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Abstract

This study takes as its point of departure the view that 4QLam, one of the manuscripts of Lamentations from Qumran, holds great significance for both text-critics and exegetes who study Lamentations. To illustrate the significance of the manuscript, this study analyses the wordings of Lamentations 1:8 in 4QLam and the Masoretic text text-critically and provides interpretive comments on the differences between the two Hebrew textual representatives. In this regard, the study focuses on the variant readings 𐤀𐤇𐤉𐤁 and 𐤀𐤇𐤉𐤁𐤀𐤇𐤉 לוקח.
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Introduction

Since the discovery of the first Dead Sea scrolls in 1947 more than 200 manuscripts of the writings included in the Hebrew Bible have been found in the eleven caves at Qumran and other sites in the Judean desert.¹ Four of these manuscripts are scrolls of Lamentations. Caves 3 and 4 contained one Lamentations manuscript each (3QLam and 4QLam), while two Lamentations manuscripts were recovered from cave 5 (5QLam⁴ and 5QLam⁵). The two fragments of 3QLam preserve individual words from Lamentations 1:10-12 and Lamentations 3:53-62.² 4QLam⁶ presents portions of the fourth and fifth chapters of Lamentations: Lamentations 4:5-8 (fragment 1 column I); Lamentations 4:11-15 (fragment 1 column II); Lamentations 4:15-20 (fragment 1 column III); Lamentations 4:20-5:3 (fragment 1 column IV); Lamentations 5:4-12 (fragment 1 column V); and Lamentations 5:12-17 (fragment 1 column VI).³ The other manuscript from cave 5 exists only in one fragment with words from Lamentations 4:17-20.⁴ 4QLam is the largest of the four manuscripts of Lamentations from Qumran. To illustrate the significance of the manuscript, this study analyses the wordings of Lamentations 1:8 in 4QLam and the Masoretic text text-critically and provides interpretive comments on the differences between the two Hebrew textual representatives. In this regard, the study focuses on the variant readings 𐤀𐤇𐤉𐤁𐤀𐤇𐤉atori and 𐤀𐤇𐤉𐤁𐤀𐤇𐤉ープ.

¹ The ages of the scriptural manuscripts among the Dead Sea scrolls range from the third century BCE to the second century CE (Tov 2010:151-155). They are, therefore, the oldest textual representatives of the Hebrew Bible writings in the original languages and provide invaluable evidence for (1) the shape of these documents as they circulated in the centuries immediately before and after the turn of the common era; (2) the composition and transmission of the scriptural writings (Ulrich 2010:209-225); and (3) the practices employed by scribes in the production of the scrolls (Tov 2004). The Qumran discoveries in particular have supplied text-critics with new data concerning the textual history of the writings of the Hebrew Bible. At the same time, the data have led to shifts in the aims and procedures of textual criticism. On these matters, see, for example, Hendel (2010:281-302); Van der Kooij (2002:167-177); Tov (2012).

² Cf. Baillet (1962:95). The manuscript was unruled and seems to have been arranged stichographically (Tov 2004:168, 170). It is dated to the period between 30 BCE and 68 CE on the basis of its Herodian script (Webster 2002:421).

³ Cf. Milik (1962a:174-177). This manuscript was not ruled or written in cola. Its late Herodian script allows it to be dated to the middle of the first century CE (Webster 2002:432).

⁴ Cf. Milik (1962b:177-178). To judge from the arrangement of the words that have survived on the manuscript, this scroll was written stichographically with two bicola per line (Tov 2004:168, 170). Milik (1962b:177)
Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran. Three unruled columns of writing are preserved on three of its fragments. Together these three columns present portions of Lamentations 1:1-18. A few words of Lamentations 2:5 appear on the fourth small fragment from a later part of the same scroll.

The importance of these four Qumran manuscripts for the study of the text and content of Lamentations should not be underestimated. 4QLam, in particular, is important for both exegesis and textual criticism. The wording of Lamentations 1:1-18 in this manuscript often diverge from the wording of the MT. These variant readings include orthographical variants, individual textual variants (scribal changes to wording and scribal errors), as well as isolated ‘interpretative insertions’. The result is that the content of the verses from Lamentations 1 in 4QLam are sometimes very different from the content of these verses in the MT. This fact should be of special interest to the exegete (Kotzé 2011:605-607).

4QLam also holds great value for the text-critic, because it preserves a number of readings that are more original than the readings in the Masoretic text (MT) and opens new vistas on the readings in the ancient translations of Lamentations. The purpose of this study is to illustrate the significance of 4QLam for the text-critic and the exegete by means of an analysis of the wording of Lamentations 1:8, and the first bicolon in particular, as it is represented by the Qumran manuscript and the MT. The analysis will, first, provide a transcription and translation of the two Hebrew textual representatives of the verse. This is followed by introductory comments on the differences between 4QLam and the MT. The wordings of Lamentations 1:8a in the MT and 4QLam will subsequently be subjected to a brief text-critical examination. In this regard, the reading in 4QLam and its counterpart in the MT, הָיִה הלי, are singled out for closer investigation. The analysis will conclude with interpretive comments on how these variant readings affect the content of the bicolon in the two Hebrew versions.

Lamentations 1:8 in the Masoretic Text and 4QLam

4QLam

Fragment 2 Column II lines 5-7

points out that the handwriting of 5QLam is of the same type as that of 5QLam. Nevertheless, the same scribe did not copy both manuscripts.

For a text-critical evaluation of the four Lamentations manuscripts from Qumran, see Schäfer (2000:127-147).

This view is corroborated by a recent study on the wordings of Lamentations 1:7 in 4QLam and the MT (Kotzé 2011:590-611).

The differences in wording between 4QLam and the MT are summarised in an appendix at the end of this study.

According to Cross (2000:229), the orthography of 4QLam is of a “late ‘full’ Palestinian type that began to develop in Maccabean times and continued in use into the Herodian era”. Tov (2004:339), however, indicates that this manuscript shares the morphological and orthographic peculiarities that are characteristic of what he labels the ‘Qumran scribal practice’. On the orthographic and morphological features of the Qumran scribal practice, see Tov (2004:266-270).

Ulrich (2010:219) defines these insertions as follows: “Learned scribes occasionally inserted into the text they were copying additional material that they considered valuable … We could envison these insertions as marginal readings, footnotes, helpful or pious thoughts, chronological updates, etc., now entered into the text”.

http://scriptura.journals.ac.za/
Jerusalem sinned greatly, therefore she became a 'wanderer'. [ ] who [ ] her despised, because they saw her [nak]edness. Also [ ] away.

MT

Jerusalem sinned greatly; therefore she became (morally) impure. All those who honour her despised her because they saw her nakedness. She also groans and turned away.

Apart from the orthographical variants, the wording of Lamentations 1:8 preserved in 4QLam exhibits three differences when compared to the wording of the MT (as represented by Codex Leningradensis). In the manuscript from Qumran, the opening word, הַדְּתֵית, has the form of an infinitive absolute, while in the MT, it is taken as a noun, which constitutes an internal object (figura etymologica) with the verb הָפַךְּהַהָפַךְּה. Since both the infinitive absolute and the internal object serve to 'strengthen the verbal idea' (Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley 1910:367), the meaning of the initial clause of Lamentations 1:8 (an emphasis on the severe nature of Jerusalem’s sin) is similar in the two Hebrew versions of the verse. The MT contains the reading לִיְהַדְתֵּית, whereas the corresponding wording in 4QLam reads לִיְהַדְתֵּית. This is an important variant, because לִיְהַדְתֵּית might very well be more original than its counterpart in the MT (see below). The third difference between the wordings of this verse in the MT and 4QLam is found in the second bicolon. Even though ink traces are all that are left of the first three letters of the verb הָלַהוֹ in 4QLam, the final waw is clearly visible on the manuscript. This means that the word was written without the third-person feminine pronominal suffix (cf. הָלַהוֹ in the MT). There does not seem to be anything in the vicinity of the reading that could have caused the scribal error. The minus of the suffix therefore strikes me as an accidental omission. Perhaps the scribe that copied 4QLam, or a predecessor, simply suffered a lapse in concentration.

The following analysis focuses on the second of these three differences in wording of the MT and the Qumran manuscript. After an overview of the different interpretations of the difficult reading לִיְהַדְתֵּית in the MT, the analysis will examine the ancient translations and determine whether the reading לִיְהַדְתֵּית in 4QLam sheds light on any of the translation equivalents. The analysis will subsequently indicate how לִיְהַדְתֵּית in the MT could have developed from לִיְהַדְתֵּית and, therefore, why the reading preserved in 4QLam qualifies as the original text.

10 With regard to the infinitive absolute in 4QLam Lamentations 1:8, the narrator asserts that Jerusalem sinned. The factuality of this claim is assumed (cf. Lamentations 1:5) and therefore the infinitive absolute describes the intensity of the action.

11 Schäfer (2004:55) characterises לִיְהַדְתֵּית in 4QLam as an assimilation to the standard form of the expression in Biblical Hebrew, but Hobbins (2006:19) argues that it is the lecture difficile and semantically more suitable than the reading לִיְהַדְתֵּית in the MT.

12 It is possible that the manuscript from which 4QLam was copied already contained the reading without the suffix. It should be noted, however, that there are a few scribal errors in 4QLam that probably originated with the copyist of this manuscript. These include dittography, wrong word division and minuses. At Lamentations 1:6, the negative particle וה in the MT was copied as וה in 4QLam. Schäfer was responsible for the lack of the words מִכְּחָה in 4QLam’s wording of Lamentations 1:7 and the long minus at Lamentations 1:10-11 (the words מִכְּחָה are missing from 4QLam).
Lamentations 1:8a in the Wordings of the Masoretic Text and 4QLam: a Text-Critical Analysis

In the MT is a *hapax legomenon*. It has elicited different interpretations from scholars. Some text-critics and commentators see הָדְנֵי as a spelling variant of הָדְנ (‘menstrual impurity’). Proponents of this view often refer to words and images in the immediate context to substantiate their interpretation of הָדְנ. Provan (1991:44), for example, mentions הָדְנ (‘her nakedness’) in verse 8b and הָדְנ (‘her impurity’) in verse 9a as two terms in the vicinity of הָדְנ which are used elsewhere in the OT, often closely associated with נִדְדָה, in statements about ritual cleanness and uncleanness (italics in the original). In his opinion, the prohibition in Leviticus 18:19 is of particular interest in this regard, because all three words (םִנְדַ נִדְדָה, מְדָנָא) appear in this passage: “You shall not approach a woman to uncover her nakedness while she is in the impurity of her uncleanness”. These associations give rise to the view that Lamentations 1:8 portrays the personified city of Jerusalem as a menstruating woman in her state of ritual impurity. The main objection against such an interpretation is that it creates a problematic link between the ritual impurity of a woman in her period and sin. The opening bicolon of MT Lamentations 1:8 states that Jerusalem sinned greatly and that this is the reason why she became הָדְנ. Berlin (2002:54-55) points out that menstruation causes a woman to become ritually, but not morally impure. Furthermore, a state of ritual uncleanness is not brought about by sin. Berlin therefore argues that הָדְנ in the MT should be derived from the root הָד meaning ‘to wander’. Accordingly, she translates Lamentations 1:8 as follows: “Grievously has Jerusalem sinned, therefore has she been banished” (Berlin 2002:42). Salters (2010:61) remarks that such an interpretation does not fit the context of the verse and Boase (2006:176) thinks that the images of shame, being despised by others, nakedness and impurity in verses 8-9 rule out Berlin’s suggested interpretation. Parry (2010:51) also regards this interpretation as suspect and notes that it is the people of Jerusalem who are banished and go into exile, not the personified city.

Several scholars propose a third interpretation of הָדְנ. Like Berlin, they relate to this word to הָד. However, they ascribe a different meaning to the verbal root. In addition to its sense of ‘to wander’, הָד can mean ‘to waver’, ‘to shake’ and ‘to move to and fro’. In Jeremiah 18:16, Jeremiah 48:27 and Psalm 64:9, the hiphil and hitpolel forms of הָד express the idea of shaking the head as a mocking (or sympathetic) gesture. The phrase הָדְנ מִדָּה in Psalm 44:15 has a similar meaning (‘object of head-nodding’). Those scholars who advocate the third interpretation of הָדְנ suggest that it should be understood along these lines.

---

13 The analysis follows an approach to textual criticism in which the various textual representatives of a Hebrew Bible writing are treated as witnesses to the content of the writing. This approach stresses the analytical aspect of the text-critical procedure insofar as its main aim is to determine how the readings in the textual representatives were created during the processes of transmission (copying and translation). For the purposes of the analysis, the following editions of textual representatives are used: 4QLam: Cross (2000:229-237); MT: *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (Schäfer 2004:54-72, 113*-136*), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Elliger and Rudolph 1977) and the third edition of Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica* (Kittel 1937); Septuagint: Ziegler (1976) and Rahlfs (2006); Peshitta: Albrektson (1963); Vulgate: Weber (2007); Western recension of Targum: Levine (1976); Yemenite recension of Targum: Van der Heide (1981).

14 Delitzsch (1920:35); Albrektson (1963:63-64).


16 Brown, Driver and Briggs (1906:622); Koehler and Baumgartner (1958:96-597).


18 Brown, Driver and Briggs (1906:626); Koehler and Baumgartner (1958:600).
lines. The text would then indicate that Jerusalem became an object of derision as a result of her great sin. Even though this interpretation of ḫāmīm can boast the support of the mediaeval Jewish exegete Ibn Ezra, other exegetes and modern-day critics remain unconvinced.

The ancient translations of Lamentations also exhibit a variety of different readings for Lamentations 1:8a. The Septuagint reads διὰ τοῦτο εἰς σάλον ἐγένετο (‘therefore, she became unsteady’). If the Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek translation contained the reading ḫāmīm, the translator obviously related the hapax legomenon τὸ σάλον in its sense of ‘to move to and fro’/‘to wander’. However, the fact that ḫāmīm is found in 4QLam raises the possibility that the Greek translator’s Vorlage also contained this reading. The image in the Septuagint may hint at political instability. LXX Lamentations 1:8a would then imply that Jerusalem suffers the distress of political turmoil because of her sin. The Vulgate exhibits the same interpretation as the Greek translation: propter ea instabilis facta est (‘therefore, she has been made unsteady’). Jerome might have struggled with the hapax legomenon ḫāmīm in his Hebrew text and translated with the help of the Septuagint or the Vetus Latina. The Aramaic translation in both the Western and Yemenite recensions of the Targum depicts Jerusalem as a wanderer (ḇekhaṭal ḫāmīm). This means that ḫāmīm was derived from the root רחא in Lamentations 1:17. The translator either interpreted ḫāmīm in verse 8 as a variant form of רחא, or the Hebrew Vorlage on which the Syriac translation was based contained this reading. The matter is moot, but Albrektsson (1963:63) and Schäfer (2004:115*) share the view that the Syriac translator probably interpreted the reading in his Vorlage as a variant form of רחא. The reading ḫāmīm might also have been present in the Hebrew manuscripts used that were used by Aquila and Symmachus. Like the Peshitta, the translation equivalents in these versions witness to interpretations of ḫāmīm in accordance with meanings of רחא.

Furthermore, some of the mediaeval Masoretic

19 Cf. Berges (2002:89); Hunter (1996:127); Westermann (1994:112-113); Hillers (1992:70); Kraus (1983:29); Rudolph (1938:102); Perles (1922:85); Gordis (1974:155) thinks that it might have been the poet’s intention to express both the meanings ‘unclean’ and ‘object of scorn’ by means of ḫāmīm. This suggestion presupposes that the form of the word that is found in Codex Leningradensis is the original reading.

20 Cf. the comments of Albrektsson (1963:63-64). Rashi, another well-known Jewish interpreter, sees in ḫāmīm a reference to the exile (Salters 2010:60), while the midrash in Lamentations Rabbah 1.8 §35 explains ḫāmīm in terms of the root רחא’s meaning ‘to wander’ (Cohen 1961:109).


23 Cf. Schäfer (2004:115*) and Cross (2000:233; 1983:141). Interestingly, 4QLam was copied at a time very close to the time usually posited for the translation of Lamentations into Greek. LXX Lamentations is generally dated to the middle of the first century BCE or the middle of the first century CE on the grounds that it forms part of the kaige group of translations and revisions (Hirsch-Luipold and Maier 2011:2831). Youngblood (2011:66) proposes that a “careful comparison of LXX Lamentations’s translation technique with other members of the Kaige-Theodotion group, other non-Kaige translation units within the LXX tradition, and other revisers such as Aquila suggests that LXX Lamentations fits somewhere between 50 BCE and 100 CE”. 4QLam was written in a semi-formal Herodian script. Therefore, it is assigned a date between 30 BCE and 1 CE (Webster 2002:412).

24 The Old Latin reading of Lamentations 1:8 is not recorded in Sabatier’s edition (1743:724), but Assan-Dhôte notes that it follows the Septuagint and has the reading instabilis (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine 2005:201).

25 The versions attributed to Aquila and Symmachus are markedly different from the reading in LXX Lamentations. According to the readings recorded in the margin of the Syrohexapla (Ceriani 1874:140 [recto]), the version of Aquila reads כלאמה כלאמה (‘therefore, [she became] one who is separated’). The
manuscripts provide evidence that היה נני was treated as an orthographical variant of יה נני. Keil (1872:564) refers to manuscripts collated by Kennicott that read יה נני instead of יה נני, while the critical apparatus of Kittel’s Biblia Hebraica mentions eight Masoretic manuscripts collected by Ginsberg that have the reading יה נני at Lamentations 1:8 and not יה נני. At the end of MT Lamentations 1:17 the apparatus of Biblia Hebraica also indicates that five of Kennicott’s manuscripts have the variant reading יה נני. With regard to Lamentations 1:8, it seems that a scribe changed the lectio difficilior יה נני into יה נני at some stage during the transmission history of the Hebrew text.26 In another copy, a scribe wrote יה נני instead of יה נני at Lamentations 1:17, possibly under the influence of the fuller spelling of the reading in verse 8.

Turning to יה נני in 4QLam, Cross (2000:233; 1983:141) argues cogently that this is a more original reading than יה נני in the MT. This presupposes that the reading in the MT developed from the one witnessed to by the Qumran manuscript. First, Cross suggests that יה נני came into being under the influence of יה נני in Lamentations 1:17. Secondly, the he at the end of יה נני can be explained as a dittograph of the initial he of the next word, יה נני.

Thirdly, in the Hebrew scripts of the late Hasmonean and Herodian periods, the letters waw and yod look almost identical (cf. Cross 1961:138-139). The waw of יה נני might therefore have been mistaken for a yod: יה נני.27 In my opinion, this argument that יה נני in the MT developed through scribal errors from the original reading יה נני, which is found in 4QLam, provides the best explanation of the variants in the two Hebrew textual representatives of Lamentations 1:8. Therefore, the text-critical analysis of the textual representatives of Lamentations 1:8a demonstrates that the wording of 4QLam can help to explain the difficult reading יה נני in the MT and brings a plausible source text reading for the translation equivalent εἷς σάλον in the Septuagint to light.

**An Interpretation of Lamentations 1:8a in the Masoretic Text**

The argument that יה נני developed from יה נני through scribal errors does not imply that later scribes could not make sense of this reading. This is evidenced by the change to יה נני in a version of Symmachus seems to have a double reading: רושי לוט ולחנור ("because of this, [she became] filth, a wanderer"). Ziegler (1976:469) gives the Greek equivalents of these readings as εἷς κεχωρισμένης (Aquila) and διὰ τοῦτο σι勘察ος αισκατασφ (Symmachus). Cf. also Field (1875:748).

The reading of Aquila reflects an interpretation of יה נני that is similar to the Greek equivalent of יה נני in LXX Lamentations 1:17: εἷς ἀποκοιμηθέντων ("one who sits apart"). The double reading in Symmachus creates the impression that the person who was responsible for this version vacillated between two possible interpretations of יה נני.

This remark is based on the view that יה נני in the wording of the MT as represented by, inter alia, Codex Leningraderensis, developed directly through scribal errors from an original reading יה נני (see below). On this interpretation of the textual evidence, the reading יה נני in some Masoretic manuscripts cannot be more original than יה נני.

26 Schäfer (2004:115*) agrees with Cross, but also mentions the possibility that יה נני in 4QLam might be a facilitation of the difficult word יה נני in the MT. Hobbins (2006:19) assumes that the readings in both 4QLam and the MT are corruptions from an original form יה נני. He argues that the form יה נני in the fragment from Qumran was created through a confusion of yod with waw, whereas יה נני resulted from dittography of he (or an aural error), as well as assimilation with יה נני in verse 17. Ilan (2008:9), however, argues that feminine metaphors in Lam 1 were replaced or removed in 4QLam and that the reading יה נני is an example of this. She also mentions other similar changes at Lam 1:13 and 1:17 in the manuscript from Qumran. The change of יה נני to יה נני in 4QLam’s version of Lam 1:13 might indeed have been introduced deliberately by a scribe, but, in my opinion, יה נני at Lam 1:17 in 4QLam can be attributed (at least partially) to scribal errors (cf. יה נני in the MT).
number of MT manuscripts, as well as the ancient translations that probably had ḫdn in their Vorlagen. The Peshitta, as well as the versions of Aquila and Symmachus show that at least some ancient interpreters brought meanings of ḫn to bear on ḫyn. Taking this association of the reading ḫn with ḫyn as a point of departure, it will be proposed in what follows that some ancient readers might have understood ḫn in the consonantal base of the MT’s wording as a reference to the defilement caused by sin.

Research on the topic of purity and impurity in the Hebrew Bible and early Judaism stress the importance of distinguishing between two types of impurity, ritual and moral impurity. Ritual impurity is a temporary state of uncleanness which is highly contagious and arises from contact with certain natural (more or less unavoidable) processes and substances. This state disqualifies one from contact with sacred objects and can be removed by means of purification rites. In contrast to ritual impurity, moral impurity is generated through actions that are so loathsome as to be considered defiling. These actions include sexual sins, idolatry and bloodshed. Such deeds defile the person who commits them, the land of Israel, as well as the sanctuary of God. They are prohibited and not subject to rites of purification. Therefore, the language of impurity is used to refer to the effects of immoral, abominable actions on the sinner, the land and the Temple.

The word ḫn forms part of the impurity language in the Hebrew Bible and early Judaism. In the priestly material of the Torah (P), it refers to the ritual impurity associated with a menstrual discharge (cf. Leviticus 12:2, 5; 15:19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 33; 18:19). In biblical texts outside of P, ḫn is a general term for impurity or impure objects (cf. Ezekiel 7:19-20 and 2 Chronicles 29:5). However, it seems that ḫn has the specific connotation of moral impurity in a few passages.

Leviticus 20:21, a passage from the holiness source in the Torah (H), prohibits an Israelite man from ‘taking’ his brother’s wife; that is, he is prohibited from having sexual intercourse with his sister-in-law. Such a deed is called ḫn and it is identified as a

29 According to Klawans (1997:3), these actions "bring about an impurity that morally – but not ritually – defiles the sinner (Lev 18:24), the land of Israel (Lev 18:25; Ezek 36:17), and the sanctuary of God (Lev 20:3; Ezek 5:11). This defilement leads in turn to the expulsion of the people from the land of Israel (Lev 18:28; Ezek 36:19). Though the sinner’s act defiles the land, the sinner does not defile those within his or her physical reach. There is no contact-contagion associated with moral impurity … Moreover, there is no purification rite akin to those associated with ritual impurity: moral purity is achieved by punishment, atonement, or by refraining from committing morally impure acts in the first place”.
30 Neusner (1975:20, 24) speaks of the metaphorical use of purity language in connection with immoral, sinful deeds. However, Klawans (1997:5-6) argues convincingly that moral impurity is not metaphorical or figurative. This kind of uncleanness is just as real as ritual impurity (although it is a different sort of defilement). It brings about tangible consequences for sinners, the land and the sanctuary.
31 ḫn derives either from ḥn (‘depart’/’flee’/’wander’) or from the verbal root ḥn (‘chase away’/’put aside’). Milgrom (1991:745) points out that, in the case of a menstruating woman, ḫn "originally referred to the discharge or elimination of menstrual blood, which came to denote menstrual impurity and impurity in general. In addition, niddâ came to refer not just to the menstrual discharge but to the menstruant herself, for she too was ‘discharged’ and ‘excluded’ from her society not by being kept at arm’s length from others but, in many communities, by being banished to and quarantined in separate quarters”. See also the discussion of Malul (2002:381-390).
32 Milgrom (2000:1758) interprets the verb יַצֵּר in the clause as a reference to marriage. This is also the interpretation witnessed to by the Vulgate and the Targum. However, יַצֵּר in verse 21 and in verses 14 and 17 should rather be understood in a sexual sense (Malul 2002:238; Gerstenberger 1996:288).
punishable offence. Therefore, here signifies an abhorrent act that causes the perpetrator to become morally unclean.

In the penitential prayer of Ezra 9:6-15, Ezra confesses the present sin of the people in verses 10-12. He admits that the people trespass the commandments of YHWH spoken by the prophets by arranging for their children to marry foreigners. appears twice in verse 11. This verse declares that the land is morally defiled (אֲרוּמָה כֵּדֶמֶת), because of the moral impurity (אֲרוּמָה), abominations (אֲרוּמָה) and uncleanness (אֲרוּמָה) of the 'peoples of the lands'.

Zechariah 13:1 is a third passage where might denote the type of defilement caused by sin. It is used, together with the word האֲרוּמָה ('sin' / 'purification offering'), as the object of the unique cleansing function of the fountain ('cleansing') that will be opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem in an eschatological future time. In their illuminating comments on this difficult verse, Carol and Eric Meyers (1993:366) argue that האֲרוּמָה, in combination with האֲרוּמָה, "provides a comprehensive conception of the state of pollution, caused by both moral wrongdoing and contaminating activity, that will be removed by the cosmic fountain in the future age".

Although it is not a capital crime, it will result in childlessness.

This interpretation of Leviticus 20:21 finds support from the ancient translations. In the Old Greek text of LXX Leviticus 20:21, as established by Wevers (1986:227), the equivalent of the clause האֲרוּמָה is . According to Muraoka (2009:19), can refer to the ritually unclean state arising from menstruation (cf. LXX Leviticus 15:24), immorality, moral or religious depravity, as well as a religiously or morally impure object. This last meaning is the most appropriate one for in LXX Leviticus 20:21, because it describes a person who commits a sexual offense (cf. Wevers 1997:325). Although is usually rendered by 'menstrual discharge') in the Peshitta text of Leviticus, at Leviticus 20:21 the Hebrew clause האֲרוּמָה is translated as , 'it is an iniquity/wickedness' (cf. Lane 1991:53). This translation implies that the Syriac translator could interpret as having a religious or moral aspect to it and not only as a term for the ritual impurity caused by menstruation. In the Vulgate, it is said that he who marries his brother's wife does something that is not allowed (rem facit illicitam). Grossfeld (1988:44) notes that the Aramaic word , the equivalent of in Targum Onqelos, Targum Neofiti and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, can be interpreted as an adjective, 'loathsome', which would be a value judgment on the marriage between a man and his sister-in-law. Alternatively, the reading can be read as a noun. In this case, the word refers to a woman who must be kept at a distance like a menstruating woman.

Werline (2006:xxv) defines penitential prayer as "a direct address to God in which an individual, group, or an individual on behalf of a group confesses sins and petitions for forgiveness as an act of repentance". For a good discussion of Ezra 9:6-15 as a penitential prayer, see Duggan (2006:165-180).

Ezra 9:11 echoes a passage such as Leviticus 18:24-30 (Fensham 1982:131). In this passage, the people's impure and abominable deeds are responsible for the desecration of the land. The result of this defilement is their expulsion from the land.

Such an interpretation of the Hebrew wording of Ezra 9:11 is also found in the Greek text of 1 Esdras 8:80. According to the text in the edition prepared by Robert Hanhart (1974:132), the counterparts of the two instances of in Ezra 9:11 are a participle form of μολυνθή καὶ the noun μολυνθή. These Greek words can have the meaning of moral defilement (Muraoka 2009:466, 467). Conversely, the wording of the corresponding passage in 2 Esdras 9:11 reads as follows: γυναικείαν έστην ἐν μετακινητίρι οἷς εἰς τοὺς πλῆθος τῶν έθνῶν (cf. Hanhart 1993:130). In NETS, the translation of this clause is "a land undergoing change by the changing of the nations" (Wooden 2007:412). The translator of 2 Esdras evidently did not understand in the sense of moral impurity.

It is also possible to understand in Zechariah 13:1 as shorthand for the 'waters of lustration' ('water'), which serve as a means of purification, especially in the case of contact with a corpse (cf. Numbers 19:9, 13, 20, 21 and also 31:23). On this interpretation, and in Zechariah 13:1 would be synonyms (Milgrom 1991:745). The ancient translations bear witness to an interpretation of in this verse that links it to the waters of lustration mentioned in the book of Numbers. The reading in the Peshitta text of Zechariah 13:1 is המולע or המולע (cf. Gelston 1980:89-90). Gelston (1987:136) identifies this reading as a possible case where the Syriac translation inverts a word pair in the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets. This identification is based on the view that המולע (‘ceremonial sprinkling’ / ‘lustration’) is a more likely translation equivalent for
The language of purity and impurity is also used in the Dead Sea scrolls in connection with sin. Apart from its usual meanings, הָדַּנְנָא appears in expressions that have to do with the impurity related to human imperfections and immorality. These expressions are found in writings of a variety of genres (rules, pesharim, poetic, sapiential and halakhic compositions). Moreover, this use of הָדַּנְנָא does not seem to have been restricted to a particular community in early Judaism, because the writings among the Dead Sea scrolls in which הָדַּנְנָא has the sense of moral impurity include non-sectarian compositions, as well as the writings of the yahad.

The data culled from the Hebrew Bible, the ancient translations and the Dead Sea scrolls show that the term הָדַּנְנָא sometimes refer to the impurity resulting from certain acts of wrongdoing. With regard to MT Lamentations 1:8a, it is quite possible that some ancient readers could have brought this sense of הָדַּנְנָא to bear on the reading הָדַּנְנָא in the consonantal base of the MT. On such an interpretation of הָדַּנְנָא, the words הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא make perfect sense, because Jerusalem’s great sin is said to be the reason for her (moral) uncleanness.

An Interpretation of Lamentations 1:8a in 4QLam

Lamentations 1:7, 8 and the final part of verse 11 are well preserved in 4QLam. Unfortunately, very little of verses 9 and 10 survived. There is also a long minus in the wording of this manuscript compared the wording of the MT. The words הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא from verse 10 are followed by הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא הָדַּנְנָא from verse 11. In addition to the minus, the wording of Lamentations 1:7-11 in 4QLam contain a number of readings that differ from their counterparts in the MT (see the appendix). The fragmentary nature of 4QLam at Lamentations 1:7-11, the long minus from verses 10 and 11, as well as the web of agreements and differences between 4QLam and other textual representatives, make it almost impossible to gain a clear picture of the content of these five verses as a whole in the Qumran manuscript. It is equally difficult to determine whether the variants in 4QLam form any kind of pattern that is specific to the wording of this manuscript. The following interpretive comments on 4QLam’s wording of verse 8 must be seen against this background.

40 Cf. 1QS column IV lines 5, 10, 22; column V line 19 (cf. also the parallel manuscripts 4Q256 column IX fragment 4 line 13 and 4Q558 column I fragment 1a, b line 11); column X line 24; column XI line 14; 1QM column XIII line 5; 1QpHab column VIII line 13; 1QH column IV line 19; column V line 21; column IX line 11; column XX line 25; column XXI line 16; 4QH⁴ (4Q428) fragment 7 line 4; 4QpNah fragment 3 column III line 1; 4Q826 fragment 7 column II line 4; 4QpPs⁷ (4Q381) fragment 46 line 6; fragment 69 line 2; 4Q419 fragment 1 line 11; 11QT⁰ column LXVI line 13; CD A column II line 1; column III line 17. In the following passages, the use of הָדַּנְנָא is debatable or uncertain: 4Q181 fragment 1 column II line 2 (cf. Garcia Martinez and Tigchelaar 1997:373); 4Q374 fragment 2 column II line 3; 4Q507 fragment 1 line 3; 4Q511 fragment 2 column II line 8; fragment 18 column II line 7; 4Q512 fragment 36-38 line 6; fragment 29-32 line 9; fragment 1-3 line 9.
41 It has been suggested elsewhere that a particular pattern can be discerned in the variant readings of verses 7, 11 and 13 in 4QLam. See Kotzé (2011:601-602).
The content of the third bicolon of the verse in 4QLam is uncertain, because of the lacuna in the manuscript. Cross (2000:232) reconstructs the missing text with the help of the MT: רִשְׁנֵי תּוֹעַבָּה לֹא הַיּוֹם יְהוָה. If the gaps in the wording of the first two bicola of 4QLam are filled in accordance with the MT, 4QLam’s text of Lamentations 1:8a-b states that Jerusalem sinned greatly (מִלְכְּרָיִה הַיּוֹם) and that this is the reason she became דָּוָן. Furthermore, all those who held the city in honour (מְמוֹנָה) are scornful (שָׂנוּנָה), because they saw her ‘nakedness’ (דָּוָן).

With regard to the reading דָּוָן in 4QLam, two possible interpretations present themselves. On the one hand, it can be taken to mean ‘(object of) head-wagging’. On the other hand, דָּוָן can be interpreted in its sense of ‘to wander’. Despite the misgivings of Salters (2010:61), Parry (2010:51) and Boase (2006:176), the idea of wandering expressed by דָּוָן carries with it at least two connotations that are quite appropriate in the context of Lamentations 1:8.

First, דָּוָן can be associated with fleeing (Ringgren 1998:271). For example, in Jeremiah’s oracle against Babylon (Jeremiah 50:3), the prophet announces that a nation from the north advances against Babylon and that it shall lay waste to the land so that no one shall live in it. The result is that both humans and animals take flight (דָּוָן) and depart (וָכַל). If this sense of the word is applied to דָּוָן in 4QLam’s wording of Lamentations 1:8a, the opening clause of the verse would mean that Jerusalem sinned greatly and therefore became a fugitive. The statement concerning Jerusalem’s sin as the grounds for her fugitive status should be read together with the following clause, which mentions the city’s ‘nakedness’, that is, her ruined condition. The personification of the city then works on two levels. It signifies the city’s inhabitants in the first bicolon and the city as a physical entity in the second one. From this perspective, 4QLam’s version of verse 8 implies that the city’s destruction not only causes those who held her in great esteem to be contemptuous, but also led to the flight of her inhabitants. All of this is the consequence of the people’s sin.

Secondly, דָּוָן can have the nuance of roving. It appears in this sense of ‘homelessness’ or ‘unsettled wandering’ together with the verb אַבְרָם (‘to be unstable’/’to be without a home’) in the curse that YHWH pronounces against Cain for murdering his brother, Abel (Genesis 4:12): דְּיֵרְךָ יִפְלָשְׂךָ וְיִפְלָשְׂךָ אִשָּׁה (‘you will be a fugitive and a rover on the earth’). According to Genesis 4:13-14, Cain recognises the “prospect of such a life of unrest and harassment without peace” as a punishment for his sin (Von Rad 1961:107). Therefore, in light of Genesis 4:12, 14, it is clear that being expelled from one’s land and forced to take up the existence of a wanderer could have been considered as a divine punishment. With this
negative connotation of יִזְזוּ in mind, Lamentations 1:8a in 4QLam can be taken to mean that Jerusalem became a wanderer as punishment for her great sin. 45

Conclusions

This study on the different wordings of Lamentations 1:8a in the MT and 4QLam presents only a small sample of the available data. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations hold value for both the text-critic and the exegete.

On the one hand, יִזְזוּ in 4QLam is an example of a reading that might not only be more original than its counterpart in the MT, but it also serves as a point of departure for explaining how the difficult reading in the MT came into being during the process of transmission. The analysis also suggests that the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX might very well have contained a reading such as יִזְזוּ. The wording of Lamentations 1:8a in 4QLam therefore opens new perspectives on the readings in some of the textual representatives of Lamentations that were available before the Qumran discoveries.

On the other hand, the interpretive comments on the wordings of Lamentations 1:8a in the two Hebrew versions draw attention to the effect that the variant readings in these manuscripts have on the content of the bicolon.

Data of the kind provided by this study will be relevant to the interpretation of Lamentations if two conditions are met. First, the data must show that the differences in wording between the MT and the Qumran manuscript of Lamentations, which were created by scribes when they copied their manuscripts, affect the content of a passage. The differences in content pertain mostly to individual variants and rarely to the orthographical variants and scribal errors. Secondly, neither the textus receptus nor the putative original text should be treated as the only valid representative of the content of Lamentations. This means that the Qumran manuscripts of Lamentations should not only be examined in order to edit the wording of the MT in cases where the former preserve ‘preferable’ readings. Admittedly, 3QLam and 5QLam b are too fragmentary to draw firm conclusions about the contents of Lamentations in these manuscripts. However, enough of the wordings of Lamentations 1 and Lamentations 4-5 have survived in 4QLam and 5QLam a respectively to make analyses of the ways in which they present the contents of the chapters viable. The differences in content between the MT and these two Qumran manuscripts of Lamentation can only be ignored or dismissed as of secondary importance if scholars continue to privilege the wording of the MT or the presumed Hebrew Urtext in their exegetical efforts.

45 The name ‘Jerusalem’ is obviously used here metonymically to signify the inhabitants of the city.
Appendix

The following list presents the variant readings in 4QLam when compared with the MT. It also indicates whether the readings in the ancient translations agree with one of these Hebrew versions. Furthermore, the readings in 4QLam are evaluated and categorized as more original than the MT (orig.), a scribal error (err.), a (deliberate) change in wording introduced by a scribe (scr.) or an interpretative insertion (int.). Orthographical variants are not recorded in the list. In cases where both 4QLam and the MT have a claim to being original, the readings are marked with an equals sign (=).

| Lam 1:6 | 4QLam MT qere | MT kethib | (=) |
| Lam 1:6 | 4QLam | adj. MT | (err.) |
| Lam 1:6 | 4QLam | masa'ah reshutoh MT LXX P V | (err.) |
| Lam 1:6 | 4QLam | melah nachah MT LXX P | (orig.?) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V W Y | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V | (orig.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V W Y | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V W Y | (err.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V W Y | (orig.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V | (err.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V W Y | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:7 | qere MT LXX P V | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:10-11 | qere MT P W Y | (err.) |
| Lam 1:11 | qere MT P W Y | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:11 | qere MT P W Y | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:11 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
| Lam 1:12 | qere MT P | (scr.) |
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