

Philological Studies in Lamentations. II (*)

Thomas F. McDANIEL — Yokohama

II. Syntactical Elements

A. Prepositions

1. *b* with the meaning "from":

The functional interchange of the prepositions *b* and *min* had been formulated by the medieval grammarians Saadya, Ibn Janah, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi⁽¹⁾. Modern students of semitic grammar have recognized the "ablative" use of *b* "from" in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, and Old South Arabic⁽²⁾. In the light of this widespread usage of *b* "from" it is not surprising that about sixty examples of its occurrence have been found in biblical Hebrew⁽³⁾. Among these OT passages three are in Lamentations: (a) *hišbî'anî bammērôrîm*, "he has filled me with bitterness" (3,15); (b) *yîšbā' beherpāh*, "let him be filled with insults" (3,30); and (c) *bəšippiyātēnū šippînū*, "from our watch-towers we watched" (4,17)⁽⁴⁾. The root *šāba'* is

(*) For Part I ("Lexical Studies") of this article cf. *Bib* 49 (1968) 27-53. The abbreviations and references peculiar to this article are explained in Part I.

(1) N. M. SARNA, "The Interchange of the Prepositions *Beth* and *Min* in Biblical Hebrew", *JBL* 78 (1959) 311.

(2) For Ugaritic see GORDON, *UT* § 10.1; for Phoenician see JEAN-HOFTIJZER, 31; ALBRIGHT, "The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblus", *JAOS* 67 (1947) 158, n. 42; GORDON, "Aramaic Incantations", *Or* 10 (1941) 341 and 348; IDEM, "Review of H. S. Drower's *The Book of the Zodiac*", *Or* 20 (1951) 507; SARNA, *op. cit.* 310-311; for Old South Arabic, see Maria HÖFNER, *Allsüdarabische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1943) 143.

(3) See SARNA, *op. cit.* 310-316; GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook* (AnOr 25; Rome 1947) § 10.1; IDEM, *UT* § 10.1; DAHOOD, *UHP* 27; IDEM, *HUL* I, 300-301; IDEM, *PNWSP* 5, 11, 12, 39.

(4) SARNA, *op. cit.* 311.

usually followed by the accusative or by the preposition *min* (1). The few times when the verb is followed by *b*, it seems quite plausible that the *b* has the force of *min*. Compare the interchange as in Qoh 6,3, *tišba' min haṭṭōbāh*, and Ps 65,5, *nišb'āh b'ṭōb*. The example cited in 4,17 is a possible example of *b* "from" but the meaning could just as easily be "on / at our watch-towers".

To these examples should be added the *b* which occurs in the text of 2,6a, as reconstructed, *wayyahmōs baggepen* (MT *kaggan*) *sōkāw*, "and he has stripped from the vine its branches" (2).

2. *beyad* with the meaning "because of":

Most modern translators follow Gesenius in understanding 1,14c MT *bīdē lō' 'ākal qūm* as a construct noun (*y'dē*) followed by a relative clause without the relative particle (3). The RSV for example translates 1,14c as, "the Lord gave me into the hand of those whom I cannot withstand". It is also possible that MT *bīdē* should be read as *beyādō*, "because of it". It has long been recognized that Ugaritic *yā* can have the force of the preposition "with" (4), and it has recently been pointed out that Ugaritic *byā* can have the meaning "because of", as in UT 49:II:25, *la.šmm.byā.bn ilm.ml*, "the heavens sag because of divine Mot" (5).

This use of *byā* "because of" is not restricted to Ugaritic, for several occurrences have been cited in Hebrew, e.g., Is 64,7; Jer 41,9; Job 8,4; and Sir 46,6 (6). Some of the textual difficulties of Lam 1,14 may be cleared up by recognizing in MT *bīdē* the prepositional phrase *beyādō* with the meaning "because of it". The antecedent of the

(1) See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, 959.

(2) See *Bib* 49 (1968) 36 for other examples of the misreading of *kaph* and *beth*; see DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler* 110.

(3) GKC § 130a; ALBREKTSON, 75-76. Albrektson fails to note that Gesenius had some doubt about the integrity of the text.

(4) GORDON UT § 10.17. See also *Or* 20 (1951) 507 where Gordon cites the meaning "for" or "through".

(5) DAHOOD, *HUL* I, 301-302. Translation is that of Dahood (*ibid*).

(6) *Ibid*. Note that AV by force of context renders Is 64,7 and Jer 41,9 as "because" but RSV reads, "into the hand of". It may be that the LXX *oti* in 1,14, (concerning which Albrektson states, "There is nothing to correspond to it") is a misplaced marginal variant reflecting another LXX reading where *bydy/w* was by force of context rendered "because".

pronominal suffix would be *piš'i* (MT *pšā'ay*) of 1,14a. 1,14c could be translated as "the Lord has delivered me up because of it (i.e., my sin), I am not able to endure".

B. Enclitic Mem

The use of the enclitic *mem* in biblical Hebrew was long unrecognized. Only in the light of the Ugaritic enclitic *mem*, where it occurs even after nouns in the construct state, was its use also recognized in biblical Hebrew⁽¹⁾. In 1957, H. D. Hummel listed over one hundred examples of enclitic *mem* in the OT; and since publication of his study several scholars have added to the list of its appearances in biblical Hebrew⁽²⁾. Two or three examples probably occur in Lamentations.

3,17 wattiznaḥ miššālôm:

The initial *mem* of *miššālôm* has caused some difficulty in the understanding of the entire clause. The LXX *kai apōsato ex eirēnēs psuchēn mou*, "he removed my soul from peace", and the Syriac *w'etṭa'yal men š'lāmā' napšī*, "my soul has been led astray from peace", both reflect the difficulty of reading the *mem* as the preposition "from". Modern translators follow the same two patterns. For example, Albrektson translates, "thou hast rejected me from peace", while the RSV reads, "my soul is bereft of peace"⁽³⁾.

The solution to this enigmatic *mem* may well be found in the suggestion of Hummel who identifies it as enclitic and states, "*znḥ* in an intransitive sense appears only here, but we may regain its usual transitive force if we read (with Peshitta and Vulgate) *wlznḥ-m šlwm npšy*, 'and my soul rejected peace'"⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See GORDON, *UT* § 11.8

⁽²⁾ "Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially in Hebrew", *JBL* 76 (1957) 85-107. Hummel adds seventy-six examples of his own to more than thirty examples previously cited. See in addition, P. J. CALDERONE, "The Rivers of 'Maṣor'", *Bib* 42 (1961) 423-432; Marvin POPE, *Job* 112; DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 12, 21, *et passim*; IDEM, *Psalms I* 19, 27, *et passim*.

⁽³⁾ ALBREKTSON, 138.

⁽⁴⁾ HUMMEL, *op. cit.* 105. Hummel is incorrect in citing the Syriac text in support of this reading, for it reads the verb as an intransitive and reflects the preposition *min* in its translation.

The poetic circumlocution of using *nāpšī* plus verb is found elsewhere in this chapter as a ballast variant (e.g., 3,20). Reading *šālôm* as the object of the verb yields a synonymous parallel in the second half of the bicolon where the first person singular verb plus object is used, *nāšitī tōbāh*, "I forgot prosperity".

3,26 w^eyāḥil w^edūmān:

As proposed above in part I of this study, these two words should be redivided and vocalized as w^eyāḥilū dōmēm or w^eyāḥilū dōmām. *Dōmēm* would be the *Pōlēl* infinitive, while the second possibility, *dōmām*, would be the *Qal* infinitive with enclitic *mem* ⁽¹⁾.

4,6 yādāw-m (MT yādāyim):

The basis for this emendation has been given above on the discussion of *ḥalū* ⁽²⁾. Here it will be sufficient to note that in the War Scroll (1QM) when the verb *ḥll* is followed by the object *yad*, the object always has a suffix, either as *ydw* or *ydm*. By reading as emended here, one finds a pattern of noun plus suffix plus enclitic *mem*, a pattern which appears elsewhere in the OT. Hummel has convincingly proposed to read the MT of Ps 22,16, *l'šōnī mudbāq* (the only occurrence of *dābaq* in *Hoph'al* as *l'šōnī-m dōbēq*, "my tongue sticks" ⁽³⁾).

C. Adverbial Mem

It may well be that the "adverbial *mem*" is but the adverbial accusative plus enclitic *mem* (as in Hebrew *yōmām*) and as such should be included in the above discussion on enclitic *mem*. But as Albright and Gordon have pointed out, more than one suffix may be represented

⁽¹⁾ See *Bib* 49 (1968) 39-40.

⁽²⁾ *Ibid.* 45-48.

⁽³⁾ *Op. cit.* 99. Altogether Hummel lists thirteen examples of enclitic *mem* after a suffix. See also DAHOOD, *Psalms I* 27, 140, 182, 237. Otto RÖSSLER, "Die Präfixkonjugation Qal der Verba I^{ae} Nūn", *ZAW* 74 (1962) 128, suggests reading MT 'anī mangīnātām as 'anī-man gīnātām in Lam 3,63, i.e., the enclitic *mem* following the independent pronoun, followed by the noun without the *mem* preformative, as it occurs in 3,14.

in final *-m*, such as *-mi*, *-ma*, *-umma/-um* ⁽¹⁾. For this reason affixed *mem* on a word used adverbially may best be considered under a separate category from enclitic *mem*, recognizing though, with Marvin Pope that, "it cannot be proven that the adverbial force is resident in the *-m*" ⁽²⁾. The vocalization *-ām* (**-am* > *-ām*) adopted below is based upon the probability that the noun goes back to an adverbial accusative in *-a*, with the loss of any final short vowel that may have originally followed the *mem*. Recognition of such an adverbial *mem* brings clarity to the following difficult and disputed passages in Lamentations.

2,2 *higgā' lā'āreṣ ḥillēl mamlākāh wəśārēhā*:

As proposed in the above discussion of MT *mamlākāh* ⁽³⁾ the text should probably be redivided and revocalized as *higgā' lā'āreṣ ḥllm malkāh wəśārēhā*, "he has struck to the ground mortally wounded her king and her princes". Such a reading improves both the meter and the syntax: a 3 + 2 read as verb-double modifier / compound object. The masoretic vocalization demands an unusual 2 + 3 line, and though the verse division in BH² produces the desiderated 3 + 2 line, the kind of verse division demanded (verb-modifier-verb / object of second verb) is not found elsewhere in the book.

2,18 *ṣā'aq libbām*:

The MT, which is considered corrupt by most scholars, is reflected in the LXX *eboēse kardia autōn* and Syriac *gə'a' lebḥōn*. Ewald's emendation of *ṣā'aq* to *ṣa'aqī* has generally been accepted in the light of the imperatives which follow ⁽⁴⁾. The real crux has been in the understanding of *libbām*. None of the proposed emendations of MT *lbm* seem very convincing, including the latest by Albrektson who reads *lbtm* "about their rage" ⁽⁵⁾. Driver's attempt to read MT here as an abbreviation for *ṣa'aqī lēb mālē* "cry with a full heart

⁽¹⁾ See ALBRIGHT in his review of Gordon's *Ugaritic Handbook*, in *JBL* 69 (1950) 387; GORDON, *UT* § 11.4.

⁽²⁾ "Ugaritic Enclitic *-m*", *JCS* 5 (1951) 128.

⁽³⁾ See *Bib* 49 (1968) 35-36.

⁽⁴⁾ *Die Psalmen und die Klagelieder erklärt* (Göttingen 1866) 335.

⁽⁵⁾ ALBREKTSON, 116.

to the Lord" is unconvincing since there is no other evidence of such an idiom, plus the fact that there remains yet some doubt as to this scribal practice of abbreviating the text ⁽¹⁾.

The correct understanding of *libbām* is probably not to be found in either emendation or abbreviation, but in recognizing the final *mem* as adverbial. The verb *zā'āq* appears with a prepositional phrase as adverbial modifier in Hos 7,14, *w'lē' zā'āqū 'ēlay b'libbām*, "they do not cry to me from their heart". Similarly this verb occurs with simply the adverbial accusative in Ps 142,2, *qōlī 'el yhw' 'ez'āq*, "I cry with my voice to the Lord". The phrase *šā'āqī libbām* here in 2,18 would reflect the same idiom as found in Hos 7,14, but in place of the prepositional adverbial modifier, the adverbial *mem* is employed, much like the adverbial accusative of Ps 142,2 ⁽²⁾.

The subject of this verb in MT is *hōmat bat šiyyon*, "wall of daughter Zion". Most commentators agree that such a personification of the wall does not fit the imagery of this verse. Instead of the proposed emendations of *betūlat* or *hemē* or *habat* for MT *hōmat*, this writer would propose to read *hōmat*, the feminine participle of *hāmāh* "to be tumultuous", with the original feminine *-at* retained here as in *pūgat* of 2,18c ⁽³⁾. A parallel occurrence is found in Is 22,2, *t'šū'ōt m'lē'āh 'ir hōmiyyāh qiryāh 'allīzāh*, "you who are full of shoutings, tumultuous city, exultant town". By thus emending *šā'āq* to *šā'āqī*, *hōmat* to *hōmat*, and reading the *mem* of *libbām* as adverbial, a most enigmatic line can be read smoothly as, "cry out unto the Lord (from) the heart, O tumultuous one, daughter Zion".

3,63 šibtām w'qimātām habbiṭāh:

The final *mem* of the first two words has been read by the translators and commentators alike as the third person plural suffix, e.g., RSV, "behold their sitting and their rising". This permits a smooth translation, but the meaning of such a phrase in this stanza is not

⁽¹⁾ "Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text", *Textus I: Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project*, ed. C. RABIN (Jerusalem 1960) 92.

⁽²⁾ Compare Ps 3,5; 66,17; 119,145; and see GORDON, *UT* § 11.6 for examples of the prepositional phrase paralleled by final *-m*.

⁽³⁾ For proposed emendations of the commentators, see ALBREKTSON, 116-117. On the old feminine ending, see GKC § 80^e; GORDON, *UT* § 8.3. On the reading of *he* for MT *heth* see DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler* 109.

at all transparent. If however one reads adverbial *mem* instead of the pronominal suffix, the whole verse can be read with greater clarity and continuity in the stanza.

As will be noted further on in this section, the word *habbîlāh* should be read with *'anî* as the infinitive absolute plus pronoun with the force of a past tense. The first two words of the verse should be read as adverbial modifiers, composed of the infinitives *šebet* and **qûmāh* plus adverbial *mem*, "upon sitting down and getting up". Such an idiomatic expression would indicate totality like the *kol hayyôm* of the preceding line or *yômām wālaylāh* in 2,18. The continuity and parallelism in this stanza can be seen in this proposed translation of vv. 62-63, "the lips and thoughts of my assailants are against me / all the day long // continually / I have endured their derisive song(s)". This chiasmic parallelism and 3 + 2 / 2 + 3 meter instead of the usual synonymous parallelism and 3 + 2 / 3 + 2 meter, are probably due here to the use of *šibtām* as the initial word in the *šin*-stanza. Another example where the acrostic pattern has influenced the meter, producing a 2 + 3 bicolon, is in 2,12a where the prepositional phrase *l'immōtām* comes first in the *lamed*-stanza.

D. The Energetic Form of the Verb

The energetic form of the verb, analogous to the Arabic *yaqtulan* and *yaqtulanna*, was quite common in Ugaritic and was found in Western Aramaic with verbs that have a suffix ⁽¹⁾. It has long been recognized that in Hebrew "energetic *nun*" survived before certain pronominal suffixes ⁽²⁾. On the basis of the Ugaritic evidence where the energetic form of the verb appears also without suffixes, numerous Hebraists have cited occurrences of the independent energetic form of the verb in biblical Hebrew ⁽³⁾. These occurrences in-

⁽¹⁾ GORDON, *UT* § 9.11; Carl BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin 1908-1913) I, 641. Brockelmann cites examples from Egyptian, biblical, and Palestinian Aramaic.

⁽²⁾ See *GKC* § 58¹⁻¹.

⁽³⁾ See G. R. DRIVER, "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs", *JTS* 41 (1940) 163-164; ALBRIGHT, "The Oracles of Balaam", *JBL* 63 (1944) 212, n. 23; CROSS and FREEDMAN, "The Blessing of Moses", *JBL* 67 (1948) 203, n. 25; FREEDMAN, "Notes on Genesis", *ZAW* 64 (1952)

clude one example from Lamentations, namely, MT *wayyirdennāh* of 1,13.

The LXX *katēgagen*, Syriac *'aḥtany*, and RSV, "he made it descend", all render this verb as though it were the *Hiph'īl* of *yārad* with pronominal suffix. The Targum's *ūkebaš yātōn* and AV, "and it prevailed against them", read the verb as *Qal* of *rādāh* "to rule, dominate" plus suffix. Scholarly opinion has been divided, generally in favor of the LXX and Syriac ⁽¹⁾.

The identification of the verb and its form was proposed, convincingly, by Dahood, who equates the *nun* of *wayyirdennāh* with the energetic *nun* and revocalizes the word as *wayyērēdannāh*. He translates 1,13a as, "from high He sent forth fire; into my bones has it descended" ⁽²⁾. It should be noted that the translation does not reflect the copula of MT—and rightly so since *waw* with the verb in the final position is best understood as pleonastic ⁽³⁾.

E. Emphatic Lamed

As early as 1894, when P. Haupt made the following statement, the emphatic *lamed* was recognized as occurring in biblical Hebrew. "A comprehensive study of the use of the *ḥ* *prae*fixum in the Old Testament will no doubt reveal a considerable number of cases where the *ḥ* is not the preposition but the emphatic particle *ḥ* = Arabic *la* and Assyrian *lū* 'verily'..." ⁽⁴⁾. Since this statement was made

191; IDEM, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry", *ZAW* 72 (1960) 102; DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 4. Note also C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges* (London 1920) 152-153.

⁽¹⁾ See ALBREKTSON, 72.

⁽²⁾ *PNWSP* 4.

⁽³⁾ See GORDON, *UT* § 13.102; Marvin POPE, "'Pleonastic' *Wāw* before Nouns in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *JAOS* 73 (1953) 95-98; and DAHOOD, *UHP* 40.

⁽⁴⁾ "A New Hebrew Particle", *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 13, No. 104 (1894) 107-108. See also HAUPT, "The Hebrew Stem *Nahal*, To Rest", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 22 (1905) 201. For the Arabic use of *la* see W. A. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language, translated from the German of Caspari...*, edd. W. R. SMITH and M. J. DE GOEJE (Cambridge 1896-1898) I, 282-283; II, 41-42. The Hebrew emphatic *lamed* should probably be vocalized as *lu/lu'*, see GESENIUS-BUHL, 380 a.

the emphatic *lamed* has been detected in most Northwest Semitic dialects ⁽¹⁾, and a host of scholars have added to Haupt's original list of the particle's appearances in Hebrew ⁽²⁾.

Israel Eitan was the first to recognize this particle in the *l'akzār* "cruel" of Lam 4,3 ⁽³⁾. His suggestion has been accepted by Rudolph, Kraus, and Nötscher, though rejected by Albrektson who prefers to read *l'akzār* as similar to *l'nîdāh hāyātāh* of 1,8 ⁽⁴⁾. In addition to this occurrence (which should be translated, "was indeed cruel") the emphatic *lamed* also appears two more times in 3,37-38, *'adōnāy lō' šiwwāh mippî 'elyōn lō' tēšē*. The *lō'* in both of these phrases is usually read with the force of *halō'* and rendered as in RSV, "...unless the Lord has ordained it? Is it not from the mouth of the Most High?" Glanzman, following Nötscher, has recently affirmed this understanding in his statement, "it is true that *lō'* can be used

⁽¹⁾ See for Ugaritic: GORDON, *UT* § 9.16; Albrecht GOETZE, "The Tenses of Ugaritic", *JAOS* 58 (1938) 292; for Amorite: Herbert B. HUFFMON, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study* (Baltimore 1965) 223; MORAN, *BANE* 60, 69; ALBRIGHT, *JBL* 69 (1950) 389; for Aramaic: H. INGHOIT, *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie* (1932-1938) (København 1940) 117, n. 4; DONNER-RÖLLIG, *op. cit.* II, 211; for Phoenician: Johannes FRIEDRICH, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (AnOr 32; Rome 1951) § 257^c; G. A. COOKE, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford 1903) 47; for Punic: H. BERTHIER - R. CHARLIER, *Le Sanctuaire punique d'El Hofra à Constantine* (Paris 1955) 33-34, 139.

⁽²⁾ See I. M. CASANOWICZ, "The Emphatic Particle *l'* in the OT", *JAOS* 16 (1896) CLXVI-CLXXI; Henry P. SMITH, "Old Testament Notes", *JBL* 24 (1905) 30; Israel EITAN, "Le particule emphatique '*la*' dans la Bible", *RÉJuvivHJud* 74 (1922) 1-16; IDEM, "Hebrew and Semitic Particles", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 45 (1928) 202; ALBRIGHT, "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature", *CBQ* 7 (1945) 24; DAHOOD, "Canaanite and Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth", *Bib* 33 (1952) 192-194; F. NÖTSCHER, "Zum emphatischen Lamed", *VT* 3 (1953) 372-380; DAHOOD, "Two Pauline Quotations from the Old Testament", *CBQ* 17 (1955) 24; IDEM, "Enclitic Mem and Emphatic Lamedh in Psalm 85", *Bib* 37 (1956) 338-340; IDEM, *PNWSP*, 19; IDEM, *Psalms I*, 143, 158, 188; John BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (The Anchor Bible; New York 1965) 333; and H. Neil RICHARDSON, "A Critical Note on Amos 7:14", *JBL* 85 (1966) 89.

⁽³⁾ *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 45 (1928) 202.

⁽⁴⁾ RUDOLPH, 247; KRAUS, 72; NÖTSCHER, *op. cit.* 379-380; and ALBREKTSON, 176-177.

for *hālō'* to introduce a question, but generally the context makes it clear; either it is preceded by a positive question (Lam 3, 37-38) or by some statement to which the clause introduced by *lō'* corresponds as a kind of apodosis (Job 2, 10)" (1).

But just as Glanzman rejects T. H. Robinson's equating the *lō'* of Hos 11,9 with *hālō'* (2) in favor of the emphatic particle, so it seems best to read the emphatic particle *lu'* here in 3,37-38. The use of a rhetorical question as a literary device is elsewhere unattested in Lamentations. But the emphatic *lamed* does occur, as well as the similar asseverative *kaph*. The following translation is proposed for 3,37-38, "Who has commanded and it came to pass? Verily, the Lord has ordained it! Verily, from the mouth of the most High goeth forth good and evil!"

F. *The Infinitive Absolute*

The use of the infinitive absolute "as a substitute for the finite verb" has long been recognized in Hebrew (3). Comparative Semitic studies have shown that not only in Hebrew, but in Amarna Canaanite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician the infinitive absolute was employed with the force of a finite verb (4). However, not until very

(1) "Two Notes: Am 3,15 and Os 11,8-9", *CBQ* 23 (1961) 231-232. ALBREKTSON (152) adopts the same idea, but seems unaware of Nötscher's article.

(2) T. H. ROBINSON, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, (HAT, ed. Otto EISSFELDT, Tübingen 1953) 44-45.

(3) *GKC*, § 113^{v-ss}.

(4) See for Amarna: MORAN, "The Use of the Canaanite Infinitive Absolute as a Finite Verb in the Amarna Letters from Byblos", *JCS* 4 (1950) 169-172; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, 168; for Ugaritic: GORDON, *UT* § 9.29; J. HUESMAN, "Finite Use of the Infinitive Absolute", *Bib* 37 (1956) 271-295; for Phoenician: HUESMAN, *op. cit.* On the Phoenician evidence compare E. HAMMERSHAIMB, "On the So-Called Infinitive Absolute in Hebrew", *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to G. R. Driver*, edd. D. Winton THOMAS and W. D. MCHARDY (Oxford 1963) 92. Similar to the views of Hammershaimb are those of FRIEDRICH (*op. cit.* § 286, n. 1) and DRIVER, "Reflections on Recent Articles", *JBL* 73 (1954) 129. For the possible finite use of the infinitive absolute in other Semitic languages see, for Syriac: BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, § 88^c; Theodor NÖLDEKE, *Compendious Syriac Grammar*, trans. James A. CRICHTON (London 1904) 236 (both assume an ellipsis of the finite verb); for South

recently has this use of the infinitive absolute been given its due consideration. In his extensive study of the Hebrew infinitive in 1956, J. Huesman cites twenty-five examples where the MT should be read (with no change in the text) as the infinitive absolute with the force of a finite verb, and twenty-three examples where it should be thus read after some alteration of MT (usually a revocalization of a perfect form as an infinitive). In addition he would read forty-three cases of the anomalous copula plus perfect as being actually the infinitive absolute used as a finite verb ⁽¹⁾. Although not every example cited by Huesman may prove to be correct, it seems quite certain that, as in the other Semitic languages noted above, Hebrew frequently employed the infinitive absolute with the force of a finite verb, and Lamentations contains one example of this syntactic feature.

The MT of 3,63, *šibtām wəqīmātām habbiṭāh 'anī mangīnālām*, is generally read as a 3 + 2 bicolon, "behold their sitting and their rising; I am the burden of their songs". But as suggested above ⁽²⁾ this understanding of the text seems to be based upon a wrong division of the verse and a misunderstanding of two syntactic elements, e. g., the adverbial *mem*'s were read as objective suffixes, and the infinitive absolute followed by personal pronoun — having the force of a preterite — was taken as an imperative belonging to the first colon, with the pronoun read as the subject of the second colon.

Once *šblm* and *qymtm* are recognized as adverbial, it becomes clear that the verb modified, *hbyṭh*, must be related to the following

Arabic: HÖFNER, op. cit. § 54; for Ethiopic: A. DILLMANN, *Ethiopic Grammar*, 2nd ed. 1899, ed. Carl BEZOLD, trans. James A. CRICHTON (London 1907) § 181.

⁽¹⁾ HUESMAN's doctoral dissertation has been published in two articles, the first part (cited above) in *Bib* 37 (1956) 271-295, and the second as "The Infinitive Absolute and the waw + Perfect Problem", *Bib* 37 (1956) 410-434. One should compare the position of DRIVER (*JBL* 73 [1954] 129) that the construction is to be found in that "well-known rule of Semitic syntax that, when the verb precedes the subject, it may stand in the simplest form, i.e. the masculine singular third person, instead of agreeing with it...". But this rule of syntax is an Arabic rule, not a general Semitic one. There is no real evidence that the third person masculine singular form was recognized as the simplest form by the people who spoke these Semitic languages.

⁽²⁾ See above, p. 204-205.

'*anî* and not the *yhw* of verse 61. By reading the infinitive *habbêt*, for the imperative *habbîṭāh*, and combining with it '*anî*, the meaning is readily transparent when translated as a past tense, "I endured their mocking songs". The proposed emendation of *hbyṭ* for MT *hbyṭh* has only the slightest manuscript evidence (one MS in Kennicott), but in light of the *Kethib* of the imperative in 5,1, *hbyṭ* (*Qere hbyṭh*), and the mixed manuscript evidence on the *w^ehabbîṭāh* of 2,20 (four MSS of Kennicott *whbyṭ*), it seems reasonable to assume that the final *he* may not have been original in 3,63, even if it were to be read as the imperative and not the infinitive. In addition, the preceding precativ perfects (vv. 58-61) and the following jussives (vv. 64-66) make the presence here of an imperative in v. 63 all the more questionable.

One should note that the Syriac translated *hbyṭh* by the first person singular '*estaklet* "I perceive". It is doubtful whether the Syriac translator recognized or understood the syntax of this line, but at least from the force of the context he comprehended in part the import of the original verbal element. The proposed translation of *habbêt* '*anî* "I endured" is based upon the use of the verb with this meaning in Hb 1,3, *lāmmāh tar'ēnî 'āwen w^e 'āmāl tabbîṭ*, "why dost thou cause me to experience wickedness and endure trouble?"⁽¹⁾.

G. The Asseverative K and Kî

A growing list of examples of the vocable *kî* used as an asseverative particle have been compiled by Pfeiffer, O'Callaghan, Gordis, Driver, Dahood, and Muilenburg⁽²⁾. Since the time of Kimchi, who coined the phrase *kaph ha'amittuth*, Hebrew grammarians have re-

(1) See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, 613 and 909. Note especially the parallel use of *rā'āh* in Ps 60,5 and 71,20. Compare also Ex 20,18, "and all the people saw (*rō'im*) the thunderings...".

(2) See Egon PFEIFFER, "Glaube im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 71 (1959) 160; R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms", *VT* 4 (1954) 175; R. GORDIS, "The Asseverative *Kaph* in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *JAOS* 63 (1943) 176-178; DRIVER, *CML* 144; DAHOOD, *UHL* III, 327; James MUILENBURG, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כִּי in the Old Testament", *HUCA* 32 (1961) 135-160.

cognized a *kaph* which cannot have the meaning of "like" (1). The presence of the asseverative proclitic *kaph* in Ugaritic has reinforced the conclusions about such a *kaph* in Hebrew. In the words of Gordis, "Biblical Hebrew uses the proclitic *kaph* as well as the vocable *kî* for asseverative purposes, the former generally at the end, the latter either at the beginning or end of the clause. The former is used before substantives, the latter to modify verbs or an entire clause" (2). Both the asseverative *kî* and *k* appear in Lamentations, and recognition of them brings clarity to several difficult passages.

1,20 miḥûṣ šikkēlāh ḥereb babbayit kammāwet:

The second colon, *babbayit kammāwet*, has been a very ancient crux. Commentators for the most part have either rejected the *kaph* (like the Syriac which reads simply *mōlā*), read the *kaph* as part of the root (with Hebrew **kēmūt* equal to the Akkadian *kamūtu* "captivity"), or assume the elision of the preposition *b* after *k*, so that an original *kbmwet* became *kmwet* (3). But none of these explanations has yielded a reasonable solution for this text.

Gordis is certainly correct when he cites, among a list of twelve OT passages where the proclitic *kaph* heightens the emphasis, the *kaph* of *kammāwet* as asseverative. He translates 1,20c as follows, "Without, the sword bereaved / Within there was death" (4).

Though unnoticed by the commentators, the best commentary on the imagery and meaning of this bicolon is Ez 7,15, *haḥereb baḥûṣ w'haddeber w'hārā'āb mibbāyit 'ašer baššādeh baḥereb yāmūt wa'ašer bā'ir rā'āb wādeber yō'kālennā*. The same idea is expressed in Jer 14,18, although the parallelism of *baḥûṣ* and *mibbayit* is not included, "if I go into the field, behold those slain by the sword, and if I enter the city, behold the diseases of famine". Other passages which make a comparison between violent death and non-violent death are Jer 16,4; 32,24; and Lam 4,9.

(1) GORDIS, op. cit. 176; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, § 51. Compare GKC § 118^x where nine passages are cited in which *k* appears to be inserted for emphasis and is translated as "in every respect like".

(2) Op. cit. 178. See also GORDON, *UT* § 13.51.

(3) See ALBREKTSON, 81-82, for a summary of the various views and bibliographical notations.

(4) Op. cit. 178.

In the light of these parallels between violent and non-violent death inside of and outside of the city, respectively, 1,20c should be translated as, "outside (the city) the sword bereaved; inside (the city) verily death (bereaved)" (1).

3,22 *kî lō' timmānû* (MT *tam^enû*) *kî lō' kîlû* (MT *kālû*):

These two *kî* particles should be added to the collection of as-severative *kî*'s already attested in biblical Hebrew. The commentators have sought to explain *kî* ... *kî* here in several different ways. For example, Kraus relates 3,22 to the preceding '*al kēn 'ōhîl* of v. 21, with the initial *kî* clause coming after *ḥasdē yhwēh* since this is the *het* strophe (2). But '*al kēn* usually points backwards and it seems unlikely and unnecessary to relate it to the following verses (3). Albrektson reads the first *kî* as introducing a subject clause and translates 3,22, as, "it is Yhwēh's mercies that we are not consumed, his compassions fail not" (4). But this destroys the synonymous parallelism of the two *kî* clauses and produces a syntactic pattern which is awkward

(1) Compare Dt 32,25, *mihûš l'sakkel ḥereb ūmēḥ^adārîm 'ēmāh*, "outside the sword shall bereave, and inside terror (shall bereave)".

(2) KRAUS, 53.

(3) The verb '*ōhîl* of 3,21 is usually read as the verb *yhl* "to hope" which appears also in 3,24. It would give much better sense, especially since '*al kēn* points backwards to the wormwood, gall, etc. of 3,19, to read the verb as '*āḥûl*, "I writhe in anguish", from the root *hyl* "to writhe in pain, travail". Compare the *Kethib* of Jer 4,19, *mē'ay mē'ay 'ōhîlāh* ('*hwlh*), "my bowels, my bowels, I writhe in anguish". The following verses (22-24) express hope and confidence, concluding with an affirmation — in good paronomastic style — by repeating the almost identical phrase with an apposite meaning, '*ōhîl lō*, "I will hope in him". Contrary to Albrektson (142), and N. GOTTWALD, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (Studies in Biblical Theology 14; London 1954) 13, MT *napšî* in Lam 3,20 is to be preferred as original to the reading *npšk* of the *tiqqūnē hassôp^erîm*, for not only is the use of the *tiqqūnē hassôp^erîm* for textual criticism very risky (see W. E. BARNES, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament '*Tikkune Šopherim*'", *JTS* 1 [1900] 387-414), but there is also a difference within this tradition. While Gottwald quotes C. D. GINSBURG (*Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition to the Bible* [London 1897] 361), who cites ms. Orient 1379 fol. 26B with a massoretic notation that *npšy* is from an original *npšk*, ms. Orient 1425 reads, *wtswh 'ly npšy npšw hyh ktw*.

(4) ALBREKTSON, 145.

in both Hebrew and English. As will become clear from the discussion below, the only explanation that does justice to the text and context is to read these particles as asseverative.

H. Third Masculine Plural Preformative *taw*

The use of *taw* as the preformative of the third masculine plural imperfect is attested in Amarna Canaanite and Ugaritic, and probably in Punic⁽¹⁾. Several scholars, including Gordon and Dahood, have claimed to find the *taw* third masculine plural preformative also in Hebrew⁽²⁾. Yet other scholars such as Albright and Driver are unconvinced that such a *taw* preformative occurs in Hebrew. They prefer to read the masculine plural noun as a kind of collective noun treated as a feminine singular, with the *taw* being the regular preformative of the third feminine singular⁽³⁾. The following verse in Lamentations may bring some additional light to the problem.

The MT of 3,22 *kî lô' tāmēnû kî lô' kālû* is generally emended. Most scholars prefer to read *tmw* for M'T *tmnw*, after the Syriac *ṭlaqnān* "we are ended" and the Targum's *p̄saqū* "they have ceased"⁽⁴⁾. With this emendation, MT could be read as, "the mercies of Yahweh are not ended". But Albrektson, though wrong in his vocalization as *tammōnū* and translation, "it is Yhwh's mercies that we are not

(1) On the Amarna imperfect see Franz M. Th. BÖHL, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* 48-58; Édouard DHORME, "La langue de Canaan", *RB* 10 (1913) 379; A. HERDNER, "Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra", *Revue des études sémitiques*, 1938, 76-83; MORAN, "New Evidence of Canaanite *taqtu-lū(na)*", *JCS* 5 (1951) 33-35; and GORDON, "The New Amarna Tablets", *Or* 16 (1947) 1-21, especially 10. For Ugaritic see GORDON, *UT* § 9.14; and on the Punic imperfect see Albrecht ALT, "Zu den Schlussformeln der punischer Weihinschriften", *ZAW* 60 (1944) 156-159, where he cites CIS I 3226, 3604 and states that *taw* and *yodh* are used along side of each other. On the other hand Friedrich prefers to leave undecided the question of the third masculine plural preformative *taw* in Punic (see op. cit. 156-157).

(2) See GORDON, *UT* § 9.14, and DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 5; IDEM, *UHP* 38; compare MORAN, *BANE* 63.

(3) ALBRIGHT, *CBQ* 7 (1945) 22-23; DRIVER, *CML* 130. ALBRIGHT and MORAN, "A Reinterpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)", *JCS* 2 (1948) 243; ALBRIGHT, *HUCA* 23 (1950) I, 17.

(4) See ALBREKTSON, 145-146, for a summary discussion on the views of the commentators.

consumed", is correct in retaining consonantal MT which is reflected in the Syro-hexaplaric reading of Aquila (*g^emarnan* "we are consumed") and Symmachus (*'etṭalleqnan* "we have perished") (1).

Before discussing the vocalization of MT *tmnw* and *klw*, it will be best to establish first the roots of these verbs. A careful study of Hebrew and Ugaritic roots which occur in poetic parallelism makes it seem just about certain that the verbs behind MT are the synonyms *mānāh* "to number, count" and *kūl* "to measure". The desiderated use of *mānāh* is attested in the following passages: *'am rāb 'ašer lō' yimmāneh w'lō' yissāpēr mērōb*, "a great people that cannot be numbered or counted for multitude" (1 Kgs 3,8); *'ašer lō' yissāpēr š'bā' haššamayim w'lō' yimmad hōl hayyām*, "as the hosts of heaven cannot be numbered, and the sands of the sea cannot be measured" (Jer 33,22); and *bpy sprhn bšpty mnthn*, "their number (is) in my mouth, their count is upon my lips" (UT 77:46-47).

Although MT *kālū* has been identified by all commentators with the root *kālāh* "to be complete, to end", the synonymous parallelism of *mānāh* with *mādad* "measure" and *sāpar* "number" strongly favors reading the root here as *kūl* "to measure" cognate to Aramaic *kūl* and Arabic *kāla* "to measure grain" (2). The *Qal* of this verb is attested only once in Biblical Hebrew, namely in Is 40,12, "who measured (*mādad*) the water in the hollow of his hand and marked off (*tikkēn*) the heaven with a span, enclosed (*w^ekāl*) (3) the dust of the earth in a measure and weighed (*w^ešāqal*) the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance" (RSV).

But the *Qal* is elsewhere attested, as in the tenth century B.C. Gezer Calendar (*yrh qsr wkl*, "one month for harvesting and measuring" (4) and the seventh century B.C. Yabneh Yam Letter (*wyqsr 'bdk wykl w'sm*, "and thy servant harvested, measured, and stored [the grain]" (5).

(1) Ibid.

(2) See JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim* and LANE, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, s. v.

(3) The RSV "enclosed" is obviously inadequate in this series of verbs of measuring. C. R. NORTH has better translated, "measured earth's soil", in his *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford 1964) 83.

(4) This derivation is accepted by most scholars; for other suggestions see DONNER-RÖLLIG, op. cit. II, 128-130.

(5) See Frank M. CROSS, Jr., "Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth - Sixth Centuries B.C.: II. The Murabba'at Pa-

The desiderated reading here in 3,22 of these two roots is achieved by vocalizing *tmw* as the *Niph'al* *timmānū* and *klw* as the *Qal* passive *kīlū* (see below). Following the asseverative *kī* as discussed above, this bicolon is best translated as, "Verily, the mercies of Yahweh are innumerable! Verily, his compassions are immeasurable!"⁽¹⁾.

The possibility that *timmānū* is a third masculine plural with prefix *taw* is suggested by the fact that the parallel masculine plural *rahāmāw* is not treated as a singular feminine collective. Since the plural noun *rahāmāw* is preceded by a verb in the third masculine plural perfect, there is some reason to assume that the parallel phrase *hasdē yhwēh* is preceded by a third masculine plural imperfect, *timmānū*. To read, *hasdē yhwēh* as a third feminine singular collective would require an emendation of the text to *timmāneh*. In this connection one may note that elsewhere the masculine plural force of these nouns is reflected in the choice of the pronoun used in parallelism, e.g., Ps 25,6, *z'kōr rahāmēkā yhwēh wāh'sādēkā kī mē'ōlām hēmmāh* (not *hēnnāh* or *hī*).

I. Qal Passive

It has been almost a full century since F. Böttcher suggested that *Pu'al* forms which occur without a *Pi'el* should be understood as *Qal* passives⁽²⁾. Not only did this thesis seem convincing in light of the Arabic *qutla/yuqtalu*, but it has been proven correct by means

pyrus and the Letter Found Near Yabneh-Yam", *BASOR* 165 (Feb. 1962) 44; J. NAVEH, "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.", *IsrEJ* 10 (1960) 129-139; and S. YEIVIN, "The Judicial Petition from Mezaḏ Hashavyahu", *BO* 19 (1962) 3-10. The latter two scholars derive *wyhl* from *kālāh* "to finish".

(¹) The *yqtl-qtl* sequence here is found elsewhere, e.g., Ps 8,7, *tamšīlēhū . . . šattāh*. For a study of this stylistic variation with identical verbs, see Moshe HELD, "The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic", in *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman*, M. BEN-HORIM et al., edd. (Leiden 1962) 281-290. Held notes that an active-passive sequence of identical verbs also appears in Ugaritic and Hebrew. Here the sequence is not with identical, but synonymous verbs. See also GORDON, *UT* § 13.58 and DAHOOD, *UHP* 39.

(²) *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1868) II, 98-106. See also *GKC* § 52^e and 53^u.

of the well-attested *Qal* passive in Amarna Canaanite, Ugaritic, and its possible appearance in Phoenician. It has since been recognized that behind the consonantal text of many Hebrew *Qal* verbs, vocalized as active, lies an original passive form ⁽¹⁾. The above translation of MT *lō'kālū* as "they are immeasurable" assumes that MT active should be read as passive, *kālū* (like the Arabic *qāla*). Likewise, as indicated above, MT *hālū* in 4,6 may be read better as a *Qal* passive *hālū*, "they were let loose", if not emended to either *hal* or *hālal* ⁽²⁾.

Conclusions

In the first part of this study suggestions have been made for a new rendering of the Hebrew text in nineteen different passages. Of these, eleven are proposed for the first time, and eight proposed derivations advanced by other writers have been presented (sometimes with additional arguments) and adopted as most probable. In the second part new renderings have been proposed for over twenty words or particles, fourteen of which are original with this study, while seven are the suggestions of other scholars with whom the writer agrees. If the suggestions advanced above are accepted, the understanding and translation of the following thirty poetic lines of the book's 266 poetic lines will be affected: 1,1a.1b.8c.13a.14c.16a.19a.20c; 2,1a.2c.6a.10a.18a.22a; 3,16.17.21.22.26.28.37.38.63; 4,3b.6b.16a.18a; 5,4-5.9.

The question of whether Lamentations was written in Palestine or Babylon may never be resolved, but on the basis of the lexical and syntactic elements employed by the poet, it seems certain that Lamentations was deeply rooted in the literary traditions of ancient Israel and Canaan. There has been no need to discuss or dispute the dating of Lamentations to the first half of the sixth century as argued by virtually all modern commentators. It is in the unexpected combination of the relatively fixed date and the clear evidence

⁽¹⁾ See BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss I*, 537-540; *UT* § 9.31; Paul JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 1923) 125-127; DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 8; IDEM, *Psalms I*, 19, 97 et *passim*. For a probable example in Phoenician, see Eshmunazar 5, *k 'y šm bn mnm*, "for nothing whatsoever has been placed in it", (DONNER-RÖLLIG, *op. cit.* I, 3).

⁽²⁾ See *Bib* 49 (1968) 48.

of many archaic syntactic and grammatical elements that Lamentations makes its contribution to the study of Hebrew literary traditions. For many years it has been recognized that archaic Canaanite linguistic features appear in the early poetic passages of the Bible, e.g., the "Song of Deborah" (Jgs 5), and certain archaizing texts such as the "Psalm of Habakkuk" (Hb 3). The use of these same elements in a work of the mid-sixth century would indicate that down to the exile itself these archaic features not only survived but were a part of the literary repertoire, readily accessible to the poet and those of the learned tradition. This literary repertoire included not only the *hireq compaginis* and old feminine ending *-at* but enclitic *mem*, adverbial *mem*, energetic *nun*, emphatic *lamed*, asseverative *k* and *kî*, the *Qal* passive, the infinitive absolute with the force of a perfect, and the third masculine plural preformative *taw* — as well as a larger lexicon of archaic words and particles than previously realized. The failure of the Septuagint translators to recognize these archaic elements would indicate that their use did not survive the exile. One might well conclude that although written during the exile, Lamentations is the last of the "pre-exilic" books.

Indices

I. — Scripture References

Genesis		Deuteronomy		3,21-24	48¹
37,36	31	32,25	212	13,10	51
39,1	31				
40,10	38 ⁰	Judges		1 Kings	
49,7	48	9,48-49	37	3,8	214
49,11	38	10,18	47	10,20	36
		19,25	48		
Exodus				2 Kings	
20,18	210 ¹	1 Samuel		24,15	50
33,14-15	48	2,5	30	25,3-6	36 ³
		10,18	36	25,4-7	50
Leviticus		19,5	53 ¹	25,8-9	31
23,40	37 ⁵	24,7.11	50	25,18-21	36 ³
		26,9.11.16.23	50		
Numbers				2 Chronicles	
11,4	32	2 Samuel		15,18	51
13,23	37 ⁵	1,14	46	36,5-20	50

Job

2,3	53 ¹
2,10	208
8,4	200
39,25	42 ¹

Psalms

3,5	204 ²
9,17	42
18,40,49	43
21,10	48
22,16	202
25,6	215
27,4-5	36
34,17	48
35,1	45
37,7	39
60,5	210 ¹
62,6	39
65,5	200
66,17	204 ²
68,33	36
71,20	210 ¹
71,22,24	32
73,18	48
80,11,12	37 ⁵
80,17	48
92,4	42
102,8	41 41 ²
102,9	43
105,18	51
106,40	35
107,20	50
119,145	204 ²
137,1	32
142,2	204

Proverbs

1,26	32 ⁰
21,13	32 ³

Qoheleth

6,3	200
8,1	48

Canticles

2,3	50 ²
-----	-----------------

Isaiah

10,33	38 ⁰
13,3	32 44
13,20-22	52
22,2	204
23,12	31
23,13	52
29,7	43
30,2	50 ²
31,9	42
34,11-15	52
40,12	214 214 ³
47,1-5	31
47,5	39 ³ 40
49,21	42 ¹
64,7(6)	200 200 ²

Jeremiah

4,19	212 ³
6,25	52
8,23	32
11,16	37 ⁵
14,17	30
14,18	211
15,17	39 ³
16,4	211
18,13	30
20,3	42
22,24	50
27,11	51
32,24	211
33,22	214
39,7	50
39,9-10	31
41,9	200 200 ⁶
46,11	31
46,16	52
48,2	32
52,9-11,24-27	36 ³

Lamentations

1,1	29 31 42 ¹ 216
1,5	30 53 ¹
1,7	53 ¹
1,8	31 53 ¹ 207 216
1,12	48
1,13	206 216
1,14	200 200 ⁶ 201 216

1,16	32 33 216
1,18	53 ¹
1,19	33 34 216
1,20	211 212 216
2,1	34 35 36 48 216
2,2	35 36 48 203 216
2,3	48
2,6	36 38 48 200 216
2,9	36
2,10	38 39 40 216
2,12	51 ² 205
2,14	36
2,18	53 ¹ 203 204 205 216
2,20	210
2,21	36 ²
2,22	42 43 48 216
3,1	48
3,14	202 ³
3,15	199
3,16	44 216
3,17	201 216
3,19	212 ³
3,20	202 212 ³
3,21	212 212 ³ 216
3,22	212 213 215 216
3,22-24	212 ³
3,24	212 ³
3,25	40
3,26	38-40 202 216
3,28	38 39 39 ³ 40 216
3,28-30	40
3,28-30	40
3,30	199
3,34-36	38
3,37-38	207 208 216
3,52	45 53 ¹
3,56	51 ²
3,58	44
3,58-59	45
3,60-66	45
3,61	53 ¹ 210
3,62	43
3,62-63	205
3,63	204 209 210 216
4,3	207 216
4,6	45 47 202 216

4,7-8 45	5,21 51 ²	Hosea
4,9 211		7,14 204
4,11 49	Ezekiel	8,6 53 ¹
4,15 51 ²	7,15 211	10,1 38
4,16 48 49 216	8,14 41	11,9 208
4,17 199 200	12,13 50	
4,18 49 49 ³ 51 ² 216	15,2 37 ⁵	Joel
4,20 49 50	17,6 38 ⁰	1,7 38 ⁰
5,1 51 ² 210	17,6-7 37 ⁵	
5,4 49 51 216	17,22 37 ⁵	Habakkuk
5,5 50 51 216	31,17 50	1,3 210
5,7 53 ¹		
5,9 51 216	Daniel	
5,11 49 ³	1,3 31	Sirach
5,18 49 ³ 52	1,1-11 31	46,6 200

II. Hebrew Words

'ēmāh 212 ¹	dōmēm/dōmām 40 202	ḥasdē yhwḥ 212 215
ne'enḥāh 31	dāmam 'mourn' 32	ḥūṣ 211 212 ¹
'anaššēw/-aw 37	38-42	ḥereb 211 212
'sm 214	yiddēmû 38-40	ḥereb hammidbār 51
b'e'appô 48	yiddôm 38-40	ḥāram: ḥeḥrīm 35
bd/bdd 41 42 42 ¹	hāgāh 32, 42	yā 45-48 200-201
bādād 40-42 42 ¹	ḥalō' 207-208	yādāh 32
bōdēd 41 41 ²	hēmāmāh 33-34	yḥl: 'ōḥl 212 212 ³
hēbī' 51	hāmāh 204	yāḥal 40 202
yābō'û/yābī'û 50-51	hōmat 204	yārad 206
beyad 200 200 ⁶	ḥōmiyyāh 204	wayy'rēdannāh 206
bākāh 32	hāras 35	wayyirdennāh 206
billa' 35	znḥ 201	yēšēb bādād 40
bat bābel 31	zā'aq 204	šebet 205
bat kaśdīm 31	ḥūl 45	šibtām 204 209-210
bat 'ēnēh 53 ¹	ḥyl: 'āḥūl 212 ³	k/ki 210-213
betūlāh 30 31 200	ḥālāh 45	kaggan 36-38
g'beret mamlākōt 31	ḥālāl-m 36 203	kammāwet 211-212
gāda' 35	ḥelālīm 36	kēmūt 211
gūr 43	ḥillē' 35 36 203	kūl 214
gam 'aloud' 31 32 32 ⁰	ḥl/ḥll 45-48 202	kālāh 214
32 ³	ḥal/ḥālāl 216	w'kal 214
gan 37	ḥālû bāh yādāyim	kālû/killû 212 215-
gārāh 43	45-48 202 216	216
dābaq 202	ḥilā 216	ḥol šōbēhā 43
dbr 'pursue' 52	ḥālaq 'destroy' 48	kāpaš/kābaš 44
deber 211	ḥilleqam 48	le'akzār 207
dwm 'wait' 39 40 202	ḥōmat 204	le'immōtām 205
dūmām 38 39 202	ḥinnām 53 ¹	le'nidāh ḥayātāh 207

lō' šiwwāh 207
lō'tēšē' 207
libbām 203
lāhad 49-50
māgōr missābīb 42
mēgīray 43
mēgūray missābīb
 42-44
mādad 214
mēhōlālay 43
mēhādārīm 212¹
maḥšēbōtām 53¹
malkāh 36 203
mamlākāh 35-36 203
mangīnātām 202^a
 209
mānāh 214
timmanū 212-215.
mē'ay 212^a
mēšukkāh 36
mišbattehā 53¹
mēšīah yhw 49-50
mšl: tamšilēhū 215¹
miššālōm 201
nbī: habbiṭāh 204-205
 209-210
tabbīt 210
ng': higgī'a 35 36
nāsītī fōbāh 202
sh̄r 43
sukkō 36 37
sāpar 214
'āb 34

'wb 35
'yb 34
yā'ib 34-35
'ēn: 'ēnī 'ēnī 32-33
'yn 53¹
'al kēn 212 212^a
'alāy 53¹
'ēlī 53¹
'allīzāh 204
pūš 48
pēnē yhw 48
pšh 43
šādāh 49
šwd: šādū 49
šawwā'rēnū 50-51
šl: bēšillō 50
šā'aq 203
qāmay 43
qūmāh 205
qīmātām 204 209-
 210
qšr 214
qārā' 32 43 44
rab 29-30 30^a
rabbātī 29-31
rab ṭabbāhīm 31
rab šarīśāw 31
rīb/rībē 44
rībāh 45
rībīm/rībōt 44
rādāh 206
rādap 51¹
nirdāpnū 50

rūah 'appēnū 49-50
rahāmāw 215
rā'āb 211
šāba' 199-200
šar 31
šar haṭṭabbāhīm 31
šārātī 29 31
šārēhā 36 203
šōk 37 37^a
šukkō 36, 37
šāhaq 32^a
šbb 53¹
šēbābīm 53¹
šābat 53¹
šw': tēšū'ōt 204
šhy 49 50
šēhīn 49
šht: bišhītōtām 49-50
škl 211 212¹
šālāh 46-48
hišlīh 35
šāsāh 52
šāsas 52
š'l 52-53
šāqal 214
ššm 52
šattāh 215¹
tikkēn 214
tamōnū 212-213
tammōnū 213
tā'ab 35
hit'ib 35
tō'ēbāh 35