

The Enjambling Line in Lamentations: A Taxonomy (Part 1)

By F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp

(Princeton Theological Seminary)

One of the refreshing aspects of D. L. Peterson and K. H. Richards' *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* is its recognition of the need to integrate the study of Hebrew verse within the larger field of poetry and poetics.¹ I share this basic outlook and it provides the point of departure for the present study. The first four poems in the book of Lamentations exhibit a strikingly high degree of couplets made up of mostly unbalanced (typically a longer followed by a shorter line)² and largely nonparallel lines.³ In this kind of couplet intralinear dynamics are governed not by the play of matching as in parallelism but by the play of syntax; lineation and syntax as they counterpoint each other provide these poems' general prosody. Bishop R. Lowth described the basic character of this counterpointing play already in 1778: the second line (my word; he uses »clause«) comes after a »half-pause« (also »small rest« or »interval«) and is »added, to use a grammatical term, by apposition to some word preceding; or coming in as an adjunct, or circumstance depending on the former part, and completing the sentence.«⁴ The continuation of syntax and sense across line junctures without a major pause, which Lowth

¹ 1992, 6. In a similar vein (though more restricted in focus), see D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Metrics*, in: G. Young (ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect*, 1981, 113–130.

² The so-called qinah meter and its prominence in Lamentations is well known. See the classic study by K. Budde, *Das hebräische Klagelied*, ZAW 2 (1882), 1–52.

³ For example, G. B. Gray estimates that only 87 out of 246 couplets in Lamentations 1–4 are parallel, or 35% (*The Forms of Hebrew Poetry, III: Parallelism and Rhythm in the Book of Lamentations*, Exp. 8th ser. 6 [1913], 117–140), while D. R. Hillers suggests that perhaps as many as 143 out of 244 couplets may be parallel, or 59% (*Lamentations*, AncB 7A, ²1992, 20). Yet, despite the disparity between these estimates, both aptly register the striking lack of parallelism in Lamentations 1–4.

⁴ Preliminary Dissertation, in: *Isaiah. A New Translation with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes*, 1848 (1778), xxxix. Hillers is describing the same phenomenon when he comments on the practical problem of deciding exactly where to divide the non-parallel couplets, since they »consist for the most part of a single sentence« (*Lamentations*, 20).

describes here, is known as enjambment⁵ and may be contrasted with end-stopping, the coincidence of line terminus with a significant break in syntax. In the present study I propose to look more carefully at the phenomenon of enjambment in Lamentations, describing the degree to which it is used, the various forms it takes, and the effects it has on our reading of these poems.

The existence of enjambment in Hebrew⁶ (and other Semitic poetic traditions, especially Akkadian⁷ and Ugaritic⁸) has been recognized. Nevertheless, the role and nature of enjambment in Hebrew verse remains little investigated and generally under appreciated. Reasons for this state of affairs are not hard to find. In the first place the potential significance of enjambment in Hebrew verse has been generally obscured by the tendency, at least since the time of Lowth, to make enjambed couplets conform to a parallelistic norm by classifying them under the category of »synthetic or constructive parallelism.«⁹ Most of the examples included in this latter category (e.g., Jes 13,10; Ps 2,6) show no signs whatsoever of actual parallelism, but at most exhibit a balance of clauses within the couplet. And while most contemporary scholars no longer find Lowth's

⁵ M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, 1971; G. S. Kirk, *Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure in Homer*, YCS 20 (1966), 105–152; J. Hollander, »Sense Variousely Drawn Out: On English Enjambment, in: *Vision and Resonance: Two Senses of Poetic Form*, 1975, 91–116; *Rhyme's Reason: A Guide to English Verse*, 1989, 11; S. Cushman, *William Carlos Williams and the Meanings of Measure*, 1985, 15–50; C. Higbie, *Meaning and Music: Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the Iliad*, 1990; T. V. F. Brogan/C. Scott, »Enjambment,« in: A. Permingier/T. V. F. Brogan (eds.), *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 1993, 359f.; D. Attridge, *Poetic Rhythm: An Introduction*, 1995, 10.

⁶ S. A. Geller, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry*, HSM, 1979, 6. 30. 295f. 379; M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 1980, 129–132, 409–22; W. G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, JSOT.S 26, 1984, 332–336.

⁷ E.g., Atr I iv 225f.; Ee I 4; Ludlul III 25f.; BWL 74:63f.; Erra I 13f. 41–44. 55f. 79f.; see K. Hecker, *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*, AOATS 8, 1974, 79f. 121; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 335; *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* (JSOT.S 170, 1994), 138, n. 165; R. M. Gronenberg, *Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen »hymnischen« Literatur*, 1987, 181–190; J. Westenholz, *Review of »Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen »hymnischen« Literatur«* by R. M. Gronenberg, *Or.* (1997), 181–195, esp. 192.

⁸ E.g., KTU 1.3.I.10–15; III.46–49; 6.I.56f.; 14.VI.36f.; 16.I.44f.; 17.VI.34f.; 19.I.38–40, II.43f., III.31–34, IV.58f.; 23.62f., 71f.; see J. C. de Moor/K. Spronk, *Problematic Passages in the Legend of Kirtu* (II), UF 14 (1982), 183f.; S. Segert, *Parallelism in Ugaritic Poetry*, JAOS 103 (1983), 300f.; D. Pardee, *Will the Dragon Never Be Muzzled?*, UF 16 (1984), 255; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 335; *Traditional Techniques*, 138, n. 165. Geller (*Parallelism*) estimates that as much as 25% of the lines in Ugaritic poetry may be enjambed.

⁹ *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (1787 [1753]); Isaiah.

particular form of classification compelling, the predisposition to all but equate parallelism with Hebrew poetry nevertheless persists. And yet to continue labelling lines as parallel even when they do not exhibit any recognizable form of parallelism simply renders the whole notion of parallelism meaningless. R. Alter's criticisms of J. L. Kugel are to the point. He reasons that »when the relation between versets turns out to be one between adverbial phrase and main clause or between subject and object, it hardly makes sense to speak of the second verset as a ›going beyond‹ or a ›seconding‹ of the first.«¹⁰ Rather, Alter continues, it is »less forced to assume with [B.] Hrushovski that such instances [Ps 137,2] are manifestations of the ›free rhythm‹ of biblical versification in which the semantic component of the parallelism is dropped.«¹¹ Two suppositions underlie the present study: 1) there is more to Hebrew prosody than parallelism (following Alter and Hrushovski) and correlatively, 2) when there are no overt signs of parallelism in the surface structure of a poem,¹² or the presence of parallelism, although noticeable, is not perceptually salient, then other elements need to be considered in order to fully comprehend the poem's prosody. In other words, lines that are not parallel require to be evaluated in different terms. It is my contention that the general play of syntax and line as they counterpoint each other offers a better perspective from which to understand the minority of non-parallel lines in Hebrew verse.

Second, the fact, as noted especially by Peterson and Richards,¹³ that the whole question of lineation in Hebrew poetry has never been seriously addressed has also impeded the appreciation of enjambment in Hebrew poetry. This desideratum is significant as enjambment is a function of lineation. Therefore the nature of lineation in a given poetic tradition will bear directly on the perceived relevance of enjambment to that tradition. So long as the line in Hebrew verse is understood to correspond to the bicolon, enjambment at the lever of individual cola is not *perceived* as a remarkable phenomenon, since, strictly speaking, it does not take place at line-end. This, of course, does not necessarily follow. While enjambment most commonly occurs at line-end, in many poetic traditions, such as French poetry, it can occur line internally as well,

¹⁰ The Art of Biblical Poetry, 1985, 19. Alter is critiquing J. L. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry, 1981.

¹¹ Ibid. For Hrushovski's [Harshav] insightful thoughts on Hebrew prosody, see Prosody, Hebrew, in: EJ 13 (1971f.), 1200–1203; On Free Rhythms in Modern Poetry, in: T. Sebeok (ed.), Style in Language, 1960, 173–190.

¹² This intentionally leaves open the question of the deep structure analysis of enjambed lines in Hebrew verse, cf. E. Greenstein, How Does Parallelism Mean?, in: A Sense of Text, JQR Suppl., 1982, 41–70.

¹³ Interpreting Hebrew Poetry, 4f.

»when there is syntactic overflow from the first hemistich to the second across the caesura.«¹⁴ Nevertheless, one consequence of the growing tendency for scholars to identify a line of Hebrew verse with what has been more traditionally referred to as the hemistich or colon will be to accentuate the presence of enjambment in Hebrew poetry.¹⁵ One of the principal claims pressed in the present study is the need to pay greater attention to lineation, whatever its ultimate nature, and the pauses which lineation enforces. In Lamentations the pause between the two lines of a couplet (the traditional bicolon), while perceptually weaker – because of the onward tug of the syntax which runs over into the second

¹⁴ A. G. Engstrom and C. Scott, Rejet, in: *New Princeton Encyclopedia*, 1019. Cushman (Meanings of Measure, 38f.) aptly observes: »The caesura is to the interior of a line what enjambment is to the ending.«

¹⁵ See Geller, *Parallelism*; O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*; A. Berlin, *Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, 1985; Peterson and Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry*. The nature of lineation in Hebrew poetry will always be arguable since no native tradition about Hebrew prosody has survived from antiquity and lineation is not routinely shown in extant manuscripts (though some Qumran manuscripts of the Psalms [esp. 4QPs^b] are lineated, as are many of the manuscripts of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and even Lamentations from the Middle Ages, see Kugel, *Idea*, 119–123). Nevertheless, that the line (or colon) is the principal unit of lineation in Hebrew verse is inferable from a wide variety of considerations, the most significant of which may be briefly summarized: the existence of single lines and triplets or tercets, along side the more common couplet (or bicolon), show that the line must be the basic unit of lineation – the former cannot be generated from couplets; likewise parallelism presumes the individual line as its basic unit, since it is that unit which is being matched or repeated; the line can be defined on bases distinct from parallelism (O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*); the acrostics in Ps 111 and 112 and the *'aleph* stanza of Ps 9f. (9,2–3) show the single line as a significant structural level; sound play appears most prominently at the level of individual lines (e.g., *šôd šadûni kaššippôr* [Thr 3,52]); cf. C. O. Hartman, *Free Verse: An Essay on Prosody*, 1996 [1980], 65); copies of Akkadian, Egyptian, and Syriac poetic texts are often lineated (cf. Kugel, *Idea*, 24f.); and couplets and tercets are common verse patterns in many poetic traditions (such as English) where the single line remains the principal unit of lineation (for the prominence of twos and threes in rhythmic systems, see Attridge, *Poetic Rhythm*). Of special significance for the present paper, note Ps 111,1 and 6 (and perhaps Ps 112,8), which exhibit enjambment within the couplet (Adjunct Enjambment, Sentential Complement) and where the lineation is explicitly marked by the acrostic (*'aleph – bet; kaph – lamed*): *'ôdæb yhw h b^ekâl-lebâb/b^esôd y^ešarîm w^e'edah* »I praise the Lord with all my heart/ in the assembled congregation of the upright« (Ps 111,1; NJV) and *ko^ab ma^{'a}šâw higgîd l^e'ammô/latet lahæm nab^alat gôyim* »He revealed to His people His powerful works./in giving them the heritage of the nations« (Ps 111,6; NJV).

Still, given the general lack of early manuscript evidence for lineation, the demarcation of individual lines cannot simply be assumed, but will frequently require argumentation. Where there is ambiguity, I lay out the reasoning for my choice of lineation in the notes.

line – than that between end-stopped and parallel lines, is nevertheless perceivable (n.b. Lowth's »half-pause«) and thus exploitable in ways not unlike those posited for parallelism.¹⁶

Third, the relatively conservative nature of enjambment when present in a Hebrew poem (i.e., syntactic cuts are made mostly at phrase and clause boundaries, only occasionally at word boundaries, and never at domains below the word level) no doubt has helped to obscure the significance of this phenomenon. That is, enjambment in ancient Hebrew verse is clearly more conservative than, for example, in some contemporary English language poetries. However, though the perception of enjambment in one poetic tradition will necessarily be shaped by the experience of it in other poetic traditions, it nevertheless is the case that enjambment and end-stopping are not categories which can be defined according to the presence or absence of some predefined set of essential properties. Rather, they represent the two ends on a continuum of how lines end.¹⁷ The degree of variation exhibited between the ends of the continuum will vary significantly depending on individual poetic style or the style of a particular poetic tradition. Hebrew verse on the whole clearly falls on the end-stopping or more conservative side of the continuum. Still, I want to suggest that there is more variety in line terminus in Hebrew verse than is usually assumed and that the typical line in Lamentations represents a more enjambed version of the otherwise end-stopped norm.

Finally, enjambment is clearly subordinate to parallelism as an intralinear linking device in Hebrew Poetry,¹⁸ and thus its presence is easily overlooked. However, even if only a subordinate phenomenon, enjambment, if present, deserves some comment. And in the case of Lamentations 1–4, where enjambment within the couplet may effect, as I contend below, roughly two-thirds of the couplets, some kind of explanation of this phenomenon is paramount. By whatever name the combination of the lack of parallelism and the prominence of run-on sentences is integral to the prosody of Lamentations.

What follows comprises the first installment of a two-part study of enjambment in the poetry of Lamentations. It presents a taxonomy of the major kinds of enjambed lines found in Lamentations. The second part of the study¹⁹ turns to a discussion of how enjambment is exploited rhythmically in Lamentations.

¹⁶ See esp. Berlin, *Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*.

¹⁷ See J. Hollander's important observations in: *Sense Variously Drawn Out*, 91–116, esp. 99.

¹⁸ O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 129; cf. M. Kinzie, *A Poet's Guide to Poetry*, 1999, 72.

¹⁹ F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *The Effects of Enjambment in Lamentations*, ZAW (forthcoming).

Clause Internal Enjambment

Clause internal enjambment is understood as enjambment at the level of the clause and below. In verbal clauses, enjambment may involve the predicate, dependent nominals (subject and object phrases), and adjunct phrases. In verbless clauses, enjambment may involve the relevant nominals and adjunct phrases. In the taxonomy of clause internal enjambment that follows I move from the softest to the harshest kinds of enjambment. My evaluation of »softness« and »harshness« is predicated on an estimate of the linguistic necessity of the *rejet*, the word or small group of words shifted (*rejeté*) by enjambment into the succeeding line.²⁰ When the *rejet* involves elements which are syntactically, semantically, or pragmatically required then the degree of enjambment is judged to be harsher than when the *rejet* involves elements which only add to or elaborate an otherwise complete phrase or clause.²¹ The labels utilized are merely descriptive in nature and are usually inspired by syntactic considerations. In general, however, the taxonomy follows the basic principles which inform other taxonomic classifications of enjambment.²²

A. Vocative Enjambment

In vocative enjambment the *rejet* contains a vocative phrase. Since the vocative element stands outside of the syntactic structure, it is hard to gauge unequivocally the severity of this kind of enjambment, though surely it is at the lower end of the continuum.²³

māh 'ašwəh-lak wa'anah'mek To what shall I compare you so to comfort you,
b'tūlat bat-šiyyōn O Maiden, Daughter of Zion (2,13b)

Other examples: 2,13a.18a.²⁴

B. Adjunct Enjambment

Adjunct enjambment obtains when the *rejet* consists of an adjunct phrase, which in Lamentations usually entails either a prepositional phrase or a temporal adverbial.

²⁰ See Hollander, *Sense Variously Drawn Out*, 97; Engstrom/Scott, *Rejet*, 1019.

²¹ For the relevance of poetic features (e.g., sense, pragmatics, meter) other than syntax in evaluating the force and significance of enjambment, see Hollander, *Sense Variously Drawn Out*, 97; Brogan/Scott, *Enjambment*, 359. In fact, G. S. Kirk (*Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure*, 111) maintains that such other non-syntactic considerations are absolutely necessary »even at the cost of a loss in precision.«

²² See Kirk, *Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure*, 106–110; Higbie, *Measure and Music*, esp. 32f.

²³ Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 33.

²⁴ Emending MT to read *ša'qî*, as do many (e.g., W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohe Lied. Die Klagelieder*, KAT 17², 220; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 101).

<i>kāl-rod^epæhā hiššīgūhā</i>	All her pursuers overtake her
<i>bēn hamm^ešarīm</i>	Between the straits (1,3c)
<i>hōridī kannahāl dim^ʿāb</i>	Pour out tears like a wadi
<i>yômām wālaylāb</i>	Day and night (2,18b)

Other examples: 1,2b.4a.5b.c.²⁵6c.10a.12c.14c.²⁶ 22b; 2,1c.3b.c.²⁷ 7c.11b.c.12b.c.15b.19a.c.d.20a; 3,1.2.6.26.32.²⁸ 35.48.55.64.66; 4,1b.3b.6a.9a.b.10b.12b.19a; 5,9.10. Possible examples: 1,3a.²⁹ 15c; 3,5.³⁰ 12.³¹ 41.³² 45.49.³³ 51.³⁴

²⁵ The line break should come after *šēbī*, leaving *lipnê-šar* alone to form the shorter second line. Prepositional phrases routinely occur by themselves in the second line of the couplet in Lamentations (1,2b.3c.5b.10a.11a.12c.20c; 2,1c.7c.11c.12b.c.16b.19c.d; 3,1.45.48.51.55.64.66; 4,1b.9a.b.10b.12b.19a). In particular, note the following second lines: *lipnê rôdep* (1,6c), *mipp^enê ʿôyeb* (2,3b), *mipp^enê hæraeb hammidbār* (5,9), and *mipp^enê zal^apôt rāʿāb* (5,10). The occurrence of *hāl^kkū baššēbī* in 1,18c also argues against dividing *hāl^kkū* and *šēbī* between two lines (cf. NJV).

²⁶ Lineating as follows: *n^etānanī yhw^b* (reading with 4QLam^a 3,5–6) *|| bīdē lo^ʿ-ʿūkal qūm*. Compare the existence of lines such as 1,13c (*n^etānanī šomemāb*) and note the fact that line ends do not otherwise break up construct chains in Lamentations (cf. F. M. Cross, *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Verse: The Prosody of Lamentations 1:1–22*, in: C. Meyers/M. O’Connor (eds.), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, 1983, 145; Hillers, *Lamentations*, 63).

²⁷ Reading: *wayyib^ʿar b^eya^aqob/ke^ʿeš < > ʿāk^elāb sābīb*. MT likely resulted from a conflation of two variant readings (so Hillers, *Lamentations*, 98): *ke^ʿeš læhabah* (cf. Hos 7,6; Jes 4,5; Ps 105,32) and *ke^ʿeš ʿāk^elāb sābīb* (cf. Ex 24,17; Jes 30,27). The latter may be preferred on the basis of its uniqueness, but either could be original.

²⁸ If not divided as in BHS, this example would exemplify »Clause External Enjambment« (B.iv).

²⁹ This assumes that the line break comes before *meʿonī* (cf. NJV; contra BHS). Compound constituent phrases are almost always retained as a unit within the line (1,7a.11c.12a.18c.19b; 2,2c.5c.6b.c.8c.9a.12a.13a.b.14a.c.15b.16b.17b.18b.19a.20a.c.21a.c.22b.c.; 3,2.4.5.8.12.19.26.28.37.38.40.42.43.47.49.50.62.63.66; 4,12b.21a; 5,1). Only if the constituent phrases, when taken together, are too long to fit happily in a single line are compound constituent phrases broken up across lines (e.g., 3,25.60; 4,12a; 3,18 is an exception). Since length is not at issue here, Thr 1,3a could be divided either before or after *meʿonī*. If divided after *meʿonī*, the enjambment becomes clause external (B.iv) and the perception of parallelism more pronounced.

³⁰ This assumes *roʿš* (or *reʿš* as Hillers, *Lamentations*, 113) *ūtlaʿab* is an adverbial phrase.

³¹ As set out in BHS. However, there is a propensity, whenever possible, to divide verb phrases equally among the lines of a couplet in Lamentations 1–4 (1,2a.c.3b.4b.5a.6b.7d.8a.b.c.9c.10b.c.11a.b.c.13a.15b.16a.c.18a.b.19a.c.20a.b.21b.c.22a; 2,5a.b.6a.7a.8c.9a.10b.11a.13c.14b.16b.c.17a.b.c.18b.21c; 3,4.9.15.16.17.22.23.24.30.33.44.53.58.59; 4,3a.7a.b.8a.b.11a.b.14a.15b.16a.b.17a.b.19.20b.22a.b – possible exceptions: 2,8b,13a.b.20a; 3,2.5.20.32.49.50.66; 4,231a [not including couplets that contain more than two verbs, e.g., 3,7.8.11.28.37.40.42.43.54.57; 4,15a.b.18b.21b]). Thus, the lines could be divided as *dārak qaštô/wayyašibenī kammattāraʿ*

That adjunct phrases are enjambed so frequently in Lamentations likely reflects the normal word order pattern for Hebrew prose, in which adjunct phrases typically occur in final position.³⁵ and thus no special significance should automatically be attached to this typological pattern in Lamentations.³⁶ Adjunct enjambment exemplifies a typical example of one of the mildest forms of enjambment, adding or progressive enjambment, wherein the sentence could have ended without the adjunct phrase.³⁷

C. Subject Enjambment

Sometimes the *rejet* contains a subject in Lamentations, though not frequently, probably owing to the fact that subjects are always indexed on the verb and thus are never required syntactically. This, too, suggests that subject enjambment remains at the softer end of the continuum.

<i>pāšû 'alenû pihæm</i>	They open their mouths against us,
<i>kâl-'oy'benû</i>	All of our enemies (3,46)

Other examples: 1,1a.b.6a; 2,10a.c.15a.21a.22b; 3,38.

D. Object Enjambment

Because direct objects are not obligatorily marked on the verb in Biblical Hebrew and are required in transitive constructions, when they occur in the *rejet*, the resulting form of enjambment is a good deal more severe than any of the other kinds of enjambment so far surveyed. Here, then, instead of the feel of expansion or augmentation which generally accompanies vocative, adjunct, and subject enjambment, one finally gets

labeš, in which case the couplet would not qualify as an example of adjunct enjambment. However, the exceptionally long nature of the second line when so divided might be the mitigating circumstance which generates the abnormal lineation here.

³² Though the sense of *'æl-kappayim* here is not unambiguous and thus the presence of parallelism not precluded, the couplet is interpretable as involving adjunct enjambment (so Hillers, Lamentations, 117).

³³ Assuming *me'ên* is understood adverbially – though Syr and LXX interpret otherwise.

³⁴ Though MT has often been thought to be corrupt (e.g., Rudolph, Klagelieder, 232f.; Hillers, Lamentations, 118), it is defensible (so I. Provan, Lamentations, NCBC, 1991, 103).

³⁵ D. R. Hillers, Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations, in: H. N. Bream/R. D. Heim/C. A. Moore (eds.), A Light unto My Path, 1974, 267f.; R. J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 1976, « 572; W. R. Garr, The Qinah: A Study of Poetic Meter, Syntax and Style, ZAW 95 (1983), 63.

³⁶ This agrees generally with Hillers (Syntax and Meter, 266).

³⁷ Kirk, Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure, 106f.; Higbie, Meaning and Measure, 32; Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, 334.

a real sense of tugging or pulling as the syntax struggles to complete itself, running straight on from the end of one line to the start of the next.³⁸

<i>billa' 'adonāy lo' hāmāl</i>	The Lord has consumed without mercy
<i>'et kāl-nē'ōt ya'aqob</i>	All the pastures of Jacob (2,2a)

Other examples: 1,7a; 2,1b.2b.c.3a.4b.5c.6b.c.7b.8a.14a.20c; 3,13.34; 4,13b.

E. Combinations

Often the *rejet* will contain some combination of adjuncts, subjects, and objects, adding further density to the nature of the syntactic dependency realized by the continuation of the enjambed unit.

<i>gam-nēbī'ēha lo'-maš'e'ū</i>	Also her prophets do not find
<i>hāzōn meyhwh</i>	Visions from Yahweh (2,9c)
<i>šōd šādūnī kaššippōr</i>	They hunted me like a bird,
<i>'oy'bay hinnām</i>	My enemies, needlessly (3,52)

Other examples: 1,15a; 2,1a.22a; 3,3.20.62. Possible examples: 1,13a;³⁹ 3,27.⁴⁰ 31.⁴¹ 50.⁴² 56;⁴³ 4,3b.⁴⁴

F. Verb Enjambment

The most violent type of enjambment found clause internally in Lamentations occurs when the verb appears in the *rejet*. In these cases the first line of the couplet cannot be understood until the second line is read. The resulting word order is non-standard. As normally in Hebrew prose, the overwhelming tendency in Lamentations and other passages

³⁸ Others term this either »necessary« (so Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 33) or »integral« (so Kirk, *Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure*, 107) enjambment.

³⁹ The second line is problematic. If a *waw* plus some kind of verb form is retained here (MT, 4QLam^a, Syr; so H. Gottlieb, *A Study of the Text of Lamentations*, 1978, 17f.), then this would represent the combination of a prepositional phrase (*bē'ašmotay*, which is a part of the idiom *šlh (b-) 'eš* »to set fire,« e.g., Jdc 1,8) and a verb (unique in Lamentations). Otherwise, this probably represents some kind of clause external enjambment.

⁴⁰ As lineated in BHS, though there are problems with the second line.

⁴¹ Assuming MT is sound and dividing the couplet as follows: *kī lo' yiznab/le'ōlām 'adonāy*. For similarly short couplets in Lamentations, compare 1,19b; 2,14a, and for other passages where *znh* appears to be used intransitively, see Ps 44,24; 74,1; 89,39 (Ps 74,1 is especially close: *lāmāh 'elohīm zānahtā lānāšah*).

⁴² As divided in BHS.

⁴³ Retaining MT, though some (e.g., Rudolph, *Klagelieder*, 233) think MT is expansionistic.

⁴⁴ K reads: *kī*.

cast in qinah meter is for the verb to appear in first position.⁴⁵ Moreover, in every case of verbal enjambment, except when there is a compound verb phrase, the verb is always combined with another sentential element.

y^edē nāšīm rab^mmāniyyôt The hands of compassionate women
bišš^elû yaldêhæn Boil their children (4,10a)

Other examples: 1,1c.12a.19b; 2,4c.17b.21b.22c; 4,5a.b.20a; 5,18.

G. Appositional Enjambment

Appositional phrases are the final clause internal syntactic constructions that get enjambed in Lamentations, as Lowth recognized.⁴⁶ However, while appositions are easily recognized in Hebrew prose, in poetry distinguishing them extracontextually from gapping or ellipsis is not always easy. Both are tropes of repetition and both exploit line endings in similar ways. The main difference between the two figures is that the latter is dependent on the parallelism of syntactic structure, while the former is not. On the one hand, because of the complexity involved or the presence of other signs of parallelism, there are several identifiable examples of gapping in Lamentations (e.g., 3,10.14.25.39.47.61.65). On the other hand, there is another group of examples in which there is no contextual support for gapping and which present syntactic profiles that consistently block ellipsis cross-linguistically:⁴⁷

'im-to'kalmāh nāšīm piryām Should women eat their own fruit,
'ol^llê tippuhīm The children they have raised? (2,20b)

Other examples; 1,16b; 3,19.41.60; 4,21a.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Hillers, *Syntax and Meter*, 267–269; Garr, *Qinah*, 63 – though current and future linguistic studies will enable us to better appreciate the role and true extent of V(S)O word order in Biblical Hebrew.

⁴⁶ Note also Parry's description (*Enjambment in Homeric Verse*, 207): »a word or phrase or clause of the same grammatical structure as one in the foregoing verse.«

⁴⁷ See C. Miller's recent paper on ellipsis in Ugaritic (*Patterns of Verbal Ellipsis in Ugaritic* [presented to the »Ugaritic Studies and Northwest Semitic Epigraphy Group« at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the SBL]), whose findings are relevant for Hebrew verse as well.

⁴⁸ Gray (*Parallelism and Rhythm*, 127. 128. 133. 134) thinks all, except 3,41, represent parallelism. But, as Higbie (*Meaning and Measure*, 33) observes, »the parallel substantive (phrase) in apposition« is »one of the most frequent forms« of adding or unperiodic enjambment. Besides, in Lamentations 1–4 the prominence of enjambment makes the appositional interpretation most likely. That is, the reader's repeated experience of having the syntax carry over from the first line of couplet to the second will undoubtedly color how these kinds of examples are understood.

Appositional enjambment occurs at the softer end of the continuum.⁴⁹

Finally, there are two examples that I want to suggest involve compound phrases. Here it is the overt presence of the conjunctive *waw* that, in light of the numerous compound constituents in Lamentations (e.g., 1,7a. 11c.12a.18c.19b; 2,2c.5c.6b.c.8c.9a.12a.13a.b.14a.c.15b.16b.17b.18b.19a.20a.c.21a.c.22b.c; 3,2.4.5.8.12.19.26.28.37.38.40.42.43.47.49.50.62.63.66; 4,21a; 5,1), inevitably colors our interpretation:

<i>gāl'tah y'hūdāh me'onī</i>	Judah goes into exile amidst oppression
<i>ūmerob 'ʿbodāh</i>	And amidst hard servitude (1,3a ⁵⁰)
<i>lo' h'æ'mīnū malkê-'æræš</i>	They did not believe, the kings of the earth
<i>ūkol yoš'bê tæbæl</i>	And all the inhabitants of the world (4,12a ⁵¹)

In predominantly parallelistic poems these could be construed as involving verb gapping.

With respect to the syntax of these couplets, two noticeable patterns emerge.⁵² The second line in a couplet exhibits a marked tendency to contain a single constituent which is also the longest constituent within the sentence (76/114) and abnormal word order is preferred within the couplet (69/114). Given the tendency in Hebrew prose for markedly long sentential elements to be placed in final position regardless of syntactic function,⁵³ it is reasonable to suppose that a similar correspondence would account for the two patterns observed in the couplets above, namely: that the tendency to place markedly long constituents in final position often results in non-standard word order.⁵⁴ Such an explanation does seem to hold, at least to some degree. However, constituent length is only one among several factors which likely impinges on the poet's syntactic decision making, and in fact it probably was not the primary factor. W. R. Garr suggests that style and metrical considerations were part of the mix of factors, along side syntactic conventions, which figure in the syntax of passages cast in the qinah meter.⁵⁵ In fact, it does appear that the *rejets* factor with some frequency

⁴⁹ Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 33.

⁵⁰ As lineated in BHS, but the lineation is debatable, see above.

⁵¹ Reading with K. Reading with Q – without the conjunction – results in another appositional construction (and would accentuate the other possible meaning of *yoš'bê tæbæl*, »rulers of the world«).

⁵² In my considerations here I assume with Garr that »poetic syntax interacts, in some way, with the standard set by narrative authors« (Qinah, 63).

⁵³ F. I. Andersen, *Studies in Hebrew Syntax*, unpub.Ph.D.diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1960, 373–379, 400f.; Hillers, *Syntax and Meter*, 269f.; Garr, *Qinah*, 63f.

⁵⁴ Hillers, *Syntax and Meter*, 267f.; Garr, *Qinah*, esp. 63f.

⁵⁵ *Qinah*, 74 and *passim*.

into larger rhetorical, prosodic, or stylistic tropes and figures. For example, note the frequency with which parallelism (1,2b; 2,10a and c; 2,11c and 12b; 2,14a and c; 3,41 and 40; 4,9a and b; 5,9 and 10), chiasmus (1,1b and c; 1,4a; 1,12a and 11c), and inclusio (1,1a and 22c; 2,1c and a.21c) involve the various *rejets*.

Metrical, or better rhythmical, considerations also appear to bear on the syntactic configurations found in clause internally enjambed couplets in Lamentations. The so-called qinah meter consists of couplets of unbalanced lines – usually the first line of the couplet is longer than the second. By necessity, then, the poet would always need to compose with the basic constraint of the qinah meter in mind. Garr brings forward examples like Ez 27,29c–d (cf. Jer 9,b–c; Ez 27,28a–b.34c–d.35c–d) in which abnormal word order prevails and a single constituent, which is longer than the rest of the sentence, comprises the whole first line. He reasons that the »violation of the normal, prosaic word order can, tentatively then, be explained on the metrical level; in other words, the lengthy S [in Ez 27,29c–d] was placed first in the sentence in order to preserve the general imbalance of the stichs in the *qināh*.⁵⁶ Similarly, in Lamentations the constraints of the qinah meter would appear to bear on the configuration of the poetic line, though the dominant means for realizing the rhythm of unbalanced lines is other than that described by Garr. Preposing of entire constituents into the first line only occurs rarely in Lamentations (e.g., 1,1c.18c; 2,17b.22c). More commonly, conformity to the constraints of the qinah meter is achieved by paying attention to the second line to make it »sufficiently long to fit the common metrical patterns of the poems.⁵⁷ This is shown most spectacularly in those couplets where there is not a correspondence between final long constituents and abnormal word order: adjunct, combination, and verbal enjambment. Each of these groups provide specific counter examples to the explanation that abnormal word order arises as a result of constituent length alone. In couplets exhibiting adjunct enjambment the adjuncts do tend to be the longest elements in the sentence, but this does not effect the word order, because adjuncts usually stand in final position in normal Hebrew prose. In verbal and combination enjambment only rarely do the longest constituents occur in final position (2,1a; 3,3.37.56; 4,20a; 5,18), and even when they do, the *rejet* is composed of more than one sentential constituent. Attention to the nature of verbal enjambment is especially enlightening. The difference between the couplets exhibiting verbal enjambment and those exhibiting vocative, adjunct, subject, and object enjambment is that the major sen-

⁵⁶ Garr, *Qinah*, 64; cf. 65.

⁵⁷ Hillers, *Syntax and Meter*, 270.

tential elements in the latter are easily expandable through compounding, construct phrases, and the use of adjectives. Thus, the poet can easily make these phrases meet the length requirements necessitated by the qinah meter without going beyond the phrase boundary. By contrast, verbs are not as easily expanded in length. They can be expanded only through compounding (only once in 1,12a) or the use of periphrastic and helping verb (reduced complement) constructions (neither of which are evidenced in our corpus). Otherwise, other sentential elements must be added to the verb in order to expand the length of the line, as is commonly done in Lamentations. This suggests that the specific rhythmic demands of the qinah meter were met most commonly by placing when possible a single constituent in the second line and expanding it to the desired length. The usual result is for this constituent to be the longest constituent in the sentence but (usually) shorter than the combination of constituents in the first line. When the constituent could not be easily expanded, as with verbs, other constituents would be added as necessary.

A final factor which likely impinged on the poet's syntactic decisions is suggested by Hillers' observation that the coincidence of placing overlong sentential elements last and abnormal word order in Lamentations has the noticeable effect of emphasizing the »caesura in these lines« and the »division of the line into cola.«⁵⁸ As with the other factors considered above, it is frequently hard for us to tell unequivocally which effects were intended by design and which fall out more naturally as a result of other decisions made. Nevertheless, it is a fact that clause internal enjambment (and the corresponding lack of parallelism) makes the determination of these poems' precise lineation problematic. Hillers illustrates the point with reference to 1,2b: *'ên lah menaḥem mikkâl-ôbâbâhâ*. He writes:

To make two parts out of these lines with only one sentence, it is necessary to divide at a great variety of places with respect to the syntax: between nominal subject and verb in 1:1c; between a prepositional phrase modifying a verb and a following nominal subject in 1:1b; between a nominal subject and a prepositional phrase modifying it, in 1:2b; between verb and prepositional phrase modifying it, in 1:3c – and so on through almost every combination of sentence elements. To put it another way, it seems impossible to define syntactically where the division between cola (caesura) is to be made in these lines.⁵⁹

In one sense, of course, Hillers' conclusion is correct. Syntax alone is not sufficient for determining the lineation of these enjambed couplets. However, in other respects, Hillers' dilemma is only theoretical in nature. In Lamentations there are potentially only a small handful of

⁵⁸ Syntax and Meter, 270.

⁵⁹ Lamentations, 20.

examples (unlike 1,2b!) in which the normal syntactic order in prose obtains and the longest sentential element is not placed last (2,1c.12b; 3,27; 4,3b.6a). That is, as it turns out, abnormal syntax and the placement of markedly long sentential constituents in final position, either in combination (as in almost all examples of subject and object enjambment) or alone, are fairly reliable indicators of line terminus. This suggests that the contention by some that enjambled couplets in Hebrew verse are lineated simply to agree with the prevailing pattern of parallelism is at best only partly true.⁶⁰ To be sure, parallelism is one of the principal devices used for end-fixing in biblical verse and given its prevalence, it is reasonable to suppose, as S. Geller notes, that the symmetry engendered by parallelism forms »an expectation in the reader's mind that after a certain number of words a caesura or line break will occur.«⁶¹ However, it is not that enjambled lines are then simply slotted mechanistically into a preset pattern of lineation. Rather, the coincidence of line-end and syntactic stop which routinely accompanies parallelism provide the very conventional environment which enables the kinds syntactic cuts which characterize enjambment. As E. Kafalenos observes, »if the demand for a pause at the end of every line is accepted, there is no need for the syntactical pause to be positioned at the end of a line. The more complex rhythm produced by placing syntactical pauses in other positions, in a series of adjacent lines, is often desirable.«⁶² But even assuming the conventional enabling force of parallelism on lineation, other local strategies will be required to secure the perception of line-end in enjambled couplets. Non-standard word order and the placement of markedly long sentential constituents in final positions offer two such strategies in clause internal enjambment in Lamentations.⁶³

To summarize, it seems apparent that a complex of factors are involved in the determination of the poetic line in these couplets, including syntactic conventions (e.g., constituent length, word order constraints), stylistic considerations, rhythmic demands, and probably even issues related to lineation. To specify more particularly a hier-

⁶⁰ Geller, *Parallelism*, 6; *Hebrew Prosody and Poetics*, 510; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 334.

⁶¹ *Hebrew Prosody and Poetics*, 509; cf. Garr, *Qinah*, 67f.; E. Greenstein, *Two Variations of Grammatical Parallelism in Canaanite Poetry and their Psycholinguistic Background*, *JANES* 6 (1974), 94.

⁶² *Possibilities of Isochrony*, unpub.Ph.D.diss., Washington University, 1974, 108 (as cited in Hartman, *Free Verse*, 74).

⁶³ Cf. Cushman, *Meanings of Measure*, 19, who shows how in William Carlos Williams's poetry »enjambment determines lineation.«

archy of our poet's concerns only seems to ask for trouble. Judging by the results – the frequency with which local lyric effects are found, the rhythmic predominance of unbalanced lines, and the perceptibility of lineation – suggest that the demands of style, rhythm, and lineation were uppermost in his mind. When these demands could be met within the bounds of normal syntactic practice, they were. But when they could not, our poet shows no qualms about violating these conventions.

Clause External Enjambment

Enjambment occurs clause externally as well.⁶⁴ That is, the relationship of dependency realized in the *rejet* may involve dependent (or subordinate) clauses and clauses whose sequential relationship is somehow dependent (temporally, logically, syntactically) on the main clause. Here the taxonomy moves in the opposite direction from that of clause internal enjambment, moving from more to progressively less prominent kinds of enjambment. My guide for making such judgments has been based on an estimate of the strength of dependency and the demand for completion exhibited between the related clauses.

A. Dependent Clauses⁶⁵

i. Sentential Complements

<i>qara' 'alay mô'ed</i>	He called against me a festival
<i>lišbor baḥûray</i>	To decimate my young men (1,15b)

Other examples: 1,11b.17c;⁶⁶ 2,14b; 3,44; 4,18a. Possible example: 4,14b.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 32; Kinzie, *Poet's Guide*, 85. Kirk (*Verse-Structure and Sentence-Structure*, 107) calls clause external enjambment »periodic« enjambment and characterizes it (following Parry) as involving cases where one normally expects »to find weak punctuation, marking some degree of pause, at the point of enjambment.« He gives as an example of those cases in which main and dependent subordinate clauses are stranded in different lines.

⁶⁵ Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 33.

⁶⁶ It is debatable whether this represents a form of sentential complementation. But it involves more than just the verb (so it does not represent a form of verbal enjambment, for example) and the strong dependency between the two clauses is obvious. Note also that the syntagma *hyh l-/k-* otherwise always occurs in a single line (1,1b.c.2c.5a.6b.8a.21c; 2,5a; 4,8b.10b; 5,1).

⁶⁷ MT is notoriously difficult (see Hillers, *Lamentation*, 142) and only construable by splitting the complement and the helping verb: *b'lo' yûk'êlû/yigg'e'û bilbušêhæm*.

ii. Relative Clauses

'im-yēš mak'ôb k^emak'obî Is there any pain like my pain
'ašær 'ôlal lî Which he caused me (1,12b)

Other examples: 1,7b;⁶⁸ 4,2a.⁶⁹

B. Syntactically Marked Sequentiality

Here I have collected all the examples where some form of sequentiality is overtly marked in the syntax.⁷⁰ While a sense of parallelism may at times prevail in some of these examples, it is the sense of sequentiality that is most pronounced.

i. 'al-ken

zo't 'āšib 'æl-libbî This I will keep in mind
'al-ken 'ôhîl Therefore I will hope (3,21)

Other examples: 1,8a; 3,24.

ii. kî

It is not always easy to determine the precise nuance of *kî* in Lamentations. However, its conventional use as a conjunction in Biblical Hebrew is enough to impart a sense of sequentiality even when *kî* is used asseveratively.

kâl-m^ekabbedâha hizzilûha All who esteemed her despise her
kî-ra'û 'erwâtaḥ For they see her nakedness (1,8b)

Other examples: 1,9c.11c.16c.18a.20b.21b; 3,28. Possible example: 4,18b.

ii. waw Consecutive

šam^etû babbôr ḥayyay They sought to end my life in a pit
wayyaddû-'ebæn bî And they threw stones at me (3,53)

Other examples: 1,8c; 4,11b.⁷¹ Possible example: 3,33.

⁶⁸ Reading: *kol maḥ^emudâḥal'^ašær ḥayû mîmê qædæm* (contra BHS). Lamentations shows a strong preference to place clauses headed by *kâl* (1,2b.3c.4b.6a.8b.11a.13c.21b; 2,3a.4b.15a.16a; 3,46.51.60.61; 4,12a) and by '^ašær (1,10c.12b.c; 2,17b; 4,20b) as inseparable units comprising a single line.

⁶⁹ Understanding the participle *m^esulla'im* as an unmarked relative.

⁷⁰ B. Hermstein Smith, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*, 1968, 137.

⁷¹ The presence of the two *waw* consecutive forms in roughly balanced couplets lends this couplet a parallelistic look (so Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 110, n. 1). However, the verb forms differ in gender and the semantics of the couplet implies temporal and causal sequentiality: the fire is set and then it consumes. This sense of sequentiality is also encoded syntactically as the object ('eš) of the first verb (*wayyaššæt*) becomes the subject of the second verb (*watto'kal*). Here again the prominence of sequentiality dominates whatever sense of parallelism may be present.

iv. Conjunctive *waw*

Here I have grouped all the likely examples of clauses joined by the conjunctive *waw*. Because of the typically paratactic nature of the conjunctive *waw* in Biblical Hebrew, I rank these kinds of clauses toward the weaker end on the dependency continuum.⁷²

hebe'tā yôm-qārā'tā Bring on the day that you called
w'eyihyû kāmônî And they will become like me (1,21c)

Other examples: 1,2a.4c.18b.19c.22a; 3,40; 4,6b.

C. Quotative Frames

Quotative frames involve examples where the line terminus divides the speech act verb from the quoted speech.⁷³

l'immotām yo'merû To their mothers they said,
'ayyeh dagān wāyayin »Where is the fish and wine?« (2,12a)

Other examples: 2,15c; 4,15a.b.

The Speech act verb and the beginning of the quote sometimes occur in the same line:⁷⁴

hælqî yhwš 'amerah napšî »My portion is Yahweh,« my soul says,
'al-ken 'ôhîl lô »Therefore I will hope in him« (3,24)

Other examples: 1,10c;⁷⁵ 3,18; 4,20b.

Indirect quotes are also introduced with a quotative frame:

šiwwāh yhwš l'ya'aqob Yahweh commanded concerning Jacob
sēbībāyw šārāw That his enemies (should be) around him
(1,17b;⁷⁶ cf. 1,10c).

D. Unmarked Dependency

There remain a goodly number of examples in which some non-parallelistic relationship of dependency obtains but without any overt syntactic markers present.⁷⁷ Most of these deserve individual discussion. However, space limitations obviously demand that a few choice examples will have to suffice. In almost all of the cases a parallelistic interpretation is blocked in some way by the nature of the second clause,

⁷² Higbie, *Meaning and Measure*, 33.

⁷³ See O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 411–414; and more generally, C. L. Miller, *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*, HSM 55, 1996.

⁷⁴ O'Connor (*Hebrew Verse Structure*, 414) cites as an example: Deut 32,26–27.

⁷⁵ If lineated as in BHS.

⁷⁶ In defence of this interpretation, see Hillers, *Lamentations*, 75f.

⁷⁷ Higbie (*Meaning and Measure*, 33) also treats unmarked cases of clause external enjambment.

and as a consequence the sequentiality that inheres when one clause follows another is permitted to come to the fore, inclining readers to relate the two clauses temporally or logically. In Lamentations 1–4 the prominence of sequentiality is heightened significantly by the broader prevalence of enjambment. In addition, semantic or pragmatic information is usually present which further supports the sequential interpretation (e.g. clauses often are chronologically or temporally ordered or form chains of causality).⁷⁸ Consider the following examples.

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| i. | <i>per^eśah šiyyôn b^eyādēba</i> | Zion spread out her hands, |
| | <i>’ên m^enaḥem lāh</i> | (But) there was no comforter for her (1,17a) |
| ii. | <i>qārā’ti lam’abābay</i> | I called to my lovers, |
| | <i>hemmah rimmūni</i> | (But) they deceived me (1,19a) |
| iii. | <i>šāpū-mayim ‘al-ro’šî</i> | Water flooded over my head |
| | <i>’amartî nigzartî</i> | I said, »I am cut off« (3,54) |
| iv. | <i>yitten bæ’āpār pibû</i> | Let him put his mouth in the dust – |
| | <i>’ûlay yeš tiqwāh</i> | Perhaps there is hope (3,29) |
| v. | <i>hāšak mišš^ehôr tâ^aram</i> | Their appearance is blacker than soot, |
| | <i>lo’nikkerû bahûšôt</i> | (And so) they are not recognized in the streets (4,8a) |

In (i) the *’ên* clause cannot be construed as a parallel statement to Zion’s petitionary gesture, and thus the sequentiality of the two clauses is interpreted temporally: the petitionary gesture and the lack of a response – i.e., the latter holds only after the former has been completed (cf. 1,9b.21a; 2,9b⁷⁹). In (ii) the different verb forms and subjects inhibit a parallelistic interpretation, while the sequential relationship of the two clauses is promoted by having the object of the first clause become the subject of the second clause. In (iii) the presence of the speech act verb *’mr* blocks the parallelism and the speaker’s words are therefore interpreted as arising because of the overflowing water noted in the first line (cf. 2,16b; 3,57). In (iv) *’ûlay* blocks the parallelism and thus we experience the second line as a comment on the action encouraged in the

⁷⁸ Alter (Art of Biblical Poetry, 27–61) has called attention to the same kind of semantic and pragmatic support in his fine discussion of »incipiently narrative« verse. The major differences between the phenomenon observed by Alter and that which entails the enjambed lines under review here are twofold: most of the individual couplets Alter brings forward remain dominantly parallelistic in nature as is the broader framework of all of the poems which he discusses (of course, most biblical poetry is parallelistic in orientation!). By contrast, in Lamentations 1–4, the sense of parallelism, if present at all in these couplets, is not salient and in the larger framework of these poems parallelism is never established as the principal grid of orientation (see below).

⁷⁹ Here the non-parallel nature of the couplet is effectively registered in the punctuation of the Masorettes, which suggests they understood the exile to have taken place among nations where there was no Torah, and in the Targ, which understands *’ên tôrah* as providing the reason for the king’s and princes’ exile (*’l d’brw ’l ptgmy ’wryt’* »because they transgressed the words of the Torah«).

first line. And in (v) the lack of obvious parallelism again gives way to a more sequential reading in that the failure of recognition is understood as a consequence of the darkened nature of the Nazirites' appearance. Other examples: 1,6b.9a.13b.14a.b; 2,13c.16c; 3,8.36.⁸⁰ 37.42; 4,4b.⁸¹ 16a.

Two general observations about the nature of clause external enjambment may be offered. First, the overwhelming coincidence of clause and line in these couplets (the only probable exceptions are 1,10c; 3,18.24 and 4,20b) shows even more clearly than in clause internal enjambment that lineation in Hebrew verse is discernable even in the absence of parallelism. Second, like clause internal enjambment, clause external enjambment figures in the poems' rhetorical troping, though perhaps not to the same degree. The tropes of chiasmus (1,20b and 20a; 1,22a and b), inclusio (1,12b and 22b; 2,12a and c; 3,21 and 24), and key phrase (1,7a.9b.21a) all figure in this group of couplets.

So far I have gone to some length to stress the absence of parallelism and the presence of enjambment in Lamentations. The intent has been to focus on what I believe is a key element of Lamentations' prosody, namely: the counterpointing play of syntax and lineation. However, the contrast – presence of enjambment/lack of parallelism – is not quite as sharp as I have so far implied. It is true that enjambment at the clause level and below – with the major exception of appositional constructions – usually precludes the presence of parallelism. But in enjambment above the clause level it increasingly becomes not so much a question of the presence of enjambment and the corresponding absence of parallelism as a question of which of the two is more perceptually salient.⁸² One way to think of the problem is in terms of two dominant strategies for linking the component lines of a couplet – parallelism and enjambment – which exist on a continuum. At the ends of the continuum the distinction between the two strategies is clear,⁸³ but as one

⁸⁰ Though MT is problematic.

⁸¹ Note the presence of *'ēn*.

⁸² The degree of overlap that can exist may be informally gauged by noting those places where Gray (Parallelism and Rhythm, 127, 133f.; Forms of Hebrew Poetry, 102, n. 1; 104, n. 1; 110, n. 1; 111, n. 1), for example, thinks couplets I have identified as involving enjambment exhibit some degree of parallelism (1,2a.3a.4c.7c.8a.b.c.9c.18b; 2,15c; 3,33; 4,2a.6b.8a.11b.15a.18b).

⁸³ Note the mirroring symmetries which emerge at the two ends of the continuum. When lines are bound together through matching or parallelism, the lines themselves tend to be roughly balanced in length (cf. Hrushovski, Prosody, Hebrew, 1201; Greenstein, Aspects of Biblical Poetry, 36f.) and end-stopped (cf. Peterson/Richards, Interpreting Hebrew Poetry, 44), while when syntax is the principal linking device, unbalanced (as in the qinah meter) and enjambed lines are the norm. Apparently, an isomorphic relationship tends to obtain between line length and termination, on the one hand, and par-

moves toward the middle the distinction becomes increasingly blurred. In those passages reviewed above which might involve parallelism, I would maintain that the perception of sequentiality or dependence is more salient. These still fall on the enjambling side of the continuum. There are couplets in Lamentations, however, which are predominantly parallel but also manage to promote a sense of forward movement (e.g., 1,3b; 3,4.7.11.16.30.59; 4,11b.22a). These are of the kind that Alter has called attention to in his discussion of incipient narrativity in Hebrew verse⁸⁴ and they would fall on the parallelistic side of the continuum.⁸⁵

Conclusion

Parallelism, as all contemporary students of the Bible readily concede, is the dominant convention of biblical Hebrew verse, functioning within the couplet to link and define individual lines. However, not all biblical verse is parallelistic in nature. Lamentations 1–4 is a good case in point. As Gray recognized already in the early part of this century a majority of the couplets in these poems are in fact non-parallel. The chief contention of the present paper is that to persist in assimilating these kinds of couplets to parallelism simply for the sake of systematization is nonsensical. Though clearly dominant there is no *a priori* reason why parallelism should be coextensive with Hebrew verse. Lamentations 1–4 provides evidence that this in fact is not the case. Since the continuation of syntax, both within and beyond the clause, is the defining trait of these non-parallel couplets, I have analyzed them in terms of the well-known poetic phenomenon of enjambment, providing an initial categorization of the different kinds and degrees of enjambment attested in Lamentations. On the ideal continuum of enjambed versus end-stopped lines, what I have described as the enjambling line in Lamentations is admittedly not so violently enjambed. However, absent the

allelism on the other. That is, balanced line length and end-stopping both facilitate and enhance isomorphically the perception of matching (in all of its varieties) which constitutes the domain of parallelism. As Gray notes, »Parallelism is, broadly speaking, incompatible with anything but ›stopped-line‹ poetry« (Forms of Biblical Poetry, 127). Correlatively, when this isomorphism breaks down (as in the qinah meter), the cognitive basis for synonymous parallelism is seriously eroded, and thus various forms of enjambment typically result (cf. Gray, Parallelism and Rhythm, 137; Garr, Qinah, 57f.).

⁸⁴ Art of Biblical Poetry, 27–61.

⁸⁵ More or less clear examples of couplets involving parallelism in Lamentations 1–4 would include the following: 1,2c.4b.5a.7d.13a.c.16a.18b.20c; 2,4a.5b.6a.7a.9a.10b.11a.17a.c.18c.20a.21c; 3,9.10.14.15.17.19.22.23.25.43.47.58.61; 4,2a.b.3a.7a.b.8b.11a.13a.14a.16b.19b.21b.22a.b.

pronounced end-fixing force of parallelism, even the mild forms of enjambment within the couplet that so typify Lamentations become noticeable and, as I attempt to show in the concluding part of this study, meaningfully significant.

Enjambment may be defined as the continuation of syntax and sense across line junctures without a major pause. The two-part study analyzes the large number of mostly unbalanced and non-parallel lines in Lamentations 1–4 in terms of this poetic phenomenon, describing the degree to which it is used, the various forms it takes, and the effects it has on our reading of these poems. The first part presents a taxonomy of the major kinds of enjambed lines found in Lamentations, while the second part turns to a discussion of how enjambment is exploited rhythmically and semantically in these poems. While enjambment is clearly subordinate to parallelism as an intralinear linking device in Hebrew poetry, still, when present, it deserves some comment. And in the case of Lamentations 1–4, where enjambment within the couplet may effect, as I contend, roughly two-thirds of the couplets, some kind of explanation of the phenomenon is required. By whatever name, the combination of the lack of parallelism and the prominence of run-on sentences is integral to the prosody of Lamentations.