

Conflating Impurity: Pun and Ambiguity in Lamentations 1:8-10 and Jerusalem's Multivalent Personifications

Olivia Rose
University of California, Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

Lamentations preserves a vivid literary testimony to the besiegement of Jerusalem, destruction of the Jerusalem temple, and Babylonian exile in 586 BCE. Lamentations 1 notably personifies Jerusalem, suggesting an awareness of and appeal to the ancient Mesopotamian city-lament genre. Jerusalem's personification, too, genders the city multifacetedly, enabling the city to be metaphorized as a sexually impure woman (e.g. a whore), a menstruant, and a rape victim—to name a few. I examine the contentious word *nydh* (נִדְּחָה) in Lam 1:8, paying mind to the word's homophonic connection to *ndh* (נִדְּחָה) (in verse 17) and contextual placement in the poem, leading to my conclusion that *nydh* indeed conjures the image of a menstruant—among other types of women. I argue in favor of a new methodological approach to reading Lam 1:8 that challenges the etymological approach offered by many scholars. *nydh* should be read as a pun on *ndh* in order to fully honor the word's evocative connotations and significations. Following a line of scholarship that recognizes two overarching types of impurity presented in the Hebrew Bible, I argue that in employing such a pun, Lamentations 1 conflates ritual and moral impurity to emphasize personified-Jerusalem's shame and challenge a divine retribution theology of the exile.

Conflating Impurity: Pun and Ambiguity in Lamentations 1:8-10 and Jerusalem's Multivalent Personifications

By Olivia Rose¹
University of California, Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION

The events of 586 BCE drastically impacted the trajectory of Hebrew literature. In 589 BCE, during Zedekiah's reign in Jerusalem, King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon laid siege to Jerusalem. In 586 BCE, Babylon successfully conquered the city, exiling to Babylon Zedekiah and many other Judean officials. The archaeology of the eastern hill of Jerusalem has given vivid testimony to the devastation that the Babylonians brought to the city. The remains associated with the layer of destruction show evidence of a prolonged siege, including rationing and starvation. The biblical book of Lamentations preserves the most vivid description of the destruction of the city.² The book contains five distinct poems, each markedly eidetic. This paper will focus on Lamentations 1 and Jerusalem's gendered personification.

Lamentations 1 opens with an unidentifiable narrator whose voice assumes about half of the poem (Lam 1:1-11a, 17). Personified-Jerusalem assumes a voice in the poem as well (Lam 1:11b-16, 18-22), shifting the narrative perspective to give a notably intimate portrayal and perspective of the city's

¹ Olivia Rose graduated from UCLA in June 2019 with a B.A. in English Literature (with a concentration in Creative Writing) and Comparative Literature. Her primary areas of interest are poetry writing, literary and critical theory, and the Hebrew Bible. She intends to pursue one or all of these avenues in graduate school. This paper was adapted from an independent study with Dr. Jeremy D. Smoak (UCLA, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures).

² While the claim that Lamentations succeeds the exile is substantiated thematically, it is (much more importantly) substantiated linguistically by F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp's linguistic dating of Lamentations, which will be outlined in the following section.

traumatic destruction. Throughout the poem, Jerusalem is personified as specific types of women, for instance: daughter, sexual adulteress, mother,³ menstruant. Much scholarship on Jerusalem's portrayal as a menstruant has favored etymological analyses of the word *ḥṭṭ* (that doubt the word's reference to a menstruant) in Lam 1:8 and the word *ḥṭṭ* in 1:17. Recent scholarship has also maintained these analyses with a typological understanding of impurity in the Hebrew Bible. I argue that these approaches fail to do justice to the lament's conflation of ritual and moral impurity that powerfully characterizes personified-Jerusalem as a woman wholly, completely, multidimensionally abandoned and, ultimately, shamed. An analytical approach that challenges the etymological and typological approaches mentioned favorably honors the text's success in creating meaning out of the trauma of 586 and challenging a divine retribution theology for the exile.

Dating Lamentations

To allow for a historically informed analysis of the book of Lamentations, we first must date the text. Many scholars have dated the book to the period following the Babylonian exile based on the book's thematic content.⁴ However, dating a poetical text on thematic grounds can prove cumbersome and inaccurate. Certainly, a key element of poetry is its often-intentional elusiveness and ambiguity. Still, such an argument proves useful in helping us analyze all the facets of the book's content.

Some scholars have argued that the book necessarily dates to the period closely following the events of 586 BCE because the poem's graphic imagery

³ Admittedly, a fault of this paper is its dismissal of Jerusalem's personification as MOTHER—a personification that is notable and important; yet, the limitations of this paper do not give time for a discussion on Jerusalem's depiction as mother. In my opinion, her other personifications are more relevant to my argument.

⁴ Frederick W. Dobbs-Allsopp, "Linguistic Evidence for the Date of Lamentations," *JANES* 26 (1998):2-3.

and descriptions of the destruction of the temple simply must have been recalled by a first-hand witness of the temple destruction.⁵ This, too, is a problematic and inaccurate assumption about a poet's narrative and visual limitations that seems to underestimate a poet's creativity and imagination. Why must a poet personally experience a horror in order to imagine—or potentially fabricate—details and sentiments associated with that horror?

Frederick W. Dobbs-Allsopp clarifies the chronological placement of Lamentations by dating the book linguistically. He identifies eighteen linguistic features of Late Biblical Hebrew in the book. However, “the total number of late features in Lamentations is far fewer than that found in known LBH [Late Biblical Hebrew] works...indicating that the language is not classically LBH.”⁶ He argues that Lamentations reflects a transitional period between Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) and LBH. He thus dates the book to the sixth century. Because of the book's linguistic similarities to Ezekiel, he also argues the book must date after 586 BCE. But, too, because of the book's dissimilarities to the post-exilic prophetic books (which have been linguistically dated to the end of the sixth/beginning of the fifth century), he dates Lamentations to the period between 586 and 520 BCE. In summary, the book linguistically dates to the period closely following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the Babylonian exile. This dating of Lamentations suggests that the imagery of the book recalls a close memory of the devastation and exile of the city and provides the literary complement to the archaeological picture of the event. The dating proposed by Dobbs-Allsopp grounds the historical, textual, and thematic analyses I will execute in this paper.

⁵ Ibid., 4.

⁶ Ibid., 34.

The City-Lament Genre

Before moving into a discussion on the subject of impurity, it is necessary to establish the genre of our text. Dobbs-Allsopp's extensive work on Lamentations has regarded the city-lament genre in much detail.⁷ He expands upon Delbert Hillers's identification of an Israel city-lament genre as "an abstraction made, for the sake of discussion, to refer to a common theme: the destruction of city and sanctuary, with identifiable imagery specific to this theme, and common sub-topics and poetic devices."⁸ Dobbs-Allsopp examines Lamentations's generic similarities to Mesopotamian laments, identifying nine key categories of the laments' content: "Subject and Mood,"⁹ "Structure and Poetic Technique," "Divine Abandonment," "Assignment of Responsibility," "The Divine Agent of Destruction," "Destruction," "The Weeping Goddess," "Lamentation," and "Restoration of the City and Return of the Gods."¹⁰ Moderate attention will be paid to the key generic features found in Lamentations that prove relevant to my arguments.

Indeed, Lamentations displays some significant differences from the Mesopotamian city laments. Firstly, personified-Jerusalem assumes the role of the weeping goddess, who in Mesopotamian city laments would weep on behalf of the city to a more powerful god. In other words, Jerusalem pleads for herself rather than having a patron goddess represent

⁷ See Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993) for the most extensive overview. See also Dobbs-Allsopp, "Lamentations from Sundry Angles: A Retrospective" in *Lamentations in Ancient and Contemporary Cultural Contexts*, ed. Nancy C. Lee and Carleen Mandolfo (Atlanta: Brill, 2008), 13-26. For more theoretical considerations on genre, see Dobbs-Allsopp, "Darwinism, Genre Theory, and City Laments," *JAOS* 120 no.4 (2000): 625-630.

⁸ Delbert Hillers, *Lamentations* (New York: Doubleday Press, 1972), 36. Hillers's statement is helpful in simplifying the tenets of the genre to focus on what are arguably most important regarding the city-lament genre—the destruction of the city *and the sanctuary*.

⁹ Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion*, 31-32.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 32-94.

her. Christl Maier makes note of this significant difference, and consequently translates the epithet *בַּת-צִיּוֹן* *bt- ywn* found intermittently throughout Lamentations as “Daughter Zion” rather than “Daughter of Zion”¹¹ to reflect the nature of personified-Jerusalem as a character who does not only represent the city, but more importantly *is* the city herself. In other words, she represents the city by being the city; she represents herself. The translation “Daughter Zion” allows the language of the text to assert a certain agency by emphasizing Jerusalem’s agency in the lamenting of her own destruction. Secondly, the biblical laments both discuss the reasons for destruction and blame the city (or her inhabitants) for the destruction.¹² Maier then identifies a third distinction regarding Lamentations’s relationship to biblical prophetic laments—namely, that “the prophet is prospectively lamenting the death of his audience and the destruction of their habitation... underscor[ing] the grim prospects of the prophetic message of doom.”¹³ Jerusalem’s destruction is retrospective, not only allowing for the genre of lament at large, but more importantly fueling the depiction of personified-Jerusalem through her carefully nuanced personifications.

JERUSALEM PERSONIFIED: A PUN ON A MENSTRUANT, A WHORE, AND A RAPE VICTIM

Personification of the City: “Daughter Zion”

The personification of Jerusalem overarches much of the poems and must be analyzed acutely in order to fully understand the text’s attitude toward the destroyed city, her people, and even the issue of temple sacrifice.¹⁴ The city is personified immediately in the first line of the lament

¹¹ Christl Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 62. Dobbs-Allsopp (and other scholars) adhere to the translation “Daughter of Zion,” reading the epithet as a genitive of location.

¹² *Ibid.*, 70-71.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 71.

¹⁴ While the limitations of this paper won’t allow for further discussion of the issue of temple sacrifice, it is pertinent enough to be here mentioned.

by being described as sitting:¹⁵

'y kh yšbh bdd h'y r rbty 'm

איכה ישבה בדרך העיר רבתי עם

How lonely sits the city that once was full of people!¹⁶

Lamentations's personification of Jerusalem, though, reaches beyond generalized personification to personify the city as woman and type-of-woman—for instance, daughter (vv.6,15), widow (v.1), princess and vassal (ibid.), mother (vv.5,16), menstruant (vv.8f?,17), and sexually-impure-woman (vv.8f?,10).

In the previous section on Lamentations's connection to the Mesopotamian city-lament genre, we touched on Jerusalem's personification as a distinctive nuance in Lamentations to the “weeping goddess” trope in Mesopotamian city-laments. We recall that this personification is emphasized and in part achieved by the epithet ציון-בת that is attributed to the personified city. Maier well identifies some of the key results of the metaphor “Zion is a daughter” communicated through this epithet. Firstly, the “Zion” element of the metaphor connotes the notion of Zion as an elect location chosen by YHWH as his dwelling place.¹⁷ More relevant to our discussion, though, is the “daughter” element of the metaphor, which Maier expounds:

In a patriarchal society such as ancient Israel, the highest grade of protection is offered to the daughter who is not yet married. Israel shares the complex concept of shame and honor valid in ancient

¹⁵ I can't but mention here that this simple statement is packed with more subliminal implied metaphors of its own; for instance, the city as a container. I owe all recognition of this sort of claim to George Lackoff and Mark Johnson's influential work on metaphor, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: UP, 1980). Much of my examination of metaphor will thus come from their work. Nonetheless, we will refrain from analyzing extensively the innumerable metaphors in the text at hand in order to pay due attention to the metaphors I argue are most pertinent to the discussion at hand.

¹⁶ This paper will utilize the NRSV for all translations unless otherwise noted. “How” here could also be translated emphatically, e.g. “Ah! Lonely sits the city”.

¹⁷ Maier, *Daughter Zion*, 73.

Mediterranean societies. Within the auspices of this notion of shame and honor, the status of a family is represented by its male head with regard to its members' reputation and conduct. Thus the virginity of a daughter and her chastity until marriage are directly related to the honor, or, in the case of its premature loss, the shame of the family and particularly its patriarch.¹⁸

So, in ancient Israel's patriarchal context, a characterization of "daughter" connotes the value such a woman has, which is (simply put) based on her being chaste and thus marriageable.¹⁹

Jerusalem's personification also allows the city to have her own voice—again, to assume the role of the weeping patron goddess and speak on her own behalf. This gives voice to her inhabitants. Jerusalem represents the inhabitants who were present during the Babylonian siege and destruction of the temple. Unlike the Mesopotamian city laments, in which the patron goddess would represent the city, Jerusalem's representing herself gives her a closer relationship of representation with her inhabitants:

Mesop. laments: inhabitants → city → patron goddess *protests* → head deity

Lamentations: inhabitants → city personified *protests* → YHWH

Similarly, the personification of the city—the conflation of city and patron goddess—puts the city at a conceptually closer distance to the divine (YHWH). Perhaps more evocatively, Jerusalem's personification cultivates a poetic voice that is intense and demands response. As Dobbs-Allsopp mentions, "The personified city in Lamentations is no passive object that can be easily ignored the reader is forced to reckon with the human consequences of the punishment...that was inflicted on Jerusalem."²⁰

¹⁸ Ibid., 74.

¹⁹ Additionally, both translations "Daughter Zion" and "Daughter of Zion" offer this understanding.

²⁰ Dobbs-Allsopp, *Lamentations* (Louisville: James Knox Press, 2002), 65.

Daniel Smith-Christopher presents archeological evidence challenging the tendencies of some scholars to dismiss the historical legitimacy of the intensity of the exile for Judahites. His findings reveal that conditions were indeed dire and harsh during the exile and thus reasonably ground the historical legitimacy of Lamentations's depiction of the exile.²¹ Jerusalem's personification, then, heightens the emotional palpability of the horrors of the exile by allowing affliction to be embodied. Her embodied pain connects her with her inhabitants who, being human, experienced physical affliction. Too, personified-Jerusalem enables the author to precisely communicate the destruction of the city in a manner particularly relatable. The extensive description of bodily discomfort works experientially, as all readers are persons embodied and can well imagine and remember bodily discomfort and pains. (This is also reflected in the conceptual affinity of personified-Jerusalem to Jerusalem's inhabitants just outlined.)

I have charted some of the implications of Jerusalem's personification as a woman and as a daughter—particularly, that the epithet “Daughter Zion” recalls the Mesopotamian city-lament genre and suggests an Israelite/Judahite literary nuance to the weeping goddess trope. I have also outlined some of the ways in which Jerusalem's personification allows the literary city to speak on behalf of herself and her inhabitants. Moreover, her personification lets her embody both the affliction experienced historically by her inhabitants and the physical destruction of the city itself in the sixth century BCE. However, to again be repetitive, the poem personifies Jerusalem not just as woman, but as type-of-woman. In this vein, the personifications of menstruant and sexually-impure-woman are of primary interest to my study, primarily due to the elusiveness of the word. In the following sections, I will outline the impurity dichotomy suggested by the

²¹ Daniel Smith-Christopher, “Violence and Exegesis: The History of Exile,” in *A Biblical Theology of Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 27-73.

1:17. In the biblical texts as studied extensively by Jonathan Klawans. I will then provide an overview of scholarship regarding Lam 1:8-10, my argument that Lam 1:8-10 should be read with a better acceptance of and appreciation for the ambiguity of $\eta\eta\eta$.

Impurity in the Hebrew Bible: Ritual Impurity vs. Moral Impurity

The issue of impurity and tabernacle/temple defilement pervades the Hebrew Bible. Jonathan Klawans highly influential work on impurity reads the biblical impurity laws in a binary.²² Under “impurity,” he identifies two distinct impurity categories: ritual impurity and moral impurity. The ritual impurity laws—laid out in Leviticus 11-15 and Numbers 19 (roughly)—provide both the bounds within which an individual must live in order to remain pure and the means for purification should one become impure. Impurity prevents one from entering the temple. Klawans summarizes his claims on the distinction of ritual impurity as follows:

In general...there are three distinct characteristics of ritual impurity: (1) the sources of ritual impurity are natural and more or less unavoidable; (2) it is not sinful to contract these impurities; and (3)

²² See Jonathan Klawans, “Chapter 2: The Sacrificial Process of Ancient Israel,” in *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple* (Oxford: UP, 2005), 49-74. See also Klawans “Introduction” and “Chapter 1: Ritual and Moral Impurity in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: UP, 2000), 3-42. Other sources of scholarship on impurity and sin in ancient Judaism abound: namely, Adolph Büchler’s *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century* (Oxford:UP, 1927), Gedalyahu Alon’s “The Bounds of the Laws of Levitical Cleanness” in *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 190-234, and Mary Douglas’s groundbreaking *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 1966). In the introduction to *Impurity and Sin*, Klawans summarizes much of the influential scholarship on impurity and sin (and the relationship between the two); he includes the previous three sources mentioned, as well as works by David Z. Hoffman, Jacob Milgrom, Tikva Frymer-Kensky, and David P. Wright. All the works here mentioned ground Klawans’s research, and his continuation on the topic in particular pays heed to “the fact that certain grave sins have their own distinct defiling force” (21). I must disclaim that referring to Klawans’s outlook as a “binary” may be a sure oversimplification, but I believe it to be a somewhat helpful one.

these impurities can convey an impermanent contagion to people (priests and Israelites) and to many items within close proximity.²³

The Holiness Code (roughly Lev 17-26) addresses specific serious sins—*תועבות* *tw'bw't*, often translated “abominations”—that result in moral impurity. These sins defile “the sinner...the land of Israel...and the sanctuary of God...This defilement, in turn leads to the expulsion of the people from the land of Israel.”²⁴

To reiterate, “ritual impurity” refers to contamination from bodily flows (e.g. menstruation), contact with corpses, etc. It leads to “temporary, contagious impurity” and can be resolved by bathing or waiting.²⁵ Moral impurity is caused by committing horrendous sins or offenses—namely, idolatry, sexual adultery (incl. incest), and murder (bloodshed). The result of moral impurity is the “[d]efilement of sinners, land, and sanctuary.” Moral impurity is resolved through atonement or punishment; but, as the defiling force of *תועבות* is so great, the ultimate resolution to moral impurity is exile from the land.²⁶ In my ongoing discussion, I will utilize Klawans’s terms “ritual impurity” and “moral impurity” in referring to the purity dichotomy he recognizes in the biblical corpus.

Klawans’s understanding of biblical impurity laws proves helpful by enabling us to better consider what Lamentations might be suggesting in the way of a theology of the exile (i.e. banishment from the land). I argue that Lamentations reflects/purports²⁷ a nuanced, fluid understanding of

²³ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 54.

²⁴ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 26.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 27.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ The language we use here has large interpretative implications. My ultimate aim and approach is literary analysis. As such, in order to honor a historically informed analysis of the text while also allowing the text to exert its own agency—and, too, to refrain from making assumptions about authorial intent—I quite intentionally explicate that the text might be reflecting a particular understanding of impurity or purporting a particular understanding of impurity. To be sure, the text probably does both. This is a simultaneous and interconnected process. Moreover, according to my acquired

typological impurity and, too, does so as a way of understanding and coping with the temple destruction and Babylonian exile. Lamentations problematizes the dissonance between ritual and moral impurity by conflating the two,²⁸ resultingly shifting the focus of the poem onto Jerusalem's position as a victim and undermining the motif that Jerusalem's destruction and her inhabitants' exile is warranted punishment for her abominations.

Impurity Language in Lamentations: A Menstruant and a Whore

In this section, I will address a pressing instance of impurity language in Lamentations 1:8—an occurrence that is up for much debate and defies the *lectio difficilior potior* reading of the verse. The word used, *הַנְּדָה*, only occurs in Lam 1:8. It is a homophone to *הַנְּדָה*, the word used in the Hebrew Bible to refer to a menstruating woman.²⁹ *הַנְּדָה* is used in Lam 1:17 to characterize personified-Jerusalem. I will take into account a myriad of scholarly opinions on Lam 1:8. I will also consider the placement of the verse within the poem's eidetic, evocative, moody context—and, too, the context afforded by verse 17 with the undoubtable reference to a menstruant/unclean woman. I will continue our discussion on metaphor by extrapolating the argument of some scholars that the (possible) reference to a menstruant in

theoretical approach to literary analysis, authorial intent must never be valued above the text's independent agency. Certainly, a more comprehensive historical analysis might allow us to say with more certainty to what level the text reflects versus purports. Still, this would leave us in the realm of assuming authorial intent. And, however likely the author's standpoint may be, this all leads back to assumption, and remains ultimately divorced from the text itself and the text's agency.

²⁸ I must also clarify that this statement seems to assume that Lamentations as a text holds an understanding of impurity as being a dichotomy. (For how else could the text conflate the two categories?) Surely, the text seems to not (necessarily) hold any such understanding. In saying that the text conflates ritual and moral impurity, we necessarily utilize the language of an interpretative stance on biblical impurity laws. (For brevity, we could say that we necessarily use Klawans's language.) Our analysis of purity conflation is thus ultimately indebted to, caught inside of, language that assumes purity as being a dichotomy.

²⁹ I will later address the metaphorical nuance to *הַנְּדָה* that we see suggested in the word's occurrences in Ezekiel 7 and Leviticus 20:21 to refer to defiled land.

verse 8—coupled with the sure reference in verse 17—operates as a metaphor for Jerusalem’s moral impurity.

The Poem³⁰ Punning: נִדְּחָה in Lamentations 1:8

The first occurrence of impurity language in Lamentations 1 has been the subject of much scholarly debate, and will begin our discussion on the nuances of Jerusalem’s gendered personification:

ḥṭ' ḥṭ' h yrwšlm 'l-kn lnydh hyth
kl-mkbbdyh hzylwh ky-r'w 'rwth
gm-hy' n' nḥh wtšb 'ḥwr

הַיְתָה כֵּן לְנִדְּחָה-חַטָּא חַטָּא יְרוּשָׁלַם עַל
 רָאוּ עֲרוֹתֶיהָ-מְכַבְּדֶיהָ הַזֵּילוּהָ כִּי-כָל
 הִיא נֶאֱנָחָה וּתְשֹׁב אָחֹר-³¹

Jerusalem sinned grievously,
 so she has become a **mockery**;
 all who honored her despise her,
 for they have seen her nakedness;
 she herself groans,
 and turns her face away.³²

Scholars argue over the proper translation of נִדְּחָה. As previously mentioned, the occurrence in Lam 1:8 is the only biblical instance of the word. Hillers follows the readings of Ibn Ezra, Löhr, and Rudolph who “take this [נִדְּחָה] as [an] ‘object of head-nodding,’ i.e., ‘object of scorn.’”³³ Like the line of interpretation Hillers holds to, Adele Berlin takes נִדְּחָה as coming from the

³⁰ An affinity for textual agency imbues the arguments of this paper. As such, I intentionally refrain from claiming that, for instance, “the poet” utilizes a pun. This would miss the mark. The text—the poem—employs a pun (according to my argument). This approach is grounded in critical and literary theory, and I am acutely aware that such an approach in many ways defies an historical approach. I reserve discussion of such literary/interpretative approaches to the footnotes for, to a degree, they do not directly substantiate the core arguments of my analysis of Lam 1.

³¹ Lam 1:8, my emphasis.

³² A hyper-literal translation could read, “Jerusalem has sinned grievously so that she has become (like) a menstruant,” if we read נִדְּחָה as נִדְּחָה. Sufficient discussion will examine this possibility. C.f. Lam 1:21, “All my enemies heard of my trouble; they are glad [שִׂשְׁוּן] that you have done it.” שִׂשְׁוּן here, from שִׂשְׂוּ, literally means “rejoice,” and could be translated as “mock.”

³³ Hillers, *Lamentations*, 9. Hillers translates the verse, “Because Jerusalem sinned so great a sin, / people shake their heads at her” (2).

root נוד *nwd*.³⁴ She entertains a translation of נִדָּה that adheres to the “menstruant” or “unclean” sense of the word, but argues against this translation on both linguistic and phenomenological grounds. She holds that, were נִדָּה indeed coming from the root נוד *ndd*, we would see a spelling like נִדָּה (c.f. Lam 1:17)—specifically, without a *yod* and with a *dagesh* in the *dalet*. Adhering to the *lectio difficilior potior* reading that traces נִדָּה to the root נוד, she argues that נִדָּה gives readers the sense of a woman banished:³⁵

... *nwd* has two meanings. One is “to move or shake [the head]” in the sense of “to mock or deride” (Jer 18:16; Ps 44:15)...A second possibility is to take *nwd* as “wanderer.” Both “derision” and “wanderer” are derived from the same root by *HALOT* and by Ibn Ezra....I have chosen the idea of wandering because the consequence of sin is less likely to be derision and more likely to be banishment or exile.³⁶

To say nothing of Berlin’s assumption of the text’s understanding of חַטָּאת *hṭ’* (“sin”) and its consequence(s), she ultimately favors an interpretation of נִדָּה that prioritizes the “wandering” sense of the word. (She goes on to mention the connotational connection to Cain’s curse in Genesis 4:12-14.)³⁷ Berlin must be credited, though, for her holistic acceptance of the word: “all three associations adhere to the word, and the dominant one shifts as we proceed from line to line...”³⁸

A strong substantiating argument in support of understanding נִדָּה as “menstruant” is verse 8’s connection with verse 17:

hyth yrwšlm lndh bynyhm

בֵּינֵיהֶם הָיְתָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנִדָּה

³⁴ Adele Berlin, *Lamentations* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 42.

HALOT also traces נִדָּה to the root נוד.

³⁵ Berlin translates the verse, “Grievously has Jerusalem sinned, / therefore she has been banished” (42).

³⁶ Berlin, *Lamentations*, 53.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 54. Regardless of Berlin’s discussion in her commentary of the nuances of נִדָּה, her *translation* ultimately does not honor the menstruant sense of the word. We enter a consideration on translation theory and the most appropriate method of translation of נִדָּה...my arguments engage the Hebrew. Though considerations of appropriate translation pervade my arguments, my arguments are ultimately analysis- and interpretation-based.

Jerusalem has become
a **filthy thing** among them.³⁹

In an attempt to make sense of the rare word and connect verse 8 topically with the more common homophone נִדָּה in verse 17, some argue⁴⁰ that נִדְּהָ is a variant spelling of נִדָּה, from the root נִדָּה *ndd*,⁴¹ a word that refers to a woman in menstruation.⁴² We should note here that both נִדְּהָ and נִדָּה supply a sense of banishment. Klawans refers to Lamentations 1:8 in passing, claiming that both verses 8 and 17 refer to a menstruant as a simile⁴³ for the moral impurity of Jerusalem.⁴⁴ Notice, though, that he does accept נִדְּהָ as referring to a menstruant. In his translation and commentary, Robert Alter brushes over the issue: “The Hebrew word *nidah*, a root that suggests banishment, is associated with a menstruant woman, considered unclean and not to be touched.”⁴⁵ Iain Provan favors the translation “filthy” for נִדְּהָ (adhering to the “menstruant” sense of the word) and compares נִדְּהָ with instances of נִדָּה in Jeremiah and the Psalms: “It is not easy to see...[how this]...could mean ‘object of scorn’... even if it were granted that the word of itself could express the idea of ‘shaking the head’. In Jer. 18:16 and Ps 44:14

³⁹ My emphasis. Literally, “Jerusalem has become (like) a menstruant among them.”

⁴⁰ See Berlin, *Lamentations*, 42, 46, 53-55.

⁴¹ Ludwig Kohler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 672.

⁴² Cf. Lev 12:2-5, 15:19-33, 18:19.

⁴³ For the sake of our study, we will consider simile and metaphor to be fairly synonymous. Scholars of metaphor and simile theory debate over the fundamental sameness or lack thereof of simile and metaphor. Nonetheless, because Klawans’s statement is not extensively extrapolated and because he does not seem to intentionally be welcoming a conversation on the distinctions between simile and metaphor, I feel safe in assuming the phenomenological underpinnings of these two devices to be understood as generally “same” for the purposes and limitations of this paper.

⁴⁴ Jonathan Klawans, “Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity: Moral Defilement in Ancient Judaism,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 29, no.4 (1998): 400.

⁴⁵ Robert Alter, “Lamentations,” in *The Hebrew Bible: A Translation with Commentary* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2018), 649. Alter’s translation of the beginning of verse 8 reads, “An offense did Jerusalem commit, therefore she became despised.” So, notably, his translation alone (apart from the note in his commentary) does not itself connote menstruation or ritual impurity.

the actual word ‘head’...is required in order to define what it is that is being shaken.”⁴⁶ Joseph Lam similarly refutes Berlin’s interpretation:

Despite the strong arguments that Berlin offers, on balance the menstruant interpretation remains more compelling....Given the close parallel in the phraseology of 1:8 [to 1:17], as well as the recurrence of ‘there is no comforter for her’...it seems reasonable to take 1:8-9 as representing the same metaphor as 1:17, but explicated in detail. The menstruant and her impurity function poetically as symbols of shame...⁴⁷

Berlin and Klawans both argue that the image of the menstruant in Lamentations 1 (again, undoubtedly present with verse 17) should be understood metaphorically. That is, the menstruant is a metaphor for a morally impure woman (i.e. personified-Jerusalem). Now, I do not want to fully challenge the claim that the menstruant in Lamentations 1 must be understood metaphorically. I instead challenge the implied notion that Lamentations 1 (or any text) should be read with the insistence that language has singular import. For, in their analyses on the matter, Berlin and Klawans both explicitly state the reason for understanding the menstruant as a metaphor in Lamentations 1 is because menstruation (ritual impurity) was not ground for banishment from the land.⁴⁸ We also must differentiate between pun and metaphor, which I believe may be distinctly different (and perhaps mutually exclusive) categories.⁴⁹

If נִדָּה is operating as a pun, then its two significations are derision/wanderer and a menstruant (נִדָּה). But, as a homophonic pun, the significations of נִדָּה are not neutral. That is, נִדָּה would have a primary and a secondary signification. The primary (wanderer/banished) signification is

⁴⁶ Iain Provan, *Lamentations* (Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1991), 44. Provan’s analysis is particularly strong in refuting the use of נִדָּה through a comparative analysis. Notably, both instances in Jeremiah 18 and Psalm 44 represent poetical instances of נִדָּה and thus relate to our study fittingly.

⁴⁷ Joseph Lam, *Patterns of Sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, Culture, and the Making of a Religious Concept* (Oxford: UP, 2016), 196.

⁴⁸ Berlin, *Lamentations*, 54; Klawans, “Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity,” 400.

⁴⁹ My attention to the distinction of pun and metaphor is catalyzed by Donald Davidson’s essay “What Metaphors Mean,” *Critical Inquiry* 5, no.1 (Autumn, 1978): 31-47.

signified by both the word's orthography and phonetics. The secondary signification is signified solely by הַנִּדָּה's phonetics that mirror the phonetics of the homophone נִדָּה and thus recall the variant word. Such recollection would all the while be an encouraged association based on imageric context, as mentioned previously. (This would be opposed to a homonymic pun, in which both possible significations of a word would have the same sound and spelling. In other words, the same word would have two incongruous definitions, and any talk of the word's primary signification would be grounded by context alone rather than by the word's distinctive orthography.) As such, we would receive a type of hierarchy of significations, if you will.⁵⁰

“Hierarchy” may prove quite problematic for us, though—and rightfully so. I will challenge referring to הַנִּדָּה's significations as a hierarchy by arguing that this hierarchy could be undermined should the connotational weight of the secondary signification be more prominent. To be specific: should the image of a menstruant better fit the thematic, imageric context of the poem, it would overwhelm the perhaps-less-specific image of a woman banished or wandering. For instance: an ancient reader might interpret הַנִּדָּה as a wonky spelling of נִדָּה, rather than interpreting הַנִּדָּה as נִדָּה only secondarily. So, to be clear, the hierarchy is not set in stone. The significations attributed to “primary signification” and “secondary signification” are debatable, pliable, and perhaps even arbitrary.

(I must also note that the primary significations of הַנִּדָּה are not in themselves clear, as Berlin succinctly outlines. Namely, we have two options suggested by the root נִדָּה—“derision” and “wanderer.” For the sake of simplicity and brevity in my analysis, I favor Berlin's adherence to the “wanderer” sense of

⁵⁰ I must again clarify that, when I speak of הַנִּדָּה operating as a pun, I do in fact mean how it operates in the text, not necessarily how the author intended. My primary concern is with literary interpretation, not authorial intent. Yet, if a pun is indeed operating in the way I argue, this would be a quite sophisticated and admirable employment on the poet's part. Nonetheless, in my arguments, I will disregard speculation about authorial intent.

the word as the pun's primary signification. Still, I must emphasize that the nature of this pun can be challenged from multiple directions—here, in its primary significations. The pun could and should be further problematized beyond what this paper offers.)

It is for these reasons that I favor an interpretation of נִדְהָ that understands it as a pun on נָדָה. This understanding honors both lines of scholarly interpretation traced thus forth (menstruant/root נָדָה vs. wanderer/derision/root נָדָה) without undermining the diligence in argumentation on any viewpoint. Moreover, with the understanding of the pun's signification hierarchy I have laid out, we see its significations are nonetheless contentious and, thus, an acceptance of the pun still allows room for fruitful discussion on the nuances of נִדְהָ. In recognizing נִדְהָ as a pun, we better see the literary nuances of the word that Berlin's and Klawans's etymological and typological approaches do not allow. The image of a menstruant is present in verse 8, even if the etymology of נִדְהָ does not seem to suggest it. And, the image of the menstruant is conjured in order to depict Jerusalem's shame.

טמא נִדְהָ/נָדָה **Read in the Context of** נִדְהָ

I have thus established the benefit of reading נִדְהָ as a pun. Present in the pun is the image of a menstruant. This image is arguably furthered in verse 9. Though I challenge it, Berlin's interpretation of verse 9 behooves us as she makes clear note of the (perceived) dissonance between ritual and moral impurity, claiming that the two types of purity are incongruous and necessarily should impact our reading of verses 8-9:

<p>... <i>kl-mkbdy hzylwh ky-r'w'rwth</i> <i>gm-hy'n'nhh wtšb 'hwr</i></p> <p><i>ṭm 'th bšwlyh l' zkrh aḥryth</i> <i>wtrd pl'yym 'yn mnḥm lh</i> <i>r'h YHWH t- 'nyy ky hgdyl ' wyb</i></p>	<p>... ראו עֲרֹתָהּ - מִכַּבְּדֶיהָ הִזְלִיחָהּ כִּי-כָל הִיא נִאֲנָתָהּ וְתִשָּׁב אַחֲזֹר-גַּם</p> <p>בְּשׂוֹלֵיָהּ לֹא זָכְרָה אַחֲרֵיתָהּ טְמֵאָתָהּ וְתָרַד פְּלֵאִים אֵין מְנַחֵם לָהּ עֲנִי כִּי הִגְדִּיל אוֹיֵב-רָאָה יְהוָה אֶת</p>
--	---

...all who honored her despise her,
for they have seen her nakedness;
she herself groans,
and turns her face away.

Her **uncleanness** was in her skirts;
she took no thought of her future;
her downfall was appalling,
with none to comfort her.
“O LORD, look at my affliction,
For the enemy has triumphed!”⁵¹

The Hebrew word *טִמְאָה* *ṭm'* (“uncleanness”) can be used in both ritual and moral impurity contexts.⁵² If we appreciate the menstruant sense of *טִמְאָה*, the “uncleanness in her skirts” provides vivid imagery of menstrual blood in Jerusalem’s skirts. As Lam notes, “The menstruant and her impurity function poetically as symbols of shame, and the visibility of the impurity on her skirts prompts rejection from her neighbors.”⁵³ Along Berlin’s line of thinking, though, the reference to uncleanness in personified-Jerusalem’s skirts is not a reference to menstruation (or menstrual blood), but a reference to sexual immodesty. She derives this claim by cross-referencing other biblical instances of the unveiling of skirts (here, *שְׂוִלְיָהּ* *šwlyh*, lit. “her skirts”) that refer to sexual immodesty. Thus, “[Jerusalem] is not a menstruant; she is a whore.”⁵⁴ Her ultimate argument, though, is underlined by her explication that “a menstruant is ritually, but not morally, impure; menstruation is not a sin....If the intended image is a menstruant, ritual impurity *must* be interpreted as a *metaphor* for the moral impurity of which Jerusalem was guilty by virtue of her unfaithfulness to God.”⁵⁵ In making this claim, Berlin represents a line of scholarship that too readily assumes an organized or clear-cut understanding of the exile on behalf of the poet. (But, as previously outlined, Lamentations dates to a period quite

⁵¹ Lam 1:8b-9, my emphasis.

⁵² Klawans, “Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity,” 395.

⁵³ Lam, *Patterns of Sin*, 196.

⁵⁴ Berlin, *Lamentations*, 54.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, my emphasis.

close after the exile and destruction of the temple. The text's grappling with the exile would, then, be barely retrospective. We should expect the text to be confused and conflicted when it comes to a theology on the exile.) Berlin's assumption then bleeds into an assumption about the understanding of the text. That is, according to Berlin, the text exerts an organized understanding of impurity and the exile. But, as this paper argues, Lam 1 indeed does not reflect or purport an organized understanding of impurity and the exile. So, in such an assumption of the poet, Berlin (and other scholars) mistakenly overvalue authorial intent and miss the text's precise method of meaning-making.

Aside from what we should expect, we nonetheless see this in the text. In identifying *הַיָּדָיִם* as a pun initially, we can converse about the ways the text employs interplaying iterations of women shamed in order to depict Jerusalem's horrific shame. The interplay is continued in verse 9. Jerusalem is both a menstruant and a whore. Rhetoric that connotes a menstruant carries over into verse 9 (namely, "Her uncleanness was in her skirts"), even if just a mere remnant. While verse 9 taken independently would likely not suggest a menstruant, the verse in context suggests varying images. Jerusalem is both ritually and morally impure—if we insist on assessing purity as a dichotomy. Now, I must admit, in identifying the simultaneous suggestions made possible by the text's ambiguity, I might be doing an injustice in not paying mind to the text's elusiveness, which Dobbs-Allsopp nicely identifies:

That is, all the details surrounding the exposure of the city's 'nakedness' have been suppressed, and as a result, the image swells with potential connotations, perhaps referring to the prophetic motif, but maybe calling attention to the shame or disgrace that the exposure of the naked body triggers in many cultures, including that of ancient Judah.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ Dobbs-Allsopp, *Lamentations*, 64.

Indeed, Jerusalem's nakedness alone conveys her shame. The amalgamation of the naked woman, menstruant, and sexual adulteress heightens the palpability of Jerusalem's shame. The poem gives us multiple iterations of a woman shamed, ensuring that Jerusalem's shame is recognized and appreciated. Pathos and sympathy are evoked more forcefully because the ambiguity of the image allows for multiple points of contact.

Now, we enter murky waters by claiming menstruation (perhaps more generally, ritual impurity) was shameful. I do not intend to argue that ritual impurity at large was viewed as shameful. We might question whether menstruation carried a connotation of shame more so than other bodily conditions that caused ritual impurity—perhaps due to the inherent sexism in ancient Israel's patriarchal culture. As the limitations of this paper do not allow for a proper discussion on the shaming of a menstruant, I do call us to recognize the likelihood of communicated shame suggested by the text. Whether or not menstruants were shamed in ancient Israel, whether or not menstruation could at times be viewed as shameful, the text nevertheless places the image of a menstruant, twice, in the context of shame. While the use of the menstruant image may or may not suggest an existing connotation of shame, the use of the menstruant so closely with clear depictions of shame (e.g. personified-Jerusalem's nakedness) associates the menstruant in the poem—be it even a miniscule association—with shame.

Further Consideration of נִדָּה in Light of a Rape Metaphor

I have heretofore substantiated an argument of reading נִדָּה as a pun on נָדָה. I have also explained how the ambiguity of נִדָּה in verse 7, with an emphasis on the image of a menstruant, affects our reading of verse 8. I will culminate our discussion on Jerusalem's personification as a menstruant by contrasting verses 8-9 with Lam 1:10:

<i>ydw prs šr 'l kl-mḥmdyh</i>	מִחֲמַדֵּיהָ-יָדוּ פָּרַשׁ צָרַע לְכָל
<i>ky-r' th gwym b 'w mqdšh</i>	רָאָתָה גוֹיִם בָּאוּ מִקִּדְשָׁהּ-כִּי
<i>'šr swyth l' -yb' w bqhl lk</i>	יָבִאוּ בְקִהְל לְךָ-אֲשֶׁר צוּיְתָה לֹא

Enemies have stretched out their hands
 over all her precious things;
 she has even seen the nations
 invade her sanctuary,
 those whom you forbade
 to enter your congregation.

The rhetoric of Jerusalem's sanctuary being invaded holds sexual connotations. The invasion of the sanctuary metaphorizes the invasion of a woman's body. Jerusalem is being (metaphorically) raped.⁵⁷ Dobbs-Allsopp identifies a shift in perspective from Lam 1:8-9 to 1:10. He notes that the poet/poem may be “tap[ping] into the motif's cultural symbolism” in verses 8-9 that, within ancient Israel's patriarchal culture, would permit a certain level of sexual violence or shame against a woman as a punishment for her infidelity.⁵⁸ He continues this line of thought in regards to verse 10:

What is most remarkable, however, is how the common subject matter and their immediate juxtaposition of 1:8-9 and 1:10 compel the reader to identify the two incidents, the net effect of which is to further problematize the already blurred relationship between assault imagery and guilt. The reader cannot help but notice that what is partially evoked as right judgment in 1:8-9...is viewed far more negatively in 1:10, where the intent would appear to be to arouse God's vengeance for the violation of Zion.⁵⁹

Dobbs-Allsopp elucidates the very outcome of the tension the text exhibits over ritual/moral impurity and a theology for the exile. Up through verse 8 and lingering through verse 9 is the explication that Jerusalem sinned with the implication that her downcast state is therefore warranted. Verse 10, though, offers the implication that Jerusalem's punishment is unjust.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 66.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 63.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 66-67.

Jerusalem's violation is sexual and sacred—the metaphor used references Deut 23:3-4, emphasizing the heinousness of the crime.⁶⁰ Jerusalem's sexual impurity is thus brought to a place where Jerusalem is utterly victimized. The interplay of verse 10 with the preceding verses resultingly places emphasis on Jerusalem's shame and horrific state rather than her guilt— conflictedly. The text appears to be grappling with the biblical trope of framing Israel's/Judah's present or past state as a punishment, evident in the language that blames Jerusalem (e.g. "Jerusalem sinned grievously") and contrasts with, for instance, her depiction as a rape victim. To return to the beginning of our discussion on Jerusalem's personification, her victimhood is, perhaps, simultaneously emphasized by her characterization as a daughter. And, Jerusalem's characterization as a daughter carries the potential to communicate her shame as a daughter who is no longer sexually pure. To be repetitive yet again, with verse 10, Jerusalem's sexual purity is challenged by rape. She is simultaneously devalued and victimized. To conclude, we see through the text the atrocity of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem and exile to Babylon that overwhelms the sentiment that Jerusalem deserved what befell upon her. The presentation of this overwhelming horror is made possible through the Jerusalem's nuanced personifications—as daughter, menstruant, whore, and rape victim.

SUMMARY

One of the aims of this paper was to argue in favor of a new methodological approach in understanding elusive words like *גִּדְוָה*. In challenging exclusively etymological and typological approaches in translating *גִּדְוָה*, I argue that *גִּדְוָה*'s nuances and ambiguity must be appreciated. Understanding *גִּדְוָה* as a pun on *גִּדְוָה* enables and enhances this appreciation.

⁶⁰ Deut 23:3: "No Ammonite or Moabite shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD. Even to the tenth generation, none of their descendants shall be admitted to the assembly of the LORD..." Berlin notes, "Not only are the Babylonians equated with Ammon and Moab, but their invasion of the temple is made to seem even more religiously reprehensible because it belies a divine command" (Berlin, *Lamentations*, 55).

Furthermore, *הַיָּד* and *הַיָּד* both operate in the poem to personify Jerusalem as a menstruant. This, in combination with repeated references to Jerusalem's sinning and guilt, challenges a stark dichotomy of ritual and moral impurity. In turn, Jerusalem's shame is depicted holistically and forcefully. Moreover, the supposition that Jerusalem's destruction is a punishment for her sinning is undermined. The poem characterizes Jerusalem as a daughter and then utilizes the image of the menstruant (only complicated by *הַיָּד*'s potential to depict a sexually impure woman) in verse 8, shifting to the depiction of a rape victim in verse 10 to problematize a divine retribution theology for the exile and suggest that Jerusalem's outcome was ultimately unjust and, perhaps, unwarranted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alon, Gedalyahu. "The Bounds of the Laws of Levitical Cleanness" in *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*, 190-234. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977.
- Alter, Robert. "Lamentations." In *The Hebrew Bible: A Translation with Commentary*. Vol. 3, 643-672. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2018.
- Berlin, Adele. *Lamentations: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Büchler, Adolph. *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*. Oxford: UP, 1927.
- Coogan, Michael D., ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*. 3rd ed. Oxford: UP, 2007.
- Davidson, Donald. "What Metaphors Mean." *Critical Inquiry* 5, no.1 (Autumn, 1978): 31-47.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, Frederick W. "Darwinism, Genre Theory, and City Laments." *JAOS* 120, no.4 (2000): 625-630.
- . *Lamentations*. Louisville: James Knox Press, 2002.

- . “Lamentations from Sundry Angles: A Retrospective.” In *Lamentations in Ancient and Contemporary Cultural Contexts*, edited by Nancy C. Lee and Carleen Mandolfo, 13-26. Atlanta: Brill, 2008.
- . “Linguistic Evidence for the Date of Lamentations.” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 26 (1998): 1-36.
- . *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 1966.
- Hillers, Delbert. *Lamentations*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972.
- Klawans, Jonathan. “Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity: Moral Defilement in Ancient Judaism.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 29, no. 4. (Leiden: Brill, 1998): 391-415.
- . *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: UP, 2000.
- . “Pure Violence: Sacrifice and Defilement in Ancient Israel.” *The Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 2 (2001): 133–155.
- . *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: UP, 2006.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Paul Kahle, Otto Eissfeldt, Hans Bardtke, Hans P. Rüger, Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, Gérard E. Weil, and D W. Thomas. [*Torah, Nevi'im U-Khetuvim*] = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. “𐤇𐤍𐤁.” *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Lackoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: UP, 1980.
- Lam, Joseph. *Patterns of Sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, Culture, and the Making of a Religious Concept*. Oxford: UP, 2016.

Maier, Christl. *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Provan, Iain. *Lamentations*. Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering, 1991.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel. "Violence and Exegesis: The History of Exile."
In *A Biblical Theology of Exile*, 27-74. Minneapolis: Augsburg
Fortress, 2002.