," 274) has proposed a less extravagant, but equally conjectural, emendation to the wording of the MT. He postulates that לראות or יראו must be added after יוכלו in light of problems with the colometry of the bicolon: "Was sie nicht sehen mögen (oder 'können'), berühren (streifen) sie mit ihren Kleidern". The colon would therefore terminate after the added word. Gordis (*Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 192) divides the bicolon as follows: (4:14bβ) בִּלְבֻשֵּׁיהֶם / (4:14bα) בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ יִגְעוּ. He attributes two accents to the long word בלבשיהם and notes that the "poetic caesura does not coincide with the logical pause". The bicolon is given the same layout in BHK and BHS. However, in BHQ the colometry of the bicolon is in accordance with the Masoretic accents: (4:14bβ) יִגְעוּ בִּלְבֻשֵּׁיהֶם / (4:14bα) בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ.

the present form of the MT, rather than insert changes that have no basis in the available textual witnesses.

The difficulty of the bicolon revolves around the opening word בלא, the relationship between the two *yiqtol* verbs and the identity of the verbs' subject(s). Brown, Driver and Briggs translate בלא יוכלו יגעו as follows: "without (that) men are able to touch".[61] In this interpretation, the subjects are impersonal, the second verb is the complement of the first[62] and בלא is rendered as a preposition that introduces an asyndetic relative clause. The prepositional phrase can also be understood as an adverbial adjunct that indicates the circumstances surrounding the defilement of the prophets and the priests: "they were defiled by blood with people being unable to touch their clothes". Rudolph[63] remarks, however, that the grammar of Lam 4:14b allows for two translations: "What they were not allowed, they touched with their clothes" (ב is dependent on יגעו and לא יוכלו constitutes a relative clause).[64] Another possible translation would be "so that no one could touch their clothes" (בלא plus *yiqtol* in a statement of consequence). On the basis of his interpretation of the content of the verse, Rudolph favours the first possibility. Albrektson, followed by Gottlieb and Renkema,[65] also thinks that בלא יוכלו is best taken as a relative clause governed by יגעו, while Meek argues that the preposition ב should be understood as introducing a clause that acts as the object of the verb יגעו: "Those whom they should not, they touch with their garments".[66] On such an interpretation of the grammar, the prophets and priests of v. 13 constitute the subject not only of נעו in the first bicolon of v. 14, but also of the verbs יוכלו and יגעו in the second bicolon. Conversely, House[67] and Berlin[68] prefer the second translation possibility according to which people had to avoid contact with the bloodstained clothing of the

---

61 BDB 520.

62 When a verb that is incomplete in itself receives its necessary complement in the form of another verbal idea, the governing verb is usually followed by an infinitive construct. Sometimes, however, it is combined with an infinitive absolute, a participle or a *yiqtol* without a conjunction. Cf. GKC § 120.

63 Rudolph, "Text," 119.

64 Jer 2:11 is another passage where a *yiqtol* verb follows בלא and constitutes a substantivised relative clause: וְעַמִּי הֵמִיר כְּבוֹדוֹ בְּלוֹא יוֹעִיל ("but my people exchanged its glory for that which does not profit/benefit"). In this case the preposition is easily explained as a *beth pretii*.

65 Albrektson, *Studies*, 187; Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 65; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 384–385.

66 Meek, "Lamentations," 33.

67 House, *Lamentations*, 445.

68 Berlin, *Lamentations*, 111.

prophets and the priests, lest they become impure as well.[69] Kraus also follows the second option by translating בלא יוכלו יגעו בלבשיהם as "so daß man nicht berühren durfte ihre Kleider".[70] His interpretation is unique in that he sees the צדיקים of v. 13 as the "blutbesudelten Unreinen" whose clothes are not to be touched, and not the prophets and the priests who are said to have spilled the blood of these righteous people.

Neither of these translation possibilities of the MT is applicable to the wording of the colon in 5QLam[a], since this manuscript has the negative particle בל instead of בלא, the preposition ב plus negative particle לא.[71] Although the change from בלא to בל or vice versa only involves the addition or omission of an *'aleph*, nothing in the immediate context seems to have triggered such a scribal error. Considering the fact that בלא plus *yiqtol* is a rare construction and that the MT wording of the verse is problematic,[72] Schäfer's suggestion[73] that the change from בלא to בל was deliberately introduced by a scribe as a facilitation of a perceived syntactical difficulty is attractive.

The second (partially preserved) variant in 5QLam[a] is [ ]יבג. Milik points out that there is a dot below the *beth*.[74] If there was another dot above it, these dots would be cancellation dots. Cancellation dots indicate that, according to the scribe who inserted them, a letter was written down by mistake and should be deleted.[75] By removing the *beth*, the reading in 5QLam[a] can be restored as יג[עו] in accordance with its counterpart in the MT. With regard to the syntax of the bicolon in 5QLam[a], the *yiqtol* verb יגעו (without a conjunction) would be the complement of the governing verb יוכלו. Based on

---

69 Salters (*Lamentations*, 318) points out that the "strict ancient taboos among primitive peoples" forms the background of the ideas expressed in Lam 4:14 (and v. 15): "With regard to blood, which, in Israel, was thought to be the seat of life (Lev 17.11; Deut 12.23), the fear of pollution by contact with it was strong (Deut 22.8)".

70 Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 71, 80.

71 According to JM §160, בל is a synonym of לא. It is chiefly used in poetic passages and negates statements. Cf. also BHRG §41.5.4.

72 Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 49.

73 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 69.

74 Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

75 On the use of cancellation dots in manuscripts among the Dead Sea scrolls with numerous examples, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 188–198. Tov (ibid, 191) shows that on rare occasions cancellation dots were placed only below letters. One example might be found in 4Q501 (*4QApocryphal Lamentations B*) where a *he* was written in the supralinear space with a dot below it and possibly a line above it. The dot below the *beth* of [ ]יבג in 5QLam[a] could therefore also be interpreted as a cancellation dot, irrespective of whether there was a dot above it as well.

the surviving letters, one could also reconstruct the word either as [עת]ובג, a conjunction *waw* plus the preposition *beth* plus a Qal infinitive construct of the verbal root נגע, or as [דו]יבג, a Qal *yiqtol* third-person masculine plural of the root בגד, "to betray"/"to be disloyal".[76] However, such reconstructions create more problems than they solve. In view of the incomplete nature of the fragment on which the word was written, it seems prudent not to speculate about this possible variant reading. It cannot be restored with any measure of certainty and it may not even qualify as a variant, seeing as there is evidence to suggest that a scribe already cancelled out the *beth*, which is the cause for speculation about a variant reading to begin with.

Concerning the content of the verse, the damaged state of the manuscript, which resulted in the loss of a number of words, makes it difficult to establish to what degree the wording of 5QLam[a] agrees or disagrees with the MT. The subject of the verbs יוכלו and יגעו and the construction with בלא in the second bicolon of the MT are open to various interpretations. Therefore, this version can either be taken to mean that the clothing of the prophets and priests may not be touched as a consequence of their defilement by blood,[77] or that the bloodstained prophets and priests are guilty of coming into contact with unclean things. The change from בלא to בל exhibited by the wording in the manuscript from Qumran might have been intended to simplify the sentence structure of the bicolon. Whereas the final part of Lam 4:14 in the MT has a convoluted syntax, the wording in 5QLam[a] (as far as it has survived the forces of decay) can be interpreted as a statement with an impersonal subject for the verbs: people are said to be unable to touch (?) the garments of (probably) the prophets and priests.

---

[76] BDB 93; KBL 107; DCH II 90–91.

[77] Cf. the Syriac translation of P: ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܗܘ ܠܡܬܩܪܒ ܠܠܒܘܫܗܝ ("So that they were not able to touch their clothes" [i.e., they could not or may not touch their clothes]). In the LXX and V, the difficult Hebrew clause is rendered by common Greek and Latin constructions. With regard to the Greek translation, an articular infinitive in a prepositional phrase (ἐν τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς) is used to translate בלא יוכלו. The preposition ἐν plus articular infinitive phrase probably indicates a temporal relationship between the infinitive, δύνασθαι, and the main verb, ἥψαντο, in which the action expressed by the former occurs simultaneously with the action expressed by the latter. Similarly, in the wording of the Vulgate, *cumque non possent tenuerunt lacinias suas*, the conjunction *cum* plus the imperfect subjunctive, can signify a temporal relationship between the verb in the subordinate clause, *possent*, and the verb of the main clause, *tenuerunt*.

Verse 15

5QLam[a] [ ]ו טמאו קראו למו סורו ס[ו]רו אל ת[ג]עו כי נצו
[ ] לגור

[ ] "They are unclean"/"They defile"/"They are defiled", they cried regarding them. "Depart, de[par]t, do not [touc]h!" When they took to flight [ ] sojourn.

MT סוּרוּ טָמֵא קָרְאוּ לָמוֹ סוּרוּ סוּרוּ אַל־תִּגָּעוּ כִּי נָצוּ גַּם־נָעוּ אָמְרוּ בַגּוֹיִם לֹא יוֹסִיפוּ לָגוּר׃

"Depart! Unclean!", they cried regarding them. "Depart, depart, do not touch!" When they took to flight and also wandered about (aimlessly), they said among the nations:[78] "They shall not continue to sojourn".

The Hebrew word נצו, which appears in both the wordings of 5QLam[a] and the MT, is a *hapax legomenon* and its precise meaning is uncertain. Driver makes use of comparative philology and suggests that נצו should be related to a root נוץ and interpreted in light of the Arabic root *nwṣ*, "to avoid"/"to flee".[79] Köhler gives the meaning of נוץ as "to leave"/"to depart".[80] Brown, Driver and Briggs tentatively relate נצו to the root נצה, "to fly",[81] as does Rudolph[82] on the basis of the position of the Masoretic accent. Some scholars prefer to emend the difficult word נצו into נדו. The latter would be derived from the root נוד, "to waver"/"to wander aimlessly"/"to move to and fro"[83] and forms a good parallel with the following verb נעו.[84]

---

[78] Budde ("Klagelied," 75), Dyserinck ("Klaagliederen," 378) and Löhr (*Klagelieder*, 22) share the opinion that אמרו בגוים must be deleted from the wording of the second bicolon for reasons of metre. Salters (*Lamentations*, 318), Westermann (*Lamentations*, 197), Kraus (*Klagelieder* [*Threni*], 72) and Albrektson (*Studies*, 190) identify these words, together with קראו למו in the first bicolon, as glosses, whereas Rudolph (*Klagelieder*, 249) and Gottlieb (*Text of Lamentations*, 65–66) treat only אמרו as a secondary gloss. Whereas the broken text of 5QLam[a] preserves only the first of these clauses, all the other textual representatives bear witnesses to both of them. The textual evidence therefore weighs in favour of retaining these clauses as part of the wording of the verse. Instead of removing words *metri causa*, Gordis (*Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 192–193) proposes that בגוים should be seen as part of the final colon and not as an adverbial adjunct of the verb אמרו. If the Masoretic accents are taken into consideration, the colometry of the bicolon will look as follows: (4:15bα) כִּי נָצוּ גַּם־נָעוּ / (4:15bβ) אָמְרוּ בַגּוֹיִם לֹא יוֹסִיפוּ לָגוּר. According to this arrangement, the two cola are terminated with disjunctive accents of grade I, the *ʾathnaḥ* and the *silluq*. Each of these larger units is divided into two smaller units by means of an accent of grade II, *tipḥa* and *zaqeph qaton* respectively. Cf. Yeivin, *Introduction*, 176–181.

[79] Driver, "Hebrew Notes," 141–142.

[80] KBL 604.

[81] BDB 663.

[82] Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 249.

[83] BDB 626; KBL 600; DCH V 634.

[84] Berges, *Klagelieder*, 233; Westermann, *Lamentations*, 197.

To judge from the translation equivalents in the ancient translations, the translators derived the form נצו from different Hebrew verbal roots. It is rendered as ἀνήφθησαν ("they were set ablaze") in the LXX. This translation might have been based on a particular understanding of the root נצה in the sense of "to go to ruin".[85] The equivalents in T[W] (אתקוטטו) and V (*iurgati sunt*) imply that the translators of these texts related נצו to the Niphal form of נצה, "to struggle with each other".[86] T[Y], however, has the Aramaic form נצו, "they wrangled".[87] Concerning אנבהו in P, scholars note that the Syriac translator read נצו as a Piel form of נאץ, "to treat without respect"/"to contemn"/"to spurn".[88]

In light of the lack of consensus among scholars regarding the root of נצו and its different interpretations in the ancient translators, one can conclude that the word is still shrouded in mystery. Its translation will not only affect, but will also to some degree be determined by one's understanding of the clause כי נצו גם נעו. The adverb גם is a focus particle that modifies the verb נעו.[89] Its function is to indicate that the verbal idea expressed by נעו must be added to the temporal clause introduced by the conjunction כי. כי נצו גם נעו is therefore a subordinate clause, while the one that follows it, אמרו בגוים ("they said among the nations"), is the main clause. In other words, the idea that "they wandered about aimlessly" (נעו) is explicitly added to the verbal idea conveyed by נצו, which forms part of a temporal clause that refers to events that occur simultaneously with the main clause. Looking at the range of meanings assigned to the two possible roots of נצו, נוץ and נצה, a translation such as "they took flight" would be appropriate for נצו in this reading of the syntax of the MT's wording. On this interpretation, the wording of the MT states that when the defiled prophets and priests took flight, they also roamed around aimlessly. At the same time, the nations refused to harbour them as sojourners. Despite the fact that only נצו was preserved in 5QLam[a] and it remains uncertain whether the rest of the clause was identical to the wording of the MT, the translation of נצו in the manuscript from Qumran draws on the interpretation of the wording of the MT.

---

[85] On this translation, see the discussion in Kotzé, "Greek Translation," 91–93. Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 263; and Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 36 present alternative views.

[86] Cf. Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 171; and Levine, *Aramaic Versions*, 171.

[87] Jastrow 928.

[88] Cf. Salters, *Lamentations*, 320; Albrektson, *Studies*, 189–190; Rudolph, "Text," 119; and Robinson, "Notes," 259.

[89] Cf. BHRG § 5.2.i.

סורו טָמֵא קָרְאוּ לָמוֹ—[ ]וֹ טִמְּאוֹ קראו למו

The wording of the opening colon of Lam 4:15 has elicited two diverging interpretations. On the one hand, scholars such as House, Gordis and Meek argue that the prophets and priests mentioned in v. 13 are the subject of the verb קראו.[90] למו can then be understood in a reflexive sense. These scholars place the imperative סורו and the exclamation טמא in the mouths of the defiled prophets and priests, and assert that the colon compares them to lepers, since Lev 13:45 instructs a leprous person to cry out "Impure, impure!" On the other hand, Renkema and other commentators interpret the colon in such a way that קראו has an impersonal subject and למו means "regarding them (the impure ones)".[91] On this interpretation, members of the public warn each other not to draw near and come into contact with the unclean prophets and priests. The wording of the colon in 5QLam^{a} can be understood in a similar way to the second of these two interpretations of the MT. The difference between the two Hebrew textual witnesses lies in the second word of the colon. טמא in the MT is taken as an exclamation on analogy with the passage from Lev 13:45 (וטמא טמא יקרא), whereas the reconstructed variant טִמְּאוֹ in 5QLam^{a} is, without doubt, a verbal form. Milik[92] restores the word as טִמְּאוֹ, although only a part of the first letter and a few ink traces of the rest of the word are preserved on the manuscript. Nevertheless, the top part of the final letter resembles the *waw* of קראו and this makes it probable that the second word of the colon in this manuscript was טמאו and not טמא, as in the MT. As a verbal form, טִמְּאוֹ can be an imperative second-person masculine plural, but the sense of the bicolon requires that it be understood as a third-person plural *qatal* in the Qal, Piel or Pual stem formations. In the Qal stem formation the root טמא means "to be/become (ceremonially) unclean", while in the Piel, it has the sense "to defile" and in the Pual, the sense "to be defiled".[93] Therefore, if טִמְּאוֹ is taken as a *qatal* form, the wording of the first colon in 5QLam^{a} allows for three slightly different interpretations depending on the conjugation of the verb. First, the (impersonal) subject of the verb קראו calls out that the prophets and the priests are unclean (טִמְּאוֹ [Qal] = "They are unclean").

---

[90] House, *Lamentations*, 445; Gordis, *Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 192–193; Meek, "Lamentations," 33.

[91] Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 386–387.

[92] Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

[93] BDB 379; KBL 353; DCH III 366–368. The Piel has a factitive meaning here. Cf. Jenni, *Pi'el*, 41 regarding the verbal root טמא.

Secondly, people are warned that these prophets and priests make other people impure (טִמְּאוּ [Piel] = "They defile"). Thirdly, it is reiterated that the prophets and the priests are defiled (טָמְאוּ [Pual] = "They are defiled").[94]

With regard to the creation of the variant readings טִמְּאוּ and טמא in the manuscript from Qumran and the MT, it is instructive to have a look at the renderings of the opening bicolon of Lam 4:15 in the ancient translations. With the exception of the two recensions of T, which have a singular equivalent,[95] the Greek, Syriac and Latin translation equivalents of the second word in the Hebrew texts are all plural.[96] The critical apparatuses of BHS and BHK suggest that טְמֵאִים was the Hebrew reading behind ἀκαθάρτων in the LXX and *polluti* in V. In contrast to this view, Schäfer alludes to the possibility that the *Vorlagen* of the LXX, P and V might have contained the reading טמאו as found in 5QLam[a].[97] He is nonetheless of the opinion that טמא in the MT is preferable to טמאו in the manuscript from Qumran, because the latter can be explained as a stylistic facilitation. It is, however, equally possible that a

---

94 It was already stated in v. 14 that the prophets and priests are polluted by blood (נגאלו בדם).

95 According to the edition prepared by Levine (based on Codex Urbinas 1), the Aramaic translation of the first bicolon of Lam 4:15 in T[W] reads: זורו ממסאבא קרו עממיא זורו זורו לא תקרבון בהום. Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 171) argues that עליהון should be added after עממיא in accordance with manuscript 3231 kept in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma, Italy. Without this addition, the wording of T[W] would not have an equivalent for the Hebrew word למו. Alexander translates the emended text of T[W] as follows: "'Turn away from the defiling one,' cried the nations concerning them, 'Turn away, turn away! Do not touch!'". T[Y] exhibits a similar translation: "'Turn away from the defiling one,' cried the nations with respect to them, 'Turn away, turn away! Do not touch [them]!'" (זורו ממסאבא קרו עממיא זורו זורו לא תקרבון בהון) (ibid., 204). In both T[W] and T[Y], the Hebrew word טמא is translated with the Pael participle masculine singular form of the root סאב, "to soil"/"to defile"/"to make unclean" (Jastrow 947).

96 Each of these translations represents a unique interpretation of the Hebrew text. In the LXX the second word of the Hebrew parent text was taken as the object of the verb סורו, and קראו was interpreted as an imperative: ἀπόστητε ἀκαθάρτων καλέσατε αὐτούς ἀπόστητε ἀπόστητε μὴ ἅπτεσθε ("Keep away from the unclean ones! Call to them: 'Keep away, keep away! Do not touch!'"). Cf. also Hirsch-Luipold and Maier, "Threnoi/Die Klagelieder," 1356; Gentry "Lamentations," 941; and Assan-Dhote and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 270. In the text of P, the Syriac translator added a prepositional phrase after the opening imperative, used two different verbal roots to render the three occurrences of סורו and disregarded the asyndeton of the *Vorlage* by joining the sentences together with conjunctions: ܠܗܘܢ ܐܬܦܪܫܘ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܐܬܦܪܫܘ ܐܬܦܪܫܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܪܚܩܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܩܪܝܘ ("Separate from them and call them 'unclean'. Pass by, pass by and do not touch them"). Concerning V, *recedite polluti clamaverunt eis recedite abite nolite tangere*, one can interpret the nominative plural form of *polluti* as a vocative: "'Stay back, defiled ones!' They called out to them: 'Stay back, go away! Refuse to touch!'". If this is correct, Jerome provides a third distinctive rendering of the verse's opening words.

97 Schäfer, "Lamentations," 133*.

scribe changed טמאו into טמא under the influence of a passage such as Lev 13:45. The evidence from the LXX, P and V can also be marshalled in support of the view that the reading of 5QLam[a] is the more original one, provided that one first accepts the theory that the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of these ancient translations did indeed contain the reading טמאו, and secondly, that the differences between these translations are due to the unique interpretations of the Hebrew wording by the respective Greek, Syriac and Latin translators. A case can be made for both explanations of the variants טמאו and טמא based on one's interpretation of the wordings in the two available Hebrew textual witnesses. Although three other words in the first colon of Lam 4:15 end in a *waw* (סורו, קראו and למו), it seems improbable that a scribe either omitted or added the *waw* of the reading טמאו by mistake.

Excursus: The Scribal Marking in the Bottom Margin of Column II of 5QLam[a]

The overview of the formal characteristics of the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran in the second chapter of this study drew attention to the presence of the scribal marking ו in the bottom margin of 5QLam[a]. The shape of this scribal marking resembles a truncated paleo-Hebrew *waw* (𐤅) or a *waw* in the square Aramaic script dating from the sixth century BCE. The functions of such signs that are found in the interlinear spaces and margins of some manuscripts among the Dead Sea scrolls are uncertain. Tov suggests that these signs might point to certain details in the wording or to a particular passage, but that they may also have been utilised to refer to the Qumran community's reading of certain passages.[98] Bearing in mind the position of the scribal marking in 5QLam[a], it might very well have been intended to draw attention to the content of v. 15 of Lam 4, which was written on the final line of the column. This verse deals with the anxiety over impurity and the need to avoid physical contact with people in such a defiled state. The potential exegetical import of the verse for the Qumran community inheres exactly in the theme of purity. Numerous passages from writings among the Dead Sea scrolls, including the so-called "foundation documents",[99] leave no room for doubt that purity was a central concern for

---

98 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 206–207.

99 On the notion of the Qumran community's "foundation documents", see S. Talmon, "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity," in *The*

the community.[100] Their regulations regarding purity are tied up in a number of other issues that were of special significance to the community and their self-definition.

The members of the community considered themselves to be the only legitimate representation of Israel, the chosen people of God with whom he had made the covenant. Consequently, obedience to the precepts of the Torah given to Moses was of paramount importance to the Qumran covenanters. Study, understanding and practice of the Torah constituted a vital part of the community's communal life and each member's position within it. For example, when a new member wanted to join the community, he had to take an oath to comply with the instructions of the Torah as they were interpreted by the Qumran covenanters (1QS 5:7–11):

> These are the regulations of their behaviour concerning all these decrees when they are enrolled in the Community. Whoever enters the council of the Community enters the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer. He shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with whole heart and whole soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of the men of their covenant who freely volunteer together for this truth and to walk according to his will. He should swear by the covenant to be segregated from all the men of injustice who walk along the path of wickedness. For they are not included in his covenant since they have neither sought nor examined his decrees in order to know the hidden matters in which they err by their own fault and because they treated revealed matters with disrespect.[101]

1QS 5:20–24 relates the practice of examining the members of the community with respect to their understanding and practice of the Torah. An individual's place in the order of the community depended on his understanding and observance of the Torah:

Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds. E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3–24. He includes the following writings under this heading: the *Rule of the Community* (1QS, 4Q255–264, 5Q11), the *Messianic Rule* (1QSa), the *Damascus Document* (CD A, CD B, 4Q266–272), the *Pesher on Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *War Scroll* (1QM, 4Q491–496), the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH[a], 1QH[b], 4Q427–432, 4Q471b) and the *Temple Scroll* (11QT[a], 11QT[b], 4Q524).

[100] Cf. J. Klawans, "Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 377–402; and S. Haber, *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism* (ed. A. Reinhartz; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 47–71.

[101] The translation is quoted from *DSSSE* 1, 81.

> And when someone enters the covenant to behave in compliance with all these decrees, enrolling in the assembly of holiness, they shall examine their spirits in the Community, one another, in respect of his insight and of his deeds in law, under the authority of the sons of Aaron, those who freely volunteer in the Community to set up his covenant and to follow all the decrees which he commanded to fulfil, and under the authority of the majority of Israel, those who freely volunteer to return within the Community to his covenant. And they shall be recorded in order, one before the other, according to one's insight and one's deeds, in such a way that each one obeys another, the junior the senior. And their spirit and their deeds must be tested, year after year, in order to upgrade each one to the extent of his insight and the perfection of his path, or to demote him according to his failings.[102]

Seeing as the controversies between the different religious parties in Second Temple Judaism revolved around the interpretation and practice of Torah, it is noteworthy that the distinguishing factor that differentiated Qumran covenanters from the other religious parties was their stringent interpretation of the Torah.[103] This rigorous interpretation of biblical laws found expression in the community's halakhah and matters relating to cultic ritual and purity enjoy pride of place in it.[104] With regard to the former, it was imperative that the ritual acts be carried out in the correct manner and at the right times. The sacrifices performed by the priests at the temple in Jerusalem were regarded by them as null and void, because the official sacrificial cult followed the wrong calendar, namely a lunar one of 354

---

[102] Ibid., 81, 83.

[103] For a discussion on the commonalities and differences between the Qumran covenanters and other Jews of the Second Temple period, see E.P. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Sect and other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context* (eds. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 7–43. Cf. also Schiffman's discussion (with examples) of the halakhah of the Pharisees, Sadducees and the Qumran community: L.H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 123–142.

[104] For discussions on the central place of purity in the halakhah of the Qumran community, see J.M. Baumgarten, "The Law and Spirit of Purity at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Two: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 93–105; and H.K. Harrington, "The Halakah and Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 74–89. Harrington (ibid., 81–85) argues that the primary purpose of the stringent interpretation of the Torah and the community's halakhah with regard to cultic and purity matters was to become as holy as possible; that is, to emulate God as best as one can by discovering and doing his will. On holiness at Qumran, see also L.H. Schiffman, "Holiness and Sanctity in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 256–269.

days. In accordance with writings such as *1Enoch* and *Jubilees*, the Qumran covenanters were convinced that the proper calendar is the 364-day solar one:[105]

> The institution of the 364-day calendar was understood by the traditions of 1Enoch and Jubilees as a commandment of God (1 En 18:14–16; 80:2–8; Jub 2:9; cf. 6:30–32) modifying the tradition preserved in Genesis 1:14–19, where both the sun and the moon are the determinants of the calendar: "The Lord appointed the sun as a great sign above the earth for days, Sabbaths, months, festivals, years, Sabbaths of years, jubilees, and all the times of the years" (Jub 2:9). The basis of the 364-day calendar also rests upon a concern to properly fulfil other *halakhot* of the torah. By fixing the festival days on the same day of the week every year, the 364-day calendar avoids conflict between the commandments to honor the Sabbath and commandments to celebrate the festivals ... As in the book of Jubilees, the Qumran community was also concerned that the Sabbath regulations, which they interpreted quite literally, be strictly followed[106] ... Thus, following of the correct calendar had halakic significance: the times of worship have been commanded by God; failure to worship at the correct time violates God's torah.[107]

Since they saw the sacrificial offerings at the Jerusalem temple as illegitimate, the members of the community did not take part in it. Although this was a great deficit in the community's religious life, they made up for it, to some extent,[108] by thinking of themselves as an "embodiment" of the temple until such a time as the sacrificial cult is purged of its illegitimate character

---

105 For details regarding the community's calendar, see the calendrical documents that were recovered from the Qumran caves, 4Q319, 4Q320–4Q330, 4Q335, 4Q336, 4Q337 and 6Q17, as well as Talmon's discussion of the calendar controversy between the Qumran community and other representatives of Second Temple Judaism: S. Talmon, "What's in a Calendar? Calendar Conformity and Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant'," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Two: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 25–58.

106 Cf. for example the regulations regarding the Sabbath recorded in CD A 10:15–11:20.

107 H.W.M. Rietz, "Synchronizing Worship: Jubilees as a Tradition for the Qumran Community," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 111–118, 112–113.

108 Kugler argues that the Qumran covenanters' self-definition as a holy, priestly community, their prayers and study of Torah was not conceived of as a substitute for the sacrificial cult, but was rather intended to mimic or mirror it. In lieu of taking part in the sacrifices performed at the temple in Jerusalem, the covenanters rewrote the rubrics for sacrifices through harmonizing and narrowing exegesis, according to Kugler. He demonstrates this by discussing legal rulings from 4QMMT. Cf. R.A. Kugler, "Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 90–112.

and the community can once more return to the temple and take part in its rituals. In the meantime, they mirrored the activities of the temple cult in their day-to-day existence by studying the Torah, practicing the community's interpretations of its laws (their halakhah) and engaging in liturgical practices, such as the daily prayer services. The *Rule of the Community* seems to imply that the community's "offering of lips" will act as substitute for sacrificial offerings (1QS 9:3–6):

> When these exist in Israel in accordance with these rules in order to establish the spirit of holiness in truth eternal, in order to atone for the guilt of iniquity and for the unfaithfulness of sin, and for approval for the earth, without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice—the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice and the perfectness of behaviour will be acceptable like a freewill offering—at that moment the men of the Community shall set apart a holy house for Aaron, in order to form a most holy community, and a house of the Community for Israel, those who walk in perfection.[109]

The Qumran covenanters therefore appropriated for themselves the status of a holy, priestly community[110] and submitted to priestly purity regulations, but interpreted these more stringently. For example, Lev 21:17–23 excludes anyone with a physical handicap from taking part in the sacrificial cult and the priestly office, but according to 1QSa 2:3–10, all such people are forbidden to enter the community when they assemble:

> No man, defiled by any of the impurities of a man, shall enter the assembly of these; and no-one who is defiled by these should be established in his office amongst the congregation: everyone who is defiled in his flesh, paralysed in his feet or in his hands, lame, blind, deaf, dumb or defiled in his flesh with a blemish visible to the eyes, or the tottering old man who cannot keep upright in the midst of the assembly; these shall not en[ter] to take their place [a]mong the congregation of the men of renown, for the angels of holiness are

---

109 *DSSSE* 1, 91.

110 See, in addition to the passages quoted from 1QS 5:7–11 and 9:3–6, the following passages: 1QS 8:5–9, CD A 3:18–4:4 and 4Q511 (*4QSongs of the Sage*^{b}) fragment 35. Lines 2–4 of this fragment read: "Among the holy ones, God makes (some) hol[y] for himself like an everlasting sanctuary, and there will be purity amongst those purified. And they shall be priests, his just people, his army and servants, the angels of his glory" (*DSSSE* 2, 1033). The note in 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*) 1:6–7 that God "commanded to build for himself a temple of man (מקדש אדם), to offer him in it, before him, the works of thanksgiving" (*DSSSE* 1, 353) might also have been understood by the Qumran covenanters to apply to themselves. Cf. G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Revised Edition* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 525; *Contra* M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg and E.M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation. Revised Edition* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2005), 226.

among their [congre]gation.[111] And if [one of] these has something to say to the holy council, they shall question [him] in private, but the man shall [n]ot enter in the midst of [the congregation,] because [h]e is defiled.[112]

In light of the important role that the concept of purity played in the Qumran community's self-identity, its interpretation of Torah and its daily existence, it does not seem too far-fetched to entertain the possibility that a scribe belonging to this community inserted the scribal marking in the bottom margin of 5QLam[a] where Lam 4:15 was written. The scribe used the sign to flag this verse because it has to do with impurity and the necessity of avoiding those who are defiled. The scribal marking could have signalled to the reader that here is a passage in need of further interpretation or it might have been used to identify the verse as some kind of a "prooftext". These suggestions are, of course, no more than indemonstrable speculations and will probably remain so. Nevertheless, it is likely that a Qumran scribe would have been attentive to a passage such as Lam 4:15, which deals with impurity, a topic that was of major concern for his community. If this likelihood is conceded, it follows that 5QLam[a] provides an example of a manuscript among the Dead Sea scrolls where there might be a connection between the *position* of the scribal marking in the manuscript and its possible intended *function*. Whether the particular shape of the scribal marking bears any significance is uncertain.

---

111 By the same rationale, 1QM 7:3–6 excludes such people (as well as women and children) from forming part of the war camp of the sons of light when they will leave for battle against the sons of darkness: "And no young boy or any woman at all shall enter the camps when they leave Jerusalem to go to war, until they return. And no lame, blind, paralysed person nor any man who has an indelible blemish on his flesh, nor any man suffering from uncleanness in his flesh, none of these will go out to war with them. All these shall be volunteers for war, perfect in spirit and in body, and ready for the day of vengeance. And every man who has not cleansed himself of his 'spring' on the day of battle will not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their armies" (*DSSSE* 1, 125). Purity was therefore essential for the community, not least of all because they believed that angels were present in their community and that their worship services are somehow in sync with the cult conducted by the angels in the heavenly temple. Cf. the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400–407, 11Q17 and MasShirShabb).

112 *DSSSE* 1, 103. Cf. also CD A 15:15–17. According to 4QMMT B 49–54, the blind and deaf must be denied access to the sanctuary, although they are allowed to eat of the holy food, while 11QT[a] 45:12–14 states that a blind person may not be granted access to the entire (ideal) temple city.

Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 4 as They Appear in 5QLam^{a}[113]

At Lam 4:7, the discussion revolved around the difficult clause אדמו עצם מפנינים in both 5QLam^{a} and the MT and the function of עצם therein. The analysis indicates that the various proposals for emending the wording of the clause is unnecessary because עצם can be interpreted as an example of synecdoche, in which case "bone" is representative of the body as a whole. In terms of the sentence structure, עצם functions as an adverbial accusative together with the verb אדמו. On the assumption that the missing wording of 5QLam^{a} was similar to that of the MT, this clause forms part of the positive depiction of Jerusalem's נזירים in the verse as a whole. In the MT, vv. 7 and 8 give a before-and-after portrait of the נזירים. Whereas their shining and ruddy complexion was a sign of health and vitality, their appearance has faded to black and their skin has become shrivelled because of hunger and famine. This then-versus-now portrayal of the נזירים contributes to a larger theme in Lam 4, namely the contrast between the past and the present situation of various groups of Jerusalem's inhabitants.[114]

Verses 14 and 15 elaborate on the content of v. 13 where the blame for Jerusalem's collapse into the hands of the enemy is put squarely on the shoulders of her sinful prophets and her iniquitous priests who shed the blood of innocent victims. The wordings of these verses in 5QLam^{a} and the MT exhibit subtle differences that can be attributed to the creative activity of scribes who introduced slight changes to the wording of the manuscripts which they copied. At Lam 4:14, the difference between 5QLam^{a} and the MT revolves around the wording of the verse's final clause. The difficult syntax in the MT can be interpreted in two ways. First, the clause can be understood as describing another illicit act perpetrated by the bloodstained prophets and priests. They touched things (or people) with their defiled clothes, while they were not allowed to do this. The second possibility is to interpret the clause as a statement of consequence. As a consequence of the uncleanness of the prophets and priests, owing to their bloodshed, people were not able to come into contact with the clothes of these religious figures. Bearing in mind that the reading בלא יוכלו יגעו in the MT constitutes the *lectio difficilior*,

---

[113] The following synopsis is restricted to 5QLam^{a} because too little of the wording in 5QLam^{b} has survived for one to make an accurate assessment as to how this manuscript presents the content of the verses from Lam 4 that are partly preserved therein.

[114] Cf. Gottwald, *Studies*, 59.

it is probable that [ ]יבג יִכָּלּוּ[ו] בל י in 5QLam[a] represents an attempt on the part of a scribe to make the sentence structure of the clause easier. From this perspective, the move from בלא to בל is not an inadvertent scribal error, but a deliberate change. This change in wording also brings with it a shift in meaning. The final clause of Lam 4:14 in 5QLam[a] declares that people are not able to touch the garments of the defiled prophets and the priests, provided that one accepts the evidence for a cancellation dot below the *beth* of]יבג and assigns impersonal subjects to the verbs.

Concerning Lam 4:15, the analysis shows that the difficult word נצו in both 5QLam[a] and the MT can be interpreted in the sense of "they took flight" and forms part of a subordinate temporal clause introduced by the conjunction כי. Unfortunately, the final part of the verse is not completely preserved in the manuscript from Qumran, but the wording of the MT indicates that the nations refused to give shelter to the prophets and the priests during the time of their flight and aimless wandering. The difference between the two available Hebrew versions of the verse is to be found in the second word of the first colon. 5QLam[a] has a verbal form, טִמְּאוּ, while טמא in the MT functions as an exclamation. If one understands the subject of קראו as the prophets and the priests themselves, the wording of the MT likens them to lepers, analogous with Lev 13:45. Alternatively, one can interpret the imperatives in the verse as a warning voiced by the impersonal subject of קראו to passers by so that they will avoid contact with the defiled prophets and priests. The wording of 5QLam[a] also allows for more than one interpretation. The different possibilities for interpretation revolve around the verbal conjugation one allocates to טִמְּאוּ. This form can be construed as a Qal, Piel or Pual. The verse in 5QLam[a] therefore opens with a warning that either the prophets and priests are unclean (Qal and Pual) or that they are in a position to render others unclean (Piel). The reading in 5QLam[a] might very well be more original than טמא in the MT, seeing as the translation equivalents of the second word of the first colon in the LXX, P and V are also plural. Admittedly, these ancient translations do not represent טמאו as a verb, but this does not eliminate the possibility that their Hebrew *Vorlagen* contained a reading similar or identical to the one in 5QLam[a]. Moreover, טמאו might have been changed to טמא under the influence of the passage from Lev 13:45. However the creation of the readings in the Hebrew versions and the ancient translations is understood, טִמְּאוּ in 5QLam[a] was not the result of a scribal error. This, in turn, implies that the meaning it conveys is also not an accidental by-product of a mistaken addition of a *waw* to טמא.

CHAPTER FIVE

TEXT-CRITICAL ANALYSES OF THE WORDING OF LAM 5 AS IT IS WITNESSED TO BY 5QLAM^{A}

Introduction

The preceding chapters of this study dealt with manuscripts of Lamentations from Qumran that witness to Lam 1 and Lam 4. 4QLam, 5QLam^{a} and 5QLam^{b} were subjected to a text-critical examination in order to establish how these fragmentary scrolls present the content of the first and fourth poems of Lamentations. In this chapter, the focus is once more on 5QLam^{a} with a view to analyse the wording of Lam 5 as it is found in this manuscript. Individual words and parts of the bicola from fourteen verses of Lam 5 have been preserved in 5QLam^{a}: vv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 17 (or possibly 18). The uncertainty whether 5QLam^{a} contains a part of v. 17 or v. 18 revolves around the letters [ ]על ה that appear on a small scrap of leather that has split off from a larger fragment of the manuscript. Milik assigns the reading to v. 17, because the word אוי of the second bicolon of v. 16 is written just above [ ]על ה.[1] Milik goes on to restore the latter as על האלה. This would constitute a variant compared to על אלה of v. 17 in the MT, which does not have the definite article. Milik points out, however, that [ ]על ה can also be identified with על הר in v. 18.[2] In this case, v. 18 was written on the sixth line of the manuscript. Taking into account the spacing of the wording of 5QLam^{a} as it appears on the photograph of the manuscript in the plate of the DJD edition, one must then assume that the final words of v. 17 were omitted as a result of homoioarcton (the second bicolon of v. 17 begins with על אלה, while the first bicolon of v. 18 opens with the words על הר). Be that as it may, too little of the wording has survived to establish with any degree of certainty which of these possibilities is the most plausible one or to draw conclusions regarding the effect such variations in wording would have on the content of Lam 5 in 5QLam^{a}.

Based on perceived textual difficulties and the textual variants identified in the second chapter of the study, this study singles out vv. 1, 2, 3, 9, 10,

---

[1] Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

[2] Ibid. Cf. also Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 754.

and 11–13 for closer text-critical investigation. The analysis of the chapter concludes with a short excursus on the seemingly inexplicable space left in the manuscript of 5QLam[a] after Lam 5:13.[3]

Verse 1

5QLam[a] זכ[ור] מ֯ה [ ] ל֯נ֯ו הביטה [ ] אֶת חרפותי[נו

Remem[ber] what [ ] to us. Take note [ ] [our] disgraces.

MT זְכֹר יְהוָה מֶה־הָיָה לָּנוּ הַבִּיטָה וּרְאָה אֶת־חֶרְפָּתֵנוּ׃

Remember, O YHWH, what happened to us. Take note and see our disgrace.

הַבִּיטָה—הביטה

The word הביטה in 5QLam[a] is a Hiphil imperative second-person masculine singular form of the root נבט plus a paragogic *he*.[4] It agrees in form with the *qere* reading noted in the *masora parva* of Codex Leningradensis, as well as

---

[3] It is also noteworthy that there are clear allusions to three verses from Lam 5 in 4Q501. Line 1 of this small composition opens with a petition that the inheritance and property of the first-person speakers must not be handed over to strangers and foreigners (אל תתן לזרים נחלתנו ויגיענו לבני נכר). The sentence shows affinities with the wordings of both Lam 5:2 and Ps 109:11. Whereas in the former the community laments over the fact that their inheritance and their houses have been turned over to strangers and foreigners and in the psalm the opponents express the wish that strangers would plunder the property of the psalmist, the speakers in 4Q501 implore God not to let such a fate befall them. According to Berlin, the passage from Lamentations has been recontextualized in 4Q501 by conflating it with Ps 109:11 so that the enemy becomes those who talk falsely of the speakers. Cf. Berlin, "Qumran Laments," 15. In lines 5–6 of 4Q501 there is a plea for God to take note (הביטה) and see (וראה) the disgrace (חרפת) suffered by the speakers. This is reminiscent of the *qere* reading of the second colon of Lam 5:1 in the version transmitted by the MT: הביטה וראה את חרפתנו. The plea is followed up by references to "our skin" (עורינו) and "hot indignation" (זלעופות), which allude to Lam 5:10. Berlin (ibid., 13–14) postulates that the words of Lam 5:10 were here combined with those of Ps 119:53 ("Hot indignation has seized me on account of the wicked; those who forsake your Torah"). The resulting conflation recontextualizes the passage from Lamentations in terms of the verse from the psalm: "'We are physically devastated,' says the poem, 'like the Jerusalemites in Lamentations, not by famine but by the wicked people who have abandoned the Torah.' The poet clarifies the nature of their wickedness by adding the explanatory words מלפני לשון גדופיהם, 'from before their insolent tongue.' Insolent words are the cause of the harm. The poet's problem comes not from famine but from Jewish opponents." On 4Q501, see also J. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (ECDSS 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 177–180. For the text of 4Q501, see M. Baillet, "501. Lamentation," in *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 79–80.

[4] This particular form of the Hiphil imperative occurs four times in Lamentations, at 1:11. 2:20, 3:63 and at 5:1.

in the text of other medieval MT manuscripts. In so doing, הביטה in 5QLam[a] and the MT manuscripts imply that the matching *qere* reading in Codex Leningradensis is based on a textual variant.[5] The *kethib* reading הביט is a *plene* spelling of the Hiphil imperative (with the *yod* acting as a vowel indicator), which usually has the form הַבֵּט. Schäfer indicates that the *kethib* form is unusual and prefers it, as the *lectio difficilior*, over הביטה in the *qere* note and the text of the fragment from Qumran.[6] As to the cause of the variation, a scribe might have augmented the unusual *plene* form הביט by a paragogic *he* in order to remove what he considered to be an orthographical irregularity.[7]

חֶרְפָּתֵנוּ—חרפותי]נו

חרפתנו in the MT is a singular form of the noun חרפה ("disgrace"/ "shame"/ "reproach")[8] plus a first-person plural pronominal suffix, whereas its counterpart in 5QLam[a], חרפותינו, is plural. The reading in the MT is supported by the Greek (τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν ἡμῶν), Syriac (ܥܠܒܢ) and Latin (*obprobrium nostrum*) versions,[9] as well as by T[W] and T[Y] (כסופנא).[10] Although the evidence from the ancient translations would suggest that the singular form represented by the MT is the earlier reading, it is by no means certain that this is indeed the case. Since both the singular and plural variants yield good sense in the immediate context, the change in number (in either direction) does not appear to be the result of a scribal error. It can rather be explained as a deliberate modification introduced by a scribe. The list of things that happened to the community, recounted in vv. 2–18 of Lam 5, could have been taken as the cause of the speakers' condition of shame.[11] On this hypothesis,

---

[5] A similar case was identified at Lam 1:6 where the form מבת in the *qere* note is also found in 4QLam.

[6] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 134*.

[7] According to JM § 48d, a paragogic *he* is often appended to a masculine singular form of an imperative. The particular nuance of the paragogic *he* is, however, difficult to discern.

[8] BDB 357–358; KBL 336; DCH III 321.

[9] In fact, the LXX translation of the whole of Lam 5:1 closely reproduces the wording of the MT as represented by Codex Leningradensis: μνήσθητι κύριε ὅ τι ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν ἐπίβλεψον καὶ ἰδὲ τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν ἡμῶν ("Remember, O Lord, what has befallen us. Look and see our disgrace"). The same holds for P and V.

[10] Alexander (*Targum of Lamentations*, 179, 206) identifies כסופנא ("our shame/disgrace") as the majority reading in the manuscripts of T[W] and T[Y]. However, manuscript 116-Z-39 housed in the Universidad Complutense in Madrid, Spain reads חיסודנא ("our shame"). One textual witness to T[Y] also differs from the majority reading. Or 2377 of the British Library has the variant סגופנא ("our affliction").

[11] This interpretation is reinforced by the semantic parallelism of the bicolon in Lam

the singular form of the noun חרפתנו implies that a scribe understood this catalogue of troubles in vv. 2–18 to amount collectively to the disgrace of the community. The plural form חרפותינו then implies that the individual items on the list of misfortunes were interpreted to add up to the community's disgraces. Therefore, in 5QLam[a] the first verse of Lam 5 conveys a community's call upon YHWH to remember what has happened to them[12] and to open his eyes for the disgraces which they are subjected to.

Verse 2

5QLam[a] לזרי]ם בתינו לנוכריאם

to stranger]s; our houses to foreigners.

MT נַחֲלָתֵנוּ נֶהְפְּכָה לְזָרִים בָּתֵּינוּ לְנָכְרִים׃

Our inheritance has been turned over to strangers; our houses to foreigners.

לְנָכְרִים—לנוכריאם

Although a break in the manuscript obscures the first part of the last word in Lam 5:2, Milik restores it as לנוכריאם with an *'aleph* inserted in the interlinear space above the *yod*.[13] He is of the opinion that the longer form לנוכריאם is metrically more satisfying than its opposite number in the MT ("ce qui est plus satisfaisant *metri causa*")[14] and draws attention to a similar

---

5:1, provided that the object clause מה היה לנו is understood as referring to the misfortunes suffered by the community described in vv. 2–18. In this parallelism, the imperative זכר in the first colon corresponds to הביטה/הביט and ראה in the second. The absence of an equivalent for the *Tetragrammaton* in the latter is due to ellipsis. The correspondence between מה היה לנו and חרפתנו/חרפותינו rounds off the parallelism. If the proviso mentioned above is accepted, the poetical link between מה היה לנו and חרפתנו/חרפותינו means that the latter is also related to the calamities recounted in Lam 5:2–18.

[12] This appeal to YHWH in Lam 5:1 is reminiscent of the version of Lam 1:7 found in 4QLam where YHWH is also asked to remember the painful conditions of a community. In the second colon of the present verse, which comprises a parallelism with the first, the imperatives הביטה and ראה are used in order to implore God to see and take note of the speakers' distressful situation. The same combination of directives is employed in reversed order from that in Lam 5:1 at Lam 1:11 and 2:20 to address YHWH, whereas ראה is used on its own in Lam 1:9 and 1:20. Furthermore, at Lam 1:12 the speaker (personified Jerusalem in the MT and the narrator in 4QLam) pleads with the passers by to take note (הביטו) and see (ראו) if there is any pain comparable to that suffered by the city (the MT) or the narrator and his community (4QLam).

[13] Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

[14] In this case, the added *'aleph* can probably be taken together with the *yod* as a digraph;

form נכריאים in the great Isaiah scroll from cave 1 (1QIsa[a] Col. II line 15 = Isa 2:6).[15] Milik, however, leaves the *waw* of לנוכריאם unexplained. In his analysis of the linguistic profile of Lamentations, Dobbs-Allsopp cites this word in Lam 5:2 as נוכרים and includes it in his list of orthographical differences between words in the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran and their counterparts in the MT.[16] He regards the *waw* of לנוכרים as a representation of a vowel that developed from the Proto-Semitic u.[17] To be sure, the *waw* acts as an indicator of a *qameṣ ḥatuph*. Qimron remarks that the

> most characteristic feature of the orthography of the DSS is the extensive use of *waw* as a vowel letter (*mater lectionis*). This *waw* in DSS Hebrew corresponds to the various o/u sounds of the Tiberian tradition, i.e. long *ḥolem* (כוהן), *shureq* (רוח), short *ḥolem* (חושך), *qibbuṣ* (כולם), *qameṣ ḥaṭuf* (-כול) and *ḥaṭef qameṣ* (חודשים).[18]

In the following paragraph of his discussion on *waw* as a vowel letter in Qumran Hebrew, Qimron goes on to note that the short Proto-Semitic u is regularly designated by a *waw* in the manuscripts among the Dead Sea scrolls. לנוכריאם therefore only presents orthographical differences compared to לנכרים in the MT.

In connection with the parallelism in this verse, one can consider זרים and נוכריאם/נכרים as a synonymous word-pair.[19] Martin-Achard indicates that the usual meaning of זר is "stranger" "im ethnischen oder politischen Sinn, also meistens 'Nichtisraelit'. Zārīm bezeichnet die Fremdvölker, mit denen Israel zu tun hat, vor allem seine politischen Feinde".[20] Similarly, נכרי, in its meaning "foreigner", "bezieht sich in der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der

---

that is, two *matres lectionis* that indicate one vowel. Qimron (*Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 20–21) shows that such digraphs are common in Qumran Hebrew. Nevertheless, the problem with this interpretation is that in medial positions digraphs occur almost exclusively in words that have an *'aleph* as a root consonant.

15 Cf. DSSMM Plate II.

16 Dobbs-Allsopp, "Linguistic Evidence," 33.

17 On Proto-Semitic short vowels, including u, and the Biblical Hebrew vowels that developed from them, see the discussions by E.Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982), 25–26.

18 Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 17.

19 On word-pairs as part of parallelism, see the discussion by W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 128–144.

20 R. Martin-Achard, "זָר *zār* fremd," in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (vol. 1; eds. E. Jenni and C. Westermann; München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1971), 520–521, 521.

Stellen auf ein anderes Volk".[21] Furthermore, נחלתנו corresponds to בתינו. The semantic match between these two words fostered by the parallelism would suggest that the former is restricted to its sense of a piece of the patriarchal real property that an heir receives through succession.[22] Yet some commentators argue for a broader understanding of נחלה in terms of the Promised Land as the portion bestowed on the Israelites by the landowner, YHWH (cf. Deut 4:21, 38; 25:19; 26:1).[23] This interpretation links the complaint in v. 2 directly to the appeal to YHWH in v. 1.

The verb נהפכה in the first colon is left without a counterpart in the second. The critical apparatus of BHK and Westermann[24] suggest that נתנו, the Niphal *qatal* third-person plural form of the verb נתן ("they were given"), should be inserted after בתינו in the MT. This proposed addition is unnecessary. The poetic feature of ellipsis adequately accounts for the absence of a verb in the second colon of Lam 5:2. נהפכה therefore governs both cola with the plural of בתינו denoting the number of houses collectively.[25] Furthermore, the part of v. 2 that is preserved in 5QLam[a], as well as the LXX, P and V witness to the form of the text represented by the MT.[26]

In summary, the bicolon in v. 2 introduces the long communal complaint by pointing to the loss of the people's patrimonial real estate and houses to the occupying forces of a foreign power.

---

[21] Idem, "נֵכָר *nēkār* Fremde," in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (vol. 2; eds. E. Jenni and C. Westermann; München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1976), 67–68.

[22] Cf. E. Lipiński, "נַחֲלָה *naḥ[a]lâ*," *TDOT* IX, 326–327. For an overview regarding patrimony in ancient Israel, see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 53–55.

[23] See the comments of Salters, *Lamentations*, 343–344; House, *Lamentations*, 459–460; Berlin, *Lamentations*, 117; Dobbs-Allsopp, *Lamentations*, 144; Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 424–425; and Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 88.

[24] Westermann, *Lamentations*, 210.

[25] Cf. GKC §124a.

[26] With regard to rendering of v. 2 in P, ܚܘܠܦܢ ܠܒܥܠܝ ܒܝܬܐ ܘܒܝܬܢ ܠܒܥܠܝ ܐܬܚܠܦ ("Our inheritance has been turned over to strangers and our houses to strangers"), Albrektson (*Studies*, 197) notes that the Syriac translator "spoils the poetical effect of the *parallelismus membrorum*, in which the same thing is said twice in different words, by using the same word both in 2a and b." Conversely the Hebrew synonyms זרים and נכרים are translated with two different words in the LXX, ἀλλοτρίοις ("stranger") and ξένοις ("foreigner"), as well as in V, *alienos* ("stranger") and *extraneos* ("foreigner").

Verse 3

5QLam[a] יתומים [ ] אב אמוֹתֵינו לאֹ בְנוֹת ואלמנות

Orphans [ ] father. Our mothers (have) no daughters and (are) widows.

MT יְתוֹמִים הָיִינוּ אֵין אָב אִמּוֹתֵינוּ כְּאַלְמָנוֹת׃

We have become orphans, fatherless. Our mothers (are) like widows.

אִמּוֹתֵינוּ כְּאַלְמָנוֹת—אמוֹתֵינו לאֹ בְנוֹת ואלמנות

The lacuna in the text of 5QLam[a] deprives one of certainty as to whether the wording of the first colon of Lam 5:3 in this manuscript was identical to that preserved in the MT. As a consequence, it is impossible to know if 5QLam[a] agreed with the *kethib* (אין) or the *qere* (ואין) variants in the MT.[27] Nevertheless, the respective second cola of the two Hebrew versions do exhibit a marked difference compared to each other. Apart from the *plene* spelling of אמותינו, the wording of 5QLam[a] includes an added phrase, לאֹ בְנוֹת,[28] which is lacking in the MT, and reads ואלמנות with a conjunction *waw* instead of the simile כאלמנות (preposition כ plus noun) in the version transmitted by the Masoretes. The wording of this verse in the manuscript from Qumran is therefore longer than that of the MT. The text-critical rule of thumb *lectio brevior praeferanda est* and the unanimous support from the Greek, Syriac and Latin translations[29] would suggest that the MT presents the earlier of the two variant wordings of the second colon in this verse. Indeed, Schäfer attributes the longer reading in 5QLam[a] to the amplification of the text by the scribe who copied the manuscript (or maybe a predecessor).[30] This characterization of the reading in the critical apparatus of BHQ does not, however, elaborate on the intention of the scribe. A closer look at the effect that this amplification of the text might have on the parallelism of the bicolon could be helpful in discovering the possible purpose behind the creation of the longer reading in 5QLam[a].

---

[27] The *kethib* reading is reflected by the translation equivalents of the phrase אין אב in the LXX (οὐχ ὑπάρχει πατήρ), P (ܠܝܬ ܐܒ) and V (*absque patre*).

[28] The circlets and dots above the letters of לאֹ בְנוֹת indicate that their identification is probable but unsure, owing to the fragmentary state of the manuscript.

[29] The second colon in the ancient translations reads as follows: LXX, μητέρες ἡμῶν ὡς αἱ χῆραι ("Our mothers are like widows"), P, ܘܐܡܗܬܢ ܟܐܢ ܐܪܡܠܬܐ ("And our mothers are like widows") and V, *matres nostrae quasi viduae* ("Our mothers are like widows").

[30] Schäfer, "Lamentations," 71.

Commentators are surprisingly silent on the parallelism expressed by the two cola of Lam 5:3, but, with regard to the MT, Watson categorizes the bicolon in this verse as an example of "gender-matched" parallelism.[31] It follows the pattern masculine + masculine // feminine + feminine.[32] The amplified text in 5QLam[a] bears out the same type of parallelism (provided that the lost wording is restored in line with the MT and the first-person plural verb היינו is taken to refer to male speakers): masculine (יתומים) + masculine (היינו) + masculine (אין אב) // feminine (ואלמנות) + feminine (אמותינו) + feminine (לא בנות). In the parallelism of both Hebrew texts, יתומים ("orphans") corresponds to אלמנות ("widows"). In other passages of the Old Testament, as well as texts from the ancient Near East, the formulaic pair of the "widow and the orphan" is often referred to in contexts where the vulnerable, needy and helpless are mentioned.[33] Widows and orphans count among those members of society who must be protected and cared for by the deity, the royal sovereign or the community.[34] A אלמנה is "eine Frau, die durch den Tod ihres Ehemannes ihren sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Rückhalt verliert (insofern ist hier 'Witwe' nicht nur Bezeichnung des Zivilstandes 'ehemalige Frau eines Verstorbenen')".[35] As such, widows are women who are deprived of the financial support, protection and care provided by adult male members of the family. According to Ringgren, the term יתום in the Old Testament denotes children without a father.[36]

With these descriptions of אלמנה and יתום in mind, scholars propound a number of different interpretations of Lam 5:3 in the MT. Renkema argues that the term יתום refers to children who have lost or have been separated from both their parents, not just the father.[37] He emphasizes the fact that the combination of the preposition כ with אלמנות/אלמנה occurs in Lam 1:1, where Jerusalem is compared to a widow, and also in Lam 5:3. In light of this,

---

31 Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 124, 126.

32 אמתינו and כאלמנות obviously constitute the feminine side of the parallelism and one might infer that Watson regards יתומים and אין אב as the representatives of the masculine side.

33 Cf. H. Ringgren, "יָתוֹם *yātôm*," in *TDOT* VI, 477–481; H.A. Hoffner, "אַלְמָנָה *'almānāh*" *TDOT* I, 287–291; J. Kühlewein, "אַלְמָנָה *'almānā* Witwe," in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (vol. 1; eds. E. Jenni and C. Westermann; München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1971), 169–173; and De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 40.

34 On the theme of the protection of the widow and orphan in ancient Near Eastern texts, see F.C. Fensham, "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature," *JNES* 21/2 (1962): 129–139.

35 Kühlewein, "Witwe," 169.

36 Ringgren, *TDOT* VI, 479.

37 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 427–429; idem, "Does Hebrew *ytwm* Really Mean 'Fatherless?'" *VT* 45 (1995): 119–121.

Renkema makes a case for understanding אלמנות in the present verse as symbolizing Jerusalem and the cities of Judah. By means of the preposition כ, these "mother cities" are portrayed in the image of widows.[38] Renkema mentions two possible interpretations for אב. It can either be taken collectively as a designation for the community's civil leaders, the priests, prophets and the king,[39] or it can be related theologically to YHWH as the father of the nation.[40] Taken together, these interpretations of יתום, אלמנות and אב lead Renkema to the view that the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are the "orphans", because they are separated from their "parents", the leaders and the cities. The absence of the "fathers" and the "children" (the leaders and the inhabitants have been killed or taken into exile) leaves the cities "widowed", figuratively speaking. Compared to Renkema's exposition of the verse, Aalders[41] and Kraus[42] offer a more literal interpretation of the expressions in Lam 5:3. According to these scholars, the verse describes the situation of those who survived the catastrophe of 587 BCE when Jerusalem was sacked by the Babylonians and the inhabitants of the city deported to Babylon. The latter have become orphans, because their fathers were either killed or taken into captivity. The mothers of the survivors resemble widows, since they have lost the protection and help of their murdered or captured husbands. Hillers puts forward a third interpretation of Lam 5:3 as represented by the MT:

> "Orphans" and "widows" (v 3) were recognized in the ancient Near East as the groups of people most defenceless against aggression, and this pair is linked in poetry already in very early biblical texts (e.g., Ps 68:6 [= 5E]) and earlier still in Ugaritic poetry.[43] Thus this line should not be made into an explicit reference to the slaughter and deportation of males; the sense is, "all of us (males included) have become defenceless."[44]

---

[38] In contrast to Berlin (*Lamentations*, 115), Meek ("Lamentations," 35) and Gordis (*Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 159), Renkema understands the preposition כ not in an asservative sense ("our mothers have indeed become widows"), but rather as expressing comparison. Cf. IBHS §11.2.9a–b. Berges (*Klagelieder*, 271) likewise objects to the interpretation of the preposition as a *kaph veritatis*.

[39] Gottwald (*Studies*, 67) mentions such an interpretation of אב in connection with Lam 5:7.

[40] Löhr (*Klagelieder*, 24), for example, comments that "mit Rücksicht auf I1, zu dem diese Stelle sicher in Beziehung steht, ist unter אב Gott zu verstehen".

[41] Aalders, *Klaagliederen*, 109.

[42] Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 88.

[43] In the *Aqht* epic from Ugarit it is said of king Danel that he sits at the city gate and judges the case of the widow and makes decisions regarding the orphan. Cf. *CTA* 17 V 7–9.

[44] Hillers, *Lamentations*, 163. Ehrlich (*Randglossen*, 52) advocates a similar understanding of the text: "Selbst-redend liegt hier ein Bild vor, doch ist weder unter אב der König oder Gott,

In view of these different understandings of the MT, the longer text of Lam 5:3 in 5QLam[a] lends itself to a literal interpretation similar to the one Aalders and Kraus propose for the MT. One need not go as far as to claim that the scribe who was responsible for the amplified text represented by 5QLam[a] had the sixth century Babylonian attack on Jerusalem in mind when he altered the wording of the verse. The content of the lament can be related to more than one historical context during which Jerusalem was under siege.[45] All the same, by adding the phrase לא בנות and changing the simile (כאלמנות) into a statement (ואלמנות), the second colon in the text of 5QLam[a] bears a closer resemblance to the first colon than is the case in the MT. The speakers' assertion that they are orphans is echoed by the observation that their mothers are widows and the fatherlessness of the speakers corresponds to their mothers' loss of daughters. Therefore, the scribe's goal in amplifying the text might have been to lay bare the perceived parallelism more clearly than did the text that he copied.

In combination with the plea addressed to YHWH in v. 1, the complaint in Lam 5:3 of both 5QLam[a] and the MT is aimed at moving YHWH to sympathy for the people who are orphaned and the mothers who are bereft of their daughters and widowed (5QLam[a]), or who resemble widows (the MT). The community's lament over their current condition must provoke YHWH into assuming his role as the protector of the widow and the helper of the orphan.

Verse 9

5QLam[a] בנפשנו נביא לחמ[נו מפנ]י חרב [ה]מדבר

At the price of our live(s)[46] we bring in [our] bread, [because] of the sword of [the] desert.

---

noch sind unter אמתינו die Städte Judas zu verstehen. Gemeint ist einfach: wir sind hilflos wie Waisen und Witwen".

45 Provan mentions the difficulties in reading poetic texts against a particular historical background. Cf. I. Provan, "Reading Texts against an Historical Background: The Case of Lamentations 1," *SJOT* 1 (1990): 130–143. Nevertheless, in his discussion of literary genres that were used in the exilic period, R. Albertz (*Israel in Exile. The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 145–146) suggests a very specific historical context for Lam 5: "The lengthy first-person plural lament in 5:2–5, 8–18 describes all too graphically the suffering of the people of Judah and Jerusalem under the rigors of foreign rule, which our knowledge of Israel's history indicates can only be Babylonian ... The harsh treatment and coercion of the civilian population at the hands of the Babylonian occupation forces may be connected with the murder of Gedaliah in 582".

46 The preposition ב in the phrase בנפשנו is here interpreted as a *beth pretii*.

MT בְּנַפְשֵׁנוּ נָבִיא לַחְמֵנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר׃

At the price of our live(s) we bring in our bread, because of[47] the sword of the desert.

The wording of Lam 5:9 in 5QLam^{a} exhibits no orthographical or textual variants compared to the MT. Nevertheless, the verse merits further discussion, in view of the verse's problematic final phrase.

The phrase חרב המדבר occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament apart from the present verse. At the end of the nineteenth century, Löhr observed that "Ausleger haben es sich Mühe kosten lassen, einen Sinn für diese Worte zu finden".[48] This apt remark holds true of more recent exegetes as well. Some scholars prefer to reinterpret the MT's חֶרֶב ("sword"). On the one hand, Löhr follows the example of Dyserinck in vocalizing חרב as חֹרֶב, "heat", resulting in the translation "the heat of the desert".[49] Gordis offers the same solution to the perceived difficulties associated with the text of the MT ("the sword of the desert").[50] On the other hand, Berlin proposes that Deut 28:22 holds the key to the correct meaning of the phrase חרב המדבר.[51] In this text, which warns the Israelites against disobedience against the commandments and decrees of YHWH, חֶרֶב has the sense of "drought" and is listed as a curse together with disease (שַׁחֶפֶת), fever (קַדַּחַת), inflammation (דַּלֶּקֶת), scorching heat (חַרְחֻר), blight (שִׁדָּפוֹן) and mildew (יֶרָקוֹן). In her exposition of Lam 5:9–10, Berlin claims that these are the conditions that are said to prevail in Judah. The country is as dry as a wilderness on account of the scarcity of water, thus starvation and dehydration constitute the metaphorical sword that kills. Due to its unvocalized state, the text of 5QLam^{a} is open to any one of these suggested interpretations of חרב.

Other scholars retain the meaning "sword" for חרב and choose to emend or reinterpret המדבר. According to Beer,[52] the status construct phrase חרב המדבר is corrupt, but the correct reading can easily be restored by substituting the definite article *he* for a conjunction *waw*. On this emendation, מדבר no longer refers to the noun "desert" (מִדְבָּר), but consists of a preposition מִן plus the noun דֶּבֶר, "pestilence".[53] Beer's reconstructed text of the second colon of Lam 5:9 therefore reads מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב וּמִדֶּבֶר, "vor dem

---

47 On the causal sense of מפני, see BHRG § 39.15.2.

48 Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 25.

49 Cf. Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 379.

50 Cf. Gordis, *Song of Songs and Lamentations*, 195.

51 Berlin, *Lamentations*, 121–122.

52 G. Beer, "Klagelieder 5.9," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 285.

53 BDB 184; KBL 202; DCH II 411.

Schwert und der Pest". Dahood offers a revised understanding of המדבר, not by resorting to conjectural emendation, but by utilizing comparative philology.[54] In his opinion, המדבר should be derived from the verbal root דבר in the sense of Akkadian *duppuru*/*dubburu* in the El-Amarna tablets ("to drive out"/"pursue") and the Syriac word ܕܒܝ ("subdue"/"drive"/"lead"). The form המדבר would then be parsed as a definite article plus Piel participle masculine singular of דבר and the translation of the second colon would read "because of the sword of the pursuer". Dahood's proposal has not convinced many scholars (McDaniel is the exception).[55] Most commentators agree with Kraus's assessment that the phrase חרב המדבר is a "verkürzte Redeweise" that has the meaning "das Schwert der Wüstenbewohner".[56] The desert dwellers are often identified with armed Bedouin,[57] but according to Westermann, חרב המדבר refer to the danger posed by marauding bandits.[58]

The rendering of מפני חרב המדבר in the LXX (ἀπὸ προσώπου ῥομφαίας τῆς ἐρήμου) can also be interpreted along these lines. With regard to ἀπὸ προσώπου, Sollamo notes that the referent is usually a person or a concrete object.[59] In the instance of LXX Lam 5:9, she asserts that ῥομφαία actually refers both to the weapon itself and its wielder.[60] The case of τῆς ἐρήμου can be taken as a genitive of origin (the sword, and by extension its user, comes from the desert) or a genitive of place/space (the sword, and its user, is confronted in the desert). If τῆς ἐρήμου is understood as a genitive of place/space, its meaning would be similar to the renderings of חרב המדבר in P and V. In the Syriac translation (ܣܝܦܐ ܕܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܗܝ), the relative pronoun ܕ plus the preposition ܒ, followed by the noun ܡܕܒܪܐ, serve to reproduce the Hebrew *postconstructus* ("the sword that is in the desert"), while Jerome decided on a prepositional phrase for his Latin translation: *gladii in deserto* ("the sword in the desert").

It follows from the different interpretations put forward by scholars and the various renderings of the phrase in the ancient translations that it is not altogether clear how חרב המדבר in 5QLam[a] and the MT should be

---

54 Cf. M.J. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography II," *Bib* 45 (1964): 393–412, 401.

55 McDaniel ("Philological Studies," 52) draws attention to the fact that *duppuru*/*dubburu* is also used in other Akkadian literature. Cf. CAD III 186–188.

56 Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 89.

57 Cf. Salters, *Lamentations*, 353; Gottlieb, *Text of Lamentations*, 69–70; Meek, "Lamentations," 36; Aalders, *Klaagliederen*, 113; and Rudolph, "Text," 121.

58 Westermann, *Lamentations*, 214.

59 R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 85.

60 Ibid.

understood. חרב is probably best interpreted metonymically as a reference to the threat located in the desert, or to inhabitants of the desert that are known for wielding this weapon. The reading of the preposition in בנפשנו as a *beth pretii* and the causal function of מפני create the impression that the community laments over the high price that they must pay to obtain bread and that they attribute this loss of lives to the threat posed by the desert or its inhabitants.

Verse 10

5QLam[a] עור֯[נ]ו כתנור נכמרו מ֯[פ]ני זלפות ר֯עב

[Our] skins grow hot like an oven, be[cau]se of rages of hunger.

MT עוֹרֵנוּ כְּתַנּוּר נִכְמְרוּ מִפְּנֵי זַלְעֲפוֹת רָעָב׃

Our skin grows hot like an oven, because of the rages of hunger.

The text of 5QLam[a] shows two differences in wording compared to that of the MT. Despite the damage to the manuscript from Qumran and the resulting uncertainty of the reading, the first word of Lam 5:10 in 5QLam[a] can be restored as עורינו. The *yod* that was inserted by the scribe in the interlinear space transforms the suffix appended to the word עור from one denoting a singular noun to one indicating a plural noun. The singular form is found in the MT. Another variant appears in the second colon of the verse. 5QLam[a] reads זלפות, where the MT has זלעפות.

עוֹרֵנוּ כְּתַנּוּר נִכְמְרוּ—עור֯[נ]ו כתנור נכמרו

The wording of the first colon in the Hebrew witnesses present the reader with two difficulties. First, in the MT there is incongruence between the noun עורנו, which is singular, and the plural verb נכמרו of which עורנו is the subject. Secondly, the meaning of the verb נכמרו is not altogether clear in this context.

With regard to the disagreement in number between עורנו and נכמרו, Ehrlich argues that עורנו should be emended into עורינו.[61] Rudolph, however, warns that the problem in the MT (Codex Leningradensis) will not be solved by substituting עורנו for עורינו, since the usual plural form of the word עור is עורות. He proposes that נכמרו should be modified by removing the final *waw*

---

61 Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 53.

so that the verb will be singular in accordance with its subject עורנו.[62] Westermann, Kraus and Dyserinck advocate the same view.[63] Renkema suggests that עורנו can be understood collectively, while the first-person plural suffix נו- forms the point of contact with the plural verb נכמרו.[64] In the opinion of Dahood, a solution to the difficulty is obtained when one takes עורנו as a defective spelling of עורינו.[65] The reading עוֹרֵינוּ is actually found in a number of Masoretic manuscripts and in the corrected text of 5QLam[a]. It seems that the scribe who copied the manuscript of 5QLam[a] initially wrote down the form עורנו. When he realized that the verb in the predicate is plural, he went back and changed עורנו into עורינו by inserting a *yod* above the line.[66] Such an explanation of the wording of 5QLam[a] implies that the manuscript from which it was copied contained the reading עורנו like the MT and that the scribe responsible for 5QLam[a] created the variant himself. The aim of the scribal correction in the text of 5QLam[a] would then have been to mitigate the discrepancy between the singular subject and the plural verb. עורנו in Codex Leningradensis can accordingly be characterized as the *lectio difficilior*. From this perspective, the suggestions of Renkema and Dahood have the benefit of upholding the more difficult reading and rendering the emendation of the verb נכמרו unnecessary. The scribal correction in 5QLam[a] and עוֹרֵינוּ in the Masoretic manuscripts are attempts at a facilitation of the perceived syntactical difficulty in this scenario.

The ancient translations make for interesting reading in view of the differences exhibited by the Hebrew witnesses. Ziegler gives the reconstructed original form of the Greek translation as τὸ δέρμα ἡμῶν ὡς κλίβανος ἐπελιώθη ἀπὸ προσώπου καταιγίδων λιμοῦ ("Our skin has become pale like an oven from before the squalls of hunger").[67] All the extant Greek manuscripts, however, have the word συνεσπάσθησαν ("they were drawn together", i.e. "shrivelled") after ἐπελιώθη.[68] This is an apparent case of a *lectio duplex*. Since both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus contain the double translation, it is presented as part of the text of Lam 5:10 in Rahlfs's *Handausgabe* of the

---

[62] Rudolph, "Text," 121.

[63] Westermann, *Lamentations*, 210; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 85; Dyserinck, "Klaagliederen," 380.

[64] Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 436–437.

[65] Dahood, "New Readings," 194.

[66] Cf. Schäfer, "Lamentations," 135*.

[67] Cf. Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 492.

[68] With regard to the Hexaplaric version, the text of Codex Marchalianus and the Syrohexapla, an obelus (÷) is placed before συνεσπάσθησαν to indicate that this word does not appear in the Hebrew text of Lam 5:10 consulted by Origen. Cf. Field, *Origenes*, 761.

LXX.[69] Tov points out that a double translation can pertain to the translation technique of the original Greek text of a particular biblical writing, if the Greek text contains two or more alternative renderings based on the same Hebrew *Vorlage*.[70] From this perspective, the characterization of ἐπελιώθη συνεσπάσθησαν as a double translation rules out the suggestion by Robinson that the LXX might be based on a *Vorlage* that already contained the doublet סמרו נכמרו.[71] It also implies that both ἐπελιώθη and συνεσπάσθησαν serve to render נכמרו, and that the singular form of the first verb is a translational adaptation to the singular form of the subject, τὸ δέρμα ἡμῶν. At the same time, the question presents itself why the Greek translator would adapt the first chosen translation equivalent (ἐπελιώθη) to the number of its subject and not the second. In other words, if we are dealing with a double translation in LXX Lam 5:10, why is συνεσπάσθησαν plural and not singular like ἐπελιώθη? Another possibility is that the *lectio duplex* in the manuscripts that witness to the Greek translation was created during the transmission of the Greek text. Since ἐπελιώθη[72] is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX, one can speculate that a scribe, who was unfamiliar with this new word, added συνεσπάσθησαν, a form which he considered to be closer to the Hebrew verb נכמרו in both number and meaning.[73] Moreover, the Old Latin translation only has an equivalent for ἐπελιώθη, *livida facta est*, "it was made bluish/black and blue",[74] and not for συνεσπάσθησαν. The Old Latin might

---

69 Cf. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 765.

70 Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 129.

71 Robinson, "Notes," 259.

72 Ἐπελιώθη is the aorist indicative passive form of the *hapax legomenon* πελιόομαι ("to become pale"/"to become livid" LEH 364b; GELS 543). The verb is related to the adjective πέλειος ("livid"/"pale"). BdA translate the LXX text accordingly: "Notre peau est devenue livide comme un four, devant les tourmentes de la faim". Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*, 280. Gentry ("Lamentations," 941) and Hirsch-Luipold and Maier ("Threnoi/Die Klagelieder," 1357) render ἐπελιώθη respectively with "became dark" and "wurde geschwärzt". In Feder's edition of the Sahidic Coptic version, the equivalent of τὸ δέρμα ἡμῶν ὡς κλίβανος ἐπελειώθη is ⲁⲡⲉⲛϣⲁⲁⲣ ⲕⲙⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲧⲣⲓⲣ ("Our skin became black like an oven"). Cf. Feder, *Biblia Sahidica*, 216. This daughter version therefore represents ἐπελιώθη in the meaning of "blackened" as well.

73 In a note on the importance of seeking the origin of Greek renderings in the vocabularies of languages that are cognate to Hebrew, such as Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic, before making claims for a variant *Vorlage*, Driver argues that πελιόομαι, in its meaning of "to become livid", demonstrates that נכמרו was derived from the same root as the Syriac words ܟܡܝܪܐ ("gloomy"/"dark"/"black") and ܐܬܟܡܝܪ ("to become darkened"). Cf. G.R. Driver, "Notes on the Text of Lamentations," *ZAW* 52 (1934): 308–309. The addition of συνεσπάσθησαν was probably intended to clarify the sense of ἐπελιώθη in this context, since this verb is not properly applied to scorching.

74 Cf. Sabatier, *Bibliorum*, 732.

very well preserve the original Greek translation in this case.[75] The evidence therefore suggests that Ziegler is justified in dropping συνεσπάσθησαν from his reconstructed text of the original Greek translation. Taking Ziegler's text of the LXX as the point of departure, as well as the assumption that the Hebrew *Vorlage* from which it was made was identical to the consonantal base of the MT at Lam 5:10, it seems as though the Greek translator solved the problem of the incongruence between the subject and verb in the Hebrew text by changing the number of the verb from plural to singular.

The Syriac text of this passage is just as intriguing as the LXX version. P reads: ܚܕܪܐ ܟܐܝܠܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܟܡ ܐܬܒܕܘ ܐܬܚܦܝܘ ܟܝܘܡ ܟܡ ܥܠ ܥܠ ("Our skins are shrivelled as from an oven and they became pale from the exhaustion from hunger").[76] It is important to notice that the Hebrew verb נכמרו is represented by two verbs in P (ܐܬܒܕܘ ܐܬܚܦܝܘ), as is the case in the different manuscripts that witness to the Greek translation, and that the subject of these two verbs (ܚܢܢ) is plural in number. The appearance of two verbs in P and the manuscripts witnessing to the Greek translation raises the issue of whether the Syriac translation was influenced by the manuscripts of the Greek one. In terms of the Old Testament as a whole, Weitzman[77] identifies three potential explanations for those instances where P and the LXX are in agreement over against the corresponding reading in the MT: (1) the LXX and P are based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the MT; (2) the Syriac translators arrived at the same interpretation of a passage as the Greek translators did (polygenesis) or consulted the LXX during the translation process; and (3) the text of P was altered by later copyists so as to bring it in line with the LXX. With regard to the present verse, Albrektson rejects Abelesz's view that this passage is proof that the P text of Lamentations was revised to conform to the LXX.[78] He nevertheless concedes that there is clearly some

---

[75] Conversely, the Sahidic Coptic version was based on a Greek text that already included συνεσπάσθησαν and assigned this verb to the next clause: ⲁⲩⲥⲟⲕⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲉⲧ ϩⲓ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲙ̄ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛϩⲁⲧⲏⲩ ⲙ̄ⲫⲉⲃⲱⲱⲛ ("They brought us down together before the whirlwinds of hunger"). Rahlfs's (*Septuaginta*, 765) punctuation of the Greek text in his edition also reflects such a syntactical arrangement: τὸ δέρμα ἡμῶν ὡς κλίβανος ἐπελιώθη, συνεσπάσθησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου καταιγίδων λιμοῦ ("Our skin became pale like an oven, they became shrivelled from before the squalls of hunger").

[76] This is the text of Codex Ambrosianus (7a1 according to the catalogue of the Leiden Peshitta Institute and manuscript A in Albrektson's edition). Weitzman (*Syriac Version*, 315) makes the suggestion that the text of 12a1 and 16a6 (manuscripts B and O in Albrektson's edition), in which ܚܢܢ is omitted, might also qualify as the original text of P.

[77] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 68–86.

[78] Albrektson, *Studies*, 200–201.

connection between the two versions. The possible explanations for this connection which he considers, a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* containing two verbs and a marginal gloss from the LXX that was incorporated in the text of P, correspond to the first and third ones mentioned by Weitzman. Despite the fact that there are two verbs with similar meanings for נכמרו in the Syriac translation and the Greek manuscripts, one must bear in mind that these verbs are in reversed order in P and the manuscripts of the Greek translation (ܐܬܦܠܚܬ // συνεσπάσθησαν; ܐܬܚܡ // ἐπελιώθη). Furthermore, ἐπελιώθη is singular, whereas its counterpart in P, ܐܬܚܡܘ, is plural. Seeing as the latter has a conjunction *waw*, it divides the verse into two related main clauses with ܚܛܝܡ acting as subject of both verbs. Accordingly, the web of agreements and differences between P and the various manuscripts witnessing to the Greek translation suggest that the Syriac translator gave his own interpretation of what he found in his Hebrew text, but also consulted a Greek manuscript. The plural form of ܚܛܝܡ is either the result of the Syriac translator's effort to iron out the disagreement in number between the subject and verb in his Hebrew *Vorlage*, or it might be based on a Hebrew text that contained the reading עורינו.

Turning to the text of Lam 5:10 in V, *pellis nostra quasi clibanus exusta est a facie tempestatum famis* ("Our skin is inflamed like an oven from before the squalls of hunger"), Jerome evidently followed the lead of the Greek translator and Old Latin in rendering the plural Hebrew verb נכמרו with a singular equivalent. His choice of *exusta est*, the perfect indicative passive of *exurere* ("to burn up"/"to dry up"/"to be inflamed"), is significant, since it represents a novel interpretation of the Hebrew verbal root כמר. The LXX, Old Latin and P allude to a discolouring of the skin due to extreme hunger, while the Syriac translation also includes the image of shrivelled skin. The two recensions of T liken the blackening of skin to an oven: משכנא היך תנורא אתקדרו מן קדם מפח כפנא ("Our skin has become black like an oven,[79] because of the exhaustion from hunger"). Conversely, V makes the hotness of an oven the point of comparison with the skin of the speakers, seemingly as a reference to fever resulting from starvation. The midrash of *Lamentations Rabbah* 5:10 §1 transmits an analogous understanding of the Hebrew verb: "Two teachers comment. One said: Like a heated mass of grapes. The other

---

79 Surprisingly, $T^{W,Y}$ do not employ the Aramaic root כמר, "to keep warm"/"to shrink"/"to be wrinkled" (Jastrow 647), but the Ithpeel form of קדר, "to become black" (Jastrow 1318). Moreover, the incongruence between subject and verb in the MT is reproduced in the recensions of the Aramaic translation.

said: Like an oven insufficiently heated".[80] The Latin counterpart of נכמרו in V approximates the meaning "to grow hot", which modern lexica assign to the Hebrew verbal root כמר.[81]

From these short remarks regarding the treatment of the Hebrew text in the ancient translations and what can be deduced about their respective *Vorlagen* from extant Hebrew manuscripts, it seems clear that the ancient translators treated the difficulties in the Hebrew text in different ways. The LXX and V adjusted the number of the verb in order to be in concordance with the singular subject. While this might be true of P as well, the possibility exists that the Syriac translation was made from a Hebrew text that contained the reading עורינו instead of עורנו. $T^{W,Y}$ reflect the same dissimilarity in number between the subject and verb as the MT embodied by Codex Leningradensis. It is also striking that the ancient translations differ in the meanings they ascribe to the verb נכמרו. In this, they foreshadow the divided opinions amongst commentators on the Hebrew text of Lamentations concerning the correct translation of נכמרו. Some scholars prefer "is wrinkled",[82] "schrumpft zusammen",[83] or "glows", "glüht", "gloeit".[84] Berlin decides on "inflamed",[85] Renkema argues for "is ruw geworden",[86] Hillers has "turned black"[87] and Kaiser "ist rissig".[88]

זַלְעָפוֹת—זֹלפות

Milik avers that the omission of the *ʿayin* from זלעפות witnesses to an instability in the pronunciation of gutterals.[89] Kutscher indicates that gutturals in general weakened in Qumran Hebrew, causing them either to be confused with one another or elided altogether.[90] זלפות in 5QLam[a] is an example of the latter. The word only occurs three times in the Old Testament at Ps 11:6 (רוח זלעפות; "a raging/burning wind"), Ps 119:5 (זלעפה אחזתני; "a burning zeal has seized me") and the present verse. Brown Driver and Briggs propose that

---

80 Cohen, "Lamentations," 240.

81 BDB 484; KBL 442; DCH IV 429.

82 Salters, *Lamentations*, 340; House, *Lamentations*, 454.

83 Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 256.

84 Westermann, *Lamentations*, 209; Kraus, *Klagelieder* (*Threni*), 85; Löhr, *Klagelieder*, 25; Aalders, *Klaagliederen*, 107.

85 Berlin, *Lamentations*, 115.

86 Renkema, *Klaagliederen*, 436–437.

87 Hillers, *Lamentations*, 158.

88 Kaiser, *Klagelieder*, 374.

89 Milik, "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)," 175.

90 Kutscher, *History*, 96.

the word has the basic meaning of "raging heat".[91] The renderings in the LXX (καταιγίδων) and V (*tempestatum*) are reminiscent of רוח זלעפות in Ps 11:6, while the equivalents in P (ܪܘܚܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ) and $T^{W,Y}$ (מפח) are singular (as opposed to the plural in the Hebrew texts) and have the rather vague connotation of "exhaustion".

In light of the foregoing observations, it appears as though v. 10 of Lam 5 in the extant Hebrew texts conveys the community's complaints about the effects of a fever that is induced by fits of hunger. The different interpretations of Lam 5:10 in the ancient translations and modern commentaries are indicative of the fact that the precise connotation between hunger and the skin that the author had in mind remains, to a large extent, obscure.[92]

Verses 11–13

5QLam[a]

נשים בְּצִיּוֹן [ע]נּו בתולות בערֹ[י יהו]דָּה
שרים בְּיָדָם נתלו [פני זקנים ל]אֹ נהדרו
בחורי[ם] טָחוֹן נשׂאו [ ] כשלו

They have [rav]ished women in Zion; maidens in the citie[s of Ju]dah.
Princes were hung up by their hands. [The faces of elders were no]t honoured.
Young me[n]bore the mill [ ] stumbled.

MT

נָשִׁים בְּצִיּוֹן עִנּוּ בְּתוּלֹת בְּעָרֵי יְהוּדָה׃
שָׂרִים בְּיָדָם נִתְלוּ פְּנֵי זְקֵנִים לֹא נֶהְדָּרוּ׃
בַּחוּרִים טְחוֹן נָשָׂאוּ וּנְעָרִים בָּעֵץ כָּשָׁלוּ׃

They have ravished women in Zion; maidens in the cities of Judah.
Princes were hung up by their hands. The faces of elders were not honoured.
Young men bore the mill and youths stumbled because of the wood.[93]

With the exception of the *plene* spelling of בתולות in v. 11, the parts of these three verses that have been preserved in 5QLam[a] are identical to their counterparts in the MT. These verses describe the misery experienced by

---

[91] Cf. BDB 273.

[92] Cf. Provan, *Lamentations*, 130.

[93] Ehrlich (*Randglossen*, 54) and Hillers (*Lamentations*, 159) contend that the preposition ב in combination with the verbal root כשל can only mean to stumble over an object and not to stumble under a load or burden. Furthermore, Hillers presupposes that the text of the MT contains a textual error. The original reading, he suggests, was בעצב ("from hard work"). The error occurred when the final beth of בעצב was lost through haplography on account of the similarity of this letter to the initial *kaph* of the next word כשלו. In my opinion, it is unnecessary to posit a scribal error here, since the preposition of בעץ can be interpreted as a *beth causa*.

pairs of people at the hands of the invading enemy forces. Verse 11 reports the rape of women and virgins, or unmarried maidens, in the capital and all over the cities of Judah.[94] The physical violence inflicted on the women has the effect of humiliating them as well. Verse 12 relates how princes were hung up and elders were shown no respect. There is some discussion as to whether the ambiguous expression בידם refers to the body part by which the princes were hung up or to the enemy who does the hanging. The precise meaning of נתלו also remains uncertain.[95] In view of the parallelism with the next colon, which mentions the dishonour suffered by the elders, it nevertheless seems clear that the hanging involved the humiliation of the nobles. As a result, commentators generally do not find the Hebrew text of vv. 11 and 12 very taxing, despite the fact that they disagree on the exact explanation of one or two words. Verse 13, however, confronts scholars with an interesting textual problem.

The difficulty in this verse centres on the *hapax legomenon* טחון. The circlet above the *teth* in the transcription of this word in 5QLam[a] indicates that this letter is uncertain. The rest of the word is well preserved. Together with the verb נשאו, the form טחון can be interpreted in a number of ways. The vocalization of טְחוֹן in the MT suggests that it was understood as a noun of the *qiṭal*-type. In Hebrew nouns of this ground-form, the ĭ changes to a *shewa* and the â is replaced by ô, according to Gesenius.[96] On such an interpretation, טחון is translated as "mill", since the word is derived from the verbal form טחן, "to grind".[97] Driver notes that nouns of this type may denote concrete objects.[98] The colon can then be taken to mean that young men bare or endure (נשאו) the labour of grinding.[99] In other words, טחון is understood to refer metonymically to the degrading menial labour usually

---

94 Berlin (*Lamentations*, 122) notes that the parallelism "married women" // "unmarried women" moves from a general category to a more specific one, whereas the parallelism of "Zion" // "cities of Judah" goes in the opposite direction (from the narrower category to the broader one).

95 Provan (*Lamentations*, 131) and Berlin (*Lamentations*, 123) see the act of hanging as a form of humiliation or torture imposed on the living. According to Aalders (*Klaagliederen*, 114), the hanging of princes refers to impalement: "Onder het 'ophangen' hebben we te verstaan het spietsen op een paal, zoals dat bij de Assyriërs en Babyloniërs, soms bij levenden lijve, soms alleen bij wijze van ontering na den dood, gebruikelijk was". Dobbs-Allsopp (*Lamentations*, 146) also understands it as a means of execution or as a way of exposing corpses for humiliation or to instil fear in the survivors.

96 Cf. GKC § 84an.

97 Cf. BDB 377; KBL 351.

98 Driver, "Hebrew Notes," 143.

99 Ibid., 143–144.

performed by slaves. This is the sense of the Hebrew text that is reflected in the translation of 5QLam[a] provided above. Alternatively, טחון can be retained as a noun while the verbal root נשא is understood in its sense "to lift up"/"to carry".[100] This would result in the translation, "Young men carry the mill", which is the meaning reproduced by the two recensions of the T.[101] A third solution to the textual difficulty can be obtained by reading טחון as an infinitive construct and בחורים as the object of the verb נשאו.[102] In this regard, טחון might also be a euphemism for sexual intercourse: "They [the enemy] took young men to 'grind' [them]". *Lamentations Rabbah* 5:13 §1 mentions this as a possible interpretation of the passage and refers to a similar use of טחן in Judg 16:21: "And he [Samson] ground at the mill in the prison".[103] Tractate *Soṭah* 10a, which forms part of *Seder Nashim* in the Babylonian Talmud, expounds the meaning of טחן in the same way in connection with the episode recounted in Judg 16:21: "R. Joḥanan said: '*Grind*' means nothing else than [sexual] transgression; and thus it is stated, *Then let my wife grind unto another*".[104] This line of interpretation probably exercised an influence on Jerome via his Jewish confidants, considering the fact that V offers an obscene interpretation of the Hebrew text of Lam 5:13a: *adulescentibus inpudice abusi sunt* ("they unchastely misused the young men"). P has a rather free rendering of the Hebrew colon which simply states that youths grind at the mill (ܫܘܝ ܕܫܠܐ ܩܛܝܪ). The Greek text of the Lucianic version, ἐκλεκτοὶ ἐν μυλοις ἤλεσαν ("Chosen ones grinded in mills"), is similar to the Syriac translation, while the Sahidic Coptic version has a conflation of images and presents the chosen ones as weeping and grinding at the mill: ⲛⲥⲱⲧⲡ̄ ⲁⲩⲥⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩⲧ ⲉ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧ ("The chosen ones sat, wept and grinded at the mill"). The image of the chosen ones weeping goes back to the LXX which departs from the meanings attributed to the Hebrew text,

---

100 Cf. BDB 669–671; KBL 635–636.

101 T[W] reads רובין ריחיא נטלו ("Young men carried the millstone"). T[Y] reads differently: עולימיא ריחיא נטלו ("Youths carried the millstone"). Cf. the comments of Alexander, *Targum of Lamentations*, 184, 207; and Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 188.

102 Cf. Meek "Lamentations," 37; Rudolph, "Text," 122. Seeing as נערים acts as the subject of the verb כשלו in the parallel colon in the MT, it is unlikely that בחורים should be seen as the object of נשאו. Cf. Albrektson, *Studies*, 202. This interpretation is, nonetheless, represented by the version of σ′. The text of σ′ in the Syrohexapla reads as follows: ܠܡܛܚܢ ܕܚܠܡ ܡܩܛܥܐ. Field (*Origenes*, 761) gives the Greek text as νεανίσκους εἰς τὸ ἀλέσαι ἔλαβον ("They took young men to grind").

103 Cohen, "Lamentations," 241.

104 Cf. A. Cohen, "Soṭah: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices," in *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nashim* (vol. 3; ed. I. Epstein; London: The Soncino Press, 1936), 45 This last quotation is taken from Job 31:10.

presumably because of inner-Greek corruption or because the translator was unfamiliar with the *hapax legomenon* טחון. The near unanimous reading in the manuscripts witnessing to the Greek translation is ἐκλεκτοὶ κλαυθμὸν ἀνέλαβον ("Chosen men took up weeping"), but some scholars consider κλαυθμόν, the equivalent of טחון, to be corrupt. Robinson wonders whether κλαυθμόν could have erroneously developed from ἀληθόμενον, a participle form of the verbal root ἀλήθω ("to grind"), which is used to translate forms of טחן in Num 11:8, Judg 16:21 and Qoh 12:3 and 4.[105] Rudolph dismisses ἀληθόμενον as "ungriechisch" and suggests κλάσμα μύλου or μυλικὸν λίθον ("millstone") as possible original readings.[106] Ziegler argues that κλάσμα μύλου "paßt nicht gut, da es zwei Wörter sind, und da es nicht als Objekt zu ἀνέλαβον geeignet ist".[107] With regard to μυλικὸν λίθον, he approvingly quotes Katz as saying that it is "eine unzeitige Reminiszenz aus dem N.T."[108] Consequently, Ziegler adopts Katz's proposal and prints μύλον ("hand-mill") as the reading of the Old Greek text.[109] To judge from the translations in LXX.D, NETS and BdA,[110] the translators of LXX Lamentations into German, English and French do not object to Ziegler's emendation. Rahlfs, however, keeps to the text found in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus for his edition.[111] Moreover, Albrektson rejects the abovementioned emendations proposed by Robinson, Rudolph and Katz on the basis that κλαυθμόν is graphically remote from all of them.[112] In other words, it is difficult to surmise how κλαυθμόν could have developed from any one of these suggested readings through a confusion of letters on the part of a scribe. Albrektson puts forward the hypothesis that the Greek translator rendered טחון with ἀλεσμόν, "grinding".[113] This proposed original Greek reading has the benefits of both being close to other Greek words that are used in the LXX to translate forms of טחן (ἀλήθω, ἀλέω and καταλέω) and of allowing for the possibility of a scribal error. On this theory, ἀλεσμόν would have changed into κλαυθμόν. In order to substantiate this proposal, Albrektson points out that the interchange

---

105 Robinson "Notes," 259.

106 Rudolph, "Text," 122.

107 Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 36.

108 Ibid.

109 Ibid.; Cf. also P. Katz, Review of BH3, Heft 13: Megilloth. *ThLZ* 63 (1938): 34.

110 Hirsch-Luipold and Maier, "Threni/Klagelieder," 1357: "Auserwählte hoben den Mühlstein auf"; Gentry, "Lamentations," 941: "Choice men took up the millstone"; Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie* 280: "Les élus ont soulevé la meule".

111 Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 765.

112 Albrektson, *Studies*, 202–203.

113 Cf. LSJ 63.

of ΑΛ into ΛΑ and the confusion of C and Θ are common in Greek uncial manuscripts.[114] The problem of the confusion of Greek letters that look alike is compounded by the practice of *scriptio continua*. In light of this, Albrektson's proposal appears plausible to a degree. Nevertheless, he fails to show how the initial kappa of κλαυθμόν came to be added and the epsilon of ἀλεσμόν turned into the diphthong αυ. Accordingly, it might be speculated that a scribe confused some of the letters of ἀλεσμόν, which resulted in a reading that did not make sense. A later scribe could then have attempted to undo the damage by changing the corrupt reading into κλαυθμόν in an attempt to create a new sense for the passage. At the same time, it is also possible that the Greek translator did not know the meaning of טחון and produced what he perceived to be a meaningful reading in the context. Seeing as the majority of the Greek manuscripts have the reading ἐκλεκτοὶ κλαυθμὸν ἀνέλαβον and טחון is a *hapax legomenon* that might very well have been unknown to the Greek translator, this second explanation seems to me to be the more probable one.[115]

Turning back to the Hebrew text of 5QLam[a], if one can suppose that the lost wording of the second colon resembled that of the MT, both the manuscript from Qumran and the MT express the idea that young men and boys are forced to perform hard menial labour. As a result, Lam 5:13 in these Hebrew texts continues the list of debasements suffered by pairs of people at the hands of the enemy forces begun in v. 11.

Excursus: The Space after כשלו *in v. 13 of 5QLam[a]*

Although it is not strictly part of the wording of 5QLam[a], the seemingly inexplicable space after the word כשלו in v. 13 in this manuscript deserves further comment. In the manuscripts of the Dead Sea scrolls, a space that extends from the last word in a line to the end of that line signifies a major sense unit; that is, a section which is "thematically distinct from the section which immediately precedes it".[116] Such a space corresponds to an "open section" in the MT. An attempt must therefore be made to elucidate the possible reason behind the space after Lam 5:13 in 5QLam[a],

---

114 Albrektson, *Studies*, 203.

115 See the comments in G.R. Kotzé, "Two Difficult Passages in the Hebrew Texts of Lamentations 5: Text-Critical Analyses of the Greek Translation," in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint* (VTSup 157; eds. J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 275–295.

116 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 145.

since it might contribute to a better understanding of the way the scribe who copied the manuscript thought about the division of the text's sense units.

If the space in question is interpreted as an indication that a major sense unit has come to an end, it is all the more perplexing, seeing as there is a change in point of view in the lament of Lam 5 beginning at v. 11 and ending with v. 14. In vv. 2–10 of the MT and 5QLam[a] (where the text is intact), the description of distress is presented from a first-person plural perspective.[117] The same point of view resumes in v. 15 and, with the exception of v. 18, which refers to the desolateness of Mount Zion, and v. 19, where YHWH is addressed in the second-person and his eternal reign is acknowledged, it continues through to the end of the poem.[118] Verses 11, 12, 13 and 14 are therefore unique in this lament's *Notschilderung* in that the focus in these verses has shifted from what befalls "us" (the first-person plural point of view) to what happened to particular pairs of people (the women and virgins [v. 11], the princes and elders [v. 12], the young men and boys [v. 13] and the old men and young men [v. 14]). It is reasonable to assume that a scribe could have picked up on this change in viewpoint, but if this was the case, one would expect the space to appear after v. 14 and not after v. 13.

Even so, one scenario comes to mind in which the space after v. 13 in 5QLam[a] can be interpreted as a technique used by a scribe to mark the end of a sense unit, namely when v. 14 is seen to introduce a new theme in the catalogue of troubles experienced by the community. To be sure, vv. 14–16 can be taken as a distinct thematic unit in the lament dealing with the absence of jollity and cheerfulness within the community. After commenting on the content of the preceding verses, Westermann writes that

---

[117] Notice the first-person plural verbal forms and first-person plural suffix attached to nouns and prepositions in the consonantal text of the MT: v. 2, נחלתנו ("*our* inheritance"), בתינו ("*our* houses"); v. 3, היינו ("*we* became"), אמתינו ("*our* mothers"); v. 4, מימינו ("*our* water"), שתינו ("*we* drank"), עצינו ("*our* wood"); v. 5, צוארנו ("*our* neck"), נרדפנו ("*we* are pursued"), יגענו ("*we* are weary"), לנו ("for *us*"); v. 6, נתנו יד, ("*we* gave the hand"); v. 7, אבתינו ("*our* fathers"), אנחנו ("*we*"), עונתיהם סבלנו ("*we* bear their iniquities"); v. 8, בנו, ("over *us*"); v. 9, בנפשנו ("at the price of *our* live[s]"), נביא ("*we* bring in"), לחמנו ("*our* bread"); v. 10, עורנו ("*our* skin").

[118] Verse 15, משוש לבנו ("the joy of *our* heart"), מחלנו ("*our* dancing"); v. 16, עטרת ראשנו ("the crown of *our* head"), אוי נא לנו כי חטאנו ("woe to *us*, for *we* have sinned"); v. 17, לבנו ("*our* heart"), עינינו ("*our* eyes"); v. 20, תשכחנו ("you forget *us*"), תעזבנו ("you forsake *us*"); v. 21, השיבנו ("restore *us*"), ונשוב ("so that *we* will return"); v. 22, מאס מאסתנו ("you have utterly rejected *us*"), עלינו ("over *us*").

Under these miserable conditions such realities as joy, conviviality, and the spirit of festivity perish ("The old men distanced themselves from the city gate, the young men from their stringed instruments" [v 14]; "the joy of our hearts is at an end, our dancing has been turned into mourning" [v 15—cf. the same themes in the Lamentation over Ur];[119] "the crown has fallen from our head" [v 16]). These lines (vv 14–16a), which are a part of the description of misery, show how a certain *joie de vivre* is normally taken for granted as an aspect of the community's life. The elders gather at the gate, the youth dance and play, festivities are celebrated, music resonates.[120]

Although the argument that a scribe might have understood vv. 14–16 to initiate a new sense unit in the larger depiction of the community's suffering seems to be quite thin, one could, along these lines, make a case that he decided to indicate the end of a sense unit after v. 13.[121]

---

119 Cf. lines 355–360 of the *Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur*. In these lines the goddess Ningal is addressed and it is stated, *inter alia*, that "(i)n the *ahu*, thy house of feasts, they celebrated not the feasts; On the *uppu* and *alû* they played not for thee that which brings joy to the heart, the ...-music. The black-headed people do not wash themselves *during* thy feasts, *Like* ... verily dirt has been decreed for them; verily their appearance has changed. Thy song has been turned into weeping ...; Thy ...-music has been turned into lamentation." These translations are quoted from S.N. Kramer, "Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur," in *ANET*, 455–463, 462 (emphasis in the original). Cf. also lines 436–437 of the *Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur* where it is said that the instruments and singers have grown silent. Cf. P. Michalowski, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 64, 65. Dobbs-Allsopp notes that the change of song and singing into weeping and lamentation forms part of the reversal motif that is characteristic of Mesopotamian city laments and shared by the book of Lamentations. Cf. F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion. A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (BO 44; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1993), 41. Moreover, the elimination of joy, music and singing is one type of calamity predicted against Israel in Old Testament texts which has parallels in the curses found in ancient Near Eastern treaty texts. Cf., e.g., Isa 24:8; Jer 7:34, 16:9, 25:10; Ezek 26:13; Amos 8:10 and Sefîre stele I A 29. In this regard, Hillers (*Treaty-Curses*, 57–58) draws attention to a number of Akkadian parallels. See also the comments of F.C. Fensham, "Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and *Kudurru*-Inscriptions Compared with Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah," *ZAW* 75/2 (1963): 171–172.

120 Westermann, *Lamentations*, 214–215.

121 There is also an indentation in line 5 of the manuscript at the beginning of Lam 5:1. The last word of Lam 4:22 in line 4 of 5QLam^{a} has, unfortunately, been lost, but Milik is probably right in assuming that there was a space that extended to the end of this line in which the final part of ch. 4 was written. Seeing as the parts of the text that have been preserved in this manuscript do not show signs of other spaces, the question presents itself why other sense units in the text were not indicated by means of spacing. One can probably do no more than speculate that the scribe who was responsible for the copying of 5QLam^{a} did not employ this scribal practice consistently.

Synopsis of the Content of the Identified Verses of Lam 5 as They Appear in 5QLam[a]

In the opening verse of Lam 5, a community invokes YHWH and pleads with him to take to heart what has befallen them. The appeal addressed to YHWH in Lam 5:1 differs slightly in 5QLam[a] and the MT. In the former, the community entreats YHWH to see and take note of their disgraces (חרפותינו—plural), whereas in the latter the singular, חרפתנו ("our disgrace"), is used. The analysis concludes that the variant reading represented by 5QLam[a] was deliberately introduced by a scribe during the process of copying. The implication of this change of number is that חרפותינו in 5QLam[a] refers to all of the misfortunes that are catalogued in the following verses of the text. Conversely, the singular form of חרפתנו in the MT collectively denotes the community's calamitous condition recounted in vv. 2–18.

The parallel cola of v. 2 in 5QLam[a] introduce the community's complaint by lamenting over the fact that the people's patrimonial real estate and houses have fallen into the hands of foreigners. Alongside the invocation of YHWH in v. 1 this bicolon might seek to goad YHWH into rectifying the injustice, since he is the one who gave the land as an inheritance to the people of Israel.

With regard to the variations in wording between 5QLam[a] and the MT at v. 3, the chapter argues that a scribe added the phrase לא בנות and altered the simile כאלמנות in the text which he copied into a statement (ואלמנות). The result is that the parallel cola of the verse in 5QLam[a] resemble each other more closely than is the case with the cola in the MT. By drawing YHWH's attention to the orphaned people and the mothers who lost their daughters and became widows, the community apparently aims to remind YHWH of his role as the protector of the widow and the helper of the orphan.

The discussion of the same wording of v. 9 in 5QLam[a] and the MT centred on the difficult phrase חרב המדבר. Although an examination of the modern-day interpretations and emendations, as well as the renderings in the ancient translations, does not lead to a definitive solution of this textual problem, the verse as a whole in the two Hebrew witnesses has as its theme the community's struggle to obtain food, especially in view of the threat posed by the desert or those who dwell there.

The analysis of Lam 5:10 exemplify both the benefits and limits of a comparative text-critical study of the various textual witnesses to the content of the passage. On the one hand, the scribal correction of עורנו into עורינו in 5QLam[a] and the various renderings in the ancient translations demonstrate that scribes felt free to remedy the incongruence between the number of

the subject and verb in the manuscripts from which they made their copies and translations. This incongruence is still visible in the version of the text transmitted in Codex Leningradensis, as well as in the two recensions of T. On the other hand, the wording of the manuscript from Qumran and the interpretations in the ancient translations do little to completely eradicate the obscurity of the words נכמרו and זלעפות in the context of the verse. Nevertheless, at this juncture in the description of the disgraces suffered by the community the wording of 5QLam^{a} conveys their complaint about the negative effects on their skin brought about by fits of hunger.

Verses 11, 12 and 13 in 5QLam^{a} are united around the theme of pairs of people that are subjugated to various types of humiliation. Women and unmarried girls are ravished in the capital and other cities of Judah, princes are hung up for public display, while the elders receive no respect. In addition, young men are forced to do work that is usually reserved for servants, such as grinding. The wordings of the three verses in the manuscript from Qumran are almost identical to the consonantal base of the MT. As a result, the two Hebrew witnesses to Lam 5:11–13 agree on the content of these verses.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding chapters, this study examined the wordings of the first, fourth and fifth chapters of the book of Lamentations as they appear in manuscripts 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam[a] and 5QLam[b] from Qumran. It focused on the readings that differ from their equivalents in the MT, as well as readings that exhibit textual difficulties. The *variae lectiones* and problematic passages were singled out for discussion with a view to gaining a better understanding of how the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran present the content of the respective chapters from the biblical writing by means of text-critical analyses. In this regard, it was important to include both the variant readings and the textual difficulties in the analysis, not only because text-critical work encompasses text-comparative and philological aspects, but also because variant readings and textual problems are two prominent features of the wordings in the textual witnesses where textual criticism is concerned with the content of passages. Variant readings in the textual witnesses were shown to be of special importance, particularly when they were not the result of scribal errors, but were deliberately created by scribes. These readings contribute a great deal to the differences in content between the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations and the other textual witnesses.[1] An emphasis on variant readings in the approach to Old Testament textual criticism that treats the Hebrew manuscripts and the ancient translations as witnesses to the content of Old Testament writings does, however, run the risk of obscuring the fact that, for the most part, the wordings of the available textual representatives are free from quantitative and qualitative differences and are essentially identical, give and take the occasional scribal error.

It follows from this that the key to using textual criticism in order to move towards a better understanding of how 3QLam, 4QLam, 5QLam[a] and 5QLam[b] present the content of Lamentations is, on the one hand, to indicate

---

[1] One might note in passing that the ancient translators' interpretations of their unvocalized Hebrew *Vorlagen* are another contributor to the differences in content between the extant textual witnesses.

why the wordings of these manuscripts look the way they do and took on their present shapes as a result of the activities of scribes during the process of transmission, and, on the other, tackling the difficult passages (some of which these manuscripts have in common with the MT) by means of comparative philology and an examination of the renderings in the ancient translations. This study submits that, in doing so, it has succeeded in attaining its purported goal. The synopses of the content of the identified verses from Lam 1, 4 and 5 as they appear in the Qumran manuscripts, at the end of the foregoing chapters of this study, can be taken as a testament to this.

The move towards a better understanding of how the manuscripts from Qumran present the content of Lamentations is the first benefit of the text-critical approach we have employed in the present study. Another benefit is that it resulted in a greater insight into the scribal transmission of the Hebrew manuscripts of Lamentations. These insights pertain to the variant readings in the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations compared to the MT version and are summarized in the following tables. The variant readings, which were discussed and evaluated in the analyses, are categorized as more original than the MT (orig.), a scribal error (err.), a (deliberate) change in wording introduced by a scribe (scr.) or an interpretative insertion (int.).[2] Orthographical variants are not recorded in the list.[3]

---

[2] Ulrich defines an interpretative insertion as follows: "Learned scribes occasionally inserted into the text they were copying additional material that they considered valuable ... We could envision these insertions as marginal readings, footnotes, helpful or pious thoughts, chronological updates, etc., now entered into the text." E. Ulrich, "The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (eds. S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 209–225, 219.

[3] For the purposes of these tables, the cases where the readings in the Qumran manuscripts and the other textual witnesses have equal claim to being original are left out of consideration, including those variants which can be attributed either to a scribal error or to a deliberate change by a scribe. In view of these criteria, it omits the variants יגה[עוד] and צָדֹו in 5QLam^{b} from the tables and, seeing as there are no variants compared to the other textual witnesses preserved in 3QLam, it is restricted to the *variae lectiones* in 4QLam and 5QLam^{a}.

Lam	Variants	Evaluation
1:6	לוא לוא 4QLam] לא MT	(err.)
1:6	מצאו מרעה MT LXX P V] מצא ומרעה 4QLam	(err.)
1:6	בלי כוח 4QLam] בלא כח MT LXX P	(orig.?)
1:7	זכרה ירושלם MT LXX P V T] זכוֹרה יהוה 4QLam	(scr.)
1:7	ימי עניה ומרודיה MT LXX P V] > 4QLam	(orig.)
1:7	כל מחמדיה MT LXX P V T] ל מכאובנו[ ] 4QLam	(scr.)
1:7	לה ראוה MT LXX P T^{W,Y}] > 4QLam	(err.)
1:7	צריה 4QLam LXX P] צרים MT V T	(orig.)
1:7	ל[ ] 4QLam] > MT LXX P V	(err.?)
1:7	משבריה 4QLam P] משבתה MT LXX V	(orig.)
1:8	לנוד 4QLam LXX V] לנידה MT P	(orig.)
1:8	הָזֵּילו 4QLam] הזילוה MT LXX P V T	(err.)
1:9	לאות[פ] 4QLam] פלאים MT	(scr.)
1:9	ואין 4QLam P T^{W}] אין MT	(scr.?)
1:10–11	בקהל לך כל עמה נאנחים מבקשים לחם נתנו MT P V] > 4QLam	(err.)
1:11	מחמדיה 4QLam LXX] מחמודיהם MT P T	(scr.)
1:11	נפשה 4QLam] נפש MT LXX P V	(scr.)
1:11	זולל 4QLam] זוללה MT LXX P V	(scr.)
1:12	[י]לוא אליכ 4QLam] לוא אליכם MT P	(scr.)
1:12	עוללו לי 4QLam] עלל לי MT P T	(scr.)
1:12	הוגירני 4QLam] הוגה MT	(scr.)
1:12	נו[ם חרו 4QLam] ביום חרון אפו MT LXX P V T	(orig.)
1:13	ויורידני 4QLam P] וירדנה MT	(scr.)
1:13	חשיבני 4QLam] השיבני MT LXX P V T	(err.)
1:13	שומם 4QLam] שוממה MT LXX P V T	(scr.)
1:13	וד[ו]י 4QLam] דוה MT LXX P V T	(scr.)
1:14	נקשרה 4QLam] נשקד MT; נשׂקד MT^{mss} LXX P V	(scr.)
1:14	וישתרג 4QLam] ישתרגו MT LXX P V T	(scr.?)
1:14	עולו 4QLam P] עלו MT LXX V T	(orig.?)
1:14	יהוה 4QLam MT^{mss}] אדני MT	(orig.?)
1:14	לקוֹם 4QLam] קום MT	(scr.?)
1:15	אבודי 4QLam] אבירי MT LXX P V T	(err.)
1:15	יהוֹה 4QLam] אדני MT	(orig.?)
1:17	מכול אוהביה צדיק אתה יהוה 4QLam] > MT LXX P V	(int.)
1:17	צפה 4QLam] צוה MT LXX P V T	(orig.)
1:17	ציון 4QLam] ירושלם MT	(scr.)
1:17	לנדוח 4QLam] לנדה MT LXX P V T	(err.)
1:16	בכוֹ עיני ירדה 4QLam] אני בוכיה עיני עיני ירדה MT P T	(scr.)
1:16	דמעתי 4QLam] מים MT LXX P V T^{Y}	(scr.)
1:16	נפש 4QLam] נפשי MT LXX P V T	(err.)
1:18	א[דוני 4QLam] יהוה MT	(scr.?)

Of the forty one readings collected in the table above, nine can confidently be characterized as scribal errors. Another partially preserved reading, ל[ ] in Lam 1:7, might also be an error. In light of these readings, which were created through erroneous copying, as well as the scribal corrections (the insertion of a letter in the interlinear space [Frg. 3 line 1] and the erasure [Frg. 3 line 7]), it seems reasonable to agree with Cross that the scribe who was responsible for 4QLam was often careless in writing this manuscript.[4] Nevertheless, 4QLam preserves at least six readings that can with relative certainty be identified as more original than their counterparts in the MT. Four other readings can also be interpreted in this way, although with less confidence. The majority of the readings in the table can be attributed to deliberate changes brought about by scribes during the transmission history of the version of Lam 1 represented by 4QLam. These twenty readings exhibit the creativity of ancient scribes who felt free to alter the details of the wordings in the manuscripts which they copied. The deliberate changes range from assimilations to usual forms of words in Hebrew and facilitations of syntax to the modification of words in vv. 7, 11, 12 and 13, so that the narrator would remain the speaker throughout the poem in this version of Lam 1. Finally, the phrases מכול אוהביה and צדיק אתה יהוה in 4QLam's wording of Lam 1:17 can be categorized as an interpretative insertion. This insertion bears witness to the freedom that an ancient scribe enjoyed to change the wording of the manuscript he copied.

Lam	Variants	Evaluation
4:14	כֻּלּוֹ[ו] בל י 5QLam^{a}] בלא יוכלו MT LXX	(scr.)
4:15	טֻמְאָו LXX P V (?)] טמא MT T	(orig.)
5:1	חרפותי[נו 5QLam^{a} MT^{mss}] חרפתנו MT LXX P V T	(scr.)
5:3	לֹא בְּנוֹת ואלמנות 5QLam^{a}] כאלמנות MT LXX P V T	(scr.)
5:10	עוֹר[נ]ו 5QLam^{a} MT^{mss} P] עורנו MT LXX V T	(scr.)

The table of variant readings in 5QLam^{a} shows that most of these variants can be attributed to intentional changes by scribes, while at least one reading, טֻמְאָו in Lam 4:15, is possibly more original than its opposite number in the MT. The most prominent conclusion that can be drawn from these tables is that, more than anything else, 4QLam and 5QLam^{a} exhibit the creative activity of the scribes who transmitted manuscripts of Lamentations

[4] Cross, "4QLam," 229.

during the Second Temple period and the modifications to the wordings of the chapters which these scribes brought about resulted in subtle, but noteworthy changes to their content.

In light of the fragmentary nature of 5QLam[a] and the fact that very little of the wordings of Lam 4 and 5 are preserved in this manuscript, Milik is correct in his assessment that the textual character of 5QLam[a] in relation to the MT is unclear. Concerning 4QLam, a number of considerations should be taken into account in delineating the textual character of this manuscript and its relationship with the version in the MT and other textual witnesses. These include the few original readings that survived in the manuscript, those readings which were created deliberately by scribes, as well as the view that 4QLam exhibits the orthographical and morphological features that were supposedly characteristic of the so-called "Qumran scribal practice". One cannot determine whether 4QLam presents a distinctive version of Lam 1 on the basis of the original readings alone, since some of these readings are also attested to by the LXX and P (cf., for example, צריה and משבריה in Lam 1:7). The readings that constitute intentional scribal changes should also be treated with caution.

First, the analyses have shown that it is probable that more than one scribe was responsible for some of these changes. They therefore came into being at different stages during the transmission history. Secondly, apart from additions of phrases and two long omissions in the wording of 4QLam, there are not any large-scale quantitative differences between this manuscript and the MT.[5] Some of the additions and omissions were due to scribal errors and therefore do not form part of any discernible pattern of variants. In fact, only one such pattern can be identified in 4QLam, namely, the changes to the wording that ensured that the speaking voice belongs to the narrator throughout the poem. These changes appear to be quite deliberate and occur in more than one verse. This pattern allows one to interpret other passages in Lam 1, especially the first-person singular references in vv. 12–17, in a different way from the corresponding wording of the MT, where personified Jerusalem is the speaker. This pattern of changes, coupled with the other variant readings in the wording of the manuscript,

---

[5] The fact that Lam 1 is an acrostic poem and, as such, follows a more or less fixed structure, could have acted as a deterrent against large-scale differences. The qualification "more or less" is important, because the usual *'ayin*/*pe* sequence of the Hebrew alphabet, exhibited by vv. 16 and 17 of Lam 1 in the MT, is inverted in 4QLam. It was indicated in the text-critical analysis that this different order of verses has a marked influence on the presentation of their content.

which were purposely produced by different scribes during the transmission history, leads to the conclusion that 4QLam and the MT do not represent the same version of Lam 1. This verdict rests on the disagreement in matters of content between the two Hebrew witnesses. Therefore, in my opinion, 4QLam contains a unique version of Lam 1 inasmuch as this manuscript has a distinctive presentation of the content of the chapter.

This raises the question whether the version of Lam 1 in 4QLam can be linked in any particular way to the Qumran community. The fact that Tov detects some of the features of the supposed Qumran scribal practice in the manuscript might point in this direction. However, even if the view that some of the manuscripts from the caves near Khirbet Qumran were copied at the settlement proves correct, and thus Tov's proposals regarding a specific Qumran scribal practice are accepted, it does not automatically follow that the distinctive traits of 4QLam's version of Lam 1 were created by the scribes belonging to the Qumran community. At the most, one can infer that the Qumran scribes contributed to the morphology and orthography of the wording in the manuscript and perhaps even introduced a number of the unique readings. This conclusion concerning 4QLam is in keeping with the view espoused by Brooke that none of the biblical manuscripts from the Qumran caves preserve a "sectarian version" of the Old Testament writings. He notes that

> great care should be exercised before any or all variants are classified as exegetically sectarian, since the character of the process of the transmission of the biblical texts during the late Second Temple period is one of manifold adjustments in minor ways as the texts are copied from one generation to the next.[6]

With regard to 4QLam, I agree with his observation that many of the variants in the biblical manuscripts were created deliberately, "but deliberate variants are not necessarily sectarian".[7] In my opinion, the present shape of the wording of 4QLam as a whole was the work of various scribes who transmitted this version over an extended period of time.

Two more issues require brief comment. The first issue pertains to the limitations of the approach to Old Testament textual criticism that was applied in analysing the Qumran manuscripts' presentation of the content

---

[6] G.J. Brooke, "*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context* (eds. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 107–119, 110.

[7] Ibid.

of Lamentations. In the text-critical analyses, one is able to interpret some of the readings as deliberate changes brought about by scribes and others as scribal errors. In the case of deliberate changes that affect the content of a passage, for example the modifications of the wording of Lam 1 in 4QLam that make the narrator the speaker throughout the poem, the text-critical approach did not pursue the question why these alterations in content were introduced. In order to answer questions of this kind, we need to know who the scribes were and, therefore, to study the historical background of scribes in the Second Temple period and to identify their possible social locations.[8] If it can be established that different scribes were responsible for the present form of the wording preserved in a manuscript from Qumran, and not only those scribes who belonged to this particular community, it is necessary that text-critics avail themselves of information regarding the scribal culture of the Second Temple period in general, as well as the contexts of the scribes' education and training. These are areas of research where the text-critic can benefit from the expertise of historians and scholars who interpret the material culture and artefacts recovered by archaeology, as well as influence of other ancient Near Eastern and Greco-Roman cultures on Second Temple Judaism. This dependency of text-critics on the works of historians can be seen as a limitation of the text-critical approach advocated in this study, but it might also be taken as a positive invitation to interdisciplinary cooperation in gaining a more complete understanding of why the wordings in the available manuscripts look the way they do.

The second issue concerns the place of text-critical analyses in the process of exegesis. Several scholars have recently addressed questions concerning the relationship between textual criticism and historical criticism. This relationship is usually bound up with a distinction between two phases in the development of the texts of the Old Testament writings, namely the phase of literary growth when the writings were still at the stage of composition and a phase of transmission after the composition was completed. The phase of composition belongs to the domain of historical criticism, while the phase of transmission provides the material for textual criticism. In such a distinction, the task of the latter discipline would be to eliminate all the

---

[8] Cf. K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); M. Bar-Ilan, "Scribes and Books in the Late Second Commonwealth and Rabbinic Period," in *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading & Inter-pretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (eds. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 21–38.; and A. Saldarini, "Scribes," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 5; ed. D.N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1012–1016.

scribal errors and sundry corruptions such as glosses and double readings in the available textual witnesses. In doing so, the text-critic supplies the exegete with a pristine, more "original" form of the wording of an Old Testament writing which can subsequently be subjected to historical-critical analysis. The exegete would scrutinize the "original text" for evidence of its composite nature, identifying possible sources or redaction-critical information in the process. This study has, however, been occupied with a different approach to textual criticism in which the primary aim was not to establish an "original text". Moreover, biblical research has in the last decades experienced the proliferation of a variety of exegetical methods.[9] These two considerations raise the question how a text-critical approach that treats the extant Hebrew manuscripts and ancient translations as witnesses to the content of Old Testament writings relates to the assortment of existing exegetical methods employed in biblical scholarship. This is another issue that can be taken up in future research.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates how a text-critical approach in which the extant Hebrew manuscripts and ancient translations are analysed as witnesses to the content of an Old Testament writing can produce a better understanding of the content of Lamentations as it appears in the Qumran manuscripts. By establishing why the present forms of the wordings in the Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran look the way they do, the text-critical analysis has also yielded greater insight into the scribal transmission of these manuscripts, and, in the case of 4QLam, into the relationship between this manuscript and other textual witnesses, especially the MT. Nevertheless, the benefits of the text-critical approach that was applied in the present study throw its limitations into sharp relief and highlight the need for interdisciplinary cooperation in reading and interpreting the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations. Such a collaboration of more than one discipline is crucial for arriving at a more complete understanding of the content of the book as it is represented by the manuscripts from the Qumran caves.

---

[9] Cf. L.C. Jonker and D.G. Lawrie, eds., *Fishing for Jonah* (*anew*). *Various Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Stellenbosch: African Sun Media, 2005); E. Talstra, *Oude en Nieuwe Lezers: Een Inleiding in de Methoden van Uitleg van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 2002); J. Barton, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); idem, *Reading the Old Testament. Method in Biblical Study. Revised and Enlarged* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996); and L.C. Jonker, *Exclusivity and Variety: Perspectives on Multidimensional Exegesis* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalders, G.C. *Klaagliederen: Opnieuw uit den Grondtekst Vertaald en Verklaard.* KV. Kampen: Kok, 1952.

Abegg, M.G. "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 325–358 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment.* Vol. 1. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998.

——— "The Linguistic Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls: More Than (Initially) Meets the Eye." Pages 48–68 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods.* Edited by M.L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Abegg, M.G., Flint, P.W. and Ulrich, E. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English.* San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999.

Adair, J.A. "A methodology for using the versions in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *JNSL* 20/2 (1994): 111–142.

Albertz, R. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Albrektson, B. *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations: With a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text.* Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963.

Alexander, P.S. "Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures." Pages 217–253 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity.* Edited by M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

——— *The Targum of Lamentations: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes.* ArBib 17b. Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Assan-Dhôte, I. and J. Moatti-Fine. *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie.* BdA 25.2. Paris: Cerf, 2005.

Baillet, M. "Lamentations." Page 95 in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le Rouleau de Cuivre.* Edited by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux. 2 Vols. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

——— "501. Lamentation." Pages 79–80 in *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520).* DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Bar-Ilan, M. "Writing Materials." Pages 996–997 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Vol. 2. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

——— "Scribes and Books in the Late Second Commonwealth and Rabbinic Period." Pages 21–38 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity.* Edited by M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Barthélemy, D. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila.* VTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

——— *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations*. OBO 50/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Barton, J. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study. Revised and Enlarged*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Barton, J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Baumann, G. *Liebe und Gewalt. Die Ehe als Metapher für das Verhältnis JHWH—Israel in den Prophetenbüchern*. SBS 185. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000.

Baumgarten, J.M. "The Law and Spirit of Purity at Qumran." Pages 93–105 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*, 93–105. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Beentjes, P.C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VTSup 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Beer, G. "Klagelieder 5.9," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 285.

Berges, U. *Klagelieder*. HThKAT. Freiburg / Basel / Wien: Herder, 2002.

Berlin, A. *Lamentations: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

——— "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature." Pages 1–17 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. STDJ XLVIII. Edited by E.G. Chazon. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2003.

Bernstein, M.J. "4Q179 (4QapocrLam A) (Preliminary Edition)." Pages 148–151 in *Poetic and Liturgical Texts*. DSSR 5. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Tov. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2005.

Boase, E. *The Fulfilment of Doom? The Dialogic Interaction between the Book of Lamentations and the Pre-Exilic/Early Exilic Prophetic Literature*. New York / London: Continuum, 2006.

Botterweck, G.J., H. Ringgren and H.-J. Fabry. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.

Brock, S.P. *The Bible in the Syriac Tradition*. 2nd rev. ed. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2006.

Brooke, G.J. "*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 107–119 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context*. Edited by T.H. Lim et al. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.

——— "The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction between Higher and Lower Criticism." Pages 26–42 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies*. Edited by J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

——— "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran." Pages 287–319 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1: *Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Broshi, M. "Scriptorium." Pages 831–832 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Brown, F., S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906.

Budde, K. "Zum hebräischen Klagelied," *ZAW* 12 (1892): 261–275.
Burrows, M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
Cathcart, K.J. and R.P. Gordon. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. ArBib 14. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989.
Charles, R.H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.
Charlesworth, J.H. "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Discovery and Challenge to Biblical Studies." Pages 1–23 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1: *Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
Clines, D.J.A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 6 Vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2007.
Cohen, A. "Soṭah: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices." in *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nashim*. Vol. 3. Edited by I. Epstein. London: The Soncino Press, 1936.
——— "Lamentations." in *Midrash Rabbah*. Vol. 7. Edited by H. Freedman and M. Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1961.
Cook, E.M. "The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 359–378 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol. 1. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998.
Cook, J. "The Relationship between Textual Criticism, Literary Criticism and Exegesis—An Interactive One?" *Textus* 24 (2009): 119–132.
Cross, F.M. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." Pages 133–202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G.E. Wright. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.
——— "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert." *HTR* 57 (1964): 281–299.
——— "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81–95.
——— "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts." Pages 306–320 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by F.M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
Cross, F.M. "Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Verse: The Prosody of Lamentations 1:1–22." Pages 129–155 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman*. Edited by C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
——— *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
——— "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 379–402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol. 1. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998.
——— "The Fixation of the Text of the Hebrew Bible." Pagegs 205–218 in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
——— "4QLam." Pages 229–237 in *Qumran Cave 4 XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD XVI. Edited by E. Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Dahood, M.J. "Dittografia, glossa o paranomosia. Nota a Lam 1,16a." *RivBib* 8 (1960): 364–365.

——— *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963.

——— Review: 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). *Bib* 44 (1963): 547–549.

——— "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography II." *Bib* 45 (1964): 393–412.

Dahood, M.J. "New Readings in Lamentations." *Bib* 59 (1978): 174–197.

Davies, P.R. "Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 144–166 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1: *The Ancient Period*. Edited by A.J. Hauser and D.F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Davila, J.R. "New Qumran Readings for Genesis One." Pages 3–11 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins and T.H. Tobin. Maryland: University Press of America, 1990.

——— *Liturgical Works*. ECDSS 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

De Hoop, R. "The Colometry of Hebrew Verse and the Masoretic Accents: Evaluation of a Recent Approach (Part I)." *JNSL* 26/1 (2000): 47–73.

——— "The Colometry of Hebrew Verse and the Masoretic Accents: Evaluation of a Recent Approach (Part II)." *JNSL* 26/2 (2000): 65–100.

——— "Lamentations: The Qinah-Metre Questioned." Pages 80–104 in *Delimitation Criticism*. Edited by M. Korpel and J. Oesch. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000.

Deist, F.E. *Towards the Text of the Old Testament*. Pretoria: NGKB, 1978.

——— *Witnesses to the Old Testament*. Pretoria: NGKB, 1988.

De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.

——— *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

De Lagarde, P. *Hagiographa Chaldaice*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873.

Delitzsch, F. *Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament*. Berlin / Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1920.

Dempster, S.G. "Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon." Pages 87–127 in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*. Edited by C.A. Evans and E. Tov. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

De Vaux, R. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids / Livonia: Eerdmans / Dove, 1997.

Dirksen, P.B. "The Old Testament Peshitta." Pages 255–297 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. BO 44. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1993.

——— "The Syntagma of *bat* Followed by a Geographical Name in the Hebrew Bible: A Reconsideration of Its Meaning and Grammar." *CBQ* 57 (1995): 451–470.

——— "Linguistic Evidence for the Date of Lamentations." *JANES* 26 (1998): 1–36.
——— *Lamentations*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2002.
——— "Lamentations from Sundry Angles: A Retrospective." Pages 13–25 in *Lamentations in Ancient and Contemporary Cultural Contexts*. Edited by N.C. Lee and C.R. Mandolfo. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. and T. Linafelt. "The Rape of Zion in Thr 1, 10." *ZAW* 113/1 (2001): 77–81.
Driver, G.R. "Notes on the Text of Lamentations." *ZAW* 52 (1934): 308–309.
——— "Hebrew Notes on 'Song of Songs' and 'Lamentations.'" Pages 134–146 in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by Walter Baumgartner et al. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950.
——— "Isaiah 6:1 'his train filled the temple'." Pages 87–96 in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by H. Goedicke. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
Duggan, M.W. "Ezra 9:6–15: A Penitential Prayer within Its Literary Setting." Pages 165–180 in *Seeking the Favor of God*. Vol. 1: *The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.J. Boda, D.K. Falk and R.A. Werline. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
Dyserinck, J. "De Klaagliederen uit het Hebreeuwsch Opnieuw Vertaald." *ThT* 26 (1892): 359–380.
Ehrlich, A.B. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1914.
Eichorn, J.G. *Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament*. London: Spottiswoode and Co, 1888.
Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.
Eskult, M. "The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Hebrew Texts." Pages 8–23 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by I. Young. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
Eslinger, L. "The Infinite in a Finite Organical Perception (Isaiah VI 1–5)." *VT* 45/2 (1995): 145–173.
Ewald, H. *Die Psalmen und die Klagelieder erklärt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1881.
Exum, J.C. *Song of Songs: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
Faulkenberry Miller, J.B. "4QLXXLev[a] and Proto-Septuagint Studies: Reassessing Qumran Evidence for the *Urtext* Theory." Pages 1–28 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by M.T. Davis and B.A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
Fabry, H.-J. "Die griechischen Handschriften vom Toten Meer." Pages 131–153 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, 131–153. Edited by H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001.
Feder, F. *Biblia Sahidica: Ieremias, Lamentationes* (*Threni*), *Epistula Ieremiae et Baruch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
Fensham, F.C. "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature." *JNES* 21/2 (1962): 129–139.

——— "Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and *Kudurru*-Inscriptions Compared with Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah," *ZAW* 75/2 (1963): 155–175.

Fernández Marcos, N. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 2000.

Field, F. *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt: sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.

Fishbane, M. "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." Pages 339–377 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre*. BO 19. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

Flint, P.W. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

——— "The Book of Canticles (Song of Songs) in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 96–104 in *Perspectives on the Song of Songs/Perspektiven der Hoheliedauslegung*. Edited by A.C. Hagedorn. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Fox, M.V. *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Freedman, D.N. et al., eds. *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Frymer-Kensky, T. "Pollution, Purification, and Purgation in Biblical Israel." Pages 399–414 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman*. Edited by C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

García Martínez, F. and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 Vols. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1997, 1998.

Gelston, A. *The Peshiṭta of the Twelve Prophets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

——— "The Ancient Versions of the Hebrew Bible: Their Nature and Significance." Pages 148–164 in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*. Edited by A. Rapaport-Albert and G. Greenberg. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Gentry, P.J. "Lamentations." Pages 932–941 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Gesenius, W. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Gordis, R. *The Song of Songs and Lamentations: A Study, Modern Translation and Commentary*. New York: KTAV, 1974.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth." *JBL* 102/3 (1983): 365–399.

——— "The Development of the Hebrew Text of the Bible: Theories and Practice of Textual Criticism." *VT* 42/2 (1992): 204–213.

Gottlieb, H. *A Study on the Text of Lamentations*. Århus: Det Laerde Selskab, 1978.

Gottwald, N.K. *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*. London: SCM Press, 1954.

Greenspoon, L.J. "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?" Pages 159–194 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate*

Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings: Manchester, 1990. Edited by G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

——— "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible." Pages 101–127 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol. 1. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998.

Haber, S. *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. Edited by A. Reinhartz. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Harrington, H.K. "The Halakah and Religion of Qumran." Pages 74–89 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Hendel, R.S. "Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran." Pages 281–302 in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Henze, M., ed. *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Herdner, A. *Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques: Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1963.

Hillers, D.R. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. BO 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.

——— *Lamentations: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd, rev. ed. AB 7. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Hirsch-Luipold, R. and C.M. Maier. "Threnoi/Die Klagelieder." Pages 1349–1358 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by W. Kraus and M. Karrer. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.

——— "Threnoi/Threni Seu Lamentationes/Die Klagelieder." Pages 2827–2841 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Band II: Psalmen bis Daniel*. Edited by M. Karrer and W. Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

Hobbins, J.F. "Lamentations 1–5: The Corpus Introduction." Pages 1–38. Online: http://ancienthebrewpoetry.typepad.com/ancient_hebrew_poetry/2006/05/index.html.

Høgenhaven, J. "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)." Pages 113–120 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London / New Castle: British Library / Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

Horgan, M.P. "A Lament over Jerusalem ('4Q179')." *JSS* 18 (1973): 222–234.

House, P.R. *Lamentations*. WBC. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2004.

Houtsma, M.T. "Textkritisches," *ZAW* 27 (1907): 57–59.

Hunter, J. *Faces of a Lamenting City: The Development and Coherence of the Book of Lamentations*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.

Hurowitz, V.A. "זוללה = peddlar / tramp / vagabond / beggar. Lamentations i 11 in Light of Akkadian *zilulû*." *VT* 49 (1999): 542–545.

Hurvitz, A. "The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew." *IEJ* 18 (1968): 234–240.

——— "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible." Pages 24–37 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by I. Young; London: T & T Clark, 2003.

Ilan, T. "Gender and Lamentations: 4Q179 and the Canonization of the Book of Lamentations," *Lectio Difficilior* 2 (2008): 1–16.

Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.

Jenni, E. *Das hebräische Pi'el: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament*. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1968.

Jobes, K.H. and M. Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.

Jonker, L.C. *Exclusivity and Variety: Perspectives on Multidimensional Exegesis*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Jonker, L.C. and D.G. Lawrie, eds. *Fishing for Jonah (anew): Various Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*. Stellenbosch: African Sun Media, 2005.

Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 Vols. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2005.

Kaiser, O. *Klagelieder*. ATD. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Katz, P. Review of BH3, Heft 13: Megilloth. *ThLZ* 63 (1938): 34.

Kedar, B. "The Latin Translations." Pages 299–338 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Keel, O. *The Song of Songs*. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Kittel, R., ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

Klawans, J. "The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism." *JJS* 48/1 (1997): 1–16.

——— "Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 377–402 in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Klein, R.W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Kopf, L. "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch." *VT* 8 (1958): 161–215.

Kotzé, G.R. "The Greek Translation of Lamentations: Towards a More Nuanced View of its 'Literal' Character." Pages 77–95 in *Septuagint and Reception*. VTSup 127. Edited by J. Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

——— "The Greek and Hebrew Texts of Lamentations 1:4–6. Establishing the Differences in Content between the Textual Witnesses by means of a Text-Critical Analysis." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009): 275–292.

——— "Short Notes on the Value of the Septuagint and Vulgate for the Interpretation of Lamentations 1:1." *JNSL* 36/1 (2010): 77–93.

——— "LXX Lamentations 4:7 and 4:14. Reflections on the Greek Renderings of the Difficult Hebrew Wordings of these Verses." *JSem* 20/1 (2011): 250–270.

——— "Two Difficult Passages in the Hebrew Texts of Lamentations 5: Text-Critical Analyses of the Greek Translation." Pages 275–295 in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*. VTSup 157. Edited by J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

——— "Lamentations 1:8a in the Wordings of the Masoretic Text and 4QLam." *Scriptura* 110/2 (2012): 190–207.

Kramer, S.N. 1955. "Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur." Pages 455–463 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Edited J.B. Pritchard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Kraus, H.-J. *Klagelieder* (*Threni*). BKAT. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1983.

Kugler, R.A. "Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 90–112 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Kühlewein, J. "אַלְמָנָה *'almānā* Witwe." Pages 169–173 in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Vol. 1. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1971.

Kutscher, E.Y. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982.

Lange, A. "The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?" Pages 177–193 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2006.

Lemmelijn, B. "What Are We Looking For in Doing Old Testament Text-Critical Research?" *JNSL* 23/2 (1997): 69–80.

——— *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called "Plague Narrative" in Exodus 7:14–11:10*. OTS 56. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2009.

Levine, E. *The Aramaic Version of Lamentations*. New York: Hermon Press, 1976.

Liddell, H.G., R. Scott and H.S. Jones. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with rev. sup. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linafelt, T. *Surviving Lamentations: Catastrophe, Lament, and Protest in the Afterlife of a Biblical Book*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000.

Löhr, M.R.H. *Die Klagelieder des Jeremia*. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893.

Lust, J., E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996.

Magness, J. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Malina, B. J and J. Pilch. *Handbook on Biblical Social Values*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998.

Malul, M. *Knowledge, Control and Sex: Studies in Biblical Thought, Culture and World-view*. Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center, 2002.

Martin, G.D. *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Martin-Achard, R. "זָר *zār* Fremd." Pages 520–522 in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Vol. 1. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1971.

——— "נֵכָר *nēkār* Fremde." Pages 66–68 in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Vol. 2. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. München / Zürich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag / Theologischer Verlag, 1976.

McCarter, P.K. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

McDaniel, T.F. "Philological Studies in Lamentations, I." *Bib* 49 (1968): 27–53.

McDonald, L.M. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007.

McLay, R.T. "Daniel." Pages 991–1022 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Meek T.J. "Lamentations." Pages 3–38 in *The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 6. New York: Abington Press, 1956.

Meyers, C.L. and E.M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Michalowski, P. *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

Milgrom, J. *Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Milik, J.T. "Lamentations (Premier Exemplaire)." Pages 174–177 in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le Rouleau de Cuivre*. Edited by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux. 2 Vols. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

——— "Lamentations (Second Exemplaire)." Pages 177–178 in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le Rouleau de Cuivre*. Edited by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux. 2 Vols. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Miller, C.W. "Reading Voices: Personification, Dialogism, and the Reader of Lamentations 1." *BI* 9/4 (2001): 393–408.

Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain / Paris / Walpole: Peeters, 2009.

Muraoka, T. and J.F. Elwolde, eds. *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 2000.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *1Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

——— *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Nöldeke, T. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904.

O'Connor, K.M. *Lamentations and the Tears of the World*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2002.

Oppenheim, L et al., eds. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956–2011.

Pabst, H. "Eine Sammlung von Klagen in den Qumranfunden (4Q *179*)." Pages 137–149 in *Qumrân: Sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978.

Parry, R.A. *Lamentations*. THOTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Payne Smith, J., ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902.

Pham, X.H.T. *Mourning in the Ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible*. JSOTSup 302. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Pope, M.H. *Song of Songs: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 7C. New York: Doubleday, 1977.

Praetorius, F. "Threni I, 12. 14. II, 6. 13." *ZAW* 15 (1895): 143–146.

Pritchard, J.B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Provan, I.W. "Reading Texts against an Historical Background: The Case of Lamentations 1." *SJOT* 1 (1990): 130–143.
——— *Lamentations*. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
Qimron, E. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
Rahlfs, A. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes: Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hanhart*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
Reider, J. "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew." *VT* (1954): 276–295.
Rendsburg, G.A. "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Phonology." Pages 104–128 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by I. Young; London: T & T Clark, 2003.
Renkema, J. "The Literary Structure of Lamentations (I–IV)." Pages 294–396 in *The Structured Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry*. JSOTSup 74. Edited by W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
——— *Klaagliederen*. COT. Kampen: Kok, 1993.
——— "Does Hebrew *ytwm* Really Mean 'Fatherless'?" *VT* 45 (1995): 119–122.
Revell, E.J. "Masoretic Accents." Pages 594–596 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 4. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Rietz, H.W.M. "Synchronizing Worship: Jubilees as a Tradition for the Qumran Community." Pages 111–118 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Robinson, T.H. "Notes on the Text of Lamentations." *ZAW* 51 (1933): 255–259.
Rudolph, W. "Der Text der Klagelieder." *ZAW* 56 (1938): 101–122.
——— *Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohe Lied. Die Klagelieder*. KAT. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1962.
Sabatier, P. *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu Vetus Italica et caeterae quaecunque in codicibus manuscriptis et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: quae cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparantur*. Vol. 2. Remis: Reginaldum Florentain, 1743.
Saldarini, A.J. "Scribes." Pages 1012–1016 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 5. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Salters, R.B. *Lamentations*. ICC. London / New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
Sanders, E.P. "The Dead Sea Sect and other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences." Pages 7–43 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context*. Edited by T.H. Lim et al. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
Sanders, J.A. "The Issue of Closure in the Canonical Process." Pages 252–263 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
Schäfer, R. "Der Masoretische Text der Klagelieder und die Handschriften 3QLam, 4QLam und 5QLam$^{a.b}$ aus Qumran." Pages 127–147 in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel*. Edited by U. Dahmen, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000.
——— "Lamentations." Pages 54–72, 113*–136* in *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato: General Introduction and Megilloth*. Edited by A. Schenker et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.
Schenker, A., ed. *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between*

the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Schenker, A. et al., eds. *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato: General Introduction and Megilloth*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.

Schiffman, L.H. "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 123–142 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context*. Edited T.H. Lim et al. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.

——— "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship." Pages 63–78 in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

——— "Holiness and Sanctity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 256–269 in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Schulz-Flügel, E. "The Latin Old Testament Tradition." Pages 642–662 in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation I/1. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*. Edited by M. Saebø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Skehan, P.W. and A.A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Sollamo, R. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

Stegemann, H. *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Stipp, H.-J. "Textkritik—Literarkritik—Textentwicklung. Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik." *ETL* 66 (1990): 143–159.

——— "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen." *BZ* 34 (1990): 16–37.

Talmon, S. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132.

——— "The Old Testament Text." Pages 159–199 in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Edited by P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

——— "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook." Pages 321–400 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by F.M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

——— "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 3–24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

——— "What's in a Calendar? Calendar Conformity and Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant'." Pages 25–58 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Talstra, E. *Oude en Nieuwe Lezers: Een Inleiding in de Methoden van Uitleg van het Oude Testament*. Kok: Kampen, 2002.

Thomas, H.A. "The Meaning of *zōlēlâ* (Lam 1:11) One More Time." *VT* 61 (2011): 489–498.

Tov, E. "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah." Pages 145–167 in *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission*. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1981.

——— "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls." *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11–27.

——— "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX." Pages 11–47 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

——— *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.

——— *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd rev. ed. Minneapolis/Assen: Fortress Press / Van Gorcum, 2001.

——— "The Status of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon." Pages 234–251 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.

——— *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004.

——— "The Writing of Early Scrolls and the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture." *DSD* 13/3 (2006): 339–347.

——— "Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity." Pages 151–172 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2010.

Tov, E. and S. Pfann, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 1992–1993.

Trebolle Barrera, J.C. 1989. "Textual Variants in 4QJudg[a] and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges." *RevQ* 54 (1989): 229–245.

Ulrich, E. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

——— "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: a Reappraisal of Their Value." Pages 49–80 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

——— *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

——— "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon." Pages 79–98 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

——— "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text." Pages 99–120 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

——— "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament." Pages 57–80 in *The Biblical*

Canons. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

——— "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts." Pages 77–100 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1: *Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

——— "The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books." Pages 209–225 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.

Ulrich, E., ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2010.

Van der Heide, A. *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

VanderKam, J.C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

VanderKam, J.C. and P.W. Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002.

Van der Kooij, A. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*. OBO 35. Fribourg / Göttingen: Universitets-verlag / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

——— "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele." Pages 185–202 in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. Leiden / New York / Köln: Brill, 1997.

——— "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries." Pages 167–177 in *The Bible as Book. The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Hiebert and E. Tov. London / New Castle: British Library / Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

——— "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Its Aim and Method." Pages 729–739 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2003.

——— "Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonaean Politics." Pages 27–38 in *The Biblical Canons*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

——— "Textual Criticism." Pages 579–590 in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Edited by J.W. Rogerson and J.M. Lieu. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., J.A. Naudé and J.H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Van der Toorn, K. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Van der Woude, A.S. "Fifty Years of Qumran Research." Pages 1–45 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol. 1. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden / Boston / Köln: Brill, 1998.

Van Rooy, H.F. "The Ancient Versions of Lamentations," *Scriptura* 110/2 (2012): 227–236.

Vermes, G. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Walters, P. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Waltke, B.K. and M. O'Connor. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Watson, W.G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. JSOTSup 26. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.

Weber, R. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem: Editionem quintam emendatam retractatam praeparavit Roger Gryson*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Webster, B. "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert." Pages 351–446 in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series*. DJD XXXIX. Edited by E. Tov. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Weitzman, M.P. *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Westermann, C. *Lamentations: Issues and Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Wevers, J.W. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. SBLSCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Wise, M.O., M.G. Abegg and E.M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2005.

Würthwein, E. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblica Hebraica*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Yadin, Y. *The Ben Sira Scroll From Masada: With Introduction, Emendations and Commentary*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1965.

Yeivin, I. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980.

Young, I. "Introduction: The Origin of the Problem." Pages 1–6 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by I. Young. London: T & T Clark, 2003.

Young, I., R. Rezetko and M. Ehrensvärd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. 2 Vols. London / Oakville: Equinox, 2008–2009.

Youngblood, K.J. "The Character and Significance of LXX Lamentations." Pages 64–69 in *Great Is Thy Faithfulness? Reading Lamentations as Sacred Scripture*. Edited by R.A. Parry and H.A. Thomas. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.

Ziegler, J. *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta*. MSU VI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

——— *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XV: Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Ziegler, J. and O. Munnich. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XVI, 2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Old Testament/Hebrew Bible

Genesis
1:14–19 143
6:1–4 130n49
7:13 126n37
20:2 71
49:26 125

Exodus
12:17 126n37
12:51 126n37

Leviticus
12:2 54
13:45 138, 140, 147
15:19–33 54
15:24 56n73
17:11 134n69
18:19 54, 105
18:24–30 57
18:24 57
18:25 57
18:28 57
19:31 57
20:1–3 57
20:3 57
20:10–21 56n73
20:21 56
21:17–23 144
23:21 126n37

Numbers
6:1–22 125
11:8 169
19:9 57n75
19:13 57n75
19:20 57n75
19:21 57n75
31:23 57n75
35:33–34 57

Deuteronomy
4:21 153
4:38 153
12:23 134n69
20:21 69n111
22:8 134n69
25:19 153
26:1 153
28:22 158
32:7 45n29
32:48 126n37
33:16 125

Joshua
5:11 126n37

Judges
9:7 73
16:21 168, 169

1Samuel
4:19 71

2Samuel
13:13 49

1Kings
12:4 87

2Kings
8:17 49

Isaiah
2:6 152
24:8 172n119
30:32 49
46:3 73
46:12 73
51:1 73
51:7 73
58:7 44
62:10 96n227

Jeremiah
2:11 133n64
7:34 172n119
8:23 109n277
13:26–27 57n77

Jeremiah (*cont.*)
16:9 172n119
18:16 54
25:10 172n119
50:26 97

Ezekiel
5:11 57
16:6–13 41n
16:14 41n
16:37–38 57n77
23:10 57n77
23:29 57n77
26:13 172n119
36:17 57
36:19 57
40:1 126n37
46:9 64

Hosea
2:4–5 57n77
2:12 57n77

Joel
4:13 83

Amos
8:10 172n119

Nahum
3:5 57n77

Zechariah
13:1 56

Malachi
2:1 71

Psalms
11:6 165, 166
37:32 104n259
44:15 54
68:5 96n227
68:6 156
80 71n119
80:13 71
89 71n119
89:42 71
109:11 149n3
119:5 165
119:53 149n3
137:7 45n29

Job
21:29 71
31:10 168n104
32:14 71

Proverbs
9:15 71
15:30 128n41
16:24 128n41
23:20 69n111

Canticles (Song of Songs)
5:9 128n43
5:10–16 128n43
5:10 128n43

Qohelet (Ecclesiastes)
12:3 169
12:4 169

Lamentations
1 36n2, 42, 47, 48, 58, 63, 65, 67, 99, 100n244, 102, 116, 117, 148, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181
1:1–18 23
1:1–11 47, 113
1:1–6 26
1:1–5 36
1:1 25, 36n1, 38n6, 155, 156n40
1:2 63, 100, 113, 115, 119, 120
1:3 24, 36n2
1:4 36, 38n6, 39, 64, 113, 115n294
1:5 36, 40n14, 41n, 53, 78, 79, 80, 91n207, 113
1:6–17 36
1:6–10 27
1:6 26, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41n, 115, 150n5, 177
1:7–11 43n18, 69
1:7–9 43n18
1:7 27, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51n52, 52, 63, 69, 75, 85, 101, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 151n12, 177, 178, 179

1:8 27, 46, 52, 54n66, 55n67, 57, 58, 59, 69, 86n180, 114, 116, 177
1:9 27, 47, 48, 54, 55n67, 59, 60, 62, 63, 69, 91n207, 100, 101, 113, 115, 117, 151n12, 177
1:10–18 27
1:10–12 21, 22
1:10–11 28, 70, 177
1:10 46, 63, 64, 65, 66n102, 67, 68, 69, 70, 86n180, 99n239, 104, 113, 114, 117
1:11 28, 39n6, 46, 47, 48, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 75, 77, 91n207, 101, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 149n4, 151n12, 177, 178
1:12–22 48
1:12–17 179
1:12–16 113, 114
1:12–15 113, 114
1:12 28, 46, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 86n180, 91n207, 113, 118, 120, 151n12, 177, 178
1:13 28, 47, 48, 54, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 96, 104, 116, 117, 118, 177, 178
1:14–16 92
1:14 28, 37, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 96, 118, 119, 177
1:15 28, 37, 39n6, 91n207, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 104, 109, 119, 120, 177
1:16–17 28
1:16 28, 39n6, 63, 98, 100, 109, 113, 114, 119, 120, 177, 179n5
1:17 25, 28, 48, 53, 54, 58, 63, 91n207, 98, 100, 104, 113, 114, 119, 120, 177, 178, 179n5
1:18 28, 36, 37, 46, 73, 91n207, 100, 177
1:20 47, 91n207, 151n12
1:21 63, 73, 100
2–4 100n244, 110
2 99, 113
2:1 37n3, 91n207, 92
2:2 37n3, 91n207, 92
2:4 37n3, 104
2:5 23, 28, 29, 36, 37, 91n207, 92
2:6 91n207
2:7 91n207, 92
2:8 37n3, 91n207
2:9 91n207
2:10 37n3
2:13 37n3
2:14 39n6
2:15 37n3, 39n6, 71
2:17 91n207
2:18 37n3, 91n207
2:19 91n207
2:20 91n207, 149n4, 151n12
2:22 91n207
3 22, 99
3:8 39n6
3:10 38n6, 104
3:12 38n6, 104
3:18 91n207
3:19 44, 46, 116n295
3:22 79, 91n207
3:24 91n207
3:25 91n207
3:26 91n207
3:28 39n6
3:31 91n207, 92
3:32 79
3:33 79
3:36 91n207
3:37 91n207
3:40 91n207
3:48 37n3
3:50 91n207
3:52–54 22n5
3:53–62 21, 23
3:53 22
3:54 125
3:55–57 22n5
3:55 91n207
3:56 22
3:58–60 22n5
3:58 91n207, 92
3:59 22, 36n6, 91n207
3:61–63 22n5
3:61 91n207
3:62 22

Lamentations (*cont.*)
3:63 38n6, 149n4
3:64 91n207
3:66 91n207
4 36n2, 99, 146, 148, 172n121, 175, 176, 179
4:3 37n3, 38n6
4:5–22 30
4:5–8 31, 121
4:6 37n3
4:7 121, 124, 125, 128, 146
4:8 146
4:10 37n3, 39n6
4:11–16 121
4:11–15 31
4:11 91n207
4:13 133, 134, 138, 146
4:14 32, 121, 124, 129, 131n51, 133, 134n69, 135, 139n94, 146, 147, 178
4:15–20 32
4:15 32, 121, 124, 134n69, 136, 138, 139, 140, 145, 146, 147, 178
4:16–17 32, 34
4:16 91n207, 124
4:17–20 34
4:17 34, 121, 122, 124
4:18 34, 121, 122, 123n17, 124
4:19 32, 121, 123, 124
4:20 91n207, 121
4:21 37n3
4:22 37n3, 172n121
5 148, 149n3, 151, 157n45, 171, 173, 175, 176, 179
5:1–17 30
5:1 32, 91n207, 148, 149, 150n9, 151n11, 151n12, 153, 157, 172n121, 173, 178
5:2–18 150, 151, 173
5:2–10 171
5:2–5 157n45
5:2 32, 148, 149n3, 151, 152, 153, 171n117, 173
5:3 32, 148, 154, 155, 156, 157, 171n117, 173, 178
5:4–12 33
5:4 148, 171n117
5:5 148, 171n117
5:6 148, 171n117
5:7 39n6, 148, 156n39, 171n117
5:8–18 157n45
5:8 39n6, 148, 171n117
5:9–10 158
5:9 148, 157, 158, 159, 171n117, 173
5:10 33, 148, 149n3, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 171n117, 173, 178
5:11–13 149, 166, 174
5:11 148, 166, 167, 170, 171, 174
5:12–17 33
5:12 148, 171, 174
5:13 29, 148, 149, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 174
5:14–16 171, 172
5:14 171, 172
5:15 171, 172
5:16 148, 171n117, 172
5:17 33, 148, 171n117
5:18 33, 148, 171
5:19 91n207, 171
5:20 171n117
5:21 91n207, 171n117
5:22 171n117

Daniel
4–6 130n47
4:10 129, 130
4:14 129, 130n47, 130n48
4:20 129, 130

Ezra
9:6–15 56n74
9:10–12 56n74
9:11 56

2 Chronicles
10:4 87

Deuterocanonical Writings and Pseudepigrapha

1 Enoch
1–36 129
1:5 130n49
10:7 130n49
10:9 129n46, 130n49
10:15 130n49
12:2 130n49
12:3 130n49
12:4 129n46, 130n49
12:10 130n49
13:10 130n46
14:1 130n49
14:3 130n49
15:9 130n49
16:2 130n49
18:14–16 143
22:6 130n46
33:3 130n46
80:2–8 143

1 Esdras
8:80 56n74

2 Esdras
9:11 56n74

Ben Sira
18:33 69n111
35:17 44n22
35:18 44
41:2 95

Jubilees
2:9 143
6:30–32 143

Testament of Naphtali
3:5 130n49

Testament of Reuben
5:6–7 130n49

Dead Sea Scrolls

1QH[a] 141n99

1QH[b] 141n99

1QIsa[a] 30, 152

1QM 141n99
7:3–6 145n111

1QpHab 141n99

1QS 141n99
5:7–11 141, 144n110
5:20–24 141
8:5–9 144n110
9:3–6 144

1QSa 141n99
2:3–10 144

3QLam 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 78n145, 175, 176n3

4Q158 2n6

4Q174
1:6–7 144n110

4Q179 36n2

4Q202 129n46

4Q204 129–130n46

4Q206 130n46

4Q227 131n51

4Q255–264 141n99

4Q266–272 141n99

4Q266 131n51

4Q319 143n105

4Q320–330 143n105

4Q335 143n105
4Q336 143n105
4Q337 143n105
4Q364–367 2n6
4Q400–407 145n111
4Q427–432 141n99
4Q471b 141n99
4Q491–496 141n99
4Q501 134n75, 149n3
4Q511 144n110
4Q524 2n6, 141n99
4QCant[b] 30
4QLam 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82n164, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 148, 150n5, 151n12, 175, 176n3, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182
4QMMT 143n108
49–54 145n112
5Q11 141n99
5QLam[a] 14, 15, 16, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 121, 123, 124, 128, 129, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172n 121, 173, 174, 175, 176n3, 178, 179
5QLam[b] 14, 15, 16, 21, 32, 34, 35, 121, 122, 124, 146n113, 148, 175, 176n3
6Q17 143n105
8ḤevXIIgr 2n5
11Q17 145n111
11Q19–20 2n6
11QT[a] 141n99
45:12–14 145n112
11QT[b] 141n99
CD A 141n99
2:19 131n51
3:18–4:4 144n110
10:15–11:20 143n106
15:15–17 145n112
CD B 141n99
MasShirShabb 145n111

Rabbinic Writings

Babylonian Talmud
Soṭah
10a 168
Lamentations Rabbah
1:7 51
1:9 62n97
1:12 73
5:10 164
5:13 168

Ancient Near Eastern literature

CTA
5VI14–15 110n282
5VI26–27 123n17
6II15–16 123n17
16I27 109n277
17V7–9 156n43

Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur
436–437 172n119

Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur
355–360 172n119

Sefîre stele A
29 172n119
40–41 57n77

INDEX OF TOPICS

Acrostic structure, 22, 40n14, 66, 99, 112, 179n5
Akkadian
  Divine epithets, 37n3
  Literature, 159n55, 172n119
  Words, 68, 159
Ancient translations, 3, 6, 10n30, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 31, 36, 44n27, 48, 56n73, 58, 60, 61, 63, 65n100, 67, 68, 77, 78, 83, 88, 95, 102, 104, 105n263, 108, 110, 111, 116n295, 121, 122, 125, 129, 137, 139, 140, 147, 150, 154n29, 159, 161, 165, 166, 173, 174, 175, 176, 182
  Aramaic, 13, 16n43, 19, 62, 81n160, 87, 96, 111, 139n95, 164n179
  Greek, 13, 16n43, 19, 51n51, 58, 63n97, 65n100, 68, 69, 72n122, 78, 83, 102, 103, 111, 121, 123, 127n37, 135n77, 139, 154, 161, 162, 163, 164, 169
  Latin, 13, 16n43, 19, 56n73, 60, 67n106, 69, 77, 103, 111, 121, 139, 154, 159
  Syriac, 13, 16n43, 19, 49, 50, 56n73, 61, 69, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82n164, 83, 84, 88n188, 90n202, 96, 103, 108, 111, 121, 131, 132, 135n77, 139, 154, 159, 163, 164, 165, 168
  See also Old Greek; Old Latin; Septuagint; Peshitta; Targum; Vulgate
Arabic, 6, 82, 136, 162n73
Aramaism, 38, 39n6
Assimilation, 38n6, 46, 49, 52, 53, 60n86, 67, 80, 89, 90n202, 93, 106, 111, 123n16, 178

Biblical Hebrew, 39n6, 53, 60, 83, 110, 152n17
  Late, 39n6, 40
  Standard, 40
Biblical Hebrew verbal forms
  Imperative, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 71n119, 72, 74, 116, 117, 138, 139n96, 147, 149, 150, 151n11, 151n12
Infinitive abs., 52, 53, 110, 116, 133n62
Infinitive cs., 50, 87, 93, 106n266, 107n268, 133n62, 135, 168
Yiqtol, 24n15, 85, 89, 91, 110, 111, 133, 134, 135
Qatal, 39, 45, 72, 74, 75, 76, 87, 89, 90n202, 91, 97, 110, 116, 123n13, 138, 153
Participle, 39n6, 47, 66n103, 68, 70, 74, 94, 95, 106, 107, 109, 113, 117, 122, 124, 133n62, 159
Wayyiqtol, 81, 82, 90

Calendar, 142, 143
Cancellation dots, 8, 134
Codex
  Alexandrinus, 23n8, 51n51, 79n154, 127n37, 130n48, 161, 169
  Ambrosianus, 163n76
  Leningradensis, 16, 66, 91, 107, 108, 109, 114, 121, 122, 124, 149, 150, 160, 161, 165, 174
  Marchalianus, 51n51, 72n122, 108n272, 127n37, 161n68
  Sinaiticus, 51n51, 79n154
  Urbinas I, 80n156, 95n223, 139n95
  Vaticanus, 51n51, 79n154, 127n37, 161, 169
  Venetus, 51n51
Colometry, 22, 42, 43, 81, 90, 91, 132n60, 136n78
  See also Stichographic arrangement
Colon, 22, 43n20, 43n21, 46, 72, 81, 82, 83n168, 90, 122, 126, 127, 132n60, 134, 136n78, 138, 140, 147, 149n3, 151n11, 151n12, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 167, 168, 170, 173
  Bicolon, 22, 34, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, 54, 57, 63, 81, 82, 83, 86, 90, 105, 116, 117, 118, 122, 124, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136n78, 138, 139, 148, 150n11, 153, 154, 155, 173
  Tricolon, 43
Content, 5n11, 6, 7n19, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 30, 35, 36, 41, 48, 58, 70, 92, 100, 101, 102, 106, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 124, 133, 135, 140, 146, 148, 157, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 179, 180, 181, 182
Coptic, 79n152, 127n37, 162n72, 168

Daughter of Judah, 93, 94, 96n230, 104, 119
Daughter of Zion, 37, 41n, 86n180, 92
Dead Sea scrolls, 1, 2n4, 6, 7n21, 8, 9, 12, 13, 22n4, 30, 39, 74, 75n138, 89, 134n75, 140, 145, 152, 170

Difficulty
Clause/phrase, 73, 126, 135n77, 146, 173
Reading(s), 5, 15, 16, 18, 19, 31, 45, 53, 82, 91, 104, 106, 161
Syntactical, 126, 134, 161
Textual, 5–6, 18, 19, 20, 35, 42, 121, 125, 126, 148, 168, 175
Word, 44, 53, 70, 126, 133, 136, 147, 167
Wording, 6, 15, 65, 68, 132, 160
See also lectio difficilior
Dittography, 9, 18, 39, 50n43, 53, 74, 77, 85, 91, 93, 110, 115, 129n44

Emendation, 4n10, 5, 13, 42, 45, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 83, 87, 88, 90n202, 95, 97, 105, 106, 108, 109, 122, 127n37, 128, 132, 158, 159, 161, 169, 173

Facilitation, 45, 53, 61, 134, 161, 178

Halakhah, 142n103, 142n104, 144
See also Law; Torah
Hapax legomenon, 38n6, 50, 87, 88, 136, 162, 167, 169, 170
Haplography, 9, 18, 90n202, 108, 112, 132, 166n93
Harmonization, 6, 99
Hebrew Bible, 2, 7, 37n3, 55n57, 60
See also Old Testament
Homoioarcton, 9, 18, 45, 148
Homoioteleuton, 9, 18, 49, 64, 111, 116

Impurity, 54, 56n74, 62, 105, 140, 145
Moral, 55n67, 56, 57
Ritual, 55n67, 55n68, 56n73, 57

Jerusalem, 37n3, 41n, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55n67, 56, 57, 58, 59n80, 61, 62, 63, 65n100, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86n180, 91, 93, 97, 98n, 100, 104, 105, 107, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 128, 142, 143, 145n111, 146, 149n3, 151n12, 155, 156, 157, 179

Kethib / *Qere*, 26, 32, 34, 38, 66, 121, 149, 150, 154

Law, 2, 103, 141, 142, 144
See also Halakhah; Torah
Lectio brevior, 5, 154
Lectio difficilior, 5, 58, 76, 78, 88, 104, 109, 146, 150, 161
See also Difficulty; Reading(s); Word
Lectio duplex, 78, 161, 162
Lectio facilior, 50, 67

Masoretic
Accents, 43, 81, 82, 90, 91, 123, 132n60, 136
Manuscripts, 23n8, 66, 67, 68n107, 87, 88, 91, 106, 108, 114, 121, 124, 150, 161
Text (MT), 4, 5, 6, 8n22, 10n30, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24n15, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55n67, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130n47, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 146, 148, 149n3, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164n79, 165, 166, 167, 168n102, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182
Metonym, 107, 160, 167
Metre, 42, 43, 81, 109n276, 136n78

Old Greek, 51n51, 79, 130, 169
See also Septuagint (LXX)
Old Latin, 162, 164
See also Ancient translations; Latin
Old Testament, 1, 158, 163, 165
Passages, 3, 54, 57n77, 71, 155, 172n119
Textual criticism, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 175, 180
Writings, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 26, 40n10, 175, 180, 181, 182
See also Hebrew Bible
Original text, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 43n48, 45, 52, 53, 65, 73, 74, 76, 78, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91n208, 94, 99, 110, 111, 116n295, 122, 165n76, 182
See also Urtext
Orthography, 8, 24, 25n18, 29, 55, 88n181, 119, 152, 180
Defective spelling, 37, 161
Mater lectionis, 25, 29, 152
See also Vowel indicator
Plene spelling, 29, 107n268, 150, 154, 166

Paleo-Hebrew, 9n27, 22, 30, 140
Parallelism, 71, 76, 82, 93, 123n17, 150n11, 151n12, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 167
Peshitta, 3, 6, 7n17, 17, 21, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 44n27, 45, 49, 50, 51, 54n66, 56n75, 61, 62, 65n100, 67n106, 68n108, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 87, 88, 90n202, 95, 96, 97, 103, 108, 109, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 135n77, 137, 139, 140, 150n9, 153, 154n27, 154n29, 159, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 177, 178, 179
See also Ancient translations; Syriac
Philology
Comparative, 6, 13, 18, 19, 68, 82, 136, 159, 176
Northwest Semitic, 83, 123n17
Plus / minus, 4n10, 45, 49, 58, 61, 64, 86, 100, 102, 103, 112, 117, 130n47

Qumran
Community, 2n6, 7, 9, 24, 25, 30, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 180
Caves, 2, 7, 10, 14, 21, 26, 129n46, 143n105, 180, 182
Document(s) / Text(s), 1n2, 2n5, 3, 6, 7n19, 36n2, 74, 131n51
Fragment(s), 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 49, 53, 78, 80, 87, 99, 106, 107, 108, 111, 114, 150
Hebrew, 40, 152, 165
Khirbet (site), 1, 7n20, 9n27, 14, 24, 25, 180
Manuscript(s), 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 26, 35, 36, 37, 38, 49, 61, 65, 66, 67, 70, 73, 74n136, 76, 80, 98, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 124, 135, 137, 139, 140, 147, 148, 152, 154, 160, 170, 174, 175, 176n3, 180, 181, 182
Scribal practice, 24, 25, 179, 180

Scribal activities
Change(s), 6, 9, 11, 46, 47, 48, 51n51, 52, 53, 66, 67, 76, 77, 80, 84, 85, 89, 104, 106n266, 116, 117, 118, 119, 134, 135, 140, 146, 147, 150, 161, 173, 176, 178, 179, 181
Correction(s), 8, 9, 30, 46, 161, 173, 178
Error(s), 6, 9, 18, 39, 40, 41, 46, 48, 51, 52, 54n62, 58, 67, 80, 85, 97, 104, 106, 115, 119, 123, 125, 127n37, 134, 147, 150, 166n23, 169, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182
Marking, 8, 9, 30, 124, 140, 145
Practices, 8, 9, 13, 22n4, 24, 25n18, 30, 172n121
Transmission, 3, 4n9, 4n10, 5n11, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 19, 35, 46, 48, 50n43, 51, 67, 77, 80, 92, 110, 112, 116n, 117, 123n16, 162, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182
Scribe(s), 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 22n4, 24n12, 25, 30, 34, 38, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 60, 62, 64, 66, 67, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 89, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 116, 117, 118, 119, 124, 127, 134, 135, 140, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151, 154, 157, 160, 161, 162, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181
Second Temple
Judaism, 1, 142, 143n105, 181
Period, 2n6, 24n12, 142n103, 179, 180, 181
Septuagint (LXX), 2, 3, 6, 12, 17, 21, 23n8, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36n1, 44n27, 45, 49, 51, 57n75, 58, 60, 61, 62n97, 65n100, 67, 68, 72, 79, 80, 82, 87, 95, 96, 97, 103, 105n263, 108, 111, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127n37, 129, 130n47, 131, 132, 135n77, 137, 139, 140, 147, 150n9, 153, 154n27, 154n29, 159, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 177, 178, 179
See also Ancient translations; Greek
Simile, 41n, 154, 157, 173
Stichographic arrangement, 16n41, 22n4, 29, 34
See also Colometry
Synecdoche, 128, 146

Targum, 3, 6, 7n17, 17, 21, 27, 28, 32, 33, 44n27, 51, 56, 61, 62, 67n106, 68, 80, 81n160, 87, 95, 96, 97, 103, 108, 109, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 137, 139n95, 150, 164, 165, 166, 168, 177, 178
See also Ancient translations; Aramaic
Temple
City, 145n112
Cult, 142, 143, 144
Heavenly, 145
in Jerusalem, 41n, 47n36, 142, 143, 144
of man, 144
vessels, 68
Textual criticism
Aim, 4, 12
Procedure, 4–5, 16–19, 20
See also Old Testament; Textual criticism
Textual representative(s), 3, 5, 6, 9n27, 10, 11, 12n33, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 108, 136n78, 175
Torah, 6, 9, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149n3
See also Halakhah; Law

Translation
Equivalent(s), 49, 51n51, 56n73, 56n74, 56n75, 58, 61n92, 68n108, 69, 79, 95, 96, 110, 125, 126, 131, 137, 139, 147, 154n27, 162
Technique, 17, 18, 162

Ugarit, 83, 109, 110, 122, 123n17, 156
Urtext, 4, 111
See also Original text

Vocalization, 4n10, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56n72, 66n103, 71, 74, 76, 82, 83, 86n181, 88, 90n203, 95, 103, 119, 122, 158, 167, 175n1
Vorlage, 2n5, 3, 17, 18, 19, 31, 44n27, 51, 54n66, 62, 67, 78, 79, 84, 87, 96, 97, 108, 109, 116n295, 121, 122, 123n16, 130, 131, 139, 140, 147, 162, 163, 164, 165, 175n1
Vowel indicator, 25, 29, 119, 132, 150
See also Orthography; *mater lectionis*
Vulgate, 3, 6, 7n17, 17, 21, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 44n27, 45, 51, 56n73, 58, 60, 63, 65n100, 68n108, 72, 76, 82n164, 87, 95, 96, 97, 103, 108, 121, 122, 125, 127, 135n77, 137, 139, 140, 150n9, 153, 154n27, 154n29, 159, 164, 165, 166, 168, 177, 178
See also Ancient translations; Latin

SSN

In *The Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations: A Text-Critical Study*, the first large-scale investigation of the topic, Gideon Kotzé establishes how the four Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran present the content of the biblical book. Kotzé takes as his point of departure the contributions of the Dead Sea scrolls to the discipline of Old Testament textual criticism and treats the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations, the Masoretic text and the ancient translations as witnesses to the content of the book and not only as witnesses to earlier forms of its Hebrew text. By focusing the analysis on variant readings and textual difficulties, the study arrives at a better understanding of these manuscripts as representatives of both the text and the content of Lamentations.

Gideon R. Kotzé, D.Th. (2011), University of Stellenbosch, is Part-time Lecturer at the Department of Ancient Studies of the same university. He has published articles on the Hebrew textual representatives of Lamentations, the Septuagint and textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

ISBN: 978-90-04-23684-4

9 789004 236844

ISSN: 0081-6914

brill.com/ssn