

Research notes regarding the clause hierarchy of Lamentations

background information to the PhD thesis
Prosodic Influence on the Text Syntax of
Lamentations

Hendrik Jan Bosman

January 6, 2019

NOTICE:

This document is very large, it contains reference material only
and is meant to be read on screen. Please do not make paper
copies, unless you absolutely have to.

Contents

Introduction	3
Status of this document	3
Rules of thumb for the clause hierarchies	3
Descriptive labels	5
1 Lamentations 1	7
2 Lamentations 2	77
3 Lamentations 3	139
4 Lamentations 4	211
5 Lamentations 5	265
6 Lists and Indexes	293
List of figures	293
List of tables	293
List of MQL queries	293
List of clause type abbreviations	294
Index of authors	295
Index of references to Biblical texts	296

Introduction

These annotations serve to account for the clause hierarchies I have presented in my dissertation. I have made these hierarchies with the help of the program `syn04types`. As explained on p. 273, p. 101 and Appendix A in the dissertation, this program proposes a hierarchy one clause at a time; the researcher is free to accept or correct this proposal. For Lamentations, I have taken prosodic observations into account in my decisions to accept or correct the proposals. As a rule, I have not annotated cases in which I agree with a proposal by `syn04types`. My assumption is, that these cases follow regular syntax and need no explanation.

Status of this document

This document represents the most recent state of my research notes. They are provided to give insight into the reasoning behind details of my clause hierarchy, but they are not to be considered research results. They form additional background material, without being part of the dissertation proper.

Rules of thumb for the clause hierarchies

In the dissertation, I have listed the rules of thumb that have emerged in the iterative process of making the hierarchies. I will list them here as well, as a summary of my account of my decisions. They do not form an air-tight set of rules: They will at times conflict, with no general rule to prioritize them; also, the texts may show peculiarities in terms of unexpected syntax or literary structures, text-critical problems, etc. This is why publishing these notes is necessary.

General conventions

1. In general, a clause is connected to another clause, to which it is linguistically dependent in some way, or which it in some way continues.

2. Whenever a clause is connected to a **unit** of text, rather than to an individual clause, it is connected to the *first* clause of that unit.
3. A clause that **closes** a larger unit of text, usually by way of some variation to the preceding clauses, is connected to that unit *as a whole*, as explained in point 2. An example is found in Lam 1,1c.
4. When an **independent** unit of text is **embedded** within another unit of text, it is 'moved out of the way' by giving it the highest indentation. Its first clause is a root clause (clause without a mother clause) so that there is no connection with the embedding context. An example is found in Lam 1,9c.

Syntactic rules

1. A clause that forms a **constituent** of another clause (object, subject, adjunct, etc.), is connected to that clause.
2. A clause with **clause-level conjunctions** is connected to the clause which it continues.
3. An **asyndetic** clause tends to connect to another asyndetic clause, only rarely to a clause with conjunction.
4. The **clause type**, and the associated degree of **discursiveness / salience** plays a role. Clauses with the same discursiveness tend to form larger units. Shifts to more discursive speech will often indicate closure or a new start; the reverse can indicate an elaboration on, or introduction to, a discursive main clause. General rules can not be given, as the discourse function of these shifts is highly syntagmatic and often depends on the discourse structure as a whole.

Rules for participant references

1. The (re)introduction of a participant as the **subject** of a clause indicates the start of a new unit. A personal pronoun also counts as a reintroduction, but on a slightly lower level.
2. A clause with **pronominal references** is connected to the clause containing the antecedent or a clause with the same references.
3. Combination of points 1 and 2 produces a **secondary participant**, which starts a referential subdomain, but remains tied to the main participant. An example is Lam 1,4b-cA, in which all participants are defined in relation to Zion by 3 f.sg suffixes.

4. When matching references and antecedents, the **entire units** formed by mother and daughter clause are taken into account.

Prosodic rules

1. The rhythm of **two-colon verselines** is strong: Clauses in the A-colon of a verseline tend to connect to a preceding verseline as a whole, only rarely to a clause in a B-colon.
2. Strophe boundaries quite often indicate a syntactic break. Enjambments occur, but are rare and will usually involve sentences and paragraphs, not clauses.
3. Where the acrostic appears to have complicated the text-syntactic structure, the force of text-syntactic arguments can be reduced while prosodic structure has increased force. This is especially true for the 1-strophes.

Descriptive labels

The application of the rules of thumb undoubtedly involves a fair bit of human intuition. In order to make this intuition visible and hopefully more consistent, I have labeled all combinations of mother and daughter clauses that *syn04types* has had to consider as alternatives with descriptive labels, in four categories:

1. *syn04types* labels: the original labels assigned by *syn04types*.
2. syntactic labels: additional syntactic labels.
3. participants labels: labels concerning participant references, participant domains and communicational domains.
4. prosodic labels: labels concerning prosodic structure (up to strophe level).

Labels in bold print There turns out to be a fair bit of redundancy in the labels: Some labels presuppose other labels and will therefore always co-occur with these. What is more: not every label is equally relevant in every situation. In my annotations, I have attempted to indicate which labels I deem relevant for my decision, by listing these labels in bold font. On the one hand, this highlighting introduces a subjective element into the labels. On the other hand, the highlighting may be seen as a shorthand for my argumentation, in terms of formally observable patterns in the text.

In many cases, my decisions require more arguments than highlighted labels. In those cases, I supply these arguments in free text.

Chapter 1

Lamentations 1

Annotation 1.1

	איִכָּה יִשְׁבָּה בְּדָד הָעִיר	1. (Lam 1,1)	accepted
		< ... >	
	הִיְתָה כְּאַלְמָנָה רַבְתִּי בַּגּוֹיִם	3.	
	How she sits alone, the city	1. (Lam 1,1)	
		< ... >	
	How like a widow she has become, once great among	3.	
	the nations!		

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep no.fronting_no.fronting same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

The connection is not the issue here, but the text-syntactic status of **איִכָּה** (lit.: ‘how?’) needs some attention, because it has possible repercussions for the clause delimitations. In the *ETCBC* data, the word is an integral part of the first clause: “How she sits alone, the city once full of people.” Pragmatically, of course, the clause has exclamatory function,¹ but syntactically it still is an interrogative *xQtX* clause (*xYqX* in Lam 2 and Lam 4).² However, some commentators take the exclamatory function of **איִכָּה** seriously to the point of making it into an interjection: ‘Alas’ or ‘Ah’, in effect making it into a separate

¹(Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley 1990, 148b); Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 18.4e.

²So also Hillers 1992, 61, 93, 135.

clause.³

For general exegesis, this is not a pressing issue. The exclamatory function of 'how'-questions is well understood, and many translators solve the matter by translating both the literal and the pragmatic meaning: "Ah, how lonely she sits, ..." ⁴ However, for a syntactic analysis, and indeed for a formal prosodic analysis, this is unsatisfactory. Both aim at a precise delimitation of the relevant textual units.

For the syntactic analysis, the issue is probably decided by the observation that in the Hebrew Bible the word always appears within a clause, never as an independent interjection.

In the prosodic analysis, however, a curious ambivalence occurs: On the one hand, isolating אֵיכָה in Lam 1,1 and Lam 4,1 results in verselines which have 3+2 (*qīnāh*) meter, just like the other verselines in their strophe. Also, the 'removal' of אֵיכָה strengthens the parallelism between these lines. Additionally, Berlin notes that the *paseq* after אֵיכָה indicates a slight pause.⁵ On the other hand, the acrostic strongly argues against separation: אֵיכָה provides the א required by the acrostic and must therefore belong to the first verseline.

This prosodic ambivalence is mirrored in Renkema's treatment of the phenomenon:⁶ He emphatically rejects the separation of אֵיכָה from the first colon,⁷ yet, in Lam 4,1 (see p. 212 of these annotations), he rearranges the traditional colometry because this yields a 3+2 meter, which requires אֵיכָה to be excluded from the verseline.

Annotation 1.2

	proposed
הֵיטָה כְּאַלְמָנָה רַבַּתִּי בַּגּוֹיִם	3. (Lam 1,1)
שָׂרָתִי בַּמְּדִינוֹת הֵיטָה לָמָס: ס	4.
How like a widow she has become, once great among the nations!	3. (Lam 1,1)
Once a princess among the states, she has become a slave.	4.

³Berlin 2002, 49; BHS places אֵיכָה on a separate line, outside the verseline.

⁴So Renkema 1998, 94; in the same vein Kraus 1983, 21; Berges 2002, 85.

⁵Berlin 2002, 49.

⁶Apparently followed unquestioningly by Berlin 2002.

⁷Renkema 1998, 94.

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj end_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline whole_verseline

	corrected	
אֵיכָה יֹשְׁבָה בְּדָר הָעִיר	1.	(Lam 1,1)
	< ... >	
שָׂרָתִי בַּמְּדִינוֹת הָיְתָה לְמַסֵּס	4.	
How she sits alone, the city	1.	(Lam 1,1)
	< ... >	
Once a princess among the states, she has become a	4.	
slave.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Ques preVlsub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_indep same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj end_to_start_of_strophe end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

4 has a different constituent order than 1–2 and 3, but apart from that, it is built up from exactly the same elements; the subjects, even though employing widely differing images, all have the same referent: The city of Jerusalem. There is no reason to assume that שָׂרָתִי בַּמְּדִינוֹת is somehow emphasized or contrasted to the other two eponyms, so the fronting is probably prosodically motivated: It closes the strophe, by varying the dominant Pred-Subj pattern. This clause, then, is not connected to the immediately preceding clause only, but to the unit 1–3 as a whole.

Annotation 1.3

	proposed	
שָׂרָתִי בַּמְּדִינוֹת הָיְתָה לְמַסֵּס: ס	4.	(Lam 1,1)
בָּכוּ תְּבֹכָה בַּלַּיְלָה	5.	(Lam 1,2)
Once a princess among the states, she has become a	4.	(Lam 1,1)
slave.		
Bitterly she weeps at night,	5.	(Lam 1,2)

syn04types	xYq0<XQt1 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected
איכה יְשֵׁבָה בְּדָד הָעִיר	1. (Lam 1,1)
	<...>
בָּכוּ תְּבַכֶּה בַּלַּיְלָה	5. (Lam 1,2)
How she sits alone, the city	1. (Lam 1,1)
	<...>
Bitterly she weeps at night,	5. (Lam 1,2)

syn04types	xYq0<xQtX 0<Ques preV2par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	disc_disc asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first

Syn04types notes congruence of the verb in this subjectless clause with the subject and verb of the immediately preceding clause and proposes a connection. This usually makes a lot of sense, but in this case, it is incorrect. The start of a new strophe is already a first indication of this, but when the larger context is considered, there are clear syntactic arguments as well.

The infinitive absolute - *yiqtol* construction makes 5 discursive, and harkens back to the textual level of 1, in which אֵיכָה ('how?') marks discursive stance.⁸ From the point of view of participant references, the subject can not simply be the nearest matching explicit subject (שָׂרָתִי בְּמַדִּינֹת, 'princess among provinces'), because of a peculiarity of the first strophe: It actually has only one participant, who is 'introduced' by three different explicit epithets. The 3 f.sg verb in 5 refers all three of these, and must therefore be connected to 1–4 as a unit.

Note that the syntactic and strophic structures converge completely here. It is just that more sophisticated observations are needed than just morphological congruence and distance to see this.

⁸To be sure: the syntactic labels *disc_disc* and *non_disc_disc* are a bit of a misnomer: They register different degrees of salience / direct communication, rather than discursive or non-discursive speech per se. In the absence of signals to the contrary, *qatal* clauses within a discursive context are themselves also discursive. They are, however, less salient / direct.

Annotation 1.4

		accepted
בְּכֹוּ תִבְכֶּה בַּלַּיְלָהּ	5.	(Lam 1,2)
וּדְמַעֲתָהּ עַל לִחְיֶיהָ	6.	
Bitterly she weeps at night,	5.	(Lam 1,2)
tears on her cheeks.	6.	

syn04types	NmCl<xYq0 Cocj<0 prevlsub00 Sfx<pngV Npd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

The connection is no issue here, but the conjunction -וֹ deserves some attention. It does not appear to serve any obvious syntactic function, and may even be a bit redundant, as the two clauses it connects basically describe the same thing ('she cries'). Therefore, its function is primarily prosodic. It serves to clarify the start of the second colon, which could otherwise be unclear at first sight.⁹

Annotation 1.5

		proposed
וּדְמַעֲתָהּ עַל לִחְיֶיהָ	6.	(Lam 1,2)
אֵין-לָהּ מְנַחֵם מִכָּל-אֲהָבֶיהָ	7.	
tears on her cheeks.	6.	(Lam 1,2)
There is no one to comfort her among all her lovers.	7.	

syn04types	NmCl<NmCl 0<Cocj prevlpar00 0<Npd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting in- dep_indep same_clause_type
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

⁹van Grol 2017, 64.

	בְּכֹוּ תִבְכֶּה בַּלַּיְלָה	5.	corrected (Lam 1,2)
		<...>	
	אֵין־לָהּ מְנַחֵם מִכָּל־אֲהָבֶיהָ	7.	
	Bitterly she weeps at night,	5.	(Lam 1,2)
		<...>	
	There is no one to comfort her among all her lovers.	7.	

syn04types	NmCl<xYq0 Sfx<pngV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj_asyn asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe whole_verseline

Syn04types proposes to connect 7 to 6, which makes sense, as both are nominal clauses. However, the rhythm of the verselines prevents this, as it binds the clauses 5–6 together first. This bond also has some syntactic aspects:

- 5–6 are bonded by -וּ, so the asyndetic 7 is connected to the two clause atoms as a unit.
- Also, a new subject is introduced, although this does not help much. It is a secondary participant, its 3 f.sg suffix referring to the main participant: ‘a comforter from among **her** lovers’. In that respect, it does not differ formally from דְּמַעַתָּה (‘**her** tear’) in the preceding clause. Only semantics can preclude that the two have an equal status.

In this case, syntax and prosody do converge, but it is the cumulative evidence of both which makes the connection clear.

Annotation 1.6

	אֵין־לָהּ מְנַחֵם מִכָּל־אֲהָבֶיהָ	7.	proposed (Lam 1,2)
		<...>	
	הָיוּ לָהּ לְאִיְבִים: ס	9.	
	There is no one to comfort her among all her lovers.	7.	(Lam 1,2)
		<...>	
	they have become her enemies.	9.	

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl prevlpar00 prev2sub00 L...//...L 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx verb_to_other
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition

Syn04types reacts to the repetition of ל + suffix in 9 and the absence of a subject in 8. However, there is a mismatch in number between the subject of 8 and the verb of 9.

corrected

כָּל־רֵעִיהָ בָּגְדוּ בָּהּ 8. (Lam 1,2)
הָיוּ לָהּ לְאִיְבִים: ס 9.

All her friends have betrayed her, 8. (Lam 1,2)
they have become her enemies. 9.

syn04types	VBT<VBT prevlpar00 prev2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj sfx_to_sfx same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline end_of_strophe

The congruence that syn04types reports is incorrect. If anything, a connection could be seen between אֶהְבִּיָּהּ ('her enemies') and הָיוּ ('they have been'), but when the intermediate clause 8 is taken into account, it is obvious that הָיוּ refers to רֵעִיהָ ('her friends').

The connection is further strengthened by the fact that both clauses occur in the same verseline.

Annotation 1.7

proposed

הָיוּ לָהּ לְאִיְבִים: ס 9. (Lam 1,2)
גָּלְתָהּ יְהוּדָה מִעֲנִי וּמִרַב עֲבָדָה 10. (Lam 1,3)

they have become her enemies. 9. (Lam 1,2)
Judah has gone into exile, after suffering and harsh 10. (Lam 1,3)
labor.

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV pngV<Sfx Npd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

corrected

- אֵיכָהּ יֹשֶׁבֶת בְּדָד הָעִיר 1. (Lam 1,1)
- גִּלְתָּהּ יְהוּדָה מַעֲנִי וּמָרָב עֲבָדָה <...>
- How she sits alone, the city 1. (Lam 1,1)
- Judah has gone into exile, after suffering and harsh <...>
- labor. 10. (Lam 1,3)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV Npd2<Npd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

The main argument to start a new unit here is the explicit new subject יְהוּדָה ('Judah'). It coincides with the start of a new strophe.

Annotation 1.8**accepted**

- גִּלְתָּהּ יְהוּדָה מַעֲנִי וּמָרָב עֲבָדָה 10. (Lam 1,3)
- הִיא יֹשֶׁבֶת בִּגּוֹיִם 11.
- Judah has gone into exile, after suffering and harsh 10. (Lam 1,3)
- labor.
- She dwells among the nations, 11.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_prps prps_to_nmpr same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe new_verseline

The connection itself is not an issue here. The fronting the pers. pron. היא ('she') is probably connected to the fronting of כָּל־רֹדְפֶיהָ ('all her pursuers') in 13. Its function would appear to be largely prosodic, as it emphasizes the parallel positions of the two subjects, thus strengthening the parallel structures of the two verselines which they open.

A pragmatic effect, of setting apart 'she' and 'her pursuers' as the two parties in the situation, may also play a role, but not quite so strongly as to suggest a contrast ('She ...; all her pursuers, however, ...').

This type of fronting shows how fluent the boundary between purely syntactic phenomena (expressing specific syntactic or pragmatic functions) and prosodic phenomena (highlighting the prosodic structure) can sometimes be.

Annotation 1.9

		proposed
לא מצאה מנוח	12.	(Lam 1,3)
כל־רֹדְפֶיהָ הַשִּׁיגוּהָ בֵּין הַמְצָרִים: ס	13.	
she finds no rest.	12.	(Lam 1,3)
All her pursuers corner her in narrow places.	13.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	היא יִשְׁכָּה בַּגּוֹיִם	11. (Lam 1,3)
	<...>	
	כָּל־רֹדְפֶיהָ הִשְׁיִגוּהָ בֵּין הַמְּצָרִים: ס	13.
	She dwells among the nations,	11. (Lam 1,3)
	<...>	
	All her pursuers corner her in narrow places.	13.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	new_secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps Subj_Subj diff_verb.png secondary_part
prosodic	new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj end_of_strophe in_same_strophe whole_verseline

The connection is not an issue, as there are sufficient syntactic arguments to make it: The 3 f.sg suffix on the secondary participant ('all *her* pursuers') refers back to the main participant היא ('she', 11) moreover, both mother and daughter are XQt1 clauses, strengthening the connection between the two subjects. The prosodic structure, showing the start of a new verseline in 13 corroborates the argument.

Annotation 1.10

		proposed
	כָּל־רֹדְפֶיהָ הִשְׁיִגוּהָ בֵּין הַמְּצָרִים: ס	13. (Lam 1,3)
	דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבִלּוֹת מִבְּלִי בְּאֵי מוֹעֵד	14. (Lam 1,4)
	All her pursuers corner her in narrow places.	13. (Lam 1,3)
	The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the feasts.	14. (Lam 1,4)

syn04types	AjC1<XQt1 preV1par00 preV2sub01 pngV<pngV NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	גַּלְתָּהּ יְהוּדָה מֵעֲנִי וּמִרֶב עֲבָדָה	10. (Lam 1,3)
	< ... >	
	דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבָלוּת מִבְּלִי בְּאֵי מוֹעֵד	14. (Lam 1,4)
	Judah has gone into exile, after suffering and harsh labor.	10. (Lam 1,3)
	< ... >	
	The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the feasts.	14. (Lam 1,4)

syn04types	AjCl<ZQtX preVlpar00 MN...//..MN 0<NPd2 Npd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe whole_verseline

The introduction by name of an entirely new participant (Zion) has prompted me to start a new syntactic unit. The fronting of דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן can actually have a pragmatic meaning, because all clauses in this strophe have fronted subjects and in effect form an enumeration of sorts: ‘the roads to Zion, her gates, her priests, her young women, and she herself’.

Annotation 1.11

		proposed
	בְּתוֹלְתֶיהָ נוֹגֹת	17. (Lam 1,4)
	וְהִיא	18.
	her young women grieve.	17. (Lam 1,4)
	And as for herself:	18.

syn04types	CPen<Ptcp Cocj<0 preVlpar00 Npd1<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence fronting_fronting main_defect new_deictic
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_prps
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

		corrected
	דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבִלּוֹת מִבְּלִי בָּאִי מוֹעֵד	14. (Lam 1,4)
		< ... >
	וְהִיא	18.
	The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the	14. (Lam 1,4)
	feasts.	
		< ... >
	And as for herself:	18.

syn04types	CPen<AjCl Cocj<0 prevlpar00 NPd1<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence fronting_fronting main_defect new_deictic
participants	new_prps prps_to_nmpr Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The return to the primary participant ('and as for herself:') breaks, and thereby, closes, the pattern of the preceding lines (15–17), which all have a clause-initial subject referring to *secondary* participants ('her ...'). That this occurs in the last verse line of the strophe seems significant: The breaking of the pattern closes the strophe.

Annotation 1.12

		proposed
	דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבִלּוֹת מִבְּלִי בָּאִי מוֹעֵד	14. (Lam 1,4)
		< ... >
	מֶרֶץ-לָהּ: ס	19.
	The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the	14. (Lam 1,4)
	feasts.	
		< ... >
	It is bitter for her!	19.

syn04types	ZQt0<AjCl prevlpar00 prev2sub00 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoRe- ferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting in- dep_dep
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_other verb_to_other
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

corrected

וְהָיָא 18. (Lam 1,4)

מֶרֶץ־לָהּ: ס 19.

And as for herself: 18. (Lam 1,4)

It is bitter for her! 19.

syn04types	ZQt0<CPen 0<Cocj preVlpar00 preV2sub00 0<NPd1 NoRe-ferral Main<CPen
syntactic	cas_pend_to_main conj_async fronting_no_fronting same_sentence
participants	sfx_to_prps no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_other
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_colon

Annotation 1.13**proposed**

מֶרֶץ־לָהּ: ס 19. (Lam 1,4)

הָיוּ צָרִיחָ לְרֹאשׁ 20. (Lam 1,5)

It is bitter for her! 19. (Lam 1,4)

Her foes have become masters, 20. (Lam 1,5)

syn04types	VBT<VBT L...//...L perV<perV NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	async_async dep_indep diff_sentence no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבָלוּת מִבְּלִי בָּאִי מוֹעֵד 14. (Lam 1,4)

< ... >

הָיוּ צָרִיחָ לְרֹאשׁ 20. (Lam 1,5)

The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the feasts. 14. (Lam 1,4)

< ... >

Her foes have become masters, 20. (Lam 1,5)

syn04types	ZQtX<AjCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 0<Npd1 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting in- dep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj new_secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr sec- ondary_part sfx_to_other
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic chiasitic.Pred.Subj new.strophe strophe_first_to_first

One might be inclined to connect this clause to 18, since the 3 f.sg verb matches the pers. pron. הִיא ('she'), which makes this the closest antecedent. My considerations for choosing otherwise are the following:

- A new strophe starts here. In other cases, this has been shown to be an argument to connect to the preceding strophe as a whole.
- Furthermore, I see the casus pendens וְהִיא as a way of closing the strophe, rather than the reintroduction of the participant Zion.
- Semantically, there is a difference between the participants in vs 4 and vs 5: The former presents parties on the side of Zion, while the latter is all about her enemies.

I have decided to take the new strophe as a separate unit, which is connected to the preceding strophe as a whole.

Annotation 1.14

		proposed
	אִיבִיָּהּ שְׁלוֹ	21. (Lam 1,5)
	כִּי־יְהוָה הוֹגָה עַל רַב־פְּשָׁעֶיהָ	22.
	her enemies are at ease,	21. (Lam 1,5)
	for YHWH made her suffer because of her many sins.	22.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Socj<0 perV<perV Npd1<Npd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence fronting_fronting in- dep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel.Pred.Subj whole_verseline

		corrected
	הָיוּ צָרִיחַ לְרֹאשׁ 20.	(Lam 1,5)
	< ... >	
	כִּי־יִהְיֶה הַגָּה עַל רַב־פְּשָׁעֶיהָ 22.	
	Her foes have become masters, 20.	(Lam 1,5)
	< ... >	
	for YHWH made her suffer because of her many sins. 22.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT Socj<0 perV<perV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_conj diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	new_nmpr_Subj sfx_to_sfx Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

By itself, a connection of the כִּי clause to 21, as syn04types suggests, is conceivable: “Her enemies are at ease, because YHWH has brought her grief ...”. However, since 20–21 form a tightly knit verse line, with synonymous subjects, כִּי (‘because’) actually connects the clause to both, as a unit. The fronting of YHWH is pragmatically motivated: It seems to mean that the enemies delight especially in the fact that YHWH himself has caused Zion grief. It is also consistent with the introduction of a new participant (this is the first time YHWH is mentioned), but this carries only limited weight (see above, 14, vs 4.1). There is no reason to assume prosodic fronting here.

Annotation 1.15

		proposed
	עוֹלָלִיחַ הֶלְכוּ שְׁבִי לַפְּנֵי־צָר: ס 23.	(Lam 1,5)
	וַיֵּצֵא מִן* בֵּת־צִיּוֹן כָּל־הַדָּרָה 24.	(Lam 1,6)
	Her little ones have gone into exile as prisoners 23.	(Lam 1,5)
	before the foe.	
	All splendor has left Daughter Zion. 24.	(Lam 1,6)

syn04types	WayX<XQt1 Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 perV<perV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt fronting_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_nmpr_other next_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

corrected

דְּרָכֵי צִיּוֹן אֲבֵלוֹת מִבְּלִי בְּאֵי מוֹעֵד 14. (Lam 1,4)

<...>

וַיֵּצֵא מִן* בֶּת-צִיּוֹן כָּל-הַדָּרָה 24. (Lam 1,6)

The ways to Zion mourn, for no one comes to the 14. (Lam 1,4)
feasts.

<...>

All splendor has left Daughter Zion. 24. (Lam 1,6)

syn04types	WayX<AjCl Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 ParalLex01 MN...//..MN NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting in- dep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_other sfx_to_other
prosodic	lexical_repetition strophe_to_strophe acrostic chi- astic_Pred_Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

The renominalization of Zion is an important syntactic observation in favor of this connection. That it occurs at the start of a new strophe is another indication of a new start. In that sense, this clause relation shows complete congruence between participant domains and strophic structures, which is in itself not remarkable. What is remarkable, however, is that a *wayyiqtol* is made the opening clause of a larger unit. Throughout much of Lamentations, *qatal* clauses form the main line of discourse, with *wayyiqtol* clauses in a subordinate role, but here things are the other way around.

It seems clear that the demands of the acrostic have caused the divergent syntactic hierarchy of Lam 1,6. For a more detailed discussion of the influence of the acrostic on syntactic hierarchy, see Chapter 10 of the dissertation. There, I will also demonstrate that the apparent tension between prosodic and syntactic demands appear to have caused a somewhat confusing mix of linguistic signals and clause relations.

As an aside: Note that the participants label *sfx_to_other* has been assigned incorrectly. The label notes congruence between the 3 f.sg suffix on הַ

הַדָּר ('her splendor') and a f.sg element in the preceding clause, which must be Zion in דָּרְכֵי־צִיּוֹן. However, the suffix actually has clause-internal reference, to Daughter Zion in מִן *בֵּת־צִיּוֹן. This has been missed because it is 'hidden' in the complement of the verb.

Annotation 1.16

	26.	לֹא־מָצְאוּ מְרֻעָה	accepted
	27.	וַיֵּלְכוּ בְּלֹא־כֹחַ לִפְנֵי רוֹדְף: ס	(Lam 1,6)
	26.	that find no pasture,	(Lam 1,6)
	27.	and fled, for lack of strength, before the pursuer.	

syn04types	Way0<xQt0 Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

Note that this *wayyiqtol* clause can not be connected to the *wayyiqtol* clause opening the strophe (24), because of the 3 m.pl participant references, which bind it to שָׂרִיָּה ('her princes' 25). It has the role which is usual for *wayyiqtol* clauses in Lamentations: as a continuation of a *qatal* clause. This confirms my contention, that the *wayyiqtol* in 24 has not been selected for a syntactic purpose (e.g., to start a short narrative), but only because the acrostic required a clause starting on a ל.

Annotation 1.17

	25.	הָיוּ שָׂרִיָּה כְּאַיִלִים	proposed
		< ... >	(Lam 1,6)
	28.	זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּה כָּל מַחְמְדִיָּה	(Lam 1,7)
	25.	Her princes have become like deer	(Lam 1,6)
		< ... >	
	28.	Jerusalem remembered, in the days of her misery and wandering, all the treasures	(Lam 1,7)

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep.indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc.non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj.Subj diff_verb.png new_indep.Subj new_nmpr.Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallel_Pred.Subj stro- phe.first.to.other

corrected

גָּלְתָּהּ יְהוּדָה מֵעֲנִי וּמִרֶב עֲבָדָה 10. (Lam 1,3)

<...>

זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּה כָּל מַחֲמָדֶיהָ 28. (Lam 1,7)

Judah has gone into exile, after suffering and harsh labor. 10. (Lam 1,3)

<...>

Jerusalem remembered, in the days of her misery and wandering, all the treasures 28. (Lam 1,7)

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep.indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc.non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj.Subj new_nmpr.Subj new_indep.Subj same_verb.png
prosodic	acrostic lexical_repetition new_strophe par- allel_Pred.Subj strophe_first_to_first stro- phe.to.strophe

The clause structure 0QtX with a proper noun in the subject appears to have a structuring function in this poem.

Annotation 1.18**proposed**

אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ מִיָּמֵי קֶדֶם 29. (Lam 1,7)

בְּנֶפֶל עֲמָהּ בְּיַד־צָר 30.

that have been there from days of old; 29. (Lam 1,7)
(the days) that her people fell into enemy hands 30.

syn04types	InfC<xQt0 prevV2par00 0<Socj NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoRefer- ral Adju<Main
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_dep diff_vt same_sentence
participants	no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדֶיהָ כָּל מַחְמָדֶיהָ 28. (Lam 1,7)

< ... >

בְּנֶפֶל עֲמָה בְּיַד־צָר 30.

Jerusalem remembered, in the days of her misery and 28. (Lam 1,7)
wandering, all the treasures

< ... >

(the days) that her people fell into enemy hands 30.

syn04types	InfC<ZQtX prevV2par00 Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx Adju<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_vt indep_dep no_fronting_no_fronting same_sentence
participants	new_secondary_part Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj

The infinitive construct clause 30 is an adjunct to 28–29 as a whole, rather than to 29 only. The semantics of this verse make this evident: The meaning can only be, that Jerusalem remembers her treasures ‘when her people fall’, not “... in the days of old, when her people fell ...”.

The verseline structure makes this clear: 28–29 form a verse line as well as a single clause, as do 30–31.

Annotation 1.19**proposed**

בְּנֶפֶל עֲמָה בְּיַד־צָר 30. (Lam 1,7)

< ... >

רְאוּהָ צָרִים 32.

(the days) that her people fell into enemy hands 30. (Lam 1,7)

< ... >

The foes saw her, 32.

syn04types	ZQtX<InfC preV1sub00 preV2par00 ParalLex01 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn asyn_conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj

		corrected
	זְכָרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּה כָּל מַחֲמָדֶיהָ	28. (Lam 1,7)
		< ... >
	רְאוּהָ צָרִים	32.
	Jerusalem remembered, in the days of her misery and	28. (Lam 1,7)
	wandering, all the treasures	
		< ... >
	The foes saw her,	32.

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_nmpr Subj_Subj diff_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj

This line introduces a new secondary participant; the suffix on רְאוּהָ indicates that Jerusalem is still the main participant. As 28–31 form a single sentence, 32 is connected to this entire unit. It also starts a new verse line, with the same clause type as 28 (0QtX).

Annotation 1.20

		accepted
	זְכָרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדִיָּה כָּל מַחֲמָדֶיהָ	28. (Lam 1,7)
		< ... >
	חָטָא חָטָאָה יְרוּשָׁלַם	34. (Lam 1,8)
	Jerusalem remembered, in the days of her misery and	28. (Lam 1,7)
	wandering, all the treasures	
		< ... >
	Jerusalem has sinned greatly,	34. (Lam 1,8)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 ParalLex01 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn same_vt diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	lexical_repetition parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Annotation 1.21

proposed

עַל־כֵּן לְנִידָה הִיטָהּ 35. (Lam 1,8)
כָּל־מְכַבְּדֶיהָ הִזְלִיחָהּ 36.

therefore she has become unclean. 35. (Lam 1,8)
All who respected her despise her, 36.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting in- dep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

חָטָא חָטָאָה יְרוּשָׁלַם 34. (Lam 1,8)

< ... >

כָּל־מְכַבְּדֶיהָ הִזְלִיחָהּ 36.

Jerusalem has sinned greatly, 34. (Lam 1,8)

< ... >

All who respected her despise her, 36.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 perV<perV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting in- dep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	new_secondary_part Subj_Subj diff_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_nmpr
prosodic	new_verseline chiastic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe

The introduction of a new secondary subject in 36, the fact that this clause atom has its own dependent daughter (37, lookahead needed to see this), and the start of the new verseline have been decisive in connecting this clause to 34–35 as a whole. 36 has a fronted subject. This may be explained as expressing contrast to the reader's expectations: Those who have always honored her, of all people, now despise her. This, then, is regular pragmatic fronting and does not appear to have a prosodic reason.

Annotation 1.22

proposed

כִּי־רָאוּ עֲרוֹתֶיהָ 37. (Lam 1,8)

גַּם־הִיא נֹאנְחָה 38.

for they see her naked. 37. (Lam 1,8)

She herself groans 38.

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 0<Socj perV<perV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

חָטָא חָטָאָה יְרוּשָׁלַם 34. (Lam 1,8)

<...>

גַּם־הִיא נֹאנְחָה 38.

Jerusalem has sinned greatly, 34. (Lam 1,8)

<...>

She herself groans 38.

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	async_async diff_sentence fronting_fronting in- dep_indep new_deictic non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_prps prps_to_nmpr same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

Multiple connections are possible here: The pers. pron. **היא** reintroduces Jerusalem, in a new verseline at that, so the connection to 34 seems plausible. However, the particle **גַּם** does appear to connect to 36–37 as well: “All who honored her, despise her ... *She herself* groans ...” **גַּם** relates the action by Jerusalem to that of her former admirers.

The occurrence of the personal pronoun, which initiates a new chain of references (lookahead is needed to see this), together with the prosodic structure (new verseline, which closes the strophe by returning to the main participant) has tipped the balance in favor of the connection with 34.

Annotation 1.23

	proposed
גַּם־הִיא נֶאֱנָחָה	38. (Lam 1,8)
< ... >	
טִמְאַתָּה בְּשׁוּלֶיָּהּ	40. (Lam 1,9)
She herself groans	38. (Lam 1,8)
< ... >	
her filthiness on her skirts.	40. (Lam 1,9)

syn04types	NmCl<XQt1 preV1par00 Sfx<pngV NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence front-ing_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj new_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_prps
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallelPred_Subj stro-phe_first_to_other

	corrected
וַתֵּשֶׁב אַחֲרָיו: ס	39. (Lam 1,8)
טִמְאַתָּה בְּשׁוּלֶיָּהּ	40. (Lam 1,9)
and turns back,	39. (Lam 1,8)
her filthiness on her skirts.	40. (Lam 1,9)

syn04types	NmCl<Way0 0<Cocj preV1par00 Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting
participants	new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro-phe_first_to_other

Nominal clauses are generally difficult to place into a textual hierarchy, be-

cause they can have many different syntactic and pragmatic functions. In this case, multiple connections are possible:

- As a fronted setting clause, or even circumstantial adjunct, to 41: ‘With her filthiness [showing] on her skirts, she no longer cares about her end.’
- As backgrounded circumstantial clause to 39: ‘...and backs away, her filthiness [showing] on her skirts.’
- As a continuation of 38–39 as a whole: ‘As for her: she moans and backs away, her filthiness [showing] on her skirts.’

The first option would fit the prosodic structure: 40 is the start of the \mathfrak{v} -strophe. However, the contents of the clause fit much better into 34–39, which form a strophe about Jerusalem’s public humiliation.

The choice between the second and third option is very difficult. I have opted, tentatively, for the second one, because semantically the filth showing on her skirt is more directly related to Jerusalem’s backing away in shame than to her groaning.

Another reason for this choice is that the same sequence of clauses (*qatal* - *way0* - nominal clause) occurs in the immediately following clauses 41–43. In these clauses, the verselines bind the *way0* and the nominal clause into a unit.

My choice has a remarkable prosodic consequence: It creates a kind of syntactic enjambement, as the sentence starting on 38 (גַּם־הִיא) spills over into the next strophe. This may be connected to the fact that \mathfrak{v} is one of the more difficult letters in a Hebrew acrostic (see Table 10.2 on page 216 of the dissertation). Possibly, the poet has had to strike a compromise between syntactic integrity and strict prosodic demands and has arrived at a somewhat imperfect solution. This speaks to my contention that not every choice by the Hebrew poets is necessarily perfect; sometimes, traces of the poet’s struggle can be recognized.¹⁰

Annotation 1.24

		proposed
טִמְאַתָּה בְּשׁוּלֶיךָ	40.	(Lam 1,9)
לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֵיתָהּ	41.	
her filthiness on her skirts.	40.	(Lam 1,9)
She had not considered her future	41.	

¹⁰See my discussion of Watson and Fokkelman, esp. note 27 on page 23 of the dissertation. See Sections 10.2.2 and 10.3.2 of the dissertation for more examples of such struggles because of the acrostic.

syn04types	xQt0<NmC1 preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<Sfx Npd2<0 0<Npd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_no_Subj verb_to_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

גַּם־הִיא נֹאנְחָה	38.	(Lam 1,8)
< ... >		
לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֶיהָ	41.	(Lam 1,9)
She herself groans	38.	(Lam 1,8)
< ... >		
She had not considered her future	41.	(Lam 1,9)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0 0<Npd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn same_vt diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj verb_to_prps Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_prps
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

Annotation 1.25**proposed**

לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֶיהָ	41.	(Lam 1,9)
< ... >		
אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ	43.	
She had not considered her future	41.	(Lam 1,9)
< ... >		
with no one to comfort her.	43.	

syn04types	Ptcp<xQt0 preV1par00 preV2par00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV 0<Npd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep neg_neg no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
וַתֵּרֶד פְּלִאִים	42.	(Lam 1,9)
אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ	43.	
and fell amazingly,	42.	(Lam 1,9)
with no one to comfort her.	43.	

syn04types	Ptcp<Way0 0<Cocj prev1par00 prev2par00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Pred no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Syn04types suggests a connection of 43 with 41, presumably because both are negative clauses. However, the verseline rhythm binds 43 to 42, almost as an adjunct: “She has come down amazingly, without a comforter for her.”

Annotation 1.26

		proposed
אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ	43.	(Lam 1,9)
רֵאָה	44.	
with no one to comfort her.	43.	(Lam 1,9)
“See,	44.	

syn04types	ZIm0<Ptcp prev1par00 prev2par00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_async diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep non_disc_disc root
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_strophe diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

Annotation 1.27

		proposed
אֶת-עֲנִי	46.	(Lam 1,9)
כִּי הִגְדִּיל אוֹיֵב: ס	47.	
my misery,	46.	(Lam 1,9)
for the enemy triumphs!”	47.	

syn04types	xQtX<Defc preV2sub00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj defect_main dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

corrected

ראה	44.	(Lam 1,9)
< ... >		
כי הגדיל אויב: ס	47.	
"See,	44.	(Lam 1,9)
< ... >		
for the enemy triumphs!"	47.	

syn04types	xQtX<ZIm0 preV2par00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV Subj<0 Objc<Main
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	to_multi_clause_colon A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

44–46 form a single clause. 47 is therefore connected to this unit as a whole. Syn04types appears to have missed this pattern.

Annotation 1.28**proposed**

כי הגדיל אויב: ס	47.	(Lam 1,9)
ידו פרש צר על כל-מחמדיה	48.	(Lam 1,10)
for the enemy triumphs!"	47.	(Lam 1,9)
The foe laid hands on all her treasures.	48.	(Lam 1,10)

syn04types	VBt<VBt preV1sub00 0<Socj pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

This proposal by syn04types would make sense in isolation: Two *qatal* clauses,

each with its own third person subject; the two subjects are synonymous (even though *syn04types* does not register this. This proposal is incorrect because 47 and 48 are in different speech domains. However, this can only be registered when the entire unit to which 47 belongs, is taken into account. The tell-tale 2 m.sg and 1 sg references occur throughout 44–46, just not in 47.

		corrected
	לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֵיהָ	41. (Lam 1,9)
	<...>	
	יָדוֹ פָּרַשׁ צֹר עַל כָּל־מַחְמַדֶּיהָ	48. (Lam 1,10)
	She had not considered her future	41. (Lam 1,9)
	<...>	
	The foe laid hands on all her treasures.	48. (Lam 1,10)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 perV<perV numV<numV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj sfx_to_Pred diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

Syn04types proposes a connection with 47, because it is another *qatal* clause and because there is congruence between the suffix on יָדוֹ ('his hand') and the verb הִגְדִּיל ('[he] is triumphant'). Formally, this is incorrect, as the suffix syntactically refers to צֹר ('the foe', 48), rather than to אֹיֵב ('the enemy', 47) even though referentially the two are obviously identical.

Even so, a connection between 48 and 47 would be quite possible in isolation. However, when the broader syntactic and prosodic contexts are considered, this is obviously incorrect. First of all, there is a change of speech. The interruption by Zion / Jerusalem (Lam 1,10) has ended, the speaker of vs 9 resumes. This is marked by a return to third person verb forms, but most of all by 3 f.sg suffixes referring to Jerusalem, rather than first- and second-person references.

That Jerusalem is not renominalized, further indicates that the discourse from vs 9 simply continues where it left off. The start of a new strophe further contributes to the separation from the immediately preceding clause atoms. This, then, is a case where a change in speech situation *does* coincide with the start of a new strophe.

Annotation 1.29

		proposed
	יָדוּ פָּרֶשׁ צָר עַל כָּל־מַחֲמָדֶיהָ	48. (Lam 1,10)
	< ... >	
	גוֹיִם בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשָׁה	50.
	The foe laid hands on all her treasures.	48. (Lam 1,10)
	< ... >	
	foreign peoples enter her sanctuary,	50.

syn04types	VBT<VB preVlpar00 perV<perV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async asyn_conj_async diff_sentence front-ing_fronting indep_dep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
	כִּי־רָאָתָה	49. (Lam 1,10)
	גוֹיִם בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשָׁה	50.
	She even saw	49. (Lam 1,10)
	foreign peoples enter her sanctuary,	50.

syn04types	VBT<VB preVlsub00 0<Socj perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	Objc_clause conj_async indep_dep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_sentence same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon

It requires a rather complex set of observations to determine that 50 is the object of רָאָתָה ('she saw', 49):

- √ראה ('to see') is a verb that usually has an object. This object may be a physical or animate object, but also an event or fact ('to see *that* ...), but any such object is missing from 49.
- 49 is immediately followed by an asyndetic clause with the subject in initial position, which makes it a suitable object of רָאָתָה: "She has seen nations enter ..."

The syntactic clause atom pair label *Objc_clause* has this pattern as one of its definitions.

Annotation 1.30

כי־רָאֵתָהּ 49. **proposed**
(Lam 1,10)

< ... >

אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָהּ 51.

She even saw 49. (Lam 1,10)

< ... >

of whom you had ordered: 51.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<Socj 1/2P<3rdP numV<numV >CR<KJ
syntactic	conj_conj diff_salience indep_dep non_disc_disc same_clause_type same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

גוֹיִם בָּאוּ מִקְדָּשָׁהּ 50. **corrected**
(Lam 1,10)

אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָהּ 51.

foreign peoples enter her sanctuary, 50. (Lam 1,10)

of whom you had ordered: 51.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2sub00 Socj<0 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd2 0<Subj Rela<Main
syntactic	Attr.clause asyn_conj dep_dep diff_salience non_disc_disc same_sentence same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

Annotation 1.31

אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָהּ 51. **proposed**
(Lam 1,10)

< ... >

כָּל־עַמָּה נֹאנְחִים 53. (Lam 1,11)

of whom you had ordered: 51. (Lam 1,10)

< ... >

All her people groan, 53. (Lam 1,11)

syn04types	Ptcp<xQt0 preVlsub00 0<Socj 3rdP<1/2P Npd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

יָדוּ פָּרֶשׁ צָר עַל כָּל־מַחֲמָדֶיהָ	48.	(Lam 1,10)
< ... >		
כָּל־עַמָּה נֹאנְחִים	53.	(Lam 1,11)
The foe laid hands on all her treasures.	48.	(Lam 1,10)
< ... >		
All her people groan,	53.	(Lam 1,11)

syn04types	Ptcp<xQtX preVlpar00 ParalLex01 Npd1<Npd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe.to.strophe acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj lexical_repetition new_strophe strophe_first_to_first

It is difficult to say where exactly this clause should be connected. Various options present themselves, which each render a slightly different internal hierarchy of 34–56. In fact, however, these differences are subtle to the point of being immaterial. The main participant throughout is Jerusalem. The various other participants are clearly secondary in that they are continually related to Jerusalem by suffixes referring to her. The relative syntactic and thematic independence of the strophes create the effect of the various participant domains being presented like beads on a string, rather than as a hierarchic structure.

Annotation 1.32**proposed**

מִבְּקָשִׁים לֶחֶם	54.	(Lam 1,11)
נָתְנוּ *מַחֲמֹדֵיהֶם בְּאֶכָּל	55.	
looking for bread;	54.	(Lam 1,11)
they give their treasures for food	55.	

syn04types	ZQt0<Ptcp pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

Syn04types nor labelman have spotted that 54 ('looking for bread') is actually an adjunct clause to 53 ('All her people moan, ...'). This connection, however, blocks the attachment of an asyndetic *qatal* clause to the adjunct.

	corrected
כָּל-עֲמָה נֹאנְחִים	53. (Lam 1,11)
< ... >	
נָתְנוּ *מַחְמוּרֵיהֶם בָּאֵל	55.
All her people groan,	53. (Lam 1,11)
< ... >	
they give their treasures for food	55.

syn04types	ZQt0<Ptcp preVlpar00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0 0<Npd1 0<Subj
syntactic	indep_indep asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt front- ing_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe

In isolation, the proposal by syn04types makes sense, but the broader context needs to be taken into account. 53–54 belong together syntactically as well as prosodically; 55 is connected to them as a whole.

Annotation 1.33

	proposed
לְהָשִׁיב נַפְשׁ	56. (Lam 1,11)
רֵאָה	57.
to restore themselves.	56. (Lam 1,11)
"See,	57.

syn04types	ZIm0<InfC preVlsub00 preV2par00 1/2P<3rdP
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt root
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_strophe diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

Again, as in vs 9, Zion / Jerusalem interrupts the anonymous narrator, addressing YHWH, and again, this happens within a strophe, not at its start. 57 has been made a root clause; it does not have a relation to 56, even though it is indented to it.

Annotation 1.34

proposed

וְהִבִּיטָה 59. (Lam 1,11)
כִּי הָיִיתִי זֹלֵלָה: ס 60.
and take notice, 59. (Lam 1,11)
how despicable I have become.” 60.

syn04types	xQt0<WIm0 0<Cocj preV2par00 Socj<0 numV<numV
syntactic	Objc_clause conj_conj diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

corrected

רָאָה 57. (Lam 1,11)
<...>
כִּי הָיִיתִי זֹלֵלָה: ס 60.
“See, 57. (Lam 1,11)
<...>
how despicable I have become.” 60.

syn04types	xQt0<ZIm0 preV2par00 Socj<0 numV<numV Objc<Main
syntactic	Objc_clause indep_dep asyn_conj diff_vt disc_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon end_of_strophe to_multi_clause_colon

The question here is, whether כִּי (‘that’) connects this clause to 559 alone, or to both 57 and 59. Syn04types opts for the former, which is in agreement with Berlin’s translation: “Look, LORD, and see what a beggar I have become.”¹¹ Hillers chooses the latter (“O LORD, look and consider / how worthless I have become!”,¹² as does Renkema: “Look, YHWH, and observe, how worthless

¹¹Berlin 2002, 43.

¹²Hillers 1992, 62.

I have become!”¹³ The fact that both $\sqrt{\text{ראה}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{נבט}}$ (hi.) usually have a complement, in combination with the fact that the two are placed within a single colon, suggests that they are in fact coordinated. The כי clause is to be connected to the two as a whole.

Annotation 1.35

		proposed
	כִּי הָיִיתִי זֹלֶלָה: ס	60. (Lam 1,11)
	לֹא אֲלִיכֶם	61. (Lam 1,12)
	how despicable I have become.”	60. (Lam 1,11)
	“Does it not concern you,	61. (Lam 1,12)

syn04types	NmCl<xQt0 0<Socj NoReferral
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc ellipsis root same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_first_sec
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

Annotation 1.36

		proposed
	כָּל־עֹבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ	62. (Lam 1,12)
	הַבֵּיטוּ	63.
	all you passing by on the way?	62. (Lam 1,12)
	Take notice	63.

syn04types	ZIm0<Voct prev1par00 prev2sub00 1/2P<3rdP Main<Voct
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj sec_ps_to_voca
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

¹³Renkema 1998, 150–151.

corrected
 61. (Lam 1,12) לֹא אֵלֵיכֶם

< ... >
 63. הִבִּיטוּ

61. (Lam 1,12) "Does it not concern you,

< ... >
 63. Take notice

syn04types	ZIm0<NmCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep same_salience
participants	verb_to_sfx no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

Annotation 1.37

proposed
 64. (Lam 1,12) וִרְאוּ
 65. אִם־יֵישׁ מִכְאוֹב כְּמִכְאֹבִי
 64. (Lam 1,12) and see:
 65. Is any pain like pain

syn04types	NmCl<WIm0 0<Cocj Socj<0 Subj<0 NoReferral Objc<Main
syntactic	Objc_clause conj_conj disc_disc indep_dep same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected
 63. (Lam 1,12) הִבִּיטוּ
 < ... >
 65. אִם־יֵישׁ מִכְאוֹב כְּמִכְאֹבִי
 63. (Lam 1,12) Take notice
 < ... >
 65. Is any pain like pain

syn04types	NmCl<ZIm0 Socj<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	Objc_clause indep_dep asyn_conj disc_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	to_multi_verb_colon B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc to_multi_clause_colon

Again, the verbs **ראה** and **נבט** (hi.) are coordinated. As 57 and 59, the verbs share a single colon, which is a strong binding force. Also, their order is reversed here, which confirms that they are coordinated into a single compound predicate (“Observe and see if ...”).

Annotation 1.38

		proposed
	אֲשֶׁר עוֹלֵל לִי	66. (Lam 1,12)
	אֲשֶׁר הוֹגָה יְהוָה בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ: ס	67.
	that he caused to me,	66. (Lam 1,12)
	which YHWH made me suffer on the day of his	67.
	burning anger?	

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalPre00 Socj<Socj Coor<Main 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0 Rela<Main
syntactic	conj_conj dep_dep diff_salience disc_non.disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_conj same_sentence same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	אִם-יֵישׁ מִכָּאוֹב כְּמִכָּאֲבִי	65. (Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
	אֲשֶׁר הוֹגָה יְהוָה בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ: ס	67.
	Is any pain like pain	65. (Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
	which YHWH made me suffer on the day of his	67.
	burning anger?	

syn04types	xQtX<NmCl preV2sub00 Socj<Socj 3rdP<1/2P Npd2<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral Rela<Main >CR<>M
syntactic	Attr_clause conj.conj dep_dep diff_salience disc_non_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_sentence
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

Annotation 1.39

	proposed	
אֲשֶׁר הוֹגָה יְהוָה בְּיוֹם חָרוֹן אַפּוֹ: ס	67.	(Lam 1,12)
מִמָּרוֹם שָׁלַח-אֵשׁ בְּעֶצְמֹתַי	68.	(Lam 1,13)
which YHWH made me suffer on the day of his	67.	(Lam 1,12)
burning anger?		
From on high he sent fire into my bones,	68.	(Lam 1,13)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 0<Socj B...//...B 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<Npd2 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	conj_async dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence no_fronting_fronting non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected	
הַבִּיטוּ	63.	(Lam 1,12)
<...>		
מִמָּרוֹם שָׁלַח-אֵשׁ בְּעֶצְמֹתַי	68.	(Lam 1,13)
Take notice	63.	(Lam 1,12)
<...>		
From on high he sent fire into my bones,	68.	(Lam 1,13)

syn04types	xQt0<ZIm0 preV1par00 NoReferral
syntactic	async_async diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	new_strophe B_colon_A_colon acrostic strophe_first_to_other

This line is difficult to place into the textual hierarchy. I see various options:

- To 67, since the implied subject is YHWH, who is mentioned there explic-

itly;

- To 65–66, since there the clause starts which directly reports YHWH's action against the speaker;
- To 63–67, since it starts an elaboration on the rhetorical questions of which these lines consist.
- To 61–67 as a whole because a new strophe starts.

I opt for the connection to the complex sentence 63–67. Note that in 66–67, YHWH is introduced as a new participant. This introduction happens at the end of the strophe, rather than at its beginning. Also syntactically, this introduction is remarkable: It happens in two dependent, attributive clauses, as if YHWH is only mentioned on the side. Yet, YHWH is the main actor in the following clauses (68–77).

This phenomenon, which happens more often in Lamentations, is a clear indication that the structure of participant references should be charted as a structure on its own, apart from the syntactic and prosodic structures.

Annotation 1.40

	נְתַנִּי שִׁמְמָה	72.	proposed (Lam 1,13)
		< ... >	
	נִשְׁקַד עַל פְּשָׁעַי	74.	(Lam 1,14)
	he made me desolate,	72.	(Lam 1,13)
		< ... >	
	The yoke of my sins was bound together,	74.	(Lam 1,14)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	מִמְרוֹם שְׁלַח-אֵשׁ בְּעֶצְמֹתַי	68.	corrected (Lam 1,13)
		< ... >	
	נִשְׁקַד עַל פְּשָׁעַי	74.	(Lam 1,14)
	From on high he sent fire into my bones,	68.	(Lam 1,13)
		< ... >	
	The yoke of my sins was bound together,	74.	(Lam 1,14)

syn04types	VBt<VBt prevlpar00 prev2sub00 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front-ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe.first.to.first acrostic new_strophe strophe_to_strophe

The syntactic and prosodic signals appear to point in different directions here. Syntactically, 74 introduces a secondary participant ('the yoke of my sins'), which temporarily interrupts the line of clauses in which YHWH is the subject. This line is resumed in 77. This would suggest that the unit 74–76 be indented / backgrounded to 72.

Prosodically, however, the shift from YHWH to another participant opens a strophe. It changes the point of view, and therefore a new train of thought. This would suggest that 74 is the head of a new syntactic unit, 75–77. For 77, this would mean that is primarily a continuation of 76 than a return to the clauses with YHWH as subject. The internal structure of these lines supports this: In 74–75, a clause about 'my sins' is paired with a clause that refers to an action by YHWH; the same happens in 76–77.

After hard deliberation, I have chosen to go with the prosodic option. This mostly has to do with the separating force of the strophe opening in 74 and with the unlikelihood of 77 really rejoining the 0Qt0 line of 70–72. For this, the distance would seem rather large, while the 0Qt0 does not continue *after* 77 (a new line begins with the mention of the name Adonay in 78).

Annotation 1.41

accepted

נִשְׁקַד עַל פִּשְׁעֵי 74. (Lam 1,14)
בִּידוֹ יִשְׁתַּרְגֹּוּ 75.

The yoke of my sins was bound together, 74. (Lam 1,14)
by *his* hands they are woven! 75.

syn04types	xYq0<ZQtX prevlpar00 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV Sfx<pngV 0<Npd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline qatal_yiqtol_verseline

This is one of the few cases in Lamentations where a shift from *qatal* to *yiqtol* or v.v. happens between the cola of a verseline, without there being very clear reasons for it. According to Kalkman's system,¹⁴ this relation should be analyzed as expressing:

- Discursive secondary line, retrospective "Now that the yoke of my sins has been fashioned, ...", followed by:
- Discursive main line, zero perspective: "they are [being] entwined by his hand."

I highly doubt this analysis: For a start, I do not believe that there is a difference in temporal perspective here. The message is not that the yoke was first fashioned (by whom?), after which YHWH is presently entwining it. Furthermore, the main line of this part of the poem is not formed by *yiqtol*s but by *qatal*s. If the *yiqtol* form would really be the main line of the communication, it would be the only clause in that line. If there is any meaning to be assigned to this shift, I propose that it indicates a difference in salience. The *yiqtol* form expresses the same shock as the fronted **בְּיָדוֹ**:

The yoke of my sins was bound together—by *his* hands it is woven!

It is interesting, that the participants label `changing_speech_situation` has been assigned. Even though it is clearly a mistake, it speaks to the fact that this *yiqtol* clause has the character of an aside, addressed to the audience much more directly than the surrounding *qatal* clauses.

There is another matter here: the confusing use of 3 m.sg references in this verse. Even though the suffix on **בְּיָדוֹ** ('by *his* hand') formally matches the verb and subject of **נִשְׁקָד עַל פִּשְׁעֵי** ('the yoke of my sins is entwined'), it of course refers to another participant altogether: YHWH. Thus, the labels `sfx_to_Subj` and `sfx_to_Pred`, although formally correct, are actually in error. However, there is no way to correct this by formal observations, as the shift in the reference of the 3 m.sg forms is not marked in any way, and can only be recognized via semantics.

¹⁴Kalkman, concordance of patterns: 0QṭX followed by xYq0 receives pattern number 612, which covers a broader range of connections: asyndetic *yiqtol* clauses with a fronted element other than the subject, connected to any asyndetic *qatal* clauses.

Annotation 1.42

		accepted
נִשְׁקַד עַל פְּשָׁעַי	74.	(Lam 1,14)
	< ... >	
עָלוּ עַל-צִוְּאָרַי	76.	
The yoke of my sins was bound together,	74.	(Lam 1,14)
	< ... >	
They were hung on my neck,	76.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV 0<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline

The real argument for this connection is, that the verb in 76 refers to פְּשָׁעַי ('my sins') in 74. However, this reference is 'hidden' within the phrase עַל פְּשָׁעַי ('the yoke of my sins'), which as a whole is singular. In principle it should be possible to draw up MQL patterns describing this type of connection, but this requires a more detailed study of the intricacies of participant references, which falls outside the scope of this study.

Annotation 1.43

		proposed
הִכְשִׁיל כָּחִי	77.	(Lam 1,14)
נָתַנִּי אֲדֹנָי בְּיָדֵי	78.	
he sapped my strength.	77.	(Lam 1,14)
Adonay has given me into the hands of those	78.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	הַבִּיטוּ	63. (Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
	נְתַנֵּנִי אֲדֹנָי בְּיָדֵי	78. (Lam 1,14)
	Take notice	63. (Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
	Adonay has given me into the hands of those	78. (Lam 1,14)

syn04types	ZQtX<ZIm0 NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc indep.indep same_salience
participants	diff.verb.png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon diff_strophe end_of_strophe new_verseline_conc strophe_other_to_other

The new subject אֲדֹנָי (Adonay) starts a new participant domain, while it is still being spoken by the same first person speaker. It is in fact a second thing the passers-by should see and hear. On the other hand, Adonay is referentially identical to 'he' / YHWH in the preceding unit. Therefore, it could just as well be interpreted as continuing these references, as syn04types suggests.

The fact of the matter is, that the signals are somewhat conflicting, and the units are relatively independent, which makes any firm decision on cases like this difficult. In the end, I have given the most weight to the 'renominalization' of YHWH / Adonay as a significant syntactic signal.

Annotation 1.44

		proposed
	קוֹם: ס	80. (Lam 1,14)
	סָלָה כָּל-אַבְיָרֵי אֲדֹנָי בְּקִרְבִּי	81. (Lam 1,15)
	withstand.	80. (Lam 1,14)
	Adonay tossed aside all warriors in my midst;	81. (Lam 1,15)

syn04types	ZQtX<InfC 1/2P<3rdP NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	corrected	
נְתַנִּי אֶדְנִי בְיָדֵי	78.	(Lam 1,14)
	< ... >	
סָלָה כָּל־אֲבִירֵי אֶדְנִי בְּקֶרְבִּי	81.	(Lam 1,15)
Adonay has given me into the hands of those	78.	(Lam 1,14)
	< ... >	
Adonay tossed aside all warriors in my midst;	81.	(Lam 1,15)

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 B...//...B pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	new_nmpr_Subj sfx_to_sfx Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	lexical_repetition acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

Annotation 1.45

	proposed	
לִשְׁבֹּר בַּחֲוֹרֵי	83.	(Lam 1,15)
גַּת דָּרָךְ אֶדְנִי לְבַתּוּלַת בֵּת־יְהוּדָה: ס	84.	
to crush my young men.	83.	(Lam 1,15)
In the winepress Adonay trod on Dear Daughter	84.	
Judah.		

syn04types	xQtX<InfC preV1sub00 3rdP<1/2P NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc no_fronting_fronting
participants	changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
סָלָה כָּל-אַבִּירֵי אֲדֹנָי בְּקֶרְבִּי	81.	(Lam 1,15)
	< ... >	
גַּת דֶּרֶךְ אֲדֹנָי לִבְתוּלַת בֵּת-יְהוּדָה: ס	84.	
Adonay tossed aside all warriors in my midst;	81.	(Lam 1,15)
	< ... >	
In the winepress Adonay trod on Dear Daughter	84.	
Judah.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 ParalLex01 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc.non.disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj same_verb.png
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe lexical_repetition end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline par- allel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

Note that the label `changing_speech_situation` should not have been assigned. The pattern that has caused this, is a shift from clauses with first and second person references to an asyndetic clause with third persons and an explicit new subject. However, in this case, the speech by the first person continues, as is apparent from the following clauses.

Annotation 1.46

		proposed
עַל-אֵלֶּה אָנִי בֹכֶיָה	85.	(Lam 1,16)
עֵינֵי עֵינֵי יִרְדָּה מַיִם	86.	
Over these things I weep,	85.	(Lam 1,16)
my eyes, my eyes run with tears:	86.	

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc.disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj

		corrected
לוא אֵלֶיכֶם	61.	(Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
עַל-אֵלֶּה אֲנִי בֹכֶיָה	85.	(Lam 1,16)
"Does it not concern you,	61.	(Lam 1,12)
	< ... >	
Over these things I weep,	85.	(Lam 1,16)

syn04types	Ptcp<NmCl perV<perV NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience
participants	new_prps new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

A connection like this shows the necessity of taking the intervening clauses into account as well: The labels have only considered the mother and daughter, and therefore only note a shift from second person to first person references. However, the entire direct speech is littered with first person references, which are actually even more characteristic of the unit than the second person reference, which only identifies the addressee once and never returns. I take the explicit pronoun אֲנִי as a sign that a new section of the direct speech starts here. This means that the clause (and its daughters) is to be connected to the entire direct speech as a whole.

It is difficult to decide to what עַל-אֵלֶּה ('about these things') refers. If it refers upwards, its reference is the entire unit vs 12–15. However, if it refers downward, its referent probably is the כִּי-clause 87–88 (in which case כִּי would have to be translated as 'because').

Annotation 1.47

		proposed
עֵינַי עֵינַי יִרְדּוּ מַיִם	86.	(Lam 1,16)
כִּי-רָחֵק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם	87.	
my eyes, my eyes run with tears:	86.	(Lam 1,16)
Because far away is any one to comfort me,	87.	

syn04types	xQtX<Ptcp preV2sub00 Socj<0 numV<numV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

עַל־אַלֶּה אֲנִי בּוֹכֶיָה 85. (Lam 1,16)

<...>

כִּי־רָחֵק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם 87.

Over these things I weep, 85. (Lam 1,16)

<...>

Because far away is any one to comfort me, 87.

syn04types	xQtX<Ptcp preV2sub00 Socj<0 numV<numV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting idiomatic indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps
prosodic	new_verseline chiastic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe

86 inherits עַל־אַלֶּה (semantics, as well as the rhythm of the verseline make this plausible), so 85–86 form a syntactic, as well as a prosodic, unit. 87–88 are therefore connected to this unit as a whole.

Annotation 1.48**proposed**

מְשִׁיב נֶפֶשִׁי 88. (Lam 1,16)

הָיוּ בְנֵי שׁוֹמְמִים 89.

to restore my life. 88. (Lam 1,16)

My children have become desolate 89.

syn04types	ZQtX<Ptcp Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	כִּי־רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם	87. (Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
	הָיוּ בְנֵי שׁוֹמְמִים	89.
Because far away is any one to comfort me,		87. (Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
My children have become desolate		89.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj perV<perV NPd2<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_vt conj_async diff_sentence disc_disc in- dep_dep_indep indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part Subj_Subj diff_verbpng sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline paral- lel_Pred_Subj

This clause can be connected into its syntactic context in different ways. Its asyndetic start and introduction of a new (secondary) subject ('my sons') appears to start a new unit. If this is taken seriously, the clause should be connected to 85, the first line of the unit 85–88. However, semantically the clause appears to belong to the the paragraph introduced by 87, which is about people connected to Jerusalem / Zion: a comforter, her sons and the enemy. It is therefore better connected to 87.

Annotation 1.49

		proposed
	כִּי־רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי מְנַחֵם	87. (Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
	כִּי גִבֹּר אוֹיֵב: ס	90.
Because far away is any one to comfort me,		87. (Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
because the enemy has prevailed..."		90.

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalPre00 Socj<Socj 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	conj.conj diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non.disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause.type same_conj
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj

corrected

הָיוּ בְנֵי שׁוֹמְמִים 89. (Lam 1,16)
כִּי גִבֹּר אוֹיֵב: ס 90.

My children have become desolate 89. (Lam 1,16)
because the enemy has prevailed..." 90.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.conj same_vt diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non.disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in_same_verseline end_of_strophe par- allel_Pred_Subj

Annotation 1.50**proposed**

כִּי גִבֹּר אוֹיֵב: ס 90. (Lam 1,16)
פִּרְשָׁה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ 91. (Lam 1,17)

because the enemy has prevailed..." 90. (Lam 1,16)
"Zion stretches out her hands, 91. (Lam 1,17)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc root same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	B.colon_A.colon acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

There is a curious change in speech situation here: For the length of one strophe, the speaker from Lam 1,1–11 interrupts the speech by Zion / Jerusalem, in much the same way as Zion / Jerusalem has interrupted the speech of the

narrator in vs 9 and vs 11. This is evident from the 3 f.sg, rather than 1 sg, references to Jerusalem.¹⁵ In fact, it would seem that vs 17 simply resumes where vs 1–11, so that it should actually be connected to 34, the start of the last chunk of text introduced by a proper name.

Even though this is technically possible (simply by pointing the ‘mother’ feature of 91 to 34, it would break the tree-like hierarchy and would be impossible to display in a two-dimensional tree-like display.

Linguistically, however, this ‘crossing’ of textual relations is quite unremarkable in dialogues, especially if the speakers not so much react to one another but rather each deliver parts of their monologue in turn. It is especially visible in dramatic texts, which simply juxtapose the various speeches, without narrative introductions.

Annotation 1.51

		proposed	
	אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ	92.	(Lam 1,17)
	צֹהַ יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב סְבִיבָיו צָרִיו	93.	
	but there is no one to comfort her.	92.	(Lam 1,17)
	YHWH has commanded foes for Jacob, all around	93.	
	him;		

syn04types	ZQtX<NmCl prevlpar00 prev2sub00 L...//...L Npd2<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected	
	פְּרָשָׁה צִוֶּן בִּידֵיהָ	91.	(Lam 1,17)
		< ... >	
	צֹהַ יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב סְבִיבָיו צָרִיו	93.	
	“Zion stretches out her hands,	91.	(Lam 1,17)
		< ... >	
	YHWH has commanded foes for Jacob, all around	93.	
	him;		

¹⁵Hillers 1992, 90, Berlin 2002, 58.

syn04types	VBt<VBt perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

Annotation 1.52

	proposed
פֶּרְשָׁה צִיּוֹן בְּיָדֶיהָ	91. (Lam 1,17)
< ... >	
הִיָּתָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנֹדָה בֵּינֵיהֶם: ס	94.
"Zion stretches out her hands,	91. (Lam 1,17)
< ... >	
Jerusalem has become an unclean thing among	94.
them."	

syn04types	VBt<VBt pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc root same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

	corrected
צוּהַ יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב סְבִיבּוֹ צָרָיו	93. (Lam 1,17)
הִיָּתָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנֹדָה בֵּינֵיהֶם: ס	94.
YHWH has commanded foes for Jacob, all around	93. (Lam 1,17)
him;	
Jerusalem has become an unclean thing among	94.
them."	

syn04types	VBT<VBT L...//...L perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Objc Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj end_of_strophe in_same_strophe whole_verseline

Apart from the prosodic bonds between these two clauses, the suffix 3 m.pl on בִּינֵיהֶם ('among them') refers to צָרָיו ('his enemies'), so that 94 also depends on 93 because of the participant references.

Annotation 1.53

	proposed	
צָוָה יְהוָה לִיעֲקֹב סְבִיבָיו צָרָיו	93.	(Lam 1,17)
	< ... >	
צִדִּיק הוּא יְהוָה	95.	(Lam 1,18)
YHWH has commanded foes for Jacob, all around him;	93.	(Lam 1,17)
	< ... >	
"...Yet,YHWH is in the right,	95.	(Lam 1,18)

syn04types	AjCl<ZQtX pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_prps prps_to_nmpr
prosodic	acrostic lexical_repetition new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

	corrected	
עַל-אֵלֶּה אָנִי בּוֹכֶיָה	85.	(Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
צִדִּיק הוּא יְהוָה	95.	(Lam 1,18)
Over these things I weep,	85.	(Lam 1,16)
	< ... >	
"...Yet,YHWH is in the right,	95.	(Lam 1,18)

syn04types	AjCl<Ptcp preV1sub00 preV2sub00 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn deictic_deictic diff_sentence front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_prps
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

The status of 95–96 is difficult, mainly because these clauses appear to be rather independent, with little or no syntactic marking of their exact position within the hierarchy.

The start of the new strophe suggests that these clauses are some kind of introduction to what follows, and should therefore be read as part of the speech by Zion / Jerusalem to the peoples. However, there is no indication of any change of address in these clauses, while semantically they appear to be a concluding reaction to the preceding interruption by the narrator than an introduction to the resumed depiction of Zion's destitution in vs 18–19.

Annotation 1.54

proposed
צֶדִיק הוּא יְהוָה 95. (Lam 1,18)

< ... >

שְׁמַעוּ־נָא 97.

“... Yet, YHWH is in the right, 95. (Lam 1,18)

< ... >

Listen, 97.

syn04types	ZIm0<AjCl 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn asyn.conj.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline

corrected
לֹא אֵלֵיכֶם 61. (Lam 1,12)

< ... >

שְׁמַעוּ־נָא 97. (Lam 1,18)

“Does it not concern you, 61. (Lam 1,12)

< ... >

Listen, 97. (Lam 1,18)

syn04types	ZIm0<NmCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	Voct_to_Voct no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe new_verseline strophe_other_to_first

The imperative followed by a vocative indicates a new speech situation: In itself, it is clear that there is a change of speech situation: The speaker no longer addresses the passers-by (62 vs 12), but ‘all peoples’.¹⁶

This change occurs within a strophe and not at strophe opening, as happens more often in Lamentations. In the other cases, this appears to heighten the effect of interrupting someones speech, but here this does not seem to work as well, because there is no change of speaker.

This case is also an example of the need to compare units, rather than individual clauses. Both vocatives are ‘hidden’ in the second clause atoms of their units, so that a comparison between the mother and daughter only reveals coherence between the suffix on אֲלֵיכֶם (‘about you (pl.)’) and the verb שְׁמְעוּ (‘listen (pl.)’), which is not even valid, because they refer to different addressees.

Annotation 1.55

	וּרְאוּ מַכְאֲבִי	99.	proposed (Lam 1,18)
	בְּתוֹלְתִי וּבַחֲוֹרֵי הָלָכוּ בְּשָׁבִי: ס	100.	
	and see my pain.	99.	(Lam 1,18)
My young women and young men have gone into		100.	
	captivity.		

syn04types	XQt1<WIm0 0<Cocj preV1par00 numV<numV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

¹⁶It is not entirely certain that this really is a change of address: Berlin (2002, 59) poses the possibility that ‘the peoples’ is the same group as the ‘passers-by’ (vs 12). At any rate, the call to listen and the vocative do indicate a new textual unit.

	שְׁמַעוּ-נָא	97.	corrected (Lam 1,18)
		< ... >	
	בְּתוֹלְתִי וּבַחֲוָרֵי הָלְכוּ בְּשָׁבִי: ס	100.	
	Listen,	97.	(Lam 1,18)
		< ... >	
	My young women and young men have gone into	100.	
	captivity.		

syn04types	XQt1<ZIm0 prevlpar00 numV<numV Npd1<0 Subj<0 NoRe-ferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

100 is asyndetic, and does not give any explicit clues as to how the clause is connected to its context. There are no second person references, nor any references to YHWH in any form, so here are no clues from participant references either. Thus, there are multiple options to connect this clause:

- To the immediately preceding clause, as a kind of specification of מַכְּבִי ('my pain'): "... and see my pain: My maidens and youths have gone into captivity."
- To 97–99 as a whole, taking שְׁמַעוּ... וּרְאוּ as coordinated, because of the parallelism: "hear and see my pain, all you people: My maidens ..."
- To 95–, as resuming the discourse after a short outburst:

YHWH is in the right, for I have rebelled against his mouth.
—hear and see my pain, all you people!—
My maidens and youths have gone into captivity.

The main arguments for my decision come from the contents and from the verseline structure. That the maidens and youths are captured makes more sense as a presentation of the pain that all peoples should hear and see, than as a continuation of the confession that YHWH is in the right. As the calls to hear and see are combined into a verseline, and the line about the youths is syntactically rather independent of it, it seems best to connect the latter to 97–99 as a whole. The other options can, however, not be ruled out definitively.

Annotation 1.56

		proposed
	בְּתוֹלֹתַי וּבַחֲוֹרֵי הָלְכוּ בְּשָׁבִי: ס	100. (Lam 1,18)
	קָרָאתִי לְמֵאֲהָבִי	101. (Lam 1,19)
	My young women and young men have gone into	100. (Lam 1,18)
	captivity.	
	I called to my lovers,	101. (Lam 1,19)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prevlpar00 prev2sub00 pngV<Sfx 0<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

		corrected
	שְׁמַעוּ־נָא	97. (Lam 1,18)
	< ... >	
	קָרָאתִי לְמֵאֲהָבִי	101. (Lam 1,19)
	Listen,	97. (Lam 1,18)
	< ... >	
	I called to my lovers,	101. (Lam 1,19)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZIm0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

Again, it is difficult to determine where exactly this clause fits into the hierarchy of clauses. It could either be connected to the immediately preceding xQt1 clause 100, or start a new unit (indicated by a connection to 97).

I have chosen the latter option, largely because of the shift to 1 sg, which furthermore has its own daughter clauses and thus opens a new participants domain.

The start of a new strophe also contributes to this decision. Nevertheless, the connections via the *qatal* forms and 1 sg suffixes are there, and do play a role in the cohesion of the text. This further indicates that syntactic coherence, especially where participant references are concerned, are not always neatly hierarchical.

Annotation 1.57

		proposed
	הֵמָּה רְמוּנִי 102.	(Lam 1,19)
	כֹּהֲנֵי וְזִקְנֵי בְעִיר גִּזְעוּ 103.	
	but they betrayed me. 102.	(Lam 1,19)
	My priests and my elders perished in the city 103.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 pngV<pngV NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part same_verb_png secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B.colon_A.colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

		corrected
	קָרָאתִי לְמֹאֲהָבֵי 101.	(Lam 1,19)
	<...>	
	כֹּהֲנֵי וְזִקְנֵי בְעִיר גִּזְעוּ 103.	
	I called to my lovers, 101.	(Lam 1,19)
	<...>	
	My priests and my elders perished in the city 103.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	new_secondary_part diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

הֵמָּה ('they') in 102 is a pronominal continuation of a secondary participant (מֹאֲהָבֵי, 'those who love me,') in 101. Therefore, it seems unlikely that an explicit reference to another secondary participant (כֹּהֲנֵי וְזִקְנֵי, 'my priests and elders') would depend on it. The start of a new verseline further supports this.

Annotation 1.58

	כי־בָקְשׁוּ אֶכֶל לָמוֹ	104.	proposed (Lam 1,19)
		< ... >	
	רָאָה	106.	(Lam 1,20)
	while they searched for food	104.	(Lam 1,19)
		< ... >	
	See,	106.	(Lam 1,20)

syn04types	ZIm0<xQt0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj 1/2P<3rdP
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	שְׁמַעוּ־נָא	97.	corrected (Lam 1,18)
		< ... >	
	רָאָה	106.	(Lam 1,20)
	Listen,	97.	(Lam 1,18)
		< ... >	
	See,	106.	(Lam 1,20)

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png Voct_to_Voct no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	new_strophe acrostic strophe_first_to_other

Annotation 1.59

	כי־צַר־לִי	108.	proposed (Lam 1,20)
		< ... >	
	נִהְפָּךְ לִבִּי בְּקִרְבִּי	110.	
	that I am distressed,	108.	(Lam 1,20)
		< ... >	
	My heart turns within me	110.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 prev2par00 0<Socj Coor<Main pngV<pngV NPD2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_async dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

ראה 106. (Lam 1,20)

<...>

נהפך לבי בקרבי 110.

See, 106. (Lam 1,20)

<...>

My heart turns within me 110.

syn04types	ZQtX<ZIm0 numV<numV NPD2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	async_async diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline

The structure of vs 20 is difficult, as there are conflicting signals. When only the clause types are considered, the hierarchy would seem to be:

ראה	ZIm0	106	1,20	See,
יהוה . . .	Voct	107		YHWH,
כי-צר לי . . .	xQt0	108		that I am distressed:
מעַי חֲמָרְמוֹ . . .	XQtI	109		my bowels churn,
נהפך לבי בקרבי . . .	ZQtX	110		my heart turns over in my body;
כי מרו מריתי . . .	xQt0	111		[see] that I am very bitter:
מחוץ שכלה חרב . . .	xQtX	112		outside, the sword bereaves,
בבית כמות: ס . . .	NmCl	113		inside [it is] like death.

However, the prosodic rhythm of these clauses strongly suggest a grouping into two chiastically structured sentences, followed by a third, slightly disconnected one:

See, YHWH, that (כי) I am distressed, [that] my bowels churn.
My heart turns over in my body, because (כי) I am very bitter.
Outside, the sword bereaves, inside—like death.

This translates to:

רֹאֵה	ZIm0	106	1,20 See,
יְהוָה	Voct	107	YHWH,
כִּי־צָר־לִי	xQt0	108	that I am distressed,
מַעֲי חֲמַרְמָרוּ	XQtI	109	[that] my bowels churn.
נִהְפָּךְ לִבִּי בְּקֶרְבִּי	ZQtX	110	My heart turns over in my body,
כִּי מָרוּ מְרִיתִי	xQt0	111	because I am very bitter.
מִחוּץ שְׁכֵלָה־חָרֵב	xQtX	112	Outside, the sword bereaves,
בְּבֵית כְּמוֹת: ס	NmCl	113	inside [it is] like death.

This to me is an example in which the prosodic form guides the syntactic interpretation. Even if prosody would primarily be a matter of performance, which I do not believe,¹⁷ the recitation of these lines as poetry leaves the audience no other option than the second division.

Annotation 1.60

	proposed
כִּי מָרוּ מְרִיתִי 111.	(Lam 1,20)
מִחוּץ שְׁכֵלָה־חָרֵב 112.	
for I have rebelled greatly. 111.	(Lam 1,20)
Outside the sword bereaved 112.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 0<Socj 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non-disc indep_indep same_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected
רֹאֵה 106.	(Lam 1,20)
< . . . >	
מִחוּץ שְׁכֵלָה־חָרֵב 112.	
See, 106.	(Lam 1,20)
< . . . >	
Outside the sword bereaved 112.	

¹⁷Talstra 1999, 113; p. 70 of the dissertation.

syn04types	xQtX<ZIm0 preVlpar00 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj changing_speech_sit no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Syntactically, the last two clauses of vs 20 stand apart from the others in that they no longer have 1 sg suffixes. This gives them a more general scope than the very personal account of the speaker's personal and physical distress. It also makes them difficult to place in the hierarchy, because they have no syntactic ties to their surroundings.

Prosodically, the clauses stand apart as the third and final verseline of the strophe, following two verselines that do have cohesion.

The labels `changing_speech_sit` and `disc_non_disc` both react to the 'disappearance' of the 1 sg references, but especially the former is incorrect. Clearly, determining things like linguistic stance of speech domain boundaries requires an even more decisively text-syntactic approach than noting first, second and third person references, even though these do play an important role.

Annotation 1.61

			proposed
	בְּבֵית כְּמוֹת: ס	113.	(Lam 1,20)
	שָׁמְעוּ	114.	(Lam 1,21)
	inside [it was] death.	113.	(Lam 1,20)
	They hear	114.	(Lam 1,21)

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl preVlpar00 preV2sub00
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

			corrected
	רָאָה	106.	(Lam 1,20)
	< ... >		
	שָׁמְעוּ	114.	(Lam 1,21)
	See,	106.	(Lam 1,20)
	< ... >		
	They hear	114.	(Lam 1,21)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZIm0 3rdP<1/2P
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	diff_verb_png changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

The start of the new strophe, and the introduction of a 3 m.pl participant call for a new start. Note that the participants label `changing_speech_situation` is overshooting its mark: The 2 m.sg forms in 119 make clear that the speech is still directed at YHWH. The label is an attempt to combine the observations behind the `syn04types` labels `3rdP<1/2P` and `ZQt0<ZIm0`, but apparently, this combination of labels is by itself not enough to conclude a different communicational domain, even though there is a different participants domain.

Annotation 1.62

		proposed
	אֵין מְנַחֵם לִי	116. (Lam 1,21)
	כָּל-אֹיְבֵי שָׁמְעוּ רָעָתִי	117.
	with no one to comfort me.	116. (Lam 1,21)
	All my enemies hear of my distress;	117.

syn04types	XQt1<NmCl preVlpar00 NPd2<0 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel_Pred_Subj

		corrected
	שָׁמְעוּ	114. (Lam 1,21)
	< ... >	
	כָּל-אֹיְבֵי שָׁמְעוּ רָעָתִי	117.
	They hear	114. (Lam 1,21)
	< ... >	
	All my enemies hear of my distress;	117.

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NPd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc.disc same_vt
participants	no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png changing_speech_sit
prosodic	lexical_repetition new_verseline in_same_strophe

When reading sequentially, the verb שָׁמְעוּ does not seem to have an antecedent in its preceding context. Only when arriving at 117, it turns out that its subject was not anonymous ‘they’, but אֹיְבֵי (‘all my enemies’).

Annotation 1.63

	שָׁמְעוּ	114.	proposed (Lam 1,21)
	<...>		
	שָׂשׂוּ	118.	
	They hear	114.	(Lam 1,21)
	<...>		
	they rejoice	118.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc.non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

	כָּל-אֹיְבֵי שָׁמְעוּ רָעָתִי	117.	corrected (Lam 1,21)
	שָׂשׂוּ	118.	
	All my enemies hear of my distress;	117.	(Lam 1,21)
	they rejoice	118.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 preV2sub00 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc.non.disc indep_indep same_vt
participants	cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_colon multi_verb_colon

The syntactic and prosodic position of שָׂשׂוּ (‘they rejoice’) is contested. The obvious syntactic division is, to connect it to the כִּי-clause:

“All my enemies who heard my distress,
rejoiced that you had caused it.”¹⁸

Renkema,¹⁹ however, pulls שׂוּ into the first colon and translates:

“All my enemies **delight to hear** of my misfortune,
 and it is you who brings it (upon me).”

His arguments are twofold:

1. The Masoretes have placed a *zaqef qaton* after שׂוּ, thereby including it in the first colon and connecting it syntactically to ‘All my enemies hear of my misfortune’.
2. The obvious division implies that the enemies recognize YHWH as the cause of their victory, which does not fit the historical theological context, in which the defeat of a people also meant the defeat of its gods.

If Renkema is right, 119 actually comments on the entire preceding unit and should be connected to 114. However, Renkema overstates his case. As Berges remarks, the Masoretes appear to have placed the *zaqef* precisely to prevent an idea that they considered improper.²⁰ The very fact that they deemed this intervention necessary shows that they, too, recognized that the theologically awkward reading is in fact the most natural one. In the end, then, this is a case in which the syntactic structure has corrective force towards a prosodic proposal.

Annotation 1.64

accepted

שׂוּ	118.	(Lam 1,21)
כִּי אַתָּה עָשִׂיתָ	119.	
they rejoice	118.	(Lam 1,21)
because <i>you</i> have done this.	119.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT Socj<0 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep new_deictic non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

See above, 118.

¹⁸Berlin 2002, 45.

¹⁹Renkema 1998, 193–194.

²⁰Berges 2002, 90.

Annotation 1.65

	שִׂשׁוּ	118.	proposed (Lam 1,21)
		< ... >	
	הִבְאֵת יוֹם-	120.	
	they rejoice	118.	(Lam 1,21)
		< ... >	
	May you bring the day	120.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT 1/2P<3rdP		
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_disc same_clause_type		
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj		
prosodic	diff_colon	diff_verseline	end_of_strophe
	in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc		

	רָאָה	106.	corrected (Lam 1,20)
		< ... >	
	הִבְאֵת יוֹם-	120.	(Lam 1,21)
	See,	106.	(Lam 1,20)
		< ... >	
	May you bring the day	120.	(Lam 1,21)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZIm0 pngV<pngV		
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience		
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png		
prosodic	diff_strophe	end_of_strophe	end_to_start_of_strophe
	new_verseline strophe_other_to_first		

Even though it does not make a lot of difference for the clause hierarchy,²¹ the hypothesis that this *qatal* clause has volitive meaning is quite compelling.²² Especially the fact that the clause is followed by a WYq0 clause, rather than by an asyndetic 0Yq0 clause, strongly suggests that a volitive clause is continued. Starting a volitive section on a main clause (and at the beginning of a strophe) also would seem to be more likely than starting it in a dependent clause, almost like an afterthought.

²¹The shift from 3 m.pl to 2 m.sg subject, at the start of a new verseline, causes the unit 120–122 to stand apart from 114–119 anyway.

²²See Hillers 1992, 78, who also interprets שִׂמְעוּ (114) as a 2 m.sg imperative, and Berlin 2002, 45; 61. Both retain the *qatal* form, but interpret it as having volitive / precative meaning.

Furthermore, this volitive use of *qatal* forms may also occur at the end of Lam 3, and under similar conditions:

1. The clause must not be subordinated by conjunctions like **כִּי** or **אֲשֶׁר**.
2. It occurs in a speech directly addressed to YHWH, so it must be a 2 m.sg *qatal* form.
3. It appears in a context with clause types that clearly *are* volitive, such as imperatives and jussives.
4. An interpretation as volitive would seem to make at least as more sense than a non-volitive interpretation, in the situation that the poem assumes.

As for the last point: This is especially true for the *qatals* at the end of Lam 3, which up to that point has extensively argued that YHWH has *not* listened and helped. In the case of Lam 1,21, it depends on the interpretation of the phrase ‘The day you proclaimed’, and here there may be a problem: In the rest of Lamentations, and even in Lam 1 itself, references to a day or time which YHWH has planned always concern the day of the destruction of Jerusalem, not a day of reckoning for her enemies: Lam 1,12.15; Lam 2,1.16–17.21.22.

On the other hand, the notion of the ‘Day of YHWH’ is ambiguous to begin with (See, e.g., Amos 5,18–20). It may well be, that the poet plays with this ambiguity here, and lets Zion wish that the enemies may receive their own Day, just as she herself has had. This would fit ‘and let them be like me’ very well.

Linguistically, precative use of *qatal* could be explained here as a remnant of liturgical language (more specifically: prayer), which may have preserved an archaic verb form misunderstood and erroneously pointed by the Masoretes, or an archaic use of the form.²³

Annotation 1.66

			proposed
	קָרָאתָ	121.	(Lam 1,21)
	וַיְהִיוּ כְמוֹנִי: ס	122.	
	you have announced	121.	(Lam 1,21)
	so they may become like me!	122.	

²³See Section 11.3 of the dissertation.

syn04types	WYq0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_conj dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline qatal_yiqtol_verseline

corrected

הַבֹּאֵת יוֹם־ 120. (Lam 1,21)

<...>

וַיְהִי כְמוֹנִי: ס 122.

May you bring the day 120. (Lam 1,21)

<...>

so they may become like me! 122.

syn04types	WYq0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc in- dep_dep_indep indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline qatal_yiqtol_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

The conjunction ׀ connects 122 to its preceding context; its linguistic stance is clearly discursive / volitive.²⁴ In fact, this is one of the arguments to assume a volitive meaning of הַבֹּאֵת ('bring!') as well.

Annotation 1.67**proposed**

וַיְהִי כְמוֹנִי: ס 122. (Lam 1,21)

תָּבֵא כָל־רָעָתָם לִפְנֵיךָ 123. (Lam 1,22)

so they may become like me! 122. (Lam 1,21)

Let all their wickedness come before you 123. (Lam 1,22)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_first_sec secondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

²⁴Kalkman 2015a, 125–126; Niccacci 1990, 62.

Syn04types proposes to connect the 0YqX clause 123 to the directly preceding WYq0 clause. In terms of verb forms this makes sense, as 122 is the only other clause with a (volitive) *yiqtol* form in the context. The only objection would be, that it is somewhat awkward to connect an asyndetic clause to a 1-clause, and that there is a change from 3 m.pl to 2 m.sg, but neither is impossible.

Of crucial importance here is the start of the new strophe, which makes breaking up the two *yiqtol* clauses inescapable.

		corrected
	הָבֵאתָ יוֹם־	120. (Lam 1,21)
	< ... >	
	תָּבֵא כָל־רָעָתָם לִפְנֶיךָ	123. (Lam 1,22)
	May you bring the day	120. (Lam 1,21)
	< ... >	
	Let all their wickedness come before you	123. (Lam 1,22)

syn04types	ZYqX<ZQt0 VLex==VLex numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	lexical_repetition new_strophe acrostic stro- phe_first_to_other

Incidentally, the resulting hierarchy, with volitive תָּבֵא ('may you bring') connected to *qatal* הָבֵאתָ (which is usually translated as: 'you have brought'), provides some more evidence in favor of a volitive / precativ interpretation of the latter (see Section 11.3 of the dissertation). The more mainstream interpretation of *qatal* as motivating background ("Now that you have brought ..., may you now bring ...")²⁵ can not entirely be ruled out.

Annotation 1.68

		accepted
	תָּבֵא כָל־רָעָתָם לִפְנֶיךָ	123. (Lam 1,22)
	וְעוֹלָל לָמוֹ	124.
	Let all their wickedness come before you	123. (Lam 1,22)
	and cause to them	124.

²⁵Kalkman 2015a, 316, cat. IIb.

syn04types	WIm0<ZYqX Cocj<0 L...//...L numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc indep.indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png sfx_to_other sfx_to_sfx verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Note that, strictly speaking, the label *sfx_to_other* has been assigned incorrectly. It denotes congruence between the 3 m.pl suffix on (‘’) and a plural masculine element (other than subject or object) in the mother clause, which can only be ‘your face’ in לִפְנֵיךָ. This is obviously incorrect, but preventing such false identifications requires semantic and idiomatic information that could not be included in the label definitions. A more sophisticated method for participants analysis is definitely needed here.

Annotation 1.69

		proposed
כַּאֲשֶׁר עוֹלֵלְתָּ לִּי עַל כָּל-פִּשְׁעֵי	125.	(Lam 1,22)
כִּי-רַבּוֹת אֲנָחְתִּי	126.	
what you have caused to me for all my sins,	125.	(Lam 1,22)
because many are my groans	126.	

syn04types	AjCl<xQt0 prev2par00 Socj<Socj NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx KJ<>CR
syntactic	conj.conj dep_indep diff_sentence disc.disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

		corrected
תָּבֹא כָל-רָעָתָם לִפְנֵיךָ	123.	(Lam 1,22)
<...>		
כִּי-רַבּוֹת אֲנָחְתִּי	126.	
Let all their wickedness come before you	123.	(Lam 1,22)
<...>		
because many are my groans	126.	

syn04types	AjCl<ZYqX preV2par00 Socj<0 NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	indep_indep asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj

The ִי-clauses 16–127 (‘because many are my groans and my heart is sick’) obviously do not give the reason for 125 (‘what you have caused to me for all my sins’), but to the combined volitives in 123 and 124. A syntactic indication for this could be the coherence of 123–125 by way of the conjunctions, but this is not very strong. A ִי-clause especially can when by itself, be expanded with a ִי-clause without problem. The rhythm of the verselines would seem to be the strongest signal here. It is hard to see how these clauses could be grouped differently than the verseline structure suggests.

Chapter 2

Lamentations 2

Annotation 2.1

	איכה יעיב באפוֹ אֲדֹנֵי אֶת־בֵּת־צִיּוֹן	1. (Lam 2,1)	proposed
	< ... >		
	וְלֹא־זָכַר הָדֶם־רַגְלָיו בְּיוֹם אָפוֹ: ס	3.	
	How Adonay has clouded Daughter Zion with his	1. (Lam 2,1)	
	anger!		
	< ... >		
	and did not remember his footstool on the day of his	3.	
	anger.		

syn04types	WxQ0<xYqX 0<Ques Cocj<0 preV2par00 ParalLex01 B...//...B pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx Npd2<Npd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting root
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline whole_verseline

	הִשְׁלִיךְ מִשָּׁמַיִם אֶרֶץ תְּפֹאֶרֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל	2. (Lam 2,1)	corrected
	וְלֹא־זָכַר הָדֶם־רַגְלָיו בְּיוֹם אָפוֹ: ס	3.	
	He flung down Israel's splendor from heaven to earth	2. (Lam 2,1)	
	and did not remember his footstool on the day of his	3.	
	anger.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2
syntactic	asyn.conj no_fronting.no_fronting same_vt diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc.non_disc same_salience
participants	cont.Subj no_Subj.no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

This last line of the strophe stands apart from the first two, which show strong prosodic parallels between them. Moreover, there is some lexical correspondence between 1 and 3: **אָר** and **בֵּן**.

All this would plead for a connection to 1, as the closure of the strophe. Syntactically, however, this can hardly be correct. The congruent *qatal* forms, as well as the conjunction **וְ**, would appear to bind 2–3 together, rather than 1–3.

This, then, is a case where the prosodic structure yields a different grouping from the syntactic one, while both are valid in their own right.

Annotation 2.2

	proposed	
וְלֹא־זָכַר הַדֶּם־רַגְלָיו בְּיוֹם אָפוֹ: ס	3.	(Lam 2,1)
בָּלַע אֲדָנִי	4.	(Lam 2,2)
and did not remember his footstool on the day of his	3.	(Lam 2,1)
anger.		
Adonay swallowed up,	4.	(Lam 2,2)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting.no_fronting non_disc.non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected	
איכה יעיב באפו אדני את-בת-ציון	1.	(Lam 2,1)
	< ... >	
בלע אדני	4.	(Lam 2,2)
How Adonay has clouded Daughter Zion with his	1.	(Lam 2,1)
anger!		
	< ... >	
Adonay swallowed up,	4.	(Lam 2,2)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYqX 0<Ques prev1sub00 prev2par00 ParalLex01 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	lexical_repetition parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

The *qatal* form does match the *qatal* forms in 2–3. However, the repetition of the subject Adonay not only starts a new poetic strophe, but also a new syntactic paragraph.

Annotation 2.3

	proposed	
איכה יעיב באפו אדני את-בת-ציון	1.	(Lam 2,1)
	< ... >	
את כל-נאות יעקב	6.	(Lam 2,2)
How Adonay has clouded Daughter Zion with his	1.	(Lam 2,1)
anger!		
	< ... >	
all the dwellings of Jacob.	6.	(Lam 2,2)

syn04types	Ellp<xYqX 0<Ques prev1sub00 Elliptical >T..//..>T 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_dep main_defect root
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_Objc
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_first whole_verseline

	corrected
בִּלְעַ אֲדֹנָי	4. (Lam 2,2)
	< ... >
אֶת כָּל־נְאוֹת יַעֲקֹב	6.
Adonay swallowed up,	4. (Lam 2,2)
	< ... >
all the dwellings of Jacob.	6.

syn04types	Defc<ZQtX preVlpar00 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	main_defect asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn indep_dep same_sentence
participants	new_nmpr_Objc Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

Annotation 2.4

	proposed
אֶת כָּל־נְאוֹת יַעֲקֹב	6. (Lam 2,2)
הָרָס בְּעִבְרָתוֹ מִבְצָרֵי בֵּת־יְהוּדָה	7.
all the dwellings of Jacob.	6. (Lam 2,2)
He tore down in his wrath the strongholds of	7.
Daughter Judah.	

syn04types	ZQt0<Defc preVlpar00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main_dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	new_nmpr_Objc no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

	corrected
בִּלְעַ אֲדֹנָי	4. (Lam 2,2)
	< ... >
הָרָס בְּעִבְרָתוֹ מִבְצָרֵי בֵּת־יְהוּדָה	7.
Adonay swallowed up,	4. (Lam 2,2)
	< ... >
He tore down in his wrath the strongholds of	7.
Daughter Judah.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	same_vt asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_Objc Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

In the verses Lam 2,1–6, a large number of participants are introduced, and reintroduced, by name: YHWH / Adonay, Daughter Zion, Israel, Jacob and Daughter Judah. This obviously lends some structure to the text, as it creates participant domains, albeit short ones.

Next to this structure, the clause types also provides a specific structure: A main line of 0QtX and 0Qt0 clauses, occasionally interspersed with *wayyiqtol* clauses or subordinate clauses.

A third structuring principle is provided by the verselines and strophes.

In these verses, the three structures concur at some places and interfere at others. With some difficulty, I have arrived at a clause hierarchy that I think defensible, but this portion of text provides a clear example of how complex these interactions can be. In such a case, the clause hierarchy is a useful, but too limited way of displaying the text.

Annotation 2.5

		proposed
חָלַל מַמְלָכָה וְשָׂרֶיהָ: ס	9.	(Lam 2,2)
גָּדַע בַּחֲרִי־אַף כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	10.	(Lam 2,3)
humiliated her kingdom and its princes.	9.	(Lam 2,2)
He cut off, in burning anger, every horn of Israel.	10.	(Lam 2,3)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<0
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_Objc no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

- corrected**
7. (Lam 2,2)
- <...>
10. (Lam 2,3)
7. (Lam 2,2)
- <...>
10. (Lam 2,3)

syn04types	VBT<VBT B...//...B pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx Npd2<Npd2
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_Objc no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	new_strophe acrostic strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

Annotation 2.6

- proposed**
11. (Lam 2,3)
- 12.
11. (Lam 2,3)
- 12.

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<Npd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict

		corrected
	גִּדַּע בַּחֲרִי-אַף כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	10. (Lam 2,3)
	< ... >	
	וַיִּבְעַר בַּיַּעֲקֹב כָּאֵשׁ לֹהֶבֶת	12.
	He cut off, in burning anger, every horn of Israel.	10. (Lam 2,3)
	< ... >	
	And he burned in Jacob like a flaming fire,	12.

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 B...//...B pngV<pngV 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict

This *wayyiqtol* clause can either be connected to the immediately preceding *qatal* clause, or to vs 3 as a whole, or even to vs 3–4, as the latter is all governed by the single subject אֲדֹנָי (Adonay 4). At any rate, the *wayyiqtol* breaks the pattern of *qatal* forms in these verses, doing so in the final verse of the 3-strophe.

The semantic links between Israel (10) and Jacob (12), which are not covered by my MQL patterns, and the fact that the syntactic unit with Adonay as main subject continues for one more strophe, prompt my decision to take the clause as the closure of 10–11 only.

Annotation 2.7

		proposed
	גִּדַּע בַּחֲרִי-אַף כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	10. (Lam 2,3)
	< ... >	
	אֲכָלָה סָבִיב: ס	13.
	He cut off, in burning anger, every horn of Israel.	10. (Lam 2,3)
	< ... >	
	consuming all around.	13.

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV numV<numV 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_dep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

		corrected
וַיִּבְעַר בַּיַּעֲקֹב כָּאֵשׁ לֹהֶבֶת	12.	(Lam 2,3)
אֲכָלָה סָבִיב: ס	13.	
And he burned in Jacob like a flaming fire,	12.	(Lam 2,3)
consuming all around.	13.	

syn04types	ZQt0<Way0 0<Cocj perV<perV numV<numV
syntactic	Attr_clause conj_asyn diff_vt indep_dep non_disc non_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	verb.to.other diff_verb.png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in.same.verseline end_of_strophe

Annotation 2.8

		accepted
גָּדַע בַּחֲרִי־אֵף כָּל קֶרֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל	10.	(Lam 2,3)
	<...>	
דָּרָךְ קִשְׁתּוֹ כְּאוֹיֵב	14.	(Lam 2,4)
He cut off, in burning anger, every horn of Israel.	10.	(Lam 2,3)
	<...>	
He strung his bow like an enemy,	14.	(Lam 2,4)

syn04types	VBt<VBt pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb.png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe.first.to.first stro- phe.to.strophe

Note that the label *sfx_to_nmpr* is incorrect: The 3 m.sg suffix on קִשְׁתּוֹ ('his bow') does not refer to Israel, but to YHWH. This is purely a matter of semantics. If the verb דָּרָךְ ('he draws') had been שָׁבַר ('he breaks', cf. Jer 49,35), the label would have been correct.

Annotation 2.9

		proposed
נָצַב יְמִינוֹ כְּצֹר	15.	(Lam 2,4)
וַיַּהַרְגַּם כָּל מְחַמְדֵּי־עֵינַי	16.	
his right hand ready, like a foe,	15.	(Lam 2,4)
and killed all those pleasant to the eye.	16.	

syn04types	Way0<Ptcp Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
	דָּרָךְ קִשְׁתּוֹ כְּאֹיֵב	14. (Lam 2,4)
		< ... >
	וַיַּהַרְגַּם כָּל מְחַמְדֵי-עֵינַיִן	16.
	He strung his bow like an enemy,	14. (Lam 2,4)
		< ... >
	and killed all those pleasant to the eye.	16.

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

This is a peculiar case: The verseline divisions as proposed by Renkema¹ have כָּצַר (sotl15) as the start of the new verseline, creating a rather crass enjambment. This does not affect the syntactic analysis, since the very definition of an enjambment entails that both syntactic and prosodic divisions are clear, but just don't match.

The actual reason that the *wayyiqtol* clause is not connected to the preceding participle clause is that the latter is probably to be read as attributive clause or an adjunct clause: "He bends his bow like an enemy, poisoning his right hand like a foe." However, the participle has not been parsed in this way, so labelman has missed it.

The enjambment accounts for the fact that the label *new_verseline* has not been assigned either: This label only applies when the *first* clauses of two verselines are connected. The label *diff_verseline* is less specific.

¹Renkema 1998, 232.

Annotation 2.10

	דָּרַךְ קִשְׁתּוֹ כְּאוֹיֵב	14.	proposed (Lam 2,4)
		<...>	
	בְּאֶהָל בַּת־צִיּוֹן שָׁפַךְ כָּאֵשׁ חֲמָתוֹ: ס	17.	
	He strung his bow like an enemy,	14.	(Lam 2,4)
		<...>	
	On the tent of Daughter Zion he poured out his	17.	
	wrath like fire.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 K...//...K pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep.indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc.non_disc same_salience same_vt		
participants	cont.Subj new.nmpr.other no.Subj.no.Subj same.verb.png verb.to.sfx		
prosodic	end.of.strophe end.to.start.of.strophe in.same.strophe new.verseline whole.verseline		

	גִּדַּע בְּחַר־אֵף כָּל קְרֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל	10.	corrected (Lam 2,3)
		<...>	
	בְּאֶהָל בַּת־צִיּוֹן שָׁפַךְ כָּאֵשׁ חֲמָתוֹ: ס	17.	(Lam 2,4)
	He cut off, in burning anger, every horn of Israel.	10.	(Lam 2,3)
		<...>	
	On the tent of Daughter Zion he poured out his	17.	(Lam 2,4)
	wrath like fire.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 B...//...B pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2		
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting same_vt asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep.indep non_disc.non_disc same_salience		
participants	cont.Subj new.nmpr.other no.Subj.no.Subj same.verb.png		
prosodic	end.to.start.of.strophe diff.strophe end.of.strophe new.verseline strophe.other.to.first whole.verseline		

The fronting of בְּאֶהָל בַּת־צִיּוֹן ('in the tent of Daughter Zion') does not appear to mark contrast or emphasis. Rather, it marks the end of a list or pattern: a series of verb-initial clauses with Adonay as their subject and several named participants as their direct or indirect objects. The departure from the verb-initial pattern happens in the last verseline of a strophe, or a series of strophes.

The precise placement of this closing line within the hierarchy depends on convention, and I am not entirely sure how to proceed here:

- If 17 is seen as a closure to the unit 4–17 as a whole, it could be connected to 4.
- However, this would set this clause apart from the rest of the unit in a way that does not do justice to its actual position within those lines: 17 is simply the last item in the series of proper nouns (4–6 Jacob), 7–9 (Daughter Judah), 10–16 (Israel/Jacob), 17 (Daughter Zion).

I have let the latter argument weigh in more than the former.

Annotation 2.11

	proposed	
בָּאֵהָל בֵּת-צִיּוֹן שָׁפַךְ כָּאֵשׁ חֲמָתוֹ: ס	17.	(Lam 2,4)
הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאוֹיֵב	18.	(Lam 2,5)
On the tent of Daughter Zion he poured out his	17.	(Lam 2,4)
wrath like fire.		
Adonay has become like an enemy,	18.	(Lam 2,5)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 preV2sub00 K...//...K pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_no_fronting in- dep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt		
participants	new_indep_Subj	new_nmpr_Subj	no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other		

	corrected	
בָּלַע אֲדֹנָי	4.	(Lam 2,2)
	< ... >	
הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאוֹיֵב	18.	(Lam 2,5)
Adonay swallowed up,	4.	(Lam 2,2)
	< ... >	
Adonay has become like an enemy,	18.	(Lam 2,5)

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj same_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	lexical_repetition strophe.to.strophe across_tic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe.first.to.first

Annotation 2.12

		proposed
	בִּלַּע יִשְׂרָאֵל	19. (Lam 2,5)
	בִּלַּע כָּל-אַרְמוֹתֶיהָ	20.
	has swallowed up Israel;	19. (Lam 2,5)
	he has swallowed up all her citadels,	20.

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B.colon_A.colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאוֹיֵב	18. (Lam 2,5)
	<...>	
	בִּלַּע כָּל-אַרְמוֹתֶיהָ	20.
	Adonay has become like an enemy,	18. (Lam 2,5)
	<...>	
	he has swallowed up all her citadels,	20.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline

The 3 f.sg suffix on אַרְמוֹתֶיהָ ('her citadels') is unexpected, as it does not have an antecedent in the immediately preceding context. This already sets this

clause apart from the 1819. The suffix either refers to Daughter Zion (17) or Daughter Judah (22).

If it refers to Daughter Zion, this connection can not be displayed, because it is blocked by the renominalization of Adonay in 18. The reference works because it is the only feminine participant in the preceding context, and possibly because Daughter Zion is a central participant in this poem.

If it refers down to Daughter Judah, the reference would precede its ‘antecedent’. While this is not at all uncommon, it would be a bit confusing, given the presence of Daughter Zion in 17.

I therefore tentatively choose for the first option. This, then, is an example of the structure of participant references being more of a web of relations (a ‘graph’) than a neatly ordered hierarchy (a ‘tree’). This is not exclusive for poetry; it happens in prose as well.

However, in this case, it may have a literary motivation, because it balances the female reference in the first colon of the verseline with the masculine suffix (referring to Israel) in the second. Note that the proper names in vs 1–5 are also combined in feminine - masculine pairs in four of the five strophes. This does, of course, not alter the syntactic treatment of this reference, but does offer an explanation for it.

Annotation 2.13

	שָׁחַת מְבַצְרָיו	21.	proposed (Lam 2,5)
	וַיַּרְבּ בְּבֵת יְהוּדָה תְּאֲנִיָּה וְאֲנִיָּה: ס	22.	
	has destroyed his strongholds.	21.	(Lam 2,5)
	And he multiplied for Daughter Judah moaning and	22.	
	mourning.		

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict whole_verseline

	הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאֹיֵב	18.	corrected (Lam 2,5)
	<...>		
	וַיִּרְבַּ בְּכַת־יְהוּדָה תִּאֲנִיָּה וְאֲנִיָּה: ס	22.	
	Adonay has become like an enemy,	18.	(Lam 2,5)
	<...>		
	And he multiplied for Daughter Judah moaning and mourning.	22.	

syn04types	Way0<ZQtX Cocj<0 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline wayy_closure_strict whole_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe wayy_closure_med

At first sight, a *wayyiqtol* clause is most naturally connected to an immediately preceding *qatal* clause, especially when the subject does not change. However, בְּתִי־יְהוּדָה ('Daughter Judah') reintroduces a participant by name, and thus has the same structuring function as the other proper names in this section. It is difficult to say whether this renominalization, in an adjunct, is sufficient syntactic evidence to reject the most obvious connection.

In this case, however, the prosodic structure provides this evidence: The prosodic status of 22 sets it apart from the preceding *qatal* clauses; it appears to function as the closure of the strophe:² It takes up an entire verseline, where all other clauses in the strophe are paired into parallel verselines. Its contents also appear of a more abstract, summarizing character than those of the rest of the strophe.

Annotation 2.14

	וַיִּרְבַּ בְּכַת־יְהוּדָה תִּאֲנִיָּה וְאֲנִיָּה: ס	22.	accepted (Lam 2,5)
	וַיַּחֲמֹס כֶּגֶן שָׂכֹו	23.	(Lam 2,6)
	And he multiplied for Daughter Judah moaning and mourning.	22.	(Lam 2,5)
	He laid waste his hut like a garden.	23.	(Lam 2,6)

²According to Renkema 1998, 238, this clause concludes and summarizes the canticle vs 4–5.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<Cocj pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0
syntactic	conj_conj diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_conj same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

In this case, I do not disagree with the proposal by *syn04types*, which text-syntactically seems to be the best option. This is, however, not entirely clear-cut. The following considerations make me hesitant:

- The suffix on שְׁכֹנִי (23, ‘his hut’) refers to Adonay himself, no longer to Judah.
- The *wayyiqtol* clause 22 mentions Daughter Judah by name. This binds it to 19, which also has a proper noun: Israel. This makes the change in references even stronger.
- 23 forms the opening of the 1-strophe, poetically but also in terms of content: the 1-strophe describes the breakdown of all cultic life, in which the temple (Adonay’s ‘hut’) is of course central. This is not the theme of the preceding strophe.

It is remarkable that, like in Lam 1,6, the acrostic appears to have created a certain tension. The strophes / verses 5–8 all have a 0QtX clause in which Adonay and YHWH alternate as the subject. In verses 5, 7 and 8, these clauses form the initial clause of the verse; syntactically, they form their main lines. In vs 6, however, the 0QtX appears in the *second* line. This is almost certainly due to the acrostic: The -י has forced a WYq0 in first position and has moved the needed 0QtX clause to the second verse line.

This case is interesting, because it is one of the few cases where a strophe opening does not constitute any kind of syntactic break. In fact, the entire syntactic structure of vs 5–6 is very unusual. This also I attribute to the acrostic, which, in the case of 1-strophes, tends to be rather disruptive to the syntactic structure (see Section 10.3.2 of the dissertation).

Annotation 2.15

		proposed
	שָׁחַת מוֹעֵדוֹ	24. (Lam 2,6)
	שָׁחַת יְהוָה בְּצִיּוֹן מוֹעֵד וְשַׁבָּת	25.
	he destroyed his place of feast.	24. (Lam 2,6)
	YHWH made feast and sabbath be forgotten in Zion	25.

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe lexi- cal_repetition new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

corrected

הִיָּה אֲדֹנָי כְּאֹיֵב 18. (Lam 2,5)

<...>

שָׁכַח יְהוָה בְּצִיּוֹן מוֹעֵד וְשַׁבָּת 25. (Lam 2,6)

Adonay has become like an enemy, 18. (Lam 2,5)

<...>

YHWH made feast and sabbath be forgotten in Zion 25. (Lam 2,6)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn.asyn diff_sentence in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_other_to_first whole_verseline

The use of the names YHWH and Adonay in Lam 2 is intriguing and, frankly, somewhat perplexing. My clause hierarchy mirrors the hypothesis that the variation in names is used to mark some form of hierarchy in the strophes:

- The poem starts with two strophes that open with Adonay, thus establishing this name as the opening mark of the major text units: vs 1, vs 2, vs 5, Lam 2,7.
- The name YHWH in vs 6b and vs 8 may have been used to refer to God without starting a major text unit.

This division seems somewhat at odds with the subject matter, as the ‘major unit’ vs 7–10 starts with the destruction of the temple, which is actually the subject of vs 7, while immediately moving into the destruction of the entire city, which is the main subject of these verses.

However, this partial overlap is apparently intentional: it happens in vs 910 as well. Also, these overlaps also cross the strophe boundaries, which are undisputed, so they are a given.

Another possible arrangement is, to treat the names YHWH and Adonay as essentially the same, and put all strophe openings with either name on the same line, without any hierarchy between them. This would have the effect of the strophes simply following each other like beads on a string. This solution speaks to the self-contained character of many Biblical Hebrew strophes.³

Annotation 2.16

		proposed
	וַיִּנָּאֶץ בְּזַעַם־אַפוֹ מֶלֶךְ וְכֹהֵן: ס	26. (Lam 2,6)
	זָנַח אֲדֹנָי מִזְבְּחוֹ	27. (Lam 2,7)
and spurned in his fierce anger both king and priest.	26. (Lam 2,6)	
Adonay rejected his altar	27. (Lam 2,7)	

syn04types	ZQtX<Way0 0<Cocj pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

		corrected
	הָיָה אֲדֹנָי כְּאוֹיֵב	18. (Lam 2,5)
	< ... >	
	זָנַח אֲדֹנָי מִזְבְּחוֹ	27. (Lam 2,7)
Adonay has become like an enemy,	18. (Lam 2,5)	
< ... >		
Adonay rejected his altar	27. (Lam 2,7)	

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	lexical_repetition strophe_to_strophe acros- tic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_first_to_first

The explicit subject Adonay in 27 already seems to preclude a connection with

³van Grol 2015, 21.

26, which has no subject. However, a connection with 25 would seem quite plausible: both are 0QtX clauses with referentially identical proper noun subjects. However, the start of the new strophe indicates a larger break, which is confirmed when the broader context is considered: The 0QtX clause 18, with Adonay, rather than YHWH, as its subject, is the best candidate for a connection.

Annotation 2.17

		proposed
	נָאֵר מִקִּדְשׁוֹ	28. (Lam 2,7)
	הִסְגִּיר בְּיַד־אֹיֵב חֹמֹת אֶרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ	29.
	and disowned his sanctuary.	28. (Lam 2,7)
	He handed over the walls of her citadels to the	29.
	enemy.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 NoReferral		
syntactic	asyn.asyn	diff_sentence	indep.indep
	no_fronting_no_fronting		non_disc non_disc
	same_clause_type	same_salience	
participants	cont.Subj no.Subj_no.Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx		
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	diff_verseline	in_same_strophe
	new_verseline_conc	whole_verseline	

		corrected
	זָנַח אֲדֹנִי מִזְבְּחוֹ	27. (Lam 2,7)
		<...>
	הִסְגִּיר בְּיַד־אֹיֵב חֹמֹת אֶרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ	29.
	Adonay rejected his altar	27. (Lam 2,7)
		<...>
	He handed over the walls of her citadels to the	29.
	enemy.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 0<Subj NoReferral		
syntactic	asyn.asyn	diff_sentence	indep.indep
	no_fronting_no_fronting		non_disc non_disc
	same_salience	same_vt	
participants	Subj_no.Subj	cont.Subj	same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
	verb_to_sfx		
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe whole_verseline		

The clause types (0QtX) suggest that 29 continues 28. However, the start of

a new verseline, in combination with the unmatched suffix on אֲרָמֹנֹתֶיהָ ('her citadels') indicate a new start. The suffix has to refer to Zion in 25, another example of a reference to Zion that crosses the boundaries of the clause hierarchy.

Annotation 2.18

		proposed
	הִסְגִּיר בְּיַד־אֹיֵב חֹמַת אֲרָמֹנֹתֶיהָ	29. (Lam 2,7)
	קוֹל נִתְּנוּ בְּבֵית־יְהוָה כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד: ס	30.
	He handed over the walls of her citadels to the	29. (Lam 2,7)
	enemy.	
	They raised their voice in the house of YHWH as on	30.
	the day of a feast.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 B...//...B perV<perV 0<NPd2		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	indep_indep
	no_fronting_fronting	non_disc_non_disc	same_salience
	same_vt		
participants	diff_verb_png	new_nmpr_other	no_Subj_no_Subj
	verb_to_other		
prosodic	end_of_strophe	in_same_strophe	new_verseline
	whole_verseline		

		corrected
	זָנַח אֲדֹנָי מִזְבְּחוֹ	27. (Lam 2,7)
	<...>	
	קוֹל נִתְּנוּ בְּבֵית־יְהוָה כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד: ס	30.
	Adonay rejected his altar	27. (Lam 2,7)
	<...>	
	They raised their voice in the house of YHWH as on	30.
	the day of a feast.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 perV<perV 0<NPd2 0<Subj		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	indep_indep
	no_fronting_fronting	non_disc_non_disc	same_salience
	same_vt		
participants	Subj_no_Subj	diff_verb_png	new_nmpr_other
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe	new_verseline	end_of_strophe
	in_same_strophe	whole_verseline	

In my hierarchy, the The plural קוֹל נִתְּנוּ ('they make noise') would seem to have אֹיֵב ('the enemy' 30) as its subject, seen as a collective, but this would be

unusual, as singular אֵיב never is the subject of a plural verb in *Tenach*.⁴ This means that the 3 m.pl is probably meant to be impersonal ‘they’: “Noise is made in the house of YHWH.” The change of subject (3 m.pl after three times 3 m.sg = YHWH) and the fact that this is the last clause of the strophe, lead me to set this clause apart, as a closure to the entire strophe.

This conclusion is strengthened by the fronting of קוֹל, which also sets this clause apart from the other clauses in the strophe.

The fronting can also be explained pragmatically, as expressing shock at the image of the enemies celebrating in the temple as if on a holy feast.

Annotation 2.19

proposed
 לְהַשְׁחִית חוֹמַת בֵּית-צִיּוֹן 32. (Lam 2,8)
 נָטָה קוֹ 33.

to tear down the wall of Daughter Zion. 32. (Lam 2,8)
 He has stretched out a measuring line, 33.

syn04types	ZQt0<InfC preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	diff_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected
 חָשַׁב יְהוָה 31. (Lam 2,8)
 <...>
 נָטָה קוֹ 33.

YHWH has determined 31. (Lam 2,8)
 <...>
 He has stretched out a measuring line, 33.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	same.vt asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_dep_indep in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_discnon_disc same_salience
participants	cont.Subj Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe

⁴I have run MQL query 2.1 on page 138 on the *ETCBC* database, which yielded no results.

Annotation 2.20

		proposed
	לֹא־הָשִׁיב יָדוֹ 34. (Lam 2,8)	
	< ... >	
	וַיֹּאבֶל־חֵל וְחֹמָה 36.	
	has not turned back his hand 34. (Lam 2,8)	
	< ... >	
	And he made ramparts and walls mourn, 36.	
syn04types	Way0<xQt0 Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2	
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_dep_indep in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience	
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx	
prosodic	diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict	

		corrected
	נָטָה קוֹ 33. (Lam 2,8)	
	< ... >	
	וַיֹּאבֶל־חֵל וְחֹמָה 36.	
	He has stretched out a measuring line, 33. (Lam 2,8)	
	< ... >	
	And he made ramparts and walls mourn, 36.	
syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV	
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience	
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png	
prosodic	end_of_strophe new_verseline in_same_strophe wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict	

I see two possibilities to connect this clause:

- The *wayyiqtol* form is interpreted as adversative to 34–35: “He did not hold back his hand from consuming, *but* caused rampart and wall to mourn, ...”
- The verseline 33–35 had an affirmative A-colon, balanced by a negative clause in the B-colon. This constellation makes this negative clause 3435

into an aside to 33: “He stretched out a line—he did not hold back his hand from consuming.” 36 starts a new verseline, returning to the affirmative line of 33–.

I have chosen for the latter, also because this clause and its daughter form the last verseline of the strophe.

Annotation 2.21

		proposed
	יָחַדּוּ אֶמְלָלוּ: ס	37. (Lam 2,8)
	טָבְעוּ בָּאָרֶץ שַׁעֲרֶיהָ	38. (Lam 2,9)
	together they have wasted away.	37. (Lam 2,8)
	Her gates have sunk into the ground;	38. (Lam 2,9)
syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 prev2par00 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral	
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc non_disc same_salience same_vt	
participants	no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png	
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other	

		corrected
	חָשַׁב יְהוָה	31. (Lam 2,8)
	<...>	
	טָבְעוּ בָּאָרֶץ שַׁעֲרֶיהָ	38. (Lam 2,9)
	YHWH has determined	31. (Lam 2,8)
	<...>	
	Her gates have sunk into the ground;	38. (Lam 2,9)
syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV Npd2<Npd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral	
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn.asyn diff_sentence in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc non_disc same_salience	
participants	new_secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr Subj_Subj diff_verb_png secondary_part	
prosodic	parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first	

The suffix on שַׁעֲרֶיהָ (*‘her gates, 38)* refers to בֵּת־צִיּוֹן (*‘Daughter Zion’, 32)*. Syn04types does not note this, because the latter is ‘hidden’ in the second clause atom of the sentence which is 31–32. The participants label sfx_to_nmpr

does make the observation, because it includes the ‘gap’ between mother and daughter clause into one of its defining patterns.

Annotation 2.22

		proposed
	וּשְׁבַר בְּרִיחֶיהָ	40. (Lam 2,9)
	מַלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ בַּגּוֹיִם	41.
	and destroyed.	40. (Lam 2,9)
	Her king and her princes are among the nations,	41.

syn04types	NmCl<WQt0 0<Cocj preVlpar00 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	conj_asyn	diff_sentence	indep_indep no_fronting_fronting
participants	next_secondary_part	no_Subj_Subj	secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	diff_colon	diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	טָבְעוּ בְּאֶרֶץ שְׂעָרֶיהָ	38. (Lam 2,9)
		< ... >
	מַלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ בַּגּוֹיִם	41.
	Her gates have sunk into the ground;	38. (Lam 2,9)
		< ... >
	Her king and her princes are among the nations,	41.

syn04types	NmCl<ZQtX preVlpar00 B...//...B 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	indep_indep no_fronting_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj	next_secondary_part	secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline	chiastic_Pred_Subj	in_same_strophe

The fronting of מַלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ can be explained from pragmatics: This clause and the following express the astonishing fact that those who were expected to lead the people (the king, princes and prophets) have themselves lost all direction and insight. This, then, expresses contrast to the reader’s expectations.

Annotation 2.23

			proposed
	אֵין תּוֹרָה	42.	(Lam 2,9)
	גַּם־נְבִיאֶיהָ לֹא־מָצְאוּ חֶזֶן מִיְהוָה: ס	43.	
	there is no instruction.	42.	(Lam 2,9)
Even her prophets do not find visions from YHWH.		43.	

syn04types	XQt1<NmCl NPd1<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral PreC<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main diff_sentence neg_neg
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Objc new_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

			corrected
	מַלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ בְּגוֹיִם	41.	(Lam 2,9)
		<...>	
	גַּם־נְבִיאֶיהָ לֹא־מָצְאוּ חֶזֶן מִיְהוָה: ס	43.	
Her king and her princes are among the nations,		41.	(Lam 2,9)
		<...>	
Even her prophets do not find visions from YHWH.		43.	

syn04types	XQt1<NmCl preV2sub01 NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep
participants	next_secondary_part Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Objc secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

The prosodic division of these lines into two verselines pleads for the current clause connection, but this makes syntactic sense as well: The nominal clause אֵין תּוֹרָה ('no Torah') almost functions as an adjunct to 41: "Her king and princes [are] among the nations, *without* instruction." This means that 43 is to be connected to 41–42 as a whole.

The reason to connect 43 to 41, rather than to the immediately preceding 42, as syn04types suggests, is based on the fronted (and semantically connected) subjects מַלְכָּה וְשָׂרֶיהָ ('her king and princes') and נְבִיאֶיהָ ('her prophets'), in combination with the conjunction גַּם ('also', 'even').

Whether this is a syntactic or prosodic connection is difficult to say, as it is a little bit of both: The first slot in the clause has syntactic or pragmatic meaning here: contrast with the reader's expectations is expressed ('X, of all people,

...'). It also has prosodic significance, as the varying repetition in the A-colon of the two verselines creates an external parallelism, even though the clause types are different.

Annotation 2.24

proposed

גַּם־נְבִיאֶיהָ לֹא־מָצְאוּ חִזּוֹן מִיְהוָה: ס 43. (Lam 2,9)

יֵשְׁבוּ לָאָרֶץ 44. (Lam 2,10)

Even her prophets do not find visions from YHWH. 43. (Lam 2,9)

They sit on the ground 44. (Lam 2,10)

syn04types	ZYq0<XQt1 preV1sub00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt front-ing_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no-Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

חָשַׁב יְהוָה 31. (Lam 2,8)

<...>

יֵשְׁבוּ לָאָרֶץ 44. (Lam 2,10)

YHWH has determined 31. (Lam 2,8)

<...>

They sit on the ground 44. (Lam 2,10)

syn04types	ZYq0<ZQtX perV<perV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no-Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first

The suggestion by *syn04types*, to connect this clause to its predecessor, taking 'her prophets' to be its implied subject, seems obvious when the clauses are read one by one and in order. However, the following clause reveals that a new participants domain has started, marked by a new proper name: 'the elders of Daughter Zion'. The start of this domain coincides with the start of a new strophe, which by itself already raises an expectation of a break of sorts.

This has been missed by my labels as well as by *syn04types*. It is another example of the need to consider mother and daughter *units*, rather than individual clauses.

Incidentally, I see this clause as a clear case in which the demands of the acrostic has decidedly influenced the syntax:

- Initial *yiqtol* as a clause type stands out in its syntactic context, which is a series of *qatal* clauses.
- Moreover, the clause type usually has volitive meaning in Biblical Hebrew poetry,⁵ which is clearly inappropriate here.

I therefore suspect that the poet has chosen this clause type mainly because they needed a clause-initial '.

Annotation 2.25

		accepted
	יֹשְׁבוּ לָאָרֶץ	44. (Lam 2,10)
	יְדֹמוּ זְקֵנֵי בֵּת-צִיּוֹן	45.
	They sit on the ground	44. (Lam 2,10)
	in silence, the elders of Daughter Zion;	45.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj	new_nmpr_Subj	no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon		

Syn04types has made the right proposal, probably because of the use of *yiqtol* in both clauses. However, this passage does pose a puzzle for a formal syntactic analysis: If 43–47 were to be read without consideration of prosodic structure, the following hierarchy would seem obvious, judging from the distribution of explicit subjects and inflectional references:

גַּם-נְבִיאֶיהָ לֹא-מָצְאוּ חֲזוֹן מִיָּהוָה: ס	43 (her prophets)
יֹשְׁבוּ לָאָרֶץ	44 (they)
יְדֹמוּ זְקֵנֵי בֵּת-צִיּוֹן	45 (the elders of Zion)
הָעָלוּ עֵפֶר עַל-רֹאשָׁם	46 (they)
חָגְרוּ שָׁקִים	47 (they)

This arrangement makes syntactic and semantic sense. It is, however, incorrect. The prosodic divisions dictate that 44–45 together form a coordinated sentence with the subject in the second clause. The *qatal* clauses 46–47 are therefore to be connected to this coordinated sentence as a whole, rather than to just the last one.

⁵Niccacci 1990, 181; Kalkman 2015a, 125.

Annotation 2.26

	חָגְרוּ שָׁקִים	47.	proposed (Lam 2,10)
	הוֹרִידוּ לָאָרֶץ רֹאשָׁן בְּתוֹלַת יְרוּשָׁלַם: ס	48.	
	and put on sackcloth.	47.	(Lam 2,10)
	They have bowed their heads to the ground, the	48.	
	young women of Jerusalem.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	indep_indep
	no_fronting_no_fronting		non_disc_non_disc
	same_salience	same_vt	
participants	new_indep_Subj	new_nmpr_Subj	no_Subj_Subj
	same_verb_png		
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	diff_verseline	end_of_strophe
	in_same_strophe	new_verseline_conc	whole_verseline

	יִשְׁבוּ לָאָרֶץ	44.	corrected (Lam 2,10)
		< ... >	
	הוֹרִידוּ לָאָרֶץ רֹאשָׁן בְּתוֹלַת יְרוּשָׁלַם: ס	48.	
	They sit on the ground	44.	(Lam 2,10)
		< ... >	
	They have bowed their heads to the ground, the	48.	
	young women of Jerusalem.		

syn04types	ZQtX<ZYq0 ParalLex01 L...//...L pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_salience	diff_sentence
	disc_non_disc	indep_indep	no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	new_nmpr_Subj	diff_verb_png	new_indep_Subj
	no_Subj_Subj		
prosodic	end_of_strophe		end_to_start_of_strophe
	in_same_strophe	lexical_repetition	new_verseline
	whole_verseline		

This clause introduces a new participant by name: בְּתוֹלַת יְרוּשָׁלַם ('the daughters of Jerusalem'). The preceding clauses all have זִקְנֵי בֶת־צִיּוֹן ('the elders of daughter Zion', 45) as their subject, but this is missed (it should have resulted in the additional participants label Subj_Subj) because the coordination of 44–45 can not be taken into account when mother and daughter clause are compared in isolation.

Annotation 2.27

		proposed
הוֹרִידוּ לָאָרֶץ רֹאשָׁן בְּתוֹלֶת יְרוּשָׁלַם: ס	48.	(Lam 2,10)
כָּלוּ בְּדִמְעוֹת עֵינַי	49.	(Lam 2,11)
They have bowed their heads to the ground, the	48.	(Lam 2,10)
young women of Jerusalem.		
My eyes are worn out with tears,	49.	(Lam 2,11)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPD2<NPD2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff.salience diff.sentence in- dep.indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc.disc same_clause_type
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_first_to_other

		corrected
אֵיכָה יָעִיב בְּאַפּוֹ אֲדֹנָי אֶת־בֵּית־צִיּוֹן	1.	(Lam 2,1)
	< ... >	
כָּלוּ בְּדִמְעוֹת עֵינַי	49.	(Lam 2,11)
How Adonay has clouded Daughter Zion with his	1.	(Lam 2,1)
anger!		
	< ... >	
My eyes are worn out with tears,	49.	(Lam 2,11)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYqX 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 B...//...B 1/2P<3rdP perV<perV NPD2<NPD2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff.sentence diff.vt disc.disc indep.indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit Subj_Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

For the first time, an 'I' refers to themselves. On the other hand, the line of mainly initial *qatal* clauses of the preceding section appears to continue, the shift to 1 sg notwithstanding. The syntactic signs are confusing: Is the 'I' still the anonymous narrator, or does Daughter Jerusalem break in? Renkema opts for Jerusalem, based on content matter and structural arguments.⁶ Salters objects that this is impossible, because vs 13 *addresses* Zion, so she can not be the

⁶Renkema 1998, 268–269.

speaker of the speech, that starts at vs 11.⁷

I hold that Renkema is correct here. As for one, the content matter (grief about the children; tears, physical reactions to emotion), as well as the sudden change to 1 sg speech, indeed strongly point toward an interruption by Jerusalem much like the ones in Lam 1.

Moreover, Sanders objection ignores the dramatic nature of the text. He assumes that the 'I' in Lam 2,11–13 must refer to the same person throughout. But in a dramatic text, this need to be the case. The vocatives in vs 13 in my view clearly indicate the start of a new speech may be addressed. Thus, there are *two* speeches here: An outburst by Zion, interrupting the report by the narrator, and a reaction by the narrator, addressed directly at Zion.

Annotation 2.28

		proposed
	חֲמַרְמְרוּ מְעִי	50. (Lam 2,11)
	נִשְׁפָּן לָאָרֶץ כִּבְדִּי עַל־שֹׁכֵר בֵּת־עַמִּי	51.
	my bowels churn.	50. (Lam 2,11)
	my liver is poured out on the ground because of the	51.
	breaking of my Dear People,	

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png next_secondary_part sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

		corrected
	כָּלוּ בְדִמְעוֹת עֵינַי	49. (Lam 2,11)
		< ... >
	נִשְׁפָּן לָאָרֶץ כִּבְדִּי עַל־שֹׁכֵר בֵּת־עַמִּי	51.
	My eyes are worn out with tears,	49. (Lam 2,11)
		< ... >
	my liver is poured out on the ground because of the	51.
	breaking of my Dear People,	

⁷Salters 2014, 146 n. 74.

syn04types	VBt<VBt perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part Subj-Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred-Subj whole_verseline

In this case, it is difficult to determine the syntactic structure. There are all manner of linguistic signals, but they point to different solutions and it is not entirely clear which signals can be called syntactic and which are prosodic in nature:

- the continuation of the clause type (0QtX) places 51 in a chain with 49 and 50, so that a connection to 50 would seem appropriate.
- The semantics of these clauses support this: They all report emotional reactions of the speaker's body parts.
- However, 51–52 stands out from the other two in that its subject and verb are singular, rather than plural. This is, of course, a very subtle change which by itself would probably not count as the start of a new unit.
- A more visible syntactic difference is that 51 is longer and has a more complex syntax than 51–52: 51 has two extra adjuncts: **עַל-שֶׁכָּרַב בַּת-עַמִּי** ('because of the breaking of the daughter of my people') and **וּבְיָמֵינוּ** ('at the collapse of children and babies in the city squares'). It is, however, unclear to what degree this has any bearing on coherence and separation between clauses, as I have not investigated this.
- Prosodically, 51–52 form the second and third verseline of the strophe. The rhythm of the cola and verseline thus separates 51 from 49–50. This is the most readily visible, and thus the most prominent, argument.

All in all, the arguments for a new start are stronger than the arguments for straightforward continuation of the 0QtX line. However, the clause types obviously bind the clauses in this strophe together very strongly.

Annotation 2.29

		proposed
	לְאִמָּתָם יֹאמְרוּ 53.	(Lam 2,12)
	אֵיךְ דָּגָן וַיֵּין 54.	
They say to their mothers,	53.	(Lam 2,12)
"Where is grain and wine?"	54.	

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence direct_speech disc_disc fronting_no_fronting indep_indep new_interr same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

בַּעֲטָף עוֹלָל וַיִּזְנֶק בְּרַחֲבוֹת קְרִיָּה: ס 52. (Lam 2,11)

לְאִמָּתָם יֹאמְרוּ 53. (Lam 2,12)

as little one and baby faint in the town squares. 52. (Lam 2,11)

They say to their mothers, 53. (Lam 2,12)

syn04types	xYq0<InfC Quot<0 preVlsub00 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt no_fronting_fronting
participants	Subj_no_Subj verb_to_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

The syntactic situation is somewhat unusual, as there is a continuation of a subordinated infinitive construct clause. In such cases, the usual connection would be to the sentence as a whole (51–52). However, since 52 is a long clause, complete with adjunct, and since the referent ‘child and baby’ occurs only in this clause, there is no other option. At any rate, this ‘enjambment’⁸ has the effect of binding the two strophes together more tightly to each other than to their surroundings.

As for the fronting of לְאִמָּתָם (‘to their mothers’), I see no pragmatic meaning for it:

- There is no contrast to other elements in the context, as the mothers are the only ones the children and babies call out to.
- Neither does there seem to be a contrast to the reader’s expectations: Mothers would be the most obvious address for a call by children.
- The introduction of a new participant could be a pragmatic motivation, but this is only partly convincing: The mothers are clearly a secondary character, while the children remain the active main participant.

It seems reasonable to assume, then, that the fronting is due to the demands of the acrostic.

⁸Strictly speaking, the term refers to the breaking up of clauses or sentences. This case concerns a larger syntactic unit (either a paragraph or a participants domain).

Note, by the way, that the *yiqtol* form, which is exceptional in the syntactic context, is not clause-initial as in 44, so prosodic considerations do not appear to play a role. This would be impossible anyway, because this line requires an initial ל, not a י. Its explanation could be that the poet switches to a more discursive clause type while painting the painful image of children desperately calling to their mothers for food.

The verb has עוֹלֵל וְיוֹנֵק ('child and baby') as its subject, which *syn04types* has not recognized as plural. In the participants labels, the congruence has been recognized, because nominal phrases with the connection -י within them are labeled as plural. This results in some errors, as nominal phrases of this type can be connected with singular⁹ as well as plural¹⁰ predicates. Moreover, congruence between a subject and the verb in a following clause does not always mean a continuation of that subject.¹¹ It is clear, then, that the (automatic) analysis of participant references in these cases still needs some sophistication.

Annotation 2.30

	לְאִמֹתָם יֹאמְרוּ	53.	proposed (Lam 2,12)
		< ... >	
	מֶה־אֶעֱיֶדְךָ	57.	(Lam 2,13)
	They say to their mothers,	53.	(Lam 2,12)
		< ... >	
	What can I testify for you,	57.	(Lam 2,13)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Quot Ques<0 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP NoRefer- ral Asyn<QtVb
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence direct_speech disc.disc fronting_fronting indep_indep new_interr same_clause_type same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe.first_to.first stro- phe_to_strophe

⁹Lam 2,20; 2,22; 3,38; 3,47; 4,12.

¹⁰Lam 1,18; 1,19; 2,21; 2,21.

¹¹Lam 1,12 (65–66), Lam 4,10 (31–32), Lam 4,22 (83–85) and Lam 4,22 (83–87).

	corrected	
כלו בדמעות עיני	49.	(Lam 2,11)
	< ... >	
מה־אֶעֱיֵדךָ	57.	(Lam 2,13)
My eyes are worn out with tears,	49.	(Lam 2,11)
	< ... >	
What can I testify for you,	57.	(Lam 2,13)

syn04types	xYq0<ZQtX Ques<0 preV2par00 pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep new_interr no_fronting_fronting same_salience
participants	verb_to_sfx Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

The main reason to start a new unit here is that there is a change in the speech situation: a ‘you’ (2 f.sg), who later on in the sentence turns out to be Daughter Jerusalem, is addressed by an ‘I’, who presumably is identical to the speaker of vs 11. The shift is not spotted by my patterns. Syn04types does note the change from the third person verb to the first person verb, but fails to notice the internal hierarchy of vs 11, in which vs 12 is only an elaboration on 52, after which 57 returns to the previous level of the discourse.

This case, then, requires a more sophisticated analysis of the participant references, which would compare *sets* of references between *units* of text.¹²

Annotation 2.31

	proposed	
מָה אֶדְמָה־לָּךְ	58.	(Lam 2,13)
הֵבֵת יְרוּשָׁלַם	59.	
with what compare you,	58.	(Lam 2,13)
Daughter Jerusalem?	59.	

syn04types	Voct<xYq0 0<Ques preV1sub00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn disc_disc indep_dep same_salience
participants	new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj voca_to_sec_ps
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

¹²See Talstra 2016; Erwich and Talstra 2017.

		corrected
	מֶה־אֶעֱיֵדָךְ	57. (Lam 2,13)
	< ... >	
	הַבֵּת יְרוּשָׁלַם	59.
	What can I testify for you,	57. (Lam 2,13)
	< ... >	
	Daughter Jerusalem?	59.

syn04types	Voct<xYq0 0<Ques preV1sub00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn disc_disc indep_dep same_salience same_sentence
participants	new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj voca_to_sec_ps
prosodic	to_multi_verb_colon A.colon.B.colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

The vocative belongs to both מֶה־clauses, rather than just the last one. The bond between the two is strengthened because they are placed within the same colon.

Annotation 2.32

		proposed
	מֶה אֲשׁוּהָ־לָךְ	60. (Lam 2,13)
	< ... >	
	כִּי־גָדוֹל כִּים שִׁבְרָךְ	63.
	To what can I liken you	60. (Lam 2,13)
	< ... >	
	For vast as the sea is your breaking,	63.

syn04types	AjC1<xYq0 0<Ques preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

corrected

מה־אֶעֱיֶדֶךָ 57. (Lam 2,13)

<...>

כִּי־גָדוֹל כַּיָּם שִׁבְרֶךָ 63.

What can I testify for you, 57. (Lam 2,13)

<...>

For vast as the sea is your breaking, 63.

syn04types	AjCl<xYq0 0<Ques prev2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

The כִּי-clause closes the series of מה clauses, and actually refers to both. There is also a subtle change in participant references: The 'I' makes way for third person forms, although the 2 f.sg references remain. This has not been caught by my patterns. It would require a more sophisticated participants analysis to chart shifts in *combinations* of references.

Annotation 2.33

proposed

מִי יִרְפָּא־לָךְ: ס 64. (Lam 2,13)

נְבִיאֶיךָ חֲזוּ לָךְ שׁוֹא וְתַפֵּל 65. (Lam 2,14)

who could ever heal you? 64. (Lam 2,13)

Your prophets gave you empty whitewash for 65. (Lam 2,14)

visions,

syn04types	XQt1<XYqt 0<Ques prev1sub00 L...//...L perV<perV NPd1<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verbpng next_secondary_part sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic lexical_repetition new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	מה־אֶעֱיֶדֶךָ	57.	(Lam 2,13)	corrected
		< ... >		
	נְבִיאֶיךָ חָזוּ לְךָ שׁוֹא וְתַפֵּל	65.	(Lam 2,14)	
	What can I testify for you,	57.	(Lam 2,13)	
		< ... >		
	Your prophets gave you empty whitewash for	65.	(Lam 2,14)	
	visions,			

syn04types	XQt1<xYq0 0<Ques prev1sub00 Npd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front-ing_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe.first_to_first strophe_to_strophe whole_verseline

This is another example of the relatively self-contained character of strophes, which makes it difficult to place them in the overall hierarchy of the text. The strophes in Lam 2,14–17 each present a different participant and their actions toward Zion. They are bound together only by way of the 2 f.sg suffixes and the dominant *qatal* forms. Apart from that, they are strung together asyndetically, like beads on a string.

As for the first of them, vs 13, a syntactic and semantic argument could be made to connect it to the rhetorical question 64 (“Who can heal you?”): The strophe describes how Zion’s prophets—the ones most suited for the job—are worthless in healing, because they have already failed at warning Israel of its wrongdoings when repentance and healing was still possible. A shift from *yiqtol* to *qatal* fits this connection perfectly.¹³

However, considering the self-containment of the strophes, it would seem more appropriate to connect the series of strophes starting with 65 to 57–64 as a whole, so that the descriptions in these strophes become an elaboration of the rhetorical questions 57–59 and 60–62 (basically the question: “With what can I compare your misery?”).

¹³Kalkman 2015a, 316, cat. IIIc: a *qatal* daughter as backgrounded information to a discursive *yiqtol* mother.

Annotation 2.34

	accepted
נְבִיאֶיךָ חֲזוּ לְךָ שׁוֹא וְתַפֵּל 65. (Lam 2,14)	
וְלֹא-גִלּוּ עַל-עֲוֹנֶךָ 66.	
Your prophets gave you empty whitewash for 65. (Lam 2,14)	
visions,	
and did not expose your wickedness 66.	

syn04types	VBt<VBt Cocj<0 preVlpar00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj same_vt diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj sfx_to_sfx Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline

This connection is rather obvious; to be frank, I do not see why syn04types would propose otherwise.

Annotation 2.35

	proposed
וַיַּחֲזוּ לְךָ מִשְׁאוֹת שׁוֹא וּמְדוּחִים: ס 68. (Lam 2,14)	
סָפְקוּ עָלֶיךָ כַּפִּים כָּל-עַבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ 69. (Lam 2,15)	
They gave you empty and misleading messages. 68. (Lam 2,14)	
All those passing on the way clap their hands at you, 69. (Lam 2,15)	

syn04types	ZQtX<Way0 0<Cocj pngV<pngV Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	corrected
נְבִיאֶיךָ חֲזוּ לְךָ שׁוֹא וְתַפֵּל 65. (Lam 2,14)	
< ... >	
סָפְקוּ עָלֶיךָ כַּפִּים כָּל-עַבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ 69. (Lam 2,15)	
Your prophets gave you empty whitewash for 65. (Lam 2,14)	
visions,	
< ... >	
All those passing on the way clap their hands at you, 69. (Lam 2,15)	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	fronting_no_fronting asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj Subj_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic chiasticPred.Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

It is remarkable that 65 has a fronted subject, while 69 (and 76)) do not. One would expect fronting in all three or in none. It is probably best not to make too much of this: fronting when introducing a new participant or a new item in a list is optional.

Perhaps the acrostic has tipped the scales towards no fronting: ס and פ are not very frequent at the beginning of words (see p. 214ff. of the dissertation). The appearance of a new participant ('all who pass by the way') starts a new unit, as does the start of the new strophe. The new participant, even though not having a suffix itself, is still bound to the 2 f.sg main participant of the preceding two strophes, so the basic form of communication continues: The speaker confronts Jerusalem / Zion with a list of groups that are in some way connected to her.

Annotation 2.36

		proposed
סָפְקוּ עָלֶיךָ בְּפִים כָּל-עַבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ	69.	(Lam 2,15)
	< ... >	
וַיִּנְעוּ רֹאשָׁם עַל-בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַם	71.	
All those passing on the way clap their hands at you,	69.	(Lam 2,15)
	< ... >	
and shake their heads at Daughter Jerusalem:	71.	

syn04types	Way0<ZQtX Cocj<0 <L...<L 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj new_nmpr_other same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
שָׁרְקוּ	70.	(Lam 2,15)
וַיִּנְעוּ רֹאשָׁם עַל-בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַם	71.	
they whistle	70.	(Lam 2,15)
and shake their heads at Daughter Jerusalem:	71.	

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon

Syn04types proposes a connection with 69 because of the repetition of עָל. However, שָׁרְקוּ ('they whistle') and וַיִּנְעוּ רִאשָׁם ('they shake their heads') are clearly connected as a single coordinated sentence: 'they whistle and shake their heads about Daughter Jerusalem'.

The fact that the two verbs occur within the same colon, with the adjunct to both clauses occurring in the second colon, strengthens this observation.

Annotation 2.37

	שָׁרְקוּ	70.	proposed (Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	הֲזֹאת הָעִיר	72.	
	they whistle	70.	(Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	"Is this the city	72.	

syn04types	NmCl<ZQt0 Ques<0 NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep new_deictic new_interr non_disc_disc
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

	סָפְקוּ עָלֶיךָ כַּפִּים כָּל־עַבְרֵי דֶרֶךְ	69.	corrected (Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	הֲזֹאת הָעִיר	72.	
	All those passing on the way clap their hands at you,	69.	(Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	"Is this the city	72.	

syn04types	NmCl<ZQtX Ques<0 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn new_deictic new_interr no_fronting_fronting diff_sentence disc_disc in- dep_indep same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj Subj_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline chiastic_Pred_Subj end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The reason to start a new unit here, is that a direct speech starts, presumably spoken by those who pass by the way (69). This is, however, not marked directly, e.g. by a quotation formula. Rather, the various clues of highly discursive language (asyndesis, deixis, interrogatives), combined with the contents, which fit the taunting gestures of whistling and shaking of the head, provide cumulative evidence for this.

This type of shift in speech situation is common in dramatic texts. To be sure, this case is slightly different, in that the passers-by do not actually start to speak here, but are quoted by the 'I'. The fact that this 'I' quotes them without any introduction, however, appears in line with what happens throughout these texts.

A prosodic observation: The direct speech coincides with the closing verseline of the strophe. This verseline differs prosodically from the preceding two (tricolon after two bicola), but also text-syntactically. In that sense, the shift to direct speech can be described as closure by breaking a pattern, although admittedly two lines can hardly be called a pattern.

Annotation 2.38

	שִׂיאֲמָרוֹ	73.	proposed (Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	מָשׁוֹשׁ לְכָל-הָאָרֶץ: ס	75.	
	that is called	73.	(Lam 2,15)
		< ... >	
	the joy of all the earth?"	75.	

syn04types	NmCl<xYq0 0<Quot prev1sub00 0<Soc j Asyn<QtVb
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_C_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

corrected

- כָּלִילַת יָפִי 74. (Lam 2,15)
 מְשׁוֹשׁ לְכָל-הָאָרֶץ: ס 75.
 the perfection of beauty, 74. (Lam 2,15)
 the joy of all the earth?" 75.

syn04types	NmCl<NmCl preV1par00
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_C_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

The precise connection of 75 (to 74 as a continuation of the nominal clause, or to 73 as a second, independent predication) is not very consequential text-syntactically; I have chosen the former because of the matching clause types and the semantic overlap.

Annotation 2.39**accepted**

- אַךְ זֶה הַיּוֹם 81. (Lam 2,16)
 שְׁקוּיִנְהוּ 82.
 Ah, this is the day 81. (Lam 2,16)
 we have waited for; 82.

syn04types	xQt0<NmCl preV2sub00 Socj<0 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral Rela<Main
syntactic	Attr_clause asyn_conj indep_dep same_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Subj
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_colon

The label *sfx_to_Subj* is formally correct, in that it notes formal congruence between זֶה ('this') and the 3 m.sg suffix, but the actual reference is the predicate הַיּוֹם ('the day'). The label *sfx_to_Pred* has, however, not been assigned, because the phrase as a whole has apparently not been labeled as masculine singular, presumably due to shortcomings in my participant labels.

Annotation 2.40**proposed**

- שְׁקוּיִנְהוּ 82. (Lam 2,16)
 מְצָאֵנוּ 83.
 we have waited for; 82. (Lam 2,16)
 now we have found it, 83.

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 prev2par00 0<Socj Coor<Main pngV<pngV
syntactic	conj_async dep_indep diff_sentence disc.disc same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

		corrected
	אַךְ זֶה הַיּוֹם	81. (Lam 2,16)
	<...>	
	מָצָאנוּ	83.
	Ah, this is the day	81. (Lam 2,16)
	<...>	
	now we have found it,	83.

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl prev1sub00 prev2sub00 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	indep_indep asyn_async asyn_conj_async diff_sentence indep_dep_indep
participants	Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline end_of_strophe to_multi_clause_colon

The proposal by syn04types amounts to assuming coordination, or multiple-duty for ψ ('that (which)'): "Indeed, this is the day that we have waited for, [that we have] found, [that we have] seen."

To be fair, there do not appear to be formal signals to preclude this interpretation, other than the absence of ψ and the rhythm of the verseline, which places a slight pause between 81–82 and 83.

Also, the semantics would seem to make a series like 'we hoped, found and saw' a bit rash, as if it were a self-evident sequence of events, but this is no argument, as it may very well have been the entire point of this wording.

All in all, however, I think that 83–84 are to be seen as two independent clauses, rather than coordinated subordinates to 82. Therefore, I have connected it to sentence 81–82 as a whole.

Annotation 2.41

		proposed
רְאִינוּ: ס	84.	(Lam 2,16)
עָשָׂה יְהוָה	85.	(Lam 2,17)
seen it."	84.	(Lam 2,16)
YHWH has done	85.	(Lam 2,17)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 3rdP<1/2P NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	Objc_clause asyn_async diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_indep same_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

		corrected
פָּצוּ עֲלֵיהֶם פִּיהֶם כָּל-אוֹיְבֵיהֶם	76.	(Lam 2,16)
	< ... >	
עָשָׂה יְהוָה	85.	(Lam 2,17)
All your enemies open their mouths wide against	76.	(Lam 2,16)
you,		
	< ... >	
YHWH has done	85.	(Lam 2,17)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_async diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

Annotation 2.42

		proposed
אֲשֶׁר זָמַם	86.	(Lam 2,17)
בָּצַע אִמְרָתוֹ	87.	
what he had planned,	86.	(Lam 2,17)
has fulfilled his word;	87.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj Coor<Main pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPD2<0
syntactic	conj_async dep_indep diff_sentence non_discnon_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

עָשָׂה יְהוָה 85. (Lam 2,17)

<...>

בָּצַע אֱמָרָתוֹ 87.

YHWH has done 85. (Lam 2,17)

<...>

has fulfilled his word; 87.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPD2<NPD2 0<Subj
syntactic	async_async same_vt async_conj_async diff_sentence in- dep_dep_indep indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_discnon_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon to_multi_clause_colon

Annotation 2.43**proposed**

בָּצַע אֱמָרָתוֹ 87. (Lam 2,17)

אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מִיָּמִי־קָדֶם 88.

has fulfilled his word; 87. (Lam 2,17)

(has done) what he decreed long ago: 88.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPD2 Rela<Main
syntactic	async_conj indep_dep main_ellipsis same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
עָשָׂה יְהוָה	85.	(Lam 2,17)
	< ... >	
אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מִימֵי־קֶדֶם	88.	
YHWH has done	85.	(Lam 2,17)
	< ... >	
(has done) what he decreed long ago:	88.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj Rela<Main
syntactic	asyn_conj indep_dep main_ellipsis same_sentence same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	new-verseline in_same_strophe

In the most obvious syntactic analysis of this clause, the prosodic analysis runs counter to the syntactic one, as is immediately clear from the layout in Berlin's translation:¹⁴

The LORD did what he planned,
 he carried out his word,
 as he ordained long ago.
 He destroyed and showed no mercy.
 And he made the enemy rejoice over you,
 he raised the horn of your enemy.

This would seem to be a double case of enjambment: Both the second and the third verseline start on a clause level conjunction (אֲשֶׁר and ו-), while the B-cola in these verses are asyndetic main clauses.

Even though enjambments between verselines are by no means unheard of in Biblical Hebrew poetry, they are rare.¹⁵ This *double* enjambment begs the question, whether the syntax should be construed differently. when prosodic balance and syntactic structure are combined, 88 could perhaps be read as an ellipsis of 85:

The LORD did what he planned,
 he carried out his word.
 [He did] as he ordained long ago:
 he destroyed and showed no mercy.
 And he made the enemy rejoice over you,
 he raised the horn of your enemy.

This option seems to be the most satisfactory one, at least for 88.

¹⁴Berlin 2002, 64.

¹⁵van Grol 2015, 96–97.

Annotation 2.44

	proposed
וְלֹא חָמֵל 90.	(Lam 2,17)
וַיַּשְׂמַח עָלֶיךָ אוֹיֵב 91.	
without mercy. 90.	(Lam 2,17)
And he made the enemy joyful about you, 91.	

syn04types	Way0<WxQ0 Cocj<Cocj preVlpar00 preV2par00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV NoReferral
syntactic	conj_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep non_disc_disc same_conj
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict

	corrected
עָשָׂה יְהוָה 85.	(Lam 2,17)
< ... >	
וַיַּשְׂמַח עָלֶיךָ אוֹיֵב 91.	
YHWH has done 85.	(Lam 2,17)
< ... >	
And he made the enemy joyful about you, 91.	

syn04types	Way0<ZQtX Cocj<0 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	end.to.start.of.strophe end.of.strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict

My treatment of 91–92 as closing the entire strophe is connected with my interpretation of 88 as an ellipsis ('[YHWH has done] what he had ordained ...'), and the introduction of the enemy and the foe, where YHWH has been the sole actor in the rest of the strophe.

Annotation 2.45

proposed

הָרִים קָרָן צָרִידָ: ס	92.	(Lam 2,17)
צָעַק לָבָם אֶל־אֲדֹנָי	93.	(Lam 2,18)
exalted the horn of your foes.	92.	(Lam 2,17)
Their hearts cry out to Adonay,	93.	(Lam 2,18)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit new_nmpr_other no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_other
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

מָה־אֶעֱיֵדָךְ	57.	(Lam 2,13)
< ... >		
צָעַק לָבָם אֶל־אֲדֹנָי	93.	(Lam 2,18)
What can I testify for you,	57.	(Lam 2,13)
< ... >		
Their hearts cry out to Adonay,	93.	(Lam 2,18)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYq0 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc fronting_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	Voct_to_Voct changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png new_nmpr_other no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

This clause is an well-known exegetical problem. It seems to mean: “Their heart cries out to Adonay.” However, it is not at all clear, to whom the 3 m.pl suffix refers.¹⁶ Various solutions have been proposed:

- Hillers heavily emends the verse,¹⁷ so that it reads: “Cry from the heart to the Lord, O remorseful Zion!”¹⁸ Renkema, however, correctly objects that no witnesses support emendation and that, in fact, LXX supports

¹⁶Renkema 1998, 307; Hillers 1992, 101; Berlin 2002, 74.

¹⁷Hillers 1992, 101.

¹⁸Hillers 1992, 95.

MT in its current reading.¹⁹

- Berlin retains MT and interprets the suffix as referring to the collective people of Jerusalem (or, quoting the Targum: Israel).²⁰
- Renkema also retains MT, but connects the suffix to Jerusalem's children (נֶפֶשׁ עוֹלָלִיךָ, vs 19c, 101), based on the concentric structure of the canticle vs 18–19.²¹ This proposal would be quite convincing if the suffix and the antecedent had appeared in the reverse order. As it stands, the proposal means that the canticle starts with an enigmatic suffix, apparently referring to no one in particular, which only in the last verseline turns out to Jerusalem's children. This type of postponed identification does occur more often in Lamentations, most conspicuously in the 3 m.sg references of Lam 3, which are not identified until Lam 3,18b. If Renkema's identification is correct, this postponed identification would probably serve to make the impact of mentioning the starving children all the more dramatic.

At any rate, barring emendation, the text-syntactic structure is the same in either case: The vocative / proper noun phrase הוֹמֶת בֵּת-צִיּוֹן ('wall of Daughter Zion') causes the start of a new syntactic unit (even though one must look further than 93 to spot this). In terms of communicational domains, another participant is addressed (or, if 'wall of Daughter Zion' is deemed to be synonymous with 'Daughter Zion', the same addressee is renominalized).

Annotation 2.46

		proposed
	הוֹמֶת בֵּת-צִיּוֹן	94. (Lam 2,18)
	הוֹרִידִי כְנָחַל דְּמָעָה יוֹמָם וּלְיָלָה	95.
	you walls of Daughter Zion!	94. (Lam 2,18)
	let your tears flow like a river day and night;	95.

syn04types	ZIm0<Voct preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd1 Main<Voct
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj sec_ps_to_voca
prosodic	B_colonA_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

¹⁹Renkema 1998, 307.

²⁰Berlin 2002, 74.

²¹Renkema 1998, 308.

		corrected
	צַעֲק לָבָם אֶל-אֲדֹנָי	93. (Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
	הוֹרִידִי כִנְחָל דְּמָעָה יוֹמָם וּלְיָלָה	95.
	Their hearts cry out to Adonay,	93. (Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
	let your tears flow like a river day and night;	95.

syn04types	ZIm0<ZQtX 1/2P<3rdP numV<numV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn indep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png sec_ps_to_voca
prosodic	new_verseline in_same_strophe whole_verseline

This verse is difficult, and is often emended.²² Among those who retain MT, the interpretations, especially of the phrase **חֹמַת בֵּת-צִיּוֹן** ('the wall of Daughter Zion'), varies greatly.²³ *ETCBC* has not made any emendations (as per *ETCBC* policy), and has parsed 94 as a vocative. This appears correct, in view of the following 2 f.sg imperatives and jussives.

The proposal by *syn04types*, to connect the 2 f.sg imperative clause to the f.sg vocative, makes a lot of sense syntactically, especially since the 3 m.sg *qatal* in 93 is *not* congruent with it. In a strictly formal, strictly syntactic analysis, 91–95 would probably have to be arranged as:

וַיִּשְׁמַח עָלֶיהָ אוֹיֵב	Way0	91
הָרִים קָרָן צָרֶיהָ: ס	ZQt0	92
צַעֲק לָבָם אֶל-אֲדֹנָי	ZQtX	93 2,18
חֹמַת בֵּת-צִיּוֹן	Voct	94
הוֹרִידִי כִנְחָל דְּמָעָה יוֹמָם וּלְיָלָה	ZIm0	95

In this arrangement, all references are connected with a congruent antecedent, and the sequences of clause types are quite common.

However, semantics already precludes the identification of the suffix in 94 with the foes in 93, since it is highly unlikely that the heart of Zion's foes would cry out to Adonay.

Moreover, the prosodic structure all but makes the arrangement impossible. Having a new participant domain start with a vocative in a B-colon, rendering the A-colon an enjambment from the preceding strophe, is very awk-

²²Albrektson 1963, 116–118; Hillers 1992, 101.

²³Berlin 2002, 75: vocative, imploring the city walls. Renkema 1998, 311: vocative, referring to Adonay; the phrase is direct speech, introduced by **צַעֲק**. Gottwald 1962, 12: apposition to Adonay.

ward. The rhythm of the verselines and strophes dictates that 93–94 belong together, awkward as this may seem.

Note, further, that the label *changing_speech_situation* has been assigned erroneously, on the basis of the shift from non-discursive, third person *qatal* to discursive, second person imperative. This is an error arising from considering mother and daughter clause in isolation: If the vocative following the *qatal* clause would have been taken into account, the *qatal* clause would have been recognized as discursive, and part of the direct speech, as well.

Annotation 2.47

	proposed	
אַל-תִּתְּנִי פִּוְגַת לִךְ	96.	(Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
קוּמִי	98.	(Lam 2,19)
give yourself no pause,	96.	(Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
Arise,	98.	(Lam 2,19)

syn04types	ZIm0<xYq0 prev1par00 prev2par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected	
הוֹרִידִי בְּנַחַל דְּמָעָה יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה	95.	(Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
קוּמִי	98.	(Lam 2,19)
let your tears flow like a river day and night;	95.	(Lam 2,18)
	< ... >	
Arise,	98.	(Lam 2,19)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_strophe acrostic strophe_first_to_other

Annotation 2.48

accepted

98. (Lam 2,19) קומי

99. רני *ב**ליל לראש אשמרות

98. (Lam 2,19) Arise,

99. cry out at night, at the start of every watch;

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon

99. Lam 2,19 . [RO74N.IJ ;Pred₂] [*B-*LJL ;Time₂] [L:-RO₂C03 ;AC:MURO80WT ;Time₂]

That these two clause atoms are to be connected, is clear, both to computer program and researcher. The two verbs קומי רני ('Rise up, cry out') appear within the same colon, and are coordinated. This means that the temporal adjuncts actually belong to both. The present clause atom division does not reflect this, keeping them with the second verb only. This raises the question whether it should not be changed, to:

98 קומי

99 . . רני

99 . בליל לראש אשמרות

Annotation 2.49

proposed

102. (Lam 2,19) העטופים ברעב בראש כל-חוצות: ס

103. (Lam 2,20) ראה

102. (Lam 2,19) who faint from hunger at every street corner.

103. (Lam 2,20) "Look,

syn04types	ZIm0<AjCl prev1sub00 prev2par00 0<Socj 1/2P<3rdP
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence root
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	C_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe strophe.first.to.other

Annotation 2.50

		root
	צַעֲקוּ לָבָם אֶל-אֲדֹנָי	93. (Lam 2,18)
	<...>	
	רֵאֵה	103. (Lam 2,20)
	Their hearts cry out to Adonay,	93. (Lam 2,18)
	<...>	
	“Look,	103. (Lam 2,20)

syn04types	ZIm0<ZQtX 1/2P<3rdP numV<numV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_async diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep non_disc_disc root
participants	Subj_no_Subj Voct_to_Voct changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png sec_ps_to_voca
prosodic	acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe strophe_phe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

This clause starts an entirely new communicational domain: A new speaker, Zion, addresses a new addressee, YHWH. This is not marked in any other way than the vocative יהוה in 104i, the semantics of the 1 sg references (*‘my maidens and youths’* 110), which can only refer to Zion, not to the narrator. In fact, this speech by Zion can be seen as the reaction to the narrator’s call to prayer in vs 19.²⁴

In order to see these things, the entire sections vs 20 and vs 19 need to be compared.

Annotation 2.51

		proposed
	וְהִבִּיטָה	105. (Lam 2,20)
	לְמִי עוֹלָלָת כֹּה	106.
	and consider	105. (Lam 2,20)
	to whom you have caused this:	106.

syn04types	xQt0<WIm0 0<Cocj prevlpar00 pngV<pngV
syntactic	Objc_clause conj_async diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep new_interr same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

²⁴Berlin 2002, 75.

corrected

רָאָה 103. (Lam 2,20)

<...>

לְמִי עוֹלָלָתְךָ כֹּה 106.

“Look, 103. (Lam 2,20)

<...>

to whom you have caused this: 106.

syn04types	xQt0<ZIm0 preVlpar00 pngV<pngV
syntactic	Objc_clause asyn_async diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep new_interr same_salience same_sentence
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon to_multi_verb_colon

106 is a complement to both רָאָה (103) and הִפִּיטָה (105). The two verbs are coordinated: “Look and see, YHWH, to whom you have done this.” This is evident from a number of arguments:

- Both verbs can have a complement expressing what is to be seen / looked at. They are virtually synonymous.
- The verbs occur together in the same colon, their shared complement occurs in the second colon.

Therefore, this complement must be connected to the coordinated clauses as a unit.

Annotation 2.52

proposed

לְמִי עוֹלָלָתְךָ כֹּה 106. (Lam 2,20)

אִם־תֹּאכְלֶנָּה נָשִׁים פְּרִים עֲלֵלֵי טַפָּחִים 107.

to whom you have caused this: 106. (Lam 2,20)

Should women eat their offspring, the little ones they 107.

cared for?

syn04types	xYqX<xQt0 preV2sub00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P Npd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_conj dep_dep diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting same_salience same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	רָאֵה 103.	(Lam 2,20)
	<...>	
	אִם-תֹּאכְלֶנָּה נָשִׁים פְּרִים עַלְלֵי טַפָּחִים 107.	
	“Look,	103. (Lam 2,20)
	<...>	
	Should women eat their offspring, the little ones they	107.
	cared for?	

syn04types	xYqX<ZIm0 preV2par00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P Npd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral Objc<Main
syntactic	Objc_clause asyn_conj diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep same_salience same_sentence
participants	new_indep_Subj diff_verb.png no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

Syntactically, the אם (‘if’) clauses 107–108 are object clauses to רָאֵה וְהִבִּיטָה (“Look and see if ...”). Pragmatically, they appear to function as exclamations; hence, probably, the use of *yiqtol*.²⁵

Annotation 2.53

		proposed
	אִם-יִהְיֶה בְּמִקְדָּשׁ אֲדֹנָי כֶּהֱן וְנָבִיא: ס 108.	(Lam 2,20)
	שָׁכְבוּ לָאָרֶץ חִיּוֹת נֶעֱר וְזָקֵן 109.	(Lam 2,21)
	Should priest and prophet be killed in the sanctuary	108. (Lam 2,20)
	of Adonay?	
	On the ground in the streets lie young and old;	109. (Lam 2,21)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYqX preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj perV<perV Subj<Subj
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb.png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

²⁵Cf., in a slightly different but related syntactic context, Joüon and Muraoka 1991, 165g-j.

			corrected
	רֹאֵה	103.	(Lam 2,20)
		<...>	
	שָׁכְבוּ לָאָרֶץ חִיּוֹת נְעִר וְזָקֵן	109.	(Lam 2,21)
	"Look,	103.	(Lam 2,20)
		<...>	
	On the ground in the streets lie young and old;	109.	(Lam 2,21)

syn04types	ZQtX<ZIm0 3rdP<1/2P Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	new_indep_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first stro- phe_to_strophe whole_verseline

The main arguments for a new start, rather than a connection to the **ראֵה**-clauses lie in the asyndetic start, the change of linguistic stance and the new participants. That these changes happen in the start of a strophe further strengthens this arrangement. In my estimation, this is an example in which strophes effectively function as syntactic units, comparable to syntactic paragraphs.

This clause obviously shifts from highly discursive clauses (imperative, vocative, interrogatives) to more descriptive clause types (*qatal*, third person). Since it has no conjunctions or matching participant references which could tie it to the preceding context, it is somewhat difficult to determine its precise mother clause.

In fact, I would argue that there is no real mother clause: Rather, there is a connection with the entire *unit* 103–108. This connection is rather loose, in that it largely consists in the fact that the one follows the other. If 109 is considered in its wider context, it is clear from the 2 m.sg forms later on that YHWH is still being addressed. This means that the label *changing_speech_situation* has been wrongfully assigned.

Annotation 2.54

			accepted
	שָׁכְבוּ לָאָרֶץ חִיּוֹת נְעִר וְזָקֵן	109.	(Lam 2,21)
	בְּתוֹלְתִּי וּבַחֲוֹרֵי נָפְלוּ בַּחֶרֶב	110.	
	On the ground in the streets lie young and old;	109.	(Lam 2,21)
	my young women and young men have fallen by the	110.	
	sword.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV Npd1<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep.indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	Subj.Subj changing_speech_sit same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

The clause hierarchy is no issue here. The fronting of בְּתוֹלָתֵי וְבַחֲוָרֵי ('my maidens and youths') does not appear to have any pragmatic meaning, especially since it is clearly parallel with נָעַר וְזָקֵן ('young and old') in the previous clause. To the letter, this case does not qualify as prosodic fronting according to Lunn: Lunn's criteria require the fronting to be in a B-colon, with the canonical clause in the A-colon, while here, the inversion happens between two verselines. Nevertheless, I would maintain that the two lines are parallel to such a degree, that their chiastic arrangement is sufficient explanation for this fronting.

Annotation 2.55

		accepted
	שָׁכְבוּ לְאֶרֶץ חוּצוֹת נָעַר וְזָקֵן	109. (Lam 2,21)
		<...>
	הֲרַגְתָּ בְּיוֹם אַפֶּךָ	111.
	On the ground in the streets lie young and old;	109. (Lam 2,21)
		<...>
	You have killed them on the day of your anger,	111.

syn04types	VBT<VBT 1/2P<3rdP 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn indep_indep same_vt diff_salience diff_sentence non_disc_disc
participants	diff_verb_png Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

At the start of the new verseline, the discourse shifts back to 2 m.sg forms again, after the 3 pl forms in the preceding verseline. Yet, the initial *qatal* forms (and the absence of a new vocative) do provide enough cohesion to 109–110 to connect to these clauses as a unit.

The label *changing_speech_situation* is again incorrect. The beginning and end of direct speech domains clearly require a broader context than just a mother-daughter clause pair.

Annotation 2.56

		proposed
	לֹא חֲמַלְתָּ: ס	113. (Lam 2,21)
	תִּקְרָא כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד מְגוּרֵי מִסְבִּיב	114. (Lam 2,22)
	without mercy.	113. (Lam 2,21)
You called, as if on a feast day, my terrors from all		114. (Lam 2,22)
around,		

syn04types	ZYq0<xQt0 preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	רֵאָה	103. (Lam 2,20)
	<...>	
	תִּקְרָא כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד מְגוּרֵי מִסְבִּיב	114. (Lam 2,22)
	“Look,	103. (Lam 2,20)
	<...>	
You called, as if on a feast day, my terrors from all		114. (Lam 2,22)
around,		

syn04types	ZYq0<ZIm0 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn indep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe whole_verseline

With the start of the η -strophe, the discourse returns to the more discursive clause type 0Yq0. However, it is quite clear from the contents that this clause type cannot be interpreted in its default volitive sense: Zion (the presumed speaker here) obviously can not be *wishing* YHWH to invite her attackers. There do not seem to be any syntactic factors blocking its volitive function, either. Kalkman does point out that 0-yiqtol frequently loses its volitive meaning when it is embedded in a narrative context,²⁶ but he specifically refers to a context of *wayyiqtol* forms, not of *qatal* forms. Moreover, even if *qatal* forms should have a blocking function toward the volitive function of 0-yiqtol clauses, its syntactic

²⁶Kalkman 2015a, 212.

function is unclear. In principle, the function of non-volitive *yiqtol* is to express relief: It presents what is said in a vivid and engaging way, more so than the surrounding *qatal* forms.²⁷ However, in this particular case, I can see no reason in the discourse why this should be so.

I therefore see no other option than to explain the clause type from the prosodic structure. The shift to a more discursive, and thus more salient, clause type may be suited for the onset of a new strophe,²⁸ although I am not sure whether a *yiqtol* form can qualify as such. At any rate, the need to start the clause on a η , in combination with a second person address, may also play a role in the choice for *yiqtol* instead of *qatal*.

Annotation 2.57

		accepted
	תִּקְרָא כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד מְגִוְרֵי מַסְבִּיב	114. (Lam 2,22)
	וְלֹא הָיָה בְּיוֹם אַף־יְהוָה פָּלִיט וְשָׂרִיד	115.
	You called, as if on a feast day, my terrors from all	114. (Lam 2,22)
	around,	
	and on the day of YHWH's anger no one escaped or	115.
	survived.	

syn04types	WxQX<ZYq0 Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2par00 ParalLex01 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV 0<NPd2 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline whole_verseline

Even though I agree with the proposal by *syn04types* here, there is some difficulty here: The entirety of vs 20–22 is addressed at YHWH. Yet, here YHWH is mentioned by name, as a third person. My hypothesis that the poet alternates between YHWH and Adonay as a structuring device (see p. 92) does not work here: Both times, the name YHWH is used.

Also, first and second person forms are conspicuously absent in this clause. Still, the contents leave no other option than to see this clause as a direct continuation of 114: “You invite as on a festival day my attackers round about, and on the day of YHWH’s anger no one escapes or survives.” The third person use of the name YHWH is probably best explained as a formula; it is the

²⁷Kalkman 2015a, 214–215.

²⁸See Van Grol’s hypothesis that strikingly discursive language is especially suited for strophe opening, van Grol 2017, 107–109, who speaks about ‘deixis’.

known name of that day, which can be used even when YHWH himself is addressed.

Annotation 2.58

	תִּקְרָא כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד מְגוּרֵי מִסְבִּיב	114.	proposed (Lam 2,22)
		<...>	
	אֲשֶׁר־טִפַּחְתִּי	116.	
You called, as if on a feast day, my terrors from all		114.	(Lam 2,22)
around,			
		<...>	
Those I cared for		116.	

syn04types	xQt0<ZYq0 preV2par00 Socj<0 numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 Rela<Main
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

	אֲשֶׁר־טִפַּחְתִּי	116.	corrected (Lam 2,22)
		<...>	
	אִיבִי כָלֶם: פ	118.	
Those I cared for		116.	(Lam 2,22)
		<...>	
my enemy has finished off."		118.	

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep disc_disc preceding_daughter same_salience same_sentence same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

This אֲשֶׁר-clause, together with its coordinated clause 117, is to be connected downward, as the object of כָּלֶם ('[he] has consumed', 118). 116–118 form an xQtX clause, which as a whole connects to the 0Yq0 clause 114, as a new sentence.

This can only be observed if the entirety of 114–118 is analyzed at once. The

only *direct* indication that this clause is to be connected downward rather than upward, is that it is the A-colon of a new verseline.

Annotation 2.59

	וְלֹא הָיָה בַּיּוֹם אֶחָד־יְהוָה פָּלִיט וְשָׁרִיד	115.	proposed (Lam 2,22)
		< ... >	
	אִיבִי כָלָם: פ	118.	
and on the day of YHWH's anger no one escaped or		115.	(Lam 2,22)
survived.			
		< ... >	
my enemy has finished off."		118.	

syn04types	VBt<VBt 0<Cocj prevlpar00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit same_verb_png
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

	תִּקְרָא כִּיּוֹם מוֹעֵד מְגוּרֵי מִסְכִּיב	114.	corrected (Lam 2,22)
		< ... >	
	אִיבִי כָלָם: פ	118.	
You called, as if on a feast day, my terrors from all		114.	(Lam 2,22)
around,			
		< ... >	
my enemy has finished off."		118.	

syn04types	XQt1<ZYq0 prevlpar00 numV<numV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part sfx_to_sfx diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_other
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Actually, it is not just 118 but the entire sentence 116–118 which is connected to 114. Because 116 is a dependent clauses, which has 118 as its mother, rather than 114, the main clauses of the two sentences have been connected.

This is a pragmatic solution to a technical limitation of a tree-like clause hierarchy. The convention that larger units are connected by connecting their first clauses (see p. 103 of the dissertation) breaks down when a subordinate clause precedes its main clause. As to the connection itself: 116–118, which as a unit forms a single clause, is connected to 114 by the 1 sg references. These clauses are also a separate verseline.

Because of the technical complications just mentioned, these patterns have not been recognized in my labels.

Note, by the way, that the label `sfx_to_other` is incorrect: it notes congruence between the (3 m.pl) suffix on כָּלָם ('has consumed *them*') and masculine plural element other than predicate, subject or object in 114, which can only be מְגִוְרֵי ('my attackers'), but this is obviously incorrect. The label definition has not incorporated that 116–118 is a complex sentence, in which the suffix already has an antecedent: the fronted object 116–117.

```
SELECT ALL OBJECTS WHERE
[clause
  [unorderedgroup
    [phrase function = Subj
      [word lex = ">JB[" and nu = sg]
    ]
    [word pdp = verb and nu = pl]
  ]
]
GO
```

MQL query 2.1 : אֵיב (sg) with plural verb

Chapter 3

Lamentations 3

Annotation 3.1

	proposed
2. (Lam 3,1)	רָאָה עֲנִי בְשֹׁבֶט עֲבָרָתוֹ:
3. (Lam 3,2)	אֹתִי נָהָג
2. (Lam 3,1)	who has seen misery by the rod of his wrath.
3. (Lam 3,2)	Me he has driven away

syn04types	VBT<VB preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence no_fronting_fronting non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected
1. (Lam 3,1)	אֲנִי הָגֵבֶר
	< ... >
3. (Lam 3,2)	אֹתִי נָהָג
1. (Lam 3,1)	I am the man
	< ... >
3. (Lam 3,2)	Me he has driven away

syn04types	xQt0<NmCl preVlpar00 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc fronting_fronting indep_dep_indep indep_indep same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe

Note that all three verselines in the first strophe have fronting. Two of these may be down to the demands of the acrostic, but I think in this case, a pragmatic explanation may definitely be valid:

All three fronted elements, אָנִי ('I'), אֹתִי ('me') and בִּי ('against me') are references to the first person. If read pragmatically, it expresses contrast to the singer's expectation. He expresses shock, not so much at the hostilities that befall him, nor at the fact that YHWH is their perpetrator, but at the fact that he himself is their target:

I, [of all people,] am the man who has suffered agony...

It is me he drove and forced to go...

Yes, against me it is that he turns his hand....¹

These fronted elements, then, form the main line of the discourse in these verses. 2 is actually a subordinate, attributive clause to הַגִּבֹּר (1): '... the man [who] has seen misery ...'

The subordination is not marked explicitly and must be deduced from the semantics, and from the congruence between the verb רָאָה and the antecedent הַגִּבֹּר.

At any rate, the subordination binds 1–2 into a single clause, to which as a whole 3 is to be connected. The start of a new verseline further strengthens this conclusion.

Annotation 3.2

	אֹתִי נִהַג	3. (Lam 3,2)
		<...>
	אֶךְ בִּי יָשָׁב	5. (Lam 3,3)
	Me he has driven away	3. (Lam 3,2)
		<...>
	Yes, against me, again and again,	5. (Lam 3,3)

syn04types	xYq0<xQt0 preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn asyn.conj.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc fronting.fronting indep.indep same.salience
participants	cont.Subj no.Subj.no.Subj same_verb.png sfx.to.sfx
prosodic	acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

¹Berlin 2002, 77 translates: 'Against me alone', which is another way of acknowledging the emphasis on בִּי.

	corrected	
אֲנִי הַגִּבֹּר	1.	(Lam 3,1)
< ... >		
אֶךְ בִּי יֵשֶׁב	5.	(Lam 3,3)
I am the man	1.	(Lam 3,1)
< ... >		
Yes, against me, again and again,	5.	(Lam 3,3)

syn04types	xYq0<NmCl preVlpar00 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

In the last verse of this strophe, the discourse shifts to more discursive language (*yiqtol* after *qatal*).

Annotation 3.3

	proposed	
יִהְיֶה יָדוֹ כָּל-הַיּוֹם: ס	6.	(Lam 3,3)
בָּלָה בְּשָׂרִי וְעוֹרִי	7.	(Lam 3,4)
he turns his hand, all day long.	6.	(Lam 3,3)
He has worn away my flesh and my skin,	7.	(Lam 3,4)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZYq0 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

	corrected	
אֲנִי הַגִּבֹּר	1.	(Lam 3,1)
< ... >		
בָּלָה בְּשָׂרִי וְעוֹרִי	7.	(Lam 3,4)
I am the man	1.	(Lam 3,1)
< ... >		
He has worn away my flesh and my skin,	7.	(Lam 3,4)

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl prev1par00 prev2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	indep_indep asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

In itself, connecting to 5–6, which form a single clause, is syntactically possible. However, I think that the shift to *yiqtol* in those clauses has had the effect of closing the strophe, which also has a closing effect on the syntactic unit. The *qatal* form בָּלָה ('he has caused to wear out') begins a new unit, on the same line as the preceding one.

In this case, then, an approach which connects *units* rather than individual clauses would be more suitable to describe what happens here.

Annotation 3.4

	בָּנָה עָלַי	9. (Lam 3,5)	proposed
		<...>	
	בְּמַחְשָׁכִים הוֹשִׁיבָנִי כְּמַתִּי עוֹלָם: ס	11. (Lam 3,6)	
	He has built against me,	9. (Lam 3,5)	
		<...>	
	In darkness he has made me stay, like those long	11. (Lam 3,6)	
	dead.		

syn04types	VBt<VBt prev1par00 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc in- dep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

	בָּלָה בְּשָׁרִי וּבְעוֹרִי	7. (Lam 3,4)	corrected
		<...>	
	בְּמַחְשָׁכִים הוֹשִׁיבָנִי כְּמַתִּי עוֹלָם: ס	11. (Lam 3,6)	
	He has worn away my flesh and my skin,	7. (Lam 3,4)	
		<...>	
	In darkness he has made me stay, like those long	11. (Lam 3,6)	
	dead.		

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

Prosodically, this clause forms the closing verseline of its strophe, and needs to start on a **ג**.

The fronting of **בְּמַחְשָׁכִים** ('in dark places') seems to be more structurally / prosodically motivated than pragmatically.

I see no particular contrast to any elements in the context, nor a contrast to possible reader expectations, since the entire strophe tells about the terrible situation in which 'he' brings the singer.

The acrostic may have played a role as well, requiring a clause starting on a **ג**. Of course, in order to make these observations, the internal syntactic structure of the entire unit 7–11 needs to be considered.

Annotation 3.5

		proposed
	בְּמַחְשָׁכִים הוֹשִׁיבֵנִי כְּמַתִּי עוֹלָם: ס	11. (Lam 3,6)
	גִּדְרִי בְּעֵדִי	12. (Lam 3,7)
In darkness he has made me stay, like those long		11. (Lam 3,6)
dead.		
He has hemmed me in		12. (Lam 3,7)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 prev2sub00 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

		corrected
	בָּלָה בְּשָׁרִי וְעוֹרִי	7. (Lam 3,4)
	< ... >	
	גִּדְרִי בְּעֵדִי	12. (Lam 3,7)
He has worn away my flesh and my skin,		7. (Lam 3,4)
	< ... >	
He has hemmed me in		12. (Lam 3,7)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Connecting to the preceding clause (11) appears to make sense: xQt0 followed by a 0Qt0 clause is by all means a possible connection. Moreover, the set of participants remains unchanged from 11 to 12: The *geber* reports about what ‘he’ has done to ‘me’. The strophe boundary is the decisive signal to start a new unit.

This new strophe is, of course, marked by the acrostic, which in Lam 3 is much more conspicuous than in the rest of Lamentations, and by the return of initial *qatal* after the preceding strophe has ended on an xQt0 clause. The latter is, of course, a syntactic observation. Yet, the strophic division is needed to identify 11 as closing a unit, instead of opening a new one.

Annotation 3.6

	proposed
הַכִּבִּיד נִחֲשָׁתִי:	14. (Lam 3,7)
גַּם כִּי אֶזְעַק	15. (Lam 3,8)
he has weighed me down with chains.	14. (Lam 3,7)
Even when I call out	15. (Lam 3,8)

syn04types	xYq0<ZQt0 preV2par00 Socj<0 numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected
גִּדַּר בְּעָרִי	12. (Lam 3,7)
<...>	
גַּם כִּי אֶזְעַק	15. (Lam 3,8)
He has hemmed me in	12. (Lam 3,7)
<...>	
Even when I call out	15. (Lam 3,8)

syn04types	xYq0<ZQt0 preV2par00 Socj<0 numV<numV pngV<Sfx
syntactic	diff_vt asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	verb_to_other diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe

The clause hierarchy is actually more complex than the clause pairs seem to indicate: 15–17 form a single protasis - apodosis construction, in which the two coordinated *yiqtol* clauses form the protasis and the *qatal* clause forms the apodosis.²

As a whole, then, there is no question of a *yiqtol* clause following a *qatal* clause here: The sentence as a whole should be labeled as a xQt0 (the x element being the *yiqtol* time clauses), which fits the dominant clause type in this strophe better.

The fronting of the protasis is, of course, syntactically obligatory; however, I think that the choice for a protasis - apodosis construction (and thus xQt0) rather than 0Qt0, may have been motivated by the need for an initial λ .

The emphatic opening with **גַּם כִּי** ('Even if') does set the sentence—which forms a prosodic verseline—apart from its preceding context. Therefore I have made a new start.

Annotation 3.7

accepted
גַּם כִּי אֶזְעַק 15. (Lam 3,8)
וְאֶשׁוּעַ 16.

Even when I call out 15. (Lam 3,8)
and cry for help, 16.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV
syntactic	coordination asyn_conj disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_sentence same_vt
participants	cont_Subj changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_colon multi_verb_colon

²See Niccacci 1990, 138, who lists **כִּי**-*yiqtol* as clause of time, but does not list 0Qt0 as apodosis, probably because this is not a common combination in narrative prose.

Annotation 3.8

		proposed
	גִּדַּר בְּעֵרִי	12. (Lam 3,7)
	<...>	
	שָׁתֵּם תְּפִלָּתִי:	17. (Lam 3,8)
	He has hemmed me in	12. (Lam 3,7)
	<...>	
	he shuts out my prayer.	17. (Lam 3,8)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPD2<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause.type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
	גַּם כִּי אֶזְעַק	15. (Lam 3,8)
	<...>	
	שָׁתֵּם תְּפִלָּתִי:	17.
	Even when I call out	15. (Lam 3,8)
	<...>	
	he shuts out my prayer.	17.

syn04types	ZQt0<xYq0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPD2<0
syntactic	protasis_apodosis asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon A.colon.B.colon to_multi_clause_colon yiqtol_qatal_verseline

The real argument for this connection is that the two clauses form a protasis-apodosis construction or, put differently: 15 functions as a temporal adjunct to 17.

Note that the label *protasis_apodosis* has been defined very sparsely: Its definition at present only involves the pattern **גַּם כִּי** + asyndesis. Obviously, more patterns will have to be added if the label is to be useful in other contexts.

The label *changing_speech_sit* is obviously wrong: It follows from the presence of a quotation verb (אֶזְעַק, 'I call out') followed by an asyndetic clause.

Annotation 3.9

			proposed
	שָׁתֵּם תְּפִלָּתִי:	17.	(Lam 3,8)
	גָּדַר דְּרָכֵי בָּגְזִית	18.	(Lam 3,9)
	he shuts out my prayer.	17.	(Lam 3,8)
	He has hemmed in my ways with stones;	18.	(Lam 3,9)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Npd2<Npd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

			corrected
	גַּם כִּי אֶזְעַק	15.	(Lam 3,8)
		< ... >	
	גָּדַר דְּרָכֵי בָּגְזִית	18.	(Lam 3,9)
	Even when I call out	15.	(Lam 3,8)
		< ... >	
	He has hemmed in my ways with stones;	18.	(Lam 3,9)

syn04types	ZQt0<xYq0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj numV<numV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The key to finding the correct mother clause is the recognition that 15–17 form a single xQt0 clause. In order to see this, the clause hierarchy needs to be viewed as a hierarchy of *units* rather than a hierarchy of clauses. is to be useful in other texts.

Also, the larger structure (syntactic as well as prosodic) of this strophe needs to be taken into account. As explained above, I see the variation in constituent order in 15–17 as a combined syntactic / prosodic indication of a new start.

Annotation 3.10

		proposed	
נְחִיבְתִי עֲוֹה: ס	19.	(Lam 3,9)	
דָּב אֲרֹב הוּא לִי	20.	(Lam 3,10)	
he has twisted my paths.	19.	(Lam 3,9)	
A lurking bear he is to me,	20.	(Lam 3,10)	

syn04types	NmCl<xQt0 NPd1<NPd1 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx			
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	disc_disc	front-ing_no_fronting
		indep_indep		new_deictic
		same_salience		
participants	new_indep_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_sfx			
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	acrostic	new_strophe	strophe_first_to_other

		corrected	
אֲנִי הָגֶבֶר	1.	(Lam 3,1)	
<...>			
דָּב אֲרֹב הוּא לִי	20.	(Lam 3,10)	
I am the man	1.	(Lam 3,1)	
<...>			
A lurking bear he is to me,	20.	(Lam 3,10)	

syn04types	NmCl<NmCl NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj NoReferral			
syntactic	deictic_deictic	fronting_no_fronting		
	same_clause_type	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	disc_disc
		indep_indep	same_salience	
participants	new_prps	Subj_Subj	new_indep_Subj	sfx_to_Subj
	sfx_to_prps			
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe	acrostic	chiastic_Pred_Subj	
	new_strophe	strophe_first_to_first		

As remarked before, nominal clauses are often difficult to place in a clause hierarchy, because they can occur in quite diverse syntactic contexts. Here, however, the start of a new unit seems warranted:

- The ‘he’ of the preceding verses is ‘renominalized’ here by the personal pronoun הוּא (‘he’). Of course, strictly speaking a pers. pron. does not count as renominalization, but in this context, in which the ‘he’ has not been introduced by name at all yet, the pers. pron., which in Hebrew is definitely more emphatic than in a language like English, does indicate a new focus on this participant.
- The fronting of דָּב אֲרֹב (‘a lurking bear (he is to me)’) can, of course,

be attributed to the acrostic, but the rashness of the metaphor also plays a role: Calling God a lurking bear in relation to one of his own people is rather unexpected. This pragmatic bombshell, expressed in syntactic fronting, further adds to the sense of separation.

- The nominal clause with a pers. pron. parallels the first clause of the poem, further indicating that a new unit is started here.

To be sure, the new start is only relative: in terms of participants ('he' vs. 'me') and clause types (predominantly 0Qt0), the discourse continues uninterrupted.

Annotation 3.11

		proposed
	אריה במסתרים* 21.	(Lam 3,10)
	דרכי סורר 22.	(Lam 3,11)
	a lion in hiding. 21.	(Lam 3,10)
	he dragged me from my ways 22.	(Lam 3,11)
syn04types	xQt0<NmCl preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 NoReferral	
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep	
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj	
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc	

		corrected
	דב ארֶב הוא לִי 20.	(Lam 3,10)
	< ... >	
	דרכי סורר 22.	(Lam 3,11)
	A lurking bear he is to me, 20.	(Lam 3,10)
	< ... >	
	he dragged me from my ways 22.	(Lam 3,11)
syn04types	xQt0<NmCl preVlsub00 NPd1<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx	
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience	
participants	cont_Subj sfx.to.sfx Subj_no_Subj verb_to_Subj verb_to_prps	
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe	

2021 belong together, as 21 is elliptic: "a lion in hiding [he is to me]." 22 is to be connected to this unit as a whole. The verseline boundary strengthens this.

The fronting of דְּרָכַי ('my ways') does not appear to have a clear pragmatic meaning. There is no contrast to elements in the context or to the readers' expectations. Therefore, I suspect that it is primarily motivated by the demands of the acrostic.

Annotation 3.12

	שָׁמְנִי שָׁמָּה:	24.	proposed (Lam 3,11)
		< ... >	
	וַיַּצִּיבֵנִי כַּמְטָרָא לַחֲזִץ: ס	26.	(Lam 3,12)
	he left me desolate.	24.	(Lam 3,11)
		< ... >	
	and made me a target for his arrow.	26.	(Lam 3,12)

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

	דָּרַךְ קֶשֶׁתוֹ	25.	corrected (Lam 3,12)
	וַיַּצִּיבֵנִי כַּמְטָרָא לַחֲזִץ: ס	26.	
	He drew his bow	25.	(Lam 3,12)
	and made me a target for his arrow.	26.	

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon end_of_strophe

Syn04types proposes a connection to 24, presumably because of the repetition of the 1 sg suffix, where 25 only has 3 m.sg references.

However, it is quite clear what the correct connection is. This is based on semantics (the two clauses describe the single act of shooting an arrow) and on prosodic structure (the two clauses start in the same colon; the second clause is divided over the A-colon and B-colon).

Note that the syntactic labels about linguistic stance are debatable. I have included first and second person references as indicators of discursive speech,

but examples like this show that this has been too much of a paradigmatic definition. First and second person forms indeed do indicate direct speech, but when in combination with non-discursive clause types like *qatal* clauses, it is really the syntagmatic context which determines where discursive speech begins and ends.

In this case, it is too schematic to see a difference in linguistic stance between the 3 m.sg *qatal* clause and the connected 3 m.sg *wayyiqtol* clause with 1 sg object. Either both are judged to be discursive because of their close connection and the presence of a 1 sg reference, or as non-discursive (or: less discursive) because of their clause types.

Annotation 3.13

		proposed
	נְגִינָתָם כָּל־הַיּוֹם:	29. (Lam 3,14)
	הִשְׁבִּיעַנִי בַמְרוֹרִים	30. (Lam 3,15)
	they taunt me in song all day long.	29. (Lam 3,14)
	He filled me with bitterness,	30. (Lam 3,15)

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd1 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	הִבִּיא בְּכִלְיוֹתַי בְּנִי אֶשְׁפֹּתוֹ:	27. (Lam 3,13)
		< ... >
	הִשְׁבִּיעַנִי בַמְרוֹרִים	30. (Lam 3,15)
	He shot into my kidneys the arrows from his quiver.	27. (Lam 3,13)
		< ... >
	He filled me with bitterness,	30. (Lam 3,15)

syn04types	VBT<VBT B...//...B pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj sfx_to_sfx no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The start of the new verseline, in combination with the return to 3 m.sg verb with 1 sg suffix forms the motivation to connect to 27 and not to the 1 sg clause 28–29.

Note, by the way, that in this strophe, divergence from the dominant pattern ('He' as subject, 'me' as object) happens in the *middle* verseline. Apparently, breaking a pattern does not exclusively happen at the end of a unit.

This stands to reason: Whereas, generally speaking, ending a unit by diverging from a pattern works well, this is by no means a syntactic or prosodic rule. It is a matter of style, which does lead to frequent selection, but is ultimately up to the author.

Annotation 3.14

		accepted
	הָרוּנִי לַעֲנָה: ס	31. (Lam 3,15)
	וַיִּגְרַס בְּחֶצֶז שָׁנִי	32. (Lam 3,16)
	he sated me with wormwood.	31. (Lam 3,15)
	He broke my teeth on gravel,	32. (Lam 3,16)

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

The shift from *qatal* to *wayyiqtol* has obviously been forced by the acrostic: The 1-strophe in this poem, requiring three -1-lines, has been shaped as a 'seminal narrative',³ with *qatal* clauses as secondary lines.

In itself, this is a regular syntactic phenomenon. However, in the context of this poem, and of Lamentations as a whole, which are dominated by series of *qatal* clauses, it is remarkable.

This, then, is another case in which the poet may simply have made a selection from the available syntactic options, but in which the question as to *why* they have made this particular choice must be answered in prosodic categories.

³'Sproßerzählung', Schneider 1985, 48.4.5.1–2.

Annotation 3.15

		proposed
הָרוֹנִי לַעֲנָה: ס	31.	(Lam 3,15)
< ... >		
הַכְּפִישָׁנִי בְּאַפֶּר:	33.	(Lam 3,16)
he sated me with wormwood.	31.	(Lam 3,15)
< ... >		
trampled me in the dust.	33.	(Lam 3,16)

syn04types	VBt<VBt pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

		corrected
וַיִּגְרַס בְּחֶצֶץ שָׁנִי	32.	(Lam 3,16)
הַכְּפִישָׁנִי בְּאַפֶּר:	33.	
He broke my teeth on gravel,	32.	(Lam 3,16)
trampled me in the dust.	33.	

syn04types	ZQt0<Way0 0<Cocj B...//...B pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Again, like in Lam 1 and 2, the 1-strophe has forced a *wayyiqtol* clause as the start of the unit (see Example 10.31 on page 229 in the dissertation). The 0-*qatal* clauses in this strophe are connected to the *wayyiqtol* clauses, not the other way around. It is the rhythm of the verselines that dictates this. It would be very awkward indeed to connect 33 to, e.g., 31, as this would require skipping over the preceding A-colon as well as crossing a strophe boundary.

Annotation 3.16

			accepted
	וַיִּגְרַם בַּחֲצֵץ שָׁנִי	32.	(Lam 3,16)
		< ... >	
	וַתִּזְנַח מִשְׁלוֹם נַפְשִׁי	34.	(Lam 3,17)
	He broke my teeth on gravel,	32.	(Lam 3,16)
		< ... >	
	My Self despaired of peace;	34.	(Lam 3,17)

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<Cocj numV<numV Npd2<Npd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_conj same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic in_same_strophe new_verseline

This *wayyiqtol* clause, even though its place in the textual hierarchy is clear, is difficult; it is quite clear that something must be amiss with the text as it stands. וַתִּזְנַח can be parsed as either a 2 m.sg form (subject: ‘you’, presumably YHWH) or a 3 f.sg form (subject: ‘my *nefeš*’). However, both parsings are problematic:

- A parsing as 3 f.sg (‘My *nefeš* rejected from peace’) does not fit the valence of וַתִּזְנַח (‘to reject’), which requires an object.⁴

Also, the preposition מִן (‘from peace’) does not make sense to make sense.

- A parsing as 2 m.sg (‘You drove out my *nefeš* from peace’) addresses YHWH directly, in a context which consistently speaks *about* YHWH in third person, quite conspicuously avoiding mentioning him by name. Even the next clause, which depends on this one both syntactically (as background clause) and prosodically (as B-colon), has another 3 m.sg form. Also, the preposition מִן requires that וַתִּזְנַח have a semantic element of locality to it.⁵

Most exegetes propose some form of emendation, usually a revocalization to the *nif'al* וַתִּזְנַח: ‘My *nefeš* was rejected from peace’.⁶ Hillers, following Hummel, explains the preposition מִן as a misplaced ‘enclitic *mem*’⁷ which was originally suffixed to the verb to indicate transitive meaning: וַתִּזְנַח-מִן שְׁלוֹם נַפְשִׁי

⁴For a clear explanation of a formal approach to the concept of valence, see Dyk and Talstra 2014, 236–241.

⁵‘Drive out’, rather than ‘reject’. See Berges 2002, 170: ‘Du hast mich vom Heil verstoßen’ (You have driven me out from wellbeing’).

⁶So, e.g., Renkema 1998, 375; Berlin 2002, 82.

⁷Hillers 1992, 114; Hummel 1959, 105.

(‘And my soul rejected peace’).⁸ It is difficult to decide here. Correction of the textual data and the word-level analysis in my database is out of the question here, since it would violate the form-to-function approach of the *ETCBC* database. The observable form is **וַתִּזְנֶה**, not **וַתִּזְנֶה**. This form permits only two parsings, and 3 f.sg *nif'al* is not one of them. Moreover, it would be the only attested *nif'al* form of this verb, which, occurs only in *qal* and *hif'il*.⁹ Still, both the syntactic and prosodic structure strongly suggest that there is no change from third to second person here. Such a shift would, in fact, be quite uncommon between two *way0* clauses.¹⁰ This means that ‘my *nefes*’ is to be seen as the subject, rather than the object. The solution by Hummel and Hillers may be on to something, but again, I can not alter the text itself; moreover, enclitic *mem* is not a category in the database. What I can do, is change the *interpretation* of the textual data:

- Change the parsing of **וַתִּזְנֶה** to 3 f.sg.
- Change the syntactic function parsing of the phrase **מִשָּׁלוֹם** to object, ignoring the presence of the preposition.

I can only make these changes in my own version of the database, not in the official *ETCBC* data. This solution is not entirely satisfactory either, but this can not be helped.

This clause is an example of a case in which the text as it stands simply does not allow for straightforward and completely satisfactory analysis. It may also be an example of ancient grammatical forms playing a role in the analysis.

Annotation 3.17

		proposed
	הָרֹנִי לַעֲנָה: ס	31. (Lam 3,15)
	< ... >	
	נָשִׁיתִי טוֹבָה:	35. (Lam 3,17)
he sated me with wormwood.		31. (Lam 3,15)
	< ... >	
I forgot everything good.		35. (Lam 3,17)

⁸So Hummel’s translation; Hillers, 110 paraphrases the expression as “I despaired of having peace.”

⁹Berges 2002, 174. The distribution is 16x *qal*, 1x *hif'il*. The relative rarity of the verb makes definite conclusions of its meaning difficult.

¹⁰Query 3.1 on page 159 results in only four matches: Deut 5,23, 1 Sam 12,11, Job 10,8 and Job 14,19–20. However, in all these cases, the second person has already been introduced in the text-syntactic context. In the Job examples, moreover, I doubt whether the *wayyiqtol* clauses should be made mother and daughter at all.

syn04types	VBT<VBT numV<numV pngV<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause.type same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

corrected

וַתִּזְנַח מִשְׁלוֹם נַפְשִׁי 34. (Lam 3,17)

נָשִׁיתִי טוֹבָה: 35.

My Self despaired of peace; 34. (Lam 3,17)

I forgot everything good. 35.

syn04types	ZQt0<Way0 0<Cocj numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Annotation 3.18**proposed**

נָשִׁיתִי טוֹבָה: 35. (Lam 3,17)

וָאֵמַר 36. (Lam 3,18)

I forgot everything good. 35. (Lam 3,17)

I said: 36. (Lam 3,18)

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Quot<0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

וַתִּזְנַח מִשְׁלוֹם נַפְשִׁי 34. (Lam 3,17)

< ... >

וָאֵמַר 36. (Lam 3,18)

My Self despaired of peace; 34. (Lam 3,17)

< ... >

I said: 36. (Lam 3,18)

syn04types	VBT<VBT Quot<0 Cocj<Cocj numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	same_clause_type conj_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_conj same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

At first sight, the syntactic analysis would view the *wayyiqtol* clause 36 as a coordinated continuation of 35 (“I forgot goodness and said.”): *qatal* - *wayyiqtol* with continuous subject; no other 1 sg subjects are found in the context. Understandably, this is the connection syn04types proposes.

However, the rhythm of the verselines in this strophe, amplified by the threefold acrostic, makes clear that, in fact, another syntactic connection must be made: The *wayyiqtol* clauses in Lam 3,16–18 form a single narrative chain.

Annotation 3.19

		proposed
	וְתוֹחֲלֹתִי מִיְהוָה: ס	38. (Lam 3,18)
	זָכַר-עֲנִי וּמְרוּדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ:	39. (Lam 3,19)
	and my hope in YHWH.”	38. (Lam 3,18)
	Remember my misery and wandering, the	39. (Lam 3,19)
	wormwood and bitterness!.	

syn04types	ZIm0<Ellp 0<Cocj prevlpar00 prev2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	אֲנִי הַגִּבֹּר	1. (Lam 3,1)
	< ... >	
	זָכַר-עֲנִי וּמְרוּדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ:	39. (Lam 3,19)
	I am the man	1. (Lam 3,1)
	< ... >	
	Remember my misery and wandering, the	39. (Lam 3,19)
	wormwood and bitterness!.	

syn04types	ZIm0<NmCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first whole_verseline

In the parsing of the *ETCBC* data, the speech situation changes here: from a speech with no apparent address—no second person forms, at any rate—to a 2 m.sg imperative. There is an exegetical puzzle here: The word זָכַר־ can be parsed as two verb forms, both of which are attested in the ancient translations of the text. Various interpretations of this clause are therefore found among exegetes:

- imperative 2 m.sg: “Remember my misery and trouble / wandering—wormwood and bitterness!”¹¹ It is unanimously assumed that if this option is correct, YHWH is the addressee. Renkema actually offers an argument for this: In the book of Psalms, the imperative זָכַר is used exclusively in prayer to YHWH.¹²
- infinitive construct: *Remembering* my miserable wandering [is] wormwood and bitterness.”¹³
- Emendation to זָכַרְתִּי or some other form which keeps the discourse within the same communicational domain: “I remember my miserable wandering—etc.”¹⁴

As it stands, the interpretation as imperative seems the most natural.¹⁵ However, I wonder whether the addressee must inevitably be YHWH. Seeing that זָכַר/ is used in the immediately following clause, with ‘my *nefes*’ as subject, I venture that this call to remembrance is directed to the *geber*’s audience, who should consider the agony described in vs 1–18, as a preparation for the ‘sermon’ which follows.

This type of argumentation is, of course, no longer verifiable by strictly formal and syntactic means. It requires a view on the overall structure of the poem. However, as far as the hierarchy itself is concerned, the shift to imperative is sufficient to assume a new speech situation.

¹¹So Peshitta and Vulgate; Renkema 1998, 379; Berlin 2002, 78.

¹²Renkema 1998, 379.

¹³Berges 2002, 170, 174: “Das Denken an mein Elend und meine Unrast ist Bitterkeit und Gift.” (my emphasis).

¹⁴Hillers 1992, 110, 114.

¹⁵A nominal clause with an initial infinitive construct as its subject is possible, but rare. I have found three cases (1 Sam 15,22 (2x), Prov 17,26, Prov 25,27 plus one false positive (Eccl 12,12, using MQL query 3.2 on the next page.

```

SELECT ALL OBJECTS WHERE
[chapter
  [clause_atom as cal typ = Way0
    [word pdp = verb and ps = p3]
  ]
  ..
  [clause_atom typ = Way0 AND mother = cal.self
    [word pdp = verb and ps = p2]
  ]
]
GO

```

SQL query 3.1 : Query: 3rd to 2nd person shift in Way0-Way0 pairs

```

SELECT ALL OBJECTS WHERE
[verse
  [clause as cal rela = Subj
    [word vt = infc]
  ]
  ..
  [clause self = cal.mother
    NOTEXIST [word pdp=verb]
  ]
]
GO

```

SQL query 3.2 : Infcl clause as subject to a nominal clause

Annotation 3.20

		proposed
	זָכַר-עֲנִי וּמְרוֹדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ:	39. (Lam 3,19)
	< ... >	
	*וְתָשִׁיחַ עָלַי נַפְשִׁי:	41. (Lam 3,20)
	Remember my misery and wandering, the	39. (Lam 3,19)
	wormwood and bitterness!.	
	< ... >	
	my Self, and is downcast within me.	41. (Lam 3,20)

syn04types	WYqX<ZIm0 Cocj<0 numV<numV Npd2<Npd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

		corrected
	זָכַר תְּזָכוֹר	40. (Lam 3,20)
	*וְתָשִׁיחַ עָלַי נַפְשִׁי:	41.
	She remembers full well,	40. (Lam 3,20)
	my Self, and is downcast within me.	41.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 prev1sub00 prev2par00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_colon A_colon_B_colon

Annotation 3.21

		proposed
	*וְתָשִׁיחַ עָלַי נַפְשִׁי:	41. (Lam 3,20)
	זֹאת אֲשִׁיב אֶל-לִבִּי	42. (Lam 3,21)
	my Self, and is downcast within me.	41. (Lam 3,20)
	Yet this I call to mind,	42. (Lam 3,21)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj prevlpar00 numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

זָכַר-עֲנִי וּמְרוּדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ: 39. (Lam 3,19)

< ... >

זֹאת אָשִׁיב אֶל-לִבִּי 42. (Lam 3,21)

Remember my misery and wandering, the 39. (Lam 3,19)
wormwood and bitterness!.

< ... >

Yet this I call to mind, 42. (Lam 3,21)

syn04types	xYq0<ZIm0 prevlpar00 numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Opening the last verse of the strophe, the fronted demonstrative זֹאת ('these things'), draws attention and thus prepares the following strophe, in which the speaker mentions what 'these things' actually are. Within the strophe, this closing verseline stands apart, while at the same time, it concatenates this strophe and the next one.

Annotation 3.22**proposed**

עַל-כֵּן אוֹחִיל: ס 43. (Lam 3,21)

חֲסִדֵי יְהוָה 44. (Lam 3,22)

for this I have hope: 43. (Lam 3,21)

It is YHWH's mercy 44. (Lam 3,22)

syn04types	Defc<xYq0 preVlpar00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0 Subj<0 MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence main_defect
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

corrected

זאת אֲשִׁיב אֶל-לְבִי 42. (Lam 3,21)

< ... >

חֲסְדֵי יְהוָה 44. (Lam 3,22)

Yet this I call to mind, 42. (Lam 3,21)

< ... >

It is YHWH's mercy 44. (Lam 3,22)

syn04types	Defc<xYq0 preVlpar00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0 Subj<0 MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence main_defect
participants	new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	new_strophe acrostic strophe_first_to_other

44–48 form a direct speech or internal monologue, which has been introduced by the phrase אֲשִׁיב אֶל-לְבִי (litt.: ‘I will return to my heart’, 42). It appears to bear connotations of correcting ones point of view.¹⁶

This new communicational domain is difficult to recognize by this nominal clause only, except for the fact that it starts a new strophe and that it mentions YHWH by name. An important signal is the occurrence of 1 pl references, but these do not appear until the second and third clause.

Annotation 3.23**proposed**

חֲדָשִׁים לְבָקָרִים 47. (Lam 3,23)

רַבָּה אֱמוּנָתְךָ 48.

They are new every morning— 47. (Lam 3,23)

Great is your faithfulness! 48.

¹⁶See 1 Kgs 8,47; Isa 44,19; Isa 46,8). Note that in all of these other cases, there is a direct object, unlike in Lam 3,21.

syn04types	AjCl<AjCl 1/2P<3rdP perV<perV NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoRe-ferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep same_clause_type
participants	no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

חֲסֵדֵי יְהוָה 44. (Lam 3,22)

< ... >

רַבָּה אֱמוּנָתְךָ: 48. (Lam 3,23)

It is YHWH's mercy 44. (Lam 3,22)

< ... >

Great is your faithfulness! 48. (Lam 3,23)

syn04types	AjCl<Defc preV1par00 preV2sub00 vblC//VblC 1/2P<3rdP perV<perV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj NoRe-ferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main diff_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj
prosodic	diff_verseline in_same_strophe

The sudden shift to a 2 m.sg address (YHWH) is remarkable, but not unheard of in the context of Lamentations. This probably has to do with the dramatic character of the texts: Any character that is considered to be 'on stage' can be addressed without further ado, and YHWH is always on stage by definition. At any rate, the 2 m.sg refers to יהוה in 44. The label *sfx_to_nmpr* has not been assigned, however, because יהוה does not occur in a vocative and thus is not a second person word.

Annotation 3.24**proposed**

רַבָּה אֱמוּנָתְךָ: 48. (Lam 3,23)

חֶלְקִי יְהוָה 49. (Lam 3,24)

Great is your faithfulness! 48. (Lam 3,23)

"YHWH is my portion", 49. (Lam 3,24)

syn04types	NmCl<AjCl preVlpar00 Sfx<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep no_fronting_no.fronting same_salience
participants	Subj.Subj new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	B.colon_A.colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel_Pred_Subj

corrected

חֲלֹקִי יְהוָה 49. (Lam 3,24)
אָמַרְהָ נַפְשִׁי 50.

“YHWH is my portion”, 49. (Lam 3,24)
says my Self; 50.

syn04types	Downward=N
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep disc_disc no_fronting_no.fronting preceding_daughter same_salience same_sentence
participants	Subj.Subj next_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	in_same_colon end_of_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj

These verses are complicated: They contain three direct speeches that are not delimited very clearly: Syntactically, it makes sense to take 48–49 together as a

lines	speaker	addressee	marking
44–47	‘I’	‘my heart’	‘This I will return to my heart:’
48	‘I’	‘you’	no marking; or could it belong to 49?
49, 51	‘my <i>nefeš</i> ’	unspecified	no initial marking; quotation verb in 50

direct speech, either by the ‘I’ or by the *nefeš*. However, the verseline structure makes clear that this can not be correct. The new verseline, clearly marked by the acrostic, separates the two.

Annotation 3.25

		proposed
חֲסְדֵי יְהוָה	44.	(Lam 3,22)
< ... >		
אִמְרָה נִפְשִׁי	50.	(Lam 3,24)
It is YHWH's mercy	44.	(Lam 3,22)
< ... >		
says my Self;	50.	(Lam 3,24)

syn04types	ZQtX<Defc Quot<0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main diff_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

		corrected
זאת אֲשִׁיב אֶל-לְבִי	42.	(Lam 3,21)
< ... >		
אִמְרָה נִפְשִׁי	50.	(Lam 3,24)
Yet this I call to mind,	42.	(Lam 3,21)
< ... >		
says my Self;	50.	(Lam 3,24)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYq0 Quot<0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe strophe_other_to_other

The connection between this clause and its mother clause largely rests on semantics: the identification of 'my *nefeš*' with 'I', and אֲשִׁיב אֶל-לְבִי (lit.: 'I return to my heart') with אִמְרָה ('says') as quotation verbs.

The syntax of a direct speech *preceding* its quotation verb proves too complicated for my patterns, hence the erroneous label *fronting_no_fronting*: 49–50 as a whole is, in fact, an xQtX clause, with fronted object.

Annotation 3.26

proposed

אָמַרְהָ נִפְשִׁי 50. (Lam 3,24)

< ... >

טוֹב יְהוָה לִי קוֹר 52. (Lam 3,25)

says my Self; 50. (Lam 3,24)

< ... >

YHWH is good to the one who hopes in him, 52. (Lam 3,25)

syn04types	AjCl<ZQtX 0<Quot 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral Asyn<QtVb
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

corrected

זָכַר-עֲנִי וּמְרוֹדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ: 39. (Lam 3,19)

< ... >

טוֹב יְהוָה לִי קוֹר 52. (Lam 3,25)

Remember my misery and wandering, the
wormwood and bitterness! 39. (Lam 3,19)

< ... >

YHWH is good to the one who hopes in him, 52. (Lam 3,25)

syn04types	AjCl<ZIm0 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	changing_speech_sit new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_ObjC
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

This clause starts a new section of the text (52–79), which by exegetes is usually categorized as sermon, admonition or moral lesson.¹⁷

The new start is relatively easy to discern from the contents and style of this passage: Rather general statements are made, about an anonymous believer who is clearly an exemplary figure rather than an actual person. The message

¹⁷Berlin 2002, 92 n.10, who herself calls it an ‘intellectual essay about God.’

of the passage is an admonition to be humble, repentant, quiet, but hopeful. The question is, whether this change in genre can be traced in formally observable linguistic signals as well. Obviously, this will only be partially possible, and both syntactic and prosodic observations are needed to build a convincing case:

- The name YHWH is mentioned again, as the subject of the clause. This in itself is not convincing, since this could also plead for a connection with 49.
- The absence of 1 sg references and the introduction of the new participant לְקוֹי ('to who hopes on him') changes the set of participants away from 'YHWH and me' to 'YHWH and a third person. The anonymity of this person (who is only characterized in relation to YHWH, via the suffix, and with the nondescript word גִּבֹּר, 'man') further adds to this change in participants set.
- טוֹב, a word starting on ט, obviously starts a new strophe. Its repetition in all subsequent ט-lines, every time as the predicate of a nominal clause, creates a series of general statements about YHWH and about the conduct of the faithful, which strengthen the impression of a different mode of speaking.

As an aside, note that the label `sfx_to_ObjC` should not have been assigned. The label definitions have missed the fact that the 3 m.sg suffix has a clause-internal antecedent.

Annotation 3.27

	טוֹב יְהוָה לְקוֹי	52.	(Lam 3,25)	accepted
			< ... >	
	טוֹב וַיְחַל וַדּוּמָם לְתַשׁוּעַת יְהוָה:	55.	(Lam 3,26)	
	YHWH is good to the one who hopes in him,	52.	(Lam 3,25)	
			< ... >	
	It is good to wait in silence for YHWH's salvation.	55.	(Lam 3,26)	

syn04types	AjCl<AjCl ParalLex01 L...//...L pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence ellipsis indep_dep_indep same_clause_type
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	acrostic in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline whole_verseline

Renkema assumes YHWH as the subject of all three occurrences of טוב in this strophe.¹⁸ Here, he emends ויחיל into the *yiqtol* form יִחִיל and translates: “Good is He. May one quietly wait for YHWH’s help.”¹⁹

Since the Hebrew of this clause (A complex nominal clause with two times the conjunction -וּ which joins syntactically different elements) is indeed difficult, it is also difficult to say whether Renkema’s solution is correct. It has the advantage of interpreting the three parallel occurrences of טוב in the same way, and eliminates the awkward syntactical construction. Its disadvantage is the need for emendation, which is always somewhat unsatisfactory, especially without tangible evidence in manuscripts. Also, it assumes that the single predicate טוב would be recognized as an (elliptic) nominal clause.

In prose, one would at least expect something like טוב הוא (‘good [is] he’). Of course, one can always submit that the well-known terseness of Biblical Hebrew poetry would allow for this type of ellipsis.

A search for nominal predicate clause atoms consisting of a single adjective yields no real parallels, except for Ps 118,8 and vs 9, in which טוב has a clause as its subject, just like the traditional interpretation of 55.

For the hierarchy itself, this question does not make any difference: All three occurrences of טוב are nominal predicates, placing them in a single syntactic series.

Annotation 3.28

		proposed
כִּי־יֵשָׁא עַל בְּנֻעָרָיו: ט	57.	(Lam 3,27)
יֵשֶׁב בָּדָד	58.	(Lam 3,28)
to bear yoke in his youth	57.	(Lam 3,27)
Let him sit alone	58.	(Lam 3,28)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj Coor<Main pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

¹⁸Renkema 1998, 395,397.

¹⁹Renkema 1998, 394.

	corrected	
טוב לגבר	56.	(Lam 3,27)
	< ... >	
ישב בָּדָד	58.	(Lam 3,28)
It is good for a man	56.	(Lam 3,27)
	< ... >	
Let him sit alone	58.	(Lam 3,28)

syn04types	ZYq0<AjCl pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_conj_asyn asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_dep_indep indep_indep
participants	verb_to_other no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	new_strophe acrostic strophe_first_to_other

Annotation 3.29

	proposed	
וידם	59.	(Lam 3,28)
כי נטל עליו:	60.	
in silence	59.	(Lam 3,28)
when it is laid on him;	60.	

syn04types	xQt0<WYq0 0<Cocj preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	conj_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline yiq-tol_qatal_verseline

	corrected	
ישב בָּדָד	58.	(Lam 3,28)
	< ... >	
כי נטל עליו:	60.	
Let him sit alone	58.	(Lam 3,28)
	< ... >	
when it is laid on him;	60.	

syn04types	xQt0<ZYq0 preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon to_multi_clause_colon yiqtol_qatal_verseline

The label `cont_Subj` is in error here, but this can only be determined by the semantics. Berlin translates: “He should sit alone and be still, for he laid it upon him”.²⁰ The second ‘he’ can not be identical to the first one. Another complication is, that the suffix on לוֹ (‘on *him*’) does refer to the *geber*, and not to YHWH.

Thus, the label `sfx_to_Pred` should have been assigned. This has been blocked by the label’s definition, which excludes suffixes which are congruent to a verb within the same clause, assuming that they are reflexive. As is clear from this example (and more), this is not always true.

In cases like this, the semantics of the verb are decisive; there do not seem to be any other linguistic signals to resolve the matter.

Annotation 3.30

		proposed
כי נָטַל עָלָיו:	60.	(Lam 3,28)
יָתֵן בְּעָפֶר פִּיהוּ	61.	(Lam 3,29)
when it is laid on him;	60.	(Lam 3,28)
let him put his mouth in the dust:	61.	(Lam 3,29)

syn04types	ZYq0<xQt0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx NPD2<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

²⁰Berlin 2002, 79; so most other commentaries. Hillers 1992, 110, 116 takes נָטַל to mean ‘be heavy’ here and translates as impersonal: ‘... when it is heavy on him’. This also involves a change of subject.

	corrected	
יֵשֵׁב בְּדָד	58.	(Lam 3,28)
	< ... >	
יִתֵּן בְּעַפֶּר פִּיהוּ	61.	(Lam 3,29)
Let him sit alone	58.	(Lam 3,28)
	< ... >	
let him put his mouth in the dust:	61.	(Lam 3,29)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe

Annotation 3.31

	proposed	
אוֹלֵי יֵשׁ תְּקוּהָ:	62.	(Lam 3,29)
יִתֵּן לְמַכֵּהוּ לְחִי	63.	(Lam 3,30)
perhaps there is hope.	62.	(Lam 3,29)
Let him offer his cheek to who strikes him,	63.	(Lam 3,30)

syn04types	ZYq0<NmCl preV1sub00 preV2sub00 0<Subj NoReferral PreC<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected	
יִתֵּן בְּעַפֶּר פִּיהוּ	61.	(Lam 3,29)
	< ... >	
יִתֵּן לְמַכֵּהוּ לְחִי	63.	(Lam 3,30)
let him put his mouth in the dust:	61.	(Lam 3,29)
	< ... >	
Let him offer his cheek to who strikes him,	63.	(Lam 3,30)

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	lexical_repetition new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Annotation 3.32

proposed

יִשְׁבַּע בְּחִרְפָּה: ס 64. (Lam 3,30)
כִּי לֹא יִזְנַח לְעוֹלָם אֲדֹנָי: 65. (Lam 3,31)

let him be filled with disgrace. 64. (Lam 3,30)
For Adonay does not reject forever, 65. (Lam 3,31)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

corrected

טוֹב יְהוָה לִקְוֹ 52. (Lam 3,25)

<...>

כִּי לֹא יִזְנַח לְעוֹלָם אֲדֹנָי: 65. (Lam 3,31)

YHWH is good to the one who hopes in him, 52. (Lam 3,25)

<...>

For Adonay does not reject forever, 65. (Lam 3,31)

syn04types	xYqX<AjCl preV2par00 Socj<0 L...//...L pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

65 introduces a new section of the discourse, which provides a motivation for the statements made in 52–64. YHWH is good to who hopes for him; one

should endure their duress in silence: YHWH will not spurn forever. This transition is first of all signaled by the conjunction **כִּי** ('For'), but the large scope of the connection follows from the renominalization of YHWH (52) as 'Adonay', from the start of a new strophe and from the contents.

Annotation 3.33

		proposed
	וְרַחֵם כְּרֹב חֲסִדוֹ	67. (Lam 3,32)
	כִּי לֹא עָנָה מְלָבוֹ	68. (Lam 3,33)
and then shows compassion in the greatness of his		67. (Lam 3,32)
	mercy.	
For not wholeheartedly does he cause misery		68. (Lam 3,33)

syn04types	VBt<VBt 0<Cocj prev2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_conj diff_sentence indep_indep same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	כִּי לֹא יִזְנֶה לְעוֹלָם אֲדֹנָי:	65. (Lam 3,31)
	< ... >	
	כִּי לֹא עָנָה מְלָבוֹ	68. (Lam 3,33)
For Adonay does not reject forever,		65. (Lam 3,31)
	< ... >	
For not wholeheartedly does he cause misery		68. (Lam 3,33)

syn04types	xQt0<xYqX ParalPre01 Socj<Socj pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	neg_neg same_conj conj_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The first clause of this strophe has a *yiqtol* form, the parallel third verseline, as well as the other clauses in the strophe, have *qatal* forms. By the forms themselves, it is difficult to attribute any meaning to this transition, especially given the highly parallel clause openings of 65 and 69.

The *yiqtol* may express modality ('does not want to...'); it may also be a matter of salience, or even foreground vs background: As far as information

is concerned, the first *yiqtol* clause contains the core of what is expressed in this strophe; the *qatal* clauses are reformulations or elaborations of the same thought, which is signaled by כִּי ('for').

This is, of course, not to say that these clauses are redundant. This strophe is a good example of the communicational effect of prosodic structure. The *yiqtol* clause represents a crucial point in the discourse. For the first time, and in stark contrast to vs 1–18, the *geber* asserts that it is not like YHWH to reject people indefinitely. This important point is given extra attention, by effectively pausing the flow of thought and making the point multiple times, each time with a slightly different nuance.²¹

Annotation 3.34

		proposed
	כִּי לֹא עָנָה מְלֵבוּ	68. (Lam 3,33)
	< ... >	
	לְדַכָּא תַּחַת רַגְלָיו כָּל אֲסִירֵי אֶרֶץ:	70. (Lam 3,34)
	For not wholeheartedly does he cause misery	68. (Lam 3,33)
	< ... >	
	Crushing underfoot all prisoners in the land;	70. (Lam 3,34)
syn04types	InfC<xQt0 preV2par00 0<Socj Sfx<pngV Sfx<Sfx Adju<Main	
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_dep	
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_sfx	
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline	

		corrected
	לְדַכָּא תַּחַת רַגְלָיו כָּל אֲסִירֵי אֶרֶץ:	70. (Lam 3,34)
	< ... >	
	אֲדֹנָי לֹא רָאָה: ס	73. (Lam 3,36)
	Crushing underfoot all prisoners in the land;	70. (Lam 3,34)
	< ... >	
	Adonay does not see to it!	73. (Lam 3,36)

²¹See van Grol 2017, 21.

syn04types	Downward=Y Adju<Main
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_vt no.fronting.fronting preceding_daughter same_sentence
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_strophe

The ל-strophe of Lam 3 is syntactically difficult. As Hillers remarks, the three ל + infinitive construct clauses have been chosen to fit the acrostic, but need a mother clause on which they depend. This is a problem, because there are multiple ways to construct these infinitives within larger sentences:

- The usual solution is to take the three infinitives as objects ('The crushing ...; the perverting ...; the subverting ...') with לֹא רָאָה 73 as its main clause, which is then taken to be either a rhetorical question ("Does not Adonay see it?") or an indicative with a somewhat figurative meaning of רָאָה ("Adonay does not [bear to] see it" → "Adonay does not approve it").²² The problem of this solution is that the construction (ל-infinitive construct as object to רָאָה) is quite unusual.²³
- Hillers takes the infinitive construct clauses as adjuncts to 68–69, with 73 as a circumstantial clause:

Because he does not deliberately torment men, or afflict them
By crushing under foot ... ,
By denying justice ... ,
By twisting ... without the Lord seeing.²⁴

Syntactically elegant as this solution may be, its problem is that YHWH is mentioned twice explicitly. Hillers acknowledges this, but states that this is not entirely without parallels, even within Lamentations (Lam 2,20 and 22; Lam 3,66).²⁵ However, these parallels do not help: The problem here is not that YHWH is mentioned here by name rather than by pronoun, but that his being mentioned at all leads to semantic contradiction if YHWH is the subject of the infinitives: YHWH can not deny anyone justice 'before the Most High', much less twist someone's case 'without the Lord seeing'.

²²See Berlin 2002, 73, but see below, Renkema, who simply translates: "Adonay does not see it."

²³MQL query 3.3 on the following page only retrieves Lam 3,34–36; query 3.4 retrieves 9 cases, of which only 2 Sam 17,17 and 2 Chr 29,17 come close to resembling the present construction; with the added requirement that the ל-infrc clause must actually be coded as an object clause, no cases are found at all.

²⁴Hillers 1992, 111, my ellipses.

²⁵Hillers 1992, 116.

```

SELECT ALL OBJECTS WHERE
[sentence
  [clause as c1
    [word lex = "L"]
    [word vt = infc]
  ]
  ..
  [clause self=c1.mother
    [word pdp = verb AND lex = "R>H[" ]
  ]
]
GO

```

SQL query 3.3 : ל-infic as preceding daughter to ראה

```

SELECT ALL OBJECTS WHERE
[sentence
  [clause as c1
    [word pdp = verb AND lex = "R>H[" ]
  ]
  ..
  [clause mother = c1.self
    [word lex = "L"]
    [word vt = infc]
  ]
]
GO

```

SQL query 3.4 : ל-infic as following daughter to ראה

- According to Renkema,²⁶ a new canto starts here, so for him, Hiller's solution is not an option. Renkema construes the infinitives as the predicates of three nominal clauses.²⁷

To be trampled under (the enemy's) foot
 serve all the prisoners of the land;
 to be subverted (serves) the right of a devout one
 before the presence of the Most High;
 human persons (serve) to be aggrieved in their rights,
 and Adonai does not want to see it!

Note that Renkema does not try to give positive meaning to 73, but interprets the 7-strophe as a complaint about YHWH not choosing not to see (and thus not to prevent) injustice. Renkema's interpretation of 73 as a straightforward negative clause can also fit the usual solution: "The crushing, etc.: Adonay does not see it!" It has the obvious advantage of simplicity and sticking to the observable syntactic signals. Broader exegesis of the poem will have to decide its validity, but I would certainly not preclude it a priori.

Annotation 3.35

	accepted
לְהַטּוֹת מִשְׁפֶּט-גִּבֹּר נֶגַד פָּנַי עָלֶיךָ:	71. (Lam 3,35)
לַעֲוֹת אָדָם בְּרִיבוֹ	72. (Lam 3,36)
denying a man his justice before the Most High,	71. (Lam 3,35)
thwarting a person in his case—	72. (Lam 3,36)

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalPre00 Coord<Main NoReferral Adju<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn coordination dep_dep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Objc
prosodic	acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

Note that the participant label *sfx_to_Objc* should not have been assigned, as it observes congruence between the suffix on רִיבוֹ ('his lawsuit') and מִשְׁפֶּט-גִּבֹּר ('a man's justice'). This is incorrect, because it has a clause-internal antecedent (אָדָם, 'a person'). The label definitions identifying clause-internal reference obviously need some improvement.

²⁶Renkema 1998, 411.

²⁷Renkema 1998, 333.

Annotation 3.36

		proposed
	כִּי לֹא עָנָה מְלֶכְבוּ 68.	(Lam 3,33)
	< ... >	
	אֲדֹנִי לֹא רָאָה: ס 73.	(Lam 3,36)
For not wholeheartedly does he cause misery	68.	(Lam 3,33)
	< ... >	
Adonay does not see to it!	73.	(Lam 3,36)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd1<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence indep_indep neg_neg non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt		
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png		
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe strophe_other_to_other		

		corrected
	כִּי לֹא יִזְנַח לְעוֹלָם אֲדֹנִי: 65.	(Lam 3,31)
	< ... >	
	אֲדֹנִי לֹא רָאָה: ס 73.	(Lam 3,36)
For Adonay does not reject forever,	65.	(Lam 3,31)
	< ... >	
Adonay does not see to it!	73.	(Lam 3,36)

syn04types	XQt1<xYqX preV2par00 ParalLex01 0<Socj pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj		
syntactic	neg_neg conj_async diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting		
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png		
prosodic	lexical_repetition chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe stro- phe_other_to_first		

Annotation 3.37

		proposed
	אֲדֹנִי לֹא רָאָה: ס 73.	(Lam 3,36)
	מִי זֶה אָמַר 74.	(Lam 3,37)
Adonay does not see to it!	73.	(Lam 3,36)
Who then has spoken	74.	(Lam 3,37)

syn04types	VBt<VBt Quot<0 Ques<0 prev2par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Objc<Main
syntactic	Objc_clause asyn_asyn diff_sentence front- ing_fronting indep_indep new_deictic new_interr non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

corrected

כִּי לֹא יִזְנֶה לְעוֹלָם אֲדֹנָי: 65. (Lam 3,31)

< ... >

מִי זֶה אָמַר 74. (Lam 3,37)

For Adonay does not reject forever, 65. (Lam 3,31)

< ... >

Who then has spoken 74. (Lam 3,37)

syn04types	XQt1<xYqX Quot<0 Ques<0 prev2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	diff_sentence new_interr conj_asyn diff_salience diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	strophe.to.strophe acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first

There are some formal observations which plead for this connection:

- מִי ('who?') changes the mode of speech, from affirmative to interrogative.
- It also introduces a change in the participants pattern.

However, these merely point to a new start of sorts, not to a clear candidate for the mother clause. In fact, judging by the clause types and the repeated subject, a connection with 73 would seem more probable.

The problem here is the considerable syntactic independence of the strophes. 65–79 are bound syntactically by the repetition of the name Adonay (Elyon in 77) and by the dominant use of the negative לֹא ('not'). But apart from that, each of the three strophes formulates a thought of its own, which is simply placed after its predecessor, without any conjunction or other signal as to how the one follows from the other to form a discourse. This discourse will therefore have to be surmised based on the contents.

This, however, is not an easy task, as some of the clauses in this passage are terse to the point of being unintelligible to a non-native speaker,²⁸ leading to widely divergent and even contradicting interpretations of 70–73,²⁹ 76,³⁰ and 77.³¹

I will base my own interpretation on the pervasive occurrence of *לֹא* ('not'), and the conclusion by the two rhetorical questions. It seems to me that the entire passage Lam 3,31–39 functions as a bridge between the admonition to be silent, humble and hopeful (vs 25–30) and the call for prayer (vs 40–41). The general aim of the passage seems to be to take away the focus on Adonay's actions and decisions (all the *לֹא* clauses), toward the people's own responsibility: It is they who have forced Adonay to punish them; He has not been the one who has approved of, let alone commanded, the people's sins:

For not of his own volition does he afflict
 or torment human beings:
 The crushing underfoot of
 all the prisoners of the land,
 the perverting of a man's justice
 before the presence of the Most High,
 the subverting of a person in his lawsuit—
 Adonay did not see to it! (or: Adonay can not bear to see it!)
 Who was it that spoke and made it happen?
 Adonay did not command it:
 From the mouth of the Most High do not come
 bad as well as good!
 How can a person still alive complain,
 a man about his punishment?

Let us search into our ways and examine them,

²⁸See also Vlaardingerbroek 1999, 90.

²⁹Berlin 2002, 79: "The crushing underfoot ... —does not the LORD see it?" (likewise Berges 2002, 171 and many modern translations); Renkema 1998, 412–415: "To be trampled ... serve [the people of the land]; ...; and Adonai does not want to see it!" (meaning: He ignores it, lets it happen); Vlaardingerbroek 1999, 81: "Te vertrappen ... —De Heer kan het niet aanzien!" ("To crush underfoot ... —The LORD can not bear to see it!"); Hillers 1992, 111: "(33) Because he does not deliberately torment men, or afflict them (34) by crushing underfoot ..., ..., by twisting a man's case without the Lord seeing."

³⁰

³¹Renkema 1998, 421: "From the mouth of the Most High come not evil words, but the good!"; Berlin 2002, 80: "Is it not from the mouth of the Most High that come bad things and good?"; similarly, but not as a rhetorical question, Hillers 1992, 111: "Both bad and good take place at the command of the Most High." Vlaardingerbroek 1999, 81: "Uit de mond van Eljon komen niet het kwade en het goede!" ("From the mouth of Elyon do not come forth the bad and the good," not referring to bad or good events, but to God's law, which the people should have known and obeyed, but instead have broken Vlaardingerbroek 1999, 90.

and return to YHWH.

...

Annotation 3.38

	proposed	
אֲדֹנִי לֹא צִוָּה:	76.	(Lam 3,37)
מִפִּי עֲלִיּוֹן לֹא תֵצֵא הָרָעוֹת וְהַטּוֹב:	77.	(Lam 3,38)
Adonay does not decree it!	76.	(Lam 3,37)
The mouth of the Most High does not utter bad as	77.	(Lam 3,38)
well as good.		

syn04types	xYqX<XQt1 preV2par00<<///<<perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<0 NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt fronting_fronting neg_neg non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

	corrected	
מִי זֶה אָמַר	74.	(Lam 3,37)
	< ... >	
מִפִּי עֲלִיּוֹן לֹא תֵצֵא הָרָעוֹת וְהַטּוֹב:	77.	(Lam 3,38)
Who then has spoken	74.	(Lam 3,37)
	< ... >	
The mouth of the Most High does not utter bad as	77.	(Lam 3,38)
well as good.		

syn04types	xYqX<XQt1 0<Quot 0<Ques preV2par00 perV<perV numV<numV NPd2<0 NPd1<0 Subj<Subj Asyn<QtVb
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt direct_speech fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	new_indep_Subj Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_verseline whole_verseline chias- tic_Pred_Subj in_same_strophe

76–and 77 both have an explicit subject, referring to the same participant; both have the negation לֹא, and semantically both seem to deny that YHWH is the

direct author of evil. However, text-syntactically, 77 is not connected to 76–, but starts a new unit. The main syntactic argument is that 74–76 form one complex sentence; 77 connects to this sentence as a whole. The repetition of a divine name at such short distance also has more divisive than connecting force. Prosodically, the start of the new verseline (indicated by the acrostic מ) is a strong argument for the corrected connection. A connection 76–77 would be rather awkward, as it would connect an complete two-colon verseline to the B-line of the preceding verseline. This goes against the usual rhythm of the verselines.

Annotation 3.39

accepted

מה־יִתְאוֹנֵן אָדָם חַי 78. (Lam 3,39)
גִּבֹּר עַל־חַטָּאוֹ 79.

How can a person still alive complain, 78. (Lam 3,39)
a man about his punishment? 79.

syn04types	Ellp<xYqX 0<Ques preV1sub00 Elliptical Sfx<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn ellipsis indep_dep main_defect main_ellipsis same_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

The label *sfx_to_Pred* should not have been assigned. The patterns identifying that the suffix already has a clause-internal antecedent apparently needs to be more sophisticated.

Annotation 3.40

proposed

גִּבֹּר עַל־חַטָּאוֹ 79. (Lam 3,39)
נַחֲפֹשֶׁה דְרָכֵינוּ 80. (Lam 3,40)

a man about his punishment? 79. (Lam 3,39)
Let us examine our ways 80. (Lam 3,40)

syn04types	ZYq0<Ellp preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP NPd2<0 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main_dep_indep_diff_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

	corrected	
זָכֹר-עֲנִי וּמְרוֹדִי לַעֲנָה וְרָאשׁ:	39.	(Lam 3,19)
	< ... >	
נִחַפְשָׁה דְרָכֵינוּ	80.	(Lam 3,40)
Remember my misery and wandering, the	39.	(Lam 3,19)
wormwood and bitterness!.		
	< ... >	
Let us examine our ways	80.	(Lam 3,40)

syn04types	ZYq0<ZIm0 Npd2<Npd2 NoReferral
syntactic	diff_vt asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

What happens here, is a change of speech situation, which can theoretically be interpreted in two ways:

1. The speaker (presumably the *geber*, in the absence of signals to the contrary) addresses his audience directly, including himself within their group.
2. A group of people (presumably the *geber's* audience) starts speaking.

From the flow of the discourse, and the communicational situation I envision, the first option is by far the more probable. The call to a communal prayer of confession follows quite naturally from the conclusion of the 'sermon', that people should look for the cause of their misery in their own sins. This means, then, that there is no change in speaker, and not even in addressee (presumably, the audience has been the addressee all along), but there *is* a difference in the way they are addressed.

At any rate, the change is marked by a shift to 1 pl references, in an asyndetic, volitive clause type, and most of all by the fact that these 1 pl have not occurred before in the text. If they had, the shift would not be nearly as significant.

As usual in dramatic texts, there is no formal introduction of the change.

Annotation 3.41

		proposed
	נְחַפְּשָׁה דְרָכֵינוּ	80. (Lam 3,40)
	< ... >	
	וְנָשׁוּבָה עַד־יְהוָה:	82.
	Let us examine our ways	80. (Lam 3,40)
	< ... >	
	and let us return to YHWH.	82.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

		corrected
	וְנִחְקְרָה	81. (Lam 3,40)
	וְנָשׁוּבָה עַד־יְהוָה:	82.
	and test them	81. (Lam 3,40)
	and let us return to YHWH.	82.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<Cocj pngV<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type same_conj conj_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

The mention of YHWH by name in this clause is another signal that the coordinated sentence 80–82 starts a new major section of the text. This can, however, only be observed when this sentence is viewed as a whole.

Annotation 3.42

		proposed
	נִשָּׂא לְבַבֵּנוּ אֶל־כַּפֵּימָּנוּ אֶל־אֵל בְּשָׁמַיִם:	83. (Lam 3,41)
	נִחְנֹנוּ פְשָׁעֵנוּ	84. (Lam 3,42)
	Let us lift up our hearts on our hands, to God in heaven!	83. (Lam 3,41)
	“We have sinned	84. (Lam 3,42)

syn04types	XQt1<ZYq0 preV1par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_fronting root same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic diff_strophe end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

This clause starts a new communicational domain, in which a ‘we’ group addresses YHWH directly. Since the verbs in the preceding clauses (80–83) are no quotation verbs, I have to assume that this speech starts with a root clause (cf Lam 1,9c.11c.17).

It may seem strange that there is a change of speaker even though 1 pl verb forms continue. This is a complication of 1 pl references in a dramatic text: They may occur in a speech from a single speaker to a group (to which that speaker themselves belong), or in a speech by an entire group.

The domain change can not be observed until 86, where it is clear that no longer the ‘we’-group but YHWH is addressed.

It is a matter of debate whether there is also a change of speaker (a ‘we’ group, presumably the audience, takes over from the *geber*), or whether the *geber* continues speaking, on behalf of his audience and himself. Because of what happens later on (97 ff.), I am inclined to say that here, the audience actually starts praying, as a separate speaking voice. However, the second option amounts to almost the same change, in terms of communicational patterns, so the difference is not all that great.

The fronting of נִהְנוּ (‘we’) deserves some attention. It is clear that it stands in opposition to אַתָּה (‘you’, 86), which is also fronted. The question is, to what degree this opposition follows from a pragmatic opposition that the poet means to express, or could be explained along prosodic lines. Invoking the poet’s meaning already indicates that this question is well-nigh impossible to answer. What I can say, is this:

- The semantic opposition is obvious, but a pragmatic meaning is not so easy to formulate: Does the opposition intend to place the two parties in a contrast (‘We, on our part, ..., while you, on your part, ...’)? This appears somewhat awkward, but can not be precluded.
- The prosodic function of the double fronting is equally obvious: Two fronted personal pronouns, opening two parallel cola of the same verse-line, create a strong internal parallelism. Furthermore, the fronting of נִהְנוּ may have been chosen to comply with the acrostic; in that case, the fronting of אַתָּה may also be explained as a simple case of the B-colon

following the pattern of the A-colon.³²

In all likelihood, a bit of both is going on here. Prosodic striving for balance in combination of starting a new speech has prompted certain syntactic constructions, which retain some of their pragmatic functions (contrast between ‘we’ and ‘you’; emphatic start of a direct speech).

Note that the start of this speech does not happen at the start of a new strophe, but as its last verseline, and that the speech continues in the next strophe without any syntactic interruption. The 1-strophe and the 2-strophe are therefore quite closely linked.

Annotation 3.43

accepted
נַחֲנוּ פָשַׁעְנוּ 84. (Lam 3,42)
וּמָרִינוּ 85.

“We have sinned 84. (Lam 3,42)
and rebelled; 85.

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 prev1par00 prev2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	cont.Subj Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_prps
prosodic	in_same_colon end_of_strophe multi_verb_colon

Annotation 3.44

proposed
וּמָרִינוּ 85. (Lam 3,42)
אַתָּה לֹא סָלַחְתָּ: 86.

and rebelled; 85. (Lam 3,42)
you have not forgiven. 86.

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj prev2par00 NPd1<0 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_first_sec
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

³²Lunn 2006, 275–276, rule 4; see p. 48 of the dissertation.

		corrected
נִחְנוּ כְּשֶׁעָנוּ	84.	(Lam 3,42)
	< ... >	
אַתָּה לֹא סָלַחְתָּ: ס	86.	
“We have sinned	84.	(Lam 3,42)
	< ... >	
you have not forgiven.	86.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev2sub00 NPD1<NPD1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async asyn_conj_async de- ictic_deictic diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	new_prps ps_shift_first_sec Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj to_multi_clause_colon

For a discussion of whether the fronting of the pronouns in the mother and daughter clause have primarily been pragmatic or prosodic meaning, see the discussion of 84 above.

Annotation 3.45

		proposed
לֹא חֶמְלָתָּ:	90.	(Lam 3,43)
סְכוּתָה בְּעָנְו לָךְ	91.	(Lam 3,44)
without mercy.	90.	(Lam 3,43)
You have covered yourself with a cloud	91.	(Lam 3,44)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 prev2par00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_colon diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected
הִרְגָּתָּ	89. (Lam 3,43)
< ... >	
סִכּוּתָהּ בְּעָנָן לָהּ	91. (Lam 3,44)
you have killed	89. (Lam 3,43)
< ... >	
You have covered yourself with a cloud	91. (Lam 3,44)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	to_multi_verb_colon B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc to_multi_clause_colon

The return to affirmative 0Qṭ0 after a negative clause is the main syntactic argument. The prosodic structure affirms this.

Annotation 3.46

	proposed
סִכּוּתָהּ בְּעָנָן לָהּ	91. (Lam 3,44)
< ... >	
פָּצוּ עֲלֵינוּ פִּיָּהֶם כָּל־אֹיְבֵינוּ:	94. (Lam 3,46)
You have covered yourself with a cloud	91. (Lam 3,44)
< ... >	
All our enemies open their mouths against us.	94. (Lam 3,46)

syn04types	VBT<VBT Npd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj ps_shift_sec_first
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	corrected
נִחַנּוּ פִּשְׁעֵנוּ	84. (Lam 3,42)
< ... >	
פָּצוּ עֲלֵינוּ פִּיָּהֶם כָּל־אֹיְבֵינוּ:	94. (Lam 3,46)
"We have sinned	84. (Lam 3,42)
< ... >	
All our enemies open their mouths against us.	94. (Lam 3,46)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prevlpar00 prev2sub00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj diff.verb.png new.secondary.part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj sfx_to_prps secondary_part
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

Annotation 3.47

	proposed
נָחֵנוּ פָּשַׁעְנוּ	84. (Lam 3,42)
< ... >	
הַשָּׂאת וְהַשִּׁבֵּר:	96. (Lam 3,47)
"We have sinned	84. (Lam 3,42)
< ... >	
the ruin and the breaking ..."	96. (Lam 3,47)

syn04types	MSyn<XQt1 prevlpar00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn_asyn coordination diff_sentence ellipsis main_defect root
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

	corrected
פָּחַד וּפַחַת הָיָה לָנוּ	95. (Lam 3,47)
הַשָּׂאת וְהַשִּׁבֵּר:	96.
Panic and pit have come over us,	95. (Lam 3,47)
the ruin and the breaking ..."	96.

syn04types	Defc<XQt1 prevlpar00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0 Subj<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	coordination ellipsis asyn_asyn main_defect same_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in.same.verseline

Annotation 3.48

		proposed
	הַשָּׂאת וְהַשָּׁבֵר:	96. (Lam 3,47)
	פְּלִגֵּי-מַיִם תִּרְדַּ עֵינִי עַל-שֶׁבֶר בֵּת-עַמִּי: ס	97. (Lam 3,48)
	the ruin and the breaking ...”	96. (Lam 3,47)
	Streams of water flow from my eye about the	97. (Lam 3,48)
	breaking of my Dear People.	

syn04types	xYqX<Defc preVlpar00 ParalLex01 1/2P<3rdP Npd2<0 0<Npd1 Subj<Subj PreC<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main diff_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	נַחֲפֹשֶׁה דְּרָכֵינוּ	80. (Lam 3,40)
	< ... >	
	פְּלִגֵּי-מַיִם תִּרְדַּ עֵינִי עַל-שֶׁבֶר בֵּת-עַמִּי: ס	97. (Lam 3,48)
	Let us examine our ways	80. (Lam 3,40)
	< ... >	
	Streams of water flow from my eye about the	97. (Lam 3,48)
	breaking of my Dear People.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 Npd2<Npd2 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	no_fronting_fronting asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	acrostic diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline stro- phe_other_to_first whole_verseline

In this clause, the *geber* interrupts the prayer by the ‘we’-group. This is signaled syntactically by the reappearance of 1 sg references and the omission of 2 m.sg references; as always in a dramatic text there is no intriductory formula, the speaker simply starts speaking. The fact that this change does not happen at strophe opening, but within the 5-strophe, may be intentional: At any rate, it greatly strengthens the impression of interruption. I consider this interruption a crucial moment in the communicational structure of the entire poem, which I have summarized in Table 3.1 on the next page:³³ The poem appears to start

³³See also Bosman 1996 and my more elaborate discussion in Chapter 14 of the dissertation.

verses	speaker	addressee	contents
1–18	<i>geber</i>	unknown	‘He’ has caused me hardship
19–24		audience	Report of internal dialogue
25–39			Sermon, consisting of three parts:
25–30			a. Be silent, humble and trusting
31–36			b. Because YHWH does not want to cause hardship
37–39			c. We have only ourselves to blame
40–41			Call to prayer
42–47	audience	YHWH	We have sinned, you have not forgiven
48–54	<i>geber</i>	unknown	Report of hardship, but with hope
55–66	<i>geber</i>	YHWH	Prayer for deliverance

Table 3.1: Lam 3, communicational structure

as an individual lament, but this lament turns out to be the ‘learning material’ on which the *geber* bases a sermon: In spite of our hardship we should be silent and hopeful, for YHWH does not enjoy causes us hardship. For this, we have only ourselves to blame.

The *geber* then calls his audience to a prayer of repentance. The audience starts praying, but they do not seem to get past the lament that they have sinned and that YHWH has not forgiven them. They remain completely without hope. At that moment the *geber* steps in and takes over the prayer, this time as a proper individual lament. The tears he sheds, already carry with them the hope that YHWH will once again look down benevolently. This is why the *geber*, unlike the people, can continue the prayer and ask for deliverance.

The *geber* in this poem acts as a substitute for, and example to, the people. He steps in where the people can not continue, and accomplishes what they could not. In this role, he is both a mediator and an example to be followed by us, the audience. In this respect, the character of the *geber* has similarities with the character of the Servant in Isa 40–55.³⁴

Syntactic features Two syntactic details of this clause need to be addressed: The fronting of the object פְּלִגֵּי מַיִם (‘streams of water’), and the use of *yiqtol*.

As for the fronting, the need for a word on פ may have played a role, but also that the hyperbole and the start of a new speech may have contributed to placing this element in initial position. Pragmatically, this hyperbole then states something like: ‘Not just tears, but streams of water will my eye shed.’

³⁴(Bosman 1996, 62); Tull Willey 1997, 266; for the role of the Servant in DJ see also van der Woude 2005, 224–225; Leene 1987, 189; Leene 1993, 242.

Temporal perspective of the verb forms As for the temporal perspective of the *yiqtol* form: As usual, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly, what the various verb forms in 97–103 signify. These lines are a clear example of how temporal perspective is not inherent to the paradigmatic form, but is determined by the syntagmatic context. In particular, it is important to know how the various clauses are to be interconnected. The verb forms concerned in these lines are:

97: xYqX By itself, the clause would seem to signify an event in the present:
The *geber* reports that his eye is streaming with tears.

98–99: xQt1 - WxY0 If 98 were to be read as the continuation of 98, it would also be in the present. However, there are arguments to take it as the start of a separate syntactic unit, in which future perspective can be observed:

- The subject עֵינַי ('my eye') is repeated, which would be quite redundant in a continuation clause.
- 99 clearly continues 98, because of the conjunction -וְ and because the two clauses appear within the same colon. In fact, 99 is often translated as an adjunct: 'without cease'.³⁵
- 97 is the closure of a strophe; 98–103 form a new strophe. The repetition of the subject appears to be a signal of this.

99—clearly does have future perspective, since it is continued by the עַד - *yiqtol* clause 101: 'until [YHWH] will look down ...' By implication, also 98 would seem to have future perspective.³⁶

103: xQt1 The last clause of this strophe appears to upset the latter conclusion again. It is clearly parallel to the first clause, 98, having the same clause type and, again, repeating its subject. This suggests, that the strophe is actually to be seen as essentially a xQt1 unit, presumably with present perspective, into which a portion with future perspective is embedded:

With streams of water my eye flows, ...

My eye flows—and it will not stop, / without relief,
until will look down and see / YHWH from Heaven!—
My eye grieves my *nefeš*, ...

³⁵Hillers 1992, 111; Renkema 1998, 441; Berlin 2002, 81.

³⁶See Hillers 1992, 111; Berlin 2002, 80.

Annotation 3.49

		proposed
מֵאֵין הַפָּגוֹת:	100.	(Lam 3,49)
עַד־יִשְׁקִיף	101.	(Lam 3,50)
without pause,	100.	(Lam 3,49)
until he looks	101.	(Lam 3,50)

syn04types	xYq0<NmCl preV2sub00 Socj<0		
syntactic	asyn_conj dep_dep same_sentence		
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj		
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	acrostic	diff_verseline
	in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc		

		corrected
וְלֹא תִדְמָה	99.	(Lam 3,49)
	<...>	
עַד־יִשְׁקִיף	101.	(Lam 3,50)
and will not stop,	99.	(Lam 3,49)
	<...>	
until he looks	101.	(Lam 3,50)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj preV2par00 Socj<0 perV<perV numV<numV		
syntactic	indep_dep	same_sentence	conj_conj disc_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj		
prosodic	acrostic	diff_colon	diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

This clause continues 99–100 as a whole, since 100 is only an adjunct to 99, it is not an independent clause.

The syntactic label *indep_dep_indep* has been designed to spot this. However, since in this case the *עַד-yiqtol* clause 101 has also been parsed as an adjunct clause to 99, the pattern ‘misses’ its second independent clause and is not recognized.

The start of the new verseline would plead for a connection to 98, but since this is a *XQt1* clause, I have rejected this. My ideas about the overall syntactic structure of the strophe have played an important role as well.

This, then, is an example of a complication caused by the recursivity of linguistic units. Making the clause hierarchy is not the problem here, but figuring out which units function on what linguistic levels is. This, of course, is by no means unique to poetry. If anything, Biblical Hebrew poetry is expected to

show less recursivity than prose, because of its preference for short, simple sentences.

Annotation 3.50

		proposed
עֵינִי עוֹלֵלָה לְנַפְשִׁי מִכָּל בָּנוֹת עִירִי: ס	103.	(Lam 3,51)
צוּר צָדוּנִי כְּצִפּוֹר אֵיבֵי הָנֶם:	104.	(Lam 3,52)
My eye brings grief to my Self for all the daughters of my city.	103.	(Lam 3,51)
They hunted me like a bird, my enemies for no reason;	104.	(Lam 3,52)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2sub00 perV<perV Npd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png next_secondary_part sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic chiasitic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
עֵינִי נָגְרָה	98.	(Lam 3,49)
	<...>	
צוּר צָדוּנִי כְּצִפּוֹר אֵיבֵי הָנֶם:	104.	(Lam 3,52)
My eye flows	98.	(Lam 3,49)
	<...>	
They hunted me like a bird, my enemies for no reason;	104.	(Lam 3,52)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2sub00 perV<perV Npd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async same_vt diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part diff_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_to_strophe acrostic chias- tic_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

Syntactically, the *qatal* line from the preceding strophe appears to continue in this one, but there is a change in subjects. Also, the content matter changes slightly: In 98–103, the *geber* reports of his emotions, while in 104/109, the actual

hardships are described. It is the start of the new strophe that makes the break certain.

Annotation 3.51

		proposed	
	צָמְתוּ בְּבוֹר חַיִּי	105.	(Lam 3,53)
		< ... >	
	צָפוּ-מַיִם עַל-רֹאשִׁי	107.	(Lam 3,54)
	They smothered my life in a pit	105.	(Lam 3,53)
		< ... >	
	the waters closed over my head.	107.	(Lam 3,54)
syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt		
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx		
prosodic	acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline		

		corrected	
	צוֹד צְדוּנִי כַּצָּפוֹר אִלְבֵּי חָנָם:	104.	(Lam 3,52)
		< ... >	
	צָפוּ-מַיִם עַל-רֹאשִׁי	107.	(Lam 3,54)
	They hunted me like a bird, my enemies for no reason;	104.	(Lam 3,52)
		< ... >	
	the waters closed over my head.	107.	(Lam 3,54)
syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt		
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj sfx_to_sfx same_verb_png		
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj		

Annotation 3.52

		proposed
	צָפוּ-מַיִם עַל-רֹאשִׁי	107. (Lam 3,54)
	אָמַרְתִּי	108.
	the waters closed over my head.	107. (Lam 3,54)
	I said:	108.
syn04types	VBT<VBT Quot<0 pngV<Sfx 0<Subj	
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt	
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_other verb_to_sfx	
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline	

		corrected
	צֹד צְדוֹנִי כְּצִפּוֹר אִיבִי חֲנָם:	104. (Lam 3,52)
		< ... >
	אָמַרְתִּי	108. (Lam 3,54)
	They hunted me like a bird, my enemies for no reason;	104. (Lam 3,52)
		< ... >
	I said:	108. (Lam 3,54)

syn04types	VBT<VBT Quot<0 prev1sub00 prev2par00 pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj	
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt	
participants	diff_verb_png verb_to_sfx Subj_no_Subj	
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe	

Annotation 3.53

		proposed
	אָמַרְתִּי	108. (Lam 3,54)
		< ... >
	קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ	110. (Lam 3,55)
	I said:	108. (Lam 3,54)
		< ... >
	I call your name,	110. (Lam 3,55)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Quot pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NoReferral Asyn<QtVb
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence direct_speech disc_disc in- dep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

corrected

אֲנִי הַגִּבֹּר 1. (Lam 3,1)

<...>

קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ 110. (Lam 3,55)

I am the man 1. (Lam 3,1)

<...>

I call your name, 110. (Lam 3,55)

syn04types	ZQt0<NmCl preVlpar00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj verb_to_prps
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first stro- phe_to_strophe

Seen in isolation, the proposal by syn04types, to connect קָרָאתִי ('I call', 110) to אָמַרְתִּי ('I say', 108), at first sight makes a lot of sense. However, there is a change in speech domains here: The speaker no longer speaks *about* YHWH (102) but *to* him (the vocative in 111). However, this can only be observed when the *units* formed by 98 (98–109 and 110–118–) are taken into account as a whole.

Annotation 3.54**proposed**

יְהוָה 111. (Lam 3,55)

מִבּוֹר תְּחַתִּיּוֹת: 112.

YHWH, 111. (Lam 3,55)

from the depths of the pit. 112.

syn04types	Defc<Voct prevlpar00 0<NPd1
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_dep same_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ 110. (Lam 3,55)

< ... >

מְבוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת: 112.

I call your name, 110. (Lam 3,55)

< ... >

from the depths of the pit. 112.

syn04types	Defc<ZQt0 prevlpar00 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd2
syntactic	embedding asyn_asyn indep_dep main_defect same_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

Annotation 3.55

proposed

מְבוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת: 112. (Lam 3,55)

קוֹלִי שְׁמַעַת 113. (Lam 3,56)

from the depths of the pit. 112. (Lam 3,55)

Hear my voice, 113. (Lam 3,56)

syn04types	xQt0<Defc prevlpar00 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ 110. (Lam 3,55)

< ... >

קוֹלִי שְׁמַעַת 113. (Lam 3,56)

I call your name, 110. (Lam 3,55)

< ... >

Hear my voice, 113. (Lam 3,56)

syn04types	VBt<VBt preVlpar00 1/2P<2/1P numV<numV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 NPd1<0
syntactic	indep_dep_indep asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc in- dep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png sfx_to_Pred verb_to_sfx no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	acrostic in_same_strophe new_verseline

The clause hierarchy is obvious here. What needs some attention, is the interpretation of the *qatal* forms in Lam 3,56–61: Hillers, Provan and Berlin contend that these have precative / volitive meaning.³⁷

The issue is complicated. On the one hand, reports of YHWH's compassion in the past as the motivation for a prayer about the future form a well-known trope in Biblical Hebrew poetry, and by applying this trope, these verses can by all means be interpreted in this way, as the ancient translations appear to have done.³⁸ Furthermore, Berges may be correct that such an extensive use of precative *qatal* is extremely rare in the Hebrew Bible.³⁹

On the other hand, the first few *qatal* forms are connected syntactically with forms which clearly have volitive or future meaning:

- אַל-תַּעֲלֵם עֲזִנִּי (אַל-תַּעֲלֵם עֲזִנִּי), 'do not shut your ear', 114;
- בַּיּוֹם אֶקְרָאָהּ, 'on the day I will call on you', 116), which fits a volitive meaning of קָרַבְתָּ better than a perfective one.
- שִׁפְטָהּ, 'judge!', 126; note the rhyming verbal ending and the semantic parallel to רָבַתָּ ('you have conducted my case' or 'conduct my case!', 119);
- הִבִּיטָהּ, 'see!', 133; note the rhyming verbal ending and the semantic parallel to שָׁמַעְתָּ ('you have heard' or 'hear!', 129, the main verb of the preceding sentence.
- The initial *yiqtol* forms in vs 6466, which are clearly volitive.⁴⁰

Also the contents of the poem would seem to favor a precative interpretation: Even though the *geber* has encouraged the people to be hopeful, and has told

³⁷Hillers 1992, 118; Provan 1991; Berlin 2002, 83.

³⁸Berges 2002, 220.

³⁹Note, however, that I have found a list of cases in the Psalms which appear to carry the same possibility, see p. 239 of the dissertation.

⁴⁰Note that Rudolph (1962) has suggested that these *yiqtol*s are prompted by the acrostic and not to be considered volitive, so that there is in fact no closing prayer at all. This, however, does not solve the problem that the poem nowhere indicates that salvation has already happened, not to mention the fact that this solution requires the unwarranted emendation of two imperatives to *qatals*, see Provan 1991, 170.

them that YHWH will perhaps turn things around, there is no indication in the entire poem that YHWH already has done this, either for the people or for the *geber* individually. The actual experiences the *geber* provides as ‘learning material’, are those of YHWH’s enmity (vs 1–18) and of oppression by his enemies (vs 52–54). In such a situation, reporting extensively that YHWH *has* heard, seen and judged the *geber*’s case against his enemies seems premature, especially if the *yiqtol* forms in vs 64–66 are interpreted as volitives, which would imply that this judgement has not yet happened.⁴¹

Annotation 3.56

		accepted
	קוֹלִי שְׁמַעַת 113.	(Lam 3,56)
	אַל-תַּעֲלֵם אֲזִנִּי לְרוֹחִתִּי לְשׁוּעָתִי: 114.	
	Hear my voice, 113.	(Lam 3,56)
	do not close your ears to my cry for relief. 114.	

syn04types	xYq0<xQt0 preVlpar00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	in_same_colon A_colon_B_colon qatal_yiqtol_verseline

The fact that 113 and 114 start in the same colon, add to their close connection, which is an important argument for the precative interpretation of שְׁמַעַת (‘hear!’).

Annotation 3.57

		proposed
	אַל-תַּעֲלֵם אֲזִנִּי לְרוֹחִתִּי לְשׁוּעָתִי: 114.	(Lam 3,56)
	קִרְבָּתְּ בַּיּוֹם 115.	(Lam 3,57)
	do not close your ears to my cry for relief. 114.	(Lam 3,56)
	Come near on the day 115.	(Lam 3,57)

⁴¹See also Provan 1991, 168 ff., who makes an extensive case for the exegetical difficulties that a perfective reading inevitably runs into.

syn04types	ZQt0<xYq0 preV1par00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

קולי שמעת 113. (Lam 3,56)

< ... >

קרבת ביום 115. (Lam 3,57)

Hear my voice, 113. (Lam 3,56)

< ... >

Come near on the day 115. (Lam 3,57)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1
syntactic	asyn_asyn same_vt diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Annotation 3.58**accepted**

קרבת ביום 115. (Lam 3,57)

אקראך 116.

Come near on the day 115. (Lam 3,57)

that I call you, 116.

syn04types	ZYq0<ZQt0 numV<numV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	Attr_clause asyn_asyn diff_vt disc_disc indep_dep same_salience same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_colon multi_verb_colon

That the *qatal* clause is connected to a *yiqtol* clause here seems to indicate that the sentence as a whole has present or future perspective (and thus a precative *qatal* form): “Come near when I (will) call you.”

Annotation 3.59

		proposed
אָמַרְתָּ	117.	(Lam 3,57)
<...>		
רַבָּתָּ	119.	(Lam 3,58)
say:	117.	(Lam 3,57)
<...>		
Take up,	119.	(Lam 3,58)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Quot pngV<pngV Asyn<QtVb		
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence direct_speech disc_disc indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience		
participants	changing_speech_sit	cont_Subj	no_Subj_no_Subj
	same_verb_png		
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	acrostic	new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

		corrected
קָרָאתִי שְׁמֶךָ	110.	(Lam 3,55)
<...>		
רַבָּתָּ	119.	(Lam 3,58)
I call your name,	110.	(Lam 3,55)
<...>		
Take up,	119.	(Lam 3,58)

syn04types	VBT<VBT numV<numV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2		
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience		
participants	Voct_to_Voct	diff_verb_png	no_Subj_no_Subj
	verb_to_other verb_to_sfx		
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe	acrostic	new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Annotation 3.60

		proposed
רִיבִי נַפְשִׁי	121.	(Lam 3,58)
גָּאַלְתָּ חַיִּי:	122.	
the case of my Self;	121.	(Lam 3,58)
redeem my life.	122.	

syn04types	ZQt0<Defc prevlpar00 prev2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

רַבֵּת 119. (Lam 3,58)

<...>

גַּאֲלַת חַיִּי: 122.

Take up, 119. (Lam 3,58)

<...>

redeem my life. 122.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	indep_dep_indep same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	to_multi_clause_colon A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Annotation 3.61**proposed**

גַּאֲלַת חַיִּי: 122. (Lam 3,58)

רְאִיתָהּ 123. (Lam 3,59)

redeem my life. 122. (Lam 3,58)

See, 123. (Lam 3,59)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected
רַבִּי	119. (Lam 3,58)
< ... >	
רַאֲיִתָּה	123. (Lam 3,59)
Take up,	119. (Lam 3,58)
< ... >	
See,	123. (Lam 3,59)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	Voct.to.Voct cont.Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe

The vocative 124 marks 123 as a new start, rather than as a continuation of 122. The start of the new verseline, marked by the acrostic, strengthens this.

Annotation 3.62

	proposed
עֲוֹנָתִי	125. (Lam 3,59)
שִׁפְטָה מִשְׁפָּטִי:	126.
the wrong done to me.	125. (Lam 3,59)
grant me my justice!	126.

syn04types	ZIm0<Defc preV1par00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

	corrected
רַאֲיִתָּה	123. (Lam 3,59)
< ... >	
שִׁפְטָה מִשְׁפָּטִי:	126.
See,	123. (Lam 3,59)
< ... >	
grant me my justice!	126.

syn04types	ZIm0<ZQt0 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	indep_dep_indep asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	to_multi_clause_colon A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Annotation 3.63

		proposed
	שָׁפְטָה מִשְׁפָּטִי: 126.	(Lam 3,59)
	רְאִיתָה כָּל־נִקְמָתָם 127.	(Lam 3,60)
	grant me my justice! 126.	(Lam 3,59)
	See all their vengeance, 127.	(Lam 3,60)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZIm0 pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	רְאִיתָה 123.	(Lam 3,59)
	<...>	
	רְאִיתָה כָּל־נִקְמָתָם 127.	(Lam 3,60)
	See, 123.	(Lam 3,59)
	<...>	
	See all their vengeance, 127.	(Lam 3,60)

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NoReferral
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe lexical_repetition

By itself, a *qatal* following an imperative with the same subject would be connected to that imperative, also when the *qatal* were to be interpreted as precative. However, it is my contention that the verseline structure overrules this and calls for a break here. The shift from *qatal* to imperative has a closing function, after which the new verseline returns to the *qatal* line.

Annotation 3.64

			proposed
	כל־מחֲשַׁבְתָּם לִּי: ס	128.	(Lam 3,60)
	שְׁמַעַתְּ חֲרָפָתָם	129.	(Lam 3,61)
	all their plans against me.	128.	(Lam 3,60)
	Hear their insults,	129.	(Lam 3,61)
syn04types	ZQt0<Ellp preV1par00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Sfx<Sfx		
syntactic	asyn.asyn defect.main dep.indep diff.sentence disc.disc same.salience		
participants	no.Subj.no.Subj ps.shift.first.sec sfx.to.sfx		
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon acrostic new.strophe stro- phe.first.to.other		

			corrected
	רְאִיתָהּ	123.	(Lam 3,59)
	<...>		
	שְׁמַעַתְּ חֲרָפָתָם	129.	(Lam 3,61)
	See,	123.	(Lam 3,59)
	<...>		
	Hear their insults,	129.	(Lam 3,61)
syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<0 NoReferral		
syntactic	same.clause.type asyn.asyn diff.sentence disc.disc indep.indep same.salience		
participants	Voct.to.Voct cont.Subj no.Subj.no.Subj same.verb.png		
prosodic	new.strophe acrostic strophe.first.to.other		

Annotation 3.65

			proposed
	כל־מחֲשַׁבְתָּם עָלַי:	131.	(Lam 3,61)
	<...>		
	שְׁבַתָּם וְקִימָתָם הַבִּיטָהּ	133.	(Lam 3,63)
	all their plans against me,	131.	(Lam 3,61)
	<...>		
	Take notice of their sitting and standing,	133.	(Lam 3,63)

syn04types	xIm0<Ellp ParalPre01 NPd1<NPd1 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_first_sec sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

שְׁמַעַת חֲרָפָתָם 129. (Lam 3,61)

<...>

שְׁבִתָּם וְקִימָתָם הַבִּיטָה 133. (Lam 3,63)

Hear their insults, 129. (Lam 3,61)

<...>

Take notice of their sitting and standing, 133. (Lam 3,63)

syn04types	xIm0<ZQt0 preVlpar00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_dep_indep no_fronting_fronting asyn_asyn diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Since 129–133 form a single sentence, 133 obviously has to be connected to this sentence as a whole.

The fronting of the object שְׁבִתָּם וְקִימָתָם ('their sitting and rising') would appear to be prosodically motivated: There does not appear to be a syntactic reason why it should receive emphasis in any way. It does start the last verseline of the strophe, provides the *ש* for the acrostic, and shows a reversal of the constituent order in 129, its parallel counterpart.

Annotation 3.66**proposed**

אֲנִי מְגִינָתָם: ס 134. (Lam 3,63)

תָּשִׁיב לָהֶם גָּמוּל 135. (Lam 3,64)

I am their taunting tune. 134. (Lam 3,63)

Give them back what they deserve, 135. (Lam 3,64)

syn04types	ZYq0<NmCl prevlpar00 prev2sub00 0<NPd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_first_sec sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

corrected

שְׁמַעַת חֲרָפָתָם 129. (Lam 3,61)

<...>

תָּשִׁיב לָהֶם גְּמוּלָה 135. (Lam 3,64)

Hear their insults, 129. (Lam 3,61)

<...>

Give them back what they deserve, 135. (Lam 3,64)

syn04types	ZYq0<ZQt0 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	diff_sentence asyn.asyn diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Voct.to.Voct cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb.png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe.to.strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Annotation 3.67**proposed**

יְהוָה 136. (Lam 3,64)

כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם: 137.

YHWH, 136. (Lam 3,64)

for what their hands have done; 137.

syn04types	Defc<Voct prevlpar00 0<NPd1 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_dep same_sentence
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

	corrected	
תָּשִׁיב לָהֶם גְּמוּלָה	135.	(Lam 3,64)
	< ... >	
כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם:	137.	
Give them back what they deserve,	135.	(Lam 3,64)
	< ... >	
for what their hands have done;	137.	

syn04types	Ellp<ZYq0 preV1par00 Elliptical 3rdP<1/2P Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	embedding main_defect same_sentence asyn_asyn indep_dep
participants	sfx_to_sfx changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	to_multi_clause_colon A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline

Annotation 3.68

	proposed	
כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם:	137.	(Lam 3,64)
תִּתֵּן לָהֶם מְגִנַּת־לֵב	138.	(Lam 3,65)
for what their hands have done;	137.	(Lam 3,64)
put a hardness on their hearts,	138.	(Lam 3,65)

syn04types	ZYq0<Ellp preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main indep_diff_sentence
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	corrected	
תָּשִׁיב לָהֶם גְּמוּלָה	135.	(Lam 3,64)
	< ... >	
תִּתֵּן לָהֶם מְגִנַּת־לֵב	138.	(Lam 3,65)
Give them back what they deserve,	135.	(Lam 3,64)
	< ... >	
put a hardness on their hearts,	138.	(Lam 3,65)

syn04types	VBT<VBT L...//...L pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	indep_dep_indep same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	cont_Subj sfx_to_sfx no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	lexical_repetition new_verseline acrostic in_same_strophe

Annotation 3.69

		proposed
	תִּאָלְתֶּךָ לָהֶם:	139. (Lam 3,65)
	תִּרְדֹּף בָּאֶף	140. (Lam 3,66)
	may your curse be on them;	139. (Lam 3,65)
	pursue them in anger	140. (Lam 3,66)

syn04types	ZYq0<Ellp preVlpar00 preV2sub00 pngV<Sfx 0<NPd1
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	תִּתֵּן לָהֶם מְגִנַּת־לֵב	138. (Lam 3,65)
	<...>	
	תִּרְדֹּף בָּאֶף	140. (Lam 3,66)
	put a hardness on their hearts,	138. (Lam 3,65)
	<...>	
	pursue them in anger	140. (Lam 3,66)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	indep_dep_indep same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline acrostic end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Chapter 4

Lamentations 4

Annotation 4.1

	accepted
אֵיכָה יוֹעַם זָהָב	1. (Lam 4,1)
יִשְׁנָא הַכֶּתֶם הַטוֹב	2.
How the gold is darkened,	1. (Lam 4,1)
the fine gold is dull!	2.

syn04types	VBt<VBt 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj

The meaning of יִשְׁנָא is disputed, and so, to a certain extent, is its syntactic function. Many scholars derive the form from $\sqrt{\text{שנה}}$ ('to change'),¹ Hillers emends to יִיעַב ('is despised') and יִשְׁנָא ($\sqrt{\text{שנא}}$ ni., 'is hated').² Renkema derives from $\sqrt{\text{שנא}}$, 'to gleam', and takes יִשְׁנָא as an attributive clause: 'the gold that gleams' → 'the lustrous gold'.³

Most of these translations have no repercussions for the clause hierarchy. Renkema's proposal, however, entails a syntactic and prosodic variant: He takes יִשְׁנָא as an attributive clause to זָהָב and places it in the first colon:⁴

Ah, how the lustrous gold has grown dim,
that pure gold.

¹Kraus 1983, 72; Berlin 2002, 101; Berges 2002, 231.

²Hillers 1992, 137.

³Renkema 1998, 492; as a parallel he mentions יִשְׁנָא (Eccl 8,1).

⁴Renkema 1998, 491.

Renkema's arguments are based on prosody (the usual division yields a 2+3 verseline, while his proposal yields 3+2, the dominant *qīnāh* meter) and on semantics (purified gold, כֶּהָם, does not change its appearance).⁵

These arguments, however, do not convince. Syntactically, attributive clauses without explicit signal by all means occur in Biblical Hebrew, but I do think that this case would be too ambivalent and confusing even to a native audience to be likely: Two parallel 0YQX clauses (the second one possibly inheriting the אִיכָה) form a much more obvious division than an unmarked attributive *yiqtol* clause followed by an apposition to a phrase in the previous clause.

An argument in favor of Renkema's proposal might be that הַכֶּהָם הַטוֹב ('the good pure gold') has two definite articles. The article is rare in Biblical Hebrew poetry to begin with, and here it contrasts זָהָב ('gold') in the first colon. Conceivably, the article is a device to set apart the phrase as a colon by itself. If this would turn out to be the case, this would be an interesting case of syntactic means to express prosodic divisions. However, without seeing more examples of this, there is no way to be certain.

On the prosodic side, the issue is complicated: The 3+2 meter only appears when אִיכָה is left out of the verseline, which Renkema emphatically rejects.⁶ which, to be fair, mirrors an ambivalence in the prosodic structure itself.

As for the semantic argument: Renkema's own translation 'has grown dim' refutes this, but this may be a translation error in the English version of his commentary.⁷ Furthermore, the mere fact that something does not happen in reality is no reason why a poet would not let it happen anyway, for instance to express that something unimaginable has happened.

But most importantly, the (syntactic and prosodic) coherence of the first *two* strophes of the song suggest that the gold and gems are in fact a metaphor themselves, for the bodies of the inhabitants of Zion lying left in the streets.⁸

In conclusion: The syntactic arguments strongly favor the traditional division and the prosodic arguments are ambivalent. Therefore, I will stick with the traditional divisions. Nevertheless, a case like this does demonstrate the need to make both syntactic and prosodic observations, because decisions on one side has repercussions on the other as well.

⁵Renkema 1998, 492.

⁶Renkema 1998, 94. Renkema's position is ambivalent even from a purely prosodic perspective, see my discussion on p. 7 of these annotations.

⁷The Dutch version has 'is bedekt' ('has been covered'), Renkema 1993, 343.

⁸Renkema 1998, 493 rejects this interpretation and maintains that literal temple gold is meant. See, however, Vlaardingerbroek 1999, 99, who remarks that real gold, especially the temple treasures, would have been taken away by the enemies, not strewn around in the streets.

Annotation 4.2

	accepted
אֵיכָהּ יוֹעֵם זָהָב	1. (Lam 4,1)
< ... >	
בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן הִיָּקְרִים	4. (Lam 4,2)
How the gold is darkened,	1. (Lam 4,1)
< ... >	
The precious children of Zion,	4. (Lam 4,2)

syn04types	CPen<xYqX 0<Ques prev1sub00 NPD1<0 0<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence main_defect no_fronting_fronting
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

The reasons for starting a new unit here are:

- The clause atom is a casus pends, which almost by definition starts a new sentence.
- 4–6 is actually an interrogative sentence (with אֵיכָהּ) just like 1. In order to see this, however, this sentence must first be reconstructed before comparing 4 with 1 as a mother-daughter pair.
- The כ of the acrostic starts a new strophe.

Annotation 4.3

	proposed
הַמִּסְלָאִים בְּפֹז	5. (Lam 4,2)
אֵיכָהּ נִחְשְׁבוּ לְנִבְלֵי־חֶרֶשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֵי יוֹצֵר: ס	6.
once worth their weight in finegold,	5. (Lam 4,2)
how they are valued as pots of clay, work of a	6.
potter's hands!	

syn04types	xQt0<Ptcp Ques<0 prev2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_dep diff_salience diff_vt new_interr no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc same_sentence
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן הַיְקָרִים	4. (Lam 4,2)
	< ... >	
	אֵיכָה נֶחְשְׁבוּ לְנֹכְלִי-חֶרֶשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה יָדַי יוֹצֵר: ס	6.
	The precious children of Zion,	4. (Lam 4,2)
	< ... >	
	how they are valued as pots of clay, work of a potter's hands!	6.

syn04types	xQt0<CPen Ques<0 preV2sub00 0<NPd1		
syntactic	cas_pend_to_main	same_sentence	asyn_asyn
	asyn_conj_asyn	fronting_no_fronting	new_interr
participants	verb_to_other no_Subj_no_Subj		
prosodic	end_of_strophe	end_to_start_of_strophe	
	in_same_strophe	new_verseline	whole_verseline

The clause hierarchy is clear, if somewhat complex: The strophe Lam 4,2 consists of a single sentence, spanning two verselines. It is remarkable that the first verseline of this strophe is not itself a complete sentence, but only the fronted subject of one.

As for this fronting: It can be explained pragmatically, as expressing contrast with the reader's expectations: It should be, of all people, Zion's precious children who are now valued so little.

However, there are strong prosodic elements as well. The acrostic requires a word on ב. Moreover, the complex syntax, eliding one אֵיכָה and moving another one to the back of the sentence, combines these two strophes into a single prosodic unit with concatenation:

How the *gold* it darkened,
 [how] the good pure *gold* changes!
 The precious sons of Zion, ...
 worth more than *gold*,
how they are valued like pottery, ...

This prosodic bond is important to the discourse: It shows that the gold and gems in the first strophe are in fact metaphors for the people of Zion.⁹

In this case, the prosodic and syntactic work together to convey this association, but it would appear that the prosodic structure has influenced the selections made in the syntactic structure stronger than vice versa.

⁹Berges 2002, 240; see also Hillers 1992, 146; Berlin 2002, 103.

Annotation 4.4

- proposed**
- אִיכָּה נִחְשְׁבוּ לְנִבְלֵי־חֶרֶשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֵי יוֹצֵר: ס 6. (Lam 4,2)
- גַּם־תַּנִּין חָלְצוּ שֵׁד 7. (Lam 4,3)
- how they are valued as pots of clay, work of a 6. (Lam 4,2)
- potter's hands!
- Even jackals offer a breast, 7. (Lam 4,3)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Ques preV1sub00 pngV<pngV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc no_fronting_fronting same_vt
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

- corrected**
- אִיכָּה יוֹעַם זָהָב 1. (Lam 4,1)
- < ... >
- גַּם־תַּנִּין חָלְצוּ שֵׁד 7. (Lam 4,3)
- How the gold is darkened, 1. (Lam 4,1)
- < ... >
- Even jackals offer a breast, 7. (Lam 4,3)

syn04types	XQt1<xYqX 0<Ques preV1sub00 perV<perV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

Seen in isolation, 7 could very well be connected to 6. However, 6 starts a new strophe, while 1–6 form such a tight unit, prosodically as well as syntactically. The clause is therefore connected to these clauses as a whole.

The fronting of גַּם־תַּנִּין ('Even jackals') is largely pragmatically motivated: The particle גַּם ('even') itself expresses contrast with expectations; also, it introduces a new participant. Nevertheless, it also has prosodic function: (initial λ; a new participant at strophe opening).

Annotation 4.5

		proposed
	הַיִּנְיָקוֹ גּוֹרִיֶּהֶן	8. (Lam 4,3)
	בֵּת-עַמִּי לֹא-כֶזֶר *כִּי **עֲנִים בַּמִּדְבָּר: ס	9.
	they nurse their young;	8. (Lam 4,3)
	but my Dear People is heartless like ostriches in the	9.
	desert.	

syn04types	NmCl<ZQt0 preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc whole_verseline

		corrected
	גַּם-תִּנִּין חָלְצוּ שֵׁד	7. (Lam 4,3)
		<...>
	בֵּת-עַמִּי לֹא-כֶזֶר *כִּי **עֲנִים בַּמִּדְבָּר: ס	9.
	Even jackals offer a breast,	7. (Lam 4,3)
		<...>
	but my Dear People is heartless like ostriches in the	9.
	desert.	

syn04types	NmCl<XQt1 preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence front-ing_fronting indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

The fronted new subject is the clearest sign for a connection to 7; the start of the new verseline enforces this. The fronting is clearly pragmatic, expressing the contrast between the jackals who can still suckle their young, while ‘the daughter of my people’ is forced to abandon her children.¹⁰

Note that the label *changing_speech_sit* reacts to the appearance of the 1 sg suffix on עַמִּי (*‘my people’*). Strictly speaking, this is incorrect, since there is no change of speaker here. What does change, is that at this point the text is explicitly identified as a direct speech by one of the participants, rather

¹⁰In the Hebrew Bible, ostriches are believed to abandon their nests, see Job 39,13–17.

than an anonymous narration.

This is something the analysis of dramatic texts will have to reckon with: The set of participants and the communicational domain will sometimes have to be corrected retrospectively. My labeling procedures, which are strictly sequential, do not do this.

Annotation 4.6

	proposed	
בֶּת־עַמִּי לֶאֱכֹזֵר *כִּי **עֲנִים בְּמִדְבָּר: ס	9.	(Lam 4,3)
דָּבַק לְשׁוֹן יוֹנֵק אֶל־חֲכוֹ בְּצִמָּא	10.	(Lam 4,4)
but my Dear People is heartless like ostriches in the	9.	(Lam 4,3)
desert.		
The baby's tongue sticks to its palate for thirst;	10.	(Lam 4,4)

syn04types	ZQtX<NmCl preV1par00 preV2sub00 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc fronting_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit new_indep_Subj
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	corrected	
גַּם־תִּנִּין חָלְצוּ שֵׁד	7.	(Lam 4,3)
	< ... >	
דָּבַק לְשׁוֹן יוֹנֵק אֶל־חֲכוֹ בְּצִמָּא	10.	(Lam 4,4)
Even jackals offer a breast,	7.	(Lam 4,3)
	< ... >	
The baby's tongue sticks to its palate for thirst;	10.	(Lam 4,4)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 preV2sub00 perV<perV Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_indep asyn_asyn front- ing_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

Participant references can play a rather subtle role in the structuring of a text: This clause starts a new unit (a strophe), marked by the new participant יוֹנֵק ('baby').

However, since this participant is not fronted, and is referenced indirectly (via לְשׁוֹן יוֹנֵק ‘the tongue of the baby’), it is not presented as a major change in the text. This fits the discourse as a whole: the strophes Lam 4,4–5 are elaborations of the contrast in vs 3, which ends in a mother abandoning her children.

Note that the strophic structure—with syntactically rather self-contained strophes—and the syntactic relation between 7 and 9 have prompted a connection of strophes, rather than a connection of two individual clauses.

Annotation 4.7

	גַּם-תַּנִּין חָלְצוּ שֵׁד	7. (Lam 4,3)	proposed
		<...>	
	עוֹלָלִים שָׁאֲלוּ לֶחֶם	11. (Lam 4,4)	
	Even jackals offer a breast,	7. (Lam 4,3)	
		<...>	
	the little ones ask for bread,	11. (Lam 4,4)	

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalPre00 pngV<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj stro-phe_other_to_first

	דָּבַק לְשׁוֹן יוֹנֵק אֶל-חֻכוֹ בַּצֶּמֶא	10. (Lam 4,4)	corrected
	עוֹלָלִים שָׁאֲלוּ לֶחֶם	11.	
	The baby’s tongue sticks to its palate for thirst;	10. (Lam 4,4)	
	the little ones ask for bread,	11.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 perV<perV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	chiastic_Pred_Subj end_to_start_of_strophe end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

The fronting of עוֹלָלִים ‘little children’ seems to have prompted syn04types to propose a connection all the way back to 7, which is also an xQt1 clause.

The prosodic divisions and their semantic parallels, however, preclude this: 11–12 is clearly a parallel verseline to 10, and does not refer back to the start of the preceding strophe.

Yet, the proposal by *syn04types* does register an interesting structural feature here: The chiasmic clause structures in 10 and 11–12 have a strong closing effect on the entire unit 7–12 (Lam 4,3–5), making it into a distinct unit of two strophes describing the fate of the children:

7–8 Subj - Pred

9 Subj - Pred

10 Pred - Subj

11 Subj - Pred

This pattern is slightly different from that in which the last line of a prosodic unit diverges from a pattern in that unit (See Section 8.4.3 in the dissertation). Here, the *penultimate* line diverges, after which the last line returns to the familiar pattern.¹¹

Since this pattern spans two strophes, the observation needs to be made on a high linguistic level, as pattern in *units* of text.

Annotation 4.8

		proposed
	פֶּרֶשׁ אֵין לָהֶם: ס	12. (Lam 4,4)
	הָאֲכָלִים לְמַעַדְנִים	13. (Lam 4,5)
	but no one gives it to them.	12. (Lam 4,4)
	Those who once ate delicacies	13. (Lam 4,5)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<0 L...//...L perV<perV pngV<Sfx Rela<Main Subj<Main
syntactic	Subj_clause asyn_conj diff_sentence indep_dep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other

¹¹Similar closing patterns are also known outside Biblical Hebrew poetry, such as in the Arabic *rubayyat* (a quatrain with *aaba* rhyme) and the Limerick (*aabba* rhyme).

corrected

הָאֵלֵּים לְמַעַדְנֵים 13. (Lam 4,5)

נִשְׁמוֹ בַּחוּצוֹת 14.

Those who once ate delicacies 13. (Lam 4,5)

are destitute in the streets. 14.

syn04types	Downward=Y Subj<Main
syntactic	dep_indep preceding_daughter conj_asyn diff_vt non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline new_strophe

The proposal by syn04types, a connection to 12, makes sense if the analysis is strictly based on formal syntactic observations: It would appear all too obvious that the 13 is attributive to the 3 m.pl suffix: “no one gives [it] to them, the ones once eating delicacies.”

However, the start of a new strophe, makes clear that the clause is to be connected downward, as a fronted subject clause.

Annotation 4.9

proposed

פֶּרֶשׁ אֵין לָהֶם: ס 12. (Lam 4,4)

<...>

נִשְׁמוֹ בַּחוּצוֹת 14. (Lam 4,5)

but no one gives it to them. 12. (Lam 4,4)

<...>

are destitute in the streets. 14. (Lam 4,5)

syn04types	ZQt0<Ptcp pngV<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_dep_indep indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

corrected

דָּבַק לְשׁוֹן יוֹנֵק אֶל־חֻכוֹ בַּצֶּמֶא 10. (Lam 4,4)

<...>

נִשְׁמוֹ בַּחוּצוֹת 14. (Lam 4,5)

The baby's tongue sticks to its palate for thirst; 10. (Lam 4,4)

<...>

are destitute in the streets. 14. (Lam 4,5)

syn04types	VBT<VBT B...//...B perV<perV 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_first

It is in fact 13–14 as a whole that is to be connected to 10, as the two form a single XQt1 clause. As such, it might have to be connected to the XQt1 clause 11 rather than to 10. I have not done this because the connection between 13/14–15/16 is stronger and thus would seem to have to be made first. But this can be debated.

Note, that some of the labels assigned here need more sophistication:

- Subj_no_Subj misses the fact that 13 is an object clause. The definition of the clause atom label has_Subj should be expanded with the pattern of a clause atom without explicit subject but with a preceding subject clause as its daughter.
- strophe_other_to_first is formally correct: It indicates that a clause which is *not* the first clause of its strophe (14) is connected to a preceding clause which is (10).¹² When this happens, this usually is a sign of some kind of strophe-level enjambment. In this case, however, the label misses the fact that the strophe starts on a complex XQt1 sentence.

Annotation 4.10

		proposed
נִשְׁמָו בַּחוּצוֹת	14.	(Lam 4,5)
הָאֲמִנִּים עָלֵי תוֹלַעַ	15.	
are destitute in the streets.	14.	(Lam 4,5)
Those brought up in purple	15.	

syn04types	Ptcp<ZQt0 preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV Rela<Main Subj<Main
syntactic	Subj_clause asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_dep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

¹²The label stands in opposition to the label *strophe_first_to_first*, which indicates that the first clauses of two strophes—and thus, the two strophes as units—have been connected.

		corrected
הָאֲמִנִּים עָלֵי תוֹלַע	15.	(Lam 4,5)
חִבְקוּ אֲשָׁפְתוֹת: ס	16.	
Those brought up in purple	15.	(Lam 4,5)
now cling to garbage heaps.	16.	

syn04types	Downward=Y Subj<Main
syntactic	preceding_daughter conj_async dep_indep diff_vt no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

There is no syntactic argument which would prevent a unit 14–15. In fact, a strictly formal program like *syn04types* is prone to see an attributive relation here: ‘... the streets, which were reared in crimson.’ While this analysis obviously fails semantically, the formal pattern is quite regular.

When 15 is parsed as a subject clause (“They starve in the streets, those who were reared in crimson”), the connection does make syntactic sense, but is still incorrect. The main signal that the clause is a *fronted* subject clause to 16 lies in the rhythm of the verse structure: The start of a new verseline indicates that this clause is to be connected to what follows, not to what precedes.

Annotation 4.11

		proposed
חִבְקוּ אֲשָׁפְתוֹת: ס	16.	(Lam 4,5)
וַיִּגְדֹּל עוֹץ בֵּת עַמִּי מִחֹטְאֵת סֹדֹם	17.	(Lam 4,6)
now cling to garbage heaps.	16.	(Lam 4,5)
The punishment of my Dear People is greater than	17.	(Lam 4,6)
that of Sodom,		

syn04types	WayX<ZQt0 Cocj<0 1/2P<3rdP perV<perV NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	async conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	diff_verb_png new_nmpr_other no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	גַּם-תִּנִּין חֲלָצוּ שֵׁד	7. (Lam 4,3)
	< ... >	
	וַיִּגְדֵּל עוֹן בֵּת-עַמִּי מִחַטָּאת סֹדֹם	17. (Lam 4,6)
	Even jackals offer a breast,	7. (Lam 4,3)
	< ... >	
	The punishment of my Dear People is greater than that of Sodom,	17. (Lam 4,6)

syn04types	WayX<XQt1 Cocj<0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP perV<perV Npd2<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_other diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

Usually, a *wayyiqtol* clause continues a preceding clause. A close connection of 17 to the immediately preceding XQt1 sentence 15–16 would appear more obvious than the start of a new syntactic unit and a new strophe.

However, the clause does open a new participants domain: בֵּת-עַמִּי ('my Dear People') is renominalized. This makes her the main participant, to which נְזִירֶיהָ ('her princes', 20)¹³ is a secondary one.

I contend that the *wayyiqtol* form has primarily been chosen to accommodate the acrostic, which necessitates a clause opening with the conjunction ו-. It may well be, that the renominalization of בֵּת-עַמִּי has been selected to mark the start of a new unit in spite of the *wayyiqtol*.

Annotation 4.12

		proposed
	וְלֹא-חָלּוּ בָּהּ יָדַיִם: ס	19. (Lam 4,6)
	זָכוּ נְזִירֶיהָ מִשֶּׁלֶג	20. (Lam 4,7)
	while no hands were raised to her.	19. (Lam 4,6)
	Her nobles once were brighter than snow,	20. (Lam 4,7)

¹³The word and its meaning here are somewhat contested, see Hillers 1992, 140; Berlin 2002, 101, but this does not concern me now, as this has no bearing on the textual structures.

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Cocj prev1par00 prev2par00 pngV<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part same_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

corrected

וַיִּגְדַּל עוֹן בֵּת-עַמִּי מִחַטָּאת סֹדֶם 17. (Lam 4,6)

<...>

זָכוּ נְזִירֶיהָ מִשֶּׁלֶג 20. (Lam 4,7)

The punishment of my Dear People is greater than 17. (Lam 4,6)
that of Sodom,

<...>

Her nobles once were brighter than snow, 20. (Lam 4,7)

syn04types	ZQtX<WayX 0<Cocj MN...//..MN 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_indep conj_async diff_salience diff_vt disc_non_disc no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj sfx_to_other changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

Annotation 4.13**proposed**

סָפִיר גִּזְרָתָם: ס 23. (Lam 4,7)

חֹשֶׁךְ מִשְׁחֹר תַּאֲרָם 24. (Lam 4,8)

sapphire their appearance. 23. (Lam 4,7)
But now they are blacker than soot; 24. (Lam 4,8)

syn04types	ZQtX<NmCl preVlpar00 preV2sub00 Npd2<0 0<Npd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

corrected

זְכוּ נְזִירֶיהָ מְשֻׁלָּג	20.	(Lam 4,7)
< ... >		
חֹשֶׁךְ מְשַׁחֵר תְּאֵרָם	24.	(Lam 4,8)
Her nobles once were brighter than snow,	20.	(Lam 4,7)
< ... >		
But now they are blacker than soot;	24.	(Lam 4,8)

syn04types	VBT<VBT MN...//...MN perV<perV Sfx<pngV Npd2<Npd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence in- dep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png sfx_to_Pred new_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

From a strictly formal point of view, connecting 24 to 23, as syn04types proposes, seems to make much sense:

The two clauses have parallel constituent orders, have the same suffixes, and are quite close together. However, semantically this can not be right: חֹשֶׁךְ ('grow dark') stands in stark contrast with סַפִּיר ('sapphire') and all other words in vs 7 describing bright, healthy and shiny colors. This contrast is in no way marked syntactically. It is here that prosodic signals take over. At verseline level, the bicolic rhythm raises the expectation that a B-colon is connected to the preceding A-colon, and that the next A-colon starts a new unit. This expectation makes connections of an A-colon to its preceding B-colon somewhat unusual.

In this case, it is the strophic structure that provides the strongest clue for a separation: The pause between 23 and 24 is clearly recognizable as a pause between strophes, because of the acrostic and the regular strophe lengths. The start of the new strophe raises the expectation that there will be a change of sorts. To be sure, this change can take many shapes, but stark contrast is cer-

tainly one of the possibilities.

Annotation 4.14

		proposed
	יָבֵשׁ הָיָה כְּעֵץ: ס	27. (Lam 4,8)
	טוֹבִים הָיוּ חַלְלֵי-חֶרֶב מִחַלְלֵי רָעָב	28. (Lam 4,9)
	it has become as dry as wood.	27. (Lam 4,8)
	Those killed by the sword were better off than those	28. (Lam 4,9)
	who die of famine,	

syn04types	VBT<VBT VLex==VLex perV<perV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc.non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	diff.verb.png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon acrostic lexical_repetition new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	וַיִּגְדֹּל עוֹן בֵּית-עַמִּי מִחַטַּאת סֹדֶם	17. (Lam 4,6)
	<...>	
	טוֹבִים הָיוּ חַלְלֵי-חֶרֶב מִחַלְלֵי רָעָב	28. (Lam 4,9)
	The punishment of my Dear People is greater than	17. (Lam 4,6)
	that of Sodom,	
	<...>	
	Those killed by the sword were better off than those	28. (Lam 4,9)
	who die of famine,	

syn04types	xQtX<WayX 0<Cocj MN...//..MN 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV 0<NPd2 Subj<Subj
syntactic	conj.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc.non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit diff.verb.png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe whole_verseline

Other than the *qatal* verb form, there are no syntactic signals connecting 28–32 to the preceding context: There are no connecting conjunctions, and the 3 f.sg references to בֵּית-עַמִּי ('my Dear People') have stopped. This is another example of the relative syntactic self-containment of strophes, which can make it difficult to place them in a textual hierarchy on purely syntactic grounds. It

is probably best viewed as a concluding unit, seeing as in 33 (vs 11) a new main unit begins, with explicit mention of YHWH and Zion (in 35), but it is difficult to say precisely, which unit it concludes.

The preceding context is dominated by the participant **בַּת־עַמִּי**, but on closer inspection, there are actually two participants domains with this participant. This is marked by the renominalization:¹⁴

vs 3: **בַּת־עַמִּי** (my Dear People)
 vs 4: starving children
 vs 5: starving people in general

vs 6: **בַּת־עַמִּי** (my Dear People)
 vs 7: her nobles
 vs 8: they

There are two options: 28–32 concludes the second unit only, simply because it is closest. However, it may be noted that vs 9 refers to the nobles (vs 7–8), while vs 10 takes up, chiastically, the children (vs 3–5). If this were to be taken into account, vs 9–10 would be a conclusion to vs 3–8 as a whole. This would mean that 28 would have to be connected as far back as 7. However, I do not believe that to be the case. 17, with its renominalization of **בַּת־עַמִּי** and the new participant Sodom, clearly marks a new syntactic unit. Syntactically, we have here a simple sequence of *qatal* units. The thematic links are real, but they are probably better explained as part of the literary structure.

Annotation 4.15

		accepted
	טוֹבִים הָיוּ חַלְלֵי־חֶרֶב מִחַלְלֵי רָעָב	28. (Lam 4,9)
	שֶׁהֵם יָזוּבוּ	29.
Those killed by the sword were better off than those		28. (Lam 4,9)
	who die of famine,	
	for these bleed out,	29.

¹⁴Note that the *wayyiqtol* does not signify subordination to the *qatal* clauses here: The acrostic seems to have forced *wayyiqtol* rather than *qatal*, see p. 223 of these annotations and p. 230 of the dissertation.

syn04types	XYqt<xQtX Socj<0 pngV<pngV Npd1<0 Subj<Subj Rela<Main
syntactic	Attr.clause asyn.conj diff.salience diff.vt indep.dep new.deictic no.fronting.fronting non.disc.disc same.sentence
participants	Subj.Subj new.indep.Subj new.prps same.verb.png
prosodic	chiastic.Pred.Subj end.of.strophe end.to.start.of.strophe in.same.strophe new.verseline

clause delimitations These clauses are notoriously difficult. **יָזוּבוּ** literally means ‘they flow’ and **מִדְקָרִים** means ‘pierced’, but this leads to a strange translation: ‘those who flowed out, pierced from the fruits of the field.’

Most commentaries take the verbs more or less figuratively: ‘who bleed slowly, stabbed by the lack of produce from the field’;¹⁵ ‘those who waste away, brought down by cropless land’.¹⁶

Hillers, however, constructs the entire sentence differently, and translates, tentatively:

Those killed by the sword were more fortunate
than those killed by famine;
Those who perished of wounds
than those who lacked the fruits of the field.¹⁷

In this arrangement, 29 is not attributive to the subject of 28, but forms the subject clause of an elliptic clause 29–30.

There is much to be said for this proposal: It makes sense of the verbs,¹⁸ and results in a strophe with two parallel verselines¹⁹ in a 3+2 meter.

Syntactically, the rare construction **-שׁ** + pers. pron. usually means something like ‘[see / know] that ...’,²⁰ but there is one other passage in which it appears to be used for a subject clause: Eccl 2,22.

Adopting Hillers’ proposal requires changes to the *ETCBC* data on clause level: At the moment, the clauses are delimited, parsed and connected as:

[Adj_u **רָעַב**] [Subj **חָלְלֵי-חָרֹב**] [Pred **הָיוּ**] [PreC **טוֹבִים**] (Main) 28
[Pred **יָזוּבוּ**] [Subj **הֵם**] [Rela-**שׁ**] . (Attr) 29
[Adj_u **מִתְנוּבוֹת שָׂדֵי: ס**] [PreC **מִדְקָרִים**] . . (Attr) 30

¹⁵Berlin 2002, 99, who also mentions the common interpretation of the M on **מִתְנוּבוֹת** as expressing the *absence* of the fruits, Berlin 2002, 108.

¹⁶Renkema 1998, 517–518.

¹⁸Combining Berlin and Hillers, a translation ‘who bled out, stabbed’ would even be more transparent.

¹⁹Both having a construct phrase with **מִן** as their second colon.

²⁰See Judg 6,17; Cant 1,6; Cant 6,5; Eccl 3,18. Eccl 2,18 has simple attributive meaning.

To follow Hillers' proposal, *מדקרים* has to be moved from 30 to 29 and has to receive a different functional parsing: as an adjunct to *יזובו* ('[who] are flowing [blood], stabbed'). Obviously, the clause hierarchy would also have to change: 29 should be connected downward to 3 as a subject clause, and 29–30 as a whole should be connected to 28 as an elliptic clause:

[<i>Adju</i> <i>מחללי רעב</i>]	[<i>Subj</i> <i>חללי-חרב</i>]	[<i>Pred</i> <i>היו</i>]	[<i>PreC</i> <i>טובים</i>]	(Main)	28
[<i>Adju</i> <i>מדקרים</i>]	[<i>Pred</i> <i>יזובו</i>]	[<i>Subj</i> <i>הם</i>]	[<i>Rela</i> <i>ש-</i>]	.	\ (Subj) 29
		[<i>Adju</i> <i>מתנובת שדי: ס</i>]	.	.	(Ellp) 30

qatal - yiqtol As for the use of *yiqtol* in 30: If Hillers' proposal is correct, its function would seem to be largely prosodic. The two parallel verselines express the same contrast, which makes a temporal function, or any other modal function unlikely, except perhaps a heightened salience to open the second and final verseline of the strophe. The problem is, that apart from the *yiqtol* itself there are no signals indicating its function, so any proposal remains a conjecture.

In the traditional arrangement of the clauses, a difference in temporal perspective could be postulated: The ones who have already died by the sword were better off than the ones who will have to waste away slowly from starvation. It is, however, difficult to determine whether this possibility is by itself an argument for this arrangement. The issue poses a dilemma: From a syntactic point of view, the traditional arrangement is more satisfactory, because it can make good sense of the difference in verb forms, but from a prosodic point of view, Hillers' scansion provides more convincing contents and prosodic structure, while having no satisfactory explanation for the verbal forms other than prosodic variation.

Annotation 4.16

		proposed
	טובים היו חללי-חרב מחללי רעב	28. (Lam 4,9)
	< ... >	
	מדקרים מתנובת שדי: ס	30.
Those killed by the sword were better off than those		28. (Lam 4,9)
who die of famine,		
< ... >		
pierced by lack of food from the field.		30.

syn04types	Ptcp<xQtX MN. .//. .MN pngV<pngV 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_vt indep_dep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj nom_Pred_to_Subj
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

corrected

שָׁהֶם יִזְוּבוּ 29. (Lam 4,9)
מִדְּקָרִים מִתְנוּבַת שָׂדֵי: ס 30.

for these bleed out, 29. (Lam 4,9)
pierced by lack of food from the field. 30.

syn04types	Ptcp<XYqt prev1sub00 prev2sub00 0<Socj pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	Attr.clause conj_asyn dep_dep diff_salience diff_vt disc_non_disc same_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj nom_Pred_to_Subj
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in_same_colon end_of_strophe

Note that this connection is only valid when the clauses of Lam 4,9 are arranged as they usually are; in Hillers' proposal, מִדְּקָרִים would be part of 29.

Annotation 4.17**accepted**

טוֹבִים הָיוּ חַלְלֵי-חֶרֶב מִחַלְלֵי רֶעֶב 28. (Lam 4,9)

<...>
יְדֵי נָשִׁים רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת בִּשְׁלוּ יְלִדֵיהֶן 31. (Lam 4,10)

Those killed by the sword were better off than those 28. (Lam 4,9)
who die of famine,

<...>
The hands of compassionate women cook their own 31. (Lam 4,10)
children;

syn04types	VBT<VB preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Npd2<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_dep_indep indep_indep no_fronting_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	acrostic chiastic_Pred_Subj new_strophe strophe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe whole_verseline

31 is an acrostic line, but the fronting of יְדֵי נָשִׁים רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת ('the hands of caring women') can be explained as pragmatic (introduction of new participant; contrast to expectations).

Annotation 4.18

accepted

יְדֵי נָשִׁים רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת בָּשְׁלוּ יִלְדֵיהֶן 31. (Lam 4,10)
הָיוּ לְבָרוֹת לָמוֹ בַּשֶּׁבֶר בֵּת-עַמִּי: ס 32.

The hands of compassionate women cook their own 31. (Lam 4,10)
children;
they become their food at the breaking of my Dear 32.
People.

syn04types	VBT<VB preVlpar00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<Npd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep non_disc_disc same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline whole_verseline

The participant references are confusing here:

- הָיוּ ('they become') refers to יִלְדֵיהֶן ('their children')
- לָמוֹ probably refers to נָשִׁים רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת ('caring mothers'), but the suffix would appear to be masculine.
- At any rate, לָמוֹ is not reflexive. It refers to a participant outside the clause; its congruence with the verb הָיוּ ('they become') is coincidental.

The issue of the gender of לָמוֹ is not inconsequential: If it is indeed unequivocally masculine, it can not refer to the mothers. It must then refer to the starving ones mentioned in 28–30. This, in turn, would mean that 31–32 belongs to

the same participants domain as the latter after all: The mothers prepare their grim meal for ‘them’, the starving ones that are worse off than the slain ones.

The poetic form לָמוֹ has masculine antecedents in all 54 other occurrences in the Hebrew Bible. The only exception might be Isa 44,9, but would require √נגד hi. + ל to mean ‘tell about’, instead of the usual ‘tell to’.

However, as there are no examples of a feminine form of לָמוֹ, there is no telling whether the form can not in fact be communal.

Annotation 4.19

		proposed
	הָיוּ לְבָרוֹת לָמוֹ בְּשֹׁכֵר בַּת־עַמִּי: ס	32. (Lam 4,10)
	כָּלָה יְהוָה אֶת־חֲמָתוֹ	33. (Lam 4,11)
they become	their food at the breaking of my Dear	32. (Lam 4,10)
	People.	
YHWH has made his wrath complete,		33. (Lam 4,11)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 3rdP<1/2P perV<perV NPd2<0 Subj<0 NoRefer- ral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc.non.disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb.png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected
	אֵיכָה יוֹעַם זָהָב 1. (Lam 4,1)
	< ... >
	כָּלָה יְהוָה אֶת־חֲמָתוֹ 33. (Lam 4,11)
How the gold is darkened,	1. (Lam 4,1)
	< ... >
YHWH has made his wrath complete,	33. (Lam 4,11)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYqX 0<Ques prev1sub00 prev2par00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc.non.disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	new_nmpr_Subj Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb.png
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

As was the case with the strophes Lam 4,9 and 10, Lam 4,11 is not connected to its context by syntactic means, other than the continued dominance of *qatal* forms. The strophes simply seem to follow each other and it is difficult to assign any kind of hierarchy on them on the basis of formal linguistic observations. Yet, Lam 4,11 does seem to have a special position, probably as the conclusion of the entire section vs 1–11.

The most formal argument for this is that in klg42–20, different groups of inhabitants are described, while vs 11 speaks about Zion as a whole. But largely, my arguments for the status of vs 11 are largely based on literary structure and contents.

literary structure Renkema identifies Lam 4,1–11 as a unit (subcanto) and sees a concentric arrangement of the canticles around the central ‘mini-canticle’ vs 6: vs 1–2, vs 3–5, vs 6, vs 7–9, vs 10–11.²¹ In this arrangement, vs 6 has a special structural position, but vs 11 does not, other than being the closing strophe of the closing canticle of the subcanto.

As often with Renkema’s proposals, his actual arguments are difficult to evaluate, because about half of these do not involve verbatim repetitions or even synonyms or antonyms,²² but rest on associations, for which the criteria are not always clear.²³ Often, they turn out to be associations between the interpreted meanings of entire verses or strophes. To mention two random examples:

- **בַּת־עַמִּי לֹא־זָכָר (3aA) // פֶּרֶשׁ אֵין לָהֶם (4bB)**, Renkema 1988, 335
This association works because the entire strophe causes the daughter’s harshness to mean neglect in suckling her children.
- **אֲבִנֵי־קֹדֶשׁ (1bA) // צִיּוֹן (11bA)** Renkema 1988, 341.
The association between the ‘holy stones’ and Zion only works when the stones are interpreted as the actual stones of the temple,²⁴ and when they are specifically associated with the Zions *foundations* which are consumed by fire (11bB).

Berges divides Lam 4,1–11 into an introduction to the entire poem (vs 1–2) followed by two stanzas (vs 3–6 and vs 7–11). In the entire poem verses 6, 11, 16 and 20 all have special significance as conclusions to their respective stanza. The last three of these are marked by the mention of the name YHWH.²⁵

²¹Renkema 1998, 485, Renkema 1988, 335–346.

²²Cf. my survey of Van der Lugt’s version of the Kampen School method, p. 28 of the dissertation.

²³See Renkema 1988, 335–337 and 341.

²⁴Note that many commentators interpret Lam 4,1 as a metaphor for the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

²⁵Berges 2002, 234–235.

In terms of contents, both vs 6 and vs 11 differ from the others in that they step away from describing the actual situations and offer an interpretation of summary of it. This pleads in favor of Berges' proposal. Be that as it may, both proposals agree that there is a major textual break after vs 11.

participants That there is a major break after vs 11 can be confirmed by the types of participants that appear.²⁶

First of all, the perspective is suddenly changed by introducing the kings of the earth and inhabitants of the world. Moreover, in Lam 4,12–20, Zion as a city or as a personage no longer plays a role. The focus is on her priests and prophets. The very first verse makes this clear by switching from the name Zion to Jerusalem, and not mentioning her again, except in the 3 f.sg suffixes in Lam 4,13, which serve to identify the prophets and priests, the real main participants of Lam 4,14–16.

syntax and literary structure In situations like this, I see three options for a formal syntactic analysis:

1. Allowing the non-formal clues into the argumentation and shaping the hierarchy of units accordingly. In the present case this means connecting 33 to 1 or 7.
2. Admitting that syntactic analysis has reached its limit, and leaving the units unconnected. In the present case this means creating root clauses at lines 4, 7, 10, 13, 17, 28, 31 and 33. This, of course, is actually one step too far, as there is one syntactic connection left: The dominant use of *qatal* forms.
3. Recognizing the connection via *qatal* forms and arranging the units in a simple chain.

From a formal point of view, there is much to be said for arranging the units as a simple chain, each one being connected to its predecessor. If the formal observations show no other connections than the use of the same clause types, such an analysis is at least consistent. Choosing this option does, however, mean the admission that a syntactic analysis only touches one aspect of the text: its formally observable coherence, and is in no way closer to 'the' text than other, more non-formal, forms of analysis.

²⁶Note that Berlin (2002, 109) places the break *before* Lam 4,11, arguing that YHWH is mentioned for the first time here, and stating that this makes the section vs 11–16 more theological than the preceding ones. This does not convince, since YHWH's role is not mentioned in these verses until vs 16. This verse is therefore better interpreted as another conclusion, like vs 6 and 11, see Berges.

A human reader receives and parses more information than formal morphological connections. This information can depend largely on non-formal or literary factors, such as the stanza structure, the content matter and the audience's knowledge about the various participants. They may even depend on text-internal, and therefore *ad hoc*, factors.²⁷ Yet, it is real and provides the reader with subtle clues about the hierarchical structure of the text. These clues are just as much part of the reader's perception of 'the text' as the formally observable syntactic features.

I have no clear-cut answer to this question, other than that, in the ear of the poet and their audience, the distinction between formal and non-formal structures is probably rather artificial. The distinction is a useful analytical tool, but we should keep in mind that 'the' structure of a text is always shaped by the total of all these structures.

Annotation 4.20

proposed
 שִׁפָּךְ חֲרוֹן אָפוֹ 34. (Lam 4,11)
 וַיִּצֶת-אֵשׁ בְּצִיּוֹן 35.

he has poured out his burning anger, 34. (Lam 4,11)
 and kindled a fire in Zion 35.

syn04types	Way0<ZQt0 Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc wayy_closure_med wayy_closure_strict

corrected
 כָּלָה יְהוָה אֶת-חֲמָתוֹ 33. (Lam 4,11)
 < ... >
 וַיִּצֶת-אֵשׁ בְּצִיּוֹן 35.

YHWH has made his wrath complete, 33. (Lam 4,11)
 < ... >
 and kindled a fire in Zion 35.

²⁷The significance of the name YHWH in Lam 4,11, for example, depends on the fact that it has not been mentioned in the text before. In other texts, the name may just be one of many, with very little structural significance.

syn04types	Way0<ZQtX Cocj<0 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj new_nmpr_other same_verb_png verb_to_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	wayy_closure_strict end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline wayy_closure_med

35–36 are not part of the acrostic, so the verb form must be syntactically functional. As they are both *wayyiqtol* clauses and report a sequence of events, they can be interpreted as a seminal narrative,²⁸ albeit a very short one.

As the first *wayyiqtol* opens the last verseline of the strophe, it conforms to the criteria for *wayyiqtol* as marker of strophe closure (see p. 190 in the book).

Annotation 4.21

		proposed
	וַתֹּאכַל יְסוּדֶיהָ: ס	36. (Lam 4,11)
	לֹא הָאֱמִינוּ מַלְכֵי־אֶרֶץ *וְכָל יֹשְׁבֵי תְּבֵל	37. (Lam 4,12)
	that consumed its foundations.	36. (Lam 4,11)
	The earth's kings did not believe, nor any of the	37. (Lam 4,12)
	world's dwellers,	

syn04types	xQtX<Way0 0<Cocj prev1par00 prev2par00 perV<perV 0<NPd2 Subj<0
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	אֵיכָה יוֹעַם זָהָב	1. (Lam 4,1)
	< ... >	
	לֹא הָאֱמִינוּ מַלְכֵי־אֶרֶץ *וְכָל יֹשְׁבֵי תְּבֵל	37. (Lam 4,12)
	How the gold is darkened,	1. (Lam 4,1)
	< ... >	
	The earth's kings did not believe, nor any of the	37. (Lam 4,12)
	world's dwellers,	

²⁸'Sproßerzählung', Schneider 1985, 48.4.5.1–2.

syn04types	xQtX<xYqX 0<Ques prev2par00 perV<perV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first whole_verseline

As noted elsewhere (p. 246), I see 37 as the start of a large syntactic unit 37–60. This is based on a number of literary, syntactic and semantic observations, most of which involve considering this larger unit as a whole.

Annotation 4.22

		proposed
כי יבא צר ואויב בשערי ירושלם: ס	38.	(Lam 4,12)
מחטאת נביאיה עונות כהניה	39.	(Lam 4,13)
that foe and enemy could enter the gates of Jerusalem.	38.	(Lam 4,12)
It was because of the sins of her prophets, the iniquities of her priests,	39.	(Lam 4,13)

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_other
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
לא האמינו מלכי־ארץ* וכל ישבי תבל	37.	(Lam 4,12)
כי יבא צר ואויב בשערי ירושלם: ס	38.	
The earth's kings did not believe, nor any of the world's dwellers,	37.	(Lam 4,12)
that foe and enemy could enter the gates of Jerusalem.	38.	

syn04types	xYqX<xQtXpreV2par00 Socj<0 perV<perV Subj<Subj
syntactic	Objc_clause asyn_conj same_sentence diff_salience diff_vt indep_dep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj whole_verseline

The syntactic connection is obvious: כִּי ('that') makes 38 the object of הָאֲמִינוּ ('[they] believe') 37.

The *yiqtol* form is easily explained in syntactic terms as modal and / or indicating future perspective: "The kings ... had not believed that a foe would [ever] be able to enter ..." It has no obvious prosodic motivation.

Annotation 4.23

		proposed
כִּי יָבֹא צָר וְאֹיֵב בְּשַׁעְרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם: ס	38.	(Lam 4,12)
מִחֲטָאת נְבִיאֶיהָ עֲוֹנוֹת כֹּהֲנֶיהָ	39.	(Lam 4,13)
that foe and enemy could enter the gates of	38.	(Lam 4,12)
Jerusalem.		
It was because of the sins of her prophets, the	39.	(Lam 4,13)
iniquities of her priests,		

syn04types	NmCl<xYqXpreV1sub00 0<Socj 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	conj_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_other
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe.first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
לֹא הָאֲמִינוּ מַלְכֵי־אֶרֶץ *וְכָל יֹשְׁבֵי תֵבֶל	37.	(Lam 4,12)
	< ... >	
מִחֲטָאת נְבִיאֶיהָ עֲוֹנוֹת כֹּהֲנֶיהָ	39.	(Lam 4,13)
The earth's kings did not believe, nor any of the	37.	(Lam 4,12)
world's dwellers,		
	< ... >	
It was because of the sins of her prophets, the	39.	(Lam 4,13)
iniquities of her priests,		

syn04types	NmCl<xQtX preVlpar00 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_dep_indep asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn indep_indep
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_other
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first whole_verseline

3738 form a single sentence with subordination. Connecting a syntactically independent clause to a dependent clause is not very probable; without further signals, it is more likely that a new sentence starts.

However, such a signal exist here: The 3 f.sg suffixes (*'her prophets, her priests'*) refer to Jerusalem. Thus, 39 by itself could very well have been a circumstantial adjunct to 38: 'that the foe and enemy could enter the gates of Jerusalem on account of the sins of her prophets ...'

However, when the broader syntactic and prosodic context is considered, this can not be correct:

- 39 itself has an attributive clause following it; what is more, it is the first clause of a large participants domain, bound together by 3 m.pl references to the prophets and priests. This observation obviously requires that the context following 39 is taken into account.
- Prosodically, 39 has already been separated from 37–38 on its own terms, because it starts a new strophe. In the absence of signals to the contrary, the pause that this involves, raises the expectation of the start of a new clause or sentence.

Annotation 4.24

		proposed
נִגְאַלּוּ בַּדָּם	42.	(Lam 4,14)
בִּלְאִי יִכְלֹוּ	43.	
They are so defiled with blood	42.	(Lam 4,14)
that no one is permitted	43.	

syn04types	xYq0<ZQt0 preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_dep non_disc_disc
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	בִּלְא יוֹכְלוּ	43. (Lam 4,14)
	יִגְעוּ בְּלִבְשֵׁיהֶם: ס	44.
	that no one is permitted	43. (Lam 4,14)
	to touch their clothes.	44.

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	dep_indep preceding_daughter conj_asyn disc_disc same_salience same_sentence same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in_same_verseline end_of_strophe

Lam 4,14 is notoriously difficult.²⁹ It raises many questions: Who is the ‘they’ in these clauses? The prophets and priests? The righteous from vs 13? The people of Jerusalem? What is the precise construction of 43–44? Auxiliary verb with main verb?³⁰ Fronted relative clause, as complement of the following main clause?³¹ Does the text need emendation?³²

From all the alternatives, I find the proposal by Rudolph and Renkema the most convincing or, if you will, least problematic. It makes good sense in the context, as Renkema demonstrates: The priests defile themselves by stumbling upon the corpses and blood in the streets.³³ Furthermore, it does not require emendation and the syntax, although somewhat terse, does not come across as strained. One might expect בִּאֲשֶׁר or בְּשֶׁ- instead of just בְּ-, but relative clauses without the conjunction are by all means possible.

As far as formal syntactic arguments for this connection are concerned: The two 3 m.pl *yiqtol* forms do not suggest an auxiliary - main verb relation. To be sure, verbs like $\sqrt{\text{שוב}}$, $\sqrt{\text{ישף}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{הלך}}$ can be auxiliary in paratactic constructions, but $\sqrt{\text{יכל}}$ does not appear to behave in this way.³⁴

In this interpretation, then, 43–44 together form an xYq0 sentence. The *yiqtol* form may be connected with raised salience at the end of the strophe, although arguments from position within the strophe are of limited value in two-verseline strophes, in which every verseline must by definition either

²⁹Hillers 1992, 142: ‘among the most difficult verses in the book’.

³⁰So Berlin 2002, 100: “that no one was permitted to touch their clothing.”

³¹So Albrektson 1963, 187: “What they were not allowed to, they touched with their garments.” Also Renkema 1998, 535.

³²So Hillers 1992, 142: *bil’ī kālū wayyīg’ū bā<lū> l’ē būsēhem* = “By exertion they are spent and exhausted; their clothing is tattered.”

³³Renkema 1998, 536f..

³⁴In the *ETCBC* database, $\sqrt{\text{יכל}}$ is followed 306 times by a daughter clause with infinitive construct. A search for $\sqrt{\text{יכל}}$ followed by a verb form in the daughter clause other than infinitive construct yields 5 hits in which the following verb is not modified by $\sqrt{\text{יכל}}$; The only case that might apply is Num 22,6, but I suspect the coding of נָכַח as infinitive construct is a coding error.

open or close a strophe.

When reading the text in sequence, it is the verseline rhythm, in combination with semantics, that prevents 43 to be connected to 42.

Annotation 4.25

		proposed
יָגֵעוּ בְּלִבְשֵׁיהֶם: ס	44.	(Lam 4,14)
סוּרוּ	45.	(Lam 4,15)
to touch their clothes.	44.	(Lam 4,14)
“Go away!	45.	(Lam 4,15)

syn04types	ZIm0<ZYq0 1/2P<3rdP numV<numV
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

		corrected
סוּרוּ	45.	(Lam 4,15)
	< ... >	
קָרְאוּ לָמוֹ	47.	
“Go away!	45.	(Lam 4,15)
	< ... >	
they cry to them,	47.	

syn04types	Downward=N
syntactic	asyn_asyn disc_non_disc indep_indep preced-ing_daughter diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt
participants	changing_speech_sit diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline new_strophe

45 obviously starts a direct speech, but its quotation verb *follows* rather than precedes it (in 47). This is difficult to spot when moving through the text one clause at a time. An approach which first reconstructs the direct speech (45–46–and 4750) and then combines this entire unit with 47 into what is essentially a xQt0 sentence, would work better in this case.

The start of a new strophe does give an indication of a syntactic break, but it does not convey the precise nature of that break. In a dramatic text, a switch to direct speech without any other syntactic signals may just as well mean that a different speaker takes the floor. Only at the embedded clause 47 (‘... they cried to / about them’) does the text signal that the direct speech is in fact

reported speech which is still part of the referential domain of the prophets and priests.

Annotation 4.26

		proposed
יָגְעוּ בְּלִבְשֵׁיהֶם: ס	44.	(Lam 4,14)
	< ... >	
קָרְאוּ לָמוֹ	47.	(Lam 4,15)
to touch their clothes.	44.	(Lam 4,14)
	< ... >	
they cry to them,	47.	(Lam 4,15)

syn04types	ZQt0<ZYq0 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_other

		corrected
נָעוּ עֹרִים בַּחוּצוֹת	41.	(Lam 4,14)
	< ... >	
קָרְאוּ לָמוֹ	47.	(Lam 4,15)
Now they wander blind in the streets.	41.	(Lam 4,14)
	< ... >	
they cry to them,	47.	(Lam 4,15)

syn04types	VBt<VBt pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_first

Annotation 4.27

		proposed
אַל-תִּגְעוּ	50.	(Lam 4,15)
כִּי נָצוּ	51.	
Don't touch!"	50.	(Lam 4,15)
When they go away	51.	

syn04types	xQt0<xYq0 preV2par00 Socj<0 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	C_colon_A_colon diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	נָעוּ עֹרִים בְּחִצּוֹת	41. (Lam 4,14)
		< ... >
	כִּי נָצוּ	51. (Lam 4,15)
	Now they wander blind in the streets.	41. (Lam 4,14)
		< ... >
	When they go away	51. (Lam 4,15)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV
syntactic	same_vt asyn_conj diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	diff_strophe end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe new_verseline strophe_other_to_first

At first sight, connecting 51 to 47 would seem correct: *כִּי-qatal* following the *qatal* clause governing the direct speech, with correspondence between the verb of 47 and the suffix in 47: "... , they called out to /about them, ... , as / for they wander aimlessly".

However, the verseline structure shows that the text is structured differently: 51, starting a new verseline, returns to the image of the wandering prophets and priests (41). This creates a parallel structure in 41–50 and 51–55:

14. (41–44) prophets and priests wander about

15a (45–50) "Go away! Impure!",

'they' call out to them,

"Go away, go away, do not touch!"

15b (51–55) Indeed, prophets and priests wander about.

'They' say:

"They can no longer reside here!"

Note that this arrangement ignores a strophe boundary: It creates a single unit Lam 4,14–15, the first part of which consists of a strophe plus a tricolon, while the second part consists of a single tricolon. The crucial syntactic signal for this division is *כִּי* (51), which must be interpreted as 'Yes, ...!' or 'Indeed, ...'.

The problem is, of course, that כִּי can have a broad range of syntactic functions. The only sign that it is not meant as explanatory, but takes up an earlier point in the discourse, is the repetition of נָעוּ ('they wander') and the semantically and phonologically quite similar נָצוּ ('they roam / stagger'). The repetition, however, is 'hidden' in the coordinated second clause of the כִּי-sentence. Reconstruction of this sentence is required to see the repetition.

In the end, the connection is more syntactic than prosodic in nature. Yet, the verseline boundary at 51, as well as the parallel buildup of these verses—largely literary as well—provide crucial clues to recognize it.

Annotation 4.28

		proposed
גַּם-נָעוּ	52.	(Lam 4,15)
אָמְרוּ בַּגּוֹיִם	53.	
and wander,	52.	(Lam 4,15)
they say among the nations:	53.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT Quot<0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 pngV<pngV
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

		corrected
כִּי נָצוּ	51.	(Lam 4,15)
	< ... >	
אָמְרוּ בַּגּוֹיִם	53.	
When they go away	51.	(Lam 4,15)
	< ... >	
they say among the nations:	53.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT Quot<0 preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj pngV<pngV
syntactic	same.vt conj_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience
participants	same.verb.png cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe to_multi_clause_colon

The 3 m.pl in these clauses can only be deciphered by semantics: The 'they' who wander around are the prophets and the priests; the 'they' who say some-

thing is the impersonal ‘they’. `Syn04types` and `labelman` miss these subtleties and reduce all these references to the same participant.

The main argument for a connection with 51 rather than 52 stems from the verseline structure: 51–52 are in the same colon, which virtually always means that the two verbs are coordinated and must be treated as a unit. The label `to_multi_clause_colon` signals this pattern.

Annotation 4.29

proposed

- לָגוּר: ס 55. (Lam 4,15)
פָּנֵי יְהוָה חִלְקָם 56. (Lam 4,16)
stay here!” 55. (Lam 4,15)
The face of YHWH has scattered them; 56. (Lam 4,16)

<code>syn04types</code>	<code>XQt1<InfC prev1sub00 NPd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral</code>
<code>syntactic</code>	<code>asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt</code>
<code>participants</code>	<code>new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj no_Subj_Subj</code>
<code>prosodic</code>	<code>C_colonA_colon acrostic diff_colon new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other</code>

corrected

- מִחֲטָאת נְבִיאֶיהָ עֲוֹנוֹת כֹּהֲנֶיהָ 39. (Lam 4,13)
< ... >
פָּנֵי יְהוָה חִלְקָם 56. (Lam 4,16)
It was because of the sins of her prophets, the 39. (Lam 4,13)
iniquities of her priests,
< ... >
The face of YHWH has scattered them; 56. (Lam 4,16)

<code>syn04types</code>	<code>XQt1<NmCl prev1par00 NPd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral</code>
<code>syntactic</code>	<code>asyn_asyn diff_sentence indep_indep</code>
<code>participants</code>	<code>new_nmpr_Subj sfx_to_other new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj</code>
<code>prosodic</code>	<code>strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first</code>

The mention of YHWH introduces a new (and important) participant, while the 3 m.sg suffix on חִלְקָם (‘scatters *them*’) must be assumed to refer to the prophets and priests, in the absence of signs to the contrary.

On the one hand, then, there is a major break, while on the other hand, 56 is still within the reference domain of the prophets and priests. This possibly confusing situation becomes clear when the overall structure of the poem is

considered. As Berges observes,³⁵ the strophes Lam 4,6, 11, 16 and 20 consist of ‘core statements’, that close the stanzas of the poem. The last three of the core statements mention YHWH by name, the only times in the poem that this happens at all.

Thus, 56 starts another one of these closing strophes. Therefore, I have connected it all the way back to the first mention of the prophets and priests.

Note that there is a slight difference between the prosodic and the syntactic structure here. Prosodically, the stanza starts at 39. Syntactically, however, the stanza has two parts, one about the kings of the world and Jerusalem (Lam 4,12) and one about the prophets and priests of Jerusalem (klg414–16).³⁶ The final clauses of the stanza are part of the second part only, by virtue of the 3 m.pl suffixes and the repetition of the word כֹּהֲנִים (‘priests’, 59).

prosodic fronting The fronting of פְּנֵי יְהוָה (‘the face of YHWH’) has pragmatic meaning: “It is YHWH, [and no one else,] who has scattered them.” At the same time, it clearly has a prosodic function as well, providing the פ-word for the acrostic.

Cases like this show that prosodic fronting, even though a real phenomenon, can not always be seen in isolation. Often there will be convergence of syntactic / pragmatic and prosodic functions. This does not mean that these cases have no prosodic fronting, just that the syntactic analysis does not need to use it as an argument, since there are sufficient syntactic ones.

Annotation 4.30

accepted

פְּנֵי יְהוָה חֲלָקָם 56. (Lam 4,16)
לֹא יוֹסִיף 57.

The face of YHWH has scattered them; 56. (Lam 4,16)
he no longer 57.

syn04types	xYq0<XQt1 preV1par00 preV2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt in- dep_indep non_disc_disc
participants	Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline qatal_yiqtol_verseline

³⁵‘Kernaussagen’, Berges 2002, 234–235.

³⁶The two are connected by the 3 f.sg suffixes in 39, which refer Jerusalem (38).

qatal-yiqtol The logic of the situation suggests that the *qatal* form is to be taken as retrospective: The prophets and priests are wandering about, so apparently the scattering has already happened.

Most commentaries translate like this, except for Renkema, who uses present tense, apparently because of the implied contrast with times gone by: Then, YHWH scattered (√הלך) Israel's enemies, but now he scatters his own people.³⁷ This is not entirely compelling, because the same contrast would work between times gone by and events that have just happened. Conceivably, he has chosen to treat the form in the same way as the other *qatal* forms in the passage, which describe the actual situation. This case, however, confirms that temporal perspective is not a paradigmatic function of the verb form itself, but must be inferred from other information in the context.³⁸ 56 does not describe the situation, but explains it: It was YHWH, and nobody else, who has done this.³⁹

The use of *yiqtol* in 57 is more difficult to explain.

- Anticipating perspective (future tense) can probably be ruled out: "YHWH has scattered them; he will not continue to look after them." does not make a lot of sense. It would make the verse a prediction, which is unlikely because it is unclear on which this prediction would be based.
- Neutral perspective (present tense) is conceivable, but creates a notable difference between the two clauses: Many commentators opt for neutral perspective (present tense): "YHWH himself has scattered them; he no longer *looks* after them."⁴⁰
- Retrospective perspective (past tense) would seem improbable, but Hillers takes this path: "The splendor of the Lord destroyed them. He stopped looking after them."⁴¹ This choice amounts to the recognition that the verb form as such does not have temporal function, although Hillers does not state what other function it may have. A number of options come to mind:
 - Modality, e.g.: "He no longer wanted to look after them."
 - A difference in salience, e.g.: "He didn't even take notice of them them any more!"

³⁷Renkema 1998, 543.

³⁸Schneider 1985, 48.3.3.3, especially n. 7.

³⁹See p. 246.

⁴⁰So Berlin 2002, 100; Berges 2002, 230. Renkema 1998, 542, who, as remarked above, also translates חלקם with a present tense.

⁴¹Hillers 1992, 136.

- Prosodic variation. Obviously, this option does not preclude the other options to be active simultaneously. In fact, even the neutral perspective is compatible with prosodic variation.

I do not pretend to be able to resolve this issue. Nor do I really need to, as it does not have any bearing on the clause hierarchy itself. This case does confirm my estimation that tense / temporal perspective is not a primary function of Biblical Hebrew finite verb forms.

Annotation 4.31

		proposed
	לְהַבִּיטֵם	58. (Lam 4,16)
	פְּנֵי כֹהֲנִים לֹא נִשְׁאוּ	59.
	takes notice of them.	58. (Lam 4,16)
	The priests are not respected,	59.

syn04types	xQt0<InfC preV2par00 pngV<Sfx NPd1<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	פְּנֵי יְהוָה חִלְקֵם	56. (Lam 4,16)
	< ... >	
	פְּנֵי כֹהֲנִים לֹא נִשְׁאוּ	59.
	The face of YHWH has scattered them;	56. (Lam 4,16)
	< ... >	
	The priests are not respected,	59.

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV2sub00 ParalLex01 perV<perV pngV<Sfx NPd1<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn indep_indep same_vt diff_sentence front- ing_fronting non_disc non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_sfx
prosodic	end.to.start.of.strophe lexical.repetition new_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe

It is not entirely clear how 59–60 fit into the clause hierarchy, as it is somewhat disconnected syntactically:

- New participants, the priests and the elders, are (re)introduced as explicit subjects.

- While the priests also figure prominently in the preceding section, the mention of the elders abruptly breaks this association.
- For the 3 m.pl verbs נָשָׂאוּ ('they lift up', 59) and הִנָּנוּ ('they favor / respect', 60) various possible subjects have been proposed,⁴² but text-internal participants, such as the prophets and priests, nor—if different from these—the antecedent of the 3 m.pl suffixes in 56 ('[He] has scattered *them*') and 58 ('to look at *them*') are out of the question on semantic grounds.

Yet, the clauses type and the repetition of לֹא ('not') do suggest a connection to the preceding unit 56–58. This connection shows a return to *qatal* forms after the incidental *yiqtol* in 57, while retaining the negative mode set in by the latter. The clauses are probably to be explained as a succinct description of the situation which has arisen out of YHWH's looking away: a state of lawlessness, in which authorities, religious and civilian, are no longer respected.

The prosodic structure strengthens the connection: 5660 form a single strophe, the two verselines of which have a parallel opening (xQt1 / xQt0), both starting with פָּנֵי ('face').

prosodic fronting The fronting of פָּנֵי כֹהֲנִים ('the face of the priests') can be explained pragmatically: introduction of a new character, and most of all contrast to expectation. Nevertheless, its prosodic function is obvious as well. See my remarks on p. 246.

Annotation 4.32

		proposed
פָּנֵי יְהוָה חִלְקָם	56.	(Lam 4,16)
	< ... >	
*עוֹרִינָה	61.	(Lam 4,17)
The face of YHWH has scattered them;	56.	(Lam 4,16)
	< ... >	
"All the while,	61.	(Lam 4,17)

⁴²Berges 2002, 230: impersonal 'they' ('German: 'man'); similarly Berlin 2002, 100, who translates as a passive. Renkema 1998, 544: the enemies; נָשָׂא רָאשׁ implies a relationship of authority; Also, he sees are song level responsion with Lam 1,16, Lam 2,16 and Lam 3,46, where the enemies are mentioned explicitly. Hillers 1992, 143–144: YHWH; Hillers emends the verbs to singular, assuming scribal correction out of piety.

syn04types	MSyn<XQt1 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<NPd1 0<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence main_defect non_disc_disc root
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

Annotation 4.33

		root
	אֵיכָה יוֹעַם זָהָב	1. (Lam 4,1)
	<...>	
	עוֹדִינָה*	61. (Lam 4,17)
	How the gold is darkened,	1. (Lam 4,1)
	<...>	
	"All the while,	61. (Lam 4,17)

syn04types	MSyn<xYqX 0<Ques 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 0<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc main_defect root same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first strophe_to_strophe

A new speaker, a 'we', takes the stage in 61. There are no syntactic to the preceding context. In fact, there is a notable difference: Up to this point, the speaker has apparently been a single person (note the expression בַּת־עַמִּי, 'the daughter of **my** people', in Lam 4,3 and vs 6). This has prompted me to start an entirely new text unit.

To be sure, we-references are always difficult, as they can be spoken by an entire group or by an individual from that group. The addressee can also be difficult to determine: In the latter case, the individual may be speaking *to* the group, to a third party *about* the group, or to a third party *on behalf of* the group.

In this case, it can not be ruled out that the individual speaker is continuing their speech, talking *about* the group to which they belong.⁴³ However, given the lack of syntactic and thematic connections, in combination with the fact that Lam 4, like the other chapters, is essentially a dramatic text, it is most prudent to treat vs 17–20 as a speech on its own.⁴⁴

⁴³So Hillers 1992, 150 ('verses ... that identify the speaker very closely with his people'); Berlin 2002, 112 ('in the hindsight of the speaker').

⁴⁴See Renkema 1998, 545–546: "The poets [i.e. not the speaker, HJB] are representing the

Annotation 4.34

		accepted
	עודינה* 61.	(Lam 4,17)
	תכלינה עינינו אל-עזרתנו הבל 62.	
	"All the while,	61. (Lam 4,17)
	our eyes wore out looking for help, in vain;	62.

syn04types	ZYqX<MSyn preV1sub00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Subj<0 Sfx<Pron PreC<Main
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main disc_disc same_salience same_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_colon

The clause atom division is debatable here. 61 has been isolated as a nominal clause ("They are still [here]. Our eyes wear down."), but in reality it is only an adjunct to 62: 'Still, our eyes wear down'. Combining the two clause atoms into a single xYqX clause would have been preferable.

Annotation 4.35

		proposed
	תכלינה עינינו אל-עזרתנו הבל 62.	(Lam 4,17)
	בצפיתנו צפינו אל-גוי 63.	
	our eyes wore out looking for help, in vain;	62. (Lam 4,17)
	in our watchtowers we watched for a nation	63.

syn04types	xQt0<ZYqXpreV1par00>L...//...>LnumV<numVpngV<Sfx 0<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

hopes, fears and disappointments of the population."; see also Berges 2002, 234.

		corrected
	עודינה*	61. (Lam 4,17)
		< ... >
	בְּצִפְתָּנוּ צִפְנוּ אֶל-גּוֹי	63.
	"All the while,	61. (Lam 4,17)
		< ... >
	in our watchtowers we watched for a nation	63.

syn04types	xQt0<MSyn preV1sub00 pngV<Pron 0<NPd1 Sfx<Pron
syntactic	diff_sentence asyn_asyn defect_main disc_disc same_salience
participants	verb_to_sfx Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

6162 actually form an xYqX clause. 63 is connected to this clause as a unit. The start of a new verseline is a further signal.

Annotation 4.36

		accepted
	עודינה*	61. (Lam 4,17)
		< ... >
	צָדוּ צִעְדֵּינוּ	65. (Lam 4,18)
	"All the while,	61. (Lam 4,17)
		< ... >
	They stalked us in our steps	65. (Lam 4,18)

syn04types	ZQt0<MSyn preV1sub00 preV2sub00 NPd2<0 0<NPd1 Sfx<Pron
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	acrostic new_strophe strophe_first_to_first stro- phe_to_strophe

There is a change in main participants here, from 'we' to 'they'; there is continuity as well: the 'we' references remain, although they change to 'us'-references. 'They' is either impersonal 'they', or it refers to 'our pursuers' (70).

Annotation 4.37

proposed

מִלְכָּת בְּרַחֲבֵינוּ 66. (Lam 4,18)

קָרַב קִצֵּינוּ 67.

so we could not walk on our squares. 66. (Lam 4,18)

Our end was near, 67.

syn04types	ZQtX<InfC prev1sub00 prev2par00 NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

צָדוּ צִעְדֵינוּ 65. (Lam 4,18)

< ... >

קָרַב קִצֵּינוּ 67.

They stalked us in our steps 65. (Lam 4,18)

< ... >

Our end was near, 67.

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_dep_indep same_vt asyn_asyn disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	secondary_part diff_verb_png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Annotation 4.38

		proposed
	צָדוּ צַעֲדֵינוּ	65. (Lam 4,18)
	< ... >	
	מִלְאוּ יָמֵינוּ	68.
	They stalked us in our steps	65. (Lam 4,18)
	< ... >	
	our days were numbered;	68.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPD2<NPD2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	diff_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

		corrected
	קָרַב קִצֵּינוּ	67. (Lam 4,18)
	מִלְאוּ יָמֵינוּ	68.
	Our end was near,	67. (Lam 4,18)
	our days were numbered;	68.

syn04types	VBT<VBT perV<perV NPD2<NPD2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part diff_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in_same_verseline parallel.Pred.Subj end_of_strophe

Annotation 4.39

		proposed
	כִּי־בָא קִצֵּינוּ: ס	69. (Lam 4,18)
	קָלִים הָיוּ רֹדְפֵינוּ מִנְּשָׂרַי שָׁמַיִם	70. (Lam 4,19)
	Yes, our end had come.	69. (Lam 4,18)
	Faster were our pursuers than eagles in the sky.	70. (Lam 4,19)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1sub00 preV2par00 0<Socj perV<perV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj diff_verb_png next_secondary_part sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	C_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe paral- lel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

corrected

צָדוּ צִעְדֵינוּ 65. (Lam 4,18)

<...>

קָלִים הָיוּ רֹדְפֵינוּ מִנְשָׁרֵי שָׁמַיִם 70. (Lam 4,19)

They stalked us in our steps 65. (Lam 4,18)

<...>

Faster were our pursuers than eagles in the sky. 70. (Lam 4,19)

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png sec- ondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first whole_verseline

70 introduces a new subject ('our pursuers'), which is a secondary participant, because it depends on 'we' in 65. It does not follow the subjects with suffixes in 67–69, because of semantics: 'our end' and 'our days' are inanimate, and do not count as true participants.

The new unit is also marked prosodically, by the start of a new strophe.

prosodic fronting I see no immediate pragmatic or syntactic need for the fronting of the predicate complement קָלִים ('swifter'). It does have prosodic relevance: Because it stands out, it strongly suggest a new start, prosodically, but also syntactically. The fronting also supplies the ק for the acrostic.

Annotation 4.40

		proposed
	בַּמִּדְבָּר אֶרְבוּ לָנוּ: ס	72. (Lam 4,19)
	רוּחַ אֶפְיָנוּ מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה נִלְכַּד בְּשַׁחֲתוֹתָם	73. (Lam 4,20)
	in the desert they ambushed us.	72. (Lam 4,19)
	The breath of our nostrils, YHWH's anointed, was	73. (Lam 4,20)
	caught in their traps.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 B...//...B perV<perV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience same_vt
participants	diff_verb_png new_nmpr_Subj next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
	עוֹדִינָה*	61. (Lam 4,17)
	< ... >	
	רוּחַ אֶפְיָנוּ מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה נִלְכַּד בְּשַׁחֲתוֹתָם	73. (Lam 4,20)
	“All the while,	61. (Lam 4,17)
	< ... >	
	The breath of our nostrils, YHWH's anointed, was	73. (Lam 4,20)
	caught in their traps.	

syn04types	XQt1<MSyn preVlsub00 NPd1<NPd1 Subj<0 Sfx<Pron
syntactic	asyn.asyn defect_main diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_nmpr_Subj next_secondary_part sec- ondary_part sfx_to_other sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first whole_verseline

The arguments to start a new unit at 73, rather than connecting the clause to one of the units in 63–72 are largely based on the contents and the prosodic structure, although the latter is marked in part by syntactic means.

The new strophe (Lam 4,20) starts by introducing a new participant quite elaborately: ‘the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of YHWH’. This elaborate introduction already suggests a break, which is confirmed by the semantic shift from enemies (verses 18 and 19) to the one person expected to help.

The use of the name YHWH mark this strophe as the closing of a stanza, as

it did in Lam 4,11 and vs 16.⁴⁵

Therefore, I have connected 73 and the clauses dependent on it, to the start of the entire unit 61–72.

prosodic fronting Although the fronting of the subject clearly performs important prosodic functions (marking of the closing strophe; providing an ר for the acrostic),⁴⁶ it has an obvious pragmatic explanation as well: As the rest of the verse expresses, the anointed one (the king) was expected to be the one providing safety; he was the last one expected to be captured.

Annotation 4.41

		proposed
	בְּצִלּוֹ נִחְיָה בְּגוֹיִם: ס	75. (Lam 4,20)
	שִׂישִׁי	76. (Lam 4,21)
	‘In his shadow we will stay alive among the	75. (Lam 4,20)
	nations.”	
	“Rejoice	76. (Lam 4,21)

syn04types	ZIm0<xYq0 preV1par00 preV2sub00
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep root same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj ps_shift_first_sec
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic diff_strophe new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

Annotation 4.42

		proposed
	*יֹשְׁבֵי בְּאֶרֶץ עוֹץ	79. (Lam 4,21)
	גַּם-עֲלֶיךָ תֵּעָבֶר-כּוֹס	80.
	you who live in the land of Uz.	79. (Lam 4,21)
	To you also the cup will come round;	80.

⁴⁵Berges 2002, 234–235.

⁴⁶Note that ר is not a particularly easy letter for a Hebrew acrostic, see Chapter 10.

syn04types	xYqX<Ptcp preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt no_fronting fronting non_disc disc
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	שִׂישִׁי	76. (Lam 4,21)
		< ... >
	גַּם־עָלֶיךָ תֵּעָבֶר־כּוֹס	80.
	“Rejoice	76. (Lam 4,21)
		< ... >
	To you also the cup will come round;	80.

syn04types	xYqX<ZIm0 preVlpar00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV Subj<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	new_indep_Subj sfx.to.Pred diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_nmpr
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Annotation 4.43

	תִּשְׁכָּרִי	81. proposed (Lam 4,21)
		< ... >
	תִּם־עוֹנֶה	83. (Lam 4,22)
	you will get drunk	81. (Lam 4,21)
		< ... >
	Your punishment is complete,	83. (Lam 4,22)

syn04types	ZQtX<ZYq0 numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn.asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj sec- ondary_part sfx.to.Pred
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon acrostic new_strophe stro- phe.first_to_other

	corrected	
שִׂישִׁי	76.	(Lam 4,21)
	< ... >	
תִּם-עֹנֶה	83.	(Lam 4,22)
“Rejoice	76.	(Lam 4,21)
	< ... >	
Your punishment is complete,	83.	(Lam 4,22)

syn04types	ZQtX<ZIm0 numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	Voct_to_Voct diff_verb_png new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_nmpr
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe acrostic new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

That a new syntactic unit starts, is signaled by the vocative (84). This requires a certain amount of looking ahead, since as a rule, vocatives are separated from their main in the *ETCBC* data.

As the label *Voct_to_Voct* shows, *labelman* is able to ‘see’ whether an individual clause atom is followed by a vocative, by making use of the *FOCUS* keyword of *SQL*, see p. 296 of the dissertation.

This solution, helpful as it may be, does not fundamentally address the complications caused by moving through the text sequentially and one clause atom at a time. An approach which first combines the vocatives and their main clauses into proper clauses,⁴⁷ and only then combines these clauses into larger units, would be more suitable for cases like this.

Annotation 4.44

	proposed	
שִׂישִׁי	76.	(Lam 4,21)
	< ... >	
בַּת-צִיּוֹן	84.	(Lam 4,22)
“Rejoice	76.	(Lam 4,21)
	< ... >	
Daughter Zion;	84.	(Lam 4,22)

⁴⁷Or, for that matter, any clause atoms connected by subordination.

syn04types	Voct<ZIm0 preVlpar00 3rdP<1/2P NPd1<0 MacroSign?
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep root same_salience
participants	new_nmpr_other no_Subj_no_Subj voca_to_sec_ps
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_first

corrected

תַּם-עֲוֹנָךְ 83. (Lam 4,22)

בֵּת-צִיּוֹן 84.

Your punishment is complete, 83. (Lam 4,22)

Daughter Zion; 84.

syn04types	Voct<ZQtX preVlpar00 Elliptical 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd2 NPd1<0 0<Subj MacroSign?
syntactic	disc_disc same_sentence asyn_asyn indep_dep same_salience
participants	voca_to_sec_ps Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	in_same_colon

Annotation 4.45**proposed**

בֵּת-צִיּוֹן 84. (Lam 4,22)

לֹא יוֹסִיף 85.

Daughter Zion; 84. (Lam 4,22)

he will not again 85.

syn04types	xYq0<Voct preVlpar00 preV2sub00 0<NPd1
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

corrected

תַּם-עֲוֹנָךְ 83. (Lam 4,22)

< ... >

לֹא יוֹסִיף 85.

Your punishment is complete, 83. (Lam 4,22)

< ... >

he will not again 85.

syn04types	xYq0<ZQtX preV1par00 preV2par00 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	diff_sentence indep_dep_indep indep_indep asyn_asyn diff_vt disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit cont_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon qatal_yiqtol_verseline

The 3 m.sg verb יוֹסִיף ('he continues') has no referent. It obviously refers to YHWH (who is not mentioned in this direct speech section), not to עֲוֹנֶךָ ('your evil / punishment'). That it nevertheless belongs to 83–84 is obvious, because of the verseline structure (a B-colon following an A-colon) and because of the 2 f.sg suffix on לְהַגְלוֹתְךָ ('to cause **you** to be in exile', 86).

Syn04types proposes to connect 85 to the vocative בַּת־צִיּוֹן ('daughter Zion'), but this stems from its sequential, clause atom by clause atom, approach. In principle, both 83–84 and 8586 should be combined into proper clauses first. Only then should these two clauses be combined.

qatal-yiqtol The reason for the use of the *yiqtol* form יוֹסִיף ('he continues') is tied in with the interpretation of the verse as a whole.

Lam 4,21 is usually interpreted as promise of salvation, even though the precise translations vary: "He will not keep you exiled any longer";⁴⁸ "nicht wird er noch einmal dich wegführen";⁴⁹ "er (= JHWH) werde mit der Exilierung nicht weiter fortfahren"⁵⁰ In this interpretation, the *yiqtol* form can be explained as pointing to a future event (or rather: the absence of an event in the future). This future reference is already part of the semantics of √יָסַח hi.: 'to continue' by definition extends beyond the moment of the action.

Renkema, however, translates the verb as having past reference, in the same time as the *qatal* clause 83. This is tied in with his radically different understanding of the verse: "Your iniquity has amplified itself, daughter Zion! He has completed your exposure!"⁵¹ In this interpretation, the *yiqtol* can not have temporal significance and must therefore serve another purpose. This could be, I venture, a prosodic one: it clearly marks the end of the verseline, so that there can be no automatic confusion of the 'you' in the first verse (Zion) and the one in the second (Edom). Without such a mark, this would not be clear until 88.

This prosodic function can also be active in the traditional interpretation. The shift from present to future and back also signals the prosodic break. In

⁴⁸Berlin 2002, 101.

⁴⁹"he will not exile you another time", Kraus 1983, 72.

⁵⁰"that he (YHWH) would not go on with the exile.", Berges 2002, 267.

⁵¹Renkema 1998, 482.

that case prosodic and syntactic functions converge.

Annotation 4.46

		proposed
	לְהַגְלוֹתְךָ 86.	(Lam 4,22)
	פְּקֹד עֲוֹנֶיךָ 87.	
	bring you into exile. 86.	(Lam 4,22)
	He will punish your wickedness, 87.	

syn04types	ZQt0<InfC preV1sub00 preV2par00 NPd2<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc same_salience
participants	diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	תִּם-עֲוֹנֶיךָ 83.	(Lam 4,22)
	<...>	
	פְּקֹד עֲוֹנֶיךָ 87.	
	Your punishment is complete, 83.	(Lam 4,22)
	<...>	
	He will punish your wickedness, 87.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT ParalLex01 pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same.vt asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc.disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Voct.to.Voct Subj_no_Subj cont_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_nmpr sfx_to_sfx verb_to_Subj
prosodic	lexical_repetition new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The subject of the verbs in 8889 is the same as that of 85: the unspecified ‘he’, obviously referring to YHWH. Thus, the label *cont_Subj*, which reacts to the congruence with הֵן (‘[it] is complete’, 83), is incorrect.

The argument for not connecting these clauses to 85 is the occurrence of a new vocative, which effectively creates a new communicational domain: Instead of Zion, Edom is addressed again. Yet, the continuing references to ‘he’ / YHWH connect the two domains. A pattern like this is typical for a dramatic text, in which a speaker can switch addressees from one clause to the other, while still referring to the earlier speech. This works because both addressees

are considered to be 'on stage', so that they hear both speeches.

The verseline structure closely follows the communicational domains and provides an additional argument for the connection.

Chapter 5

Lamentations 5

Annotation 5.1

מה־הָיָה לָנוּ 3. (Lam 5,1)
הַבֵּיט* 4.

what has happened to us; 3. (Lam 5,1)
Take notice, 4.

syn04types	ZIm0<XQt1 0<Ques preV1sub00 preV2par00 numV<numV 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png ps_shift_first_sec
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon in_same_verseline

זָכַר 1. (Lam 5,1)
<...>
הַבֵּיט* 4.
Remember, 1. (Lam 5,1)
<...>
Take notice, 4.

syn04types	VBT<VBT pngV<pngV
syntactic	same_clause_type asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_dep_indep indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	in_same_verseline to_multi_verb_colon A_colon_B_colon to_multi_clause_colon

Annotation 5.2

		proposed
	וְרָאָה אֶת־חֲרָפָתָנוּ:	5. (Lam 5,1)
	נִחְלָתָנוּ נִהְפָּכָה לְזָרִים	6. (Lam 5,2)
	and see our disgrace.	5. (Lam 5,1)
Our inheritance has been turned over to strangers,		6. (Lam 5,2)

syn04types	XQt1<WIm0 0<Cocj preVlpar00 numV<numV NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	conj.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc indep.indep no_fronting_fronting same_salience
participants	diff_verb.png next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B.colon.A.colon diff_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	זָכֹר	1. (Lam 5,1)
	<...>	
	נִחְלָתָנוּ נִהְפָּכָה לְזָרִים	6. (Lam 5,2)
	Remember,	1. (Lam 5,1)
	<...>	
Our inheritance has been turned over to strangers,		6. (Lam 5,2)

syn04types	XQt1<ZIm0 preVlpar00 numV<numV NPd1<0 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc.disc indep.indep same_salience
participants	ps_shift_sec_first diff_verb.png no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

1–5 are imperative clauses with their constituent clauses; 6 is connected to these clauses as a whole.

This is also marked by the shift in participants references: from 2 m.sg verbs to a 3 pl verb; continuity is provided by the 1 pl suffixes, but these connection can only be observed when 1–5 is considered as a unit.

Annotation 5.3

	proposed
בְּתִינוּ לְנֹכְרִים:	7. (Lam 5,2)
יְתוּמִים הָיינוּ	8. (Lam 5,3)
our houses to foreigners.	7. (Lam 5,2)
We have become orphans,	8. (Lam 5,3)

syn04types	XQt1<Ellp preV1par00 pngV<Sfx 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected
זָכֵר	1. (Lam 5,1)
< ... >	
יְתוּמִים הָיינוּ	8. (Lam 5,3)
Remember,	1. (Lam 5,1)
< ... >	
We have become orphans,	8. (Lam 5,3)

syn04types	XQt1<ZIm0 preV1par00 Subj<0
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	ps_shift_sec_first diff_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Connecting 8 with 7 is out of the question in any case, because 7 is an ellipsis. However, this connection is also rejected, because there is a shift in participants: From 'you' + 'us' / 'our' in 1–7 to 'we' (subject) / 'our' from 8 onward. That this shift coincides with the start of a new strophe strengthens its separating force.

Annotation 5.4

	proposed
אֵין אָב	9. (Lam 5,3)
אִמֵּינוּ כְּאַלְמָנוֹת:	10.
fatherless,	9. (Lam 5,3)
our mothers widows.	10.

syn04types	NmCl<Ellp 0<Cocj prevlpar00 1/2P<3rdP Npd1<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral PreC<Main
syntactic	conj_async defect_main
participants	Subj_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_C_colon in_same_verseline

		corrected
	יְתוּמִים הָיִינוּ	8. (Lam 5,3)
		<...>
	אִמֵּינוּ כָּאֵלְמָנוֹת:	10.
	We have become orphans,	8. (Lam 5,3)
		<...>
	our mothers widows.	10.

syn04types	NmCl<XQt1 prevlpar00 Sfx<pngV Npd1<0 Subj<Subj
syntactic	main_ellipsis asyn_async asyn_conj_async disc_disc in- dep_dep same_salience same_sentence
participants	new_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	in_same_verseline A_colon_C_colon

Annotation 5.5

		proposed
	אִמֵּינוּ כָּאֵלְמָנוֹת:	10. (Lam 5,3)
	מִיָּמֵינוּ בִּכְסֵף שָׁתִינוּ	11. (Lam 5,4)
	our mothers widows.	10. (Lam 5,3)
	We pay money for our drinking water,	11. (Lam 5,4)

syn04types	xQt0<NmCl prevlpar00 pngV<Sfx Npd1<Npd1 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_async dep_indep diff_sentence disc_disc front- ing_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx
prosodic	C_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	יְתוּמִים הָיִינוּ	8. (Lam 5,3)
	< ... >	
	מִיָּמֵינוּ בְּכֶסֶף שָׁתִינוּ	11. (Lam 5,4)
	We have become orphans,	8. (Lam 5,3)
	< ... >	
	We pay money for our drinking water,	11. (Lam 5,4)
syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 0<Subj	
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience same_vt	
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png	
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe	

Annotation 5.6

		proposed
	אֲשׁוּר	17. (Lam 5,6)
	לִשְׂבַע לֶחֶם:	18.
	to Assyria,	17. (Lam 5,6)
	to get enough bread.	18.
syn04types	InfC<Ellp preV2sub00 0<NPd1 Adju<Main	
syntactic	asyn_asyn defect_main dep_dep same_sentence	
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj	
prosodic	end_of_strophe in_same_colon	

		corrected
	מִצְרַיִם נִתְּנוּ יָד	16. (Lam 5,6)
	< ... >	
	לִשְׂבַע לֶחֶם:	18.
	To Egypt we stretch out our hand,	16. (Lam 5,6)
	< ... >	
	to get enough bread.	18.
syn04types	InfC<xQt0 preV2sub00 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd1 Adju<Main	
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_vt fronting_no_fronting indep_dep same_sentence	
participants	no_Subj_no_Subj	
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline	

The question here is: Is the לִּ-infinite construct clause as adjunct to 17 alone, as syn04types proposes, or to 16–17 as a whole? From the contents, it is clear that the latter must be the case. The fact that 17 is an elliptic clause atom may be a syntactic indication for this. At present, I have no label describing this particular pattern.

Annotation 5.7

			proposed
	לִּשְׂבַּע לֶחֶם:	18.	(Lam 5,6)
	אֲבֹתֵינוּ חָטְאוּ	19.	(Lam 5,7)
	to get enough bread.	18.	(Lam 5,6)
	Our fathers sinned	19.	(Lam 5,7)

syn04types	XQt1<InfC preV1sub00 1/2P<3rdP NPD1<0 Subj<0 NoRe-ferral			
syntactic	asyn_async	dep_indep	diff_sentence	diff_vt
	no_fronting_fronting			
participants	no_Subj_Subj			
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	diff_colon	new_strophe	stro-phe_first_to_other

			corrected
	עַל צַוְאֵרֵנוּ נִרְדָּפְנוּ	13.	(Lam 5,5)
		<...>	
	אֲבֹתֵינוּ חָטְאוּ	19.	(Lam 5,7)
	At our necks we are pursued,	13.	(Lam 5,5)
		<...>	
	Our fathers sinned	19.	(Lam 5,7)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preV1par00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx			
syntactic	asyn_async	diff_sentence	disc_disc	indep_indep
	same_salience same_vt			
participants	new_secondary_part	sfx_to_Pred	diff_verb_png	
	no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx			
prosodic	strophe_first_to_first	strophe_to_strophe		
	new_strophe			

Annotation 5.8

			proposed
	אינם**	20.	(Lam 5,7)
	אנחנו עונתיהם סבלנו:	21.	
	and are no more,	20.	(Lam 5,7)
	we bear their punishment.	21.	

syn04types	WXQt<Defc Cocj<Cocj preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<NPd1 Subj<0 Sfx<Pron
syntactic	conj_conj defect_main diff_sentence new_deictic same_conj
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj new_prps sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_C_colon in.same.verseline

			corrected
	אבותינו חטאו	19.	(Lam 5,7)
		< ... >	
	אנחנו עונתיהם סבלנו:	21.	
	Our fathers sinned	19.	(Lam 5,7)
		< ... >	
	we bear their punishment.	21.	

syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 preVlpar00 numV<numV Sfx<pngV pngV<Sfx NPd1<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	fronting_fronting same_vt asyn_conj diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj diff_verb_png new_indep_Subj new_prps
prosodic	in_same_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj A_colon_C_colon

אנחנו (21) obviously stands in contrast to אבותינו (19): “Our fathers ..., but we ...” Syn04types misses this: It appears to place large weight on the ך at the beginning of 20 and 21.¹

¹Both cases of ך appear in the *qere*.

Annotation 5.9

		accepted
אֲבֹתֵינוּ חָטְאוּ	19.	(Lam 5,7)
	<...>	
עֲבָדִים מָשְׁלוּ בָנוּ	22.	(Lam 5,8)
Our fathers sinned	19.	(Lam 5,7)
	<...>	
Slaves rule over us,	22.	(Lam 5,8)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence disc_disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj.Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline parallel_Pred_Subj

22 is connected to the entire construction 19–21.

Annotation 5.10

		proposed
פָּרַק אֵין מַיָּדָם:	23.	(Lam 5,8)
בְּנַפְשֵׁנוּ נִבְיֵא לְחַמְנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר:	24.	(Lam 5,9)
and there is no one who frees us from their hands.	23.	(Lam 5,8)
We risk our lives to get our bread because of the sword in the desert.	24.	(Lam 5,9)

syn04types	Downward=Y
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting non_disc_disc
participants	changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

		corrected
עֲבָדִים מָשְׁלוּ בָנוּ	22.	(Lam 5,8)
פָּרַק אֵין מַיָּדָם:	23.	
Slaves rule over us,	22.	(Lam 5,8)
and there is no one who frees us from their hands.	23.	

syn04types	Ptcp<XQt1 preV1par00 preV2sub00 3rdP<1/2P Sfx<pngV 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc fronting_no_fronting indep_indep
participants	sfx_to_Pred sfx_to_Subj Subj_no_Subj chang- ing_speech_sit
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon_in_same_verseline end_of_strophe

Strictly speaking, 23 has been delimited and parsed incorrectly, as:

[<Cmpl> מִיָּדָם] [<NCop> אֵין] [<PreC> פִּרְק]

The pattern participle + אֵין + complement is very rare, in fact, the only other occurrence is Lam 4,4 (12):²

[<Cmpl> לָהֶם] [<NCop> אֵין] [<PreC> פִּרְק]

However, the present clause has an important extra complication: מִיָּדָם is not the complement to the אֵין-clause, as לָהֶם in Lam 4,4,³ but to פִּרְק.⁴ This makes the participle into a *verbal* predicate, and מִיָּדָם... פִּרְק into a discontinuous subject clause.⁵

In order to correctly register this, the following steps must be taken:

1. Delimitation of three clause atoms: פִּרְק, אֵין and מִיָּדָם.
2. Combination of פִּרְק and מִיָּדָם into a (discontinuous) clause.
3. Combination of אֵין and the discontinuous clause into a nominal clause.

Even though this construction may be entered into the *ETCBC* data manually,⁶ it would be impossible to display in two dimensions. The two alternatives:

$\Downarrow(?)$ [<PreC> פִּרְק] . 1. main of Subj clause, mother = 2.
 [<NCop> אֵין] $\Uparrow(?)$. . . 2 main, mother in preceding context
 [<Cmpl> מִיָּדָם] . . 3. cml. to Subj clause, mother = 1.

which misses the downward relation of clause atom¹ and blocks clause atom² from its mother clause, and:

²The usual pattern has אֵין at the front. So, e.g., in Lam 1,2.9.17.21.

³“There is no liberator for them.”

⁴“There is no one [who] liberates from their hand.”

⁵Or a predicate complement clause, in keeping with the *ETCBC* policy concerning אֵין-clauses. My point is, that this clause has constituent status within the larger אֵין-clause.

⁶Syn04types will not allow the user to make ‘crossing’ clause relations.

- [<PreC> פִּרְקָה] ↓ . . 1. main of Subj clause, mother = 2.
 [<NCop> אֵיךְ] . . 2. main, mother in preceding context
 [<Cmpl> מִיָּדָם: ↑(?). . 3. cml. to Subj clause, mother = 1.

which blocks clause atom³ from its mother clause, are both inadequate.

Annotation 5.11

	עֲבָדִים מְשָׁלוּ בָנוּ	22.	proposed (Lam 5,8)
	<...>		
	בִּנְפִשָּׁנוּ נָבִיא לַחֲמֵנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר:	24.	(Lam 5,9)
	Slaves rule over us,	22.	(Lam 5,8)
	<...>		
	We risk our lives to get our bread because of the sword in the desert.	24.	(Lam 5,9)

syn04types	xYq0<XQt1 preVlpar00 B...//...B numV<numV pngV<Sfx NPd2<0 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc front- ing_no_fronting indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj diff_verb_png verb_to_other verb_to_sfx
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_first_to_other whole_verseline

	יְתוּמִים הָיִינוּ	8.	corrected (Lam 5,3)
	<...>		
	בִּנְפִשָּׁנוּ נָבִיא לַחֲמֵנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר:	24.	(Lam 5,9)
	We have become orphans,	8.	(Lam 5,3)
	<...>		
	We risk our lives to get our bread because of the sword in the desert.	24.	(Lam 5,9)

syn04types	xYq0<XQt1 preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Sfx<pngV NPd2<0 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj same_verb_png no_Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	strophe_first_to_first new_strophe stro- phe_to_strophe whole_verseline

What prompts the start of a new unit here, is the occurrence of the xYq0 clause,

at strophe opening. Had it occurred at the end of a strophe, I would probably have interpreted it as a closure.

Also, the participant references return to 1 sg after a section (a strophe) in which third person participants are the subjects, with ‘us’ in suffixes.

Annotation 5.12

		proposed
	עוֹרְנוּ כְּתִנּוֹר נִכְמְרוּ מִפְּנֵי זֶלְעָפוֹת רָעָב:	25. (Lam 5,10)
	נָשִׁים בְּצִיּוֹן עָנוּ	26. (Lam 5,11)
	Our skin is hot as an oven, from the scorch of hunger.	25. (Lam 5,10)
	Women are raped in Zion,	26. (Lam 5,11)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prevlpar00 3rdP<1/2P pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence disc_non_disc fronting_fronting indep_indep same_vt
participants	Subj_no_Subj changing_speech_sit cont_Subj new_nmpr_other same_verb_png
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

		corrected
	בְּנַפְשֵׁנוּ נִבְיָא לְחַמְנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר:	24. (Lam 5,9)
	< ... >	
	נָשִׁים בְּצִיּוֹן עָנוּ	26. (Lam 5,11)
	We risk our lives to get our bread because of the	24. (Lam 5,9)
	sword in the desert.	
	< ... >	
	Women are raped in Zion,	26. (Lam 5,11)

syn04types	xQt0<xYq0 prevlpar00 B...//...B 3rdP<1/2P numV<numV 0<NPd2
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_salience diff_sentence diff_vt disc_non_disc indep_indep no_fronting_fronting
participants	diff_verb_png new_nmpr_other changing_speech_sit no_Subj_no_Subj verb_to_other
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_first_to_first stro- phe_to_strophe

5.26 is the start of a unit in which only third person participants occur. This is why the participants label *changing_speech_situation* is assigned, but this is incorrect. At any rate, this unit is embedded within the larger unit of vs 2–18, which make up the (mostly *qatal*) litany with 1 pl references, that

forms the introduction of the prayer in Lam 5,19–22.

Annotation 5.13

proposed	
פְּנֵי זְקֵנִים לֹא נִהְדָּרוּ:	29. (Lam 5,12)
בַּחֹרִים טָחוּן נָשְׂאוּ	30. (Lam 5,13)
elders are not respected.	29. (Lam 5,12)
Young men take up the millstone;	30. (Lam 5,13)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B.colon_A.colon new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

corrected	
שָׂרִים בְּיָדָם נִתְּלוּ	28. (Lam 5,12)
<...>	
בַּחֹרִים טָחוּן נָשְׂאוּ	30. (Lam 5,13)
Princes are hung up by their hands,	28. (Lam 5,12)
<...>	
Young men take up the millstone;	30. (Lam 5,13)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prev1par00 pngV<pngV pngV<Sfx Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_clause_type same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_other

29 is a negative clause, and closes the verseline and the strophe;⁷ 30 starts a new verseline and is affirmative again. Negatives are not taken into account by my labels, except when both mother and daughter are negative.

⁷Note that the label *new_verseline* is omitted when *new_strophe* is also assigned, because the latter implies the former.

Annotation 5.14

		proposed
	נָשִׁים בְּצִיּוֹן עָנוּ 26.	(Lam 5,11)
	< ... >	
	וְנַעֲרִים בְּעֵץ כָּשָׁלוּ: 31.	(Lam 5,13)
	Women are raped in Zion, 26.	(Lam 5,11)
	< ... >	
	and boys stagger under loads of wood. 31.	(Lam 5,13)
syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 ParalPre01 B...//...B pngV<pngV Subj<0	
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt	
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png	
prosodic	diff_strophe strophe_other_to_first	

		corrected
	בַּחֲוָרִים טָחוּן נִשְׂאוּ 30.	(Lam 5,13)
	וְנַעֲרִים בְּעֵץ כָּשָׁלוּ: 31.	
	Young men take up the millstone; 30.	(Lam 5,13)
	and boys stagger under loads of wood. 31.	
syn04types	VBT<VBT Cocj<0 prevlpar00 pngV<pngV Subj<Subj	
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc_non_disc same_salience same_vt	
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png	
prosodic	A.colon.B.colon in.same.verseline parallel_Pred_Subj	

Annotation 5.15

		proposed
	וְנַעֲרִים בְּעֵץ כָּשָׁלוּ: 31.	(Lam 5,13)
	זְקֵנִים מִשְׁעַר שָׁבָתוּ 32.	(Lam 5,14)
	and boys stagger under loads of wood. 31.	(Lam 5,13)
	Elders have left the city gate, 32.	(Lam 5,14)

syn04types	VBT<VBT 0<Coc j preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	conj_async diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc non_disc same_salience same_vt
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc parallel_Pred_Subj

corrected

בַּחֲוֵרִים טָחוּן נִשְׂאוּ	30.	(Lam 5,13)
< ... >		
זְקֵנִים מִשְׁעַר שְׁבָתוֹ	32.	(Lam 5,14)
Young men take up the millstone;	30.	(Lam 5,13)
< ... >		
Elders have left the city gate,	32.	(Lam 5,14)

syn04types	VBT<VBT preVlpar00 pngV<pngV Subj<Subj
syntactic	asyn.conj_async same_clause_type asyn_async diff_sentence fronting_fronting indep_indep non_disc non_disc same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj new_indep_Subj same_verb_png
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj

30–31 are bound into a larger unit by -ו. Asyndetic 32, which opens a new verseline, connects to this larger unit as a whole.

Annotation 5.16**proposed**

בַּחֲוֵרִים מְנִינָתָם:	33.	(Lam 5,14)
שְׁבַת מְשׁוֹשׁ לִבָּנוּ	34.	(Lam 5,15)
young men their music.	33.	(Lam 5,14)
Joy has left our hearts;	34.	(Lam 5,15)

syn04types	ZQtX<Ellp preVlpar00 preV2sub00 1/2P<3rdP NPd2<0 Subj<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_async defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	Subj_Subj changing_speech_sit
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

	corrected	
בְּנַפְשֵׁנוּ נִבִּיא לַחֲמֵנוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב הַמִּדְבָּר:	24.	(Lam 5,9)
	< ... >	
שִׁבַּת מְשׁוּשׁ לִבֵּנוּ	34.	(Lam 5,15)
We risk our lives to get our bread because of the	24.	(Lam 5,9)
sword in the desert.		
	< ... >	
Joy has left our hearts;	34.	(Lam 5,15)

syn04types	ZQtX<xYq0 preV1par00 preV2sub00 Sfx<pngV Npd2<Npd2 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	new_secondary_part sfx_to_Pred diff_verb_png no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_first_to_first stro- phe_to_strophe

The return of 1 pl references is the main reason to connect 34 all the way back to 24.

Annotation 5.17

	proposed	
נִפְלָה עֲטֶרֶת רֹאשֵׁנוּ	36.	(Lam 5,16)
אֵוִי-נָא לָנוּ	37.	
The crown has fallen from our head.	36.	(Lam 5,16)
Woe to us,	37.	

syn04types	NmCl<ZQtX 0<Npd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	Attr_clause asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

	corrected	
שִׁבַּת מְשׁוּשׁ לִבֵּנוּ	34.	(Lam 5,15)
	< ... >	
אֵוִי-נָא לָנוּ	37.	(Lam 5,16)
Joy has left our hearts;	34.	(Lam 5,15)
	< ... >	
Woe to us,	37.	(Lam 5,16)

syn04types	NmCl<ZQtX 0<NPd2 0<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	diff_sentence asyn_async disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	sfx_to_sfx Subj_no_Subj
prosodic	diff_verseline end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe end_of_strophe

The exclamation in 37 is difficult to place in the syntactic hierarchy, because apart from its 1 pl references, the clause has no syntactic connections to its preceding context; it literally is an interjection, thrown into and interrupting the discourse.

Its highly discursive nature would seem to place it on the same level as the imperatives in vs 1 and vs 21. However, both these discursive sections are connected with the vocative YHWH, which is missing here. Moreover, its placement in the B-colon of a verseline which does *not* close a larger unit (vs 17–18 continue the unit, both prosodically and syntactically), suggests that it is bound to its direct surroundings.

These surroundings can either be the immediately preceding 36 or the entire string of three 0QtX clauses 3436. The verseline structure would seem to plead for a close connection of this B-colon to its A-colon; the obvious interruption of the dominant pattern pleads for a connection to the unit as a whole.

I have opted for the latter, although in fact the two are not mutually exclusive. The first verseline sets the norm: two parallel 0QtX clauses. The second verseline opens up the possibility for change, but this does not happen: Its first colon is another 0QtX, which makes the expectation of a fourth one in the B-colon almost inevitable. This expectation lends all the more power to the exclamation. It is also immediately clear—if the rhythm of two verselines per strophe had not already indicated this—that the strophe ends on this verseline.

Annotation 5.18

	proposed	
אִי־נָא לָנוּ	37.	(Lam 5,16)
	< ... >	
עַל־זֶה הָיָה דְּוָה לְבָנוּ	39.	(Lam 5,17)
Woe to us,	37.	(Lam 5,16)
	< ... >	
Because of this our hearts are sick,	39.	(Lam 5,17)

syn04types	xQtX<NmCl prevlsub00 NPd2<0 Subj<0 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience
participants	next_secondary_part no_Subj_Subj secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

שֶׁבֶת מְשׁוּשׁ לִבֵּנוּ 34. (Lam 5,15)

<...>

עַל־זֶה הָיָה דְּוָה לִבֵּנוּ 39. (Lam 5,17)

Joy has left our hearts; 34. (Lam 5,15)

<...>

Because of this our hearts are sick, 39. (Lam 5,17)

syn04types	VBT<VBT prevlpar00 ParalLex01 pngV<pngV NPd2<NPd2 Subj<Subj Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	same_vt asyn_asyn diff_sentence disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic no_fronting_no_fronting same_salience
participants	Subj_Subj next_secondary_part same_verb_png secondary_part sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	lexical_repetition strophe.to.strophe new_strophe parallel_Pred_Subj strophe_first_to_first

The unit 39–43 has strong internal syntactic cohesion, but it has few syntactic connections to its context. עַל־זֶה ('because of this') clearly has an internal, not an external reference. the only connections are the continued use of *qatal* forms and the repetition of the subject לִבֵּנוּ ('our heart', 34 and 39).

Nevertheless, these connections appear to be sufficient. The *qatal* forms would seem to preclude a connection to any clause before 34, because that clause signals that the xQt1 section has ended. A connection to the exclamation in 37 would be conceivable, but the recurrence of the subject 'my heart' and the start of a new strophe strongly suggest that a new unit starts here, which as a whole is connected to 34–38.

Annotation 5.19**proposed**

עַל־אֵלֶּה חָשְׁכוּ עֵינֵינוּ: 40. (Lam 5,17)

עַל הַר־צִיּוֹן 41. (Lam 5,18)

because of these things our eyes grow dim: 40. (Lam 5,17)

Because of Mount Zion, 41. (Lam 5,18)

syn04types	Ellp<xQtX ParalPre00 Elliptical <L...//...<L 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	asyn.asyn indep_dep main_defect main_ellipsis
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

corrected

עַל־זֶה הִיָּה דָּוִה לְבָנוּ 39. (Lam 5,17)

< ... >

עַל הַר־צִיּוֹן 41. (Lam 5,18)

Because of this our hearts are sick, 39. (Lam 5,17)

< ... >

Because of Mount Zion, 41. (Lam 5,18)

syn04types	Ellp<xQtX ParalPre00 Elliptical <L...//...<L 3rdP<1/2P 0<NPd2 0<Subj
syntactic	main_ellipsis asyn.asyn indep_dep main_defect same_sentence
participants	Subj_no_Subj new_nmpr_other
prosodic	new_verseline end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

The parallel עַל־זֶה / עַל־אַלֶּה clauses ('because of this / these ...') must first be combined; the elliptic עַל clause 41 is connected to the two of them. The verseline structure also makes this clear.

Annotation 5.20**proposed**

שָׁמֶם 42. (Lam 5,18)

שׁוֹעֲלִים הֶלְכוּ־בּוֹ: פ 43.

that lies desolate, 42. (Lam 5,18)

with jackals prowling over it. 43.

syn04types	XQt1<AjCl preV1sub00 0<Socj Sfx<pngV Subj<0
syntactic	conj.asyn dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj sfx_to_Pred
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon diff_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline

	corrected	
עַל הַר-צִיּוֹן	41.	(Lam 5,18)
	< ... >	
שׁוֹעֲלִים הֶלְכוּ-בּוֹ: פ	43.	
Because of Mount Zion,	41.	(Lam 5,18)
	< ... >	
with jackals prowling over it.	43.	

syn04types	XQt1<Ellp prevlpar00 Subj<0 NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn asyn_conj_asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence
participants	sfx.to.other new_indep_Subj no_Subj_Subj
prosodic	A_colon_B_colon end_of_strophe in_same_verseline to_multi_clause_colon

The connection to 41 is indisputable, because of the suffix on בּוֹ ('on it'), which refers to הַר-צִיּוֹן ('Mount Zion'). However, commentaries offer various syntactic interpretations of this connection, usually with little or no argumentation:

1. As straightforward indicative XQt1: clause: "Jackals roam around on her."⁸
2. As a second attributive clause (presumably with inherited -שׁ): "About Mount Zion, which lies devastated, on which jackals cavort."⁹
3. As the referent of עַל-אֵלֶּה (40), presumably with inherited עַל (41): "because of the desolate Mount Zion, because of the jackals which range there!"¹⁰ Renkema argues from parallelism between the verse lines, noting correspondence between Zion and הֵּ (‘this’, singular) and ‘jackals’ and אֵלֶּה (‘these’, plural).

All in all, I think that simple XQt1 is the most obvious interpretation. Renkema's parallelism is interesting, but I doubt whether it implies actual reference. Referring to Zion with הֵּ would be odd, because of its gender (הֵּ has masculine reference).¹¹ This does not dismiss Renkema's observation, but does makes it more abstract. The poet has used singular and plural as a literary tool, but this is of no relevance to the syntactic analysis here.

⁸"Schakale laufen auf ihm herum." Berges 2002, 271. Similarly also Hillers 1992, 156, and Berlin 2002, 115, who admits that this is the literal translation, but chooses to take 'a small syntactic liberty ... in order to better capture its meaning': "because of Mount Zion, so desolate that foxes roam around on it."

⁹"Über den Zionsberg, der wüßte daliegt, auf dem Schakale sich tummeln." Kraus 1983, 85.

¹⁰Renkema 1998, 574.

¹¹Joüon and Muraoka 1991, 36a.

As for a second attributive clause: This is in itself possible, but requires the assumption of an inherited -שׁ, while the clause is perfectly clear without it.

Annotation 5.21

		proposed	
	עַל הַר-צִיּוֹן	41.	(Lam 5,18)
		< ... >	
	אַתָּה יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם תִּשָּׁב	44.	(Lam 5,19)
	Because of Mount Zion,	41.	(Lam 5,18)
		< ... >	
	You, YHWH, reign forever;	44.	(Lam 5,19)
syn04types	XYqt<Ellp preVlpar00 1/2P<3rdP NPd1<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn.asyn defect_main dep_indep diff_sentence new_deictic		
participants	new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj		
prosodic	new_strophe strophe_first_to_other		
		corrected	
	זָכֹר	1.	(Lam 5,1)
		< ... >	
	אַתָּה יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם תִּשָּׁב	44.	(Lam 5,19)
	Remember,	1.	(Lam 5,1)
		< ... >	
	You, YHWH, reign forever;	44.	(Lam 5,19)
syn04types	XYqt<ZIm0 preVlpar00 pngV<pngV NPd1<0 Subj<0		
syntactic	asyn.asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep new_deictic same_salience		
participants	Voct.to.Voct new_indep_Subj new_nmpr_Subj new_prps no_Subj_Subj same_verb_png		
prosodic	strophe.to.strophe new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first		

Obviously, the direct and emphatic appeal to YHWH starts a new major section in the discourse. It is connected to the entire preceding section by way of the vocative YHWH.

Note that the *ETCBC* has not parsed the name as a vocative, but as an apposition to אַתָּה: 'You, YHWH, ...' Nevertheless, I have added this pattern (pers. pron. + proper noun as subject) to the definition of the clause atom label *has_Voct*, which in turn has triggered the clause atom pair label *Voct.to.Voct*.

Annotation 5.22

		proposed
	כְּסֵאָךָ לְדֹר וָדֹר:	45. (Lam 5,19)
	לָמָּה לִנְצַח תִּשְׁכַּחַנוּ	46. (Lam 5,20)
	your throne endures from generation to generation.	45. (Lam 5,19)
	Why would you always forget us?	46. (Lam 5,20)

syn04types	xYq0<NmCl Ques<0 L...//...L pngV<Sfx 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral		
syntactic	asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	disc_disc indep_indep new_interr same_salience
participants	Subj_no_Subj verb_to_sfx		
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon	diff_verseline	end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

		corrected
	אַתָּה יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם תִּשָּׁב	44. (Lam 5,19)
		< ... >
	לָמָּה לִנְצַח תִּשְׁכַּחַנוּ	46. (Lam 5,20)
	You, YHWH, reign forever;	44. (Lam 5,19)
		< ... >
	Why would you always forget us?	46. (Lam 5,20)

syn04types	VBT<VBT Ques<0 preV2sub01 L...//...L pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral		
syntactic	same_vt asyn_asyn	diff_sentence	disc_disc indep_indep new_interr same_salience
participants	cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj	same_verb_png	verb_to_prps
prosodic	new_verseline	end_of_strophe	end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe

Annotation 5.23

		proposed
	תַּעֲזֹבֵנוּ לְאַרְךָ יָמִים:	47. (Lam 5,20)
	הַשִּׁיבֵנוּ	48. (Lam 5,21)
	Why would you forsake us for all that time?	47. (Lam 5,20)
	Return us	48. (Lam 5,21)

syn04types	ZIm0<ZYq0 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_asyn dep_indep diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	B_colon_A_colon new_strophe strophe_first_to_other

corrected

אַתָּה יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם תִּשָּׁב 44. (Lam 5,19)

< ... >

הַשִּׁבֵנוּ 48. (Lam 5,21)

You, YHWH, reign forever; 44. (Lam 5,19)

< ... >

Return us 48. (Lam 5,21)

syn04types	ZIm0<XYqt prev1par00 prev2sub00 pngV<pngV 0<NPd1 0<Subj NoReferral
syntactic	asyn_asyn diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	Voct_to_Voct cont_Subj Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png verb_to_prps
prosodic	strophe_to_strophe new_strophe stro- phe_first_to_first

Annotation 5.24**proposed**

חֲדַשׁ יָמֵינוּ כְּקֶדֶם: 52. (Lam 5,21)

כִּי אִם־מָאֵס מְאֹסָתָנוּ 53. (Lam 5,22)

renew our days as of old; 52. (Lam 5,21)

for let it not be true that you completely reject us, 53. (Lam 5,22)

syn04types	xQt0<ZIm0 prev2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV 0<NPd2 Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn.conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	C_colon_A_colon diff_verseline end_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline_conc

	הַשִּׁיבֵנוּ	48.	corrected (Lam 5,21)
		< ... >	
	כִּי אִם-מָאֵס מְאַסְתָּנוּ	53.	(Lam 5,22)
	Return us	48.	(Lam 5,21)
		< ... >	
	for let it not be true that you completely reject us,	53.	(Lam 5,22)

syn04types	xQt0<ZIm0 preV2par00 Socj<0 pngV<pngV Sfx<Sfx
syntactic	asyn_conj diff_sentence diff_vt disc_disc indep_indep same_salience
participants	cont_Subj no_Subj_no_Subj same_verb_png sfx_to_sfx
prosodic	end_of_strophe end_to_start_of_strophe in_same_strophe new_verseline

In itself, Lam 5,21–22 could be parsed as two sentences, each one consisting of an imperative with a dependent clause connected by a conjunction:

Bring us back to you, YHWH,
and we will return.
Renew our days as in earlier times,
unless you reject us forever,
rage against us without measure.

However, the rhythm of the verselines strongly suggests, as do indeed the semantics of the verse, that the two imperatives need to be combined into a unit first, and that **כִּי אִם** ('or', 'unless', 'but', see below) connects to this unit as a whole. For the interpretation of **כִּי אִם** + *qatal* in 53, see p. 258ff. in the dissertation.

Bibliography

- Albrektson, B. (1963). *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations. With a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text*, Volume 21 of *Studia Theologica Lundensia*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Berges, U. (2002). *Klagelieder*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder.
- Berlin, A. (2002). *Lamentations*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox.
- Bosman, H. J. (1996). Weer durven klagen. *Schrift* 164, 60–62.
- Dyk, J. W. and E. Talstra (2014). Deportation or forgiveness in Hosea 1.6? Verb valence patterns and translation proposal. *The Bible Translator* 65(3), 235–279. DOI: 10.1177/2051677014554389.
- Erwich, C. and E. Talstra (2017). The text as our teacher. Participant tracking in Psalm 64. In B. J. Koet and A. L. H. M. van Wieringen (Eds.), *Multiple Teachers in Biblical Texts*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Gesenius, W., E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley (1990). *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (20 ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gottwald, N. K. (1962). *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (2nd rev. ed.), Volume 14 of *Studies in Biblical Theology*. London: SCM Press.
- Hillers, D. R. (1992). *Lamentations* (2nd rev. ed.), Volume 7A of *The Anchor Bible*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday&Company.
- Hummel, H. D. (1959). Enclitic *Mem* in early northwest semitic, especially Hebrew. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76.
- Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka (1991). *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Kalkman, G. J. (2015a). *Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Poetry. Poetic Freedom or Linguistic System?* 's Hertogenbosch: Box Press.
- Kalkman, G. J. (2015b). jupyter notebook: Biblical Hebrew analysis. <https://tinyurl.com/KalkmanPhD> (accessed 2018-12-01).

- Kingham, C. (2017). ETCBC website: Data Creation.
<http://www.etcbc.nl/datacreation> (accessed 2018-12-01).
- Kraus, H. J. (1983). *Klagelieder (Threni)* (4 ed.), Volume 20 of *Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Leene, H. (1987). *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen bij Deuterojesaja*. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Leene, H. (1993). Kan een fictionele gestalte onze plaats innemen? Overwegingen bij de uitleg van Jesaja 53. *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift* 93, 232–253.
- Lunn, N. P. (2006). *Word-Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry. Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Niccacci, A. (1990). *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Volume 86 of *JSOT Supplement Series*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Provan, I. W. (1991). Past, present and future in Lamentations III 52-66: The case for a precativ perfect re-examined. *Vetus Testamentum* 41.2, 164–175.
- Renkema, J. (1988). The literary structure of Lamentations. In W. van der Meer and J. C. de Moor (Eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry*, Volume 74 of *JSOT Supplement Series*, pp. 294–396. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *Klaagliederen*. Commentaar op het Oude Testament. Kampen: J. H. Kok.
- Renkema, J. (1998). *Lamentations*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters. Translated from *Klaagliederen* (1993) by Brian Doyle.
- Rudolph, W. (1962). *Das Buch Ruth – Das Hohe Lied – Die Klagelieder*, Volume 17 of *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Salters, R. B. (2014). *Lamentations. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. International Critical Commentary. London: Bloomsbury.
- Schneider, W. (1985). *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch* (6 ed.). München: Claudius Verlag. (first edition 1974).
- Talstra, E. (1999). Reading Biblical Hebrew poetry. Linguistic structure or rhetorical device? *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25,2, 101–126.
- Talstra, E. (2016). Approaching the mountain of Exodus 19: thou shalt explore syntax first. *HIPHIL* 3, issue 1, 2–24.

<https://hiphil.org/index.php/hiphil/article/view/73/64>
(accessed 2018-12-01).

- Tull Willey, P. (1997). *Remember the Former Things. The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, Volume 161 of *SBL Dissertation Series*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- van der Woude, A. (2005). *Geschiedenis van de Terugkeer. De rol van Jesaja 40, 1-11 in het drama van Jesaja 40-55*. Maastricht: Shaker.
- van Grol, H. W. M. (2015). *Een inleiding in de klassiek Hebreeuwse versbouw. Verkenningen op het gebied van versbouw en textsyntaxis*, Volume 11 of *Theologische Perspectieven*. Bergambacht: 2VM.
- van Grol, H. W. M. (2017). *Een parallel syntagma. Verkenningen in het grensgebied van versbouw en textsyntaxis*, Volume 10 of *Theologische Perspectieven*. Bergambacht: 2VM.
- Vlaardingerbroek, J. (1999). *Klaagliederen. Een praktische bijbelverklaring*. Kampen: Kok.
- Waltke, B. K. and M. O'Connor (1990). *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Chapter 6

Lists and Indexes

List of Figures

List of Tables

3.1	Lam 3, communicational structure	191
-----	--	-----

List of MQL queries

2.1	איב (sg) with plural verb	138
3.1	Query: 3rd to 2nd person shift in Way0-Way0 pairs	159
3.2	Infc clause as subject to a nominal clause	159
3.3	ל-infc as preceding daughter to ראה	176
3.4	ל-infc as following daughter to ראה	176

List of clause type abbreviations¹

ZQt0	Zero-qatal-null clause	ZImX	Zero-imperative-X clause
ZQtX	Zero-qatal-X clause	XImp	X-imperative clause
XQt1	X-qatal clause	xIm0	x-imperative-null clause
xQt0	x-qatal-null clause	xImX	x-imperative-X clause
xQtX	x-qatal-X clause	WIm0	We-imperative-null clause
WQt0	We-qatal-null clause	WImX	We-imperative-X clause
WQtX	We-qatal-X clause	WXIm	We-X-imperative clause
WXQt	We-X-qatal clause	WxI0	We-x-imperative-null clause
WxQ0	We-x-qatal-null clause	WxIX	We-x-imperative-X clause
WxQX	We-x-qatal-X clause	InfC	Infinitive construct clause
ZYq0	Zero-yiqtol-null clause	InfA	Infinitive absolute clause
ZYqX	Zero-yiqtol-X clause	Ptcp	Participle clause
XYqt	X-yiqtol clause	NmCl	Nominal clause
xYq0	x-yiqtol-null clause	AjCl	Adjective clause
xYqX	x-yiqtol-X clause	Voct	Vocative clause
WYq0	We-yiqtol-null clause	CPen	Casus pendens
WYqX	We-yiqtol-X clause	Ellp	Ellipsis
WXYq	We-X-yiqtol clause	MSyn	Macrosyntactic sign
WxY0	We-x-yiqtol-null clause	Reop	Reopening
WxYX	We-x-yiqtol-X clause	XPos	Extraposition
Way0	Wayyiqtol-null clause	Defc	Defective clause atom
WayX	Wayyiqtol-X clause	Unkn	Unknown
ZIm0	Zero-imperative-null clause		

¹Taken from Kingham 2017, with different sorting.

Index of authors

- Albrektson, B. – 125, 240
Berges, U. – 8, 69, 154, 155, 158, 180,
199, 211, 214, 234, 246, 247,
249, 251, 257, 261, 283
Berlin, A. – 8, 39, 55, 59, 69, 70, 121,
123, 128, 140, 158, 166, 170,
175, 180, 192, 199, 211, 214,
223, 234, 240, 247, 249, 250,
261, 283
Bosman, H. J. – 190, 191
Dyk, J. W. and E. Talstra – 154
Erwich, C. and E. Talstra – 109
Gesenius, W., E. Kautzsch, and A. E.
Cowley – 7
Gottwald, N. K. – 125
Hillers, D. R. – 7, 39, 55, 70, 123, 125,
154, 155, 158, 170, 180, 192,
199, 211, 214, 223, 240, 247,
249, 250
Hummel, H. D. – 154
Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka – 130, 283
Kalkman, G. J. – 46, 72, 73, 102, 112,
133, 134
Kraus, H. J. – 8, 211, 261, 283
Leene, H. – 191
Lunn, N. P. – 186
Niccacci, A. – 72, 102, 145
Provan, I. W. – 199, 200
Renkema, J. – 8, 40, 69, 85, 90, 104,
123, 154, 158, 168, 180, 192,
211, 212, 228, 233, 240, 247,
249, 250, 283
Rudolph, W. – 199
Salters, R. B. – 105
Schneider, W. – 152, 236, 247
Talstra, E. – 65, 109
Tull Willey, P. – 191
van Grol, H. W. M. – 11, 93, 121, 134,
174
van der Woude, A. – 191
Vlaardingerbroek, J. – 180, 212
Waltke, B. K. and M. O'Connor – 7

Index of references to Biblical texts

Num	1,6 – 228
22,6 – 240	6,5 – 228
Deut	Lam
5,23 – 155	1,1–11 – 54, 55
Judg	1,1c – 4
6,17 – 228	1,1 – 8
1 Sam	1,2.9.17.21 – 273
12,11 – 155	1,3–4 – 83
15,22 – 158	1,3 – 83
2 Sam	1,4.1 – 21
17,17 – 175	1,4b–cA – 4
1 Kgs	1,4 – 20
8,47 – 162	1,5 – 20
Isa	1,6 – 22, 91
44,9 – 232	1,9c.11c.17 – 185
44,19 – 162	1,9c – 4
46,8 – 162	1,9 – 34, 39, 55
Jer	1,10 – 34
49,35 – 84	1,11 – 55
Amos	1,12–15 – 51
5,18–20 – 71	1,12.15 – 71
Ps	1,12 – 59, 108
118,8 – 168	1,16 – 249
118,9 – 168	1,17 – 55
Prov	1,18–19 – 58
17,26 – 158	1,20 – 64, 66
25,27 – 158	1,21 – 71
Job	2,1–5 – 89
10,8 – 155	2,1–6 – 81
14,19–20 – 155	2,1.16–17.21.22 – 71
39,13–17 – 216	2,1 – 92
Cant	2,2 – 92
	2,4–5 – 90
	2,5–6 – 91
	2,5 – 92
	2,6b – 92
	2,6 – 91
	2,7–10 – 92
	2,7 – 92

- 2,8 – 92
 2,9 – 92
 2,11–13 – 105
 2,11 – 105, 109
 2,12 – 109
 2,13 – 104, 105, 112
 2,14–17 – 112
 2,16 – 249
 2,18–19 – 124
 2,19c – 124
 2,19 – 128
 2,20 and 22 – 175
 2,20–22 – 134
 2,20 – 128
 3,1–18 – 158, 174, 200
 3,16–18 – 157
 3,18b – 124
 3,21 – 162
 3,25–30 – 180
 3,31–39 – 180
 3,34–36 – 175
 3,40–41 – 180
 3,46 – 249
 3,52–54 – 200
 3,56–61 – 199
 3,64–66 – 200
 3,64 – 199
 3,66 – 175
 4,1–11 – 233
 4,1–2 – 233
 4,1 – 8, 233, 280
 4,2 – 214
 4,3–5 – 219, 227, 233
 4,3–6 – 233
 4,3–8 – 227
 4,3 – 218, 227, 250
 4,4–5 – 218
 4,4 – 227, 273
 4,5 – 227
 4,6 and 11 – 234
 4,6, 11, 16 and 20 – 246
 4,6 – 227, 233, 234, 250
 4,7–11 – 233
 4,7–8 – 227
 4,7–9 – 233
 4,7 – 225, 227
 4,8 – 227
 4,9 and 10 – 233
 4,9–10 – 227
 4,9 – 227, 230
 4,10–11 – 233
 4,10 – 108, 227
 4,11–16 – 234
 4,11 – 227, 233–235, 257
 4,12–20 – 234
 4,12 – 246
 4,13 – 234, 240
 4,14–15 – 243
 4,14–16 – 234
 4,14 – 240
 4,16 – 234, 257
 4,17–18 – 280
 4,17–20 – 250
 4,20 – 256
 4,21 – 261, 280
 4,22 – 108
 5,2–18 – 275
 5,19–22 – 276
 5,21–22 – 287
- Eccl
 2,18 – 228
 2,22 – 228
 3,18 – 228
 8,1 – 211
 12,12 – 158